



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
TWIN CITIES

Laboratory of Physiological Hygiene
School of Public Health
Stadium Gate 27
611 Beacon Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

(Corres. - ^{BLUEBOOK} Hausmann) P

December 2, 1980

Patricia Hausmann, M.S.
Center for Science in the Public Interest
1755 "S" Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009

Dear Patti:

Two days before leaving for Europe, with three briefcases full of troubles and a million deadlines, I made the mistake of opening your manuscript! I couldn't put it down! Peerless lines for the jacket haven't yet popped into my mind; they probably will on the airplane in a couple of days.

I simply want to say that you have done a marvelous job. It reads like a mystery story, and it is fine scientific and political reporting. Of course, it is good science.

Let me just mention a couple very little things in case you have the opportunity to change them in galley proof. You would make Jeremiah Stamler and me much more comfortable with our colleagues if you called us both "heart researchers" rather than "cardiologists." We've hardly listened to a heart in 20 years and our cardiologist colleagues are annoyed by that label; whereas they respect our research undertakings.

You almost deify Adelle Davis and give her credibility that is rather dangerous without any qualifying statement.

Your chapter on "too much of a good thing" is impeccable.

There is a better source on the Japanese immigrants than the Ancel Keys study, that is the Nihonsan study with various authors including Marmot and Syme in the American Journal of Epidemiology in 1975, 1976.

You do not mention in your discussion the lack of correlation of HDL and population rates of coronary disease as shown in our epidemiology section of the Optimal Lipid Monograph from the American Health Foundation Study and in the enclosed. It is very important to distinguish between individual and population relationships, as you well know.

Your discussion on low serum cholesterol and other diseases is first-rate. Your arguments about causation and controversy are very effective. I loved the "incredible edible pea" but of course you didn't qualify by its incompleteness of protein. I am puzzled about paragraph two on page 117, and can't figure whether you are quoting somebody or what happens there about "nutritionists

Today please:
Send 40 final
corrected version - Jan.
as is.

Good letter. Frank.
Let's never use
"couple" without
"of" - el donk.
Thanks HB.

12/10/80
JH

December 2, 1980
Hausmann Letter
Page Two

wanting 4,000 foods banned," and so forth. It just doesn't tie in and make sense. Please read the paragraph again and see how it could be troubling.

There is a later edition of the American Heart Association cookbook which you might do better to refer to. You leave out the exciting things on salt, but they have little to do with Jack Sprat.

It's not very important, but you neglected to mention that our group was the one that demonstrated, with our Finnish colleagues, the high North Karelia rates, and which (inadvertently) activated the community to action. That was entirely the result of our studies.

The "federal turtle" is obviously worth the price of admission and is a marvelous exposé.

You have mistaken on p. 189, I believe, the American Heart Journal with Circulation. The American Heart Journal has nothing to do with the American Heart Association, and to my knowledge, and I am on its board, has never published anything significant or original in this field at all. Circulation and a number of other journals have been far more important in this area, as you, of course, know.

I've got to fly through it again, before I read it seriously, but I am puzzled now how the recipes and menus come into Chapter 7 and disappear in Chapter 8 in regard to the logic of presentation.

Obviously, you finished this before the election. What will happen now? Carol Foreman will be out, Berglund will be out, and presumably Hegsted and McGovern and Chris Hitt will be looking for jobs. All the vested interests and lobbies will be riding high. I don't know of any particular strength in health or nutrition in Congressional Committees. You might want to add or have Michael add in the prologue some speculation about the possible dark days ahead unless the public pushes.

I am sorry that you avoided criticizing Alfin Slater rather than her husband. She was really responsible for that lousy study on eggs.

For the moment I am just happy to have all this stuff down in one place. It is a very effective, scientific and socio-political reporting and essay. I wonder a little about its audience. It will not fall into the cookbook section, where it would be a bestseller. Maybe you know that Jane Brody's book has already been bought by the Book-of-the-Month Club. Yours is a serious, critical, non-fiction work, but I find it hard to classify. I presume your publishers, have advised you appropriately on that. Obviously you had pitched it more as an exposé of the ~~science of politics~~, and it will be very valuable.

Politics of Science

December 2, 1980
Hausmann Letter
Page Three

Maybe the words are coming: "Patti Hausmann has quietly, effectively, and thoughtfully, from her background of nutrition, science reporting and consumer interest, developed ~~the science and politics~~ 'the science and politics of fat and cholesterol' in an original fashion. Nothing like it exists in any literature. In fact, it is a new style of criticism which highlights the interaction between centers of power in science, politics, and the market place.

Not only is it good science and political analysis, but it contains profound insights on how scientific decisions and public health recommendations are made. They are seldom based entirely on science. The analysis also portrays sharply a fundamental schism in the scientific world between those ^{concerned} with mechanisms and genetic determinism, who tend to despair of human nature or the beneficial effect of human institutions. In contrast ^{are the} humanitarians, who in their science as well as their politics, ^{are} ~~are~~ ^{disinterested} ~~expressed~~ with the overwhelming effects of environment, culture and behavior, and ~~who~~ demonstrate that institutional change does change human lives.

Ms. Hausmann brilliantly exposes the three rich ^{food} ~~nutritional~~ lobbies, meat, dairy and eggs, and suggests that they are putting their heads in the sand. Instead, they ~~should~~ realize the immense potential in marketing ^{of} in energy efficiency ~~in~~ health ~~changes~~ already underway in the buying practices and eating patterns of the educated public."

I can do better and more succinctly if you give me time. I hope I will have an opportunity to review the book for other publications. Many thanks for the preprint.

Cordially,

Henry Blackburn, M.D.
Professor and Director

HB:jnl

Enclosure: HAYSTON PREPRINT