

1 get a chance to analyze lung tissue in somebody who their
2 only known exposure was to friction products, we try to do
3 that to see if we can find a counterexample.

4 And I haven't yet. Which -- which would lead one
5 to say it's not impossible, but more likely than not, it
6 would be the case that friction products would not cause the
7 disease.

8 Q Okay. So in your mind, the hypothesis has been --
9 has been proven now.

10 A Well, it's -- science doesn't go that way to
11 really prove a hypothesis.

12 Q Okay.

13 A Put forward a hypothesis, then you collect data to
14 try to disprove it. And until you have data to disprove it,
15 if the hypothesis is the best explanation for the data out
16 there, then you continue to believe that hypothesis until
17 there is data that disproves it.

18 Q Okay. It's more likely than not.

19 A Right. Unless somebody offers another explanation
20 that is as good or better to explain the findings.

21 Q So prior to the late 1980s, was -- in your mind,
22 was it a settled question that it was more likely than not
23 that exposure to friction products could not cause
24 asbestos-related disease?

25 A Prior to when?