The story of ACSH and my involvement in it has several main threads as follows:

- The origin of ACSH, its main purpose and the response of the American public to it.
- How the creation of ACSH reprises the significance of parade leadership in human affairs.
- My pathway into and through ACSH and what this says about my motivations.

ACSH was formed in 1978 by the late Dr. Elizabeth Whelan as described by her in an essay she penned at its 25th anniversary, as shown in Appendix A. This essay reveals clearly how she and the late Dr. Frederick Stare came to be co-founders. The founding was complete when the late Dr. Norman Borlaug, a Nobel laureate, was recruited to add luster to the organization. Elizabeth and Frederick were fellow nutritionists, but he was the senior of the two and had impeccable credentials as a nutritionist and as the founder of the Harvard Department of Nutrition. In due course, as a member of the ACSH Board from 1993 to 1996, I came to know all three founders. I had earlier become close to Dr. Borlaug because of our association in CAST, as told elsewhere in these memoirs.

Elizabeth founded ACSH because her attempts in the early 1970’s to inform the public about the importance of science in guiding personal decisions about health issues were thwarted by factual distortions. The thrust of ACSH has a near perfect parallel to the foundation of CAST, growing out of the food and agricultural arena in 1972. Of the latter, I was a factotum as well.

A special parallel of the two organizations was that, in large measure, the essence of both organizations was the length and breadth of the shadow of a single person – Elizabeth Whelan in the case of ACSH and Charles Black in the case of CAST. Both organizations were noble and of high character and desperately needed by American society in a post-WWII world flooded by charlatans and distorted ideologies, which played upon a gullible public all too willing to be led astray. After a couple of decades of leadership in the named organizations, both Charles and then Beth passed away. The well-being of ACSH and CAST without them is beyond this telling.

As an aside, it was always my impression that Dr. Whelan gave a high priority to combating smoking as a passion. I suspected someone close to her had suffered in the extreme as a result of smoking. If so, this is a moot point, as her crusade against smoking was meritorious. Still, even some well-wishers counseled that the broader purposes of ACSH could be better served if the anti-smoking crusade could be moderated. Beth was not dissuaded.

Elsewhere in these memoirs I have posited that some people have such a bent to lead that they seek out a parade and get in front of it. With no ill will intended, it was my impression that this was in effect what led Dr. Whelan to create and to lead ACSH until her demise. Although she had a board and a large cadre of scientific advisors, it was Elizabeth who made all the decisions. In a way, she earned this right because she not only single handedly created ACSH, she personally went hat in hand on a sustained basis to raise the substantial sums required to

---

*This document will constitute a chapter in From City Shadows, the memoirs of the author. This document, having been completed in June 2016, is being made a part of the Upchurch Collection both in print and digitally at N.C. State University, along with supportive documents as inventoried in Appendix E.*
keep it afloat. She deserves accolades for this. All the while, she set a high standard for scientific integrity and held the organization above reproach. Even so, her critics unfairly accused her and ACSH of being a hand maiden of industry – a totally unfounded accusation as the record shows. CAST faced the same scenario. All during the 1980’s and 1990’s, I had the recurrent thought as to what would happen to ACSH if Beth was not around to lead, raise money, sustain integrity, and undergird a robust outreach program.

That Frederick Stare would come under the sway of the ambitious and visionary Beth was a natural evolution based on their collaboration and that Stare was well positioned to see the void that ACSH was created to fill.

The appearance of Borlaug on the ACSH scene was a natural opportunity which fit well within the wheelhouse Borlaug had created for himself. His role of creating short strawed wheat and rice which could tolerate high increments of nitrogen without lodging led to higher yields and world-wide reductions in hunger. Given the Nobel Prize for this, he quickly realized his new platform could be used to tout modern agricultural science. He became an effective world-wide advocate for the adoption of modern practices and for the funding of research for agriculture and food production. He became a forceful advocate combating the extreme positions espoused by misguided environmentalists. It was a natural step for him to join Whelan and Stare as a co-founder of ACSH, as he saw this as one more step in advocating the adoption of rational scientific positions. He fully supported ACSH and regularly attended board meetings. This was one of many outreach platforms he encouraged.

