

Seamons, Colleen

From: Jo Douglas [mailto:joannedouglas.com]
Sent: Sunday, 28 February 2010 10:41 PM
To: submissions
Subject: Proposal P1007 -Primary Production & Processing Requirements for Raw Milk Products.
Attachments: Reasons raw milk is not risky.docx

Categories: Blue Category

Please read the attached document... contains many reasons why good quality raw milk is not risky.
I request that the FSA change the category for raw milk into one that would allow investigation into a certification process and making it available

Also, why is raw goats milk being placed in a risky category when there have been no illnesses caused by it in Australian's history. I believe this was a finding of the investigation in 2002.

Yours sincerely
Jo Douglas
Nerang, QLD, 4211

Vonderplanitz and Campbell Douglass's testimony on Raw Milk

This report was written, compiled and condensed by the International Medical Expert on MILK, natural and pasteurized, Dr. William Campbell Douglass, M.D., author of the definitive analysis of scientific and clinical study on milk, The Milk Book; and the proponent and leading present-day empirical scientist on the positive effects of natural milk products on humans, Dr. Aqjonus Vonderplanitz, Ph.D. Nutrition, Nutritional Scientist and author of We Want To Live, Vol.1 Out of the Grips of Disease and Death, and Vol.2, Healthfully, the Facts, and The Recipe For Living Without Disease.

We search for, pay extravagant prices for and jump through citizen's-rights hoops to obtain natural milk. It is not fun or exciting. We, and all of the natural-milk drinkers would much rather go to our local stores, buy and drink pasteurized dairy and live more average lives. However, we cannot. We have allergies to pasteurized dairy. Either we get sick from pasteurized dairy or our health does not improve when we consume it. We thrive and are happy when we consume natural dairy products. For us it is not a choice, it is a necessity for a healthy and happy life. Our Constitutional and Bill of Rights freedoms are the pursuit of health and happiness, including having our necessary raw-milk products readily available nationally, commercially. We are not invested in winning the raw-milk debate and retribution for those who have made our lives difficult by depriving us of raw dairy products. We simply want the freedom to commercially obtain natural dairy between States for our well-being.

ANALYSIS of the FDA and FDA/CFSAN's literature on line and letters to the States, many written by attorney John F. Sheehan regarding raw milk.

- FDA's cited for the years 2002-2003 that "Two children were hospitalized in Ohio for infection with Salmonella enterica serotype Typhimurium. These children and 60 other people in Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Tennessee developed bloody diarrhea, cramps, fever, chills, and vomiting from S. Typhimurium tracked to consuming raw milk. The milk producer voluntarily relinquished its license for selling raw milk upon recommendation of the Ohio Department of Agriculture." Sheehan (an attorney and wayward judge, not a scientist of milk) purposely misleads us with his language. Those cases were all survey-associated, not scientifically proved and were from many so-called events. Many people got sick who did not drink raw milk at the same time as those who did. The farmer told us that

the government threatened to take his license for the 90% of his milk-sales that he sold to a large dairy firm for pasteurization. The farmer did NOT voluntarily relinquish his license to sell raw milk.

- FDA makes reference to the UCLA statistical Assessment of the Excess Risk of Salmonella dublin Infection Associated with the Use of Raw Milk, Public Health Reports, Vol. 103, No. 5. The Assessment stated, "37% of reported Salmonella dublin infections were acquired from raw milk." The assessment was a statistical guestimation based on many unknown variables. Dr. Nancy Mann, PhD Biostatistics, UCLA 1965, Exhibit B (p. 46 herein), refutes the statistics. She indicates that the conclusion that any milk caused the sporadic 241 cases studied was improbable. She states that if milk had been the cause, there would have been an epidemic. There was no epidemic; only sporadic incidences. Other flaws with the Assessment were: 1) it was not known why a case entered a hospital or saw a doctor; 2) case histories do not disclose cause of death in the 36 who, later, were reported to have died in that 3-year period; 3) at least 3-4 weeks had elapsed when case histories were taken. People do not remember what they ate yesterday much less a month ago. "It is very difficult, if not impossible to identify, in an individual case, which of the possible risk factors caused the illness," said Dr. Benson Werner, epidemiologist with the California Department of Health Services. The UCLA Assessment was based on analysis of questionnaires and mathematics, not clinical or empirical science.
- FDA lists an epidemic of Listeriosis "linked" to soft cheese that contained raw milk. The court ruled in this case that raw milk was not responsible.
- FDA admitted that there was a yearly "2.6% incidence rate for Salmonellae and a 6.5% incidence rate for Listeria monocytogenes" in pasteurized dairy products. Instead of discussing the lack of safety of pasteurized dairy, they wrote about raw milk as dangerous. The subject is incidences in pasteurized dairy. Bacterial contamination of pasteurized milk is a health issue. (RFNM p. 15-24.)
- FDA states many confirmed cases of Salmonella typhimurium. Testimony reveals that people consumed raw milk in the week prior to their illness but milk was not all they ate. Dr. Werner testified in court about Salmonella typhimurium, the "...most common Salmonella infection in humans...each year... Salmonella typhimurium is such a large category, it receives probably half of all cases...could be in any food... it could be related to person...and other sources." The Report continues, "Molecular fingerprinting determined that the strain from ill persons was the same as found in raw milk." Yet, Dr. Werner's testimony states that that strain is everywhere. If someone drinks out of the bottle, as many milk drinkers do, they place it in the milk. There is no empirical evidence that raw milk has caused S.

typhimurium. As Dr. Mann said, if milk had been causative, there would have been an epidemic.

There was no epidemic. All of the other cases cited by FDA fail on the same grounds.

- Plenty of scientists proved that raw milk is the only empirically safe and health-giving milk. So, why would the FDA ignore that science and fixate on persuading our 50 United States' health departments to outlaw raw milk? Why did it hire an attorney/judge, John F. Sheehan, L.D., with a zealous judicial history to argue its perspective of raw milk? Since natural milk is not dangerous, why did Sheehan resort to emotionally inflammatory hysteria to persuade people to believe natural milk is dangerous and FDA publish it instead of science? Why didn't he tell the truth that all cases accused natural milk by surveys? What does FDA have to gain? Two rational reasons are apparent:
 - 1) Employees of FDA/CFSAN ignore science and believe the myth that raw milk is dangerous because they lack any direct long-term experience with handling and consuming raw milk products, and that is what they were taught to vehemently believe, and/or
 - 2) There is a revolving door between large agribusiness companies, food giants, pharmaceutical companies and the FDA. Most of the last heads of the FDA worked for food, agribusiness or pharmaceutical companies before and/or after working for the FDA. The USDA has a similar history. Could it be that they are protecting the greedy interests of the conglomerates who want highly processed foods as the only foods accepted as clean and healthy? Conglomerates are the only ones wealthy enough to afford such modern equipment and therefore the only "safe" foods would be theirs; monopoly. Therefore, they are invested in convincing people that raw dairy and most raw foods are dangerous. That is a violation of fair trade and monopoly laws.
- All local, county, state and federal health departments in the USA have been standardized to use a generic questionnaire often called "Incident Report" to determine the substance(s), such as food or chemical that caused one or more incidences of illness. There are two main categories to be answered. One set inquires about the consumption of foods, particularly citing natural foods such as raw milk, sushi and rare and raw meat. Another set asks about contact with farm animals. If the person surveyed answers "yes" to consuming raw milk and raw dairy products, the cause is always attributed, linked, associated, related, tracked, traced or connected to raw dairy. It does not really matter what else is learned about the person's recent escapades. There is no science to substantiate the accusation; the conclusion is merely survey-association. Health departments should be instructed that they cannot use surveys to conclude blame and relay it to the media.

- FDA raised the concern that natural milk caused “substantially higher risk of serious infections, and some of which can be transmitted to others.” However, the assumption that raw milk is a carrier of disease is unsubstantiated by case history and empirical science.

I. Throughout USA, for nearly 40 years, millions of people drank over 3 billion glasses of Alta Dena Dairy’s raw milk and there was not one epidemic, and not one proved case of foodborne illness because of it (Exhibit K, p. 58).

II. Raw milk produced under gross conditions is not proved to be causative in any epidemic. No one has been maimed by drinking raw milk even with high bacterial counts. (RFNM p. 20-24.) Until 1950, raw milk commonly contained bacterial counts of 3 million ml and 200 ml pathogens, compared to 10,000 ml and 10 ml pathogens now. Furthermore, no epidemics were proved to be caused by raw milk, indicating that raw milk is not harmful even when it contains many so-called pathogens (RFNM p. 23, ¶ 4-5). Even when raw milk was used as a preservative to keep raw meat fresh for 13 years, it did not harm any of the consumers. (RFNM p. 33).

III. A review of the cases CDC cited shows 156 individual cases attributed to raw milk from 1973 until 1992, but no outbreaks or epidemics attributed to raw milk. If that figure were valid, and it is not, as explained above, there were only 5.6 cases yearly ($156 \text{ cases} \div 19 \text{ years} = 5.6 \text{ cases}$) attributed to natural milk. That is the lowest case incidence of any animal product produced. However, there is extensive evidence showing that pasteurization is a great health risk to the public. Pasteurized dairy caused numerous epidemics, involving 200 people, 468 people, 1,492 people, 16,284 people, 17,000 people, and 197,000 people. Pasteurized dairy has caused numerous epidemics. In each incident the product was from a single source producer. In the years 1978-1997, 232,485 people suffered due to outbreaks from pasteurized milk. (RFNM p. 8-10.) In almost all cases, CDC reported that investigation showed proper pasteurization. CDC’s figures and FDA/CDC’s conclusions that “pasteurization provides assurances against infection” are contradictory and untrustworthy. As facts state, pasteurized milk has caused 2,185 times more food borne illness than was “attributed” to raw milk. Raw milk has never been proved to cause outbreak or epidemic where as pasteurized dairy has. Scientifically and statistically, natural milk is the safest product to consume and does not merit the prejudice that it receives.

IV. The decline in raw milk consumption met with a dramatic increase in Salmonella illness (CDC illustration, RFNM p. 42). It could be reasonably argued that the deprivation of natural milk to the public resulted in a gross loss of health.

