



McDougall Newsletter

Volume 6 Issue 1



March 2-11

**Join the
McDougall 10-Day
Live-in Program**

You no longer have to
depend upon luck.
Improve your health
forever with
information taught by
John and Mary
McDougall and Staff

**Cooking Classes
Outings
Lectures
and More**

**Call Us:
800-941-7111
www.drmcDougall.com**

**Costa Rica
with the
McDougalls
July 11-18, 2007**

**Sign up today!
(800) 941-7111**

Human Health and Planet Health—Same Solution

An amazingly simple win-win opportunity stares us in the face: a global switch to a plant-food-based diet will solve the diseases of overnutrition and put a big dent in global warming with one U-turn—since the up-to-now insatiable appetite for foodstuffs made from livestock (cows, sheep, pigs, and chickens) are at the root of both disasters.

The human health crisis is pandemic with more than 1.1 billion people overweight and 312 million obese, 197 million have diabetes, and 1 billion have hypertension.¹ One final and fatal result of these three chronic diseases is 18 million people die of heart disease annually.*¹ You would think by now world leaders would have launched serious measures to reverse all this human suffering by attacking the primary cause—eating meat and dairy products.

PAGE 2

Favorite Five My favorite articles found in recent medical journals

- The Food Industry Buys Nutrition Research—Threatening Your Family's Health
- How Long to Take Plavix and Aspirin after a DES (Heart Angioplasty Stent)
- Ear Tubes—Another Money Maker's Benefits Disproved
- Antacids Promote Hip Fractures
- Complications Are Common from Colonoscopy

PAGE 7

Featured Recipes

- Coconut Thai Rice
- Vegetable Orzo
- Barbecue Bean Sloppy Joes
- Crockpot Pizza Potatoes
- Greta's Gingersnaps with a Twist

PAGE 12

Responses to The December 2006 McDougall Newsletter on Global Warming

I have included almost every e-mail and discussion board response from my December 2006 newsletter article on Global Warming received over the past month. Most people were very supportive of my discussion of reducing animal-food consumption and planet survival. Others, you will read, would have rather I would have kept to my usual focus of the newsletter on their personal health and diet.

PAGE 14



John McDougall, MD

Human Health and Planet Health—Same Solution

Our battlefield is against the devastating role animal foods play in human health, global warming, and environmental damage. Those of us who eat a plant-food-based diet understand the problems and solutions. People still eating meat and dairy don't have a clue.

[See the December 2006 McDougall Newsletter for the beginning of this story.](#)

An amazingly simple win-win opportunity stares us in the face: a global switch to a plant-food-based diet will solve the diseases of overnutrition and put a big dent in global warming with one U-turn—since the up-to now insatiable appetite for foodstuffs made from livestock (cows, sheep, pigs, and chickens) are at the root of both disasters.

The human health crisis is pandemic with more than 1.1 billion people overweight and 312 million obese, 197 million have diabetes, and 1 billion have hypertension.¹ One final and fatal result of these three chronic conditions is 18 million people die of heart disease annually.*¹ You would think by now world leaders would have launched serious measures to reverse all this human suffering by attacking the primary cause—eating meat and dairy products.

Mounting levels of sickness march side by side with escalating environmental catastrophes: Extremes of weather are intensifying with droughts and severe flooding, many species of plants and animals are threatened with extinction, diseases are spreading, and crops are failing. Fatalists predict that our only salvation will be a radical reduction in the earth's present population of over 6.5 billion people by nuclear war or a viral pandemic. Let's hope our species is sufficiently advanced to reach less severe answers—like, for one, eating far less meat and dairy.

*All of this sickness fails to reduce population growth because these diseases kill only after the reproductive years—not only are children born, but deadly eating habits are passed on to the next generation.

Our Unique Perspective

The solutions will come from governments, businesses, local groups, and yes, individuals changing behaviors—people wanting to do the right thing. Worldwide, multidisciplinary efforts are being made to reduce the use of fossil fuels (coal, oil, and natural gas), out of control forest fires, and industrial wastes. The war on chronic diseases is being fought with strategies to reduce smoking, alcohol, illicit drugs, environmental chemicals, and infectious diseases (such as HIV). But almost nothing is being done to fix the food. That battlefield has been left to us who have already made the change—and know the enjoyment, practicality, and benefits of eating a low-fat, plant-food-based diet.

Have you ever talked to a cigarette smoker about their addiction? My 83-year old mother has smoked a pack a day throughout her adult life. She does not believe that the health messages on smoking apply to her. When smoking was banned from restaurants she considered the action a personal attack on her liberties. Hotels that ban smoking are off limits for her. In other words, her habit blinds her from truth and responsibility. Fortunately, in our society 79% of people are non-smokers, who understand the importance of curbing this form of pollution. (By the way, in spite of some emphysema, my mother at 83 can run circles around people in their 20s, in part because she has eaten the McDougall diet for nearly 3 decades.)

The matters of eating meat and dairy products are complicated by the fact that only 3% of the population considers themselves vegetarians and most of these people still consume milk, cheese, and eggs.² This leaves you and me, about 1% of the population, who can clearly see the problems created by livestock for the environment—and the obvious solution. As the character played by Nicolas Cage in the film *National Treasure* said, "...if there is something wrong, those who have the ability to take action, have the responsibility to take action."

[Go to this website for a humorous perspective on our planetary responsibilities.](#)

The Real Solution Is Ignored

The 2006 United Nations report, [Livestock's Long Shadow –Environmental Issues and Options](#), concludes "Livestock have a substantial impact on the world's water, land and biodiversity resources and contribute significantly to climate change." Yet a search of this 407 page document reveals only 4 sentences with the word "vegetarian," and each sentence contains no meaningful discussion of this obvious answer. Search for the word "vegan" (a diet without animal foods) and you will find no responses.

Henning Steinfeld, Chief of Food and Agriculture Organization's Livestock Information and Policy Branch, and senior author of the UN livestock report said: "[Livestock are one of the most significant contributors to today's most serious environmental problems. Urgent action is required to remedy the situation...Encouraging the global population to become vegans is not a viable solution, however.](#)" Why not?

The solutions offered by this report are only half measures, such as improvements in grazing, manure, and water management; and a diet for cows, pigs, and sheep that reduces the toxicity of their burps, farts, and feces. Although this report's plans may seem politically correct—offending few people—the recommendations will have little impact on the environment. What are these people thinking?

Greed and Gluttony Are Still Winning

There is three-way, schizophrenic-thinking in the United Nations—one branch is promoting pollution and disease, while two others are fighting against both:

- ✓ The International Finance Corporation, the private equity arm of the World Bank (which is a specialized United Nations agency), is presently in the process of approval of a \$90 million loan to the Brazilian beef exporter Bertin to double production at its [Amazon forest facilities](#).
- ✓ The World Bank also supported the founding works that led to the 2006 UN Report, *Livestock's Long Shadow*.
- ✓ The World Health Organization, a major branch of the United Nations, is also well aware of the burden of human disease caused by livestock, and has concluded that in 2002, the leading chronic diseases caused 29 million deaths worldwide.³

Witness how incorrect information about "meat being necessary for protein" and "milk for calcium" persists even when solid scientific research clearly and consistently states the opposite. How often have you heard "I could never become a vegetarian; they look weak, pale, and sickly?"—and we all know better. Ignorance and greed have created an unprecedented health crisis and catastrophic damage to our environment—and change will not come easily because people don't like being told that their eating habits are destructive. In the background, trillions of dollars are invested in "staying the profitable course."

Yes, There will Be Sacrifice

Have you heard this boast, "I would rather die than give up my meat"? The present-day question is, how many people are there who are so self-centered that they will claim, "I would rather destroy Planet Earth, and the



futures of all of the children who would have ever been born, than give up my beef"? I believe, faced with ominous catastrophe, and fully informed, most of us will decide that one more grilled cheeseburger is not worth suffering a heart attack, or covering half of Florida under six feet of water.

Which would you rather give-up? Your meat and dairy or...

The chance to drive a car anywhere ever again

Taking a trip to visit relatives on an airplane forever

Vacationing anywhere by bus, train, or airplane

Watching television (even football games) ever again

The chance to show your children wildlife in the forest

The opportunity to swim with your children and fish on colorful coral reefs

The good fortune to say, "Gorillas, panda or polar bears are not extinct."

One-third of the world's land mass

The rainforests of South America

Security to live without being invaded by people who have lost their homes to flooding

Living free of constipation? Heart failure? Diabetes? Cancer?

The opportunity to live 10-healthy-years longer (Vegetarian 7th Day Adventists live 10-years longer than the average Californian⁴)

Pleasant body odor (meat stinks)

Is giving up meat all that much of a hardship?

Actions to Be Taken

Some years back when I owned a big black Lincoln Navigator, a man approached my gas guzzling behemoth with a sign reading, "Stop Polluting." I heard the message. Now we all need to start carrying signs that say, "Stop Polluting with Your Meat and Dairy Habit." These words do not have to be on a cardboard placard, but should be in the forefront of your thoughts and be easily formed on your lips. Ultimately, meat- and dairy- eating must become vilified as "dirty, destructive habits," worse than cigarette smoking and public drunkenness—because they are.

**The McDougall
10 Day Live-in
Program
April 13-22, 2007**



*Sign up today and
change your life!*

**Call Us
800-941-7111
www.drmcDougall.com**

Personal Activities to Put on Your Schedule:

- ✓ Forward the December 2006 and January 2007 McDougall newsletters to everyone—friends, family, and politicians.
- ✓ Write and talk to everyone you know. Talk about this subject in church, synagogue, and at any other religious fellowship—these people are like family. Bring this subject up at Rotary, Lions Club, and all other appropriate, and even, inappropriate meetings. Call talk radio shows, and
- ✓ Encourage everyone you know to consume healthy and non-polluting food. Go so far as to inform friends who follow environmentally-polluting weight loss programs, such as Atkins, South Beach, the Zone, Jenny Craig, and Weight Watchers. Even if these diets were effective in the
- ✓ Stop listening to corporate lies. The food industry buys researchers who craft “scientific” reports (advertisements) published in nutrition and medical journals that damage your family’s health. (See the article in this month’s (January 2007) favorite five). [This unethical behavior is equivalent to ExxonMobil Corp. giving \\$16 million to 43 ideological groups between 1998 and 2005 in an effort to mislead the public by discrediting the science behind global warming.](#)
- ✓ Buy locally grown foods. Vote with your shopping dollar for grains, fruits and vegetables—even better buy products that are organic, “rainforest friendly,” sustainable, and family-farmed. Plant
- ✓ Begin cooking and health education classes in your communities, churches, and schools.
- ✓ Keep your focus—We will make a difference.

