Thank you for your letter, and the ms.

My main comment is that it is very


equivocal statement and I agree with all of it.

Perhaps I would stress even more strongly

(if that is possible) how futile is the

argument without more theoretical clarity

about mechanisms. No empirical

study is going to be generalizable or otherwise

useful if it doesn't exaggerate or

steal clarity, understanding of mechanisms.

One approach to PCT is rationality of

health effects - namely that the health

impact of all costs (including opportunity
cost) of regulation to a minimal level

exceed the impact of the adverse effects

of exposure to the same.

Joshua Lederberg
President
The Rockefeller University
New York, N.Y. 10021
(212) 360-1234

P.S.

I would like to think of a way

to pursue this promising

idea to be able to model a

stronger etiological statement in

"appears to be involved".

(You did state this with

appropriate caution.)
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