

CORRESPONDENCE

November 26th, 1960

To The Editor, *Alpine Journal*

Alpine Club, London, W.1.

North Face, Cima Grande, ordinary route

First climbed by G. Dimai, A. Dimai and E. Comici (1933).

DEAR SIR,

I have read with very great interest the descriptions of the climbs of the North faces of the Tre Cime di Lavaredo made by C. J. S. Bonington. I was however, somewhat surprised to see that he considers the ordinary route of the North face of the Cima Grande as Standard—Grade IV.

On referring to the *Guida Dei Monti D'Italia—Dolomite Orientali*, Vol I, by Dr. Antonio Berti—the standard work published by the Club Alpino Italiano—one finds this climb graded as a VI (See Page 522 'Dis livello C. 550 m. 6° Grado'). Further if one examines the standard German work—the Guide-book by Dr. Gunter Langes *Dolomiten - Kletterführer Band II Östliche Dolomiten* we find on Page 125 under Par. 259—a description of this climb—which is rated also as a VI.

I showed Bonington's article to Gaston Rébuffat. He was surprised as much as I was to find it graded as a IV. It is true that he and Solda climbed this route in 1949—in 4 hours, but these climbers are in the forefront of their profession. Rébuffat's remark was that if the climb was a IV—why should it take 10 hours? (Bonington's figure on page 184). The height is about 500 metres.

It will be interesting to hear from other members of the club on this matter.

Yours sincerely

RICHARD AYRTON.

[We thank Mr. Ayrton for drawing attention to this error. Mr. Bonington writes 'The North face is undoubtedly a Grade VI, though no longer a hard one owing to the number of pitons already in place.'—Editor.]

Trivor Base Camp

24.8.60

To the Editor

DEAR SIR,

I was very interested in Sir Arnold Lunn's paper on the Writings of Geoffrey Winthrop Young, and admire him for tackling so complex a subject.

Unfortunately the discussion afterwards was closed before one or two of us were able to make points on the paper, and there were many which deserved to be made. I am therefore risking a letter from the Karakoram (I say risk, because I am not able here to check up memory by consulting others).

So far as I remember, Anthony Rawlinson's point, which I endorse, was that while the Cornhill accounts might have a freshness and verbal spontaneity which appeals, they are not the great writing of *On High Hills*. My own query concerned his so-called 'philosophy'. Sir Arnold seemed to find his philosophy weak because, having got so far in his perception of a something behind the majesty of mountains, he refused to go a step further and turn that something into God.

Of course he refused. I talked with him many times of these things and he seemed to me perfectly logical. He was as logical an agnostic as A. C. Pigou in his refusal to be driven on, through the many things he marvelled at but did not understand, into something he personally could not believe. But because all roads do not lead to Rome, or anywhere near it, that does not mean that they lead nowhere.

Yours etc.,

WILFRID NOYCE.