National Health Federation
BULLETIN

SEPTEMBER, 1973

35c

FDA's
Food Filth
Allowances
Page 14

FDA's Vitamin Regulations Are A Usurpation Of Bureaucratic Authority

An address by Representative Bob Wilson

HYPERKINESIS LINKED WITH FOOD CHEMICALS

A possible major breakthrough: In preliminary tests removal of synthetic food colors and flavors relieved symptoms of hyperactivity in 60% of children tested

CHRONOLOGY OF CONTROVERSY

Critics versus supporters of the health food and the natural-organic food movement

HEALTH FOOD STORES SUE FDA

At issue is FDA's directive outlawing kelp in capsules (FDA says kelp in capsules falsely suggest kelp has nutritive or therapeutic value) and the inclusion of kelp in products along with nutrients deemed essential by FDA

Dedicated to the Protection of Health Freedoms

THE
NATIONAL HEALTH FEDERATION BULLETIN

Protection of Health Freedoms — *Published Monthly*

Volume XIX — No. 8 — September, 1973

CONTENTS

The Bulletin serves its readers as a forum for the presentations and discussion of important health issues including the presentation of minority or conflicting points of view, rather than by publishing only material on which a consensus has been reached. All articles published in the NHF Bulletin—including news, comments and book reviews—reflect the individual views of the authors and not necessarily official points of view adopted by the Federation.

National Health Federation Bulletin, published monthly January through December, except July-August which are combined, at 212 West Foothill Boulevard, Monrovia, California 91016, by National Health Federation, a nonprofit corporation. Fred J. Hart, Managing Editor; Raymond H. Houser, Editor. $1.50 of the annual membership dues is paid as a yearly subscription to the **National Health Federation Bulletin**. Single copies, 35 cents. Second-class postage paid at Monrovia, California 91016.

Editorial Commentary

Our Senior Citizens Have Been Short-Changed

Our senior citizens were sadly short-changed last year when Congress enacted legislation to include chiropractic care in the services approved for reimbursement under Part B of their Medicare coverage.

The effective date of this legislation was July 1, 1973 but now those who have sought to avail themselves of chiropractic care have discovered a host of restrictive inequities facing them and their chiropractic doctor. They have found that Medicare will pay only for the manipulation of the spine to correct a subluxation demonstrated by X-ray to exist. Medicare will not pay for other therapies even though the chiropractor may legally use the therapies in his respective state and though the chiropractor is qualified by training to use them. Neither will Medicare pay for manipulation of other parts of the body even though this seems indicated in the judgement of the doctor.

Furthermore, the doctor of chiropractic is compelled by the law to X-ray the spine of his Medicare-eligible patient prior to treatment, thus, in many cases expose the patient to X-rays needlessly inasmuch as chiropractors have other methods capable of detecting the presence of most subluxations. BUT, Medicare will not pay for the cost of the required spinal X-ray—the patient must pay for this himself. Additionally, Medicare will not pay for any examination or diagnostic procedures conducted by a chiropractor. Thus, if the doctor of chiropractic suspects the possibility that his patient might have an anemia, a kidney disorder, diabetes or some other disorder, he must ask his patient to pay for the laboratory tests which would determine the presence or absence of these diseases. Even the simplest examination procedures are not covered, yet every chiropractic graduate, in order to pass his state licensure examination, has had to prove his knowledge and competency in physical and laboratory diagnostic procedures and in the interpretation of the findings.

Many senior citizens having Medicare coverage, and who choose to have chiropractic care for their particular disability have become gravely disappointed in what Congress presumably gave them. They feel their rights and their freedom of choice have been all but ignored.

FDA's Vitamin Regulations Are A Bureaucratic Usurpation Of Authority

An address by the HONORABLE BOB WILSON
U.S. Representative from California
Delivered in San Diego before the
Convention of the National Nutritional Foods Association

The Hosmer bill, which I co-sponsored on March 2, 1973 will, when enacted in this Congress, prevent the U.S. Food and Drug Administration from destroying the health foods industry. Incredible as it may seem, since June 1962, it has been increasingly obvious that the FDA has intended to regulate this industry out of existence. Many of us in Congress became alarmed, and in 1968 we introduced the pioneer legislation that is now known as the Hosmer bill, first drafted by Representative Craig Hosmer, of Long Beach. As of today, one hundred and sixty other U.S. Representatives have also co-sponsored the Hosmer bill. It is short, simple, and easily understood. It will prevent FDA from banning the sale of vitamins and minerals for reasons other than lack of safety or existence of fraud. It keeps all the consumer protection provisions of the Food and Drug Act as they now exist. It defines a food supplement for the first time in the Food and Drug Act. By defining a food supplement as a *food*, it indicates that it is the will of the Congress that FDA shall regulate vitamins and minerals and other concentrated foods and food supplements as *foods*, not as *drugs*.

Support for the Hosmer vitamin bill has come *equally* from Democrats and Republicans. Here in California, for example, 26 of our 43 U.S. Representatives have co-sponsored the bill. Thirteen of the 26 are Republicans and thirteen are Democrats.

There can or should be no petty partisan politics when it comes to freedom of choice in matters like this. The wide variety of co-sponsors on this bill is amazing—imagine Bella Abzug, from New York, side by side with Barry Goldwater, Jr. of California; Claude Pepper of Florida and Gerald Ford of Michigan; ultra conservative John Rarick of Louisiana and the dedicated liberal, Benjamin Rosenthal, of New York.

Our 160 co-sponsors, over ⅓ of the House, represent every political shade and conviction. They are all united on our bill to stop the Food and Drug Administration from banning vitamins and minerals for reasons other than lack of safety or existence of fraud.

Less than a month ago, on June 18, 1973 the Food and Drug Administration won a nearly unanimous Supreme Court decision (7-0). It gave FDA broad, virtually unlimited authority and approval to sweep what FDA considers as "ineffective drugs" from the marketplace. This decision will have a tremendously devastating impact on this industry if the Hosmer bill doesn't pass.

Under the Hosmer bill there would naturally be no need for the health foods industry and the food supplement industry to be concerned about that decision. You sell *foods*, not *drugs*. FDA would not have the authority to move against any of your products as drugs, if you made no drug claims for them. However, without the Hosmer bill, or a favorable court ruling, under FDA's new vitamin regulations, soon to be effective, most of the products you sell will be reclassified and then regulated by FDA as *drugs*. Even if you never make a single drug claim for any of them! This is why FDA, if it desires, can regulate some of you out of business if the Hosmer bill doesn't pass *in this Congress*. FDA has made it most clear that it desires bury you. The Supreme Court has given FDA's cunning scheme the green light if it can get away with regulating your products as *drugs* instead of the foods they are.

Under FDA's new regulations, they have gone far beyond the definition of "drug" made by Congress. This point will be challenged by your law firm, Bass and Ullman, which defended this industry so well during the FDA's vitamin hearings. However, Congress must make it clear through the Hosmer bill that *foods* are never to be regulated as *drugs* unless drug claims are made for them.

FDA wrongfully claims that Congress intended it to issue regulations which will allow it to regulate vitamins as drugs if they:

1. Are sold in the shape or form of drugs.
2. Are sold in potency greater than 150% of FDA's Recommended Daily Allowance (RDA).
3. Are sold in combinations other than those few canonized by FDA.
4. Are hazardous in excessive quantities.
5. Have nutritional or health claims.
6. Have drug claims.

Only the last authority (6), was given to FDA by Congress. The other 5 provisions are typical bureaucratic usurpations of authority.

From the *Congressional Record* of June 7, 1973 we find Dr. Linus Pauling is officially on record in strong opposition to FDA's regulations. He says:

> "... I believe that the recently proposed rules set out by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration dealing with dietary supplements of vitamins and minerals, their definition, identity and label statements, would, if they are put into effect, do great harm to the American people ... the Food and Drug Administration is taking the wrong steps, moving in a direction that could be

(Continued next page)

calamitous for the American people."

It is important to note that Dr. Pauling not only attacks FDA for attempting to unreasonably limit the availability of vitamin C. He also extends his defense to vitamin A. When the two-time Nobel Prize winner heard that vitamin A would be limited to 10,000 units, he wrote the strongest possible protest to then FDA Commissioner Dr. Charles C. Edwards as follows:

"Dear. Dr. Edwards:

"I have read in the newspapers that the Food and Drug Administration is proposing to limit the sale of tablets and capsules without a prescripiton to those containing not more than 10,000 IU of vitamin A.

"I think that such a regulation would be asinine—not quite as asinine as to make a similar limit of 100 mg. for vitamin C, as was proposed by the Food and Drug Administration on 9 December 1966, but almost as asinine.

"The optimum daily intake of vitamin A is, in my opinion, about 25,000 IU for many people. The FDA has no convincing evidence that this opinion is not correct. The FDA should not make a regulation that interferes with the proper nutrition of the American people."

Linus Pauling continued:

"If the proposed limitation of the sale of vitamin A were extended to foods, a prescription would be required for a serving of one half of one ounce of broiled lamb liver or two ounces of sweet potatoes. The FDA is either wrong in proposing the limitation of the sale of vitamin A tablets or capsules or remiss in not also proposing the equivalent limitation of the sale of liver, sweet potatoes, and other foods rich in vitamin A.

"There is very little chance of damage to humans from ingesting too much vitamin A—far less chance than for many drugs that are sold over-the-counter. The argument that the proposed regulations would significantly protect the American people from a serious danger, that of hypervitaminosis A, is invalid.

"The proposed regulation would be largely ineffective, and would be economically damaging to the public.

"The proposed action would, without justification, limit the the freedom of the people."

There will be a strong temptation to compromise on the two vitamins under greatest attack by FDA because they may be slightly more toxic than the others. Don't give in and admit they are drugs just because FDA can prove they are toxic at excessively high potencies. This is a ridiculous reason to classify a food as a drug! Everything we eat is "toxic at excessively high amounts." That fact doesn't make foods or food supplements *drugs!* Eat too much sugar, or salt, or green apples and see how toxic you get.

