

RMB Newsletter Vol 5:1 EDM No.335 PROCESSED PET FOODS AND VETS February 2005

Dear Reader,

February here already and this is the first RMB Newsletter of 2005. How have you been? How was Christmas? Is 2005 shaping-up as you hoped?

We venture into the unknown with expectations high. It's nice when things go well. In this newsletter I'm delighted to report on some terrific developments in the drive for a fairer deal for pets and pet-owners and transparency, honesty and accountability from vets.

In the UK the campaigners at the UK Raw Meaty Bones Support & Action Group www.ukrmb.co.uk make steady progress. Their lobbying of Members of Parliament gathers momentum spurred-on by the tabling of Early Day Motion No.335 PROCESSED PET FOODS AND VETS <http://edm.ais.co.uk/weblink/html/motion.html/ref=335>

Here's a brief account.

Wishing you a happy, healthy 2005,

Tom Lonsdale

Early Day Motion No.335 PROCESSED PET FOODS AND VETS

What, you might ask, is an Early Day Motion? Is it something a dog passes first thing in the morning? Is it the motion of a person, half-asleep, rummaging in a drawer for socks? No. According to the British Parliamentary website an Early Day Motion (EDM): 'Is a colloquial term for a notice of motion given by a Member for which no date has been fixed for debate. EDMs exist to allow Members to put on record their opinion on a subject and canvass support for it from fellow Members. In effect, the primary function of an EDM is to form a kind of petition that MPs can sign.'
http://www.parliament.uk/about_commons/early_day_motions.cfm

As a result of efficient campaigning by the UKRMB Group a British Member of Parliament, David Taylor MP, tabled EDM No.335 on 7 December 2004:

‘That this House deeply regrets the professional endorsement of processed food for domestic dogs, cats and ferrets by some members of the veterinary profession; is concerned at the level of incidence of malodorous gum disease and associated diseases of the kidneys, liver and other organs amongst the domestic pet population; recognises that their health and welfare is best served by foods, such as raw meaty bones, that reflect the full range of nutritional need; applauds and recommends the work of veterinary surgeon Tom Lonsdale and others in this field; recognises also that vets in the UK are trusted and independent advisers on the health of our pets; is therefore concerned by the nature of the relationship between some vets and producers of foods that cause illnesses in pets; and calls upon the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons to make a definitive statement on the active endorsement and promotion of processed pet foods by vets.’

43 MPs have, at this time, signed the motion and we look forward to the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons doing what’s asked of them.

About 21,000 vets are registered with the Royal College which publishes at its website <http://www.rcvs.org.uk/>:

ROLE OF THE RCVS

This can be summarised by the Strapline:

‘Promoting and Sustaining Public Confidence in Veterinary Medicine’

and the Mission Statement:

‘To safeguard the health and welfare of animals committed to veterinary care through the regulation of the educational, ethical and clinical standards of the veterinary profession, thereby protecting the interests of those dependent on animals and assuring public health;

To act as an impartial source of informed opinion on animal health and welfare issues and their interaction with human health.’

In effect the RCVS is made up of three distinct organisations:

The College – as a statutory regulator: undertaking the statutory responsibilities set out in the Veterinary Surgeons Act 1966 – to maintain a register, regulate veterinary education and to regulate professional conduct.

The College – acting as a ‘Royal College’: exercising powers under the Royal Charter to award Fellowships, Diplomas and Certificates to veterinary surgeons, veterinary nurses and others and to act as informed and impartial source of opinion on veterinary matters.

RCVS Trust – a separate charity: established to promote and advance the study and practice of the art and science of veterinary surgery and medicine – by providing the RCVS Library and Information Service and a range of grants largely to support educational and research activities.

Since the RCVS answers to the British Parliament, then it’s a ‘no-brainer’. The RCVS should set the record straight; demonstrate that they know and abide by the rules and issue a statement setting out their position -- or so one might reasonably think.

But so far, nothing, not a word has been written by the Royal College, to let British vets know that they and their governing body are under scrutiny by elected representatives of the British people. The British Veterinary Association has not, to my current knowledge, published anything either. Why are vets kept in the dark, not trusted to know about matters directly affecting them? When will an official statement be forthcoming from the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons?

When Dog World (24 Dec 2004), a leading UK dog magazine, spoke with the RCVS this is what they said:

“However, as the regulatory body for the veterinary profession, the RCVS does not exist to represent the views of vets and is not in a position to

provide authoritative scientific comment on the nutritional benefits of pet foods.

“Vets are not expected to endorse products without due justification or if they might compromise the clinical care of animals. The RCVS does, however, expect vets to make clinical decisions according to their professional judgment and based on the best available evidence at the time.

