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

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 Lateline report presented the main aspects of my critique - including the FAQ’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 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 15-page final Investigation Report. In my opinion, the University of Sydney’s Academic Board should take the time to assess those two documents – the 36-page complaint and the A&CA’s 15-page response – then force the retraction of the academic disgrace and menace to public health that is the infamous Australian Paradox paper.
Journalist, prolific author, “footballer who can type” and Fellow of the University of Sydney Senate, Peter FitzSimons, shines a bright light on the Charles Perkins Centre’s Australian Paradox scandal, in Chapter 7 of his new best-seller:

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 it’s a “myth” that added sugar (100% carbohydrate) causes type 2 diabetes? Below, Rory Robertson presents graphic evidence on the University of Sydney’s Australian Paradox fraud, highlighting how shonky science is harming public health.
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, Boonka – 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’ but the public continues to suffer from a ‘myth of a sugar-free fairy tale.”
The findings confirm an "Australian Paradox" - a substantial decline in refined sugars intake over the same period in which obesity has increased. The implication is that efforts to reduce sugar intake may reduce consumption of energy and the taxpayers' purse of funds for hospitals.

This report was written to highlight the need for action on sugar consumption in Australia and to encourage individuals to reduce their intake. The study's results suggest that reducing sugar intake is a key factor in combatting obesity.

Moreover, the study also highlights the role of government and industry in promoting healthy eating habits. It is important for these stakeholders to take responsibility and work together to ensure that the population's diet is balanced and free from excessive sugar consumption.
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.10 (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,11 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.12

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 serious fraud VP!

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 ringer 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 its 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.

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 dietician with the most impeccable credentials in the country, Dr Rosemary Stanton of the University of NSW – who has graciously helped me a great deal 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, hulloa! – 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.**

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’.  

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 G.I. food at each meal and snack’.  

Okay, good to know. To find out about dietary G.I. 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’, 13 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’.  

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’. 14 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 to 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 Greepool 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 McNeill 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
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: http://retractionwatch.com/2016/12/05/retractions-holding-steady-650-fy2016/

Following Peter FitzSimon’s excellent summary, in this section 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. 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, taxes and other measures to reduce sugar consumption will be unhelpful in reducing obesity:

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.


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: http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/diabetes.pdf

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. 13-15 below)

In short, Professor Brand-Miller and her sidekick 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.15-16).

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” that Vice-Chancellor Michael Spence in 2012 assured me was properly conducted (p.23), clearly was a sham: http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/quickquizresearch.pdf

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: http://www.mdpi.com/journal/nutrients/special_issues/carbohydrates

In the history of the world, how many times has a Guest Editor said to herself - as the lead author - “No, I couldn’t possibly publish my paper, because it is 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.

Regards,
Rory (ph. +61 414 703 471)
Charles Perkins Centre scientists’ own published graphic evidence of “a consistent and substantial decline”, 1980-2010
Charles Perkins Centre scientists’ graphic evidence of “a consistent and substantial decline”, 1980-2010 (continued)

Figure 4a: National surveys - Children

Figure 5: Australian sugar industry’s measure of sugar consumption

Figure 6: Annual change in sugar via sugary drinks (tonnes per year)

Figure 6a: Annual change in sugar via sugary drinks (kg per person per year)


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

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

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 hiding strongly that their key series for that 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. 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 the consumption of highly processed foods and drinks meant that statisticians’ sugar-counting exercises were marred from counting bags of sugar to counting grams of added sugar in millions of kinds of processed foods and drinks: http://www.australianparadox.com/pdf/New-nonsense-based-sugarreport.pdf; https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C4C281EmAow

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!


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”

University of Sydney unreasonably “buried” my clear evidence

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

So, why did Vice-Chancellor Michael Spence, his Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) Jill Trewella and their “independent investigator” Professor Robert Clark AO (University of NSW) unreasonably - dishonestly? – bury my evidence that the FAO (self-evidently) faked its conspicuous flat line for that curious 2000-2003 timeframe (instead of just writing “not available”, after the ABS stopped providing real data)? And why do they pretend the authors’ other four indicators all trend down?

Readers, some I have spoken to suspect the University of Sydney’s - and the Group of Eight’s - highest management wanted to avoid the embarrassing need to formally retract the infamous Australian Paradox paper that was self-published by a highly influential scientist who brings 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 food companies and pharmaceutical companies. What do YOU suspect is going on?

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 write to one or more of the following:

- https://go8.edu.au/page/go8-board
- http://www.aph.gov.au/Senators_and_Members/Parliamentarian_Search_Results?q=&sen=1&par=1&gen=0&ps=0
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.

The Australian Paradox fraud falsely exonerates added sugar as a menace to public health

A spoonful of sugar is not so bad

Bill Sharpe was not amused. He logged on to the National Health and Medical Research Council’s website a few weeks ago and read the draft dietary guidelines recommendations.

“My reaction was that the NHMRC is supposed to be the bastion of evidence-based nutrition,” recalls Sharpe, consultant dietitian 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 Sharpe’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, Sharpe 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.

