

**Plato's Noble Lie  
Codevilla's Scientific Pretense  
Gov't Lying for Justice**

Handout

Doctors for Disaster Preparedness  
August 12, 2017  
New Orleans. LA

John Dale Dunn MD JD  
Lecturer, Department of Emergency Medicine  
Carl R. Darnall Army Medical Center, Fort Hood, Texas  
Policy Advisor, American Council on Science and Health,  
New York City,  
Policy Advisor, Heartland Institute, Chicago, IL

Dr. Dunn's opinions are personal and not attributable to the US Army or Department of Defense

**Socrates** in Plato's dialogues explained how the Noble Lie is useful for achieving political harmony. Socrates speaks of a socially stratified society, wherein the populace are told "a sort of Phoenician tale." Over the centuries the Noble Lie has been a constant and repeated in matters of politics and political affairs best exemplified today by the delusion of socialism as a scientific formula for social and societal propriety. The Grand Lie at present is the claim that Government is wise and beneficent and the bigger the better, and Noble Lies promoted by environmentalists in matters of science are built on the lie that humans are a cancer on the earth and destructive of the beauty and perfection of nature.

The two component lies essential to the fabric of the science and policy lies of government sponsored environmentalism are:

1. There is **no threshold** of toxicity or harm from radiation or chemical agents, so they must be eliminated from the environment, and;
2. Small association epidemiological findings, even though not capable of proving causation of toxicity or lethality are acceptable for the cause, even if the researchers know they are not proof that ambient air quality is toxic and harmful.

In the case of the **no threshold for toxicity lie** Ed Calabrese has exposed the lies of Hermann Muller, Fruit Fly radiation effects researcher and 1946 Nobel Prize winner for "proving" Linear No Threshold (LNT) radiation biophysics. Muller influenced international Biological Effects of Ambient Radiation (BEAR) panels to adopt his no threshold theory but his influence also resulted in adoption of linear no threshold (LNT) for general toxicology (particularly cancer research) even though the reality is that Paracelsus was and is right—**Dose Makes the Poison** even when it comes to carcinogenicity.

In the case of the **small association epidemiology lie**, the rules are the rules and are well described in the *Reference Manual on Scientific Evidence*, (3<sup>rd</sup> ed. 2011) published by the Federal Judicial Center, discussed in detail below.

### **Plato and the Noble Lie.**

Plato (427 BC-347 BC) advocated a socialist order with property held in common (the state) and that human nature can and should be molded and transformed, influenced for the benefit of the state. NOT AN AMERICAN CONCEPT AT ALL BUT WELL DEVELOPED IN EUROPE.

**On the other hand**--Aristotle argued that the laws of nature and the rule of law demand that government should govern for the good of the people, not for the good of those in power. Cicero (106 BC-43 BC) asserted that the "right of ownership is inalienable" His reasoning was rooted in natural law and the "laws of human society."

[http://www.americanthinker.com/articles/2017/07/americas\\_long\\_march\\_toward\\_a\\_secular\\_socialist\\_democracy.html](http://www.americanthinker.com/articles/2017/07/americas_long_march_toward_a_secular_socialist_democracy.html)

**Angelo Codevilla** wrote an extraordinary essay in *American Spectator*, "Scientific Pretense vs. Democracy" (April 2009)

[https://spectator.org/41862\\_scientific-pretense-vs-democracy/](https://spectator.org/41862_scientific-pretense-vs-democracy/)

Codevilla quoted President Obama in the intro "*We will restore science to its rightful place...*" Codevilla unpacked Obama's statement—to this translation:

‘Under my administration, Americans will have fewer choices about how they live, and fewer choices as voters because, rightfully, those choices should be made by officials who rule by the authority of science.’

The argument "Do what we say because we are certified to know better" is a slight variant of "Do what we say because we are us." (Make you think of the Noble Lie?)

