

elsewhere have promulgated several different ABC theories and some have gained widespread acceptance and influence within the scientific community. This influence stems from a vast body of academic literature, published primarily from McGill University, which supports the claims of the industry.

Beyond promoting the marketing and sales of asbestos, these studies have had a tremendous effect on litigation from the 1960s onwards. Lawyers for asbestos-manufacturing corporations have used the corrupted studies to assert that the causal link between asbestos exposure and cancer was unclear and hypothetical, thus effectively denying injured workers and their dependents compensation for their illness.

In this paper, we analyze and discuss four fallacies that underlie the most recent wave of ABC arguments. The first is that organic and synthetic oil contamination—and not the chrysotile itself, is the cause of lung cancer and primary malignant mesothelial tumors in miners and other people who work with asbestos. The second is that the crocidolite allegedly imported from Australia and found at a nearby factory during World War II was what caused an increase in mesothelioma in the workers. A third myth put forth by the industry is that tremolite, and not chrysotile was the culprit, and that current commercial chrysotile is “innocuous” because contemporary mining practices either avoid it entirely or remove it during processing. Finally we review the flawed methodology that the QAMA epidemiologists and scientists used to support the various industry claims.