



## Democrats History of “Politicized Science” Under the Clinton Administration

*Here’s a test: When were the following statements made?*

1. “EPA has had to reverse previous policies found to be scientifically flawed and to amend statistical ‘errors’ it used to argue for new policies. And it has a habit of punishing those who dare point out its flaws. Two years ago, six EPA scientists lost their jobs after writing a letter to a newspaper saying that EPA regulations ‘stand to harm rather than protect public health and the environment.’”<sup>i</sup>
2. “Major scientific uncertainties and the political and legal constraints of a regulatory agency combine to weaken the scientific basis of decisions made by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)...”<sup>ii</sup>
3. “EPA also should reinstitute and strengthen its internal scientific review processes to ensure transparency, account for scientific uncertainty, and improve the analytical bases for its policy decisions.”<sup>iii</sup>
4. “Many of EPA’s regulatory programs are unscientific and illogical and afford little or no protection to human health or the environment. ... They breed well-deserved cynicism about government’s motives.”<sup>iv</sup>
5. “... EPA has become too politicized in its actions, too eager to pursue narrow political goals, and too willing to ignore Congressional intent in making regulatory decisions. Political motives rather than workable policies based on sound science and reliable data seem to be the driving force behind this EPA.”<sup>v</sup>
6. “EPA’s abuse and misuse of science is no surprise and well known to those who follow the agency closely. ... Its record on electric utility NOx emissions, long-range transport, and ozone pollution can only be described as shameful.”<sup>vi</sup>
7. “The National Research Council - the working arm of the National Academy of Sciences --- last week published its fourth and final assessment of the way EPA uses and abuses science. The conclusion was a reaffirmation of what a repeated analysis of the agency has found.”<sup>vii</sup>
8. “At least a dozen former EPA officials who played roles in setting pesticide policy now work as industry consultants. ‘The EPA has become a farm team for the pesticide lobby,’ says Mike Casey of the Environmental Working Group, which released a report on the issue.”<sup>viii</sup>
9. “In a scathing opinion, the court stated, ‘EPA publicly committed to a conclusion before research had begun, adjusted scientific procedure and scientific norms to validate the agency’s public conclusion, and aggressively utilized authority to disseminate findings to ... influence public opinion.’”<sup>ix</sup>
10. “Science is as politicized in America as it was in the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany. And this EPA is a prime example.”<sup>x</sup>
11. “For years, the federal government has known that power plants produce mercury. It knows how technology could be used to reduce that pollution. But the Environmental Protection Agency’s efforts to regulate the toxic metal have been slowed by industry lobbyists and their allies in Congress...”<sup>xi</sup>

12. ““This is by far the most politicized EPA I’ve seen in my three decades of working in state governments. ... It is an agency driven more by sound bites than by sound science.””<sup>xii</sup>

**You’d be correct if you answered:  
“During the Clinton Administration and Carol Browner’s watch at the EPA.”**

The fact is, Carol Browner used, abused and politically manipulated science during her tenure as EPA Administrator under the Clinton-Gore Administration.

