Five-year update on the University of Sydney’s Australian Paradox fraud, and associated harm to public health

Over the year to March 2017 – the fifth year of this academic and public-health scandal - the main developments included:

(i) Emma Alberici on ABC TV’s Lateline presented the key aspects of my time-tested critique of the extraordinarily faulty Australian Paradox paper;

(ii) Peter FitzSimons, a Fellow of the University of Sydney Senate, featured the Australian Paradox scandal in Chapter 7 of his new book (p. 53);

(iii) Professor Jennie Brand-Miller wrote a 36-page letter of complaint to ABC re Lateline. The ABC confirmed my critique, including the fake-data issue;

(iv) Michael Spence, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Sydney and Chair of the Group of Eight, in an epic failure of leadership, ditched the promise to taxpayers of Go8 research “excellence”, and embraced Academic Freedom, as he refused to correct blatantly false information harming public health;

(v) Provost Stephen Garton and VC Michael Spence in 2017 each wrote to Rory Robertson, who responded in turn to their detailed false claims (p. 64);

(vi) Professor Brand-Miller and Dr Alan Barclay published new Australian Paradox paper, featuring fake data, supported by a USyd security guard! (p. 78);

(vii) Rory Robertson documented more clearly the ongoing research misconduct, the defrauding of taxpayers and the scandal of harm to public health.

Please read on, starting in Parts 1, 2, 3 and 4 with Rory Robertson’s background, and exactly why the Australian Paradox paper should be formally retracted.

ABC's Audience and Consumer Affairs (A&CA) unit confirms Australian Paradox paper dominated by extraordinary errors

In 2016, after journalist Emma Alberici’s ABC TV Lateline report presented the main aspects of my critique - including the FAO’s conspicuously flat fake line spanning the 2000-2003 timeframe - the University of Sydney’s Professor Jennie Brand-Miller claimed falsely to Alberici that the Charles Perkins Centre’s infamous Australian Paradox findings remain as valid as ever. The scientific record was left uncorrected.

Indeed, the Charles Perkins Centre guru wrote a 36-page formal letter of complaint to the ABC on 24 May 2016. On 14 September, the ABC’s A&CA unit advised the best-selling Low-GI diet book promoter that her detailed complaints about the factual nature of my critique - as presented on Lateline - are wrong on all important matters of fact.

Again, the scientific record was not corrected. Again, Professor Jennie Brand-Miller and co-author Dr Alan Barclay just pretended nothing happened!

This latest independent assessment of competence and integrity at the highest levels of Group of Eight “science” is documented in the A&CA unit’s final Investigation Report. In my opinion, the University of Sydney’s Academic Board should obtain, and take the time to assess, those two documents – the 36-page complaint and A&CA’s 15-page response – then instruct e-journal Nutrients to retract the extraordinarily faulty Australian Paradox paper that has become a menace to public health.
This *Five-year update* on the University of Sydney’s *Australian Paradox* fraud is organised as follows:

**PART 1:** Welcome! Here’s a detailed summary of the infamous *Australian Paradox* case-study, via eight important observations (p. 3)

**PART 2:** Background on Rory Robertson, the economist who solved “The Australian Paradox”. Who is the guy making all the fuss? (p. 12)

**PART 3:** Graphic evidence of profound flaws - including the use of fake data - in the original *Australian Paradox* research (p. 18)

**PART 4:** Disingenuous defence of *Paradox* by University of Sydney, *Nutrients*, industry – What extent incompetence, negligence, dishonesty? (p. 28)

**PART 5:** Why the Charles Perkins Centre's pro-sugar *Australian Paradox* fraud matters for public health, and why it matters for Group of Eight (Go8) integrity, including evidence that the Go8 is defrauding taxpayers on a massive scale via its false promises of “excellence” in research (p. 40)

**PART 6:** A Fellow of the University of Sydney's Senate, Peter FitzSimons - the "Footballer Who Can Type" also is a journalist and best-selling author – has “mainstreamed” many of Rory Robertson’s concerns surrounding the *Australian Paradox* scandal, in Chapter 7 of his new book (p. 53)

**PART 7:** Why was legitimate public scrutiny of the authors’ new *Australian Paradox* paper – now published in the *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, again featuring fake data - aggressively shut down in 2016 by the University of Sydney *sooling* a security guard on to *Rory Robertson*? Is it ethical for Vice-Chancellor Michael Spence to threaten to ban Robertson from campus for publicly highlighting the facts surrounding the *Australian Paradox* fraud? Why not simply stop the blatant scientific fraud on campus and leave it at that? What does the video-action-reply show? And what should we make of Provost Stephen Garton’s threat to ban Robertson from campus on the basis of a series of made-up false claims provided to him...by whom? When will Robertson receive a letter of apology from the University to atone for its reckless misrepresentation of events? (p. 64)

**PART 8:** The tragedy of modern nutrition “science” and official dietary advice is that the *Australian Paradox* case-study is merely the tip of an enormous iceberg of incompetence and worse that has resulted in widespread misery, harm and early death for millions of everyday people across the globe. Most troubling is the fact that “scientists” and GPs know less about fixing type 2 diabetes today than was known a century ago! (p. 81)

**PART 9:** A large sample of heavy-hitters in Australian universities, public-health entities and scientific journals who should start doing more to fix the *Australian Paradox* fraud, and/or fix profoundly faulty official dietary advice that is promoting widespread harm to the health of Australians (p. 107)

Readers, a request: please email me on strathburnstation@gmail.com if you consider anything in this document to be factually incorrect or otherwise unreasonable. I will correct any errors, if any, as soon as possible.
Welcome! Here’s a detailed summary of the infamous *Australian Paradox* case-study, via eight important observations.
ABC's Audience and Consumer Affairs (A&CA) unit confirms Australian Paradox paper dominated by extraordinary errors

In 2016, after journalist Emma Alberici’s ABC TV Lateline report presented the main aspects of my critique - including the FAO’s conspicuously flat fake line spanning the 2000-2003 timeframe - the University of Sydney’s Professor Jennie Brand-Miller claimed falsely to Alberici that the Charles Perkins Centre’s infamous Australian Paradox findings remain as valid as ever. The scientific record was left uncorrected. Indeed, the Charles Perkins Centre guru wrote a 36-page formal letter of complaint to the ABC on 24 May 2016. On 14 September, the ABC’s A&CA unit advised Professor Brand-Miller that her detailed complaints about the factual nature of my critique - as presented on Lateline - are wrong on all important matters of fact. Again, the scientific record was not corrected. Again, Professor Brand-Miller and co-author Dr Alan Barclay just pretended nothing happened!

This latest independent assessment is documented in the A&CA unit’s Investigation Report. In my opinion, the University of Sydney’s Academic Board should obtain, and take the time to assess, those two documents – the 36-page complaint and A&CA’s 15-page response - then instruct the e-journal Nutrients to formally retract the extraordinarily faulty Australian Paradox paper that is a menace to public health.

Issue 1: Several independent investigations confirm Rory Robertson’s critique of the extraordinarily faulty Australian Paradox paper

Emma Alberici: http://www.abc.net.au/lateline/content/2015/s4442720.htm

After the ABC RadioNational’s investigation in 2014 - that highlighted the issue of 2000-2003 fake FAO data - Professor Brand-Miller and Dr Barclay published a sham formal correction that pretended: “These changes have no material impact on the conclusions of our paper”: http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/CPCscientistsresponse.pdf

Disturbingly, the refusal of the Charles Perkins Centre’s most-famous scientists to properly correct or formally retract their paper - despite being repeatedly advised that it is dominated by serious problems including a series that was discontinued as unreliable and then faked - means they are deliberately exaggerating its scientific evidence that sugar in modern doses is harmless.

Time and time again, the authors have improperly responded to my correct critique by pretending their paper is basically flawless, allowing the public debate to be misled, as the sugar and sugary drinks industries use their false “findings” to campaign against any proposed sugar tax. Clearly, this has become a matter of blatant scientific fraud.
**Issue 2:** Incompetence and worse are suppressing proven diet cure for type 2 diabetes. Today’s high-carb advice is harmful for diabetics.

Added sugar is 100% carbohydrate. In 1923, it was widely known by competent GPs that excess added sugar and other carbohydrates are the main driver of (Type 2) diabetes. Accordingly, a low-carb, high-fat cure was advised. Today, that LCHF diet cure is almost universally suppressed by public-health careerists. Sadly, nutrition “science” last century was hijacked by mistaken but highly influential anti-fat, pro-carb researchers. For diabetics today, official advice is worse than useless: it’s high-carb and thus harmful (see Part 8). Disturbingly, low-GI Professor Stephen Colagiuri - a co-author of that ludicrous “absolute consensus” falsehood on the right - is the main author of Australia’s National Diabetes Strategy 2016-2020 (p. 84). The known cure suppressed, Indigenous Australia dies young (p. 6).
Issue 3: Charles Perkins Centre’s *Australian Paradox* fraud insists sugar and sugary drinks are not an issue for public health

Indigenous Affairs Minister Nigel Scullion says sugary soft drinks ‘killing the population’ in remote communities

By political reporter Anna Henderson
Parked 12 Feb 2016 2:07pm

In the wake of this week’s progress report on Closing the Gap, the Indigenous Affairs Minister Nigel Scullion has declared sugary soft drinks are “killing the population” in remote Indigenous communities.

According to evidence provided to Senate estimates today, at least 1.1 million litres of so-called “full sugar” soft drink was sold in remote community stores last financial year.

“I think particularly in remote communities and very remote communities sugar is just killing the population,” Senator Scullion said.

http://www.abc.net.au/news/2016-02-12/scullion-says-sugar-is-killing-remote-communities/7162974

**Characteristics of the community-level diet of Aboriginal people in remote northern Australia**

By Alice K Elbert

**Abstract**

Objective: To describe the nutritional quality of community-level diets in remote northern Australian communities.

Design, setting and participants: A multiple 12-month assessment (July 2010 to June 2011) of community-level diet in three remote Aboriginal communities in the Northern Territory, linking data from food outlets and food services to the Australian Food and Nutrient Database.

Main outcome measures: Contribution of food groups to total food expenditure; macronutrient contribution to energy and nutrient density relative to requirements; and food sources of key nutrients.

Results: One-quarter (24.8%) SD 1.4% of total food expenditure was on non-alcoholic beverages; 15.6% (SD 1.2%) was on sugary sweetened drinks; 22.2% (SD 0.2%) was spent on fruit and 5.4% (SD 0.4%) on vegetables. Robins contributed 25.7% = 34.3% of dietary energy, 77% of which was taste sugar and 23% were added sugars. Dietary protein contributed 12.9% = 7.4% of dietary energy, lower than the recommended 15% = 25% optimum. Furthermore, while bread was a major source of energy and most nutrients in all three communities.

Conclusion: Very poor dietary quality continues to be a characteristic of remote Aboriginal community nutrition profiles since the earliest studies almost three decades ago. Significant proportions of key nutrients are provided from poor quality nutrient-rich fortified processed foods. Further evidence is urgently needed on the impact of the cost of food on food purchasing in this urgent and should include cost-benefit analysis of improved dietary intake on health outcomes.


Issue 4: Disturbing financial conflict of interest: University of Sydney and its Australian Paradox authors operate a (50% owned) Glycemic Index business that exists in part to be paid by industry to put “Low GI” healthy stamps on products up to 99.4% added sugar.

The public-health community must have been proud of the pro-sugar Charles Perkins Centre scientists and their extraordinarily faulty Australian Paradox paper, when Sydney University’s Low-GI Milo (GI=36, 46% sugar) won Choice’s coveted “Shonky” award in 2016.

Issue 5: The University of Sydney’s Charles Perkins Centre and the sugar and sugary drinks industries use shonky *Australian Paradox* paper and its sham Green Pool sister series to mislead policymakers on the extent to which sugar causes obesity and type 2 diabetes

Does added sugar cause weight gain?

This form may be obesogenic [x] [x] in Australia, however, added sugar intake and SSB intake have been declining over the same period as obesity has increased – the so-called Australian sugar paradox – suggesting sugar intake is not a primary driver of population obesity levels [xii].

This article was reviewed by Professor Jennie Brand Miller from the School of Molecular Biosciences and Charles Perkins Centre and Director, Sydney University Glycemic Index Research Service.

http://www.srasanz.org/sras/sras-advisors/

Submission to NHMRC re Australian Dietary Guidelines:

The Beverages Council believes that important dietary factors related to obesity are being overlooked by the current emphasis on sugars and soft drinks. Australia’s refined sugar consumption has decreased over the past 40 years yet obesity rates have increased. This is described as the ‘Australian Paradox’. (3)

[Assessment via Australian Paradox *et al*]

- ‘In particular, limit sugar-sweetened drinks in order to prevent weight gain or obesity’ is not supported by a preponderance of the scientific evidence.

(3) Barclay AW, Brand Miller J, The Australian Paradox: A Substantial Decline in Sugars Intake over the Same Timeframe that Overweight and Obesity has Increased, *Nutrients* 2011, 3, 491-504
http://www.abc.net.au/cm/lb/5251976/data/bev-sub-to-nhmrc-data.pdf

Why a soft drinks tax is not the answer

As the nation’s collective waistline continues to expand, through the media there are various calls for a tax on certain products, including soft drinks, as a means to curb obesity. Whilst theoretical modelling might point to taxes as a solution, in reality these punitive measures are ineffective, inefficient and unfair for a range of reasons.

- Added sugar consumption declining:

Australia’s consumption of added sugar is declining. A recent study identified that the prevalence of obesity has increased 3 fold in Australians since 1980 while per capita consumption of refined sugar (sucrose) decreased by 23% from 1980 to 2003! The research also found that when all sources of...

2007. The findings confirm an “Australian Paradox”—a substantial decline in refined sugars intake over the same timeframe that obesity has increased. The implication is that efforts to reduce sugar intake may reduce consumption but may not reduce the prevalence of obesity.

http://australianbeverages.org/for-consumers/soft-drink-tax-answer/
Issue 6: Group of Eight claims a devotion to “excellence”, so why Go8 Chair Michael Spence indifferent to Australian Paradox facts?

Rory Robertson
20 April 2016

Request for formal retraction of infamous Australian Paradox paper

Dear members of the Senior Executive Group of the University of Sydney, and outside observers,

I’m sorry to have to write to many of you again about the Charles Perkins Centre’s Australian Paradox scandal. I will try to be brief, providing the relevant history and a four-point argument for the formal retraction of the infamous paper: http://www.senunce.academy/Al/en?Barclay: http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/OriginalAustralianParadoxPaper.pdf

For starters, note that an ABC Lateline report last week confirmed my assessment that the paper is extraordinarily faulty, has false conclusions and works to damage public health: http://www.abc.net.au/lateline/content/2015/04/17/6542270.htm

As I explained in 2014 to the Academic Board – which did not act - Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) Professor Jill Tremain’s “Initial Inquiry” into this matter was simple, with the Initial Inquiry Report wrong on five of its seven “Preliminary Findings of Fact”: http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/Letter-Academic-Board-Inquiry-Report.pdf

Disturbingly, Professor Tremain and her hand-picked independent investigator Professor Robert Clark AO combined to blatantly “bury” the fact that the Australian Paradox paper features a faked, falsified, made-up flat line. Call it whatever you like, but please check out Figure 6 (p.5 below). The suppression of the fake-data issue is “PROBLEM 1” in my response to the mistake-riddled Initial Inquiry Report: http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/RR-response-to-inquiry-report.pdf

Further, Professor Tremain and Professor Clark combined “not to notice” that the authors’ own published charts of valid indicators - reproduced on the next three pages - spectacularly contradict the author’s mistaken claim of “a significant and substantial decline” in the consumption of added sugar over their chosen 1980-2010 timeframe.


Shockingly, the Charles Perkins Centre’s Professor Brand-Miller reportedly told Lateline that her Australian Paradox findings are “more valid than ever”. I think this is scientific fraud, and so does a former Deputy Governor of the Reserve Bank of Australia p. 35 http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/225slideshowaustralianparadoxconfrontational.pdf

Unreasonably, since 2012, the University of Sydney’s scientists and management have falsely claimed everything is fine:

“Dear Mr Robertson
I have received your email of 24 May [2012].

On the advice available to me the report of Professor Brand-Miller’s research which appears in nutrients was independently and objectively peer-reviewed prior to its publication in that reputable journal.

In that circumstance there is no further action which the University can or should take in relation to your concerns.

Yours sincerely
Michael Spence


In fact, any “peer review” of the Australian Paradox paper was a catastrophic failure. Indeed, as was made clear by my Charles Perkins Centre Quick quiz on research integrity: http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/quickquizresearch.pdf

The next four pages reproduce the authors’ own Australian Paradox charts, followed by my four-point case for retraction.


**Issue 7: University of Sydney and Group of Eight supporting scientific fraud, and thus defrauding Australian taxpayers on massive scale**

In an epic failure of leadership in 2016, University of Sydney Vice-Chancellor and Chair of the Group of Eight, Dr Michael Spence, ditched the Go8’s promise of “excellence” in research, as he embraced Academic Freedom and refused to correct blatantly false information tending to harm public health. Critically, formal retraction is the standard approach to fixing false and harmful “findings” on the scientific record. Over 600 faulty peer-reviewed papers are retracted each year (~2 per day). Supporting false and harmful “findings” published without proper quality control is unethical and unacceptable: [http://retractionwatch.com/2016/12/05/retractions-holding-steady-650-fy2016/](http://retractionwatch.com/2016/12/05/retractions-holding-steady-650-fy2016/)

![Dear Mr Robertson](http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/Go8Chair-academicfreedom.pdf)

**While soliciting billions of dollars from hapless taxpayers and politicians**, the University of Sydney and its Group of Eight partners promised to pursue “excellence” in research; yet post-funding, they actively support blatantly false, harmful research “findings”!

**The Group of Eight**: Research intensive universities promote excellence in research...integrity is the requirement, excellence the standard...the application of rigorous standards of academic excellence...placing a higher reliance on evidence than on authority...the excellence, breadth and volume of their research...help position the standards and benchmarks for research quality...research intensive universities are crucial national assets...[they have] the right and responsibility to publish their results and participate in national debates...provide information that supports community well-being...they are citadels of ability and excellence... Excellence attracts excellence... The reputation of these universities reflects substance, not public relations...the research intensive universities are critical. The way in which they operate ensures the highest possible standards of performance across a broad range of disciplines and helps set national standards of excellence. [https://go8.edu.au/sites/default/files/docs/role-importanceofresearchunis.pdf](https://go8.edu.au/sites/default/files/docs/role-importanceofresearchunis.pdf)
The University of Sydney’s Charles Perkins Centre and (50% owned) Glycemic Index Foundation are world leaders in defending modern doses of added sugar as harmless. Why? And why do Australian Diabetes entities falsely insist that it’s a “myth” added sugar (100% carbohydrate) causes type 2 diabetes? In Chapter 7 of his latest book, Peter FitzSimons mainstreamed some of Rory Robertson’s deep concerns about the Charles Perkins Centre’s Australian Paradox sham, highlighting how influential but shonky science is working to harm the health of ordinary Australians (selected pages reproduced in Part 6, below).
PART 2: Background on Rory Robertson, the economist who solved “The Australian Paradox”. Who is the guy making all the fuss?

Alas, explaining the paradox turns out to be as simple as the “paradox” is dodgy: The University of Sydney scientists misread up versus down in their own published charts (!), then embraced a conspicuously “flatlining” 2000-2003 series that obviously was faked by their unreliable data collator (FAO), after its decades-old-source Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) sugar series was discontinued as unreliable after 1998-99 (p. 19).
RR’s university days didn’t begin at Group of Eight university devoted to research “excellence”; JCU degree included First Class Honours.
A. Background on Rory Robertson

- RR was born in Alice Springs in the Northern Territory in 1966 and has lived in all mainland States and Territories except Western Australia. RR’s dad – a Scots Guardsman (No.1 Guards Independent Parachute Company) and then an Edinburgh policeman as a young man (before moving to Australia) - once claimed to have won first-fights in the 1950s and 1960s in every pub in the vast outback region spanned by Broome in the west, Mt Isa in the east and Adelaide and Darwin in the south and north. In response to his own story reminding her of that boast, RR’s mum - for four decades a Nursing Sister in remote Aboriginal communities and elsewhere in country Australia - claimed that she had bailed a bloke out of jail the very next day in some of those places: http://au.totaltravel.yahoo.com/destinations/maps/australia/

- In the 1970s, RR was teased unmercifully at school about the outsize nature of one of his body parts (yes, lips!!): http://www.australianparadox.com/baralaba.htm


- In 2006, RR delivered a Graduation Ceremony Address at James Cook University, with some complimentary reviews coming later, from readers who didn’t have to sit through 30 minutes of an economist’s “wisdom”: http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/rrgraduationmns06.pdf


- In 2011, RR playing his own version (14 clubs, back tees, no cart, no caddy, no running) of “Speed Golf” – a scoring system that values minutes taken the same as shots played over 18 holes – set what he claims is the true course record - 79 shots in 110 minutes, and so 189 “off the stick and on the clock” - at the famous NSW Golf Club: http://www.nswgolfclub.com.au

- In 2012, RR documented that the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations is an unreliable publicly funded entity that falsifies published data when it suits (Letter 7?): http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/FAOOfStuffedSugar.pdf

- In 2013, RR claimed a unique fishing “Grand Slam” involving nearly 2.5 combined metres (eight feet) of (i) first-time Barramundi in Australia’s Northern Territory (photo by Nick Becket) plus (ii) ugly European Carp In Sydney’s Centennial Park plus (iii) poison-pronged native Catfish in Cape York: http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/RR-Fishing.pdf

- RR completed his First Class Honours degree in Economics at James Cook University in 1987 and a Master of Economics at the Australian National University in 1991. He was awarded a prestigious Reserve Bank of Australia Cadetship in 1985.

Before working for the RBA from January 1988 until January 1994, when he left to work for Chris Caton at Bankers Trust. RR these days claims to have been a competent applied macroeconomist for a quarter of a century. Of course, those who spent an extended period on his old BT-Macquarie distribution list - for a year or two up to a decade or two - may be able to provide a more objective assessment of RR’s competence as a professional analyst. Here’s a hastily cobbled-together sample:


Baralaba Class Photo

http://www.australianparadox.com/baralaba.htm

Sandy and Rory, Grinnells Hal, Balranaldano. South Australia, c.1968

Infamous Keen/Robertson bet showed that professors can struggle with basic analysis, then confidently promote woefully bad advice

'Rate Cut Rory' challenges pessimist Keen, November 28, 2008

An academic predicting a collapse in house prices has made a bet with Macquarie Group economist Rory Robertson that commits the loser to walk from Canberra to the top of Australia's highest mountain. A forecast by University of Western Sydney associate professor Steve Keen that house prices will collapse by 40%, double the current plunge in the US, has a 1% chance of being correct, Mr Robertson said today.

