

Abdul Zeynalov

English 1101

11/14/2023

Word count: 1851

The research question that propels this investigation is why has the FDA seemingly fallen short of fulfilling its regulatory duties effectively? This question has its roots in a personal encounter, an experience marked by the transformation in the taste and quality of a cherished childhood candy bar. What began as a nostalgic reflection on the evolving nature of a simple pleasure evolved into a broader investigation turned into the questioning of the FDA's role in overseeing the intricacies of the food industry. The investigation takes a comprehensive approach. The main reason for this questioning the desire to discover if there is potential collaboration between the FDA, the food industry, and the medical industrial complex. The connection between these groups is looked at with a critical lens, seeking to understand the subtle complicity on the part of the FDA in permitting practices within the food industry that may be detrimental to public health. The notion of the FDA being implicated in the decline of American health raises important questions about the agency's, its relationship with powerful stakeholders in the food and medical industries, and the potential consequences of this intricate web of connections. As the investigation progresses, the focus extends beyond the immediate anecdotal experience with the candy bar, transcending into a broader analysis of systemic issues that may compromise the FDA's ability to safeguard public health effectively. By unraveling the layers of this complex narrative, the hope is to shed light on potential areas of improvement

within the regulatory framework and stimulate a broader conversation about the interplay between regulatory bodies, industries, and public health in the United States.

Source Entries:

1. Corliss, Julie. "Choosing Heart-Healthy Oils for Home Cooking." Harvard Heart Letter, 1 Feb. 2023.

MLA Bibliographic Citation:

Corliss, Julie. "Choosing Heart-Healthy Oils for Home Cooking." Harvard Heart Letter, 1 Feb. 2023.

Summary:

Julie Corliss discusses the selection of heart-healthy oils for home cooking in this article from the Harvard Heart Letter. The piece emphasizes the importance of choosing oils with health benefits. It provides insights into the impact of different oils on heart health, guiding readers toward informed choices.

Rhetorical Analysis:

Corliss's article, originating from the prestigious Harvard Heart Letter, holds credibility in addressing heart health. The goal is clear: to educate the audience on making heart-healthy choices. The target audience appears to be individuals interested in maintaining or improving

their cardiovascular health. The source aligns with mainstream health recommendations but may lack a comprehensive exploration of potential biases in the food industry.

Quotation:

"According to the Harvard Heart Letter, 'Choosing the right cooking oil is crucial for heart health. Oils rich in unsaturated fats, such as olive oil and canola oil, are better choices than those high in saturated or trans fats.'"

2. Kearns CE, Schmidt LA, Glantz SA. "Sugar Industry and Coronary Heart Disease Research: A Historical Analysis of Internal Industry Documents." *JAMA Intern Med.* 2016;176(11):1680-1685. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2016.5394

Kearns, C. E., Schmidt, L. A., & Glantz, S. A. "Sugar Industry and Coronary Heart Disease Research: A Historical Analysis of Internal Industry Documents." *JAMA Intern Med*, 2016, 176(11), 1680-1685. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2016.5394

Summary:

Within the extensive realms of investigative scholarship, this research article represents a meticulous exploration of the intricate historical relationship between the sugar industry and coronary heart disease research. Authored by Kearns, Schmidt, and Glantz, this scholarly endeavor transcends the surface of conventional discourse, delving into the annals of internal industry documents to unveil a narrative that intricately weaves potential biases and influences into the tapestry of public perceptions regarding the impact of sugar on heart health. The crux of this research lies in the authors' commitment to a detailed and comprehensive analysis, a deep dive into the often-opaque corridors of industry practices and decision-making. By peering

behind the curtain of internal documents, the researchers aim to expose not only the overt connections between the sugar industry and coronary heart disease research but also the subtler threads of influence that may have shaped, if not manipulated, the prevailing understanding of the relationship between sugar consumption and cardiovascular health. The significance of this research extends beyond the immediate subject matter, reaching into the very foundations of scientific inquiry and public discourse. It serves as an illuminating beacon, spotlighting the historical interplay between economic interests and scientific narratives, challenging the presumed objectivity of research, and prompting a reconsideration of the reliability of information disseminated to the public. As readers engage with the findings presented by Kearns, Schmidt, and Glantz, they are not merely confronted with historical revelations; they are invited to contemplate the broader implications for contemporary health discourse. The research beckons a reevaluation of the trust placed in industries that play a pivotal role in shaping public health narratives. It prompts critical reflections on the potential impact of industry interests on scientific objectivity, encouraging a more discerning approach to interpreting research findings in the context of complex relationships between commercial entities and public health concerns. In essence, this research article emerges not only as a historical exposé but as a catalyst for a more nuanced and vigilant approach to understanding the intricate intersections of industry, research, and public health. As society grapples with evolving challenges in health communication, this research contributes to an ongoing conversation about the importance of transparency, integrity, and critical scrutiny in ensuring the reliability of information that shapes our understanding of health and well-being.

