Introduction

As the year draws to a close, some of us will be reminded that olde acquaintance should not be forgot. So, before we can officially commence the New Year, the American Council on Science and Health would like to reflect upon this year past. We’d especially like to spend an extra moment considering what we hope the world will eventually learn to forget the most unfounded health scares of 2007.

What were these? Not all of them were so novel. Just as old habits die hard, old scares don’t seem to disappear easily either, and some headlines that received noted media attention in years past have reared their ugly heads once more in this current publication of our annual list of health scares.

But whether old or new, the hoaxes and frauds haven’t left us. And their persistence distracts parents from the real threats their children face by hyping non-existent dangers of everyday products like toys, cosmetics, rubber duckies and shower curtains. Phobias about these innocuous products are based on findings that trace amounts of certain supposedly toxic chemicals from which they are made may be found in our blood or urine. Through these claims radical environmentalists take advantage of the new-found ability of investigators to measure chemicals within our bodies in such miniscule quantities as parts per trillion. That this method of analysis lacks any toxicological validity is not a concern to the activists though it should be to the rest of us.

In addition, we remind our readers that correlation does not prove causation. Just because the presence of a particular substance or chemical is found in the body, it does not mean that it causes a negative health outcome. Also, don’t forget that the results concluded from animal studies cannot be directly extrapolated to humans.

So please read the following list, and remember that this is meant to reassure Americans that our health and well-being, and that of our children, is not really under attack by insidious exposures to chemicals, toys and vaccines though it may be from the activist groups that promulgate these fallacies.

1. Lipstick Is Toxic (Lead in Cosmetics)

The (Unfounded) Scare: Lipstick contains toxic levels of lead, which causes multiple health problems including infertility, miscarriage and brain damage. Pregnant women and their unborn children are especially vulnerable.

Origin of the Scare: The Campaign for Safe Cosmetics (an environmentalist group) published a
report this year entitled *The Poison Kiss*. They purchased more than 30 lipsticks in four cities and sent them to a lab for lead testing. More than half came back with detectable levels of lead. The group sent out a press release, which said that one-third of the tested lipsticks exceeded the U.S. Food and Drug Administration’s (FDA) 0.1 ppm limit for lead in candy—a standard established to protect children from directly ingesting lead.\(^1\) There was no standard for lipstick, so they used the lead limit for candy instead.

Last spring, there was also an e-mail chain letter that hyped the fear of lead in lipstick. It warned that lipstick causes cancer because it contains a dangerously high level of lead and claimed that if your lipstick stays on longer, it’s because of the higher content of lead.\(^2\) \(^1\)

**Media Coverage:** On October 11th, the Campaign for Safe Cosmetics sent out a press release about the *Poison Kiss* report. The next day major media outlets ran the story under scary headlines such as ABC News’s Don’t Pucker Up: Lead in Lipstick and the *New York Daily News*’s Some red lipsticks contain unhealthy levels of lead: study. The *Seattle Times* took a more neutral approach with the headline Lead in lipstick: Red alert or false alarm?\(^3\) \(^1\) In their article, they had a quote from Paula Begoun, known as the Cosmetics Cop for her books and website CosmeticsCop.com, in which she evaluates claims made by cosmetics companies. Regarding lead in lipstick, she said that the Campaign for Safe Cosmetics report incorrectly states that lipstick is ingested like candy. It mentions the FDA’s 0.01 parts per million limit for lead in candy, and that no such safety limits exist for lipstick...What’s missing is that women aren’t eating lipsticks in the same manner they do candy or food.

**The Bottom Line:** The Campaign for Safe Cosmetics says that it is a coalition of women’s, public health, labor, environmental health and consumer-rights groups. Their stated goal is to protect the health of consumers and workers by requiring the health and beauty industry to phase out the use of chemicals linked to cancer, birth defects and other health problems, and replace them with safer alternatives.\(^4\) \(^1\) They are clearly an anti-chemical group with an environmentally-driven agenda. Comparing the lead guidelines for something edible, such as candy, to lead in lipstick is not an accurate technique. At high levels, lead is toxic, but there is no evidence that the small amounts in lipstick pose any threat to human health.\(^5\) \(^1\)

### 2. Fluoridated Water Jeopardizes Your Health

**The (Unfounded) Scare:** The addition of fluoride to tap water causes multiple health problems, including fluorosis, abnormal thyroid function, lower IQ and osteosarcoma.

