PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT AB-89
PENGAD-Bayonne, N.J.

AMERICAN BRAKE SHOE COMPANY

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT
2501 Wise Island Ave.
Chicago 8, Ill.

C
O
P
Y

November 3, 1948.

I have read carefully the report you forwarded and am returning it with my comments.

Mr. Brown's remarks on the "qualifying adjectives" in the abstract and conclusions.

While admitting the advisability of reconciling the two, it must be remembered that any animal experimentation cannot be absolutely conclusive. Observations on the tissue reactions to various substances can mean nothing more than reasonably accurate supportive evidence that the effect noted is what is likely to occur in man after similar exposure. The report notes that the same result is not always obtained in each species of experimental animal used. It is therefore only possible to employ such phraseology as, "the dust apparently does not alter significantly the course of experimental tuberculosis in guinea pigs," etc. Possibly a similar experiment carried over a longer period of time could produce an entirely different result. There are too many intangibles to allow dogmatic or more definite statements. This is true of any experimental work in animals or humans. The value of the experimental work lies in the fact that it forms a reasonable basis for study of characteristic tissue changes which are similar to those seen in humans.

I gain the impression from Mr. Brown's letter that he is concerned with possible repercussions from the legal point of view but I must confess I do not see anything in the report in its present form which could cause undue concern. Similar reports are frequent in the literature not only in this country but also from abroad.

Certain implications have been made in the report such as that referring to the high incidence of pneumonia among the experimental animals and the suggestion that asbestos dust might have some degree of responsibility for such a development, but these are explained and discounted in the ensuing text. Perhaps these implications might be modified somewhat pending further factual data.

I feel that since most of the basic facts with the exception of the more detailed studies mentioned in the report are already known and have been published in other studies on asbestos, no unfavorable reaction need be anticipated. I think the idea of reviewing the manuscript prior to publication is a good one in order to achieve mutual understanding with Sarnac, but I feel that this can be accomplished quite satisfactorily without my presence.

Mr. Brown has stated that it would be advisable for us to designate a representative of another company to act for us in connection with the decisions to be made. I think this would be a satisfactory alternative and would like to suggest that we request him (Mr. Brown) to act for us. It would be most difficult for me to attend personally at this time because of the meetings I mentioned to you over the phone. I am sure our interest in the matter could be adequately protected by Mr. Brown.

/s/ L. E. Hamlin

Medical Director