

pc to J. Stamler
A. Keys.

September 27, 1972

Dr. George V. Mann
Vanderbilt University
School of Medicine
Division of Nutrition
Nashville, Tennessee 37203

Dear George:

I protest! Despite my admiration for your thinking processes I don't understand how you can use the methods and the language you do, as in the Meat Industry Research Conference pamphlet. They are unscientific and emotionally charged and inappropriate. Ancel and Jerry are not responsible for the "Madison Avenue techniques." They are no more adventurists" than you; they are serious scientists and you err to challenge their integrity and motives.

Ancel has not attempted to change the diet in Scandinavia, Malmros has.

Your facts are inaccurate. Keys did not conclude in 1950 that the causal agent in CHD is saturated animal fat.

You distort the truth to say that Keys indicts saturated fats as the cause of CHD. You err in saying that Keys is neither nutritionist nor epidemiologist when he is highly qualified and original in both disciplines.

You rail continuously, but never say, what the alternative hypotheses and studies should be, other than your weak cry over physical activity, which ignores the Finns and much other evidence.

"Quantitated" is probably not a word.

You ignore the reasons why diet history in the U.S. cannot indicate any possible importance of diet in CHD.

Is it "wrong" to advise therapy without proof, if it is probably harmless and if indirect evidence is supportive? You eliminate the very tradition of sound therapeutic medicine.

If anyone ever confused hypothesis with fact, "a cardinal scientific^{sin}," it is you with physical activity.

The evidence to support your alternatives of carbon monoxide, hard water, surface active materials, and physical activity is ridiculously weak.

I would like to see your rejected proposal to follow young people. I imagine it was turned down because you can't count.

Dr. George V. Mann
Vanderbilt University

September 27, 1972
Page 2

Your challenge of the "diet hypothesis" is highly appropriate. Your arguments are shockingly naive. Your language, in public, is unacceptable. I beg of you as a friend to modify your language, always immoderate, so that your views may be heard and so that you may continue to have friends.

Regards,

Henry Blackburn, M.D.
Professor and Director

HB/rs