That I would become involved with ACSH and supportive of it was a natural outgrowth of my penchant for seizing opportunities to put my talents to work at every turn. At the end of this chapter I will pose the question as to whether or not it would have been wiser to have let this cup pass me by.

My initial involvement with ACSH began innocently enough about 1979. It was triggered by a colleague by the name of Dr. Robert M. Devlin. He and I had been close collaborators in the operation of the Plant Growth Regulator Society in the 1970’s. He was active as a reviewer of articles for ACSH, thus qualifying as a “Scientific Advisor” for the organization. ACSH played this game aggressively and had many dozens of such reviewers cum advisors. I readily accepted Bob’s endorsement and became a regular reviewer of scientific articles for ACSH. This assignment was in my wheelhouse, as by this time I was a skilled reviewer and, as in other organizations, soon became a valuable contributor to ACSH. I took great pride in devoting the time for each review leading to hard-hitting, penetrating evaluations, at the same time attempting not to bruise egos.

ACSH had a strong focus on nutrition in general and health care in particular. Their emphasis was on using science to evaluate risks. While they took on agricultural issues, the high proportion of their reviewers/advisors came from areas other than agriculture. Thus it was easy for my reviews in the agricultural arena and especially as regards pesticides to stand out. It was this situation which, in fact, led to my being selected to serve as a member of the Board of ACSH starting in 1993. See Appendix B for my invitation from Beth to serve on the Board. The member of the staff with which I had closest contact was Edward Remmers. My reviews were returned to him. He called me to say that ACSH was anticipating more activity in the agricultural arena and that Beth Whelan had authorized him to call me and to extend an invitation for me to serve as a member of the ACSH Board. There would be no stipend, but I
would be reimbursed expenses for attending about two meetings of the Board each year. I accepted.

The Board meetings I attended were:
1. April, 1993 – New York City
2. October, 1993 – San Francisco
3. October, 1994 – New York City
4. October, 1995 – New York City

Each meeting started with an elegant reception with superb hor d’oeuvres in very nice settings followed by one or more formal sessions. At these sessions, presentations would be made on the status of projects underway, proposed projects, finished reports, finances, personnel issues and the like. These were pro forma meetings as Beth was in total control and had, in essence, made all decisions in advance. There was good transparency, but in large measure, our meetings were for show.

Being from the agricultural sector and a late addition to the Board, I was considered an outsider. I took it upon myself to get to know my fellow Board members, but it was always clear that I was not one of the insiders. I continued to make the most of the meetings by grasping the issues and forming judgements in my own mind. However, there was little opportunity for having an impact. Still, I considered that the experience gained broadened my grasp of issues faced by society and how science entered the picture.

The fortunes of ACSH ebbed and flowed. In 1993-1994, funds were dangerously low and Beth reduced the staff and cancelled the spring, 1994 Board meeting. Then in May of 1995, reserves had rebounded to an all-time high. Here was Beth in action. My own circumstances were changing during this period. I spent the year 1994 planning and executing my retirement from the University of Arizona. January 1, 1995 found us officially retired and living in Missouri where we had ambitious plans including farming, real estate activities, family history, and more. Before long, it dawned on me that the benefits of my continued service on the ACSH Board were marginal to me and to the organization. My resignation from the Board to Beth was dated July 9, 1996 (Appendix C) and it was in due course accepted. Even so, ACSH letterhead still showed me as a Board member as late as March 4, 1997. My last interaction with ACSH was on June 16, 1999, closing out a twenty-year relationship. Still, ACSH publications flowed my way as late as 2014.

It was quite a coincidence that my mentor on the ACSH staff, Ed Remmers, had grown up in the southern part of Montgomery County, MO where Sallaine and I in 1985 started building a farm enterprise in the northern half of the county. I was never able to identify an array of people native to the county who would augment the relations I had with Ed.

