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This story concerns the politics of the raw milk situation and the government seizure of raw milk products from Stueve's Natural Farm's in California in October 1990. This is a very common story in states where raw milk is sold. Only the name of the dairy differs. The safety of certified raw milk should be a scientifically, medically verifiable issue, not a political one.

The ban on raw milk did not result from illness among people consuming it. The Department of Food and Agriculture is preventing the bottling of raw certified milk by requiring ten-day consecutive tests without detecting any Listeria or Salmonella, something that is not required of most other foods of animal origin.

Tests on raw certified milk reveal how clean it is. The standard plate count of bacteria falls within the required range of 10,000 bacteria per milliliter - 5,000 bacteria less than pasteurized milk which is allowed to have 15,000 bacteria per milliliter. It may surprise you to know that milkshakes are allowed to have 75,000 bacteria per milliliter. In fact, in the August 1988 issue of *Dairy and Food Sanitation*, the Department of Food Science and Technology, University of California, Davis, reported that from the time of purchase to the pull date (when it's most likely to be consumed) pasteurized milk in California had from 15,000 to 150,000 organisms per milliliter in it. Some of the pasteurized milk had over 1,500,000 organisms per milliliter in it nearly 9% of the time!

Most foods will contain some organism that may be harmful to some people from time to time, yet the Department does not test other foods daily, frequently or even routinely. Without daily tests, they cannot report the organisms that they know are in our food supply nor do they ban these foods. The bottom line is that bovine milk is not dirty unless people make it dirty via unclean milking and handling procedures. This can occur before or after pasteurization.

Now, what's wrong with pasteurized milk? Dr. William Campbell Douglass' humorous and well-documented book, *The Milk of Human Kindness is Not Pasteurized*, and his 1995 new edition, *The Milk Book* gives us the following comparisons. It's guaranteed to make you join the fight for the raw milk industry. I say 'fight' because raw milk is illegal in 15 states and California may well become the sixteenth.

What's the difference between raw and pasteurized milk? Raw milk is a living food containing enzymes, protective bacteria (such as lactic acid bacillus), vitamins, minerals, fats, proteins and sugar (lactose). If you leave raw milk at room temperature the lactic acid bacillus will change the lactose into lactic acid. This is called sour milk. It is even better for you than sweet milk. On the other hand, try leaving pasteurized milk out at room temperature. Since pasteurized milk is a dead food, it will rot, just like any dead animal. Pasteurization kills the lactic acid bacillus which turns milk sour. It kills or alters the enzymes, proteins, fats and sugar in milk. Some of these enzymes, such as phosphatase, are essential for calcium absorption and the assimilation of other minerals. Only raw milk and whole grains (containing the wheat germ and bran and no flour bleach) contain phosphatase.

The propaganda that pasteurized milk is safer than raw milk is wrong. Raw milk and pasteurized milk are equally susceptible to man's contamination! The only way to make milk safe is to keep it clean - clean cows, clean dairies. Instead we kill milk by heating it (pasteurization).
In the following discussion, page numbers refer to Douglass' book (first edition). Douglass cites recorded cases to show that when milk gets contaminated, it's usually after pasteurization. For example, in 1945 there were 450 reported cases of infections caused by raw milk and 1,490 cases caused by pasteurized milk (page 25). In 1945 there was an epidemic of 300 food poisoning cases in Phoenix, Arizona from pasteurized milk which developed a toxin AFTER pasteurization. Great Bend, Kansas, in 1945 had 468 cases of gastroenteritis from pasteurized milk, causing nine deaths. It was traced to unsanitary dairies and unsterile bottles. In June 1982, more than 172 people in the Southeast were stricken with intestinal infection from pasteurized milk. Over 100 required hospitalization. In June 1982, Consumers Union reported on dirty dairies and found fecal bacteria (called coliforms) in many samples of pasteurized milk, some as high as 2200 organisms per cc. Raw certified milk must contain no more than 10 coliforms per cc (page 25).

Dirty raw milk is safer than dirty pasteurized milk, because raw milk contains enzymes and antibodies that are able to destroy certain pathogenic bacteria. Pasteurized milk contains no such protective factors. For example, campylobacter, a nasty germ that causes diarrhea, has never been recovered from raw milk, because it contains an enzyme (lactoperoxidase) which inactivates this germ. Yet if you or your children who drink raw milk get diarrhea and you call the Center of Disease Control, they may tell you to cancel your milk order because the raw milk contains campylobacter. So where does it come from? Primarily eggs, chicken, turkey and tap water, say Douglass and others (page 26).

