

Noble Lies

America First Energy Conference

Nov. 9, 2017 | Houston, Texas

John Dale Dunn, M.D., J.D.

- The Noble Lie is told to promote societal accord.
- It is a tool of totalitarians (group think).
- The Noble Lies told by enviros are intended to cement their role as saviors and rescuers.
- Mostly the Noble Lie is to create control and power.

NOBLE LIES OF MODERN

Environmentalism

- 1 The planet is at risk because of human activity.
- 2 Carbon Dioxide will produce deadly and harmful warming.
- 3 Small particle and ozone air pollution is toxic and lethal, and it kills hundreds of thousands of Americans, millions around the planet, annually.

LET'S TALK COMMON SENSE ABOUT THIS SCAREMONGERING.

CCR II Chapter 4

Human Health Benefits

Chapter Lead Authors: John D. Dunn, M.D. J.D.,
James E. Enstrom, Craig D. Idso, Sherwood B.
Idso, S. Stanley Young

Contributors and Reviewers: Jerome C. Arnett,
Jr., M.D., Charles G. Battig, M.D.
(Chapter 4 draft Oct. 2017
120 pages, 394 references)

Key Findings

Introduction

4.1 Direct Benefits

4.1.1 Prosperity

4.1.2 Environmental Protection

4.2.3 Technology

4.2 Air Pollution

4.2.1 EPA versus the Scientific Method

4.2.2 Assumptions

4.2.3 Observational Studies

4.2.4 Circumstantial Evidence

4.2.5 The EPA human experiments scandal

4.2.6 Conclusion

- 4.3.1 Basis in Medical Science
- 4.3.2 Observational Research in Asia
- 4.3.3 Observational Research in Europe
- 4.3.4 Observational Research in North America
- 4.4 Global Warming and Cardiovascular Disease-
- 4.5 Global Warming and Respiratory Disease
- 4.6 Global Warming and Strokes
- 4.7 Global Warming and Insect-borne Diseases
 - 4.7.1 Malaria
 - 4.7.2 Dengue Fever
 - 4.7.3 Tick-borne Diseases
- 4.8 Conclusion

- 4.3 Global Warming and Mortality Rates
 - 4.3.1 Basis in Medical Science
 - 4.3.2 Observational Research in Asia
 - 4.3.3 Observational Research in Europe
 - 4.3.4 Observational Research in North America
- 4.4 Global Warming and Cardiovascular Disease
- 4.5 Global Warming and Respiratory Disease
- 4.6 Global Warming and Strokes
- 4.7 Global Warming and Insect-borne Diseases
 - 4.7.1 Malaria
 - 4.7.2 Dengue Fever
 - 4.7.3 Tick-borne Diseases

- 4.8 Conclusion

The key findings of Chapter 4 include the following:

Direct Benefits from fossil fuels include

- A dramatic increase in per-capita income and productivity that promotes human welfare and quality of life.
- A world that is cleaner and safer.
- Energy and chemical feedstocks for many products.

Air Quality

- USEPA claims that air pollution kills hundreds of thousands of Americans annually and millions annually on the planet. The claim that ozone causes significant health problems is classic scaremongering without supportive evidence.
- The EPA failed toxicological studies has resulted in reliance on Epidemiology, the refuge of scaremongers because it allows for data dredging for small associations that are then projected to large population effects.

US EPA sponsored air pollution research violates the Bradford Hill Criteria for proof of causation. The research shows no inadequate strength of effects and no evidence for a plausible mechanism for harm, two critical elements for proof.

Mouse and rat toxicology studies and small association result epidemiology studies are NOT reliable methods for EPA conduct and actions under the Clean Air Act—that charges the EPA to identify air pollutant risks and mitigate those risks.

In spite of efforts for 2 decades to get the data from the EPA research the EPA and the Researchers have conspired to keep the data Secret.

Secret Science prevents the basic scientific process of verification and replication of evidence but it allows for the NOBLE LIE.

- Observational population studies sponsored by the EPA have only shown small effects (Relative Risks less than 1.1) that fail to evidence of toxicity or lethality.
- Air pollution severe events causing deaths from the past (Meuce Valley, 1930, Donora 1948, London 1953) are not ambient air quality events, but extraordinary events caused by inversions that trapped toxic gasses or asphyxiating soot.
- Although much has been made of a new scare – open biofuel fires in the Third World –there is no reliable research currently to support the claims of millions dying from indoor fires.

The NOBLE LIE about CO2 rising and catastrophic warming is easily refuted.

