

EAT First!

Colleen Tigges, Communications
503-358-2567 – info@eatfirst.org
www.eatfirst.org



March 2004

Can't we all just "get along"?

By Colleen Tigges

Speaking to a group of golf course superintendents recently, I obviously hit a nerve. Immediately afterward a man from the audience took the floor to rant at both my message and the association that had hired me to speak. He claimed to be so upset that he was leaving the meeting early! He disputed the fact that the environment in this country is improving and noted that water pollution is not getting better because "he could tell".

He went on to say that taking my information to the urban public would make them a laughingstock, implying that my information was false. And he concluded by imploring the superintendents to try to work with the environmental groups, indicating a message of goodwill and cooperation.

Since I didn't have an opportunity to respond that day, I'd like to respond now. And first, I'll state that I hold nothing against this man personally – he is certainly entitled to his own opinion.

I want to focus on the message he delivered – a message of appeasement – because it is far too dangerous to ignore.

"Can't we all just get along?"

In a word, NO! Farmers, ranchers, aerial applicators – and golf course superintendents – need to realize that the ideological environmentalists don't want to get along... they want to put you out of business.

Appeasement is what they feed on – it makes them stronger – and activists understand that environmentalism, along with many other issues, is a game of inches. If you can keep getting inches, pretty soon you've got your mile.

Environmental activists have one rule: there are no rules. There is no playing fair, no getting along. Give in on one chemical and they'll take two. Ignore one ESA listing, they'll take three. Give up a few water rights, they'll take the whole damned river!

Inch by inch they move in, until it gets uncomfortable and then people finally to prepare to fight. The problem is, by the time you're ready to fight you've lost the battle! You've lost your property rights, your water rights, your grazing rights... and maybe your way of life.

There is no appeasement and there is no time to waste. They are bigger, richer and more organized and if we don't learn how to fight, it's not just one or two battles we'll lose. If we don't fight NOW, we're going to lose this war.

Stop giving in and draw a line. Then defend that line as if your life depends on it – because someday soon, it just might.

For information on planning an EAT First! Activist Training workshop in your area, call (503) 358-2567 or visit www.eatfirst.org.

URGENT! Help needed to stop frivolous lawsuits

Those who use pesticides are well aware of the havoc caused by the Washington Toxics lawsuit against EPA that has resulted in imposition of buffers along all "Salmon Supporting Waters". The ruling is complex but briefly, it applies to 38 pesticide active ingredients and is 20 yards for ground applications and 100 yards for aerial applications. In effect, it will shut down farming and forestry on thousands of acres.

The suit is not about any pesticide hazard to any species. It concerns a quirk in the Endangered Species Act which requires EPA to "consult" with National Marine Fisheries and Fish and Wildlife when registering and reregistering pesticides. Activists found this quirk and subsequently found a judge that would allow them to take advantage of it.

For more than a year, all these federal agencies that were supposed to have "consulted" have been developing counterpart regulations to fix and eliminate this quirk and thus stop these nuisance lawsuits. The new proposed regulations have been published in the Federal Register and the public has until March 30, 2004 to comment.

Time is short but some of you reading this newsletter may not have heard about the proposed change and may not realize how important it is that we send in comments supporting the change. As usual, anti-pesticide groups are way ahead of us. They have filed thousands of comments against the regulation, claiming that it "guts the ESA". This is nonsense of course; what it does is take away one of their 'monkey-wrenches'.

There are several websites at which you can add your comments. Oregonians for Food and Shelter, www.ofsonline.org. Click on "Have your say on ESA" and you can file a favorable comment in "less than two minutes". Please DO IT NOW. This is important!

If you prefer, here's another link at which you can comment: www.cpha.net, click on "Have your say on ESA," and follow the steps there to automatically send in a letter of support.

EAT First! Update...

By Pat Tigges

Winter has been busier this year than last, and that's good. Collie has spent quite a bit of time on the road, traveling to events here in the Northwest and as far away as Canada. I thank everyone for supporting her and this organization and hope that it continues to grow.

Those of you who have seen Collie in action know that she's a spark plug (runs in the family), willing to "stir the drink" wherever she goes (those words are from the Agvision television hosts who interviewed her). Those of you who haven't seen her, what are you waiting for? Get her onto a convention program or book her for a keynote speech! Donations from presentations are of utmost importance to the continued viability of this organization.