It doesn’t actually do any direct harm to the human body. It doesn’t raise blood cholesterol or raise blood pressure or cause cancer,” says Brand-Miller, known for her book The Low GI Diet. The GI stands for glycemic index, a measure of the effect of carbohydrates on blood sugar levels.

According to Brand-Miller, these findings sit neatly with data from the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation: national dietary surveys and industry. “Australians have been eating less and less sugar, and rates of obesity have been increasing,” she says.

https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B9nI_ydjDXxkTlhscFNPR2RkcFk/edit
Plenty of evidence that sugar and sugary drinks are a menace to public health, especially Indigenous health

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


The University of Sydney’s Charles Perkins Centre, the sugar industry and the sugary drinks industry use the *Australian Paradox* paper and sham Green Pool series to mislead the Australian Parliament on the extent to which sugar causes obesity (and so type 2 diabetes).

**Does added sugar cause weight gain?**

This form may be obesogenic [x] [xii] 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/

---

**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 1960 to 2003. The research also found that when all sources of...
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

Despite ABS advice, Green Pool pretends sham series reliable

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

A valid criticism?


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 FAS 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 indicating 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.


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


http://www.nature.com/ejcn/journal/v69/n11/full/ejcn2015105a.html

2015: Is it scientific fraud to pretend sham Green Pool data reliable?
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 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 her Australian Paradox findings remain as valid as ever.

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 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.

Then Brand-Miller again 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 15-page Investigation Report. The University of Sydney’s Academic Board should assess those two documents – the 36-page complaint and the A&CA’s response – then force a retraction of the academic disgrace and menace to public health that is the infamous Australian Paradox paper.

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 University of Sydney to properly correct or formally retract its paper - despite being repeatedly advised that it is dominated by serious problems including a series that was discontinued as unreliable and then faked - means it is 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.
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 the problem of false “findings” on the scientific record. Over 600 faulty peer-reviewed papers are retracted each year (~2 per day). Supporting blatantly false “findings” published without proper quality control is unusual 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
Just as the University of Sydney scientists and management pretend there are no serious problems, so too does University of Newcastle’s Professor Peter Howe, the Editor in Chief of pay-as-you-publish, no-need-for-quality-control e-journal Nutrients
What do you think? After five years, does the *Australian Paradox* scandal involve serious research misconduct?

![Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research](https://www.nhmrc.gov.au/_files_nhmrc/file/research/research-integrity/r39_australian_code_responsible_conduct_research_150811.pdf)

**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.

Disturbing financial conflict of interest

Vice-Chancellor Michael Spence’s University of Sydney and its *Australian Paradox* authors operate a (50% owned) *Glycemic Index* business that exists in part to get paid by industry to put “Low GI” healthy stamps on products that are up to 99.4% added sugar. The University community must have been proud when its 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 (with its “strict nutrition criteria” limit of 99.4% added sugar) that promotes sugary “Low GI” health products to diabetics, for up to $6,000 a pop.
Is it a problem that Low-GI Professor Stephen Colagiuri - the main author of Canberra’s *National Diabetes Strategy: 2016-2020* - and his University of Sydney’s *Australian Paradox* authors have falsely exonerated modern doses of added 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.

---

Here is the tragedy of modern nutrition “science” and advice: The Australian Paradox is just tip of a huge iceberg of incompetence and worse that has resulted in “scientists” and GPs knowing less about fixing type 2 diabetes today than they did 100 years ago.

Given the proven low-carb diet cure for type 2 diabetes below, is it a problem that careeers who drafted Canberra’s National Diabetes Strategy (suppressing the diet cure) tend to be heavily involved with “Big Pharma” (which benefits from suppression)?
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, tending to harm the obese and diabetic.


See Dr Jason Fung, at minutes 14:00 & 37:00 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FcLoaVQN3rc
Charlie Perkins’ peoples dying young via type 2 diabetes on misguided mouse diet (~60% carbs) advised by Charles Perkins Centre


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


Box 2 – Estimated energy availability and macronutrient profile, overall and by community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy intake</th>
<th>Community A</th>
<th>Community B</th>
<th>Community C</th>
<th>All communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protein</td>
<td>12.5% (0.3)</td>
<td>14.1% (0.8)</td>
<td>13.4% (0.6)</td>
<td>12.7% (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fat</td>
<td>24.5% (0.4)</td>
<td>31.6% (1.5)</td>
<td>33.5% (1.1)</td>
<td>25.7% (0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturated fat</td>
<td>9.4% (0.3)</td>
<td>11.6% (0.6)</td>
<td>12.1% (0.3)</td>
<td>9.7% (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbohydrate</td>
<td>62.1% (0.8)</td>
<td>53.3% (1.8)</td>
<td>52.1% (1.1)</td>
<td>60.7% (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugars</td>
<td>34.3% (0.8)</td>
<td>28.9% (2.2)</td>
<td>25.7% (1.8)</td>
<td>33.4% (0.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response of C57Bl/6 mice to a carbohydrate-free diet

Sahian Borghjd and Richard David Feinman
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Abstract

