

timothy  
santo, dc  
chiropractor

# Healthy Notes

38 Oak Street  
Ridgewood, NJ  
201.444.1215

April, 2010

## Some thoughts on Happiness.

### The Sandra Bullock Trade

By [DAVID BROOKS](#)

Two things happened to Sandra Bullock this month. First, she won an Academy Award for best actress. Then came the news reports claiming that her husband is an adulterous jerk. So the philosophic question of the day is: Would you take that as a deal? Would you exchange a tremendous professional triumph for a severe personal blow?

On the one hand, an Academy Award is nothing to sneeze at. Bullock has earned the admiration of her peers in a way very few experience. She'll make more money for years to come. She may even live longer. Research by Donald A. Redelmeier and Sheldon M. Singh has found that, on average, Oscar winners live nearly four years longer than nominees that don't win. Nonetheless, if you had to take more than three seconds to think about this question, you are absolutely crazy. Marital happiness is far more important than anything else in determining personal well-being. If you have a successful marriage, it doesn't matter how many professional setbacks you endure, you will be reasonably happy. If you have an unsuccessful marriage, it doesn't matter how many career triumphs you record, you will remain significantly unfulfilled. This isn't just sermonizing. This is the age of research, so there's data to back this up. Over the past few decades, teams of researchers have been studying happiness. Their work, which seemed flimsy at first, has developed an impressive rigor, and one of the key findings is that, just as the old sages predicted, worldly success has shallow roots while interpersonal bonds permeate through and through. For example, the relationship between happiness and income is complicated, and after a point, tenuous. It is true that poor nations become happier as they become middle-class nations. But once the basic necessities have been achieved, future income is lightly connected to well-being. Growing countries are slightly less happy than countries with slower growth rates, according to Carol Graham of the Brookings Institution and

Eduardo Lora. The United States is much richer than it was 50 years ago, but this has produced no measurable increase in overall happiness. On the other hand, it has become a much more unequal country, but this inequality doesn't seem to have reduced national happiness.

On a personal scale, winning the lottery doesn't seem to produce lasting gains in well-being. People aren't happiest during the years when they are winning the most promotions. Instead, people are happy in their 20's, dip in middle age and then, on average, hit peak happiness just after retirement at age 65. People get slightly happier as they climb the income scale, but this depends on how they experience growth. Does wealth inflame unrealistic expectations? Does it destabilize settled relationships? Or does it flow from a virtuous cycle in which an interesting job produces hard work that in turn leads to more interesting opportunities?

If the relationship between money and well-being is complicated, the correspondence between personal relationships and happiness is not. The daily activities most associated with happiness are sex, socializing after work and having dinner with others. The daily activity most injurious to happiness is commuting. According to one study, joining a group that meets even just once a month produces the same happiness gain as doubling your income. According to another, being married produces a psychic gain equivalent to more than \$100,000 a year.

If you want to find a good place to live, just ask people if they trust their neighbors. Levels of social trust vary enormously, but countries with high social trust have happier people, better health, more efficient government, more economic growth, and less fear of crime (regardless of whether actual crime rates are increasing or decreasing).

The overall impression from this research is that economic and professional success exists on the surface of life, and that they emerge out of interpersonal relationships, which are much deeper and more important.

The second impression is that most of us pay attention to the wrong things. Most people vastly overestimate the extent to which more money would improve our lives. Most schools and colleges spend too much time preparing students for careers and not enough preparing them to make social decisions. Most governments release a ton of data on economic trends but not enough on trust and other social conditions. In short, modern societies have developed vast institutions oriented around the

things that are easy to count, not around the things that matter most. They have an affinity for material concerns and a primordial fear of moral and social ones.

This may be changing. There is a rash of compelling books — including "The Hidden Wealth of Nations" by David Halpern and "The Politics of Happiness" by Derek Bok — that argue that public institutions should pay attention to well-being and not just material growth narrowly conceived.

Governments keep initiating policies they think will produce prosperity, only to get sacked, time and again, from their spiritual blind side.

