

Shrp

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT

MET-980

August 20, 1937

Dr. Leroy W. Gardner, Director,
Sarason Laboratory,
7 Church Street,
Sarason Lake, N.Y.

Dear Dr. Gardner:

I have read carefully your letter of August 18 and the attached correspondence. While I am in sympathy with your reactions to Dr. Hais' paper and can appreciate the attitude of Enechle and Sayers, I think it would be a great mistake to approach the A.M.A. with the idea of postponing or blocking the publication of Hais' paper.

Dr. Hais is a reputable physician in very good standing. He presents in this paper conclusions based upon the clinical study of his patients and he is entitled to do this the same as anyone else. If his conclusions are faulty, based upon insufficient evidence or resulting from the old fallacy of adding up 2 and 2 and getting 11, then the proper thing to do is for those who differ with him to come back at him through the Journal. I think you will agree with me that it would be highly undesirable for any special interests to block the publication of bona fide articles on the basis that the objection thought that they were wrong or untimely. If the writer had gone off at half cock, then he lets himself open to attack and if the objection can be successfully maintained, everybody is better off.

Incidentally, the whole thing has been published by Hais in the Military Surgeon for August, which makes it all the more certain that it will not be published in the A.M.A. and at the same time leaves you and Sanders free to open the heavy artillery on the article.

What's the dope on California?

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. Lamm, M.D.
Assistant Medical Director

cc to Dr. Sayers

003518

PRODUCED S/C/M/Ms

August 20, 1937

Dr. Leroy W. Gardner, Director,
Sarason Laboratory,
7 Church Street,
Sarason Lake, N.Y.

Dear Dr. Gardner:

I have read carefully your letter of August 18 and the attached correspondence. While I am in sympathy with your reactions to Dr. Hais' paper and can appreciate the attitude of Enckle and Sayers, I think it would be a great mistake to approach the A.M.A. with the idea of postponing or blocking the publication of Hais' paper.

Dr. Hais is a reputable physician in very good standing. He presents in this paper conclusions based upon the clinical study of his patients and he is entitled to do this the same as anyone else. If his conclusions are faulty, based upon insufficient evidence or resulting from the old fallacy of adding up 2 and 2 and getting 11, then the proper thing to do is for those who differ with him to come back at him through the Journal. I think you will agree with me that it would be highly undesirable for any special interests to block the publication of bona fide articles on the basis that the objector thought that they were wrong or untrue. If the writer has gone off at half cock, then he lets himself open to attack and if the objection can be successfully maintained, everybody is better off.

Incidentally, the whole thing has been published by Hais in the Military Surgeon for August, which makes it all the more certain that it will not be published in the A.M.A. and at the same time leaves you and Sanders free to open the heavy artillery on the article.

What's the Gaps or California?

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. Lamm, M.D.
Assistant Medical Director

cc to Dr. Gardner

003518

PRODUCED S/C/M/Ms