14

JOHNS-MANVILLE CORPORATION

TWENTY-TWO EAST FORTIETH STREET

NEW YORK, N.Y.

EXECUTIVE OFFICES

February 27, 1937

Mr. Sumner Simpson,
Raybestos-Manhattan, Inc.,
Bridgeport, Conn.

Re: Asbestos Dust Experiments -
Dr. L. U. Gardner

Dear Mr. Simpson:

The United States Gypsum Company signed the Memorandum of Agreement relating to the underwriting of Dr. Gardner's experiments with asbestos dust, limiting its participation to the sum of $250 per annum, or a total of $750 for the three-year term of the experiments.

I believe that we have now fully canvassed the industry. The co-operation of the following companies has been obtained on a basis whereby their respective contributions are limited to $250 per annum:

(1) American Brake Block Corporation
(2) Gatke Corporation
(3) Union Asbestos & Rubber Company
(4) United States Gypsum Company.

The participation of the above named companies will provide $1,000 a year, leaving the sum of $4,000 per year to be pro-rated between the following companies who have not limited their participation in the enterprise:

(1) Asbestos Manufacturing Company
(2) Johns-Manville Corporation
(3) Keasbey & Mattison
(4) Raybestos-Manhattan, Incorporated
(5) Russell Manufacturing Company
(6) Thermoid Company and Southern Asbestos Company.

The six companies last above named will, therefore, be called upon to contribute the sum of $666.67 per year for the three-year period.

m-16

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-000452

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/13187/1

I am enclosing herewith, for your records, a photostatic copy of the Memorandum of Agreement and photostatic copies of my letter to Dr. Gardner of November 20, 1936 and his reply of November 23, 1936, which set forth the substance of the arrangement between Dr. Gardner and the group.

Copies of this letter, together with copies of the enclosed photostats, are being sent to each of the other participants.

Last December Johns-Manville Corporation sent Dr. Gardner its check for $1250, constituting advance payment for the first quarter of 1937 on account of his annual retainer. Your Company and others of the group will be billed shortly for your share of this payment under the terms of the Memorandum. Johns-Manville Corporation is willing to continue making these advances to Dr. Gardner at the commencement of each succeeding calendar quarter during 1937, unless you or others prefer the matter be handled differently. I believe, however, that Dr. Gardner will prefer, in the matter of payment, to deal with one member of the group and it is my opinion, in which I believe you concur, that this represents the most satisfactory procedure.

Johns-Manville Corporation has likewise provided Dr. Gardner with 1200 pounds of asbestos fibre which he considers satisfactory for his purposes, although it has been found necessary for him to subject it to a "ball milling" process in order to reduce it to the desired degree of fineness. He estimates that this quantity will be sufficient for the first year's experiments and we will be very glad, at our expense, to provide him with similar quantities for the other two years.

I have also sent Dr. Gardner a photostatic copy of the Memorandum of Agreement so that he is fully advised as to the identity of those companies whose support he is receiving. At the same time I advised Dr. Gardner that those concerns which had limited their contributions were to participate just as fully in the benefits resulting from his experiments as were the others.

Very truly yours,

Vandiver Brown

Vandiver Brown
General Attorney

VB:T
Enclosures

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-000453

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/13187/2



JOHNS-MANVILLE CORPORATION
TWENTY-TWO EAST FORTIETH STREET
NEW YORK, N.Y.
EXECUTIVE OFFICES

May 3, 1939.

Sumner Simpson, Esq.,
President,
Raybestos-Manhattan, Inc.,
Bridgeport, Conn.

Dear Mr. Simpson:

I wonder if you have seen the 1938 report of The Saranac Laboratory. If not, I suggest you obtain a copy from Dr. Gardner and note the references to Asbestosis on Page 9 of the "Report of the Director".

Included in the report are reprints of several articles or addresses delivered by various persons connected with the Laboratory. One of these by Dr. Gardner is a paper read before a meeting of the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers in February, 1938. In this you will note also certain references to asbestos on Page 5.

There is also a reprint of an article by Dr. Gardner entitled "Etiology of Pneumoconiosis" reprinted from the November, 1938 issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association. In this article your attention is directed to a reference to Asbestosis on Pages 12, 13, and particularly at the top of Page 14.

