

Cody's testimony:

Wednesday December 8th, 2010 at about 13:00 my assistant Samantha interrupted my meeting with a client, Mrs. Williams, to say "the health inspectors are here". I came to the front of the store with Mrs. Williams to find a tall man flanked by a female and AN oriental male, the latter taking pictures of five – two liter jugs of milk lying down on the floor in front of my large display cooler. I walked over to them and noticed that my wife's name was clearly written on each milk jug. The tall man, who I later learned was Dale Nelson, shoved two photocopied papers into my hands and hurriedly explained that I had failed to comply with an order he had given to my wife earlier, and as a result he was taking all the milk he had found in my cooler. A moment of shock went through me as I realized that the life-saving milk my 2 year old daughter desperately needed was being scooped into a garbage bag to be confiscated! I shouted "NO! That is my daughter's milk!" and dove for the bag. Dale grabbed the bag and jerked back, tearing two jugs free of the shredded bag. He hollered "That was assaulting an officer!" while I scooted the remaining jugs towards the back of my health food store from a kneeling position. I replied "Give me my milk" and Dale said to his agents "call the police" while making a hasty exit. I shouted "Stop THIEF" and started after Dale. I gave the oriental man a push out of my store, as he was now blocking my doorway, but he did not fall down. Dale shouted 'call the police' again and started running away, so I shouted 'STOP THIEF' and gave chase. Dale was a better runner and I realized I should go back to protect Abigail's milk. I stopped at Cindy Ady's office, she is directly across from my store and is my MLA, **Member of the Legislative Assembly for Calgary-Shaw**.

I called Samantha to assess the situation and took time to explain everything to Cindy Ady's assistant Mary Cahoon and her war veteran friend. I returned to my store while the veteran patrolled the parking lot for me. I put my milk into a shopping bag and sent Samantha to my home with it, having her exit at my back door. The veteran returned to inform me of the thieves' whereabouts so I called 911 to report the theft. The polite operator said police were already on the way and would hear my side of the story. I made it known that a theft occurred to that operator, and to the police when they arrived later, but they said the investigators were within their authority to take the milk and were pressing for assault charges against me. They wrote me a notice to appear for fingerprints January 5th and to CMO – Case Management Office at the courthouse on January 19th, 2011.

When Samantha returned I learned that the oriental inspector was present in my store as my wife Tonya was leaving the store in a rush to make it to a 3 hour appointment. As it was very sunny out, she decided to remove our milk from the trunk of our car, because she did not have time to drop it off at home. She had instructed Samantha to wrap it up and put it at the back of our cooler on the bottom shelf then arrange product in front so no one could see it. The oriental inspector observed this, left my store then came back with the other two, which is where my story begins.

The next day, two city business license inspectors came in to present us with a \$1000 fine and

threat of up to \$10,000 per day of fines because my business license was not current, and on Friday another spy was in my store. It is getting a little hot for us now!
Cody Dahl

A letter from Alberta Health Services

Ms. Cole Dahl,

I have reviewed your email and discussed the inspection with the Health Inspector involved. You seem to be poorly misinformed about your rights and the regulations under which you operate.

As an owner/operator of a food facility, you have chosen to operate in a regulated industry. As such, you must comply with the rules and regulations placed on that industry. As a business and a food establishment, your store is, by law, a public place. Under the Public Health Act, a Health inspector or Executive Officer, has the authority to inspect any public place and, as part of the inspection:

- enter the public place at any reasonable hour
- require the production of books, records or documents
- make reasonable oral or written inquiries of any person
- inspect and take samples of any substance, equipment or food in the public place
- perform test, take photographs, and make recordings

Alberta Health Services has an expectation that Health Inspectors will make inquiries of any product found in a facility that we inspect. The Health Inspector was well within her authority to make the inquiries that she made and your refusal to cooperate with those inquiries amounts to obstruction of an Executive Officer and is an offence under the Public Health Act.

Your assumption that simply not having a product for sale means we should have no interest in it is also incorrect. A food permit applies to the supply, sale, offering for sale, processing, preparation, packaging, providing, display, service, dispensing, storage or transportation of food. The fact this product is being stored, displayed, and dispensed in your facility is more than enough reason for Alberta Health Services to take an interest in it. As a permitted food establishment, you may not store, display or provide any food that is not from an approved source, or food that is unfit for human consumption in your facility. The unlabeled and, presumably, unpasteurized milk is most likely not an approved product nor from an approved source. You may not continue to store or distribute this product from your facility unless you can provide evidence that this product is from an approved source and safe for public distribution.

In summary, I find no wrongdoing in the actions of the Health Inspector during the inspection of your facility.

As for the general legalities of distributing unlabeled raw milk, we will be in contact with our federal and provincial counterparts in Health and Agriculture to determine our best course of action going forward.

