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Mainstream media’s coverage of the health and nutrition issue, pertaining to CANCER, is nothing more than BOGUS SENSATIONALISM.

A SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE SEARCH for articles EVALUATING THE CANCER RISK of 40 cookbook ingredients — everything from flour to parsley, lobster to duck — REVEALED BORDER-LINE OR NO STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE.

Additional research has also shown that BIAS EXIST IN THE NUTRIENT CANCER LITERATURE.

One researcher described cancer as the result of a LOTTERY-LIKE ACCUMULATION OF STOCHASTIC MUTATIONS.

Faced with such a LOTTERY that none of us voluntarily enter, WE GRASP DESPERATELY FOR SIGNS OF CONTROLLABILITY.

There is a FUNDAMENTAL NEED AMONG RESEARCHERS TO PERCEIVE CONTROL OVER FEARED EVENTS.

The FIDELITY OF RESEARCH FINDINGS between nutrients and cancer may have been COMPROMISED in several ways —

- They identified an OVERSTATING OF WEAK RESULTS (most associations were only WEAKLY SUPPORTED)
- A LACK OF CONSISTENT COMPARISONS (inconsistent definitions of exposure and outcomes)
- POSSIBLE SUPPRESSION OF NULL FINDINGS (a bimodal distribution of outcomes, with a NOTICEABLE LACK OF NULL FINDINGS)

It is therefore imperative that we SPEND LESS TIME REPEATING WEAK CORRELATIONS and invest the resources to vigorously investigate nutrient-cancer and other disease associations with STRONGER METHODOLOGY.
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Does Everything You Eat Give You Cancer? (continued)

Reading the mainstream media’s coverage of the health and nutrition issue, you’d be forgiven if you thought EATING EVERYTHING FROM RED MEAT TO BURNT TOAST COULD CAUSE CANCER.

But a study by Michelle M. Bohan Brown, Andrew W. Brown, and David B. Allison shows many of these reports are nothing more than BOGUS SENSATIONALISM — just as we’ve been saying for years.

The study was published in American Journal Of Clinical Nutrition, and provocatively entitled —

Is Everything We Eat Associated With Cancer? A Systematic Cookbook Review.

Drs. Jonathan Schoenfeld of the Harvard School of Public Health in Boston and John Loannidis of Stanford University randomly selected 50 ingredients from a popular cookbook.

They did a SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE SEARCH for articles EVALUATING THE CANCER RISK of 40 of the 50 ingredients — everything from flour to parsley, lobster to duck.

According to Dr. Jonathan Schoenfeld —

When we examined the reports, we found many had BORDER-LINE OR NO STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE.

And even if one individual study did find a statistically significant link to cancer ...

... it was very often DIFFICULT TO REPEAT that in other studies.

[ These studies are ] rife with EMOTIONAL AND SENSATIONAL RHETORIC that can subject the general public to INCREASED ANXIETY AND CONTRADICTORY ADVICE.
According to Dr. Ruth Kava of the American Council on Science and Health (ACSH) —

*This review underlines that, by and large, these SCARES we’ve been talking about for years are INSIGNIFICANT, to say the least.*

*It provides scientific backing for what we’ve said repeatedly — as exemplified by the American Council On Science And Health’s classic publication, the HOLIDAY DINNER MENU.*

**Holiday Dinner Menu**

November 20th, 2008
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The focus of this Holiday Dinner Menu is on so-called carcinogens, defined here as chemicals, either natural or synthetic, that cause cancer in rodents when consumed in large amounts.

A related topic, however, is that of so-called poisons, technically known as TOXICANTS.

Just as it is SCIENTIFICALLY UNWARRANTED to believe that the food supply is free of natural rodent carcinogens and mutagens, it is equally UNREALISTIC TO EQUATE SO-CALLED NATURAL WITH SAFE.
Foods abound in natural chemicals that are toxic or potentially toxic — because ALL CHEMICALS WILL BE TOXIC AT SOME DOSE.

Toxicologists have confirmed that food naturally contains a myriad of chemicals traditionally thought of as so-called POISONS —

- CARROTS contain carototoxin, a NERVE POISON.
- LIMA BEANS contain hydrogen cyanide, a classic SUICIDE SUBSTANCE.
- NUTMEG, BLACK PEPPER, and CARROTS all contain the HALLUCINOGENIC compound myristicin.
- POTATOES contain solanine, arsenic, and, chaconine.

