

NORTH EASTON, Mass.

October 10th, 1922.

My dear Mr. Powell:

Your good letter of the twenty-seventh September has just been read. Your understanding of the use to be made of "type labels" is now correct. I will make the changes you suggest and at the same time substitute the new herbarium label for the old. I believe I have on hand enough for the purpose.

The additional material of your no. 47, *Camaridium affine* Schltr., is a delight. This will be added to the sheet at once.

Your camera-lucida drawing of *Habenaria petalodes* var. is most promising. As a rule you ought to secure best results from fresh material. It is not necessary to flatten out the flowers as you did with the *Epidendrum*. Try to get a symmetrical arrangement and then draw the flower carefully up to the capacity of the camera-lucida. Then fill in surface details, shading of calli etc. by observation through a medium powered lens. A binocular dissecting microscope is excellent for finishing up a drawing. We use one constantly as it reveals the structure of minute details in pleasant relief and brings out things that the one-eyed instruments seem unable to accent.

I will give the matter of permanent plant labels my best attention and send you a supply next week.

*Epidendrum confusum* Rolfe = *Epidendrum pentotis* Reichenb. f. fide Rolfe! Schlechter thinks that the Central American species usually referred to *E. pentotis* = *Epidendrum Beccroydianum* Schltr. I am not yet decided in my own mind as to the final treatment of this matter.

I have noted the change in the names of



Oct. 10, 1922

2

numbers 83 & 84. When I was in Berlin, Schlechter showed me the specimen he had determined to be *Epidendrum asperum* Lindl. I assured him that he was well off the track; that from my studies of the Kew Set I was convinced that your 84 was new. Then we came to 83 determined as *Epidendrum profusum* Rolfe. I told him that his determination was wrong and that from my present knowledge it was a new species. So much for that little episode. Apparently you have profited through my trip to Berlin.

I move to winter quarters on Monday next. Then for constructive work. Since my return home from Europe my orchid work has been chiefly the preparation for the herbarium of the wonderful collections I made in England, France, Austria and Berlin.

I really have Panama in my mental list of places to be visited soon. There is no reason why I should not drop down your way this winter as I have from mid-February to April free from classes.

In your letter of the twenty-seventh, you ask what you characterize as a very pertinent question. Let me answer it in a straightforward manner, not as a question of the relationship that exists between you and Schlechter but as a question that has to do with any collector. Unless you are bound by some very delicate agreement you have a perfect right to send your material anywhere you wish to send it. Or you can send any part of it to authorities who may be specializing in any part. For example, knowing that Kraenzli is monographing *Masdevallia* and *Dichaea* and other genera for the *Pflanzenreich* you might be prompted to send him material of these genera to benefit by the conclusions of a monograph. Or if you knew that I was working intensively among the



Oct. 10, 1922

3

species of *Epidendrum* you might wish to send your specimens of that genus to me. Or you might ~~yo~~ decide to put your herbarium specimens on sale to obtain funds for the development of your garden. In that case you would be free to send material to the institution that would pay the highest rate per specimen. In the final analysis you are at liberty to do what you wish. I quite understand your desire to keep your specimens in the United States. I almost wept when I discovered how much Central American material is going to Germany at a time when I have the preparation of a flora in hand for the United States National Museum. Why not take this matter up with Dr. Standley or Mr. Maxon, of the United States National Museum. I am sure that you could rely on their decision. Whatever you do I must impress upon you the fact that it was with deep regret that I learned of the unfortunate circumstances that turned you away from our institutions, first to Kew and then to Schlechter. It seemed as though fate was working against us. Notwithstanding my friendly relations with Schlechter, nobody would receive with greater joy the news that you had decided to give Americans an opportunity to keep America free from Germany in the realm of Panama orchids. Although science is admittedly international I am convinced that supremacy in science is national. It pains me to think that we should join with German colonists, or sojourners to swell the stream of material that goes to Germany. I feel stronger than ever about this since my visit to Berlin. I realize that I have expressed myself very clumsily in answering your question, but I have restrained myself purposely because the desire to go deep had to be kept in check.

Yours faithfully,

Oakes Ames





Ames, Oakes. 1922. "Ames, Oakes Oct. 10, 1922 [to C.W. Powell]." *Oakes Ames Orchid Herbarium correspondence files*

**View This Item Online:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/262809>

**Permalink:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/281093>

**Holding Institution**

Harvard University Botany Libraries

**Sponsored by**

Harvard University. Anonymous Donor.

**Copyright & Reuse**

Copyright Status: Public domain. The BHL considers that this work is no longer under copyright protection.

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org>.