

just
say
you heard
it
through
the

Viva VINE

THE NEWSLETTER OF THE VIVA VEGIE SOCIETY
by Pamela Teisler



lifestyle and daily habits, especially with regard to diet. A scientifically designed study second to none, on the level of importance of the landmark epidemiological studies a quarter century ago indicting smoking as linked to lung cancer, **The China Study** explodes myth after myth about protein (especially animal protein), dietary fiber and fat.

Clearly, among other things, **The China Study** proved the link between animal protein intake (even a little) and markedly higher rates of various cancers and heart disease. According to Dr. Campbell, the research clearly states that "basically, eating food that is mostly plant material is in fact the kind of food to eat to reduce cancer risk. . . (Animal protein and the other sorts of nutrients that come along with that kind of food. . . tends to raise the risk of the kinds of diseases that 80% to 90% of us in this country die of." Dr. Campbell also noted that other studies going on

"In the next 10 to 15 years, one of the things you're bound to hear is that animal protein . . . is one of the most toxic nutrients of all that can be considered"

. . . words spoken by Dr. T. Colin Campbell at the 1991 American Natural Hygiene Society Conference in his keynote address.

ANIMAL PROTEIN EXPOSED

The following is a synopsis of Dr. T. Colin Campbell's keynote address to the 1991 American Natural Hygiene Society Conference. Dr. Campbell is today in a distinct position to offer a powerful credibility to the argument for vegetarianism. His most recent achievement was being one of the four world reknown researchers involved with the 1983-1989 "Study on Diet, Nutrition and Disease in the People's Republic of China," otherwise known as **THE CHINA STUDY**.

Dr. Campbell is a Professor of Biochemistry in the School of Nutrition at Cornell University, and has spent a career examining diet as it relates to cancer and other diseases.

"In the 'Grand Prix' of epidemiology, scientists traced eating habits of 6,500 Chinese." So was the subtitle of the New York Times story about **The China Study** in its May 2, 1990 edition. There have been, in fact, hundreds of articles about the groundbreaking study in which 6,500 Chinese people and their families in 65 counties were each asked 367 questions about their general health habits and lifestyles.

China it happens was a superb place to obtain data for this kind of study because lifestyle and eating habits vary so markedly from one region to another.

Where diet and risk for disease are virtually homogeneous throughout all regions of the U.S., data in China came from subjects who came from regions that ran the gamut from rural and poor, to modern and affluent. The range of the data stretched across a wide spectrum, so that certain diets and lifestyles could very distinctly be correlated to risks of specific diseases.

The China Study was not done in a laboratory under artificial conditions. It was done with ordinary people, over time (6 years), in their own surroundings. They were categorized by their

today are suggesting that even if tumor growth is detected, it can be controlled, and maybe even reversed, by reducing the intake of animal protein.

And calorie intake? Some studies have shown that disease can be reduced by limiting the number of calories one consumes within a day. Dr. Campbell acknowledges the benefits of a lower calorie diet, taking into account various exercise levels, but points out that it has been found that calorie levels need be quite unreasonably low to even begin to impact the risk for cancer. According to Dr. Campbell, ". . . when animals or people, either way, are given low protein intakes they can actually consume more calories and still get less cancer." **The China Study** showed that Chinese calorie intake is in fact 25% to 30% higher than that of people in the U.S. However, the Chinese had a much lower incidence of cancer. Average protein intake in China is 2/3 the amount it is in the U.S., and of that portion, an average of only 7% of it is animal protein. Average protein intake in the U.S. approaches 40% of calories, with 70% of that from

cont. on p. 3

NOW, FOOD IRRADIATION . . . NO!

Dear Senator:

I am very much opposed to IRRADIATED FOOD on our grocer's shelves, in our restaurant food, and in our processed food. I am very worried about the trend to food irradiation beginning with the now functioning food irradiator in Mulberry, Fla.

I understand that many irradiated foods have been approved by the FDA (as well as by the USDA where necessary); that is, most fruits and vegetables, wheat, and pork; with chicken likely to be completely approved soon. The fact that so many irradiated foods are legal allows irradiated food to be imported. Most food irradiation plants are, in fact, in foreign countries, and not the most democratic countries at that; specifically Burma,

cont. on p. 2

CALENDAR

Tues, Mar. 3: EARTHSAVE VEGAN POTLUCK, 6:30 p.m.. Greenpeace offices, 462 Broadway @ Grand St., 6th Fl.; bring a tasty vegetarian dish; no dairy; and please bring a 3x5 sign listing the ingredients. Call 212-978-4338 to confirm.

