

# No, Plastics Are Not Lowering Your Testosterone Levels - Real Science Explained Inside

1367 upvotes | 8 September, 2017 | by InvoluntarySickCunt

---

**This post is in response to another community member's post that essentially amounts to fear mongering over the use of plastics. The fact that almost no one in the comments, including multiple ECs, questioned the validity of the linked literature is worrying, and illustrates the need for a quick run-down of scientific skepticism.**

First off, let me say that bringing up topics like estrogen-mimicking plasticizers is completely valid and important. However, stating that "plastics are the tobacco of the 21st century" without a wealth of credible primary literature is absurd and akin to stating that "water is a chemical in weed-killer so it must be bad for you".

**Why you should trust my judgement:** I am a molecular biologist and immunologist who is active in the academic sphere and have expertise in *in vitro* cellular assays. This is a fancy way of saying that I grow lots of cells in plastic dishes and then look at them in different ways, and it's how most of these studies are conducted. Also, it's my job to evaluate academic literature.

**Ok let's do this I'll try to make it as entertaining as possible.**

---

## Polymer Chemistry - also known as REEEEEEEEEEEEEEE

As mentioned in the original article, some specific types of plastic polymer are embedded with *plasticizers* - essentially molecules added to the polymer matrix to change the physical properties of the material. Now most plastics are really just long carbon chains arranged horizontally with some interlinking vertical bonds, kind of like the lines on a sheet of paper. Plasticizers insert themselves in the spaces between the lines and push them apart, making the material more flexible.

Knowing that there are many types of plastic and many ways of making each type you might ask - "well what kind of plastics should I watch out for? Am I really being dosed by 'big tampon' with endocrine disruptors until I get a period so they can make even more money?" Well big tampon may be trying, but substances recognized as harmful by the primary literature are really only commonly found in the following materials:

1. Polyvinyl chloride (PVC)
2. Nitrile (like the rubber gloves your doctor wears for your weekly prostate exam)
3. Polyesters (this is more of a class of plastics)

Now keep in mind that polymer chemistry is really a black magic in itself and nothing is as simple as, "yes this water bottle will give you bitch tits" or "no this prostate stimulator will not - unless you stick it in your mouth". So instead of going through a list of plastics, of which there are many, and their production methods let's just get to refuting the literature linked in the OP. If you're *dying* to talk physical chem you can contact me and we can both pretend like we know what's going on after reading wikipedia.

---

## Das Swedish Study

The first claim the article makes is that a Swedish study (n=200) found a correlation between maternal phthalate levels and "anogenital distance" - that's the distance from the anus to the genitals (commonly referred to as the scrote or undercarriage) after 20 months of life.

First of all, you have to go on a wild goose chase to even understand why anogenital distance was used. It's actually a method of measuring reproductive toxicity as the trait is under androgen-receptor control. *However*, this method is really only used in animal studies and is not commonly applied to humans. Secondly, looking at Table 5 as presented in the study, the researchers present a model of confidence intervals that are not even close to significant. Not only that, but the article provides no evidence that (1) the phthalates in the maternal urine samples measured were from incidental ingestion of plasticizers or that (2) the correlation between maternal phthalate levels and scrote length has anything to do with the correlation between you drinking water out of a microwaved bottle and your dick shrinking up into an infinitesimally dense and small point, birthing a black hole.

**This study is completely irrelevant to the original posters point.**

## Study #2: The Mysterious Case of Shitty Workers' Rights in China

Luckily I didn't even have to waste my time reading deciphering jargon and ugly figures this time around because this isn't even a research paper. It's a huffington post article **that literally says half way down the page, "This data should not raise alarm bells for men who don't work in chemical factories"**.

The study the article sites was looking at levels of free testosterone in men who worked in a plastic factory in China- now this may be news to some of you guys but working in a Chinese plastic factory with no OSHA to save you is quite a bit different than drinking from a water bottle. And don't worry, we will get to the water bottle data soon enough.

## Study #3: Estrogen-dependent proliferation of MCF7 Cells, or, 18 bottles of bitch tits on the wall

This study is the closest thing linked to actually being somewhat valid. In this study an assay is carried out where MCF7 cells are essentially treated with tap water where the solids in it have been concentrated way down from 1.5L to a few mL. For those who don't like commie units that means whatever is in that water is 1500x more concentrated than in your tap water.

Anyway, so to 1500 MCF7 cells is added all the different water "extracts" (this is a highly simplified explanation) and a week or so later they look at the proliferation of the cells. What the hell, you may be asking? Why would you even measure the proliferation of these cells in response to water? Well, as it turns out, MCF7 is an immortal breast cancer cell line that expresses high levels of estrogen receptors and proliferates in response to activation of those receptors. Now if you scroll down to the results you can see that **WOAH**, the relative proliferation increased almost 80% when the evil dire-aids bottled water was used (but only sometimes when DMSO or dimethylsulfoxide is used as a solvent, which could very well be significant because DMSO makes anything dissolved in it pass through cellular membranes)! Big

tampon strikes again boys. **But wait... Lets think about this for a second.**

This is an assay carried out in a cell culture dish on a cancerous immortal cell line. Now I have a lot of experience with cancerous cell lines, I work with them every day, and I can tell you that these aren't normal cells. Cancerous cell lines are the kind of thing that you can look at the wrong way and they start dividing- it's literally cancer my dudes. Not only that, but the estrogenic activity is only even significant when DMSO is included (although highly diluted), and the water is "concentrated" (look up solid phase extraction if you want in-detail info on this process it's actually fascinating) in a specific way!

Even if we put all of these potential flaws of methodology aside we can see in the results section that the relative estrogenic activity is equal to that of 1-12 **picrograms (pg) per liter**. For reference, a picogram is  $1 \times 10^{-12}$  grams. Putting this in perspective, a liter of water from Tampon-Corp has a truly devastating mass of 0.0000000018% the mass of a single grain of fucking sand. Guys. Oh, and that relative increase in proliferation was all that with just 1500 cells (avg. human has upwards of 15 trillion, or  $15 \times 10^{12}$  cells or 10 factors of 10 more).

---

## Conclusions

Now, my dudes. I understand that not everybody can be or wants to be a scientist. If you don't have first-hand experience working with cells and these kinds of methodologies, there would be no possible way to even read through some of these articles (the first one in particular is grueling as hell). **However**, we all have a responsibility to think critically about what we're reading instead of jumping to the conclusion that the government wants to cuck you. Think about it, if plastics were a government conspiracy like some of you apparently think, why would they use them on their own fucking armed forces?!

Next time you read something that tells you you're going to get dire-vagina-period-out-your-dickhole, use the following process to assess the evidence:

1. Look at the model organism in the study. How close is it to human? In scale? Genetically? Is it cancerous? In these cases, rodent models would have been far superior to established cancer cell lines in my opinion.
2. Read the results section first, the introduction second, and the methods last. Look at the figures, do they look right? Are they clear?
3. Where is this info coming from? HuffPo? Or is it a legitimate scientific journal. Is it in all Chinese?
4. Make sure that anyone who disagrees with your uninformed opinions is called a shill, as this argument has been passed down through the ages.

Anyways, my dudes, you're not going to grow bitch tits because you drink out of a water bottle. Is it possible there could be picogram levels of estrogen-mimicking molecules in your water? Yup. But guess what, there's probably about 100x more cockroach jizz in everything you eat, because a picogram is literally such a small amount that I can't even describe it without scientific notation. So sack up and read the primary literature so you don't look like a dumb ass.

Thanks for reading. Mistakes in this article are a result of late-night writing. -ISC

**UPDATE:** Many community members have been asking me to provide scientific context to related issues such as steroid use and aluminum in deodorant.

I'm happy to see this kind of curiosity but can't address all of the questions. I've decided to make a series of posts where I will review the literature on a specific topic from both sides in plain speak, as well as demonstrate how to assess the literature without having to have 3 degrees. A huge problem with academia

is the jargon that locks the public out of the discussion, and the shoddy quality science "reporting" that makes it to the public. Let's do something about that.

You can vote for the first topic we will address together, or select other and send me a private message with your suggestion.

[www.strawpoll.me/13888594](http://www.strawpoll.me/13888594)

Thank you all and I look forward to continued learning within this unique community.

---

Archived from [theredarchive.com](http://theredarchive.com)

---

## Comments

---

ThePounder • 314 points • 8 September, 2017 06:48 AM

I clicked the links in the original post and stopped as soon as I saw that the Huffington Post was used as if its a credible (academic) source.

Thanks for clearing this up.

Kinbaku\_enthusiast • 73 points • 8 September, 2017 12:10 PM\*

Here are some studies that support being careful with BPA from sources other than the huffington post.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1280330>

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378427410000561>

<https://academic.oup.com/endo/article/149/3/988/2454992/Bisphenol-A-Prevents-the-Synaptogenic-Response-to>

The science is far from settled and it seems there is good cause to be careful.

Let's not forget that there were scientists supporting the thesis in the other post, so your request that people should believe you because you are a scientist just puts us back at square one: which scientist should we believe?

[deleted] 8 September, 2017 12:48 PM\*

[permanently deleted]

antorbug • 22 points • 8 September, 2017 04:25 PM

So basically eating store receipts will make you grow tits? Nice.

Kinbaku\_enthusiast • 14 points • 8 September, 2017 04:30 PM

No, it is absorbed through the skin.

dr\_warlock • 6 points • 10 September, 2017 05:22 AM

The matrix printer receipts were invented to make us beta males!

Troll\_Name • 3 points • 10 September, 2017 03:43 AM

There's a point to all of this, and it isn't that water bottles are safe.

Rather, the point is that BPA is also-fucking-lutely everywhere in the developed world. Is it solely responsible for the pussification of the modern male? Of course not, no one factor is solely responsible for a perfect storm.

metallicdrama • 7 points • 11 September, 2017 03:58 AM\*

Just eat extra red meat and squat more. Problem solved. And if not, you won't give a fuck after anyways.