“We understand that there is currently an abundance of scientific evidence available to support the use of processed pet foods for everyday feeding of companion animals, together with medicated or ‘science’ diets to provide advanced nutrition for animals that may be unwell, nutritionally deficient or at a certain stage in life.

“Mr Lonsdale has stood in the RCVS council elections for the past eight years in order to promote his concerns. Each time he has secured the least number of votes, which would imply there is little support for his views within the veterinary profession, in which there are currently over 21,000 registered RCVS members.

“We have discussed Mr Lonsdale’s concerns with him on a number of occasions and have urged him to submit scientific evidence to support his claims and to publish this material in peer-reviewed (veterinary) scientific journals. We understand that Mr Lonsdale has not yet accomplished this but we would encourage him to do so.”

The RCVS declare their allegiances but otherwise misrepresent the facts. Face-to-face discussion with the RCVS occurred once only. In June 2004 the then RCVS President, Professor R Halliwell, responded to our request for a meeting and met with Roger Meacock and me. Professor Halliwell poured scorn on our submissions. Otherwise, letters to the RCVS have elicited either minimal or hostile responses that could scarcely be described as ‘discussions’. The recommendation to submit material to ‘scientific journals’ sounds somewhat disingenuous. The RCVS are well aware of and have refused to deal with the censorship and suppression of the diet issue in the ‘scientific journals’.

For the record, five eminent veterinarians have reviewed or commented on the book *Raw Meaty Bones*. (Including three past or present Directors of the Sydney University, Post Graduate Foundation in Veterinary Science www.rawmeatybones.com) *Raw Meaty Bones* thus constitutes 389 pages of peer-reviewed evidence — evidence that the Australian, NZ, UK and US ‘scientific’ veterinary journals refuse to consider. The following articles and

papers overcame considerable obstacles and were published in so-called 'scientific' journals.

1993 Feeding vs Nutrition: Have we lost the plot in small animal dietetics? (Non-reviewed opinion) Australian Veterinary Practitioner 23(1)

1993 Putting Feline Lower Urinary Tract Disease in Context, (Non-reviewed letter.) Journal of Small Animal Practice, December 1993, Vol. 34 592-593
<http://www.rawmeatybones.com/FLUTD.html>

1994 Cybernetic Hypothesis of Periodontal Disease in Mammalian Carnivores, Journal of Veterinary Dentistry 11:1
<http://www.rawmeatybones.com/Cybernetic.html>

1995 Periodontal Disease and Leucopenia, Journal of Small Animal Practice 36, 542–546

Periodontal Disease and Leucopenia found a gap in the veterinary protective cordon around the junk pet food industry. But directly after publication of the paper the veterinary establishment moved to plug the gap. Despite the likely implications for human health in general, HIV AIDS sufferers in particular and the foundations of veterinary science, the Editor of the Journal of Small Animal Practice (published by the British Small Animal Veterinary Association) banned further discussion within the pages of the Journal. The Editor also revoked written undertakings and prevented re-publication of the paper -- thus stopping a wider readership from learning about and acting on the serious implications.

Research findings that have the potential to transform the lives of millions need be verified by repeated experiment. Professor Tony Buffington, a spokesperson for American veterinary teachers and researchers, on 8 August 2002 stated on National Public Radio: 'I've seen the paper. I haven't seen it reproduced by anyone anywhere else.'

<http://www.rawmeatybones.com/radio.html>

Now in 2005, to my knowledge, still no-one has repeated the easy-to-perform research.

Something needs to be done about the games the RCVS and international veterinary leadership play.

If you live in the UK you can help.

Please write to your MP to either thank him/her for signing EDM No.335 or to encourage him/her to do so. You can find details of your MP at:

<http://www.locata.co.uk/commons/>

To check if your MP has signed the EDM No335 go to:

<http://edm.ais.co.uk/weblink/html/motion.html/ref=335>

Letters addressed to the constituency office or to Parliament House are best and email messages are OK.

To fax your MP go to:

<http://www.faxyourmp.com/>

Tell your MP about the pet-food industry/veterinary alliance that harms our pets whilst purporting to do the opposite. However, if you are stuck for words or need help please contact the folks at www.ukrmb.co.uk

If you live in any other country you might like to form a lobby group and start a dialogue with your political representatives. It's the politicians who delegate responsibility to the veterinary profession and it's the politicians who need to take back responsibility in the name of the people.

OTHER DEVELOPMENTS

Vet associations in many countries use their positions of influence, not to advance the health benefits of a natural diet, but to do the opposite. Perhaps one day those associations will be made to apologise and make amends.

