M E M O R A N D U M

TO: P. J. Merkus

November 10, 1955

FROM: R. J. Kenard

CC: G. C. Montgomery
J. M. Wilson
S. B. Thomas
A. G. Smith

SUBJECT: SUMMARY AND COMMENTS ON SPEECH GIVEN BY CHANDLER PHILLIPS ON NOVEMBER 8, 1955 AT THE JONATHAN CLUB

On November 8, 1955, the writer was present at a speech given by Chandler Phillips at the Jonathan Club in Los Angeles. The speech was given at the weekly meeting of the Breakfast Club of this organization.

Mr. Phillips was not a polished speaker, and appeared ill at ease in front of the organization. However, he spoke with sincerity and conviction which had the overall effect of impressing the audience very strongly with his desire to eliminate air pollution. There were 80 to 100 people at the meeting and at least 60% stayed after his speech to ask questions or hear questions asked by others. About half of the audience that remained asked questions.

The approach the speaker took was that his main purpose was the elimination of air pollution. Smog was indicated as being only a minor factor as it was merely one manifestation of the overall air pollution problem. This approach permitted him to pass lightly over the hydrocarbon emission problem and dwell on the "contaminants" in the gasoline, i.e., sulfur, nitrogen, lead, chlorine, bromine, and phosphorous, some of which he stated are 500 times more toxic than hydrocarbons. He then proceeded to say that over the 1300 square miles of the L.A. Basin a certain number of feet of air are required to dilute the lead below the toxic range, the phosphorous below the toxic range, etc. He noted that the contaminants are heavier than air and hug the ground, and therefore, we are breathing air that has extremely high concentrations of contaminants.

Mr. Phillips repeated a number of times that he has no axe to grind, that he would welcome appearing before groups with speakers that didn't agree with him. He states that he has presented his findings to Haagen-Smit, Griswold and

the APCD, but that they were not particularly interested in his work inasmuch as they are interested only in eliminating hydrocarbon emission because they believe it causes smog, while he is interested in eliminating all air pollution. He gives the impression that he is the only one who dares to speak outright and that the oil industry doesn't dare face the public and give them facts.

From the questions asked afterward it was apparent that he had effectively scored against the oil industry even though he persisted in saying that you can't really blame the oil industries (since they had to run a crude that had a form of sulfur that was difficult to remove). There were three types of questions asked. (1) Those desiring an explanation of information that had probably been read in the papers but was not understood, for example, "What is the function of the ozone?"; those desiring to know (2) what can be done to eliminate the air pollution; and (3) how can we get the refineries to do these things.

In answering the latter questions Phillips spoke of processes available to eliminate sulfur and the need for additives and pointed to the production of low sulfur aviation gasoline. He said he has offered his services free of charge to consult with oil companies on this subject. The refineries, he stated, could be forced to eliminate sulfur, etc., by aroused public opinion.

Phillips successfully aroused in his audience at least the desire to know more about the subject, and in particular what the oil industry's position is on these matters. The writer spoke to several people after the meeting, and found that there was a definite desire to know more about the smog problem. The question was raised that if Phillips was misinterpreting the facts why didn't the oil companies get up and say so. A member of the Jonathan Club offered to make arrangements to have an oil industry speaker appear at some future breakfast meeting. (It was later determined that Gerald Fisher of General Petroleum is scheduled to address the Jonathan Club on November 22 to present the oil industries side of the air pollution problem.)

Phillips still wears his Shell service pin. He claims that he received lead poisoning in Shell's service and could have sued Shell but did not because he is not vindictive and he really can't blame Shell anyway. He speaks as though he were proud to have been an expert employed by Shell. He later says that maybe the fact that he suggested to Shell that they "clean up" their gasoline had something to do with his discharge from the company. (The speech was a "Brutus is an honorable man" type of speech.)

Most of the basic data and premises of Phillips' speech are correct, the only argument that can be made is with the conclusions drawn--which in some cases were incorrect, but in most cases were just incomplete.

Phillips implies that Haagen-Smit, Griswold, the APCD and other technical people are influenced in their work by the oil industry. It is the writer's opinion therefore, that it would be unsatisfactory to try to attack Phillips' speeches or statements directly since in most cases the basic premise Phillips uses is correct. The approach should be one of giving the public an

overall view of (1) the smog and air pollution problem, (2) the various organizations and people actively trying to solve the problem, (3) the refining industry with attention directed primarily to the development of high octane gasoline and the function of TEL and hydrocarbon type, and (4) the efforts to date made by the oil industry to eliminate pollution of the atmosphere. In the last two items the points made by Phillips can be covered and developed in a logical form so that they become statements of fact rather than conclusions drawn from uncoordinated data.

