

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS – GLOBAL FOOD IMPERIALISM

By Greg Ciola

[Editor's Note: Greg Ciola of The Crusador (www.healthtruthrevealed.com) interviewed Scott Tips, NHF's President & General Counsel, about the NHF and its many efforts to protect and expand our health freedoms. This interview was published on January 11, 2008; and Mr. Ciola was kind enough to allow us to re-publish this interview here.]

Crusador begins: “The NHF has been actively fighting to protect the health freedoms of all Americans for over fifty years. When it comes to the subject of Codex Alimentarius and the standards and regulations they are trying to implement on an international level, Scott Tips stands out as the lead spokesman to present us with straight-forward, truthful facts. Tips is not just a bystander, he actually attends the Codex meetings as a delegate through the NHF, which has official INGO status to attend and speak out at the meetings.

Tips has just released a new book titled CODEX ALIMENTARIUS – GLOBAL FOOD IMPERIALISM, which I consider to be one of the most authoritative works in print on the subject of Codex. There has been a ton of misinformation deliberately published about Codex and its potential effects on our dietary supplement and health rights and it's a breath of fresh air to see a real expert on the subject finally put something in print that the laymen can grasp and understand. If you want to cut through the clutter and get straight answers with a clear path to where Codex is ultimately going, Scott's new book is an absolute must read.”

Crusador: Thanks for your time, Scott. You do an excellent job of cutting through the clutter of the Codex confusion to let people know where the rubber meets the road. Tell our readers why you just published this new book and why you feel these issues are so important to the health-freedom message here in this country and around the World?

Tips: Thanks, Greg. The idea to publish this book came to me about two years ago. I put this book together because it occurred to me that there were a lot of articles being written about the Codex Alimentarius Commission and its various committees, and the impact that these committees were having, and will continue to have, on our health freedom, especially the Codex Committee on Nutrition and Foods For Special Dietary Uses (CCNFSDU) that meets annually in Germany.

The idea behind the book was to gather some of the most important articles written about Codex, some as far back as 1994 and 1996, and put them in book form so a reader who wants to understand Codex could go to this one source and have it all there. In the process of doing this, other articles

have been written up as well and included in the book. It's a way for anyone who wants to be educated on the Codex Alimentarius process to be educated, and to actually tap into the thoughts and the thinking of the various people who were there and took part in the meetings and made observations at the time. It's very current thinking.

Crusador: Where does Codex stand at the moment?

Tips: Back in 2004, the Codex committee that I mentioned adopted a framework of standards to be applied to dietary supplements. It is called the Codex Vitamin and Mineral Food Supplement Guidelines. This was done over NHF's objections and the South African delegates' objections. It's important to know, though, that this was just a framework. They set in place some of the basic rules, but what's entirely missing from this framework are the maximum upper permitted levels for the vitamins and nutrients that they will regulate. This is in the process of still being determined. It's one reason why the NHF just went to the most recent German Codex meeting last month and took part in the process of this risk assessment, both the working group and the committee that deal with that, in order to have some impact and influence on where these maximum upper permitted levels are set – the MUPLs. The chairman at this meeting, Dr. Rolf Grossklaus, announced that he expected that these levels will be in place by no later than the year 2013. It was interesting to hear his timetable on that.

In the meantime, the NHF has been making great inroads in arguing our scientific case for either, in one instance, not even setting these limits at all or, in the other, just setting them so high that they won't have any impact on the American market.

Crusador: Do you feel that the 2013 date is accurate or is it sooner than that based on the formation of the North American Union and our national sovereignty getting destroyed?

Tips: My own personal belief is that the accurate date is somewhere in between 2011 and 2013. I've been going to these meetings for a real long time and I can see the pace at which they proceed. It's possible that it could be accelerated and it has happened, but at the rate they're going it will be about 2011 at the absolute earliest.

Crusador: How does the European Union, NAFTA, CAFTA, the FTAA, and the already-birthing NAU figure into this overall scheme with Codex?

Tips: That's an excellent question. The big picture is really a simple one. In creating this global framework, which is to create regional blocks and then join them together because it's much easier than joining all these countries of the World together in

Codex and health freedom. I'd like you to touch on a few other highlights to entice our readers to obtain a copy.