If you think pasteurization fully protects you from food poisoning, you are wrong. For example, pasteurization does not protect you from staphylococcal food poisoning which is caused by a toxin formed in the food from staph microorganisms. This enterotoxin is largely unaffected by pasteurization (page 26).

Now, thanks to Douglass' research let's lay to rest some other rumors I'm sure you've heard. Contrary to what you've been told by the National Dairy Council, the AMA, the Center for Disease Control (CDC), and even perhaps your mother, you can drink raw milk without getting tuberculosis even if the cow has TB. Says Dr. Douglass, "the blood-brain barrier prevents the tubercule bacteria from passing into the milk. It was tuberculous milkers who infected the milk by coughing into it" (page 10). Neither is brucellosis (undulant fever) contracted from milk but from direct contact with the infected animals. The milker would get undulant fever but seldom his children who drank the milk (page 11).

As if pasteurization and homogenization were not enough, what about all those chemicals, hormones and drugs that are added for commercial (not health) reasons? For example, organophosphate insecticides are fed to cows who then excrete it in their feces which then poisons the larvae of flies. Does this decrease the need for cleaning the cow stall (page 30)?

Did you know that cows are given synthetic estrogen which causes increased fat deposition and edema, making them appear "juicy"? Three pituitary hormones are also given to cows, which stimulate milk production, water retention and production of thyroid, adrenal and sex hormones. Dr. Douglass asks if this could be behind our modern sex problems and glandular problems. For example, a pituitary hormone (called TSH or thyroid stimulating hormone) stimulates the thyroid. If minute amounts of this hormone are absorbed daily from pasteurized milk, thyroid gland suppression could result. Could this contribute to the common occurrence of low thyroid function in America? According to Douglass, 50% of Americans have low thyroid function (Page 31). I would put this number to 99%.

In my own practice, I have observed precocious sexual development and other problems associated with excess estrogen stimulation including breast tumors (fibrocystic breast disease) in children as young as five years old, both male and female. In girls, precocious sexual development includes vaginal discharge and early menses as young as age eight. When hormone-containing foods, including commercial meat,
poultry, dairy and eggs, are removed from the child's diet, the breast tumors gradually disappear, only to reappear if the hormone-containing foods are reintroduced. Estrogen-related disorders in children is graphically described in John Robbin's book, *Diet for a New America*.

And that's not all folks. A recent report from the spring 1990 *Health Care Letter* will be of interest to concerned parents who believe commercial milk is safer than raw milk. They often believe that pasteurized milk is safe because it is routinely tested for antibiotics. Yes and no. The standard test readily detects antibiotics in the penicillin family but is virtually blind to other drugs in wide use. Many farmers are aware of the "blind spots" and simply switch to less detectable drugs. A Rutgers University study reported in the *Wall Street Journal* tested 50 samples from ten cities using a more sensitive test which detects drugs other than penicillin. They found residues of other drugs, including sulfamethazine, a sulfa drug that causes thyroid cancer in animals; sulfadimethazine, a drug of unknown safety; and chloramphenicol, an illegal drug which in minute quantities can cause aplastic anemia in as many as one in 30,000 people. They also found erythromycin and streptomycin. What about other drugs known to be used in this industry - tranquilizers, hormones, diuretics, worming medicines and other antibiotics not detectable by the current testing?

What about skim milk? Drinking it to loose weight? Ask farmers what they feed their pigs to fatten them. You guessed it! Skim milk. Dr. Wulzen fed guinea pigs skim milk and they died, after developing wrist stiffness named the "Wulzen calcium dystrophy syndrome." In humans, this syndrome is called degenerative (calcific) arthritis (calcification of joints). Other related common conditions include hardening of arteries, cataracts and calcification of the pineal gland (which we now know is important in light physiology and hormonal regulation, especially in women). Why does this calcification occur? Among other things, calcium needs a bit of fat and an enzyme to be assimilated. Skim milk has neither. The enzyme has been killed (by heat) and the fat has been removed.