- Strains of bacteria have become immune to antibacterial agents and humans are more toxic and more susceptible to viral illness. (RFNM p. 40, ¶ 4.) Science has proved that humans become immune to bacteria to which they are regularly exposed. Legally and morally, it would be correct to allow people to develop or maintain natural immunity by ingesting bacteria in food-form, especially those who are considered at “high risk”. People who buy raw milk are informed educated people.
- No empirical scientific proof exists that feeding or contact with raw milk is unsafe or dangerous to infants and children, nor to “at high risk” groups defined by FDA and CDC. We do not propose that food-poisoning does not exist. However, we have no evidence that natural milk proved to cause any illness in any children or other “at high risk” individuals. Evidence exists that infants and children thrive on raw milk even with high bacterial levels. (RFNM p. 28-30, and Exh. L.) Illnesses in infants have been treated successfully with raw milk for centuries in hospitals and clinics.(RFNM p. 28-29.) Raw milk reduced infant deaths in St. Vincent’s Hospital by 94%. (RFNM p.28, ¶ 6.)
- FDA and CDC claim they found no scientific study which demonstrates medical or health benefits of raw milk. RFNM presents a portion of the expert data on the benefits of raw milk from: Harvard, Princeton, Cambridge, University of Georgia Dairy Science Department, Dartmouth College, Ohio State University School of Agricultural Chemistry, Washington University School of Medicine, Tufts University, the Mayo Clinic of Minnesota, The Price-Pottenger Nutrition Foundation, Weston A. Price Foundation as well as medical journals and publications such as Certified Milk Magazine, American Association of Medical Milk Commission, Milk Industry Foundation, The Lancet, JAMA, World Cancer Research Fund, American Journal of Clinical Nutrition, New England Journal of Medicine, British Medical Journal, Consumer Reports, Consumer’s Union, St. Vincent’s Hospital, and the prestigious Hartford Hospital. (RFNM p.28-33.)
- Dr. J.E. Crewe, M.D., from the Mayo Clinic, Rochester, said, “...the treatment of various diseases over a period of eighteen years with a practically exclusive [raw] milk diet has convinced me personally that the most important single factor in the cause of disease and in the resistance to disease is food...” (RFNM p.32, ¶ 1)

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The barrage of present-day bacterial misinformation taught to the public regarding raw milk is predominantly unscientific speculation and not based on empirical examination. (RFNM p.39-43.) Any dissemination of it by departments of USHHS (FDA, CFSAN, CDC) is a violation of the

health protection for all Americans to which those agencies were entrusted. Regulations/codes for Pasteurized milk are more lenient than those for natural milk yet pasteurized milk is associated with very high disease rates. The FDA and CDC are on an unscientifically based campaign to completely eliminate raw dairy. Why?! Ignorance and/or closed-mindedness? Racketeering (RICO) for the food industry to eliminate competition and save money and profits? Racketeering (RICO) for the medical professions and pharmaceuticals who evidently would love to have us sick for their profits?

Raw milk, even if produced with little cleanliness is SAFE. It has built-in natural safeguards (that are destroyed by pasteurization). (RFNM p. 25-27.) It is clear that bacterial testing requirements are relatively unnecessary to produce safe raw milk but important for pasteurized milk. Considering any "hold and test" requirements as a compromise to allowing natural milk to pass state lines is unnecessary and compromises the fresh taste of raw milk. No "hold and test" recommendations are in force for pasteurized milk.

Grade A milk standards are more than enough to ensure safe raw milk. All Californians enjoy the freedom to consume Grade A natural milks from any store. Grade A natural milk should be permitted to be sold in any part of USA, especially with its high ratio of ethnic groups who are often allergic to pasteurized milk. (RFNM p.28, ¶ 7-8.) To deny those groups is discriminatory, prejudicial and a violation of civil rights.

It is also recommended that possible metabolic or other infectious and environmental causes of vomit and diarrhea must be explored where pathogens are found. The questions must be asked: Are pathogens the instigators or the consequence of degenerative disease? Are they the cause or the cure? Is pointing the finger at microbes in raw food a distraction from true causes of disease? Is pollution of our food, water, air and medicine the predominant cause of disease, which then fosters bacterial growth? All hypotheses must be open to independent testing and researchers held accountable to the rules of evidence. Also, raw milk should not be the scapegoat to usher into this country regulations that require all foods to undergo expensive processing that only the wealthiest food-processors can afford.

The facts are that raw dairy has proved to help millions of people to better health and saved many infants lives (see PFNM p. 24-33). The present unlawful practice by the FDA and CDC citing,

trying and fining people for taking raw dairy over state lines is prejudicially discriminatory and violates freedom of choice and peoples' right to health and happiness.

HEALTH RISKS FROM DRINKING PASTEURIZED MILK

As we consider reports of infectious diseases attributed to food, we must be very cautious before we come to any conclusion. Dr. Douglass and I will give you a perspective of microbiology that is different than what you are told. With diligent observation, we learned in thousands of our experiments, separately undertaken, nature delivered an entirely different picture of the causes of infectious diseases. At first you may be stunned to learn that bacterial food-poisoning is rare. When it occurs, it is caused by cooked and processed food wherein the bacteria have mutated/deformed. Their wastes are toxic and irritating to the human body. Also, there is food-poisoning caused by concentrations of chemical food-additives, or toxins or cleansers on food-processing machines or counters that were not properly rinsed.

The body is resplendent with microbes of all varieties labeled "pathogenic" such as Salmonella species, Listeria monocytogenes, Campylobacter jejuni, Staphylococcus, Escherichia coli species, Mycobacterium species and other bacteria common to humans and other animals are important to well-being. They never act pathogenically. Those microbes act as janitors, eating damaged or decaying biological substances, such as derived from cooked, processed or chemically contaminated diets. Pure food is paramount to a healthy, thriving and radiant body.

Scientists have introduced laboratory versions of natural bacteria in artificial settings and watched bacteria do its janitorial work and called it pathogenic. Scientists have introduced raw and mutant bacteria into isolated animal tissue that has caused the destruction of that tissue but that tissue was not in its natural habitat and did not function naturally. Yet they have pointed to their experiments and said, See, that bacteria caused disease. That is what they were paid to do. They did not tell us that that is not as it is in nature. As we mentioned in the Preface, no natural animal suffers from the exchange and consumption of high concentrations of common natural bacteria. I, Aajonus, demonstrated that on Ripley's Believe It Or Not (July 17, 2002).

Also, consider that we should expect many occurrences of diarrhea and vomit in our fastfood, processed food and polluted evolution. Such ill occurrences are more frequent amongst people who do not drink raw milk. What would health departments, encouraged by food conglomerates,

gain by accusing food, especially raw food for illness? Would it be to eliminate competition of smaller companies, and keep the health departments in business? We must consider anyone who accuses natural bacteria of abhorrent behavior (pathogenic) as suspect with ulterior motives. Who would gain by the biological food-poisoning consciousness that exists in our society? Would it be the processed food industry that wants highly processed foods with long shelf lives? And large profits by food-processors? I will let you decide as we evaluate the information about safety/benefits and dangers/harm of milks.

Case on Point

Coca Cola was highly influential and involved in the incident where Odwalla Juice company's raw apple juice was accused of a 16-months-young girl's death from kidney disease and failure. If it had been Odwalla's juice that "infected" the little girl with E.coli O157H:7, many more than 49 people would have been affected and not just from a few locations in the country and Canada. However, relatively few were affected. Another factor to consider is that the antibiotic that was given to the little girl probably caused her kidney disease and failure. Young animal subjects in the testing of antibiotics, including Cipro, had the same symptoms of kidney disease as HUS. Also consider that we have been unable to locate the bacteria E.coli O157H:7 in nature. I, Aajonus, secured a sample from a University. I was told it was given to that university by the FDA/CDC. When I tried to enzymatically fractionate it for study, it reacted as if it were manmade. I was unable to get it to thrive in organic apple juice. Also, several days prior to the juicerecall, consider that over 80,000 juices containing the accused apple juice had been consumed by thousands of people, many children, without incident. If it had been Odwalla's apple juice, thousands of people would have been harmed instead of 49. Bacterial fingerprinting only identifies the exact strain of bacteria and cannot be matched with a source, as human fingerprints can. Why was Odwalla accused? Isn't there something beyond fishy here? The story continues.

Coco Cola, FDA, CDC and many health departments supported and encouraged the bereft mother of the deceased little girl to speak before the Congress, pleading with them to demand the pasteurization of all prepared juices. From one incident! Every person in the USA has been deprived of buying fresh live juices from our stores except at juice bars. Was it a sham by conglomerate Coca Cola to eliminate the raw juice competition, supported by the FDA? You

decide; the media-damaged Odwalla juice company was bought by Coca Cola for a fraction of the price it had been worth prior to the E.coli-claimed death.

September 2006, 7 children in Riverside County, California experienced vomit and diarrhea. Simultaneously, the California Department of Health Services (CDHS) and the FDA were on a campaign to eliminate the large California raw milk producer Organic Pastures Dairy in the wake of the E.coli/Spinach event. Authorities blamed the children's illness on the natural milk, closed the dairy and the FDA tested everything at the dairy. Two of the children were heavily treated at a hospital with antibiotics and they developed kidney disease. The other 5 children left the hospitals, refusing treatment and did not develop kidney disease and were fine the next day. Also, consider that about 3,000 children drank the same milk for a week prior to being recalled. There were no other incidents throughout California. Antibiotics were likely the cause of kidney damage in the children..7 What did those 7 children do in Riverside County to get sick? When all of CDHS and FDA's tests were completed, they revealed no E.coli O157H;..7 were found on the dairy's land or in its herd. FDA workers commented that the dairy was the cleanest they had ever inspected. However, CDHS and FDA had done their damage to the dairy, including through the media. What food caused the illnesses? Or was it simply children getting sick from toxins stored within their bodies and detoxifying, as happens every day.

We must consider that many people regularly develop infections simultaneously with the same strains of bacteria that are unrelated to any food that they may have eaten for the past weeks. Most occurrences have no direct link to the immediate food consumed. Why do health departments go on witch hunts to blame raw milk for incidences of diarrhea that have not affected hundreds of people when hundreds or thousands of people have consumed the same natural milk? Maybe it is because they have accepted a job that is impossible to do and they need scapegoats to justify their employment. Also, we must ask, who profits from bacterial phobia?

