



# ASBESTOS BULLETIN

Newsletter of the Asbestos Relief Trust & the Kgalagadi Relief Trust



## Special Edition

### Asbestos Is Still with Us: Repeat Call for a Universal Ban

Author: *Collegium Ramazzini*

**The first call for a universal ban on asbestos by the Collegium Ramazzini was made in 1999. Asbestos is though still mined and used in several countries across the globe. The Asbestos Relief Trust and the Kgalagadi Relief Trust note that the South African Government has honoured this call through the asbestos banning regulations but appeal to Government, stakeholders and interested parties to add their voices to the call for an international ban.**

#### Introduction

Asbestos is a term applied to six naturally occurring fibrous minerals. These minerals occur in two configurations: serpentine and amphibole. The only type of asbestos derived from serpentine minerals, chrysotile, also known as white asbestos, accounts for 95 percent of the asbestos ever used around the world, and it is the only type of asbestos in commercial use today. Amphibole minerals include five asbestos species: amosite, crocidolite, tremolite, anthophyllite, and actinolite. The two forms of serpentine asbestos that previously were most commercially important --amosite, or brown asbestos, and crocidolite, or blue asbestos--are no longer in use.

Asbestos fibers can withstand fire, heat and acid. They have great tensile strength. They provide thermal insulation and acoustic insulation. For these reasons, asbestos came into wide commercial use and gave rise to a burgeoning industry many years before its detrimental health effects, which often take years to appear, became known.

All forms of asbestos cause asbestosis, a progressive, debilitating fibrotic disease of the lungs. All forms of asbestos also cause malignant mesothelioma, lung, laryngeal, and ovarian cancers, and may cause gastrointestinal and other cancers (Straif et al, 2009). Asbestos was declared a proven human carcinogen by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) of the World Health Organization, and the National Toxicology Program (NTP) more than 20 years ago (EPA, 1986; IARC, 1988; NTP, 1980). The scientific community is in overwhelming agreement that there is no safe level of exposure to asbestos (Welch, 2007). Moreover, there is no evidence of a threshold level below which there is no risk of mesothelioma (Hillerdal, 1999).

#### The Asbestos Cancer Pandemic

##### Occupational Exposures to Asbestos

Many millions of workers have already been exposed to asbestos. About 20–40 percent of adult men report past occupations that may have entailed asbestos exposures (Goldberg et al., 2000). In the most highly affected age groups, mesothelioma may account for over 1% of all deaths (Driscoll et al, 2005; Rake et al, 2009). In addition to mesothelioma, 5–7 percent of all lung cancers are potentially attributable to occupational exposures to asbestos (Tossavainen, 2004).

Worldwide, the yearly number of asbestos-related cancer deaths in workers is estimated to be 100,000–140,000. In Western Europe, North America, Japan, and Australia 20,000 new cases of lung cancer and 10,000 cases of mesothelioma result every year from exposures to asbestos (Tossavainen, 1997). The British mesothelioma death-rate is now the highest in the world, with 1,740 deaths in men (1 in 40 of all male cancer deaths below age 80) and 316 in women in 2006. About 1 in 170 of all British men born in the 1940s will die of mesothelioma (Rake et al, 2009). Australia's high incidence of mesothelioma is expected to reach 18,000 by 2020, with 11,000 cases yet to appear (Leigh & Driscoll, 2003).

The US National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) estimates that current occupational exposures to asbestos even at OSHA's permissible exposure limit will cause 5 deaths from lung cancer and 2 deaths from asbestosis in every 1,000 workers exposed for a working lifetime (Stayner et al., 1997). This mortality reflects the fact that an exposure to 0.1 fibers of asbestos per cc of inspired air, over the course of a day, amounts to daily inhalation of more than one million asbestos fibers.\*

#### Environmental Exposures to Asbestos

Non-occupational, environmental exposure to asbestos from the use of asbestos in construction materials is also a serious and often neglected problem in countries throughout the world. In developed countries large quantities of asbestos remain as a legacy of past construction practices in many thousands of schools, homes, and commercial buildings. And in developing countries, where asbestos is used today in large quantities in construction, asbestos-contaminated dust is now accumulating in thousands of communities.

