

Trump's EPA Is a Huge Cancer Risk

Industry-friendly regulators are letting chemical companies flood the country with toxins. It should be a scandal.

By [Sam Pizzigati](#)

Global Research, January 28, 2020

[OtherWords](#) 27 January 2020

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Environment](#), [Law and Justice](#)

This January, President Trump [claimed credit](#) for new figures from the American Cancer Society showing “the sharpest one-year drop in cancer death rate ever recorded” between 2016 and 2017.

The society politely pointed out that the Trump administration had nothing to do with this encouraging decline. The new numbers, chief Gary Reedy [explained](#), “reflect prevention, early detection, and treatment advances that occurred in prior years.”

Media outlets [rushed to relate](#) this latest Trump Twitter flap. But this story doesn't deserve to end there. Something is shaking on the cancer front that needs our full attention.

The Trump administration, investigative journalist Sharon Lerner [detailed](#) a few days later, “is executing an old tobacco industry scheme to dismantle the federal government's ability to protect the public from cancer.”

The Trump White House has packed the Environmental Protection Agency's top echelons with free-market fundamentalists who've set about “freeing” chemical companies from regulations designed to limit the presence of cancer-causing chemicals in our nation's air, water, and soil.

These appointees, Lerner's reporting [documents](#), are working hand in glove with chemical manufacturers, which have spent \$1.4 billion on lobbying over the past dozen years.

Those lobbying dollars paid off. Chemical companies now have their pals running the regulatory show — and more Americans, as a result, will find themselves fighting cancer.

Americans like Angela Ramirez, a mother in Illinois who traces her personal cancer to a carcinogen known as ethylene oxide. Two years ago, EPA scientists tagged ethylene oxide a clear and present danger and, writes Lerner, proposed a new safety threshold “30 times more sensitive than previous estimates.”

Dow Chemical — a huge ethylene oxide producer — pushed back. Now, the Trump EPA's political appointees are abandoning the standards their own scientists are seeking.

This is “only one of the changes made under the Trump administration,” [notes](#) Lerner, “that promise to weaken protections for Americans' health, many of which were intended specifically to stave off cancers.”

Any hands-off approach to fighting carcinogens, Rep. Rashida Tlaib [\(D-MI\) notes](#), will particularly devastate the poor communities that already face “disproportionately high rates of air and water pollution.”

“If you really want to see what doing nothing truly looks like, come to my district,” adds Tlaib. “Rows and rows and rows of homes have these little white crosses in front of them, representing cancer, survivors of cancer.”

Meanwhile, chemical executives are raking it in.

In 2017, the industry’s two biggest companies, Dow and Dupont, merged in a deal that nearly [tripled](#) the compensation of CEO Andrew Liveris to \$65.7 million. In 2018, Stephen Angel — CEO of Linde PLC, the nation’s fourth-largest chemical company — [pulled down](#) \$66.1 million.

The enrichment of these executives — at the same time their companies are battling attempts to regulate their toxic products — represents a far greater scandal than any vain and empty boasting out of the White House. Yet the deregulatory collusion between the chemical industry and the Trump administration continues to go largely unnoticed.

Also largely unnoticed: a counter trend, the emerging efforts to limit the mammoth CEO pay rewards that give top executives — in the chemical industry and beyond — an ongoing incentive to play fast and loose with America’s health.

One of those efforts just took a significant stride forward in California, where state senators [moved a step closer](#) to hiking the tax rate on corporations that pay their CEOs over 50 times what they pay their most typical workers.

Last May, the United Steelworkers union [noted](#) that the newly merged DowDupont was paying its CEO *249 times* more than the company’s median worker.

Average Americans pay a deadly price for the excessive corporate pay packages that incentivize profit-making by any means necessary. If the California legislation becomes law, America’s corporations may finally begin paying a price for continuing that excess.

*

Note to readers: please click the share buttons above or below. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

*Sam Pizzigati co-edits [Inequality.org](#) for the Institute for Policy Studies. His recent books include *The Case for a Maximum Wage* and *The Rich Don’t Always Win*. Follow him at [@Too_Much_Online](#). This op-ed was adapted from [Inequality.org](#) and distributed by [OtherWords.org](#).*

Featured image is from Shutterstock

The original source of this article is [OtherWords](#)
Copyright © [Sam Pizzigati](#), [OtherWords](#), 2020

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Sam Pizzigati](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca