

Table 2.—Ferruginous Bodies in Human Lungs in Autopsy Series*

Year	Percent Positive
1963	26.4
1965	27.1
1965	41
1965	39.2
1966	57.6
1966	48
1966	42

*Long smears except series from Finland were examined.

†C. R. Tabershaw, unpublished.

reports were on the basis of relatively few asbestos bodies per case. In cases with many bodies, there were invariably occupational or residential as to a source of asbestos and most commonly in males. In most of the series, all small, when attempts were attempted with diagnosis, there was no apparent association with any other specific causes of

ample evidence in the literature that so-called asbestos bodies can be produced in humans with exposures other than asbestos workers, soft coal miners, graphite workers, etc. Asbestos bodies can be produced in guinea pigs with other exposures. Invariably, they represent a non-specific reaction to any relatively insoluble mineral dust in the lungs.

As Cooke²¹ said, "... the question why any fine spicule of asbestos does not have colloidal matter around it and become moulded into a body. But as no other mineral dust is known to cause this occurrence must be so negligible from a diagnostic point of view."

Now, is Cooke's statement of 1963 still valid today? Or, are we adding new kinds to our environment, changing the picture of our human

environment, many of the bodies that are really asbestos minerals. We need to determine their significance and to draw the conclusion that we know that they necessitate a study of neoplasms. It is

quite warranted to speculate on the matter, however. It is important not only to identify positively these ferruginous bodies but also to quantitate them in populations with known exposures to various fibrous minerals. If those with small or moderate numbers of asbestos bodies show no detectable increased risk of disease, then one could feel more secure about those in whom the bodies are scant in number.

It is also important to learn the sources of these fibrous minerals that are found in lungs. The view that asbestos minerals are indestructible is not quite true; this is a relative term only, and we cannot assume that the millions of tons used annually actually enter our physical environment forever. Many are bound indefinitely into products that do not release them; those that are released are subject to the effects of heat, acids, and other insults to minerals. Nevertheless, it is important to get a better idea of our asbestos balance, so to speak.

Summary

In summary with the increasing use and indispensability of asbestos minerals, there has come realization of some very real hazards that must be better defined and controlled. Present standards for dust control do not appear adequate to prevent asbestosis over a working lifetime, and many segments of industry aggressively attacking the problem have already been using more rigorous standards. The associations between asbestos minerals and malignancies of the lungs, pleura, and peritoneum have become increasingly convincing. Current efforts must be directed toward better definition of the importance of type, size of fiber and the importance of co-factors. It has been suggested that asbestos fibers act as carriers of carcinogenic metals or other substances to vulnerable sites. The demonstration of ferruginous bodies in from one-quarter to one-half of the lungs examined in consecutive autopsies in a number of cities around the world points to an urgent need for the positive identification of the mineral fibers that are responsible. If they prove to be asbestos, we do not know what point on the dosage response curve is represented and conse-

quently are not now in a position to estimate their significance in terms of human health.

Conclusions

I have one final set of conclusions. I think you will notice that I have not conformed to the usual pattern of talks with titles such as the one I was assigned, lining up on the one hand a list of the things we really know and then decrying unwarranted and mischievous extrapolations. Actually, that could have been done here, as I do think misleading statements have been made with respect to asbestos. The more fundamental problem is one that is a major affliction of occupational health. We often try to emphasize that part of the challenge of the field is that it is at the forefront of medicine and technology, where environmental hazards can first be detected, in view of the relative levels of exposure and the opportunities to study populations at risk. But when relationships are actually suspected and then gradually established, very real and practical consequences become apparent. So the speculations, call them fancies if you will, that are part of the normal process of developing new knowledge in other fields become menacing and are misused and misunderstood. Polarization of views and severance of communication is the rule, not the exception. I think that this has been the case history of much occupational disease research in the United States, and I cannot say I know how it could be eliminated. I do believe, however, that scientific progress requires both fact and fancy.

References

1. May, T.: "Asbestos," in *Mineral Facts and Problems*, US Department of the Interior Bulletin No. 630, 1965.
2. Raunio, V.: *Occurrence of Unusual Pleural Calcification in Finland. Study on Atmospheric Pollution Caused by Asbestos*, Supplement 47 to vol 55, *Ann Med Intern Fenniae*, Helsinki, 1966.
3. Wells, J.: in discussion Hills, D.W. Economics of Dust Control, *Ann NY Acad Sci* 132:337-338 (Dec 31) 1965.
4. Fleischer, W.L., et al: A Health Survey of Pipe-Covering Operations in Contracting Naval Vessels, *J Industr Hyg Tox* 28:156, 1946.
5. Marr, W.T.: Asbestos Exposure During Naval Vessel Overhaul, *Amer Industr Hyg Assoc J* 25:234-238, 1964.
6. Mitchell, J.: Health Progress in an Asbestos-Textile Works, *Arch Environ Health* 1967 11, 1-61.