

Because I wanted to do everything possible to set the accusations and allegations of the documents into the right perspective, I wrote to the Publisher of the Medical Tribune and described to him the highly unusual behavior of one of his Editors, a behavior which I felt to be quite opposite to the slogan on the Tribune's mast-head: fast-accurate-complete ! I got a fast response, but that was all: Mr. H. called apologizing for his rudeness; he had been ill for weeks, unable to go to the office, to get his mail or to review all the new information which had become available; he asked for my permission to discuss the whole matter with me again when he had come up to date. I agreed under the condition that nothing would be published about the documents until then and that my reply would appear together with any article he would decide to write later. He said that he was willing to abide.

I have never heard from him again!

You have seen his Editorials in the Medical Tribune, and you have received carbons of my manuscript through the good services of the Coordinating Center.

We all know - and have said so at many occasions - that undoubtedly some mistakes were made and that with the knowledge of hindsight we would have had a much better protocol. So far, it seems to me - and I hope you will agree - the validity of the conclusions of the UGDP has not been cast in doubt by any of the shortcomings of our protocol as found by ourselves, our consultants or the scientific Review Committees.

If careful analysis of the new allegations raises doubts in the mind of any of you we should consider to turn again to a court of our Peers.

But I trust that you will agree with me that Mr. Horwitz is not the man to given the privilege of communicating with us about these problems, and that the Medical Tribune is not the Forum to decide upon the merits or demerits of the UGDP.

*my apologies for this lengthy letter! But I thought you ought to know. Robin S.S.*