Please feel free to contact me at this email address or at 403-943-8073

Dale Nelson BSc.Ag, CPHI(C), Coordinator, Safe Food Program
Public Health Inspector, Executive Officer
Environmental Health, Alberta Health Services

10101 Southport Rd SW, Calgary T2W 3N2
(403)-943-8073 (Desk), (403)-943-8056 (Fax), (403)-943-2295 (Reception Desk); <http://www.calgaryhealthregion.ca/envhealth>

My email to Mr. Nelson after the milk seizure.

Canadian Bill of Rights

1960, c. 44

[Assented to August 10th, 1960]

An Act for the Recognition and Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms

Preamble

The Parliament of Canada, affirming that the Canadian Nation is founded upon principles that acknowledge the supremacy of God, the dignity and worth of the human person and the position of the family in a society of free men and free institutions; Affirming also that men and institutions remain free only when freedom is founded upon respect for moral and spiritual values and the rule of law;

And being desirous of enshrining these principles and the human rights and fundamental freedoms derived from them, in a Bill of Rights which shall reflect the respect of Parliament for its constitutional authority and which shall ensure the protection of these rights and freedoms in Canada:

Therefore Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:

PART I

BILL OF RIGHTS

Recognition and declaration of rights and freedoms

1. It is hereby recognized and declared that in Canada there have existed and shall continue to exist without discrimination by reason of race, national origin, colour, religion or sex, the following human rights and fundamental freedoms, namely,
 - (a) the right of the individual to life, liberty, security of the person and [enjoyment of property, and the right not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law](#);
 - (b) the right of the individual to equality before the law and the protection of the law;
 - (c) freedom of religion;
 - (d) freedom of speech;
 - (e) freedom of assembly and association; and
 - (f) freedom of the press.

Mr. Nelson-

I wanted to point a few things out. Your inspector came into my store secretly, saw me put my personal milk in the cooler, I covered it up so that it was not visible. An inspector came in, did not clearly identify or show identification to my staff and had to physically dig and move product to find my covered milk. This person provided a photo copy not an original official government agency document. I was not submitted an official document regarding a warning before stating your intent. We are processing our video monitor to see what all we have on video for evidence if this shall go to court.

I feel there are double standards here. Cigarettes are a known toxic chemical substance that is clearly marked, causes disease that burden the tax payers, yet is legal to sell and you are telling me that storing my personal raw milk is a health concern to the public? More people die of cigarette smoking and second hand smoking, also the deaths of alcohol related drinking and driving causes more death than people getting sick over drinking raw milk. It is legal to sell a toxic chemical substance that causes cancer and other health related diseases called CIGARETTES. Where is the LOGIC in your case here? Are you on my side here or are you being funded by the taxes from the legal sale of a toxic substance called cigarettes and alcohol that cause disease that burden the public health system? People need to know this information. I feel like I am dealing with a corrupted system called Alberta Health Services. You have double standards and use them at your whim.

As I stated before, I do not sell, distribute, package or service raw milk in my store. I own a goat and have my milk shipped to me and will no longer store my personal milk at my government controlled owned business, that I thought I owned but have now been informed that you control it.

IF you are acting in the best interest of the business owner and the consumer as I am a consumer then please read all information regarding in this email:

Grass-fed Dairy is an exceptional product. For starters, grass-fed livestock are not hosts for E. coli O157:H7. That strain of E. coli can only grow in an acidic stomach and animals fed grain have acidic stomachs. The stomachs of livestock that source their nutrient flows to the green leaf have a neutral pH in their digestive tracts and the E. coli that lives in that environment is killed in a human's acidic stomach. That's why for all of time E. coli was never a problem for either the Stone Age man or modern man until most recently. But in the late 1940s man invented the feedlot where he fed grain to finishing livestock and ever since he has had to deal with E. coli O157:H7 in his critters. So, in terms of food safety, grass-fed is best by far.

And if you happen to have any spiritual or belief system in yourself: Genesis 1:30- **3**And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is life, I have given every green herb for meat: and it was so.

Did you see that? Green herb, greens like grass- not grain like they feed to those poor tortured cows in the feedlots. It is a disgrace that the government allows such torture and feeds that to the Canadian people.

What your agency should be doing is investigating the cause and death from cigarette and alcohol related issues and work on banning these known toxins that are known medical facts rather than milk from a cow.

<http://wildthingorganics.com/milk.pdf>

<http://www.rawmilk.org/pdf/raw-milk-critical-evaluation.pdf>

Also, I would like to know how my raw milk stands up compared to raw deli meats, raw beef sold in the grocery store, raw pork and what are the toxic levels compared to cigarettes or alcohol?

