

Letters to the Editor

Appreciative

Editor, The Wall Street Journal:

This is written to thank you for your greeting to our men returning from captivity in Vietnam, published Feb. 23. I have seen nowhere else in print a tribute to equal yours.

This handful of men has become, and deservedly so, a symbol of all that is best in our country.

Small-minded men say that these quiet heroes who have survived the ordeals of prison are speaking for the Pentagon rather than for themselves. What a shabby insult!

Let us be thankful that our country still breeds such men.

FREDERIC S. WITHINGTON
Rear Admiral, U.S.N. (Ret.)

Washington

Asbestos Report

Editor, The Wall Street Journal:

I wish to make a small correction to a generally accurate article that appeared on Feb. 26, dealing with the FDA's concern over the possible health hazard posed by the presence of large amounts of asbestos-type impurities in cosmetic powders. The method of analysis we have employed, consisting of a combination of X-ray diffraction and light microscopy, is quite unambiguous in disclosing the presence of, and estimating the concentration of, asbestiform minerals in talcum powders when the amount present is substantial.

However, certain ambiguities in the interpretation of the analytical data may arise when the concentration of the asbestos-type minerals is low. For this reason, we have reported that, in terms of the present state of development of the analytical techniques, there are certain talcum powders for which we cannot be certain that asbestos is definitely present; nor can we be sure that it is totally absent. In such cases, however, the asbestos, if present, would be there in low concentration (in the range of 1% to 2%).

In the article referred to, I was erroneously quoted as having reported that Johnson and Johnson's talcum powder contained 2% to 3% asbestos. In actual fact, I reported that of 11 samples of the products of this company, I found no evidence of asbestos in nine

of the samples, and the other two samples fell into the inconclusive category described above. These results are not seriously at variance with those reported by investigators retained by the company.

SEYMOUR Z. LEWIN
*Professor of Chemistry
New York University*

New York

The Nixon Budget

Editor, The Wall Street Journal:

The Nixon budget is defective on at least three counts:

First, it keeps defense spending scandalously immune from the kind of cost-benefit analysis supposedly applied to other areas—not a word on overkill nor on the corporate, union and bureaucratic welfare recipients in the arms establishment. This is a shocking abrogation of managerial responsibilities.

Secondly, in slashing federal social programs wholesale and proposing to replace a few of them with revenue-sharing grants, the administration has not only been callous but has also violated one of the principal tenets of good management, to wit that authority and responsibility must not be out of balance. The federal government collects taxes and is not responsible for the funds; however, it now proposes to give authority over them to state and local governments—the probity of some of which is indicated by the number of their officials now convicted of fraud or serving time. It thus acts, to put it mildly, as an imprudent trustee of our money. It is precisely local failure, both public and private, which was in large part responsible for making the programs now under attack federal in the first instance.

Third, there isn't a word on our many unmet needs. The proposed enthronement of Scrooge, military-industrial waste and Balkanization bode ill for our future—and our tax money. In the forthcoming actions on the budget, Congress can neither shirk its responsibilities nor leave the choice of priorities to Mr. Nixon.

JOHN E. ULLMANN
*Professor
Hofstra University*

Hempstead, N.Y.

Case No: BC666513

Joanne Anderson et al.

VS Johnson & Johnson et al.

DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT 7058

JNJAZ55_000003312