FORCE OF NATURE | THE WHOLE TRUTH FROM AN INDEPENDENT PERSPECTIVE FROM National Organization Responding Against HUJE that seek to harm the Green Space Industry (NORAHG)
Parkinson’s Disease is a degenerative disorder of the central nervous system. Anti-Pesticide Activists have attempted to FALSELY ASSOCIATE the increased risk of Parkinson’s Disease with pest control products. They do so through the use of GARBAGE SCIENCE and EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDIES.

EPIDEMIOLOGY is the MERE STATISTICAL STUDY of diseases in humans. EPIDEMIOLOGY studies have been used to somehow VALIDATE EVERY CONSPIRACY against pest control products used in the Urban Landscape.
The Myth Of Parkinson’s Disease (continued)

EPIDEMIOLOGY studies have been used to somehow CONCOCT IMAGINARY LINKS between pest control products and health issues, such as certain types of cancer and Parkinson’s Disease.

In fact, pest control products CAUSE NO HARM, and DO NOT CAUSE Parkinson’s Disease.

EPIDEMIOLOGY studies are NOT TO BE TRUSTED!

Anti-Pesticide RESEARCHERS will say ANYTHING to get their PAY-OFFS, including FAKING DATA and POINTLESS AND BADLY DESIGNED RESEARCH about Parkinson’s Disease.

Anti-Pesticide RESEARCHERS have even been found GUILTY OF FAKING DATA associating pest control products and Parkinson’s Disease.

INDISPUTABLE AND CONCLUSIVE SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH shows that, as reported through the VAST TOXICOLOGY DATABASE of Health Canada and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, NO HARM WILL OCCUR when pest control products are used according to label directions.

According To Dr. Elizabeth M. Whelan And American Council On Science And Health (ACSH) …

An Anti-Pesticide EPIDEMIOLOGY study, which NEVER DESERVED TO BE PUBLISHED in the journal Neurology, TRIED TO SUGGEST that there may be an association between pest control products and Parkinson’s Disease.

According to Dr. Elizabeth M. Whelan and American Council On Science And Health, this study was a FIRST-RATE MESS and GARBAGE SCIENCE.

It could be used as an illustration in a college text on «HOW NOT TO DO EPIDEMIOLOGY».

Even the authors of the Anti-Pesticide EPIDEMIOLOGY study were aware that DEFINITIVE CONCLUSIONS COULD NOT BE MADE.

EPIDEMIOLOGY studies are NOT TO BE TRUSTED!
Exposure To « Pesticides »
A Risk Factor For Parkinson’s Disease ?
Not So Fast !

May 28th, 2013

American Council On Science And Health
Responding To The Journal Neurology
Selected And Adapted Excerpts
A study published in the journal Neurology TRIED TO SUGGEST that there may be an association between exposure to pesticides and solvents and Parkinson’s Disease.

Even the study authors are BLATANTLY AWARE OF THE SHORTCOMINGS OF THEIR STUDY when they say ... 

... the evidence is « LIMITED, OR AT LEAST INCONCLUSIVE », because of « LACK OF DEFINITIVE AGREEMENT between cohort and case-control studies ».

Yet that didn’t stop them from publishing it.

This META-ANALYSIS was based on 89 prospective and case-control studies considering a range of chemicals — pesticides, herbicides, insecticides, fungicides, rodenticides, solvents, organophosphates, paraquat, and DDT, among others — and their relation to Parkinson’s Disease.

META-ANALYSIS is widely used in EPIDEMIOLOGY.

EPIDEMIOLOGY is the MERE STATISTICAL STUDY of diseases in humans.

After the META-ANALYSIS, researchers concluded that the risk of developing Parkinson’s Disease was [ SOMEHOW ] increased by 33 per cent to 80 per cent due to exposure to these chemicals.

The META-ANALYSIS was a FIRST-RATE MESS.
CONCLUSIONS from the included studies WERE NOT IN AGREEMENT THE MAJORITY OF THE TIME, and even higher quality studies showed statistically significant associations for solvents, paraquat, and well-water drinking, but they also found REDUCTIONS in Parkinson’s Disease for exposure to insecticides, farming and well-water drinking.

How can something — well-water drinking — both increase risk of Parkinson’s Disease and also decrease risk?

The answer — GARBAGE SCIENCE.

As if to prove this point, the case-control studies differed in terms of study quality and size and in the prospective studies, estimates of exposure were not determined in the same way.

And, the secondary causes of Parkinson’s Disease were completely ignored by the authors.

Dr. Gilbert L. Ross is the Executive Director and Medical Director of the American Council On Science And Health (ACSH).

According to Dr. Ross —

This is a prime example of a bad study.