Codevilla pointed out that the administrative state, that found its footing on the Continent as conceived and created by the French and then the Prussian government bureaucracies in particular, depends on the designation and sponsorship of an army of government "experts" that influence, persuade the populace and intimidate or even suppress opposing viewpoints. The intimidation is totalitarian in nature and the army serves the paternalistic state.

Codevilla:

Only in Switzerland and America did the theory and practice of popular government survive into the modern world. But note: they survived because they were planted on older, hybrid pre-Enlightenment roots. Because the pretense of rare knowledge is the source of the modern administrative state's intellectual and moral authority, its political essence is rule of *the few, by their own authority, over the many.*

It follows then that *the modern struggle is over control of the process of accreditation*, and that the arguments the masses hear must be mostly *ad hominem*, seldom *ad valorem*— not least because the experts deem the masses incapable and unworthy of hearing anything else.

Codevilla favorably quoted Eisenhower’s farewell speech:

The prospect of domination of the nation’s scholars by Federal employment, project allocations, and the power of money is ever present and is gravely to be regarded. Yet, in holding scientific research and discovery in respect, as we should, we must also be alert to the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific technological elite.

Codevilla followed the 2009 essay on Scientific Pretense vs. Democracy with another stunning discussion of what has happened to America as it becomes an administrative state ruled over by a class of elites.

“America’s Ruling Class and the Perils of Revolution.” Summer issue 2010 *American Spectator*

[https://spectator.org/39326\\_americas-ruling-class-and-perils-revolution/](https://spectator.org/39326_americas-ruling-class-and-perils-revolution/)

Codevilla:

Hence more power for the ruling class has been our ruling class's solution not just for economic downturns and social ills but also for hurricanes and tornadoes, global cooling and global warming. *A priori*, one might wonder whether enriching and empowering individuals of a certain kind can make Americans kinder and gentler, much less control the weather. *But there can be no doubt that such power and money makes Americans ever more dependent on those who wield it. . . .*

Today’s ruling class, from Boston to San Diego, was formed by an educational system that exposed them to the same ideas and gave them remarkably uniform guidance, as well as tastes and habits. These amount to a social canon of judgments about good and evil, complete with secular sacred history, sins (against minorities and the environment), and saints. Using the right words and avoiding the wrong ones when referring to such matters — speaking the “in” language — serves as a badge of identity. . . .

America’s ruling class speaks the language and has the tastes, habits, and tools of bureaucrats. It rules uneasily over the majority of Americans not oriented to government.

The two classes have less in common culturally, dislike each other more, and embody ways of life more different from one another than did the 19th century’s Northerners and Southerners — nearly all of whom, as Lincoln reminded them, “prayed to the same God.” By contrast, while most Americans

pray to the God “who created and doth sustain us,” our ruling class prays to itself as “saviors of the planet” and improvers of humanity.

(Dunn: That is why they can live with their NOBLE LIES)

**Eric Hoffer:**

Faith in a holy cause is to a considerable extent a substitute for lost faith in ourselves. Our sense of power is more vivid when we break a man's spirit than when we win his heart.

**Friedrich Hayek** called it the Fatal Conceit, the pretense of knowledge.

**CS Lewis**—“Of all tyrannies a tyranny sincerely exercised for the good of its victims may be the most oppressive.”

**Joseph Schumpeter** said the first casualty of idealism is the truth.

**Thomas Sowell** and **William Voegeli** have eloquently pointed out in their writings that Intellectuals traffic in abstract concepts and notions, and most importantly are never required to show that their ideas work. They have no accountability but have a high opinion of themselves and their good intentions.

**George Orwell:** “During times of universal deceit, telling the truth becomes a revolutionary act.”

**Karl Popper** thought the Noble Lie smelled of totalitarianism.

The point is that political tyrannies and totalitarian states are built on lies, and the populace is tamed by lies and intimidated by lies, particularly if compliant in voicing those lies. As Orwell asserted in 1984, it is important to get the populace to believe the lie, to assert the lie, to believe the lie.

