FILE NAME: Raybestos-Manhattan (RBM)

DATE: 0000

DOC#: RBM125

DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION: Barry Castleman Notes, Typed - Stratford Correspondence

STRATFORD CORRESPONDENCE

76A-C

Washington State memo, June 1943, insulation contractor protesting the regulation of health hazard - Brown rebukes writer and suggests he is ignorant. [Didn't I request asbestos magazine correspondence.] [Where is Simpson's letter of June 22, 1943 to DeForest of Washington. Brown refers to receiving Simpson's letter with enclosures.]

128

Newspaper Article - letter by President of Southern Asbestos rebutting prior newspaper article - statements denegrating to blacks are contained therein.

142

January 30, 1935, letter Raybestos-Manhattan to Brown ~~refers Broron~~ regarding Mellon Institute (refers to 144 A and B): no current interest but suggests getting industry interested in enacting proper legislation.

144 A & B

(See 142) Page 2. "the necessity of some form of united action by the afflicted industries".

Page 2. "only two forms of dust are known to produce disabling fibrosis - silica and asbestos.

Page 2. Refers to Lanza statement about spurious claims against industry.

Describes common problems:

1. Ambulance chasing attorneys and unscrupulous doctors.

2. Need for occupational disease workmen's compensation legislation to

(i) Eliminate juries

(ii) Eliminate shysters and quacks

(iii) Permit reviews of awards to reduce them.

3. Forum for discussion of dust suppression.

4. Establish dust count and x-ray standards- Brown named to steering committee, but didn't want to be officially a member since asbestos industry wanted to dis-associate from silica industry in eyes of public and employees.

154

Minutes of November 28, 1933 meeting between Lanza, Brown, Simpson and Seagle.

Lanza discusses desire to complete his study begun three years earlier. "Unbiased reports of this character (such as Lanza's) would be helpful to us, if favorable, in the event we should ever be involved in litigation."

103A

December 8, 1936 touting Air Hygiene Foundation:

> "It is certainly a cross section of the very finest American industries... interested in... the protection of industries from ~~unknown~~ unreasonable claims of workers"

103B

Letter December 4, 1936 - Brown to Asbestos Magazine regarding Air Hygiene Foundation:

(a) Refers to Bulletin No. 1 of Legal Committee and its compilation of occupational disease compensation decisions nationwide (p.2).

(b) "Although the Air Hygiene Foundation is approaching various problems...from an ~~unbiased~~ unbiased viewpoint it is nevertheless the ~~nature~~ creature of industry and is the one institution ~~upon~~ upon which ~~one~~ employers can rely completely for a sympathetic appreciation of their viewpoint."

97

Letter May 19, 1938, Gardner to Sumner Simpson (SS) regarding Dr. Lynch. Critigue of Lynch's criticism of Gardners early theories. Suggests Lynch's cases may have been silicotics instead of or in addition to asbestotics.

93, 94, 95, 96

All refer to ~~Dreessen~~ Dreessen Article

94

Letter March 23, 1939 - Asbestos Magazine to Sumner Simpson re: Gardner's ~~work~~ preliminary work:

> "of course, we understand that all this info on asbestos is to be kept confidential and that nothing should be published about asbestos in Asbestos Magazine at present".

(See handwritten note referring to American Journal of Public Health, March, 1939, Vol. 29).

93

Brown thanking Sumner Simpson for Dreesen article (4-5-39).

95

Sumner Simpson to Asbestos Magazine re: Dreessen article sent to him (3-22-39):

> "I think when we get through with our Saranac investigation, we will show that this paper is considerably distorted although he does say at last that where the air can be kept down to five million microns [wrong] there is no danger, and I can tell you confidentially, but am not willing to make it public, that the air can be kept below five million microns with proper controls, but I am not willing to start a controversy with my competitors".

Says he and Johns-Manville will share dust control secrets ~~and~~ with competitors "when the time is right."

Says he knows the plants studied ~~in~~ by Dreessen:

> "And as nearly as I can find out they have no dust control at all that amounts to anything."

96

Letter March 21, 1939 from Asbestos to Sumner Simpson attaching Dreessen article.

79

Letter November 3, 1941 from Brown to (SS) re: proposed book review of book "Pneumoconiosis" by Lanza - says Johns-Manville nor Raybestos-Manhattan would object, but refers to sensitivity of rest of industry to public discussion of asbestos and specifically says that:

> "I have in mind the ostrich like attitude which

has been evidenced from time to time by some members of the industry.

75

Program 8th meeting Industrial Hygiene Foundation (November 1943) includes presentation by Drinker of "Control of Health Hazards in Shipbuilding, including Welders".

121 - 122

Letters from (SS) to Dr. McConnell and back re: Assistance of Metro in lawsuits in Charleston.

122

Passionate plea for assistance, refers to fact that they carried compensation and Health Insurance with Metropolitan, but under the policy asbestos was not covered in damage suits [i.e. No Occupational Disease - workmen's compensation statutes enacted in South Carolina until 1948]

Refers to fact that no insurance company had data on asbestos and that Johns-Manville and Raybestos-Manhattan cooperated and now Metropolitan has monopoly on the data.

Characterizes law suits as unfair and a favorable result would be of benefit to Metropolitan and also have "considerable bearing on the dust racket".

Infers that Metropolitan will profit from data.

124A and B and 125

All refer to Asbestos desire to write about asbestos.

124B

Letter Asbestos to Sumner Simpson.

> We have written you many times re: publishing on asbestos "always you have requested that for certain obvious reasons, we publish nothing, and naturally, your wishes have been respected."
>
> Possibly a discussion of it (asbestosis) along the right lines would serve to combat some of the rather undesirable publicity given to it in current newspapers."