It could be used as an illustration in a college text on «HOW NOT TO DO EPIDEMIOLOGY».
First of all, there was SO MUCH VARIATION BETWEEN STUDIES, a point even the authors are aware of, that definitive conclusions cannot be made.

And results were clearly CONTRADICTORY as pointed out in the well-water example previously.

The one good point made by study authors was that NO ASSOCIATION WAS FOUND BETWEEN DDT AND PARKINSON’S DISEASE.

Dr. Josh Bloom is the Associate Director of the American Council On Science And Health (ACSH).

Dr. Bloom points out that the entire premise is BIOLOGICALLY IMPLAUSIBLE.

According to Dr. Bloom —

THERE IS NO WAY THAT YOU CAN LUMP THESE SUBSTANCES TOGETHER AND DRAW ANY TYPE OF VALID CONCLUSION.

They are all chemically different, work by different mechanisms, and each one is processed in the body in a different way.

This is like saying « since a cannon ball is round and kills people, all other round objects are dangerous ».

According to this logic, perhaps the Department Of Homeland Security ought to think about banning Nerf Balls.
The WISDOM Of REAL Experts

Dr. Elizabeth M. Whelan And American Council On Science And Health

The American Council On Science And Health (ACSH) is a non-profit organization founded in 1978 by Dr. Elizabeth M. Whelan that produces peer-reviewed reports on issues related to food, nutrition, chemicals, pharmaceuticals, life-style, the environment, and health. Its core membership is a board of 350 physicians, scientists and policy advisors who review the Council’s reports and participate in ACSH seminars, press conferences, media communications and other educational activities. American Council On Science And Health (ACSH) describes itself as a « consumer education consortium ». ACSH describes its mission as « ... to add reason and balance to debates about public health issues and bring common sense scientific views to the public ». ACSH frequently defends science against claims that industry products create risks of injury, ill-health or death.

Dr. Elizabeth M. Whelan is President of the American Council On Science And Health (ACSH) and a member of its Board Of Trustees. In 1978, she founded ACSH, a consumer education-public health organization. Dr. Whelan is a graduate of Connecticut College. She has a Master’s Degree in Public Health from the Yale School of Medicine, a Master Of Science from the Harvard School of Public Health, and a Doctor Of Science from the Harvard School of Public Health. Dr. Whelan is the author or co-author of twenty-three books on nutrition, smoking, and environmental issues. She has authored or co-authored over 300 ARTICLES for popular and professional publications such as • Across The Board • Health Confidential • Journal Of The American Medical Association. And NEWSPAPERS such as • New York Post • The Wall Street Journal. Dr. Whelan has many PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS and HONORARY POSITIONS in associations such as • American Institute Of Nutrition • American Medical Writers Association • Men And Women In Science. Dr. Whelan has received many AWARDS, including • American Institute Of Chemists • American Public Health Association.

Dr. Josh Bloom is the Associate Director of the American Council On Science And Health (ACSH). Dr. Bloom is an Organic Chemist, and has worked in the pharmaceutical industry for about twenty years.

Dr. Gilbert L. Ross is the Executive Director and Medical Director of the American Council On Science And Health (ACSH). Dr. Ross received his undergraduate degree in Chemistry from Cornell University’s School of Arts and Sciences in 1968, and received his M.D. from the N.Y.U. School of Medicine in 1972.
Pest Control Products CAUSE NO HARM, AND DO NOT CAUSE PARKINSON’S
META-ANALYSIS Goes Looking For Problems Where NONE Exist

In statistics, a META-ANALYSIS refers to methods focused on contrasting and combining results from different studies, in the hope of identifying patterns among study results, sources of disagreement among those results, or other interesting relationships that may come to light in the context of multiple studies.

In other words, META-ANALYSIS goes looking for problems where NONE exist.

The MOST SEVERE FAULT in META-ANALYSIS often occurs when the people doing the META-ANALYSIS have an economic, social, or political agenda such as the CONSPIRACY TO PROHIBIT PEST CONTROL PRODUCTS.

META-ANALYSIS, a MERE statistical tool, is widely used in EPIDEMIOLOGY.

EPIDEMIOLOGY is the MERE STATISTICAL STUDY of diseases in humans.

EPIDEMIOLOGY studies have been used to somehow VALIDATE EVERY CONSPIRACY against pest control products used in the Urban Landscape.

EPIDEMIOLOGY studies have been used to somehow CONCOCT IMAGINARY LINKS between pest control products and health issues, such as certain types of cancer and Parkinson’s Disease.

EPIDEMIOLOGY studies are NOT TO BE TRUSTED!

INDISPUTABLE AND CONCLUSIVE SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH shows that, as reported through the VAST TOXICOLOGY DATABASE of Health Canada and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, NO HARM WILL OCCUR when pest control products are used according to label directions.