Discussion of anti-raw humbug occurs here:

<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/rfwebreview/>

American Veterinary Medical Association humbug demolished here:

<http://www.rawlearning.com/responsetoavma1.html>

In Perth, Western Australia, on the recent lecture tour I was fortunate to meet up with some members of the team who are putting together the AussieRMB Group www.AussieRMB.org.au Thanks and best wishes to Shona, Pat, Sue, Chris, Doug, Julie and all for enthusiasm and hard work.

Kim Roberts, after 31 years as Director of the University of Western Australia Extension, is due to retire at Easter. It was he who put on the first RMB Seminars in 2002 and he again hosted the seminars this year. My sincere thanks to Kim and his team and warm wishes for a fun-filled retirement.

ABC Western Australia interviewed me on 20 January 2005. Audio here: <http://www.abc.net.au/wa/stories/s1293692.htm>

With the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons elections about to get underway the 21,000 British vets will once again be able to show their support for the fair, healthy way to feed pet carnivores. <http://www.rawmeatybones.com/RCVS/RCVS2005.html>

STOP PRESS

In news just to hand, class actions against veterinarians are soon to be filed in Texas, California, Florida and possibly other states. The suits will be for fraud and seek refund of four years fees for unnecessary vaccinations.

In Maine a bill is before the state legislature requiring vets to disclose the truth regarding vaccines. <http://morningsentinel.mainetoday.com/view/letters/1276811.shtml>

Consider the implications if pet owners were to launch legal actions for the cost of four years supply of junk food (whether cooked or ‘barf’). And what about legislation in every nation and state requiring vets to be truthful about the devastating effects of the junk cooked and raw diets they peddle. (Actually, it’s about getting existing consumer protection and truth in advertising laws enforced, but that’s another story.)

In every country there are lawyers and politicians who can take aim at the pet-food fraud. It's just a matter of alerting them to the scam. If you try spreading the word, you may be pleasantly surprised what happens next.

Wishing you and your pets the best of good health,

Tom Lonsdale

We welcome copies of correspondence/emails/faxes for possible inclusion in future RMB Newsletters.

Please circulate, distribute or reproduce this newsletter as you wish.

The Raw Meaty Bones Newsletter is published by:

Tom Lonsdale
Rivetco P/L
PO Box 6096
Windsor Delivery Centre
NSW 2756
Australia

Phone: +61 2 4574 0537

Fax: +61 2 4574 0538

Email: rivetco@rawmeatybones.com

Web: <http://www.rawmeatybones.com>

To subscribe or unsubscribe go to:

<http://seureshop.rawmeatybones.com/newsletter>

Dear Name,

February here already and this is the first RMB Newsletter of 2005. How have you been? How was Christmas? Is 2005 shaping-up as you hoped?

We venture into the unknown with expectations high. It's nice when things go well. In this newsletter I'm delighted to report on some terrific developments in the drive for a fairer deal for pets and pet-owners and transparency, honesty and accountability from vets.

In the UK the campaigners at the UK Raw Meaty Bones Support & Action Group www.ukrmb.co.uk make steady progress. Their lobbying of Members of Parliament gathers momentum spurred-on by the tabling of Early Day Motion No.335 PROCESSED PET FOODS AND VETS <http://edm.ais.co.uk/weblink/html/motion.html/ref=335>

Here's a brief account.

Wishing you a happy, healthy 2005,

Tom Lonsdale

Early Day Motion No.335 PROCESSED PET FOODS AND VETS

What, you might ask, is an Early Day Motion? Is it something a dog passes first thing in the morning? Is it the motion of a person, half-asleep, rummaging in a drawer for socks? No. According to the British Parliamentary website an Early Day Motion (EDM): 'Is a colloquial term for a notice of motion given by a Member for which no date has been fixed for debate. EDMs exist to allow Members to put on record their opinion on a subject and canvass support for it from fellow Members. In effect, the primary function of an EDM is to form a kind of petition that MPs can sign.' http://www.parliament.uk/about_commons/early_day_motions.cfm

As a result of efficient campaigning by the UKRMB Group a British Member of Parliament, David Taylor MP, tabled EDM No.335 on 7 December 2004:

'That this House deeply regrets the professional endorsement of processed food for domestic dogs, cats and ferrets by some members of the veterinary profession; is concerned at the level of incidence of malodorous gum disease and associated diseases of the kidneys, liver and other organs amongst the domestic pet population; recognises that their health and welfare is best served by foods, such as raw meaty bones, that reflect the full range of

nutritional need; applauds and recommends the work of veterinary surgeon Tom Lonsdale and others in this field; recognises also that vets in the UK are trusted and independent advisers on the health of our pets; is therefore concerned by the nature of the relationship between some vets and producers of foods that cause illnesses in pets; and calls upon the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons to make a definitive statement on the active endorsement and promotion of processed pet foods by vets.’

