

October 11, 1948

Miss Margaret S. Perry, Editor
The Journal of Industrial Hygiene and Toxicology
55 Shattuck Street
Boston 15, Massachusetts

Dear Miss Perry:

I am sorry that I have been so slow in the returning of the manuscript enclosed herewith. It came at a time when I was out of the laboratory, and unfortunately I have spent most of the last month away from my office. It was impossible to return it promptly with my comments. This was especially true because I felt it necessary to take serious exceptions to the efforts of the authors, and therefore it was necessary to explain my viewpoint in some detail.

In studying the manuscript I made certain pencil notes in the margin and elsewhere. This I probably should not have done, but my editorial habits betrayed me, especially at points where I felt that serious criticism was needed. I trust that this will not embarrass you unduly, and certainly what I have written in can easily be erased. I would have erased these marks myself, except for the fact that I feel they may reveal something of the nature of my criticism which may not be wholly evident otherwise.

You and your reviewers may feel that I am being unduly severe in my criticism of this paper. If so, you will not wish to accept my judgment. It is by no means necessary that you should, of course, but I wish to make one additional comment concerning the publication of this paper. If it is published in anything like its present form, I shall have to prepare a paper based on the accumulated data of more than fifteen years, in an effort to offset what I consider a devastating attack on sound methods of dealing with this problem in the lead trades. The data being used in this paper are only a minute fraction of data which we have collected from corresponding industries, and I believe I can show clearly what Hamlin and Weber are saying is largely the result of an inept and inexperienced approach to this general problem. In commenting on their paper at the time of the meeting at which it was presented in slightly different form, I was only gently critical. I actually commended their resort to methods which would give useful information and I concluded by saying that if they would stick to their observations, they would come around to our point of view. This may have sounded patronizing, but I did not mean it that way. The publication of this paper, on the