What about goat's milk? Fine, if it too is raw. Many people who cannot tolerate cow milk do fine on goat milk, which has several advantages over cow milk. The fat in goat milk is only one fifth the size of cow fat particles. Goat milk curd is small and flocculent; in cow milk it is large and dense. Goat milk is the closest substitute to human milk and is more easily digested than bovine milk."

Now you know what's wrong with homogenized, pasteurized, chemical milk and why my children have never been allowed to drink it.

**What next?**

As of this writing, Stueve's will not sell raw milk until an agreement can be reached regarding the testing procedures. Negotiations are now proceeding and as of this writing, over 10,000 signatures have been received on a California petition to stop the discrimination against raw certified milk. A class action suit against the Department of Food and Agriculture is pending.

Until this problem is resolved I am buying Alta Dena's milk, which is automatically homogenized and pasteurized. The advantage of Alta Dena's milk is that is comes from Stueve's Natural and does not contain the above list of hormones, drugs, pesticides and other chemicals. I allow my children to put some on their cereal but they do not drink it otherwise.
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The Raw Milk Controversy, Part II

Stueve's raw certified milk was finally allowed to be sold with a huge warning label saying: **WARNING RAW (UNPASTEURIZED) MILK AND RAW MILK DAIRY PRODUCTS MAY CONTAIN DISEASE-CAUSING MICROORGANISMS. PERSONS AT HIGHEST RISK OF DISEASE FROM THESE ORGANISMS INCLUDE NEWBORNS AND INFANTS; THE ELDERLY; PREGNANT WOMEN; THOSE TAKING CORTICOSTEROIDS, ANTIBIOTICS OR ANTACIDS; AND THOSE HAVING CHRONIC ILLNESS OR OTHER CONDITIONS THAT WEAKEN THEIR IMMUNITY.**

Would you buy a food exhibiting the warning label shown above if you had no other information? Of course not! If the implications of the label are true - namely that raw certified milk may contain dangerous microorganisms - then why is raw milk being sold at all? If the implications of the label are not true, then this label is more than wrong.

For those of you who may not know this, raw milk was NOT taken off the market in October 1990 because it made anyone - not even one person - sick. It was confiscated because The Department of Food and Agriculture required ten-day consecutive tests without detecting ANY bacteria - a condition not required of most other foods of animal origin. Other foods are allowed to have as much as TEN TIMES the amount of bacteria as raw certified milk. For example, milkshakes are allowed to have 75,000 bacteria per milliliter. Pasteurized milk may have 15,000 bacteria per milliliter, whereas raw milk is only allowed 10,000 bacteria per milliliter. The University of California, Davis, reported that from the time of purchase to the pull date, pasteurized milk in California had from 15,000 to 150,000 bacteria per milliliter and that some pasteurized milk had over 1,500,000 bacteria per milliliter in it nearly 9% of the time. Why don't these commercial products have warning labels?

Notice that the raw milk label mentions only "disease-causing micro-organisms". It cannot, of course mention other disease-causing or immune system suppressing goodies such as antibiotics, hormones, tranquilizers, and pesticides, because Stueve's raw certified milk does not contain these chemicals and drugs. In fact, this is what distinguishes Stueve's milk from commercial homogenized, pasteurized milk. The label says that practically everybody on earth is at risk of disease from these microorganisms - including newborns, infants, pregnant women, the elderly and those taking steroids, antacids and antibiotics. Did you know that anyone who eats commercial beef, poultry, dairy products and eggs eats residues of all the steroids and other hormones, antibiotics, pesticides, tranquilizers, etc. given to the animals? So anybody who eats commercial meat, poultry, dairy or eggs will have these residues in their bodies. The effects of eating chemical cows, chemical poultry and their products have been well documented by John Robbins, Dr. William Campbell Douglass and Dr. Leon Chaitow. But I have never seen a label on any of these commercial foods indicating that they contain drug and chemical residues which may have terrible side effects.

It is quite natural for the public to assume that when the government stamps a food "poisonous" or "disease-causing ", it is dangerous and not to be consumed. What about the reverse? Do you assume that commercial pasteurized homogenized milk is safe since the FDA has not confiscated it, ordered ominous warning labels for it, and runs periodic tests on it for drug and pesticide residues? If you do, you are in trouble.
A New York Times article (Thursday, February 8, 1991) reported that the New York commercial milk supply was found to be highly tainted, in spite of reassurances by the FDA and the commercial dairy industry that consumers have nothing to fear. WCBS, a New York TV station, fueled the commercial milk-safety debate when it reported finding the metropolitan New York milk supply to be highly contaminated with animal drug residues. THE CBS-owned station reported that 80% of fifty off-the-shelf samples tested contained various amounts of tetracyclines (a family of antibiotics) and 26% contained traces of sulfamethazine, a suspected carcinogen banned by the FDA for use on dairy farms. Do you think that New York is the only state with contaminated commercial milk?