Troll\_Name • 2 points • 11 September, 2017 11:05 PM

If you didn't give a fuck you wouldn't be eating extra red meat and squatting.

metallicdrama • 2 points • 12 September, 2017 04:53 AM

If one did not give a fuck about their T, yes. The idea clearly was that if you're eating red meat and squatting, you won't give a fuck about plastic bottles because your head is already somewhere better. That's so fucking obvious, you're a moron.

Kinbaku\_enthusiast • 11 points • 8 September, 2017 01:28 PM

Yes, exactly.

Your article too contradicts this OP, btw.

Sidenote: the claim that BPA is no longer used for water bottles isn't accurate. I saw a recent study in my country that more than half of sold water in bottles were bottles that contained BPA.

Finally it may well be impossible to significantly reduce BPA exposure for individuals at this point, as one of participants of a study in the other post pointed out.

Imachangin • 10 points • 8 September, 2017 02:53 PM

Even if they stopped using BPA in them it seems like everyone and their mom forgets that there's other bisphenol's than bisphenol a that can be used and still called BPA free.

[deleted] • 2 points • 10 September, 2017 10:19 AM

Right. Whenever a self-proclaimed scientist with or without experience in his field says something along the lines of: despite contradicting evidence I am right cause X, thus you are wrong, is to be taken with a huge grain of salt.

We saw T levels dropping in the first and second world, while there is still no conclusive explanation what causes it. So it has to do with modern life. That is all that is for sure.

Kinbaku\_enthusiast • 2 points • 10 September, 2017 10:33 AM

I recommend reading further down, because he does make a compelling argument. But yes, I agree, it's healthy to be careful.

Btw how do we know T levels have dropped?

[deleted] • 2 points • 10 September, 2017 10:40 AM

Yes he does make a compelling point but still, I am just skeptical.

Reduced T-levels made it even into the mainstream:

<http://uk.reuters.com/article/health-testosterone-levels-dc/mens-testosterone-levels-declined-in-las-t-20-years-idUKKIM16976320061031>

I don't know to why but making out a correlation with the increase in allergies on a broad scale are to obvious - so it has something to do with modern life.

Kinbaku\_enthusiast • 2 points • 10 September, 2017 10:47 AM

1% per year for 4 decades? Something that I will look into deeper, thanks.

Troll\_Name • 1 point • 11 September, 2017 11:08 PM

That only suggests 40% if we're talking about percentage points.

I would call this deceitful sugar-coating.

Kinbaku\_enthusiast • 1 point • 11 September, 2017 11:23 PM

Depends if it's cumulative or not, but in either case it's a considerable amount.

Troll\_Name • 1 point • 11 September, 2017 11:07 PM

Perfect fucking storm. No one component is the whole.

Have T levels been dropping the past several decades? Just look outside, if you can *find* outside. Perfect storm.

Future\_Alpha • 1 point • 13 September, 2017 03:01 PM

Easy peasy lemon squeezy.

1. being cucks and cucked society.
2. lack of exercise/movement
3. lack of war
4. corresponding adoption of feminine value traits (empathy/compassion).
5. large amounts of psychological stress
6. shit diet

There are studies that show that behavior influences hormonal levels.

Gaze731 points 14 September, 2017 03:24 PM **[recovered]**

Could be a chicken and egg thing. Low T causes your 6 points and it's a self-reinforcing cycle.

Future\_Alpha • 1 point • 14 September, 2017 03:28 PM

Low T would definitely cause these behaviors but these behaviors would lead to low T for most guys. Unless they have testicular injury or genetic impotence.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 January, 2018 06:32 AM

large amounts of psychological stress

lack of war

i'm sorry what? that seems like a contradiction, war is pretty stressful, even traumatic to the point it causes PTSD.

Future\_Alpha • 1 point • 28 January, 2018 12:10 AM

Chronic psychological stress has been shown to lead to lower testosterone levels. Unless one doesn't know how to deal with it.

People get PTSD because they have not learned how to deal with stress and be stress-resistant. Partly this can be attributed to religion and partly to the fact that society has become so 'safe'. In an environment where death and war are part of life - war is not a big deal and will be less likely to cause PTSD. Instead it will bring out the best traits (as well as the worst) in men as it will allow them to be stress resistant (nothing else they will face in society will scare them anymore). For these reasons, many modern soldiers experience PTSD. In ancient times, PTSD was not so common (though it was just as bad - having to face your enemy and be literally knee deep in gore and feel his blood and guts on your hands and face - can be a scary thing to experience) because in addition to constantly facing war and death in the ancient world, soldiers also were psychologically trained to deal with fear. For example, in Ancient Sparta there was a "science" of fear that soldiers would pass on from generation to generation.

whuttupfoo • 13 points • 8 September, 2017 12:30 PM

I already knew it was BS as soon as I read the post title.

kieran9323 • 3 points • 9 September, 2017 08:17 AM

same, even BBC news is low quality, with tabloid like topics plotted in, lack of resources section, explaining as if the reader left school at 16 - is that a target audience? If someone links to Huffington Post or similar ... it just tells me a lot about that person

[deleted] • 2 points • 9 September, 2017 05:54 PM

Right on! HuffPro is only credible "evidence" for femi-Nazis. I would just assume ask my Husky for his opinion

welshmin • 1 point • 11 September, 2017 12:20 AM

Well gosh, here I was about to go change big chunks of my life based on a huffpo piece

Crimson\_Eyes • -36 points • 8 September, 2017 10:26 AM

Implying that sources deemed credible by Big Brother are any more reliable than the Huffington Post, I see.

ThePounder • 40 points • 8 September, 2017 10:45 AM

I review academic papers. It is a part of my job. Checking the methods which were used and proofreading papers, then publishing them in a credible journal (like Nature) is what makes them credible.

Some studies are funded by governments or organizations who have a particular outcome in mind, if this is what you are referring to: it is obvious that those papers have an 'agenda', the same way it is obvious that media outlets like the Huffington Post have their own agenda. If you sincerely believe that the 'research' conducted and published by the Huffington Post is in the same league as research published in credible, peer-reviewed scientific journals, like Nature, I've got some bad news for you..

joh2141 • 6 points • 8 September, 2017 12:40 PM\*

Next you'll be telling me GMO's are fucking evil and fluoride in our water is a ruse to destroy our sperm and that Alex Jones is far more credible than the CDC regarding science. I don't trust federal agencies like NSA and CIA and the good ole faithful but federal agencies for the purpose of things like science and health and the like are concrete. The reason why .gov and federal agencies are far more reliable than shitty .org or some random no name group that has a better looking website is because any moron can make a misleading website filled with bullshit information and these federal agencies provide ALL their research data publicly so that you can review them. Albeit you might have to pay money but that money doesn't go to the government; it goes to those journal database. Scientists who conduct the experiment usually end up having to pay to access their own data too which sucks but everything is interconnected.

Big Brother can't pass out a bullshit information without the science community reviewing the data as it is available publicly. You need to stop watching the Alex Jones brother. This isn't like a thing with Snowden where these agencies are not to be trusted. And yes a lot of bias can go in experiments but usually government funded experiments provide a neutral platform to conduct. You seriously don't think some random in reddit will think of that shit before any other scientists reviewing the data once it comes out?

[deleted] 8 September, 2017 05:33 PM

[permanently deleted]

joh2141 • 4 points • 8 September, 2017 05:51 PM

Does it say blindly trust big bro? They go public with the data that you can check yourself. And it's not like these federal agencies like CDC is being told by big bad bro to lie about fluoride in our water so they can control us. It is independently functioning agency. Where the data can be reviewed if you think it is bullshit.

It's crazy people choose to be dumbasses because they cite "don't trust everything they tell ya." That's how you end up with anti vaxing morons and the new measles outbreak. And look at what happens when you practice sex ed and proper condom instructions? Much less teen pregnancy yet bible thumpers still go crazy against that kind of shit.

[deleted] 8 September, 2017 06:04 PM

[permanently deleted]

joh2141 • 5 points • 8 September, 2017 06:18 PM

I don't get it the first statement is basically excusing people who think like "I don't understand this and won't waste my time so this is a lie or i won't listen to it."

As an analogy that's like some fat kid saying he doesn't want to put in the work to go the gym. That fat kid has no right to bitch about being incel or give input on how to get laid in our eyes. Now translate that to people who refuse to learn the science. Why are your (not you but rather the people in question) opinions valid then?

The fluoride in water thing has been blown out of proportion. In extreme high doses yeah it is harmful but in regulated doses it can help. Saying fluoride in water is big bros way of giving you autism is no different than people saying vaccinations give you autism. You're using your fears of the unknown simply because you don't understand it. Granted the study in fluoride is very extensive but again... refer to CDC. I mean look at how GMO are treated in Europe. CDC really knows best. I mean they aren't perfect. I'm sure they'll mess up every now and then but I believe the saying is trial and error.

Listen I get what you're saying regarding conservative society too but I'm just speaking from the current modern standpoint. People said condoms and sex ed would lead to more teen pregnancies. That was the major argument. And it's not like we can ever go to pure procreation sex only. You're gonna wanna fuck and not harbor kids sooner or later.

However as proven condom and sex ed drastically lowers teen pregnancy. In our current society how is teen pregnancy by any means a good thing?

[deleted] 8 September, 2017 07:09 PM\*

[permanently deleted]

joh2141 • 4 points • 8 September, 2017 07:30 PM

Doctors can't explain what's in vaccinations...? I'm sorry but med students know what's in vaccinations. Hell I'm going to school for nursing and I know what's in vaccinations... This is what I mean. I get that eater fluoridation debate is more of "well I didn't ask for it and it's not like vaccines where if I don't do it, it won't start an epidemic like anti vax."

Also no one is telling you to blindly trust CDC... I constantly posted they publicly release their data. If you don't know what's written on there, It's you're job to learn and understand it. This is TRP get that complacent incompetent shit out of here. If

you refuse to source check a reliable source like CDC, then you're not source checking ANYTHING.

Vaccinations are becoming mandatory because of anti vaxers who use bad logic and reasoning to excuse ignorance. Every anti vaxers are literal retards who don't know anything. Imagine a 10 year old trying to explain the functions of a black hole and the kid doesn't know shit. You're just going to laugh and think "ok kid."