**The McDougall
Maximum Weight
Loss Program**



**Next 5-day
live in program
May 2-6, 2007**

**Call Us
800-941-7111
www.drmcDougall.com**

Ask Your Government to:

- ✓ Enact pollution, sewage, and/or pesticide taxes on livestock, seafood, and animal-feed busi-
- ✓ Place a direct to consumer "disease tax" on foods: Add a dollar to each pound of beef, chicken, fish, and cheese, and to each gallon of milk. Spend this new revenue for education directed at disease prevention and treatment by using a healthy diet and lifestyle—and for programs that rejuvenate our environment.
- ✓ Stop dishonest advertising from the food, pharmaceutical, and polluting industries.
- ✓ Ban lobbyists and "earmarks" favoring polluting, pharmaceutical, and unhealthy food industries.
- ✓ Provide money for public education on proper human nutrition through TV, radio, newspapers,
- ✓ Serve plant-food centered diets in schools and government institutions, including the military—
- ✓ Stop grain and livestock subsidies, which have helped large agribusiness, not the small farmer,
- ✓ Change government subsidy programs for the poor to encourage consumption of plant foods. Restrict food stamps to healthy items only—no more colas, cheddar cheese, or chuck roast.
- ✓ Enact laws to reduce lands available for use of livestock.
- ✓ Enact laws to preserve our natural resources.
- ✓ Enact tax breaks for those who provide plant foods to consumers.
- ✓ Require hospitals to stop serving the very foods that brought the patients there in the first place. (Not too long ago cigarettes were sold in hospital gift shops—that's finally stopped—today McDonald's sell sickness in hospitals.)
- ✓ Require foods to be properly labeled with health risks. For example, cheese should be sold with this statement: "Warning from the Surgeon General: "This Food is Known to Damage Your Arteries Causing Strokes and Heart Attacks."
- ✓ Add environmental labels to meat and dairy: "Cattle Pollute Lakes, Rivers, and the Ocean."
- ✓ Offer financial incentives for students who choose a "green career," working to improve the en-
- ✓ Promote lifestyle medicine. Offer financial incentives for young doctors to choose general practice based on treatment with a plant-food-based diet, physical activity, and clean habits.
- ✓ Require all drug and surgical treatments to be directly compared—and shown equal or superior—to treatments with a plant-food-based diet and proper lifestyle before being approved for use.

Any changes that can be made in the right direction are worthwhile—like with our personal health, the more we can replace animal foods with plant foods the better off Planet Earth will be—this is not an all or nothing approach.

Shifting the Wealth

Many people believe saving our environment is too difficult and will be too expensive. A report by economist Sir Nicholas Stern suggests that global warming could shrink the global economy by 20%. [But taking](#)

[action now would cost just 1% of global gross domestic product.](#) The financial burdens from diseases of overnutrition threaten the world's largest economies; most notably the USA and countries of Western Europe—even China now has twice as many overweight people as it did in 1991.⁴ In truth, giving up eating animals is a fundamental step necessary to avoid economic collapse from the burdens of disease and environmental disasters.

While appearing on a talk radio show one evening I received a call from a distraught dairy farmer. "Dr. McDougall, you are destroying my family with your claims about the dangers of drinking milk. I have children to feed and to put through school, and you may make that impossible." I told him I was sorry for his predicament, and then asked him, "What if you were a tobacco farmer?—should I not tell people the killing-truth about tobacco so your family prospers?" People in the business of destroying lives and the planet must find new work.

Innovations that result in plant-food-based eating practices will cause new people to rise to power and new fortunes to be made. Many will be displaced: cardiologists, bypass surgeons, oncologists, diabetes specialists can use their doctor skills for fighting malaria and other infectious diseases in Africa. People who now make their living from beef and dairy farms, slaughter houses, and processing plants will find cleaner work in grain- and vegetable-based agriculture. Family farms will return as corporate agribusiness disappears. A few cattle barons may be left destitute, but the rest of us will be much better off economically—enjoying excellent health on a habitable planet.

References:

- 1) [Hossain P, Kavar B, El Nahas M.](#) Obesity and diabetes in the developing world--a growing challenge. *N Engl J Med.* 2007 Jan 18;356(3):213-5.
- 2) Only 3% are vegetarians: (<http://www.vsc.org/1103-How-Many-Veggies.htm>).
- 3) [Yach D, Hawkes C, Gould CL, Hofman KJ.](#) The global burden of chronic diseases: overcoming impediments to prevention and control. *JAMA.* 2004 Jun 2;291(21):2616-22.
- 4) Fraser G. Ten years of life. Is it a matter of chance? *Arch Intern Med* 161:1645-52, 2001.
- 5) [Dobson R.](#) China may have twice as many overweight people as in 1991. *BMJ.* 2007 Jan 27;334(7586):173.

Favorite Five Articles from Recent Medical Journals

The Food Industry Buys Nutrition Research— Threatening Your Family's Health

Relationship between Funding Source and Conclusion among Nutrition-Related Scientific Articles

by Lenard I. Lesser in the open access journal *PLOS Medicine* concluded, "Industry funding of nutrition-related scientific articles may bias conclusions in favor of sponsors' products, with potentially significant implications for public health." The main finding of this study is that scientific articles about commonly consumed beverages funded entirely by industry were approximately four to eight times more likely to be favorable to the financial interests of the sponsors than articles without industry-related funding. Of particular interest, none of the interventional studies with "all industry support" had an unfavorable conclusion.

The authors state further that, "When an industry is the major sponsor of research on its own product, unfavorable effects of that product are less likely to be investigated. The next step down the slope is adjustment of designs. The dosage of the product and the nature of control treatments may be adjusted so as to increase the chance that the study will demonstrate benefits of the product or that adverse effects will not reach statistical significance. Also, unfavorable data may be deemed less relevant and may be left out of the

abstract and the press release, or out of the paper itself. Finally, the whole publication may be cancelled or seriously delayed when the outcome is disappointing to the sponsor."

This study reviewed articles about soft drinks, juice, and milk published between January 1, 1999 and December 31, 2003.

Ways That Industry May Influence Outcomes of Studies

- 1) Fund only those studies that they believe will present their products in a favorable light, or their competitors' products in an unfavorable light.
- 2) Formulate hypotheses, design studies, or analyze data in ways that are consistent with the financial interests of their industrial sponsors.
- 3) Choose to delay or not publish findings that have negative implications to the sponsor's product. Researchers sign contracts that allow the sponsor to veto publication.
- 4) Search and interpret the literature selectively, in ways consistent with the sponsor's interests.
- 5) Scientific reviews arising from industry-supported scientific symposia, often published as journal supplements, may over- or under-represent certain viewpoints. Presenters whose opinions conflict with the sponsor's financial interests are not invited to participate.

Comment:

When I read a scientific study in a medical journal, I first look for the source of funding. This nugget of information foretells what I am likely to read in the article and why the researchers have reached their conclusions. Contamination of the research is so great that I trust no paper published with industry funds—such as from food, pharmaceutical, testing, or device industries. When the funding sources are not clearly identified in a suspicious paper, I will look at other papers written by the authors to see if they have worked for an industry favored by the article in the past.

Anyone serious about knowing the truth about human nutrition and working from a solid foundation of knowledge needs to read the basic research on protein, fat, carbohydrates, oils, milk and meat that was performed from the late 1800s to the 1970s; at a time when researchers did not have their hands in the pocket-books of big business. Much of this research is cited in my first 2 books: *The McDougall Plan* and *McDougall's Medicine—A Challenging Second Opinion*. Both can be purchased in our store as downloadable e-books.

Research on medications, tests, and surgical treatments published since the early 1970s is so contaminated by money that I do not know the true benefits and risks of the treatments I am asked to prescribe. Even under these compromised circumstances, I have to make the best decisions possible for my patients. When tests and treatments seem indicated, I choose the ones with the greatest safety and efficacy record; which are also the simplest and least expensive. In the case of medications this usually means older and generic drugs. My [November 2004](#) newsletter discusses the few medications I commonly prescribe.

Lesser LI, Ebbeling CB, Goozner M, Wypij D, Ludwig DS. [Relationship between Funding Source and Conclusion among Nutrition-Related Scientific Articles](#). *PLoS Medicine* Vol. 4, No. 1, e5
doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0040005

How Long to Take Plavix and Aspirin after a DES (Heart Angioplasty Stent)

Clopidogrel use and long-term clinical outcomes after drug-eluting stent implantation by Eric L. Eisenstein published in the January 10, 2007 issue of the *Journal of the American Medical Association* found, "The extended use of clopidogrel (Plavix) in patients with DES (drug eluting stent) may be associated with a reduced risk for death (by 3.3%) and death or MI (by 4.5%) (at 24 months). However, the appropriate duration for clopidogrel administration can only be determined within the context of a large-scale randomized clinical trial."¹ Of the 1501 patients in one group evaluated over the study period of almost 5 ½ years, "...14 patients receiving drug-eluting stents died or had a nonfatal MI, and none of these 14 patients was in the drug-eluting stent with clopidogrel group."¹

An accompanying editorial pointed out that, "For patients without contraindication, clopidogrel therapy should be continued through at least 1 year and possibly indefinitely until the time course of vulnerability for stent thrombosis in patients treated with drug-eluting stents is better defined."²

Comment: I see many patients who have had these drug-eluting stents (DES) placed in their heart arteries and are very worried about dying from a complication of very late stent thrombosis (blood clot formation closing down the artery). This often fatal complication occurs 9 to 12 months after surgery in about 0.5% of patients with DES—and can occur as late as 3 to 4 years after surgery. My patients want to know what to do. Based on this research my best recommendation at this time is to take the Plavix and aspirin as prescribed, indefinitely. This treatment is not without risk "...bleeding events requiring transfusion were observed in 2.1% of patients followed up for a similar duration (approximately 2 years) to that of the current study."²

The reason DES may have this complication is the cancer chemotherapy drugs imbedded in the stent prevent healing after the surgery—stopping the cells of the artery lining from covering up the stent. The exposed stent is highly reactive and causes the blood to suddenly and tragically clot.

