

FILE NAME: JH

DATE: 1980 Nov 18

DOC#: JH015

DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION: Letter JH from AIA RE J-M Suggested Modifications to the M.A.P. Criteria for Diagnosis Document

BA100432055 X
ASBESTOS INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION

(Limited by Guarantee)

60 GLOUCESTER PLACE, LONDON W1H 3HL, ENGLAND

Telephone: 01-486 3528/9

Telegrams: Intag London

NOV 26 1980

Telex: 298418 INTA G

18 November 1980

AIA/20/./16

Dr S F McCullagh
James Hardie & Co.Pty.Ltd
Box 219 P.O.,
Granville
New South Wales 2142
AUSTRALIA

XC: Mr. Paul
Mr. Wright

Dear Terry

Jimmy Stack has allowed me to see your letter of 13.11.80 concerning the J.M. suggested modifications to the M.A.P. criteria for diagnosis document. This reached me on my return from the working party's meeting in Denver last week, where we had a most useful discussion of our "training" document and demonstrations of audio-visual material.

At one stage the discussion was widened by mutual consent to a consideration of the M.A.P. "criteria" document. Had your letter been available to form a basis for our discussion of both the J.M. and the M.A.P. versions, much argument would have been unnecessary.

Drs:Kotin, Wright and Paul were gravely concerned about our paragraph 2.1 on X-ray findings, particularly the suggestion that fine shadows of profusion I/O were diagnostic of asbestosis. In their view that statement under the aegis of such a prestigious body as the M.A.P. of the A.I.A. in Europe (the phrase was theirs) could give powerful ammunition to those tendentious opponents who would then quote as a diagnostic certainty what informed medical opinion regards merely as one index among others.

The differentiation between the clinical and the epidemiological approach was emphasized in Denver, just as it has been in discussions in the U.K. For that reason the J.M. medicos were reluctant to retain the reference to the I.L.O. standards lest the error be compounded by those who do not appreciate the need for comparing any film with its predecessors rather than with arbitrary standard films.

Your agreement with the modified statement in their 2.2 as expressed in the sixth paragraph of your letter indicates how well you too appreciate the subtle differences in diagnostic approach. I feel confident that the acceptance of their paragraph 2.2 will enable all of us to realise that the importance of this modification makes other minor points fade to the level of editorial discretion.

MT004961

Turning to the subject of the training of Industry doctors, a further report of the working party's meeting will, I hope, be in your hands by the end of the year. There is a mass of material to be summarized, condensed and arranged, so I must seek your indulgence for a few weeks.

Yours sincerely

W. J. Smither

Dr. W. J. Smither

c.c. Sir Neville Stack
Dr. Paul Kotin

MT004962