

November 19, 1963

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

Dear Professor Warren:

Your letter of October 25th arrived at a time when I scarcely had time to read it (and no time to read your paper), so that I was unable to reply to you in any useful manner. I have little more time now, and certainly I cannot review your paper before replying, but I cannot bring myself to ignore your nice letter for longer than present circumstances require of me.

Perhaps, I should explain to you, that while I was in Madrid at an international meeting, my associate, Professor Frank Princi, died suddenly, and all of the responsibilities which he had shared with me for years were returned to me. Considering that we were both very busy at the time, and that the schedule of the Graduate School involved the opening of school on the first of October, I have been unable to finish my day's work at any time since my return home. I shall catch up, ultimately, no doubt, but not very soon.

I am sure that you are aware of the difficulties of the position which you occupy in relation to biological and medical problems, for the second paragraph of your letter so indicates. It seems to me that, so long as you retain this attitude, you will not make any very serious blunders. I noted what you said on page 8 of your paper about toxicity, and I cannot but regard this as an example of naivete. It is, in fact unwise for the inexperienced person to talk about toxicity in any other than very broad lay terms, for the entire matter depends so upon physiological considerations as to be utterly unintelligible otherwise. Incidentally, the dosage of "colloidal lead" used hopefully at one time in the treatment of cancer was not small, as your words suggest, but was dangerously large. This was abandoned not because of the danger, but because it was an unsuccessful type of therapy. The dose could easily have been kept within safe limits, but the therapy would then have been even less promising. This is neither here nor there, for your words have not done any damage to my views, although they suggest that I was willing to take a chance on inducing ill effects in my subjects. The fact is that I was investigating the physiologic responses of human subjects wholly within safe limits, being certain in advance that they were incurring no risk.

I shall read your entire paper when I can find the time, and if I have any criticisms to offer I'll send them along. I have no doubt, however, that the facts and their meaning will be sorted out fairly well and that I need not be unduly concerned about my failure to make suggestions before the publication of your paper.

Sincerely yours,

RAK:vr

Robert A. Kehoe, M.D.

LE 00535