These findings sharply undermine the FDA's assertion that U.S. commercial homogenized pasteurized milk is pure and clean. Yet the same government confiscated Stueve's milk, despite the fact that no one got sick from it, and Stueve's was forced to put the above warning label on their milk before they could sell it again.

What about the meat of the cow and of poultry? Should they contain a warning label? Has anybody gotten sick from eating tainted beef? You bet! For example, Leon Chaitow reported in Health Consciousness (October 1989) that 35-70% of all commercial chickens sold in British, European and American supermarkets are contaminated with salmonella. He cited the following levels of bacterial contamination in one survey: roast beef 52%, chicken breast 53% ground beef 17%. The major strains of bacteria are Clostridium botulinum (the deadliest by far), salmonella, staphylococci and Listeria. The overuse of antibiotics in the commercial animal industry has lead to antibiotic-resistant strains of bacteria. This is a major and potentially fatal problem for anyone poisoned by such an organism. Yet no warning label is required on commercial meat or poultry.

What about commercial eggs? The Center of Disease Control has reported that a large incidence of salmonella poisoning comes from eggs. Washing won't help - the salmonella is INSIDE the eggs, so states the CDC. Cooking is supposed to help - boiling for 7 minutes, poaching for 5 minutes or frying on each side for 3 minutes. Half-cooked eggs are a potential health hazard. Where is the warning label on commercial eggs?

I am trying to figure out the answer to my own question - why are raw milk dairies forced to put an ominous warning label on their chemical-free, hormone-free, antibiotic-free, pesticide-free, certified, clean, fresh, natural, nutritious and delicious raw milk WHEN NO ONE IS GETTING SICK FROM IT and other commercial foods that have repeatedly caused illness, disease and death in those who consume them have no warning label. I don't know, but I suspect it has nothing to do with health or safety.
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Raw Milk, Part III

This article discusses a California court decision against Stueve’s raw milk, produced by Alta Dena. In its ruling in Consumers Union and American Public Health Association vs. Alta-Dena Certified Dairy and Stueve’s Natural, Inc., the Alameda, California Court held that the defendants cease their deceptive advertising of raw milk as safe, pure, free of harmful bacteria, or healthier or more nutritious than pasteurized milk. The decision states in part, that raw certified milk can contain highly dangerous organisms, is less safe than pasteurized milk, does not possess superior health and nutritional benefits, and is not produced under the strictest health standards. Because of this ruling, Stueve’s was forced to put a warning label on their milk that probably scared most people away from buying it.

This article will show that all of the above statements are correct when applied to commercial (pasteurized, homogenized) milk, but not to certified raw milk. Further, we will examine just what happens to the nutritional value of milk when it is heat-treated and loaded with drugs, synthetic hormones, pesticides, and tranquilizers.

Douglas, author of *The Milk of Human Kindness is Not Pasteurized* and it’s later edition, *The Milk Book*, issues a sad prediction based upon the declining per capita use of pasteurized milk and the availability of raw milk in only three states, plus the fact that raw milk is illegal in 14 states. Because of the health problems associated with pasteurized milk, milk itself will disappear unless it becomes available in its natural raw state.

Is Certified Raw Milk Safe? Does It Contain Highly Dangerous Organisms?