You must stand your ground on vitamin A and D or you have lost the legal principle on which your industry is based . . . that food supplements are foods unless (and only if) drug claims are made for them!

My 11 terms in Congress have taught me that there are certain great legal principles which we must never compromise. I believe when the balance of Congress fully understands what FDA has attempted to do to this industry and the millions of consumers you serve, they will overwhelmingly support the fundamental and basic legal principle inherent in the Hosmer bill.

If you vacillate or give way and agree with FDA's principle in their ban of vitamin A and D, you concede that vitamins are drugs. Why? Because they, like all other foods, are toxic at some astronomically, but seldom if ever consumed, potency.

Don't concede on vitamins A and D. They are not drugs any more than any other vitamin.

SUMMARY

The battle can be summarized in two words—*food or drugs.* If you are selling drugs, you're through. If you are selling foods, you're in the healthiest business in America. The Hosmer bill holds you are selling foods up to the point you make drug claims for them. This is the great principle of law under which this industry has prospered, yes, flourished, for the past 35 years.

Good law is built upon certain great general principles. FDA has based its battle upon the principle that it has the authority to classify food supplements as drugs without congressional authority or approval. The principle upon which the FDA has hinged its entire battle against food supplements is that they are drugs. If you, in any way, concede or accept FDA's principle it is curtains.

You are to be congratulated for joining with The National Health Federation and other groups to get 160 co-sponsors on the Hosmer bill. You are halfway home in the

(Continued next page)

BEQUESTS and GIFTS

BEQUEST IN WILL: Here is a suggested statement for the convenience of those who wish to incorporate into their wills a bequest to The National Health Federation:

"I give, devise and bequeath to The National Health Federation, a non-profit corporation, incorporated under the laws of California, with headquarters at Monrovia, California, the sum of.....($.....) (and/or property herein described) for its discretionary use in carrying out its general aims and purposes."

INSURANCE POLICY GIFT: For those who wish to name The National Federation as sole beneficiary, or one of the beneficiaries, in an insurance policy, it is suggested that you obtain from your insurance agent the necessary legal form or application for your signature, before witnesses if required. The following designation is suggested:

"The National Health Federation, a non-profit corporation, incorporated under the laws of California, with headquarters at Monrovia, California, the sum of.....($.....) for its discretionary use in carrying out its general aims and purposes."

MEMORIAL FUND: Should the donor desire to create a Memorial Fund in a will or insurance policy, state, after the sum of property described in the beneficial gift, that the fund is to be known and designated as the "....(name).... Memorial Fund."

House. However, recently I received information on good authority that if the Hosmer bill passes, FDA and HEW will recommend a veto. A simple majority won't do on this fight. We must be prepared, on the first go around, to show enough force to override any potential veto. In other words, we need 300 strong co-sponsors. The next 150 congressmen, who co-sponsor, will tip the scales.

Here in California it is especially important that Representatives John Moss and Lionel Van Deerlin support your position. They are conspicuous by their omission from the Hosmer bill. Both are high ranking members of the full Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This committee must pass on the bill before it ever gets to the floor of the House for the rest of us to vote on it.

I'm proud to stand before you as an ombudsman for vitamins and vitamin supplements. I do my very best to eat a well balanced diet. However, every day I take out additional insurance against possible nutritional deficiencies which may arise due to the special stress I am under as a congressman. Because of pollution, Watergate or other stressful situations which I cannot control, my nutritional needs may increase. For this reason I have taken a complete vitamin and mineral supplement for 20 years.

Just to make sure, I also take every day 50,000 units of vitamin A, 1250% of RDA; B-complex vitamins galore; 2000 mgs. vitamin C, 6660% of RDA; 500 units of vitamin D, 125% of RDA; 800 units vitamin E, who knows what the RDA is on that. Then just to be sure, I take 4 kelp tablets, 1200 mgs. of lecithin, and some natural dolomite.

I believe these vitamins have helped me work harder, think smarter, enjoy life more fully, and be happier. However, I am not happy that FDA would now classify some or all of these vitamins as drugs. *I am not taking drugs.* I'm taking concentrated foods and food supplements and I resent FDA trying to make me feel guilty instead of great!

MEMORIAL CONTRIBUTIONS

The idea of memorial contributions, of course, is not new. It would seem that there could be no finer way to express remembrance and give honor to a deceased friend or loved one than to make a memorial contribution, in the name of the deceased, to a church, charity, foundation, or other nonprofit organization. The National Health Federation has received a number of memorial contributions and we trust that we shall always remain a worthy recipient of such contributions.

Naturally, all memorial contributions are acknowledged, but, in addition, when such a contribution is received from other than the immediate family of the deceased, a very suitable and lovely card is prepared and mailed to the family or surviving spouse. In this way, the family may know that the memory of their loved one has been both honored and perpetuated through the work of the organization.

Chronology of Controversy

Excerpted from "Arsenal Of Truth"
By MAX HUBERMAN, President,
National Nutritional Foods Association

For years, the public has been exposed to the controversy waging between those who advocate the use, insofar as possible, of naturally produced, unprocessed foods free of chemical additives, and those who have been vociferous in their defense of the safety and nutritive value of the highly refined, processed, "chemicalized" food products which predominate on the supermarket shelves. In examing the statements made over the years supporting the two views, it becomes apparent that the list of those supporting the former view steadily grows longer with the addition of the names of more and more prominent physicians and scientists, while the latter view is, and has been, defended chiefly by Dr. Frederick Stare, of Harvard University, and the vested interests of giant food processors.

JAN. 1955—FTC and FDA Issue "Orders" to Stop Producers and Sellers of Natural Food Products from Claiming That Natural Food is Better Than Imitation or Counterfeit. Synthetic foods are officially pronounced to be equal to the real, natural, and original product. (Reported by Dr. Royal Lee in address to Organic Health Foundation of America, San Diego, Calif.)

JULY 1955—Dr. Frederick Stare of Harvard Attacks Health Food Dealers and Natural Farmers as "Charlatans" and "Food Fakers." Dr. Stare's slanders and distortions include: ". . . For generations the food quack has struggled to have mankind turn its back on progress in favor of 'nature' . . . We get as much food value from refined, enriched foods as from natural foods and sometimes more . . . Foods from any good grocery store will produce just as good nutritional health as any and all health foods and natural foods at half the price . . ." (Featured article in **McCall's** magazine in which 60% of the advertisements promote drugs and refined foods.)

JULY 1955—A Doctor Replies to Dr. Stare's Attacks. ". . . We suspect it is you, Dr. Stare, who seems to be trying to stop progress by trying to prevent the nutrition for health advocates from educating more and more people to try this new way of life, the farmer to rebuild his soil and produce better crops, the food merchant to produce and sell real organically produced food free from damaging processes." (Excerpt from letter from Dr. Walter F. Chappelle, Buffalo, N.Y.)

JULY 1957—"Nutrition Is Possibly the Most Important Single Factor Affecting the Life Span." (Dr. Edward Henderson, noted physician and editor

(Continued next page)

of the Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, quoted in "How to Keep Your Husband Alive," Birk & Co., publishers.)

JUNE 1958—From Journal of American Medical Association (167:675-690, of June 7). "Today germs are not our principal enemy . . . coexisting nutritional disorders complicate all problems of the sick, and there seems little likelihood of a final solution of the great problems of medicine until we can obtain optimum nutrition . . . We know that excellent nutrition is basic . . ." (From address by Dr. Tom Spies, AMA medal winner for his work involving nutrition and the aged.)

SEPT. 1959—Health of the American People. Hon. David S. King of Utah cites eminent medical and scientific authorities plus evidence from American Academy of Nutrition, N.Y. State Medical Journal and other sources that prove the rise in degenerative diseases is related to the hazards of absorbing chemical food additives. (Rep. King's speech in Congressional Record, 86th Congress, First Session, Sept. 9.)

JUNE 1960—"Prevention Is Better Than Cure." Chairman of Britain's Royal College of Surgeons, Dr. Ronald W. Raven, declares: ". . . The main method of attack should be preventive medicine . . . Prevention is better than cure . . . We know that insecticides produce cancer in animals, yet we continue to use them on our fields and vegetables. We know that certain food additives and coloring agents produce cancer in animals, yet we continue to feed them into the human body." (From Dr. Raven's interview with **National Enquirer** in London.)

MAY 1963—White House Report Proves Rachel Carson Was Right. The official report of the President's Science Advisory Committee confirms that hazards of pesticides far outweight any alleged "benefits." ("Use of Pesticides," May 15, 1963, Supt. of Documents, U.S. Printing Office.)

FEB. 1968—Ten Year Study Confirms U.S. Decline in Nutrition. "U.S. Dept. of Agriculture survey discloses that only half of the households sampled were found to be eating enough of the right foods to give a nutritionally 'good' diet . . ." (**N.Y. Times,** front page, Feb. 27.)

FEB. 1969—Unhealthy Soils Equal Unhealthy Diets Equal Unhealthy Students. Articles in **Science** magazine, "Nutrition and Learning," and "Rundown Soils and Scholars" establish relationships between poor diets, poor mineral content in foods and the poor health of students. (Reported in address prepared for NFA by Dr. Norman J. Curtis: "Soil Fertility in Relation to Nutrition.")

OCT. 1969—Senators Charge Government Laxity on Chemical Additives. Senate Committee on Nutrition charges that "Government practices permit sale of more than 680 everyday food additives without requiring tests for safety." Report also quotes National Academy of Science estimate that "2,000 chemicals are employed as food additives." (Washington AP, **Cleveland Plain Dealer,** Oct. 25, page 4B.)

JAN. 1970—Former FDA Chief Spills the Beans. Dr. Herbert L. Ley, Jr., ousted FDA Commissioner disclosed that he "had been under tremendous pressure from the drug industry" during his three years in office. "Some days I spent as many as six hours fending off representatives of the drug industry," Ley said. He also stated that FDA is **not** protecting the people as many think. "What the FDA is doing and what the public thinks it's doing are as different as night and day," he added. (Washington AP report, quoted in **Youngstown Vindicator,** Jan. 1.)