125

Letter (SS) to Brown re: Asbestos request to publish:

> "I think the less said about asbestos the better

off we are..."

Asbestos has "been very decent about not reprinting the English Articles."

124A

Letter October 3, 1935 - Brown to Sumner Simpson re: Asbestos request to publish:

"I quite agree with you that our interests are best served by having asbestos receive the minimum of publicity...I think we should warn the publishers (if they decide to publish) to use American data (generated by Lanza) the subject rather than English."

145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150

All refer to efforts to affect Lanza Report.

150

December 10, 1934 - Brown to Lanza. Examined galley proof - sent December 7th - tells Dr. he is sending to Hobart for his comments and that he will talk to Raybestos-Manhattan.

COMMENTS OF BROWN

(1) Conclusion "1" - should include language that asbestos is milder than silicosis;

[See Lanza conclusion #1]

(2) Omission of sentence about observations of community doctors.

[See Lanza p. 8 where sentence is included]

(3) Grammatical clarification

(4) "Preliminary" in third conclusion is superfluour

[Preliminary does not appear in Laza third conclusion]

(5) Can't find Brown's citation to earlier preliminary draft.

149

December 15, 1934 - letter to Hobart to Brown - Reports he has compared galleys with preliminary report of three years earlier.

(1) Suggests elimination of comparison of silicosis with

asbestos because of pendency of workmen's compensation legislation in New Jersey where Johns-Manville was lobbying against recog. of asbestos as an occupational disease.

Eloquently explains state of art defense being used by Johns-Manville in common law suits by employees. [Lanza ignored this advice and included this phrase at pg. 2]

(2) ~~Innocuous~~ Insidious suggestion re: placing footnote regarding measuring technique in text.

[Lanza retained in footnote (p. 3)]

(3) Complains that plant E is ~~described~~ described as : "unnecessarily dusty" Says he knows E isn't Johns-Manville Plant, but wonders "whether the proprietor of Plant E has had an opportunity to review the comment." Concludes that comment indirectly concerns Johns-Manville and requests that it be deleted.

[Lanza considerably toned down this reference to Plant E:"aside from Plant E, it would appear that the dust hazard was not excessive except in the preparation rooms of Plants B and C"]

(4) Grammatical suggestion

(5) Conclusions:

(1) Same suggestion that Brown had relative to inclusion of language suggestive that asbestosis is milder than silicosis.

Argues the importance of distinguishing asbestosis ~~and~~ FROM silicosis because of probability of effort by New Jersey legislation to bring asbestos under workmen's compensation "and if it is the policy of Johns-Manville to oppose any bill that attempted to include asbestos as compensable, it would be very helpful to have an official report to show that there is a substantial difference between

asbestosis and silicosis and by the same token, it would be troublesome if an official report should appear from which the conclusion might be drawn that there is very little, if any, difference between the two diseases.

[Lanza, of course, complied. In 1935, the first cancer cases appeared in the literature. In the early 1930's the British were reporting an epidemic of asbestosis in the factories as were several United States Authors. One wonders why the 1931 preliminary survey referred to extensively by Hobart and Brown was not published. The answer, of course, lies in the industry's desire to deny the disease as long as possible.]

(2) Says industry should cease resisting cardiac enlargement as a sequala of asbestosis.

(3) Preliminary is superfluous

(4) O.K. [Certainly is from industry view as it suggests limited disability from the disease. Retired and disabled workers were not examined of course.]

(5) Objects to language as possibly giving rise to inference that asbestosis does add to the mortality of T.B. cases. Suggests elimination of last three words, for sake of "scientific accuracy" to wit "other than T.B."

[Lanza dutifully complied rephrasing sentence to "non-T.B. pulmonary infections."]

(6) Objects to phrase in this conclusion which apparently compared asbestos dust to granite dust as Hobart feared that the conclusions might suggest a "possibility that a pneumoconiosic may arise more readily from asbestos than granite dust." Therefore, Hobart suggests elimination of this part of the conclusion.

[Lanza complied. The conclusion #6 as printed left off all reference to comparison with granite dust.]

(7) No comment on suggestion offered.

(6) Recommendations:

Suggests that recommendation 4 be softened by inclusion of "possible" before "studies." Doesn't think his suggestion was ~~impossible~~ "important."

[Lanza didn't either; language was unchanged.]

148

December 18, 1934 - Brown to Judd (Raybestos-Manhattan). Brown forwards Galleys, his and Hobarts comments to Judd:

> "I was just talking to Dr. Lanza and I am inclined to believe he will accede to most of our requests by making appropriate provisions in the article."

147

December 21, 1934 - Brown to Lanza - Returns Galleys to Dr.Lanza. with Hobarts comments:

> "I trust you will give" Hobart (Ex. 149) and his (Ex. 150) "your most serious consideration."

Says they are not suggesting that any scientific facts or inevitable conclusions be altered.

> "All we ask is that all of the favorable aspects of the survey be included and that none of the unfavorable be unintentionally pictured in darker tones than the comments justify. I feel confident we can depend upon you and Dr. McConnell to give us this 'break'..."

146

December 24, 1934 - Brown to Judd (Raybestos-Manhattan). Apologizes for requesting return of galley prior to Raybestos-Manhattan review, but this was necessitated because of publication date pressure and failure to promptly remit would have resulted in papers publication "as it stood." Touts efforts of he and Hobart in suggesting changes:

> "that will be beneficial from the Industry viewpoint. The interest of your company in the Report is identical to that of Johns-Manville" and our accomplishments respecting the report will be for the "benefit of both."

145

Judd to Brown - January 2, 1935 - Acknowledging receipt of Exhibit 146.

> "Both Mr. Simpson and myself feel quite safe in leaving the approval of the report in your hands."

Congratulaes Hobart especially on his suggestions.