Tips: Basically the main thing is that it shows the structure of Codex and how it operates so someone will understand what takes place and how it all comes together. The importance of this book is that instead of having a dry recitation of this and that, what you have are people who were there at the time, on the spot, and eye-witnessing all of this, with little personal stories that get interwoven as well. With the book you get the feeling that you were actually there attending the meetings with descriptions of the rooms, descriptions of the people, with things that happened and events. The book is constructed in such a way that one doesn't have to read it from start to finish. You can skip around. You can get a feel-

ing for what Codex is truly like; and if there's an article that is more technical and you aren't a technical person, then you can skip those articles and just read those with a more general approach. On the other hand, if you are a technical person and you like technical details, then those kind of pieces are in there as well. It is really like a travel guide through the Codex process and through the various committee meetings that have happened over the last ten-to-eleven years.

Crusador: Thank you for your time, Scott. I look forward to doing a lot of work with you in the future helping to defend our health freedoms.

Tips: Thank you, Greg. You're doing an excellent job through *The Crusador* keeping people informed. 

*Proposition 65 Meeting in Sacramento, California
Continued from Page 2*

is, that the concept would apply only to chemicals already listed under Proposition 65, such as chromium and vitamin A (retinol) and does not propose any new listing or warning requirements. Interestingly enough, the ferocious response sent to OEHHA from NHF members in answer to NHF's first press release on the subject (March 24, 2008) had taken OEHHA aback so much that Ms. Kammerer specifically commented on it to me.

For one thing, in its March 21st request for public participation, OEHHA stated, "Certain chemicals or compounds such as vitamins and minerals are necessary to promote human health or to ensure the healthy growth of food crops. Excessive exposure to these same chemicals or compounds can cause cancer or adverse reproductive effects."

As one of the first to speak at the meeting, I told them that with only one or two well-known exceptions (such as iron), this is incorrect, misleading and does a great disservice to those dewy-eyed consumers who will trust the government and thus forgo taking beneficial nutrients in sufficient cancer-preventing quantities. In fact, numerous studies show that only **large doses** of natural Vitamin E, Vitamin D, selenium, fish oils, resveratrol, and other such beneficial nutrients will prevent or ameliorate cancer. Synthetic nutrients and those either at or below Recommended Dietary Intake (RDI) levels rarely show any such benefit. In fact, a major review of studies on the relationship between vitamin intake and various diseases published between 1966 and 2002 revealed that suboptimal intake of vitamins is correlated with increased risk of chronic diseases such as cancer, heart disease, and osteoporosis.

To be assured of obtaining these benefits, however, I continued, one must take more than simply RDI levels of beneficial nutrients. What may seem "excessive" to some individuals would actually be the minimal amounts needed by others. So, OEHHA does an enormous disservice mischaracterizing the cancer-preventative effects of large-dose vitamin-and-mineral dietary supplements. How many people will die or

suffer harm because this myth is put forth yet again by institutions that should know better?"

Moreover, "RDAs" are the wrong standard here. The proposed regulatory concept states, in part, that "[t]his section [1250X] applies only to exposures that do not exceed the Recommended Daily Allowance (RDA) established in the Dietary Reference Tables of the Food and Nutrition Board of the Institute of Medicine, National Academies, current edition, if one is established." At the meeting, and in its written submission of May 2nd to OEHHA, the NHF also pointed out that, "*Leaving aside the fact that the term of art has been revised to RDI, this standard – whether RDA or RDI – is not and never has been a safety standard. Rather, it is a nutrition standard that constitutes more of a floor than a ceiling for appropriate nutrient intake levels. Setting an exemption from the definition of 'exposure' at or below the RDI levels would dramatically exclude nutrient levels that would actually help prevent cancer and reproductive harm.*"

Besides, Upper Levels are established for a whole number of reasons not necessarily related to cancer or reproductive toxicity. The application of RDIs here would be of zero value as to cancer and reproductive toxicity since they were not established with these problems in mind. The general consensus expressed by most attendees was that at the very least RDIs were the wrong standard of measure for creating an exemption. Two other NHF members, Donna Moncrieff and Monica DeWitt, were also present at the meeting to support our position; and thanks to Ms. DeWitt, I was the only independent attendee to be interviewed by the local capital television station about this meeting and our views.

The NHF Petitions and its May 2nd Written Comments

Although there are only two beneficial nutrients (retinol and chromium) on the Prop 65 list as of today, the list grows regularly. It grows through OEHHA's Science Advisory Board, which has two committees to review and add carcinogens and reproductive toxicants to the list. But authoritative bodies such as the FDA, the Environmental Protection