

Overview From An Independent Perspective

Anti-Pesticide RESEARCHERS will say ANY-THING in order to get their PAY-OFFS, including FAKING DATA and POINTLESS AND BADLY DESIGNED RESEARCH.

Most Anti-Pesticide RESEARCH FORE-CASTS have been categorically WRONG and lead to nothing but NEEDLESS HYS-TERIA.

There is a long and dismal history of Anti-Pesticide RESEARCH FORECASTS that were literally TOO BAD TO BE TRUE.

Because most Anti-Pesticide RESEARCH-ERS FAIL TO USE proper forecasting methods, there is no reason to expect their FORECASTS to be accurate, EXCEPT BY CHANCE.

Moreover, Anti-Pesticide RESEARCHERS will say ANYTHING in order to get their PAY-OFFS, including FAKING DATA and POINTLESS AND BADLY DESIGNED RE-SEARCH.

There is something HORRIBLY WRONG with a system where Government Officials CONSPIRE with Anti-Pesticide Lunatics and their Environmental Terrorist Organizations to DICTATE PUBLIC POLICY based upon Anti-Pesticide RESEARCH FORE-CASTS THAT ARE WRONG!



CONSPIRACIES have NOT just restricted to Pesticides, but also Agent Orange, Agriculture, Artificial Sweeteners, Cancer, DDT, Global Cooling, and Global Warming, Lawn Care, Organic Food, and Wind Power.

UNMASKING Research Forecast Alarms About DDT and Cancer Epidemics — Needless Hysteria That DDT Will Lead To Our Doom ?!?! — Ehrlich

[...] the oceans will die of DDT poisoning by 1979 [...] the U.S. life expectancy will drop to 42 years by 1980 due to cancer epidemics.

 Anti-Pesticide Lunatic-Alarm by Paul R. Ehrlich. Author of the 1968 book The Population Bomb. He expressed this light-hearted warning in 1969.

Overview From An Independent Perspective

UNMASKING Research Forecast Alarms About DDT and Birds — Needless Hysteria That DDT Was Bad For Us ?!?! — Carson

[...] exposure to DDT, even when doing no observable harm to the birds, may seriously affect reproduction.

- Anti-Pesticide Lunatic-Alarm by Miss Rachel Louise Carson. 1962.

The effect of DDT on birds like Bald Eagles is a MYTH!

During the sixteen-year period (1961 - 1977) representing much of the end of the « DDT years », a mere TWO HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SIX Bald Eagles were found dead by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

The biologists who analyzed the dead eagles reported NO adverse effects caused by DDT or its metabolites.

The Anti-Pesticide Movement has often given the public the FALSE AND FRAUDULENT IMPRESSION that thousands of Bald Eagles died while DDT was in use.

As a matter of fact, early in the Twentieth Century, HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS of these birds were destroyed, but not because of DDT.

A WHOPPING ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTEEN THOUSAND were calculatedly slaughtered by the State of Alaska between 1917 and 1942.

Government-sponsored exterminations seem to have killed more Bald Eagles than DDT allegedly did.

Everyone should maintain some perspective on this matter.

The alarms from Rachel Carson concerning DDT were NOT TRUE!

It is also a MYTH that the populations of predatory birds have recovered remarkably since the U.S. removal of DDT in 1972.

The alarms were BASED ON FORECASTS, but not ones from PROPER scientific forecasting methods.

Activists have made their alarming forecasts in three broad ways —

- by using UNREALISTIC mathematical models, such as Malthus'
- by extrapolating the genuine effect of a large dose to a NEAR-ZERO DOSE
- by hypothesising that a WEAK EFFECT EXISTS and extrapolating that it will become important over time or over a large population

The third of these unscientific forecasting methods is the one most favoured by alarmists.

Overview From An Independent Perspective

UNMASKING Research Forecast Alarms About DDT and Birds — Needless Hysteria That DDT Was Bad For Us ?!?! — Carson (continued)

Because activists like Rachel Carson failed to use proper forecasting methods, there is NO REASON TO EXPECT THEIR ALARMING FORECASTS TO BE ACCURATE, except by chance.

The unscientific methods that activists like Carson used are BIASED TOWARDS MAKING ALARMING FORECASTS.

UNMASKING Research Forecast Alarms About Pesticides and Parkinson's Disease — Needless Hysteria By Faking Data — Thiruchelvam

According to Anti-Pesticide Neuro-Scientist Mona Thiruchelvam and her colleagues. pesticides have somehow been implicated as risk factors in Parkinson's disease, a degenerative disorder of the central nervous system.