And that whole instilling strong moral values onto the kid... really are you that naive? Instilling strong moral values don't change the fact you have hormones that largely dictate how you behave. This is TRP, stop regurgitating some blue pill mindset. No matter how hard you try to teach people abstinence is the best way to Go, kids are going to have sex. You can't change that shit. If you can't stop it anyways you might as well educate kids so they can prevent unwanted pregnancies and STDs. This is why you can't really listen to bible thumpers regarding this topic because they really believe if they properly raise and teach their kids, it'll solve problems.

Look at Afghanistan where they stone women to death for being raped. I mean it's rare but adultery still occurs even in the most of conservative places. It's naive to believe sex is only for procreation. Your hormones and instinct doesn't give two shits about god or procreation. Ofc people who refuse to read and learn science will denounce that shit. But why are people who don't know shit about the topic given any attention? It isn't like that virgin kid who is obese and socially awkward can give you good advice about how to score a hottie so why is it any different when bible thumpers do it?

joh2141 • 3 points • 8 September, 2017 07:42 PM\*

And I get you dude i don't think anyone is a fan of the cock carousel but honestly deal with it. People spout nonsense blindly saying "wow this culture is so red pill. Wish we were more like that."

No. No you don't. A lot of younger TRP members who just started on their way don't understand. The current society is still better match for you than a RP society. In a RP society majority of us won't even get a chance. You will most likely be born a beta child and live as a beta most of your life. If you try to be alpha, the real alphas who lead your country will execute you. In this blue pill society you were given the knowledge of RP to try to make a name for yourself and the blue pill society prevents people from forcibly taking away your right to do so. In a RP world, your mom will get raped in front of you while you watch as bandits take advantage of your village and shit and kings have the right to impregnate newlyweds for the firstborn child of the woman while you have to sit there and allow some fat king impregnate your wife before you're able to father any children.

The problem is people like you came to TRP to get luckier with women and as a result of finding out what WOMEN are like and sex culture is currently, you become embittered and "salty." You can't think like that. The only thing in this world you can definitively control is yourself and yourself only. It is a blue pill thing to do to feel bitter about the current status of the cock carousel especially since it is something you can't do anything about.

[deleted] 8 September, 2017 07:57 PM

[permanently deleted]

sweetleef • 5 points • 8 September, 2017 12:26 PM

No idea about reliability of "big brother" - but huffington post is definitely not reliable, no matter what it's measured against.

Kinbaku\_enthusiast • 5 points • 8 September, 2017 12:31 PM

Pretty much. Andrew Breitbart helped start the huffington post, because he thought the insanity of far left though tacitly supported by leftwing media wasn't on full display and by getting one started people would more easily be horrified by it and be nudged to the right.

That's what he claimed afterwards anyways.

joh2141 • 2 points • 8 September, 2017 12:59 PM

People don't trust big brother because of federal agencies like NSA and CIA. Thing is though they are fed agencies based on doing something for security and national security reasons. Fed agencies like CDC and the like; their sole purpose is to bring us scientific data. This means they'll also publish their research material on journal databases that any one of us can review. It's not impossible to pass off unreliable experiment as conclusive. The biggest case of personal bias interfering with research was an anthropological study in Somalia where the western anthropologist seemingly put her own spin into what women in Somalia were like, misinterpreting and misrepresenting what the culture was like because it was what she wanted to see. Since then official formats have become extremely strict regarding personal bias. When reviewing research and experiments, personal bias interfering with the data is something everyone already actively looks for.

It's good that people aren't accepting everything at face value but that attitude is just retarded to have especially because that guy definitely never reviewed scientific data released by federal agencies like CDC or other science-minded federal agencies.

nazis\_are\_socialists • 5 points • 8 September, 2017 01:22 PM

Nice poisoning the wells fallacy. Scientific consensus is not bound by any government. Meanwhile the huffington post is proven fake news

Crimson\_Eyes • 5 points • 8 September, 2017 01:48 PM

I appreciate the outpouring of critical thinking, thank you all =)

I'm not Alex Jones, and I'm not about to go that far off the deep-end, but let's apply some critical thinking skills here:

To address ThePounder: I am sure that you do your best rigorously and honestly examine the work put in front of you, but can you be absolutely sure that everyone involved in these studies did the same?

Not just the people who conducted it, but the people who reviewed it as well. How much money does it take to bribe the panel/group/insert descriptor here to give a wonky study their approval? What kind of drive does it take to overcome the subtle, or, in some cases, not so subtle, attempts at coercion, whether positive or negative?

If we lived in a world where no one/collective could be coerced, I would be very happy.

Unfortunately, we live in a world where people have agendas and are willing to push them.

If I gave you a functionally infinite amount of wealth, do you think you could leverage it to get scientific consensus to, on the surface, if not on the whole, agree with you?

As SEVERAL others pointed out: We, as laypeople, have considered many of the possible biases and have examined the information for fallacies, faults of procedure, etc. Logically, people in the actual field with a vested interest are also capable of checking for these biases, but the Ivory Tower is in a rather poor state at the moment.

Scientists have to fight for funding, their position as accredited researchers is subject to the whims of the powerful, and so on.

Most everyone here readily accepts that Big Brother is shilling out entertainment which, by design or accident, is radically changing the nature of men (and perhaps women)

Is it really that large a leap to conclude they might be doing the same with science as they are media?

There will always be keen-eyed skeptics who cannot be bribed or coerced, but to paraphrase T. H. White, there will always be more fools than wise men, and the fools will hang the wise men.

Can we -prove- that the people refuting these studies with studies of their own aren't simply being marginalized and discredited to suppress the information? Can we be sure that every person reviewing a study, or that every group doing so, is as morally upright as ThePounder?

Or is the sad reality that, in truth, when push comes to shove, people with power can write the narrative as they see fit and cast doubt on the few brave enough to refuse to bow to threats and bribes?

rp\_newdawn • 2 points • 8 September, 2017 02:19 PM

Peer-reviewed scientific research is the hardest source of information to corrupt. Not impossible (humans are sneaky cunts) but damn difficult.

WolfofAnarchy213 points 8 September, 2017 09:40 AM\* **[recovered]**

## OP OF THE POST THIS IS REGARDING HERE

Hi, I wrote the other article you're referring to. Although there's absolutely nothing good about BPAs and the other 'substances' mentioned to be in your water, I see that I was too fast with concluding it lowers Testosterone.

Thank you for applying your knowledge to this subreddit.

I apologize for the misinformation.

InvoluntarySickCunt[S] • 66 points • 8 September, 2017 03:46 PM

Thank you for the integrity and intellectual honesty you've shown in this reply.

Skimming papers and jumping to conclusions is all too easy, and any scientifically minded person who claims to never have done it is lying.

I look forward to discussing the literature with you and others in the future.

WolfofAnarchy • 16 points • 8 September, 2017 04:42 PM

You're welcome. Thanks for this post. Actual science deserves to be known.

[deleted] • 6 points • 8 September, 2017 04:01 PM

I think the takeaway here is that it's important to be informed and cautious. It wasn't too long ago that a

lot of people died because we thought radioactive materials were fun (radium watches to glow in the dark for example). Learn how to interpret actual science so you don't fall prey to the media's view on it. A correlation that is barely beyond experimental uncertainty can be picked up and declared gospel while much stronger evidence is buried.

[deleted] • 2 points • 9 September, 2017 02:27 PM

Have you done any research into things like toothpaste, body washes, shampoo's, etc? I've heard of things like flouride in toothpaste and xenoestrogens (if that's a real word) in conditioners, body washes, shampoo's and some soap products. I am pretty skeptical about it, and I personally have done 0 research on it. I heard it off hand from a friend before finding TRP, and was curious if you've heard anything similiar?

chrisv650 • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 08:42 PM

Just to check here, you claim to be all about integrity and intellectual honesty, but then use a title like "No, Plastics Are Not Lowering Your Testosterone Levels"

Are you seriously claiming that plastics have no influence on lowering testosterone levels?

InvoluntarySickCunt[S] • 8 points • 8 September, 2017 09:01 PM

My claim is that the presented evidence from the post I've responded to is not sufficient to make that claim.

As I've mentioned below it is well documented that in vitro stimulation of cells with bisphenols and pthalate esters can result in an estrogen-like response.

Are you claiming that in the general population, xenoestrogens from plastic use has contributed to a meaningful and measurable drop in serum free testosterone? I'm ready to be convinced if the work exists, but cell culture based assays and shoddy methodologies in backwater journals are not convincing.

chrisv650 • -4 points • 8 September, 2017 09:33 PM

No, thats 100% bullshit.

Your claim is that Plastics Are Not Lowering Your Testosterone Levels. Which is why its easy to see you're full of shit.

InvoluntarySickCunt[S] • 9 points • 8 September, 2017 09:54 PM

The burden of proof lays on the person making the claim and extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence.

chrisv650-3 points 8 September, 2017 09:59 PM [recovered]

And people who claim to be following scientific principles but use clickbait bullshit titles should be ashamed of themselves.

MrAnachi • 3 points • 8 September, 2017 10:05 PM

"Your title disagrees with my world view and im too illiterate to read the post  
REEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEE"

chrisv650-1 points 8 September, 2017 10:06 PM [recovered]

World view? How about completely disagrees with scientific process, then I

continue to make a mockery of it in the post, whilst continuously ignoring actual scientific research?

MrAnachi • 4 points • 8 September, 2017 10:16 PM

You are suggesting that rejected the null hypothesis with little to no evidence to support that position would be more scientific? :/

[deleted] 8 September, 2017 01:01 PM\*

[permanently deleted]

InvoluntarySickCunt[S] • 2 points • 8 September, 2017 10:14 PM

For BPA, the lowest dose studied for risk assessment purposes was 50 mg/kg/day, which is the currently accepted lowest observed adverse effect level (LOAEL) that was used to calculate a reference dose of 50 µg/kg/day based on experiments conducted in the 1980s (IRIS 1988).

BPA is often described as a very “weak” estrogen because in a few assay systems, such as MCF-7 breast cancer cells in culture, the dose of BPA required to stimulate cell proliferation (~ 10<sup>-7</sup> M or 23 ppb) is roughly 100,000 times higher relative to estradiol, which stimulates cell proliferation at approximately 10<sup>-12</sup> M (Welshons et al. 1999).