More than 90 percent of the asbestos used worldwide today is used in the manufacture of asbestos-cement sheets and pipes. Use of asbestos in these materials continues despite repeated warnings that the use of asbestos in these products is highly dangerous because of the large numbers of people exposed to the airborne dust and the extreme difficulty of controlling exposures once these materials have been disseminated into communities where people of all ages, including young children, are at risk of exposure (WHO, 1998).

Both community-based and industrial exposures to asbestos and asbestiform fibers increase risks for mesothelioma (Pasetto et al, 2005). Thus a study of women residing in Canadian asbestos mining communities found a sevenfold increase in the mortality rate from pleural cancer (Camus et al, 1998). The risk of developing asbestos-related cancer following in-home exposures in communities near Canadian mines over a 30-year period is estimated to be 1 in 10,000 (Marier et al, 2007). Likewise, environmental exposures to asbestos waste on the surfaces of roads and yards in a contaminated community of 130,000 residents in The Netherlands result each year in several cases of malignant mesothelioma (Driecce et al, 2009). And in a third example, the currently observed increase in female cases of mesothelioma in the United Kingdom, many with no occupational exposure to asbestos, suggests widespread environmental contamination (Rake et al, 2009).

#### The Position of Industry

In efforts to sustain markets in the face of a steadily growing body of scientific evidence that irrefutably links asbestos to asbestosis and human cancer, the asbestos industry has attempted to obfuscate the links between asbestos and disease by provoking spurious scientific debate over the roles of,

\* footnote: The average adult at rest inhales 7 to 8 liters of air per minute. That totals approximately 11,000 liters of air in a day. An exposure standard of 0.1 f/cc would then result in 11,000,000 cc x 0.1 f/cc = 1.1 million fibers/day.

viruses, fiber types and genetics in the development of lung cancer and malignant mesothelioma. These tactics closely resemble those used by the tobacco industry.

Early on the asbestos industry blamed malignant mesothelioma occurrence on poliovirus vaccines used during the 1950s and 1960s that were contaminated with simian virus 40 (SV40), a monkey virus tumorigenic in rodents. However, age-specific trends in pleural mesothelioma incidence rates are not consistent with an effect of exposure to SV40-contaminated poliovirus vaccine (Strickler et al, 2003).

The industry continues to generate endless debate on the relative hazards of asbestos of different fiber type and dimension. In these debates industry spokespersons argue that some forms of asbestos are less harmful than others. However, epidemiological and statistical efforts to characterize relative cancer potencies for different asbestos fiber types and for fibers of different sizes have not been able to overcome limitations of the exposure data. Nor can these analyses account for the fact that in the real world exposure is almost always to mixtures of asbestos fibers of different types and sizes.

Epidemiologic, experimental, and molecular evidence suggests that the arguments for the role of fiber size relative to dose, dose-response effect, and genetic susceptibility are fraught with enormous uncertainties (Tomatis et al, 2007). Indeed NIOSH scientists contend that the uncertainties have been so great that these estimates should not be used to determine occupational and environmental health policy. The EPA has rejected and discontinued work on its proposed methods for quantifying potency factors for partitioned asbestos fiber types and sizes (Silverstein et al, 2009). A third activity of the asbestos industry is to commission the publication of articles, primarily in toxicology journals, termed "product defense" articles. These articles are frequently sponsored by asbestos interests such as the defendants in personal injury asbestos litigation. They are distinguished from other science papers in that they are written by scientific consultants and consulting firms, who are paid substantial sums for their work. Their goal is to defeat liability claims (Michaels, 2006; Michaels, 2008; Michaels & Monforton, 2007; Boden & Ozonoff, 2008). Editors of scientific journals must be very stringent about the details and wording of authors' statements on conflicts of interest, and carefully select unbiased peer reviewers of articles regarding asbestos in accordance with the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors guidelines (ICMJE, 2009).

Despite their lack of scientific foundation,

these continuing controversies and ploys generated by the asbestos industry have helped to make the disease experiences and early deaths of asbestos-exposed workers and people in asbestos-contaminated communities invisible and uncompensated, allowing the asbestos industry to escape accountability (Braun, et al, 2003).

### **Chrysotile Asbestos**

Chrysotile represents 95 percent of all the asbestos ever used worldwide. It is the only variety in international trade in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. There is general agreement among scientists and physicians, and widespread support from numerous national health agencies in countries around the world, United Nations agencies, and the World Trade Organization, that chrysotile causes various cancers, including mesothelioma and lung cancer (ACGIH, 2001; ATSDR, 2001; ILO, 2006; ISSA, 2004; NTP, 2004; NCI, 2003; OSHA, 1994; UNEP, 1998; WHO, 2006; WTO, 2000).