Mr Keen, who made headlines in Australia and overseas with his forecast that the nation may be facing a depression, and last month sold his inner-Sydney home, accepted Mr Robertson's challenge. If house prices fall by less than 20% he will embark on the 230 km hike from Canberra to 2228-metre high Mount Kosciuszko. "Moreover, the loser must wear a tee-shirt saying: 'I was hopelessly wrong on home prices! Ask me how,'" said Mr Robertson, dubbed "Rate cut Rory" after accurately forecasting the central bank would cut rates in 1996, betting against the market.

"I expect to record an easy win within two years," Mr Robertson added. "That's because falls in Australia-wide home prices will be limited by our lack of overbuilding, our much more disciplined mortgage market, and especially, the Reserve Bank's ability to drive mortgage rates lower."


Unimaginable events rock US
by Rory Robertson (0 917 821 272 4)

**This is my account of some of the terrible things that happened in New York City today, followed by some thoughts on the financial-market implications.**

**Like many others, I was way too close to the action. I am pretty shaken, though have not even a scratch. Thank you to all those who came to see that I am okay.**

**At about 8.45am, we were on the ground floor of the World Trade Centre Marriott listening to the breakfast speaker at the NABE (National Association for Business Economics) conference when what turned out to be the first hijacked plane hit our tower.**

**There was a bit of a bang and the building shook. We all looked at each other across the table, wondering. Earthquake? Presumably everyone else was also thinking about the 110 floors above us. Then the building shook again. Everyone ran for the door and then the foyer. The move was reasonably orderly. I noticed dust and smoke coming from one lift well; probably it was a bomb (as in 1993), I thought. I was terrified, but okay.**

**Everyone was keen to get out into the street, but we didn’t really know how frightened to be. On getting to the foyer, you could see the debris outside on the ground. Hotel officials told people not to go outside, as things might still be crashing down. Maybe five minutes later, people moved outside and we could see the hole near the top of the building. And the fire. It was mind-numbing sight.**

**Thousands of people were spilling out into the street from buildings in the financial district, but none of us had much idea what had happened. Someone said it was a missile; another said a helicopter had crashed into the tower. So it might have been an accident?**

**I didn’t have a clue what to do. I guessed the conference was over. Growing crowds were milling around. Like everyone else, I kept looking up, marveling at the hole and the fire near the top of the first tower. I didn’t see people jumping out, but many were talking about it. I noticed a car torn in half and an engine that seemed to have flown out of nowhere. I tried to ring Owen and Matt (they knew I was in the WTC today) to let them know I was okay. The mobile wouldn’t work but eventually Owen got through, and she Bloomerised Matt at work for me. I tried to ring my brother in Brisbane, but the mobile wouldn’t call out.**

**I figured I would walk downtown away from the WTC and then walk to midtown via the East side. As I started to move away, I observed debris here and there, the sorts of things you would expect to see when a passenger plane explodes. I was maybe 250 yards from the WTC when I looked up and saw the second plane fly directly - maybe 150 yards - above me. Instantly, I knew it was going to hit the tower. I didn’t watch, I didn’t see it hit. I just ran, maybe 50 yards towards an alley behind a building, terrified that the debris could easily carry me to where I stood.**

**As I ran, I heard the explosion as the second plane hit. I made the alley, and hugged the near-side of the building. My thought was that the building was high enough to block out...**
James Cook University
Graduation Ceremony Address
Faculty of Law, Business and Creative Arts
Townsville, 25 March 2006
By Rory Robertson
(Economist, Debt Markets Division, Macquarie Bank, Sydney)

Mr Chancellor, Mr Vice-Chancellor, Members of Council, members of staff, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, graduates -

It's a great honour to be with you on this special occasion. The only cloud over today's event is the havoc wreaked by Cyclone Larry just to our North. I'm sure the sympathies of everyone here go to those whose homes and livelihoods have taken a battering.

My role today is to congratulate the graduates and to try to say something of consequence to them as they move into the next exciting stage of their lives and careers.

First, to the congratulations. The degrees conferred today are a tribute to our graduates' intellectual talents. And to the power of hard work.

Some of today's graduates will never work as hard again. Others are just warming up. A sub-set of the cleverest and most determined in this graduating class will do extraordinary things in coming decades.

For now, well done. Congratulations to you all on securing your degrees. You should be very proud.

Behind each impressive crop of graduates can be found loving families and friends. In particular, many parents are here today, swelling with pride about their young star's achievements.

Many of you have stood behind your graduate - through thick and thin - all their life. Congratulations to you on all your efforts behind the scenes, keeping your graduate's eyes on the main game. Today's degree rightly will forever be a source of very great pride.

Everyone please take lots of photos later this afternoon, as in coming decades they will spark priceless memories: a reminder of youthful exuberance and good looks back in 2006; a reminder of all sorts of
PART 3: Graphic evidence of profound flaws - including the use of fake data - in the original *Australian Paradox* research
Hello. I’m Rory Robertson. I’m campaigning near and far for the formal retraction of the University of Sydney’s *Australian Paradox* paper. Retraction is the usual scientific response to extraordinarily faulty papers published without proper quality control, especially if their false “findings” become a menace to public health (p. 26).

In this document, I present clear evidence of serious problems with competence and integrity at the highest levels of University of Sydney and Group of Eight science *and management*. (Check out our January and February 2017 “exchange of letters”, on pp. 71-76.) This lack of competent quality control *when it matters* is working to poison the public debate - including in Parliament - on obesity and diabetes, with false information promoting harmful advice to Australians, especially those fat, sick, young and/or Indigenous.

In more detail, the main invalid “finding” presented in the *Australian Paradox* paper is that there was *a consistent and substantial decline* in the consumption of added sugar (per person) in Australia *between 1980 and 2010*. The authors thus claimed “an inverse relationship” between sugar consumption and obesity.

Professor Jennie Brand-Miller and Dr Alan Barclay use their invalid “Australian Paradox” finding to promote far and wide the false claim that added sugar is *not* a key driver of Australia’s growing obesity epidemic. Thus, they insist, “sugar taxes” designed to reduce sugar consumption - such as those proposed in 2016 by the Grattan Institute and The Greens (p. 45) - will be unhelpful in reducing obesity.

Importantly, Professor Jennie Brand-Miller and Dr Alan Barclay’s high-profile fiction of “a consistent and substantial decline” in sugar consumption between 1980 and 2010 is *falsified not be me, but by their own published charts*! (pp. 21-23)

In short, Professor Brand-Miller and her co-author Dr Barclay present *five main indicators* of sugar consumption. *Four of those five indicators trend up not down*, directly contradicting their (false) conclusion of “decline”. The *fifth series - their preferred series - was discontinued as unreliable by the ABS after 1998-99 and then faked* by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

Again, almost all of the available data presented by Professor Brand-Miller and Dr Barclay trend up not down. Their preferred series was discontinued as unreliable by the ABS after 1998-99, then for 2000 to 2003 is *faked* by the FAO (see pp. 34-35).

Readers, these catastrophic problems are blindingly obvious once you consider the charts and other evidence reproduced on the following pages. Please email me at strathburnstation@gmail.com if you think I’m wrong. I’m not. This is simple stuff.

My summary is that the Charles Perkins Centre’s *Australian Paradox* research is both an academic disgrace and a menace to public health. The “peer review” quality control that Vice-Chancellor Michael Spence in 2012 assured me was properly conducted, *clearly was a catastrophic failure, if not a sham* (pp. 24-25).

How could this happen? Well, believe it or not, the *Australian Paradox* paper was (self) published by the lead author operating as a “Guest Editor” of the publishing journal (p. 20). In the history of the world, how many times has a Guest Editor said to herself - as lead author - “No, I mustn’t publish *my* paper, because it’s dominated by blatant errors, small and large, and features an obviously invalid conclusion”?

Readers, I have advised Vice-Chancellor Michael Spence and the University of Sydney’s Academic Board of these serious problems multiple times. Yet Michael Spence and his Academic Board have been happy for nearly five years to simply pretend that everything is fine. After five years, I’m confident that University of Sydney management is soft on scientific fraud, is a menace to public health, and is defrauding taxpayers on a massive scale. Please consider my evidence, below.

Rory Robertson: strathburnstation@gmail.com or phone +61 414 703 471

Nor do modern doses of added sugar have anything to do with type 2 diabetes, the authors falsely claim - *There is absolute consensus that sugar in food does not cause [type 2] diabetes* - in the multi-million sold copies of their big-selling pop-sci Low-GI diet books (p. 84).


5. Conclusions

The present analysis indicates the existence of an *Australian Paradox*, i.e., an inverse relationship between secular trends in the prevalence of obesity prevalence (increasing by ~300%) and the consumption of refined sugar over the same time frame (declining by ~20%). The findings challenge the implicit assumption that taxes and other measures to reduce intake of soft drinks will be an effective strategy in global efforts to reduce obesity.

Retraction is the usual scientific response to extraordinarily faulty papers published without proper quality control, especially if their false “findings” become a menace to public health.
The aim of this study was to analyze the trends in obesity and sugar consumption in Australia over the past 30 years ... obesity has increased 3 fold in Australians since 1980.
1. Charles Perkins Centre scientists’ own published graphic evidence of “a consistent and substantial decline”, 1980-2010


2. Charles Perkins Centre scientists’ graphic evidence of “a consistent and substantial decline”, 1980-2010 (continued)
RR’s formal submission featured issue of FAO’s faked flat line

University of Sydney noted FAO fake-data issue, later buried it!

In any case, the underlying facts are as follows. The ABS stopped even pretending to count apparent consumption of sugar after 1998-99. Then, extraordinarily, instead of writing "Not available" in its global spreadsheets, the FAO recklessly began pretending that the Australian sugar series for the 2000s is a flat line. That is, the FAO series for the 2000s has no basis in reality, no-one is actually doing any real counting; there are no underlying data beyond 1998-99. The conspicuous flat line in the authors’ preferred chart was a big red flag hinting strongly that their key series for the 2000s is invalid/falsified/made up (see pp. 12-13 in http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/GraphicEvidence.pdf).

In neither scientific nor economic studies of human behaviour is it valid to assume a straight line and then pretend it represents genuine information. I have documented that the FAO is pretending to do something that, closely, is not: http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/FAOfalsifiedsugar.pdf.

So, again, “falsified” - not “estimated”, “extrapolated” or “interpolated” - is indeed the appropriate description.

Readers, it is unreasonable to insist that a made-up series with no basis in reality truncates signals from a range of valid indicators. Moreover, any credible study investigating trends in added or refined sugar consumption would discuss the particular difficulties faced by statisticians in measuring modern sugar consumption. That is, the worldwide trend over recent decades towards consumption of highly processed foods and drinks meant that statisticians’ sugar consumption indices merged from counting bags of sugar to counting grams of added sugar in many thousands of kinds of processed foods and drinks: http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/New-nonsense-based-sugarreport.pdf; https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=54C281EmAow

This glaring omission of any such discussion tells us a great deal about the authors’ lack of competence in this matter. They now have steered well clear of this basic data-reliability issue, in one, then two, and now three published papers.

ABS series discontinued as unreliable 1998-99, then FAO faked
Rory Robertson’s Quick Quiz on the Charles Perkins Centre’s Research Integrity

Good evening, morning, afternoon,

In the past month or so, I have written to hundreds of scientists at BioMed Central - http://www.biomedcentral.com/about/trustees - and the Academic Board of the University of Sydney - http://sydney.edu.au/ab/about/members.shtml - to request official investigations into the origins, quality and influence of the extraordinarily faulty Australian Paradox paper.


The following quiz is an attempt to provide investigators and observers with a better understanding of the detail of my concerns about the lack of competent quality control that has promoted reckless misinformation in the public debate - including in Federal Parliament - on the origins of obesity and type 2 diabetes, together the greatest public-health challenge of our times: http://www.smh.com.au/national/health/research-causes-stir-over-sugars-role-in-obesity-20120330-1w4e5.html ; http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/11j6SugarAustraliaPlsugar.pdf ; http://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlinfo/pnpdf/chamber/hansard/nrd/95/36/3b-96/74-459d-9669-7c315a7c11a1/0138/hansard_frag.pdf?fileType=application%2Fpdf

For those interested, good luck with the quiz.

Best wishes,

Rory

SIX OF THE BEST

**Question 1:** What if there were no competent quality control on scientific output when it mattered at the University of Sydney’s new $500 million Charles Perkins Centre (CPC) for the study of obesity, diabetes and related maladies?


Correct answer: OOps. We will fix the problem immediately.

University of Sydney’s answer:

“Dear Mr Robertson

I have received your e-mail of 24 May [2012].

On the advice available to me the report of Professor Brand-Miller’s research which appears in Nutrients was independently and objectively peer-reviewed prior to its publication in that reputable journal.

In that circumstance there is no further action which the University can or should take in relation to your concerns.

Yours sincerely

Michael Spence

**DR MICHAEL SPENCE | Vice-Chancellor and Principal UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY**: Chart 6 at http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/22slidestwoshowslargearostparadoxcamberwellfinal.pdf

Readers, the extraordinarily faulty Australian Paradox paper is the highest-profile “peer-reviewed” research ever self-published by the Charles Perkins Centre’s highest-profile health scientists. Here is a copy of the faulty paper: http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/OriginalAustralianParadoxPaper.pdf (scroll down http://www.ndpi.com/journal/nutrients/special_issues/carbohydrates ;)

 section 5 of the Brain-Miller paper: section 10 of the Whiteley paper and section 10 of the Hall-Egan paper are all straightforward. They are not the kind of misleading presentation of data that is at issue in the animal studies paper and the Australian Paradox paper. The danger of misleading presentation of data is that it may suggest a false and misleading causation argument.


Question 8: Readers, one of the rarest things in nature – and thus pretty well non-existent in genuine scientific observations of humans, animals and plants - is a dead-flat straight line. Indeed, the term "flat-lining" is associated with things not living but dead. So when CPC scientists discover a dead-flat straight line in one of their own self-published charts - Figures 9 and 10 in my Graphic Evidence link - should they investigate the extent to which the data have been falsified, or simply declare a "paradox" and pretend everything is fine, especially if it's a pro-sugar, Gil-man business-supportive result?

CPC answer: Simply declare an "Australian Paradox" and pretend everything is fine.

Correct answer: Write to the data provider and then assess the extent to which the data were falsified. Discuss the problem that falsified flat-lining data are not usually embraced as fact in "peer reviewed" research.


Question 9: It is reasonable for a competent member of the public to document the problems with an extraordinarily faulty piece of self-published "peer reviewed" research - highlighting its simple arithmetic errors, falsified data and mistaken interpretations of up versus down - and then make a fuss that its authors - influential CPC scientists with strong links to the sugar and sugary food industries - are seeking to falsely exonerate sugar including sugary softdrinks as a menace to public health?

CPC answer: "Professor Brand-Miller says Mr Robertson is not a nutritionist and does not understand nutrition": http://www.smh.com.au/national/health/research-cares-stir-over-sugars-role-in-obesity-20130330-1jwbe5.html#x2kkbkvyp94

Correct answer: Yes. In particular, note that the final sentence in Australian Paradox’s "Conclusions" reads: "The findings challenge the implicit assumption that taxes and other measures to reduce intake of soft drinks will be an effective strategy in global efforts to reduce obesity" (p. 502). Clearly, it is the CPC’s food/drink experts who refuse to face simple facts on the links between sugar, sugary softdrinks and public health: http://www.rethinksugar.org/au/sfacts

Question 10: After influential but overconfident CPC scientists - three million popsci-diet books sold - had self-published an extraordinarily faulty paper and it had become both an academic disgrace and a menace to public health, should they have taken the approach of simply saying or doing anything that pretend that their faulty paper is flawless?

Correct answer: No.

CPC answer: Mr Robertson’s critique is wrong in part because in the late 2000s cars not humans were consuming a big chunk of the available sugar via ethanol production: http://www.smh.com.au/business/peaky-economist-wont-let-big-sugar-ile-20120731-2qph6.html (p. 3) http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/RESPONSE-TO-ROBERTSON.pdf

Question 11: Incompetent scientific papers litter the scientific record. In general, that has little to do with scientific fraud. Mostly, it is just incompetence facilitated by a lack of competent quality control. But what if influential authors of an extraordinarily faulty paper - after having been advised multiple times that their high-profile paper is dominated by basic arithmetic errors, falsified data and confusion about up versus down - recklessly ignore a correct critique and choose instead to keep publishing rework in formal journals pretentiously that their notoriously faulty paper is flawless. Isn’t that basic fraud?

CPC answer: It appears to be so. After all, fraud simply is "intentional deception made for personal gain or to damage another individual" (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fraud). The University of Sydney’s high-profile scientists are well aware that their paper is faulty and yet time and again they continue to claim that it is flawless; clearly, they have sought to bolster their credibility and careers at the expense of mine: http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/letters09-00491-u003.pdf; http://www.thewafricanparadox.com.au/


RR’s submission to formal inquiry into competence and integrity surrounding University of Sydney’s Australian Paradox research

By Rory Robertson

March 2014

On 29 November 2013, I was advised by the head of the Charles Perkins Centre, Professor Stephen Simpson, that the University of Sydney had opened - after nearly two years of encouragement from me - a formal inquiry into the competence and integrity of the extraordinarily faulty Australian Paradox research: http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/LetterCPCnotSimpson.pdf

On 5 March, I was asked by the University of Sydney if I would like to provide further information to the Inquiry. This is my summary of the Australian Paradox scandal. After two years, various things have become crystal clear. I have four main concerns, as discussed in the following pages. Cutting to the chase, here’s my proposed Retraction Notice:

Abstract: it has been brought to our attention by a reader of Nutrients that the conclusion of “a consistent and substantial decline” in per-capita sugar consumption between 1960 and 2010 in “The Australian Paradox: A Substantial Decline in Sugars Intake over the Same Timeframe that Overweight and Obesity Have Increased” is based on serious misinterpretations and errors that invalidate the finding of “an inverse relationship” between sugar intake and obesity. For example, the uptrend in the authors’ own chart – Figure SA [Figure 2 xlabel] - suggests strongly that sugar intake via softdrinks increased as obesity increased between 1980 and 2010. Indeed, the same is true of Figure 4a [Figure 4 xlabel] which shows four different indicators of sugar consumption by children all trending up not down over the relevant timeframe. Unfortunately, those observations eliminate two central “lines of evidence” for the authors’ claimed “paradox”. Moreover, the other claimed “line of evidence” is based on a data series that was discontinued as unreliable by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) after 1998-99 and then falsified for the 2000s by the Food and Agriculture Organization. MDPI has a strict “zero tolerance policy” towards the use of falsified data, whether the authors were aware of the invalidity of the data or not. Separately, the authors’ business links to the sugar and sugary food/drink industries [http://www.gysymbol.com/category/products/sweeteners/] also are somewhat unsettling. Taking public-health considerations into account, particularly evidence that excessive sugar consumption is a major contributor to global obesity and type 2 diabetes - http://care.diabetessjournals.org/content/33/1/2477.full.pdf; http://www.who.int/mediacentre/news/releases/2014/consultation-sugar-guideline/en/; and http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0ya6AR8T6Qw&feature=youtu.be - the Editorial Team and Publisher have determined that this manuscript should be retracted. Further, MDPI intends to conduct an investigation into how these problems successfully evaded all our normal quality-control processes. Twice. In the meantime, we also intend to retract Australian Paradox Revisited, the second faulty piece published in our journal by the same Charles Perkins Centre author and “Guest Editor”, and further, to seek the retraction of another sister piece published last year in BMC Public Health [http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2458/13/898/preview]. We apologize for any inconvenience this may cause, but have chosen to take the only approach that gives proper priority to the integrity of the scientific record.

[An earlier version of that proposed Retraction Notice is posted at http://retractionwatch.com/2013/08/22/journal-to-feature-special-issues-on-scientific-misconduct-seeks-submit.html]
In 2013, the CEO of MDPI – publisher of *Australian Paradox* – said he would retract if he received note from VC Michael Spence or Prof Peter Howe. Since then, ~2,000 faulty papers have been formally retracted. Why are VC Spence and Prof Howe soft on scientific fraud?


What do you think? After five years, does the *Australian Paradox* scandal involve serious research misconduct?

![Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research]

**BREACHES OF THE CODE AND RESEARCH MISCONDUCT**

In addressing the process for responding to allegations, it is useful to distinguish between minor issues that can clearly be remedied within the institution and more serious matters where the involvement of people who are independent of the institution is desirable. The boundary between minor and serious issues is not sharp, and those determining a particular case will find it helpful to consider the penalties that might be applied by the employing institution if the allegations are true, the steps needed to ensure procedural fairness to all concerned, the extent to which there are consequences outside the institution, and the standing of the research community in the eyes of the general public.

Here, the term *breach* is used for less serious deviations from this Code that are appropriately remedied within the institution. The term *research misconduct* is used for more serious or deliberate deviations.

**Research misconduct**

A complaint or allegation relates to research misconduct if it involves all of the following:

- an alleged breach of this Code;
- intent and deliberation, recklessness or gross and persistent negligence;
- serious consequences, such as false information on the public record, or adverse effects on research participants, animals or the environment.

---

PART 4: Disingenuous defence of paper by University of Sydney, *Nutrients*, industry – What extent incompetence, negligence, dishonesty?
Why did *Australian Paradox* authors invent a cars-not-humans-eating-the-sugar fiction to try to discredit Robertson’s critique?


To what extent incompetence, negligence, dishonesty?

The University of Sydney’s management and its Charles Perkins Centre scientists have spent years pretending that the valid data trending up not down - in their own published charts! - is not an issue. They’re also devoted to pretending that the FAO’s conspicuously fake flat line is not a fake line, even though Blind Freddie can see that it is what it is. Professor Brand-Miller, Dr Alan Barclay, Professor Jill Trewhella, Vice-Chancellor Michael Spence and the heavy hitters on the Academic Board have been advised of the problems multiple times over multiple years. Year after year, they do nothing but disingenuously pretend there’s no problem.