**Origin of the Scare:** The Environmental Working Group (EWG) published an article in their August 2007 Bulletin entitled Fluoride in Your Water: Friend or Foe?\(^6\) \(^1\) The article claimed that even the American Dental Association has changed its tune and tells parents to avoid fluoridated water. The EWG also featured a study done by researchers at Harvard, which was also published in the Harvard journal *Cancer Causes and Control*.\(^7\) \(^1\) The study linked fluoridated water to a rare bone cancer in boys.

**Media Coverage:** This story scared many cities about their public water supply and was picked up by hundreds of local newspapers. ABC in Fayetteville, North Carolina ran a story about fluoridated
water entitled Fluoridation fears. It quoted Dr. Michael Fleming, a member of the FDA dental advisory committee, saying, frighteningly, Fluoride in the water is essentially a drug, it's an uncontrolled use of a drug. (8)

The Bottom Line: The EWG is a strident anti-chemical group that took two claims about fluoride and ran with them, in a bad direction. The authors of the Harvard paper noted that their work is just a part of a much bigger project and that it is an exploratory analysis that will require scientific confirmation. In addition to this, the principal investigator of the larger study states that the full study will not suggest an overall association between fluoride and osteosarcoma. (9) Not only did EWG skew their reporting of the Harvard data, they also misrepresented the ADA's recommendations about fluoride and infant formula. (10) The ADA states that infant formula prepared with fluoridated water presents no health risk but may create a small increased risk of fluorosis, which only affects the way teeth look, not overall health as the EWG would like everyone to believe. They should be ashamed for telling a flat-out lie about the ADA.

3. Red Meat and Processed Meat Increase Cancer Risk

The (Unfounded) Scare: Red Meat and processed meat, such as bacon or hot dogs, increase risk of colorectal cancer and also increase women’s risk for breast cancer.

Origin of the Scare: The breast cancer scare was based on two studies one published in the April issue of the British Journal of Cancer (11) and the other published in the November issue of the Archives of Internal Medicine. (12) The studies claimed that women who ate red and processed meat regularly were at an elevated risk for breast cancer.

The scare linking red meat to colorectal cancer was the product of a report, released in October, by the World Cancer Research Fund and the American Institute for Cancer Research (AICR) examining diet and cancer. (13) The report specified that high consumption of red meat and processed meat were dangerous and increased cancer risk.

Media Coverage: BBC News and Reuters both covered stories linking red meat and processed meat to breast cancer under headlines such as Red Meat Ups Breast Cancer Risk and Red and processed meat linked to breast cancer. The Washington Post also covered this story under the headline Breast Cancer Risk Linked to Red Meat. Dr. Ritva Butrunm, a science advisor of AICR, said, this new study offers further confirmation of AICR’s standing recommendation to limit intake of red meat to less than three ounces per day. (14) The Washington Post also said research suggests that substances produced by cooking meat may be carcinogenic, naturally occurring substances in meat may mimic the action of hormones, or growth hormones that farmers feed cows could fuel breast cancer in women who consume meat from the animals. (15) They did not cite any evidence that this has been demonstrated in humans.

Media coverage of the alarming report linking red meat and processed meat to colorectal cancer was widespread. Headlines such as USA Today's Put down the bacon! Report emphasizes cancer-fat links and the Boston Globe's Report ties meat, body fat to cancer were meant to scare the public about their diet.
The Bottom Line: Red meat and processed meat often have a high fat content and therefore someone who indulges in red meat and processed meat too often could become obese which has been shown to be a risk factor for several cancers, including breast cancer and colorectal cancer. (16) [1]