BACTERIAL RISKS FROM DRINKING PASTEURIZED MILK

From the late 1880's to approximately late 1930's, milk caused many illnesses as cities developed and arms grew farther from cities because milk was sold on the streets preserved with soap, formaldehyde, other chemicals or enriched with castor oil and lard. The poisons entered the human body, damaging tissue. Bacteria resulted from necessity, to clean the damaged tissue. Instead of blaming the chemicals that were used to preserve milk, bacteria were accused. Ice

boxes, and later refrigerators were wealthy families' luxuries until the late 1940's. So, 98% of city populations always drank milk that had soured and contained high bacterial levels. Why did health departments suddenly blame raw milk for the incidences of diarrhea and vomit?

Maybe it was for the advantage of food producers, like Knudsen dairy. All food producers want long shelf lives for their food products. In 1934, Alton Eliason began working for Knudsen dairy. She described Knudsen's ruthless conspiracy to eliminate its small competitors and ensure less spoiled milk product in the late 1930's. Knudsen began pasteurizing its dairy products and claiming that pasteurized dairy was the only safe dairy. Even though Knudsen's employees and representatives knew it was not true, they hired doctors to testify that raw milk caused diseases. They paid and worked with health officials to outlaw public and farm sales of raw milk. They paid writers to tell gruesome tales about dirty raw milk if people bought unpasteurized directly from a farm or on the street. The stories made city people afraid of raw milk. City dwellers began to believe that anyone who drank it was mentally incompetent.

However, the people who worked with raw milk and drank it regularly were not fooled..⁸ The campaign to force pasteurization down people's throats is still alive today as mentioned above by food conglomerates and health departments.

By 1945, half the population of America drank pasteurized milk. In 1945, there were 1,492 cases of infectious diseases attributed to pasteurized milk..⁹ There were 450 cases attributed to raw milk. There was 1 case of disease for every 12,400,000 quarts of pasteurized milk consumed, and 1 case of disease for every 18,900,000 quarts of raw milk consumed..¹⁰ In other words, a person could drink 6,500,000 more quarts of natural milk than pasteurized without getting sick.

However, if we consider the covert cases against raw milk and our experiments with people drinking raw milk that was very high in "pathogens", the number of raw-milk incidences could very possibly be none. However for arguments sake, we will continue with the acceptance that people may rarely experience a little vomit and diarrhea after consuming raw dairy products, caused by them.

In 1945 an epidemic of food-poisoning occurred in Phoenix, Arizona..¹¹ The official report reads, "Pasteurization charts...show milk was properly pasteurized and leads to the assumption that

toxins were produced in milk while it was stored..." Three hundred (300) persons were sickened by that pasteurized-milk food-poisoning incident.

Great Bend, Kansas, in 1945, reported 468 cases of gastroenteritis from pasteurized milk. This was "traced" to "unsanitary conditions in dairies' unsterilized bottles". Nine people died.

Consumer Reports, January 1974, revealed that out of 125 tested samples of pasteurized milk and milk products, 44% proved in violation of state regulations. Consumer Reports concluded, "The quality of a number of the dairy products in this study was little short of deplorable." Consumer Reports stated that "former objections" to pasteurized milk are valid today:

- a) Pasteurization is an excuse for the sale of dirty milk.
- b) Pasteurization may be used to mask low quality milk.
- c) Pasteurization promotes carelessness and discourages efforts to produce clean milk.

In October 1978, an epidemic of salmonella was attributed to food-poisoning by pasteurized milk involving 68 people in Arizona. The bacterial level was 23 times the legal limit. The CDC reported that the milk was properly pasteurized. Yet the FDA and CDC continue to insist that, "...only with pasteurization is there. . . assurance" against infection. Consumer's Union reported in June 1982, that coliform bacteria were found in many tested samples of pasteurized dairy products. Some counts were as high as 2200 organisms per cubic centimeter.

In June, 1982, 172 people in a three-state area in the Southeast were stricken with an intestinal infection. Over 100 were hospitalized. The infection, which caused severe diarrhea, fever, nausea, abdominal pain, and headache, was traced to pasteurized milk.¹² Many of those people did not drink the same brand of milk. It was probably just a localized seasonal flu.

Cases with similar outcomes are: In 1983, in an outbreak of listeriosis in Massachusetts, pasteurized whole or 2% milk was implicated as the source of infection. Inspection of the milk producing plant detected no apparent breach in the pasteurization process.¹³ In August 1984, approximately 200 persons became ill with *S. typhimurium* from pasteurized milk produced in a plant in Melrose Park, IL. The regulators kept this outbreak secret. Without evidence, they concluded that the milk wasn't properly pasteurized. But, again, in November 1984, another outbreak of *S. typhimurium* occurred in persons who consumed pasteurized milk bottled in the same plant. Again, they kept it secret and assumed the milk was not properly pasteurized.

Then, in March 1985, there were 16,284 confirmed cases of *S. typhimurium* resulting from pasteurized milk bottled in the same plant. Tests proved the milk was properly pasteurized. Investigators with preconceived notions that the milk did not get properly pasteurized, fueled by the efforts of health departments, drew conclusions without an investigation and accused natural milk. As always, the media relayed that unscientific theory to the public..¹⁴ **Listeria survives the pasteurization process..¹⁵**

Some Outbreaks Attributed to Bacterial Food-poisoning from PASTEURIZED MILK..¹⁶

- 1945?1,492 cases for the year in the U.S.A.
- 1945?1 outbreak, 300 cases in Phoenix, Arizona.
- 1945?Several outbreaks, 468 cases of gastroenteritis, 9 deaths, in Great Bend, Kansas.
- 1978?1 outbreak, 68 cases in Arizona.
- 1982?over 17,000 cases of yersinia enterocolitica in Memphis, Tenn.
- 1982?172 cases, with over 100 hospitalized from a three-Southern-state area.
- 1983?1 outbreak, 49 cases of listeriosis in Massachusetts.
- 1984?August, 1 outbreak *S. typhimurium*, approximately 200 cases, at one plant in Melrose Park, IL.
- 1984?November, 1 outbreak *S. typhimurium*, at same plant in Melrose Park, IL.
- 1985?March, 1 outbreak, 16,284 confirmed cases, at same plant in Melrose Park, IL.
- 1985?197,000 cases of antimicrobial-resistant Salmonella infections from one dairy in California..¹⁷¹⁸
- 1985?1,500+ cases, Salmonella culture confirmed, in Northern Illinois.
- 1993?2 outbreaks statewide, 28 cases Salmonella infection.
- 1994?3 outbreaks, 105 cases, E. Coli & Listeria in California.
- 1995?1 outbreak, 3 cases in California.
- 1996?2 outbreaks Campylobacter and Salmonella, 48 cases in California.
- 1997?2 outbreaks, 28 cases Salmonella in California.

Professor Fosgate, Dairy Science Department of the University of Georgia, said, "Pasteurization has been preached as a one-hundred percent safeguard for milk. This simply is not true. If milk gets contaminated today, the chances are that it will be after pasteurization."

INFANT DEATH SYNDROME, COLIC AND OTHER INFANT DISEASES FROM FEEDING PASTEURIZED MILK

The Sudden Infant Death Syndrome (SIDS), crib death, has baffled scientists for years. Apparently healthy babies die in their sleep without crying, without struggle. Infants affected are from 1-6 months of age, with the highest incidence at about 3-months old. Almost every conceivable cause, from Vitamin C deficiency to suffocation in bedding has been hypothesized as cause. Barrett, in 1954, suggested that inhalation of food while sleeping may be the cause. Barrett and co-workers at the University of Cambridge worked from facts that already proved that most infants fed on pasteurized cow's milk had evidence in their blood that they are potentially allergic to pasteurized milk protein. Infants often regurgitate various amounts of milk while asleep that could cause anaphylaxis to a tiny amount of milk inhaled into the lungs. Subjecting guinea pigs sensitized to milk, they dripped pasteurized milk into the throat and down the windpipe. "Very soon after introducing the [pasteurized] milk into the larynx of an anesthetized guinea pig, the animal stopped breathing without any sign of struggle."

Colic is a concern with infants who are fed pasteurized milk. One out of five babies suffers from colic. Pediatricians learned long ago that pasteurized milk was often the irritant. A more recent study linked pasteurized milk consumption to chronic constipation in children..¹⁹ These researchers also observed that pasteurized milk consumption resulted in perianal sores and severe pain on defecation, leading to constipation.

Dr. Ralph R. Steinman of Loma Linda University studied rats..²⁰ The decay process in rats' teeth is biologically identical to that in human teeth. He divided his rats into several groups. The control group received a standard nutritious rat chow. Steinman discovered that these rats would average less than one cavity for their entire lifetime. The second group received a very heavily refined sugar diet. Although they grew faster than the nutritiously fed rats, they averaged 5.6 cavities per rat. The third group was fed "homogenized Grade A pasteurized milk" and they had almost twice as many cavities as the sugar-fed group - 9.4 cavities per animal.

