

February 23, 1933

Mr. E. G. Webber
Standard Oil Company
3426 Spring Grove Avenue
Cincinnati, Ohio

Re: [REDACTED]

Dear Mr. Webber:

Mr. [REDACTED] a case of specific gasoline dermatitis, was first seen by us October 14, 1932. It was our intention after taking his history, to ascertain if possible, the specific agent causing his dermatitis and attempt to de-sensitize him if we were able to isolate this agent. On October 14th he was skin tested by exposure of small areas of the skin on his forearm to three grades of gasoline. These produced positive reactions which remained strictly localized and gradually cleared up by October 26, 1932. Four other small skin tests were done between this date and October 28, 1932, at which time a general reaction set in which was attributed to his hypersensitivity to the gasoline vapors employed in the skin tests, and further skin tests were discontinued and have not been resumed to date.

The general eruption followed very much the same course as his previous attacks, clearing up for a time - then growing worse in spite of treatment and in the absence of any known exposure. Due to unsatisfactory conditions at his home, Mr. [REDACTED] was sent to the Deaconess Hospital December 11th, 1932 where treatment was continued. He remained there, improving steadily until December 24, 1932 when he had advanced sufficiently that it was felt safe for him to go home for the holidays. This he did and very promptly got worse. The second recrudescence continued with minor improvements for three or four weeks, during which period the patient manifested evidences of sensitization to a variety of substances other than gasoline. Since it was felt that these materials were contributing to the extent of his illness, the patient was again sent in to the Deaconess Hospital where he remained until January 26th, 1933 during which two weeks' period his improvement was steady, and he was discharged practically free from symptoms. Within twenty-four hours after his return home, he suffered another flare up which we again attributed to either indiscretion or negligence in diet or to some factor in his home environment outside of our knowledge. During the past three weeks Mr. [REDACTED] has regulated his treatment and activities very largely on the basis of his own judgment though I understand from him he has had a skin consultant who saw him with us, to see him on one or two occasions.

It is our opinion that Mr. [REDACTED] present condition is in no way related directly to gasoline exposure but that his present dermatitis is a result of his hypersensitive state which as is well known, may be aggravated by acute attacks or by chance variations in an individual from time to time.

Due to the unfortunate circumstances, we have maintained Mr. [REDACTED] salary up to and including February 25th, 1933 at which time we understand he is to be cared for under the Employees Mutual Benefit Association with your company.

If we can aid you by furnishing you any further detailed information, we shall be glad to do so.

Yours very truly,

WFM:IS