However, in 2012, the U.S. Office of Research Integrity found Thiruchelvam. a Federally-Funded Pesticides Researcher, GUILTY OF FAKING DATA.

At University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey, Mona Thiruchelvam had FAKED CELL COUNTS in two grant applications and a number of papers that claimed to show how the pesticides paraquat, maneb, and atrazine might somehow affect parts of the brain involved in Parkinson's Disease.

When the case was passed to the U.S. Office of Research Integrity (ORI) for oversight review, agents used FORENSIC COMPUTING SOFTWARE to determine that MANY OF THE FILES, DESPITE HAVING DIFFERENT FILE NAMES AND DATES, WERE IDENTICAL IN CONTENT.

Consequently, Thiruchelvam agreed to RETRACT two of her papers, LEFT University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey, and is now BARRED FROM RECEIVING FEDERAL GRANTS FOR SEVEN YEARS.

Moreover, the whole line of experiments by Thiruchelvam may have been POINTLESS AND BADLY DE-SIGNED, without regard to data quality issues.

Despite being DISCREDITED AND GUILTY OF FAKING DATA, Thiruchelvam is a GRANT RECIPIENT of Michael J. Fox Foundation.

UNMASKING Needless Hysteria

In other industries, activists have also created NEEDLESS HYSTERIA with FORECASTS concerning Y2K Bug, Villejuif Leaflet, and Fan Deaths.

NEEDLESS HYSTERIA has not only led to CONTROVERSIAL PROHIBITIONS against Pest Control Products, but also against PCBs, Plastic Bags, and Incandescent Bulbs.

Environmental Terrorists

UNMASKED



How Activism Distorts The Assessment Of Health Risks

November 20th, 2012

Geoffrey C. Kabat

Forbes

Selected and Adapted Excerpts



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.

How Activism Distorts The Assessment Of Health Risks

CONFLATION occurs when the identities of two concepts, sharing some characteristics of one another, seem to be a single identity — the differences appear to become lost.

The CONFLATION OF ADVOCACY WITH SCIENCE has A HIGH COST —

- It DISTRACTS THE PUBLIC by FOCUSING ATTENTION ON THREATS which, in many cases, turn out to be NON-EXISTENT
- It FORCES industry and government to DEVOTE LIMITED RE-SOURCES to issues where the return is likely to be NIL
- It DAMAGES THE CREDIBILITY OF SCIENCE, and particularly the discipline of epidemiology — which society depends on to address serious issues

What these distortions and abuses make clear is THE NEED FOR A FIRE-WALL BETWEEN ADVOCACY AND SCIENCE.

We have to recognize that studies that carefully assess the effects of an exposure on health are extremely difficult to carry out correctly without the errors of bias and confounding and, thus, ARE OF VARIABLE RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY.

We also need to recognize that scientists are human and CAN BE INFLU-ENCED BY PRESSURES AND AGENDAS THAT HAVE NOTHING TO DO WITH SCIENCE.

This does not mean that we should be complacent about threats to health and the environment.

It does mean that the scientific evidence needs to be evaluated rigorously and dispassionately by people who do not feel they know the answer but whose sole goal is the accurate assessment of the evidence.

People who know the answer and have an agenda are believers and advocates, and they should have NO ROLE in assessing the science.

How Activism Distorts The Assessment Of Health Risks

Society's Preoccupation With Hazards

Over recent decades there have been DRAMATIC INCREASES IN LIFE EX-PECTANCY and IMPROVEMENTS IN HEALTH in the developed world.

It is a paradox that, as a society, we are OBSESSIVELY PREOCCUPIED with the SPECTER OF HAZARDS lurking in our environment and consumer products.

Many factors have contributed to this EVER-INCREASING CLIMATE OF FEAR, including —

- the SUCCESS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENT
- a DEEP-SEATED DISTRUST OF INDUSTRY
- the PUBLIC'S INSATIABLE APPETITE FOR STORIES RELATED TO HEALTH, which the media duly cater to
- and last but not least the STRIKING EXPANSION OF THE FIELDS OF EPIDEMIOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENC-ES and their burgeoning literature

False Positives In Epidemiology

Epidemiologists have long been aware of the baleful effects of CONTRADIC-TORY 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.

How Activism Distorts The Assessment Of Health Risks

Most Research Findings Are False

In 2005, the epidemiologist John Ioannidis published a paper entitled WHY MOST RESEARCH FINDINGS ARE FALSE.