The information covered by these references has presumably been derived from the experiments which Dr. Gardner is conducting for, and with funds provided by, the group of members of the Asbestos Textile Industry. The Progress Reports which we have received to date would seem to indicate as much. This raises a question upon which I would like to have your thoughts, namely, whether Dr. Gardner's use of this material is proper in view of the following paragraph from my letter of November 20, 1936, in which I outlined our proposal to Dr. Gardner:

> "It is our further understanding that the results obtained will be considered the property of those who are advancing the required funds,

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-000454

who will determine whether, to what extent and in what manner they shall be made public. In the event it is deemed desirable that the results be made public, the manuscript of your study will be submitted to us for approval prior to publication."

The proposal contained in this letter was accepted by Dr. Gardner in a letter of November 23rd, from which I quote the following paragraph:

"The Saranac Laboratory agrees that the results of these studies shall become the property of the contributors and that the manuscripts of any reports shall be submitted for approval of the contributors before publication. "

Sincerely,

Vandiver Brown

Vandiver Brown,
General Attorney.

VB:y

JOHNS-MANVILLE CORPORATION

TWENTY-TWO EAST FORTIETH STREET

NEW YORK, N.Y.

EXECUTIVE OFFICES

December 26, 1939.

Mr. Sumner Simpson,
President,
Raybestos-Manhattan, Inc.,
Bridgeport, Connecticut.

Re: Asbestos Dust Experiments -
Dr. Leroy U. Gardner

Dear Mr. Simpson:

Enclosed is a photostatic copy of an "Interim Report" submitted by Dr. Leroy U. Gardner in connection with the asbestos dust experiments he has been conducting during the past three years with the assistance of your company.

You will note Dr. Gardner's statement at the conclusion of the report that the experiments are not yet complete and that an additional sum of $5,000 will be required to finish them. Dr. Gardner, in his letter transmitting the report, says "I sincerely trust that the companies who have sponsored this work may feel disposed to help us to finish it."

May I have, as soon as possible, an expression of your company's position as regards the continuance of these experiments and its willingness to share in the expense thereof for an additional year?

Sincerely,

Vandiver Brown,
General Attorney.

VB:y

M-18

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-000456

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT 113

25 Charleston 17

Interim Report on Experimental Asbestosis at the Saranac Laboratory

The original purpose of these experiments was to reproduce in animals an advanced stage of asbestosis whose progress could be followed anatomically and in x-ray films. There were two major objectives - one, to establish a better correlation between the various shadows seen in x-rays and the pathological changes in the lungs, and the other to determine in how far associated infection was responsible for the severer manifestations of the disease.

Upon the basis of previous experience with pure free silica, it was thought that the reaction to inhaled asbestos would develop most rapidly if the inhaled fibres were exceedingly fine. Accordingly Canadian chrysotile was ground in a steel ball mill until practically all of the material was reduced to 2 microns or less in maximum diameter.

This ground fibre was placed in a hopper and churned to liberate dust in the atmosphere of an 8x8x8 foot animal room. It has not been previously reported to the sponsors of the experiments and in fact the writer was until recently unaware that one volume of unground fibre was being added to every three volumes of the very fine asbestos to facilitate agitation of the material in the hopper. Thus there has been a limited amount of long fibre asbestos liberated in the atmosphere, however the quantity is comparatively small as the paddle, moving freely in the hopper, does not fracture much of the coarse fibre. The average concentration of fine asbestos dust inside the animal cages ranged about the wall of this room has been 145 million particles per cubic foot of air. (It should be noted that this figure is 29 times that set by the U.S.Public Health Service as the maximal permissable concentration of asbestos dust in industry).

Exposed to this concentration for 8 hours a day, 6 days a week, were 80 guinea pigs, 8 rabbits, 20 white rats and 17 cats. Beginning with the fifth month of the exposure, sample guinea pigs were sacrificed at intervals. The last group was killed on Sept. 25,1939, thirty months after starting the exposure. As shown in figure 1, there is barely enough change in a thin microscopic section to be visible on magnification of 2 or 3 diameters. Still higher magnifications (not reproduced here) reveal that the reaction is not fibrous in character, but more of the nature of a chronic inflammation.

4-29-77 JRC
M-19

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-000457

Figures 2A and 3A show the less advanced changes after exposures of 12 and 20 months respectively. Figure 2B demonstrates for comparison the very much greater reaction obtained after a 12 months asbestos exposure in a previously reported experiment. In that instance the average atmospheric dust concentration was only about one-third that in the present experiment, but the fibre was longer in that case.

This experience seemed to demonstrate that, contrary to the behavior of quartz, asbestos dust would not become more irritating as the size of the particles decreased.

