

## TOXIC SOY

by Elaine Hollingsworth

To see, read and hear about it in most mainstream and ‘alternative living’ media you’d think that the ubiquitous soy bean and its derivatives are the most versatile, natural, heart-friendly, health-improving, fat-preventing, growth-promoting and generally loveable foods ever grown on our good earth. A simple, easily-cultivated bean which has been part of our diet since the dawn of civilization, promising health and vitality to the lactose-intolerant, the newborn, the aged, the menopausal, the frail, the athletic, the health-conscious and just about everyone else as well.

It’s inexpensive, available everywhere, on its own or as a vital ingredient in thousands of other food products, such as our daily bread, cakes, confectionery, baby formula, milk and meat substitutes, breakfast cereal, sauces, snack foods, pasta; it forms the basis of non-stick cooking sprays. It is widely used in stock feeds and is in most pet foods. Doctors, farmers, nutritionists, athletes, respected companies whose household names have become part of our culture, government authorities – all make a point of telling us how safe and health-giving this wonder-food is for us. It’s so good and harmless, they tell us, that it’s often not even listed as an ingredient in many processed foods. And even when it is we don’t mind; everyone knows it’s safe. Our health watchdogs happily accept the assurances given by companies who produce and process it that it is ‘GRAS’ – Generally Regarded As Safe – so it must be.

Around the world, hundreds of millions of acres are devoted to its cultivation, providing a secure cash crop for millions of farmers who cheerfully pay a levy to the developers of their genetically-modified strains to help Monsanto Chemical Company and other huge companies make billions, while spreading the gospel that *‘Soy is Good For You’*.

Too bad that for decades these same developers and corporations have known of and deliberately suppressed the evidence that prolonged ingestion of soy causes cancer and countless other life-threatening illnesses, destroys bone, creates havoc with the hormonal systems of humans and animals alike, represses the sex drive and, even if eliminated from our diets overnight, is so entrenched in the food chain and the bodies of everyone who has ever ingested it that its adverse effects would still plague the health of generations yet unborn.

The truth behind the blatantly commercial integration of soy into the Western diet is a disturbing tale of fraud, corporate irresponsibility, greed, bad science, public and media manipulation, corruption, intimidation, political opportunism, suppression, legal maneuvering, regulatory inaction and governmental incompetence that makes the tobacco companies look like Good Guys.

Find that hard to believe? Maybe after you’ve been acquainted with some of the

evidence for these assertions you'll share my outrage over the fact that not only is yet another proven life-endangering product allowed to be cultivated, manufactured and sold in the first place, but that in this case its producers and pushers have so successfully created their own mythology around it that government regulators and so-called health watchdogs have buckled under and given them virtual *carte blanche* to continue to misinform, confuse and poison not only those who are suckered into consuming their noxious products, but also everyone who is unknowingly obliged to partake of this toxic time bomb through its placement in all manner of basic foodstuffs and in the feed of animals and poultry destined for human consumption. Passive smoking is one thing; forced feeding quite another.

Since our interest in the promotion of safe natural alternatives to many of the manufactured elements of Western diets and medical treatment has become widely known, we have received an influx of desperate pleas for help or accounts of terrible personal tragedies directly connected to the use of soy.

### **Physiological Havoc**

And, yes, we do hear from a few people who tell we have it all wrong and send us reprints of magazine articles quoting 'solid scientific evidence' which 'proves' how wonderful and safe soy is for everyone, or assure me that "Sanitarium wouldn't sell it if it wasn't OK." It doesn't seem to have occurred to them, or maybe they don't care, that almost all this 'evidence' and the 'research' on which it is based has been published, and usually funded by, the very same corporations who are producing and selling the stuff. Or that they are perpetuating the 'everybody knows' urban myths so helpfully placed in appealing editorial features liberally scattered through the pages of mainstream media and, regrettably, repeated in many health-oriented and alternative lifestyle publications that should know better!

So, if you're one of those who feels bound to harangue me with the 'well-known fact' that Asian people have thrived on soy for centuries, hold on to your pen for a while and be prepared to learn just how wrong that particular 'Furphy' is. It's one of the most widely believed 'scientific facts' touted by the proponents of soy – and one of the best examples of how successful they've been in brainwashing the public.