The AICR is an organization devoted to finding links between diet and cancer. (17) [1] Every 10 years, it reviews the published literature about how diet and physical activity affect cancer risk. It starts that review with the assumption that a diet-cancer risk exists and then cherry-picks research that supports this notion. That being the case, it is imperative that the public examines the report with a keen eye. It is not the consumption of large amounts of red meat and processed meat that causes cancer, only that there is a weak association between the two due to obesity. A more accurate report would focus on how obesity as a whole can increase risk for cancer. Steven Milloy said it best in his op-ed Junk Science: Food Nannies Halloween Cancer Scare: The latest food scare was announced, appropriately enough, on Halloween. But the science behind the scare is about as believable as are ghosts and goblins. (18) [1]

4. PFOA Causes Low Birth Weight Babies

The (Unfounded) Scare: Babies exposed to perfluorooctanoate (PFOA) in the womb may be born at low birth weights. PFOA is a chemical used to produce substances needed to manufacture Teflon and many other products. (19) [1] Research has shown that PFOA is toxic to animals at high doses.

Origin of the Scare: In a study published online in August, researchers tested blood from 1,400 pregnant women in a Danish birth registry. (20) [1] The study claimed that women with high PFOA levels gave birth to babies that were on average four ounces lighter than those born to mothers with low levels. All babies were still of normal weight. Another study, published online in July, tested the cord blood of 300 babies born at John Hopkins hospital. (21) [1] The babies with high exposures to PFOA were found to be thinner with lower birth weights and slightly smaller heads.

Media Coverage: PFOA has made headlines for years. The study in question was published in Environmental Health Perspectives, a journal whose stated goal is to determine the impact of chemicals in the environment on human health. (22) [1] This year, news reports dealing with the topic were found in USA Today as well as on MedPage Today. Study co-author Dr. Joseph McLaughlin of Vanderbilt University School of Medicine said, the changes are relatively small given that the babies weighed an average of about eight pounds. And even babies with high exposures were still within the normal range for birth weight. (23) [1] Nonetheless, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) supported limiting PFOA despite lack of evidence that it has any negative affects on humans. The agency is not waiting until all the answers are in, spokesman Dale Kemery said in an e-mail. (24) [1]

The Bottom Line: It is important to note that while PFOA is often called the Teflon chemical, PFOA is not present in Teflon; it is only used in the manufacturing process of the product. Research has shown that high doses of PFOA are harmful to animals. The amount of PFOA to
which the general population is exposed is nowhere near comparable to the high doses used in animal studies. PFOA affecting birth weight by four ounces does not imply any real harm to the babies they were all of normal weight. Additionally, studies of workers (who are exposed to much higher doses of PFOA than the general population) have not shown the same effects in humans that occur in animals.

5. Nitrites in Cured Meat Cause Lung Disease

The (Unfounded) Scare: People who eat the most sodium-nitrite-containing meats, such as hot dogs or bacon, are more likely to have chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) compared to those who eat none or very little. COPD is the fourth leading cause of death in the US.\(^{(25)}\) It is characterized by inflammation and blockage of the airways leading to a reduction in breathing capacity. The leading cause of COPD is smoking and 15 to 20 percent of long-term smokers develop the condition. Salt and spices have been used to preserve foods and cure meat since the beginning of civilization. By the late 19th century, scientists had identified sodium nitrate as a substance that acted as a preservative in meat and provided the meat with a nice color and flavor. Sodium nitrate was approved as a food additive in 1906, under the earliest federal food safety laws.

In the 1920s it was discovered that sodium nitrite, a breakdown product of sodium nitrate, performed the same function more effectively, and the USDA approved it as a direct additive.\(^{(26)}\) By the 1950s scientific studies had also shown that nitrite prevented germination of the bacterial spores that cause deadly botulism\(^{(27)}\) in canned goods and other foods stored under airtight conditions.

Origin of the Scare: In 1970 a paper in the journal Nature concluded that nitrites reacted in the body with other agents in food to form nitrosamines substances know to be animal carcinogens.\(^{(28)}\) The following year Congress held hearings, and in August 1972 a Congressional committee released a report declaring nitrates and nitrites pose a potential danger to public health.\(^{(29)}\) Rodent studies have shown a link between nitrite consumption and reduced lung function. In April, a new study in the *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine* concluded that eating cured meat was directly linked to an increased risk for COPD.\(^{(30)}\) Critics of the study highlighted that cured meat no longer contained the levels of nitrite that were present 10 or 20 years ago citing the fact that only 5 percent of nitrite consumption comes from cured meat.