Early suggestions that chrysotile might be less dangerous than other forms of asbestos have not been substantiated. And although chrysotile accounts for almost all the asbestos ever used, the asbestos industry continues to claim that asbestos-related cancers are the result of the amphibole varieties (McCulloch 2006; Renner, 2007). Consultant experts of the Canadian chrysotile asbestos industry contend that "Exposure to chrysotile in a pure form seems likely to present a very low if any risk of mesothelioma" (Gibbs & Berry, 2008).

The Chrysotile Institute, a registered lobby group for the Quebec asbestos mining industry, takes the position that chrysotile can be handled safely (Chrysotile Institute, 2008). Numerous epidemiologic studies, case reports, controlled animal experiments, and toxicological studies refute the assertion that chrysotile is safe (Bang et al, 2006; Landrigan et al, 1999; Lemen, 2004a; Lin et al, 2007; Smith and Wright, 1996; Stayner et al., 1996; Tossavainen, 1997). These studies demonstrate that the so-called "controlled use" of asbestos is a fallacy (Lemen, 2004b). Workers exposed to chrysotile fiber alone have excessive risks of lung cancer and mesothelioma (Frank et al, 1998; Li et al, 2004, Mirabelli, 2008).

The Canadian Medical Association, the Canadian Cancer Society, and Canada's leading health experts oppose the export of asbestos to developing countries. The National Public Health Institute of Quebec (INSPQ) has published fifteen reports, all of them showing a failure to achieve "controlled use" of asbestos in Quebec itself. Pat Martin, a member of Canada's parliament and former asbestos miner asks, "If we in the developed world haven't found a way to handle chrysotile safely, how can we expect them to do so in

developing nations? (Burki, 2010)"

The reality of the current use of Canadian asbestos in India was broadcast by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in a 2009 documentary (CBC, 2009). This stunning piece of investigative journalism exposed the fallacy underpinning the asbestos industry's commercial propaganda; showing there is no such thing as the safe use of asbestos. The World Trade Organization has accepted this conclusion (Castleman, 2002).

### **Current Production and Use of Asbestos**

Despite all that is known about the health effects of asbestos, annual world production remains at over 2 million tons. This level of production has remained steady following a 50% decline in the 1990s. Russia is now the leading producer of asbestos worldwide, followed by China, Kazakhstan, Brazil, Canada, Zimbabwe, and Colombia. These six countries accounted for 96% of the world production of asbestos in 2007 (USGS, 2008). Russia has mines rich enough in asbestos deposits to last for more than 100 years at current levels of production. The majority of the 925,000 tons of asbestos extracted annually in Russia is exported.

Asbestos is now banned in 52 countries, including all EU member countries, and safer products have replaced many that were once made with asbestos. Virtually all of the polymeric and cellulose fibers used instead of asbestos in fiber-cement sheets are greater than 10 microns in diameter and hence are non-respirable. Nonetheless, these 52 countries make up less than a third of WHO member countries.

A much larger number of WHO member countries still use, import, and export asbestos and asbestos-containing products (WHO, 2006). Over 70 percent of the world production of asbestos is used in Asia and Eastern Europe, in countries desperate for industrial growth and often naïve to the health effects of occupational and environmental exposures to asbestos. Most of the world's people still live in countries where asbestos use continues with little or no provision for prevention or compensation. And in many countries that have banned other forms of asbestos, the "controlled use" of chrysotile asbestos is still exempted from the ban because of the size of the asbestos industry, its pervasive influence, and the importance of asbestos mining and manufacture to the economy. The toll in most countries still using large amounts of asbestos may never be fully recorded.

In developing countries, where too often there exists little or no protection of workers and communities, the asbestos cancer pandemic may be the most devastating.

China is by far the largest consumer of asbest

os in the world today, followed by India, Russia, Kazakhstan, Thailand, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan.