If we have the right to buy raw meats why do we not have the right to buy raw milk? I would like a comparison of my raw milk compared to raw pork that is sold in the grocery store or any raw meat for that matter. Perhaps you seizing my milk is just what I needed to start a campaign on the selling of raw meat toxic cigarettes and toxic alcohol.

Alcohol-related deaths on the rise globally

One in 25 deaths across the globe can be directly attributed to alcohol consumption, according to new research from the Toronto-based Centre for Addiction and Mental Health. "These numbers are high," says Dr. Jurgen Rehm, one of the authors of the study published in this week's edition of the Lancet. "And they're only getting higher as more people drink in higher volumes and more frequent patterns." Researchers attribute the recent global increase in part to greater consumption by women. "Plus, production is more widespread and marketing has globalized," he added.

Rehm also said the effect of alcohol on the human body is better understood and can be more easily linked to causes of death.

"The public doesn't always recognize an alcohol-related death," he added. "It's not like if your neighbour dies of lung cancer, and you assume he was a smoker. Nobody ever assumes that their neighbour's breast cancer was because she was a drinker."

Most diseases the public associates with alcoholism — such as cirrhosis of the liver — constitute a minority of alcohol-related deaths, said Rehm.

Alcohol can influence several hormonal systems in the body, causing various diseases such as mouth and throat, colorectal and breast cancers, as well as strokes.

A woman who has three drinks per day on average increases her risk of getting breast cancer by about 15 per cent, said Rehm. "That means that (perhaps) only one in 20 cases of breast cancer is due to alcohol consumption. And that's why the public ignores alcohol as a carcinogen."

The report noted alcohol consumption also leads to accidental, premature deaths.

"When you have more people drinking more alcohol, you get more people who are risk-prone," said Rehm. "You have more people on our highways, drunk driving, and more people drunk while snowmobiling or boating. Accidents and deaths will happen."

Separate data from the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health published in 2006 found 3,892 deaths attributable to alcohol in Canada, (Mr. Nelson do we have more than 4,000 people dying or getting ill from raw milk? People are dying of a government approved legal toxic substance here) or 1.8 per cent of all Canadian deaths. The three biggest contributing factors were unintentional injuries, cancers and digestive diseases. While the Canadian figure is lower than the world percentage, the global numbers are bolstered by areas such as Europe, where one in 10 deaths is directly attributable to alcohol, and Russia, where about one in seven deaths can be directly linked to alcohol.

The study published in Lancet this week found that globally, alcohol consumption worked out to about 12 units per person per week on average. A unit is comparable to a small can of beer, glass of wine or a one-ounce shot of liquor. "But globally, the vast majority of adults abstain from liquor," said Rehm. "So the drinkers are actually drinking about twice as much." The Canadian consumption is calculated at almost nine units per person per week. By contrast, in Europe it is 21.5 unit per week. "The public disregards a lot of what alcohol does to the system," said Rehm. But whatever happened to the adage of a glass of wine being good for the heart?

While that still holds true, Rehm said, people simply don't drink in a way that benefits the body. The study showed more people are binge drinking, instead of spreading consumption out.

"If you drink one drink — and I really mean one drink, not one bottle — you will benefit your heart," he said. But, Rehm warned, even those who drink light and responsibly need to weigh the benefits.

"There are benefits to drinking," said Rehm. "We have good evidence for that. Unfortunately, for our populations, they are less relevant because no one seems to care to drink at those low levels, which would actually do you a little bit of good."

Top of Form
Bottom of Form

Fresh, Unprocessed (Raw) Whole Milk: Safety, Health and Economic Issues

The Safety of Raw Milk:

PROTECTIVE COMPONENTS: Raw milk contains numerous components that assist in:

- Killing pathogens in the milk (lactoperoxidase, lactoferrin, leukocytes, macrophages, neutrophils, antibodies, medium chain fatty acids, lysozyme, B12 binding protein, bifidus factor, beneficial bacteria);
- Preventing pathogen absorption across the intestinal wall (polysaccharides, oligosaccharides, mucins, fibronectin, glycomacropetides, bifidus factor, beneficial bacteria);
- Strengthening the Immune System (lymphocytes, immunoglobulins, antibodies, hormones and growth factors) (*Scientific American*, December 1995; *British J of*

Nutrition, 2000:84(Suppl. 1):S3-S10, S75-S80, S81-S89).

PASTEURIZATION HARMFUL: Many of these anti-microbial and immune-enhancing components are greatly reduced in effectiveness by pasteurization, and completely destroyed by ultra-pasteurization (*Scientific American*, December 1995; *British J of Nutrition*, 2000:84(Suppl. 1):S3-S10, S75-S80, S81-S89).

