

submissions

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, 10 February 2015 2:02 PM
To: submissions
Subject: SUBMISSION - Proposal P1016 Hydrocyanic acid in Apricot Kernels & other Foods

Submission - Proposal P1016 Hydrocyanic acid in Apricot Kernels & other Foods.

Name: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]
Address: [REDACTED]

I do not give permission for my personal details to be released to persons under the Official Information Act 1982.

This submission is given in accordance with my rights under the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990.

I do not wish to speak in support of this Submission.

STATEMENT: I DO NOT SUPPORT THIS PROPOSAL IN ANY OF ITS FIVE OPTIONS. INTERVENTION, REGULATION AND WEBSITE ADVICE ARE NOT REQUIRED.

REASONS WHY FSANZ DOES NOT APPEAR TO BE FIT TO MAKE JUDGEMENT

- FSANZ bases its assessments on Codex Alimentarius (Codex), a food standard operated jointly by the United Nations FAO and WHO, and rigorously enforced on nations through the WTO under threat of imposed trade sanctions (this is highlighted in Section 2.4.2 of the Call for Submissions document). Well qualified expert observers have been stating for many years that Codex is the single biggest threat to world health and health freedom. The entire chain from UN to WTO has been fully captured by multinational corporations who masquerade behind a mask of public acceptability while manipulating Codex to their advantage. Codex is not about consumer protection but exists purely to promote trade, power and profit for multinational corporations. Codex is designed to protect the profits of big pharma and big agri by introducing patented GM foods and eliminating conventional foods, natural health products and treatments. By incrementally degrading foods and natural health products, or banning them altogether, Codex is 'weaponising' food to support illness not health. Chillingly, reputable observers state that the WHO, the co-sponsor of Codex, is dedicated to depopulation measures at unimaginable levels in support of UN Agenda 21. Codex, and the agencies that support it, do not appear to be entities that the public would knowingly want to embrace. In using Codex, it appears that FSANZ and its political controllers are not necessarily acting in the best interests of the public.
- If the above assertion is true, FSANZ does not aim to protect public health and safety and appears to have violated Sections 3 and 18 of the FSANZ Act.
- The Canadian, UK, European, US and Japanese Health & Safety authorities mentioned in SD1, appear to be part of the worldwide Codex cartel and are working from the same Codex base as FSANZ, and as such do not appear to offer anything new in the way of reputable independent sources of information. The studies cited also appear to be cherry-picked documents supporting FSANZ's claims. In failing to consider other independent reputable sources of information, FSANZ appears to have violated the statement in its submission document '*FSANZ is required to use the best scientific evidence available*' and also appears to have violated Sections 3 and 18 of the FSANZ Act.

- Sections 14 & 107 of the FSANZ Act state that FSANZ can acquire hold and dispose of personal property, can accept gifts grants bequests and advances, is not bound to act in a formal manner, is not bound by the rules of evidence, can inform itself on any matter in such manner as it thinks fit, is not obliged to receive written or oral information or submissions, can do anything incidental to any of its powers and can exercise these powers globally. The reader could perhaps be excused for thinking they were reading a fascist manifesto. These statements make a mockery of the rest of the Act where FSANZ's obligations and responsibilities are specifically defined, as would be expected of a high integrity authority acting in the public interest. Since FSANZ is seemingly not obliged to take any notice of independent expert opinion or public submissions and can seemingly do whatever it wants, its scientific credibility, and its ability to make sound decisions in the public interest, is effectively zero.
- Notwithstanding the above discussion on the FSANZ Act, as a corporate entity FSANZ appears to have no direct democratic accountability to the Australasian public and as such has no binding requirement to consider any submissions from the public whatsoever. It appears that the public submission process really is a sham.
- Further, if any of the government departments that are responsible for enforcing the Food Standards Code produced by FSANZ are themselves corporate entities, their rights of enforcement under corporate law may also be questionable.
- It appears FSANZ and its political controllers are carrying out policies enforced by overseas agencies beyond the democratic reach of the public to implement Codex over which the public also does not have any democratic control. It appears that taxpayers' money is being used to promote foreign interests, not necessarily in the interests of the public, bypassing Australasians' sovereign rights in the process.

