RM 150-1a
4-29-77 E.E.

December 10, 1934.

Dr. A. J. Lanza,
Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.,
1 Madison Avenue,
New York City.

Re: Preliminary Study of
Asbestos Dust Effects

Dear Dr. Lanza:

I have examined the galley proof of yours and Dr. McConnell's preliminary study entitled "Effects of the Inhalation of Asbestos Dust on the Lungs of Asbestos Workers", which you were good enough to send me with your letter of December 7th, and have compared it with the mimeographed pamphlet of which it purports to be a condensation.

Confirming my telephone conversation of this afternoon, I am planning to transmit the proof sheets to Mr. Hobart so that he will receive them tomorrow and shall request that he return them to me not later than Thursday with his comments, after which I shall see that they are promptly transmitted to you. I shall also inquire of the Raybestos Company whether or not they desire to examine the proof of the article before its final printing and shall endeavor to persuade them not to insist upon such an examination.

I have the following comments to make:

(1) Conclusion No. 1 (galley 14) has omitted a sentence appearing in the original which, as modified by you, read as follows: "Clinically, from this study it appeared to be of a type milder than silicosis".

(2) There is also omitted the first paragraph on page 15 of the original report which reads as follows:

"During the progress of the study, physicians who were practicing in the communities where asbestos workers lived, were questioned, and stated that they did not find an unusual amount of tuberculosis among these workers. The contrast between this state of affairs and that found in communities with

M-226

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-001287


Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/11922/1

a silicosis hazard, is noteworthy".

Both the foregoing observations included in your original report presented an aspect of your survey that was favorable to the industry and we should like to see them retained.

(3) On galley 14 the word "death" has been omitted after the phrase "6 of 36".

(4) Conclusion No. 3 (galley 14). The word "preliminary" is inserted — to my mind unnecessarily — since the entire article is definitely labelled at the commencement as a "preliminary" study.

(5) Referring to the last sentence of the third paragraph on page 13 (which is not changed in the galley proof), it seems to me that some sort of additional phrase or clause is required in order to relate it properly to what has gone before. As it stands now, it is not entirely clear just what one is expected to deduce therefrom.

Very truly yours

Vandiver Brown
Attorney

VB:T

CC: Messrs. George S. Hobart
E.H. Voorhees
S.A. Williams

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-001288