JAN. 1970—Senator Demands Tougher Food Additive Laws. "Unless our food safety laws are vastly reformed, the American public will continue to serve as a massive testing ground for a variety of sweeteners, preservatives, spices and coloring agents that are marketed without safety research." (Senator Gaylord Nelson, Wisconsin Democrat, as reported by Washington Bureau of **Supermarket News,** Jan. 5, Page 7.)

MARCH 1970—Dr. Jean Mayer Cites Decline in U.S. Nutrition and Longevity. "All medical advances in the United States in the past 25 years have been wiped out by the decline in nutrition in the American diet." Dr. Mayer cites World Health Organization finding that U.S. has dropped from 11th place in longevity twenty-five years ago, to 37th place. He believes that consumers must have more guidance about diet and nutrition. (N.Y. Bureau, **Supermarket News,** March 14.)

APRIL 1970—Cereal Makers Probed on Monopoly Pricing. FTC hearings disclose that three giant food manufacturers control over 80% of breakfast food sales doing $894 million in annual sales. (David Vienna in **Washington Post,** April 21.)

MAY 1970—More Smears and Misinformation from Dr. Stare.

Question (Asked by reader in Dr. Stare's column): "You seldom mention the superior nutritional value of fresh fruits and vegetables. How about the refining of foods such as white sugar and white flour? Also, you seldom say anything about the wonderful work health food stores are doing."

Answer (Dr. Stare's total reply): "My reasons for not stressing the points you raise is that I do not agree with them. Fresh fruits and vegetables are good tasting and good nutritionally but as consumed in a varied diet do not have superior nutritional values of any practical importance over commercially frozen and canned products. They taste differently and some like the taste better. Refined sugar and flour, or as you write, white sugar and flour, are not inferior in mixed diets to the unrefined products relative to your health. The reason being that the tiny amounts of minerals and vitamins that may be removed in the refining are supplied by the meat, fish, fruits and

(Continued next page)

vegetables from the rest of your diet. I'm not aware of any 'wonderful work' being done by health food stores. Their products are no better nutritionally. They usually are more expensive. They do not contribute to the support of nutritional research. What do they do?" (**Youngstown Vindicator,** May 14.)

FEB. 1971—Dr. Stare Charged with Conflict of Interest: "Robert Choate, Jr., head of Robert B. Choate and Associates, Washington nutrition consultants, reported to **Supermarket News** that Dr. Stare tends to 'inflate' the value of cereals because he is 'in the employ of the cereals industry' . . . Choate noted Dr. Stare had been a consultant to the Cereals Institute and to a major ready-to-eat cereal producer for many years." The report adds: "Dr. Stare appeared at Senate Commerce Subcommittee hearings last August to testify on behalf of Kellog Co. and National Biscuit Co. He is a director of Continental Can Co." (N.Y. Staff Report, Feb. 22.)

AUG. 1971—Government for the People? U.S. Dept. of Agriculture declares its **opposition** to U.S. District Judge's ruling that a hot dog labeled **all meat** . . . "must contain meat and nothing else." (Front page, **Supermarket News**, Aug. 16.)

FEB. 1972—Nader Asks Ban on Preservatives. "Ralph Nader's Center for Science in the Public Interest" has asked the Dept. of Agriculture to ban the use of sodium nitrate and sodium nitrite in baby foods and bacon because government scientists have linked the chemicals to cancer." (Washington AP report, Feb. 11.)

JUNE 1972—More Commentary on Food Additives. Dr. Jean Mayer, government nutrition consultant, declares that "We can live perfectly well without additives." Ogden Johnson, chief of FDA's Division of Nutrition states, "If the additive has no definite benefit why use it at all?" (NHF **Bulletin.**)

SEPT. 1972—More Warnings from Senate About Additives. Senator Gaylord Nelson, Chairman of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Health, states that recent scientific studies indicate some additives on the FDA "safe list" actually "can cause disease, including cancer in test animals." Among them, Nelson said, "are nitrites and nitrates widely used in processing ham, hot dogs and similar meats, freshness preservers, BHA, BHT, MSG, DFS. . . ." (Washington UPI Report, **Youngstown Vindicator**, Sept. 20, page 64.)

OCT. 1972—Dr. Stare Praises Additives But Knocks Extra Vitamin E. Denies that any scientific facts support claims for vitamin E. Answering readers' questions about vitamins and natural foods, Dr. Stare declares: ". . . Extra vitamin E belongs to the food faddists, the health charlatans and those who believe they know everything about nutrition but in reality know very little . . ." Dr. Stare also states that natural nutrition and the natural-organic movement "has grown from a far-out fad to a full-fledged craze . . . Why are people willing to pay more for organic foods? Many believe the false claims that organic foods contain more nutrient value than normal foods, which simply is not true . . ." Dr. Stare does not forget his friends and sponsors of the processed food and chemical industry. He adds: "As for additives, these may contribute rather than reduce the nutritive value of a food . . ." (From syndicated column shared with Cynthia Ford, M.S., page 10, **Youngstown Vindicator** and regular column, also Oct. 18, page 24.)

NOV. 1972—Norway to Ban Use of Nitrate and Nitrite Effective January 1, 1973, with Certain Exceptions. (Reported in NHF **Bulletin**, "Washington Roundup.")

NOV. 1972—New Boost for Hot Dogs from Dr. Stare. Attacks **Consumer Reports,** Ralph Nader and other critics for charging that "The frankfurter is a nutritional disaster, contaminated with bacteria, full of preservatives and a very expensive buy for the amount of protein it gives . . ." Dr. Stare's "rebuttal" deals with fat content, not the additives Dr. Stare sums up his blessing on hot dogs with the unblushing opinion: "They are a clean, safe, nutritious and wholesome food . . ." (Syndicated column with Cynthia Ford, **Youngstown Vindicator,** Nov. 21.)

NOV. 1972—Nader Reveals Unpublished USDA Findings on Additives: ". . . Chemical residues from the use of pesticides, nitrites, hormones, antibiotics and other ingredients of the chemical alphabet soup are continually ignored by producers and processors and a passive government, despite increasing health risks such as cancer and birth defects . . .Lawsuits by environmental and consumer groups ask the government to ban the cosmetic use of sodium nitrite in bacon, hot dogs, ham and other processed meat . . ." (Ralph Nader, quoted by **Cleveland Plain Dealer**, editorial page, Nov. 22.)

NOV. 1972—More Lullabys About Nitrites. A reader asks Dr. Stare if nitrites are harmful and "Where can I get meats without these chemicals?" . . . Dr. Stare assures her there is nothing to worry about, that these chemicals "protect" the meat from botulism, give meat a "flavor we enjoy" and a pink color that "most people prefer in meat." (Syndicated column, **Youngstown Vindicator,** Nov. 22, page 6.)

NOV. 1972—Giant Food Makers Tolerate Criticism from NOBODY. Consumer advocates are blasted by meat processors. Evan Binkerd of Armour Foods declares that, ". . . The likes of Turner, Nader, Bess Meyerson and Virginia Knauer all had one thing in common: none

(Continued on next page)

of them know what they are talking about." (From report of annual newspaper Food Editors Conference, by Marion Burros, Staff Reporter, **Washington Post,** Nov. 23.)

DEC. 1972—"The Health Food Industry Is the Conscience of the $125 Billion National Food Industry." (Statement by Huberman on behalf of NNFA, **Miami Herald,** Dec. 9.)

DEC. 1972—A Different View from Harvard. Dr. Jean Mayer lauds higher values of fresh fruits and vegetables. Harvard nutrition professor calls fresh fruits and vegetables "the near perfect answer" . . . Warns about undue confidence in commercial food enrichment: ". . . Unfortunately, many people are getting a false sense of security from food enrichment . . . Enrichment is fine as far as it goes but by itself doesn't guarantee a healthy diet. Quite a few necessary vitamins and minerals are excluded from any enrichment program. Moreover it is not always wise to make up the deficit by eating nutrition rich milk, eggs and meat. These foods are high in calories, saturated fat and cholesterol . . ." Dr. Mayer, a White House nutrition consultant, concludes by observing: "It's time we changed our approach and focused our agriculture and nutritional policy on the foods and the good nutrition of the American people." (Syndicated column "Food for Thought," **Youngstown Vindicator,** Dec. 17.)

DEC. 1972—"Eating May Not Be Good for You": Time Magazine cover story credits the health food industry and movement with performing valuable benefits. Dr. Jean Mayer is quoted as stating that "The organic movement has increased public awareness of the chemicals that have become regular ingredients of processed foods." Despite some unfounded criticisms, the survey finds that, "The organic food movement has also helped to make consumers more conscious of their general diet and led many people to read the labels of the products they buy." Most significant is the finding by **Time** researchers that, "The field of nutrition is terra incognita for the average doctor. Courses are not widely taught in medical schools, and even among specialists there are substantive disagreements." **Time** quotes Dr. Latham of Cornell University Graduate School of Nutrition: "Nine out of ten doctors in New York would give wrong answers to dietary questions." (Dec. 18, "The Perils of Eating, American style.")

JAN. 1973—Who's Getting the Consumer's Dollar? While the critics of the health food movement scream about the "fabulous sums" (Dr. Stare says more than $500 million) spent on health foods each year, **Supermarket News** discloses that just one major firm, the Safeway supermarket chain, "in the nip and tuck race with A & P for sales leadership," topped more than **$6 billion** in retail sales for 1972. (Front page, Jan. 1.)

Hyperkinesis Linked With Food Chemicals

It appears that some of the views of the so-called "food fanatics" are about to be vindicated again.

Newsweek magazine, in their July 9, 1973 issue, carried a highly significant report concerning hyperkinesis. Hyperkinesis is a behavioral disorder characterized by excessive physical activity and the inability to concentrate and learn. Medically, hyperkinetic children are usually treated with amphentamines or other drugs.