High fat feeding in rodents generally leads to obesity and insulin resistance whereas in humans this is only seen if dietary carbohydrate is also high, the result of the anabolic effect of poor regulation of glucose and insulin. A previous study of C57Bl6 mice (Kennedy AR, et al.: Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab (2007) 292 E1724-1739) appeared to show the kind of beneficial effects of calorie restriction that is seen in humans but that diet was unusually low in protein (5%). In the current study, we tested a zero-carbohydrate diet that had a higher protein content (20%). Mice on the zero-carbohydrate diet, despite similar caloric intake, consistently gained more weight than animals consuming standard chow, attaining a dramatic difference by week 16 (46.1 ± 1.38 g vs. 30.4 ± 1.00 g for the chow group). Consistent with the obese phenotype, experimental mice had fatty livers and hearts as well as large fat deposits in the abdomino-pelvic cavity, and showed impaired glucose clearance after intraperitoneal injection. In sum, the response of mice to a carbohydrate-free diet was greater weight gain and metabolic dysfunctions in distinction to the response in humans where low carbohydrate diets cause greater weight loss than isocaloric controls. The results suggest that rodent models of obesity may be most valuable in the understanding of how metabolic mechanisms can work in ways different from the effect in humans.

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 products promoted the “need for” and widespread use of expensive but ineffective drugs (Statins).
Low-fat *Australian Dietary Guidelines* based on shonky US science re false demonisation of dietary fat, esp. saturated fat in meat & dairy

Low-fat Australian Dietary Guidelines based on shonky US science re false demonisation of dietary fat, esp. saturated fat in meat & dairy

Dietary Fat and Its Relation to Heart Attacks and Strokes

Circulation, Volume XXIII, January 1961

Circulation, February XXIII, January 1961

Circulation, February XXIII, January 1961

Dietary Fat, Heart Attacks and Strokes

What makes people fat?
For many years, nutritionists have taught that too much of almost any kind of food could be converted to body fat. Recent research has shown this to be wrong; in almost all cases, the only thing that adds to body fat is the fat we eat.

It seems the body does not like turning protein into fat, and will only convert carbohydrates into body fat if you eat huge amounts. Carbohydrates are generally used to power the body. Any excess is stored as glycogen in the muscles, and can also increase the energy used for metabolism. It's not until you eat more than 500 grams of carbohydrate at one sitting—the amount in more than 30 slices of bread—that the body converts it to fat.

This means we should stop avoiding bread and blame the spread instead.

Alcohol, so often blamed for excess fat, is not directly converted to body fat. It's obvious, since alcoholics who take in many calories from alcohol but eat little food are almost always thin. Alcohol, however, does contribute indirectly to body fat by making it more difficult for the body to burn up the fats in food. Alcohol plus fat is therefore a bad combination for those who gain weight easily.

Sugar (a rapidly absorbed carbohydrate) when combined with fat may have a similar effect in preventing the body burning fat to provide energy. But in all cases, it's fatty foods that are the root cause of excess weight.

http://circ.ahajournals.org/content/circulationaha/23/1/133.full.pdf+wptouch_preview_theme=enabled
Low-fat Australian Dietary Guidelines based on shonky US science re false demonisation of dietary fat, esp. saturated fat in meat & dairy

Even now, #1 dietary evil is saturated fat (2013 edition)

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

- High cholesterol, Triglycerides unimportant
- Bad cholesterol (LDL-C), Good cholesterol (HDL-C)
- Modifiers LDL atherogenic, Oxidised, Glycated, Apo(a)/Lp(a), Small Dense LDL
- Triglycerides are important!

A/Prof Ken Sikaris - ‘Blood Tests to assess your Cardiovascular Risk’


https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9BFri-nH1v8
Entity representing 100,000 US dietitians concedes huge errors; meanwhile, Dietitians Association of Australia pretends 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”.

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 formidable 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…
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


http://www.strathburn.com
Strathburn Cattle Station is a proud partner of YALARI, Australia’s leading provider of quality boarding-school educations for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander teenagers. Check it out at http://www.strathburn.com/yalari.html


The New York Times

A Call for a Low-Carb Diet That Embraces Fat

By ANAHAD O’CONNOR SEPTEMBER 2, 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=8GUIBNKnT1M

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

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AY4eTGMe-EY&t=1307s
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 yoghurts
- 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

GOOD CALORIES, BAD CALORIES
FATS, CARBS, AND THE CONTROVERSIAL SCIENCE OF DIET AND HEALTH
GARY TAUBES

SWEET POISON
WHY SUGAR MAKES US FAT
DAVID GILLESPIE
NEW YORK TIMES BESTSELLER

“A page-turner... A gripping read for anyone who has ever tried to eat healthily.” —The Economist

THE BIG FAT SURPRISE
Why Butter, Meat & Cheese Belong in a Healthy Diet

NINA TEICHOLZ

GARY TAUBES

The Case Against Sugar
From the best-selling author of
Why We Get Fat
Finally, 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.

--

rory robertson

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

www.strathburn.com

Strathburn Cattle Station is a proud partner of YALARI, Australia’s leading provider of quality boarding-school educations for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander teenagers. Check it out at http://www.strathburn.com/yalari.php