I witnessed the downfall of Ed in the ACSH cadre of employees. I do not know that his downfall greatly impacted my role and status on the Board, but it certainly did not help. The downfall was based on a harsh reality with which I can readily identify. Ed grew into the work world in the absence of computers and, as a mature individual, he eschewed the opportunity to become proficient using the new tools. Beth became increasingly frustrated with his inability or unwillingness to become computer literate. They danced around the issue for a couple of years without Beth gaining a feel that ACSH was being well served. I could tell that she did not want to treat Ed harshly, as he had helped her build ACSH in its early years and served as VP. Ed always represented that he did not need computer skills, but in the end, as the handwriting was on the wall, he found an opportunity elsewhere.
Now I return to the issue of whether I should have avoided getting involved in ACSH in the first place. For me to have turned down reviewing papers for ACSH would have been out of character for me. For many years, my energy was unbounded and I rarely turned down any particular challenge. That having been said, it is clear that each of us has only 24 hours in a day to spend. Just to pick an example, I would, in retrospect, say that the time I spent on ACSH activities would have been more productive had the effort instead been spent on enhancing the Desert Legume Program or on any of several other ventures in which I was active during the time period involved.

Lest the reader gather that I never turned down anything, I will cite one example. At the time I became head of the Plant Sciences Department at the University of Arizona in 1975, I was an associate editor of the American Society of Agronomy Journal of Environmental Quality. While my star was rising as regards the Journal, the duties I assumed at the university were mind boggling. Retreat seemed to be the better part of valor and I resigned my position at the Journal, eschewing prospects for greater recognition.

That I had accepted the associate editorship in the beginning is almost like my later becoming involved with ACSH. In retrospect, again, it might be properly stated that the pathways of my career that unfolded over several decades could have been smoothed had I sought and utilized mentors more effectively. Surely a good one would have said that each new task assumed should have been evaluated in terms of whether the new task represented the wisest use of my time.

My experience with ACSH provides, introspectively, something about the arc of my career and how it related to others who charted their own paths. Beth Whelan and I, each in our own way, wanted to lead parades and we managed to do so. We both had great confidence in our respective visions. We both made common cause with colleagues, but placed strict limits on the extent to which we allowed others to modify our thrusts. I believe we both served society well and that society needs people like us. This is not to gainsay that others might follow that same path with ill outcomes, whether intended or not. I leave it to society to place limits on what the likes of Beth Whelan and Phil Upchurch are allowed to accomplish. In my case, I have no doubt that my domineering attitude prevented me from gaining promotions where my talents could have been put to good use. From 1988 to 1995, I reported to Dr. Eugene Sauder, dean of the University of Arizona College of Agriculture. Like me, he was an autocrat, but he, somehow, achieved his deanship in spite of his character. He proved to be effective in making changes, which I helped him to bring about, although I could question the nature of the changes. Here we will let the matter rest.

Reflections on ACSH

A fair appraisal of the goals, operating procedures and outputs of ACSH leads me to a profound conclusion about the needs of the public and its failure to effectively utilize what ACSH offered over several decades. Among my lifetime of commitments to a dozen or more visionary projects, ACSH falls into the lesser category of time and energy invested. I was close enough to it to make an honest appraisal, but yet not so invested as to be defending my pride or ownership.

First, let me validate what ACSH offered. The best way to do this is to examine a sampling of the publications the organization produced. This may be accomplished by looking at the titles provided in Appendix E, which provides an inventory of ACSH publications placed
in the Upchurch Collection at N.C. State University. One can see that a huge number of issues were addressed dealing with the health and safety of the American public. Furthermore, every one of the publications issued by ACSH can withstand detailed scientific scrutiny. To demonstrate the validity and usefulness of these publications, one only needs to juxtapose them against the daily barrage whereby the print and electronic media every minute of the day and night beseeches us to embrace one nostrum or another. Many appeals claim to be in our own best interest, but the profit motive often leads to a distortion.

There can be no denial that the American public would be well served if guided by the ACSH publications. And yet, ACSH was besieged at every turn with false accusations that it was being paid to shill for one commercial entity or another. Those who so challenged ACSH need to have their own morals, biases, and distortions brought into the light. An example of my own defense of ACSH is shown in Appendix D.

That ACSH was able to garner resources to mount its decades-long effort was due in large part to the drive, determination, and sincere effort of the late Elizabeth Whelan, RIP. She did this in spite of the fact that there were few entities funded to support the work ACSH undertook. The federal government, state governments, a few foundations and some commercial entities would sometimes throw financial crumbs her way. But it was a never-ending chore to raise money and success was often ephemeral.

