

APRIL 1977

THE GARGOYLE Henry George School of N.J. PO Box 637 Woodbridge, N.J. 07095

THE PEOPLE'S SAVIOR  
THE FEDERAL DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Everyone knows that there is nothing common about common sense, except, of course, the Federal Drug Administration. It considers common sense some kind of speciality beyond its capability. Once again it has demonstrated the superiority of its wisdom to common sense.

On the basis of highly questionable evidence, it is banning saccharin. This is a sweetener which is used as a substitute for sugar, and is particularly useful for diabetics, the obese and others who should consume as little sugar as possible. It has been in use for about 80 years without having ever been known to cause human cancer in any person.

In Canada some tests on rats who were fed a diet containing 5% saccharin indicated that cancer developed. The equivalent dosage for a human being would be 800 12 ounce cans of soda containing saccharin, daily. Before the cancer, if any developed, on that basis, a man would have drowned in the dosage he consumed.

The excuse offered by the FDA is that the law states that any additive which causes a malignancy in humans or animals must be forbidden. This brings home the point that Congress, in its almighty wisdom legislates in matters in which it has no competency. Of course, this assumes it has competency in other matters, which is quite an assumption.

But, the FDA did not need to ban saccharin. Anytime a bureaucracy wishes to get around a ruling, it can. That's why all bureaus have a horde of lawyers on their staffs. Their function

is not to tell the bureaucrats what they cannot do, but to tell the bureaucrats how to do what they want to do despite the law.

If saccharin is to be banned, why not tobacco? There is little doubt that smoking tends to cause lung cancer if indulged in over a long period of time. Few people doubt this--all the evidence supports it. Although advertising is banned, the sale of tobacco is not. The excuse, again is that tobacco is not a food, and technically does not come under the ban. But since tobacco is chewed as well as smoked, no doubt, ingenious lawyers could easily put tobacco within the frame of the law.

Probably the reason tobacco is ignored is that it is a much bigger industry, with powerful vested interests. Farmers carry a lot of political clout. So, expediency calls for looking the other way where this cancer inducing substance is concerned.

Saccharin vested interests are nowhere nearly as powerful as the tobacco interests. Nonetheless, the FDA has found that it has bitten quite a bit off in attempting to ban saccharin, now is talking about treating it as a drug which one can obtain by means of a perscription. But if the FDA is to prevent the use of cancer inducing substances, why permit it to be obtained at all? All perscriptions do is to put more money in the pockets of physcians and druggists at the expense of the mass of the people. Probably most of those who should not consume sugar are the elderly and the poor, the ones least able to pay the increased costs which would result.

How sweet it would be if banning this sweetner woke people up to absurdity of the government trying to

protect the people from the womb to the tomb. What gives to government bureaucrats that wisdom and knowledge to tell us how to live our lives?

The essence of freedom is the right of an individual to make a fool of himself. If I wish to smoke myself to death, that's my business. If I wish to consume saccharin and eventually it induces in me a cancerous growth that's my business. It is one thing to warn me of the dangers involved. It is another thing to prevent me from doing whatever foolish thing I want to do on the theory you are protecting my life. People know smoking is cancer inducing. Yet, today they smoke more than ever. The satisfaction they gain from smoking more than outweighs the possible after-effects they will suffer. They know the facts; they have made their decision. That is their right.

Isn't it fortunate that Moses did not have to submit the Ten Commandments to government for its approval. Maybe government would have forbidden the Ten Commandments on the grounds that no human being could live up to its precepts.

If there is any banning to be done, why not ban Congress from passing any laws for the next decade except laws to repeal other laws. Is that too sweet a thought?

OSCAR B. JOHANNSSEN