Moreover, all chemicals, whether natural or synthetic, are potential TOXICANTS at high doses but are perfectly safe when consumed in low doses.

- CAFFEINE, a familiar stimulant, is also a TOXICANT if consumed in high doses (say, 50 to 100 cups of coffee per day).
- COMMON TABLE SALT, an everyday chemical, when consumed in excess, can cause ELEVATIONS IN BLOOD PRESSURE in sensitive individuals; a couple of tablespoonsful can KILL A SMALL CHILD.
- IRON, an essential mineral supplement, all too often causes POISONING IN CHILDREN.
- SELENIUM, a mineral essential in the human diet, can cause nausea and nerve changes when chronically consumed in excess.

When it comes to TOXICANTS in the diet — natural or synthetic — THE DOSE MAKES THE POISON.
The world can be a scary place. Bad things sometimes happen to us and our loved ones, and few things are scarier than cancer.

When we are facing frightening things, a sense of controllability can ease our fears.

But experience and empirical evidence tell us that things are often more seemingly random and less predictable and controllable than we commonly think.

Before Benjamin Franklin’s scientific investigation of lightning and invention of the lightning rod, lightning was a terrifying, seemingly random and uncontrollable, and often deadly occurrence.

People sought explanations and control: they found those explanations in divine provenance and perceived control in the ringing of church bells.

Unfortunately, ringing church bells does not actually dissuade lightning and often led to the deaths of bell ringers who ascended the bell towers in the midst of storms.

One author described cancer as the result of a LOTTERY-LIKE ACCUMULATION OF STOCHASTIC MUTATIONS.

Faced with such a LOTTERY that none of us voluntarily enter, WE GRASP DESPERATELY FOR SIGNS OF CONTROLLABILITY.
Would it not be wonderful if food itself, the daily sustenance that we all take and one of our greatest pleasures, offered such controllability?

For centuries, we have sought causes and cures for cancer, and food has been a prime candidate in that search.

Has this search and our collective conflict-of-interest in wanting to reduce our fear potentially affected our interpretation and reporting of research results, leading to bias in the scientific record?

Are we like church-bell ringers in a storm?

John Ioannidis has been a pioneer in creatively finding the skeletons in the epistemologic closet of the biomedical research community.

In this issue of the Journal, he and Jonathan Schoenfeld do so again with the provocative and innovative flair we have come to expect.

They raise an important question in nutritional epidemiology by asking ...

**Is Everything We Eat Associated With Cancer?**

As they noted in the Discussion, analyzing all nutrient-cancer interactions would be impossible.

Yet, by selecting 50 ingredients from a cookbook, they ensured that the analysis would be relevant to common, familiar foods, including specific dairy products, meats, vegetables, and spices and even tea and rum.

This method of selecting the subject of review was just as innovative as the question at hand.

They found that almost three-fourths of the articles they reviewed concluded that there was an increased or decreased risk of cancer attributed to various foods, with most evidence being at least nominally significant.
It appears, then, that according to the published literature almost everything we eat is, in fact, associated with cancer.

However, Schoenfeld and Ioannidis proceeded to show that **BIASES EXIST IN THE NUTRIENT CANCER LITERATURE**.

The **FIDELITY OF RESEARCH FINDINGS** between nutrients and cancer may have been **COMPROMISED** in several ways —

- They identified an **OVERSTATING OF WEAK RESULTS** (most associations were only **WEAKLY SUPPORTED**)
- **A LACK OF CONSISTENT COMPARISONS** (inconsistent definitions of exposure and outcomes)
- **POSSIBLE SUPPRESSION OF NULL FINDINGS** (a bimodal distribution of outcomes, with a **NOTICEABLE LACK OF NULL FINDINGS**).

Although Schoenfeld and Ioannidis showed that **BIASES EXIST IN THE NUTRIENT-CANCER LITERATURE**, it is unclear what causes these **BREACHES IN SCIENTIFIC OBJECTIVITY**.