The RISK ASSESSMENT of pest control products indicates that they are PRACTICALLY-NON-TOXIC.

There is NOT ONE KNOWN ILLNESS OR DEATH from the proper use of pest control products used in the Urban Landscape.
Pest Control Products & Epidemiology Studies 
( continued )

Epidemiology Studies Are Not Used By Health Canada ?!?!?

This is WRONG!

Pest control products are regulated by Health Canada’s Pest Management Regulatory Agency (PMRA), which requires thorough scientific reviews and safety assessments to ensure they meet strict health and environmental standards and are shown to have value.

Pest control products are one of the most stringently regulated products in Canada.

Nonetheless, NON-EXPERT Anti-Pesticide Lunatics ALLEGE that Health Canada is somehow « weak » in examining Epidemiology Studies when evaluating the safety of pest control products.

This is NOT TRUE.

This is merely an attempt to INVALIDATE THE CREDIBILITY of Health Canada.

EPIDEMIOLOGY is the study of the causes, distribution, and control of health problems in populations.

However, EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDIES cannot be relied upon ALONE, and MUST BE BACKED-UP WITH ANIMAL TOXICITY STUDIES.

These ANIMAL TOXICITY STUDIES are assessed to determine if there is any biological basis for the POTENTIAL ASSOCIATIONS noted in EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDIES.

The examination of ANIMAL TOXICITY STUDIES from internationally-accepted guideline studies using doses well-above those to which humans are typically exposed, combined with exposure data obtained from well-
Pest Control Products & Epidemiology Studies (continued)

designed studies, is currently a useful methodology available for assessing risks to human health.

Health Canada’s Pest Management Regulatory Agency (PMRA) undertakes this kind of ASSESSMENT to SUPPLEMENT INFORMATION about POTENTIAL ASSOCIATIONS that may be established by EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDIES.

This approach is consistent with that of other regulatory authorities that base human health risk assessments on ANIMAL TOXICITY DATA.

Animal Toxicity Data Are RELIABLE

NON-EXPERT Anti-Pesticide Lunatics ALLEGE that Health Canada uses ANIMAL TOXICITY DATA that are somehow not reliable.

This is WRONG!

In fact, if a pest control product actually could cause cancer, it is fairly certain that this would be ascertained through the EXTENSIVE TESTING PROCEDURES required before it is registered for use in Canada.

Dr. Connie Moase is Director, Health Effects Division II, Health Evaluation Directorate, Pest Management Regulatory Agency of Health Canada.

According to Dr. Moase —

For any known human carcinogen, whatever the chemical might be — I’m not speaking directly to pesticides — THE ANIMAL MODELS THAT HAVE BEEN USED HAVE SHOWN TO BE POSITIVE FOR ANYTHING THAT’S KNOWN TO BE CARCINOGENIC TO HUMANS AS WELL.

So they are well understood predictors of potential human toxicity, and those are the models that are well worked out and used for toxicity testing.

William H. Gathercole & NORAHG  │  force.of.de.nature@gmail.com  │  Force Of Nature
Epidemiology Studies Are Almost Worthless

Dr. Stan Young is a Statistician at National Institute Of Statistical Sciences In Research, Triangle Park, North Carolina.

According to Dr. Young —

… EPIDEMIOLOGY studies are SO OFTEN WRONG that they are coming close to being WORTHLESS.

We spend a lot of money and we could make claims just as valid as a random number generator.

Epidemiology Studies Have False Positives

Dr. Geoffrey C. Kabat is a Cancer Epidemiologist at Albert Einstein College Of Medicine and the author of « Hyping Health Risks : Environmental Hazards In Daily Life And The Science Of Epidemiology ».

According to Dr. Kabat, epidemiologists have long been aware of the baleful effects of CONTRADICTORY FINDINGS reported in the media, which CONFUSE THE PUBLIC about what threats to health are worth worrying about.

However, only recently have prominent epidemiologists begun to critically examine their own discipline and to speak out about the FALSE POSITIVES — initial findings that LATER PROVE TO BE WRONG.

FALSE POSITIVES are latched onto by the media, the public, advocacy groups, and regulatory agencies.

In 2005, Epidemiologist John Ioannidis published a paper entitled WHY MOST RESEARCH FINDINGS ARE FALSE.
Among the factors contributing to MOST RESEARCH FINDINGS THAT ARE FALSE, Ioannidis cited …

- **METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES.**
- **RESEARCHERS’ DESIRE FOR THEIR RESULTS TO BE MEANINGFUL.**
- **THE STRONG MOTIVATION OF PROFESSIONAL ADVANCEMENT.**

**NO Scientific Basis For PROHIBITION**

Sir Richard Doll and Sir Austin Bradford Hill were the British authors behind the momentous 1950 study.

