

Subj: **Your message concerned me that you are not getting the non-science.**  
Date: 7/22/2008 2:40:54 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time  
From: [SNK 1955](#)  
To: [dheimpel@gmail.com](mailto:dheimpel@gmail.com)

Hey,

I got the impression you are going to try to present what Kelman says about the science and what I say about the science in balance.

UNDERSTAND: WHAT KELMAN IS SELLING IS NOT SCIENCE.

The new AIHA book "Recognition, Evaluation and Control of Indoor Mold" addresses throughout the issue of the complexity and lack of singularity of mold exposure. Perhaps best summarized in Chapter 1, Section 1.3.5, page 13:

"Indoor exposures are a complex mixture of molds, bacteria, fragments of both types of organisms; their multiple toxic products; and biologically derived small particles, gases and other air pollutants. Effects, depending on the susceptibility of the exposed occupants and their degree of exposure, can be combinations of allergic response, inflammation and its consequences, and other toxic responses. **This complex exposure and effect picture is not addressed by risk assessment focused on spores or individual toxins.**"

**Yet assessing risk by focusing on one spore and one individual toxin is EXACTLY what Kelman did to conclude,** "Thus the notion that 'toxic mold' is an insidious secret 'killer' as so many media reports and trial lawyers would claim is 'Junk Science' unsupported by actual scientific study." (the US Chamber version)

Or as written in the ACOEM paper: "Levels of exposure in the indoor environment, dose-response data in animals, and dose-rate considerations suggest that delivery by the inhalation route of a toxic dose of mycotoxins in the indoor environment is highly unlikely at best, even for the hypothetically most vulnerable subpopulations."

The above sentence was concluded by looking at one spore (*Stachybotrys*) and one toxin from that spore (T-2 toxin). And you can't do that. It's not science. It's tobacco science.

The rest of the article - I hope I don't come across as a nut, but the science part is really important to me that you get it correct.

WR,  
Sharon

In Dr. Michaels new book "Doubt is their product", he discussing the media not being certain about the science, and so they tend to try to present both sides...which just helps to legitimize the industry frontmen's position as a valid side. KELMAN'S SCIENCE IS NOT LEGIT OVER THE MOLD ISSUE. Never was!!

---

Get fantasy football with free live scoring. [Sign up for FanHouse Fantasy Football today.](#)