Here is Rory Robertson and Professor Brand-Miller on ABC Radio National’s Background Briefing in February 2014:

http://www.abc.net.au/radionational/programs/backgroundbriefing/2014-02-09/5239418#transcript

Professor Brand-Miller’s decisive interruption to insist that NO “scientist” had criticised her paper is blatantly untruthful. Five University of Western Australia scientists published their formal critique in July 2013 (p. 38), but only after they battled in October and December 2012 against her and co-author Dr Alan Barclay, who tried to kill “Australian Paradox” in the title. Then the sugar industry and its sham Green Pool series showed up in the comments section as well!

Charles Perkins Centre’s clownish analysis of soft-drink sales

Emma Alberici: After this interview, a correction was issued in the same online journal it was originally published in. The confusion, the authors claimed, lay in the overall amount of sugar being added to regular soft drinks... [see Figure 6a on p. 22]

The correction failed to mention that the volume of sales of regular sugary drinks was up, not down. This includes higher sales of sports drinks like Powerade and iced teas, as well as regular soft drinks like Coke, Fanta, Solo and Sprite.

When Lateline asked Professor Brand-Miller which varieties had reduced sugar content, she explained that while formulas of the classic soft drink versions are the same, there are now new ones on the market like Coca-Cola Life, with 35 per cent less sugar, and Pepsi Next, with 30 per cent less.

But neither of those drinks existed when the ‘Australian Paradox’ paper was written, much less over the 30 years it seeks to establish an Australian paradox.

Also see Section 2 in http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/GraphicEvidence.pdf

http://www.abc.net.au/lateline/content/2015/s4442720.htm
Just as University of Sydney scientists and management pretend there are no serious problems, so too does University of Newcastle’s Professor Peter Howe, the negligent Editor-in-Chief of the pay-as-you-publish, no-need-for-quality-control e-journal *Nutrients*

*After ABC investigator Wendy Carlisle shredded the credibility of the Charles Perkins Centre’s *Australian Paradox* paper on ABC Radio National’s *Background Briefing* on 9 February 2014, its disingenuous authors the next day submitted a sham formal “Correction” to *Nutrients* that again pretended the profound problems in the paper - valid data trending up not down, contradicting the main “finding”, and the inclusion of fake data - do not exist: “...no material impact”!!*

http://www.abc.net.au/radionational/programs/backgroundbriefing/2014-02-09/5239418
**Initial Inquiry Report** wrong on 5 of 7 “Preliminary Findings of Fact”, so University of Sydney just pretends everything is fine!

---

**Professor Robert Clark AO**
Chair, Energy Strategy and Policy
The University of New South Wales
Former Chief Defence Scientist of Australia and
CEO Defence Science and Technology Organisation

26 June 2014

**Professor Jill Trewhella**
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research)
Level 5, Room 646
G02 Jane Foss Russell Building
The University of Sydney NSW 2006

---

**INITIAL INQUIRY REPORT: COMPLAINT BY MR RORY ROBERTSON AGAINST PROFESSOR JENNIE BRAND-MILLER AND DR ALAN BARCLAY**

1. INTRODUCTION

I was nominated by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) at the University of Sydney to conduct an initial inquiry into a complaint by Mr Rory Robertson (the Complainant) against Professor Jennie Brand-Miller and Dr Alan Barclay. In accordance with clause 23 of the University of Sydney Research Code of Conduct 2013, the purpose of the initial inquiry is to determine how to respond to the complaint.

This report is a written record of my inquiry.

2. BACKGROUND

**Professor Brand-Miller** holds a Personal Chair in the School of Molecular Bioscience and the Boden Institute of Obesity, Nutrition, Exercise & Eating Disorders at the University of Sydney. She is a past-President of the Nutrition Society of Australia, immediate past Chair of the National Committee for Nutrition of the Australian Academy of Science, and President of the Glycemic Index Foundation Ltd.

**Dr Barclay** is the Chief Scientific Officer at the Glycemic Index Foundation Ltd, and part-time Head of Research at the Australian Diabetes Council.

---

**RR’s DRAFT RESPONSE TO INITIAL INQUIRY REPORT: COMPLAINT BY MR RORY ROBERTSON AGAINST THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY CHARLES PERKINS CENTRE’S PROFESSOR JENNIE BRAND-MILLER, AND DR ALAN BARCLAY**

University of Sydney Inquiry factually incorrect on 5 of 7 “Preliminary Findings of Fact”

Still, Inquiry gives Australian Paradox a fail grade, recommends authors re-write paper under strict supervision

By Rory Robertson, 27 July 2014
https://twitter.com/DrParadoxdotcom

1. INTRODUCTION

The Australian Paradox scandal is a multi-year saga involving unacceptably unreliable “science” at the highest level of Australian Group of Eight university research. Here is independent Investigator Professor Robert Clark AO’s 18 July Initial Inquiry Report into the competence and integrity of the University of Sydney Charles Perkins Centre’s Australian Paradox research:


The University of Sydney of course quickly put a positive spin – for it - on the Initial Inquiry’s preliminary findings:


By contrast, here’s how it was reported by an ABC investigative journalist with a strong understanding of the Australia Paradox scandal:


What follows is my Draft Response to the Initial Inquiry Report. I encourage all interested observers to assess my take on the facts of this matter, and please correct me if you think I am wrong. In particular, I would like to hear from the Investigator, Professor Robert Clark AO; University of Sydney Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research), Professor Jill Trewhella; and the Australian Paradox authors - Professor Jennie Brand-Miller and Dr Alan Barclay - if they think anything I have written in this Draft Response is factually incorrect or otherwise unreasonable. If concerns arise, I will, naturally, correct any matters of fact ASAP.

My main finding is that, awkwardly, *five of seven of Professor Clark’s Preliminary Findings of Fact* are factually incorrect. These include the listings of fact - 1, 2, 3, 5 (or the second “a” as listed in the Report) and 7 (p. 16–18) – are discussed below. Unfortunately, the Initial Inquiry Report did not get to the heart of several critical matters. Key evidence has been overlooked, ignored or misinterpreted by Professor Clark. Problem 1 is the falsified FAO data that is��ently framed in the authors’ “best” chart (page 3). Critically, the authors’ more valid/reliable indicators of sugar consumption tend to trend up not down over the relevant 1880 to 2010 timeframe (page 2).

These dominating problems argue strongly for the formal retraction of the profoundly flawed Australian Paradox paper. To assist the scientific-integrity process, my proposed retraction notice is reproduced in Section 6, below.

To assist the scientific-integrity process, I encourage Professor Brand-Miller and Dr Barclay to formally retract their profoundly faulty paper and its false “finding” – an inverse relationship between sugar consumption and obesity - from the scientific record and from the University of Sydney’s Glycemic Index business website: http://www.glycemicindex.com/

Professor Clark clearly tried hard to be fair to both sides – recommending that the authors re-write their profoundly faulty research from scratch, and otherwise address the issues raised in his report. Unfortunately, by fumbling the ball on a range of critical matters he has damaged the prospects for any quick end to this slowly-inflating Australian Paradox scandal. The public debate on the formal retraction of Australian Paradox can be followed at http://twitter.com/DrParadoxdotcom (just click - no login is required.)

The remainder of this Draft Response to the Initial Inquiry Report is organised as follows:

2. INITIAL INQUIRIES RESULTS (Page 4)
3. EIGHT SERIOUS PROBLEMS (Page 4)
4. SUMMARY OF AUTHORS’ THREE “LINES OF EVIDENCE” (Page 10)
5. HAS RORY ROBERTSON DONE THE WRONG THING? (Page 11)
6. RETRACTION REQUIRED, TO CORRECT SCIENTIFIC AND PUBLIC RECORDS (Page 14)
7. MY MOTIVATIONS AND QUALITY OF RESEARCH AT THE FLEETING CHARLES PERKINS CENTRE (Page 16)
8. PEER-REVIEW PROCESS (Page 17)

RR’s formal submission featured issue of FAO’s faked flat line

In any case, the underlying facts are as follows. The ABS stopped even pretending to count apparent consumption of sugar after 1998-99. Then, extraordinarily, instead of writing “Not available” in its global spreadsheets, the FAO recklessly began pretending that the Australian sugar series for the 2000s is a flat line. That is, the FAO series for the 2000s has no basis in reality; no one is actually doing any real counting; there are no underlying data beyond 1998-99. The conspicuous flat line in the authors’ preferred chart was a big red flag hinting strongly that their key series for the 2000s is invalid/falsified/made up (see pp. 12-13 in http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/GraphicEvidence.pdf).

In neither scientific nor economic studies of human behaviour is it valid to assume a straight line and then pretend it represents genuine information. I have documented that the FAO is pretending to do something that, clearly, it is not: http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/FAOfalsifiedsugar.pdf

So, again, “falsified” - not “estimated”, “extrapolated” or “interpolated” - is indeed the appropriate description. Readers, it is unreasonable to insist that a made-up series with no basis in reality trumps signals from a range of valid indicators. Moreover, any credible study investigating trends in added or refined sugar consumption would discuss the particular difficulties faced by statisticians in measuring modern sugar consumption. That is, the worldwide trend decreases towards the consumption of highly processed foods and drinks meant that statisticians - sugar-counting exercises morphed from counting bags of sugar to counting grams of added sugar in many thousands of kinds of processed foods and drinks: http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/New-nonsense-based-sugarrreport.pdf; https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q4C281EmAnw

This glaring omission of any such discussion tells us a great deal about the authors’ lack of competence in this matter. They now have steered well clear of this basic data-reliability issue, in one, then two, and now three published papers.

University of Sydney noted FAO fake-data issue, later buried it!


ABS series discontinued as unreliable 1998-99, then FAO faked

In 2012, FAO confirmed 2000-2003 data based on nothing valid

Scientific fraud? In 2014, Professor Brand-Miller and Dr Barclay dishonestly advised research-integrity Investigator Professor Robert Clark AO that the data behind the FAO’s faked flat line for 2000-2003 are “robust and meaningful”

University of Sydney unreasonably “buried” my clear evidence

Epic fail: To what extent negligence? How much dishonesty?

So, why did Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) Jill Trewhella and her “independent investigator” Professor Robert Clark AO (University of NSW) – their investigation overseen by Vice-Chancellor Michael Spence – unreasonably (even dishonestly?) “disappear” my unambiguous evidence that the FAO faked its conspicuous flat-lining series for that curious 2000-2003 timeframe (rather than simply writing “not available” after the ABS stopped providing its data)? And why do they pretend that it is of no importance that the authors’ other four indicators all trend up not down?

Readers, why have Vice-Chancellor Michael Spence, the Chairman of the Academic Board, Tony Masters and Provost Professor Stephen Gorton all chosen not to respond to my important assessment that their University’s Initial Inquiry Report is wrong on five of its seven “Preliminary Findings of Fact”, instead disingenuously pretending that there is no issue? Is it unethical to simply declare case-closed?

What about the need for competence and integrity in quality control in Group of Eight science, in order to protect public health from obviously false but highly influential and harmful pro-sugar “findings” that rely on fake data? Isn’t unnecessary early death a problem? (p. 42)

Some seasoned observers who have been following this scandal for years suspect that the University of Sydney’s (and thus the Group of Eight’s) highest management has chosen to pretend that there is no serious problem here so as to avoid the embarrassing need to formally retract the infamous Australian Paradox paper that was self-published by a highly influential scientist who has brought millions of taxpayer dollars to the university via research grants from the likes of the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) and the Australian Research Council (ARC), as well as from processed-food and pharmaceutical companies.

Readers, what do YOU suspect is going on? (Also see exchange of letters in Part 7.)
Several independent investigations have confirmed Rory Robertson’s critique of the extraordinarily faulty *Australian Paradox* paper.

**ABC's Audience and Consumer Affairs (A&CA) unit confirms *Australian Paradox* paper dominated by extraordinary errors**

In 2016, after journalist Emma Alberici’s ABC TV *Lateline* report presented the main aspects of my critique - including the FAO’s conspicuously flat fake line spanning the 2000-2003 timeframe - the University of Sydney’s Professor Jennie Brand-Miller claimed falsely to Alberici that the Charles Perkins Centre’s infamous *Australian Paradox* findings remain as valid as ever. The scientific record was left uncorrected.

Indeed, the Charles Perkins Centre guru wrote a 36-page formal letter of complaint to the ABC on 24 May 2016. On 14 September, the ABC’s A&CA unit advised Professor Brand-Miller that her detailed complaints about the factual nature of my critique - as presented on *Lateline* - are wrong on all important matters of fact. Again, the scientific record was not corrected. Again, Professor Brand-Miller and co-author Dr Alan Barclay just pretended nothing happened!

This latest independent assessment is documented in the A&CA unit’s final Investigation Report. The University of Sydney’s Academic Board should obtain, and take the time to assess, those two documents – the 36-page complaint and A&CA’s 15-page response – then instruct the e-journal *Nutrients* to formally retract the extraordinarily faulty *Australian Paradox* paper that is a menace to public health.


Emma Alberici: [http://www.abc.net.au/lateline/content/2015/s4442720.htm](http://www.abc.net.au/lateline/content/2015/s4442720.htm)

After the ABC RadioNational’s investigation in 2014 - that highlighted the issue of 2000-2003 fake FAO data - Professor Brand-Miller and Dr Barclay published a sham formal correction that pretended: “These changes have no material impact on the conclusions of our paper”: [http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/CPCscientistsresponse.pdf](http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/CPCscientistsresponse.pdf)

Disturbingly, the refusal of the Charles Perkins Centre’s most-famous scientists to properly correct or formally retract their paper - despite being repeatedly advised that it is dominated by serious problems including a series that was discontinued as unreliable and then faked - means they are deliberately exaggerating its scientific evidence that sugar in modern doses is harmless.

Time and time again, the authors have improperly responded to my correct critique by pretending their paper is basically flawless, allowing the public debate to be misled, as the sugar and sugary drinks industries use their false “findings” to campaign against any proposed sugar tax. Clearly, this has become a matter of blatant scientific fraud.
Sugar industry seeking to rescue *Australian Paradox* paper via “framing”, funding and publishing of sham Green Pool sugar series

Bill Shrapnel in 2012 defends *Australian Paradox* via sham Green Pool data

![Image](http://scepticalnutritionist.com.au/?p=514)  
*The Sceptical Nutritionist*

*The Australian Paradox is confirmed: sugar intakes are falling*


Earlier, ABS told Green Pool that dated ABS counting factors unreliable

The ABS can’t comment on the sources and methods underlying the data the FAQ publish. The ABS published data on apparent consumption of sugar up until the reference period 1998-9. After this time the ABS discontinued the estimation and publication of the data. Since then, the ABS have not been involved in the estimation or publication of data on apparent consumption of sugar.

In 2005, and again in 2012, the ABS did respond to two separate requests and supplied a copy of the factors ABS used in the calculation of apparent consumption of sugar. These factors were supplied *along with appropriate caveats including that the ABS no longer believed them to be appropriate*. The ABS had no involvement with either recipient’s use of these factors. Because the ABS have not reviewed the methodologies used by other organisations, the ABS can not comment on the methodologies used to estimate apparent consumption of sugar for non-ABS data or for time points after 1998-9.

p. 80 of 86  

Despite ABS advice, Green Pool collated and published sham sugar series


Despite ABS advice, Green Pool pretends sham series reliable


2015: Is it scientific fraud to pretend sham Green Pool data reliable?

http://www.nature.com/ejcn/journal/v69/n11/full/ejcn2015105a.html
Growing misinformation via the sugar industry’s sham Green Pool series that was designed to rescue Australian Paradox paper


http://ilsi.org/event/symposium-on-sugar-in-the-diet-is-there-a-sweet-spot/

What do you think? After five years, does the *Australian Paradox* scandal involve serious research misconduct?

![Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research]

---

**BREACHES OF THE CODE AND RESEARCH MISCONDUCT**

In addressing the process for responding to allegations, it is useful to distinguish between minor issues that can clearly be remedied within the institution and more serious matters where the involvement of people who are independent of the institution is desirable. The boundary between minor and serious issues is not sharp, and those determining a particular case will find it helpful to consider the penalties that might be applied by the employing institution if the allegations are true, the steps needed to ensure procedural fairness to all concerned, the extent to which there are consequences outside the institution, and the standing of the research community in the eyes of the general public.

Here, the term *breach* is used for less serious deviations from this Code that are appropriately remedied within the institution. The term *research misconduct* is used for more serious or deliberate deviations.

**Research misconduct**

A complaint or allegation relates to research misconduct if it involves all of the following:
- an alleged breach of this Code
- intent and deliberation, recklessness or gross and persistent negligence
- serious consequences, such as false information on the public record, or adverse effects on research participants, animals or the environment.

---

PART 5: Why the Charles Perkins Centre's pro-sugar *Australian Paradox* fraud matters for public health, and why it matters for Group of Eight integrity, including evidence the Go8 is defrauding taxpayers on a massive scale via its false promises of research “excellence”
Incompetence and worse since 1960s has suppressed proven cure for type 2 diabetes. Today’s high-carb advice is harmful for diabetics.

Added sugar is 100% carbohydrate. In 1923, it was widely known by competent GPs that excess added sugar and other carbohydrates are the main driver of (Type 2) diabetes. Accordingly, a low-carb, high-fat cure was advised. Today, that LCHF cure is almost universally suppressed by public-health careerists. Sadly, nutrition “science” last century was hijacked by mistaken but highly influential anti-fat, pro-carb researchers. For diabetics today, official advice is worse than useless: it’s high-carb and thus harmful (see Part 8). Disturbingly, low-Gi Professor Stephen Colagiuri - a co-author of that ludicrous “absolute consensus” falsehood on the right - is the main author of Australia’s National Diabetes Strategy 2016-2020 (p. 84). The known cure suppressed, Indigenous Australia dies young (p. 42).
Charles Perkins Centre’s *Australian Paradox* fraud promotes false claim that sugar and sugary drinks are not an issue for public health.

Indigenous Affairs Minister Nigel Scullion says sugary soft drinks 'killing the population' in remote communities

By political reporter Anna Henderson

In the wake of this week's progress report on Closing the Gap, the Indigenous Affairs Minister Nigel Scullion has declared sugary soft drinks are "killing the population" in remote Indigenous communities.

According to evidence provided to Senate estimates today, at least 1.1 million litres of so-called ‘full sugar’ soft drink was sold in remote community stores last financial year.

"I think particularly in remote communities and very remote communities sugar is just killing the population," Senator Scullion said.

http://www.abc.net.au/news/2016-02-12/scullion-says-sugar-is-killing-remote-communities/7162974

**Characteristics of the community-level diet of Aboriginal people in remote northern Australia**

**Abstract**

**Objective:** To describe the nutritional quality of community-level diets in remote northern Australian communities.

**Design, setting and participants:** A multiple 12-month assessment (July 2010 to June 2011) of community-level diet in three remote Aboriginal communities in the Northern Territory, using data from food outlets and food services to the Australian Food and Nutrition Database.

**Main outcome measures:** Contribution of food groups to total food expenditure; macronutrient contribution to energy and nutrient density relative to requirements; and food sources of key nutrients.

**Results:** One-quarter (24.8%) of total food expenditure was on non-alcoholic beverages, 15.5% (9.2%) was on sugary sweetened drinks. 2.2% (SD 0.2%) was spent on fruit and 5.4% (SD 0.4%) on vegetables.点击前往http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/by%20Subject/4727.0.55.003~2012-13~Media%20Release~Aboriginal%20and%20Torres%20Strait%20Islander%20adults%20experience%20diabetes%202020%20years%20earlier%20than%20non-Indigenous%20adults%20(Media%20Release)-130


Extraordinarily faulty Australian Paradox paper was used to campaign against NHMRC’s tougher diet advice against added sugar

A spoonful of sugar is not so bad

The University of Sydney’s Jennie Brand-Miller and Bill Shrapnel with a variety of foods, some more nutritious than others, that all contain sugar. Picture: Jane Dempster

BILL Shrapnel was not amused. He’d logged on to the National Health and Medical Research Council’s website a few weeks ago and read the draft dietary guideline recommendations.

“My reaction was that the NHMRC is supposed to be the bastion of evidence-based nutrition,” recalls Shrapnel, consultant dietician and deputy chairman of the University of Sydney Nutrition Research Foundation. “But their dietary work is still laced with the dogma that diminishes our profession.”

What raised Shrapnel’s ire was the word sugars in recommendation No 3: “Limit intake of foods and drinks containing saturated and trans fats; added salt; added sugars; and alcohol”, Limit sugars? “Show us the evidence,” he says. “There isn’t any.”

Along with University of Sydney nutritionist Jennie Brand-Miller, Shrapnel takes the highly contentious position that sugar isn’t a dietary evil, as dangerous to human health as saturated and trans fats, salt and alcohol.

SUGAR, HEART DISEASE AND STROKE

FACTS

- Heart disease and stroke are leading causes of death in Canada, responsible for 27.3% of all deaths.1 Over 1.3 million Canadians are living with heart disease2 and 315,000 Canadians are living with the effects of stroke.3
- More than 60% of Canadian adults4 and 31% of children and youth aged 5 to 17 years are overweight or obese.5 Children who are obese are at increased risk of remaining overweight or obese as adults.6
- Up to 80% of early heart disease and stroke can be prevented through adopting healthy behaviours including eating a healthy diet.
- Sugar is a carbohydrate that provides energy to the body. Other than providing energy, sugar has no other nutritional benefits.
- Sugar can occur naturally in milk, fruit, vegetables, starches, grains and most plant-based foods. Sugars can also be added to foods and drinks for flavour, as a sweetener, as a preservative, or to enhance the texture of products.
- Free sugars include all monosaccharides and disaccharides added to foods by the manufacturer, cook or consumer, plus sugars naturally present in honey, syrups and fruit juices.
- It is estimated that Canadians consume as much as 13% of their total calorie intake from added sugars.8 This added sugar estimate does not take into account the broader range of sugars captured by free sugars (which also include 100% fruit juice, honey, etc.). Consumption of free sugars among Canadians would be higher than 13%.
- Ten per cent of total energy (calories) from free sugars in a 2,000-calorie-a-day diet is equivalent to about 48 grams (roughly 12 teaspoons) of sugar. Five per cent of total energy is equivalent to about 24 grams (roughly 6 teaspoons) of sugar.
- Excess sugar consumption is associated with adverse health effects including heart disease,4,8 stroke,10 obesity,11 diabetes,12 high blood cholesterol,12,13 and dental caries (tooth decay).14
- Individuals who consume greater than or equal to 10% but less than 25% of total energy (calories) from added sugars have a 30% higher risk of death from heart disease or stroke when compared to those who consume less than 10%. For those who consume 25% or more of calories from added sugar, the risk is nearly tripled.15
- While there are a variety of causes of obesity, researchers speculate that excess caloric intake may be the single largest driver.15 Larger portion sizes contribute to over consumption of calories and excess body weight.14
- Sugar sweetened beverages (SSB): the single largest contributor of sugar in the diet. A single 355 mL can of sugar-sweetened soda contains up to 40 grams (about 10 teaspoons) of sugar and no health benefits.16
- The total volume of SBs available to Canadians is 3.5 billion litres, the equivalent of 110.1 per person per year or over 300 mL per day.20 If the average size of soft drink can is 355 mL.
- As children get older, they consume more sugar from soft drinks. Boys’ average daily consumption of regular soft drinks is 68 grams at ages 4 to 8 years and increases to 76 grams at ages 14 to 18 years. Among girls the increase is from 47 to 179 g.21

https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B9nI_ydjDXxkTlhscFNPR2RkcFk/edit
Faulty analysis and fake data in pro-sugar Australian Paradox formally cited >50 times, misinforming global “science” re diabetes


http://advances.nutrition.org/content/6/4/493S.full.pdf+html

http://advances.nutrition.org/content/6/4/493S.full.pdf+html


http://advances.nutrition.org/content/6/4/493S.full.pdf+html


http://advances.nutrition.org/content/6/4/493S.full.pdf+html


The Greens propose a “sugary drinks tax” to help reduce obesity & type 2 diabetes. Industry uses shonky *Australian Paradox* paper as an intellectual spearhead to poison public debate, mislead policymakers on causes of obesity & diabetes, and kill sugar tax (overleaf)

A sugary drinks tax: recovering the community costs of obesity

by Stephen Duckett and Hal Swireksen

Australia should introduce a tax on sugary drinks to recoup some of the costs of obesity to the community.

