c/O Oliver & Boyd,
Publishers.

The Cancer Controversy

Dear Sir Ronald,

When the TIMES agony notice of your pamphlet was shewn to me today I was thrilled at the idea, honoured to find myself in such illustrious company as a challenger of the smoking correlation. To be truthful, I was also chagrined to have been anticipated, for I am almost ready to publish a statistical denial of the carcinogenic assumption. But I go on from there to some unconsidered consequences to the cancer problem arising from the assumption.

I sent my view to Hill and Doll some years ago. Their reply seemed unimpressed. Then, when Huxley published "Biological Aspects of Cancer" last Spring, obviously influenced by the correlation and the superiority of multiple correlation over the causation concept, I sent him a chart showing universal cancer death rate unaffected by the lung cancer increase. He replied "I don't understand you." I think he understood but couldn't accept. This decided me to do a paper to the R.S.S.

Feeling so alone I've dawdled with it and spent half the year "tidying up".

P.T.O.
I am sending this with my order to O & E., asking them to forward it to you. I have, therefore, not yet seen your pamphlet and do not know whether and how much we may overlap. If I find I've something worthwhile to say which you have not already said, may I take the liberty of sending my MS to you for an opinion?

For background: I am a member of the London Group of the Industrial Applications Section of the R.S.S., and am well known to Dr Bernard Dudding.

Yours sincerely,

Harry Howell.