**Dissent and disagreement are fundamentally democratic and statists are dedicated to suppression of dissent, censorship of opposition. I would suspect the totalitarians are a little uneasy with the nature of the audience at DDP that I address here today.**

**HL Mencken** said—

The whole aim of practical politics is to keep the populace alarmed (and hence clamorous to be led to safety) by menacing it with an endless series of hobgoblins, all of them imaginary.

**The Precautionary Principle and the goal of practical politics energizes and enables the Noble Lie and paternalistic tyranny.**

**The noble lie that creates a hobgoblin enables the statist tyrants.**

**Fear and anxiety expressed in the political mind set of zero tolerance and the precautionary principle is also the key to enablement of the state and it's apparatchiks and bureaucrats, who derive their power from their ability to designate "experts" in the service of the state and the purpose of rescuing the populace from the hobgoblins and uncertainties that are portrayed as hobgoblins.**

**Richard Feynman on Cargo Cult Science (Cal Tech Commencement speech 1974)**

<http://www.lhup.edu/~DSIMANEK/cargocul.htm>

. . . The first principle is that you must not fool yourself--and **you are the easiest person to fool. So you have to be very careful about that.** After you've not fooled yourself, it's easy not to fool other scientists. You just have to be honest in a conventional way after that.

. . . you should not fool the layman when you're talking as a scientist.

It is very dangerous to have such a policy in teaching--to teach students only how to get certain results, rather than how to do an experiment with scientific integrity.

**Is there a path in America to rational science and policy making? A way to prevent the Noble Lie?**

***Daubert v. Merrell Dow 509 US 579 (1993) and Scientific Evidence Reliability and Admissibility.***

Justice Blackmun wrote the opinion for the Supreme Court that established new and more rigorous rules for admissibility of scientific evidence. He made the general assertion that the science offered should be the product of methods and processes used by professionals in their daily conduct of science and specified the characteristics of good science.

The *Reference Manual on Scientific Evidence*, published by the Federal Judicial Center in response to the dicta and impact of *Daubert*, is now in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition (2011) and provides legal and scientific advice and guidance written by experts to educate judges and lawyers on evidence admissibility issues under the Federal Rules of Evidence (1973) with particular attention to Rules

104 of relevance and fit and 702 on Expert Testimony. I would recommend the discussions in the chapter on epidemiology related to proof of causation and the importance of showing a strong relationship between the alleged toxin and the effect, the effect of 100%, a relative risk of 2.0 being a critical minimum.

The Noble Lie about projected warming is:

Warming is going to be catastrophic and we will reach intolerable warmth that is destructive and harmful.

Answer—warming is good, carbon dioxide is beneficial to life and the history of the planet does not support the catastrophic predictions for effects of warming or increased carbon dioxide. The planet has done quite well in the past when it was much warmer and carbon dioxide levels were much higher.

**The longest running Noble Lie of the researchers and policy makers at the US EPA?** Ambient Air Pollution is toxic and lethal. It kills hundreds of thousands of Americans annually. It causes asthma, heart disease, lung disease strokes, pimples, premature births, anxiety, pneumonia, irritable bowel disorders, insomnia, (name something) and IT KILLS HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF AMERICANS EVERY YEAR, MILLIONS AROUND THE GLOBE.

In the 1993 and 1995 two studies by Douglas Dockery and C. Arden Pope (they shared the work as co-authors) were alleged by Carole Browner, a fanatic environmentalist and Administrator of the US EPA, to prove the toxicity and lethality of ambient small particle air pollution, justifying dramatic and aggressive new air pollution regulations.