The best option is an excise tax of 40 cents per 100 grams of sugar, on all non-alcoholic, water-based drinks that contain added sugar.

Such a tax would increase the price of a two-litre bottle of soft drink by about 80 cents, raise about $500 million a year, and generate a fall of about 15 per cent in the consumption of sugar-sweetened beverages, as consumers switched to water and other drinks not subject to the new tax.

Obesity costs Australian taxpayers more than $5.3 billion a year. Obese people are more likely to go to doctors and be admitted to hospital more often than other people. They are also more likely to be unemployed and therefore paying less tax than the rest of the population.

These costs – more taxpayer dollars spent on healthcare and welfare, and less tax raised – are caused by obesity but borne by the entire community. The new tax would help redress that imbalance.


The University of Sydney’s Charles Perkins Centre and the sugar and sugary drinks industries use the shonky *Australian Paradox* paper and its sham Green Pool sister series to mislead policymakers on the extent to which sugar causes obesity and type 2 diabetes.

---

**Submission to NHMRC re Australian Dietary Guidelines:**

*The Beverages Council believes that important dietary factors related to obesity are being overlooked by the current emphasis on sugars and soft drinks. Australia’s refined sugar consumption has decreased over the past 40 years yet obesity rates have increased. This is described as the ‘Australian Paradox’. (3)*

[Assessment via Australian Paradox et al]

- "In particular, limit sugar-sweetened drinks in order to prevent weight gain or obesity" is not supported by a preponderance of the scientific evidence.

(3) Barclay AW, Brand Miller J, The Australian Paradox: A Substantial Decline in Sugars Intake over the Same Timeframe that Overweight and Obesity Has Increased, *Nutrients* 2011, 3, 491-504

http://www.abc.net.au/cm/lb/5251976/data/bev-sub-to-nhmrc-data.pdf
Charles Perkins Centre’s *Australian Paradox* fraud now has a five-year history of poisoning critical public-health debates, recklessly misleading the Australian Parliament and damaging the credibility of Federal Government spokesmen.

Thank heavens in Australia we have a number of scientists that have debunked much of what the author of this article has claimed. The commentary by Lustig [sic] and his colleagues at the University of California has been condemned by leading scientists, academics and the key body representing dieticians in Australia. ... They include Jennie Brand-Miller from the University of Sydney, the pioneer of the glycemic index measure of the effects of carbohydrates on blood sugar. ...

In the Australian media recently Ms Brand-Miller was quoted as saying that she was disgusted that Nature would publish this and that because it is published in Nature people assume it has some validity and some basis in science. ...

Many nutritionists, dieters and researchers in Australia have come out and supported her stance. In fact, I was hard pressed to find anyone with scientific qualifications that had come out in support of Lustig’s article in Nature. ...

The Dietitians Association of Australia has also come out saying that there is little evidence sugar was the cause of the worldwide obesity epidemic and related health problems. Their position statement, Sugar and Obesity in June 2011 stated:

*Sugar has been blamed as the ‘root of all evil’ in Australia’s obesity crisis.*

The Dietitians Association of Australia (DAA) believes it is simplistic and unhelpful to blame sugar alone for such a complex issue. ... It is important to highlight some interesting facts related to this debate in Australia. According to Alan Barclay from the Australian Diabetes Council and the Glycemic Index Foundation [also a spokesman for the DAA, as well as a co-author of *Australian Paradox*], sugar consumption in Australia has actually dropped by 23 per cent since 1980. [Calculated on fake data at 2003 endpoint.] Despite this, during that time cases of overweight or obese people have doubled, while diabetes has at least tripled.

A similar inverse relationship between sugar-sweetened beverages and obesity has been observed. The consumption of low- or zero-kilojoule beverages doubled over a 12-year period—1994 to 2006—*while sales of sweetened beverages decreased by around 10 per cent*. [Figure 2 on p. 21 shows a 30% increase, from 35kg to 45kg!] Yet obesity levels have continued to climb during this time period. ... [My emphasis]

http://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/genpdf/chamber/hansards/bb7ad202-ca4c-4ec8-ad46-0b67219def5b/0062/hansard_frag.pdf;fileType=application%2Fpdf
Charles Perkins Centre’s *Australian Paradox* fraud now has a five-year history of poisoning critical public-health debates, recklessly misleading the Australian Parliament and damaging the credibility of Federal Government spokesmen.

George Christensen (LNP): *...This was found in a paper entitled The Australian paradox: a substantial decline in sugars intake over the same timeframe that overweight and obesity have increased*. The name of the report says exactly what the report found.

One of the authors of that report was Professor Jennie Brand-Miller who holds a personal chair in human nutrition ... at the University of Sydney. The other author was Dr Alan Barclay, the Chief Scientific Officer, at the Glycemic Index Foundation and a spokesman for the Dieticians [sic] Association of Australia.

The Dieticians [sic] Association of Australia have also come out saying that this attempt to demonise sugar and link sugar directly to obesity is not helpful. The same view is shared by the Australian Diabetes Foundation. Dr Alan Barclay, who I have just talked about, is quoted as saying:

‘Sugar’ is not the issue—it is far more complicated than that. ... casting sugar as the ultimate villain and calling for regulation is misleading, unfounded and unnecessary. ...[said the mistaken co-author of the *Australian Paradox* paper!]

Disturbing financial conflict of interest: University of Sydney and its *Australian Paradox* authors operate a (50% owned) *Glycemic Index* business that exists in part to be paid by industry to put “Low GI” healthy stamps on products up to 99.4% added sugar

The public-health community must have been proud of the pro-sugar Charles Perkins Centre scientists and their extraordinarily faulty *Australian Paradox* paper, when Sydney University’s Low-GI Milo (GI=36, 46% sugar) won *Choice*’s coveted “Shonky” award in 2016

Pretending added sugar has nothing to do with obesity and type 2 diabetes is helpful to University of Sydney’s business that gets paid to promote sugary “Low GI” health products to diabetics, while adhering to its “strict nutrition criteria” limit of 99.4% added sugar!

It was Harvard in the 1970s, now Charles Perkins Centre is world leader in insisting that added sugar is harmless in modern doses.
What do you think? After five years, does the *Australian Paradox* scandal involve serious research misconduct?

---

BREACHES OF THE CODE AND RESEARCH MISCONDUCT

In addressing the process for responding to allegations, it is useful to distinguish between minor issues that can clearly be remedied within the institution and more serious matters where the involvement of people who are independent of the institution is desirable. The boundary between minor and serious issues is not sharp, and those determining a particular case will find it helpful to consider the penalties that might be applied by the employing institution if the allegations are true, the steps needed to ensure procedural fairness to all concerned, the extent to which there are consequences outside the institution, and the standing of the research community in the eyes of the general public.

Here, the term *breach* is used for less serious deviations from this Code that are appropriately remedied within the institution. The term *research misconduct* is used for more serious or deliberate deviations.

**Research misconduct**

A complaint or allegation relates to research misconduct if it involves all of the following:

- an alleged breach of this Code
- intent and deliberation, recklessness or gross and persistent negligence
- serious consequences, such as false information on the public record, or adverse effects on research participants, animals or the environment.

---

PART 6: A Fellow of University of Sydney's Senate, Peter FitzSimons - the "Footballer Who Can Type" also is a journalist and best-selling author – has “mainstreamed” Robertson’s concerns surrounding the Australian Paradox scandal, in Chapter 7 of his new book
The University of Sydney’s Charles Perkins Centre and (50% owned) Glycemic Index Foundation are world leaders in defending modern doses of added sugar as harmless. Why? And why do Australian Diabetes entities falsely insist that it’s a “myth” added sugar (100% carbohydrate) causes type 2 diabetes? In Chapter 7 of his latest book, Peter FitzSimons mainstreamed some of Rory Robertson’s deep concerns about the Charles Perkins Centre’s *Australian Paradox* sham, highlighting how influential but shonky science is working to harm the health of ordinary Australians.
news stories? I accept that it doesn’t come close to the excitement of the Duchess of Cambridge opening a garden fete in a pretty dress, but in terms of putting your head above the parapet and inviting people to take a shot – which I do on many other subjects, like the republic, gun control, same-sex marriage, climate change, maintaining $10 million was too much to pay for Buddy Franklin etc. – it simply never occurred to me that my views on sugar could attract flak.

I mean, what are the bad things you could say about, ’Fat bloke, who used to be fit bloke, becomes fit and healthy again, and humbly offers clues to other fat blokes how they can become fit again too’?

Where, pray tell, is the downside?

Alas, no. I was to be exposed, even named and shamed, in The Australian Women’s Weekly, in an article titled ’THE FIVE WORST CELEBRITY BACKED DIETS’. And by gawd, they didn’t miss me or my mates, either:

‘Eva Longoria, Megan Gale, Tom Hanks … Peter FitzSimons and Alec Baldwin are among high-profile followers of sugar-free diets.’

My goodness! How did they find out about us?

How did they know, that just three months earlier, while eating celery sticks down at the Carrot Club, there we were … Eva, Megan, Tommy, Smart Alec and me, standing around, lamenting lamingtons, decrying donuts and wondering just when our embarrassing pasttime of not loading up on sugar would be found out. Little did we know … the Weekly had already put their best and brightest on our tail, and were right onto us, as this particular story showed.

‘People are looking for a prescription,’ a Dietitians Association of Australia’s spokesperson was quoted by the Weekly. ‘But you can eat a healthy balanced diet including all food groups and lose weight. It’s about cutting your portion sizes and getting outside and exercising.’

It actually also might help if, instead of the two kilograms a year of sugar that humans are equipped to eat without damage, we didn’t have the 20 to 30 times that amount that so many of us do now. And if I know one thing from all this, it is that sugar is not just another ’food group’.

The DAA (that’s the Dietitians Association of Australia, Boomka – acronyms are used throughout this book as they are very low in calories), mind, is the same organisation that, as documented by Gillespie, once put out a press release, titled ’Sweet truths: Eating sugar may not make you fat.’ I am serious! The Dietitians Association of Australia actually put out that press release because it was so important that Australians know that sugar is not the great white enemy!

Representing the DAA on the subject was their spokesperson, Dr Alan Barclay, who was the co-author of the study the press release was based on, a study that he had co-authored with Professor Jennie Brand-Miller, first published in the E-journal Nutrients that Dr Brand-Miller – from my own Sydney University, where I am a Fellow of the Senate – was guest editor of at the time.

As the Kiwis say, the plot thickens …

As Alan Barclay told the DAA conference, ’consumption of fructose has decreased by nearly 20 per cent in Australia’.

Lead author and Guest Editor

Great for quality control!
since the early 1970s, while overweight and obesity has doubled!'

Odd.

'Much to everyone's surprise, it looks as if, unlike in the US, sugar is not the culprit here...'

Ah-HA!

Now we are getting somewhere!

Enter the notorious 'Australian Paradox', which started out as a can of worms, but frankly more resembles - and I say this respectfully to all concerned - a nest of vipers, at least in terms of the hissing venom that has been hurled because of it.

The study purports to show that while 'research from the USA has demonstrated a positive relationship between sugars consumption and prevalence of obesity', no such relationship exists here.

That is, while 'prevalence of obesity has increased three-fold in Australians since 1980...' in this country, 'per capita consumption of refined sucrose decreased by 23%...'.

Yes, as Professor Brand-Miller would tell The Australian, even though Australians have been eating less and less sugar ... rates of obesity have been increasing...

True! (Yes, here is the most paradoxical part of the 'Australian Paradox!') Even as sugar consumption had declined, obesity levels had tripled!

In sum...

'The findings confirm an "Australian Paradox" - a substantial decline in refined sugars intake over the same timeframe that obesity has increased. The implication is that efforts to reduce sugar intake may reduce consumption but may not reduce the prevalence of obesity...'

Who cares anyway, you say?

Well, Big Sugar in Australia does.

This report was manna from heaven to them, because from the moment that you can demonstrate in this country that the crippling rise in obesity - which saps the population of energy and the taxpayers' purse of funds for hospitals - is directly linked to an equivalent rise in sugar consumption, it is bleeding obvious that the duty of the Federal Government is to bloody well do something, starting with a sugar tax, to start to lower that consumption, and also to change their official dietary guidelines to encourage the population to consume less sugar.

But the Australian Paradox says that is not the case, that no such link can be established!

How could that be? While we all have our thinking caps on I think it fair to observe that the DAA's corporate partners include Nestlé chocolate, Arnott's biscuits and Unilever, the maker of Street's ice-cream? Over the years, such partners, and other food companies, have lent a helpful hand with the DAA's activities, with the likes of Kellogg's - purveyors of staggeringly sugary breakfast cereals - sponsoring the DAA's promotion of Breakfast Week.

Meanwhile the DAA's 2014 conference was partly sponsored by 'The Healthier Australia Commitment', which sounds great, until you realise they are an alliance of Nestlé, Coca-Cola South Pacific, Campbell Arnotts, Sugar Australia, ...
General Mills, Lion, Unilever and PepsiCo. What is wrong with this picture?

At another recent DAA conference, attendees were offered a free McDonald's Deli Choices Wrap, so long as they visited the Heart Foundation booth to get their food voucher and, sure enough, the Macca's Wrap had the tick of approval from the Australian Heart Foundation too. (More on that, shortly.) Seriously, Dr Ronald McDonald is making a house call to the Dietitians conference? Does anybody at the DAA ever use the phrase, 'This is not going to look good' at conference planning meetings?

One of the features of the DAA website is an 'Accredited Practising Dietitian in the Spotlight'. Recently, one dietitian they were bathing in warm attention proved to be the Director of Communications and Public Affairs at Kellogg's. Another was PepsiCo Australia's – and I am not making this up – 'Nutrition Manager'. (The mind boggles. And if you think your boss doesn't care what you think, try being the Nutrition Manager at PepsiCo!) Meanwhile, one of those on the board of the DAA is also the Director of the Australian Breakfast Cereal Forum of the Australian Food and Grocers Council.

Now, and I mean this seriously, I don't call into question the integrity and professionalism of the individual dietitians who make up the membership of the DAA. I am actually close to several and know their dedication to the cause and the great work they do. But I can't help but wonder if the likes of Nestlé and Kellogg's and PepsiCo might be, just a bit, maybe, using the organisation of those dietitians, the DAA, to make their products look a tad more healthy than they actually are. Friends, to my eyes, this is like developers getting themselves elected to local councils. Lots of those developers now running the show are lovely people, of impeccable integrity. But give them serious input into council deliberations on what the urban environment should look like, when the decisions they make for council affect their own profits? You can call me a visionary of stupendous wisdom if you like, but wouldn't it be better if they were one step removed.

And if you heard your local council was in a 'corporate partnership' with Big Bob's Development Inc, their motto being 'Every tree looks more beautiful with a block of flats on top of it', wouldn't you suggest to the council that it might look better, and be better, if they, like, DIDN'T DO THIS?

And I do say that any organisation devoted to promoting health that puts out pro-sugar press releases like 'Sweet truths: Eating sugar may not make you fat', which takes money from companies with that much sugar in their products, that has that level of integration between the companies and their organisation, has a case to answer.

If you care to google 'Rory Robertson and Australian Paradox' you will get a taste of just how strongly the Sydney economist - whose particular skill is picking apart statistics to discover truths – worked to help the DAA sleuths solve this puzzling 'Australian Paradox'. (Robertson, like me, had read Gillespie, dropped sugar out of his diet, and quickly and fairly effortlessly went from being a fat man to close to
the weight he was when he was 20 and fit. Unlike me, he had an intellectual focus that would kill a brown dog, and was determined to find a solution to the paradox, which has not shown up anywhere else in the world). Just to spell it out again for the slow Boomkas, here is the paradox, according to DAA members Dr Alan Barclay and Professor Jennie Brand-Miller. Everywhere else in the world people are eating more sugar and getting fatter. But in Australia, we’re eating less sugar and getting fatter. A paradox!

Can you guess the solution?

Robertson is a fiend on the subject: the analysis of their data is wrong. Not just wrong in the sense of relying on out-of-date sugar consumption figures that – Robertson quickly discovered – the Australian Bureau of Statistics had themselves acknowledged as unreliable they had stopped using them and in fact stopped gathering from 1999 on; but some of the figures they used were wrong in the sense of being self-contradicting. A series trend up!

For instance, the paper stated that Australians were drinking ten per cent less sugary soft drink per capita now than in previous years, while also including a chart showing that consumption had risen by 30 per cent. And Professor Brand-Miller had to admit that part of the report was wrong when interviewed on ABC radio, explaining, under some pressure, that a ‘key word’ had been left out of the report.

But back to those paradoxical sugar consumption figures; Robertson actually went to the trouble of ringing some of the sources cited in “The Australian Paradox” like ... the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). Now, they sound like a wonderfully reliable collection of chaps and chapesses. And they are. Usually. But this time ... well, it got interesting. You see, as he delights in recounting, they told him that they were relying on the Australian Bureau of Statistics figures! Rory told them those figures stopped being counted after 1999 because they were unreliable. The FAO confirmed with Rory that it’s 1999–2003 sugar figures for Australia – which feature in the 2011 Australian Paradox paper as a conspicuously dead-end, flat-line segment – are based on an algorithm, based on the last ABS figure published from 1999, not actual, real-world measurements. You got it, Boomka. Rory insists they had reported figures that did not exist, based on an algorithm, based on figures so inaccurate that they were discontinued, that were then cited in an academic report ...

For my money, we have found the solution to the ‘Paradox’. And this silly sugar falsehood would have been on a self-perpetuating loop if the likes of Robertson had not called it out.

By analysing the figures from the Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics – which is, in any case, precisely the kind of figures he has crunched through in his adult life to become a leading economist – Robertson contends that, in fact, in Professor Brand-Miller and Dr Barclay’s own published chart, ‘sugar availability’ – based on figures from the Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics – increased by about 20 per cent between 1980 and 2010.
To be fair, as detailed by the ABC Lateline program in 2016, an external inquiry cleared Professor Brand-Miller and Dr Barclay of misconduct, but the report did observe that Dr Barclay’s acceptance of a fee from Coca-Cola might not have demonstrated good judgement.18

You can also read Brand-Miller and Barclay’s robust defence of their position by googling, “Trends in added sugar supply and consumption in Australia: there is an Australian Paradox…” Both have made it clear they will be saying more about it.

And I might note in passing, I do not accuse any of the aforementioned of misconduct either, and in any case am not remotely academically qualified to do so. But what I do believe, upon investigation, is that those scientists and academics who do hold such views can count on enormous support from the sugar companies, while a sure source of generous funding for those who want to ring alarm bells on sugar is not obvious.

Either way, if you google ‘Lateline and the Sugar Paradox’, it completely demolishes the whole nonsense of the Paradox.

The dispute goes on, though it is worth noting that the dietitian with the most impeccable credentials in the country, Dr Rosemary Stanton of the University of NSW – who has graciously helped me with this book – has come down on the side of Robertson, in saying there is no evidence that sugar consumption in Australia has fallen and I have many objections to that particular paper and to the idea that sugar is not a problem’. For her part, Professor Brand-Miller has not backed off a jot, telling Lateline the findings in the Australian Paradox paper were more valid than ever.19

Personally, I remain more sceptical than ever. I just hope that health conscious companies PepsiCo and Kellogg’s and Nestlé can form new corporate partnerships with people like Rory and others who want to ring alarm bells on sugar.

Still, the DAA is not alone when it comes to an influential health organisation steering us into very strange territory on the subject of sugar and our health.

The Australian Diabetes Council appear very careful not to point the finger of doom at sugar as one of the prime causes of diabetes.

Curious, Watson. I think this may be a three-pipe problem.

Meanwhile, the Head of Research for the Australian Diabetes Council from 1998 to 2014 – well, hullo! – Dr Alan Barclay, steadfastly maintains, as he told the Today program, that the way to prevent diabetes is, in fact, to cut intake of fat and salt, while eating more fish. In that interview, mention of sugar – regarded by an ever-growing nucleus of scientists globally as a key cause of Type 2 diabetes – did not make the cut.

In June, 2016, Dr Barclay wrote an article for SBS, where he sought to correct two myths.

Myth 1: Sugar causes diabetes.

Myth 2: People with diabetes should not have sugar.20

The official position of the former Australian Diabetes Council – which recently changed its name to the Diabetes
Council of NSW — is the same, maintaining that ‘We want to end the myth that sugar causes diabetes’.²¹

Now I am no fan of myths. (Except the one about when St George slayed the Loch Ness Monster with a golden thread before he turned into a pumpkin at midnight — that was a cracker.) But I, and plenty of people who actually know what they are talking about, was extremely surprised to find out that the link between sugar and diabetes was a myth. But let’s go with it for the moment. What should diabetics eat then?

