Dear Charles,

Thanks for yours of May 15th.

Firstly, I quite appreciate that of course any final commitment you are undertaking must up to a point depend on your agreement to the final plans for the project, but I assure you I don't think there will be any problem there.

We are having a meeting next Tuesday, and we will then discuss your papers I and II, but before that, I would like to make a couple of points which I would be grateful if you could respond on before that date.

One

1. Can I persuade you to make this up to £5000, as I proposed in my letter of 8th May? If, for example, you pay the judges £250 (that seems a decent minimum) and if you have five judges, half your expenses are gone before you start. If you have seven, you have only got £750 left for all other expenses, which will hardly cover them. I can assure you that everyone concerned will keep the expenses to a minimum, and have no doubt that you yourselves will to a considerable degree be in control of them.

2. I do think you should guarantee to keep the award going (except in the unlikely event of mutual consent to fold) for a minimum of more than two years. I asked for seven, feel it should be not less than five, but two is really unfairly short. Would you think about this again? The option periods to extend seem to me very fair.
Charles Tyrrell Esq  2  16th May 1968

Two

I have only one point here, which is that in part 5 I'm afraid you are slightly misquoting me. What I said was that the prize should be given to a book a great number of people might enjoy reading; that is very different from 'the greatest', but it is a small point.

All the other points should certainly be open to discussion between us, and I will come back to you about them as soon as we have had our meeting next Tuesday, to arrange one with you.

Yours

[Signature]
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