DANGERS EXAGGERATED: Although raw milk, like any food, can become contaminated and cause illness, the dangers of raw milk are greatly exaggerated. In an analysis of reports on 70 outbreaks attributed to raw milk, we found many examples of reporting bias, errors and poor analysis resulting in most outbreaks having either no valid positive milk sample or no valid statistical association ([Response to Marler List of Studies.pdf](#)).

USDA/FDA STATISTICS: Based on data in a 2003 USDA/FDA report: Compared to raw milk there are 515 times more illnesses from *L-mono* due to deli meats and 29 times more illness from *L-mono* due to pasteurized milk. On a PER-SERVING BASIS, deli meats were TEN times more likely than raw milk to cause illness (*Intrepretive Summary - Listeria Monocytogenes Risk Assessment*, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition, Sept. 2003, page 17).

OUTBREAKS DUE TO PASTEURIZED MILK: Due to high-volume distribution and its comparative lack of anti-microbial components, pasteurized milk when contaminated has caused numerous widespread and serious outbreaks of illness, including a 1984-5 outbreak afflicting almost 200,000 people. In 2007, three people died in Massachusetts from illness caused by contaminated pasteurized milk ([Real Milk PowerPoint](#), slide 30).

FORTY-YEAR-OLD SCIENCE AND ANCIENT HISTORY: Claims that raw milk is unsafe are based on 40-year-old science and century-old experiences from distillery dairy "factory farms" in rapidly urbanizing nineteenth century America.

MODERN ADVANTAGES: Compared to 30-50 years ago, dairy farmers today can take advantage of many advancements that contribute to a dramatically safer product including pasture grazing, herd testing, effective cleaning systems, refrigeration and easier, significantly less expensive, more accessible and more sophisticated milk and herd disease testing techniques.

UNIQUE FOOD: Raw milk is the ONLY food that has extensive built-in safety mechanisms and numerous components to create a healthy immune system.

Health Benefits of Raw Milk:

BENEFITS IN EARLY HUMAN STUDIES: In early studies involving humans, raw milk was shown to be superior to pasteurized in protecting against infection, diarrhea, rickets, tooth decay and TB; and children receiving had better growth than those receiving pasteurized milk ([Real Milk PowerPoint](#), slides 54-56, 58).

BENEFITS IN EARLY ANIMAL STUDIES: In early animal studies, animals fed raw milk had better growth, denser bones, greater integrity of internal organs, less anemia, fewer signs of anxiety and stress, and fewer signs of nutrient deficiency than animals fed pasteurized milk ([Real Milk PowerPoint](#), slides 57, 59-64).

ASTHMA: Three recent studies in Europe found that drinking "farm" (raw) milk protected against asthma and allergies (*Lancet*. 2001 Oct 6;358(9288):1129-33; *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2006 Jun;117(6):1374-8; *Clinical & Experimental Allergy*. 2007 May; 37(5) 627-630).

RAW HUMAN MILK: In recent studies, infants on pasteurized human milk did not gain weight as quickly compared to those fed raw human milk (*J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr.* 1986 Mar-Apr;5(2):248-53) and premature babies given raw human milk had more rapid weight gain than those given pasteurized human milk. Problems were attributed to pasteurization's destruction of lipase (*J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr.* 1986 Mar-Apr;5(2):242-7).

THE MILK CURE: In the early 1900s, the Mayo Clinic administered the "[Milk Cure](#)," which consisted in drinking 4-5 quarts of raw milk per day, obtaining favorable results for a range of illnesses including cancer, weight loss, kidney disease, allergies, skin problems, urinary tract problems, prostate problems and chronic fatigue; these results are not obtained using pasteurized milk.

DANGERS OF PASTEURIZED MILK: Many studies have linked consumption of pasteurized milk with lactose intolerance, allergies, asthma, frequent ear infections, gastro-Intestinal problems, diabetes, auto-Immune disease, attention deficit disorder and constipation.

During a period of rapid population growth, the market for fluid pasteurized milk has declined at 1% per year for the past 20 years. Fewer and fewer consumers can tolerate pasteurized (and ultrapasteurized) milk (*Don't Drink Your Milk*, Frank Oski, MD, 1983).

LACTOSE INTOLERANCE: In a survey of raw milk drinkers in the state of Michigan, over 80 percent of those advised by a healthcare professional that they were lactose intolerant were able to consume raw milk without problem. ([LactoseIntoleranceSurvey.doc](#)).

POSITIVE TESTIMONIALS: Hundreds of testimonials involving reversal of failure to thrive in infants; allergies, asthma and behavior problems in children; and digestive disorders, arthritis, osteoporosis and even cancer in adults ([Testimonials](#), [MI-RawMilkHealthTestimonials.pdf](#)).