Dr. Weston Price, D.D.S., in *Nutrition and Physical Degeneration* proved fifty years ago what Steinman repeated in 1963: Processed milk leads to disease and premature death..²¹ Nizel of Tufts University reported that decayed teeth were four times more common in Pasteurized milk-

fed babies compared to breast-fed babies. Dr. Price, observed that eating processed food, such as pasteurized milk, parallels poor development of the facial bones. Dr. A. F. Hess wrote in his abstracts, "...pasteurized milk...we should realize...is an incomplete food...infants...develop scurvy on this diet. This form of scurvy takes some months to develop and may be termed sub acute. It must be considered not only the most common form of this disorder, but the one which passes most often unrecognized..." ..22

"Some have questioned whether pasteurized milk is really involved in the production of scurvy. The fact, however, that when one gives a group of infants this food for a period of about six months, instances of scurvy occur, and that a cure is brought about when raw milk is substituted, taken in conjunction with the fact that if we feed the same number of infants on raw milk, cases of scurvy will not develop—these results seem sufficient to warrant the deduction that pasteurized milk is a causative factor. The experience in Berlin, noted by Newmann (Newmann, H., Deutsch. Klin., 7:341, 1904) In 1901, a large dairy in that city established a pasteurization plant in which all milk was raised to a temperature of about 60 degrees C. After an interval of some months infantile scurvy was reported from various sources throughout the city. Neumann wrote: ..23 "Whereas Heubner, Cassel and myself had seen only thirty-two cases of scurvy from 1896 to 1900, the number of cases suddenly rose from the year 1901, so that the same observers—not to mention a great many others—treated eighty-three cases in 1901 and 1902.' An investigation was made as to the cause, and the pasteurization was discontinued. The result was that the number of cases decreased just as suddenly as they had increased." ..24

"One of the most striking clinical phenomenon of infantile scurvy is the marked susceptibility to infection which it entails—the frequent attacks of 'grippe,' the widespread occurrence of nasal diphtheria, furunculosis of the skin...pneumonia in advanced cases." ..25

More recently, Minot and his colleagues concluded that adult scurvy can be precipitated by infectious processes. That is, a person with latent scurvy from drinking pasteurized milk could manifest scurvy during an infection. In general, therefore, investigations in the laboratory as well as clinical observations are in agreement in stressing the interrelationship of scurvy and bacterial infection. That illustrates "the futility of pasteurization of milk to prevent infection from diseases...The infant is... subject to the common infectious diseases, and deaths from these common diseases are not attributed, as they should be, to the defective nature of the milk." ..26

DISEASE AND DISEASE RISKS FROM DRINKING PASTEURIZED MILK

Pasteurization totally destroys the enzyme **lipase** that helps fat digestion. Pasteurized milk contains no **galactose** for milk-sugar digestion, no **catalase**, **diastase**, or **peroxidase**.

Pasteurization alters milk proteins that have caused major health problems that are allergies in children and adults throughout the United States. Lactose intolerance for pasteurized dairy is common among many populations, affecting approximately 95% of Asian Americans, 74% of Native Americans, 70% of African Americans, 53% of Mexican Americans, and 15% of Caucasians..²⁷ Symptoms, which include gastrointestinal distress, diarrhea and flatulence, occur because these individuals do not possess the enzymes that digest the milk sugar lactose and protein in pasteurized milk..²⁸ Often, with these gastrointestinal symptoms, bacteria such as salmonella will be found active in the blood and stools but not in the pasteurized dairy, indicating that pasteurized dairy incites bacterial activity that is, then, associated with a food. Food-contamination is often not the problem because the bacterial activity originates in the body to help the body dissolve damaged tissue that results from poor-quality processed, pasteurized diets. Milk pasteurization turns lactose into beta-lactose that is far more soluble and therefore more rapidly absorbed into the blood stream. That sudden rise in blood sugar is followed by a fall leading to low blood sugar, hypoglycemia, which induces hunger. If more pasteurized milk is drunk to satisfy the hunger, the cycle is repeated: hyperglycemia, hypoglycemia, hunger, more milk, etc. The end result is obesity. Obesity has become one of the most common diseases of childhood. Pasteurized milk causes more obesity when it is skimmed. Pigs have been and are regularly fattened with skimmed milk.

In an effort to alleviate hunger among a Northeast Brazilian tribe, they were given processed powdered milk. The milk caused rapid growth and irreversible blindness..²⁹

Pasteurization completely destroys phosphatase that is essential for calcium absorption. The “decalcification” of pasteurized and formula milks fed to children can be a major cause of osteoporosis later in life. We now know that low calcium absorption in healthy women may cause loss of spinal bone mass as early as age 20. Such women may lose 50% or more of their bony mass by the age of 70..³⁰

R.D. Briggs of the Pathology Department of Washington University School of Medicine read that the British reported a higher incidence of heart attacks among persons with chronic peptic ulcers..^{31,32} In 1960, Briggs and his associates undertook a statistical study of ten medical centers in the United States and five in Great Britain. They compared the incidence of heart attacks in ulcer patients taking a Sippy (pasteurized, homogenized milk and cream) diet with those not using milk. Results were startling and unequivocal. In the US, patients taking the Sippy diet had a three-fold higher incidence of heart attacks. In England the heavy pasteurized, homogenized milk drinkers had a six-fold increase in heart attacks as the non-milk users. We know from the work of Pottenger, Wulzen, McCulley, and Oster that the specific constituents creating this type of calcification are heated protein and xanthine oxidase. Pasteurized milk contains cholesterol epoxides and oxides. Raw milk has none of them.

Studies have shown oxidized cholesterol products cause atherosclerosis and cancer. One reason pasteurized milk doesn't taste as good as raw milk from the farm is due to the practice of "holding over" milk. The milk is placed in large "milk silos" until it is ready for processing. It may be stored for 10 days. This favors the growth of certain bacteria..³³ Those bacteria, such as *Listeria monocytogenes*..³⁴ grow at refrigeration temperatures of the silos used for storage. Pasteurization alters the enzymes produced by those bacteria, causing milk to sometimes taste bitter, unclean, oily, chalky, metallic or medicinal. Dairy processors add chemicals to make the nasty-tasting milk taste appealing.

The pituitary hormone, TSH, stimulates the thyroid gland (in animals as well as humans). If minute amounts of TSH bovine pituitary hormone are absorbed daily from unbalanced pasteurized milk, depression of the thyroid gland could eventually result. Low thyroid function is extremely common in the USA today. Some of our expert colleagues estimate that fifty percent of the people over 50 years have some degree of low functioning thyroid. Another pituitary hormone, ADH, absorbed from regular consumption of pasteurized milk, causes water retention. ACTH, a powerful adrenal stimulator, absorbed regularly from pasteurized milk contributes to many conditions ranging from diabetes and hypertension to Addison's Disease (adrenal exhaustion), and acne.

Several cancers, such as ovarian cancer, have been linked to the consumption of pasteurized dairy products. According to a study by Daniel Cramer, M.D., and colleagues at Harvard, pasteurized

dairy-product consumption affects women's ovaries..³⁵ Some women have particularly low levels of certain enzymes, and regular consumption of processed dairy products may triple their risk of ovarian cancer compared to other women.

J.L. Outwater of Princeton University and Drs. A. Nicholson and N. Barnard of The Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine cited more epidemiological studies that show a positive correlation between pasteurized dairy products and breast cancer and prostate cancer, presumably related, at least in part, to increases in a compound called insulinlike growth factor (IGF-I).³⁶ IGF-I is found in processed cow's milk and has been shown to occur in increased levels in the blood by individuals who consume processed dairy products regularly..³⁷ Another recent study showed that men with the highest levels of IGF-I had more than four times the risk of prostate cancer compared to those with the lowest levels..³⁸

Synthetic hormones such as recombinant growth hormone (rBGH) are commonly used in dairy cows to increase the production of milk for pasteurization that often results in inflammation of the mammary glands (mastitis). When rBGH is present, it increases levels of cancer-causing and other dangerous chemicals in milk. rBGH-derived milk has dramatically higher levels of IGF-1 (Insulin Growth Factor), a risk factor for breast and colon cancers. IGF-1 is not destroyed by pasteurization. An article in *Cancer Research*, June 1995, shows that high levels of IGF-1 are also linked to hypertension, premature growth stimulation in infants, gynecomastia in young children, glucose intolerance and juvenile diabetes.

Dr. Samuel Epstein, M.D. professor of occupational and environmental medicine at the University of Illinois School of Public Health and chair of Cancer Prevention Coalition, reports that IGF-1, which causes cells to divide, induces malignant transformation of normal breast epithelial cells, and is a growth factor for human breast and colon cancers. In reviewing the data, Canadian scientists discovered that the suppressed Monsanto-studies showed that rBGH was linked to prostate and thyroid cancer in laboratory rats. Even after that was discovered, FDA continued and continues to allow rBGH to be fed to dairy animals..³⁹

Epidemiological studies of various countries show a strong correlation between the use of pasteurized dairy products and the incidence of insulin-dependent diabetes (Type I or childhood-onset)..⁴⁰

Researchers in 1992 found that a specific protein in pasteurized dairy sparks an auto-immune reaction, which is believed to be the destructive factor for the insulin producing cells of the pancreas. Wulzen, of Wulzen Calcium Dystrophy Syndrome notoriety, reported that test animals fed pasteurized milk did not grow well and consistently developed a characteristic syndrome of arthritis, the first sign of which was wrist stiffness. But the effects of pasteurized skim milk were far worse. First they developed the characteristic wrist stiffness and then muscular dystrophy. These animals became weak and emaciated and then died. Autopsy revealed severe hardening of the arteries and calcification of other soft tissues. The animals also developed testicular atrophy with complete sterility, severe calcification of most large blood vessels, anemia, decrease in hearing resulting in complete deafness, high blood pressure, and development of calcium deposits around the bone openings in the spine that provide for the exit of nerves. Sciatica and other nerve compression syndromes result from calcification.

No one has offered well-documented, experimental proof of any other cause for the extensive calcific disease we see today. Until science conducts tests on humans drinking raw versus pasteurized milks, we are wise to assume it is probable that the consumption of pasteurized milk causes the same disease-conditions in humans. The Wulzen experiments were repeated and conclusive.

Professor Hugo Kruger of Oregon State University confirmed the Wulzen experiments. He proved that there is a definite connection between pasteurized milk and stiff joints that eventually led, in experimental animals, to muscular dystrophy.

Francis M. Pottenger, Jr., M.D. wrote in his abstract, "Milk, an animal product, is the essential food of all infant mammals." Mammals are so classified in the scale of living things because of the common characteristic of the female nursing her young. The infant mammal is accordingly carnivorous in his natural habits irrespective of whether the adult of the species is herbivorous or carnivorous. "If the adults on a carnivorous diet show conditions of deficiency on cooked meat, is it not reasonable to suppose that growing infants on entirely cooked carnivorous diets will do likewise?" Many experimenters, such as Catel, Dutcher, Wilson, and others have shown deficiencies in animals fed pasteurized milk diets.