The topic of food contamination applies to ALL foods, whether raw or cooked. In all cases of food contamination, man is the culprit and unsanitary processing conditions the method, be it milking a cow, slaughtering an animal or picking a plant from a field. If milk becomes contaminated, it is because its producers contaminated it via unclean production practices, unsanitary working conditions or unsterile equipment. The contamination of milk can occur BEFORE or AFTER pasteurization but it usually occurs AFTERWARDS. Here are some examples referenced from Douglas’ book:

- In 1945, 300 people in Phoenix, Arizona got food poisoning from pasteurized milk.
- In 1945, 468 people got gastroenteritis from pasteurized milk in Great Bend, Kansas. Nine victims died. It was traced to unsanitary dairies, improper pasteurization and unsterile bottles.
- In June 1982, 172 people in a three-state area in the Southeast developed an intestinal infection causing severe diarrhea, fever, nausea, abdominal pain and headache. Over 100 required hospitalization. The infection was traced to pasteurized milk. The enterotoxin causing this diarrhea is largely unaffected by pasteurization which destroys only the tell-tale odor. However, if left unpasteurized, it would develop a telltale odor and taste.
- Pasteurization does not protect from staphylococcal food poisoning which is also caused by an enterotoxin formed in food from staph microorganisms.
- In 1982, the Consumers Union found a coliform (fecal bacteria) count as high as 2,200 organisms per cc in many pasteurized milk samples tested. Certified raw milk can contain no more than 10 coliforms per cc.

If you’re going to drink milk, you’d be safer with dirty raw milk than dirty pasteurized milk because raw milk contains enzymes and antibodies that inhibit or destroy certain pathogenic bacteria. For example, campylobacter, a nasty germ that causes diarrhea, has never been recovered from raw milk. Why? Raw milk contains lactoperoxidase which destroys campylobacter. Pasteurization destroys this enzyme, thus
leaving the milk vulnerable to contamination. In fact, the major sources of campylobacter are eggs, poultry, tap water and pasteurized milk.

**Here are some diseases which authorities say may be caused by drinking raw milk:**

*Salmonellosis (salmonellae bacilli):* Salmonella is everywhere: in your nose, your gut, your carpets, your cats, and all unsterilized foods. In 1978, the CDC reported that the most common source of salmonella was meat. Others include eggs (it’s inside the eggs), mayonnaise, tap water, Mexican food, potato salad, and hamburger casserole. There have been hundreds of reported cases of salmonellosis from pasteurized milk and cheeses but why blame the milk? You can heat milk all day and kill everything in site, but if the workers at the end of the line are infected, the product will be infected.

Just one example! A March 1968 Journal of the American Medical Association article reported that salmonella contamination of powdered milk came from raw milk found in ONE cow out of 800 dairy farms (my my!). What the article did not say was that two workers at one of the farms were found to be infected with salmonella. But the raw milk got the blame. To paraphrase Douglas, since we can’t pasteurize the workers, why don’t we inspect them?

*Brucellosis or undulant fever (brucella bacilli):* The incidence of brucellosis is not affected by pasteurization because it is contracted only by direct contact with the infected animal, not from the animal’s milk. The milker would get undulant fever but seldom his children, who drank the milk and had no contact with the sick cow.

This did not stop the publication of frightening stories such as one told by Douglas which appeared in the May 1945 issue of Coronet Magazine, entitled “Raw Milk Can Kill You” and accompanied by a milk bottle with a skull and cross bones on it. Coronet’s “expert,” Dr. Harold Harris described an epidemic of undulant fever in Crossroads, U.S.A. that infected 25% of the population and killed one out of four victims. The story was complete with lurid descriptions of case histories, such as a doctor dying a few days after eating raw cheese “dripping with germs.” Only one problem. The town of Crossroads does not exist, therefore, neither do the people, nor the disease! Beware of what you read. It may be a fairy tale (I’m being polite!).

*Tuberculosis (tubercule bacillus):* Says Douglas, the blood-membrane barrier prevents the transmission of the bacilli from the blood into the milk. So, milk from a tuberculous cow would still be ok to drink providing it was clean! Intestinal TB was transmitted by tuberculous workers hacking into the clean milk. This was eliminated by automatic milking machines.

*Q fever virus:* In 1977, the CDC (Center for Disease Control) reported that Q fever, “a minor virus of little consequence,” according to Douglas, can be caught from raw milk. Not so. Q fever is an airborne virus, transmitted via inhalation into the lungs, not from milk drinking!

*Cholera infantum (summer diarrhea):* This killed 5,000 babies annually. Dr. Park of the New York City Health Department found that it was caused by “ordinary dirt bacteria.” But, instead of cleaning the dairies and the workers, they decided to kill the milk.

