

From: John Dunn

Sent: Saturday, April 21, 2012 10:21 PM

To: Patrick Mower; Richard Farina

Subject: Re: EPA human experiments debunk notion of 'killer' air pollution:
Agency hides exculpatory results

here's the short version.

pay attention.

So Richard Peto and Bradford Hill, famous Brit epidemiologists do studies on smokers and find that one pack a day smokers for that period of history (strong unfiltered cigarettes, James Bond smoked Chesterfield unfiltered—that'll put hair on your chest) had a 10 percent lifetime risk of cancer of the lung, relative risk of 10, 900% increase over the rate of lung cancer in non smoker/never smoker.

In the various cuts of study groups, 10 or less cig a day physicians lived longer than the non smoker controls and did not have an increased cancer rate. Threshold and dose pops up its persistent head.

Moving on—many studies on second hand smoke in the 80s were done to promote the crusade to stop smoking by making smokers killers or at least a nuisance and public health risk.

The best the studies could show, with caveats like they threw away any data that didn't show anything or showed a negative risk (benefit) was the studies showed less than 20 % increased risk of lung cancer in the non smoking spouse population.

Two major studies, Boffetta/WHO in 98, and Enstrom in 2003 showed no spousal cancer effect. Attached above.

the 20 % risk is a Relative Risk of 1.2. and we all know, don't we boys and girls, that a Relative Risk of less than 2 in an observational population study is not proof—maybe hypothesis generating but not proof.

So that's where we stand—not allowing for the rules and pushing forward on an abolitionist agenda, using the public health nuisance gambit, the Surgeon General, the anti smoking crusade, all well funded by anti smoking interests—just say, small associations mean possible risk, hit the precautionary principle rail—ban smoking to make sure no second hand smoke exposure for the innocents.

The research paper above is by the very Boston National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER), and it neutralizing another part of the anti smoking campaign, the cherry picking they do on smoking bans, usually by parsing time frames and data dredging to confirm their biases in short term or out of context studies. As you know disease frequency and effects are dynamic and ripe for data dredge.

Anyway the NBER did a comprehensive national and long term study of effects of smoking bans and found no effect.

But the anti smoking mobs with matching t shirts are still scaring the beejesus out of the politicians so I have to smoke my cigars at home. Soon there will be a ban on smoking in the presence of dogs—no doubt promoted by the PETA people and approved by the dog eater himself.

John Dale Dunn MD JD
Consultant Emergency Services/Peer Review
Civilian Faculty, Emergency Medicine Residency
Carl R. Darnall Army Med Center
Fort Hood, Texas
Medical Officer, Sheriff Bobby Grubbs
Brown County, Texas