Sun., Mar. 8: JFA March Against Fur, 11:30, begins @ Columbus Circle. Call 718-224-2531 for info. **Fri., Mar. 20:** THE GREAT AMERICAN MEAT-OUT, 6 to 9 p.m., at McDonalds, W. 3rd St. & 6th Ave. Call Pam at 212-966-2060 to confirm. (There are other MEAT-OUT events too!)

SCHEDULE TO HAND OUT "101 Reasons Why I'm a Vegetarian": **Tues., Mar. 17:** THE SAINT PATRICK'S DAY PARADE. 4:00 p.m., meet promptly at Madison Ave. and 51st St. and we will move closer to the parade; **Sun., Apr. 19:** EASTER PARADE, 10:30 a.m., Fifth Ave., in street in front of St. Patrick's Cathedral.

FOOD IRRADIATION, cont. from p. 1

Thailand, South Africa, The Commonwealth of Independent States and China. (The Mulberry plant is the first and only irradiator in this country designated strictly for food irradiation.)

Irradiating food does not benefit the consumer, only the food producer and food distributor . . . and the nuclear industry. The only purported function food irradiation actually performs is that it kills insects -- that it does thoroughly. It does not kill all bacteria, and it may kill necessary bacteria. It does not kill all of the salmonella in a food, so any salmonella can begin to reproduce again. (Salmonella is mostly a function of the intensive confinement of animals in factory farms today, anyway.) Food irradiation does not kill viruses. And of course any entity that food irradiation destroys, whether it be beneficial or undesirable, is still in the food. Irradiated food is not "clean food" as its proponents claim.

And food irradiation is not necessarily safe. Just as many tests show food irradiation to be suspect as those that say the process is benign.

The tests on food irradiation are absolutely not cut and dry as to its safety. They are suspicious at best. It is odd that the FDA petitioned itself to test food irradiation. (Nearly all petitions to the FDA come from industry.) Why was this? Food irradiation, I understand, is a way to utilize nuclear waste. Why are we producing so much nuclear waste that we need to dream up uses for it? These are the important questions.

It is known that data in the tests we are using to prove the safety of irradiated food were ignored, such as weight loss and deaths of test animals and their offspring. Animals in tests fed irradiated food have mostly all had to be fed supplemental vitamins. Eating irradiated food is known to destroy vitamins A, B, C and E. Incidentally, the proponents of food irradiation have decided to ignore the animal tests that serve to question the viability of food irradiation, which just goes to show again that animal tests, and all of the cruelty that they cause, are pointless. Animal tests are often used as proof for a point of view only if they agree with the sponsor's view.)

One human study done in India, which has been attacked but not scientifically refuted, showed human subjects to develop 2 and 3 times the number of chromosomes in the nuclei of their blood cells after eating irradiated wheat. The blood cells returned to normal after the test subjects discontinued eating the irradiated wheat.

FOOD IRRADIATION CREATES THE PRESENCE OF FORMALDEHYDE AND BENZINE IN FOOD. AND IT CAUSES THE PRESENCE OF FREE RADICALS (UNSTABLE RADIOLYTIC BY-PRODUCTS). Food irradiation allows molecules to break up and to recombine in unusual forms, perhaps dangerous forms. We are far from sure that food irradiation is safe. On wishful thinking alone we should not allow a food irradiation industry to get a foothold into our country's economy; perhaps hundreds of food irradiation plants will sprout up if the Mulberry plant becomes commercially successful. And if the trend continues, the general consumer could in the future find it difficult or even impossible to avoid irradiated food on a daily basis.

Food irradiation is not a benign process such as pasturization. (Some would argue that pasturization is not a benign process.) The industry involves nuclear radiation. Periodically, radioactive fuel rods from food irradiation plants would have to be transported cross country to be re-generated. We could have many, many more possibilities for accidents involving nuclear material.

Should we have more nuclear material in private (or public!) hands than is already there? The NRC is finding violations to laws regulating the handling of

nuclear material all the time, a constant threat and danger to the public.