**Is Certified Raw Milk More Nutritious Than Pasteurized Milk?**

To understand the difference, we must know exactly what happens when milk is cooked several times at high temperatures, and further treated to remove the impurities, then de-odorized and adulterated with synthetic vitamin D. Read Douglas’ description of this process if you don’t mind being shocked.
Raw milk is a living substance full of enzymes, vitamins, minerals, proteins, antibiotics, hormones and unidentified factors that have positive health effects. Pasteurization kills the enzymes, destroys many of the vitamins, and changes the structure of the proteins and the sugars. This makes the resulting product very different than the original natural product. Commercial cows are given many drugs, pesticides, hormones, and tranquilizers. They are for commercial, not health benefits.

**Nutrients lost or damaged via pasteurization:**

**Enzymes:** Raw milk is loaded with enzymes which are destroyed at temperatures above 115 degrees F, robbing it of proteolytic enzymes, mainly casein, to digest the proteins; lipase to digest the fat; lactase to digest lactose (milk sugar); lactoperoxidase to digest campylobacter (the diarrhea bug); phosphatase to facilitate calcium assimilation; catalase, diastase, and so on.

**Proteins:** The protein in cow milk is 82% casein, the balance being lactalbumin and lactoglobulin. Pasteurization kills the enzymes that digest protein. Undigested casein forms a tough rubbery curd.

**Sugars:** Heat transforms lactose into beta-lactose, which is far more rapidly absorbed, creating the same yo-yo blood sugar problem as white sugar (sucrose) or other refined sugars.

**Vitamins:** Raw milk contains 33% more vitamin C than pasteurized. Also, fluorescent lights (such as those found in grocery stores where milk is sold) destroy half of the remaining vitamin C.

**Minerals:** Pasteurization decreases calcium by 50% by precipitating calcium as fatty acid salts and destroys the phosphatase enzyme required for its absorption. The optimum ratio of calcium to phosphorus is 2.5:1 or 10 parts of calcium to 4 parts of phosphorus. In pasteurized milk, this ratio is decreased to 1.2:1. Thus, cooked cow milk has excess phosphorus, which decreases the blood calcium level, laying the foundation for osteoporosis. This explains why pasteurized milk can cause neonatal hypocalcemia (low blood calcium).

**Other goodies:** Raw milk contains an unidentified anti-viral agent which is found in the aqueous layer just below the cream layer. It is heat labile, thus not found in cooked milk.

Dr. Francis Pottenger found an unidentified condition similar to scurvy (vitamin C deficiency) that can be cured by an unknown factor in raw milk. This nutrient is also in raw (not cooked) meat, but in view of recently exposed filthy slaughtering practices, I would not advise eating raw meat.

The Wulzen “anti-stiffness factor” is an unidentified steroid in the cream portion of raw milk. Animals fed raw milk thrived and showed no abnormalities. Animals fed pasteurized milk develop the Wulzen Calcium Dystrophy Syndrome, a highly characteristic arthritis-like wrist-stiffness condition. Animals fed pasteurized skim milk became weak, emaciated and then died after developing the characteristic wrist-stiffness and then muscular dystrophy. Lack of carbohydrate in the animals’ diet increased the symptoms.

**Synthetic additives found in pasteurized BUT NOT raw milk:**

**Synthetic hormones:** There are several. Synthetic estrogen, such as DES (diethyl stilbestosterone) are given to cows to cause increased edema, which makes the beef look “juicy.” Synthetic hormones create fibrocystic breast disease in both boys and girls as young as four years of age, precocious sexual development, and premature menses. TSH (thyroid stimulating hormone) and other pituitary hormones are given to cows to increase milk production. Continuous daily amounts of TSH can suppress thyroid function. BST, or sometimes labeled BGH, a genetically engineered bovine hormone, was recently introduced into cow’s diets. This also increases milk production by 10-30%. Milk from BST herds were
fed to Cornell University college students without their knowledge, says Susan Denzer, head of the Pure Milk Campaign for the National Family Farm Coalition. When the students found out, “they went crazy. They got it pulled off.”

Pesticides: commercial cows are fed pesticides (organophosphates) so their feces will poison fly larvae in their stalls.

Antibiotics: Fifty percent of the antibiotics ingested in this country are given to animals to prevent infection and promote growth.

Tranquilizers: These are used to control animal behavior by obliterating their sense of doom and rendering them incapable of reacting to inhumane treatment.