NUTRIENT DEGRADATION BY PASTEURIZATION:

Vitamin C	Raw milk but not pasteurized can resolve scurvy. ". . . Without doubt. . . the explosive increase in infantile scurvy during the latter part of the 19th century coincided with the advent of use of heated milks. . ." (Rajakumar, <i>Pediatrics</i> . 2001;108(4):E76).
Calcium	Longer and denser bones on raw milk (Studies from Randleigh Farms).
Folate	Carrier protein inactivated during pasteurization. (Gregory. <i>J. Nutr.</i> 1982, 1329-1338).
Vitamin B12	Binding protein inactivated by pasteurization.
Vitamin B6	Animal studies indicate B6 poorly absorbed from pasteurized milk (Studies from

	Randleigh Farms).
Vitamin A	Beta-lactoglobulin, a heat-sensitive protein in milk, increases intestinal absorption of vitamin A. Heat degrades vitamin A. Said and others (<i>Am J Clin Nutr.</i> 1989;49:690-694. Runge and Heger. <i>J Agric Food Chem.</i> 2000 Jan;48(1):47-55).
Vitamin D	Present in milk in protein-bound form, assimilation possibly affected by pasteurization. Hollis and others (<i>J Nutr.</i> 1981;111:1240-1248).
Iron	Lactoferrin, which contributes to iron assimilation, destroyed during pasteurization.
Iodine	Lower in pasteurized milk. Wheeler and others (<i>J Dairy Sci.</i> 1983;66(2):187-95).
Minerals	Lactobacilli, destroyed by pasteurization, enhance mineral absorption (MacDonald and others. 1985).

Economic Potential of Raw Milk:

CONVENTIONAL SITUATION: Thirty cows in a confinement situation; high-protein feed to increase milk production; cows produce 190 hundredweight* of milk each year; farmer sells milk to co-op and receives about \$12 per hundredweight*:

- Income is about \$1.50 per gallon or \$68,400 per year
- Farmer receives no subsidies (only corporate farms get these)
- Farmer has high cost of feed, vet bills, replacement cows, artificial breeding, interest on equipment loans.

*A hundredweight or centum weight (abbreviated cwt) is a unit of mass defined in terms of the pound. In the US and Canada, a hundredweight is defined as 100lbs. The British definition is 112lbs, chosen to make it divisible by 14, the British Stone weight (1 stone=14 pounds).

In 2002, dairy farms in the U.S. went out of business at the rate of 16 per day.

DIRECT SALES OF RAW MILK FROM PASTURE-FED COWS: Thirty cows on 100 acres; cows are fed grass, hay and silage from the farm; cows produce 100 hundredweight each per year.

- Income on raw milk or raw dairy products is \$4 - \$8 per gallon, or \$150,000 - \$300,000 per year.
- If the farmer is making cheese, cream or butter, he has whey and skim milk,

free food for pigs

- Additional farm income from pork, beef, eggs, chicken, produce, etc., possible in a diversified farm based on dairy, could be \$50,000 - \$100,000 per year.
- Total gross income to farmer \$200,000 - \$400,000 per year
- Costs for feed, vet bills, interest are much lower; no replacement cow costs.

RURAL REVIVAL: Every \$1 earned on the farm = \$5-7 for the local community; if 10 percent of the population would buy raw milk and other products directly from the farm, we would need 75,000 farms, all making at least \$200,000 per year. Raw milk sales hold the potential for a huge rural revival.

CURRENT SITUATION FOR RAW MILK SALES

-

Retail sales

are legal in 10 states

- On-farm sales are legal in 15 states
- Herd shares** are legal in 4 states
- There is no law on herd shares** in 6 states
- Pet food sales are legal in 4 states, implying that human consumption is feasible
- Raw milk sales are illegal in 11 states and the District of Columbia

***Herd shares are agreements in which an individual buys a share in a herd and thus owns some of the milk from the herd. (May also be called cow shares, goat shares, farm shares, etc.)*

SITUATION IN EUROPE: Raw milk sales legal in England, Wales and most of Europe; sold in vending machines in several European countries.

Raw Milk Vending Machine in Italy

A Campaign for Real Milk is a project of [The Weston A. Price Foundation](#)

PMB 106-380, 4200 Wisconsin Ave, NW, Washington DC 20016

Phone: (202) 363-4394 | Fax: (202) 363-4396 | Web: www.westonaprice.org

General Information/Membership/Brochures: info (at) [westonaprice.org](mailto:info@westonaprice.org)

Local Chapters and Chapter Leaders: chapters (at) [westonaprice.org](mailto:chapters@westonaprice.org)

Website: webmaster (at) [realmilk.com](mailto:webmaster@realmilk.com)

[Disclaimer](#) (Terms & Conditions)

How to catch wild pigs

A chemistry professor in a large college had some exchange students in the class. One day while the class was in the lab the Professor noticed one young man (exchange student) who kept rubbing his back, and stretching as if his back hurt. The professor asked the young man what was the matter. The student told him he had a bullet lodged in his back. He had been shot while fighting communists in his native country who were trying to overthrow his country's government and install a new communist government.

