

April 12, 1965

Professor Harry V. Warren  
Department of Geology  
The University of British Columbia  
Vancouver 8, Canada

Dear Professor Warren:

Please accept my thanks for your letter of March 10 and the material enclosed with it. I am hard pressed for time, especially at this end of the year, and we shall be short-handed until Dr. Radford comes to take over. Therefore, I have had time only to glance at the material. I hope soon to have time to review it more carefully.

I wonder if you have seen the publications and some of the other reports of C.C. Patterson and his associates concerning some of their investigations. I find it difficult to appraise the technical oceanographic work, and the direct interpretation of the findings, in relation to the sources of lead, seems to carry inferences that go far beyond the facts. These matters I cannot judge with competence. As to his venture into the biological field and his sweeping conclusions therein, he has certainly gone a bit wild, and because of this I am forced to question his judgment in his own field. Be these things as they may, I am due to be involved in a controversy, it seems, and this controversy starts out in a professional atmosphere which I find very unfortunate. It appears to Dr. Patterson, I am told, that I am and have been the tool of the lead industries for many years, and that he has no wish to communicate with me in any manner. This is in such contrast with the usual attitude of one's scientific colleagues, including those like yourself, whose technical approach to the problem of the mineral elements is so different and hence so intriguing, that I find it difficult to view it charitably. I am all the more interested in talking with you on this account, since your field and that of Dr. Patterson are related.

There is so much to be done in this field of phenomena, and there are so many things that are of intense interest and of practical importance in the fields of industrial and public health, not to mention the over-all nutritional and general physiological

Professor Warren (2) April 12, 1965

significance of these elements, that one should be cautious in his conclusions. The posture of the crusader is not the posture of the scientist, albiet it is not always feasible to define the characteristics of the scientific teacher in terms that differentiate him from the crusader. Perhaps, the differential characteristic is that of humility in facing the realms of the unknown, and perhaps one should not expect this in the young scientist.

I wonder whether any engagements or meetings may bring you in this direction between now and the middle of July. If there should be such an opportunity, please let me know, and I'll undertake to arrange a meeting with our graduate students.

Sincerely yours,

---

Robert A. Kehoe, M.D.  
Director

RAK:meh

LE ■ 00525