Commercial organizations and their foundations were notably unreliable when some half-baked issue attracted the attention of the public. The fear of not being politically correct or of offending some segment of their clientele would often jeopardize ACSH funding.

Dr. Beth Whelan would often risk having ACSH be criticized by taking support for a good project. She would know that ACSH would present only sound science, but recognize that somehow a basis for a complaint about integrity would surface. The necessity to accept such funding was a risk that Beth took, knowing that pain would come.

As of this writing in 2016, the passage of time has led to additional documentation concerning ACSH, which any interested party may wish to consider. Three come to mind and have been acquired and placed with my ACSH papers. They are:

- The Charity Review on ACSH by the Better Business Bureau covering 2011-2012 operators and showing ACSH met 13 of 20 standards.
- The obituary of Beth Whelan, who passed away on September 11, 2014.

These three documents add context to my personal experiences as expressed in this memoir chapter and as validated by documents accumulated as a part of my association with ACSH and as preserved as a part of the Upchurch Collection at N.C. State University.

A separate reflection on ACSH has to do with the limitation imposed because Beth Whelan placed herself in the position of being the dominant shaper of vision, policy, procedures, and implementation. This has been alluded to earlier in this chapter. I do not feel it compromised the validity of the work of ACSH or its scientific integrity. One has to be grateful that Beth passed our way and took on the mantle of ACSH leadership. It is unfortunate that she did not give enough attention to nurturing others to take her place. We are left to hope that leaders have and will emerge and keep the fires burning.
Appendix A: ACSH as Portrayed by Founder Elizabeth Whelan on 25th Anniversary

Where did the American Council on Science and Health come from?

The Council’s founder, Dr. Elizabeth Whelan, described the American Council on Science and Health’s origins, mission, and even detractors in this essay written on the occasion of our 25th anniversary in 2003:

A 25th Anniversary Commentary
from Dr. Elizabeth Whelan
President, Co-Founder
American Council on Science and Health:

After I received my doctorate from the Harvard School of Public Health in 1971, I began writing on health issues for consumer magazines — Harper’s Bazaar, Glamour, and others — and found it fascinating that these magazines focused so heavily on purely hypothetical health risks and totally ignored real health hazards, like smoking. (Indeed, the editors I worked with regularly spiked my articles highlighting smoking as a risk, saying they would anger advertisers. I protested about this constantly.)

On April 3, 1973, I accepted a freelance writing assignment from the pharmaceutical company Pfizer: they wanted a background paper on something called “the Delaney Clause” — which I had never heard of.

I was soon to learn that the Delaney Clause was part of the 1958 Food Additive Amendment, and it banned any food additive that caused cancer in laboratory animals. That brief, isolated, assignment prompted me (on my own time, at my own expense) to write a book on the history of food scares: Panic in the Pantry.

Origins

When the manuscript was drafted, I asked Dr. Fredrick Stare, founder of the Harvard Nutrition Department, to write a preface. He liked the manuscript so much that he became involved as a co-author. The book argued that our food supply was safe and that banning chemicals “at the drop of a rat” had no scientific basis. When it was published in 1976 it shocked many, particularly those in the media, as the prevailing popular wisdom was that organic, “chemical-free” food was superior. And no one else had then prominently challenged that misconception.

Panic in the Pantry, which was listed by The Wall Street Journal editorial page as one of the best books of 1976, was the first consumer-oriented book to challenge the popular wisdom that “chemicals” were inherently dangerous and that natural was better. Dr. Stare and I later wrote books that elaborated on that same theme, including The 100% Natural, Purely Organic, Cholesterol-Free, Megavitamin, Low-Carbohydrate Nutrition Hoax. I later took on the issue of chemicals in the general environment with books like Toxic Terror.

At the same time, I wrote and published books dealing with real health threats, including A Smoking Gun? How the Tobacco Industry Gets Away with Murder.