If you are at risk of having heart surgery (angioplasty) then you need to become fully informed quickly—[read my Hot Topics](#) section from my home page on heart disease. I have discussed angioplasty therapy in detail in my [September 2006 newsletter](#).

1) [Eisenstein EL, Anstrom KJ, Kong DF, Shaw LK, Tuttle RH, Mark DB, Kramer JM, Harrington RA, Matchar DB, Kandzari DE, Peterson ED, Schulman KA, Califf RM.](#) Clopidogrel use and long-term clinical outcomes after drug-eluting stent implantation. *JAMA*. 2007 Jan 10;297(2):159-68.

2) [Kereiakes DJ.](#) Does clopidogrel each day keep stent thrombosis away? *JAMA*. 2007 Jan 10;297(2):209-11.

Ear Tubes—Another Money Maker's Benefits Disproved

Tympanostomy Tubes and Developmental Outcomes at 9 to 11 Years of Age by Jack L. Paradise in the January 18, 2006 *New England Journal of Medicine* found that, "In otherwise healthy young children who have persistent middle-ear effusion, as defined in our study, prompt insertion of tympanostomy tubes does not improve developmental outcomes up to 9 to 11 years of age."

Comment: My young son, Patrick, at age 5 developed chronic fluid accumulation in his inner ears—most likely from abundant molds growing in the moist Hawaiian climate where we lived. The doctor I took him to 25 years ago recommended the placement of tubes in both ears to drain this fluid. He threatened me with his prediction that Patrick would lose his hearing and could become developmentally impaired with future speech, language, mental, and social difficulties. I went to the medical library and discovered this was not true and that there were great risks from the surgery. He had no ear surgery and today he is a doctor (PhD) of organic chemistry and working at Stanford University in Palo Alto, California. Few parents stand a chance

of defending their children against unnecessary surgery; especially when their doctors threaten permanent brain damage of their child if they refuse the ear tubes.

The placement of tympanoplasty tubes, also known as ventilation tubes, is one of the most common procedures performed on children. These tubes, open at both ends, are inserted into incisions made in the eardrums during a surgical procedure (myringotomy). They are left in place until they fall out by themselves or until removed by the doctor. Common complications include: chronically draining ears, infection, and hearing loss.

The condition that is usually being treated is chronic otitis media (an inflammation of the middle ear) and is accompanied by an accumulation of fluid in the inner ear (behind the eardrum). The cause of this inflammation with fluid is usually allergy to substances present in the air and the food. Dairy proteins are the most common cause of food allergy and this condition.^{2,3} A change in diet is often all that is needed to stop the inflammation and reverse the fluid accumulation.

If a change in diet does not stop the fluid and hearing loss becomes a problem, then the inner ears can be ventilated by using a bulb syringe, called a Politzer device. Air is blown through the nose into the eustachian tubes which temporarily opens the inner ear and drains the fluid. Hearing returns in 90% of cases.⁴ This simple cost-free treatment is done at home by the child or the parents. We used the Politzer device on our son with great success.

- 1) Paradise J, Feldman H, Campbell T, Dollaghan C, Rockette H, Pitcairn D, Smith C, Colborn K et al. Tympanostomy Tubes and Developmental Outcomes at 9 to 11 Years of Age. *N Engl J Med* 2007;356:248-61.
- 2) [Bernstein JM](#). The role of IgE-mediated hypersensitivity in the development of otitis media with effusion. *Otolaryngol Clin North Am*. 1992 Feb;25(1):197-211.
- 3) [Juntti H, Tikkanen S, Kokkonen J, Alho OP, Niinimäki A](#). Cow's milk allergy is associated with recurrent otitis media during childhood. *Acta Otolaryngol*. 1999;119(8):867-73.
- 4) [Silman S, Arick DS, Emmer MB](#). Nonsurgical home treatment of middle ear effusion and associated hearing loss in children. Part II: Validation study. *Ear Nose Throat J*. 2005 Oct;84(10):646, 648, 650

Antacids Promote Hip Fractures

Long-term proton pump inhibitor therapy and risk of hip fracture by Yu-Xiao Yang published in the December 29, 2006 *Journal of the American Medical Association* found "Long term PPI therapy, particularly at high doses, is associated with an increased risk of hip fracture." (PPI, or proton pump inhibitors, are powerful inhibitors of stomach acid production.) The authors hypothesized that this increased hip fracture risk may be due to calcium malabsorption caused by the drug or by inhibition of bone cell activity.

This study compared 13,556 people with hip fractures to a control group of people. People taking PPI antacids for more than one year had almost twice the risk of hip fracture. Higher doses and longer use increased the risk of hip fractures. The authors suggested doctors prescribe the lowest effective doses to patients with appropriate indications.

Comment: Doctors prescribe PPIs to treat people with heartburn, GERD (acid reflux disease), ulcers of the stomach or intestine, or a condition of relentless stomach acid overproduction, known as Zollinger-Ellison Syndrome. Common examples of these medications are Prilosec, Nexium, Prevacid, Aciphex, and Protonix.

Protein, especially animal protein, in foods is a powerful stimulant for acid overproduction.² Therefore, not surprisingly, indigestion is a very common problem for people eating the Western diet—just walk down the aisles of your local drugstore and see the multitude of intestinal remedies for sale. This same animal protein is also the primary cause of bone loss, leading to osteoporosis, and to hip fractures.^{3,4} Therefore, it is likely that the association between PPI use and hip fractures has a common link to diet—in other words, people who eat a lot of animal protein develop osteoporosis and also have lots of indigestion, which leads to antacid

use.

The solution to both problems is to eat an alkaline diet—one consisting of fruits and vegetables. I must add a few precautions. Grains and legumes are slightly acidic and may need to be minimized in the diet of people who have any tendency towards osteoporosis—however, these foods do not usually cause any stomach upset. Indigestion is aggravated by raw vegetables, especially onions, green peppers, cucumbers, and radishes. Fruit juices (but not the whole fruits) commonly cause severe stomach burning, and so do spicy foods. Beer and wine (but not distilled spirits) contain acids that cause indigestion. Just by changing their diets almost all of our patients throw away their antacids the first day. Additional benefit comes from raising the head of the bed 4 to 6 inches in order for gravity to pull the acid out of the esophagus and back into the stomach at night. Wafer antacids (like TUMS) are a better choice. They relieve acid indigestion and their alkaline makeup actually helps the bones maintain their strength by neutralizing very powerful dietary acids from hard cheeses, meat, poultry, eggs, fish, and shellfish. For more information see the new book, [Dr. McDougall's Digestive Tune-up](#).

1) [Yang YX, Lewis JD, Epstein S, Metz DC](#). Long-term proton pump inhibitor therapy and risk of hip fracture. *JAMA*. 2006 Dec 27;296(24):2947-53.

2) [McArthur KE, Walsh JH, Richardson CT](#). Soy protein meals stimulate less gastric acid secretion and gastrin release than beef meals. *Gastroenterology*. 1988 Oct;95(4):920-6.

3) Maurer M. Neutralization of Western diet inhibits bone resorption independently of K intake and reduces cortisol secretion in humans. *Am J Physiol Renal Physiol*. 2003 Jan;284(1):F32-40.

4) Remer T. Influence of diet on acid-base balance. *Semin Dial*. 2000 Jul-Aug;13(4):221-6.

Complications Are Common from Colonoscopy

Complications of colonoscopy in an integrated health care delivery system by Theodore B. Levin published in the December 19, 2006 issue of the *Annals of Internal Medicine* found, "...that perforations occurred nearly once in every 1000 colonoscopies and that serious complications occur in 5 of every 1000. Removal of polyps through biopsy with a snare or forceps increases the risk for a serious complication nearly 9-fold compared with colonoscopy without biopsy. Postpolypectomy bleeding was the most common complication."

The study of 16,318 Kaiser patients who were over the age of 40 years at the time of testing found:

- ✓ Eighty-two serious complications occurred.
- ✓ Serious complications occurred in 0.8 per 1000 colonoscopies without biopsy or polypectomy.
- ✓ Serious complications occurred in 7.0 per 1000 colonoscopies with biopsy or polypectomy.
- ✓ Perforations occurred in 0.9 per 1000 colonoscopies.
- ✓ Postbiopsy or postpolypectomy bleeding occurred in 4.8 per 1000 colonoscopies with biopsy.
- ✓ Biopsy or polypectomy was associated with an increased risk for any serious complications.
- ✓ Ten deaths (1 attributable to colonoscopy) occurred within 30 days of the colonoscopy.

Comment: Colonoscopy is a test performed by specialty-trained gastrointestinal doctors and used to look at the interior lining of the colon (large intestine). A thin, flexible 4 to 6 foot-long viewing instrument, called a colonoscope is used to detect ulcer, polyps, cancers and areas of inflammation or bleeding. During the procedure tissue samples can be collected (biopsy) and polyps can be removed. Colonoscopy is the most common test recommended for screening for colon cancer. Intervenuous sedation is usually given. Patients are

often told that the risks from the procedure are very few and minor, and that the benefits far out-weigh the risks. This study shows that in real-life medical practice (such as at Kaiser) the complications are not so uncommon and can be very serious.

The alternatives are a barium enema and sigmoid exam or a virtual colonoscopy when necessary to evaluate problems of the lower intestine and to look for precancerous polyps (screening). Don't overlook the fact that almost all problems of the intestines are caused by the foods you put in it and most of these disorders are quickly solved with a change to the McDougall Diet. For more information see the new book, [Dr. McDougall's Digestive Tune-up](#).