The article goes on to say that at extremely low concentrations, (parts per trillion), BPA mimics estradiol in its ability to stimulate a calcium flux within MCF7 and rat pituitary tumor cell lines (calcium ions act as a signaling molecule within the cell through their interaction with calcium binding proteins, leading to non-binary signaling arrays). Anyway, this doesn't really have any bearing on my thesis, which is that macro-scale effects in humans don't seem plausible in the general population.

dankvibez • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 11:03 PM

I still think you are right actually about some of it. I think a lot of the people going against you are people who are conservatives, and they are trying to hamster away at the ideas that "Muh deregulation" and "fuck the EPA", actually harms their body. (It does.)

nazis\_are\_socialists • -1 points • 8 September, 2017 01:23 PM

Then why do you still have a post up about Plastic being a conspiracy?

ockhams-razor • 0 points • 8 September, 2017 11:47 PM

My gut feeling was that original post felt like nonsense you typically here on the news and then the opposite on the news the next day.

I didn't have the time or expertise to refute it, but i'm glad someone did.

CrazyHorseInvincible[M] [score hidden] 8 September, 2017 04:09 PM stickied comment

Pinned.

Remember, the metaphor of the "red pill" is about \*seeing what is in front of you, not what you expect to see".

Kinbaku\_enthusiast • 3 points • 8 September, 2017 04:29 PM

Considering the data, a better conclusion would have been:

"Yes, plastics are probably messing with your testosterone levels, but changing your plastic water bottles for

glass bottles is not enough"

(see links in other posts below)

As such, people will be easily misled by this post being pinned. I'm fine with that, people should be researching stuff anyways, but I do think it deserves to be pointed out for anyone a whiff more skeptical who actually opens this post and reads the replies.

[deleted] • 6 points • 8 September, 2017 09:08 PM

But testosterone levels really are plunging right?

So if not plastics, what? Soy? Boring desk jobs? Obesity?

InvoluntarySickCunt[S] • 8 points • 8 September, 2017 09:46 PM

I will be attempting to address this from multiple angles in a followup post in the next few days. Stay tuned.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 09:16 PM

Good question. Unfortunately I'm not qualified to answer it scientifically. Someone should open a post attempting to answer this.

TheYekke • 1 point • 9 September, 2017 06:50 PM

When it comes to low T and what it does to the body one sees many things all at once, happening so quietly as to be imperceivable unless one keeps metrics. Meticulously. Another example- The crap we call margarine used to have bad side effects until they got the formulation right.. or did they?

JamesSkepp • 81 points • 8 September, 2017 07:00 AM

We need more people like you here.

The impact of "plastic" on T levels might as well be true (or might be not, science will tell sooner or later). So far there's enough evidence (despite rather simplistic conclusions b/c endocrine system is a bit more complicated than "just measure T levels" as is the chemistry of "plastic" interactions with it) to warrant further research, which is being done.

As I said in my reply to the first article - science will tell - and it did. This is why you trust scientists not opinion blogs, this is the difference between people who know stuff and people who have an opinion about stuff.

Look at the model organism in the study. How close is it to human? In scale? Genetically? Is it cancerous? In these cases, rodent models would have been far superior to established cancer cell lines in my opinion.

Read the results section first, the introduction second, and the methods last. Look at the figures, do they look right? Are they clear?

Where is this info coming from? HuffPo? Or is it a legitimate scientific journal. Is it in all Chinese?

Make sure that anyone who disagrees with your uninformed opinions is called a shill, as this argument has been passed down through the ages.

You have no idea how funny that is for me when confronted with what certain user calls his own "method".

InvoluntarySickCunt[S] • 31 points • 8 September, 2017 07:49 AM\*

It's good to see that you and a few others represented voices of reason and skepticism in the original.

Kinbaku\_enthusiast • 11 points • 8 September, 2017 12:13 PM\*

I think it's healthy that people were skeptical. I think it's unhealthy that everybody bows down immediately to this OP, instead of applying a similar skepsis.

There are definitely studies that show that BPA is a growing concern for its xenoestrogenic effect and ubiquitousness in our products:

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1280330>

EDIT: it's valuable to look at this follow up post and judge for yourself:

[https://www.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/6yt1ak/no\\_plastics\\_are\\_not\\_lowering\\_your\\_testosterone/dmqb6ik/](https://www.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/6yt1ak/no_plastics_are_not_lowering_your_testosterone/dmqb6ik/)

InvoluntarySickCunt[S] • 12 points • 8 September, 2017 02:03 PM

You're absolutely right, and I appreciate you digging up more sources. This is an ongoing debate and will be on going for a while.

max\_peenor • 6 points • 8 September, 2017 02:43 PM

Meanwhile, is there any harm in avoiding drinking from things that smell like tires?

antariusz • 3 points • 10 September, 2017 12:33 AM

Nope, other than losing out on the convenience factor, you might be inconveniencing yourself over things that aren't actually impacting your life.

For example, the people who move away from high power lines or refuse to use cell-phones because of "the radiation". Or that don't vaccinate their kids because of "toxins"

That being said, where I work, we went from handling literally thousands of pages of thermal printed pages of information a day down to about half a sheet worth of information.... and I'm much much happier about it. Thank god for technological progress.

max\_peenor • 2 points • 10 September, 2017 02:44 PM

other than losing out on the convenience factor

Drink from something that smells like tires is convenient? Do you cruise HB3s at the club because they are easy to ride?

antariusz • 2 points • 10 September, 2017 04:19 PM\*

Sure, and someone else will say if you don't wash your hands for 45 seconds (but not 44 or 46) and then flick the bathroom light 5 times something bad will happen to you too, but I prefer not to be crazy (in the classical sense of the word).

There is convenience in being sane. I spend my mental energy on many other things, my water bottle is not one of them. Making sure I'm not fucking a 3/10 happens to be one of the things I spend far more time thinking about... than the plastic a water bottle is made from.

Actual issues that affect your life will always take precedent over things that neither affect my life, nor that I can have any effect on.

For example, Im 5'8" and if I spent all my time worrying about being short, that would be wasted energy. Because A) I'm not that short, and B) I can't do anything about it,

except I generally wear boots because it's nice to be average. C) The reason I'm not getting laid (theoretically speaking, because I currently have no problem in that department) is not my height.

In the old days, pre-internet, they called people like that penny-wise but pound-foolish. Don't be that. Spend an appropriate amount of time on each problem as is appropriate for not only its severity, but also your ability to fix it.

Something that theoretically might or might not impact my testosterone/estrogen level, by a tiny theoretical percentage, I don't care about.

My ability to easily have access to water for hormone production (ever take a glass into a car?) outweighs the possible downsides of hormone production from what the water bottle is made of.

max\_peenor • 1 point • 10 September, 2017 04:34 PM

There is convenience in being sane.

Choosing quality over shit is sane. I have a choice of two products that DO the same thing; I'll pick the one that doesn't smell funny. This is an actual issue that affects my life, ever single time I take a sip. I don't need someone to go on a rant about **science** to tell me this.

hexagonsol • 1 point • 10 September, 2017 09:16 AM

Hey, fellow researcher here, want to get in a discord next sunday and go through the literature?

tb87670 • 4 points • 9 September, 2017 09:28 PM

We need more people like you here.

Can't say that enough. The bro-science I have seen in my few years hanging around TRP in posts and private messages has made me concerned.

"Don't whack off and lift bro, you reduce your gains"

"No-FAP for months, you get to keep your test levels up man"

"Do an exercise a certain way to tone them muscles even more with the same effort, brotastic"

"Lots of anti-oxidants are good for you, especially if you weight lift bro"

Rian\_Stone • 4 points • 8 September, 2017 11:21 AM

I thought you were an automated script, not a shill

Kinbaku\_enthusiast • 14 points • 8 September, 2017 11:31 AM

Why you should trust my judgement: I am a molecular biologist and immunologist who is active in the academic sphere and have expertise in in vitro cellular assays. This is a fancy way of saying that I grow lots of cells in plastic dishes and then look at them in different ways, and it's how most of these studies are conducted. Also, it's my job to evaluate academic literature.

How do we know that you are?

Now keep in mind that polymer chemistry is really a black magic in itself

So it's hard to judge for certain in either direction?

Think about it, if plastics were a government conspiracy like some of you apparently think, why would they use them on their own fucking armed forces?!

There may be any number of explanations for this, from being an acceptable cost for another goal to minimizing BPA exposure for armed forces.

---

I want to take your post at face value, I really do. Particularly since I am neither a chemist or educated in reviewing scientific literature.

While recognizing my own lack of scientific training, I have come across multiple instances where people try to claim authority and bludgeon away an idea, not atypically with a strong trust in the state, despite history being rife with examples where conspiracies against the public did take place, such as the mk-ultra experiments where unsuspecting civilians were fed LSD for months to discover its coercive effects, for example. This was long one of those kooky conspiracy theories, until the CIA unveiled documents that say it did happen.

### let's get into some specifics

Regardless of your position in regards to plastics as a whole, I did come across studies in my country that the sludge water, the mix of mud and water on shores of our rivers (netherlands), had high estrogenic qualities. Our water supply itself did not have these high levels, but according to the paper we neither routinely tested it or treated it to prevent it. I'll see if I can dig up the study.

The following article, much like the supposed test subject that posted in the previous post, show that it is practically impossible to currently avoid getting BPA into your system.

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0960076011001063>

There are studies that support the adverse effect on testosterone production by BPA:

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378427410000561>

<https://academic.oup.com/endo/article/149/3/988/2454992/Bisphenol-A-Prevents-the-Synaptogenic-Response-to>

And this older study from 2005 gives a roundup of previous literature:

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1280330/>

For someone preaching skepticism, your mind does seem to be made up (judging from your title), when from my perspective there seems to be more than ample evidence that it's likely though not certain BPA messes with our testosterone production.

Of course it took decades to conclusively prove the dangers of smoking too. It seems to me there is far too much evidence currently out to simply dismiss the xeno-estrogenic effects of BPA, which is in most plastics (and unfortunately seem impossible to avoid wholly).