Book Update! So far we've sold over 1,000 copies of A Field Manual for the Green War. While that's not going to get us on the NY Times list, we are so thankful for the amazing response. Orders come in over the website every week and we seem to sell a passel every time we give a presentation. And a big THANK YOU to Bill Lavender at Ag Air Update, who graciously let us add a flyer for the book to his newspaper (for free, I might add), generating sales all over the country.

Finally, I want to comment on Collie's lead article. I've been in and around this fight for years. But we're still losing and we still don't know how to fight. We're giving an ag leadership class for Syngenta in Greensboro, NC next month. We need to give more classes like this all over the country, and we need your help. Please consider arranging a class or, if you're not the decision maker, put a bug in someone else's ear. The battles are heating up and we're ready to help teach people how to fight back!

EAT First! has developed a brochure that outlines what is covered in our classes and includes helpful tips on generating interest and funds to plan a class. Call Colleen at (503) 358-2567 or e-mail info@eatfirst.org to request a copy.

Summer spills to cost \$77 million for 20 fish

Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) estimates that the summer spills will cost \$77 million this year and will only save about 20 adult endangered salmon. That's \$3,850,000 (\$3.85 million) PER FISH! Sound ridiculous? Now add that to the \$3.44 billion already lost in electricity during the past twenty years as water was diverted down the river instead of sent through power-generating turbines.

Am I making this up? No, the '\$77 million for 20 fish' bombshell was dropped on Oregon legislators early this month at a legislative hearing in Portland. Too bad all the urban taxpayers weren't on hand to hear it.

At least one policymaker was listening though. Rep. Mike Schaufler, a Democrat representing the outer suburbs of Portland, asked incredulously "Am I reading this correctly?" Schaufler also commented that the economic situation in the northwest, especially Oregon, simply can't afford this waste of money. Y' think?

Of course, all the paid salmon savers (tribes, fish biologists, environmental groups, ad infinitum) disputed BPA's computer projections. They would prefer we listen to *their* computer projections. Of course they would! They have a vested interest here – after all, the billions that have already been spent went into someone's pockets and those pockets certainly weren't attached to the average urban taxpayer.

The northwest is not flush with cash. State budgets are in dire shape, electricity costs – once the lowest in the country – are up 50% since 2001, and job creating industries are taking flight. I find it hard to believe that, given the truth, the urban public would condone the spending of \$3.85 million to save one fish. And as currently written, the Endangered Species Act leaves no option on saving the fish. Under the law the costs are irrelevant. Fish must be saved even as classrooms are overcrowded and school athletics are cut from schools.

Unfortunately the public never hears the truth. And that's where you readers can make a difference. We need to get the right message out to the public, one that puts the salmon issue into perspective. We're not asking for the ESA to be gutted, just for some common sense! Compare well-funded schools, programs or reductions of already sky-high taxes to a \$3.85 billion salmon and even the most soft-hearted of animal lovers might be swayed.

Victory in Coho legal battle

The Pacific Legal Foundation (PLF) scored a major victory for common sense on February 24 when a Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruling invalidated (again) the ESA listing of Oregon Coast Coho salmon as endangered. At the basis of the ruling is the fact that the National Marine Fisheries Service, when counting the salmon for protected status, counted only naturally

spawned salmon, completely ignoring hatchery-spawned salmon. This kept salmon counts artificially low, justifying ESA protection and creating land use restrictions. The problem is that there is no difference between the two types of salmon! They swim together, interbreed and are biologically identical!

Said PLF attorney Russell Brooks, "I certainly believe... this decision could have wide ranging effects for many species listed under the ESA. And the fact of the matter is, when the fisheries service considers a species for listing they are going to have to consider all members of all that species and not just simply the species they prefer or members of species they prefer."

This hopefully means good news for our friends in the Klamath Basin. The ESA listing of the Klamath Coho, which has resulted in water being taken away from farmers in the Klamath area, has the same illegal flaw in the counting of species. The PLF had already filed a case challenging the Klamath Coho listing, and so will head back to court to ask the judge to invalidate that listing, too.

Rich fat people trump starving poor people

Being that 25,000 people on this planet die of starvation every single day, one would think the World Health Organization (WHO) would have better things to do than waste time – and U.S. dollars - developing an anti-obesity strategy. Think again. The most important issue on the WHO agenda in Geneva last month was not starving poor people but fat rich people.