Conditions associated with commercial (pasteurized) milk:

Milk allergy: Allergies arise from enzyme deficiencies in cooked milk. Therefore, milk allergy is not surprising. Lactose-intolerance was rare in the raw milk days because raw milk contains lactase to digest it. Also, pasteurization converts natural milk sugar, lactose to an unhealthy isomer, beta-lactose. Have you ever heard of beta-lactase?

Milk-induced juvenile diabetes in children less than one year old: In pasteurized milk, a segment of bovine milk protein is identical to a protein on the surface of the beta cells of the pancreas, which produce insulin. Infants with a genetic tendency to diabetes produce antibodies against the bovine milk protein which then destroy the beta cells of the pancreas, prohibiting insulin production. When raw milk and breast milk containing proteolytic enzymes to digest the protein were common, juvenile diabetes was rare. Now, one out of 20 people have diabetes, or 1.5 million Americans.

The skim milk syndrome: States Douglas (page 35) “skim milk may cause degenerative arthritis, also called hypertrophic or calcific arthritis. Calcification of other tissues such as the pineal gland, arteries, and kidneys may also be caused by drinking fractionated (skim, non-fat) milk.” Think this sounds far out? Read on!

Dr. Wulzen’s anti-stiffness factor was found in the cream (e.g. fat) portion of whole milk. It is probably not the only substance of benefit in the cream. Animals placed on skim milk even with vitamin supplementation to replace those lost by removing the cream have poor development. When whole milk (containing 4% fat) is given, the animals developed normally. Animals fed skim milk developed testicular atrophy with complete sterility, severe calcification of large blood vessels, anemia and high blood pressure. Other severe symptoms were recorded in these test animals, including calcium deposits, sciatica, loss of hearing, anemia and high blood pressure. Other scientists repeated and verified Wulzen’s experiments.

I know there are other factors involved in the etiology of calcium and cardiovascular problems but they do not change the importance of these findings. Yet, doctors, nutritionists and dietitians alike recommend non-fat milk to protect from cardiovascular disease and obesity.

Quality of Raw vs. Pasteurized Milk: Bacterial growth in certified raw milk increases very slowly because friendly bacteria and enzymes retard the growth of invading organisms. Not so with pasteurized milk, which contains no protective organisms of any kind. Thus, bacterial growth in pasteurized milk is exponential (quite rapid).
Is Certified Raw Milk Produced Under The Strictest Sanitary Conditions Possible?

The following is an abstract from the September 1938 issue of Certified Milk Magazine, which I found in Douglas’ book (page 259). Certified raw milk comes from cows in perfect health. Any indication of sickness leads to removal of the cow from the certified herd. Certified cows are housed in well-lighted, well-ventilated barns kept scrupulously clean. Prior to each milking, the cow’s flanks and udder are brushed, washed and wiped clean with linen cloths. Workers who attend and milk the cows must be in perfect health and have frequent health examinations. When ill, the worker cannot go near the certified dairy until pronounced well. Workers at certified dairies are required to be scrupulously clean. This includes clean white gloves, regular manicures, frequent washing of hands and strict control of personal habits.

Douglas has a ten-page comparison of certified raw milk versus commercial pasteurized milk composition and dairy condition requirements. For example:

- All states with certified raw milk require an anaerobic bacteria test once a week. Commercial diaries don’t.
- All states require streptococci tests once a month. Commercial diaries don’t.
- All certified herds are vaccinated for brucellosis. Not so for commercial herds.
- Certified dairy cows are tested every 180 days for TB. Commercial cows are tested annually.
- Certified diaries have monthly sanitation visits from the Certified Milk Commission. No visits are required at most commercial dairies.
- All certified dairy employees have monthly health exams. This includes monthly streptococcus throat cultures, yearly chest X-rays and twice a year stool specimen tests. These tests are not required in commercial dairies.

What about the cows? Certified dairies are almost paranoid in their health requirements. For example, cows are examined once a month by a veterinarian designated by the County Milk Commission. This is not required for commercial dairies. Milking procedures are equally stringent. For example, the udder and teats are washed, sanitized and dried immediately prior to milking. Following the milking, each teat is cleansed with a bactericide. This is not required in commercial dairies. Why should it be if you can heat-kill all the germs.