43 MPs have, at this time, signed the motion and we look forward to the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons doing what’s asked of them.

About 21,000 vets are registered with the Royal College which publishes at its website <http://www.rcvs.org.uk/>:

ROLE OF THE RCVS

This can be summarised by **the Strapline**:

‘Promoting and Sustaining Public Confidence in Veterinary Medicine’

and **the Mission Statement**:

‘To safeguard the health and welfare of animals committed to veterinary care through the regulation of the educational, ethical and clinical standards of the veterinary profession, thereby protecting the interests of those dependent on animals and assuring public health;

To act as an impartial source of informed opinion on animal health and welfare issues and their interaction with human health.’

In effect the RCVS is made up of three distinct organisations:

The College – as a statutory regulator: undertaking the statutory responsibilities set out in the Veterinary Surgeons Act 1966 – to maintain a register, regulate veterinary education and to regulate professional conduct.

The College – acting as a ‘Royal College’: exercising powers under the Royal Charter to award Fellowships, Diplomas and Certificates to veterinary

surgeons, veterinary nurses and others and to act as informed and impartial source of opinion on veterinary matters.

RCVS Trust – a separate charity: established to promote and advance the study and practice of the art and science of veterinary surgery and medicine – by providing the RCVS Library and Information Service and a range of grants largely to support educational and research activities.

Since the RCVS answers to the British Parliament, then it's a 'no-brainer'. The RCVS should set the record straight; demonstrate that they know and abide by the rules and issue a statement setting out their position — or so one might reasonably think.

But so far, nothing, not a word has been written by the Royal College, to let British vets know that they and their governing body are under scrutiny by elected representatives of the British people. The British Veterinary Association has not, to my current knowledge, published anything either. Why are vets kept in the dark, not trusted to know about matters directly affecting them? When will an official statement be forthcoming from the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons?

When Dog World (24 Dec 2004), a leading UK dog magazine, spoke with the RCVS this is what they said:

“However, as the regulatory body for the veterinary profession, the RCVS does not exist to represent the views of vets and is not in a position to provide authoritative scientific comment on the nutritional benefits of pet foods.

“Vets are not expected to endorse products without due justification or if they might compromise the clinical care of animals. The RCVS does, however, expect vets to make clinical decisions according to their professional judgment and based on the best available evidence at the time.

“We understand that there is currently an abundance of scientific evidence available to support the use of processed pet foods for everyday feeding of companion animals, together with medicated or ‘science’ diets to provide advanced nutrition for animals that may be unwell, nutritionally deficient or at a certain stage in life.

“Mr Lonsdale has stood in the RCVS council elections for the past eight years in order to promote his concerns. Each time he has secured the least number of votes, which would imply there is little support for his views

within the veterinary profession, in which there are currently over 21,000 registered RCVS members.

“We have discussed Mr Lonsdale’s concerns with him on a number of occasions and have urged him to submit scientific evidence to support his claims and to publish this material in peer-reviewed (veterinary) scientific journals. We understand that Mr Lonsdale has not yet accomplished this but we would encourage him to do so.”

The RCVS declare their allegiances but otherwise misrepresent the facts. Face-to-face discussion with the RCVS occurred once only. In June 2004 the then RCVS President, Professor R Halliwell, responded to our request for a meeting and met with Roger Meacock and me. Professor Halliwell poured scorn on our submissions. Otherwise, letters to the RCVS have elicited either minimal or hostile responses that could scarcely be described as ‘discussions’. The recommendation to submit material to ‘scientific journals’ sounds somewhat disingenuous. The RCVS are well aware of and have refused to deal with the censorship and suppression of the diet issue in the ‘scientific journals’.

For the record, five eminent veterinarians have reviewed or commented on the book *Raw Meaty Bones*. (Including three past or present Directors of the Sydney University, Post Graduate Foundation in Veterinary Science www.rawmeatybones.com) *Raw Meaty Bones* thus constitutes 389 pages of peer-reviewed evidence — evidence that the Australian, NZ, UK and US ‘scientific’ veterinary journals refuse to consider. The following articles and papers overcame considerable obstacles and were published in so-called ‘scientific’ journals.