The WHO's "war on fat" plan not only included taxes on candy, pop, hot dogs and most everything else that tastes good, but they also propose minimum purchase ages for designated foods (no ID, no candy) and zoning restrictions on certain "fat food" restaurants. If the food scolds get their way it will be easier for kids to buy tobacco than it will be to buy Twinkies.

Fortunately the plan was temporarily stymied by the Bush Administration who noted that the strategy neglected to mention, or even acknowledge, personal responsibility.

As expected, the food police at the Center for Science in the Public Interest (CSPI) accused the Administration of "sabotage". That group has long lobbied for a "fat tax" and when they couldn't get one past the U.S. public they took their proposal to the WHO. Typical of bureaucratic free-loaders, the WHO took up the cause (maybe they expect the U.S. to increase their dues) and agreed with the food police.

CSPI, and apparently the bureaucrats at the WHO, think that we, of the ignorant masses, are simply too stupid to make our own food decisions.

Poetic justice: greens sue over 'bird blenders'

Recently the Greens have found themselves in the middle of a civil war over wind energy. While many enviro groups proclaim the virtues of "sustainable" wind energy, other eco-groups are railing against wind energy because of the use of the giant turbines – or, as we at EAT First! call them, "bird blenders."

A lawsuit was filed in January by the Center for Biological Diversity alleging that the giant wind turbines on Altamont Pass in California are illegally killing over 1,000 raptors every year, including golden eagles and burrowing owls. The suit is seeking an injunction to stop the turbines until actions are taken to protect the birds.

Owners of the wind farms are crying 'fowl', claiming continued efforts to stop the kills. They also scoff at conciliatory actions recommended by the groups, which include moving all the turbines to a location outside of migratory routes, because in addition to the outrageous cost of moving the turbines, the farm was built on Altamont Pass for a reason, that reason being that it was WINDIER than other places. Also, wind farm owners continually face expansion problems because of the NIMBY's and BANANA's. Ted Kennedy was Mr. Green until a wind farm was planned off the coast of Cape Cod, and then suddenly Teddy was worried about the "ecological" effects of such farms and the impact on biodiversity. And who can blame him? Do you want thousands of bird blenders in your backyard?

So while the "renewable energy" greens are fighting for more wind farms, the "biological diversity" greens are trying to shut them down. Poetic justice!

And by the way, if you think that this lawsuit is for the birds, wait until greedy tort lawyers in the U.S. get hold of the studies in England that claim that the noise emitted by wind turbines is causing illness in humans who live near them. Apparently the low-frequency sounds made by the turbines are causing fatigue, headaches and irritability in people who live near them. Think that's bird-brained? So is suing McDonalds because you're fat, but we haven't seen the last of those cases!

Wolf delisting hits snag

The heavily anticipated delisting of gray wolves as "protected" under the ESA has hit a road block, as Fish and Wildlife Service has rejected Wyoming's proposal to regulate wolves. And even though FWS had already accepted proposals by Montana and Idaho, those are now in limbo, because all three states are tied together in the process.

What's the problem? FWS doesn't like Wyoming's proposed "dual classification" of wolves, which provides protection for some wolves while allowing others to be legally killed. But the Wyoming plan is pragmatic, allowing for the presence of wolves in national parks and wilderness areas but limiting the spread of wolves to places they don't belong (like in the middle of herds of sheep or cattle)! Yet, FWS is concerned that the lines between "protected" wolves and those that could be hunted would be fuzzy, endangering recovery levels.

As politicians in Wyoming point fingers at politicians in Washington, D.C. and environmentalists dance a jig, ranchers continue to suffer. As one Montana resident put it, "What will happen if packs get established in the Park Range of the Snowies and start munching their way through Colorado's elk herds, or Moffat County's mule deer? What will happen if wolves get into the Laramies and start raiding the game herds and ranches on either side? Ranchers and outfitters around Yellowstone are already kissing their futures goodbye."

Clips and Quips...

James Watt on common sense

Stated by James Watt, Secretary of the Interior during the first Reagan administration, in a recent interview on NPR: "Reasonable people can balance the demands to use the people's land, the federal lands... And that requires that some of the lands be set aside as wilderness, and some lands need to be mined for coal. And common sense and reasonableness can reign if we can limit the influences of the selfish interest groups from across the spectrum, from left to right, from industry to purist preservationists who think only a 22-year-old with a backpack is entitled to see a national park."

