

October 11, 1948

Miss Margaret S. Perry, Editor
The Journal of Industrial Hygiene and Toxicology
55 Shattuck Street
Boston 15, Massachusetts

Dear Miss Perry:

I am sorry that I have been so slow in the returning of the manuscript enclosed herewith. It came at a time when I was out of the laboratory, and unfortunately I have spent most of the last month away from my office. It was impossible to return it promptly with my comments. This was especially true because I felt it necessary to take serious exceptions to the efforts of the authors, and therefore it was necessary to explain my viewpoint in some detail.

In studying the manuscript I made certain pencil notes in the margin and elsewhere. This I probably should not have done, but my editorial habits betrayed me, especially at points where I felt that serious criticism was needed. I trust that this will not embarrass you unduly, and certainly what I have written in can easily be erased. I would have erased these marks myself, except for the fact that I feel they may reveal something of the nature of my criticism which may not be wholly evident otherwise.

You and your reviewers may feel that I am being unduly severe in my criticism of this paper. If so, you will not wish to accept my judgment. It is by no means necessary that you should, of course, but I wish to make one additional comment concerning the publication of this paper. If it is published in anything like its present form, I shall have to prepare a paper based on the accumulated data of more than fifteen years, in an effort to offset what I consider a devastating attack on sound methods of dealing with this problem in the lead trades. The data being used in this paper are only a minute fraction of data which we have collected from corresponding industries, and I believe I can show clearly what Hamlin and Weber are saying is largely the result of an inept and inexperienced approach to this general problem. In commenting on their paper at the time of the meeting at which it was presented in slightly different form, I was only gently critical. I actually commended their resort to methods which would give useful information and I concluded by saying that if they would stick to their observations, they would come around to our point of view. This may have sounded patronizing, but I did not mean it that way. The publication of this paper, on the

most active in this are rediscovering what some of us have outgrown years ago. This flurry will have run its course in five or ten years or less when present information shall have gained more current application. The Journal should not, without great caution, lend itself as the sounding board for this activity. It should demand contributions to our information, not inadequately supported expressions of opinion. By such policy it will continue to have reason for pride in what it has done to advance concepts and practice in the field of industrial hygiene.

- To return to this paper - It is possible or even likely that the facts represented in this paper could be assembled advantageously in such a manner as to be useful. First, a simple statement would be required as to their origin in a program which is not as yet fully developed and perfected. Then should come the presentation of the data in more appropriate form (by years, for example, and/or with illustrations of variability in relation to time and method of sampling and analysis). Then a modest and tentative interpretation of further procedure and applications of procedure could properly be made. "Impressions" referred to previously, could be stated, but the thesis that present standards are too exacting for "practical" purposes, on the basis of the apparent accomplishments up to date, is presumptuous and impertinent and, excepting as it is made naively, and in ignorance of what others have done and published, it is professionally reprehensible. Such a statement should not be countenanced in the pages of the Journal on such flimsy evidence as has been provided. Also the philosophy concerning the health of the "greatest number of men" cannot be acceptable, without very careful qualifications, to the Journal. Actually I think this philosophy is badly expressed rather than badly conceived, but certainly it cannot be accepted as it is said, for the sake of either "practicality" or common decency.