The *Newsweek* article reports the work of Dr. Ben F. Feingold of the Kaiser-Permanente Medical Center who decided to test the possibility that chemical additives commonly found in manufactured foods and soft drinks might be responsible for some cases of hyperkinesis. Being an allergist, he had already noted that certain artificial flavors and colors, and the like, often causes a wide variety of allergic reactions and it was this observations that prompted him to test his new theory.

Dr. Feingold and his colleagues selected 25 hyperactive San Francisco schoolchildren, a number of them had a history of other allergies, most of them had normal or high IQ's—and all of them ate large quantities of processed foods. The children were placed on a diet eliminating all foods containing artificial flavors and colors. This is no easy task because, as Dr. Feingold noted, 90 percent of the processed foods contain them.

Within a few weeks, 15 of the children showed dramatic improvement. The article tells of one 7-year-old boy who had been extremely hyperactive for years. Around home, he stomped around, slamming the doors, kicking the walls and even charging oncoming cars on his bicycle. As might be expected, his hyperactivity prevented him from learning at school and he disrupted the rest of the class. Neither medication nor the efforts of a psychiatrist brought benefits. After a few weeks of dietary control, the boy settled down and was able to perform well in school and behave properly at home. Feingold noted that any infraction of the diet led almost immediately—within a matter of hours—to a return of the hyperkinetic behavior. He was reported as saying, "We can turn these kids on and off at will by just regulating their diet."

Dr. Feingold cautioned in the *Newsweek* article that his observations must be regarded as preliminary since no controlled study has been conducted.

The two books, *The Chemical Feast* and *The Dictocrats* which NHF helped to introduce to the American people, are no longer available from the Federation office. There are many outlets now handling the books, and it is the policy of the Federation not to be a bookselling company. Our efforts need to be used in other project areas.

FDA's Food Filth Allowances

By ARTHUR KOCH

Many persons were shocked when they learned the FDA allows a certain amount of filth in foodstuffs. For your information, here is FDA's explanation of these "filth allowances"

For many years there was talk about a secret "filth allowance" list that was promulgated by and known only to the Food and Drug Administration and selected food manufacturers. Finally, after much consumer pressure was applied to the Food and Drug Administration, the Agency released what it has chosen to call "Current Levels for Natural or Unavoidable Defects in Food for Human Use that Present No Health Hazard." This list is an indication to the food industry of the amount of filth above which it cannot go when producing food for human consumption. A simple reading of the list will probably be unbelievable to most readers. For example, according to this list, manufacturers of Black Currant Jam can manufacture a product with a microscopic mold count average of 75% while the manufacturers of peanut butter can produce a product with an average of 50 insect fragments and an average of 2 rodent hairs per 100 grams!

Consumer Reports magazine did an excellent critique of the FDA lists in an article in their March, 1973 issue titled "The High-Filth Diet, Complements of the FDA." In the article, which I highly recommend to all who are or become concerned with the Defect Levels, *Consumer Reports* indicates that the levels for filth are much higher than they need be.

At this time, I wish to simply make available to the NHF readers both the FDA explanation and the list. The reply and the list received from the Food and Drug Administration follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION
Washington, D.C. 20204

Attached is the listing that you requested. The action levels contained in this list were set on the basis of no hazard to health. Any products that might be harmful to consumers are acted against on the basis of their hazard to health, whether or not they exceed the action levels. The action levels were set because it is not now possible, and never has been possible, to grow in the field, harvest, and process some crops that are totally free of natural or unavoidable defects. The fact that the Food and Drug Administration has an established defect level does not mean that a manufacturer need only to stay below that level. Poor manufacturing practices by a manufacturer will result in regulatory action, whether the product is above or below the defect level.

Most of the action levels on this list were set a number of years ago. One of the first set in 1911. Many more were set in the late 1930's when improved detection methods were developed. Some of the defect levels on this list have been recently revised. The entire list is being made public because Commissioner Charles C. Edwards has determined that the interest of consumers would be best served by making the list public. The Agency's past position was that by making the list public, some manufacturers in the affected industries would not strives for perfection, but would strives only to meet the action levels. In making the list public, FDA reiterates its position that:

a. Compliance with defect levels will not prevent FDA from acting against a manufacturer who does not observe current good manufacturing practices. Such a violation renders the food unlawful, even though the defect levels are below the FDA's Action Levels.
b. The mixing of a food containing any amount of defect at or above the current defect level with another lot of the same or another food is not permitted and renders the final food unlawful regardless of the defect level of the finished food.

The defect action levels on this list have been lowered as technology has improved. FDA will continue to attempt to lower the action levels. It must be remembered that few foods contain no natural or unavoidable defects. Even with modern technology all defects in foods cannot be eliminated.

The defect action levels do not represent an average in any of the food categories. The averages are actually much lower. The levels represent the limit at or above which FDA will take legal action against the product to remove it from the market.

One alternative to establishing natural defect levels in some foods

(Continued next page)

would be to insist on increased utilization of chemical substances to control insects, rodents and other natural contaminants. This alternative is not satisfactory because of the very real danger of exposing consumers to potential hazards from residues of these chemicals, as opposed to the aesthetically unpleasant, but harmless natural and unavoidable defects.

Editor's Note: The list is long—too long to print in full here—but following are a few representative listings.

PRODUCT	DEFECT ACTION LEVEL
Corn Meal	1. Average of one whole insect (or equivalent) per 50 grams. 2. Average of 25 insect fragments per 25 grams. 3. Average of one rodent hair per 25 grams. 4. Average of one rodent excreta fragment per 50 grams.
Cherries (fresh, canned or frozen)	Average of 10% rejects due to rot. Average of 4% insect infested cherries.
Peaches (canned)	Average of 5% wormy or moldy fruit by count or 4% if a whole larva or equivalent is found in 20% of the cans.
Prunes (dried)	Average of 10% by count insect infested and/or showing mold and/or showing dirty fruits or pieces of fruit.
Raisins	Average of 5% by count of natural raisins showing mold. Average of 40 milligrams of sand and grit per 100 grams of natural or Golden Bleached raisins. 10 insects or equivalent and 35 drosophila eggs per 8 ounces of Golden Bleached raisins.
Apple Butter	Microscopic mold count average of 12%. Average of 4 rodent hairs per 100 grams. Average of 5 whole insects or equivalent (not counting mites, aphids, thrip, scales) per 100 grams.
Peanut Butter	Average of 50 insect fragments per 100 grams. Average of 2 rodent hairs per 100 grams.
Curry Powder	Average 100 insect fragments per 25 grams. Average of 8 rodent hairs per 25 grams.
Nutmeg	Average of 10% insect infested and/or pieces showing mold by count.
Mushrooms (canned)	Average of 20 larvae per 100 grams of drained mushrooms and proportionate liquid. Average of five larvae, 2 mm. or longer, per 100 grams of drained mushrooms and proportionate liquid. Average of 75 mites per 100 grams drained mushrooms and proportionate liquid.
Tomato Juice	10 Drosophila fly eggs per 100 grams; or 5 Drosophila fly eggs and 1 larva per 100 grams; or 2 larvae per 100 grams.

NOTE: 100 grams is approximately 3½ ounces.

Health Food Stores Sue FDA

Sea weed kelp is the subject of a federal lawsuit filed recently in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia against the Food and Drug Administration. Suing FDA are the East Coast Healthfood Organization (ECHO), a Washington, D.C. - based association of healthfood retailers, and The Diet Shop, Inc., 1213 East Grand Street, Elizabeth, New Jersey, the store of Sidney Cammy, president of ECHO. Plaintiffs are complaining about a part of FDA's Compliance Manual called "Program Circular No. PC 7318.01A" which purports to prohibit the sale of sea weed kelp in capsules and the mixture of sea weed kelp and food ingredients FDA considers necessary or valuable in human nutrition, vitamins, mineral and other nutrients for which Recommended Daily Allowances (RDA) have been established. The FDA claims that the consumers would think that kelp in capsules is a medicine or is essential in nutrition, and that the mixture of kelp with established nutrients will mislead the consumer into thinking that kelp is an established nutrient.

The Healthfood retailers' complaint asserts that FDA's action is "thought control" and an invasion of the constitutional rights of healthfood sellers and consumers. ECHO and the Diet Shop claim that powdered or granulated kelp in capsules offers the sea weed consumers the option of sprinkling a measured amount of kelp on food or swallowing kelp capsules.

Washington, D.C. lawyer, John Joseph Matonis, counsel for the Healthfood retailers said: "FDA feels the American consumers are stupid and need FDA protection. Actually, American consumers, particularly the healthfood consumers, are not only smarter than Big Brother FDA thinks, but do not want FDA protection against sea weed. We would like some protection though against real dangers like filthy food, pesticides, artificial colorings and preservatives and highly toxic drugs."

Some Basic Facts About Fluoridation

By LEE HARDY

The first in a comprehensive series of scientifically-based papers dealing with fluorides and fluoridation which will appear regularly in these pages.

What are the facts about fluoridation? Is is a boon to children's teeth, as promotors claim, or is it a dire threat to health and an ill-conceived hoax as is claimed by opponents? This writer has studied the proposition for more than twenty years and has collected pertinent data from sources as widely separated as New York and New Zealand. In this and succeeding articles many of these data will be reviewed, with referenced sources for further reading by those who may wish additional details or for verification of those given here. It is obvious that if there is a preponderance of evidence on either side this will be noticeable throughout the series. Opinions of readers should not be based upon mere unsupported "authority" or upon preconceived ideas, but on evidence and on reliability of methods used to arrive at conclusions.

What is fluoridation? Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary defines "fluoridate" as meaning "to add fluoride to." Then fluoridation would mean the addition of fluoride, in general to water and specifically to public water supplies, and will be so used throughout this series of articles. Water to which fluoride has been added, then, is properly called fluoridated water. It must be remembered that many natural sources of water already contain fluoride. Unless further fluoride is added to these waters they can not properly be called fluoridated. Claims of fluoridationists as to numbers of Americans who drink fluoridated water will need to be revised in view of this fact.

