703126

February 28, 1955

Dr. Paul C. Aebersold
Isotopes Division
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission
Oak Ridge, Tennessee

Dear Paul:

I am not quite sure whether I should be bemused, horrified, indifferent or irate about Bill Myers and his letters, particularly the one dated January 31. In this, he is either at the point of losing his sense of proportion, or else is adopting a John L. Lewis type of rugged individualism in order to gain attention.

There is really nothing left to be said that is not beautifully expressed in your letter of February 10, with the possible exception of pointing out to them that if they choose to undertake an institutional general authorization, they should be aware of the responsibilities which it imposes upon them at a local level. It has been quite interesting to me how the patterns of thought are influenced by one's personal relationship to the situation. This has been very clearly exemplified by the activities of our own Radiation Safety Committee here at the University of Pennsylvania. Many of the men who thought that the restrictions and regulations imposed upon them were too rigid when it was done by the AEC have now taken an exact about-face position since the responsibility now rests locally within the University. As a matter of fact, I think that our local regulations and controls are considerably more rigid than any of the ones that we have agreed are necessary at a national level.

With respect to the extent to which their courses should be used as a basis for qualification for isotope use, I do not know whether anything of value will be obtained by discussing it with them at our meeting in Washington, but at least, it can do no harm, and it might open their eyes somewhat. It is interesting that they seem to be taking an almost directly opposite viewpoint from that expressed by the people who met with us in Los Angeles.

US DOE ARCHIVES
RG 326 US ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION
Collection Division of Biology Medicine
Box 3368
Folder 7

0000524

February 28, 1955

I have been interested again in the recent past in seeing whether the medical profession might not be stimulated to do something about setting up criteria for isotope training at the professional level. It seems to me that it is quite possible that the Board of Radiology may do something for the high level training certification, but it will, of necessity, require broader viewpoints from some less restricted medical body for similar qualifications to be set up at the lesser experience level for smaller amounts of isotopes at tracer levels. So far, most of my conversations and correspondence has been with the radiology board people. I hope that you may be hearing from them with some constructive suggestions in the not too distant future. I do think that this is a goal that should be encouraged, not necessarily by the AEC, officially, but by those of us in the medical profession who are interested in this field from a broader aspect, and that it might ease somewhat the pressure on the AEC, without infringing on its prerogatives or responsibilities.

With very best regards.

Sincerely yours,

Dick

Richard H. Chamberlain, M.D.

RHC/das

cc: Dr. Edith H. Quimby
Dr. Leon O. Jacobson
Dr. Charles Dunham

0000525

DOE ARCHIVES