### Position of United Nations Agencies on Asbestos

International organizations have condemned the continuing use of chrysotile asbestos (LaDou 2004). In 2006, WHO called for the elimination of diseases associated with asbestos (WHO, 2006). WHO supports individual countries in developing national plans to ban asbestos and eliminate asbestos disease. The ILO has expressed concern about an evolving epidemic of asbestos-related diseases, and has drafted a resolution to promote a worldwide asbestos ban (ILO, 2006).

The Rotterdam Convention is an international treaty intended to regulate global trade in dangerous chemicals –chemicals that have been banned or severely restricted because of their hazards to human health or the environment. It was enacted in 2004, and 122 nations are currently parties to the Convention. The goal is to protect the world's most vulnerable countries - developing countries and countries with economies in transition - against importation without their prior knowledge or consent of hazardous pesticides and other regulated chemicals.

Prior Informed Consent (PIC) is the core principle of the Rotterdam Convention. This legally binding procedure requires that governments in all countries be provided full information prior to importation about the risks to health and the environment of each of the hazardous materials regulated by the Convention. Annex III of the Rotterdam Convention contains a list of the chemicals – 37 in number – currently regulated by the Convention.

Repeated efforts to include chrysotile asbestos under the Rotterdam Convention have failed, because of the Convention's requirement for unanimity and the determined opposition of asbestos mining and manufacturing countries (Terracini, 2008). At the 2008 conference of parties on the Convention, opposition to chrysotile asbestos was led by Canada, Russia, and India. Kazakhstan and a few asbestos importing countries thwarted the will of over 100 other countries.

### Conclusion - The Need for a Universal Ban on Asbestos

The profound tragedy of the asbestos pandemic is that virtually all illnesses and deaths related to asbestos are preventable. Safer substitutes for asbestos exist, and they have been introduced successfully in many nations.

Asbestos-cement (A-C) pipes, sheets, and water storage tanks account for 90 percent of asbestos used in the world today.

Substitutes for A-C water pipe include ductile iron pipe, high-density polyethylene pipe, and metal-wire-reinforced concrete pipe. Many substitutes exist for roofing, interior building walls and ceilings, including fiber-cement flat and corrugated sheet products, made with polyvinyl alcohol fibers and cellulose fibers. For roofing, lightweight concrete tiles can be made and used in the most remote locations, using locally available plant fibers including jute, hemp, sisal, palm nut, coconut coir, and wood pulp. Galvanized iron roofing and clay tiles are among the other alternative materials (WBG, 2009).

If global use of asbestos were to cease today, a decrease in the incidence of asbestos-related diseases would become evident only two or more decades from now (WHO, 2006). The asbestos cancer pandemic may take as many as 10 million lives before asbestos is banned worldwide and all exposure is brought to an end (LaDou, 2004; Leigh, 2001). In this conservative estimate, it is assumed that asbestos exposures are going to cease and that the epidemic will run itself out, but currently the world's production of asbestos continues at an alarming rate, and therefore these figures may be underestimates of the true reality of this pandemic.

An international ban on the mining and use of asbestos is urgently needed. The risks of exposure to asbestos cannot be controlled by technology or by regulation of work practices. Scientists and responsible authorities in countries allowing the use of asbestos should have no illusion that "controlled use" of chrysotile asbestos is an effective alternative to a ban on all use of asbestos (Castleman, 2003; Egilman et al. 2003; Egilman & Roberts, 2004). Even the best workplace controls cannot prevent occupational and environmental exposures to products in use or to waste.

All countries of the world have an obligation to their citizens to join the international endeavor to ban all forms of asbestos.

**The Collegium Ramazzini, an international academic society that examines critical issues in occupational and environmental medicine, is dedicated to the prevention of disease and the promotion of health. The Collegium derives its name from Bernardino Ramazzini, the father of occupational medicine, a professor of medicine of the Universities of Modena and Padua in the early 1700s. Currently, 180 renowned clinicians and scientists from around the world, each of whom has been elected to membership, comprise the Collegium. It is independent of commercial interests.**