I ask again. Who does this benefit? If food irradiation really did everything that its proponents said it does, I believe that the process should still not be allowed. We must go at the problem of perishability and spoilage by forcing food producers to clean up their production processes. This, so we need not be so concerned about various (real or imagined) contaminations in our food. We need to stop subsidizing the huge food producers and allow smaller, more local producers to stay in business. The problem is a complex one to be sure. Generally, I am opposed to certain big interests in the agriculture and the nuclear industry dictating on this issue. You must stand up to these interests as a servant of the American people, let alone people anywhere in the world who may eat irradiated food coming from the United States.

I would like to hear your views on this issue. Let me know that you are still open to hearing all of the views from both sides, pro as well as con!

Senator George Mitchell of Maine introduced a bill to ban food irradiation as well as irradiated food in the United States. It died. This bill must be reintroduced and followed through. France and Germany are working to ban food irradiation or strongly regulate it -- especially through tough labeling laws.

At worst (and I do think that this is an unacceptable compromise), please support any bill which requires the strictest labeling of irradiated food. And please help make it mandatory that consumers be made aware of the presence of irradiated food no matter if it is in fresh or processed or restaurant foods.

I vote! This is a very important issue to me. This issue will tell me if our country is a democracy, run by the people, or if this country can be bought or sold by big interests no matter the danger to the public.

Sincerely, Pamela Teisler

The above letter was sent to my U.S. senators. Other letters to send on this issue include letters to:

Disney World, (Walt Disney World Company, P.O. Box 10,000, Lake Buena Vista, Fla. 32830) to threaten not to visit their amusement park as it is within about 50 miles from the Mulberry, Fla. irradiation plant. Say that you are afraid of bringing your children there because the food irradiation plant is so close, and that you are afraid of being served irradiated food while you are at the park. (Disney may become more active in helping to shut down the plant if it gets enough of these letters.)

Governor Lawton Chiles, of Florida (Executive Office of Governor, the Capital, Tallahassee, Fla. 32399) to simply show your opposition to food irradiation plants. Say you will not visit Florida as long as the irradiator is functioning.

There are some interesting facts to be aware of so you can continue to do your own research.

1) At present, irradiated foods on our grocer's shelves today are mostly spices and dry ingredients. If your canned soup or pancake mix has irradiated ingredients in it, there is no law that requires the label to tell you that. The government, however, does require fresh produce that has been irradiated to be labeled with a logo. In fact, that logo has a name. It is called a "radura."

2) The name of the food irradiation plant in Mulberry, Fla. is called Vindicator, Inc.

3) The amount of radiation in a common X-ray one receives at the doctor's office is .05 RAD. The amount of radiation that will kill a man is 300 RAD. The amount of radiation used to irradiate food is 100,000 RAD, designated euphemistically by food irradiation proponents as "low." Yes, this amount is low if compared with other forms of radiation, perhaps the kind necessary to sterilize medical equipment. But to call it "low" is not forthcoming. cont. on p. 3

FOOD IRRADIATION, cont. from p. 2

4) Vindicator, Inc. did not get built and be allowed to go into operation without a fight. Opposition began from the time it was learned that Vindicator proposed a sign for its plant.

It is **important** now that pressure be put: 1. on our government officials to ban food irradiation, 2. on our local grocery store not to purchase irradiated food (though they are not always aware that they are purchasing it as labeling laws either do not exist or are not enforced), 3. on major food producers such as Dukee and General Mills (write to food producers and simply ask if they are using irradiated ingredients in their processed food), and 4. on the above people in Florida.

What we really need is marching in the street about this issue, although there is something that tells me that will never happen and this is what the proponents of food irradiation know.

For more information about FOOD IRRADIATION, contact Joe Acquisto of Citizens for Safe Food at 813-581-4378. (He is the source for most of the information in this article.)

DR. CAMPBELL, cont. from p. 1

animal sources. So, what we eat is more critical to cancer risk than the amount of what we eat.

According to Dr. Campbell, **The China Study** "found that if you put just a little animal protein into your diet, cholesterol levels, heart disease and cancer levels start going up." In fact, Dr. Campbell points out, cholesterol in foods do not necessarily cause cholesterol levels to rise in the people who eat those foods. It's the animal protein one ingests that causes the most cholesterol elevation. To quote Dr. Campbell, "It turns out that, yes, cutting down on fat intake will reduce (plasma cholesterol levels) a bit. Not much. But what really reduces cholesterol levels is taking out the animal foods all together."