**BIAS IS NOT NEW TO THE FIELD OF SCIENCE.**

Antoine-Laurent Lavoisier in the 1700s wrote about bias and its clouding of scientific findings, stating ...

*Imagination, on the contrary, which is ever wandering beyond the bounds of truth, joined to self-love and that self-confidence we are so apt to indulge, prompt us to draw conclusions which are not immediately derived from facts; so that we become in some measure interested in deceiving ourselves.*

White Hat **BIAS**, Confirmation **BIAS**, and Publication **BIAS** can lead to **SELF-DECEPTION**.
White Hat BIAS, defined by Cope and Allison as ...  

**BIAS leading to distortion of research-based information in the service of what may be perceived as « righteous ends »**.

This may be a factor in the **OVERSTATEMENT** of research findings.

In addition, **OVERSTATEMENT** of results can be influenced by Confirmation BIAS, in which the **OVERSTATED** results match preconceived views and hypotheses, leading to acceptance of the results, even if the results are **WEAK OR NON-SIGNIFICANT**.

When results are **NULL**, publishing can be difficult and can lead to Publication BIAS in which significant findings are more likely to be published, further distorting our view of what is known.

When results are presented in a **BIASED** manner, the **DISTORTED RESULTS ARE DISSEMINATED TO THE PUBLIC THROUGH LAY MEDIA**.

The implications of Schoenfeld and Ioannidis’ analysis may be important for **NUTRITIONAL EPIDEMIOLOGY** even more broadly.

Numerous food ingredients are thought to have medicinal properties that are **NOT SUFFICIENTLY SUPPORTED BY CURRENT KNOWLEDGE** — for example, **COFFEE « CURING » DIABETES**.

These **DISTORTIONS** can also be used to **DEMONIZE** foods, as shown by the long-standing **PRESUMPTION** that **DIETARY CHOLESTEROL IN EGGS CONTRIBUTES TO HEART DISEASE**.

Causative relations between various foods and diseases likely do exist, but the evidence for many relations is **WEAK**, although conclusions about these relations are stated with the certainty one would expect only from the most strongly supported evidence.
Important steps to improve the FIDELITY OF RESEARCH reporting include the following —

- increased use and improvement of clinical trial and observational study registries
  - Making raw data publicly available.
  - Making supporting documentation such as protocols, consent forms, and analytic plans publicly available.
  - Mandating the publication of results from human (or animal) research supported by taxpayer funds.

As Schoenfeld and Ioannidis highlighted, comprehensive approaches to improve reporting of nutrient-disease outcomes could go a long way toward DECREASING REPEATED SENSATIONAL REPORTS OF THE EFFECTS OF FOODS ON HEALTH.

However, none of these DEBIASING SOLUTIONS address the FUNDAMENTAL HUMAN NEED TO PERCEIVE CONTROL OVER FEARED EVENTS.

Although scientists may have ULTERIOR MOTIVES for looking for nutrient-disease associations, the public is always the final audience.

It is therefore imperative that we SPEND LESS TIME REPEATING WEAK CORRELATIONS and invest the resources to vigorously investigate nutrient-cancer and other disease associations with STRONGER METHODOLOGY, so that we give the public lightning rods instead of sending them up the bell tower.
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Anti-Pesticide Lunatics Are WRONG About Cancer
There are NO pest control products that are known or probable carcinogens.

It is a MYTH to believe that pest control products somehow cause cancer.

There are THOUSANDS OF DEATHS per year from KNOWN CANCER-CAUSING SUBSTANCES such as cigarette smoke and alcohol.

There is NOT ONE KNOWN CANCER DEATH from the proper use of pest control products used in the Urban Landscape.

Canadian Cancer Society, through its promotional literature, continues to insist there is a link between pest control products and cancer, despite the fact that its U.S. counterpart, American Cancer Society, DOES NOT SHARE THE SAME VIEWPOINT.

Even Canadian Cancer Society’s own web-site states that scientific research does NOT provide a conclusive link between pesticides and human cancer.

In 2007, the United States Environmental Protection Agency and the Pest Management Regulatory Agency of Health Canada issued a ruling that products like 2,4-D Herbicide ARE NOT CANCER-CAUSING IN HUMANS.

