

October 4, 1971

Harold H. Sandstead, M.D.
United States Department of Agriculture
Agricultural Research Service
Human Nutrition Research Division
Human Nutrition Laboratory
2420 Second Avenue, North
Grand Forks, North Dakota 58201

Dear Doctor Sandstead:

Thanks for your note of September 28. I appreciate your courtesy the more because of the manner in which my contribution to this subject, which, until recently, were directed largely toward an understanding of the occupational problem of exposure to lead, had been received by a certain segment of the scientific community. I even hesitated to commend your report, except in a strictly private communication, lest my approval should turn out to be its "kiss of death," so virulent have been the attacks upon me.

If I have turned out to be a bit defensive in the off moments of my later years, you will be able to understand something of the stress of finding out what a base deceive I am reputed to be, particularly when you read the article in the Saturday Review of two weeks ago. Not that Paul Craig mentioned me in his article. As a one-time associate of Claire Patterson at California Institute of Technology, he is probably aware that a personal attack is not an entirely convincing technique. The separation of fact from fancy, however, in the mind of even an intelligent lay audience, is not very effective, when the allegedly trained scientist cannot, himself, differentiate between documented evidence and hearsay sources of alleged information, relating to the fields of phenomena entirely beyond his competence to appraise. This is the aspect of this entire problem of our attempts to protect ourselves, i.e., mankind, against the often blind technology of our time, which gives me a skeptical glance. If we cannot investigate, without the need for investigation, of itself, making a case against a product or a process, or an enterprise, what chance do we have to find the truth about a situation. Such a chance exists, it seems, only when there is an agency, an institution, or a unit sponsored by government which has acquired public confidence. We are, indeed, in a parlous state when the enemies of the "establishment" exercise every means of destroying public confidence in everything which stands, in any way, as a symbol of whatever is meant by the "governing" or "ruling" or influential class, and succeed, even for a time, in doing so. Unfortunately modern life yields up to all discerning people too many examples of intuitive errors, apparent misjudgments, and seemingly willful malfeasances of responsibilities for personal gain of one kind or another, some of which may be seen fairly clearly, but many of which are subject to the interpretation of the press, radio and television.

But I had not intended to give vent to my increasing concern about such matters, in relation to the present and future status of America in the world. I trust you will not think of me as an unduly apprehensive man, for my impulse was merely to express my personal appreciation of your courtesy. It so happens, however, that I am writing a piece for a 'Festschrift' in honor of Alice Hamilton, which has involved me fairly

Harold H. Sandstead, M.D.

Page 2

October 4, 1971

deeply in the consideration of the "then" and "now" of the Mexican scene, as I have reread some of her letters to me.

Cordially yours,

Robert A. Kehoe, M.D.
Professor Emeritus of
Occupational Medicine

Ruf:wb