Sir Richard Doll has been designated as « **THE GREATEST EPIDEMIOLOGIST OF THE 20TH CENTURY** ».

In 2003, Sir Richard delivered a lecture in Guelph, Ontario.

The following is taken from an article published at the time —

*Sir Richard gave a public lecture in Guelph.*

*Afterward, a city councillor asked whether he’d support a BAN ON PESTICIDES in the city.*

« **NO**, he said, to her immense surprise.

« **There’s NO SCIENTIFIC BASIS FOR IT.** »
Canadian Cancer Society Cherry-Picked Very Weak Epidemiological Studies

Canadian Cancer Society CONSPIRES TO PROHIBIT against pest control products that are HEALTH-CANADA-APPROVED, FEDERALLY-LEGAL, SCIENTIFICALLY-SAFE, PRACTICALLY-NON-TOXIC, and CAUSE NO HARM.

Canadian Cancer Society is a FUND-RAISING, PROFIT-SEEKERING, and LOBBYING organization, and NOT a science, research, or health organization.

Health Canada, and NOT Canadian Cancer Society, has THE ESSENTIAL EXPERTISE on the subject of pest control products.

Observers do not understand how Canadian Cancer Society has trouble comprehending information provided by Health Canada regarding the OVERWHELMING EVIDENCE THAT PEST CONTROL PRODUCTS ARE SCIENTIFICALLY-SAFE.

Observers have tried to follow the trail (a.k.a. growing body) of information against pest control products provided by Canadian Cancer Society, but to no avail.

Canadian Cancer Society is NOT PROVIDING ANY INFORMATION THAT IS FACTUAL.

Canadian Cancer Society implies that that Health Canada is LYING TO THE PUBLIC?

NO LEADING EXPERTS WERE EVER CONSULTED by Canadian Cancer Society, and yet, it CONCOCTED IMAGINARY DANGER about pest control products by alleging that it consulted with the HIGHEST QUALITY SCIENTIFIC EXPERTS.
Canadian Cancer Society should LEAVE THE FACTS ON PEST CONTROL PRODUCT SAFETY UP TO THE EXPERTS AT HEALTH CANADA.

Health Canada, and NOT Canadian Cancer Society, has THE ESSENTIAL EXPERTISE on the subject of pest control products.

Canadian Cancer Society is RIDICULOUSLY IMPLYING that its NON-EXPERT ASSESSMENT is somehow being withheld from Health Canada and EVERY other regulatory agency in the world.

Canadian Cancer Society is NOT BEING HONEST since it is CHERRY-PICKING VERY WEAK EPIDEMIOLOGICAL STUDIES, and PRETENDS that this is the ONLY evidence that is available.

It CHERRY-PICKED A MERE 100 EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDIES !

Furthermore, Canadian Cancer Society has STATED REPEATEDLY that scientific research does NOT provide a conclusive link between pest control products and cancer.

Why is Canadian Cancer Society WASTING EVERYBODY’S TIME on the issue of pest control products ?

Canadian Cancer Society REFUTED By Health Canada

Canadian Cancer Society claimed to possess a MERE 100 EPIDEMIOLOGY Studies somehow linking pest control products to cancer.

Health Canada has estimated that ABOUT 23 MILLION PAGES OF SCIENTIFIC STUDIES have been used to support the decisions made about pest control products.
Pest Control Products & Epidemiology Studies (continued)

Canadian Cancer Society’s position concerning CANCER IS CONGRUENT WITH ALL OTHER ANTI-PESTICIDE AND NON-SCIENCE-BASED ORGANIZATIONS —

Over 100 STUDIES have linked pesticide exposure to both adult and childhood cancers. [?!?!]

The findings of this LIMITED NUMBER OF EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDIES can be challenged by reference to the following statement provided by Health Canada’s Pest Management Regulatory Agency (PMRA) in 2012 —

We estimated that just proprietary studies that are submitted to us, which we keep on file, AMOUNTED TO ABOUT 23 MILLION PAGES OF SCIENTIFIC STUDIES that are used to support the decisions that we make on pesticides, which is FAIRLY SIGNIFICANT.

Canadian Cancer Society REFUTED By Health Canada, Again

Furthermore, Canadian Cancer Society FAILED TO EXPLAIN that its 100 STUDIES are ALL EPIDEMIOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONAL STUDIES WITH VERY WEAK LINKS between pesticides and disease.

According to Health Canada —

EPIDEMIOLOGY studies identify associations rather than causation, and are examined IN CONJUNCTION WITH well conducted toxicity studies that are specifically designed to elicit toxic effects over a series of dose levels.

