and by 1967, some sort of warning was universally used. However, the warnings were pretty mild, and the court in Borel held that the jury could reasonably have concluded that the warnings did not adequately communicate to the workers knowledge of the dangers to which they were exposed.

In the typical case, the plaintiff is an insulation worker who has been working with products containing asbestos for many years. The plaintiff's attorney, at least in the earlier cases, would undertake to show that the scientific knowledge, even prior to Dr. Selikoff's article, was that asbestos dust was harmful. This is done by the introduction of the various medical articles. This is usually followed up by the testimony of a medical witness who counters the argument of the defendants that the scientific knowledge applied only to textile workers and miners, as distinguished from insulators, by giving his opinion that the earlier articles in the medical literature should have alerted the manufacturer to the possible danger of the use of even small amounts of asbestos, and thus should have either warned or should have conducted further investigation--even though most of the articles before 1965 had to do with textile workers and miners, rather than insulators. Thus, the issue of the State of the Art was extremely important. In many of these cases, there is also the issue, as to each individual defendant, of the exposure of the plaintiff to that particular defendant's

8001 0994

PRODUCED BY FORD