InvoluntarySickCunt[S] • 6 points • 8 September, 2017 02:08 PM\*

Thank you for citing your sources I will take a look after work. Please note that I am NOT claiming that plasticizers do not have the *capability* to do harm in vivo. I am claiming that the original evidence presented was insufficient to support their claim. This is why the thesis of my post is essentially, "show me the data".

My post was more concerned with scientific skepticism and intellectual honesty than this issue in particular.

Thanks for your thoughtful input friend.

Edit: Ok let's take a look at your linked studies.

Starting w/ "Bisphenol A Prevents the Synaptogenic Response to Testosterone in the Brain of Adult Male Rats". The article culminates in the claim that:

bisphenol A prevented both the prefrontal and hippocampal synaptogenic response to testosterone supplementation in castrated males

This basically means that, at a BPA dose of 300ug/kg, or around 21 mg or an average adult male, supplemental testosterone (in the form of testosterone propionate @ 1.5mg/kg) had impaired binding in 2 specific brain regions. While this is interesting, testosterone isn't actually decreasing, it's undergoing competitive inhibition in these specific cells in this specific model at this specific dose, which is quite high. While this kind of paper warrants further investigation at far, FAR lower doses, I don't see cause for concern to the average consumer.

I'll do the other primary one because a review article doesn't really have much to refute, its just a conglomeration of other primary literature: "Bisphenol A may cause testosterone reduction by adversely affecting both testis and pituitary systems similar to estradiol"

Prepubertal Wistar/ST male rats (4 weeks old) were subcutaneously administered BPA (0, 20, 100 and 200 mg/kg/day) or E2 (10 and 100 µg/kg/day) for 6 weeks. Both BPA and E2 treatments decreased plasma and testicular testosterone levels, and plasma luteinizing hormone (LH), but not E2 and follicle-stimulating hormone levels...

Ok, so in this case the dosage of BPA they're administering is fucking insane. Also note that prepubertal rats were used. I would argue that puberty changes brain chemistry significantly but anyways, Average test in males is between 280-1,100 nanograms per dL or 10 liters of blood (average adult male blood volume is 5.5 L). If we do the math real quick we can see that they're administering roughly (200 mg/kg body mass \* avg adult weight of ~70kg) /  $1.1 \times 10^{-6} \text{ g} = 12,727$  times the amount of testosterone in an extremely high test individual of BPA PER DAY. For six weeks.

I hope that this information convinces you as I can see you are quite the skeptic. Every study I have seen has used massive doses of these chemicals directly injected (not ingested).

If you are convinced I would request that you please modify your other replies so as to not push studies making conclusions that their methodologies do not warrant.

Kinbaku\_enthusiast • 4 points • 8 September, 2017 02:36 PM\*

This is why the thesis of my post is essentially, "show me the data"

The title you chose would suggest otherwise.

Though I find overstated clickbaity titles conducive to getting people engaged (contrary to what intuition might suggest), so I'm not really faulting you for that and this response at least seems to show you're both serious and curious.

I'm looking forward what you think about this after you've dug into it a little.

I myself must confess that I did not engage with the sources of the previous post, since I had already come across a number of reasons to suspect BPA as a xeno-estrogen and having significant effects in vivo.

---

Edit: for people reading keep in mind that this post was made prior to his edit.

reply to edit:

Thank you for the response. Your edit made my reply look asinine, but that's okay. I am grateful that you took the time to look into it seriously. I don't have the time to evaluate the veracity of your claims this weekend, but I will after it and regardless, the way you have presented information this time, I would

consider it very likely that your assessment is correct.

As a result, I've added in a link to your comment in my other skeptical replies.

You might still be wrong in considering it safe, I don't know, but I consider it highly unlikely at this point. We'll see what I think after I've read the studies more closely, which probably goes slower for me, because as I've said before, I'm just a skeptical layman. We'll see.

Thank you for engaging with this seriously and thank you for sharing your thoughts.

InvoluntarySickCunt[S] • 2 points • 8 September, 2017 10:43 PM

Please see above.

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 September, 2017 03:09 PM

After MKUltra, it's absurd more wasn't done to reign in the intelligence agencies

WISE\_TURD • 10 points • 8 September, 2017 02:43 PM

I don't doubt the legitimacy of your argument; I see it as risk/reward of two options (the worst case for each option):

1. Avoiding plastics when they turn out to be benign, Cost: expended needless money and effort.
2. Using plastics when they turn out to be harmful, Cost: my physical well-being, the extent of which is unknown.

It's an ongoing cost/benefit analysis: -If i'm in a setting (hospital) where plastics are predominantly used, i won't complain about their use. -If I have the choice of not using plastic at a marginally higher cost, i'll likely choose no plastic (getting a glass or stainless steel water bottle instead of plastic or using foil instead of saran wrap).

-If plastics are harmful, we'll likely find out when it's too late.

-Avoiding plastics when you can is prudent. Completely abstaining from all polymers is as futile as it is time-consuming.

RedSugarPill • 2 points • 8 September, 2017 09:34 PM

You the real RP! Precisely spoken

SuperStalin • 28 points • 8 September, 2017 08:58 AM

whatever chemical we use lowers testosterone levels - it's not nearly as detrimental as behaviours which lower testosterone levels

185poundsofhatredWIP • 5 points • 8 September, 2017 11:05 AM

What behavior lowers testosterone?

SuperStalin • 24 points • 8 September, 2017 11:14 AM

being complacent, inactive, indecisive, passive... when you don't use your testosterone production facilities AKA balls

PantsonFire1234 • 6 points • 8 September, 2017 03:48 PM

Exactly, some things might tamper my levels but compared to the rest of the population it's obvious i'm not missing out. Drinking alcohol for example. If you party like a raging whore every weekend

you are only achieving three things. 1. a drain on your bank account 2. lots of fake numbers and those that go nowhere 3. muscle loss, T loss, loss of healthy appetite.

Maybe sometimes you get laid. Probably less and less so after you poisoned yourself enough. Things like that impact you far more than a plastic bottle.

185poundsofhatredWIP • 4 points • 8 September, 2017 05:27 PM

Do you have any studies that back this up?

SuperStalin • 4 points • 8 September, 2017 06:03 PM

Actually I did read some studies about how european football fans have raised testosterone levels from just being a part of a group of males... but I can't be arsed to search on my phone.

Also, lifting heavy weights, especially squats co-relates positively with long term T-level raise.

George\_Rockwell • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 11:06 PM

This is actually very interesting. Someone post links dammit

[deleted] • 3 points • 8 September, 2017 06:10 PM

Isn't it a chicken and egg type situation?

SuperStalin • 2 points • 8 September, 2017 07:26 PM

It's not if you live in a family or a wider society where being a man is frowned upon.

Ask men who've grown up without a male role model

mental\_models • 4 points • 8 September, 2017 03:04 PM

deference, bad posture, lack of mindfulness (getting emotionally overwhelmed and stressed-out /cortisol), lack of eating/supplementing right, lack of talking to attractive women, lack of ever being the alpha in any social situations,

185poundsofhatredWIP • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 05:27 PM

Do you have any studies that back this up?

mental\_models • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 06:55 PM

some of these are common knowledge and some have studies.

google "Proceedings of the Royal Society B" with "testosterone" until you find a univ cal study. - that will show you one study. Sorry don't have time to present it like a term paper or scientific study at the moment. Good luck.

InvoluntarySickCunt[S] • 3 points • 8 September, 2017 03:50 PM

I think this post has tremendous value and of I could sticky it I would. Thanks for the input and I hope everyone takes the time to do some research on prolonged sitting, posture, cortisol, exercise, and T levels.

LOST\_TALE • 2 points • 8 September, 2017 03:51 PM

like losing.

I listened to a secondary source that losing or winning in competition affects your testosterone levels

What about the gay frogs doe

[deleted] • 22 points • 8 September, 2017 06:38 AM

Nice

Filtered water in my plastic PUR filter won't make me buy an Xbox.

Ta mate. +1 Internets.

AlphaGrad • 3 points • 8 September, 2017 02:50 PM

That's cuz we all know PC is better than consoles.

InvoluntarySickCunt[S] • 6 points • 8 September, 2017 06:41 AM

If mind control were that simple I'd think academics could find a way to make more money!

sorceryofthetesticle • 9 points • 8 September, 2017 07:01 AM

Wrong again! The real academics work for Tampon Corp and have convinced the beta labrat underling workforce to wear testosterone shredding nitrile gloves. Might as well change your name to

InvoluntarySickCuck bro, sorry.

InvoluntarySickCunt[S] • 7 points • 8 September, 2017 07:08 AM

Damn I knew those gloves were pink for a reason. It was right in front of my eyes the whole time!

MentORPHEUS • 6 points • 8 September, 2017 11:39 PM

I'm not really a fan of this essay. It purports to be scientific, but is written in a flippant manner typical of anti-science writers. It spends a long time being dismissive of a few claimed sources of estrogen-mimics, but apparently ignores the reality that humans bear a heavy load of not only this class of chemicals, but PCBs, furans, PFOA, phthalates, organochlorate/phosphates, and VOCs.

"That New Car Smell" is largely plasticizers. Cheap plastic car mats positively reek of phthalate, so do many cheap imported plastic products.

This may diminish the claims made in particular articles from the other post, but it doesn't make a good case to dismiss one's concerns about body chemical burdens entirely.

InvoluntarySickCunt[S] • 2 points • 8 September, 2017 11:55 PM

I believe that, as GLO mentioned in his front page post earlier today, the key to having an informative and impactful post is to match the style to the audience. You're absolutely correct that the post is flippant; i wrote it that way by design to gain the attention of the young men who make up the audience. From my perspective, getting people thinking critically is the ultimate goal.

In the comments below I've picked through several other studies on BPA specifically to demonstrate how oftentimes in research, the conclusions of the authors are contradicted by their methodology. Not all peer-reviews are equal, as it were.

Anyway, criticisms of my style aside, the point I'm trying to make was never about any material in specific. The point was that people need to read the literature that they're purporting to understand, because the truth is nuanced.