## **Cell phones and brain tumors: A review including the long-term epidemiologic data Surgical Neurology September 2009; 72; pp. 205 - 215**

### **KEY POINTS**

- 1) This article has 68 references. An editorial comment ascribed to this study indicates that it is "the most comprehensive study and analysis to date of this topic."
- 2) These authors found 11 long-term studies in the PubMed database of participants using cell phones for  $\geq 10$  years.
- 3) "The results indicate that using a cell phone for  $\geq 10$  years approximately doubles the risk of being diagnosed with a brain tumor on the same ("ipsilateral") side of the head as that preferred for cell phone use."
- 4) "The authors conclude that there is adequate epidemiologic evidence to suggest a link between prolonged cell phone usage and the development of an ipsilateral brain tumor."
- 5) The power [and danger] generated by a cell phone will vary according to the amount of interference with the signal. Higher power is required when using a cell phone in a moving vehicle, within a building, or in an elevator.
- 6) "The output power [and danger] of the phone is generally set to the highest level during 'handovers' between networked base stations as a user moves from one geographic area to another or when signal interference is greatest."
- 7) Evidence presented suggests that cordless phones are also not safe.
- 8) Cell phones emit electromagnetic radiation only during calls.
- 9) Cell phone systems have been presumed to be safe because their longer wavelengths are nonionizing, lacking sufficient energy to break intermolecular bonds. Therefore, their increased cancer risk is not as a consequence of ionization.
- 10) "Science Magazine has recently acknowledged that there are several peer reviewed studies from laboratories in at least 7 countries including the United States, showing that cell phone or similar low-intensity electromagnetic fields can (contrary to expectations of non-ionizing sources) break DNA or modulate it structurally."
- 11) "Irrespective of the type of phone, exposure is highest on the side of the head against which the cell phone is held

and appears to be even higher in children owing to thinner scalps and skulls, increased water content of their brain, and lower brain volume."

- 12) "Many independent laboratory investigations have suggested adverse biologic effects of cell phone radiation." (12 references)
- 13) The authors present evidence that cell phones can be DNA-damaging as a consequence of "nonthermal interaction between incoming microwaves and exquisitely sensitive oscillatory electrical processes found in living tissues." "This is akin to the reception of a clock radio being susceptible to interference from a nearby cell phone." This "oscillatory similitude may lead to genetic or epigenetic damage through increased local production of reactive oxygen species or free radicals."
- 14) "There are several hundred studies that support the existence of low-intensity, non-thermal effects of cell phone radiation on biological systems. The consequences are mostly adverse: DNA single- and double-strand damage, changes in gene transcription, changes in protein folding, heat shock protein generation, production of free radicals, and effects on the immune system."
- 15) "Taken together, the long-term epidemiologic data suggest an increased risk of being diagnosed with an ipsilateral brain tumor related to cell phone usage of 10 years or more."
- 16) There is also "significantly elevated odds for the development of ipsilateral parotid gland tumors among heavy cell phone users."
- 17) The Central Brain Tumor Registry of the United States maintains comprehensive tumor incidence rates in the USA, and their data shows an increase in incidence of brain tumors of about 36% in less than a decade. This increase is not explained by an ageing population (because these figures were age-adjusted) or by better detection.
- 18) "The authors believe that the aforementioned epidemiologic and laboratory findings underscore the need for reassessment by governments worldwide of cell phone and also most radiation exposure standards and the usage and deployment of this technology. If the epidemiologic data continue to be confirmed, then in the absence of appropriate and timely intervention and given the increasing global dependence on cell phone technology especially among the young generation, it is likely that neurosurgeons will see increasing numbers of primary brain tumors, both benign and malignant."

### **Walk-In Office Hours:**

Mon, Wed, Fri: 7:30am-11am  
3pm-6pm

Thursday: 7:30am-11am

Saturday: 9am-1pm

### **Appointment Hours:**

Mon, Wed, Fri: 11am - 3pm

---