Relying on the educational program of the APCD is not an adequate means of combating Phillips' statements and implications. The oil industry has been attacked directly; the oil industry must reply directly--not in the form of press releases and advertisements that people may or may not read but through a direct and personal approach to the people concerned and in words that the layman can understand, remember, and tell his neighbor.

/S/ R. J. Kenard, Jr.

RJK:KM

CC--Pacific Coast Area--Legal Department (2)
Attention Mr. D. S. Coye

ATTACHMENT

Outline of the Speech Given by Chandler Phillips

Following is an outline of the speech given by Chandler Phillips on November 8, 1955 at the Jonathan Club. The writer unfortunately sat directly in front of Phillips and consequently was unable to take extensive notes during Phillips' speech. However, most of the data and figures quoted by Phillips appeared to be at least of the proper order of magnitude.

1. Discussed meeting with Haagen-Smit and pointed out Haagen-Smit was interested only in smog. He, Phillips, was interested in all air pollutants.

2. Mentioned he talked with Dr. Paul Kotin, (member U.S.C. staff). Then went on to develop fact that contaminants (lead, sulfur, chlorine, bromine, phosphorous) are many times more toxic than hydrocarbons and should be of greatest concern in air pollution.

3. Demonstrated burning of what he called two competitive gasolines. One smoked much more heavily than the other did. He then poured acid into bottles containing what he called two competitive gasolines; one sludged much more heavily than the other did. (From the colors of the gasolines one was probably premium and the other housebrand.) He then asked which would you burn in your car. He also showed a sample of white gasoline, which he said he had acid-treated, caustic washed and water washed. From his comments, the writer would conclude that when, at the other meetings, he burned a white gasoline that did not smoke he probably was burning a sample of gasoline that he had acid-treated.

4. Spoke about incident of cancer in chimney sweeps because of sulfur and other noxious materials they came in contact with. Then stated the increase in deaths due to lung cancer can be correlated with TEL consumption.

5. Discussed at great lengths quantities of contaminants in the air. Used the analogy of the number of feet (vertical) of air over the 1300 square miles of the L.A. Basin area necessary to dilute the contaminants to below the toxic concentration.

6. Told about stenographer employed at an airport where the air is highly contaminated with lead who gave birth to a malformed child. This he attributed to lead.

7. States that he got lead poisoning working for Shell but none of the company doctors would diagnose it as such. It wasn't until he went to San Francisco that he found a doctor who diagnosed it as lead poisoning. He apparently recovered from whatever symptoms he had while in San Francisco but when he returned to Los Angeles he had a recurrence of symptoms.

8. States that present consumption of TEL is 10 times that of 1941.

9. States that TEL poisoning will not kill but will destroy organs of the body so that complications arise.

10. States that TEL was causing preignition and TCP and other phosphorous additives were developed to combat this problem. States that lead combined with phosphorous is much more toxic than lead or phosphorous alone.

11. Associates the increase of both cancer and heart disease with TEL consumption.

12. States that chlorine and hydrocarbons are both toxic but when you run the motor of your car you make chlorinate hydrocarbons which are extremely more toxic. Also states that presence of additives in gasoline makes the hydrocarbons 500 times more toxic.

13. States that only one foot of air over 1300 square miles is needed to reduce concentration of hydrocarbon to below its toxic concentration but 167 feet are required to reduce concentration of gasoline additives to below their toxic concentration.

14. Refers to SAE Journal for article on jet fuel which states that aromatics cause heavy deposits in jet engine, but straight run products do not. States that Los Angeles had no smog problems when straight run gasolines were used in automobiles.

15. Stresses dirty tail ends in gasoline as causing engine deposits and smoking, and shows Gulf advertisement in Life magazine. States that some refineries have cleaned up their gasoline, the rest of the industry can do likewise. Stresses very strongly, several times, that he is not responsible for labeling gasolines as "dirty" or "dirty tail end" gasoline, but that the refineries themselves call it that, and he refers to the Gulf advertisement for proof.

16. Shows Amoco advertisement for unleaded premium gasoline. (Copy of wire supposedly from American Oil Company was distributed before speech. Wire was addressed to Phillips and read:

> "Re wire Amoco unleaded gasoline is marketed expressly for modern high compression engines.
>
> AMM OIL CO."

17. Offers to take lie-detector test.

18. States that today's gasolines have an 83 octane number whereas 1941 gasolines had an 82-½ octane number. Implies that 1941 gasolines would operate satisfactorily in today's engines. States that public shouldn't be misled, that the oil companies have merely changed their methods of measurement of octane number.

19. States that people are dying three times as fast in central district as in beach cities because people in the central district breathe polluted air whereas people in beach cities breathe clean air.

20. Mentioned that he is writing a book and preparing a film on the subject of air pollution.