The World Health Organization only lists the common pest control product 2,4-D in the SAME CANCER-RISK CATEGORY AS PICKLED VEGETABLES AND CELL-PHONES.

Pest control products are SCIENTIFICALLY SAFE, and NO HARM WILL OCCUR when they are used according to label directions.
Canadian Cancer Society’s own web-sites STATE REPEATEDLY that scientific research DOES NOT PROVIDE A CONCLUSIVE LINK between pest control products and cancer.

Even some of Canadian Cancer Society’s HIGHEST-RANKING LOBBYISTS states that the connection between cancer and pesticides is NOT CONCLUSIVE.

INDISPUTABLE AND CONCLUSIVE SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH shows that, as reported through Health Canada’s VAST TOXICOLOGY DATABASE, NO HARM WILL OCCUR when pest control products are used according to label directions.
Pest control products CAUSE NO HARM, and DO NOT CAUSE CANCER
We are living in the 9/11 Era of Anti Pesticide and Environmental Terrorism where at least ONE SUBVERSIVE ACT OF TERROR is Perpetrated EVERY SINGLE DAY by enviro lunatics.

We are living in the DARK AGE OF ANTI PESTICIDE TERRORISM where sound science is trumped by FAKE SCIENTISTS, JUNK SCIENCE and UNVERIFIABLE SECRET EVIDENCE through FABRICATION, INNUENDO, and INTERNET RUMOUR — scientific research PROVES that pest control products CAUSE NO HARM and can be USED SAFELY.

NORAHG is the National Organization Responding Against HUJE that seek to harm the Green space industry.

NORAHG morally represents the VAST SILENT MAJORITY of people associated with turf and ornamental plant maintenance who are OPPOSED to Anti Pesticide PROHIBITION and the CLOSURE of green spaces under the RIDICULOUS PRETEXT of somehow « saving » the environment.

NORAHG is a NATIONAL NON PROFIT NON PARTISAN organization that does not accept money from corporations or governments or trade associations, and represents NO VESTED INTERESTS WHATSOEVER.

NORAHG is dedicated to reporting the work of RESPECTED and HIGHLY RATED EXPERTS who promote ENVIRONMENTAL REALISM and PESTICIDE TRUTHS.

Anti Pesticide HUJE are enviro lunatics and lawn haters who particularly DESPISE the golf industry — they are Hateful Underhanded Jokes as Environmentalists who have been WRONG FOR OVER 50 YEARS.

There is NO RECOURSE but LITIGATION against Anti Pesticide HUJE.

Another RECOURSE is to SEEK the CANCELLATION of GOVERNMENT GRANTS and REVOCATION of the TAX EXEMPT STATUS of Anti Pesticide Organizations.

HUIE should Get OFF OUR GRASS and they should Roast in Hell.

NORAHG managed the Library of Force Of Nature Reports and References which is a VAST ARCHIVE of REPORTS, MEDIA REFERENCES, AUDIO CLIPS, and VIDEOS on ALL Anti Pesticide Terrorist Acts of Subversion.

The purpose of the ARCHIVE is to provide information that will lead to a SUCCESSFUL LITIGATION AGAINST Anti Pesticide Organizations.

All names, statements, activities, and affiliations have been ARCHIVED for the intention of eventual CRIMINAL CHARGES.

When CRIMINAL CHARGES for FRAUD and CONSPIRACY are laid, legal experts say that the ARCHIVE is sufficient to lead to a SUCCESSFUL PROSECUTION!

NORAHG also produces FORCE OF NATURE reports that present THE WHOLE TRUTH FROM AN INDEPENDENT PERSPECTIVE about environmental issues, including the pesticide terrorism.

FORCE OF NATURE is a series of reports destined for the green space industry, the environmental terrorist movement, governments, and the media, nationwide across Canada, the United States, and overseas.

FORCE OF NATURE is committed to SOUND SCIENCE, as well as ground breaking original reporting that informs, entertains, and creates real change.

FORCE OF NATURE was launched for CONTINUOUS transmission on the Internet on January 1st, 2009 — however, the VERY FIRST Stand-Alone FORCE OF NATURE Report was issued on September 19th, 2008.

By early 2009, the reports were released no more than five times per week, but by August 25th, 2009, FORCE OF NATURE was produced on a DAILY basis.