The Harvard Nurses' Health Study, 1997, which followed more than 75,000 women for 12 years, showed no protective effect from increased processed-milk consumption on fracture risk..⁴¹ In fact, increased intake of calcium from pasteurized dairy products was associated with a higher fracture risk. An Australian study showed the same results..⁴² Additionally, other studies have found no protective effect from pasteurized dairy calcium on bone..⁴³

Krauss, W. E., Erb, J.H., and Washburn, R.G. wrote in their abstract, "Kramer, Latzke and Shaw (Kramer, Martha M., Latzke, F., and Shaw, M.M., A Comparison of Raw, Pasteurized, Evaporated and Dried Milks as Sources of Calcium and Phosphorus for the Human Subject, *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, 79:283-295, 1928) obtained less favorable calcium balances in adults with pasteurized milk than with 'fresh milk' and made the further observation that milk from cows kept in the barn for five months gave less favorable calcium balances than did 'fresh milk'.." ⁴⁴

"According to S. Schmidt-Nielsen and Schmidt-Nielsen (*Kgl. Norske Videnskab. Selsk. Forhandl.*, 1:126-128, abstracted in *Biological Abstracts*, 4:94, 1930), when milk pasteurized at 63 degrees C. (145 degrees F.) was fed to mature rats, early death or diminished vitality resulted in the offspring.." ⁴⁵

Mattick and Golding, "Relative Value of Raw and Heated Milk in Nutrition", in *The Lancet* . (220:662-667) reported some preliminary experiments which indicated that pasteurization destroys some of the dietetic value of milk, including partial destruction of Vit. B1. These same workers found the raw milk to be considerably superior to sterilized milk in nutritive value. ..⁴⁶

"Pasteurization was also found to negatively affect the hematogenic and growthpromoting properties of the special milk (raw milk from specially fed cows, whose milk did not produce nutritional anemia—whereas commercially pasteurized milk did)..." ..⁴⁷ When pasteurized whole milk was fed to Guinea pigs, deficiency symptoms began to appear, wrist stiffness was first. When fed skimmed milk, deficiencies intensified characterized by great emaciation and weakness before death. "At autopsy the muscles were found to be extremely atrophied, and closely packed, fine lines of calcification ran parallel to the fibers...calcification occurred in other parts of the body...The feeding of raw cream cured the wrist stiffness." Guinea pigs fed raw milk ...grew well and showed no abnormalities at autopsy. ..⁴⁸

Milk Pasteurization destroys about 38% of the B complex (Dutcher and associates...)..49 "Using standard methods for determining vitamins A, B, G and D, it was found that pasteurization destroyed at least 25% of the vitamin B in the original raw milk." ..50

"On the 7.5 cc. level, two rats on raw milk developed mild polyneuritis toward the end of the trial; whereas three rats on pasteurized milk developed polyneuritis early, which became severe as the trial drew to a close. On the 10.0 cc. level, none of the rats on raw milk developed polyneuritis, but three on pasteurized milk were severely afflicted." ..51

Dr. R. M. Overstreet wrote, "The vitamin C of cow's milk is largely destroyed by pasteurization..."..52 proved to destroy 20-50% of Vitamin C..44 Woessner, Warren W., Evehjem, C.A., and Schuette, Henry A. wrote in their abstract, "Samples of raw, certified Guernsey and certified vitamin D milks were collected at different dairies throughout the city of Madison. The Vitamin C content of these milks on the average are only a little below the fresh milks recorded...indicating that commercial raw and certified raw milks as delivered to the consumer lose only a small amount of Vitamin C...samples of commercial pasteurized milks were collected and analyzed. On an average, they contained only about one-half as much Vitamin C as fresh raw milks.

"It was found that commercial raw milks contained a [Vitamin C] potency which was only slightly less than fresh raw milks and that pasteurized milks on the average contained only one-half the latter potency. Mineral modification and homogenization apparently have a destructive effect [on Vitamin C]." ..53

In Washington, DC in 1911, an 18-months research program was adopted to study the short term effects of raw versus pasteurized milk on human growth in hundreds of babies. The milk station study revealed that babies who drank pasteurized milk gained a fraction more weight than those who drank raw. Similar short-term studies were implemented in Lanarkshire and about 25 American cities. The results were the same. However, Dr. Francis Pottenger, MD made a 10-years study of 900 cats who were fed raw and pasteurized milks that showed little differences in the first generation but all succeeding generations of pasteurized-milk fed cats developed diseases whereas the raw-milk fed had no diseases for the all generations over 10 years..54 In 1936, the Lancet published a study of baby rats. They intended to compare health of groups of the fourth

generation who ate raw, pasteurized or sterilized milks. However, the litters from rats fed sterilized milk were unable to produce offspring after the first generation. The females from litters that ate pasteurized milk could not lactate by the third generation so the fourth generation died of malnutrition and starvation. All of the rats fed raw milk were healthy for all generations.

More research implicates pasteurized milk as a factor in cancer..⁵⁵ multiple sclerosis,..⁵⁶ female sterility..⁵⁷ and Type 1 diabetes in children..^{58,59,60,61}

HEALTH BENEFITS AND RISKS FROM DRINKING NATURAL MILK

a. BACTERIAL, VIRAL & PARASITICAL RESISTANCE AND NUTRITIVE VALUES FROM DRINKING RAW MILK

A letter from the Pennsylvania Bureau of Foods and Chemistry left no doubt about their confidence in raw milk, "I can think of no incident in Pennsylvania in the past twenty years in which raw milk was determined to have been the cause of human illness." ..⁶²

From 1958-1999, there had not been one outbreak caused by raw milk in California, and only speculative sporadic occurrences. In 1958, a Salmonella-outbreak of 11 cases was blamed on certified raw milk but "no Salmonella was ever found in batches of the milk...or in the herds." ..⁶³ Californians enjoyed 50 years of drinking raw milk without a single outbreak. Raw milk contains enzymes and antibodies that make milk less susceptible to bacterial contamination, such as nisin, and lactoperoxidase that inhibits the growth of Salmonella.

Raw milk contains: Phosphatase that is essential for the absorption of calcium; enzyme lipase aids in the digestion of fats, lactobacillus bacteriocins (nisin and others which kill listeria), lactoperoxidase, lactoferrin, xanthine oxidase, and lysozyme. Raw milk contains the proteins lysine and tyrosine that are altered by pasteurization. Also, raw milk contains fatsoluble vitamins A, D, E and K that pasteurization alters by up to 66%; and water-soluble vitamins C, H and K that pasteurization alters 38-80%.

In 2004, University California Davis, Agricultural Department experimented with spiking raw milk with various pathogens to see if raw milk truly exhibited antibacterial activity. The

experiments proved absolutely, conclusively that Organic Pastures Dairy's raw milk inhibited pathogenic bacteria from breeding in it.

Dold, H., Wizaman, E., and Kleiner, C. wrote in their abstract, "[Raw] Human or cow milk added to an equal volume of agar did not support the growth or allowed only slight growth of B. diphtheriae Staph. aureus, B. coli, B. prodigiosus, B. pyocyaneus, B. anthracis, streptococci, and unidentified wild yeast.⁶⁴ The 'inhibins' in cow's milk are inactivated by heating between 60-70 degrees C. for 30 minutes. Attempts have not been made to identify the natural antiseptics."

Dr. Alan Howard, Cambridge University, England, discovered that whole raw milk actually protects against abnormally high cholesterol. Feeding two quarts of whole milk a day to volunteers caused a drop in cholesterol.

Dr. George Mann, Vanderbilt University School of Medicine, concurs with Dr. Howard. He found that four quarts of whole milk per day lowered blood cholesterol level by 25%. Cambridge's Howard concluded, "...all this business that saturated fats in milk are bad for you is a lot of nonsense." Raw milk therapy is preferable to taking clofibrate, a chemical prescribed by doctors for lowering the cholesterol level of the blood. Clofibrate can cause heart attacks, gall bladder attacks and cancer.

Example Of Protective Qualities Of Raw Milk, Even When It Is Dirty

In the course of my research, I, Dr. Douglass, visited dozens of dairies. As you know from cleaning your car, spraying the surface with a hose is ineffective. The surface must be wiped. The same is true of a cow teat. This was demonstrated to me quite dramatically at a dairy producing milk destined to be sold raw. The hose was taken and the teats sprayed in the usual manner. A white towel from the stack was used to wipe one of the four teats. Plenty of mud and manure could be seen on the towel. If those teats aren't cleaned properly, and they often were not in those other dairies, that mud and manure went in the milk. They pasteurized it, but how many people want feces, mud, and urine in their milk even though it is heated by pasteurization?

Jack Mathis, President of Atlanta's Mathis Dairy, was invited to inspect the dairy at the Atlanta City Prison Farm and make suggestions for modernization. He said, "It looked more like an

outhouse than a milking parlor.” Manure on the cow’s hindquarters was running over the teats, the milking apparatus, and into the milk. From the milking machine, the milk ran into an open ten-gallon can by hose. “You couldn’t see the top of the can for the flies,” Mathis said. “It was like a bee hive with flies walking in and out of the can.”

Mr. Mathis assumed that the milk was for the prison farm pigs, but it wasn’t. It went directly to a cooler in the prison dining hall, complete with cow and fly manure and fly carcasses. It was simply strained through the cooler and then drunk by the prisoners. No case of pathogenic contamination occurred that was caused by the raw milk in 10 years. If raw milk is such a danger, why didn’t any one get sick?

Consider that disease-free tribes ate abundantly and primarily unsalted raw meat, unsalted raw fats, and/or unsalted raw dairy products. They did not wash their hands or food prior to preparing and eating. Every form of natural bacteria, including salmonella, E.coli, listeria and campylobacter, were eaten with their food, abundantly and constantly. Why didn’t they get sick, diseased and die? Why were they vibrant, healthy and disease-free?