These animal toxicity data are assessed to determine if there is any biological basis for the potential associations noted in EPIDEMIOLOGY studies.
The examination of animal toxicity data from internationally accepted guideline studies using doses well above those to which humans are typically exposed, combined with exposure data obtained from well-designed studies, is currently a useful methodology available for assessing risks to human health.

Health Canada’s PMRA undertakes this kind of assessment to supplement information about associations that may be established by epidemiology studies.

This approach is CONSISTENT with that of OTHER REGULATORY AUTHORITIES that base human health risk assessments on animal toxicity data.

Canadian Cancer Society Irresponsibly Squandered Its Efforts On Municipal Anti-Pesticide Campaigns

Canadian Cancer Society has SQUANDERED OVER 5,000,000 DOLLARS ON NEEDLESS ANTI-PESTICIDE CONSPIRACIES.

Dr. Lorne Hepworth is among several LEADING EXPERTS who have recognized expertise, training and background in matters concerning pest control products.

Dr. Hepworth is also Canada’s MOST EFFECTIVE AND CONSISTENT SPOKESMAN on the subject of public policy and pest control products.
According to Dr. Hepworth —

*If the CANADIAN CANCER SOCIETY has information to back up its pesticide claims it is IRRESPONsibly SQUANDERING ITS EFFORTS ON MUNICIPAL [ANTI-PESTICIDE] CAMPAIGNS rather than presenting «proof» to Health Canada, which regulates the products, or to the industry, which runs hundreds of tests on each and every product seeking federal government registration.*

*Furthermore, if the CANADIAN CANCER SOCIETY had even a shred of relevant, compelling information Health Canada would be all over it.*

*After all, the health of Canadians is Health Canada’s top priority and it is mandated to assess all scientifically credible evidence available regarding the pesticides it has approved for sale and use.*

*If the CANADIAN CANCER SOCIETY does know something about the safety of pesticides that the rest of us do not, they have an obligation to bring it to Health Canada so it can be investigated.*

**OCFP Review Contained Weak Epidemiology Studies**

Ontario College Of Family Physicians (OCFP) has CONSPIRED to PROHIBIT against pest control products that are HEALTH-CANADA-APPROVED, FEDERALLY-LEGAL, SCIENTIFICALLY-SAFE, PRACTICALLY-NON-TOXIC, and CAUSE NO HARM.

In 2004, Ontario College Of Family Physicians CONCOCTED an Anti-Pesticide Literature Review of CHERRY-PICKED WEAK EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDIES.
Pest Control Products & Epidemiology Studies (continued)

The BOGUS OCFP Anti-Pesticide Literature Review of CHERRY-PICKED WEAK EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDIES was NEEDLESSLY ALARMIST with its ALLEGATIONS that pest control products MAY be the cause of certain types of cancer.

It was a PRINCIPAL PARTISAN ARCHITECT with the Ontario McGuinty Government in CONSPIRING TO PROHIBIT pest control products used in the Urban Landscape.

Unfortunately, the OCFP Anti-Pesticide Literature Review DID NOT CONSIDER ALL OF THE RELEVANT EPIDEMIOLOGY EVIDENCE.

What is not explained in the OCFP Anti-Pesticide Literature Review is that the so-called evidence against pest control products consisted of some EPIDEMIOLOGY studies showing a WEAK (in most cases, a VERY WEAK) link between some pest control products and cancer.

The best method for assessing risks to human health is the examination of ANIMAL TOXICITY DATA from internationally-accepted guideline studies, which OCFP DID NOT DO.

OCFP DID NOT conduct a serious scientific study of EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDIES ... it conducted a mere Literature Review, and could only use those reports found in the OPEN PUBLIC LITERATURE.

OCFP was NOT even in «The Information Loop» on issues regarding pest control products.

Moreover, OCFP DID NOT avail itself to the EXTENSIVE TOXICOLOGY DATABASE that is available from Health Canada.

Unfortunately, this database is NOT DIRECTLY AVAILABLE TO OUTSIDE GROUPS like OCFP.

OCFP never even bothered to request to look at the TOXICOLOGY DATABASE through a process that Health Canada refers to as The Reading Room.
Pest Control Products & Epidemiology Studies (continued)

The authors and reviewers of the BOGUS OCFP Anti-Pesticide Literature were not only SCIENTIFICALLY IGNORANT, they were LAZY AND STUPID.

This organization is a DISCREDITED, RADICAL, and SCIENTIFICALLY IGNORANT Anti-Pesticide Organization.

Health Canada, and NOT OCFP, has THE ESSENTIAL EXPERTISE on the subject of pest control products.

