Aug. 5th, 19

Mr. Brinton M., Brompton 46, New.

Dear Sir Ronald—

I have read the 'Smoking: The Cancer Controversy' by you. I have no idea who sent it but I have read it with pleasure. Many of the articles I had read previously in journals or in reprints. Even the last item "Inhaling" I had seen in the Digest of TIRC. Without further analysis I should hesitate to draw the conclusion even in jest that inhaling reduced the 'cigarette' plume to being cancer. The statistical finding is that cigarette smoking as contrasted with cigar and pipe smoking is a generally lethal practice raising the death rate from a great many diseases and differentially it may raise the death rate or at any rate the excess deaths from other diseases and notably from coronary disease more than from lung cancer. This makes it very difficult to fit a really good control---by the usual method in retrospective studies of taking the controls of disease in patients who have not diseases but some other diseases bringing them to the hospital. I told TIRC when they asked me to come to a meeting and before I was in their Sci. Adv. Rev. that they could forget about lung cancer (cigarettes 1914, 76 deaths) because the main reason for the rise in the general death rate would be forced to be due to the excess of deaths in the coronary group. (In America their figures to be 4 times the excess deaths in the heavy cigarette group.)

Now if the coronary group were in the controls and were chiefly due to the eaters one might well find that the heavy cigarette group were less eaters than the controls. Of course, actually, this may not be the case but unless proven out, it might well be at least in this country. When only 13% of the excess deaths is in the heavy cigarette group and 87% in the others proves and when the relative effects of inhaling on the various excess deaths is not explored, I doubt if the conclusion relative to