Far more distressing, and never mentioned in the producers' "solid scientific evidence" are the tales I hear, almost daily, from parents whose baby daughters have commenced menstruation, developed pubic hair, underarm odour and breasts from as young as four and five years of age. Or whose teenage sons are too embarrassed to shower with their mates because they have grown breasts of female proportions or because their genitalia haven't developed.

The most upsetting stories were from mothers whose children suffer from the usual soy symptoms, and by far the worst was the testimony of a shocked mother who described her son's tragic childhood. She had drunk copious amounts of soy milk during pregnancy – unknowingly poisoning her son with a female hormone. Then, because the oestrogen had damaged her reproductive system, she was unable to breastfeed and her baby received

more oestrogen (the equivalent of five birth control pills each day) from the soy baby formula her doctor told her to use. Her son's genitalia did not develop, but his breasts did and he refused to go to school until he had had a double mastectomy. Unaware of the cause of their health problems, the family continued drinking soymilk and now, at 21, her son needs another double mastectomy, but they can't afford it.

True, such disasters do not befall *every* child who is fed soy. But neither are they rare, isolated or anecdotal instances. They are the documented, widespread, frequent and in many cases predictable results of hormonal imbalance caused by the assimilation of high levels of oestrogen. And where did the oestrogen come from? From the baby formula and soy drinks fed to these unfortunate offspring by their caring parents – often on professional medical advice. Presumably the same source of 'professional' advice that apparently sees no contradiction in recommending that the identical ingredient prescribed to menopausal women to manipulate their hormonal levels can be safely fed to men and newborn babies!

The Swiss Health Service put it this way: "100gr of soy protein has the oestrogenic equivalent of one contraceptive pill", and there are numerous other studies published since the early 1960s that confirm this undeniable fact. Many enlightened scientists and medical professionals argue that the continued use of soy in baby formula is a form of genocide, since these effects have been known and published within the scientific community for decades. The finely tuned endocrine system depends upon hormones in concentrations as tiny as one trillionth of a gram to influence the womb environment, and the money-hungry soy propagandists urge women to destroy this delicate environment with oestrogen-laden soy!

Frequently, as in the case cited above, drinking soy milk during pregnancy can cause a failure to produce breast milk, which then leads to feeding the baby soy formula. It's tragic that so many of the most distressing cases of soy damage that I have heard are those of women who have had precisely that experience. Often these women cannot restrain their tears when describing the dreadful health problems their children suffer. They keep repeating, "I didn't know, I just didn't know; the doctor told me to drink it for my bones and to feed baby the soy formula."

As you will see shortly, one of the major culprits as to why soy is so dangerous is the fact that the bean contains high levels of aluminium absorbed from the soil in which it is grown. In 1997 no less an authority than the American Academy of Paediatrics' Committee on Nutrition reported, "Aluminium in breast milk is 4 to 65 ng/mL. Soy-based formulas contain 600 to 1300 ng/mL," of this exceedingly dangerous mineral.

Similarly, a recent study at the University of California-Irvine, led by Francis Crinella, Professor of Paediatrics, pointed to the increased risk of significant behavioural problems such as ADHD being triggered by high concentrations of manganese in soy formula. According to Crinella, "Soy milk formula contains about 80 times the levels of manganese found in breast milk, posing the risk that infants could receive too much manganese in the first weeks of life."

Apart from the ravaging of delicate hormonal systems, serious gastrointestinal disturbances suffered by babies on soy formula are now commonplace.

### **Money Spinner**

The multinational Nestlé Corporation, which owns the Carnation brand, is a major soy advertiser; you may remember them as the company that brought infant formula to third world countries, discouraging breastfeeding and killing, according to the World Health Organisation, 1.5 million babies each year. Well, they're still at it, shamelessly flogging their soymilk formulas such as *Alsoy* in spite of all the evidence that it is deadly.

Surely risks such as those mentioned above should have been sufficient for the use of this killer bean to be outlawed years ago at least in baby formula. And even if the regulators are not prepared to act, despite all the well-known and easily accessible compelling evidence, how can it be that physicians are still prescribing soy formula?