[Levin TR, Zhao W, Conell C, Seeff LC, Manninen DL, Shapiro JA, Schulman J.](#) Complications of colonoscopy in an integrated health care delivery system. *Ann Intern Med.* 2006 Dec 19;145(12):880-6.

Featured Recipes

Coconut Thai Rice

This is a delicious variation on the Thai Green Curry Rice from last month's newsletter.

Print out the recipe from last month and make these substitutions.

In place of the ½ cup soy sauce, use only 1 tablespoon. Mix 1 ½ teaspoons of coconut extract into 1 ½ cups rice or almond milk, and stir this into the vegetable mixture. Use cooked Thai purple rice in place of the cooked brown rice. All other ingredients remain the same.

Coconut extract in rice or almond milk makes a wonderful substitution for coconut milk in recipes.

Vegetable Orzo

Contributed by Mika Thieme, Dublin, OH

Mika is the girlfriend of our youngest son, Craig. They spent the holiday season with us in Santa Rosa and they prepared this delicious, slightly curried, dish for us one evening. We loved it and are sure you will too.

Preparation Time: 15 minutes

Cooking Time: 15 minutes

Servings: 2-4

¼ cup water
1-2 zucchini, diced
1 carrot, grated
2 shallots, diced
3 cups vegetable broth
1 cup orzo
pinch of curry powder
pinch of salt
several twists of freshly ground pepper
¼ cup soy parmesan cheese

Place the water in a large non-stick frying pan. Add the zucchini, carrot and shallots. Cook, stirring occasionally until softened, about 4-5 minutes. Add the vegetable broth and bring to a boil. Stir in the orzo and curry powder. Cook until orzo is tender, about 5-6 minutes. Stir in the salt, pepper and soy parme-

san. Cook for another minute and serve hot.

Hint: One of the best tasting soy parmesan cheese substitutes on the market is made by The Vegetarian Express. It is called Parma Zaan Sprinkles. Go to thevegetarianexpress.com or call 734-355-3593 for more information.

Barbecue Bean Sloppy Joes

I got this recipe from my sister, Carol Van Elderen, who lives in Michigan. She found it on a supermarket card and modified it slightly. Maybe this is a sign that people are changing the kinds of foods that they eat. This is great on a bun with all the usual trimmings, or try it ladled over the bun and eat it with a fork.

Preparation Time: 10 minutes (need cooked rice)

Cooking time: 15 minutes

Servings: 6-8

1 onion, chopped
1 bell pepper, chopped
¼ cup vegetable broth
3 cups cooked brown rice
2 15 ounce cans pinto beans, undrained
¾ cup fat-free barbecue sauce
1 ½ tablespoons chili powder
whole wheat buns

Place the onion and bell pepper in a non-stick pan with the vegetable broth. Cook, stirring occasionally until vegetables soften slightly, about 3 minutes. Add remaining ingredients (except the buns) and cook for about 12 minutes, until well heated.

Hints: There are many delicious barbecue sauces on the market shelves these days. Choose one without oil and preferably without high fructose corn syrup. Use another kind of bean to vary the recipe, or maybe one can each of pinto and black or white. There are several manufacturers that make frozen cooked whole grain brown rice that reheats in the microwave in 3 minutes. Trader Joe's stocks one brand and Whole Foods also carries another brand. Look for these items in the frozen food department.

Crockpot Pizza Potatoes

Contributed by Sandie, Salt Lake City, UT

I saw this recipe on our bulletin board a couple of months ago and it sounded so interesting that I had to try it. We have made it several times in the past few months and enjoyed it very much. It is very easy to make and it cooks in the crockpot so it is easy to cook too!

Preparation Time: 20 minutes

Cooking Time: 6-8 hours on LOW

Servings: 6-8

4 cups thinly sliced potatoes (use a Mandolin for best results)
2-3 cups of pizza toppings
 sliced onion
 sliced mushrooms
 sliced bell peppers
 sliced tomatoes
 sliced water-packed artichoke hearts
 sliced black olives
 fresh spinach
2 15 ounce cans fat-free pizza sauce or Marinara sauce
¼ cup water

Mix the water into the sauce and set aside.

Place 2 cups of the potatoes in the bottom of the crockpot. Layer all of the toppings that you choose to include over the potatoes. Cover with half of the sauce. Layer on the remaining 2 cups of potatoes and finish with the sauce. Cover and cook on low for 6-8 hours.

Greta's Gingersnaps with a Twist

Contributed by Greta Weingast, Silverdale, WA

In a medium bowl sift:

2 cups whole wheat pastry flour
1 teaspoon ginger (ground)
1 teaspoon cloves (ground)
1 teaspoon cinnamon (ground)
1/2 teaspoon salt
2 teaspoons baking soda

In a large bowl mix:

1/4 cup + 2 tablespoons Wonderslim Fat & Egg Substitute
1 cup Sucanat
1 1/2 tablespoons water
1/4 cup molasses (Grandma's is my favorite!)

Add the dry ingredients to the wet and mix thoroughly. Chill the dough before handling further.

Pre-heat oven to 350 degrees and line cookie sheet with parchment paper or use a non stick pan.

Roll dough into small (1") balls (a melon baller works good!)

Sprinkle some sugar or Sucanat on a plate and roll the balls in it. Place 2 inches apart on the prepared cookie sheet and bake at 350 for about 10 minutes (cookies will puff and then collapse). Let rest for a minute or 2 and remove to a cooling rack.

Makes about 3 doz.

Note from Greta: This recipe originally came from Marge Solomon via Marshall Soltz and I have modified it to be McDougall.

Responses to The December 2006 McDougall Newsletter on Global Warming

I have included almost every e-mail and discussion board response from my December 2006 newsletter article on Global Warming received over the past month. Most people were very supportive of my discussion of reducing animal-food consumption and planet survival. Others, you will read, would have rather I would have kept to my usual focus of the newsletter on their personal health and diet. Since there were only a few of these more critical opinions, I have mixed them up in the beginning—I believe it is important to know what those who disagree are thinking. At the end I placed a mildly confrontational dialog.

Hi John,

I read all your newsletters. I just read December- incredible job. You know I am a school assembly performer. 2 years ago my assembly program was on the rainforests of the world- "the lungs of the earth". (Completed 250 programs) This last Sept-Dec I completed another 127 rainforest programs for a different company in a different region- the central U.S. Just to let you know I'm right there with you, and with all the people who are aware that animal foods are harmful to both human and planet health, not to mention

the misery of factory farmed animals.

I, like you try to spread the message that what you eat DOES affect the earth. Keep up your great work. If there's anything I can do for you.

Greg

Until your December 2006 your newsletters have been great, BUT you crossed the line with this issue. We're not interested in your opinion about global warming, and we're much less interested in Al Gore's. Stick to what you do best. You have strayed and will rue this day if you stick with this fruitless course.

Very disappointed,
Bob & Maxine

Dear Dr. McDougall,

I want to say how much I appreciate the December newsletter and the fact that you are taking action to raise awareness about this critical issue.

These are some of the ideas I've had related to diet and the earth:

First and foremost, we can eat a plant-based diet all or most of the time. We can recycle, reduce driving vehicles, use public transportation and bicycles, drive hybrid or biodesil vehicles, lower our thermostats and turn off electricity when not in use, and use more solar options in our homes and businesses.

We can forward information such as your newsletter and other documents related to the issues.

We can speak out at our churches, synagogues, and our community centers. At the church I attend, I've already spoken to two people about developing ways to share information about the impact of dietary choices as part of a ministry of stewardship of the earth.

We can talk to people at every opportunity, never underestimating the power of the "grapevine" and of the difference each person can make (Margaret Mead).

We can contact public officials and newspapers.

We can support vegetarian/vegan organizations and publications, such as EarthSave and the bimonthly publication VegNews, just to name two examples.

We can organize vegetarian events in our communities. Earth Day, which is observed in March each year, is a good time to begin this. Standing on street corners and distributing information to passers by is another possibility.

We can speak to the administrators and PTAs of our children's schools to support curriculum and school lunch programs that incorporate plant-based meals based on programs like Dr. Antonia Dumas' food curriculum.

If vegetarianism is key to reducing global warming, then a grassroots movement to spread the word about the significance of our food choices is the most direct means of effecting change. If we wait for politicians and food or agricultural industries to change, global warming will overtake us; it will be too late. Howard Lyman is a great example of someone who understood the facts and then changed his diet and life, from cattle rancher to vegan activist. His is an example for all of us to follow. Yours is as well. Thank you Dr. McDougall for all you've accomplished, all you've shared, and all you continue to do in your work as a true physician.

Best Regards,

Kathryn

There is no need for the ridiculous global warming articles on your website. Next you'll be telling us we came from monkeys. Stick to the basics of health and if you'd like to read some good information on the "myth" of global warming, read the magazine-- 'New American'.

katie h

Hi SB!

I like your idea for a forum topic addressing Global Warming. You just never know what it will take to finally have something click for someone, to give them just that one little extra incentive to really make a commitment to a plant based diet. I have been moving in this direction for 22 years, with slips along the way. Each year the slips get smaller, but I still found myself rationalizing when I wanted to go off program for whatever reason. Long ago I read John Robbins "Diet For a New America" and Frances Moore Lappe's "Diet For a Small Planet", so for years I've known about the connection to raising livestock and depletion of our precious natural resources. But for some reason, when I read Dr. McDougall's article in the December 2006 Newsletter, I was really moved, more so than I ever have been, about the importance of a plant based diet to the future of our planet. Maybe it was finally the culmination of 22 years of exposure to the information; Al Gore's movie (despite the lack of discussion on how a vegan diet could help reduce global warming); the increase of coverage in the media on Global Warming. Whatever it was, I am so committed to this way of eating now that I have totally lost my desire and cravings for anything even remotely related to coming from an animal. I guess I am a hard case - 22 years, for heaven's sake! I have become more vocal about this topic with others (while always trying to remain non-preachy, and to stay off the soap-box).

I really like the idea of a forum on this topic - I hope others will agree!