In 1976, after exposure to Eskimos’ practices of eating “high” raw meats (aged-decayed and resplendent with bacteria, including pathogens) to improve their health, I, Dr. Vonderplanitz, began experimenting with contaminated raw milk. That, too, seemed to improve my health problems a little quicker. I drank milk contaminated with bovine urine and feces milked around roaming chickens and pigs for three months. From 1988 to present (2007), I experimented with thousands of healthy and sick volunteers who drank very “contaminated” raw milk and had no history of milk allergies. The milk was spiked with bovine and chicken feces and porcine hair. I allowed the bacteria to grow at 47° F. for 24 days in refrigeration to raise the bacterial levels to exceed 500,000,000 per ml. Only 10 people of approximately 25 experienced nausea because of the smell and taste, 2 of approximately 80 experienced one or two vomits, 4 of approximately 200 experienced brief diarrhea, and 10 of approximately 750 experienced several days of diarrhea. Those are lower than the normal rates for such symptoms in the general public on everyday processed-food diets. No one got very sick and no one died. All of them said that they felt healthier and calmer from drinking the “contaminated” raw milk. However, all of them complained about the disgusting taste and odor.

The British journal The Lancet reported, "Resistance to tuberculosis increased in children fed raw milk instead of pasteurized, to the point that in five years only one case of pulmonary TB had developed, whereas in the previous five years, when children were given pasteurized milk, 14 cases of pulmonary TB developed." ..65

Raw milk also contains an anti-viral agent. In 1997, British studies showed that some mysterious substance in the aqueous portion of the raw milk, below the cream layer, works to reduce viral infections..66 Formula and boiled milk do not contain this virus-interfering agent.

Raw milk as a vermifuge: James A. Tobey, Doctor of Public Health, Chief of Health Services for the Borden Company, wrote about the successful use of raw milk in the treatment and prevention of worms in humans..67 We know that worms flourish on starch but have a tough time surviving on protein. Hegner proved experimentally that a diet consisting largely of the raw protein casein, the principle protein of milk, will often lead to a total elimination of worms..68

Phosphatase is essential for the absorption of calcium and is plentifully present in raw milk but completely destroyed by pasteurization. Phosphatase is an essential agent to the proper development of a strong skeletal structure.

b. MEDICAL MILK THERAPY – PREVENTION AND REVERSAL OF DISEASE FROM DRINKING RAW MILK

One of the most remarkable and important discoveries in medicine, the incredible healing power of fresh raw milk, goes unnoticed by the medical profession. No one knows who first used raw milk as a therapeutic agent. The bible extols milk and honey as the food for man. Cleopatra used raw milk to enrich and whiten her skin. Hippocrates, the father of medicine, Galen, Pliny, Varro, Marcellus Empiricus, Baccius, and Anthimus prescribed raw milk for diseases..69 We might feel inclined to dismiss them as thoughtless quacks but those men were entrusted physicians, caring for the lives of emperors and other royalty. If something worked to improve health, they embraced it as many people do today in America because medicine does not work for them. They would often feed a goat, ass, cow or sheep an herb that was known to effect a certain ailment that a patient suffered. Then they would feed the raw milk of that animal to their patient and assist the patient's condition..70

Raw milk was prized as medicine throughout the Middle Ages. During the Renaissance, raw milk therapy was so effective that papers and books about it were widely in print. In 1595, *De Facili Medicina per Seri et Lactis Usum*, Giovanni Costeo's book on milk cures was published; in 1681, *Tractatus Medicus de Cura Lactis in Anthritide*, by Johann Greisel's book was published; in 1732, William Stephens wrote a book about Dolaeus' phenomenal cures with raw milk diet; in 1754, Frederick Hoffman wrote a treatise on the treatment of "gout, scurvy, and nervous disorders" utilizing raw milk; in 1785, Samuel Ferris delivered a prize-winning oration entitled "A Dissertation on Milk" about curing various disease with raw milk. In the 18th and 19th centuries, raw milk was recognized around the world for its curative effects: Philippe Petit-Radel in France, C. Vivante in Italy, Dr. Philip Karell read his paper "Milk Cure" to the Medical Society of St. Petersburg, and Dr. Inozemtseff in Moscow treated thousands of patients with raw milk...⁷¹

In England, John Tatum Banks wrote "On the curative virtues of raw milk" for *Edinburgh Medical Journal*; Dr. George Balfour lectured on the cure of diabetes at Edinburgh Royal Infirmary, Professor of Clinical Medicine and Senior Physician to King's College Hospital wrote an article for England's most respected medical journal the *Lancet*, stating that, "You have seen some cases of chronic diarrhea and dysentery rapidly and completely cured by this [raw milk] diet, without the aid of medicines,"...⁷² giving detailed descriptions of patients who recovered from Bright's (glomerulonephritis), other bladder ailments, cystitis, and typhoid when other remedies failed. Dr. Donkin wrote for the *Lancet* about his success with raw milk to cure Bright's.

In America in 1884, we had Dr. James Tyson of Philadelphia who reported to and was published in the *Journal of American Medical Association* on medical uses of raw milk with diabetes, gastrointestinal disorders, kidney stones, obesity and ulcers; In 1915, physician Dr. Charles Porter's book "Milk Diet as a Remedy for Chronic Disease" was sold through 12 editions, and stated that the only requirement was that the milk be raw and unaltered in any way since leaving the cow; in 1923, Bernarr Macfadden's, *The Miracle of Milk: How to Use the Milk Diet Scientifically at Home* remained in print for 20 years; Dr. John Harvey Kellogg successfully treated John D. Rockefeller for his chronic digestive problems exclusively with a raw-milk diet...⁷³ Kellogg stated that only raw milk should be taken for therapy. Almost every type of disease recognized or not was cured by consuming massive amounts of raw milk.

William Osler, the most respected physician of the early 20th Century, said, "A rigid [raw] milk diet may be tried ... this plan in conjunction with rest is most efficacious." And then he quoted Cheynes, "Milk and sweet sound blood differ in nothing but color: Milk is blood." Dr. J.E. Crewe, from the Mayo Foundation, Rochester, Minnesota, presented his findings on the therapeutic uses of raw milk before the Minnesota State Medical Society in 1923. Although Dr. Crewe's experiments were on the feeding of raw milk for disease, the key, he injects, is not milk but raw milk. Dr. Crewe reported, "While milk is widely used and recommended as an article of diet, it is seldom used by regular physicians exclusively as an agent in the treatment of disease. For fifteen years I have employed the so-called [raw] milk treatment in various diseases ... the results obtained in various types of illnesses have been so uniformly excellent that one's conception of disease and its alleviation is necessarily modified.".. 74

His report was met with apathy and indifference, saying, "The method itself is so simple that it does not greatly interest medical men..75 The fact that many diseases are treated and successful results [ignored], leads almost to disrespect."

i. INFANT SAFETY AND HEALTH BENEFITS FROM FEEDING NATURAL MILK

Physicians in charge of five of the largest city hospitals "frankly admitted" that greater health occurred in babies who drank pure raw milk over pasteurized milk, that it would be "vastly better" to have raw milk than milk which had been cleansed and disinfected (pasteurized)..76 Johns Hopkins University and the University of Maryland found that raw cow's milk contains 2½ times more of the enzyme-like factor IgG, that inhibits rotavirus that causes diarrhea in infants, than in pasteurized milk.

Dr. George Goler of the Rochester Department of Health switched from pasteurized milk to raw milk for the city. Other public health officials were stunned and predicted calamity for the infant mortality rate. However, the infant death-rate dropped considerably for the next 3 years although the population of Rochester increased considerably. For the next 3 years, the infant mortality rate dropped even lower..77

The sister in charge of St. Vincent's hospital was very concerned about the high death rate among infants from gastroenteritis. She asked Dr. Paul B. Cassidy, M.D. for his advice, and he recommended a switch from pasteurized to raw milk. The raw critics predicted that there would

be a catastrophic increase in infant deaths from feeding infants raw milk. The death rate in infants from gastroenteritis quickly fell by 94%, from a high of 89 in 1922 to less than 5 per year..78 until the use of raw milk was stopped. Raw milk was extremely popular among leaders in medicine before World War II. The prestigious Hartford Hospital used only certified milk, most of it raw, "in the artificial feeding of infants, for expectant and nursing mothers, and for all other cases. It has been known since the earliest days of husbandry that the newborn calf thrives on raw milk. Calves fed pasteurized milk since birth die between 3-9 months old.

John Fowler, M.D., Worcester, Massachusetts stated that, used faithfully, raw-milk therapy was "very effective, and in no instance...were the muscle cramps in pregnant women a cause of discomfort."

Child Allergy Case study

Destin Callahan was one of Dr. Douglass' patients who started badly in life. Destin was not breast fed. Asthma developed by six months of age. His mother couldn't recall any time during his nine years that he hadn't wheezed. He was in and out of hospitals with asthma attacks, sometimes nearly fatal, at least six times yearly. He took antibiotics and cortisone almost continuously after the age of six months. Although Destin was nine years old, he was physically the size of a six year old. He was intelligent, but thin and delicate. Destin's mother and father sought Dr. Douglass' help at the Douglass Center in Atlanta. They were desperate to try something different and non-toxic. They felt Destin's poor growth was at least partially due to constant medication. He had seen many allergists and undergone frequent skin tests. His parents were told that their son was allergic to milk. We informed them that 99% of affected individuals are allergic only to pasteurized milk. We custom ordered the manufacture of a serum which contained the various factors to which Destin was allergic by skin test. This serum was then injected into a pregnant cow. After the calf was born, the raw colostrum was taken from the mother and given daily to Destin. After six weeks of this raw milk treatment, Destin began to improve. For the first time in his life he stopped wheezing. His parents were astounded and hesitant to believe the difference they witnessed. On Christmas Eve, Destin became overly excited and suffered a severe asthmatic attack. Marcy and Les Callahan had the courage to eschew customary medications and gave Destin raw milk colostrum every hour. By Christmas morning,

Destin was completely free of symptoms. Destin grew rapidly after the raw milk and colostrum treatment began.