In the 70's, three noteworthy research groups came up with the claim that 80% to 90% of the cancers in the world were due to environmental factors. Carcinogens in the environment were one of the suspected culprits that medical science looked at. According to Dr. Campbell, his years of research has taught him that the human body has great fighting abilities against toxins, if given half a chance. Not to completely discount the terrible effects of toxins in our environment, he points out that he thinks "it's clear to say now that we really don't have good evidence that it's the chemical carcinogens that actually cause the cancer risk to rise in people; instead, it's the nutrients." That is, the animal protein. Without animal protein in one's diet, a person has a much greater ability and chance to fight toxins he or she is exposed to.

So, where is the animal protein? . . . It's in the flesh and the milk of animals.

That seems obvious. But the main point Dr. Campbell wanted to make in his talk to the American Natural Hygiene Society was that modern medical research seems to see something sacred in the consumption of animal foods. It is now obvious to Dr. Campbell who has been, in fact, right in the center of the biomedical research community, that medical research goes out of its way to avoid looking at animal derived foods critically. It seems that in the face of glaring evidence indicting animal food, mainstream medical research will let meat and dairy off the hook, quickly looking in some other direction in search of the villain, or of the cure. After 20 years of examining animal protein as a nutrient, Dr. Campbell sees it "as one of the most significant nutrients insofar as the causation of cancer is concerned of all. Yet on the other hand it is the nutrient that somehow has a religion attached to it. . ."

In the early 80's, Dr. Campbell took part in a

National Academy of Science study that was the first of its kind to recommend dietary guidelines to reduce risk of cancer. It became clear that the facts pointed to a more vegetarian diet as the road to health. Just the same, it was decided (though not Dr. Campbell's idea) that the recommendation for fat intake be 30% of calories, even though the research pointed to lower levels as optimal. The researchers of the study feared, and no doubt rightly so, that the public would dismiss their entire study altogether if they recommended a lower percentage. So 30% would be a start, a target for a public with a meat-centered diet.

This National Academy of Science study conducted its research by examining individual nutrients and noting their positive or negative effects. But in the final analysis, Dr. Campbell and the other researchers recommended that people eat more of those whole foods that contained the nutrients that had a positive effect; and conversely, recommended that people eat less of those foods that contained the nutrients that had negative effects; i.e.: more whole fruits, whole vegetables and whole grain cereals; and less dairy and meat.

But low and behold, ultimately, 1) industry ignored the final analysis of the study and commenced to marketing individual nutrients in the form of supplements, and 2) the American Cancer Institute (which contracted for the National Academy of Science study) based its subsequent research on the effects of individual nutrients. This is why our sacred cow, animal derived food, is left without a scrape.

What are the little sound-bites from television advertising, mini-features in the media and magazine articles telling us? Getting their guidance from a mainstream medical community adverse to indicting animal derived foods, the mainstream media say in effect, go ahead and continue to eat flesh food and milk products. It's o.k. as long as you take your fiber powder, your beta-carotene, your vitamin C and use your juicer. It's o.k., as long as you trim the fat or the skin off of your meat, or occasionally substitute fish or chicken for beef or pork. The fact is, people are being grossly ill informed and led to feel a false sense of security if they follow the misguided general wisdom of the airwaves and print media.

According to Dr. Campbell, "There's a tremendous reluctance (to put it mildly) on the part of the scientific community to even consider the adverse effects of animal protein on disease processes. What they really want to do is go around that question . . . Just address other things that we can maybe take out or put back. . . . (T)hey're hoping to develop supplements for the reduction of risk." The problem is, the risk is in eating the animal protein itself; and you cannot take the protein out of the flesh or out of the milk. You cannot trim it away.

In addition, **The China Study** has squarely and boldly dealt a blow to many pro-animal food studies; studies such as those that warn of breast and colon cancer risk if cholesterol levels go below 140; and studies that warn that too much fiber in one's diet causes depletion of minerals from the body.

If it is not ignored, **The China Study** could be the answer to the disjointed, reductionist approach that the American Cancer Institute and many other researchers have taken -- that is studying individual nutrients for the development of vitamin and mineral supplements as magic cures to avoid cancer risk.

So, though it may discredit the meat and dairy industry, or the trade in vitamin pills, **The China Study** offers the wholistic and comprehensive approach to studying diet as it relates to disease.