Fluorine, which combines with other elements to form fluorides, is one of the halogens, along with chlorine, bromine, iodine and astatine. The halogens are recognized as toxic substances. Some of these, however, have become established as essentials in human nutrition. Iodine is needed in minute amounts for the health and normal activity of the thyroid gland. Iodine deficiency results in goiter. Chlorine is presumed to be an aid in digestion, in normal heart activity, in normalizing blood pressure and in other body functions. However, regardless of claims, no requirement for fluorine in the human body system has yet been established. Because of its activity as a poison, chlorine is used to rid water supplies of certain harmful organisms. Since water systems are not infallible in their operation excessive amounts are sometimes injected, as may be evident from the taste. Fluorides in water are not detectable, either by taste or by smell.

Fluorides are introduced into water supplies not to treat the water but to treat those who drink it. Fluoridationists claim that fluoridated water will reduce the number of dental cavities by 60% among children who have used it from birth until the age of ten or twelve years. The concentration of fluorides for this purpose is set at one part of fluorine to one million parts of water. No claims of benefit for adult populations have been proved. It has been attempted to establish benefits for older people in the prevention of osteoporosis and other bone disorders, but such claims have been disproved by impartial studies made in England[1] and elsewhere.

Previous to 1939 the U.S. Public Health Service had advised communities to remove fluorides from their water supplies because of possible harm to the health of those who drank from them. After the idea of fluoridation was proposed in that year the USPHS soon reversed its policy, and now is foremost among those who advocate fluoridation. Active programs for the promotion of fluoridation in communities, in entire states and on a national level are being conducted and financed by the USPHS.

Fluorine is recognized by biochemists as one of the most toxic substances known in its effect on organic life. It is available to the public through pharmacies only on prescription. Fluorides are used commercially in insecticides, in rodenticides, in the etching of glass, in the production of aluminum, in the refining of gasoline and in various other industrial processes. In 1958 H. E. Stokinger, Jr., chief toxicologist, and R. L. Woodward, chief of water supply, Cincinnati, Ohio, presented a chart stating "approximate limiting concentrations for a healthy adult population" of a number of substances in water for drinking.[2] For cyanide they set the limit at 19 parts per million, with a 40 to 125 safety factor; for fluoride, at 1.25 ppm, with a zero safety factor. In other words, the given concentration of cyanide could be increased 40 to 125 times without exceeding the limits of safety, while there is no margin of safety in the drinking of water containing 1.25 ppm of fluoride. Even disregarding the difference in safety factors, it is seen that fluorides are recognized officially as fifteen times as dangerous to health as cyanide, a known lethal poison.

1. "National Fluoridation News," January-February, 1970.
2. Stokinger, H. E., Woodward, R. L., "Toxicological Methods of Establishing Drinking Water Standards," JAWWA, Apr. 1958, P. 515 Table 2.

Thoreau, as he was dying, was asked if he had made peace with God. "I have never quarreled with Him," was his reply.

Consumer Affairs Report

By TREESA DRURY

Drained Weight Labeling Proposed

Consumer's Union has petitioned the FDA to require drained weight listings for all fruits and vegetables packed in liquids. The proposed regulation does not specify a minimum legal weight, but merely would require that the drained weight . . . what's left after the liquid is drained off . . . be listed on the label. Consumer's Union conducted a study and discovered that drained weights varied as much as three ounces in containers listing the identical net weight. Dr. Herbert Ley, a former FDA Commissioner, told a congressional committee that "the consumer could best be served by being advised of the drained weight as well as the net weight of canned fruits and vegetables which they are purchasing." The consumer group also pointed out that the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Defense Supply Agency require minimum drained weights for many of the processed fruits and vegetables they purchase.

Female Deodorants

In 1971, we reported to you the problems of female deodorants . . . a product that through mass advertising, managed to pick up a large segment of the female buying public. At that time. we quoted medical doctors who claimed that not only was soap and water a far superior remedy to any female odor problems, but that these genital sprays could cause serious allergic reactions. In January 1972, *Consumer Reports Magazine* urged the avoidance of these so-called hygiene sprays. As a minimal remedy, Consumers Union asked the FDA to require warning statements on the sprays. Labels that would tell about the possible adverse reactions of some users. CU's Medical Consultants also felt the use of such deodorants might mask the warning signs of vaginal infections or tumors.

In its May issue for 1973, *Consumer Reports* says that the FDA has not only failed to act on its recommendations, but on its own data. CU maintains that an FDA Medical Officer reviewed data on a company's test which revealed that 25% of the 32 subjects used in the test did, in fact, show signs of irritation or reddening of the skin. The FDA's Advisory Panel of Obstetricians and Gynecologists voted unanimously that the deodorants should be considered drugs. The genital deodorants are now classified as cosmetics. Controlled tests are not required to prove a cosmetic's effectiveness or safety.

CU maintains the problem is best described as bureaucratic bickering. Two FDA divisions each wish to claim domain over the product. This sibling rivalry has caused, according to Dr. John Gowdy of the FDA, a wait and see what happens attitude. It would appear that it will be some time before the true classification of these deodorants are figured out. While not ruling on the issue of whether they are a drug or cosmetic, proposals to require warning labels are in limbo. Genital deodorants along with aspirin, have also been included among the over the counter drugs that FDA will review for effectiveness. *Consumer Reports* interprets this as yet another delay in decisive action which is long overdue.

Milk Containers Questioned

Milk containers have become a big item in consumer news of late. Full page ads in many newspapers told consumers that light could seriously affect the flavor of milk sold in ordinary plastic containers and cited test results demonstrating that the milk packaged in paper cartons was superior as it did not let in fluorescent light. Then there are those three quart returnable non-transparent plastic containers. A Canadian medical officer, Dr. L. H. Douglas, declares that returnable plastic milk jugs pose a serious health hazard and should be removed from the market. The problem here seems to be one caused by the consumer. They will use the containers to carry gasoline, oil or toxic chemicals before returning them to the dairies.

While the containers are carefully washed and sterilized, gasoline and other chemicals can eat into the plastic leaving traces of the toxic substances and finally the Connecticut Department of Health spoke up about canned milk. Preliminary studies show that canned milk, including baby formulas, contain 13 times more lead than regular homogenized milk. It is theorized at this point that the cans in which the milk is packaged are responsible for the relatively high lead content. More investigation is being done to determine the exact cause and effect.

Treesa Drury can be heard nightly in the Los Angeles area, Monday through Friday at 9:30 p.m. with CONSUMER WATCH on KHJ-TV's NEWSWATCH—Channel 9. She also may be heard on a nationally syndicated show — check your local radio station schedules.

COMING NHF CONVENTIONS

Albuquerque, Holiday Inn, Midtown ..... **September 1**
Denver, Cosmopolitan Hotel ..... **September 2**
Miami Beach, Deauville Hotel ..... **September 23**
Orlando, HolidayInn- Orlando South ..... **September 24**
New York, Statler Hilton ..... **November 17-18**

The Never-Never Land Of Non-Regulation

By IDA HONOROF
Consumer Advocate

Are you the average American that consumes 5 lbs. of synthetic chemicals of dubious toxicity, added to your food to beguile, deceive and defraud? Worthless chemicals are substituted for natural ingredients, most of them destroy the natural life-giving qualities of food. Once the life-process is destroyed, chemical ingenuity steps in to give the appearance of vitality, to add color, restore aroma and give flavor to that lifeless product, made tasteless by chemical processing, necessitating additional chemicals to enrapture your taste-buds. By its very nature, all living things must decay. These chemicals make stale products appear fresh, prevent spoilage, mask inferior quality, allow for unsanitary conditions, increase shelf-life at the same time your own shelf-life suffers because your body was never meant to absorb the steady onslaught of toxic chemicals.

Initially produce (fruit, vegetables and grains) are harvested from chemically saturated fields, gathered from chemically-strewn barns, then capriciously subjected to a barrage of additional toxicants . . . dyes, bleaches, buffers, emulsifiers, antioxidants, preservatives, stabilizers, flavors, acidifiers, sweeteners, bitter-agents, flavor enhancers, tenderizers, conditioners, thickeners, neutralizers, moisteners, drying-agents, alkalizers, extenders, anti-caking and anti-foaming agents, curers, hydrolizers, hydrogenators, maturers, fortifiers, disinfectants, deodorants, gasses, fungicides assidulants, potentiators, surfacants . . . very few of them need appear on the label. 3,000 deliberately added to your food without your consent, without proof that they are "reasonably" certain to be safe.

FDA's conservative estimate "about ⅓ are known to be harmless, another ⅓ considered safe in the amounts used, and the remaining ⅓ are in a scientific no-man's land."

The public remains hoodwinked into believing that additives are necessary to improve food quality and wholesomeness, and with the blessings of the FDA, synthetic chemical use has zoomed from 400 million lbs. in 1955 to over 1 billion lbs. At their 1971 Convention, the American Chemical Society reported that food additives represent a $500 million business, and their expectations for 1980 were $756 million, with a 40% growth in surfacants, a 50% growth in flavorings and stabilizers, a 60% growth in assidulants, synthetic sweeteners and bitter agents, a 67% growth in preservatives, and a 100% growth in antioxidants, flavor enhancers or poteniators (MSG falls into that category).

The public has become the testing ground for many toxic chemicals, added to our foods without proper testing to determine whether they can cause cancer, birth deformities or genetic damage. This also holds true for those substances known as GRAS (Generally Recognized As Safe) which came into being around 1958. This untested (until recently, unpublished) list exempts items which (prior to 1958) had been given "prior sanction." Food processors need not give the FDA notice that they plan to use the additive, neither need they file a petition for use. Manufacturers reserve the privilege of determining the "safety" of any given food additive. Once a chemical is on the GRAS list it is even exempt from the legal definition of "food additive." The only way the FDA can remove this divine chemical from the GRAS list, is by demonstrating that it is harmful! The sensible approach is ignored . . . that it should have been found absolutely safe. In addition, we question whether there has been an analysis done determing the synergistic effects of food additives . . . pesticides, heavy metals, fertilizers, animal-feed, drugs, radiation, alcohol. All these in combination may produce catastrophic hazards.