Pope study 1995, Particulate Matter as a predictor of mortality [http://www.atsjournals.org/doi/abs/10.1164/ajrccm/151.3\\_Pt\\_1.669?journalCode=ajrccm](http://www.atsjournals.org/doi/abs/10.1164/ajrccm/151.3_Pt_1.669?journalCode=ajrccm) Pope study Douglas Dockery, An Association between Air Pollution and Mortality in Six U.S. Cities, 1993 <http://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/nejm199312093292401#t=article> The problem with epidemiology is that in a spatial/temporal inquiry that allows for slicing and dicing data, there is always the temptation to try this and that methods with the data until the answer desired comes up. IT'S called data dredging.

However, after the sponsored studies were in and small associations found in the population studies of Pope, Dockery and others, all financed handsomely by the EPA, the NOBLE LIE WAS IN.

**Karl Popper**, philosopher of science and strong advocate of evidence based deductive science, thought that the Noble Lie was an element of political totalitarianism, and intellectual tyranny. (Popper, Noble Lie) His assessment appears to be correct.

All of the conduct of the US EPA researchers that violates the rules of Austin Bradford Hill on proof of causation are violations of the rules of the scientific method. They are intended to support the claims of air pollution toxicity and lethality or carcinogenicity to support the US EPA's agenda and regulatory regime but the science is a scam and sham, and as unreliable as the EPA claims of hundreds of thousands of deaths to support a political agenda.

How many Noble Lies can a society tolerate, considering that the Noble Lies are mostly seen in the political/social science areas of inquiry? I could wear you out with the lies that are perpetrated by social scientists and psychologists.

Today James E. Enstrom (PhD Physics, Stanford, MPH (epidemiology) UCLA) will provide the DDP conference with a reanalysis of the results on important air pollution research to show that there is no justification for the claims of horrific death counts annually.

**Enstrom said “The methodology used in my study is completely consistent with the methodology used in the 2002 Pope study. For instance, my study controlled for smoking at entry and presented results for never smokers. Furthermore, fully adjusted relative risks hardly differed from age-adjusted relative risks. My study used the same 1979-1983 PM2.5 data that was used in the Pope studies” (Enstrom, 2006). Enstrom also noted that his findings were consistent with those of Krewski et al. (2005) who found “no excess mortality risk in California due to PM2.5 among the ACS CPS II cohort during 1982-1989” (Ibid.).**

**Enstrom returned to the issue with a paper presented in 2012 at a meeting of the American Statistical Association (Enstrom, 2012). Part of that presentation included a new table summarizing more recent California-specific studies of PM2.5 and total mortality in California. That table appears below in Figure 4.2.3.3.**

**In 2012 Enstrom wrote, “There is now overwhelming epidemiologic evidence that particulate matter (PM), both fine particulate matter (PM2.5) and coarse particulate matter (PM10), is not related to total mortality in California” (Enstrom, 2012, p 2324). At one time 10 micron particle particles were the only measured particle pollution and small particles were assumed to be part of the total large particle pollution load.**

**Enstrom, J.E. 2012. Particulate matter is not killing Californians. Presentation at American Statistical Association Joint Statistical Meeting, San Antonio (August 1). <http://www.scientificintegrityinstitute.org/PFSupp072015.pdf>.**

**In 2017 Enstrom published another review and analysis of the CPS data and concluded that the claims made were flawed.**

**From the Abstract:**

Conclusion: No significant relationship between PM2.5 and total mortality in the CPS II cohort was found when the best available PM2.5 data were used. The original 1995 analysis found a positive relationship by selective use of CPS II and PM2.5 data. This independent analysis of underlying data raises serious doubts about the CPS II epidemiologic evidence supporting the PM2.5 NAAQS. These findings provide strong justification for further independent analysis of the CPS II data. (Enstrom 2017)



Conclusion: No significant relationship between PM2.5 and total mortality in the CPS II cohort was found when the best available PM2.5 data were used. The original 1995 analysis found a positive relationship by selective use of CPS II and PM2.5 data. This independent analysis of underlying data raises serious doubts about the CPS II epidemiologic evidence supporting the PM2.5 NAAQS. These findings provide strong justification for further independent analysis of the CPS II data.