MentORPHEUS • 6 points • 9 September, 2017 12:54 AM

the key to having an informative and impactful post is to match the style to the audience

That's not wrong, but a writer can't neglect matching the style to the gravitas of the subject matter as well. This was well suited for debunking a 100% false claim, and then to an audience that already mostly agrees. For this particular topic, where there remains an underlying serious concern, and to a broad audience, talking about scientific matters in the typical manner of anti-science writers results in cognitive dissonance. *Is he being dismissive of those who stretch and fabricate scientific facts, or science itself?*

Anyway, that's my feedback on this particular post. I'll look with interest for further writings of yours.

InvoluntarySickCunt[S] • 3 points • 9 September, 2017 02:25 AM

I thank you sincerely for the thoughtful feedback. I hadn't considered that perspective and was writing hastily right before bed; I got a bit lazy. I still think my criticisms of the original articles stand for themselves despite the tone- but again- thank you.

This kind of dialogue is what makes this community unique.

ytfromsnwrsh • 10 points • 8 September, 2017 08:06 AM

To whom may be interested in Testosterone levels, here are some tips that can save you time and point you in the right direction if you want to research and act on your problem. My testosterone levels were in the low threshold, dont know how is measured in america by in my country my level was 290. I was suffering from various methabolic disorders, high blood pressure, high sugar in the blood, was 20kg overweight and had tits bigger than my girl's. Now, 14 months later, my T level is 730, my workout at the gym actually makes visible difference in terms of muscle. lost those 20kgs and my blood tests and exams are normal again. What is the trick? I cut carbs and sugar (not radically, but I only eat that poison exceptionally). I went to endochrinologist doctor with all my research and showed him, and said I would do that with or without medical supervision. He jumped in and bought the idea, skeptical at first but he finally admitted I had a point, after my new blood tests. Ok, testosterone replenishment per si can make your body stop producing it. The way I found to get around this was a new treatment. The drug XXXX(please google and find out) (commercial names are xxxx or xxxx, in my country). It is a drug used to induce ovulation in women that cannot get pregnant. Fertility Doctors also prescribed it off label to the husbands to increase sperm production and ejaculation volume. It triggers your own body to produce testosterone. It worked for me, I had one of those pills every day and now Doctor reduce to one every two days, to keep my testosterone under 800. The sperm volume actually increased (but I didnt have problems there before) and my testies did not shrink, on the contrary, they seem fuller. In most aspects I feel like I am 29 again (Im 44 years old), not miracle overnight but definitely worth taking a look if you are in the situation I was. EDIT: removed the drug name and commercial brands, its not rocket science to find the names on line. Or PM me if you need.

[deleted] • 13 points • 8 September, 2017 11:14 AM

This: obesity is responsible for your lower testosterone levels.

<http://www.buffalo.edu/news/releases/2010/05/11311.html>

Fedor\_Gavnyukov • 4 points • 8 September, 2017 09:59 AM

the drug is called clomid for anyone wondering. it may or may not work for everyone. the tests needed to be performed to see if clomid might actually work are for primary and secondary hypogonadism. your LH and FSH levels should tell you a great deal about it.

un-supervised-savage • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 04:24 PM

There are a few others that work better than clomid. Clomid is a fairly old drug but still does the trick.

D3ATH943 points 8 September, 2017 10:45 AM [recovered]

Thank you for confirming my theory that quite a few Red Pillers are gullible idiots so long as a post is formatted well and matches their view points.

Dead\_\_Hand • 7 points • 8 September, 2017 10:51 AM

You provide some excellent reasons to be skeptical.

However, we are still faced with the fact that sperm counts in western men have dropped by something like 50% in the last 50 years. Now, it is a jump from there to saying that a decrease in testosterone is playing an important role, but assuming that is the case (and I acknowledge that, if this is wrong, the rest does not follow): we need to account for what is lowering population testosterone levels.

Plastics and other endocrine disrupters (e.g. soy) interfering with T levels seems like a plausible explanation (at least in part).

The thing about reasoning is that we don't actually proceed inductively or deductively in our every day life - not really. Most of our reasoning is "abductive" - also known as "inference to the best explanation". It's a weaker form of inference than induction (inference from the particular to the general, e.g. scientific generalizations) and deduction (necessary inference built up from first principles, e.g. math). But it's still a legitimate one.

At this time, environmental plastics playing a role in lowering testosterone levels seems to me to be (part of) the best available explanation for lower testosterone levels.

BaronVonNrx • 3 points • 8 September, 2017 03:48 PM

The problem is that is that society as directed (by media, academia, corporations etc) has apparently no desire to find a solution for lowering sperm counts and lowered testosterone in western men.

It is not much of a leap to conclude that it's intentional. (As demographic displacement of the founding stock of western countries by third world immigrants is an obvious objective) as is creating a more docile male population.

There is a massive demand within the male community for increased testosterone so no one can tell me this is just based on free market demand.

So we are stuck grasping at straws as to how to counteract the apparent assault on what makes us men.

[deleted] • 3 points • 8 September, 2017 11:14 AM

Thanks for the insight. However I'm curious about heating/cooking food stuffs in certain plastic containers/packaging. Would this have more of an impact in any way?

Shaman6624 • 3 points • 8 September, 2017 01:59 PM

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3210908/> you say a few picogram but this study suggests it's a lot more.

GayLubeOil • 17 points • 8 September, 2017 08:20 AM

Can you stay? We need you. Stay and help us wrangle our sperg children. Help them develop critical reading skills their teachers never taught them.

jonknownothing • 44 points • 8 September, 2017 09:27 AM

dude, you were agreeing with the other article before. Stop acting like wise old man

GayLubeOil • -12 points • 8 September, 2017 09:39 AM

There is a world of difference between saying:

- A) They are putting chemicals in the water and turning the frickin frogs gay
- B) Obama's Chief Scientist Eric Holdrens wrote a book called EcoScience advocating forced sterilization and putting chemicals in the water.

Hopefully you are intelligent enough to understand the difference. If you are not, please tell us so we can have you thrown in the Ban Van with the retards.

Golderoy\_Lickhart23 points 8 September, 2017 10:40 AM **[recovered]**

lol. b) is the pseudo-educated version of a). hopefully you are intelligent enough to understand the analogy. if you are not, please tell me so i can have you roasted in the next reply.

only because a chief scientiest of some president writes a book, it does not justify validating some shit posts as science.

trying to wiggle your little dick out of it just makes it more pathetic, boy.

JamesSkepp • 2 points • 8 September, 2017 04:24 PM

[https://gangstalkingsurfers.files.wordpress.com/2015/06/11665454\\_908089715901326\\_5071293693620284633\\_n.jpg?w=960](https://gangstalkingsurfers.files.wordpress.com/2015/06/11665454_908089715901326_5071293693620284633_n.jpg?w=960)

If you're talking about this link, with few obvious exceptions, it's basically RP done top-down style.

anonymoushero1 • 5 points • 8 September, 2017 07:01 AM

its fucking sad that you need to go these lengths to try to explain to people that retards online aren't to be taken seriously.

PantsonFire1234 • 3 points • 8 September, 2017 03:51 PM

Granted, certified government officials, social workers and licences politicians are not to be taken serious either. So where does a man turn to when he is out of his field of expertise? Exactly, to another rationale man who is in this field. Like OP.

In essence that's what the red pill is all about. Not taking information from anyone but from the accumulative as a whole and deciding which information holds truth.

IVlaskerade • 2 points • 8 September, 2017 07:35 AM\*

Questions:

Do you think that BPAs (less so nowadays) and phthalate-based plasticisers do not have xenoestrogenic properties?

Do you think that there hasn't been a marked rise in estrogen levels in water sources due to female contraception?

InvoluntarySickCunt[S] • 5 points • 8 September, 2017 07:43 AM\*

The evidence is clear that some plasticizer compounds do indeed exhibit xenoestrogenic properties, at least in vitro. Where i become skeptical is claims of macro-scale physiological effects in the general population as a result of those compounds use in consumer goods.

What's most important to note is the concentrations at which effects begin to manifest, and the specifics of those effects. For instance, how does the binding affinity of estrogen-mimicking compounds to the androgen

receptor compare to actual estrogen? Are these molecules polar or nonpolar? Hormones typically act on transcription factors in the nucleus and can pass through membranes easily.

I always say, in *in vitro* experiments you can shoot a cell dish and then claim it was the lead in the bullet that killed the cells.

Great question.

As for BC contributing, I'm not familiar with the literature. Let me do some research tomorrow and I'll message you privately with my opinion. If I had to guess I would say it would be measurable increase but physiologically negligible since so much BC has become progesterone based or implantable. Could be wrong here though.

max\_peenor • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 02:53 PM

The evidence is clear that some plasticizer compounds do indeed exhibit xenoestrogenic properties, at least in vitro. Where i become skeptical is claims of macro-scale physiological effects in the general population as a result of those compounds use in consumer goods.

See, this is where I have a problem with your post. When people throw fits about mercury in their flu shots, it's fucking retarded. When you look at the available science there is no serious reason to worry about it, but there is definite reasons why the flu vaccine has huge health benefits, which in many cases are life saving. What we are talking about here is the quality of food containers. There are tons of choices in this department AND there are some indications that the containers in question might be a problem. The only reason these in question exist is because it is cheaper for the manufacturers to make.

So why am I choosing a potential problem just to make someone else some more profit? When you play science all the time you lose the big picture and that's what happened here.

You'll notice my response in the previous thread was about how LCF reacted. It was an overreaction and she will admit it. However, the stuff we have now is much higher quality and the cost is not an issue for me. In the big picture, the overreaction was a net positive to me.

InvoluntarySickCunt[S] • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 04:01 PM

I understand and respect your viewpoint but I feel I must clarify- I'm simply stating that I have not seen sufficient evidence of a effect on the human level. If evidence is provided I am ready to modify my post and torch some university buildings.

We can debate the ethics of companies saving a buck at the potential cost of consumer health and how the free market and general education can combat this, but I feel that that discussion belongs in a different post.

max\_peenor • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 04:09 PM

I have not seen sufficient evidence

Arbitrary metric, but here's the point: if there was a mountain of evidence or no evidence, then the course of action would be obvious. However, if there is some evidence, then the course of action needs to be a discussion of risk. You cannot separate these things. You want a real world example of why this is? Medical science. Its practice is almost entirely balancing what we know, which is almost never everything, against what we know about the risks. Now I will admit given what we know here, the risks would appear to be ridiculously low.

