Quintessential Cases of Bureaucratic Abuse Over several Obama year. Based on flawed science and assumptions, falsified evidence EPA had repeatedly abused its power in premeditated and concerted attacks on hydraulic fracturing as highlighted in three specific cases: Dimock, Pennsylvania, Pavillion, Wyoming, and Parker County, Texas. While there was no confirmed cases of groundwater contamination resulting from hydraulic fracturing throughout over one million fractured wells, EPA used these three instances to attempt to publicly besmirch the practice and to appease far-left environmentalists while swaying public opinion towards baseless and overzealous claims. In each case EPA circumvented the states, made unfounded claims directly attempting to implicate hydraulic fracturing, and then backpedaled and withdrew from the investigations. Although EPA eventually abandoned all these cases, they were an effective tool for the Agency to shift public perception of hydraulic fracturing and set the stage for future opportunities to attack the process.

UAE stood to lose billions in lost oil revenues as the U.S. oil and natural gas boom continues. By Working hand in Hand with Hollywood stars and Environmental activist was one way to ensure money flowed to their nation not America People. One of 2014 illustrations of involved two film producers (Hollywood anti-fracking activists' hypocritical), eager to accept Middle Eastern oil money to create an American anti-fracking film. Hollywood propaganda in the anti-fracking movement, In May 2014, a video was released demonstrating an undercover investigator portraying himself as a wealthy Middle Eastern investor and makes clear he wants to ban hydraulic fracturing in American because it hurts the Middle Eastern oil industry. The
Hollywood producers not only agree to make the movie, but they also express no qualms with hiding his financial support behind a wall of far-left environmental activists and other non-profit organizations. One producer explained it is necessary to hide his investment so that the film will have greater credibility and political impact. People recognize the misinformation in Hollywood films. According to a report of one survey, one of the controversial films ranked dead last in terms of trustworthiness and as a source of information on shale gas extraction in the Marcellus. While publicly admitted knowledge of these findings and chose to leave them out because he considered them 'not relevant', funding for documentaries may explain his baseless anti-fracking illustrations. The New York-based and member of the Billionaire's Club Foundation was listed as the only "Key Funder". Activism extends beyond documentaries making claims without supporting information. While Hollywood actors-turned-activists enjoy disinformation, these individuals are far removed from the everyday economic and energy needs of the American people. For example, one actor used the yacht of deputy prime minister of the United Arab Emirates (UAE) a country that makes billions each year due to the export of fossil fuels during the 2014 World Cup and previously hosted a party on the yacht with other Hollywood stars. Experts estimate the yacht emits more than 2,700 tons of carbon dioxide per tank with an estimated fuel economy of one mile per gallon. Another example of Hollywood anti-fracking hypocrisy a member of Against Fracking wrote and directed the anti-fracking film, which was financed by the UAE.

One should ponder how Hollywood would make money if it was not for film equipment, televisions, DVD's and DVD players made of fossil fuels, if people could not drive to a movie theater in an automobile that is made from and runs on fossil fuels, and if actors and crew could not fly to filming locations all around the world in planes and helicopters that are made from and run on fossil fuels. Anti-fracking activists may have social media, fame, and wealth on their side, but they do not have the facts. While activists' motives for promoting such misinformation into the public sphere are hypocritical, it is critical for the public to understand that the vast majority of assertions are easily and extensively refuted.

Improper Scientific Approach to Reach Preconceived Conclusions While EPA aggressively moved forward with its attack on the oil and gas industry, it routinely lacked the necessary scientific foundation to justify its actions. Even former EPA Senior Policy Counsel, acknowledged EPA uses questionable science to regulate hydraulic fracturing, statements were characterized in a report as admitting that although EPA would continue looking for justifications to regulate the process, "limited scientific conclusions exist to support stricter regulations."