Global Warming and Illness/Mortality Rates

- Cold weather, even cooler weather increases death rates and REAL premature deaths impacting the affected population.
- Extreme heat wave events kill the neglected, debilitated and ill (harvesting effect). Acclimation nullifies impact of hot.
- The medical research around the world shows convincing evidence of the human health benefits of warming and the harm of colder temperatures.
- CO2 rise will improve plant growth and green the planet, and if CO2 does produce warming it will result in a significant net benefit from greater food supplies, more habitable space and reduce human and biosphere cold stress and damage.

1. Antonio Gasparrini In *Lancet May 2015*--23 researchers 384 locations around the world, analysis of 70 plus million deaths 1985 to 2012,.

"more temperature-attributable deaths were caused by cold (7.29%) than by heat (0.42%)." COLD IS SEVENTEEN TIMES MORE DEADLY THAN HOT.

Gasparrini A., Guo Y., Hashizume M., et.al.,. Mortality risk attributable to high and low ambient temperature: a multi-country observational study. *The Lancet*: 10.1016/S0140-6736(14)62114-0. 20 May 2015.

2. Wang studies in China 2013 and 2016 same findings—warm good, cold bad.

3. World Wide research shows the rate of cardiovascular/respiratory illness and death is aggravated by cold and cooler weather, even in moderate latitudes.

4. DIURNAL temp difference increases negative health effects.

5. Vector disease scares are speculation, based on the label TROPICAL DISEASE but mosquitos, fleas, ticks and diseases like Malaria and Yellow fever are far ranging.

THE AIR POLLUTION NOBLE LIE

EPA HIRED RESEARCHERS TO PUT UP SMALL PARTICLE AIR POLLUTION STUDIES AND TREAT SMALL ASSOCIATIONS LIKE THE RESULTS IN RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIALS (RCTS). JOURNAL GO ALONG.
LIPSTICK ON A PIG.

GUIDANCE ON GOOD SCIENCE

FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER PUBLISHED *REFERENCE MANUAL ON SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE* (3RD ED. 2011) (RMSE)
PROVIDES EXPERT LEGAL/SCIENTIFIC ADVICE FOR DETERMINING
ADMISSIBILITY OF SCIENTIFIC TESTIMONY AND EVIDENCE IN U.S. FEDERAL
COURTS.

The authors of the epidemiology chapter defining relative risk (p. 566) as the ratio of the incidence rate. $RR = (\text{Incidence rate in the exposed}) / (\text{Incidence rate in the unexposed})$. . .

“The relative risk is one of the cornerstones for causal inferences. Relative risk measures the strength of the association. The higher the relative risk, the greater the likelihood that the relationship is causal” (p. 602).

On the important question of how high a relative risk finding must be to pass the legally required threshold (in civil cases) of “more likely than not,” or at least 51% probable, the FJC authors wrote:

Some courts have reasoned an incidence in the exposed group that is more than twice the incidence in the unexposed group (i.e., a relative risk greater than 2.0), the probability that exposure to the agent caused a similarly situated individual’s disease is greater than 50%. (RMSE, 2011, p. 612).

Grade Working Group guidelines

The GRADE Working Group is a large, well published international group studying on quality of evidence in research since 2000.

Paper 9 in the *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*:

“The most common reason for rating up the quality of evidence is a large effect. GRADE suggests considering rating up quality of evidence one level when methodologically rigorous observational studies show at least a two-fold reduction or increase in risk, and rating up two levels for at least a five-fold reduction or increase in risk.”

Guyatt G, Oxman A, Sultan S, GRADE guidelines: 9. Rating up the quality of evidence. *J Clin Epidemiol* December 2011 Volume 64, Issue 12, Pages 1311–1316.

In 2017 James Enstrom published a reassessment of small particle air pollution studies by Pope and Krewski and others that relied on the Cancer Prevention Study (CPS) cohort. And his reanalysis shows there was no small particle death effect.

Enstrom says:

“The 1982 to 1988 relative risk (RR) of death from all causes and 95% confidence interval adjusted for age, sex, race, education, and smoking status was 1.023 (0.997-1.049) for a 10 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ increase in PM_{2.5} in 85 counties and 1.025 (0.990-1.061) in the 50 original counties. The fully adjusted RR was null in the western and eastern portions of the United States, including in areas with somewhat higher PM_{2.5} levels, particularly 5 Ohio Valley states and California.”

Enstrom JE. Fine particulate matter and total mortality in cancer prevention study cohort reanalysis. Dose Response 2017;15:1559325817693345-1559325817693345

YOUNG, SMITH AND LOPIANO PUBLISHED AN EXTENSIVE LONG TERM STUDY OF CALIFORNIA DEATHS AND AIR POLLUTION, WITH THE SAME OBJECTIVES AS THE SMALL PARTICLES STUDIES BY EPA RESEARCHERS—SEARCHING FOR ANY DEATH EFFECTS FROM AIR POLLUTION.