### References

- ACGIH (American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists). Asbestos: TLV Chemical Substances 7<sup>th</sup> Edition Documentation. Publication #7DOC-040. Cincinnati OH: ACGIH, 2001.
- ATSDR (Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry). Toxicological Profile for Asbestos. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Atlanta, GA, 2001.
- Bang KM, Pinheiro GA, Wood JM, Syamlal G. Malignant mesothelioma mortality in the United States, 1999-2001. *Int J Occup Environ Health*. 2006;12(1):2-15.
- Boden LI, Ozonoff D. Litigation-generated science: why should we care? *Environ Health Perspect*. 2008;116(1):117-122.
- Braun L, Greene A, Manseau M, Singhal R, Kisting S, Jacobs N. Scientific controversy and asbestos: Making disease invisible. *Int J Occup Environ Health*. 2003;9:194-205.
- Burki T. Health experts concerned over India's asbestos industry. *The Lancet*. 2010;375(9715):626-627. [http://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736\(10\)60251-6/fulltext](http://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(10)60251-6/fulltext)
- Camus M., Siemiatycki J., and Meek, B.: Nonoccupational exposure to chrysotile asbestos and the risk of lung cancer. *N. Engl. J. Med*. 1998;338: 1565-71.
- Castleman B. WTO confidential: The case of asbestos. *Int J Health Serv*. 2002;32:489-501.
- Castleman B. 2003. "Controlled use" of asbestos. *Int J Occup Environ Health*. 2003;9:294-298.
- CBC (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation). The National. Canada's Ugly Secret. June 10, 2009. <http://www.cbc.ca/thenational/>
- Chrysotile Institute. The crusade against chrysotile must end. Newsletter. 2008;7(2):2. [http://www.chrysotile.com/data/newsletter/Chrysotile\\_Dec2008\\_EN.pdf](http://www.chrysotile.com/data/newsletter/Chrysotile_Dec2008_EN.pdf)
- Collegium Ramazzini. Call for an international ban on asbestos. *J Occup Environ Med*. 1999;41(10):830-832.
- Driece HA, Siesling S, Swuste PH, Burdorf A. Assessment of cancer risks due to environmental exposure to asbestos. *J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol*. 2009; in press.
- Driscoll T, Nelson DI, Steenland K, Leigh J, Concha-Barrientos M, Fingerhut M, The global burden of disease due to occupational carcinogens. *Am J Ind Med*. 2005;48(6):419-431.
- Egilman D, Fehnel C, Bohme SR. Exposing the "myth" of ABC, "anything but chrysotile": a critique of the Canadian asbestos mining industry and McGill University chrysotile studies. *Am J Ind Med*. 2003;44:540-557.
- Egilman D, Roberts M. Controlled use of asbestos. *Int J Occup Environ Health*. 2004;10:99-103.
- EPA (Environmental Protection Agency). Airborne Asbestos Health Assessment Update. EPA/6000/8-84/003E, EPA, Washington, D.C., June, 1986.
- Frank A.L., Dodson R.F., Williams M.G.: Carcinogenic implications of the lack of tremolite in UICC reference chrysotile. *Am. J. Ind. Med*. 1998;34:314-317.
- Gibbs GW, Berry G. Mesothelioma and asbestos. *Regul Toxicol Pharmacol*. 2008;52(1 Suppl):S223-31.
- Goldberg M, Banaei A, Goldberg S, Anvert B, Luce D, Gueguen A. Past occupational exposure to asbestos among men in France. *Scand J Work Environ Health*. 2000;26:52-61.
- Hillerdal G. Mesothelioma: cases associated with non-occupational and low dose exposures. *Occup Environ Med*. 1999;56(8):505-513.

IARC (International Agency for Research on Cancer). Asbestos: Monograph on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risk to Man. Lyon, France. IARC, 1988.

ICMJE (International Committee of Medical Journal Editors). Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals: Writing and Editing for Biomedical Publications, <http://www.icmje.org/>

ILO (International Labour Organization). ILO adopts new measures on occupational safety and health, the employment relationship, asbestos. International Labour Organization, 2006. <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/inf/pr/2006/34.htm>

ISSA (International Social Security Association). Déclaration sur l'amiante, Pékin, Septembre 16, 2004.

LaDou J. The asbestos cancer epidemic. *Env Health Perspect.* 2004;112:285–290.

Landrigan P, Nicholson WJ, Suzuki Y, LaDou J. The hazards of chrysotile asbestos: a critical review. *Ind Health.* 1999;37:271–280.

Lemen RA. Chrysotile asbestos as a cause of mesothelioma: Application of the Hill causation model. *Int J Occ Env Health.* 2004a;10:233–239.

Lemen RA. Asbestos in brakes: exposure and risk of disease. *Am J Ind Med.* 2004b;45(3):229–237. Review.