Just because it's on your grocers shelf . . . just because it has the approval of the FDA . . . don't accept the fact that it's healthy for you. William Longgood in his excellent book "The Poisons in Your Food" quoted Dr. Edward Ryan (editor of the Dental Digest): "Everytime a natural substance is removed from your food, everytime an adulterant is added to a food, the balance of nature is disturbed. The chemical and cellular processes within the body cannot react to the passing whims of chemists without disturbance in function. It took thousands of years for the body to adjust itself to changing environmental conditions . . . when these conditions are suddenly altered by the actions of man, the cells cannot make the adjustment and disease is the result."

The bigest problem today is that the final decision to determine whether a chemical is harmless, is left up to judges and lawyers who have no real understanding of the biological subtleties involved. They judge chemicals by . . . "will it kill instantly . . . will it produce a corpse . . . if it doesn't then it is perfectly safe to be used in food." Injuries from chemicalized foods may take years to develop . . . then there is the added difficulty of pinpointing the culprit.

There are roughly 1,000 chemicals used directly in food and food additives, with another 2,000 infiltrating through packaging materials or other indirect contact. The chemical industry boasts that the use of chemical food additives has risen from 419 million lbs in 1955 to over 1,000 billion lbs. today. In 1971 the food industry did $139.2 billion in sales, a 63% increase since 1960 ($5 billion of this was food additives). During World War II, there were approximately 1,500 items on the supermarket shelves, today there are approximately 32,000—the aver-

(Continued next page)

age supermarket stocks anywhere from 7,000 to 8,000.

Leonard Trauberman ("Food Engineering") reports that convenience foods contributed more than anything else to the growth of the food industry. In 1970 Americans spent more money for processed, convenience, snack and franchised foods than they did for fresh foods. The FDA is "considering" setting standards for the nutritional quality of these, while the FTC considers investigating the advertising claims of "nutrition" in synthetic products.

The foregoing is an excerpt from "A REPORT TO THE CONSUMER" published bi-monthly by Ida Honorof, P.O. 5449, Sherman Oaks, Calif. 91503. Subscriptions $7.00 per year.

Chapters Use Ingenuity In Raising Money

Your NHF officers and staff members have always been doubly appreciative of contributions received from local chapters because the contribution generally was made possible through some special money-raising event which entailed the initiative, ingenuity and efforts of many people. Today, such contributions are needed more than ever before in the face of the important court battles which we have already instituted or will soon instigate. The very important court battle to block the implementation of FDA's dietary supplement regulations is still before us.

Recently, we received a generous check from the Ithaca (New York) Chapter. The way in which they raised the money will interest you. They staged a "Taste-a-Bite" buffet served on the occasion of a large rummage sale held by a local historical group. Thirty-eight different dishes were offered and a dime was charged for each taste-size serving. Those who were interested in obtaining the recipe for the dish or dishes tasted could then buy the recipe for an additional dime. We think this is a very practical as well as ingenious way to raise money and perhaps other chapters will be inspired to sponsor a similar event.

The San Diego (California) Chapter traditionally stages a home bake sale during the NHF regional convention held annually in San Diego. Members who can do so, donate cookies, cakes, muffins, whole grain sandwiches, etc. which they have made themselves and these are then sold during the convention. It might be mentioned that there is never anything left because these delicious items literally go like hot cakes. This year, the receipts from the sales amounted to approximately $200. Whatever the receipts, the money is then always presented to the NHF headquarters during a brief ceremony at the end of the convention.

High Vitamin Intake Not Dangerous Says Dr. A. Hoffer

By JAY PATRICK

"The body can deal with an excess of vitamins and minerals much more effectively than it can deal with a deficiency," reported Dr. A. Hoffer at a recent meeting in Los Angeles of physicians utilizing the new orthomolecular medicine approach.

"In other words," he continued, "too much doesn't do any harm, too little does – so that the body handles an excess by simply getting rid of it.

"My colleagues seem to have a tremendous concern for saving their patients' money. They don't like to see them buy extra quantities of vitamins.

"But vitamins are not harmful in quantities substantially above the minimum daily requirements of the FDA. This is because most of them are water soluble and are easily thrown off by the body if not required.

"Indeed, many vitamins were present on the earth, it is believed, even before life began. In other words, the molecule such as that of niacin was present before life started and, therefore, life has had a long time in which to adapt itself to the presence of it and such nutrients and knows what to do with the excess.

"Of course anyone can kill himself by drinking too much water, by eating too much salt, or by eating too much sugar—but in my opinion the massive doses employed by orthomolecular physicians are not toxic to the body, although minor side-effects may result."

Convention Talks Available On Tapes

Tape recordings of the addresses given at most of the western NHF conventions during 1972 and thus far in 1973 are available on cassettes or on reel tapes. Likewise, available from the same source, are tape recordings of all the talks given at the 1972 Los Angeles convention and the 1973 New York convention of the International Association of Cancer Victims and Friends as well as the recently held convention of the Cancer Control Society.

Making these tapes available to NHF members and friends, is an independent endeavor of Ray H. Womack, 227 West Fairview Blvd., Inglewood, CA 90302. A large stamped, self-addressed envelope sent to him will bring you a complete listing of the convention addresses available to date. Prices start at $3.75 for a 60-minute tape which may provide one hour-long address or two 30-minute talks of your choice. Prompt handling of your order is assured.

Small chapter groups who find it difficult to locate suitable speakers for meetings, might consider procuring tapes to be played at the chapter meeting. Most of the tapes will provide "food" for a lively group discussion after the tape is played.

Update On NHF Court Cases

The class action suit filed by NHF last fall is still pending and tentatively is scheduled to be heard in Los Angeles federal district court sometime in September. In this case, NHF is seeking an injunction to halt the FDA from pursuing certain policies and actions relating to nutritional products which NHF charges are unwarranted, discriminatory and illegal. The action was filed shortly after a rash of seizures by FDA of dietary supplements such as 100 IU capsules of vitamin E, Choline tablets, multivitamin products of modestly high potencies, etc. Though FDA enforcement officers charged that these products could not be legally sold as dietary supplements, there is, in fact, no present, legally-implemented regulations which make such products illegal.

Just as soon as FDA issues its FINAL version of its dietary supplement Order (that issued in January was the *tentative* final Order), NHF will file an action asking a federal appeals court to make a judicial review of the Order to determine FDA's legal authority to promulgate such regulations and whether such regulations are based on substantial facts in evidence. The court will be asked to issue a temporary injunction to stall the implementation of the new regulations until the court has the opportunity to hear the case.

NEW PERPETUAL AND LIFE MEMBERS

Perpetual Members

Richard C. Schneider
Dr. C. George Champagne
Berniece T. Green
Dr. Forrest C. Shaklee, Sr.

Life Members

Dr. D. Wayne King
Mrs. Foster F. Birch III
Mr. Foster F. Birch III
Gus Ruggieri
James J. Dungan
Mrs. Magdalene Klane
Mr. and Mrs. Raymond J. Stimac
William E. Charlesworth, D.C.
Isabel Steiner
Lee S. Glessner
Lloyd H. Gardner
Dr. and Mrs. John E. Martin
Deloris A. Miller
Gladys Levy
Mrs. Bertha Hansen
Avis A. Schernzel
Mrs. Wilmuth Smith
Marie A. Montgomery
Ruby B. Coe
Frances A. Dyer
Alma Hagen
Joe and Marilyn McEachron, D.C.
Patricia O. Schutte
Mr. and Mrs. W. Eugene Morava
Superior Health Company
Queen E. Tonnemaker
Porter Health Food Center

(Received June first to mid-July)

Book Reviews

CHIROPRACTIC SPEAKS OUT by Chester A. Wilk, D.C. (published by Chiropractic Speaks Out, P.O. Box 320, Park Ridge, Illinois 60068; 256 pages; hard cover; $6.95).

The American Medical Association would like us all to believe that chiropractic is a cult completely unworthy of being considered as a profession, based on a false premise having no truth in scientific fact, that its practitioners are perpetrating a gigantic fraud upon the public, that the course of study presented in chiropractic colleges is inadequate and woefully inferior, and thus, in the interest of the public welfare, immediate steps should be taken to de-license all the presently practicing doctors of chiropractic and abolish the profession once and for all.

There is scarcely a person who has not seen, or heard, the propaganda attacks of the AMA upon the chiropractic profession. Each new legislative session has seen the introduction of bills in the legislatures of several states aimed at repealing the existing chiropractic acts and de-licensing the practicing doctors. Those closer to the scene have had the opportunity to observe the viciousness and the intensity of the medical lobbying efforts to prevent the chiropractic profession from gaining even the slightest added legal recognition.

It undoubtedly was this situation which impelled Dr. Wilk to prepare, as stated on the title page, this "reply to medical propaganda, bigotry and ignorance." In this reviewer's opinion, his reply is a masterpiece. Without emotionalism or rancor and with the skill of a capable defense attorney, the author refutes all the major propaganda points generally used by organized medicine in its attacks on the chiropractic profession. And he does this by citing authoritative references. In fact the last 30 pages or so of the book consists of a listing of his references, chapter by chapter.

The author makes it clear that he is not attacking the members of the medical profession, most of whom he regards as conscientious, dedicated individuals who, more often than not, do not approve most of the actions of the AMA. In fact, the author notes the marked decline in AMA membership during recent years so that now less than half the physicians in the country belong to the American Medical Association.

Chiropractic Speaks Out very briefly reviews the history of manipulation and the development of chiropractic as a distinct and separate healing arts profession. The author, in a simple and non-technical manner, then explains the principles upon which the practice of chiropractic is based. Stress is laid on the fact that chiropractors treat the whole person, and in this sense do not necessarily treat diseases per se. Rather, they treat the pa-

(Continued next page)

tient in an attempt to help return his body to a normal state of function, thereby permitting the body to overcome its ailments. The main purpose of this book is to give competent rebuttal to the critics of chiropractic and therefore space is not given to reviews of case histories of those who have been successfully treated by chiropractic methods.