ESA termed an "abject failure"

From Jonathan Adler, Case Western Reserve University Assistant Professor of Law: "For all the ESA's force, it is surprisingly ineffective. Indeed, it may be the greatest failure of all federal environmental laws. The purpose of the ESA is to save species from the brink of extinction. ... The ultimate measure of the ESA's success is the extent to which it is effective at recovering species from endangered status. By this measure the law is an abject failure. In the past 30 years, fewer than 30 of the over 1,000 domestic species have been taken off the endangered and threatened species lists. Of these, more have been delisted by reason of extinction than because of recovery due to regulatory protection."

DeGregori on eating 'naturally'

From the article, *Mad Cow and Madder Organic*, written by Thomas DeGregori: "The forms of food production presumed to be 'natural, sustainable' and in harmony with nature are simply myth. Ironically, if the terms 'eating closer to nature' or eating as 'nature intended us to do' have any meaning whatsoever, they imply seeking sugars and fats. What we need is the modern technological system of food production – which can always be improved upon by intelligent criticism – and the dietary utilization of that production. There are no 'natural' quick fixes and no ideological solutions or slogans. If we are to learn anything from 'mad cow,' it is that our food production system is so safe that even the most minor threat can draw our attention. Informed suggestions for improvement should be given careful consideration, but a call to abandon modernity is a folly that should be sharply condemned as the real threat to public health and wellbeing."

ECO-SHORTS

Swallowing a bitter 'holistic' pill

Along with their beloved, and much-touted, herbal 'holistic' medicines, Greens may have to swallow the bitter pill of capitalism. According to an article in *New Scientist* (Jan. 4), herbal medicine demand is up 100% in just the past 10 years and is threatening up to one-fifth of the plant species on which it depends. The article is based on a study by the World Wildlife Federation to be released later this year.

Ironically the people creating the demand for these rare plants, and thus causing the extinctions, are the same ones making a big show of spurning modern technology, man-made chemicals and, of course, capitalism.

Goes to prove that you can't "have your plants and eat them too". A note on the NatureProducts. net website – an online herbal store - states that the answer to the threat of extinction of rare species is to domesticate them and contract with farmers to grow them.

Good for them! It's high time the Greens learned why chickens are not on the endangered list? Even though the world eats billions of chickens daily, we never run out. Why? Because someone is making a profit growing them! Duh.

Cashing in on food scares

A Seattle woman is suing food giant QFC for mental anguish caused by the mad cow scare. She claims to have served her family beef purchased at the supermarket about the same time as the news of the one sick cow hit the press. This is merely the latest episode of trial lawyers and money-grubbers trying to cash in on media generated food scares. Her suit claims that QFC should have tracked her purchase through its shopper card program and personally called her with a warning.

Good grief! A Harvard study says that the risk of a human getting sick from mad cow disease is “zero or as close to zero as scientists ever dare say.” We are 2000 times more likely to be killed by a giant asteroid hitting the earth than we are by catching a disease from a BSE infected cow.

Nuclear power plants may be good for your health

By Dennis Avery

Would building more nuclear power plants help Americans live longer?

Many people currently fear that burning fossil fuels is warming the planet. Nuclear power plants deliver electricity without creating greenhouse gases like coal-fired generators. Nuclear plants don't "drown" river gorges like hydro-electric dams. Nuclear power is reliable, compared to windmills that produce electricity only about 30 percent of the time.

However, the public worries about the human health impacts of low-level radiation that might be emitted if we built hundreds of additional nuclear power plants.

Would a major shift to nuclear power create a public radiation health hazard? Dr. S. Fred Singer, a noted atmospheric scientist and former Interior Department official, says no.

Dr. Singer reminds us of a \$10 million study of nuclear shipyard workers' health done in the 1980s by the U.S. Department of Energy. The DOE's Nuclear Shipyard Worker Study found that nuclear workers had a cancer death rate 15 percent lower, and a non-cancer death rate 31 percent lower, than their unexposed shipyard colleagues. The nuclear workers were estimated to live nearly three years longer. (An independent scientific committee supervised the research.)

An earlier 1973 study published by the Argonne National Laboratory found people living in the six Mountain states with the highest natural radiation levels because of higher levels of cosmic radiation there had 10 percent lower cancer death rates than the national average, says Dr. Singer.