There is some good news. A few governments are starting to take seriously the warnings of independent scientists and are considering a ban on the sale of soy-based infant formulas. Or, in some cases, at least warnings.

Unfortunately, outrageous and preventable as are these crimes against infants, they are only the tip of the iceberg. The bad seed within the Killer Bean has no regard for the age or gender of its victims.

Aluminium is one of the most prevalent minerals in soil, but it doesn't affect most crops. The soy plant, however, has an affinity for aluminium, which it extracts from the soil and concentrates in the beans. This contamination is exacerbated when the beans are dumped in aluminium holding tanks and subjected to an acid wash during processing. Inevitably, traces of aluminium from both sources are absorbed into the body through the consumption of soy.

### **Seen a Soy Cow Lately?**

Soymilk contains 100 times more aluminium than untreated cow's milk. And, while on the subject of so-called soymilk, have you ever seen a soy cow? You cannot milk a soybean; in order to obtain that pure-looking, inviting stream of white liquid pictured so appealingly in the ads; many processes are needed. It is necessary to grind the beans at high temperature, and then extract the remaining oils with dangerous solvents, some of which remain in the meal. Then the meal is mixed with an alkaline solution and sugars, in a separation process designed to remove fibre. Later it is precipitated and separated, using an acid wash. At each stage, some poison remains in the soy. Government regulators say it's so small an amount that it doesn't count.

It's also worth mentioning here that a by-product of soy processing is a form of *lecithin*. Unlike the naturally occurring variety found in free-range eggs, nuts, seeds and avocados, this by-product is always rancid, and is extracted from the sludge left after the oil is removed from the beans. It contains high levels of solvents and pesticides. And guess what? Rather than consign it to the toxic waste dump where it belongs, the manufacturers

have instead created another hugely profitable market for it as a ‘healthy’ food additive. Among its delightful qualities is the ability to induce severe joint pains (often mistaken for arthritis), and serious gout. (During many years as natural health advocates, we have counselled countless people who thought they had incurable arthritis. Their doctors prescribed strong drugs, without discussing improvement through diet. All reported cessation of symptoms after quitting soy, and/or lecithin; but it requires time, and lots of water).

Putting in additional poisons is bad enough, but the killer bean hardly needs them to accomplish its deadly purpose. It is already riddled with potential carcinogens and lots of other plant chemicals guaranteed to wreak havoc within the human body. Yet in the face of overwhelming evidence of catastrophic effects resulting from their prolonged ingestion by humans and animals, the soy pushers continue to assert the exact opposite – that all these things are not only harmless *but are actually good for you!*

The fact is that the soy bean contains numerous *phytoestrogens* – a descriptive name for plant chemicals having *oestrogenic (oestrus-inducing)* effects. They occur in nature to help regulate animal breeding cycles and, in synthetic form, are used in farming for the same purpose. The ubiquitous birth control pill is, of course, the human synthetic version. At high dosage or over long periods, phytoestrogens become anti-oestrogenic. Much higher doses are used in chemotherapy to kill cancer cells.

The class of chemical compounds called phytoestrogens contains dozens of sub-classes, such as *coumestans, isoflavones, lignans* and *sterols*, each of which contains further sub-classes. Soy contains many isoflavones, including the sub-classes *genistein, coumestrol* and *daidzein*.

Scientists have known for years that isoflavones in soy products can depress thyroid function, causing autoimmune thyroid disease and even cancer of the thyroid. As far back as the 1950s phytoestrogens were being linked to increased cases of cancer, infertility, leukaemia and endocrine disruption.

Charlotte Gerson, of the prestigious Gerson Cancer Clinic in the USA, has published detailed research (*Gerson Clinic: Cancer Research, June 1, 2001 - 61 (11): 4325-8*) proving that the phytoestrogen genistein is more carcinogenic than DES (*diethylstilbestrol*), a synthetic oestrogen drug that was given to millions of pregnant women primarily from 1938-1971. Few would be unaware of the death and misery that particular drug inflicted on countless women and their daughters.