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 September, 2017 12:14 PM

Since there always has to be one cheeky cunt in every thread like this I'll do it and get it out of the way so no-one else has to:

and illustrates the need for a quick run-down of scientific skepticism.

Ok

Why you should trust my judgement: I am a molecular biologist and immunologist who is active in the academic sphere and have expertise in in vitro cellular assays.

Appear to authority fallacy.

But in all seriousness I do have a couple of questions regarding plastics.

I've been lead to believe that plastics are harmful to animals because they are essentially unable to be broken down, the fragments of plastic just get divided into smaller and smaller pieces and hang around in the bodies of animals that ingest them, moving up the food chain.

I presume that the human digestive system has no method of digesting plastic, so similar to fibre and other indigestible molecules it just gets passed.

I believe this is where most of the "danger" from plastic comes from, when particles are small enough to pass through the digestive system into the rest of the body through diffusion because of their small size. Presumably they are not recognised as a pathogen so they just sit there, accumulating.

So my concern is that is there nothing the body that can break down plastic completely? not even stomach acid? an immune response? If there isn't, what does the plastic do in the body?

An EC should award a point for OP as well.

InvoluntarySickCunt[S] • 4 points • 8 September, 2017 04:04 PM

Why you should trust my judgement: I am a molecular biologist and immunologist who is active in the academic sphere and have expertise in in vitro cellular assays.

Appear to authority fallacy.

Yes!!! I was hoping someone would call me on this! Naturally I cannot provide detailed evidence of my stature in the academic realm due to the political climate and the forum on which we are debating.

**I implore every reader to trust my arguments on those arguments' merits alone.**

I'll respond to the other remarks in this post later as an edit.

joh2141 • 2 points • 8 September, 2017 01:02 PM

At the end of the day most people don't read or research or find sources so even if you warn them and people go "I UNDERSTAND OP, I WILL HEED YOUR WORDS TILL THE DAY I DIE," they'll forget it tomorrow. Huff Puff sucks period but never forget to question and never take anything at face value. Most scientific research will publicly release their experiment/data. You can review it yourself and see whether the data is compromised or concrete or still remains to be conclusive. Federal agencies like CDC is still trustworthy. It's just CIA and NSA that people don't like.

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 September, 2017 02:27 PM

how can we be sure you're not some paid shill employed by Big Tampon?

PantsonFire1234 • 2 points • 8 September, 2017 03:59 PM

Always possible, that's why you need to fact check what OP says. Some of us are too busy, hence why we need a critical user base. Couple guys find the time to do this before the end of the weekend. One guy rings the bell and calls out OP on his bullshit. People not allocate their own time to verify and the post gets labelled bs.

The problem now is that everyone just blindly agrees. The first post everyone agreed. Now everyone agrees again. It's the easiest way. Also I really doubt everyone who read the post is swamped this weekend.

Especially the EC's and mods who are partially responsible for the quality on this sub.

That or just look at OP's commenting history and decide if he's legit.

Rian\_Stone • 2 points • 8 September, 2017 02:53 PM

Like I said last thread. My whiskey hobby affects it far more than BPA does.

low hanging fruit

adr007 • 5 points • 8 September, 2017 08:36 AM

Fellow molecular biologist, I salute the work you've done here.

[deleted] • 3 points • 8 September, 2017 10:06 AM\*

I really hated that initial post acting like plastic water bottles would turn you into a sniveling soyboy (although you can bet your ass that heated greasy food in a plastic container will confer noticeable and measurable estrogenic activity... I, ahem, had a short bout of gyno which was extremely responsive to anything estrogenic, and those suckers stung and doubled in size within an hour of eating lasagna heated up in a cheap plastic sandwich tupperware). I didn't have the time, energy, nor wherewithal to debate it but you, sir, have common sense/scienced his ass more effectively than I could have though, so kudos for the quality post.

un-supervised-savage • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 04:36 PM\*

The problem is some guys are more sensitive to estrogen than others. So they will write it off as anecdotal evidence because it didn't work for them or it wasn't reproduced in a peer review study. Making personal changes and monitoring your own blood work to see how those changes work for you is the best way to go about it. Going with non bpa plastic/metal bottles for water and definitely avoiding heated plastics contact with my food/water the best I can have personally made my nipples less puffy/sensitive. On top of keeping very lean.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 10:04 PM

I think that's definitely true, but some guys are also not very perceptive or critical when it comes to the effects of things they're eating. My gyno was reversed with tamoxifen and avoiding estrogenic foods, but when I had it, it was very clear which foods were making it worse by binding to those estrogen receptors. Soy, cheap refined fat foods with no fiber (which probably had an indirect effect on endogenous estrogen), too much stone fruit, and plastic were all extremely clear culprits when it came to estrogenic activity.

Actually, the OP's post is slightly misleading since you have to kind of make inferences when it comes to scientific understanding, rather than just reading the results of a few limited, lackluster studies with weak methodology. This is actually a very difficult subject to study for many reasons and we are far from understanding the effects of plastics on the body. We barely even understand what phytoestrogen ligands do in the body aside from loosely correlating them with lowered testosterone and lowered hormone receptor positive cancer risk, which some studies conflict with as well. Nutrition science is a weak area of science to be sure.

un-supervised-savage • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 11:05 PM

I definitely agree that there needs to be more scientific studies done in the nutrition field. You pretty much have to test them all out yourself to see what works. Then look for the available science there is on it to get a loose understanding of why it worked. I've been playing with different diets for most of my life and still haven't mastered what works best for me. I'd went with some consulting from a top level nutritionist that specializes in preping pro competitors and learned more in 12 weeks than the past 18 years. Folks like that don't drop that info into the internet hoping to teach the masses because there's limited controlled studies on it, and why give away tips for free when you can make money from it by reputation.

[deleted] • 1 point • 9 September, 2017 09:22 AM

Same here. I've been experimenting and poring over nutrition science studies on a near constant basis since I first got into bodybuilding, and especially when I hit my early 20's and had some health issues. At first, I didn't even understand the value of fiber aside from colon health. Now I recognize that fiber is not only crucial for the health of every tissue in the body, but that every source of fiber has essentially its own unique effects (not to mention the thousands of accompanying phytonutrients with unique effects). It's immense, yet I feel like having that foundation of nutrition science sets you up for future success. I constantly feel sharper and lighter as I continue to increase my Omega 3 ratio, etc. And yet doctors know very little about nutrition, and nutritionists often pick a side and only share the evidence that supports it (e.g. Dr. Gregor of NutritionFacts.org, who selectively shares only studies that support a vegan diet - and he himself looks like a pale bag of bones). Essentially, it's entirely up to us, with the help of experts and science, to forge our own sense of nutritional understanding because nothing can help promote our own understanding quite as well as personal experience and a bevy of complex, contradictory knowledge.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 10:37 AM

i salute you for bringing real quality content back. like, science for once and for all.

Disciple\_of\_Libertas • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 10:54 AM

Interesting, I'm still not a huge fan of plastics. I am.interested in hearing your opinion on what may be the source of decreasing test levels in Western men.

PantsonFire1234 • 3 points • 8 September, 2017 03:56 PM

No exercise (no real excersise)

No confidence (power stances, body language)

Feminine behaviors and emotional sophilism

Crap diet

Alcohol, smoking, drugs

Genetics (bad breeding)

Lack of sun (hello upper northern hemisphere)

Stress, Depression, Cognitive Dissonance, Mental illnesses

Honestly there's more but you get the point. Everything contributes to it. Women btw are also low E just like men are low T. Attributing everything to guys and pretending like women don't suck is the highest of fallacy's

Kinbaku\_enthusiast • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 05:19 PM

Women btw are also low E

Based on what? It's more likely that they're too high in E, as they too are vulnerable to the xeno-estrogens.

On top of that, many are on the pill, which frequently has estrogen in it.

PantsonFire1234 • 2 points • 8 September, 2017 08:08 PM

I'm not sure about the science behind it all but it's a repeated sentiment among those who look at society making red pill observations. Broad shouldered hambeasts for example. Thick girls etc. Men need allot of T to get the engine starting, a little bit of T is enough to fuck with a woman's hormones though. You won't see chicks growing beards but the imbalance created by a shitty diet (McDonalds) and binge drinking is enough to change a sensual woman. Same can be said for men, the T-lowering factors just bottles down to hormonal imbalance. So you won't be growing tits but certainly won't be Chad either.

un-supervised-savage • 3 points • 8 September, 2017 05:13 PM

Sedentary lifestyle is a large irrefutable factor.

notajith • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 10:56 AM

What about chlorinated PVC? In my area CPVC can be used for household water supply. PEX is also available but is unpopular for anything but new construction.

TheBloodEagleX • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 11:06 AM

Throwing in this article while we're at it:

<https://arstechnica.com/science/2017/09/survey-finds-small-amounts-of-microplastics-in-tap-water-the-world-over/>

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 11:15 AM

Concerned about your testosterone levels? Lose weight.

<http://www.buffalo.edu/news/releases/2010/05/11311.html>

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 12:28 PM

We need more people like you.

Do you have something to say about deodorants with aluminum?

We\_Flatten\_Stuff • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 12:29 PM

I think you're just Big plastics trying to trick us /s

Nice to see a well written comprehensive post, that was interesting thanks

reddttt • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 01:14 PM

How can you like biomolecules that much. Holy fuck that shit brings painful memories from a past semester in my current medschool. That shit is fucking boring.

BiggestBoop • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 01:25 PM

Thank you for this! There are far too many posts here with anti-science undertones. Or even explicitly anti-

science ones like you just mentioned.

omega\_dawg93 • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 02:58 PM

dude said, "weekly prostate exams." lol.