On March 15th, 2010, Uncle Adolph independently launched the Blog-Site called The Pesticide Truths, for the posting of information right off the press.

By May 27th, 2010, Uncle Adolph expanded Pesticide Truths to a SECOND Blog-Site, and independently acquired the rights to archive the ENTIRE FORCE OF NATURE Library of Reports.

By mid-December 2010, ENTIRE FORCE OF NATURE Library of Reports was FULLY SUMMARIZED and CROSS-REFERENCED, and by early 2012, the library was archived on The Pesticide
Truths Web-Site, in the form of Web-Pages.

The information presented in FORCE OF NATURE has been developed for the education and entertainment of the reader by providing a sequence of events WITH COMMENTARY, striving for accuracy in history, politics, and science.

FORCE OF NATURE is TOTALLY INDEPENDENT and provides NO guarantee regarding accuracy or completeness. In no event shall FORCE OF NATURE be liable for any incidental or consequential damages, lost profits, or any indirect damages.

NORAHG also produces A LOOK AT, a series of reports providing TECHNICAL INFORMATION on issues such as Cancer Management, Golf Course Maintenance, Green Alternatives, Summer Stress, Turfgrass Pests, and Turfgrass Species.

Finally, NORAHG frequently responds to anti pesticide activists in LETTERS TO THE EDITOR in newspapers across Canada and around the world.

All information, excerpts, and pictures contained in FORCE OF NATURE, A LOOK AT, and LETTERS TO THE EDITOR were retrieved from the Internet, and may be considered in the public domain.

FORCE OF NATURE, A LOOK AT, and their various incarnations, was the brainchild of William H. Gathercole and his colleagues in 1991. Mr. Gathercole is now retired, although his name continues to appear as founder.

Here is a brief summary of Mr. Gathercole’s career —

Fields of study — Horticulture, Agriculture, Mathematics, Physics

Alma mater — McGill University, University of Guelph, the first person ever to obtain university degrees and contribute to both the professional lawn care and golf maintenance industries

Expertise in — environmental issues and anti pesticide terrorism, turf and ornamental maintenance and troubleshooting, history of the industry, sales and distribution of seeds, chemicals, fertilizers, and equipment, fertilizer manufacturing and distribution

Notable activities — worked in virtually all aspects of the green space industry, including golf, professional lawn care, distribution, environmental compliance, government negotiations, public affairs, and workplace safety, supervisor, consultant, and programer for the successful execution of hundreds of thousands of management operations in the golf and urban landscape, as well as millions of pest control applications, advisor, instructor, and trainer for thousands of turf and ornamental managers and technicians, pesticide certification instructor for thousands of industry workers, founder of the modern professional lawn care industry, prolific writer for industry publications and e-newsletters, first to confirm the invasion of European Chafer insect in both the Montreal region and the Vancouver/Fraser Valley region, with Dr. Peter DeWoody, confirmed the presence of Take All Patch as a disease of turf in Eastern Canada, with Dr. David Shearer, confirmed the presence of Kentucky Bluegrass Scab as an insect pest in South Western Ontario, and later, in the Montreal and Vancouver regions

Special contributions — creator of the exception status that has allowed the golf industry to avoid being subjected to anti pesticide prohibition, creator of the signs that are now used for posting after application, founder of annual winter convention for Quebec golf course superintendents, the major influence in the decision by Canadian Cancer Society to stop selling for profit pesticide treated daffodils, the only true reliable witness of the events of anti pesticide prohibition in the town of Hudson, Quebec, retired founder of FORCE OF NATURE and A LOOK AT reports

Notable award — the very first man of the year for contributions leading to the successful founding of Quebec professional lawn care industry, which served as a beach-head against anti pesticide activists in the 1980s and 1990s

Legacy — Mr. Gathercole and his colleagues … designed and implemented strategies that reinforced anti pesticide activists to provide peace and prosperity for the entire modern green space industry across Canada, orchestrated legal action against anti pesticide activists in the town of Hudson, Quebec, launched the largest founding professional lawn care business in Canada, quadrupled the business revenues of one of the largest suppliers in Canada.

Mr. Gathercole is now retired, although his name continues to appear as founder of FORCE OF NATURE and A LOOK AT reports.