A 1998 study (when the Argonne laboratory had become a DOE facility) compared people living in three Gulf States with people living in three Mountain States that had triple the natural radiation. The Gulf State residents had 25 percent higher cancer death rates.

The Mountain States residents also had five times the radon exposure, but the Gulf States residents had 40 percent more lung cancer. (The EPA rates radon as a major U.S. lung cancer risk factor.)

A study of English radiologists published in 2001 found that radiologists are living more than three years longer than England's non-radiologist MDs.

Has anyone told the Environmental Protection Agency about these studies? Both the Energy Department and the EPA base their rules and regulations on the assumption that a single 'roentgen' of radiation may trigger a case of cancer. (They take their cue from a non-governmental organization, the National Council for Radiation Protection, which has also ignored these studies.)

Dr. Singer stresses the reality that cancer remains overwhelmingly a disease of old age -- so much so that finding cures for all human cancers would lengthen the average human life span by only three years.

Some of the renewed interest in nuclear energy comes from the concern about emission of greenhouse gases from fossil-fueled power plants and the fears that have been raised about global warming. Yet there are serious questions whether the warmer global temperatures of the past 150 years have been due to human activities. There are natural climate cycles, and the world's temperatures have historically cycled up and down with the Little Ice Age, the Medieval Warming, and even earlier, the Dark Ages and the Roman Warming.

However, Dr. Singer says if the world wants "no-regrets" policies that would serve us well as climate-change insurance, we might do well to rethink investments in fourth-generation nuclear power plants that have no water coolant and thus are immune to the concern about melt-downs.

There undoubtedly are many reasons for the better health statistics-including diet, lifestyle habits, etc. But, it does seem clear that low-level radiation apparently presents no human risk. Will the public someday demand that nuclear power plants be built in their neighborhoods for the health benefits therein?*of the Center for Global Food Issues (www.cgfi.org).*

Getting rid of 'risk hunters'

Friends who have heard us speak, or read our book, know our feelings on "risk hunters" -- bureaucrats who hunt for ever smaller risks in order to enhance budgets, achieve personal status, and assure job security. These ever-smaller risks feed

ammunition to the Greens. A perfect example of this is the current flap over mercury emissions from coal power plants that fall on water and eventually end up in fish.

The activist demonstrations in Seattle and the flood of news articles are not about danger, or risk, or people's health. They are a protest against an attempt by the Bush Administration to do what Bush-backers (me included) sent him there to do: reign in the growth and power of the 4th branch of government - the huge contingent of un-elected bureaucrats who use exaggerated, and often invented, fears to justify their existence.

The mercury flap is about job security and bigger budgets at EPA. But, it's also about entrenched Greens that have spent their entire careers at that agency, pushing the anti-industry agendas of large environmental groups. And they are frantically protecting their jobs.

No one is saying that mercury is not dangerous when ingested in large enough amounts. However, the current emission levels in the U.S. are not dangerous to our health and have been declining for years. In fact emissions are expected to fall by another 70% in the next 10 years as coal-burning power plants continue to employ cleaner technology. With emissions reaching near zero, how many more studies are needed?

What Bush people (myself included) are saying is, "How clean is clean enough?" "When do we stop spending money on things that don't need fixing? And, when can we cut back on bureaucracy that has no other purpose than job creation?" It's like saving salmon. How many dollars are enough? How much can the U.S. afford to pay in higher power rates just to keep EPA staffers employed?

To buttress their demands for more studies and more regulations, EPA staffers and Green groups continually harp on the dangers of mercury. But, they never produce any hard evidence to back up these supposed threats. And, they conveniently ignore qualified studies that refute their claims. In fact, we couldn't even find the following study on their website.

In May 2003 *The Lancet*, one of the most respected medical journals in the world, presented the findings of a University of Rochester (New York) Medical Center study of mercury exposure in 776 mother-child pairs in the Seychelles islands for 14 years. The level of mercury in the fish in the Seychelles is nearly identical to levels in the U.S. But, the women there eat fish up to 12 times per week, far more than women here. Consequently, women and children's hair samples tested for mercury indicated levels many times higher than levels found in the U.S. And, no health problems in either mothers or children have been found.

Dr. Gary J. Myers, author of the study, concluded that his data do not support the hypothesis that there is a neurodevelopmental risk from prenatal methyl mercury exposure resulting solely from ocean fish consumption. And, don't think that EPA staffers "just missed" the U of Rochester' study. Last May's report was the fifth follow-up on these women and children published by Myers.