The Anti-Pesticide Literature Review was BOGUS, BIASED, DISGRACEFUL, FALSE, MISLEADING, and SUBVERSIVE, and had absolutely NO CREDIBILITY in the legitimate scientific community, and has been DISCREDITED, DEBUNKED, and REFUTED by Health Canada and by The Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution and by SEVERAL LEADING EXPERTS.

OCFP Review Was MISLEADING and UN-SCIENTIFIC

John J. Holland is among several LEADING EXPERTS who have recognized expertise, training and background in matters concerning pest control products and public policy.

Mr. Holland is Communications Director for Integrated Environmental Plant Management Association Of Western Canada (IEPMA).

He is Canada’s MOST ELOQUENT and INTELLIGENT WRITER on the subject of public policy and pest control products.

According to Mr. Holland —

This [OCFP] «study» has been widely used by anti-pesticide groups as part of their claim of a «growing body of evidence», and has then been accepted by many municipalities as proof of pesticide carcinogenicity.
However, [OCFP] the Review has been INTERNATIONALLY DISCREDITED, due to the fact it consists of CHERRY-PICKED EPIDEMIOLOGICAL STUDIES, with VIRTUALLY NO REFERENCE TO IMPORTANT AND RELEVANT TOXICOLOGICAL RESEARCH.

and

As you may be aware, there are also numerous MISLEADING — or UNSCIENTIFIC — studies with such a negative point of view, such as the Ontario College of Family Physicians’ [OCFP] Pesticide Literature Review (2004).

THIS REVIEW HAS BEEN USED TO SUPPORT ALMOST EVERY PROPOSED PESTICIDE BAN, from the Municipal to the Provincial (e.g., Ontario) level.

The information used by those like the OCFP has been CHERRY-PICKED by the physicians — NOT SCIENTISTS — writing the report, and the report has been DISCOUNTED by many scientists and government experts in this and other countries.

Studies used are generally all epidemiological, and links to cancer and other diseases have been WEAK and NOT CONSISTENT from study to study.

Toxicological studies DO NOT CONFIRM the EPIDEMIOLOGICAL findings.

By definition, EPIDEMIOLOGY CANNOT FIND CAUSES — they merely suggest correlations, and the basic tenet of EPIDEMIOLOGY is that CORRELATION DOES NOT MEAN CAUSATION.

Studies must also be consistently reproducible before a finding can be found meaningful.
Background Information From An Independent Perspective

Pest Control Products & Epidemiology Studies (continued)

At any rate, the OCFP study ignored or down-played other important EPIDEMIOLOGY studies that did not conform to its premise of the dangers of pesticides (again, check with the PMRA).

OCFP Review DEBUNKED By Dr. Frank N. Dost

Dr. Frank N. Dost is among several LEADING EXPERTS who have recognized expertise, training and background in matters concerning pest control products.

Dr. Dost is Emeritus Professor of Agricultural Chemistry And Forest Toxicology, Oregon State University, and Fellow Of The Academy Of Toxicological Sciences.

According to Dr. Dost —

In my view, the OCFP report FAILS SEVERAL IMPORTANT SCIENCE TESTS, and SHOULD NOT BE USED AS A GUIDE TO SETTING POLICY ON PESTICIDE USE.

Indeed, I question whether the OCFP paper should have been made public, given that IT WAS NOT SUBJECT TO RIGOROUS EXTERNAL PEER SCRUTINY.

This document [OCFP REVIEW] DOES NOT DESCRIBE THE HEALTH IMPACT OF PESTICIDES.

It should NOT supplant the judgment of Health Canada on regulatory policy issue.
Background Information From An Independent Perspective

Pest Control Products & Epidemiology Studies (continued)

OCFP Review DEBUNKED By Dr. Keith R. Solomon

Dr. Keith Ross Solomon is among several LEADING EXPERTS who have recognized expertise, training and background in matters concerning pest control products.

According to Dr. Solomon is the nation’s LEADING EXPERT IN THE FIELD OF ENVIRONMENTAL BIOLOGY, TOXICOLOGY, AND PESTICIDE SAFETY.

Dr. Solomon is Professor of Environmental Biology and Director at the Centre for Toxicology, University of Guelph.

The OCFP Anti-Pesticide Literature Review somehow made some links between pest control product exposure and diseases in humans.

According to Dr. Solomon —

\[ \text{Ontario College of Physicians [...] made some CONCLUSIONS about linkages between pesticide exposure and diseases in humans.} \]

\[ [...] \text{there are some ISSUES with this report.} \]

\[ \text{First of all, IT’S BASED ONLY ON EPIDEMIOLOGY.} \]

\[ \text{MANY STUDIES WERE OMITTED FROM THEIR REPORT.} \]

\[ \text{It DIDN’T CONSIDER THE TOXICITY DATA that PMRA [ Pest Management Regulatory Agency Of Health Canada] and other agencies use.} \]

\[ \text{It DIDN’T CONSIDER THE EXPOSURES, and it DIDN’T CONSIDER THE PUBLISHED REGULATORY REVIEWS from PMRA and the U.S. EPA and other agencies.} \]
According to Dr. Solomon (continued) —

In terms of EPIDEMIOLOGY [...] EPIDEMIOLOGY is the study of diseases in humans.