Leigh JP. Asbestos-related diseases: International estimates of future liability. Abstract. 5th International Congress on Work Injuries Prevention, Rehabilitation and Compensation & 2nd Australian National Workers Compensation Symposium (18–21 March, 2001, Adelaide, Australia).

Leigh J, Driscoll T. Malignant mesothelioma in Australia, 1945–2002. *Int J Occup Environ Health.* 2003;9(3):206–217.

Li L, Sun TD, Zhang X, Lai RN, Li SY, Fan XJ, Morinaga K. Cohort studies on cancer mortality among workers exposed only to chrysotile asbestos: a meta-analysis. *Biomed Environ Sci.* 2004;17(4):459–468.

Lin RT, Takahashi K, Karjalainen A, Wilson D, Kameda T, Chan CC, Wen CP, Furuva S, Higashi T, Chan LC, Ohtaki M. Ecological association between asbestos-related diseases and historical asbestos consumption: an international analysis. *Lancet.* 2007;20(9564):844–849.

Marier M, Charney W, Rousseau R, Lanthier R, Van Raalte J. Exploratory sampling of asbestos in residences near Theford Mines: The public health threat in Quebec. *Int J Occup Environ Health.* 2007;13:386–397.

McCulloch J. Saving the asbestos industry, 1960 to 2006. *Public Health Reports.* 2006;121:609–614.

Michaels D. Manufactured uncertainty: protecting public health in the age of contested science and product defense. *Ann N Y Acad Sci.* 2006;1076:149–162.

Michaels D. *Doubt Is Their Product. How Industry's Assault on Science Threatens Your Health.* Oxford University Press; New York, 2008.

Michaels D, Monforton C. How litigation shapes the scientific literature: asbestos and disease among automobile mechanics. *J Law & Policy.* 2007; 5(3):1137–1169.

Mirabelli D, Calisti R, Barone-Adesi F, Fornero E, Merletti F, Magnani C. Excess of mesotheliomas alter exposure to chrysotile in Balangero, Italy. *Occup Environ Med.* 2008;65(12):815–819.

NCI (National Cancer Institute). Factsheet—Asbestos: Questions and Answers. Bethesda, MD: National Institutes of Health, 2003.

NTP (National Toxicology Program). Report on Carcinogens, 1ST ed. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, 1980.

NTP (National Toxicology Program). Report on Carcinogens, 11th ed. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, 2004.

OSHA (Occupational Safety and Health Administration). Occupational exposure to asbestos: Final rule. *Fed Reg.* 1994;59:40964–41162.

Pasetto R, Comba P, Marconi A. Mesothelioma associated with environmental exposures. *Med Lav.* 2005;96(4):330–337.

Rake C, Gilham C, Hatch J, Darnton A, Hodgson J, Peto J. Occupational, domestic and environmental mesothelioma risks in the British population: a case-control study. *Br J Cancer.* 2009;100(7):1175–1183.

Renner R. Chrysotile on ice. *Environ Health Perspect.* 2007;115:3:130.

Silverstein MA, Welch LS, Lemen R. Developments in asbestos cancer risk assessment. *Am J Ind Med.* 2009;15:850–858.

Smith AH, Wright CC. Chrysotile asbestos is the main cause of pleural mesothelioma. *Am J Ind Med.* 2006;30:252–266.

Stayner LT, Dankovic DA, Lemen RA. Occupational exposure to chrysotile asbestos and cancer risk: A review of the amphibole hypothesis. *Am J Pub Health.* 1996;86:179–186.

Stayner L, Smith R, Bailer J, Gilbert S, Steenland K, Dement J, Brown D, Lemen R. Exposure-response analysis of risk of respiratory disease associated with occupational exposure to chrysotile asbestos. *Occ Env Med.* 1997;54:646–652.

Straif K, Benbrahim-Tallaa L, Baan R, Grosse Y, Secretan B, El Ghissassi F, Bouvard V, Guha N, Freeman C, Galichet L, Cogliano V; WHO International Agency for Research on Cancer Monograph Working Group. A review of human carcinogens—part C: metals, arsenic, dusts, and fibres. *Lancet Oncol.* 2009;10(5):453–454.

