FILE NAME: Uniroyal (UNIR)

DATE: 1964 Oct 14

DOC#: UNIR018

DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION: Letter to Mr. A.C. Link, Hogansville, from US Rubber Co. RE Consequences of Newspaper Articles in the NYT and the Standard, CT Paper

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT UR 56

United States Rubber Company

Administrative Center, Winnsboro
(Location)

October 14, 1964

Mr. A. C. Link
Hogansville

Enclosed are copies of articles which appeared last week in the New York Times and the Stamford, Connecticut, paper. I am sure you have seen similar articles in your local papers.

At the A.T.I. Meeting on Thursday, we learned that this press release went to 1,750 daily papers and in view of the news worthiness of the subject matter, there is a great possibility that the majority of these papers published the release in total or in part.

It was the consensus of the A.T.I. that articles such as this present a very grave hazard to our Industry from both personnel standpoint and the economic standpoint.

After considerable discussion of the pros and cons, we arrived at the conclusion that it would be unwise to attempt any denial of these articles inasmuch as we have rather sketchy information to make such denials. It was decided that each company would attempt to play down the Selikoff Report and await the outcome of publicity from the conference in New York next week.

As a result of these articles, Dr. Cralley of the Public Health Service has prepared a paper for publication in New York next week which he told us on Friday appeared most promising from the Industry standpoint. He further stated that his data, of course, was incomplete but data collected so far within the Asbestos Textile Industry, would tend to repute many of the statements made in the press releases.

As an example of the implication arrived from such articles as these, we were advised on Thursday by General Textiles in New Jersey, that they had received three cancellations for ironingboard covers that morning as a result of people reading these articles. I talked with Johns-Manville today and they are being beseiged with telephone calls asking for clarification or explanations of the articles. The Management and Medical Department have taken the stand that the articles are without foundation and that the findings of the study group next week as well as the Public Health Survey now being conducted would support the contention. In view of the foregoing, it may be well that we reassess our position with respect to the Public Health Survey being conducted by Dr. Cralley. I am not suggesting that we reverse our position but upon Dr. Wells' return from New York and after consulting with Dr. Wolfsie, we may wish to alter our position.

At the Board of Governors Meeting at the A.T.I., it was unanimously voted that the A.T.I. ask Dr. Ken Smith of Johns-Manville to coordinate the

doctors from our various companies and in this connection, it was suggested that all of the doctors meet in New York with Dr. Smith sometime Sunday afternoon or Sunday evening to determine the position they will uphold in the forthcoming meetings. I am sure Dr. Wells will want to be a part of this group.

We will keep you advised of any developments within our Industry and particularly any positions which the A.T.I. may take on this matter.

S. J. Peele, Jr.
pi

CC: Mr. R. A. All
Mr. R. C. Harrington

50020039