- “In an effort to elevate EPA’s scientific profile, in 1989 the agency had brought on board former National Institutes of Health deputy director William Raub as the senior science advisor. Raub was known to be a smart, savvy, and collegial scientific administrator. Nonetheless, the EPA staff proceeded to make his life miserable. From the beginning, they ignored him when they could. When they couldn’t, they sent him drafts of important documents too late for a meaningful review--often just days before a court-ordered deadline for an agency action. Instead of disciplining those responsible, EPA administrator Browner excluded Raub from her inner circle and finally replaced him in 1995 with a less-threatening lower-level EPA staffer.”<sup>xiii</sup>
- “Under mounting pressure from environmental groups to ignore the recommendation of the agency’s own scientists, Browner last December scrapped a science-based standard for chloroform in drinking water. In 1998, EPA had proposed raising the Maximum Contaminant Level Goal for chloroform in drinking water from zero to 300 parts per billion. This recommendation had resulted from a thorough review by EPA scientists of toxicological data on human exposure to chloroform going back 20 years, and took into account the principle contained in the agency’s draft cancer guidelines that there are thresholds below which toxins are essentially harmless. But the recommendation was to become the victim of political sabotage, and the agency instead retained a ‘zero tolerance’ rule. In April of this year, however, a federal court rejected EPA’s proposed standard, saying that the proposal was contradicted by the agency’s own review of the ‘best available science.’”<sup>xiv</sup>
- NPR’s Bob Edwards: “A federal court earlier this year overturned an Environmental Protection Agency rule regarding a chemical in drinking water. The decision was made after EPA administrator Carol Browner declined to follow the findings of the agency’s own scientists as to what was safe. She sought a more stringent standard.”<sup>xv</sup>
- “Here’s what the NAS said in its latest review of EPA science, in the context of a 1995 report highly critical of EPA’s manipulation of science in the pursuit of politically correct policy: ‘Throughout EPA’s history, no official below the level of the administrator has had overall responsibility or authority for the scientific and technical foundations of agency decisions, and administrators of EPA have typically been trained in law, not science.’ What the scientist[s] are saying here is that the administrator and her top aides have typically been political hacks.”<sup>xvi</sup>
- “Apparently, even before its research was completed, the EPA had already written its ‘Workplace Policy Guide’ on secondhand smoke. But none of the original 11 U.S. studies used in the agency’s analysis reported a statistically significant increased risk of lung cancer using accepted scientific levels of confidence. For convenience, the agency not only deviated from standard scientific practice but also from its own risk assessment guidelines in carrying out its analysis.”<sup>xvii</sup>
- “EPA Administrator Carol Browner-with the enthusiastic backing of her patron, Vice President Al Gore-has molded the EPA into an instrument of environmental zealotry that knows no legal or ethical bounds. Miss Browner’s EPA works to silence internal dissent, defy Congress, trample on states and localities, and cover up its own wrongdoing. The EPA stands out as the most lawless-and ruthless-agency in an Administration that specializes in bureaucratic aggrandizement.”<sup>xviii</sup>

<sup>i</sup> Editorial, “EPA -- Clean it up,” *The Cincinnati Enquirer*, 12/26/2000

<sup>ii</sup> “Research Gaps, Legalistic Focus Hinder EPA’s Use of Science,” *Resources for the Future*, 8/18/1999

<sup>iii</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>iv</sup> Henry I. Miller, “Environmental Protection, In Name Only,” *The Scientist*, 9/18/2000

<sup>v</sup> Allen James, “Politics Play a Plum Part in FQPA,” *Pest Control*, 9/1/2000

<sup>vi</sup> “Commentary: Political Science at the EPA,” *The Electricity Daily*, 6/19/2000

<sup>vii</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>viii</sup> Peter Eisler, “Toughest decisions still to come in pesticide review Congress wanted the rules updated, but politics slowing process,” *USA Today*, 8/30/1999

<sup>ix</sup> J.R. Clark, “EPA Corrupting Science For Political Purposes,” *Chattanooga Free Press*, 10/11/1998

<sup>x</sup> Charley Reese, “It’s A Shame That Americans Can’t Trust Their Own Government,” *Orlando Sentinel*, 6/30/1998

<sup>xi</sup> “Coal-Fired Power Plants Spew Mercury But Avoid Crackdown,” *Portland Press Herald*, 9/29/1997

<sup>xii</sup> Pranay Gupte and Bonner R. Cohen, “Carol Browner, master of mission creep,” *Forbes*, 10/20/1997

<sup>xiii</sup> Henry I. Miller, “Environmental Protection, In Name Only,” *The Scientist*, 9/18/2000

<sup>xiv</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>xv</sup> “Morning Edition,” National Public Radio, 6/27/2000

<sup>xvi</sup> “Commentary: Political Science at the EPA,” *The Electricity Daily*, 6/19/2000

<sup>xvii</sup> J.R. Clark, “EPA Corrupting Science For Political Purposes,” *Chattanooga Free Press*, 10/11/1998

<sup>xviii</sup> Bonner R. Cohen, “Polluted Agency,” *National Review*, 8/3/1998