Among the factors contributing to MOST RESEARCH FINDINGS ARE FALSE, Ioannidis cited ...

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

International Agency For Research On Cancer

International Agency For Research On Cancer (IARC) is renowned for producing ASSESSMENTS OF CARCINOGENS.

Its reports were widely regarded as the most authoritative assessments available on cancer risks.

Since the early 1970's, International Agency For Research On Cancer, a part of the World Health Organization, has produced assessments of carcinogenic hazards for use by researchers and regulators.

But it appears that some of the agency's evaluations may OVERSTATE the risks, for reasons that tell us a great deal about the science and politics of risk assessment.

Since only a SMALL NUMBER of IARC's assessments have been REVIEWED BY INDEPENDENT SCIENTISTS, it remains to be seen to what extent the ranking of other agents is affected by FALSE POSITIVES.

How Activism Distorts The Assessment Of Health Risks

IARC Biased and Prejudiced

In the past several years, International Agency For Research On Cancer (IARC) has come under scrutiny for ALLOWING ITS ASSESSMENTS TO BE COLORED BY A BIAS TOWARD POSITIVE RESULTS and TO BE SWAYED BY ADVOCACY IN THE WIDER SOCIETY.

However, a number of scientists with direct experience with IARC have felt compelled to DISSOCIATE THEMSELVES from the agency's approach to evaluating carcinogenic hazards.

Their critique goes to the heart of the agency's epistemology and its deliberative process.

IARC Classification

International Agency For Research On Cancer (IARC) classifies the agents it evaluates into one of the following categories —

Category 1 — carcinogenic to humans

Category 2A — probably carcinogenic to humans

Category 2B — possibly carcinogenic to humans

Category 3 — not classifiable as to its carcinogenicity in humans

Category 4 — probably not carcinogenic to humans

However, there is reason to believe that at least two other exposures classified by the agency as group 1 carcinogens are OPEN TO QUESTION — namely, DIESEL EXHAUST and environmental TOBACCO SMOKE.

How Activism Distorts The Assessment Of Health Risks

IARC Epidemiologic Studies

In its evaluation, International Agency For Research On Cancer (IARC) considers experimental evidence of carcinogenicity but GIVES PRIORITY TO HUMAN EPIDEMIOLOGIC EVIDENCE.

But — as pointed out by Ioannidis and others — EPIDEMIOLOGIC STUD-IES ARE SUBJECT TO HIGH RATES OF FALSE POSITIVES.

When IARC's classification of individual agents is examined critically, it appears that the agency's ratings may be SYSTEMATICALLY INFLATED.

IARC Classification Of Formaldehyde

For example, according to the critics, the classification of FORMALDEHYDE in group 1 [carcinogenic to humans] appears to be « particularly problematic », being based primarily on two positive studies, one of which has SERIOUS METHODOLOGICAL FLAWS, while the other shows INCON-SISTENT RESULTS.

IARC Classification Of Coffee and DDT

Among the agents classed in Group 2B [possibly carcinogenic to humans] are COFFEE and DDT, both of which have been extensively studied, and found NOT BE LINKED TO CANCER.

How Activism Distorts The Assessment Of Health Risks

Problems With The IARC Process

FIRST PROBLEM WITH THE IARC PROCESS —

A major problem with the IARC process is that it makes it ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE to assign an agent to category 4 — probably not carcinogenic.

Of the roughly one thousand agents evaluated by the agency, exactly ONE is in category 4 — probably not carcinogenic.

SECOND PROBLEM WITH THE IARC PROCESS —

One that REINFORCES THE CLASSIFICATION PROBLEM.

Some of the WORKING GROUPS convened to assess a particular agent have INCLUDED SCIENTISTS WHO HAVE CARRIED OUT STUDIES ON THE AGENT UNDER EVALUATION.

It is fanciful to think that scientists who HAVE A VITAL STAKE in a particular question can evaluate the evidence, including their own studies, dispassionately.

THIRD PROBLEM WITH THE IARC PROCESS —

IARC REACHES ITS ASSESSMENTS BY CONSENSUS.

But this can mean that those who are more forceful and persuasive may influence the group decision-making process.

In addition, CONSENSUS IMPLIES A PHILOSOPHIC STANCE WHICH HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH SCIENCE.

How Activism Distorts The Assessment Of Health Risks

IARC Classification Of Cellular Phones

In 2011, International Agency For Research On Cancer (IARC) classified Cell Phone use as « possibly carcinogenic », when the agency's own review showed that the overall evidence overwhelmingly indicated that Cell Phone use was NOT ASSOCIATED WITH INCREASED CANCER.