Raw milk contains bioactive vitamins. Through the process of chromatography, we now recognize that synthetic vitamins are not the same as natural vitamins, yet marketers of pasteurized milk continue to advertise the supplemental vitamin content of their pasteurized milk as an equivalent replacement of the nutrient value of natural milk. Natural Vitamin C, for instance, is 33% higher in fresh natural milk than in pasteurized milk. Some professionals conclude that both milks are inadequate in Vitamin C, and neither raw nor pasteurized milks should be relied upon as a Vitamin C source. However the fact that many babies fed pasteurized milk develop a scurvy-like syndrome which raw milk-fed babies do not suffer proved those professionals' conclusion wrong. The research of Friederger also testified that pasteurized milk with vitamins added produced the same deficiencies as those caused by plain pasteurized milk..⁷⁹

Francis Pottenger, M.D. proved there is disease similar to Vitamin C deficiency (scurvy) that can be cured without Vitamin C. He proved that raw milk contains an endocrine nutrient that reverses scurvy. Pasteurized milk does not have it. He proved that raw milk reversed and prevented scurvy. Stefansson, an Anthropologist working for the U.S. government, demonstrated that a supposedly adequate intake of Vitamin C in the form of tomato juice did not prevent scurvy in an arctic sea captain. When the captain ate raw meat for a few days he was completely cured..⁸⁰ It was observed in 1942 that grazed cows "...produce as much Vitamin C as does the entire citrus crop, but most of it is lost as the result of pasteurization."..⁸¹

French physiologist, Rene Dubos said, "From the point of view of scientific philosophy, the largest achievement of modern biochemistry has been the demonstration of the fundamental unity of the chemical processes associated with life." In other words, if it happens in guinea pigs, rats and cats, it probably happens in humans. A Dutch chemist, Willem J. Van Wagtendork at Oregon State College, confirmed the Wulzen findings that pasteurized dairy creates calcification and stiffness. He found that guinea pigs with calcification of the tissues could be relieved with raw cream but not so with pasteurized cream. The active factor is transmuted and rendered ineffective by pasteurization.

ii. RAW MILK SAFETY AND HEALTH BENEFITS IN GENERAL—INCLUDING TB

The Bahimas, Nuers of the Upper Nile, the Todas, Kazaks, and Hottentots of Africa each drink six pints of natural milk daily and they all live healthfully. Dr. Crewe's use of raw milk therapy in advanced cases of pulmonary tuberculosis often resulted in rapid improvement for the patient. This was ironic since raw milk was blamed, incorrectly, for a great deal of the tuberculosis seen in that decade. (Hippocrates told doctors hundreds of years ago that raw milk greatly alleviates tuberculosis.) Crewe reported on his raw-milk treatment of edema (swelling), "In cases in which there is marked edema, the results obtained are also surprisingly marked. This is especially striking because so-called dropsy has never been treated with large quantities of fluid. With all medication withdrawn, one case lost twenty-six pounds in six days, huge edema disappearing from the abdomen and legs with great relief to the patient."

Cardiac and kidney cases showed remarkable improvement. One patient with advanced heart and kidney disease lost thirty pounds of fluid in six days on raw milk. Dr. Crewe, treating high blood pressure with raw milk, reported that he had "never seen such rapid and lasting results by any other method." Patients with heart failure were taken off medications, including digitalis (Lanoxin), and "responded splendidly."

Perhaps the most startling raw-milk treatment that goes counter to present-day thinking was for obesity. Dr. Crewe: "One patient reduced from 325 pounds to 284 pounds in two weeks on four quarts of milk a day, while her blood pressure was reduced from 220 to 170." Crewe implied that the same results might be obtained by eating fresh raw meat. He relates the story of the explorer Stefansson, who traveled the frozen Arctic with his colleagues living on fish, seal, polar bear, and caribou, nothing else for nine months. Most of that was eaten raw and decayed (full of pathogens). Although Eskimos endured the severest of hardships, they were never sick. On the return journey, they discovered a cache of civilized food, including flour, preserved fruits and vegetables, and salted, cooked meat. Against Stefansson's advice, the men ate that food for several days. They developed diarrhea, loose teeth, and sore mouths. Stefansson immediately placed them on raw caribou tongue, and in a few days they recovered.

Raw milk is by far the most convenient and acceptable form of raw animal protein supplying the enzymes, antibodies, and nutrients needed for recovery from disease. Dr. Crewe reported on his

work again in 1930. He quoted a colleague, who also treated with raw milk, "This was the worst case of psoriasis I have ever seen. This boy was literally covered from head to foot with scales. We put the boy on a [natural] milk diet and in less than a month he had skin like a baby's."

Crewe postulated, because of the remarkable effects seen in such a great variety of diseases, that natural milk may supply some hormonal elements to the patient. He repeatedly saw marked improvement in patients with toxic thyroid disease, a hormonal malady. Rapid and marked improvement in the infection and in the reduction of the size of the prostate gland was seen routinely. With shrinkage of the gland, the blockage clears and surgery is avoided, Crewe reported. Urinary tract infections, even with prostate swelling are greatly improved.

Natural milk treatment for diabetes caused most patients' sugar levels to normalize in 4-10 weeks without any diabetic symptoms. This was astounding because the milk sugar in five quarts of milk, the amount he used daily for diabetes, was 1/2 pound. And finally Crewe commented on the large group of patients for which no specific disease could be found, "These patients are often underweight. They may consume a fairly large amount of food, but they do not gain in weight or strength. They are often nervous and frequently classed as neurasthenics. Usually, the skin condition is poor, they are sallow, and disappointed because no one can tell them what the trouble is. They do not respond well to medical treatment...Every physician knows this class of patient because they are unhappy and unsatisfactory to treat." He reported that they "respond admirably" to raw-milk therapy, but he added, "The chief fault of the treatment is that it is too simple . . . it does not appeal to the modern medical men."

Dr. Crewe: "...the treatment of various diseases over a period of eighteen years with a practically exclusive [natural] milk diet has convinced me personally that the most important single factor in the cause of disease and in the resistance to disease is food..." Dr. L. J. Harris wrote, "Dr. Evelyn Sprawson of the London Hospital has recently stated that in certain institutions children brought up on raw milk (as opposed to pasteurized milk) had perfect teeth and no decay."..82

The Lancet published that in children, teeth are less likely to decay on a diet supplemented with raw milk than with pasteurized milk..83

“The dividing line between a food and a medicine sometimes becomes almost invisible. In many diseases nothing heals the body and restores strength like [raw] milk...” Dr. J.F. Lyman, Prof. of Agricultural Chemistry, Ohio State University. Milk has been used for gastric disorders, especially ulcers, for centuries. In the 19th century, Cruvelheir advocated raw milk as the most important factor for treatment of gastric ulcer..⁸⁴ Benjamin M. Bernstein, M.D., a gastroenterologist, described a very difficult gastrointestinal disease, “...very sick with active diarrhea, abdominal pain, loss of blood and consequent anemia, frequently with fever, markedly dehydrated and in severe cases, near death.”..⁸⁵

Referring to his successes with natural milk, he said, “...milk not only may, but should be used in the management of any type or variety of gastrointestinal disorder.”..⁸⁶

Samuel Zuerling, M.D., ear, nose, and throat specialist, Assistant Surgeon, Brooklyn Eye and Ear Hospital, reported an unusual case treated with raw milk..⁸⁷ “Not long ago a gentleman came to me for relief of a severe burning sensation in the nose...he was panicky. He had sought relief and obtained no results...the patient readily acceded to a milk...diet and in a few days had complete relief.”

Pelvic Inflammatory Disease in women is an abscess involving the fallopian tube and ovary.

Barbara Seaman reported a case that conventional antibiotic therapy had not helped. The woman went to an Indian country doctor who treated her with raw milk straight from his cow. In six weeks she was free of disease..⁸⁸

Fermented raw milk has been shown to retard tumor growth and decrease the activity of alkylating agents associated with stomach cancer..⁸⁹

iii. IMMUNE NATURAL MILK THERAPY BENEFITS

Eighty years of research with successful Immune Raw Milk Therapy, from Ehrlich to Peterson, has been ignored by members of the American Medical Association. The Lancet reported on immune milk therapy by showing conclusively through a scholarly review of the literature and research that:

- 1) Antibodies against disease are absorbed from the gastrointestinal tract into blood.
- 2) Rheumatoid arthritis and hay fever respond to immune raw milk therapy.

3) The udder acts as an antibody-forming organ independent of the cow's blood-immune system. The appropriate bacteria, fungus, or virus need only be infused directly into the teat canal for antibody production in the colostrum milk.

Doctors Peterson and Campbell of the University of Minnesota began rekindling the fires of controversy in 1955. Peterson had had success treating rheumatoid arthritis patients with immune raw milk from cows immunized with streptococcus antigen...⁹⁰ Now, Peterson stimulated the cow's udder with pollen antigen such as rag weed. The resulting immune raw milk was fed to asthma and hay fever sufferers. In a controlled experiment, thirty-six patients improved to a significant degree. The symptoms disappeared in a definite order: First, the asthma, then nasal congestion, and lastly, itching of the eyes. There was great blind resistance to this arthritis therapy. Emotions ran so high in Virginia that this perfectly harmless food was impounded by the state from two dairies..⁹¹ They claimed it was a "biological product" (no kidding) and needed a Federal license. The FDA declared that immune raw milk was a drug and confiscated 80 cases [of that raw milk]."

Dr. Donald H. Hastings, a Bismarck, North Dakota veterinarian, from University of Minnesota, aware of Peterson and Campbell's work, produced immune raw milk from measles inoculated cows and fed the raw milk to multiple sclerosis sufferers. Hastings reported that forty percent of the multiple sclerosis patients got relief including alleviation of numbness, decrease in muscle twitching, and less fatigue..⁹²

NATURAL MILK AS A PRESERVATIVE

A remarkable quality of natural milk that housewives of pioneer days used was its ability to preserve meat. Housewives immersed chops, steaks and roasts in large crocks of raw buttermilk that assured fresh meat for the family year round..⁹³ The Arabs have preserved meat with raw camel milk for thousands of years. The Icelanders of 200 years ago preserved their sheep's heads in sour raw milk.