This is the complete text of the Enstrom study in Dose Response:

<https://junkscience.com/2017/04/epidemiologist-accuses-prominent-epa-funded-researchers-of-deliberate-misrepresentation-on-key-air-pollution-studies/>

## **The GRADE Working Group**

GRADE Working Group research on epidemiological methods and reliability of epidemiological research is the product of cooperative work of an international group of academic and public entity researchers. The list of participants is impressive.

**This ninth article in the series examines the criteria for rating up the quality of evidence. The three primary reasons for rating up the quality of evidence are (Table 1) as follows:**

- 1. When a large magnitude of effect exists,**
- 2. When there is a dose response gradient, and**
- 3. When all plausible confounders or other biases increase our confidence in the estimated effect. . . .**

Grade Working Group Publications and International organization  
<http://www.gradeworkinggroup.org/>

Guyatta G, Oxman A, Sultand S, et. al. GRADE guidelines: 9. Rating up the quality of evidence J Clin Epidemiol. 2011 Dec;64(12):1311-6.  
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21802902>  
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/51534193\\_GRADE\\_guidelines\\_9\\_Rating\\_up\\_the\\_quality\\_of\\_evidence](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/51534193_GRADE_guidelines_9_Rating_up_the_quality_of_evidence)

## **Steve Milloy**

**Steve Milloy will discuss with you today the EPA record of sponsoring human exposure experiments using this supposedly lethal and toxic small particulate air pollution on humans, that is unethical and illegal if what the EPA claims is true. Of course his web site JunkScience.com provides the necessary references and information for any questions you have.**

The National Academy of Sciences contract research arm, the National Research Council recently exonerated the EPA on the charge that they were doing unethical and illegal human experiments because the panel asserted the EPA public claims of thousands, hundreds of thousands of annual deaths were not

correct and proposed that the EPA small particle air pollution deaths claims were based on chronic, not acute toxicity.

**George Wolff PhD, former chair of the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee of the US EPA Provides a shocking indictment of US EPA researcher perfidy and misconduct.**

George Wolff, toxicologist, epidemiologist, former Chair of the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee (CASAC) of the US EPA during the mid 1990s wrote a complementary blurb for Steve Milloy's book *Scare Pollution* and I met him at the DC Heartland climate conference in the spring of 2017 but I also did research on his comments to the EPA on behalf of industry and commercial interests on proposed air pollution regulations.

After a long look at all of this I was pleased to be able to meet Dr. Wolff, and I interviewed him on the issue of US EPA commitment to junk epidemiology. Dr. Wolff confirmed to me that the US EPA made a conscious decision to go with junk epidemiology in the mid 1990s. That was opposed by the CASAC but that opposition was buried and the CASAC members were ignored and subsequently dismissed, apparently for insubordination and adherence to reliable scientific inquiry.

Dr. Wolff told me that the EPA consciously and intentionally decided to go with the lie that the Pope, Dockery and other research claims were valid. I am not surprised, are you? The pertinent Wolff submission to the EPA are found on the Heartland Institute Policy Bot under George Wolff, for example:

<https://www.heartland.org/publications-resources/publications/review-and-critique-of-us-epas-assessment-of-the-health-effects-of-particulate-matter>

## **Conclusion**

**I was always convinced that the researchers for the US EPA were intentionally lying about their results and the meaning and impact of their results—I never believed they had any evidence of the tremendous number of deaths from air pollution they claimed. It is alarming and troubling that junk scientists could continue to perpetrate their mendacious claims, their scientific deceptions, but people will do terrible things for money and power and control, for ideology.**

**I would suggest that the NOBLE LIE IS STILL AN IMPORTANT FACTOR IN POLICY MAKING IN MODERN SOCIETY—AND WE THINK WE ARE SO SOPHISTICATED.**

I have written a much longer version of this handout with more materials inserted.

The Website link is here for that paper:

---

Thank you for your attendance and your attention.

John Dale Dunn MD JD  
Brownwood, Texas