(1) John Cuttle 3/[illegible]
(2) ~~Reading~~ file.
Classified Problem

BROOKHAVEN NATIONAL LABORATORY
ASSOCIATED UNIVERSITIES, INC.
UPTON, L.I., N.Y. 11973
TEL. YAPHANK 4-6262

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT

REFER: R
408408

November 4, 1963

REPOSITORY NARA - College Park
COLLECTION Hal Hollister's Files
BOX No. 1 (NN3-326-92-001)
FOLDER Classified ATTACK STUDY Problems I & II, 1963

Hal Hollister, Chief
Technical Analysis Branch
Division of Biology and Medicine
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission
Washington 25, D.C.

Dear Hal:

I must again apologize for delay in answering your letter of September 9. However, I circulated your report to members of the staff, and it just took this long to get it back with comments. I shall limit my remarks to Appendix E.

The general tenor of comments, including my own, run about as follows. The impression one would derive from reading Appendix E is at variance with what we feel should be given, and actually we disagree with quite a number of the statements made. I doubt that the book by P. Alexander is the best place from which to extract this type of information. Our knowledge of effects of radiation is much more precise than that indicated in the write-up. A few examples might suffice. On page 2 it is stated that antibiotics do not increase the resistance of the animals to a lethal dose of radiation. It has been clearly demonstrated in the mouse that antibiotics alone very substantially increase the LD_{50}, and we have shown in dogs that antibiotics combined with platelet transfusions very significantly increase the dose level at which animals can still survive. On page 3 the impression is given that we do not know the chain of events leading to death. While there certainly is more to be learned, we do have a very good idea of the chain of events leading to death. On page 7 it says that the outcome is almost entirely dependent upon the make-up of the individual and there is little opportunity for the physician to influence the course of the illness. I think this gives a completely inaccurate impression, since there is a great deal the physician can do to influence the course of the disease. The statements in the last paragraph on the page simply are not consistent with the fact, as are the statements in the first full paragraph on page 10. I can give a number of other examples

but I think this is probably sufficient to indicate our thoughts, and to indicate that we feel Alexander's book is not a good source for this type of information.

I would strongly recommend that other source material such as Behren's book "Atomic Medicine" be used for this sort of information. Also the book by Cronkite and myself, "Radiation Injury in Man", although it has definite defects, certainly is a better source of information than that used.

I am sorry that I cannot be perhaps more in agreement with what was presented, but I know you prefer a straight-forward evaluation. Please let me know if we can be of any further help.

With best regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

V. P. Bond, M.D.
Chairman
Medical Department

swf