They’re good organisms to study, but we are extremely difficult to work with because we don’t always say what we do.

These [EPIDEMIOLOGY] studies are really based only on correlation and suggested links, and they CANNOT ESTABLISH CAUSALITY ON THEIR OWN.

[...] the Ontario College Of Family Physicians report WAS NOT VERY WELL DONE, but others have done the same thing.

These people [CRITICS OF OCFP] are not even from Canada, so I don’t think there’s any axe to grind here at all.

But the U.K. Advisory Committee on Pesticides basically said that this [OCFP] report didn’t raise any new concerns, and there was NO REASON FOR ADDITIONAL REGULATORY ACTION in the United Kingdom.

There was another opinion on this report from the Royal Commission On Environmental Pollution.

The quotation [...] from this is that, basically, STRONG CONCLUSIONS WERE BEING DRAWN FROM EVIDENCE THAT WAS OF VERY WEAK QUALITY.
Pest Control Products & Epidemiology Studies (continued)

OCFP Review REFUTED By Health Canada


Health Canada’s respected Pest Management Regulatory Agency (PMRA) is the federal regulatory body responsible for the regulation of pest control products in Canada.

According to Health Canada —

As the OCFP report notes, some population groups, such as children and pregnant women, may be more susceptible to potential effects of pesticides.

This is why PMRA assessments include the application of EXTRA SAFETY FACTORS to ensure that the most sensitive sub-populations are protected.

For example, the PMRA PAYS SPECIAL ATTENTION TO THE UNIQUE EXPOSURES AND PHYSIOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF CHILDREN, ensuring that factors such as their unique behaviours, different diets and lower body weights are considered.

The OCFP report is a review of EPIDEMIOLOGY studies selected from the public scientific literature.

There are many such studies published which suggest that there MAY OR MAY NOT be associations between adverse health effects and pesticide exposure.

As the report acknowledges, EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDIES ARE HARD TO INTERPRET because of BIASES AND CONFOUNDING FACTORS that make it very difficult to either establish or definitively rule out links between pesticide exposures and effects.
According to Health Canada (continued) —

*For example, other chemical and physical environment effects are usually encountered at the same time as pesticide exposures and biases in the exposures remembered by study participants may affect the result.*

*Without an actual exposure calculation, it is difficult to assess whether pesticides could have been responsible for an adverse health outcome.*

*When determining the acceptability of a pesticide, PMRA scientists CRITICALLY EXAMINE THE TOTALITY OF THE SCIENTIFIC DATABASE for pesticide active ingredients and end-use products, including the types of studies in the OCFP report.*

*When new studies in the public literature are released, the PMRA examines them to determine if further regulatory action is required on the pesticides mentioned in the study.*

**OCFP’s Mere 140 Epidemiology Studies**

Ontario College Of Family Physicians claimed to possess a MERE 140 EPIDEMIOLOGY studies somehow linking pest control products to cancer.

On June 19th, 2012, Ontario College Of Family Physicians issued the following statement —

*The Ontario College of Family Physicians (OCFP) is strongly recommending the public reduce their exposure to pesticides wherever possible, based on the findings [OF A LIMITED NUMBER OF EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDIES] of its second comprehensive review of research on the effects of pesticides on human health.*
Pest Control Products & Epidemiology Studies (continued)

Released today, this review shows associations between pesticide exposure and various neurological and respiratory diseases, as well as reproductive problems.

Covering 142 studies, the review also demonstrates that children are particularly vulnerable to pesticide exposures that occur during pregnancy.

OCFP ALLEGED having A MERE 140 UNDISCLOSED, NON-EXISTENT, AND UNVERIFIABLE SECRET EVIDENCE about the safety of pest control products.

The findings of this LIMITED NUMBER OF EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDIES can be EASILY CHALLENGED.

How could this Anti-Pesticide Organization obtain studies that have somehow been withheld from the entire world?

Moreover, pest control products like 2,4-D Herbicide have been the subject of over 40,000 STUDIES.

40,000!

Furthermore, since 1988, The Industry Task Force II on 2,4-D Research Data has submitted to U.S. Environmental Protection Agency over 250 studies concerning mammalian and environmental toxicology, environmental fate and residues.