Media Coverage: Despite the fact that the data in this study does not represent nitrite levels in cured meat today, headlines such as Is Bacon To Die For? and Hot Dogs and Bacon Cause Increased Risk of Lung Disease were widespread. The study’s author, Rui Jang of Columbia University, acknowledged, the study’s design did not allow her to state definitively that the nitrites caused lung disease.\(^{(31)}\)

The Bottom Line: Nitrites have been used to cure meat for almost a century with no evidence of any risk to human health. Studies showing nitrites to be harmful have been done in high-dose animal experiments that are not comparable to the small amounts that we are exposed to as humans. In addition to this, cured meat have lower nitrites today than they did in the past since the
1970s nitrite levels have dropped by 80 percent.[32] Most importantly, vitamin C is now added to cured meat to prevent formation of the supposedly harmful nitrosamines.[33]

6. Roses Are Toxic

The (Unfounded) Scare: Valentine’s Day flowers shipped into the U.S. from Colombia were doused in an assortment of chemicals including pesticides and fungicides. Colombia is the second largest exporter of flowers in the world, with exports around $1 billion dollars worth of cut flowers every year. The United States gets 62 percent of all its flowers from Colombia, which gave this topic great scare potential.[34]

Origin of the Scare: Although flowers are required to be bug-free before entering the U.S., they are not required to be clear of chemical residues as are edible imports such as fruits and vegetables. Because Colombia flower exporters did not have to rid the flowers of chemical residues, there were claims that using pesticides and fungicides was encouraged.[35] These chemicals that can sometime remain on imported flowers have been shown to cause cancer and neurological disorders in high-dose animal experiments.

Media Coverage: Media coverage of toxic flowers came out just in time to scare those eager to exchange flowers for Valentine’s Day. An AP release was picked up by major news websites, including USA Today and Fox News. Although the real story was that pesticides on flowers could potentially be hazardous to workers, the media aimed for the hearts of consumers with headlines such as Valentine’s Roses Get Dipped In Chemicals and Not-So-Nice: Valentine’s Day Highlights Problem of Toxic Chemical-Doused Flowers.

The Bottom Line: There is no evidence showing that exposure to pesticides at trace levels causes any adverse health effects. High doses of the chemicals can pose a threat, and therefore it is important that the safety of workers is made a top priority. However, there is no evidence of low-level exposure to pesticides causing cancer or other health problems. Without these chemicals, the Colombian flowers would be vulnerable to pests and turned away at the border, which would lead to unnecessary economic hardship for those who make their living from the flower business.

7. Rubber Ducks Are Toxic (Phthalates Endanger Children)

The (Unfounded) Scare: Phthalates, often found in rubber ducks and other soft plastic toys, leach out into the mouths of children, posing risks to their health. Phthalates are added to polyvinyl chloride (PVC) as a softener for plastic items such as rubber ducks, pacifiers, intravenous medical tubing, examination gloves, catheters, and blood storage bags. They are also used in nail polish to prevent chipping and in perfumes to help the fragrance last longer.[36]

Origin of the Scare: Concerns over phthalates and human health have been around for a decade or so. Phthalates are found in a wide variety of consumer products. Recently, children’s rubber ducks have become the poster child of the anti-phthalate campaign most likely to juxtapose the (purported) toxicity of phthalates with the presumed innocence of rubber ducks. The state of
California was in the forefront of this movement and even passed legislation banning the use of phthalates despite opposition from the California Chambers of Commerce, California Retailers Association, and the American Chemistry Council.\(^{(37)}\) [1]

