

January 12, 1948

Mr. Philip Drinker,
Harvard School of Public Health,
55 Shattuck Street,
Boston 15, Mass.

Dear Phil:

I am slow in replying to your letter of December 15, with respect to Dr. Haag's paper. As you can imagine, the year's end imposes a great many urgent duties, and this paper has had to wait. However, I have looked it over and have also asked Dr. Heyroth to do so, and I am glad to give you our joint opinions, which are in complete agreement.

Considering the great bulk of published work on DDT, none of which has appeared in your journal, I should feel that you were fully justified in your refusal to publish this paper. Incidentally we have a long paper ourselves which we would like to publish, but we have not felt justified in submitting it to you. This fact should prove our sincerity in arriving at the present conclusion.

The data on DDD are for the most part new, but since this is related to DDT, I can see no good reason for separating it out, and thus creating a paper which would be a useful contribution to this subject. The most of the published material on DDT has appeared in the Journal of Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics and in supplements to Public Health Reports. I doubt if the editor of the Journal of Pharmacology would accept this paper, but it might be worth a trial. Public Health Reports might be willing to take it.

The material on DDT is scarcely new except, perhaps, in its relation to the hazards of the use of ultrasene sprays and emulsion sprays for agricultural purposes. These data might properly belong in your journal, since I feel that the occupational hazards of agriculture are a part of industrial hygiene. However, Public Health Reports may be regarded as a proper site for the publication of such information.

The paper seems to me to be a very good one. Our only reservation concerning it lies in the failure to find evidence of damage to the organs in association with chronic feeding experiments using DDT. Other observers have found evidence of such injury. However, this may not be regarded as a very serious criticism, and it is certainly not one that I would emphasize.

I would like to see this published and I would like to see ours published, and I would also like to see some of Cattell's observations more fully represented in the literature. However, it is our

Mr. Philip Drinker - (2) - January 12, 1948

feeling as well as Cattell's, that this subject has taken a great deal of space already, and that further articles are going to have to take their chances in finding audiences that are specifically concerned with any new and original contributions to our knowledge. We have come to the conclusion that we shall have to publish in the Journal of Economic Entomology.

I have no objection to being quoted if it seems advisable to you, although I should prefer, by the circumstances of our own dilemma, not to be, as I might not be regarded as wholly disinterested. In any case, I would prefer that you did not mention the last named journal as an outlet for Dr. Haag's paper, for obvious reasons.

I hate to be a party to turning down good papers, but I realize your difficulty and I agree with your viewpoint.

The paper is returned herewith.

Sincerely yours,

Robert A. Kehoe, M. D.

HAK ef

Enc.

VE 03946