Strickler HD, Goedert JJ, Devesa SS, Lahey J, Fraumeni JF Jr, Rosenberg PS. Trends in U.S. pleural mesothelioma incidence rates following simian virus 40 contamination of early poliovirus vaccines. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 2003;95(1):38–45.

Terracini B. Rotterdam Convention: Chrysotile is still in the waiting list. *Epidemiol Prev.* 2008;32(6):275–276. Italian

Tomatis L, Cantoni S, Carnevale F, Merler E, Mollo F, Ricci P, Silvestri S, Vineis P, Terracini B. The role of asbestos fiber dimension in the prevention of mesothelioma. *Int J Occup Environ Health.* 2007;13:64–69.

Tossavainen A. Asbestos, asbestosis and cancer: the Helsinki criteria for diagnosis and attribution. *Consensus report.* *Scand J Work Environ Health.* 1997;23:211–216.

Tossavainen A. Global use of asbestos and incidence of mesothelioma. *Int J Occup Environ Health.* 2004;10:22–25.

UNEP (United Nations Environment Program), ILO (International Labor Office), WHO (World Health Organization). Chrysotile Asbestos, Environmental Health Criteria 203. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO, 1998.

USGS (U.S. Geological Survey). U.S. Department of the Interior. 2008 Minerals Yearbook, Volume 1—Metals and Minerals. Asbestos, 2008. <http://minerals.usgs.gov/minerals/pubs/commodity/asbestos/index.html#myb>

WBG (World Bank Group). Good Practice Note: Asbestos: Occupational and Community Health Issues, May 2009. <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTPOPS/Resources/AsbestosGuidanceNoteFinal.pdf>

Welch LS. Asbestos exposure causes mesothelioma, but not this asbestos exposure: An amicus brief to the Michigan Supreme Court. *Int J Occup Environ Health.* 2007;13:318–327.

WHO (World Health Organization). Environmental Health Criteria 203: Chrysotile Asbestos. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO, 1998.

WHO (World Health Organization). Elimination of Asbestos Related Diseases. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO, 2006.

WTO (World Trade Organization). European Communities—Measures Affecting Asbestos and Asbestos-containing Products. WT/DS135/R. 2000.

## Appendix

### National Asbestos

Bans:<sup>1</sup>

Argentina  
Australia  
Austria  
Bahrain  
Belgium  
Brunei  
Bulgaria  
Chile  
Croatia<sup>2</sup>  
Cyprus\*  
Czech Republic  
Denmark  
Egypt  
Estonia\*  
Finland  
France  
Gabon  
Germany  
Greece\*  
Honduras  
Hungary\*  
Iceland  
Ireland  
Italy  
Japan  
Jordan<sup>3</sup>

Korea (South Korea)  
Kuwait  
Latvia  
Lithuania\*  
Luxembourg  
Malta\*  
Netherlands  
Ne Caledonia  
Norway  
Oman  
Poland  
Portugal\*  
Qatar  
Romania  
Saud Arabia  
Seychelles  
Singapore  
Slovakia\*  
Slovenia  
South Africa  
Spain  
Sweden  
Switzerland  
Taiwan  
United Kingdom  
(including England,  
Scotland, Wales and  
Northern Ireland)  
Uruguay

Revised Jan 28, 2010.

List periodically updated by International Ban Asbestos Secretariat (IBAS), [http://ibasecretariat.org/lka\\_alpha\\_asb\\_ban\\_280704.php](http://ibasecretariat.org/lka_alpha_asb_ban_280704.php)

<sup>1</sup> Exemptions for minor uses are permitted in some countries.

<sup>2</sup>Croatia banned asbestos as of January 1, 2006. Six weeks later, the Ministry of Economy, under political and commercial pressure, forced the Ministry of Health to reverse its position with the result that the manufacture of asbestos-containing products for export was permitted again.

<sup>3</sup>An immediate ban on amosite and crocidolite was imposed on August 16, 2005; a grace period of one year was allowed for the phasing out of the use of tremolite, chrysotile, anthophyllite and actinolite in friction products, brake linings and clutch pads. After August 16, 2006, all forms of asbestos were banned for all uses.

\* January 1, 2005 was the deadline for prohibiting the new use of chrysotile, other forms of asbestos having been banned previously, in all 25 Member States of the European Union; compliance with this directive has not been verified in countries with an asterisk (\*). As of May 2009 there are 27 Member States, with Romania and Bulgaria joining the EU in 2007