In the midst of his story he looked at the professor and asked a strange question. He asked, 'Do you know how to catch wild pigs?'

The professor thought it was a joke and asked for the punch line. The young man said this was no joke. 'You catch wild pigs by finding a suitable place in the woods and putting corn on the ground. The pigs find it and begin to come everyday to eat the free corn. When they are used to coming every day, you put a fence down one side of the place where they are used to coming. When they get used to the fence, they begin to eat the corn again and you put up another side of the fence. They get used to that and start to eat again.. You continue until you have all four sides of the fence up with a gate in The last side. The pigs, who are used to the free corn, start to come through the gate to eat, you slam the gate on them and catch the whole herd.

Suddenly the wild pigs have lost their freedom. They run around and around inside the fence, but they are caught. Soon they go back to eating the free corn. They are so used to it that they have forgotten how to forage in the woods for themselves, so they accept their captivity.

The young man then told the professor that is exactly what he sees happening to North America. The governments keep pushing us toward socialism and keep spreading the free corn out in the form of programs such as supplemental income, tax credit for unearned income, tobacco subsidies, dairy subsidies, payments not to plant crops (CRP), welfare, medicine, drugs, etc.. While we continually lose our freedoms -- just a little at a time.

One should always remember: There is no such thing as a free lunch! Also, a politician will never provide a service for you cheaper than you can do it yourself.

Also, if you see that all of this wonderful government 'help' is a problem confronting the future of democracy in North America, you might want to send this on to your friends. If you think the free ride is essential to your way of life then you will probably ignore this, but God help you when the gate slams shut!

'A government big enough to give you everything you want, is big enough to take away everything you have'.

Thomas Jefferson

Democracy is two wolves and a lamb voting on what to have for lunch. Liberty is a well-armed lamb contesting the vote.

The Safety of Raw Milk

by Mark McAfee

The Colorado Department of Public Health

Denver, Colorado

May 19, 2004

Dear Sirs,

I have been requested to share with you our commercial organic raw milk production and sales experience. For the last four years, Organic Pastures Dairy has produced a full line of raw organic dairy products for retail sale (300 stores including Wholefoods) and consumption here in California. The state of California (CDFA) monitors and tests all of our raw dairy products multiple times per month. The state has never found one pathogen (salmonella, E. coli O157:H7 or listeria) in any of our products. Even more interesting is the fact that not one human pathogen has ever been found in the hundreds of environmental swabs that have been taken in our plant facility.

Dr. Caterina Berge, DVM and PhD candidate at UC Davis, tested our milk cows' fresh manure and did not find any human pathogens. That's right. . . no Salmonella. She was able to show that when antibiotics are not ever used on the herd (as stipulated in the organic standards) and when cows are not stressed (grass-fed and kept healthy) they simply do not slough off pathogens in their manure. The data collected at Organic Pastures was quite different from that found at other dairies. The typical conventional milk tank had either salmonella or E. coli O157:H7 detected about 30 percent of the time. In comparison, Organic Pastures has never had one pathogen—ever.

To study this issue further, Organic Pastures contracted with BSK labs in Fresno to perform multiple challenge and recovery tests on our raw milk and raw colostrum. When 7 logs (10 million counts) of pathogens were added to one-milliliter samples of organic raw milk they would not grow. In fact they died off. The salmonella was so badly out-competed that it could not be found less than 24 hours later. The listeria drop was less dramatic and was similar to the E. Coli O157:H7 samples that were studied, but they also did not grow and declined substantially over time.

The lab concluded: “. . . organic raw milk and colostrum do not appear to support the growth of pathogens. . .”

During the period 2000 through 2004 there were several listeria-related food recalls in California associated with pasteurized milk products and ice cream. During this same period more than 12 million servings of Organic Pastures products were consumed and not one person complained of illness and not one pathogen was ever found either by the state, FDA or Organic Pastures.

This begs the bigger question. What is it that causes raw milk to kill pathogens? Just in the last 24 months, the FDA has approved lactoferrin as an approved method of treatment for pathogen reduction in beef slaughter plants. Raw milk naturally has levels of this enzyme-based pathogen killer. Pasteurization inactivates this and other enzymes that kill pathogens. These enzymes include lactoferrin, xanthine oxidase, lactoperoxidase, lysozyme and nisin. There are other interrelated enzymes and beneficial bacteria that also act on the pathogens to inhibit their growth. All of these systems are destroyed by pasteurization. It is no wonder that dairy plants that pasteurize must be kept absolutely spotless. There are no remaining safety systems in the processed milk.