Becky (BB)

The recent FAO report on livestock says that 18% of human-caused (anthropogenic) greenhouse gases (GHGs) can be attributed to the raising, processing, and transportation of livestock and their products. To many people, this is probably a surprisingly high number. However, higher numbers have been published, for example in an article by Alan Calverd in "Physics World," which estimates that 23% of anthropogenic GHGs are attributable simply to physiologic processes of animals raised for food -- i.e., not including processing and transportation.

Calverd's article goes further, pointing out that if we allow the possibility that plant-based foods could replace animal-based ones, then we realize that the huge amount of land dedicated to grazing livestock and growing crops to feed them could be used instead for growing crops to be converted to fuel. Such fuel could replace most or all usage of coal, which generates a huge additional amount of GHGs, probably somewhere between 12-17% of anthropogenic GHGs.

As for the percentage of anthropogenic GHGs deriving from transportation and processing related to livestock: It's considerable. We have to count the energy used for transporting the live animals and refrigerating and transporting the end-products, but also transporting the crops used to feed the animals. Much of this transportation uses the most polluting, least efficient forms of energy, such as diesel in the internal combustion engines of the barges used to transport feed.

In addition, meat must be cooked at higher heat and for much longer than plant-based equivalent foods, such as veggie burgers, which can be microwaved rather than grilled. There's a lot of indirect energy needed to pump and pipe the vast amounts of water needed to produce meat, and more energy needed for both the water and electricity to provide the extra dishwashing to clean animal fats and charred material from pans and plates and ovens, and also for the extra cleaning needed for sanitizing areas used for prepping meat. More energy is needed for the frequent radiation of meat these days for safety purposes.

Another indirect use of energy is in the processing of the vast number of human diseases resulting from the consumption of animal products. The medical systems used in such treatment, such as x-rays and surgery, are highly energy-intensive.

It's hard to estimate the GHGs deriving from all those processes under the heading of "transportation and processing," but as a conservative guesstimate, let's say it's between 7-10% of all anthropogenic GHGs.

Adding the numbers above, it turns out that the total amount of GHGs that could be averted by substituting plant-based foods for animal-based ones is more on the order 40-50% than the 18% (under)counted by FAO.

Why would FAO undercount the number? And why does FAO make no recommendation for reducing production/consumption of livestock products? The answer might be in the list of authors, among which are veteran livestock promoters. Those authors have previously published documents claiming that meat is needed to improve childhood malnutrition in developing countries -- which goes against the opinion of most mainstream nutritional experts -- and you can see they repeat that claim in this new report.

One or more of those FAO authors have worked at the World Bank, which like the FAO is a specialized agency of the United Nations. Interesting, in 2001, the World Bank published a strategy document saying that large-scale livestock production was to be avoided, on environmental grounds, and for fairness toward small scale mixed farmers.

However, the World Bank's private sector arm, the International Finance Corporation (IFC) -- although it too is a UN specialized agency -- never considered itself bound by that strategy document, and has continued to finance large-scale livestock production. In 2005, IFC actually proposed financing a project to expand beef production in the Amazon. The Sierra Club and others protested -- you can read about this at <http://www.brettonwoodsproject.org/article.shtml?cmd%5B126%5D=x-126-107739> -- and the project was suspended. However, that project is now moving forward again. Some protesting has started again; you can read about this at <http://www.amazonia.org.br/english/noticias/noticia.cfm?id=228107>. Stay tuned!

A member of the Sierra Club

Dr D

Your program is based on your study of science. It worries me when you link your worthy program to Global Warming, before that science has been submitted to scrutiny. Even the pro-GW potential LA Times has stories about historical anomalies in temperature rises in the past. Had to let my crew go home early today here in LA due to ice on our equipment at noon time?.....just hate those anomalies like radiation spikes thru our ozone layer in the early 1930's Keep up the good work.

Carl

We were approached by some "environmentalists" as we left Whole Foods this morning, and I was able to share some thoughts from "Global Warming Strategy" by Noam Mohr. Good timing!

Edezell

John,

I always appreciate the effort you must make to put your newsletter together. Thank you. Global Warming, who among us would not have to say that it is something that must be continually watched. However, while I am not a student of such, there seems to still be two major and creditable sides to the issue.

I know that there have been articles from not too long ago that even referred to just the opposite happening - global cooling. And, politics aside, I so very strongly feel that Al Gore is a nut, and, should global warming be even most accurate, he is possibly the poorest leader that could be out front.

Now to our animals and the negative effect they have on us all - both in our body and in the field, I strongly agree with your position, and appreciate your calling it to our attention.

blessings, bob

I am proud of you, Dr. McDougall. I always laughed at your joke about not being a vegetarian (since you eat turkey every other year at Thanksgiving) and forgave you for that, since we agree on the important truth that eating meat and dairy is bad for humans, but now I am proud, so proud, that your message is going beyond what is personally good to what is universally good.

Thank you so much.

Darla

Thank you for writing about this very important issue. Not a day goes by that I don't think about global warming. Eminent British scientist James Lovelock says the trees and plants of North America will melt away in 50 short years. I'm trying to stay positive and act and inform my community of the consequences of our action. Take care and thank you for your life-altering work.

Annette

Thank you for bringing up the animal issue as part of the global warming problem. I haven't seen the film yet, but a vegan friend told me that she was really sorry that Gore had not discussed it.

My one concern is that you may lose some people by your comments about Gore's physical appearance (those of us who are already vegans don't need convincing!). Such attacks tend to make people feel defensive and I'd really hate to see that happen. This animal issue stands on its own and is extremely important. I hope you might consider removing this from your website:

To explain the second source of his blindness to livestock's role in global warming, I offer one of my personal quotes, "People love to hear good news about their bad habits." With no intention to offend, I must point out that Al Gore's physical appearance reflects overindulgence in the Western diet-filled with meat, chicken, seafood, milk, and cheese. To speak plainly, he cannot see over his own dinner plate.

And possibly even remove the discussion about Gore's financial connections. My reason? One, so that people don't turn on what you say because it angers them. Two, it would be wonderful to get Gore's support on plant based consumption, and if cornered, that might not happen.

Just a thought. Since I support what you do to help people, I wanted to toss this feedback your way. Thanks again for writing about this topic.

Karen

Thank you so much for this month's addition to the Newsletter on this important subject. I did call Gore's office and left a respectful message. As well as thanking him for his courage, I suggested, "...in your sequel (An Inconvenient Truth and how we are doing'), that you be just as courageous as you were and bring out this "Giant step for mankind", the poisoning of the planet of over-breeding livestock. I am forwarding the letter to all.

I so appreciate your work. God Bless you!

Paris

John - Thanks for your VERY IMPORTANT newsletter. We in the Sustainability Council are emphasizing locally-grown, plant-based diets as a central part of our program for local sustainability.

I know you are entirely aware of this but the following point needs to be emphasized as a way to motivate people to switch to a vegetarian diet. A plant-based diet would pay enormous economic benefits in terms of reduced health care costs, both at the individual level and at the national level. We spend an obscene amount of money on a health care system that is providing little more than symptomatic relief for our self-indulgent diets and leaving us only 37th in the world in health care delivery, behind Cuba and countries in Eastern Europe. The money we saved on health care would go a long way toward mitigating the environmental damage mentioned in the UN report as the result of the livestock industry. Imagine what we could do about global poverty and malnutrition by cutting in half our military expenditures at the same time!! Zowie!!

Don

In the movie there is a very moving part where Gore describes his family's tobacco growing heritage and how his father stopped growing tobacco only after smoking had killed his daughter (Al Gore's younger sister). It was his father's 'Amazing Grace' moment, I thought.

Well, I think Al Gore needs an Amazing Grace moment here himself. Thank you Dr. McDougall, for pointing this out and being bold enough to push this. This needs to be aired in the public forum, somehow.

~~You know, I don't think Americans as a whole will go for the idea of becoming vegetarians, at least not the majority.~~ BUT, if cutting our meat consumption in half will make the difference I think that is a very reasonable argument to put forward. Will people reduce their meat consumption if they see the connection to the survival of the planet? For beef producers (farms/ranchers) I think you could argue that consumers reducing meat consumption might actually improve prices and help the small family farmer vs. the corporations. So, I don't think this is an impossible discussion to have.

Anna S

Dr. McDougall,

The whole human population of the world going vegan will not save us without enforcing a population reduction policy as well (ie. a one child per woman policy). Gaia will reduce our population for us because we are incapable of doing so voluntarily.

<http://www.mnforsustain.org/energy%20punctuation%20marks%20morrison.htm>

Paul

Dr. McDougall:

I just can't believe that someone like you can be so successful in his quest for truth when it comes to health and nutrition and fall short when it comes to global warming.

Global warming is a political issue led by devious people like Al Gore and the UN for the purposes of acquiring power and destroying corporate America.....in that order. Do you honestly think that Al Gore is going to quit eating meat cause he thinks he's contributing to the earth's demise? I think not.

In case you think that bad science/scientists are just in the medical field, I've copied (above) some FACTS for you to ponder regarding Global Warming and mans role in it. I don't think the good Lord would want man to have the power to destroy the earth till He was ready. In short, the world has been here for billions of years, according to some, and I don't think the evil Americans can bring her to her knees in 2 or 3

If we want people to be healthy.....example is the way. We can't force people to change to our way of life.

Respectfully,

Dick

<http://www.junkscience.com/Greenhouse/>

This resource is a site by Steven Milroy:

Steven J. Milloy is a columnist for [Fox News](#) and a paid advocate for [Phillip Morris](#), [ExxonMobil](#) and other corporations. From the 1990s until the end of 2005, he was an adjunct scholar at the libertarian [think tank](#) the [Cato Institute](#). http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=Steve_Milloy

WOW! FANTASTIC NEWSLETTER ARTICLES on global warming!

We watched Al Gore's "Inconvenient Truth" just two nights ago! We were speechless for a few minutes after it was over! Then I asked out loud, "Did I miss something or did he NOT mention the problems caused by raising livestock?" --- It is almost like you HEARD me and answered my question!!! Thank you!