Rhetorical Analysis:

The source exposes institutional corruption in the sugar industry's influence on heart disease research. Published in the Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA), the article holds high academic standing. The authors aim to unveil the manipulation of research narratives, highlighting the need for scrutiny when interpreting health information. However, the focus is limited to the sugar industry's influence on coronary heart disease, leaving gaps in a broader discussion of food industry practices.

Quotation:

"In their analysis, Kearns, Schmidt, and Glantz reveal how internal industry documents point to a historical manipulation of coronary heart disease research narratives, emphasizing sugar's potential role in shaping public health perceptions."

3. Light, D. W., Lexchin, J., & Darrow, J. J. "Institutional Corruption of Pharmaceuticals and the Myth of Safe and Effective Drugs." *The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, vol. 41, no. 3, 2013, pp. 590-600. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jlme.12068>

Light, D. W., Lexchin, J., & Darrow, J. J. "Institutional Corruption of Pharmaceuticals and the Myth of Safe and Effective Drugs." *The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, vol. 41, no. 3, 2013, pp. 590-600. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jlme.12068>

Summary:

This article critically examines institutional corruption within the pharmaceutical industry, questioning the commonly held belief in the safety and effectiveness of drugs. Light, Lexchin,

and Darrow scrutinize the practices that contribute to this institutional corruption and its implications for public health.

Rhetorical Analysis:

Published in the esteemed pages of *The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, this article stands as a meticulous examination and critique of pharmaceutical practices, offering a nuanced perspective that probes the very foundations of the industry. Within the scholarly discourse presented, the authors assert that the pervasive myth of safe and effective drugs is perpetuated by the insidious presence of institutional corruption, a phenomenon that casts a shadow over the integrity of pharmaceutical processes. The overarching rhetorical goal embedded within the article is not merely to disseminate information but to actively challenge prevailing assumptions surrounding pharmaceutical practices. By doing so, the authors aim to stimulate a paradigm shift in the mindset of readers, fostering a more critical and discerning approach to the evaluation of drug safety and efficacy. Through compelling arguments and evidence, the article seeks to unravel the layers of complacency that may surround the pharmaceutical industry, encouraging readers to question established norms and demand a higher standard of scrutiny in evaluating the claims made by this influential sector. In contributing to the broader scholarly conversation, this source goes beyond a mere critique of pharmaceutical practices; it serves as a catalyst for intellectual engagement and debate. The meticulously crafted arguments and insights presented within its pages add significant depth to our overall understanding of systemic issues within industries intertwined with public health. By peeling back the layers of complexity, the article sheds light on the intricate web of factors that influence the

pharmaceutical landscape, providing readers with a richer context for evaluating the implications of institutional corruption on the safety and efficacy of drugs. In essence, this contribution to *The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics* emerges not only as a critical appraisal of pharmaceutical practices but also as a beacon guiding scholars, policymakers, and the public toward a more informed and discerning perspective on an industry that plays a pivotal role in shaping the health and well-being of individuals and communities. As readers engage with the insights presented, they are prompted to question assumptions, advocate for transparency, and actively participate in ongoing conversations about the ethical dimensions of pharmaceutical practices.

Quotation:

"Light, Lexchin, and Darrow assert that institutional corruption within the pharmaceutical industry perpetuates the myth of safe and effective drugs, urging a reevaluation of public trust in pharmaceutical practices."

Conclusion:

In a comprehensive exploration of the research landscape, the annotated bibliography delves into three diverse sources, each offering valuable insights that collectively contribute to unraveling the intricacies of the overarching research question: why hasn't the FDA effectively fulfilled its regulatory obligations? The selected sources traverse the realms of peer-reviewed journals, institutional analyses, and heart health recommendations, providing a multidimensional perspective on the challenges faced by regulatory bodies and their impact on

public health. The investigation, guided by these diverse sources, exposes instances of institutional corruption entrenched within both the sugar and pharmaceutical industries. This revelation brings to light potential biases and influences that intricately shape public health narratives, raising questions about the integrity of regulatory processes and their susceptibility to external pressures. A closer examination through rhetorical analyses reveals the unique contributions of each source, underscoring their distinct roles in advancing the comprehension of the complex dynamics at play. The Harvard Heart Letter, for instance, emerges as a practical guide, offering insightful recommendations for heart-healthy cooking practices. In contrast, the JAMA article takes on a historical lens, uncovering manipulations in sugar research that have permeated public discourse. The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics article critically dissects the pharmaceutical industry, significantly augmenting our understanding of institutional corruption and its far-reaching implications. This body of research serves as a crucial resource for individuals seeking a nuanced understanding of the multifaceted factors influencing public health, particularly within the context of the FDA's regulatory responsibilities. The findings underscore the pressing need for a more critical and vigilant approach to interpreting health information, urging readers to recognize potential biases and actively hold regulatory bodies accountable for ensuring public safety. As society navigates a complex landscape where profit motives and health considerations may intertwine, this research acts as a clarion call for heightened transparency and public awareness. It highlights the imperative of fostering a collective commitment to safeguarding well-being, urging individuals to be informed consumers of health information and advocates for a regulatory framework that prioritizes the public good over potential conflicts of interest.