Well, the Diabetes Council’s official recommendation is that people with diabetes choose at least one serve of a low-GI food at each meal and snack.²²

Okay, good to know. To find out about dietary GI let’s go over to the Glycemic Index Foundation, keepers of the medical construct that, very broadly, it is possible to form a ‘relative ranking of carbohydrate in foods according to how they affect blood glucose levels’.

If only we had someone we knew to explain further . . .

Their spokesperson — goodness! — Dr Alan Barclay, maintains that losing weight and countering diabetes has nothing to do with the sugar that ill-educated nuts like I and the Mayo Clinic (more on them shortly) are obsessed with, either, and much to do with buying foods with ticks for Low GI.

Those foods include Nestlé Muesli Bars, with 25 per cent sugar, and Nestlé’s Milo, with 47 per cent sugar.

Look, they could only be more dismissive of the effects of specifically fructose on diabetes sufferers if they endorsed a product that was 100 per cent fructose, correct? Well, they do. Danisco puts out a product called Fruisana Fruit Sugar ‘the low GI alternative to cane sugar’,²³ which, of course, comes with the Low GI tick of approval.

I know, I was stunned, too. And confused. How could something that is pure fructose — *the* killer nutrient identified by Lustig and scientists around the world as doing terrible damage to our health — get a big thumbs-up from the Low GI crowd, that the Diabetes Council had steered us to? And then I remembered, fructose is metabolised by your liver to fat, not glucose, so, whatever else, it doesn’t mean there is an immediate spike in your blood sugar, so, according to Low GI people, all good.

In fact, Dr Alan Barclay and, yes, Professor Jennie Brand-Miller, are among co-authors of a book titled *Low GI Diet Diabetes Handbook*, which makes the extraordinary claim, ‘There is absolute consensus that sugar in food does not cause diabetes’.²⁴

This news did not reach Dr Stanton, who says, in a consensus-ruining response, ‘The people who eat the most sugar have by far the highest risk of Type 2 diabetes. So I think that evidence is now compelling’.²⁵ And it is. In fact, in recent times, medical research has only cranked the siren up louder in warning of the dangers of sugar, especially sugared drinks, for Type 2, and many other health conditions for that matter, most particularly affecting the heart, liver and kidneys.

In 2015, the *British Medical Journal* — drawing on 17 previously published studies on links between sugary
drinks and diabetes risk – found that drinking one sugar-sweetened beverage each day led to an 18 per cent increased risk of diabetes over a decade.26

In 2015, one of the most highly regarded medical establishments in the world, the Mayo Clinic, conducted a comprehensive review of all available animal and human trials on fructose and concluded: ‘Added fructose in particular (e.g., as a constituent of added sucrose or as the main component of high-fructose sweeteners) may pose the greatest problem for incident diabetes, diabetes-related metabolic abnormalities, and [Cardio-Vascular] risk.’27

How is that ‘absolute consensus’ travelling now?

And yes, there are reputable scientists who still deny that link, but to say there is universal consensus is, I humbly submit, demonstrable nonsense.

There also proved to be something of another curious paradox in that the Glycemic Index Foundation are receiving up to $6000 per product from food and drink companies for a low GI health tick.28 Some of the products that get a tick have high levels of added sugar, including that excellent 99.4 per cent sugar Lo GI sugar.

(All up, it won’t surprise you that when I interviewed Dr Barclay for the Channel Seven Sunday Night program, it did not end well.)

In sum, even as some of the leading members of the Dietitians Association of Australia maintain – against scant evidence and more common sense than you could jump over – that sugar consumption is falling and is not the key problem in any case, the highest diabetes councils in the land are steering those with diabetes to the Glycemic Index Foundation, who are giving the okay to foods and products loaded to the gullets with the very substance that other reputable medical science has identified as a key cause of Type 2 diabetes in the first place!

(In the course of writing this book, I happened to be addressing 300 medical professionals – most of whom dealt with the consequences of diabetes – in an after-dinner speech. In question time, I took the liberty of asking them how many believed, in 2016, that sugar was the primary cause of Type 2 diabetes. An entire forest of hands went up around the room. And how many of you don’t? Just four hands went up. When I asked the senior one of them why he said that, he maintained the cause was obesity. ‘Which comes mostly from sugar?’ I asked. ‘Yes,’ he said.)

Go figure.

Still, the pro-sugar forces continue to go hard and they don’t just get help from GI fans like the aforementioned Dr Barclay and Professor Brand-Miller. Just last year one report was published which argued not just that ‘Australia’s sugar consumption has fallen by 16.5 per cent from 1970 to 2011, according to Australian research published in this month’s European Journal of Clinical Nutrition’, but that per capita sugar consumption peaked in Australia at 57 kilograms per year in – wait for it — 1951.29

Yes, if you believe the research, all of us Boonikas waddling down the street in recent years were actually having less sugar than those lean Aussies from 60 years ago. According to the study, Australians never consumed
as much sugar as they did in 1951, back when there basically were no sugary breakfast cereals, the very year before Kellogg's introduced Frosties (29 per cent sugar) in 1952!

So, from the very year extra sugary cereals were introduced, sugar consumption dropped from its peak the year before?

I can smell another Paradox.

That year of the peak, 1951, was also a time, of course, before service stations also became confectionary emporiums, before the science of getting sugar into so many food and drink products became so corporately sophisticated and pervasive; before school canteens in Australia served things like soft drinks and ice-creams; before ubiquitous vending machines on every corner pumped out soft drinks and products packed with sugar; before every urban environment in the country became heavily occupied by takeaway food franchises serving up fizzy sugar-water by the tanker-load. Dr Stanton notes there were 600 to 800 food products available for sale in the 1950s and 60s and over 30,000 now. All of the above have only accelerated as phenomena as the decades have rolled on, and yet, somehow, despite all that, our sugar consumption has fallen! As Robertson points out, the under-appreciated issue here is that no-one is reliably measuring the consumption of added sugar in Australia. Sure, some claim to be doing so, but on closer inspection it turns out that they are doing something quite different.

The study in question, titled 'Apparent Consumption of Refined Sugar in Australia (1938-2011)', purported to show that 'Sugar consumption in Australia appears to have been relatively stable in the three decades following the end of World War 2 but since the late 1970s there has been a substantial decline'.

One of the authors of the study, Bill Shrapnel, even made the point: 'The downward trend in sugar consumption observed in our study is interesting because it runs counter to recent assumptions that sugar intake is rising and driving increasing rates of overweight and obesity in Australia. However, cause and effect conclusions cannot be drawn from our study. Given the current attention being paid to sugar, we thought it was essential that healthcare professionals and policy-makers had access to recent and accurate data on trends in sugar consumption. Informed policies can now be developed from such studies.'

Oh, by the way, Shrapnel works for the 'Sugar Research Advisory Service', which is funded by the sugar industry, which 'aims to provide an evidence-based view of the role of sugars in nutrition and health'.

His co-author, Tom McNeill, who formerly worked for Queensland Sugar, is a director of Greenpool Commodities, which is a consultancy employed by the sugar industry.

Interestingly, the Australian sugar series they published is based on the counting methodology that the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) itself abandoned as unreliable after 1998-99. (Is this all starting to sound strangely familiar? Almost like we are wandering in a big sugary loop, rather like a donut?) Indeed, the ABS advised Rory Robertson in 2012 that its sugar series was discontinued as unreliable. That was
confirmed in 2014 by ABC investigative journalist Wendy Carlisle: ‘The ABS has also told [Radio National] Background Briefing it could no longer rely on that data because they didn’t have the resources to properly count how much sugar we were eating because sugar was now embedded in our food and drink.”31, 32

Bill Shrapnel and Tom McNell disagreed, and maintain that the ABS methodology they used was not broken and abandoned, but is rather a ‘reliable and trusted reference for policy makers, health professionals, industry and others’.33

Without impugning the academic integrity of either man, can you forgive me for thinking that the dynamic which so maligned the work of John Yudkin all those decades ago – financed by the corporate power of those who sell sugar – is still alive and well in Australia in the 21st century, and it is not even restricted to those organisations specifically devoted to diet.

Let’s look at the Australian Heart Foundation.

Surely, if they give a tick to a food product, you can count on it being healthy for your heart?

In a word, no.

In the case of the Australian Heart Foundation,44 I was stunned by the observation by Gillespie that they gave the tick of approval ‘to products which are sold to children which contain 70 per cent sugar’, checked it out, and discovered he was right!

Look at Uncle Tobys Fruit Fix. Before it was recently withdrawn from sale after the outcry, an extraordinary 7/10ths of it was pure sugar – and yet the Australian Heart Foundation had given it the big tick! One wonders, in passing, if a product that has 70 per cent sugar is okay with our Heart Foundation, just what percentage of sugar would have been too much for them? At what point would they withhold the tick? 80 per cent? 90 per cent?

Where exactly would they draw the line?

Does it trouble you, as it troubles me, that those companies who wish for their products to receive a tick had to first pay a ‘licence fee’ to the Australian Heart Foundation for the trouble of being assessed? Does it seem right to you that in so many of these health organisations, far from being removed from matters of base commerce, the money passes between the companies and the very organisation asked to give their products a clean bill of health? And that they know that if they do give it the tick, they will be able to collect an annual licence fee for as many years as that same product is on the market?

Does it trouble you, as it troubles me, that the Australian Heart Foundation is giving ticks to products loaded with the very substance that as reputable an institution as the Mayo Clinic has specifically identified as one that ‘may pose the greatest problem for incident diabetes, diabetes-related metabolic abnormalities, and [Cardio-Vascular] risk’?39

I know, I know, I am merely – as one of my many critics once fabulously noted – ‘a footballer who can type’, but to my eyes something is seriously amiss here.

A rough equivalent would be paying Choice magazine to review your product, with most readers completely clueless of any money changing hands between you and the
PART 7: Why was the legitimate public scrutiny of Professor Jennie Brand-Miller and Dr Alan Barclay’s latest Australian Paradox paper – now published in the *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* (AJCN), again featuring fake data - aggressively shut down in 2016 by the University of Sydney sooling a security guard on to Rory Robertson? Is it ethical for University Vice-Chancellor Michael Spence to threaten to ban Robertson from campus for publicly highlighting the facts surrounding the Australian Paradox fraud? Why not simply stop the blatant scientific fraud on campus and leave it at that? What does the video-action-reply show? And what should we make of Provost Stephen Garton’s threat to ban Robertson from campus on the basis of a series of made-up false claims provided to him...by whom? When will Robertson receive a letter of apology from the University to atone for its reckless misrepresentation of events?
What happened at Charles Perkins Centre on 1 March 2016, and at USyd’s Food Governance Conference on 3 November 2016?

**About the Speaker:**

Professor Marion Nestle is Paulette Goddard Professor in the Department of Nutrition, Food Studies, and Public Health at New York University, which she chaired from 1996-2000. She is also Professor of Sociology at NYU and visiting Professor of Nutritional Sciences at Cornell. Her research examines scientific and societal influences on food choice, obesity, and food safety, emphasizing the role of food marketing.

She is the author of five prize-winning books, notably *Food Politics: How the Food Industry Influences Nutrition and Health* and *What to Eat*. Her most recent book is *Soda Politics: Taking on Big Soda (and Winning)*.

She blogs daily (most) at www.foodpolitics.com and tweets @marionnestle (ranked by Time Magazine, Science Magazine, and The Guardian as among the most influential in health and science).

At Charles Perkins Centre on 1 March 2016, Rory Robertson spoke after waiting ~20-30 minutes with arm raised in Q&A session.

1 March 2016: http://www.abc.net.au/lateline/content/2015/s4442720.htm

http://www.foodpolitics.com/2016/03/sugar-in-australia-its-better-for-you/
On 3 November 2016, Brand-Miller and Barclay launched new *Australian Paradox* paper, not addressing blatant problems in original

In July 2014, research-integrity investigator Professor Robert Clark AO advised Professor Jennie Brand-Miller and Dr Alan Barclay to write a new paper that “specifically addresses” my observations that their *Australian Paradox* “finding” relies on a conspicuous flat line (1999-2003) that clearly is based on fake FAO data, and also is contradicted by valid data trending up in their published charts (Part 3).

Brand-Miller and Barclay said, yes, we’re already “preparing” that new paper for a “major journal”. More than two years...nothing! Then, on 3 November, the Charles Perkins Centre’s finest expanded their *Australian Paradox* fraud by pretending there are no issues with fake data in their original paper, nor with the blatant contradiction of their original “finding” by valid data in their own published charts. Moreover, they now also promote the sham Green Pool series that was contrived and funded by the sugar industry and published by paid agents of industry (p. 37).


In more detail, Brand-Miller and Barclay launched new Australian Paradox paper, without addressing blatant problems in original.


p.13

http://www.srasanz.org/sras/news-media-faq/sras-articles/do-c

So, after more than two years, there is no new “peer reviewed” paper in a “major journal”, no discussion of the conspicuously flat 2000-2003 fake data in the original paper, and the Charles Perkins Centre still is using its shonky sugar study to assist the sugar industry to pretend that sugar has nothing to do with obesity or diabetes (below). The Australian Paradox is used to argue against the proposed “sugar tax”.

By continuing, for years, to dishonestly exaggerate their “evidence” that added sugar has little or nothing to do with obesity (or diabetes), Professor Brand-Miller and Dr Alan Barclay are perpetrating a serious scientific fraud. And the University of Sydney Academic Board is supporting that blatantly false, harmful misinformation.
RR's series of Tweets at the time, documenting the key events of 3 November 2016, at USyd's Food Governance Conference

rory robertson @OzParadoxdotcom  2 Nov 2016
Tragedy
#Diabetes experts know less than in 1923 australianparadox.com/pdf/1923-Medic...
after hijacked in 1960s by shonky sci nytimes.com/2016/09/13/wel...
#USyd

anahad oconnor @anahadoconnor
Nearly 86 million Americans have prediabetes. That's one quarter of the country. We are fast becoming a diabetic nation. twitter.com/ClevelandClini...

rory robertson @OzParadoxdotcom  3 Nov 2016
Wow!
Today
#USyd relaunches #AustralianParadox fraud

p14 sydney.edu.au/health/foo...
abc.net.au/lateline/conte...
@anahadoconnor #foodgovernance2016

rory robertson @OzParadoxdotcom  4 Nov 2016
As new #AustralianParadox delivered, #USyd asked if I had paid $80 (Yes) #ProfJBM’s Q&A cancelled, as everyone needed full hour for lunch

rory robertson @OzParadoxdotcom  4 Nov 2016
Audience invited to seek out #ProfJBM afterwards Quietly waiting in line, #USyd security guard asked me to leave, as JBM feels "threatened!"

rory robertson @OzParadoxdotcom  4 Nov 2016
I didn’t. So #ProfJBM ushered out. I made point to #USyd officials that JBM refusing to correct false info on sci-record is scientific fraud...

rory robertson @OzParadoxdotcom  4 Nov 2016
#ProfJBM's new #AustralianParadox does not correct dominating errors featured on #Lateline abc.net.au/lateline/conte...

rory robertson @OzParadoxdotcom  4 Nov 2016
#USyd #VCMichaelspence & Go8 solicit $900k from taxpayers & pollie via promise of research "excellence" go8.edu.au/sites/default/...
What a scam!

rory robertson @OzParadoxdotcom  4 Nov 2016
#ProfJBM told #foodgovernance2016 she has NO sugar COIs False gisymbol.com/csr-logicane-s...
abc.net.au/mrb/5258294/...
#LowCI #USyd #DrAWS @albernie

rory robertson @OzParadoxdotcom  4 Nov 2016
#AustralianParadox relaunch sad day for #USyd science @anahadoconnor @WendyCarlisle @gillespi @MarikaSborsos @MichaelPascoe01 @1petermarlin

https://twitter.com/OzParadoxdotcom
Two letters involving Provost Professor Stephen Garton (one to him, one from him), and RR’s response (overleaf) to false allegations

From: rory robertson <strathburystation@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Aug 10, 2014 at 11:37 PM
Subject: Letter to Sydney Academic Board: Professor Clark’s flawed Inquiry Report into the Australian Paradox scandal

To: chair.academicboard@sydney.edu.au, jill.trishall@sydney.edu.au, vice.chancellor@sydney.edu.au, dvc.provost@sydney.edu.au, michael.spence@sydney.edu.au, sue.adams@sydney.edu.au, stephen.garton@sydney.edu.au, shane.houston@sydney.edu.au, tyrone.carlin@sydney.edu.au, ann.brewer@sydney.edu.au, marie.carroll@sydney.edu.au, mark.adams@sydney.edu.au, john.redmond@sydney.edu.au, duncan.levin@sydney.edu.au, christopher.powell@sydney.edu.au, business.dean@sydney.edu.au, fran.waugh@sydney.edu.au, archie.johnstone@sydney.edu.au, jj.ho@sydney.edu.au, john.reddont@sydney.edu.au, joy.randall@sydney.edu.au, tracey.holmes@sydney.edu.au, colin.ford@sydney.edu.au, kari.kramer@sydney.edu.au, rossanne.tandy@sydney.edu.au, annie.bell@sydney.edu.au, simon.bartle@sydney.edu.au, gilliam.luck@sydney.edu.au, jack.collier@sydney.edu.au, tina.bell@sydney.edu.au, stephen.cattle@sydney.edu.au, shymal.chowdhury@sydney.edu.au, wendy.davis@sydney.edu.au, nicole.garrigan@sydney.edu.au, rob.saunders@sydney.edu.au, william.christie@sydney.edu.au, ben.goldsmith@sydney.edu.au, merida.jarney@sydney.edu.au, kathryn.welch@sydney.edu.au, p.williams@sydney.edu.au, jinhong.gao@sydney.edu.au, tania.geritz@sydney.edu.au, sandra.wanderlaan@sydney.edu.au, susan.maguire@sydney.edu.au, philip.saluslcik@sydney.edu.au, john.childs@sydney.edu.au, catherine.sutton@bradby@sydney.edu.au, judy.andoni@sydney.edu.au, susan.coffman@sydney.edu.au, richard.walker@sydney.edu.au, rachel.wilson@sydney.edu.au, philip.levin@sydney.edu.au, david.low@sydney.edu.au, yuki.wing.mai@sydney.edu.au, andrew.rug@sydney.edu.au, tim.willkinson@sydney.edu.au, roger.bourn@sydney.edu.au, michael.milton@sydney.edu.au, elias.mulopo@sydney.edu.au, kieron.rooney@sydney.edu.au, roger.stanesby@sydney.edu.au, elisa.arco@sydney.edu.au, mary.crook@sydney.edu.au, jamie.gister@sydney.edu.au, greg.colehurst@sydney.edu.au, manuel.graebner@sydney.edu.au, peter.knight@sydney.edu.au, Leslie.nicholson@sydney.edu.au, paul.young@sydney.edu.au, eagle.zhang@sydney.edu.au, jacqueline.bloomfield@sydney.edu.au, janice.gullick@sydney.edu.au, run-hee.jeon@sydney.edu.au, thomas.balle@sydney.edu.au, best.church@sydney.edu.au, mary.collins@sydney.edu.au, david.deas@sydney.edu.au, anthony.masters@sydney.edu.au, colin.owens@sydney.edu.au, jerry.saldana@sydney.edu.au, charlotte.taylor@sydney.edu.au, brendan.buckley@sydney.edu.au, john.conomo@sydney.edu.au, christine.fahd@sydney.edu.au, michael.hull@sydney.edu.au, matthew.hindson@sydney.edu.au, david.larkin@sydney.edu.au, real.penrissacosta@sydney.edu.au, robyn.bathgate.wray@bathgate@sydney.edu.au, susan.matthews@sydney.edu.au, claire.wade@sydney.edu.au, p.white@sydney.edu.au, xavier.hodgson@sydney.edu.au, president@ehoc.org.au, usyd.dhivaths@gmail.com, apagaj5455@nulnini@sydney.edu.au, jane.hannah@sydney.edu.au, daniela.train@sydney.edu.au, megan.kennedy@sydney.edu.au

Rory Robertson
Sunday, 10 August 2014

**Initial Inquiry into Australian Paradox scandal wrong on 5 of 7 "Preliminary Findings of Fact"**

Dear Chairman of the Academic Board, members of the Academic Board - [http://sydney.edu.au/about/about/members.shtml](http://sydney.edu.au/about/about/members.shtml) - and outside observers,

I'm sorry to have to write to you again about the Charles Perkins Centre’s Australian Paradox scandal.

1. **BACKGROUND**


My previous letter to the Academic Board of The University of Sydney - [http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/Letter-UofS-Academic-Board.pdf](http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/Letter-UofS-Academic-Board.pdf) - prompted Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) Bill Trethewills in November 2013 to begin a research-integrity investigation.


This letter is a warning that if you again conduct yourself in a manner that is aggressive and intimidating towards any of our staff or students on any of the University’s campuses including at events, the University will revoke its consent for you to enter University of Sydney lands. In that case, we will issue you with a Termination of Licence Notice in accordance with the University of Sydney (Campus Access) Rule 2009 (attached).

The University considers this a serious matter and I encourage you to adhere to the terms set out in this letter.

Yours sincerely

Professor Stephen Garton  
Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor

cc Mr Dennis Smith, Manager – Security Operations, Campus Security
Video replay please.... RR’s initial response to University of Sydney’s false allegations of serious misbehaviour at two events in 2016

30 January, 2017

Re: Correspondence from Professor Stephen Garton

Dear Professors Stephen Garton and Duncan Ivison (Deputy Vice-Chancellors), Associate Professor Tony Masters (Chair of Academic Board) and Vice-Chancellor Michael Spence, http://sydney.edu.au/secretariat/academic-board-committees/academic-board/membership.shtml

Good evening. I hope you are well.

Given my efforts over recent years to advise each of you multiple times of the need to fix your Charles Perkins Centre’s Australian Paradox fraud, I was surprised to receive on 16 January an email from Professor Garton threatening to ban me from future visits to the University of Sydney’s campuses.

Of most concern remain the reckless misrepresentations in Professor Garton’s letter, including his suggestion of serious misbehaviour by me on campus on 1 March 2016, nearly a year ago. (Shouldn’t you have written earlier?)

I am writing to ask Vice-Chancellor Spence to provide me, please, as a matter of urgency, a copy of the University’s video of that 1 March 2016 event at the Charles Perkins Centre.

I require the complete video, please, spanning both Professor Marion Nestle’s speech and the full Q&A session afterwards. Does your video also cover the key minutes after the Q&A session when I approached and met in person, with Professor Marion Nestle?