### **Forbidden Food**

Ms Gerson also wrote the following in the *Gerson Healing Newsletter*: “Soybeans contain *hemagglutinin*, a clot-promoting substance that causes red blood cells to clump together. These clustered blood cells are unable to properly absorb oxygen for distribution to the body’s tissues, which can damage the heart.” In his classic book, *A Cancer Therapy – Results of 50 Cases*, Charlotte’s late father, Max Gerson, MD, put soy and soy products on the forbidden list of foods for Gerson Therapy patients.

No less an authority than the US Department of Energy Health Risk Laboratory has published research showing that isoflavones in soy act in the same way as the outlawed insecticide *DDT* to cause breast cancer cells to multiply. In 1988 a Taiwan University team led by Dr Theodore Kay remarked that for more than half a century soy has been known to cause thyroid enlargement, especially in women and children.

Dr Mike Fitzpatrick, a respected toxicologist who is at the forefront of the New Zealand campaign against soy, wrote a paper in 1998 citing much of the published work on the dangers of soy isoflavones, which he submitted to the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA). This paper was also published in the *Price-Pottenger Nutrition Foundation Journal* under the title *Isoflavones: Panacea or Poison?*, and subsequently as *Soy Formulas and the Effect on the Thyroid* in *The New Zealand Medical Journal*. It is long, detailed, and frightening.

Here are just some of the things he has to say: “The toxicity of isoflavones to animals first raised the awareness of the scientific community to the fact that soy isoflavones are endocrine disruptors... There have been profound negative endocrine effects in all animal species studied to date.”

In plain speak, this means that your glandular system can be damaged by soy, and if your glands don't function properly, your health will suffer drastically. There is more: “Soy isoflavones increase the risk of breast cancer... Soy isoflavone disrupts the menstrual cycle during, and for up to three months after, administration... Dietary concentration of genistein may stimulate breast cells to enter the cell cycle... Concern was expressed that women fed soy protein isolate have an increased incidence of epithelial hyperplasia.”

### **Neither Safe Nor Natural**

With these and numerous other credible studies warning women of the adverse effects of prolonged consumption of soy, how, in all conscience, can Australian household brands like *Herron*, *Novogen* and those self-proclaimed icons of good health, *Blackmores* and *Sanitarium*, continue to promote the use of soy and isoflavones extracted from soy as ‘tonics’ for middle-aged women in menopause? Or health professionals endorse claims that soy is a safe, natural alternative to HRT? What they are pushing is neither safe nor natural, and they should be ashamed for suggesting that it is either.

*Phytic acid* is another jolly little part of the abominable bean's makeup – and also totally destroys the credibility of the manufacturers' claims that soy products are a good source of calcium and help prevent osteoporosis. Because soy contains more phytic acid than any other grain or pulse, and because phytic acid impairs absorption of all minerals, especially calcium, soy actually strips your body of calcium. The enzyme inhibitors in soybeans block *trypsin* and other enzymes essential for good health. This can produce serious gastric distress, reduced protein digestion, and chronic deficiencies in essential amino acids.

Most of this ‘subversive’ evidence has not achieved wide circulation, being the

work of corporate-neutral or independent scientists, who are not in the pay of the multinationals, and who are as voices in the wilderness. Their papers often appear only in esoteric professional journals, or 'alternative' publications, such as the Australian *Nexus Magazine*, which also publishes editions in New Zealand, the UK and US, who have been courageous in pursuing a 'publish and be damned' policy by enabling publication of arguments against the lies of the big corporations.

**Attention Animal Lovers:**

Be vigilant when buying pet food. Most contain soy, because it is dirt-cheap. It will shorten your animals' lives and make them miserable while they are here! It will cause painful arthritis and many other ailments, including cancer. Years ago, our domestic animals died of old age, after vigorous lives. It's so different now -- if you buy commercial pet foods you will condemn your poor, trusting companions to painful deaths. For evidence, simply read the shameful ingredients listed on packages, and make changes.

Nevertheless, through the efforts and dedication of many enlightened, courageous, independent and highly-respected scientists, it has been possible to unearth volumes of credible research and evidence that clearly demonstrates the criminality of these companies, spearheaded by the mighty and reprehensible Monsanto Corporation.