One has to ask what « possibly carcinogenic » means, if extensive evidence in humans and animals points to no threat.

All three Problems With The IARC Process came together in IARC's assessment of Cell Phones —

FIRST PROBLEM WITH THE IARC PROCESS IN ASSESSING CELL PHONES -

UNDUE EMPHASIS ON A SMALL NUMBER OF POSITIVE EPIDEMIO-LOGIC STUDIES from a single group, when the much larger body of studies indicated no elevated risk.

SECOND PROBLEM WITH THE IARC PROCESS IN ASSESSING CELL PHONES -

THE IMPROPER INFLUENCE OF AN ACTIVIST RESEARCHER (the lead author of the anomalous positive studies) on the deliberations of the working group; and, finally,

THIRD PROBLEM WITH THE IARC PROCESS IN ASSESSING CELL PHONES -

A TILT TOWARD THE « PRECAUTIONARY PRINCIPLE ».

How Activism Distorts The Assessment Of Health Risks

Precautionary Principle

The Precautionary Principle states that, if there is uncertainty regarding the effects of exposure to an agent, the burden of proof that exposure does not cause harm falls on those who utilize the agent.

While this formulation may sound reasonable, in actuality IT HAS NOTHING TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE ASSESSMENT OF RISKS —

- THERE ARE ALWAYS UNCERTAINTIES, and
- IT IS NOT POSSIBLE TO PROVE THE ABSENCE OF RISK

Furthermore, in practice invocation of the Precautionary Principle —

- focuses attention solely on the possibility of harm
- often ignores information about the dose to which people are exposed
- avoiding consideration of benefits of the agent in question, and whether safer substitutes are available
- giving greater weight to studies that appear to indicate a hazard, even when these studies may be of poorer quality

For all its self-justifying claims, the Precautionary Principle SEEKS TO DENY A CENTRAL FACT —

THERE IS NO WAY TO AVOID RISK IN LIFE

All we can do is to try to use available knowledge to distinguish between —

- Those risks that are LARGE AND WELL-ESTABLISHED
- Those risks that are PROBABLE
- Those risks that available evidence suggests are TRIVIAL OR NON-EXISTENT

How Activism Distorts The Assessment Of Health Risks

Precautionary Principle (continued)

Contamination of what is billed as science-based risk assessment by activist researchers and by the Precautionary Principle has become a PERVASIVE PROBLEM.

By emphasizing precaution, advocates can FAVOR THOSE STUDIES THAT APPEAR TO SHOW A HAZARD AND APPEAL TO THE PUBLIC, always relying on the argument that anyone who questions the interpretation of the evidence must be a shill of industry.

California's Air Resources Board (CARB)

Given IARC's prestige and authority, its assessments carry enormous weight with regulatory agencies, such as the U.S. environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and California's Air Resources Board (CARB).

But, of course, these agencies are also subject to pressures from Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and advocacy groups [a.k.a. Environmental-Terrorist Organizations 1 in their own right.

To give just one example, California's Air Resources Board (CARB) has recently proposed major restrictions to reduce the levels of Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5) in the state.

However, the IARC's assessment AVOIDS ACKNOWLEDGING EXTENSIVE EPIDEMIOLOGIC STUDIES that consistently show that, in recent decades, Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5) levels are NOT ASSOCIATED WITH TOTAL MORTALITY IN CALIFORNIA.







tions of the Prohibition Conspiracy • Pesticide Q & A (Questions and Answers) • Positive Waves (Interesting and Innovative Thinking) • PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (PEI) Conspiracy • QUEBEC Prohibition • Quotations About Enviro Lunatics & Maniacs • Rachel Carson, The Queen of Junk Science • SASKATCHEWAN Conspiracy • Satire, Laughs & Insanity • Terror That NEVER Ends • TERROR Talk and Weasel Words • THE AVENGERS • The Environmental Factor • The FAILURES of Green Alternatives, Organic Golf Courses, BROWN Golf Courses, Integrated Pest Management, Pesticide Free Parks. and Pesticide Manufacturers • The Ontario Trillium Foundation • The Industry STRIKES Back • The Wilhelm Scream • The Wisdom of REAL Experts • Tukey TERRORISM • TWISTED Precautionary Principle • United States Enviro TERRORISM • VIOLATING Federal Law • VIOLATING Prohibition • WARNINGS • Weapons of Ultimate Environmental Terror • Wind Power (Bogus) • 2.4-D

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 Dernoeden, 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 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 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.