Raw Milk and E Coli,

On July 31, 1993, in a front-page Register Guard article the Oregon State Department of Agriculture warned raw milk drinkers that five Oregonians got sick from raw milk contaminated with E Coli, a common intestinal bacterium. The State refused to identify the victims but warned that Lakeside Dairy raw milk “PROBABLY” caused the outbreak. Katrina Hedberg, State deputy epidemiologist, concluded that the diary’s raw milk caused the E Coli 0157:H7 outbreak. She said, “We have epidemiological proof that the milk is the source of the infection.” Where’s the proof? The victims drank raw milk. The victims also ate hamburgers or poultry, drank tap water and ate in restaurants. Was the milk consumed by the victims tested? No! Was the meat consumed by the victims tested? No!

Where’s the proof?

E coli is tested for at the Lakeside Dairy, usually every six weeks and more recently twice a week. No E coli has been found to date. How can a substance be condemned when it has not been analyzed for its
alleged poison? In the January 1993 Jack In The Box E Coli outbreak in Washington and other Western States, analysis of the meat PROVED E Coli contamination. This meat-contaminated E Coli outbreak, which sickened 500 and killed several in January 1993, did not get headlines in several local newspapers.

On Friday, July 30, Lakeside Dairy began a state-sponsored program to test their 40 cows for E Coli. To date (September 1993) none of their dairy cows tested positive for E Coli (The Register-Guard, August 20, 1993). Four calves did test positive, a common occurrence in calves, but these calves had no contact with the dairy cows. Even if E coli was found in the intestines of the milk cows, how can it get from there into the milk?

E coli can be spread only through fecal contamination. This happens only with sloppy milking practices, for example, when the cow teats are not cleaned and sterilized and when milking machines are not used. This is not true at Lakeside, nor is it true at any raw milk dairy. Why? The dairy KNOWS that the milk must be kept clean because they are not going to heat it to destroy the labile nutritional substances.

Jim Black, the Agriculture Department’s food and dairy administrator says, “Raw milk is inherently unsafe.” Does this mean that it’s an unsafe product inside the cow but pasteurization makes it “safe?” Is human breast milk also inherently unsafe?

If the mother pasteurizes her breast milk, will it become “safe?” How can you convert an “inherently unsafe” food to a safe one just by heating the heck out of it and destroying everything in the food - not just the bugs, but the enzymes required to digest and assimilate the food, and the original nutrients in the milk?

Is “safe” equivalent to “nutritious?”

There have been recent outbreaks of E coli linked to Sizzler restaurants in Corvallis, Oregon and Seattle, Washington and also to the water at an Oregon rest stop along the highway. Note that in these cases the sources of contamination were confirmed by testing. In the Sizzler restaurants, contaminated mayonnaise and cantaloupe were confirmed from tests. In the August 21, 1993 Register Guard article, the list of contaminated sources included raw milk, beef, mayonnaise and cantaloupe. Of these sources, the raw milk consumed by the victims was the only food not tested. However, the Lakeside cows and the milk WERE tested. No E coli was found in either. Yet Hedberg said that she had “proof” that the milk caused the E coli infection.

Where’s the proof?

Meanwhile, Lakeside Dairy, which produces great tasting, clean, raw milk, lost thousands of dollars because people are now afraid to drink their milk after Lakeside was ordered to put a warning label on their milk containers. They were so harassed by the government that they finally went out of business in 1998.

Do you think this is fair?
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"Disclaimer: I am a chemist and an enzyme nutritionist, not a medical doctor. I do not diagnose, prescribe for, treat or claim to prevent, mitigate or cure any human diseases. I do not provide diagnosis, care, treatment or rehabilitation of individuals, nor apply medical, mental health or human development principles. I do not prescribe
prescription drugs nor do I tell you to discontinue them. I provide enzymes and other dietary supplements to improve digestion and to nourish and support normal function and structure of the body. If you suspect any disease, please consult your physician."

Disclaimer: These statements have not been evaluated by the Food and Drug Administration. They are not intended to diagnose, prescribe for, treat or claim to prevent, mitigate or cure any human disease. They are intended for nutritional support only. The FTC requires that we tell you that the results in case notes and testimonials published here are not typical, however, they do show what some people have been able to achieve. Individuals vary, which is why we must always consider the whole person when recommending a course of action. The third party information referred to herein is neither adopted nor endorsed by this web site but is provided for general information purposes. The listing of specific disease terms is based upon medical literature and is not a substitute for competent medical advice. If you suspect a medical condition, you should consult a physician.
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