

*Geigy file
Dr. Deichmann author-
izing publication*

July 16, 1946 - 1130

Dr. McKeen Cattell,
Department of Pharmacology,
Cornell University Medical College,
1300 York Avenue,
New York City 21.

Dear Dr. Cattell:

Thanks very much for your letter of July 8. I am not re-submitting the paper on DDT at this time, but rather am raising the question for your consideration.

I can very well realize the attitude of your Journal toward the publication of evidence on this or any other problem that is merely confirmatory in character. As I indicated in my letter to Dr. Wallace, the contribution made in this Laboratory on the subject of DDT was principally concerned with the critical examination of the toxicity and the more obvious aspects of the mode of action of DDT. At the time we came into this picture it was believed that a number of laboratories ought to be engaged in this work. The Geigy Company was sent to us on the advice of technical people in the Department of Agriculture, and what we really undertook to do was to examine these matters independently. As it happened, and as a matter of fact, as might have been expected, our results agreed substantially with those of the other investigators who were experienced people in this field of work. We undertook some additional investigations, which were of a rather sketchy type. Practically all of these matters were included in Dr. Deichmann's paper, and I am frank to say that certain points were not very well presented. Actually for reasons which are neither here nor there, the paper went to Dr. Wallace without having received the critical examination that it should have had at my hands. On the basis of the criticisms returned to Dr. Deichmann by the Editorial Board, most of the material of real consequence was stripped out of the paper and the fragments so-to-speak, which represented something new or different, remained. Under these circumstances I am not very keen to publish the revised paper. I recognize that the work done on the physiological side was not complete, or even well rounded out, and in view of the physiological information available from other sources and obtained by other techniques, I do not consider it a very meritorious contribution to the subject. I do think that there is ample justification for presenting the confirmatory data on the toxicity and general mode of action of this material. There are new questions arising about it every day, and as a consequence the weight of evidence from a variety of sources is required to establish the nature of certain effects and the absence of certain others.

KE 0020135

Dr. McKeen Cattell - (2) - July 16, 1946

If it could be agreed that this is a valid argument, I am quite prepared to review our evidence quite carefully to present it as briefly as possible, and yet as comprehensively as need be, and to strip out of it any of the experimental procedures that can be regarded as ambiguous or in any way dubious. In this manner the essential evidence on the subject as obtained by this Laboratory could be presented for what it is worth, in support of the point of view which is now prevailing.

You may feel that your Journal is not the place for such an article. If so, it will probably be a matter of convenience for you to say so, since under those circumstances I shall not put you to the trouble or perhaps the embarrassment of considering this paper for publication.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

Robert A. Kehoe, M. D.

FAK ef

Dictated but not read.

KE 0020136