I will be presenting my experiences and the factual references that I have mentioned here during my verbal address in Colorado on May 19th.

Our company ships product all over the world. We have been inspected by the FDA and the FDA has also never found a pathogen. It may seem strange to say or claim this, but Mother Nature is right, her blue print is right on point. It is mankind that has added variables that cause much of the concern for pathogens in our current market systems. Our consumers are made ill by pasteurized milk products and the additives and processing methods. Our consumers share their testimonials with us every day. Asthma, allergies, arthritis, immune-related disorders, autism, ADD, Crohn's disease, rare enzyme deficiencies. . . the list goes on and on. In each of these cases raw milk or raw dairy products makes a dramatic improvement in health. There have been cases when patients have been written off by modern medicine only to return to perfect health after drinking raw colostrums and raw dairy products. Please see www.makersdiet.com for a story of one person's recovery from near death using raw dairy.

It is imperative that the citizens of our nation, not just California, have an informed choice in foods. If raw milk was so horrible then why is it that raw milk has such an incredibly safe record here in California and in Colorado? I would argue that since we have been in business there have been many listeria recalls and food outbreaks with pasteurized milk. . . but none with organic raw milk.

As an American we can buy raw eggs, raw meat, raw fresh juices, so why not raw dairy products? Show us one case of disease related to natural raw dairy products in Colorado or California. They are very hard to find. They are nearly all related to pasteurizer failure not raw dairy products intended for consumption.

The dairy industry does not understand what I have explained here in detail. What the dairy industry believes is that raw milk contaminates pasteurized milk. This is not the case. Pasteurized milk kills the safety systems that control pathogens in raw milk and therefore permit unlimited growth of dangerous bacteria if present.

Our products have what Mother Nature intended, a diversity of good bacteria and a wide range of essential enzymes including lactase for lactose digestion and phosphatase that is essential for the utilization of calcium.

One reason raw milk is so much easier to digest compared to pasteurized milk is due to the presence of lactase, the enzyme that breaks down milk sugar and which many humans are unable to produce. The experts I have spoken with deny the presence of lactase in raw milk; however, it is the friendly bacteria in raw milk that facilitate the creation of lactase in the intestine where it is needed. That is why lactose-intolerant people can drink raw milk without a problem. Pasteurization kills these friendly bacteria.

Please call 1-877-Raw Milk and I would be happy to discuss these experiences and the hard data that backs them up. Feel free to call Organic Pastures and ask for the lab tests results. You will find zero pathogens detected at any time from any test. I look forward to your questions. I am dedicated to sharing information, education and the building of understanding relationships. In fact we place our most sensitive bacteria data at our website for all the world to see at www.organicpastures.com. I have a medical background having served as a certified paramedic and medical educator for the Fresno County Health Department for 16 years and having run more than 14,000 911 calls.

I am the only creamery operator in North America to produce the products at issue and believe my experience and tests are absolutely on point.

Most kind regards,
Mark McAfee
Founder, Organic Pastures

Lactose Intolerance and Raw Milk

by Doctor Meg Haworth

<http://www.deliciousandhealthy.com/>

I never liked milk although I was forced to drink it with dinner each night during my formative years. As a child, the only time I remotely enjoyed milk was when ice cold (so I could barely taste it) with a warm piece of chocolate cake. Since I found out about my lactose intolerance problem, I found that a glass of room temperature water with chocolate cake was just as satisfying to cut the sweet of the cake. When my friends told me about the virtues of raw milk, I told them to forget it. I don't like milk and I have no intention of drinking it. But, I had to investigate it anyway...

Recently, a couple of my friends informed me that people with lactose intolerance could often tolerate raw milk without incident. Several people I know actually lost weight going on a raw dairy and high fat diet. These were people who already consumed dairy products. I wanted to know why this raw milk was better than homogenized, pasteurized, hormone-laden milk (other than the obvious idea that in the latter description, milk has been messed with beyond recognition!).

This is what I learned:

Using raw milk is essentially like any other whole, unprocessed food given to us by the forces of nature - it is medicine for those with the right chemical make-up to receive it in that way. But, as is the case with other foods, how it is produced, handled, processed and used has everything to do with how well it may work for you. With raw milk this is imperative.

The best source of raw milk is found from cattle that are grass-fed in large organic fields. You may be thinking; "organic grass?" Yes. My former B&B was flanked by cattle pasture where, each year, we witnessed the covering of the grassy field with chicken manure from hormone-fed chickens that went from chick to market in 11 weeks. A local chicken farmer once shared with me that over half the chicks would die from the hormone, placed in their drinking water at only a few weeks old. Even with the loss of half his livestock it was profitable to him because they went to market so fast. This hormone-laden chicken manure rendered that pasture, and many others like it, non-organic.