REASONS WHY FSANZ'S PROPOSAL IS NOT SOUND

- FSANZ has gone to great lengths throughout the proposal to imply that apricot kernels contain free HCN, which is incorrect. This is comparable to stating that table salt contains lethal chlorine gas and should be banned.
- FSANZ has cited the deaths of two children in Turkey between 1957 and 1962, and two more in Gaza around 1981, from eating apricot kernels and kernel products. In just 15 minutes of online searching I found over twenty well documented deaths in the last twenty years from the overconsumption of potable water and a vast number of reported adverse reactions. There are tens of thousands of deaths and permanent disabilities every year in Australasia alone caused by properly approved, properly prescribed and properly administered pharmaceutical drugs. FSANZ has failed to conduct a meaningful risk analysis taking into account a variety of ingested substances and other causes of death and harm.
- There is no independent peer review of FSANZ's proposal in accordance with good scientific principles. This considerably weakens the scientific credibility of the proposal and appears to be in keeping with the views expressed in the first section above that FSANZ and its political controllers essentially want to pursue their undemocratic foreign policies unencumbered by anybody else's views.
- There is absolutely nothing of significance in FSANZ's proposal which even remotely suggests apricot kernels should be banned. This is just junk science.
- So why is FSANZ so eager to ban apricot kernels? Could it be that apricot kernels are a threat to the conventional surgery/radiation/chemotherapy cancer industry, one of the biggest money making scams in medical history (worth an estimated US\$200 billion annually) with an appalling average 5 year survival rate of about 2% and an even more abysmal long term success rate? Since around 1920 there have been dozens of alternative low cost treatments proposed for cancer, many with documented success rates in excess of 90%. All of these cures have been viciously destroyed or covered up and their practitioners savagely harassed, imprisoned or murdered by the powerful medical/pharmaceutical cartel in order to maintain profitable sales of equipment and chemotherapy drugs. Mainstream cancer treatment is not about curing, it's about maintaining the status quo and making money, lots of it.
- FSANZ's offhand dismissal of apricot kernels as a potential treatment for cancer appears to be a deliberate attempt to follow the above practice of removing any opposition to conventional cancer treatment and thereby promoting multinational interests, rather than providing a health benefit to the public. Estimates have put the risk of individuals developing cancer in the future at about 30-50%. Currently the only treatment involves pain, fear, heartache and loss of dignity with virtually no hope of a long term cure. As a purported Health & Safety authority, FSANZ should be promoting interest and research in apricot kernels for effective cancer treatment rather than denigrating them.

- Natural substances like apricot kernels and their active substance (amygdalin) cannot be patented and profitability would therefore be severely compromised. Spending millions to gain suitable approval (as a drug) would be a pointless exercise. This lack of 'official' approval does not automatically make apricot kernels and amygdalin ineffective as FSANZ implies in its proposal. Usage of foods over thousands of years for treatments and cures is powerful evidence of their effectiveness and apricot kernels are no exception. As an example of this, the Hunza people measure wealth by the number of apricot trees owned and the number of kernels produced. Ground-up kernels are consumed at virtually every meal. These people have no word in their vocabulary for cancer because it has always been non-existent. FSANZ has failed to acknowledge and disclose such powerful epidemiological evidence.
- The mechanism by which amygdalin and its derivatives attack cancer cells but not healthy cells is well known and understood. FSANZ has failed to acknowledge and disclose this process, while playing up the general toxicity of HCN for dramatic effect.
- In the early 1970s, the reputable Sloane-Kettering Cancer Institute carried out research on laetrile, a derivative of naturally occurring amygdalin in apricot kernels, and had considerable early success. When the positive findings became known, 7 out of 9 members of the board with ties to the pharmaceutical industry promptly buried the project.
- Many studies by reputable organisations in recent years have vindicated amygdalin as a valuable tool in the fight against cancer and are available online. Again, FSANZ has failed to acknowledge and disclose these studies while deriding the effectiveness of apricot kernels in general.
- The cost to the taxpayer in preparing and processing this proposal probably far outweighs any future costs likely to be incurred by the medical system in treating an insignificant number (compared to other causes) of minor adverse reactions attributable to apricot kernels.
- The professional negligence, lack of transparency, failure to disclose, bias, deception, scaremongering and plain junk science described above, appears to violate virtually all of the objectives and responsibilities stated in Sections 3 and 18 of the FSANZ Act. This is a completely unsatisfactory state of affairs for a supposedly high integrity Health & Safety authority acting in the public interest and does not lend any credibility to this proposal whatsoever.

This proposal has failed to prove that apricot kernels should be banned or interfered with in any way.

Regards,

[REDACTED]