**Media Coverage:** Due to the ban in California, many smaller media outlets in California ran large pieces on the story such as the *California Progress Report*’s Rubber Ducks in a Row as Schwarzenegger Signs Bill to Protect Children from Toxic Chemicals in Toys. The *Los Angeles Times* ran an article entitled Chemical stirs up controversy in which Rachel Gibson, an attorney for Environment California, made the alarmist statement that when a child puts a phthalate-laden teether in her mouth, it’s like sucking on a toxic lollipop.\(^{(38)}\) [1]

**The Bottom Line:** Phthalates have not been shown to be harmful to humans at low-level exposure only to rats at high exposures. They are extremely useful chemicals that are found in a wide range of everyday consumer goods. With that being said, it is no surprise that the general population have detectable amounts of this chemical in their blood. The important issue to stress is that the presence of a chemical does not necessarily mean that it is harmful after all, it is the dose that makes the poison.

### 8. Vaccines Cause Autism

**The (Unfounded) Scare:** Vaccines, specifically their thimerosal content, cause autism. There have been years of debate around the impact of childhood vaccines, especially the MMR used to combat measles, mumps, and rubella on autism. Ironically, the MMR vaccine never contained thimerosal. Regardless, anti-vaccine zealots managed to have their voices heard by the legal system at a vaccine court which was really the U.S. Court Of Federal Claims. They aimed to prove legally, not scientifically that vaccines do cause autism.\(^{(39)}\) [1]

**Origin of the Scare:** In 1998 a paper by Dr. Andrew Wakefield and colleagues, published in *The Lancet*, claimed to have found a link between the MMR vaccine and autism.\(^{(40)}\) [1] Eventually, *The Lancet* and several of the study’s authors withdrew their support of Wakefield’s article due to its questionable assumptions and weak findings, but Wakefield, later revealed to be working for the attorneys of parents suing vaccine makers, stuck to his claims. Today parents, attorneys, and environmental activists continue to fuel the fire of the anti-scientific autism-vaccine link.

In the U.S., thimerosal-containing vaccines, rather than MMR as in Britain, have been the main targets of anti-vaccine paranoia. Thimerosal is a vaccine preservative, which is partially composed of ethyl mercury, that has been used since the 1930s to prevent bacterial contamination in vaccine vials. Because mercury is a known neurotoxin, the public became fearful of the exposure associated with vaccines. Therefore, in 1999, there was a decision to reduce or eliminate thimerosal from pediatric vaccines manufactured for the U.S. market.\(^{(41)}\) [1]

**Media Coverage:** There was wide coverage of the supposed link between vaccines and autism, despite the myth being repeatedly rejected by scientists. The *New York Times*, *Wall Street Journal*, and HuffingtonPost.com are a few media outlets that covered the debate. Actress Jenny McCarthy also wrote a book about her son’s battle with autism, which she discussed on several
TV shows including *Oprah* and *Larry King Live*. She was quoted as saying, What number will it take for people just to start listening to what the mothers of children who have seen autism have been saying for years, which is, we vaccinated our baby and something happened? *(42)*

Usually the media stories take a credulous or debunking attitude toward the vaccine-autism link, but this year there was also a different story: Dr. Wakefield, Whose Research Links MMR and Autism, Now Under Investigation. *(43)* The charges include unnecessary procedures performed on children, coordinating with autism litigators, and taking blood from children at a birthday party. Hopefully, this raises the eyebrows of those so quick to point a finger at vaccines. Furthermore, the *New York Times* published an article entitled *What Autistic Girls Are Made Of* which was about sex ratios for autism. *(44)* Boys were shown to be much more likely to have autism, which suggests just how off-base the vaccine-autism link is since vaccination rates are equal for the sexes.

**The Bottom Line:** There are no scientific data to support the theory that vaccines cause autism. Despite this, there is a large group of people who continue to waste time and energy in hopes of proving this imaginary link. The concept of the vaccine court is very dangerous. The three judges were not experts in medicine or science in fact, one was described as a former environmental lawyer. This, of course, creates a big risk for potential bias in the case against vaccines, which are on the hit list of many environmentalists. Furthermore, the nonexistent link between autism and vaccines has been disproven by scientific research. *(45)* Therefore, it should not be a matter for ongoing legal debate. Vaccines are a powerful and crucial method of preventing life-threatening disease, and attacking them jeopardizes the public's health in a profound way.