Bjorn Lomborg vindicated

Readers of our book are familiar with the name Bjorn Lomborg. His book, *The Skeptical Environmentalist*, pops up in the reference notes at the end of many of our chapters.

Last year, in what can only be described as a shameful move, the Danish Committees on Scientific Dishonesty (DCSD) found Lomborg and his book guilty of "scientific dishonesty" following two years of intense efforts by environmental groups and their academic counterparts to discredit Lomborg and his book.

The story behind *The Skeptical Environmentalist* is this: in 1997 Lomborg, waiting in an airport, picked up a copy of *Wired Magazine*. The magazine contained a wonderful article about Julian Simon, the "doomsayer" (and author of the Litany that begins our book), in which Simon debunked the silly accusations and claims of environmental alarmists, stating that the environment was not getting worse. Lomborg didn't believe Simon – why would he when the media reported doom and gloom every day – and set out to prove him wrong. But a funny thing happened as he and his statistical students began doing research and analyzing data – it turned out that Simon was right. Environmental quality was much better than was being reported and was continuing to get better on a yearly basis. As the book took shape, Lomborg showed that environmental facts don't support environmentalist claims, proving it with detailed scientific analysis of valid, peer-reviewed studies.

Fast forward to 2001 and one can only imagine the stir that *The Skeptical Environmentalist* was causing. Here was this huge book full of scientific information, all carefully noted and resourced, that discredited environmental fears and the fear-mongers who profited from them. The enviros waged an all-out attack on Lomborg's credibility. And they finally got the DCSD, a government-funded body made up of mostly non-scientists, to parrot their claims of dishonesty.

Those claims were wrong. The dishonesty case was built by four leading academic environmental alarmists and aided by a magazine that published four separate pieces accusing Lomborg's book of containing errors, and accusing Lomborg himself of incompetence and bias. Of course, the articles did not refute Lomborg's work – couldn't refute it, because it was true – and so just contained opinions and hostile arguments from scientists with whom Lomborg had disagreed.

But the truth – the scientific truth – prevailed, and the Danish Ministry of Science, Technology, and Innovation overturned the verdict of scientific dishonesty, calling the DCSD's handling of the case "dissatisfactory" and its conclusion of scientific dishonesty "completely void of argumentation." Respected magazine *The Economist* agreed, calling the scientific dishonesty ruling, "incompetent and shameful."

Lomborg won, but perhaps most importantly, junk science and alarmism lost. And for that we can all be thankful.

Eco-labeling for the rest of us...

People love eco-friendly labels, especially the urban public. Slap a picture of a happy cow, cute bunny or the words "environmentally friendly" on a product and watch it sell! It doesn't have to be true or even verifiable... who's going to remember to look it up when they get home? People just want to feel good about themselves when they purchase it!

Our friends at the Center for Global Food Issues have come up with their own label. The label is real, true, verifiable... and pure genius. Kudos to these guys, some of our favorite people in the industry! Read on to learn about their "Earth Friendly, Farm Friendly" seal of approval. And go to the website to look at the seal – it looks great! I feel better about myself just thinking about it!

The following is taken from the website of the Center for Global Food Issues. CGFI is on our list of favorite websites (www.cfgi.org) and regular readers know we frequently pilfer articles from Dennis and Alex Avery.

New seal of approval: "Earth Friendly, Farm Friendly"

The Hudson Institute's Center for Global Food Issues (CGFI), in conjunction with independent academic, consumer and farm policy and practice experts, has designed a program of farm and process management practices that are independently verifiable as both farm and environment friendly. CGFI's "Earth Friendly, Farm Friendly" Seal will assure the public that all products that bear the Seal are produced in a manner consistent with the best available scientific, environmental and quality standards and technologies. Unlike other certification programs, like Organic or Humane Farmed, CGFI's Earth Friendly, Farm Friendly Seal is not based on restricting or eliminating farmers' production choices. The certification program is based on farmer's adoption of environmentally sound and economically sustainable practices while not limiting their freedom to farm.

This seal certifies that products are produced under the best available, scientifically proven and economically sustainable agricultural methods. These techniques have been shown to help conserve or use fewer natural resources, thereby preserving more of nature and earning the approval of independent scientists including Nobel Prize winners. Purchasing products with this seal supports farmers while protecting nature.