This conclusion could not be maintained, however, until it was proved that the particular lot of asbestos was capable of producing fibrosis in the lungs of guinea pigs. The only way to be certain of this point was to try another inhalation experiment as previous experience had shown that injection tests are not applicable to asbestos dust as they are with quartz.

Accordingly, in the fall of 1938 another dust room was taken over for an experiment with unground asbestos of the same lot. After some experimentation a suitable dust, containing a high proportion of fairly long fibres was secured by affixing both to the sides of the dust hopper and to the rotating paddles a series of steel wire brushes. The sheering action of the opposing sets of wires broke the asbestos into lengths that could be inhaled. Inside the cages the average atmospheric concentration of fibres that could be expected to be inhaled into the lungs was 37.5 million particles per cubic foot of air.

On the same 8 hour daily schedule 100 guinea pigs, 20 white mice and 6 cats were exposed in this room.

The guinea pigs have been sacrificed at intervals, the last group being killed on November 3, 1939, one year after starting the exposures. As shown in figure 3B there is much more reaction to the long fibres than to the finely ground material from the same lot, even though the concentration in the air was only about one-fourth as great. Higher magnifications show that the longer fibres are beginning to cause fibrosis rather than the chronic inflammation produced by the fine material.

To learn more than could be inferred from mere inspection of microscopic sections about the quantities of dust inhaled into the lungs, representative proportions have been subjected to chemical analysis. For the fine material these tests were not started until the 18th month of exposure, when it came to be appreciated that the anticipated fibrosis was not developing. In the long fibre experiment they were made earlier but only a few of them will be reported here as they have no basis of comparison. In the following figures it will be noted

Vandiver Brown to Sumner Simpson on Dr. Gardner's Asbestos Dust Experiments (1937–1940) Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 13187 · Page 7 of 13 asbestosclaims.law/library/13187/7

that in neither series is the weight of inhaled material sufficient to affect the per cent of ash very much.

Magnesium silicate cannot, of course, be determined as such and the amount of available tissue in each lung precluded determination of both magnesium and silica. Therefore only the latter was done. It is to be understood that in the table the SiO_2 values are merely an index of the relative amounts of asbestos present in the different lungs. The values shown by the figures for 1 month's exposure to long fibre asbestos begin to approximate those for a normal guinea pig. It will be noted that 3 or in some cases 2 animals' lungs were analysed after each interval of exposure. The results for each is given to indicate the degree of individual variation.

Table

Period Exposed	Long Fibre Asbestos			Short Fibre Asbestos		
	Dry Lung Tissue		Ash	Dry Lung Tissue		Ash
	% Ash	% SiO_2	% SiO_2	% Ash	% SiO_2	% Si
1 mo.	4.35	0.04	1.10			
	4.33	0.09	2.11			
	4.37	0.04	0.93			
8 mo.	4.72	0.10	2.21			
	4.92	0.09	1.90			
	4.34	0.07	1.58			
12 mo.	4.87	0.25	5.20	5.02	0.51	10
	5.02	0.20	4.09	4.58	0.46	10
	5.16	0.31	5.99	5.16	0.54	10
15 mo.				5.00	0.49	9
				4.76	0.43	9
				4.95	0.53	10
20 mo.				5.86	0.85	14
				6.34	0.90	14
24 mo.				5.42	0.78	14
				5.50	0.78	14
30 mo.				5.35	0.96	17
				6.55	1.27	19

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-000460

The above figures prove that with both long and short fibre dusts significant quantities are entering the lungs. The comparisons at the 12 monthinterval indicate that more short fibre enters the lung than long. This of course would be expected in view of the more ready penetration of the fine dust and the fact that its average concentration in the air was four times as great.

The proof now seems conclusive that grinding asbestos to this degree of fineness destroys its capacity to irritate the lungs.

1. It has been shown that long fibre asbestos will produce significant changes in guinea pigs lungs within a period of one year.

2. It has been shown that on grinding some of the same lot of asbestos it is no longer capable of causing the same effect in 30 months.

3. It has been proved by chemical analysis that the failure to react is not due to failure of the fine material to penetrate into the lungs.

4. It has been shown that about one-fourth the atmospheric concentration of long asbestos fibres has much greater effect upon the lungs than a concentration 145 million per cubic foot of exceedingly fine particles.

This evidence strongly suggests that the irritation from asbestos is not chemical but mechanical in nature. Attempts to prove this hypothesis have taken various directions.

It has been shown in a series of injection experiments that no fibrosis results when asbestos is injected into other organs of the body than the lungs. Chemically active quartz, however, causes fibrosis wherever it comes in contact with connective tissue cells.