Dr. McDougall, I PROMISE you that this little 89-pound, vegan, solar cooking, very energy saving McDougall-ler who uses NO AC in the summer and just enough heat to keep from freezing to death during the winter WILL do ALL SHE CAN to inform others of how consuming LESS livestock can save our plant -- OUR HOME --

that little dot in the vast universe!

I am only ONE person, but if many other McDougallers join in (as I am SURE they will -- after reading your article), I am optimistic that ALL of us can have a positive effect.

I am getting ready to go back to your article so I can contact AL GORE's office -- just like you suggested!

Thanks, again! YOU ROCK!!!

SB (BB)

Bravo on the December Newsletter! This is one of the most succinct and clear explanations about the live-stock link to global warming I've read! It will be going out to many of my friends, especially those who own hybrid cars, use fluorescent bulbs, and buy green electricity while pouring money into the livestock industry with their diet.

If we want our children and grandchildren to be healthy, they not only need to be fed well now, but they need clean water and air thirty years from now.

How wonderful that a healthy human and a healthy Earth need exactly the same things!

Thank you, Dr. McDougall, for stepping up to the plate on this issue. What a lovely positive boost for starting the new year with better habits.

Anne (BB)

Hi Anne,

I couldn't agree more!!! I just finished reading it and I am getting ready to forward to all my family members, friends, co-workers, anyone I can think of! I also intend to contact Al Gore's office, per Dr. McD's suggestion. Every once in a while I get discouraged and have little slips and wonder if it is really worth while going against the tide all the time. Well, I think it is really time to turn the tide!

Dr. McDougall, you really inspired me, and helped strengthen my resolve, thank-you!

Becky (BB)

I think the US government and it's politicians are at the root of too many problems. Congress either lies or masks the truth in order to get support and votes.

Although the vegan diet for health movement is growing, I believe most people will continue to eat the SAD diet until the government exposes the truth about the relationship between health and lifestyle. Similarly, the public will never believe the truth about global warming until the government and politicians expose it. Pressure for what's right will bubble up from the public; but first the public must be given the entire truth. Armed with print-outs (ouch for the ink supply) of your web site's global warming articles, we're off to watch the Rose Bowl with friends. :-) Thank you VERY much for this information. Happy New Year,

Jill

Dear Dr. McDougall,

This is in regard to your desire to see the planet saved. There's no doubt that the planet needs saving. I don't know if you are a religious man. But if you are, and if you use the Bible as your measure of important truths, you may know that the Creator is very much alive and already has his purpose and manner to save the planet. Neither is he delaying. The time that is passing by is serving the purpose of allowing mankind to see what disastrous results can occur from his rejection of Jehovah God's universal sovereignty.

From the beginning in the Garden of Eden, man has been rebelling. You've heard the expression, "If you give a person enough rope he will hang himself." Well, man is nearly at the end of his rope. Soon the Creator will declare to nations of the earth, in essence, "You have had enough time to prove that you can successfully manage the earth and its inhabitants. Now because of your stubbornness and pride, I am ridding the earth of you." This Jehovah will do in the war of Armageddon which is God's war against the nations. Humans do not need to engage in this war. It will be totally fought from heaven by God's first-born son, Jesus Christ, together with the obedient angels and the resurrected co-rulers (co-heirs) of the Kingdom.

Meanwhile, the teachable ("meek") from God's standpoint, have noticed man's failure to govern appropriately and are taking their stand in favor of God's incoming government (God's Kingdom for which Jesus taught his followers to pray). These will form the nucleus of a new society inhabiting the earth under God's Kingdom. God's Kingdom will save the earth.

So, if you are a god-fearing man, John, put faith in Jehovah's ability and purpose to save the planet. See yourself, Mary, your children and your grandchildren in a Paradise earth. Global warming and ruination will be a thing of the past. Of course, what we can individually do for the sake of our consciences and perhaps a somewhat healthier and longer life is a plus. But remember too that "Who by being anxious can add a cubit to his lifespan?" In comparison to eternal life (which obedient mankind will eventually be rewarded), a few years longer in our old age is only a "cubit" in God's estimation.

One's duty now is to endure until deliverance arrives. Of course you are doing a good work in sharing your knowledge and understanding with your readers and patients. There is a great need for good physicians and quite a scarcity. If you have had much contact with Kaiser HMO, you know what I mean.

I applaud you for your love for your fellowman and your willingness to do what you can to relieve ailing individuals. We all want to enjoy life without debilitating circumstances. We appreciate all the help we can get. We are accumulating a library of your writings and DVD's, which are making our lives more livable. Your encouragement and optimistic outlook are also appreciated.

Keep up the good work and leave the planet in God's hands. He knows exactly what to do and he will expose all the lies, the hypocrisy and the greed in his due time.

Respectfully, Elsa

Greetings, Dr. McDougall.

I'm writing in response to your request for feedback on meaningful ways to move forward with the global-warming crisis:

Please Help with the Solution: Over the next month, during every spare moment, think about this crisis. (I have been able to think of little else myself recently.) Watch Al Gore's DVD, read the UN report, and Noam Mohr's article in this newsletter. If you have not done so already, stop (or reduce) eating meat, poultry, fish and dairy—ask your family and friends to do the same and tell them why. Mail your thoughts to me at drmcDougall@drmcDougall.com. Next month's (January 2007) newsletter will reflect our collective efforts for meaningful ways to move forward.

I'm an editor working with an author/scientist to publish a remarkable book on alcohol fuel that presents a sustainable, DOABLE, solution to global warming and many, many other social, economic, political, and ecological problems--from a systems perspective that incorporates permaculture farming and considers the health of the entire ecosystem. This author, David Blume, actually wrote this book 25 years ago, and PBS was funding the project along with a 10-part television series on the topic. As the book went to press, with more than 4,000 preorders in hand from PBS viewers, Chevron threatened to pull funding from PBS, and the book sat in a vault all these many years. As you know, the topic is now even more urgent...and we are working hard to get this book out asap.

You may be interested to know that David Blume received a patent in 2006 that has the potential to put a HUGE dent in Monsanto's ability to sell Roundup and Roundup Ready seed...I am so eager to get this information out to the public!

I would love for this author to write a synopsis for you that could pique your interest and that you could pass onto your mailing list. He is doing phenomenal work, and the political forces and disinformation about this topic are as huge as those that obscure the truth about health and nutrition from the mainstream.

As you can imagine, Mr. Blume is "doing the work of saving the world" and has precious little time...so I'd like to tell him something about the size of your mailing list and how many health- and earth- conscious people he could reach by writing to you and getting word out with your assistance.

Would you kindly write back and tell me about the size of your email subscription base and anything else that would help me approach him with this request?

Thank you!

Laurie

Thank you for insightful comments in your December 2006 newsletter regarding global warming and the need to go vegan. I am sure you knew you were "preaching to the choir." Over the past years our efforts to educate our grown children and other family members (all college grads) have been fruitless -- except for my wife's sister-in-law who is a retired librarian. She read "The China Study" and is using your recipes. Her husband is supportive but not a participant.

I have come to the realization that trying to educate others about good nutrition is like trying to tell an alcoholic to stop drinking. We support AA through our local Unitarian Universalist church and have learned from them that nothing works until the individual admits his/her dependence on alcohol and their need to change. I believe this is the same with "meat eaters." They, too, must experience the complete destruction of their health to learn there is a better way to eat to live. And even then some people are deaf and blind to the facts!

Incidentally, I recently read that the growing need for corn for ethanol is starting to create a higher demand for livestock feed! This will be an interesting economic development for sure! And we know the golden rule of economics: "He with the most gold makes the rules." Let me close with a phrase from the 60's : "Keep the faith."

Jim

Hi there,

I just finished your fine article. It doesn't surprise me, though I would be surprised if the UN report generated any meaningful change.

We are mostly vegetarian but do eat meat on occasion. We do NOT eat factory farm meat except on the occasions where we are guests at other people's home and they are serving factory farm meat. Factory farm meat is wrong on every possible level and seriously grosses me out.

My question for you is what about locally raised free range meat? Eating less meat is, of course, a must but what about eating meat that has been raised on grass; has never been pumped full of chemicals; was purchased from a small local farmer with only a small number of animals; has been humanly treated while living; and humanly treated when slaughtered? Does eating animals like these contribute to the problem in any significant sort of way?

Americans will never give up their meat. I doubt they'll even reduce their consumption. I'm very pessimistic about people changing and have given up on trying to persuade them to change. Now I just try to live in a way which sets a good example. I'm known as the crackpot in my family. No one will even think about listening to what I think about diet or the environment, though the salad I bring to family gatherings is always welcome and touted as the best ever. Not surprising considering it's organic and fresh.

Thanks,
m.

I agree... these are dynamite articles. Because I'm a scientist who worked in the environmental field for many years, this has always been a major incentive for my adoption of a veg*n diet. Anyone who has ever been involved in any kind of assessment of the environmental impact of livestock-raising facilities can't help but be aware of the large negative effects they have. Heck, anyone who has ever driven by a large dairy facility and been nearly overcome by the ammonia fumes, will have had that experience. I understand chicken farms can also be "memorable".

I remember being astonished that concrete building foundations were found to be rotting and crumbling away on land that had previously been used for dairy farming in southern California, due to the left-over soil contamination from cattle urine that had soaked the soil over the decades. Wanna buy one of those houses?

I loved Gore's film, but already knew that it did not address the large effects from livestock. Hopefully this knowledge will become better understood. Up till recently, there have been very few sources for credible synthesis of the relevant data, especially sources understandable to the public. I think that's been one of the problems.

Another problem has been blatant (and creative) attempts by recent governmental entities to (1) deny that global warming is even occurring, (2) suppress the obvious fact that atmospheric CO2 has increased dramatically and is at least contributing to the global warming, and (3) discourage non-governmental attempts at disengaging from fossil fuel use for energy. You'd think they would have given up on (1) by now, but recent administration attempts to squelch concerned scientists at the U.S. Geological Survey is just a continuation of the shameful efforts by the administration and its lawyers to censor and actually rewrite science.

A big thanks to Dr. McDougall for bringing these matters to our attention.

Pumpkin

....and what different strategies are you using to help spread this information?