2,4-D is probably THE MOST studied and best understood of ANY chemical ... not just pesticide ... in existence.

INDISPUTABLE AND CONCLUSIVE SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH shows that NO HARM WILL OCCUR when pest control products like 2,4-D are used according to label directions.
Pest Control Products & Epidemiology Studies (continued)

Pest Control Products Are SCIENTIFICALLY SAFE

The following LEADING EXPERTS have recognized expertise, training and background in matters concerning pest control products.

These EXPERTS have publicly stated, in one form or another, that pest control products are SCIENTIFICALLY-SAFE —

AMES, Bruce Nathan, Doctor
BRANHAM, Bruce, Professor
BLOOM, Josh, Doctor
CHORNEY, Doug, Policy Expert
CHUDLEIGH, Ted, Political & Policy Expert
DOLL, William Richard Shaboe, Doctor
DOST, Frank N., Doctor
DRIESEN, Paul K., Juris Doctor
DRYSDALE, Art C., Horticulturist
EDWARDS, J. Gordon, Doctor
FELSO, Allan S., Doctor
HEPWORTH, Lorne, Doctor
HOLLAND, John J., Communications Director
MAINS, Howard, Government Relations & Public Affairs
MILLOY, Steven J., Juris Doctor
RITTER, Leonard, Doctor
ROSS, Gilbert L., Doctor
SCHWARCZ, Joseph A., Doctor
SOLOMON, Keith Ross, Doctor
STEPHENSON, Gerald R., Professor
SWITZER, Clayton M., Doctor
TAYLOR, Peter Shawn, Journalist & Policy Expert
The 350 EXPERT SCIENTISTS at HEALTH CANADA
The THOUSANDS OF EXPERT SCIENTISTS at U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
VON STACKELBERG, Katherine, Doctor
WHELAN, Elizabeth M., Doctor
WOOD, Joel, Doctor
EPIDEMIOLOGY Studies Are NOT TO BE TRUSTED!
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 RE COURSE but LITIGATION against Anti Pesticide HUJE.

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

HUJE should Get OFF Our grASS, and they should Roast In Hell.

NORAHG manages 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 this 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 anti 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.

The Force Of Nature Series of Reports   —   Agriculture   •   ALBERTA Conspiracy   •   Bee Colony Collapse Disorder   •   Benefits of the Turfgrass Industry   •   Beyond Pesticides   •   Books That Screwed Up the World   •   BRITISH COLUMBIA Conspiracy   •   Canadian Cancer Society   •   Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment   •   CARNAGE and Consequences of Lunatic Terrorist Prohibition   •   Controversial Prohibitions   •   Culprits of the Prohibition Conspiracy   •   Daffodils, Toxic Pesticide Treated Flowers Soaked Formaldehyde   •   Dating Services for Enviro Maniacs   •   David Suzuki Foundation   •   DOT and Our World of Politicized Science   •   Death and Illness (Alleged)   •  Departure Letters   •   Ecojustice Canada   •   Energy Sector   •   Environmental Terrorists UNMASKED   •   Environmental Terrorist Organizations   •   Enviro PROFIT   • Environmental Defence   •   FAILURE of IPM, Pesticide Manufacturers, Prohibition, Trade Associations   •   Famous Quotations About Enviro Lunatics   •   Fertilizer TERROR   • Food and Farming   • Get Off Our grASS   • Global Warming, The Scam of Our Lifetime   • Glyphosate Herbicide   • Golf Industry   • Green Alternatives   • Green Party   • Halloween Terror   • Happy Holidays   • Health Canada   • Health Concerns with Pest Control Products   • Heroes Speaking Out Against Environmental Terror   • History of Environmental Terror in Canada   • History of the Turfgrass Industry   • Letters to the Editor   • LIARS and Lying Sacks of (Enviro Maniac) Cwap   • Mock Advertisements   • Mock Speeches   • Myth BUSTING   • NATIONAL Prohibition   • NEW BRUNSWICK Conspiracy   • NO Prohibition Exception for AGRICULTURE Industry   • NO Prohibition Exception for GOLF Industry   • NOVA SCOTIA Conspiracy   • North America Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA)   • ONTARIO Conspiracy, Haven For Environmental Terrorists   • Organic Golf Courses   • Organic Maintenance   • Organizations of the Prohibition Conspiracy   • Pesticide Q & A (Questions and

The Whole Truth from an Independent Perspective
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 Career 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, programmer 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 Demoeoden, confirmed the presence of Take All Patch as a disease of turf in Eastern Canada • with Dr. David Shetlar, confirmed the presence of Kentucky Bluegrass Scale 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 • co-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

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 reined 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.
It Requires Wisdom
To Understand Wisdom
The Music Is Nothing
If The Audience Is Deaf