As part of the 50th birthday celebration, we are arranging to reprint 12 papers, *the Editor's Choice*, which have appeared in previous issues of the *Journal*. They have been chosen partly to illustrate the range and scope of the *Journal* over the years and partly because they are or were important in their day. More significantly, they have been chosen because they exemplify some of the best in scientific writing and can all be read with great pleasure and all who wish to communicate their observations, their ideas, or their enthusiasms would do well to study them and learn from them.

We will publish one paper each month through the year and they will appear in the order in which they were originally published.

Editor's Choice

Tumours of the urinary bladder in workmen engaged in the manufacture and use of certain dyestuff intermediates in the British chemical industry

by R A M Case, Marjorie E Hosker, Drever B McDonald, and Joan T Pearson

(*British Journal of Industrial Medicine* 1954;11:75-96)

Case's study of bladder cancer in the chemical industry is a landmark in the history of occupational cancer. Under the auspices of the Association of the British Chemical Manufacturers Case and his colleagues were able to follow up over 4600 men in the chemical industry from 1920 to 1949. They found that the overall risk of dying from bladder cancer was about 30 times that of the general population and that contact with benzidine, α -naphthylamine or β -naphthylamine (but not aniline) in either manufacture or use was liable to cause an excess number of tumours. Furthermore they confirmed what was known for other occupational tumours, that is, that both onset and death occurred at an earlier age than in non-occupational cases.

Case is a good example of the scientist who, although not primarily working in the field of occupational medicine, has nevertheless made a significant contribution to it. There are other instances in this series and it would be of interest sometime to compile a more complete list.

I met Case only once, after he had retired for reasons of ill health to the Isle of Wight. I went to his house in Ryde, accompanied by two other examiners, where he was to examine my PhD thesis. We spent a good deal of time discussing cricket and having lunch before the business began in earnest. There was a particularly nasty moment when he questioned an interpretation I had made of some of the data about latent intervals in this paper. To this day I am not sure that he was convinced that I had actually read the paper, and this is at least one reason why it is firmly imprinted in my memory.

There are two minor points in the paper which are worth noting. The first is that "The accuracy of any statistical analysis is limited by the accuracy of the information upon which it is based;" such a pity that this self evident truth is so often forgotten. The second is the statement that "accurate records of men employed should be kept, and their age, date of starting work, and occupational history noted." Those who carry out epidemiological studies will need no reminding of the extent to which this advice has been acted upon!