At some point around 1978, Dr. Stare and I asked the question: why are there not more scientists speaking out to counter misinformation about the relationship between chemicals, nutrition, the environment, and health? Twenty-five years ago, we wrote to fifty scientists — including Nobel Laureate Norman Borlaug, who was among ACSH’s founding directors — asking them to join an effort to bring the message of sound science to consumers, via the media. And the blueprint of ACSH came into being.
With the legal and financial assistance of two attorneys — my father and my husband — ACSH’s non-profit, tax-exempt status was secured. And with assistance from former Secretary of the Treasury William Simon, ACSH was introduced to the Scaife Foundation and John M. Olin Foundation, which provided ACSH with its first financial support.

Critics

ACSH adversaries have over the years referred to ACSH as a creation of “the petrochemical industry.” In fact, though, ACSH did not accept funding — even general operating funding — from any corporation or trade association for the first two years of operation. I initially ran things that way because, when we wrote Panic in the Pantry (Atheneum, 1976), I was regularly called a “shill” for the food industry. Barbara Walters, for example, canceled a TV appearance by me, calling me a “paid liar for industry” — even though I had no support whatsoever from the food industry or any other industry in writing and promoting the book.

So I convinced the original Board of Directors that ACSH should only accept funding from private foundations. For two years we tried that, but the media still regularly implied that ACSH had industry support. When we released a report saying that New Jersey’s so-called “cancer alley” was not a real case of industrial chemicals raising cancer rates, the Star-Ledger called ACSH a surrogate for the petrochemical industry. The ACSH Board of Directors concluded that what critics objected to was not ACSH’s funding but ACSH’s views — and that in avoiding corporate donations we were limiting ACSH’s fundraising potential to no avail. So the Board voted to henceforth accept funding from corporations as long as no strings were attached. This remains the fundraising policy today, with about 40% of ACSH funding coming from private foundations, about 40% from corporations, and the rest of the sale of ACSH publications.[1]

Sometimes, if reporters complain about our corporate funding, I remind them that they are funded by corporations and advertisers as well. Phil Donahue was stunned into silence when I pointed that out on his show, and Ed Bradley once threw down his microphone and stormed out of an interview with me. The important thing, though, is not the source of your funding but the accuracy of the points you make, and ACSH’s scientific advisors and use of peer review keep us honest.

Growth

Since 1978, ACSH has grown from fifty scientists to nearly 400. In the past quarter century, on a budget that has never exceeded $1.5 million (compared to our adversaries in the so-called consumer advocacy/environmental movement, with budgets of $20 million or more annually), ACSH has entered public debates on issues ranging from food safety to cigarette smoking, environmental chemicals to bioterrorism. Enter terms like “cancer epidemic,” “cranberry scare,” “lead and health,” “junk food tax,” “cigarette warning label,” and many more into the Internet search engine Google and you will find that ACSH comes up #1 each time.

As ACSH begins its second quarter of a century, its missions remain the same: a) promote sound science in regulation, in public policy, and in the court room; and b) assist consumers, via the media, in distinguishing real health threats from purely hypothetical ones.

As of today, ACSH’s funding continues to come from individuals across the country, as well as private family foundations and corporations — although the percentages fluctuate from year to year.
March 23, 1993

Elizabeth M. Whelan, Sc.D., M.P.H.
President
American Council on Science and Health
1995 Broadway, 2nd Floor
New York NY 10023-5860

Dear Beth,

Thank you for your letter of March 11, 1993, extending an invitation for me to fill a position as a member of the Board of Directors of ACSH. I am pleased to accept your offer, and am highly honored by this opportunity to serve. The work of ACSH is extremely important to our society.

Dr. Edward Remmers and I have talked by phone, and he is sending me details on the April 13, 1993, meeting which I will plan to attend.

I have a number of ideas for consideration by ACSH, but perhaps it is best that a new member spend at least one meeting listening before moving to a proactive stance. If the opportunity presents itself, perhaps you and I could spend a few minutes privately about some ideas.

I look forward to learning more about the board function, and to being of greater service to the ACSH movement.

Sincerely yours,

R. Phillip Upchurch, Professor and Director, Ag Development and Alumni Affairs

cc: Dr. Eugene G. Sander, Vice Provost and Dean
    Dr. Colin C. Kaltenbach, Vice Dean
July 9, 1996

Dr. Beth Whelan, President
American Council on Science and Health
1995 Broadway, 2nd Floor
New York, NY 10023-5860

Dear Beth:

During the last two years I have retired from the University of Arizona and moved to Missouri where I have taken on a number of responsibilities. This has been a period of considerable adjustment as we have disengaged from previous activities and developed momentum on others. My desire had been to continue collaboration with ACSH as I believe strongly in the purposes of the Council. However, it has now become clear to me that I must make some more hard choices. It is with regret that I ask you to accept this as my letter of resignation as a member of the Board of Directors of ACSH effective August 1, 1996.