In a detailed analysis of the tools used by the propagandists, the author properly observes that "when a writer conspicuously avoids the good that can be said about a subject and dwells at length on the bad, his material must be viewed with suspicion and distrust. When an author abandons objectivity, relies upon half-truths, innuendoes, exceptions to the rule, obscure sources, obsolete material, material out of context, and fallacious material in an effort to derogate his subject, honesty and decency are outraged and the reader's intelligence is insulted as a lie replaces the truth." It is in this frame of attitude that the author then shows how these tools have been skillfully used in an effort to create an unfavorable image in the public mind regarding chiropractic and then he goes about setting the record straight with documented facts.

Very often in presenting the documented facts, it backfires on the medical profession by exposing comparative shortcomings, which again suggest that those who live in glass houses shoudn't throw stones. For example, the author cites a study of workmen's compensation records of 44 states and Canada in the 1950s, comparing chiropractic and medical treatment cost and wage loss. The average cost of chiropractic treatment was $27.07, while the average cost of medical treatment without hospitalization was $85.34. The wage loss of the average chiropractic patient was $55.42, while the wage loss of the average patient under medical care without hospitalization was $95.06.

An analysis of organized medicine's concerted drive to abolish chiropractic (and in the past, some of the other health care professions) forces one to conclude that the real reason for their efforts stems from the desire for absolute dictatorial control of the healing arts and that the AMA is more concerned with this objective than in cooperating with government and the allied healing fields to get much needed health services to more people at a lower cost. To aid them in maintaining a monopolistic control of health care services in this country, the AMA has the highest spending lobby in Washington, D.C. The Congressional Record Almanac for 1966, for instance, reveals that the AMA spent $1,155,935.30 – more than spent by the next nine highest lobbies combined—and this doesn't include the massive expenditures of AMPAC (American Medical Political Action Committee) a political front organization for the AMA, nor the sums channeled through the state associations and local societies to aid in the election of legislators friendly to organized medicine's goal. Thus, with its excessive spending to influence Congress, the AMA has been able to impose its influence on the masses of the people in this country. In spite of all its influence, however, Congress voted last year to include chiropractic among the services available under Medicare.

Organized medicine's arguments against chiropractic would be more convincing were it not for the fact that while it is condemning the methods of treatment utilized by chiropractors, it is adopting these methods. Spinal manipulation is being taught in some medical quarters and is being used under the names of physiatry, manipulative medicine, manual medicine, etc. An entire chapter of *Chiropractic Speaks Out* is devoted to the comments and quotations of prominent medical physicians and surgeons supporting manipulation as an appropriate and valuable therapy.

The chiropractic educational institutions have been a target of vicious attacks by organized medicine in spite of the fact that the fruits of those institutions – the graduates—in many states, take the same examinations in the basic sciences as do the medical graduates and approximately the same percentage of chiropractic graduates successfully pass these examinations as do the medical graduates. The author documents the fact that the chiropractic colleges as well as chiropractic research has been supported almost entirely by the profession itself but, in spite of this, the colleges have followed an ongoing program of advancement. While medical colleges receive huge sums through federal grants, from large foundations, or as tax-supported institutions, chiropractic colleges have never received a single dollar from government sources for their support.

After reading this book, one cannot help but be impressed that in spite of the medical propaganda and oppression, chiropractic has become the second largest healing profession in the world and continues to grow in numbers, sophistication and recognition. In addition to being legally recognized in 49 states and the District of Columbia, chiropractic is recognized also by most private insurance companies, by workmen's compensation, by Medicare and Medicaid, and perhaps most important of all, by 50 million chiropractic patients including some of the most prominent and brilliant people in the world—but then, the AMA doesn't like you to know all this.

COMPUTERS CAN'T THINK

The Melrose Drive Church of Christ in Dallas recently received a computer-type letter soliciting business for a correspondence course in electronics. It was addressed to *"Mr. Melrose Drive Church of Christ"* and sold the merits of the course. Computers are taught to pick up the last name when used in the content of a letter, so the letter ended with, *"Accept the challenge. Mr. Christ; don't waste your life in a dead-end, low-paying job."*

NHF REPRINTS

The following is a list of NHF reprint available from NHF by writing Box 688, Monrovia, California 91016. The price includes handling and postage. California residents, please add 5% sales tax. Allow three (3) weeks for delivery unless first-class postage is sent with order. Build your own library from these excellent reprints. Revised list as of July 1, 1973 — PLEASE DISREGARD ALL OTHER REPRINT LISTS. PLEASE INCLUDE NAME AND NUMBER OF REPRINT.

		1st Copy	Each Additional Copy
NHF PROMOTIONAL MATERIAL			
1A	15-page pamphlet that tells about NHF		no charge
2A	NHF postage-paid envelopes with membership application		no charge
3A	Story of NHF		no charge
4A	NHF Freedom Crusade leaflets		no charge
5A	Are we living in a Fool's Paradise?		no charge
6A	Take Off that Blindfold		no charge
IMMUNIZATION AND SHOTS			
1B	Your Right ot Refuse Immunization in Travel	.25	.10
2B	Polio Immunization Certificate	.25	.05
BEAUTY			
1C	Help Yourself to Beauty—Jheri Redding, M.A.	.25	.05
EYES			
1D	Cataract Cure without Operation—Irving A. Kruinsky	.25	.10
2D	I Threw My Glasses Away	.25	.10
PESTICIDES			
1E	What Are Pesticides Doing?—Granville Knight, M.D.	.25	.20
2E	Public Health & New Pesticides—Morton Biskind, M.D.	.25	.15
DRUGS AND VITAMINS			
1F	Time to Lift the Lid for a Clear Look—Clinton R. Miller	.30	.15
2F	Humans Used as Guinea Pigs—Los Angeles Times	.25	.05
3F	The Concept of Safe Tolerance Dosage—J. Baldwin Bruce	.25	.05
4F	What the Proposed FDA Vitamin Regulations Will Mean—Miles H. Robinson, M.D.	.25	.05
FOOD AND NUTRITION			
1G	What is Wrong With White Bread?	.40	.30
2G	The Role of Nutrition in the Healing Arts—Myrna Schultz, D.C.	.25	.10
3G	Kelp—G. L. Seifert, M.D. and H. C. Wood, Jr., M.D.	.25	.10
4G	Pros and Cons of Salt—Howard F. Lewis	.25	.05
5G	Sources of Fundamental Nutrition—Louis Bromfield	.25	.10
6G	Enzymes the Miracle Health Builders—Delfi Monteagudo, D.C.	.25	.10
7G	Peril on Your Food Shelf—Congressman James J. Delaney	.25	.10
9G	Are We Eating a Diseased Diet?—Wm. A. Ellis, D.O.	.50	.30
10G	What's in the Ice Cream you Buy?	.25	.05
11G	And Then the Real Fight—Harvey W. Wiley, FDA	.60	.50
12G	Sugar	.25	.05
13G	A Statement on Aging—Karl Lutz, L.L.B.	.25	.15
14G	Let Food Be Your Medicine—Doris Grant	.25	.15
15G	Are We Starving to Death?—Neil M. Clark	.25	.10
16G	Chemicals in Food—Dr. Harvey W. Wiley	.40	.30
17G	Bleaching of Flour—N. Dakota Agricultural College	.60	.25
18G	Nutrition in Everyday Life—Canadian Medical Association	.35	.15
19G	Hypoglycemia: Shortage of Body Fuel—William Cole	.25	.10
20G	Hypoglycemia—Alan H. Nittler, M.D.	.25	.20
21G	Mineral Nutrition—George P. Larrick, Commissioner FDA	.25	.10
22G	The Human Need for Hydrochloric Acid—Dr. E. Hugh Tuckey	.25	.10
CANCER			
1H	Should the Pill be Given to Teenagers	.25	.10
2H	Carcinogens in Our Human Environment—W. Heuper, M.D.	1.25	1.00

(continued on next page)