YOUNG USED VARIABLE LAG TIMES AND DID HUNDREDS OF VARIATIONS OF DATA SAMPLING ON AN EXTENSIVE PROTOCOL DESCRIBED IN THE PAPER. THEY FOUND NO DEATH EFFECT ATTRIBUTABLE TO SMALL PARTICLES OR OZONE.

Young says:

“Here we make publically available a dataset containing daily air quality levels, PM2.5 and ozone, daily temperature levels, minimum and maximum and daily maximum relative humidity levels for the eight most populous California air basins, thirteen years, >2M deaths, over 37,000 exposure days. The data are analyzed using standard time series analysis, and a sensitivity analysis is computed varying model parameters, locations and years. Our analysis finds little evidence for association between air quality and acute deaths. These results are consistent with those for the widely cited NMMAPS dataset when the latter are restricted to California. The daily death variability was mostly explained by time of year or weather variables; Neither PM2.5 nor ozone added appreciably to the prediction of daily deaths.”

Young S, Smith R, Lopiano K Air quality and acute deaths in California, 2000-2012. Regul Toxicol Pharmacol. 2017 Aug;88:173-184.

Nothing can compare with the despicable, unethical and tortious EPA sponsorship of human exposure experiments.

In 2011 Milloy and Dunn discovered that the EPA was sponsoring human exposure experiments with air pollutants at the U of North Carolina School of Medicine.

Multiple protests were filed with medical school officials, state licensure board officials and nothing was done to stop the exposure experiments in spite of the fact that the EPA asserted in public documents and congressional testimony that small particles in the air kill hundreds of thousands of Americans annually.

The short version of the subsequent battles is that Milloy could not get any medical officials or Medical Licensure Boards to act. Federal agency watchdogs refused to act, and a Federal Lawsuit to stop the human experiments was dismissed because Milloy, Dunn and the American Traditions Institute lacked standing to sue since we weren't experimental subjects.

Dunn wrote letters to the deans of ten domestic Medical Schools doing human experiments and all the Republican physicians in the congress-18. No response.

Then something broke, the EPA Inspector General, doing an investigation based on Milloy's complaint, reported a problem with consent, failure to get informed consent from the subjects. The House Space Science and Technology Committee demanded an EPA explanation.

The EPA engaged the subservient and conflicted National Academy of Sciences research arm, the National Research Council (NRC) to investigate, but the NRC did it secretly, then exonerated the EPA on the theory that the EPA exaggerated the harm of Small Particle air pollution.

During discovery in the lawsuit sworn affidavits were helpful:

First on the magnitude of the human experimentation: Dr. Wayne Cascio

Between 2000 and 2012 EPA sponsored environmental research scientists in the US and abroad published 61 controlled human exposure studies in peer-reviewed scientific journals related to PM exposures. . .

Institutions who have or are conducting such studies include: the University of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry, Rochester, NY; University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI; University of Washington, Seattle, WA; University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA; Rutgers The State University and University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey Robert Wood Johnson Medical School, Piscataway, NJ. . . .

In addition, similar studies involving controlled human exposure to PM are conducted by non-domestic institutions including the University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada; University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK, Goteborg University, Goteborg, Sweden; Umea University, Umea, Sweden; University of Copenhagen, Denmark, and the University of Southampton, Southampton, UK.

Cascio W, Affidavit in the case of American Tradition Institute v US EPA

<https://www.heartland.org/publications-resources/publications/declaration-of-wayne-cascio-md-in-american-traditions-institute-v-epa>

Senior EPA Human Experiments Researcher, Robert Devlin, admitted in his affidavit why the EPA sponsored human experiments, because epidemiology didn't prove their small particles claims.

Dr. Devlin:

7. . . . Large population studies cannot assess the biological mechanisms (called biological plausibility) that could explain how inhaling ambient air pollution particles can cause illness or death in susceptible individuals. This sometimes leaves open the question of whether the observed association in the epidemiological study is causal or whether PM2.5 is merely a marker for some other unknown substance.

8. Controlled human exposure studies conducted by EPA scientists and EPA funded scientists at multiple universities in the United States fill an information gap that cannot be filled by large population studies. . . .

Controlled human exposure studies offer the opportunity to study small numbers of human subjects under carefully controlled exposure conditions and gain valuable insights.

Devlin R, Affidavit in the case of American Tradition Institute v US EPA

<https://www.heartland.org/publications-resources/publications/affidavit-of-dr-robert-devlin-american-traditions-institute-v-us-epa>

Conclusions

Global Warming, if it should occur, will be beneficial not harmful, just as increases in CO₂ from the previous CO₂ inadequacies will be beneficial.

The EPA sponsors junk epidemiology and toxicology to support its Noble lie strategy

Air quality is not so bad it kills, anyone.

Ozone does not cause asthma.

Small particle air pollution does not kill hundreds or thousands.