

**More than Risk:  
Synthetic and Natural Risk  
in the case of  
EDB and Aflatoxins**

(1) ...  
to show safety ...  
need to ...  
(2) ...  
as a polemic - ask why ...  
much of arg. is underground -  
esp. on RA - RP?  
(gives a basis of ideas of methods  
of point arg.)

by

**Charles C. Chester**

**Thesis**

**Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the  
Degree of Bachelor of Arts  
in the Center for Environmental Studies at Brown University**

## Abstract

According to different risk assessments of toxicological data, the carcinogenic risk from naturally occurring aflatoxins is more significant than the carcinogenic risk from the synthetic pesticide EDB. Aflatoxins, however, are subject to less stringent regulation than is EDB. In light of this, the two contaminants have been compared in order to demonstrate that synthetic carcinogens receive much more regulatory attention than do natural carcinogens. Is this discrepancy unwarranted? Chapter 1 takes a close look at how the comparison was made and what it means. It is hypothesized that risk assessments alone cannot comprise the basis for an adequate comparison of the two chemicals. Chapter 2 examines the legal basis for the regulation of both contaminants. Chapter 3 looks at several justifications for regulating the two contaminants differently. Chapter 4 examines the hypothesis that risk perceptions -- more than legal differences or justifications -- are behind the stricter regulation of EDB than of aflatoxins. Chapter 5 offers conclusions on several levels. The central conclusion is that the comparisons drawn between EDB and aflatoxins during the 1983-4 controversy over EDB were incomplete and ignored important factors that should be involved in a comparison between the chemicals.