We're going to have to see if the biomedical research community becomes willing to jar itself out of its tunnel vision; and we're going to have to see if the mainstream media has it in them to properly interpret the indisputable conclusions of **The China Study**.

GOOD FOLKS. GET TO KNOW THEM.

Good Food Coop, No irradiated food here! Gain control over your food choices. Working members get 20% off w/\$10. yearly dues after a one-time fee of \$10. Non-working member option available also for \$20. a year (plus one-time fee) with 10% off. Find 'em at 58 E. 4th St. Call 212/260-4045 to confirm current hours.

North American Vegetarian Society (NAVS) is a non-profit educational organization dedicated to promoting the vegetarian way of life. They sponsor the annual Vegetarian Summerfest conference, which every vegetarian without fail should attend at least once in his or her life. They publish the outstanding publication, Vegetarian Voice as well as booklets; and promote Local Contact programs. They founded and promote World Vegetarian Day, October 1st. Contact them. Become a member. Write to Box 72, Dolgeville, NY 13329. Call 518/568-7970.

FARM (Farm Animal Reform Movement) is a national public interest organization formed in 1981 to expose the devastating impacts of intensive animal agriculture on animal welfare, consumer health, and environmental

quality -- an important activist group near Washington, DC. Just a few of the campaigns they have spearheaded or participated in over the last decade include the Great American Meatout, World Farm Animals Day, and the Veal Ban Campaign. Contact them at P.O. Box 30654, Bethesda, MD 20824; 301/530-1737.

Gail Heebner of her own **Triangle Vegetarian Society** is one very important advocate getting the vegetarian alternative into school lunches. Fighting the USDA which dumps its surplus meat and milk products on our nation's schoolkids, Ms. Heebner convinced local public schools to provide a vegetarian lunch for the Great American Meatout. Find out more. Write: Gail Heebner, 3513 Eden Croft Drive, Raleigh, NC 27612-4323.

Other groups involved with bringing vegetarian alternatives to school lunches include: **Vegetarian Education Network, CHOICE! USA**, P.O. Box 896, Bel Air, MD 21014; and **People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA)**, P.O. Box 42516, Washington, DC 20015.

Two-Fu, the vegetarian singles connection. Personal listings to meet that special veggie someone. Write: Box 824, Westwood, NJ 07675

So, what is The VivaVeggie Society? The VivaVeggie Society takes vegetarian advocacy to the streets. VivaVeggie members confront Mr. and Ms. Pedestrian to get the facts out about their healthful, ethical and environmentally conscious vegetarian diet.

Advocates assemble where there is plenty of pedestrian traffic. They come equipt with brightly-colored T-shirts with vegetarian messages, and plenty of fact-filled information. Founder Pamela Teisler wears the outfit shown on the reverse side of this newsletter. The mission? To pass out the flyer, "**101 REASONS WHY I'M A VEGETARIAN**," written by Pamela Teisler, and inspired by John Robbins' book, Diet for a New America. The VivaVeggie Society has been, and will be in the future, involved with various projects such as World Vegetarian Day, special mailings of "101 Reasons Why I'm a Vegetarian," and media awareness campaigns. Donations can be sent to: Pamela Teisler, The VivaVeggie Society, 234 Mulberry St., #17, NYC 10012 (212)966-2060

A **DEVASTATING ARTICLE** in the February, '92 issue of Consumer Reports: is out: "Is Our Fish Fit to Eat?" Do you still eat fish? I dare you to read this one. If you cannot get an issue, call Pam @ 212-966-2060.

Here are 2 very precious letters that the Viva Veggie Society has received since the publication of "101 Reasons Why I'm Vegetarian":

Dear Pamela Teisler,

While I was visiting New York, I read your "101 Reasons Why I'm a Vegetarian." It was very touching and it really makes you think. I have been thinking about becoming one for quite some time and it made me want to even more. What I was wondering is if you could send me a copy of it. Thank you very much !!

Shawn W., Bluefield, W.V.

Age 16

P.S. Have a Merry Christmas!

Dear Sirs,

I am a vegetarian and people are always asking me why. I find it hard to explain sometimes. I'm really interested in your Society and the flier "101 Reasons Why I'm a Vegetarian."

Sincerely, Claire S., Escondido, CA

P.S. Please send me any info you can. I'd really appreciate it.



Pamela Teisler
The VivaVeggie Society
234 Mulberry St., #17
New York, NY 10012
(212) 966-2060