In 1908, an American doctor decided to try it himself. He immersed a beefsteak in raw buttermilk. Thirteen years later it remained in a state of perfect preservation, "showing not the slightest taint or decay." The doctor emphasized, "It should be mentioned right here, however, that these remarks are true only of clean cow's milk as it flows from the original fount, and do not

hold for milk which has been boiled or pasteurized...processes which...deprive the milk of its most unique and valuable properties.”..94

References

7. Vonderplanitz, A, Thanks to Raw Milk, They're Happy and Healthy; Los Angeles Times, Dec 24, 2006
Section: West Magazine; Part I.
8. The Crimes Against Raw Milk, Wise Traditions in Food, Farming and the Healing Arts, quarterly magazine, Weston A. Price Foundation, Washington, DC, Summer 2000, 59-63.
- 9 Milk Facts, Milk Industry Foundation, New York City, 1946-47.
- 10 Letter from Professor Fosgate, Dairy Science Department of the University of Georgia.
- 11 Darlington, pp. 21 and 19.
- 12 The Atlanta Journal, Atlanta, Georgia, September 24, 1982.
- 13 Fleming DW, Cochi SL, MacDonald KL, et al. Pasteurized milk as a vehicle of infection in an outbreak of listeriosis. N Engl J Med 1985; 312:404-7.
- 14 Raw Certified Milk and Foodborne Illness, 1998.
- 15 Calif.Morbidity Weekly Report, March 31, 1989.
- 16 CDC
- 17 Ryan CA, Nickels MK, Hargrett-Bean NT, et al. Massive outbreak of antimicrobial-resistant salmonellosis traced to pasteurized milk. JAMA 1987;258:3269-74.
- 18 CDC. Outbreaks of Salmonella enteritidis gastroenteritis — California, 1993. MMWR 1993; 42:793-7.
- 19 Iacono G, Cavataio F, Montalto G, et al. Intolerance of cow's milk and chronic constipation in children. N Engl J Med 1998;339:110-4.
- 20 Pottenger, Clinical Physiology, Volume IH, Nr. 3, 1961.
- 21 Price-Pottenger Nutrition Foundation, La Mesa, California.
- 22 Infantile Scurvy. III. Its influence on growth (length and weight), Am. J. Dis. Child., August, 1916.
- 23 Infantile Scurvy, V. A study of its pathogenesis, Am. J Dis. Child., November, 1917.

24 Ibid.

25 Ibid.

26 Hess, A. F., "Recent advances in knowledge of scurvy and the antiscorbutic vitamin," J.A.M.A., April

23, 1932.

27 Bertron P, Barnard ND, Mills M. Racial bias in federal nutrition policy, part I: the public health

implications of variations in lactase persistence. J Natl Med Assoc 1999;91:151-7.

28 Stig Erlander, PhD. a talk on Raw vs. Pasteurized Milk, 2001.

29 Certified Milk Magazine, November/December, 1946.

30 Medical Month, January 1964, pp. 43.

31 Morris, British Medical Journal, 2:1485, 1958.

32 Circulation, Vol. XXI, pp. 438, April 1960.

33 Dairy Record, February, 1982.

34 Journal of Bacteriology, June 1995, p. 3205-3212.

35 Cramer DW, Harlow BL, Willet WC. Galactose consumption and metabolism in relation to the risk of

ovarian cancer. Lancet 1989;2:66-71.

36 Dairy products and breast cancer: the IGF-1, estrogen, and bGH hypothesis. Medical Hypothesis

1997;48:453-61.

Chan JM, Stampfer MJ, Giovannucci E, et al. Plasma insulin-like growth factor-1 and prostate cancer

risk: a prospective study. Science 1998;279:563-5.

World Cancer Research Fund. Food, Nutrition, and the Prevention of Cancer: A Global Perspective.

American Institute of Cancer Research. Washington, D.C.: 1997.

37 Cadogan J, Eastell R, Jones N, Barker ME. Milk intake and bone mineral acquisition in adolescent

girls: randomized, controlled intervention trial. BMJ 1997;315:1255-69.

38 Chan JM, Stampfer MJ, Giovannucci E, et al. Plasma insulin-like growth factor-1 and prostate cancer

risk: a prospective study. *Science* 1998;279:563-5.

39 New York Times, "Synthetic Hormone in Milk Raises New Concerns," Jan. 19, 1999.

40 Scott FW. Cow milk and insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus: is there a relationship? *Am J Clin Nutr* 1990;51:489-91.

Karjalainen J, Martin JM, Knip M, et al. A bovine albumin peptide as a possible trigger of insulin-independent diabetes mellitus. *N Engl J Med* 1992;327:302-7.

41 Feskanich D, Willet WC, Stampfer MJ, Colditz GA. Milk, dietary calcium, and bone fractures in women: a 12-year prospective study. *Am J Public Health* 1997;87:992-7.

42 Cumming RG, Klineberg RJ. Case-control study of risk factors for hip fractures in the elderly. *Am J Epidemiol* 1994;139:493-505.

43 Huang Z, Himes JH, McGovern PG. Nutrition and subsequent hip fracture risk among a national cohort of white women. *Am J Epidemiol* 1996;144:124-34.

Cummings SR, Nevitt MC, Browner WS, et al. Risk factors for hip fracture in white women. *N Engl J Med* 1995;332:767-73.

44 Studies on the nutritive value of milk, II. The effect of pasteurization on some of the nutritive properties of milk, Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 518, p. 8, January, 1933.

45 Ibid., p. 9

46 Ibid., p. 7.

47 Ibid., p. 11.

48 Annual Review of Biochemistry, Vol. 18, p. 435. 1944.

49 Lewis, L.R., The relation of the vitamins to obstetrics, *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 29.5:759. May 1935.

50 Ibid, p. 30.

51 Ibid, p. 23.

52 Northwest Medicine, June, 1938, as abstracted by *Clinical Medicine and Surgery*, "The Increase of

Scurvy," 42, 12:598, December 1938.

53 The determination of ascorbic acid in commercial milks, *Journal of Nutrition*, 18,6:619-626, December 1939.

54 Francis M. Pottenger Jr. M.D., *Pottenger's Cats* (Price Pottenger Nutrition Foundation,1983),p.15.

55 Ursin G, Bjelke E, Heuch I, Vollset SE, Milk consumption and cancer incidence: a Norwegian prospective study, *Br J Cancer* 1990;61:454-459.

56 Malosse D, Perron H, Sasco A, Seigneurin JM, Correlation between milk and dairy product consumption and multiple sclerosis prevalence: a worldwide study, *Neuroepidemiology* 1992;11:304
312.

57 Cramer DW, Xu H, Sahi T, Adult hypolactasia, milk consumption, and age-specific fertility, *Amer J Epidemiol* 1994 Feb 1, 139(3):282-289.

58 Dahl-Jorgensen et al, Relationship between cow's milk consumption and incidence of IDDM in childhood, *Diabetes Care*, 1991;14:1081-1083.

59 Virtanen et al, Cow's milk consumption, HLA-DQB1 Genotype, and Type 1 Diabetes, *Diabetes*, 2000 June; 49:912-917.

60 Elliott et al, Type 1 (insulin-dependent) diabetes mellitus and cow milk: casien variant consumption, *Diabetologia*, 1999; 42:292-296.

61 Scott FW, Cow milk and insulin-dependent diabetes; is there a relationship? *Am J Clin Nutr* 1990;51:489-491.

62 Private communication, August 9, 1979.

63 Raw Certified Milk and Foodborne Illness, 1998.

64 Z. Hyt. Inf., "Antiseptic in milk," *The Drug and Cosmetic Industry*, 43,1:109, July, 1938.

65 *The Lancet*, p. 1142, May 8, 1937

66 Matthews, et al, *The Lancet*, December 25,1976, pp. 1387.

67 *Ibid.*, April, 1935.

68 *Science*, 75:225, February 20, 1932; *JAMA*, April 9, 1932; *JAMA* 83:83, 1924.

69 Anthimus, *On the Observance of Foods*, tr and ed. Mark Grant (Totnes: Prospect, 1996), 117.

70 John Harvey Kellogg, *Autointoxication; or, Intestinal toxemia*, 3^d ed. (Battle Creek: Modern

Medicine

Publishing Co., 1922) p.125.

71 Mentioned in Tyson, Milk Treatment of Disease, JAMA 1884 Jun: 626.

72 Johnson G, Clinical Lecture on the Curative Influence of an Exclusive Milk Diet in Some Cases of

Inflammation of the Bladder, Lancet Dec 16 1876;2:847-848.

73 Kellogg, p. viii.

74 Certified Milk Magazine, January 1929.

75 Ibid.

76 John Spargo, The Common Sense of the Milk Question (New York: MacMillan, 1908) p. 85-6.

77 Spargo, 216.

78 Annual Convention, Certified Milk Producers Association, Hotel Roosevelt, New York City, February 8, 1938.

79 Certified Milk Magazine, October 1927 as reported by Victor E. Levine, Prof. of Biological Chemistry & Nutrition, Creighton University School of Medicine.

80 Harper's Magazine, November/December, 1925 & January 1936, from the Stefansson Collection, Dartmouth College.

81 Proc. Nat. Nut. Conf. for Defense, May 14, Federal Sea Agency, pp. 176; U.S. Government Pat. Off., 1942.

82 Vitamins in Theory and Practice, p. 224, Cambridge, University Press, 1935.

83 EFFECTS OF PASTEURIZATION OF MILK ON TOOTH HEALTH, The Lancet, p. 1142, May 8, 1937

84 B.M. Bernstein, Paper presented to the AAMMC Conference, Atlantic City, NJ, June 8, 1942.

85 Loc. cit.

86 Loc. cit.

87 Certified Milk Magazine, September 1936.

88 Seaman, B., Women and the Crisis in Sex Hormones, Bantam Books, 1979, pp. 203.

89 Raw Certified Milk and Foodborne Illness, 1997.

90 The Milk Dealer, June 1960.

91 Ibid.

92 DVM, February 1981.

93 American Association of Medical Milk Commissions, Proceedings 15th Annual Conference, 1921.

94 Ibid.

Seamons, Colleen

From: Jo Douglas [mailto:joannedouglas.com]
Sent: Sunday, 28 February 2010 10:41 PM
To: submissions
Subject: Proposal P1007 -Primary Production & Processing Requirements for Raw Milk Products.
Attachments: Reasons raw milk is not risky.docx

Please read the attached document... contains many reasons why good quality raw milk is not risky.
I request that the FSA change the category for raw milk into one that would allow investigation into a certification process and making it available

Also, why is raw goats milk being placed in a risky category when there have been no illnesses caused by it in Australian's history. I believe this was a finding of the investigation in 2002.

Yours sincerely
Jo Douglas
Nerang, QLD, 4211