9. Office Printers Are as Hazardous as Secondhand Cigarette Smoke

**The (Unfounded) Scare:** Breathing in ultra-fine particles (UFP) released from office printers causes health problems comparable to those caused by secondhand smoke.

**Origin of the Scare:** A study published in the August issue of the American Chemical Society's journal *Environmental Science and Technology* tested emissions from 62 different printer models. *(46)* The results showed that 27 percent were labeled high emitters. The study also found that indoor particle counts in office air increased fivefold during work hours due to printer use. The UFP are considered pollutants, and because they are so small there were claims that they could be inhaled deep into the lungs and even enter the bloodstream. A similar study was performed in Canada. In this study, 27 percent of the printers were considered high emitters, that is, printers that emit more than 10 times the UFP normally found in air.

**Media Coverage:** This story appeared in many media outlets such as CNET News, AOL News, and *BusinessWeek*. Headlines such as Having a desk next to an office printer may be as bad as sitting next to someone who is smoking, scientist says were definitely meant to frighten the general public. *(47)* Stephen van Eeden, a Canadian scientist, was quoted as saying, Just per mass, the amount of small particles that you inhale if you sit anything from two to three feet from the printer is about the same as sitting next to a person that smokes. *(48)* A particularly flagrant example of
irresponsible coverage was the headline in Business Week that read Printer Emissions as Bad as Cigarettes? This headline could easily be understood to imply that UFP are not merely being compared to being near a smoker but indeed are as harmful as being a smoker clearly a ridiculous comparison.

The Bottom Line: This is an example of how far people are willing to go to scare the public. There are no indications that UFP emissions from laser printing systems are associated with special health risks. Nonetheless, the EPA is supporting efforts to identify any possible health effects of UFP. To compare the health risks of sitting next to an office printer to those of secondhand smoke (even though the effects of secondhand smoke, as opposed to the effects of smoking, have themselves sometimes been exaggerated) is false and irresponsible.

10. Water Bottles Cause Cancer

The (Unfounded) Scare: Bisphenol A, or BPA, a component commonly found in hard plastics, causes cancer. BPA can be found in many polycarbonate products such as baby bottles, water bottles, sippy cups, and soda can liners. Research has shown, however, that the amounts of BPA that may migrate into food and beverages from plastic containers are extremely small and are at acceptable limits that are set by regulatory agencies.

Origin of the Scare: Concern over BPA has been around for a few years, and this year an experiment published in the July issue of Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences added more fuel to the fire. This study found that feeding BPA to female mice changed the color of their babies' coats. The mice with brown coats grew up with healthy weights, while those with yellow coats grew up to be obese, with a higher susceptibility to cancer and diabetes. The Environmental Working Group (EWG) attacked BPA, linking it to breast cancer, prostate cancer, obesity, and reproductive problems.

Media Coverage: BPA is used in many consumer products and the media took full advantage of this fact. Scary headlines were found in USA Today and a Reuters report. This fear was especially intense for consumers due to BPA's use in baby bottles scary for mothers everywhere. This is exemplified by USA Today's own headline Everywhere chemicals in plastics alarm parents. EWG's senior scientist, Dr. Anila Jacobs, said BPA was a chemical that can leach into food and drinks. Dr. Fred vom Saal of the University of Missouri reportedly said that while there were no definitive human studies of BPA, he is concerned about BPA products used by children, such as baby bottles. He added, It's like putting a time bomb into the organs of your baby that later on in life is going to cause those organs to malfunction.

The Bottom Line: The United States Environmental Protection Agency concluded that BPA is safe and set a maximum acceptable dose of 0.05 milligrams per kilogram of body weight. The only time that BPA has been shown to have significant effects in humans is in the case of workers who were exposed to the substance while on the job. As a result of long-term exposure to high levels of BPA in the air at their workplaces, some of these individuals experienced irritation of the eyes, respiratory tract, and skin. These symptoms resulted from inhaling BPA, not from ingesting it.
through foods and beverages. Therefore, the experiences of these workers are not applicable to the experiences of the general public.
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