InvoluntarySickCunt[S] • 2 points • 8 September, 2017 04:07 PM

Want to help make it daily?

max\_peenor • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 03:02 PM

### The Mysterious Case of Shitty Workers' Rights in China

Completely unrelated to your post, kinda, but I do have a problem here. We debate the dangers of properly manufactured products, but we get container ships full of poorly manufactured garbage from China all the time. How many houses have had their drywall and/or flooring ripped out in the last couple years because it was slowly killing the residents? More than one. So keep that in mind. Even if you are convinced the alleged material is safe, who the hell knows if you are actually getting that if you are buying low quality cheap shit.

Putins\_Masseuse • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 03:22 PM

I wonder who's downvoting this

thInc • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 03:55 PM

I'm more concerned about eating fish due to bioaccumulation and the ocean food chain. Can you comment on that issue?

casemodsalt • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 03:58 PM

I think masturbating while high on meth is what lowered mine.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 04:09 PM

Okay, so what is the cause of the lowered testosterone in the west?

RedSugarPill • 2 points • 8 September, 2017 09:54 PM

Not enough exercise can likely explain the effect

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 10:28 PM

That really explains the entire drop?

RedSugarPill • 1 point • 18 September, 2017 12:04 AM

You can test it yourself. Check your t-levels now, then lift weights for a month and check again. You'll be amazed at the changes. Not just testosterone: quality of life is enhanced in many ways.

[deleted] • 1 point • 18 September, 2017 12:13 AM

1. That wouldnt measure shit on me considering Ive been lifting for the last month.
2. The fact that lifting raises T doesnt mean drop in T is only due to lack of lifting.

Do you have any evidence that people workout 50% less now than 20 years ago?

RedSugarPill • 1 point • 18 September, 2017 12:50 AM

The evidence is my own body. I was trying to encourage you to do your own experiment.  
Since you're already healthy, you don't need my advice. The rest is just ego children scratch.  
All the best

kikage • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 05:03 PM

If I wear a nitrile glove most of my day, should I be worried?

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 06:11 PM

What about pesticides? The xenoestrogens present in society are not restricted to just plastics.

Chikinhok • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 06:56 PM

What about flouride making us stupid? Know anything about that?

JFMX1996 • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 07:25 PM

While the BPA thing is controversial, it'd be cool to go more into environmental estrogens affecting young men later down the road.

I think it is a topic that should be covered, as it could have a greater significance to why young men may be becoming more effeminate or lacking in masculine qualities.

Things like all the estrogens in milk, tap water, etc.

As well as dietary influences on our endocrine systems.

Iconoclast674 • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 08:42 PM

Triclosan in many antibacterial soaps, like Dial, has only recently been regulated by the FDA.

This chemical is a hormone disruption, and can mimic estrogen in the body.

latincanuck • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 09:22 PM

No they are reviewing it still, it is considered an emerging concern, and it banned the marketing of antibacterial soap and mouthwash, as these were not proven to be any more beneficial than using regular soap. As well the fda did not say triclosan is a hormone disruptor but is possibly harmful to the environment. in the ban that the FDA was talking about there were 19 chemicals named, some of them or one of them may be a hormonal disruptor This is the type of fear mongering he is talking about.

Iconoclast674 • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 11:07 PM\*

There are many hormone disrupting chemicals in the water supply. It one thing that has given rise to amphibian and fish to abnormal serial development.

Here is a paper addressing it's effect on rats: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20562219>

The FDA maybe reviewing the regulation, but that doesn't change the science.

Same could be said about glyphosate and neonics.

We know they are damaging, science shows us, but USDA would rather take impartial data from the mnufactuers

latincanuck • 1 point • 9 September, 2017 12:45 AM

Again read it, female rats, no estrogen increase in male rats

Iconoclast674 • 1 point • 9 September, 2017 01:03 AM

Fair enough;

However, I think the potential impact on human females is still a reason to be concerned,

And

How it impacts the overall human population, or those who come into contact with it the most may vary from rat models.

Granted that's a bit of conjecture on my part

latincanuck • 1 point • 9 September, 2017 02:07 AM

Right, the question is how much is safe. However the FDA did not find anything towards human usage. So far only possible environmental issues due to bacterial resistance

saint\_pill • 1 point • 9 September, 2017 01:17 AM

"Along with 36 other researchers, led by vom Saal, the group analyzed hundreds of government-funded studies and found that 90 percent had concluded BPA was a health risk. It was the dozen or so industry-funded studies, vom Saal says, that failed to replicate other BPA research."

<https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/just-how-harmful-are-bisphenol-a-plastics/>

sd4c • 1 point • 9 September, 2017 01:32 AM

I'd love to hear your theory as to why testosterone levels have plummeted in Western men:

<https://www.healio.com/endocrinology/hormone-therapy/news/print/endocrine-today/%7Bac23497d-f1ed-4278-bbd2-92bb1e552e3a%7D/generational-decline-in-testosterone-levels-observed>

InvoluntarySickCunt[S] • 3 points • 9 September, 2017 03:09 AM

Fascinating article, thank you for bringing it to my attention. I'm going to dedicate a new top level post to this phenomenon as it seems to be of general interest as well.

NiceTryDisaster • 1 point • 9 September, 2017 06:54 AM

Can someone address the effect of cold showers on testosterone?

Kalidane • 1 point • 9 September, 2017 08:07 AM

Good job man.

We need more science in here, and a hell of a lot less magical thinking and bullshit.

prodigy2throw • 1 point • 9 September, 2017 05:54 PM

Hilarious how no matter how many upvotes TRP posts get they never get to the front page.

[deleted] • 1 point • 10 September, 2017 03:40 AM

Why does water in plastic bottles sometimes taste "plastic-y?"

drsherbert • 1 point • 11 September, 2017 11:32 AM

It's a form of population control. Keep the T levels down and control the birth rate. You can't just eat the red pill on women and take the blue pill in every other facet of life. We always pursue the truth even when it's unpopular. It's deeper than females. We ride or die for this shit.

i4mn30 • 1 point • 12 September, 2017 04:29 AM

Pico-unit is by the way  $10^{-12}$

I\_Need\_More\_Space\_ • 1 point • 12 September, 2017 06:17 AM

I think I'll just take the easy route and avoid plastics. Whether it has anything to do with Testosterone, I'll err on the side of caution.

I think the bigger problem with plastics is that the oceans are suffering a great deal due to toxicity from plastics. Given that the ocean and the organisms that live in the ocean produce 70% of the earth's O<sub>2</sub> production, I'd say that that is a bigger issue than a suspected decline in current male testosterone levels.

To OP, instead of defending plastics in regards to the small scope of direct human impact, try thinking of the bigger picture. The world is not going to miss plastics if they ever go away. The world will however miss the O<sub>2</sub> production the oceans provide us if we fuck them up.

InvoluntarySickCunt[S] • 1 point • 12 September, 2017 07:41 PM

instead of defending plastics in regards to the small scope of direct human impact, try thinking of the bigger picture. The world is not going to miss plastics if they ever go away. The world will however miss the O<sub>2</sub> production the oceans provide us if we fuck them up.

My goal isn't to defend plastics, but rather to make a broader commentary on scientific literacy.

However, I don't think you realize the vast scope of application of plastics. Sure you can swap out bags for cloth, but in many applications polymers like nylon are unmatched in durability. Furthermore, the O<sub>2</sub> in the oceans is a result of photosynthetic cyanobacteria, and I haven't seen any evidence of plastics harming them. If you have it as this is certainly an issue I'm ready to be persuaded on.

I\_Need\_More\_Space\_ • 1 point • 13 September, 2017 07:04 PM

Do you not believe that photosynthetic cyanobacteria are part of the vast ocean ecosystem? What affects one part of the ecosystem inherently affects others. You call yourself a scientist.

You call yourself a scientist. More accurately, you sound like a scientist employed by plastics companies. Cheers to your scientific integrity.

5t3fan0 • 1 point • 12 September, 2017 10:37 PM

this is good content, thanks Sickcunt!

i personally vote the **endocrine and hormones** topic especially regarding glucose levels, feast/fast and about how an imbalanced insulin/glucagon can fuck up health and lifts... i believe these to be very important knowledge often disregarded for the sake of simple "calories in/out advice"

calloberjig • 1 point • 12 September, 2017 11:49 PM

Drink water from the sky using a glass vessel

Bodybuilder1453 • 1 point • 13 September, 2017 01:54 PM

Thanks. this is very interesting

[deleted] • 0 points • 8 September, 2017 08:39 AM

Glad to have contributors like you on board. People need to use common sense, Occam and Hanlon's razor rather than assume the big bad shadow government is trying to make us all beta. Now we just need to convince people

that there are no baby eating, reptilian aliens among us.

[deleted] 8 September, 2017 09:28 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 8 September, 2017 10:10 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 8 September, 2017 11:01 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 8 September, 2017 02:29 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 8 September, 2017 03:46 PM\*

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 9 September, 2017 01:21 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 9 September, 2017 04:04 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 9 September, 2017 05:10 AM

[permanently deleted]

Ether\_Freeth • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 08:53 AM

Thank you.

And for the record you are a better person than I am. Why? Because instead of just skipping the first article as worthless like me you actually took the time to refute it in great detail.

Keep up the good work.

LOST\_TALE • 1 point • 8 September, 2017 03:46 PM

commie units? your us units are commie because USA is the mother of all commie nests. You guys should check your history, you weren't even able to get rid of them. check the truth about mcarthysim by stefan molyneux

[deleted] 8 September, 2017 10:04 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 0 points • 8 September, 2017 09:47 AM

It could be lowering it technically... like .0000455%

turok281 • 0 points • 8 September, 2017 10:02 AM

like the rubber gloves your doctor wears for your weekly prostate exam

I think you are overdoing it with your prostate exams buddy.

liquiddrummer2 • 0 points • 8 September, 2017 10:34 AM

/u/wolfofanarchy This is how you science. □

ColdEyeZ • 0 points • 8 September, 2017 10:50 AM

SCIENCE!! Now do one where you say fat shaming generally doesn't help no matter what the majority opinion here is.

antinatalist-mgtow • 0 points • 10 September, 2017 01:09 PM

Thankfully I am a MGTOW, so I don't care at all about my testosterone levels because I don't care what women think, and because I'm so rich due to saving so much money from never marrying or having children, I don't care what men think as well. I figure if I just avoid dairy in my diet, my testosterone levels will be fine.