Obviously I’m keen to view the video to firm-up the detail of my defence regarding the University of Sydney’s scurrilous false allegations.

Gentlemen, I experienced a taste of adversity in some earlier parts of my life, so I’m not going to be intimidated by false claims from an underperforming University management.

After you provide me with the requested video, I will be writing to you again, with a more detailed response to the University’s false claims.

Meanwhile, my strongest view remains that you should fix your Charles Perkins Centre’s Australian Paradox fraud, by writing to the MDPI Journal Nutrients’ publisher and insisting that the extraordinarily faulty paper be retracted.

No matter what the University of Sydney wants to pretend, the formal retraction of false scientific “findings” - especially those based on fake data and/or that tend to harm public health - is pretty standard.

Across all entities where competence and integrity are given proper priority, retractions tend to flow at an aggregate rate of around a dozen per week: http://retractionwatch.com/2016/12/05/retractions-holding-steady-650-fy2016/

Awkwardly, your Charles Perkins Centre’s Australian Paradox fraud is becoming a rather high-profile problem.

In particular, there’s a growing public and political awareness that the University of Sydney - a prestigious Group of Eight university - lacks competent quality control in research when it matters.

It turns out that the Go8 management’s promise to taxpayers and politicians of a unique devotion to research “excellence” is a sham, a misrepresentation apparently designed to help solicit billions of dollars of research funding: https://go8.edu.au/sites/default/files/docs/role-importanceofresearchunis.pdf

Why should taxpayers continue to fund the Go8 universities so generously when management chooses to ignore promises of “excellence”, instead supporting an extraordinarily faulty “peer reviewed” paper that amongst other issues, rests on fake data?

I really do not know why the University of Sydney has chosen - for years! - to defend the indefensible in this Australian Paradox matter, in part by formally pretending there is no problem.

Oh well, that’s your choice. But I will continue to highlight the problem as best I can.

I look forward to viewing your video of my claimed misbehaviour. It might be easier if you simply upload your complete video of Professor Marion Nestle’s 2016 event onto the University’s website?

Please let me know asap what you decide.

Best wishes,

Rory

---

rory robertson

economist and former-fattie

https://twitter.com/OzParadoxdotcom

Active links:

http://sydney.edu.au/secretariat/academic-board-committees/academic-board/membership.shtml ;
http://retractionwatch.com/2016/12/05/retractions-holding-steady-650-fy2016/ ;
https://twitter.com/OzParadoxdotcom ;
http://www.australianparadox.com/baralaba.htm ;
http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/AlecRobertson-born2oct33.pdf ;
http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/rorygraduationmar06.pdf ;
http://www.strathburn.com/yalari.php
Vice-Chancellor Spence responded by falsely claiming “...there is no video”, and running implicit line that there is no scientific fraud

BUT THERE IS A VIDEO! USyd provided key video to ABC TV’s Lateline team, and A&CA confirmed my critique, including re fake data
(i) RR responds to Vice-Chancellor Spence: Will Canberra need to investigate University of Sydney’s Australian Paradox fraud?

There is a video! RR on USyd’s video of 1 March event at 15:30 here: http://www.abc.net.au/lateline/content/2015/s4442720.htm
(ii) RR responds to Vice-Chancellor Spence: Will Canberra need to investigate University of Sydney's Australian Paradox fraud?

Or maybe, just maybe, none of that matters? In my quiet moments, I've started to wonder if the University of Sydney's senior management is not simply indifferent to facts, uncaring about misinformation and indifferent to any threat to public health: it cares about protecting its underperforming scientists. Full stop! I wonder if it has just chosen to pretend there is no problem, no matter how unconvincing and unethical that process has become.

That is, I worry the University of Sydney's senior management has adopted the Catholic Church's decades-old policy of "Deny, Deny, Deny", no matter what the facts: "... there is no video", and there was no problem with quality control before. Moreover, there are no fake data, there's no conspicuous flat line, and there's no research misconduct (Parts 3, 4 and 5). Thus, there's no need to formally retract the paper, in particular because there's no "independently-verified research misconduct or falsehood" (p. 10).

I think all those University of Sydney claims are false. And I think my five-year update - the document in which this letter sits - makes that plain for all to see. Critically, despite the rise of President Trump in the United States, Australian taxpayers can still insist that Group of Eight universities remain respectful of facts. Since at least 2013, the Go8 has promised - in an official marketing document used to solicit funding - a devotion to "excellence" in research. I note the University of Sydney received $402.5m of funding for research from taxpayers in 2015. That big pile of cash followed the Go8's promise to provide strong quality controls, via "excellence" in research (p. 10).

Accordingly, I am writing to the Academic Board again because I am deeply troubled by the misinformation and various other unreasonable responses over recent years by Professor Brand-Miller and Dr Barclay, by Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) Trewinella and Vice-Chancellor Michael Spence, and by the Academic Board, to my repeated and correct observations that the University of Sydney - and thus the Go8 - is supporting scientific fraud.

Could that support be inadvertent? Sure. But if it looks like a duck, walks like a duck and quacks like a duck, it could also be a duck. I am writing again to encourage the Academic Board to decide to do the right thing, to bring this prolonged episode of blatant scientific fraud to an end. I ask, please, that all members of the Board study this five-year update document carefully. Please also secure, and study carefully, Professor Brand-Miller's 33-page letter of complaint to the ACC, and the ACC's 15-page dismissal of her factually incorrect claims (p. 1).

After each of you has absorbed the available evidence, I think the Academic Board should insist that Dr Spence write a letter to MDPI's e-journal Nutrients and instruct it to formally retract the profoundly faulty paper. Already, I've made important preparations to smooth my way in. First, I've had the (then) CEO of MDPI journals confirm to me that formal retraction would be as simple as receiving a letter from the University of Sydney (p. 26). Second, I've drafted a Retraction Notice to assist the process, and the explanation is straightforward: the authors' bizarre mis-reading of up versus down, alongside their unhealthy reliance on fake data, led to a false conclusion (p. 25).

If somehow, instead, the Academic Board recklessly chooses not to retract the paper, to keep defending the indefensible, I will pursue this matter further, calling for Canberra to properly investigate your Australian Paradox research and related goings on. One growing problem for you is that your "shonky sugar study" now is poisoning important Parliamentary debates with false information (Part 5). Misleading Parliament is a serious matter.

Dirty dozen questions for any proper investigation of the Australian Paradox fraud

I do have at least a dozen questions, but I promised myself I would keep this letter to five pages. Let's start with the obvious issues that need to be addressed, and please contact me if you would like to know the rest:

1. Why, instead of fixing the well-documented Australian Paradox fraud happening at the University of Sydney, is senior management instead threatening to ban me from campus for publicly highlighting my legitimate concerns?

2. Why did Professor Jennie Brand-Miller and Dr Alan Barclay dishonestly advise Professor Robert Clark AO that the data underlying the FAQs conspicuously flat (fake) line for 2000-2003 are "robust and meaningful"? (p. 35)

3. Was it reasonable for Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) Jill Trewinella and her hand-picked investigator Professor Robert Clark AO in 2014 to simply "disappear" my clear evidence that those curious 2000-2003 data are fake? Why did they combine to avoid any reference to my detailed communications with the FAQ, except to say that they do not exist? (p. 76) My evidence continues to hold in plain sight (pp. 34-36). In carefully disappearing my evidence, were Professors Trewinella and Clark AO merely incompetent, or were they dishonestly intent on producing a "whitewash" to avoid formal retraction of the Charles Perkins Centre's profoundly flawed paper?

4. Was it ethical for the University of Sydney to abruptly shut down its "initial inquiry" into the integrity of the Australian Paradox research, refusing to even consider my evidence that its Initial Inquiry Report is wrong on five of its seven claimed "Preliminary Findings of Fact"? Was it ethical for the University of Sydney to refuse to pass on my evidence that its Initial Inquiry Report is deeply flawed to Professor Robert Clark AO (via the University of New South Wales), even as a courtesy, insisting that my observations are no longer relevant, so get lost? Is it ethical for Vice-Chancellor Spence to pretend that it is Case-Closed, that the facts of the matter are irrelevant?

5. Regarding the University of Sydney's Food Governance Conference on 3 November 2016, who is the source of Professor Garton's detailed false claims? (Importantly, I was there. Professor Jennie Brand-Miller was there. Professor Garton was not. The facts I recorded publicly at the time (p. 69) - and a University staff member explicitly encouraged me to take my concerns to Twitter - are completely at odds with Professor Garton's account, apparently invented months later. Who invented Professor Garton's detailed fictional account?

To be clear, I did not interrupt, nor did I attempt to interrupt, Professor Brand-Miller's presentation. In fact, I observed quietly for the full hour (12-1pm) through three presentations (p. 68) and two Q&A sessions before Professor Brand-Miller's testy talk. I did not "confront" anyone. I was confronted twice, for no good reason. First, during the event, an official demanded to know whether I had registered for the event. I pointed to my conference name-tag, provided to all who had registered and paid ($80 in my case). Later, I was shocked to be confronted by a security guard! Here's what happened: After the unusual cancellation of the Q&A session that stopped any public scrutiny of Professor Brand-Miller's newly released Australian Paradox paper (p. 68), the Chair of the session invited all those in the audience with questions for the speakers to approach the speaker. I did have a question, so I joined the queue. At this stage, I still had not said a word out loud or done anything notable. Most of the audience had filed out to have lunch. As I was waiting, quietly, I was confronted by a security guard asking me to leave the queue and leave the building. I calmly told him - while I was shaking inside - I had a question for Professor Brand-Miller, that I had paid to be in the room, and that I had joined the queue at the Chair's request. He seemed instantly, but was determined not to be intimidated by the University seeking to shut down legitimate public scrutiny of Professor Brand-Miller's new Australian Paradox story. So I kept waiting in the queue for my turn to come. Before I could ask my question about why Professor Brand-Miller had not "specifically addressed" the issue of fake data in her original paper - as advised by Professor Robert Clark AO and agreed by Professor Brand-Miller in July 2014 (p. 67) - she simply left the room. I was left talking to the various University of Sydney officials who ran the session. To those few officials who were not already out to lunch, I complained and I complained loudly. I was unsettled and angry after having been treated so poorly, having had a security guard stand on me for no good reason. I tried to make my strong view that the University's aggressive suppression of public scrutiny of the controversial new paper - a paper designed to prolong rather than fix the Australian Paradox fraud - was outrageous. The officials appeared to have no real understanding of what just happened, and little or no interest in any case. One explicitly advised me that, if I had a problem with how the University operates, I should take my concerns to Twitter. So, I did (p. 69).

6. Finally, for now, I think an independent inquiry should ask why the University of Sydney recklessly allowed Professor Brand-Miller and Dr Barclay to operate without close Faculty supervision, as advised by Professor Robert Clark AO. Why did the University decide, instead, to aggressively shield Professor Brand-Miller and Dr
(iii) RR responds to Vice-Chancellor Spence: Will Canberra need to investigate University of Sydney’s Australian Paradox fraud?

Barday’s always will-be-controversial new Australian Paradox paper from legitimate public scrutiny? Why did the dodgy new Australian Paradox paper they presented on campus neither “specifically address” nor properly “clarify the key factual issues” - including the use of fake FAQ data - as advised and agreed in July 2017 (p.76)?

Summary: What should happen next?

First, Academic Board, I would like a complete copy of your video of Professor Markel Nestle’s presentation at the Charles Perkins Centre on 1 March a year ago, please, including the prolonged Q&A session after her speech.

Second, I would like a letter of apology from Provost Stephen Garton, please. The apology should include a sincere retraction of his initial letter’s detailed false claims. As noted, the actual events of 3 November have been publicly documented on Twitter since 3 November (p. 69). I’d also like to know who misrepresented the events of 3 November to Professor Garton, in an attempt to convey the impression that I am not a reasonable person. Again, I was there. Brand-Miller was there. Professor Garton was not. Who invented Professor Garton’s story?

Third, I think everyone on the Academic Board should carefully study my Five-year update. You can see that it’s an impressively detailed document highlighting the key aspects of your Charles Perkins Centre’s Australian Paradox fraud. After that, as noted above, the Board should secure, and then study, Professor Brand-Miller’s 36-page letter of complaint to the ABC, and the ABC’s 15-page investigation Report response to her series of factually incorrect claims (p. 1).

Fourth, once each of you has taken the time to assess the evidence provided in these previously unseen documents, the Academic Board should advise Vice-chancellor Michael Spence to instruct MDPI’s e-journal Nutrients (p. 26) to formally retract the extraordinarily faulty Australian Paradox paper.

Of course, whether you do all that, or not, is up to you. Remember, however, that facts don’t cease to be facts just because they are ignored or suppressed. I’m not going away and neither are they. Continuing to defend the indefensible by doing nothing will simply maximise the ultimate damage to the GoD’s reputation for competence and integrity. And yours! More importantly, the University of Sydney’s false information is poisoning critical public-health debates, Federal Parliament is being misled, and Australians are dying prematurely in droves (p. 6).

This, my final suggestion, also might not meet with unanimous approval, if a Board vote were taken at this time. Perhaps way down the track, however, after you have ended the scientific fraud that has been allowed to continue for way too long, and the dust has long settled on your Australian Paradox scandal, the Academic Board in (say) 2020 might choose to award me an Honorary Doctorate, in recognition of my determined efforts this decade to encourage the re-introduction of competence and integrity as a priority in University of Sydney science and management.

I’ll leave you with that thought.

Regards,
Rory

rory robertson
Economist and former-fattie
https://twitter.com/OzParadoxdotcom

This page has intentionally been left blank

It is reserved for a letter of apology from University of Sydney Provost, Professor Stephen Garton.

He no doubt is a man of great integrity so, now that he knows, will want to write to say sorry for allowing himself to be recklessly misled on the relevant facts before he wrote to me on 13 January (p. 70)

(Some page numbers have been changed since the original letter was sent.)
Action replay: Why did authors tell untruths to Robert Clark AO re FAO’s fake flat line, and why did USyd “disappear” RR’s evidence?

The Complainant draws special attention to FAO data points shown in the Australian Paradox paper Figure 2 for the years 2000-2003, beyond the time at which the ABS ceased to publish apparent consumption of sugar data. This is the so-called “flat line” data, also described as “falsified” and “erroneous” data by the Complainant; the implication being that the FAO simply re-issued the 1999 figure for these years in the absence of new ABS data, and that Professor Brand-Miller and Dr Barclay should have realised and checked this issue as part of their due diligence.

I referred this issue to the ABS for comment, but was informed that its employees are only able to comment on ABS data (which is reasonable).

In Attachment 3, the authors state: “FAOStat has continued to publish data for Australia and other nations beyond 1998-9. Their sources both before and after 1999 include ABS, the International Sugar Organisation, and Australia’s trading partners. The FAOStat methodology accounts for stocks, production, imports, exports and other utilisation to derive intake estimates.”

For countries such as Australia, USA and the UK, FAOstat data series therefore provide for a robust and meaningful comparison of trends in added sugars consumption over decades. This allows us to validate and compare the percentage reduction in refined sugar intake.

Awkwardly, authors’ sucrose – green – series “exists” in 2003 despite underlying dataset discontinued as unreliable by ABS after 1998-91?

In 2012, FAO confirmed 2000-2003 data based on nothing real

Scientific fraud: In 2014, Professor Brand-Miller and Dr Barclay dishonestly advised research-integrity Investigator Professor Robert Clark AO that the data behind the FAO’s faked flat line for 2000-2003 are “robust and meaningful”

I have, however, identified a number of ‘lessons learnt’ from this case and I recommend that these be considered by the University and discussed with Professor Brand-Miller and Dr Barclay at Faculty level. In particular, I recommend that the University consider requiring Professor Brand-Miller and Dr Barclay to prepare a paper for publication, in consultation with the Faculty, that specifically addresses and clarifies the key factual issues examined in this Inquiry. This new paper should be written in a constructive manner that respects issues relating to the data in the Australian Paradox paper raised by the Complainant.


University of Sydney threatens to ban Rory Robertson over sugar dispute

Professor Brand-Miller’s books have sold millions of copies worldwide and claim there is an “absolute consensus” that sugar in food does not cause diabetes.

Last year Mr Robertson attended two nutrition conferences hosted by the university, at which he says he voiced concerns about Professor Brand-Miller’s controversial research, which appears to have drawn the wrong conclusion from sugar consumption data—a view corroborated separately by the ABC’s Lateline program and author Peter Fitz Simons.

At the second conference, in November, security officials asked Mr Robertson to leave after he tried to question Professor Brand-Miller.

Deputy vice-chancellor Stephen Garton wrote to Mr Robertson in January saying the economist, who has worked in senior finance positions in New York and Sydney, had behaved in an “aggressive and intimidating manner”.

“This letter is a warning that if you (repeat this behaviour) the university will revoke its consent for you to enter University of Sydney lands,” Professor Garton said.

In his response, Mr Robertson called the accusation “reckless misrepresentations” and demanded the university release a video of the earlier March conference, that showed him asking questions during the Q&A session. “I’m not going to be intimidated by false claims,” he wrote on January 30.

Dr Spence confirmed the threat in his February reply, writing, “so far as I have been able to gather, there is no video”.

“The university reserves the right … to secure and maintain an environment in which there is appropriate and respectful discourse,” he wrote.

Excerpts of the video, which show Mr Robertson asking questions in a reasonable fashion, are on the ABC’s website.

The Australian does not suggest Professor Brand-Miller has acted inappropriately.

Mr Robertson has waged a five-year campaign against the university to retract the paper.

The university has cleared Professor Brand-Miller of any “research misconduct”.

“There are respectable proposals for a sugar tax to help reduce the misery of obesity and diabetes. But shonky (university) science is poisoning the important public debate with false information: the sugar and sugary drinks industries are brandishing the Charles Perkins Centre’s Australian Paradox fraud as an intellectual spearhead in an effort to kill any such tax,” Mr Robertson said.

Professor Brand-Miller did not respond to a request for comment.

What a disgrace: Fake data is featured in three charts in University of Sydney’s 2017 *Australian Paradox* “update”, now published in *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* (AJCN). Legitimate public scrutiny of a draft of this paper was stopped via a security guard (p.69)

In July 2014, research-integrity investigator Professor Robert Clark AO advised:

> I have, however, identified a number of ‘lessons learnt’ from this case and I recommend that these be considered by the University and discussed with Professor Brand-Miller and Dr Barclay at Faculty level. In particular, I recommend that the University consider requiring Professor Brand-Miller and Dr Barclay to prepare a paper for publication, in consultation with the Faculty, that specifically addresses and clarifies the key factual issues examined in this inquiry. This new paper should be written in a constructive manner that respects issues relating to the data in the Australian Paradox paper raised by the Complaint.


In March 2017, the authors published a different paper, again featuring fake data:

Paper features fake FAO and Green Pool data in three charts (see pp. 35-37). Publication of fake data okayed by Faculty supervisors Simpson and Truswell!

University of Sydney and Group of Eight supporting scientific fraud, and thus defrauding Australian taxpayers on a massive scale

In an epic failure of leadership in 2016, University of Sydney Vice-Chancellor and Chair of the Group of Eight, Dr Michael Spence, ditched the Go8’s promise of “excellence” in research, as he embraced Academic Freedom and refused to correct blatantly false information tending to harm public health. Critically, formal retraction is the standard approach to fixing false and harmful “findings” on the scientific record. Over 600 faulty peer-reviewed papers are retracted each year (~2 per day). Supporting false and harmful “findings” published without proper quality control is unethical and unacceptable: http://retractionwatch.com/2016/12/05/retractions-holding-steady-650-fy2016/

Dear Mr Robertson
I have received your e-mail of 24 May [2012].
On the advice available to me the report of Professor Brand-Miller’s research which appears in Nutrients was independently and objectively peer-reviewed prior to its publication in that reputable journal.
In that circumstance there is no further action which the University can or should take in relation to your concerns.
Yours sincerely
Michael Spence

Dear Mr Robertson
An independent enquiry has found there to have been no academic misconduct in the publication of this research justifying any type of disciplinary action or requiring the retraction of this paper.

Universities are not advocacy organisations. They do not promote particular points of view. They are for research and debate and must, absent independently established research misconduct or some type of unfaithfulness, protect the right of their academic staff to undertake and publish research. This includes research that you may believe to be wrong in its conclusions. Indeed, the whole progress of scientific understanding depends upon the constant correction and retraction of published research. For a university to require the retraction of a piece of research simply on the basis that someone believes it to be wrong, even patently wrong, would be a fundamental blow to the tradition of free enquiry that has made universities such powerful engines of innovation and social development over many centuries. Repeat, we will not censor or require the retraction of the the academic work of our staff on any grounds save independently verified research misconduct or unfaithfulness.

Your campaign of public vilification will not change this position.
Yours sincerely
Michael Spence


While soliciting billions of dollars from hapless taxpayers and politicians, the University of Sydney and its Group of Eight partners promised to pursue “excellence” in research; yet post-funding, they actively support blatantly false, harmful research “findings”!

The Group of Eight: Research intensive universities promote excellence in research...integrity is the requirement, excellence the standard...the application of rigorous standards of academic excellence...placing a higher reliance on evidence than on authority...the excellence, breadth and volume of their research...help position the standards and benchmarks for research quality...research intensive universities are crucial national assets...[they have] the right and responsibility to publish their results and participate in national debates...provide information that supports community well-being...they are citadels of ability and excellence... Excellence attracts excellence...The reputation of these universities reflects substance, not public relations...the research intensive universities are critical. The way in which they operate ensures the highest possible standards of performance across a broad range of disciplines and helps set national standards of excellence. https://go8.edu.au/sites/default/files/docs/role-importanceofresearchunis.pdf
What do you think? After five years, does the **Australian Paradox** scandal involve serious research misconduct?

BREACHES OF THE CODE AND RESEARCH MISCONDUCT

In addressing the process for responding to allegations, it is useful to distinguish between minor issues that can clearly be remedied within the institution and more serious matters where the involvement of people who are independent of the institution is desirable. The boundary between minor and serious issues is not sharp, and those determining a particular case will find it helpful to consider the penalties that might be applied by the employing institution if the allegations are true, the steps needed to ensure procedural fairness to all concerned, the extent to which there are consequences outside the institution, and the standing of the research community in the eyes of the general public.

Here, the term *breach* is used for less serious deviations from this Code that are appropriately remedied within the institution. The term *research misconduct* is used for more serious or deliberate deviations.