3H	Cancer Reprint (Directory for Treatment and Services)	.25	.05
4H	What's in the Hoxsey Treatment?—E. Edgar Bond, M.D.	.25	.15
5H	Cancer Organizations that Need Investigating—Senator Wm. Langer	.30	.25
6H	Trials and Tribulations of a New Remedy—Joseph W. Wilson, M.D.	.25	.10
7H	Sarcoma and Glucose Indictment—Japanese Jnl. of Cancer	.25	.10
8H	Twelve Questions on Cancer Treatments	.25	.10
9H	Who Murdered This Girl?—Olga Schaeffer	.25	.05
10H	Television and X-ray Radiation—Virginia Veltrano, B.S., D.C.	.25	.05
11H	Laetrile Problem Explained In Detail—Dean Burk	.40	.20
12H	Laetrile—Don C. Matcham	.25	.05
MEDICAL MONOPOLY AND MEDICAL QUACKERY			
1J	The Role of Vitamin A—Umberto Saffiotti	.25	.05
2J	Monopoly as an Approach to Quackery—David Dobreer, D.O.	.25	.15
3J	Scientific vs Smear Tactics—George Crane, M.D.	.25	.15
4J	Misuse of our Pure Food Law—Royal Lee, D.D.S.	.25	.15
5J	Death Food Propaganda—Royal Lee, D.D.S.	.25	.15
6J	Medical Monopoly—Charles Orlando Pratt	.25	.15
7J	Medical Monopoly & Chiropractic—Leonard Savage, D.C.	.50	.20
8J	Medical Myths about Chiropractic—C. W. Weiant, D.C.	.25	.10
9J	Freedom and Truth—Charles I. Crecelius, B.S.	.50	.25
10J	The Seven Myths Exploded	.25	.10
11J	Autocrat at the Breakfast Table—Lowell B. Mason	.50	.50
12J	Dictocrats—Omar V. Garrison	1.00	
13J	Four Food Traps—R. Dean Conrad, B.A., M.A.	.25	.10
14J	Government Subsidizes Malnutrition—Royal Lee	.50	.30
15J	Are We Masters or Slaves?—John J. Miller, Ph.D.	.30	.20
16J	Regulation vs. Regimentation—Milton A. Bass	.30	.20
17J	Grandfather Clause—George F. Townes	.25	.10
RAW MILK			
1K	How to Stop a Ban of Certified Raw Milk—Louise D. McCann	.30	.15
2K	Certified vs. Pasteurized Milk	.25	.10
FLUORIDATION			
1L	Fluoridation (NHF compiled book—best reference in U.S.)	3.50	3.00
2L	A Hoax from Harvard—F. B. Erner, M.D.	.25	.10
3L	Fluoridation and Dental Caries—A. Burgstahler, Ph.D.	.25	.10
4L	Medical Reasons Against Fluoridation— J. B. Bruce, M.D.	.25	.10
5L	Fluoridation vs. Freedom—F. B. Exner, M.D.	.25	.10
6L	How to Fight Fluoridation in your Area	.25	.10
7L	Another Fluoriidation Bombshell—Betty Gyneth T. Franklin	.25	.10
8L	Suggested Letter to Officials in Opposition to Fluoride	.25	.10
9L	Perilous Credulity About "Scientific Progress"—Russell Kirk	.25	.05
10L	Fresh Facts About Fluoridation—James Kilpatrick	.25	.05
11L	Dental & Medical Aspects Against Fluoridation—Albert Burgstahler	.40	.20
12L	Effects of Fluorides—H. Burkhart, D.D.S.	.25	.10
13L	Congressional Record—Extension of Remarks—J. Kilpatrick & J. Lear	.25	.10
14L	Nip It In The Bud—Don Matchan	.25	.05
15L	Farmers Crippled, Crops Burned—Dunnville, Ontario Incident	.25	.05
16L	Air is Fluoridated—Ned Groth	.25	.10
17L	Government "Not Doing Job" in Fluoridation Research—Ralph Nader	.25	.05
18L	Fluoride Kills Ponderosa Pines—Herald Dispatch by Gladys Caldwell	.25	.05
19L	Ralph Nader Discusses Fluoridation—Let's Live	.25	.05
20L	Fluoridation—George Washington Law Review	.50	.50
21L	Fluoridation in the Light of Recent Evidence—Albert Burgstahler	.25	.10
22L	Scientists and Fluoridation—Albert Burgstahler	.30	.20
MISCELLANEOUS			
1M	The Truth About This Man, Fred. J. Hart—A sketch of our Founder	1.00	.50
2M	George Kennedy & Chiropractic—Burt Prelutsky in West Magazine	.25	.05
3M	Aluminum	.25	.10
4M	Liberty Stamps (sheet of fifty)	1.00	
7M	NHF Member Decals	.25	

NHF Legal Defense Fund Needs Support

A brand new phase in the activities of NHF was marked by the establishment of the **NHF Legal Defense Fund** out of which financial help can be given to defendants in health related cases where constitutional issues are involved, where important precedent may be involved, or where the case is clearly one of harassment and entrapment.

The Legal Defense Fund became an actuality when all the revenue received from our recent Liberty Stamp Drive was deposited in the account. Then, at the suggestion of a member, a DOLLAR-A-MONTH CLUB was established to provide a continuing source for the Fund. Anyone may become a member of the Club merely by sending in a dollar and then each month, without being billed or reminded, sending in another dollar. Many who have already joined, have sent in a check for $12.00 for the entire year and thus saving the inconvenience of mailing a dollar each month. If the **Legal Defense Fund** is to adequately fulfill its intended purpose however, we must have at least 1000 members in the Dollar-A-Month Club. If you have already joined or have contributed in other ways to the Fund, we extend to you our heartiest thanks. If you have not, please give this need your thoughtful consideration.

Your Invitation To Join
THE NATIONAL HEALTH FEDERATION

Name (Print).....

Street.....

City..... State..... Zip.....

☐ I wish to become a REGULAR MEMBER of the NHF and am enclosing $5.00 as yearly dues. $1.50 of which is for a subscription to the BULLETIN for the current year.
☐ New subscription. ☐ Renewal subscription.

☐ I wish to become a SUSTAINING MEMBER and am enclosing $.....(minimum fee, $25.00) as membership dues for the current year. $1.50 of which is for a subscription to the BULLETIN.

☐ I wish to become a LIFE MEMBER and will pay the sum of $.....each month until the sum of $100.00 is reached.

☐ I wish to become a PERPETUAL MEMBER ($1,000.00 payable in cash or convenient terms).

☐ Enclosed please find a donation of $.....for the Washington Office.

☐ Enclosed is a donation of $.....for the NHF Legal Defense Fund.

☐ Enclosed in a donation of $.....to be used for.....

☐ I wish to pledge $.....per month/per quarter/per year (check which applicable) in support of NHF.

Mail to: The National Health Federation, P.O. Box 688, Monrovia, California 91016

THIS IS THE
NATIONAL HEALTH FEDERATION

The National Health Federation is America's largest, organized, noncommercial health consumer group. It is a nonprofit corporation founded in 1955. Its membership is comprised of men and women in all walks of life, belonging to a variety of religious faiths and political persuasions, and engaged in nearly every profession and trade.

Its members believe that health freedoms are inherently guaranteed to us as human beings, and our right to them as Americans is implied in the words, "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." Yet, frequently, these freedoms and rights have been and continue to be violated. Too often, as a result of the unopposed pressures from organized medicine, the chemical industries, pharmaceutical manufacturers, and others, laws and regulations have been imposed which better serve these special-interest groups than the public at large. We see and hear of new instances daily. To name a few: spiraling health-care costs, consumer exploitation by leading industries, excessive devitalization and adulteration of our foods, restriction of certain types of treatment, banning of certain health books from the mails, the harrassment of those who advocate natural methods of healing and natural foods, the poisoning of our air, water and soil through greed and carelessness, and many other health-related issues.

The NHF opposes monopoly and compulsion in things related to health where the safety and welfare of others are not concerned. NHF does not oppose nor approve any specific healing profession or their methods, but it does oppose the efforts of one group to restrict the freedom of practice of qualified members of another profession, thus attempting to create a monopoly.

The public needs a strong voice, such as the NHF provides, to speak and act in their behalf in these health-related matters. Legislators need your support to balance the pressures exerted upon them by the special interests. The National Health Federation, through a special legal and legislative staff in Washington, keeps its members apprised of all health legislation, opposes inadequate or undemocratic health legislation, while supporting or drafting bills to protect the individual's health freedom.

Will you join us in this worthy effort?

ELECTED FEDERATION OFFICERS

Charles I. Crecelius — President and Executive Head of the Federation.
Address: P.O. Box 688, Monrovia, California 91016

Kurt W. Donsbach, N.D., D.C., B.T.S., Vice President

Betty Lee Morales — Secretary

Dorothy B. Hart — Treasurer

Fred J. Hart—Chairman of the Board of Governors and Managing Editor of the **Bulletin.**
Address: P.O. Box 688, Monrovia, California 91016

PAID FEDERATION STAFF AND THEIR FIELDS OF ACTIVITY

Clinton R. Miller — Vice President in charge of the Washington Office, which includes Legislation and Regulations.
Address: 121 2nd Street N. E., Washington, D.C. 20002
Phone: (202) 547-2547

Arthur Koch—NHF Legal Counsel
Address: 121 2nd Street N. E. Washington, D.C. 20002

R. A. Laurye—Business Administrator
Address: P.O. Box 688, Monrovia, California 91016. Phone: (213) 358-1155

Convention Bureau — Plans and coordinates all convention activities.
Address: P.O. Box 688, Monrovia, California 91016
Phone: (213) 358-1155

Willadean Vance — Director of Public Relations
Address: 17241 Santa Barbara St., Fountain Valley, California 92708
Phone: (714) 842-9422

Raymond H. Houser — Editor of the **NHF Bulletin.**
Address: 5366 Auburn Drive, San Diego, California 92105

Opinions expressed in the **Bulletin** are those of the writers of the articles and are not necessarily the opinion of the National Health Federation.

NATIONAL HEALTH FEDERATION
P.O. Box 688
212 West Foothill Boulevard
MONROVIA, CALIFORNIA 91016

Entered as Second-class Matter
$5.00 Membership (includes **Bulletin** subscription)
PRICE FOR ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THIS ISSUE
35¢ each—5 for $1.00—30 for $5.00—50 for $7.50—100 for $14.00

PLACE
6¢ STAMP
HERE

Every family in America should belong to the National Health Federation to —

1. Support the principle of freedom of choice and liberty in health matters.
2. Be a part of a strong and united consumer's voice in all health matters.
3. Work for beneficial and needed health legislation and, at the same time, oppose proposals which are detrimental to the health interests of the people or which do not provide for equality of recognition of all legally established health professions.
4. Support a united effort to reduce the cost of health care.
5. Oppose insults upon our ecology which have an impact on health
6. Oppose the use of chemical food additives which have not been proved absolutely safe or which are not needed.
7. Secure fair and impartial enforcement of food and drug laws and regulations.
8. Insist that all monies raised for health research and care be used exclusively for these purposes.
9. Compel all health fund-raising organizations to disclose in an annual report, the amount of funds collected and how the funds were expended.

THESE ARE THE THINGS THE NATIONAL HEALTH FEDERATION IS ORGANIZED TO DO — JOIN ITS RANKS AND TAKE PART IN THIS VITAL EFFORT ON BEHALF OF YOURSELF AND OF ALL AMERICA.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

If the last numbers in the code appearing under your name in the address above read 7-73 (or any earlier date), your dues are now past due. If you are one of these, please remit your dues NOW so that your membership and subscription to the **Bulletin** will not be interrupted.

HELP SAVE OUR HEALTH FREEDOMS