Hopefully, by posting this, we can obtain ideas from one another, encourage each other to NOT give up, and maybe even inspire others to join in the cause!

This is what I have done and am trying to do to:

1- Have written to Al Gore about his oversight about livestock farming in "An Inconvenient Truth".

2- Have contacted my congressman about global warming and about how raising livestock plays a major part in it (through Al Gore's global warming site).

3- Have emailed link to the McDougall Dec. 2006 newsletter (on global warming) to friends, family, and even business acquaintances -- with short personal notes explaining why I did this.

4- Have printed out several copies of each of the two global warming articles in the Dec. 2006 McDougall Newsletter and stapled them together to create "handouts" that contain one copy of each article. On top of each "handout" is a note (handwritten in my neatest handwriting) asking each recipient to please read the two articles and then to pass the "handout" on to someone else who is asked to do the same -- and so on, and so on..... I am now in the process of distributing them. By doing this, (in addition to reusing paper and helping to conserve natural resources) I HOPE that the handouts will reach many people -- with a high percentage of them being people that my husband and I do not know!and even if all of the "handouts" are thrown in the trash before they get very far, hopefully, at least a few people will have read them.

5- Already eat a vegan-type diet (McDougall MWL) and my immediate family members eat far less animal products than they used to. [Plus, I dry laundry on a clothesline; solar cook; reduce/re-use/recycle; have a small organic vegetable garden; will NOT cut the trees on our wooded property that surrounds our yard; grow fruit trees IN our "already cleared" yard (instead of having to clear more land for our tiny orchard); and try to conserve fuel, electricity, and natural resources as much as possible.]

6- A VERY HARD PLAN! I am searching for ideas for and information on PROFITABLE and SUITABLE environmentally friendly alternatives to livestock farming (such as growing fruit, vegetables, grains, and/or even trees for lumber and paper). That way, maybe we can give livestock farmers something positive to think about BEFORE we upset them with the horrible truth about livestock farming.

7- Am trying to learn how to be more tactful so that I will NOT offend people and accidentally turn them AGAINST the idea of cutting back on livestock consumption/raising.

.....and as luck would have it....Just before the global warming newsletter came out, I had just written a letter about growing persimmons to a childhood friend whose family raises beef cattle! I did not mention anything about the cattle. I simply told her how delicious, profitable, and easy to grow Fuyu persimmons are (from my personal experience of growing a few of these trees). At that time, I knew livestock farming was detrimental to the environment -- BUT I did NOT know HOW detrimental it was until AFTER I had mailed her the letter! [By the way, I HAVE told her about McDougalling (several times) -- but even after commenting on how healthy and young I look in my recent photos, she is still eating a SAD diet.....]

SO, after reading Dr. McDougall's global warming newsletter, I wrote her another letter. This one was on the subject of global warming. Along with this letter, I snail mailed her (she's not online) a copy of each of the two global warming articles in that newsletter. The fact that the first letter was about growing persimmons made the second letter MUCH easier to write because, in the first letter, I had UNKNOWINGLY already given her one possible alternative to raising beef cattle!

I tried very hard to make the second letter polite and to the point -- but I am a little worried about how she and her family will react to it. Although I doubt that they will be seriously offended (if at all), they will probably think that I am just being a little eccentric and will not take the letter, articles, and "Livestock's Long Shadow" very seriously.

So, WHY did I even BOTHER to send her this letter? I sent it to her because it is one of the MANY small steps that I think we NEED to take in order to help people see the truth about global warming (and good health). I believe that, in the near future, as MORE truths about global warming begin to surface, she and her family might think back to this letter, the articles, and "Livestock's Long Shadow".....and that ALL of these things TOGETHER (not just one thing by itself) might finally cause them to take a few small steps in the right direction.

Therefore, even if I lose many of my first battles, I will keep striving to win the war against global warming!

I know that everything I have done and am trying to do, combined, is like only one drop of water in a large rain barrel. However, if every McDougaller does this or similar, I believe we CAN fill the barrel and help save

our planet!

Dr. McDougall, thank you for supplying such great information on global warming for us to share with others AND for encouraging us to "get up off of our butts" and do something about the problem!

I believe we McDougallers can have a loud enough voice to influence enough people to cut back on livestock consumption/farming that we CAN have a positive impact on global warming -- if we REALLY try!

SB

Good for you for being so active and caring so much about our small planet!!!!

I used to write a lot of letters but these days I don't do as much. I do talk to friends and family about my diet though and slowly have influenced people towards adopting a vegetarian diet. One friend of mine went vegetarian in 2006 and my husband (total meat and potatoes guy) now eats vegetarian about 95% of the time, and vegan perhaps 75% of the time. So although they seem like slow changes when you look at your small circle of friends and family; the rising #'s of the vegetarian population speak for themselves! It is exciting and comforting to see how much more commonplace it is than even 10 years ago.

As far as anything else goes, only minimal changes. We recently bought some energy efficient light bulbs and have been switching those out as the old ones die in our new apartment. We recycle as much as possible. Even small things like saving our plastic grocery bags & giving them to the library to be reused. We buy organic as much as our budget allows, and my husband buys free-range eggs.

Off the topic of environmental issues but still good things to do; I volunteer weekly at a nursery. I also walk the dogs at the humane society on occasion, lol. While it isn't doing much good for our planet per se, it makes me feel better to know I've brightened an animal's day. Plus it is a fun fun way to get exercise in. Who doesn't love dogs?

"Any country that would give up a little freedom for a little security deserves neither and will lose both." - Benjamin Franklin

Happyalyssa

The Dec. newsletter, and the quote below from a list I subscribe to both arrived in my e-box today:

Today's Thought Is:

Our awesome responsibility to ourselves, to our children, and to the future is to create ourselves in the image of goodness, because the future depends on the nobility of our imaginings. --Barbara Grizzuti Harrison

The world we live in depends on the responsible contributions each of us makes. And this world is just as good as are the many talents we commit ourselves to developing and offering. None of us is without obligation to offer our best to our family, friends, or strangers, if our hope is to live in a good world. The world can only be as good as each of us makes it.

Individually and collectively our power to mold the outer circumstances of our lives is profound. Our personal responses to one another and our reactions to events that touch us combine with the actions of others to create a changed environment that affects us. No action, no thought goes unnoticed, unfelt, in this interdependent system of humanity. We share this universe. We are the force behind all that the universe offers.

Whether I acknowledge the depth of my contribution is irrelevant. It is still profound and making an impact every moment and eternally. --from the book, The Promise of a New Day, by Karen Casey (BB)

I really enjoyed the movie "An Inconvenient Truth", but was quite disappointed by the fact the link between diet and planetary health was not emphasized in any way. Thank you for pointing it out in a format that may reach yet more people! I agree that sometimes knowing what is best for our own health is not always enough to keep temptation away from eating the SAD diet. As far as I am concerned, the more layers of reasons for why I need to eat low fat vegan helps maintain my motivation.

Hope 101 (BB)

An Interesting Interaction between Dr. McDougall and Rick:

12-31-06

Dear Dr. McDougal,

I attempted respond to your newsletter, but perhaps that is not the way to get to you. So here is an edited version of what I tried to send you yesterday.

Please read some of the "challenging second opinions" regarding the actual threat of mankind induced global warming. I am concerned that your current opinion on this matter may not be based on the best evidence.

I recommend the following: 1) a recent book by S. Fred Singer "Unstoppable Global Warming – every 1500 years"; 2) a novel by Michael Crichton "State of Fear" that although a work of fiction is none-the-less researched and foot noted; 3) books by Patrick Michaels (e.g. Satanic Gases.) and 4.) The Skeptical Environmentalist by Bjorn Borg (sp?). Borg points out the very real costs of human life to be paid by jumping to wrong conclusions, now. Poverty kills and energy policy (taxes) can deplete world resources. Singer is a very accomplished scientist with decades of experience researching this problem. In fact, he mentioned the possibility of global warming more than 35 years ago. In 1971 he predicted that human activity (cattle, rice, population growth) would result in a jump in methane that COULD contribute to global warming. So, he was on the leading edge of studying this issue and is worth reading.

Some sources of information are politically tainted. The United Nations report on climate (IPCC) was spun this way in that the summary that misrepresented the science within.

If you have not evaluated the other side, I encourage you to do so and I would start with Singer's latest book.

Oh, and please be aware that computer models that are used to scare us have never been validated with predicting current weather patterns.

Richard

Response:

Is this true?

David Archer at www.RealClimate.org attended a recent Heartland Institute luncheon and lecture featuring the denying duo, Dennis Avery (who is [famous](#) for his misleading claims about the health risks of organic foods) and [S. Fred Singer](#) (who is famous for his coincidental scientific endorsement of industries, from big tobacco to fossil fuel, who happen to be paying money directly to him or to his [Science and Environmental Policy Project](#)).

Best Wishes,

John McDougall, MD

Dr. McDougal,

The truth here is that I don't know.

But, it is not unusual to find negative things about "special interest money" behind people whose opinions go against the mainstream. I am sure you are familiar with the tactic or similar ones. You have put your neck out a lot!

And I am not in love with one source and, like you, I consider myself a scientist without an axe to grind either way.

As I understand it, S. Fred Singer does not endorse tobacco, he was an editor that reviewed the methods used for the study. His long history as a scientist predates recent associations that you might find suspect, I believe. He does not claim to be a health expert, in any case.

It is the science of climate change that concerns me and big businesses will not be the ones that suffer if energy taxes (for example) are used to change behavior. Government intrusion into the market does not hurt big businesses, it saves them from competition. But, that's another topic!

Thanks for considering this.

Richard

Well, here I get into politics. There are two ingredients that MAY go together to make this soup - the anti-capitalists and the radical environmentalists. Neither of these admittedly extreme ideologies are very fond of an objective analysis of things. Who could be against the environment and who trusts big business? Not hard to see why most folks are sympathetic to this point of view.

Back to the Skeptical Environmentalist (Bjorn LOMBORG not Borg - closer anyway, I refuse to get up and go to my book shelf just now) : He lays out some of the claims of the radical environmentalists for a critical look from a statisticians perspective. I also recommend the novel by Michael Crichton as a painless way to enter this world of contrary opinion - he did quite a bit of research for the book and the footnotes are real.