Whole, raw milk that comes from organic grass-fed cattle is a complete food with all of its enzymes, beneficial bacteria, vitamins, minerals and calcium intact. When milk is processed through homogenization and pasteurization, it changes the composition of the milk to such a degree that enzymes like lactoperoxidase (necessary for the digestion of milk) are killed thus breaking down its' natural ability to be digested and assimilated properly. Many people who are lactose intolerant have reported that raw milk, treated with the highest of standards, is perfectly and easily digestible for them and has improved their strength, stamina, skin tone, weight issues and over all health.

The sale and consumption of raw milk is legal in California and can be purchased through Whole Foods Market, Rainbow Acres, Erewhon, or other health food stores. I have listed several resources for you to look into the possibility of raw milk. One of the websites has a list of where you can get the milk. You can also have it shipped to you.

I personally am convinced that raw milk is highly beneficial to people who use it and love it. I personally don't have plans to consume it since I don't like the taste of milk; however, I do have plans to try it. I do like to experiment! Evidently, it is best if consumed whole rather than cooked or blended as both processes change the structure of the milk and may lower its nutritional value.

Since this is a dairy-free website and business, it may be a bit perplexing as to why I am showcasing raw milk. But the question regarding raw milk is one I get asked frequently, so I wanted to research and report to you what I found.

You do not have to try raw milk and if you do not feel really good about it, I suggest you don't even think about it. What we think about the things we consume has an impact on how the body assimilates it. Our emotions release chemicals into our entire bodies just like our foods do.

I do hope this article helps to educate you on milk and what is currently a huge trend in its consumption. I hope you have learned something useful!

THE CASE FOR UNTREATED MILK

A SPECIAL REPORT

FROM

THE ASSOCIATION OF UNPASTEURISED
MILK PRODUCERS & CONSUMERS

Originally Published by The Soil Association.

This Paper was written by

DR. B. M. PICKARD

The Department of Animal Physiology and Nutrition The University

LEEDS LS2 9JT

Edited originally for The Soil Association

by Sue Stickland and Lawrence Woodward

Introduction Publication for

Sir Julian Rose & Marwood Yeatman

The Association of Unpasteurised Milk Producers and Consumers

Hardwick Estate Office

Whitchurch-on-Thames Reading RG8 7RB

0118 984 2955

hardwickestate@btinternet.com

1

INTRODUCTION

It is already illegal to sell unpasteurised milk through shops, catering establishments, hotels, hospitals and schools in England and Wales. In 1989, for political and financial reasons, the government went for a total ban to fall in line with Scotland. The attempt failed, owing mainly to consumer pressure. However, on November 4th of this year (1997) the government announced its renewed intention to ban unpasteurised milk on the grounds that it presents a health hazard. There is no evidence for this. As our booklet explains, unpasteurised milk has special qualities that are destroyed by pasteurisation. The fight to save 'Green Top' is symbolic. It is a whole, living food whose demise would signal a new level of impoverishment for all of us who treasure real food with real flavour. It would also sound the death knell for the five hundred or so small farmers who still produce Real Milk. The last of their number has already been killed off by corporate interests in the USA and Canada. Do not let it happen here.

The supposed aim of pasteurisation of milk is to prevent risks to public health. Yet this ignores the many benefits of untreated milk and the damaging effects of heat treatment; these are outlined below.

The question is whether these effects are outweighed by the one advantage of pasteurisation, the destruction of disease bacteria. An evaluation of the infections caused by milk is presented here, in an attempt to show that pasteurisation is not the universal solution that it may first appear to be.

THE DETRIMENTAL EFFECTS OF HEAT TREATMENT

Many years ago when pasteurisation was a relatively new phenomenon, dire warnings were made of its harmful effects on the health-giving properties of untreated milk. Pottenger completed his famous cat experiments (1) and concluded that unpasteurised milk was better for health than pasteurised. Studies on rats over several generations showed that haemoglobin counts were higher in the untreated milk-fed rats compared to the pasteurised fed group; hair loss occurred in the pasteurised milk group and after four generations those on pasteurised milk failed to lactate and could be bred no further (2). Even sanatoria made a point of obtaining specially tuberculin-tested untreated milk for their patients.

Mr Nelson- I am not a governemnet educated conformed consumer. I am a highly educated consumer when it comes to my food. I don't just do things because I was raised a certain way. I question and research EVERYTHING!!! I didn't just decide to put my daughter on raw goats milk on a whim. The toxic pool of milk sold in grocery stores is just that: dirty milk cooked full of dead bacteria and toxic manure from mistreated poor cows fed an unnatural diet of grains, hormones, antibiotics and God knows what

else.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nUG-4uUbjbY&feature=related>

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pd488LXsqhs&feature=related>