Bringing the covert actions of the soy industry into the public arena has been an undertaking of David and Goliath proportions. The public relations machine extolling the virtues of soy has been global and relentless. It has to be – there are hundreds of millions of acres of soy under cultivation throughout the world, much of it genetically engineered, and it has to be sold.

Displaying the kind of ingenious duplicity that Machiavelli would applaud, and conscious of the public unease regarding genetically modified foods and the trend towards organically grown produce, Monsanto Corporation came up with a cunning plan. They grow a small amount of organic soybeans in the US, which they mix with enormous amounts of their genetically modified soy. The reason? American law permits these crops to be mixed, and the result may be labelled 100% organic. So much for government control over industry.

With these levels of production at stake a market must be found, increased and maintained. To this end, American soybean farmers contribute approximately US\$80 million per year to finance what is one of the most effective propaganda campaigns ever known to the Western world. The resultant high-powered publicity blitz ensures that 'news' stories about soy's benefits are everywhere, reinforced by multi-million dollar advertising campaigns.

## Golden Eggs

Thumb through any popular women's magazine, read the newspapers, watch the television commercials and count, for example, those for soy drinks alone. Soy producers, processors and manufacturers spend billions of dollars advertising the 'goodness' of their products. The economics of the mass media ensure that such expenditure guarantees the regular placement of news and feature items extolling the claimed health benefits of soy. The same economics also guarantee that the chances are minimal of any extensive publicity being given to reports of tragic cases such as those mentioned earlier, and the dire warnings of hundreds of corporate-neutral scientific and academic researchers. What media mogul is going to risk offending the goose that lays these particular golden eggs by appearing to question the worth of the product or the truth of the ads?

Sure, occasionally, a report of adverse scientific findings or medical evidence may be too newsworthy to be ignored and will find its way into the inside pages. No problem; in the interests of balanced reporting, the manufacturer will receive their Right of Reply, and has an army of in-house or retained 'independent' experts ready with a rebuttal. Even if the rebuttal is unsubstantiated, or based on limited or inaccurate research, it will be published and we're all expected to drink up our soy milk and go back to sleep.

This industry has secured the services of some of the best scientific prostitutes money can buy. And if that doesn't work, the usual 'Plan B' is simply to attempt to discredit the whistleblower. But it's not only the media who bear responsibility for helping the soy industry carry out this mass-manipulation and brainwashing. Most of our health professionals appear so busy, or so unconcerned, that even if they were prepared to question what they are told in the glossy handouts the suppliers give them to hand to you, if you ask for information, they probably wouldn't consider it worthwhile. People who wouldn't believe anything else Monsanto Chemical say still swallow, hook line and sinker, their self-serving lies about soy.

Consider the words of Dr Raymond Peat, the noted endocrine physiologist at the University of Oregon who was one of the first to blow the whistle on the dangers of HRT, years before it finally made headlines:

"There is a distinct herd instinct among people who 'work in science' which makes it easy to believe whatever sounds plausible, if a lot of other people are saying it is true. Sometimes powerful economic interests help people to change their beliefs. For example, two of the biggest industries in the world, the estrogen industry and the soy bean industry, spend vast amounts of money helping people to believe certain plausible-sounding things that help them sell their products."

We could add to that the tendency for people to believe what they want to believe. Especially when it's comforting, reassuring and comes from 'someone who knows'. Which brings us to those who are offended that we question the masses of 'independent scientific research' extolling the virtues of their favourite health-giving food. Or that we should choose to dismiss the 'well known fact' that people in Japan practically live on soy and don't suffer from any of the problems I go on about.

## The Asian Myth

It's a lie. The truth is that Asians never ate soy until they discovered how to ferment it and remove the toxins. Since the bean was introduced in Asia, it was only used as a rotation crop, to fix nitrogen in the soil. It was good at that.

