

Rehe MS
Px 99

May 26, 1933

Dr. Philip Drinker,
The Journal of Industrial Hygiene,
55 Van Dyke St.,
Boston, Mass.

Dear Doctor Drinker:-

I thank you for your letter of May 23rd. I understand your position, and in so far as I am able to do so I am glad to comply with your feeling and that of your associates in the matter of my criticisms of Fairhall's methods. The difficulty, as I have indicated in the appended pages, resides in the fact that Fairhall has not been specific as to the details of his procedure and I have been unable, therefore, to compare methods side by side. Thus I have been compelled to test our methods step by step, to ascertain their accuracy, and to employ the results only as the basis of comparison. I believe, from the data alone, I am justified in concluding that Fairhall's method is relatively inaccurate, since our results have been verified by different methods elsewhere. I should not hesitate, therefore, to allow him to make any reply to my criticisms that may occur to him. On the other hand I do not wish to argue the point with you, and I do not wish to place the onus of a controversy on your doorstep. I hate arguments and polemics and I should be glad to avoid them. Therefore I am sending you a modified and augmented page 14 for the 2nd paper, which if satisfactory to you can be substituted for the one now in your hands. If you prefer the original I am willing to have it stand as it is, subject to reply by Dr. Fairhall.

In the matter of the time of publication, I should be pleased to defray the additional expense involved in the publication of the papers in the same issue if the cost is not prohibitive. They are so closely related that it would be a great advantage to have them appear at the same time. If you will give me an approximate idea of the expense I shall give you a prompt reply. By that time I hope to have the sixth paper of the series completed.

Cordially yours,

Robert A. Kehoe