I am off to a New Year's eve party (in my living room.)

Bless you for the good have done in the world and in my family in particular.

Richard

So who profits from slowing and stopping global warming?

Best Wishes,

John McDougall, MD

Sorry, but I let something slip by on the last response. Who benefits from slowing and stopping global warming? That's not the issue for me. Who benefits from pretending to do something about a problem that does not exist or that may be a boon or that can be handled in less hurtful ways?

The issue is scarcity of resources to address the world's problems. Like clean water, malaria,

Richard

Richard

Did you read the rap sheet on Singer?

<http://www.desmogblog.com:80/no-apology-is-owed-dr-s-fred-singer-and-none-will-be-forthcoming>

Best Wishes,

John McDougall, MD

1-1-07

Dr. McDougal,

I have seen the original charge and Singer's response. I had not seen the response to Dr. Singer's complaint, however. Thanks.

I admit to being frustrated by all this. And there is much on both/all sides to criticize. But, I think the issues raised on both sides are worthy of consideration. I agree it is good to know the incentives of any proponent. And no matter what the incentives, the truth of the research and reasonable conclusions can be drawn. Second hand smoke research is not the same as being a proponent of tobacco - but I am concerned about his name being on a draft when he claims it is not his research! Is it possible there is a less nefarious interpretation of these facts? Can he be right about his area of expertise and still get funding from oil companies? Worthwhile questions.

As to untruthful statements: the rap sheet on Singer contains one <<RE: IPCC: These people agree, unreservedly, that climate change is happening and is caused by human activity.>> That is not true. BUT, the summary of IPCC claimed this! The scientists said something else within the report. So both sides can claim victory and tell the truth in some way. This back and forth politicization of what should be a scientific matter (first) is maddening. Of course the climate is changing as it has always waxed and waned from ice age to ice age. And most scientists believe that some human effect is likely. It is a long jump from here to dramatic expenditures to cut greenhouse gases.

Regarding my frustration with the IPCC - am I supposed to do read the whole IPCC report? Then what? (I ask myself)

Like everything that has turned out to be critical to my health and my family's well being, I have had to look into the issues myself and become more of an expert than I really want to be. I do this by reading other sources.

I trust your ability to evaluate opposing arguments when you decide they are worth the time to evaluate. I still believe the other points of view on this are very worthy of your time. You are a respected source of information for thousands and thousands of people.

Richard

1-10-07

Dr. McDougal,

Here is another source that I consider in placing the global warming issue in perspective. This link takes you to the head of environmental studies for the CATO Institute, a libertarian think tank. He has written three books on the topic.

<http://www.cato.org/speakers/michaels.html> I believe they have pod casts on many topics that might be of

interest, too.

While I always appreciate knowing the incentives behind someone's work, I also believe the scientific claims can be evaluated independent of this. Admittedly, finding a source one trusts saves time, so I am not dismissing incentives as a factor in determining trust.

Spokespeople for environmental groups have an incentive to make the world a very dangerous place so they can get funds to save it. Government politicians have incentives to rally the environmental leanings of all of us to vote for them so they will save the day, too. News media have incentives to make dramatic stories to sell papers, ads. A fair evaluation of incentives will see them at play everywhere.

I was taught from my anthropology studies that primitive people tend to adopt beliefs that are consistent with their economic interests. I assume this is generally true for all of us.

Best wishes in all you do.

Rick

Dear Richard:

You are just trying to make fun by sending such references as the CATO Institute. Right? You can't be serious?

The Cato Institute, a libertarian think tank based in Washington DC, was founded in 1977 by Edward Crane and Charles Koch, the billionaire co-owner of Koch Industries, the largest privately held oil company in the U.S.

The Cato Institute holds regular briefings on global warming with known climate 'skeptics' as panelists. In December 2003, panelists included Patrick Michaels, Robert Balling and John Christy, all of whom believe that the current scientific understanding of climate change is inconclusive. Cato held similar briefings on climate change in Washington in July 2003 and 2002. (C. Coon, & Erin. Hymel (2003) Sound Policy for the Energy Bill, Heritage Foundation Reports, 23 September.) According to People for the American Way, Cato has been funded by: Philip Morris, R.J. Reynolds, Bell Atlantic Network Services, BellSouth Corporation, Digital Equipment Corporation, GTE Corporation, Microsoft Corporation, Netscape Communications Corporation, NYNEX Corporation, Sun Microsystems, Viacom International, American Express, Chase Manhattan Bank, Chemical Bank, Citicorp/Citibank, Commonwealth Fund, Prudential Securities and Salomon Brothers. Energy conglomerates include: Chevron Companies, Exxon Company, Shell Oil Company and Tenneco Gas, as well as the American Petroleum Institute, Amoco Foundation and Atlantic Richfield Foundation. Cato's pharmaceutical donors include Eli Lilly & Company, Merck & Company and Pfizer, Inc.

(<http://www.pfaw.org/pfaw/general/default.aspx?oid=9261>) Between 1985 and 2001, the Institute received \$15,718,040 in 112 grants from only ten conservative foundations: Castle Rock Foundation (reformed Coors Foundation), Charles G. Koch Charitable Foundation, Earhart Foundation, JM Foundation, John M. Olin Foundation, Inc., Claude R. Lambe Charitable Foundation, Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation, Sarah Scaife Foundation, Carthage Foundation, David H Koch Foundation.

(http://www.mediatransparency.org/search_results/info_on_any_recipient.php?51) The Cato Institute is a member of the State Policy Network 4/04

<http://www.exxonsecrets.org/html/orgfactsheet.php?id=21>

Best Wishes,

John McDougall, MD

Dear Dr. McDougal,

Yes, I was aware of the founding duo.

Believe me, I have been to many CATO events and have never even smelled a wiff of corruption in their approach to issues. And, at their founding, I don't think that Koch had any ulterior motives other than his libertarian ideals, certainly not to put up a shell to counter global warming (actually it would have been global cooling back then anyway.) Cato does address issues that might be used to give government more power and serve as excuses for being more intrusive (e.g. Patriot Act) and global warming is a minor part of what they have addressed.

I also suspect, that any organization that must rely on donations would seek out those that support their work. Does a politician have the views he has because of his supporters? Or does he have the supporters because he has the views he has? It depends I imagine on the politician.

So, back to my previous contention, that science can be debated and evaluated on the propositions proposed and the evidence that supports or fails to support it.

Thanks for sharing your point of view.

Sincerely,

Rick

This may interest you:

<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/n/a/2007/01/03/national/w100933S67.DTL&hw=global+warming&sn=002&sc=746>

[ExxonMobil Corp. gave \$16 million to 43 ideological groups between 1998 and 2005 in an effort to mislead the public by discrediting the science behind **global warming**, the Union of Concerned Scientists asserted Wednesday...]

Best Wishes,

John McDougall, MD

1-11-07

Dr. McDougall,

I choose to minimize my focus on implied corruption of motives and instead try to evaluate the propositions for reasonableness and coherence. Because a group accuses a company of something does not make it so. If I knew the truth was not getting a fair hearing I might very support institutions that would help investigate and get the truth out. Supporting people who seek to look into the truth of big issues is both self-interested and worthwhile at the same time. In my experience, the people at Cato are not empty shells for hire by corporate masters. They analyze and report on hundreds of policy issues and are respected, if not agreed with, over a wide range of issues from privatizing social security to the flat tax. The LEFT has their think tanks, the RIGHT has theirs and the libertarians have Cato - who the left places as a tool of the right. Actually the libertarians are left on social freedoms (abortion, alternative medicine, gay rights) and right on economic freedoms (less government involvement in private contracts, cut taxes, reduce regulations.)

So, I invite you to go to some source that does not already match the commonly held lay opinion and read what they actually say. I would advise to go the ultimate anti-source! The one that the radical environmentalists know is just a tool of the capitalist cabal. This may well be Singer. But, perhaps you might enjoy the Skeptical Environmentalist. (Bjorn Lomborg.) This man set out to disprove a Cato scholar who claimed that life on the earth is not getting worse but better. Using his grad students in statistics he ended up supporting what the Cato scholar was claiming on a host of environmental issues. He has a detailed chapter on global warming in the book. It is a complicated topic. That is one thing I see in the books I've read is that the topic is very complicated and much is not known. Listen to the pod cast from Cato, too. Am I being an os-

trich with my head in the sand or are the radicals being chicken littles running around saying the sky is warming?

Before you send me a link about Lomborg, know that I am aware of the smears in the press about this scholar too! (Is it a coincidence that everyone that disagrees with the radical view on climate change is attacked as an idiot or of having been bought off?)

I do appreciate your effort to share what your concerns are about hidden incentives. And I know the time you spend is precious.

I am an independent thinker in many regards. I scored a "0" in college on the Deference to Authority part of my personality test. (The press would say "Wells scores Zero on Personality Test.") This was a factor in my being open to your message on diet. I recall that we had attended your workshop in Del Mar in the 1990's then told our family doctor about you and loaned him one of your books (A Challenging Second Opinion.) He brushed you off as someone who made radical claims to sell books! Well, you did make radical claims and you do sell books. So what? What I wanted to know was is what you say true or not? In my judgment, that was the issue with you and is the issue with the science of man-forced climate change.

What's at stake here really matters.

Warmest regards, Rick

Dear Rick:

I would be very happy to know that global warming is not real.

But even what I personally witness in weather changes says the obvious must be true: if you pollute the environment with trillions of tons of CO2 and other pollutants things change.

The consequences of not cleaning up the environment are too serious. An apology won't make it right.

Best Wishes,

John McDougall, MD

Dear Dr. McDougal,

I agree that the consequences are large either way on this issue. I am sure there is some medical analogy that might apply here – one where action in one area that may or may not be life threatening causes known life threatening side effects. Assessing the real risks is important. The best thing to do is to understand what is really going on and what the impact truly is. That's what makes sense to me. .

The logic that says adding tons of CO2 must have some effect is very reasonable and that is why people are so concerned about this.

Me, too.

Rick