Eventually, Asians discovered that if they fermented soybeans for up to five years, most of the toxins would be removed. Most but not all. One remains, and that is the toxin that strips B12 from the body. Because of this, affluent Asians eat only very small amounts of fermented soy products, and are careful to combine them with meat or fish, to offset the B12-stripping. The Japanese eat a small amount of tofu and miso as part of a mineral-rich broth, followed by meat or fish, which offsets some of the dangers. Monsanto Chemical and other soy growers/pushers don't take time to ferment, but ship the beans direct from the farm to the processing plants: their victims get the full-monty of toxins every time they ingest soy, in any form.

Further, soy does *not* comprise a major part of the Japanese, or any other Asian diet. And it is likely that very little of the domestically produced soy is grown from the genetically modified cultivar which dominates the Western market. In any case, except in poverty and during times of famine, Asians consume soy in tiny amounts – 7 to 8 grams per day – and most of this has been fermented for years to remove the toxins. The fermentation process also reduces the growth depressants in all soy products, but does not remove them entirely.

Dr Raymond Peat and others have shown that tofu (a soy derivative) consumption is associated with dementia. In a major US study, eight thousand Japanese-American men from Hawaii were assessed for mid-life tofu consumption and its relation to brain function and structural changes in later life. Researchers performed radiologic brain neuro-imaging, extensive cognitive function studies, and post mortem follow-ups. Among the subjects of the study, an increased level of tofu consumption was found to be associated with indications of brain atrophy and cognitive impairment in later life. They even found, at autopsy, swelling of the brain cavities and a decrease in brain weight among heavy tofu eaters.

Whilst on the subject of soy consumption in Asian countries, one real and bitter truth that does not appear in the producers' handouts is that an abnormally high incidence of cretinism in parts of China where soy is widely consumed because the people are too poor to get other forms of protein has been linked to brain damage caused by the iodine-depleting effect of soy-based goitrogens on the thyroid. New Zealand toxicologist Dr Mike Fitzpatrick says, "An epidemiological study in China has shown that high soy intake is not protective against breast cancer. There have been several similar studies, which have refuted the theory that soy helps prevent breast cancer."

Furthermore, Asians, unlike Westerners, do not guzzle soy protein isolate as a milk substitute. Milk is not a part of their culture.

## **Bad Science**

So how do these ‘myths’ originate? In recent years, several studies have been published regarding the soybean’s effect on human health. Thanks to the power of the well-oiled PR machine, the most widely published results are those of the studies *underwritten by various factions of the soy industry*. Not surprisingly, they are always presented as being overwhelmingly in favour of soy, even when this is not the conclusion of their own researchers! The primary claims about soy’s health benefits are based purely on bad science or ‘skewed’ interpretation.

Although arguments for cancer patients to use soy focus on statistics showing low rates of breast, colon and prostate cancer among Japanese people, there are obvious facts being utterly ignored. While soy industry-funded studies boast that Japanese women suffer far fewer cases of breast cancer than do American women, they neglect to point out that these women eat a diet that is dramatically different from that of their Western counterparts.

Perhaps the most influential difference is the large amount of cancer-protecting iodine all Japanese people ingest. In addition, the standard Japanese diet consists of more natural products, greater amounts of vegetables, and more fish. Their diets are also lower in chemicals and toxins, as they eat far fewer processed foods. It is likely these studies are influenced by the fact that cancer rates rise among them when they move to the US and adopt American diets. Ignoring the remarkable diet and lifestyle changes, to assume only that reduced levels of soy in these American-Japanese diets is a primary factor in greater cancer rates is bad science.

Need more evidence of the soy producers’ dominance of what you can read about their product? A widely circulated article, *Scientists Suggest More Soy in Diet*, by Jane E. Allen, *Associated Press*’ science writer, cites numerous speakers in the course of a symposium discussing the probable advantages of soy under the topic, *Health Impact of Soy Protein*. Their deliberations are still widely quoted as proof of soy’s beneficial effects. Less well publicised is the article’s comment that the US\$50,000 symposium “...was underwritten by Protein Technologies International of St.Louis,” a *DuPont subsidiary that makes soy protein!* What price impartiality?

