To: Medical Advisory Panel (for information)

AIA/20/1/HAS
10 August 1984

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT
UC-3326

ASBESTOS INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION

68 GLOUCESTER PLACE,
LONDON, W1H 3HL
TEL: 01-486 3528/9

With Compliments

Herewith copy of a letter dated 10 July to Dr. Kevin Browne about comments on asbestos and health questions.

00971

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-3326: Sir Neville Stack (Asbestos International Association) to Dr. K. Browne, Cape I... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 18114 · Page 1 of 4 asbestosclaims.law/library/18114/1

ASBESTOS INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION

(Limited by Guarantee)

68 GLOUCESTER PLACE, LONDON W1H 3HL, ENGLAND

Telephone: 01-486 3538/9
Telegrams: Intag London
Telex: 298618 INTA G

Your Ref.

Our Ref. AIA/20/1/HAS

Dr. K. Browne,
Cape Industries PLC,
114 Park Street,
London W1Y 4AB

10 July 1984

Dear Kevin,

Asbestos & Health Questions

We spoke the other day about certain comments on the asbestos and health problem which occur regularly in articles, discussions (the law courts!) etc. and which could with advantage be listed.

The comments are usually over-simplified statements of fact which are not easy to refute. They also tend to have a scare factor.

In many cases, while there is some truth in what is stated, there is usually a qualification or two omitted which if expressed could radically modify the impact of the statement.

The aim is to isolate the offending statements and then to see if there is sufficient evidence in the shape of learned papers to enable us to raise a doubt in people's minds by showing another angle to each statement; i.e. not necessarily a refutation, but more of an "ah, but have you thought of this point?".

It would be hopeless to go into detailed arguments from the learned papers but one should know of them and be confident that they support one's views and could if necessary be produced subsequently.

Attached are nine statements and on a separate sheet a few ideas in response to help start a process of argumentation.

I have picked the nine questions at random and have probably left out the important ones!

Do you think that you could support the responses?

I am copying this to Brian Commins who has expressed an interest.

Yours ever

Jimmy

Sir Neville Stack

Directors: Mr. E. van der Rest (Belgium); Mr. E. Costa (Italy); Sir Neville Stack (Director General & Secretary)
Reg. no. 1392454 England Registered office as above

C0972

UCC 000810

AIA/20/1/HAS

ANNEX 1
to letter dated 10 July 1984

Some Statements

1. One fibre can kill (i.e. mesothelioma and cancer are not dose-related).
2. Only asbestos fibre causes mesothelioma.
3. All fibre sizes are equally dangerous.
4. Asbestos inhalation causes cancer.
5. Asbestos ingestion causes cancer.
6. Children have developed mesothelioma from asbestos exposure.
7. Working in asbestos factories causes thousands of cancer deaths in the UK (or US etc. etc.).
8. The general population is at risk from asbestos.
9. There is no threshold level for asbestos fibre.

C0973

UCC 000811

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-3326: Sir Neville Stack (Asbestos International Association) to Dr. K. Browne, Cape I...
Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 18114 · Page 3 of 4
asbestosclaims.law/library/18114/3

AIA/20/1/HAS

ANNEX 2
to letter dated 10 July 1984

Some Comments on the Statements

1. (a) If one fibre kills, then we should all be dead since asbestos, a naturally occurring mineral, is everywhere and we have been inhaling fibres since birth;

   (b) there are papers showing that asbestos-related diseases are dose related;

   (c) this is the same logic as saying that one cigarette can kill.

2. Baris and others has shown otherwise.

3. There is increasing evidence that the longer fibres are the dangerous ones (> 5μ).

4. Cancer-causing substances are now divided into "initiators" and "promoters". The second type (of which asbestos is one) cannot by themselves cause cancer.

5. This is now generally accepted to be untrue.

6. There are no documented cases of childhood mesothelioma.

7. (a) The proportion of cancer deaths due to occupation is 4%, of which that due to asbestos forms a part.

   (b) Deaths due to other occupations far exceed those due to asbestos work.

8. This is untrue. The levels experienced by the general population are about 3 orders of magnitude less than those at the workplace which are considered safe.

9. Common sense suggests there must be - see 1. However, it is difficult to prove.

00974

UCC 000812

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-3326: Sir Neville Stack (Asbestos International Association) to Dr. K. Browne, Cape I... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 18114 · Page 4 of 4 asbestosclaims.law/library/18114/4