July 1st, 1936

Mr. W. S. Campfield
The Virginia State Horticultural Society
Staunton, Virginia

Dear Mr. Campfield:

I have gone to some little trouble to make notations on your manuscript, not because there is anything wrong with what you said, but rather because I feel that what you say must be said rather carefully. For example, you will note that I have cut out your sentence indicating "that one of the big problems in the lead residue situation would be to change the attitude of scientists, etc." In my opinion this is an unwise statement and I have, therefore, deleted it. It would antagonize a considerable number of men, and to no purpose. In fact I have deleted or modified any and every statement in your article which would place me indirectly in a controversial position. This is not because I dislike controversy so excessively, but rather because controversy with regard to the subject of experimentation should come after the facts are obtained, rather than before. Moreover in connection with this lead problem, one must bear continually in mind the problem of the physician who knows whatever we may choose to say, that lead poisoning is an all too frequent occurrence. The doctor who sees these cases usually has no way of telling the magnitude of the exposure. He does know, however, that his patient is sick and in many instances, though not always, he is right in believing that he has lead poisoning. He is, therefore, very loathe to accept any situation which he believes has a certain element of risk attached to it, and no amount of criticism will change his attitude. It can be changed only by convincing data, and in this field the data are not yet available except in a certain limited way. It is wise, therefore, not to engage in controversy, and although I realize that you are in some measure trying to stimulate an interest in this subject, and to raise new hope, we must not - at least I must not - anticipate the results.

Very truly yours,

RAK:is

Robert A. Kehoe, M.D.

KE 0020173