1993 Feeding vs Nutrition: Have we lost the plot in small animal dietetics? (Non-reviewed opinion) *Australian Veterinary Practitioner* 23(1)

1993 Putting Feline Lower Urinary Tract Disease in Context, (Non-reviewed letter.) *Journal of Small Animal Practice*, December 1993, Vol. 34 592-593 <http://www.rawmeatybones.com/FLUTD.html>

1994 Cybernetic Hypothesis of Periodontal Disease in Mammalian Carnivores, *Journal of Veterinary Dentistry* 11:1
<http://www.rawmeatybones.com/Cybernetic.html>

1995 Periodontal Disease and Leucopenia, *Journal of Small Animal Practice* 36, 542–546

Periodontal Disease and Leucopenia found a gap in the veterinary protective cordon around the junk pet food industry. But directly after publication of the paper the veterinary establishment moved to plug the gap. Despite the likely implications for human health in general, HIV AIDS sufferers in particular and the foundations of veterinary science, the Editor of the *Journal of Small Animal Practice* (published by the British Small Animal Veterinary Association) banned further discussion within the pages of the *Journal*. The Editor also revoked written undertakings and prevented re-publication of the paper -- thus stopping a wider readership from learning about and acting on the serious implications.

Research findings that have the potential to transform the lives of millions need to be verified by repeated experiment. Professor Tony Buffington, a spokesperson for American veterinary teachers and researchers, on 8 August 2002 stated: ‘I’ve seen the paper. I haven’t seen it reproduced by anyone anywhere else.’
<http://www.rawmeatybones.com/radio.html> Now in 2005, to my knowledge, still no-one has repeated the easy-to-perform research.

Something needs to be done about the games the RCVS and international veterinary leadership play.

If you live in the UK you can help.

Please write to your MP to either thank him/her for signing EDM No.335 or to encourage him/her to do so. You can find details of your MP at:

<http://www.locata.co.uk/commons/>

To check if your MP has signed the EDM No335 go to:

<http://edm.ais.co.uk/weblink/html/motion.html/ref=335>

Letters addressed to the constituency office or to Parliament House are best and email messages are OK.

To fax your MP go to:

<http://www.faxyourmp.com/>

Tell your MP why something needs to be done about the pet-food industry/veterinary alliance that harms our pets whilst purporting to do the opposite. However, if you are stuck for words or need help please contact the folks at www.ukrmb.co.uk

If you live in any other country you might like to form a lobby group and start a dialogue with your political representatives. It's the politicians who delegate responsibility to the veterinary profession and it's the politicians who need to take back responsibility in the name of the people.

OTHER DEVELOPMENTS

Vet associations in many countries use their positions of influence, not to advance the health benefits of a natural diet, but to do the opposite. Perhaps one day those associations will be made to apologise and make amends. Discussion of anti-raw humbug occurs here:
<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/rfwebreview/>

American Veterinary Medical Association humbug demolished here:
<http://www.rawlearning.com/responsetoavma1.html>

In Perth, Western Australia, on the recent lecture tour I was fortunate to meet up with some members of the team who are putting together the AussieRMB Group www.AussieRMB.org.au Thanks and best wishes to Shona, Pat, Sue, Chris, Doug, Julie and all for enthusiasm and hard work.

Kim Roberts, after 31 years as Director of the University of Western Australia Extension, is due to retire at Easter. It was he who put on the first RMB Seminars in 2002 and he again hosted the seminars this year. My sincere thanks to Kim and his team and warm wishes for a fun-filled retirement.

ABC Western Australia interviewed me on 20 January 2005. Audio here:
<http://www.abc.net.au/wa/stories/s1293692.htm>

With the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons elections about to get underway the 21,000 British vets will once again be able to show their support for the fair, healthy way to feed pet carnivores.

<http://www.rawmeatybones.com/RCVS/RCVS2005.html>

STOP PRESS:

In news just to hand, class actions against veterinarians are soon to be filed in Texas, California, Florida and possibly other states. The suits will be for fraud and seek refund of four years fees for unnecessary vaccinations.

In Maine a bill is before the state legislature requiring vets to disclose the truth regarding vaccines.

<http://morningsentinel.maintoday.com/view/letters/1276811.shtml>

Consider the implications if pet owners were to launch legal actions for the cost of four years supply of junk food (whether cooked or ‘barf’). And what about legislation in every nation and state requiring vets to be truthful about the devastating effects of the junk cooked and raw diets they peddle. (Actually, it’s about getting existing consumer protection and truth in advertising laws enforced, but that’s another story.)

In every country there are lawyers and politicians who can take aim at the pet-food fraud. It’s just a matter of alerting them to the scam. If you try spreading the word, you may be pleasantly surprised what happens next.

Wishing you and your pets the best of good health,

Tom Lonsdale