Brought to you by The Center for Global Food Issues, this is the only science-based seal of approval which supports both farm economics and protects the environment without added costs to consumers. Endorsed by recognized world leaders in the fields of animal agriculture, veterinary health, conservation and environmental stewardship and backed by published peer-reviewed data.

Activists oppose drilling in petroleum reserve

Seven environmental groups have filed a suit to stop the federal government from accessing the oil in the National Petroleum Reserve, set aside by President Harding in 1923.

The following statement was issued by Richard Pombo, R-CA, Chairman of the House Resources Committee:

"Most Americans know that environmental organizations operate outside the realm of common sense and accountability, but this time Americans will see just how radical they have become.

"Suing to stop petroleum production in a petroleum reserve is like suing farmers to stop producing milk from cows. If we can't get petroleum from the National Petroleum Reserve, where can we get it? These groups say they are pro-environment, but it is clear that they are just anti-energy, anti-American jobs, and anti-economic growth.

"The more they halt production at home, the more we send American jobs and money overseas to make up the difference. Last year alone, the U.S. sent over \$100 billion worth of American jobs to foreign nations for energy that could have been produced here at home.

"As demand grows and so-called environmentalists continue to file lawsuits, Americans will lose more jobs and pay more for their energy. Given the choice, what taxpayer wouldn't want to spend \$100 billion here on jobs, safe energy development, and a stronger economy?

"There is a big difference between active environmentalism and environmental activism. Most Americans today fall into the first category, taking part in community conservation efforts and recognizing that balance must exist between man and the environment. The very shrill, vocal minority that fall into the latter category, such as those who filed this absurd lawsuit, do not believe in balance, nor can they claim to work on behalf of the environment. Their focus is on fundraising, politics, and obstruction."

(from Subcommittees Issues Legislation Hearing Archives, Feb. 18, 2004)

Nutrition news focus... Topic: Milk Madness

Milk, depending on your beliefs, is either nature's best food or the cause of half the diseases in the world. But beliefs need to be supported by evidence. In a six page commentary in the October 2002 issue of Pediatrics, these issues are addressed. The authors point out that the campaigns against milk drinking by People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals and Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine are animal rights issues and not based on sound science.

Potential relationships of milk drinking with type 1 diabetes, lactose intolerance, and obtaining sufficient calcium for adequate bone formation are addressed in the commentary. The relationship of milk or any environmental factor with type 1 diabetes is speculative, at best. Multiple studies have shown that although about a quarter of American adults display some degree of lactose intolerance, almost any can consume two cups of milk or other dairy products with no symptoms.

HERE'S WHAT YOU NEED TO KNOW: The commentary points out that it is very difficult to obtain enough calcium from nondairy sources. Some of these are tofu, fortified cereals and juices, almonds and broccoli. But be prepared to eat more than 20 cups of broccoli if that is your preferred source of calcium.

EAT First! Calendar

March 18: Keynote speaker, Ellensburg Farmer Appreciation Lunch, Ellensburg, WA

March 24-25: Orofino 5th Grade Farm Fair, Orofino, ID

April 16: Workshop, Syngenta Leadership Conference, Greensboro, NC

May 7-8: Spokane 5th Grade Farm Fair, Spokane, WA

Support the War Effort

And

LEARN HOW TO FIGHT!

**Schedule a presentation,
workshop, or activist training.**

**Entertaining, informative
and affordable!**

**Call Colleen at (503) 358-
2567 or e-mail
info@eatfirst.org**

A Field Manual for the



**A reference book for fighting myth and
misinformation about
environmental issues.**

By Pat Tigges and Colleen Tigges

Facts and historical background that refute and debunk the misinformation that has characterized the environmental movement since the 1970s.

Organized by battle and meticulously researched. 135 pages, 8.5 x 11 spiral bound for easy copying and faxing.

Field Manual for the Green War

_____ copies @ \$15 per copy \$ _____
(\$20 Canadian)

Shipping and handling:

\$3.50 for first copy \$ _____

\$1.50 for each additional \$ _____

(Add \$2 shipping to Canada)

Total \$ _____

Name (print): _____

Postal Mailing Address: _____

City, State, Zip: _____

Phone: _____

Email: _____

Mail check and form to:

EAT First!

2381 Lambert Road,
Cle Elum WA 98922