**Research misconduct**

A complaint or allegation relates to research misconduct if it involves all of the following:

- an alleged breach of this Code
- intent and deliberation, recklessness or gross and persistent negligence
- serious consequences, such as false information on the public record, or adverse effects on research participants, animals or the environment.

PART 8: The tragedy of modern nutrition “science” and official dietary advice is that the Australian Paradox case-study is merely the tip of an enormous iceberg of incompetence and worse that has resulted in widespread misery, harm and early death for millions of everyday people across the globe. “Scientists” and GPs know less about fixing type 2 diabetes today than was known a century ago!
The tragedy of modern nutrition “science” and advice: The Australian Paradox is just the tip of an enormous iceberg of incompetence and worse that has resulted in “scientists” and GPs knowing less about fixing type 2 diabetes today than was known a century ago.
Given the proven low-carb diet cure for type 2 diabetes below, is it a problem that careerists who drafted Canberra’s National Diabetes Strategy (suppressing the diet cure) tend to be heavily involved with “Big Pharma” (which benefits from suppression)?
Is it a problem that main author of Canberra’s *National Diabetes Strategy: 2016-2020* - Low-GI Professor Stephen Colagiuri - and the Charles Perkins Centre’s *Australian Paradox* authors have falsely exonerated modern doses of sugar as a cause of type 2 diabetes?

**Common questions**

Does sugar cause diabetes?

No. There is absolute consensus that sugar in food does not cause diabetes.

It’s a national scandal that Diabetes Australia and the Dietitians Association of Australia are harming Australians by recklessly ignoring what has been known for a century: Type 2 diabetes is caused mainly by excess consumption of added sugar and other carbohydrates.


So too, NHMRC’s Australian Dietary Guidelines recklessly advise 45-65% carbohydrates, promoting obesity and Type 2 diabetes.


See Dr Jason Fung, at minutes 14:00 & 37:00 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FcLoaVNQ3rc
Misguided careerists waste lives and $millions targeting reduced fat & saturated fat not sugar & carbohydrates in anti-diabetes efforts
Latest low-carb, high-fat (LCHF) interventions reducing sugar & carbohydrates show great success in reducing obesity, diabetes & CVD.


Improvement in Atherogenic Dyslipidemia at 70 Days Following a Reduced Carbohydrate Intervention for Treatment of Type 2 Diabetes

Sarah Hallberg, DO, MS, Amy McKenzie, PhD, Brent Creighton, PhD, Britannie Volk, RD, PhD, Therese Skimiard, RN, Ashley RN, Roberta Gloin, RN, Detlev Yeomans, James McCarthy, MD, PhD, Jeff Volek, RD, PhD, Stephen Phinney, MD, PhD

Study Funding

This study was funded by Vinta Health Incorporated and has a financial relationship with its authors.

Background/Synopsis

This initial report of a novel multi-disciplinary lifestyle intervention in adults with type-2 diabetes (T2D) demonstrates improved atherogenic dyslipidemia and improved glycemic control as indicated by HbA1c reduction despite markedly less medication use. Whereas intensive management of T2D by optimizing medication usually results in weight gain, this lifestyle intervention was associated with significant weight loss.

Objective/Purpose

Atherogenic dyslipidemia (high circulating triglycerides, low HDL-C, and increased small LDL particles) is an important marker of increased cardiovascular disease risk in T2D. We have previously demonstrated marked improvement in atherogenic dyslipidemia in response to a very low-carbohydrate diet in subjects with metabolic syndrome, but reports of blood lipid responses to this type-2 diabetes are limited.

Methods

We are performing a prospective study of over 200 subjects with T2D who chose to enroll in a lifestyle intervention involving initial carbohydrate restriction ≤ 20 grams/day. Here we describe initial blood lipid changes at 70 days versus baseline for the first 72 T2D subjects enrolled. Nutritional counseling and feedback were provided via an online mobile app that allowed tracking of weight, glucose and nutritional ketosis; diabetes medications were adjusted as necessary. Statin medications, if prescribed prior to enrollment, were not changed during the study period.

Results

At baseline, mean (±SEM) age was 54±1 y, BMI was 41±1 kg/m² and 53 of 72 subjects were women. All subjects met diagnostic criteria for T2D and most were on multiple medications for T2D and hypertension. After 70 days, weight declined from 117±4.2 kg to 107±2.7 kg (p<0.001), HbA1c was reduced from 7.4±0.3% to 6.6±0.1% (p<0.0001), and diabetes medications were halved or reduced in 63% of participants. triglycerides were reduced from 191±149 mg/dL to 149±102 mg/dL (p<0.0001) while HDL-cholesterol was unchanged (44±27 vs 45±27 mg/dL), as was calculated LDL (95±4 to 102±5 mg/dL). The triglyceride:HDL ratio improved from 4.3 to 3.2. LDL heterogeneity was further examined by NMR LipidProfile revealing a reduction in small LDL particles at baseline vs. 70 days (p=0.02) while total LDL particle was unchanged (1291±5 to 1295±4 nmol/L).

Conclusions

These initial data from an ongoing study indicate that a well-formulated low carbohydrate lifestyle intervention can improve type-2 diabetes control and atherogenic dyslipidemia concurrent with substantial weight loss in a community clinic setting.

And not just Type 2 diabetes: LCHF intervention shows **profound** success in neutralising Type 1 diabetes in adults and children!

Slide via David Dikeman, a devoted parent of a child with Type 1 diabetes. I met him at a San Diego health conference in 2016. Here he is discussing the results:

**Minute 35:00** [https://www.dietdoctor.com/member/presentations/dikeman](https://www.dietdoctor.com/member/presentations/dikeman)

Also, please try Dr Troy Stapleton discussing how he manages his Type 1 diabetes using a LCHF diet [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hxs63IO0H0U](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hxs63IO0H0U)
Charlie Perkins’ mobs dying young via type 2 diabetes on misguided mouse diet (~60% sugar&carbs) advised by Charles Perkins Centre

See comment by RR at http://www.cell.com/cell-metabolism/comments/S1550-4131(14)00065-5


Recent reviews of evidence on effectiveness of LCHF diets in reversing Type 2 diabetes, minimising CVD (ie. fixing Metabolic Syndrome)
Australian cricket-team doctor Peter Brukner is a leader in the LCHF community that is trying to improve public health.

Peter Brukner is an Australian sports and exercise medicine physician and author of the leading sports medicine text book Clinical Sports Medicine. He is currently the Australian cricket team doctor after previous stints with Liverpool FC, the Socceroos, Australian national swimming, field hockey, athletics, Olympic and Commonwealth Games teams.

So you want to know about Low Carb High Fat (LCHF) ...

Well let’s start with a bit of history.

Up until about 30 years ago most Western societies ate a diet containing plenty of saturated fat in the form of butter, milk, cream and fatty meats. Then on the basis of some flimsy research, the U.S initially, followed by other countries, decided to adopt a low fat diet. It seemed to make sense and was an easy concept to sell – fatty foods lead to fat people with fatty arteries leading to cardiovascular disease.

The only problem is that it hasn’t worked! In the last thirty years coinciding with the switch to a low fat diet, the incidence of obesity and Type 2 diabetes has steadily increased.

The reason for this is that the cause of obesity and diabetes is probably excess carbohydrates rather than excess fat. The low fat mantra and its associated food pyramid has resulted in increased carbohydrate intake in the form of grains, cereals, bread, pasta, rice etc. In addition, in many “low fat” foods when the fat was removed, the manufacturers replace it with carbs such as high fructose corn syrup to improve the taste.

To understand all this we need to look at what happens when we eat carbs. When eaten, carbs are broken down to their simplest form – glucose - in the gut and absorbed into the bloodstream. To keep the blood glucose levels down, the hormone insulin is secreted from the pancreas. Insulin, which is the hormone that is absent in Type 1 diabetes, causes the glucose to be taken up by tissues such as liver.

Eating LCHF

EAT NATURAL FOODS & AVOID PROCESSED FOODS

EAT ALL YOU LIKE ...

- Eggs
- Meat – beef, lamb, pork, chicken (preferably pasture fed not grain fed)
- Bacon
- Fish esp cold water fish (salmon, sardines)
- Vegetables that grow above ground – incl all cabbage (cauliflower, broccoli, cabbage and Brussels sprouts), asparagus, zucchini, eggplant, olives, spinach, mushrooms, cucumber, lettuce, avocado, onions, peppers, tomatoes
- Berries – strawberries, raspberries, blackberries, blueberries
- Dairy – full fat milk, cream, butter, cheese, Greek yoghurt
- Drinks – water, coffee, green tea, beef broth
- Nuts – almonds, walnuts, Brazil nuts, hazelnuts, macadamia

AVOID ...

- Sugar - soft drinks, candy, juice, sports drinks, chocolate, cakes, buns, pastries, ice cream
- Breakfast cereals
- Bread and related products (biscuits, crumpets, muffins, cakes)
- Rice
- Potatoes and other starchy vegetables
- Pasta
- Margarine
- Beans and legumes
- Most fruit (exc berries)
- Fruit juices
- Flavoured yogurts
- Beer

Don’t cook with ....

- Vegetable oil
- Seed oils (canola, sunflower, safflower, cottonseed, grapeseed oil etc)

Have occasionally

- Alcohol – red or white wine, spirits
- Chocolate – >70% cocoa

Incompetence and worse in modern diet “science” spans much more than sugar, carbohydrates and diabetes: The false demonisation of saturated fats in meat and dairy has promoted sham “need” for, and widespread use of, expensive but ineffective Statins (drugs).

http://ajcn.nutrition.org/content/91/3/535

Meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies evaluating the association of saturated fat with cardiovascular disease

Patty W Siri-Tarino, Qi Sun, Frank B Hu, and Ronald M Krauss

Abstract

Background: A reduction in dietary saturated fat has generally been thought to improve cardiovascular health.

Objective: The objective of this meta-analysis was to summarize the evidence related to the association of dietary saturated fat with risk of coronary heart disease (CHD), stroke, and cardiovascular disease (CVD; CHD inclusive of stroke) in prospective epidemiologic studies.

Design: Twenty-one studies identified by searching MEDLINE and EMBASE databases and secondary referencing qualified for inclusion in this study. A random-effects model was used to derive composite relative risk estimates for CHD, stroke, and CVD.

Results: During 5 233 years of follow-up of 347,747 subjects, 11,006 developed CHD or stroke. Intake of saturated fat was not associated with an increased risk of CHD, stroke, or CVD. The pooled relative risk estimates that compared extreme quantities of saturated fat intake were 1.07 (95% CI: 0.96, 1.19; P = 0.22) for CHD, 0.81 (95% CI: 0.62, 1.05; P = 0.11) for stroke, and 1.00 (95% CI: 0.85, 1.11; P = 0.95) for CVD. Consideration of age, sex, and study quality did not change the results.

Conclusions: A meta-analysis of prospective epidemiologic studies showed that there is no significant evidence for concluding that dietary saturated fat is associated with an increased risk of CHD or CVD. More data are needed to elucidate whether CVD risks are likely to be influenced by the specific nutrients used to replace saturated fat.

Received March 6, 2000.
Accepted November 25, 2000.

http://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/5/9/e007118.full

This extraordinarily awkward RCT-based BMJ paper was not included as one of the 309 references in Sir Rory Collins et al’s high-profile 2016 justification for Statins.

Salim Yusuf, recent President of World Heart Federation, explains carbohydrates not saturated or total dietary fat drive cardiovascular disease, thus junking centrepiece of modern nutrition “science” (Sat.fat = CVD) as wrong, insisting official diet guidelines are harmful.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DAScGnxaEkg
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YCSw0fXgbw
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0y3K3wkCHgM (same video, three links)
A. Low-fat Australian Dietary Guidelines based on shonky US demonisation of dietary fat, particularly saturated fat in meat and dairy

In 2017, Australia’s #1 dietary evil is saturated fat (2013 edition)

Australian Dietary Guidelines

Providing the scientific evidence for healthier Australian diets

3.1 Limit intake of foods high in saturated fat

3.1.1 Setting the scene

3.1.2 The evidence for ‘limit intake of foods high in saturated fat’

3.1.3 How limiting intake of foods high in saturated fat may improve health outcomes

3.1.4 Practical considerations: limit intake of foods high in saturated fat

How the Guidelines were developed

These Guidelines are an evolution of the 2003 edition of the dietary guidelines and build upon their evidence and science base. New evidence was assessed to determine whether associations between food, dietary patterns and health outcomes had strengthened, weakened, or remained unchanged. Where the evidence base was unlikely to have changed substantially e.g., the relationship between intake of foods high in saturated fat and increased risk of high serum cholesterol additional review was not conducted.


Interpretation of blood fats

30 years ago

High cholesterol, Triglycerides unimportant

20 years ago

Bad cholesterol (LDLc), Good cholesterol (HDLc)

10 years ago

Modified LDL, atherogenic, Oxidised, Glycerated, Apo(a), Lp(a), Small Dense LDL

Today

Triglycerides are important!

Move away from LDLc: Non-HDLc = LDLc + VLDLc

A/Prof Ken Bistrian, ‘Blood Tests to assess your Cardiovascular Risk’


http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9BFRI-nH1v8
B. Low-fat *Australian Dietary Guidelines* based on shonky US demonisation of dietary fat, particularly saturated fat in meat and dairy

Dr Ancel Keys attacks Prof. Yudkin’s sugar story in “Sucrose in the Diet and Coronary Heart Disease” (1971):

C. Low-fat Australian Dietary Guidelines based on shonky US demonisation of dietary fat, particularly saturated fat in meat and dairy

**Dietary Fat and Its Relation to Heart Attacks and Strokes**

Report by the Central Committee for Medical and Community Program of the American Heart Association*

Circulation, Volume XXIII, January 1961

Third, the blood cholesterol concentration may also be reduced by controlling the amount and type of fat in the diet without altering caloric intake. Not all fats in the diet have the same effect on the amount of cholesterol in the blood. In the usual diet eaten in the United States, a large part of the fat is of the saturated type (Appendix II). Too much of this type of fat tends to increase the cholesterol in the blood. Table 1 summarizes the amount of saturated fat in the diet and the cholesterol in the blood of men and women in the United States. The amount of saturated fat in the diet is expressed as a percentage of the total cholesterol in the blood. This percentage is shown in the second column of Table 1. The percentage of saturated fat in the diet is lower when the amount of saturated fat in the diet is reduced, blood cholesterol levels usually decrease.

In contrast to the above foods, many natural vegetable oils, such as corn, cotton and soyas, as well as the fat of fish, are relatively low in saturated fat and high in fat of the polyunsaturated type (Appendix II). When these fats are substituted for a substantial part of the saturated fats without increasing calories, blood cholesterol decreases. Finally, some food fats, such as olive oil, are saturated with the saturated oils of red meat, eggs and whole milk. For example, the average person in the United States consumes about 1.5 pounds of beef per week, which contributes about 20 to 30 percent of the total calories from saturated fat. Substitution of polyunsaturated fats for a substantial part of the saturated fat in the diet may also be a valuable addition to this program.

C. Those people who have had one or more atherosclerotic heart attacks or strokes may reduce the possibility of recurrence by such a change in diet.

It should be borne in mind that moderate amounts of fat, particularly those containing an appreciable quantity of the polyunsaturated type, are necessary for good health. Fat is an economical, and in limited amounts, a wholesome food. Food faddism of any sort should be avoided and significant changes in diet should not be undertaken without medical advice.

In Conclusion

The reduction or control of fat consumption under medical supervision, with reasonable substitution of polyunsaturated fat saturated, fats, is recommended as a possible means of preventing atherosclerosis and decreasing the risk of heart attacks and strokes. This recommendation is based on the best scientific information available at the present time. More complete information must be obtained before final conclusions can be reached. Such information can be obtained only through intensified research into the causes and prevention of atherosclerosis—a program to which the American Heart Association is fully dedicated.

**Ad Hoc Committee on Dietary Fat and Atherosclerosis**

Irvine H. Page, M.D., Chairman, Cleveland, Ohio
Edgar V. Allen, M.D., Rochester, Minnesota
Francis G. Chamberlain, M.D., San Francisco, California
Arthur Keys, Ph.D., Minneapolis, Minnesota
Jeremiah Stamler, M.D., Chicago, Illinois
Fredrick J. Starr, M.D., Boston, Massachusetts

*The Ad Hoc Committee on Dietary Fat and Atherosclerosis reported to the Central Committee for Medical and Community Program of the Association.

http://circ.ahajournals.org/content/circulationaha/23/1/133.full.pdf?wptouch_preview_theme=enabled

Stewart Truswell imported shonky US guidelines, converted to ADGs, then controlled false saturated-fat and sugar stories for 40 years?

Dietary Guidelines for Australian Adults

Endorsed 10 April 2003

1.6 LIMIT SATURATED FAT AND MODERATE TOTAL FAT INTAKE

A Stewart Truswell

BACKGROUND

The first Dietary Guidelines for Australians, published in 1982, recommended, 'Avoid eating too much fat—that is, total fat. The type of fat was not considered, unlike the 1977 Dietary Goals for the United States, which recommended 10 per cent of total energy from saturated fats, 10 per cent from mono-unsaturated fats, and 10 per cent from polyunsaturated fats.

In the second edition of Dietary Guidelines for Australians, published in 1992, the guideline had evolved to 'Eat a diet low in fat and, in particular, low in saturated fat'. The more recent Dietary Guidelines for Older Australians.

REFERENCES


Saturated fatty acids raise plasma LDL cholesterol, a major risk factor for coronary heart disease. Saturated plus trans-fatty acid intakes averaged over 12.5 per cent of energy in Australia in 1995. A population average of 10 per cent of energy is recommended as a realistic target. (pp. 123-124) https://www.nhmrc.gov.au/_files_nhmrc/publications/attachments/n33.pdf

In 1992 ADGs, Stewart Truswell also controlled the sugar recommendation

Coronary heart disease

Sucrose was first implicated as a risk factor for CHD by Yudkin and although the hypothesis gained some popular credibility it was quickly refuted by Willet, in reviewing the evidence, keeps an open mind and notes 'that the hypothesis has not been securely confirmed or refuted'. Truswell, however, reviewed ten case-control studies of sucrose and CHD and found that none supported the hypothesis. One cause of the confusion has been that sugar is often correlated with fat consumption and therefore becomes a confounding factor in population based studies. As Truswell notes, the international scientific community thinks so little of this hypothesis that "no prevention trial of CHD with sugar has been completed, started, planned or even contemplated." A


In addition the revision of the dietary guidelines has changed their order, to better reflect the relative importance of the recommendations being made by dietary guidelines to the Australian diet. The guideline on sugars has been moved down from the previous fourth position, to the new sixth position.

Harmful *Health Stars* advice just a marketing vehicle for industry: Don’t drink plain milk, drink added sugar ++++ and milk powder! It’s a disgrace that University of Sydney’s flawed *Low-GI* methodology helps sell harmful sugary “healthdrinks” to parents and children.

[Image of Nestle Milo](https://twitter.com/gillespi)

Milo’s Low-GI healthdrink is via RR photo
“Mediterranean Diet” excluding red meat a sham because inventor Prof. Walter Willett imposed his faulty choices over historical fact

Many respected nutrition “experts” suggest falsely that carbohydrates essential for human brain to operate**, yet it’s been known for a century – eons! - that even meat-only diets are healthy. Ham-fisted “scientists” also invented those silly false meat and cancer stories

**For example: Jim Mann and A. Stewart Truswell (Editors), Essentials of Human Nutrition (Fourth Edition, 2012), Oxford University Press, p. 39

The measure of statistical strength in observational (associational) studies is the Hazard (or Risk) Ratio (HR or RR). Only if the HR is greater than 2 and preferably greater than 5 ...can one begin to believe that the associated risk factor is the direct cause of the disease of interest. Classic examples for high HR values in epidemiological studies include an 1875 study showing an HR of 2000 for scrotal cancer in London chimney sweeps, and a 1950 study that found the HR for lung cancer was 10-30 in smokers depending on how heavily they smoked. In 1849 John Snow calculated that the HR for infection with cholera was 14 in those London residents who received their (cholera-infected) water from the Southwark and Vauxhall Company; many argue that his study heralded the beginning of modern epidemiology. ...http://www.thenoakesfoundation.org/news/blog/noakes-risk-factors-and-insulin-resistance-part-2

http://www.jbc.org/content/87/3/651.full.pdf

http://www.dcscience.net/2013/04/13/another-update-red-meat-doesnt-kill-you-but-the-spin-is-fascinating/
Entity representing 100,000 US dietitians concedes huge errors; meanwhile, NHMRC, DAA and Diabetes Australia pretend all is fine

The US Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics is “the world’s largest organisation of food and nutrition professionals, representing more than 100,000 registered dietitian nutritionists and nutrition and dietetics technicians”.

By
NINA TEICHOLZ
Updated May 6, 2014 10:25 a.m. ET
"Saturated fat does not cause heart disease”—or so concluded a big study published in March in the journal Annals of Internal Medicine. How could this be? The very cornerstone of dietary advice for generations has been that the saturated fats in butter, cheese and red meat should be avoided because they clog our arteries. For many diet-conscious Americans, it is simply second nature to opt for chicken over sirloin, canola oil over butter.

The new study's conclusion shouldn't surprise anyone familiar with modern nutritional science, however. The fact is, there has never been solid evidence for the idea that these fats cause disease. We only believe this to be the case because nutrition policy has been derailed over the past half-century by a mixture of personal ambition, bad science, politics and bias.

Our distrust of saturated fat can be traced back to the 1950s, to a man named Ancel Benjamin Keys, a scientist at the University of Minnesota. Dr. Keys was formidably persuasive and, through sheer force of will, rose to the top of the nutrition world—even gracing the cover of Time magazine—for relentlessly championing the idea that saturated fats raise cholesterol and, as a result, cause heart attacks.

This idea fell on receptive ears because, at the time, Americans faced a fast-growing epidemic. Heart disease, a rarity only three decades earlier, had quickly become the nation’s No. 1 killer. Even President Dwight D. Eisenhower suffered a heart attack in 1955. Researchers were desperate for answers.

As the director of the largest nutrition study to date, Dr. Keys was in an excellent position to promote his idea. The “Seven Countries” study that he conducted on nearly 13,000 men in the U.S., Japan and Europe ostensibly demonstrated that heart disease wasn’t the inevitable result of aging but could be linked to poor nutrition.

