CONFIDENTIAL

Research Center
October 1, 1952
File: 2916

D. W. Mastin, CHQ

I have read with interest your proposed industrial hygiene training program for Lompoc personnel and, in general, I admire the apt way in which you have put together specific information especially in view of the fact that you started with no knowledge of diatomite.

There are several points which I would like to raise:

1. We speak of "the company" throughout as though this were something apart from the individual. It is essential, I believe, that we avoid this in the interest of making everyone realize that they are in fact "the company" in however small a part. I, at my minor level, feel that I am a part of the company, in some small measure affecting the success or failure. It is important that I feel that way and it is equally important that Pete, the plumber at Lompoc, feel that way. If we didn't know it before the strike, we now know that Pete and dozens like him have a tangible and a very tangible part in the effort on the whole personnel that make up "the company."

  Why not "our company" or "us"?

2. I like the manner in which you ask the active support of all members of the Johns-Manville organization, and I believe you can elaborate on this theme and carry their responsibilities further to include a request for suggestions for correcting dust situations of their own observations.

3. I assume that the statements regarding hazards and effect on health have been checked with the Medical Director and other health authorities. Since some of the statements could be controversial, this should be done and if controversial, this so stated.

4. Do you believe it wise to emphasize that it is only the particles you can't see that are hazardous? Every time you see a cloud of diatomite dust, you can be sure that it contains some small visible dust particles. In fact, every small particle in the air that you can't see had its origin in some visible dust cloud.

5. As a minor point, some eager beaver is sure to divide the $[illegible] spent from 1939 to 1952 by the 25 years and come up with $[illegible] per year versus the $[illegible] per year now contemplated. Why not "We have installed specific dust control measures as rapidly as knowledge and equipment could be acquired (if this is factual) and this has totalled $[illegible]. We plan to continue the program of improving working conditions and have committed at least $[illegible] to be spent for additional dust control equipment. We estimate that the time required for equipment development and selection will require the spending of this money at about the rate of $[illegible] per year."

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/11424/1

[redacted] Page 2

[redacted]

H. L. King, Jr.

cc [redacted]

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/11424/2