## **Allergenic**

Other popular arguments in support of soy state that fermented soy products such as tempeh or natto contain high levels of vitamin B12. However, these supportive arguments fail to mention that soy’s B12 is an inactive B12 analog, not utilised as a vitamin in the human body. Some researchers speculate this analog may actually serve to block the body’s B12 absorption. It has also been found that allergic reactions to soybeans are far more common than to all other legumes. Even the American Academy of Paediatrics admits that early exposure to soy through commercial infant formulas may be a leading cause of soy allergies among older children and adults.

And while on ‘Furphys’, one persistent critic tells us that he “knows for sure” that

allowing the bean to sprout removes all the toxins. He remains unconvinced by the scientific evidence that shows that sprouting allows genistein to metamorphose into coumestrol, which happens to be 30 times more oestrogenically potent!

A while back, as information regarding the dangers of soy started leaking out, the public relations machine went into overdrive, churning out stories about how the ‘baddies’ known to be in soy are removed during processing. This is a complete untruth, which has been refuted by many studies, yet is fervently espoused by the soy adherents. As described earlier, processing actually *adds* more deadly ingredients to an already potent toxic cocktail.

There are many more ‘truths’ that the pro-soy lobby will trot out as the answer to just about any health concern, and if you still believe the claim that soy will improve hormonal health in men and women, consider this. Eating soy with that intention is not only dangerous, it is futile, as reported in *Nexus Magazine*: “Celibate monks living in monasteries and leading a vegetarian lifestyle find soy foods quite helpful because they dampen libido.”

In developed countries such as the USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, governments have established statutory bodies with the power to ensure the safety of proprietary food and drugs made available to the public. Sadly, as far as the marketing of soy is concerned, these bodies have displayed a willingness to put the commercial interests of manufacturers ahead of those of the consumers, even to the extent of falsifying data or withholding commercially unpalatable information.

### **Shun Soy Protein Isolate! (SPI)**

**The Whole Soy Story**, an impeccably researched book, explodes every lie told by the soy growers/pushers. Kaayla T. Daniel, PhD, CCN, is to be congratulated for the monumental work she has done, and for the way she takes readers by the hand and leads them to the truth about soy protein isolate. This is science writing at its best and it’s entertaining, too. Dr. Daniel explains that SPI contains “...some 38 petroleum compounds including, but not limited to: butyl, methyl and ethyl esters of fatty acids; phenols, diphenyls and phenyl esters; abietic acid derivatives, dihydroabietinal, hexanal and 2-butyl-2-octenal aldehydes; dehydroabietic acid methyl ester; dehydroabietene and abietatriene.”

Dr. Daniel exposes the way SPI increases the requirements for vitamins E, K, D and B12, and details the way carcinogenic nitrosamines and lysinoalanines are created during processing. Not surprisingly, severe mineral deficiencies appear in test animals fed SPI. (And, presumably, in people as well.) Yet, if you buy processed food, you will not be able to avoid SPI and it will not necessarily appear on the label. This deadly “food” belongs in the toxic waste dump, but the multi-nationals prefer to dispose of it in **you, your family and in baby formulas**. I call this genocide. They call it business as usual.

For those who ask if organic soy is safe, I say, “Would you eat organic arsenic?”

## **DAIRY**

For decades we have been bombarded with ads telling us we must drink lots of milk and eat yogurt and cheese in order to get our calcium. The ads don't mention that the calcium in dairy products is altered by pasteurisation and homogenisation and is turned into a hard mineral. When this denatured form of calcium gets into the bloodstream, it becomes deposited along the insides of the blood vessels. These deposits can lead to arteriosclerosis or, when it is deposited in the joints, it can lead to arthritis.

And, of course, dairy products can create mucous, which leads to colds and flu and asthma. It's a vicious circle, and the only winners are doctors, hospitals and the drug companies. Some cheeses have the added disadvantage of having aluminium added by manufacturers.

Powdered milk, which is highly advertised and recommended as a non-fat source of calcium, is especially hazardous. In order to thicken the consistency of powdered milk, oxidised cholesterol is added, and this creates a build-up of plaque in the arteries. Avoid this non-food.

Remember that billions of people throughout the third world never drink milk once weaned, and have little osteoporosis, while milk-guzzlers in Western countries are afflicted in ever-increasing numbers. It would not be an exaggeration to state that osteoporosis is in epidemic proportions now in industrialised nations.