Monsanto

CNK Discus

FROM (NAME & LOCATION): C. N. Keeney - Galt Labs - 1730

DATE: September 2, 1977

SUBJECT: STATEMENT ABOUT S-160 BY R. J. REYNOLDS P.A.

REFERENCE:

TO: J. M. D'Angelo
Greenville

cc: M. W. Farrar - R2E
N. W. Touchette - 1730
R. W. Bucknell - B3NA
D. S. Shimamoto - B3ND
J. H. Orem
A. W. Morgan
J. T. Renshaw
P. Stordeur - 5045
R. H. Mills - Q2D
R. W. Radue - Q2C
R. U. DeSchutter - B3NA
T. G. Iversen - B3NC
J. S. Williams - 1940

The statement made by Mr. Willard in the attached call report (7-28-77) requires a rebuttal. His statement is that "S-160 is a marginal substitute for Benzoflex 9-88."

The data contained in the attached memo (CNK to JMD, BRD, CMR AND AAS, 7-28-77) indicates total parity when S-160 is compared to Benzoflex 9-88 (B9-88) in Franklin Chemical's Duracet 30. Santicizer 160 developed the same level of viscosity as B9-88, exhibited excellent viscosity stability and produced the same wet tack and open times. It is realized that R. J. Reynolds uses a different PVAc (National Starch) than Duracet 30, however, unless that emulsion is radically different, it is anticipated that parity exists in it as was shown in the Duracet work. National Starch is one of Monsanto's largest plasticizer adhesives accounts, which should alone refute Mr. Willard's statement. This would appear to be an appropriate time to show the data in the attached memo to Mr. Willard, and the appropriate technical men to begin dispelling the bad impression they have of S-160.

Regarding current adhesives work; an evaluation is currently under way to show the effect S-160 and competitive plasticizers have on a variety of PVAc emulsions. The National Starch emulsion is included in the evaluation. The results of this study will be released to you as soon as they become available.

Neil
C. N. Keeney

CNK/gls
attach.

DSW 587197

STLCOPCB4092533