Critics have pointed out that Dr. Keys violated several basic scientific norms in his study. For one, he didn’t choose countries randomly...

http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052702303678404578533780760481486
OBESITY AUSTRALIA ANNUAL SUMMIT

The Charles Perkins Centre — 19-20 November 2014

The Charles Perkins Centre’s main objective is “easing the burden of obesity, diabetes, cardiovascular disease and related conditions”

Attached are randomized-controlled trials and other evidence supporting the case for carbohydrate-restriction as the primary intervention to reverse obesity, fix type 2 diabetes and minimise cardiovascular disease


The New York Times

A Call for a Low-Carb Diet That Embraces Fat

By ANAHAD O’CONNOR  SEPT. 1, 2014

People who avoid carbohydrates and eat more fat, even saturated fat, lose more body fat and have fewer cardiovascular risks than people who follow the low-fat diet that health authorities have favored for decades, a major new study shows.

The findings are unlikely to be the final salvo in what has been a long and often contentious debate about what foods are best to eat for weight loss and overall health. The notion that dietary fat is harmful, particularly saturated fat, arose decades ago from comparisons of disease rates among large national populations.

But more recent clinical studies in which individuals and their diets were assessed over time have produced a more complex picture. Some have provided strong evidence that people can sharply reduce their heart disease risk by eating fewer carbohydrates and more dietary fat, with the exception of trans fats. The new findings suggest that this strategy more effectively reduces body fat and also lowers overall weight.

The new study was financed by the National Institutes of Health and published in the Annals of Internal Medicine. It included a racially diverse group of 150 men and women — a rarity in clinical nutrition studies — who were assigned to follow diets for one year that limited either the amount of carbs or fat that they could eat, but not overall calories.

“To my knowledge, this is one of the first long-term trials that’s given these diets without calorie restrictions,” said Dariush Mozaffarian, the dean of the Friedman School of Nutrition Science and Policy at Tufts University, who was not involved in the new study. “It shows that in a free-living setting, cutting your carbs helps you lose weight without focusing on calories. And that’s really important because someone can change what they eat more easily than trying to cut down on their calories.”


ABC TV’s *Catalyst* and Dr Maryanne Demasi produced four excellent shows that helped to inform Australians about the lack of competence and integrity at the heart of some of the critical dietary and medical advice provided by our GPs and dietitians.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UU3GvRsFHqY

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8GUINKnT1M

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=imJQinU1Mcg

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AY4eTGMe-EY&t=1307s
PART 9: Sample of heavy-hitters in Australian universities, public-health entities and scientific journals who should do more to fix the *Australian Paradox* fraud and/or correct profoundly faulty official dietary advice, helping to reduce widespread harm to public health.
Group of Eight universities solicit taxpayer funding on promise of “excellence” in research, yet Go8 supports Australian Paradox fraud

With our best chance of fixing major problems in society centred on hard information and reliable science, it’s a problem that “findings” from Group of Eight science cannot be trusted. We’ve seen that (outgoing) Group of Eight Chair Michael Spence is indifferent to facts, choosing in the Australian Paradox matter to prioritise Academic Freedom over “excellence” in research, and refusing to correct blatantly false information that is poisoning important public debates – including in the Federal Parliament – and harming public health.

Readers, if you end up agreeing with me that the Australian Paradox paper is an academic disgrace and a menace to public health, you might choose to email Vice-Chancellor Spence - michael.spence@sydney.edu.au - or others on the left who run the expensive Group of Eight. Or perhaps you will write to one or more of the academic and public-health entities and officials mentioned in this section (Part 9).

So too, writing to Federal and State parliamentarians may be useful, as they increasingly are having their credibility damaged by citing shonky Group of Eight nutrition “science”. Sadly, their children and/or friends - like ours - also tend to be harmed by the NHMRC’s profoundly faulty official dietary advice that has its origins in the overconfident incompetence and worse tolerated in Group of Eight nutrition “science”.

Notably, Parliamentarians are the officials who have to find the funding via taxpayers to mop up the misery inflicted by the growing pandemics of obesity, type 2 diabetes, cardiovascular disease, obesity-related cancers and dementia, all of which are maladies boosted by the false and harmful diet-and-health information widely promoted and/or supported by university managements, academics and other careerists in the public-health space:

- http://www.aph.gov.au/Senators_and_Members/Parliamentarian_Search_Results?q=&sen=1&par=1&gen=0&ps=0
University of Sydney Academic Board advised of big *Paradox* problems in 2013, disingenuously chooses to pretend there’s no problem

http://sydney.edu.au/secretariat/academic-board-committees/academic-board/membership.shtml
Dietitians Association of Australia (DAA) leads the way in suppressing LCHF cure for Type 2 diabetes that was GPs’ standard in 1923

[Image: Logo of Dietitians Association of Australia]

**Board of Directors and Executive**

Elizabeth Kellett, President

Elizabeth is an Advanced Accredited Practising Dietitian who graduated as a dietitian from the University of Adelaide in 1975. After completing a nutrition degree at the University of Adelaide in 1973, she has worked in a range of organisations and settings in South Australia, including Chief Dietitian, Adelaide Children’s Hospital, and in community health and private practice. She worked in 3D Ltd, Vice-President.

Napier, Great Yarmouth, Great Britain, and Canada.

Dr Helen Stuckey, Chair of DAA

Helen is an Advanced Accredited Practicing Dietitian. She completed a Bachelor of Science and a Graduate Diploma in Nutrition and Dietetics from QUT in 1997. She has worked as a Clinical Dietitian in Mount Gambier, Alice Springs, Scotland and London. She worked as a Dietitian at Princess Alexandra Hospital in Brisbane from 2013 to 2016. She was Medical Team Leader at Royal Brisbane and Women’s Hospital and spent 2012 in the role of Assistant Director of Business & Services, PHD, University of Melbourne.

Claire Hewat

CEO Dietitians Association of Australia

Canberra, Australia - Health, Wellbeing and Food

Current

Dietitians Association of Australia PDA/Chair Member of the Board of Directors

Previous

South Western Sydney Area Health Service

Education

University of Sydney

[Image: Board Members]

DAA regularly responds to inaccurate or misleading stories on nutrition in the media:


**Our Spokespeople**

**New South Wales**

**Professor Clare Collins**

PhD, BSc, Dip Nutr&Diet, Dip Clin Epi, ANPTR AN

Areas of Interest: Children’s health, evidence-based practice, weight loss and diet, family nutrition, cystic fibrosis, nutrition research methods.

[View Full Profile]

**Dr Trent Watson**

PhD, Biostatistics, APD AN

Areas of Interest: Obesity, diabetes, general nutrition, vitamins and mineral supplements, diet, men’s health, sports nutrition, nutrition and fatigue.

[View Full Profile]

**Dr Helen Stuckey**

BSc, MSc, Dip Dietetics, PhD, APD AN

Areas of Interest: Metabolic syndromes, diabetes and pre-diabetes, overweight and obesity, food allergy, and intolerance, carbohydrates (sugars, starches and monosaccharides) and food labelling.

[View Full Profile]

**Dr Rosemary Stanton**, chief defender of deeply flawed Australian Dietary Guidelines


**Public Statements**

Marika Sboros series of blog posts

DNA is aware of a series of blog posts by Marika Sboros. Starting on 23 January 2017, we provided responses to many questions Ms Sboros asked, not based on Australian dietetians by several months in 2016.

From our nutrition, her line of questioning indicated her blog would be critical of DNA.


http://foodmed.net/2017/01/23/daa-bed-big-food-low-fat-paleo-lchf/

http://foodmed.net/2017/01/24/daa-talking-heads-time-for-new-conversation/


http://foodmed.net/2017/01/30/daa-targets-dietitians-with-fake-news/
Nor can NHMRC’s or Diabetes entities’ advice be trusted, given they suppress GPs’ LCHF advice for diabetes that was standard in 1923.
For decades, the influential Australian Heart Foundation has promoted profoundly faulty US diet-and-health advice on dietary fat, saturated fat, carbohydrates, cholesterol and cardiovascular disease. It remains a menace to public health.

![Heart Foundation logo and images of food products](https://heartfoundation.org.au/about-us/our-charity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical Issues Committee</th>
<th>Research Committee</th>
<th>Cardiovascular Health Advisory Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof David Brieger, Chair</td>
<td>Prof Anushka Patel (Chair)</td>
<td>Prof Leonard Kritharides, Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Derek Chew, Deputy Chair</td>
<td>Prof Chris Semsarian (Deputy Chair)</td>
<td>Dr Jennifer Johns, National President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Prof David Sullivan</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof James Sharman</td>
<td>Prof Garry Jennings AO, Chief Medical Advisor, Heart Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Prof Andrea Driscoll</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof Livia Hool</td>
<td>Prof David Brieger, Chair Clinical Issues Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Gemma Figtree</td>
<td>Prof David Kaye</td>
<td>Dr Jennifer Johns, National President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Genevieve Gabbi</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof John Atherton</td>
<td>Prof David Dunstan, Chair National Physical Activity Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Graham Hillis</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof Tom Briffa</td>
<td>Dr Mick Adams, Chair National Aboriginal Health Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Marcus Itton</td>
<td>Dr Warrick Bishop</td>
<td>Mr Nick Goddard, Chair National Food and Nutrition Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Maria Sheehan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prof Leonard Arnolda, Chair National Blood Pressure and Vascular Disease Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Mark Harris (NSW)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Roger Wilkinson, Queensland Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Phillip Roberts-Thomson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prof Jonathan Kalman, CSANZ representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Siaw-Teng Liaw</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr John Aloizos AM, expert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diabetes Australia is governed by a Board and is chaired by an independent President and Directors from our member organisations. Currently the Board is led by the Honourable Julia Banks as the Diabetes Australia President.

Current Board members:
- Hon Julia Banks AO, Independent President and Board Chair
- Associate Professor Ali Andreasoultz
- Ms Tracy Aylen
- Mr Craig Beyers
- Mr Chris Jose
- Mr Robert Manning
- Mr John Townend AM
- Mr Les Tutt
- Dr Moira Watson
- Associate Professor Paul Williams
- Professor Sophia Zournas

Read more about the Board and Directors

Chief Executive Officer

Professor Greg Johnson

Greg Johnson joined Diabetes Victoria as Chief Executive in January 2003. He was Acting Chief Executive of Diabetes Australia from July 2009 to February 2011 and was appointed permanently in November 2012.

He has over 25 years experience in healthcare leadership in CEO and Board roles and has lived and worked in NSW, Victoria, SA and Tasmania.

He is an Adjunct Professor with Deakin University and holds a degree in pharmacy, post-graduate qualifications in hospital pharmacy and health service management, and a masters degree in business administration.

He has participated in a wide range of health industry and government advisory committees and has a particular interest in prevention and has led the establishment of a number of leading diabetes prevention initiatives. Greg is also a passionate advocate for people affected by diabetes and raising awareness of the seriousness and impact of diabetes on the health and productivity of Australia.

Senior Management Team

- General Manager Corporate Services - Paul Southcott
- General Manager NDSS - Susan Davidson
- National Policy and Program Director - Taryn Back
The Royal Australian College of General Practitioners (RACGP) is “responsible for maintaining standards for quality clinical practice, education and training, and research in Australian general practice”

RACGP’s harmful high-carb advice: p. 33

The RACGP’s mission is to improve the health and wellbeing of all people in Australia by supporting GPs, general practice registrars and medical students through its principal activities of education, training and research and by assessing doctors’ skills and knowledge, supplying ongoing professional development activities, developing resources and guidelines, helping GPs with issues that affect their practice, and developing standards that general practices use to ensure high quality healthcare

Council Members

Dr Tim Koh
MBBS FRACGP
Chair RACGP Council
Chair RACGP Western Australia

Dr Bastian M Seidel
MBBS, PhD, MACHI, MRCGP, FRACGP
President

Dr Edwin Kruys
MD, FRACGP
Vice President
Chair RACGP Queensland

Dr Mark Miller
MBBS DRANZCOG FRACGP
Censor-in-Chief

Dr Clare Ballingall
MBChB FRACGP
Chair RACGP Tasmania

Dr Daniel Byrne
MBBS FRACGP
Chair RACGP South Australia and Northern Territory
Chair RACGP Specific Interests

Dr Cameron Loy
MBBS BMedSc(Hon) FRACGP FARGP DCH DRANZCOG
Chair RACGP Victoria

Christine Nixon, APM
Co-opted Council Member

Dr Ayman Shenouda
MBBCH, FRACGP, FARGP, Dip Derm. UK
Chair RACGP Rural

Mr Martin Walsh
Chair of Finance, Audit and Risk Management Committee
Board Member of Oxygen Pty. Ltd.
Co-opted Council Member

Dr Mary Therese Wyatt
BSc (Biomedical), Dip Ed (Maths), MBBS, DCH, FRACGP
General Practice Registrar Representative

Dr Gean Yeo
FRACGP MBBS, GAICD
Chair RACGP New South Wales and Australian Capital Territory

The main priority of the AHPRA is supposed to be "Protecting the public". Instead, it insists on harmful high-carb treatment of obesity and diabetes.
Federal and State departments of Health must lift their game, start promoting effective LCHF cure for obesity and type 2 diabetes


The Executive Board comprises of 10 deputy secretaries who are directly responsible for a specific division within our departmental structure:

- Kym Peake, Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services (chair)
- Chris Asquini, Deputy Secretary, Operations
- Amanda Catterson, Deputy Secretary, Community Services Programs and Design
- David Clements, Deputy Secretary, Organisational Redevelopment
- Anne Congleton, Deputy Secretary, Community Participation, Sport and Recreation, Health and Wellbeing
- Frances Diver, Deputy Secretary, Health Service Performance and Programs
- Nick Foa, Deputy Secretary, Sport and Recreation, Infrastructure, International Engagement, and Director of Housing
- Elizabeth Langdon, Deputy Secretary, People, Capability and Oversight
- Melissa Skilbeck, Deputy Secretary, Regulation, Health Protection and Emergency Management
- Terry Symonds, Deputy Secretary, Portfolio Strategy and Reform
- Lance Wallace, Deputy Secretary, Corporate Services

If MDPI Nutrients’ Editor-in-Chief and/or Editorial Board were competent, the Paradox paper would have been formally retracted

Editors
Prof. Dr. Peter Howe
Joint Editor-in-Chief
Director, Clinical Nutrition Research Centre, University of Newcastle, Callaghan, NSW 2308, Australia

Prof. Dr. Jonathan Buckley
Joint Editor-in-Chief
Alliance for Research in Exercise, Nutrition and Activity (ARENA), Sansom Institute for Health Research, University of South Australia, GPO Box 2471, Adelaide, South Australia, Australia 5001

Prof. Dr. Lynda M. Williams
Associate Editor
Metabolic Health Group, Rowett Institute of Nutrition and Health, University of Aberdeen, Greenburn Road, Aberdeen AB21 9SB, UK

Editorial Board
Prof. Dr. Colin Binns
Faculty of Health Sciences, School of Public Health, Curtin University, PO Box U1987 Perth WA 6845, Australia

Prof. Dr. Jeffrey B. Blumberg
Jean Mayer USDA Human Nutrition Research Center on Aging, Tufts University, 711 Washington Street, Boston, MA 02111, USA

Prof. Dr. Jennie Brand-Miller
School of Molecular Bioscience, The University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia

Prof. Dr. Lindsay Brown
School of Health and Wellbeing, University of Southern Queensland, Toowoomba, Australia

Dr. Tracy Burrows
School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Health, University of Newcastle, Newcastle, NSW 2308, Australia

Prof. Dr. David Cameron-Smith
Chair in Nutrition, Liggins Institute, The University of Auckland, Private Bag 92019, Auckland 1142, New Zealand

Dr. Anitra C. Carr
Department of Pathology, University of Otago, Christchurch Street: 2 Riccarton Ave, Christchurch 8011, New Zealand

Prof. Dr. Margarida Castell
Dept. Fisiologia Facultat de Farmàcia, Institut de Recerca en Nutrició i Seguretat Alimentària (INSA-UB), Universitat de Barcelona, Av. Joan XXIII s/n, 08028 Barcelona, Spain

Prof. Dr. Carlo Catassi
Head, Department of Pediatrics, Università Politecnica delle Marche, Ancona, Italy; President, Italian Society for Pediatric Gastroenterology, Hepatology and Nutrition (SIGENP)

Dr. Karen Charlton
Associate Professor, School of Medicine, Faculty of Science, Medicine and Health, University of Wollongong, Wollongong, NSW, 2522, Australia

Dr. Oliver Chen
Associate Professor, Antioxidants Research Laboratory, Jean Mayer USDA Human Nutrition Research Center on Aging, Friedman School of Nutrition Science and Policy, Tufts University, 711 Washington St., Boston, MA 02111, USA

Dr. Alison M. Coates
Associate Professor, Nutritional Physiology Research Centre, Sansom Institute for Health Research, University of South Australia, GPO Box 2471, Adelaide, South Australia 5001, Australia

Prof. Dr. Winston Craig
Department of Nutrition and Wellness, Marsh Hall 301C, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan 49104-0210, USA

Prof. Dr. Michael Felix Fenech
CSIRO, Animal, Food and Health Sciences, PO Box 10041, Adelaide BC, SA, 5000, Australia

Prof. Lynnette Ferguson
Discipline of Nutrition and Dietetics, Faculty of Medical and Health Sciences, The University of Auckland, Private Bag 92019, Auckland 1142, New Zealand

Dr. Barbara A. Fielding
Department of Nutritional Sciences, Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, University of Surrey, Guildford, Surrey GU2 7XH, UK
Prof. Dr. Vicki Flood  
Allied Health, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Sydney, Westmead Hospital, Western Sydney Local Health District, Sydney, NSW 2006 Australia

Dr. William B. Grant  
Sunlight, Nutrition, and Health Research Center, P.O. Box 641603, San Francisco, CA 94164-1603, USA

Prof. Dr. Mark D. Haub  
Physical Activity and Nutrition Clinical Research Consortium, Department of Food, Nutrition, Dietetics and Health, 212 Justin Hall, Kansas State University Manhattan, Kansas 66506, USA

Dr. Leanne Hodson  
Associate Professor, Oxford Centre for Diabetes, Endocrinology and Metabolism, University of Oxford Churchill Hospital, Headington OX3 7LE, UK

Prof. Dr. Bengt Jeppsson  
Skåne University Hospital, Inga Marie Nilssons gata 47, (Entrance 42) 3rd floor, SE-205 02 Malmö, Sweden
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Lack of competence in quality control and follow-up means dishonest Australian Paradox defence sitting in BMC Public Health journal.

Trends in added sugar supply and consumption in Australia: there is an Australian Paradox

Alan W Barclay and Jeannie C Brand-Miller

Abstract

In 2011, Barclay and Brand-Miller reported the observation that trends in refined sugar consumption in Australia were the inverse of trends in overweight and obesity. The Australian Paradox. Rikers et al. claim that the Australian Paradox is based on incomplete data because the sources utilised did not incorporate estimates for imported processed foods. This assertion is incorrect. Indeed, national nutrition surveys, sugar consumption data from the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organisation, the Australian Bureau of Statistics and Australian beverage industry data all incorporated data on imported products.

Keywords

Public health – Sugar – Obesity – Food supply

The Australian Paradox has not been refuted

In the July 2013 issue of BMC Public Health, Rikers et al. [1] attempt to estimate Australian refined sucrose supply and consumption over recent decades. They conclude that it is not possible to produce a reliable and robust estimate because of data limitations and a lack of current data sources. Nonetheless, their analysis suggests that imported foods are now a greater contributor to intake of refined sucrose than they were in the past. Common sense would suggest that it’s true because over the past decade we have imported more foods in general, but this finding does not prove that added sugars intake from all sources is now higher than in the past. Indeed, new data indicate that Australia now exports more foods and ingredients containing refined sucrose than 10 years ago [2]. There is evidence that not only Australians, but Americans are consuming less refined sugars than a decade ago [3].

In 2011, Barclay and Brand-Miller [4, 5] reported three separate lines of evidence indicating downward
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University of Sydney and Group of Eight supporting scientific fraud, and thus defrauding Australian taxpayers on a massive scale

In an epic failure of leadership in 2016, University of Sydney Vice-Chancellor and Chair of the Group of Eight, Dr Michael Spence, ditched the Go8’s promise of “excellence” in research, as he embraced Academic Freedom and refused to correct blatantly false information tending to harm public health. Critically, formal retraction is the standard approach to fixing false and harmful “findings” on the scientific record. Over 600 faulty peer-reviewed papers are retracted each year (~2 per day). Supporting false and harmful “findings” published without proper quality control is unethical and unacceptable: http://retractionwatch.com/2016/12/05/retractions-holding-steady-650-fy2016/

While soliciting billions of dollars from hapless taxpayers and politicians, the University of Sydney and its Group of Eight partners promised to pursue “excellence” in research; yet post-funding, they actively support blatantly false, harmful research “findings”!

The Group of Eight: Research intensive universities promote excellence in research...integrity is the requirement, excellence the standard...the application of rigorous standards of academic excellence...placing a higher reliance on evidence than on authority...the excellence, breadth and volume of their research...help position the standards and benchmarks for research quality...research intensive universities are crucial national assets...[they have] the right and responsibility to publish their results and participate in national debates...provide information that supports community well-being...they are citadels of ability and excellence... Excellence attracts excellence...The reputation of these universities reflects substance, not public relations...the research intensive universities are critical. The way in which they operate ensures the highest possible standards of performance across a broad range of disciplines and helps set national standards of excellence. https://go8.edu.au/sites/default/files/docs/role-importanceofresearchunis.pdf
Finally, readers, that request again: If you consider anything in this document to be factually incorrect or otherwise unreasonable, please email me on strathburnstation@gmail.com. I will correct any errors, if any, as soon as possible.

--

rory robertson (phone +61 414 703 471)
economist and former-fattie
https://twitter.com/OzParadoxdotcom

ABC TV Lateline re Australian Paradox scandal: http://www.abc.net.au/lateline/content/2015/s4442720.htm


RR to-and-fro with USyd VC and Chair Go8 Dr Michael Spence, with RR highlighting what appears to be blatant scientific fraud by USyd, and USyd & Go8 management defrauding taxpayers on a massive scale: http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/Go8Chair-academicfreedom.pdf

Tragically, USyd Charles Perkins Centre researchers are falsely exonerating as harmless the substance that’s promoting early death for many in mobs Charlie fought hard to protect:
http://www.abc.net.au/news/2016-02-12/scullion-says-sugar-is-killing-remote-communities/7162974
http://www.foodpolitics.com/2016/03/sugar-in-australia-its-better-for-you/


Comments, criticisms, questions, compliments, whatever welcome at strathburnstation@gmail.com
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