It has been shown that, in animals, asbestosis does not progress after cessation of exposure. The reverse is true in the case of chemically active quartz. The smooth covering deposited upon the surface of an asbestos fibre that forms the asbestosis body after two months contact with the tissues would tend to minimize mechanical injury.

It seemed probable that the lungs rather than the other organs should be mechanically injured by asbestos because the lungs move rapidly and constantly. To test this theory the lungs of four dogs were injected with a heavy suspension of long fibre asbestos. By means of a tube in the wind pipe, material was carefully introduced in both lungs. Then one lung was collapsed by

Vandiver Brown to Sumner Simpson on Dr. Gardner's Asbestos Dust Experiments (1937–1940) Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 13187 · Page 10 of 13 asbestosclaims.law/library/13187/10

cauterizing the inside of its stem bronchus with silver nitrate so that it no longer moved in respiration. Thus we had what was thought to be effective doses of asbestos in either lung but only one would move to produce the mechanical injury and resultant fibrosis.

The animals survived their treatment with no apparent ill effect. A month ago two of the dogs were killed on the first anniversary of their injection. In each case one lung was well collapsed and there were asbestos fibres on each side. However, there was neither fibrosis nor asbestosis bodies in either lung of both animals. Apparently we were misled by a report in the literature that dogs were susceptible to the action of asbestos. The result was disappointing but the method of attack seems reasonable if it can be applied in guinea pigs. We are now trying to overcome the technical difficulties involved in working with such a small animal.

The matter of species susceptibility is a puzzling feature which need not be discussed here. None of the rats, rabbits or cats exposed to the short fibre asbestos have reacted. The 6 cats, now exposed to long fibre dust for 13 months, are being kept in the dust room until their exposure reaches two years before comparative x-ray and anatomic studies are begun. The guinea pigs continues to be a reliable animal with which to experiment.

While the experiments have demonstrated that it is not possible to accelerate the rate of reaction in the body, and the anticipated results have not been realized, it is felt that the effort has been extremely profitable. As pointed out in a previous report to the sponsors, they have shown the innocuousness of finely ground asbestos, which is of real practical significance. They probably explain the lack of asbestosis in the mills at Thetford. They may help to define the hazard in other plants where very finely ground material rather than fibres constitute the major element in the dust. They serve as a guide to engineers who must control the hazard in plants, indicating that their efforts must be directed particularly toward the fibrous material in the air.

In view of the probability of fulfilling the original purpose of these experiments, it is hoped that the sponsors may agree to renew their appropriation for another year. For the past 12 months the Laboratory has assumed the obligation of operating a second dust room for the asbestosis work. The expense is somewhat over $5000. In addition it has carried on various collateral injection experiments, such as those upon the dogs and others not mentioned in this report. It has secured an appropriation for an inhalation experiment upon the

Vandiver Brown to Sumner Simpson on Dr. Gardner's Asbestos Dust Experiments (1937–1940)
ACL Doc 13187 · Page 11 of 13
Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/13187/11

the effect of glass wool, which may prove a useful control to the mechanical theory of the action of asbestos. It is hoped that you may find these accomplishments sufficiently valuable to be willing to continue the work.

Respectfully submitted,

Leroy U. Gardner, M.D.

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-000463

Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
asbestosclaims.law/library/13187/12

JOHNS-MANVILLE CORPORATION
TWENTY-TWO EAST FORTIETH STREET
NEW YORK, N.Y.

EXECUTIVE OFFICES

May 10, 1940.

Sumner Simpson, Esq.,
President,
Raybestos-Manhattan, Inc.,
Bridgeport, Connecticut.

Re: Dr. Gardner's Experiments.

Dear Mr. Simpson:

I am sorry I was away when you telephoned me a few weeks ago. However, my secretary informed me of the matter about which you wished to speak to me.

In the same connection, I believe you will be interested in the attached excerpt from Air Hygiene Foundation Digest of April, 1940, covering current matters in the field of industrial hygiene. I have not read the original article, but it is apparent from the Digest that Dr. Gardner is already publishing, without seeking our advance approval, certain conclusions which his reports to us have indicated were arrived at as a result of the experiments underwritten by the textile group.

I shall appreciate your comments on this situation.

Sincerely,

Vandiver Brown

Vandiver Brown,
General Attorney.

VB:y
Enc.

4-29-77 jkt
m-20

CRMC-Motley1000-Subj-000464