By taking this action now I hope to allow you time to identify a replacement for me who can attend the 1996 fall meeting of the Board and thus get off to a strong start.

In closing out my formal association with ACSH, I want to commend you, the Staff, the Board, the Scientific Advisors and all who have helped in any way to promote the objectives of ACSH. Our country and the world has a great need for decisions about our health, the environment and ordinary activities to be made on a rational basis. I feel that ACSH has been and continues to make a contribution to this end. I am proud to have played a small part in such a noble and worthwhile effort.

Please accept my best wishes for your continued personal endeavors and for a bright future for the Council.

Sincerely yours,

Robert P. Upchurch, PhD
Professor Emeritus
The University of Arizona

6/3/2016 9:39 AM
June 22, 1994

Mr. Joel Gurin, Editor
Consumer Reports
101 Truman Avenue
Yonkers NY 10703-1057

Dear Mr. Gurin:

I am writing to protest the unfair treatment of the American Council on Science and Health (ACSH) in the article, "Public Interest Pretenders," which appeared in the May 1994 issue of Consumer Reports. I have been a scientific advisor for ACSH for over a decade. During this time I have reviewed many of their articles prior to publication and I have read everything they have published. In this process I have been joined by hundreds of official and unofficial scientific advisors to ACSH. The sole purpose of our combined participation has been to encourage the presentation of facts and reasonable interpretations on important matters of science and health to the American public. It is my deep conviction that ACSH and its scientific advisors have been faithful and accurate in their presentation of facts and interpretations. Your article impugns the integrity of a broad segment of the scientific community. Furthermore, you do this without one scintilla of evidence that any ACSH presentation is invalid. How can responsible journalism sink so low?

The American public is in desperate need of understanding the facts relating to science and health. In the end the citizens and their elected representatives will decide how to spend scarce public resources to protect our society from ills of all sorts. As matters stand now, our public resources are being spent on various matters disproportionate to their harm or potential harm to society. Can't we all act in such a way as to present the facts and reasonable interpretations?

I am not a regular reader of Consumer Reports, but I have always held it in high esteem and have assumed that one could turn to it for an honest evaluation of goods and services. Your article on ACSH does not serve you, your publication, or your readership well. You may be sure that in the long run the truth will be served. I hope that you will take whatever action you can to repair the damage you have done to ACSH and to remove the stigma that your article has tended to place upon hundreds of honest, knowledgeable scientific advisors.

Sincerely yours,

R. Phillip Upchurch, Professor and
Director, Ag Development and Alumni Affairs

School of Renewable Natural Resources
College of Agriculture
School of Family and Consumer Resources
Appendix E: Inventory of RPU Correspondence and ACSH Publications

(Dates shown for newsletters represent a broad range, not a detailed list of each publication for that year.)

Box 1:


Wristband for walking/jogging, blue cloth/Velcro/zipper, “American Council on Science and Health: A Healthier Lifestyle in 1994...One Step at a Time.”

ACSH News: 2001-2003, 2005
Priorities for Health: 1989-2001
Special Report: The Unhealthy Alliance, Crusaders for “Health Freedom,” 1983
Special Report: AIDS in New York City, June 1990
Special Report: Quackery and the Elderly, 1990
Special Report: Dubious Dental Care, April, 1991
Special Report: Marketing Cigarettes to Kids, April, 1993
Special Report: Much Ado About Milk, July, 1993
Special Report: Unproven “Allergies”: An Epidemic of Nonsense, 1993
Special Report: The Beef Controversy, Aug., 1993
Special Report: The Tobacco Industry’s Use of Nicotine as a Drug, May, 1994
Special Report: The Role of Eggs in the Diet, Sept., 1996
Special Report: Dietary Fiber, Jan., 1997
Special Report: Is a Deal with the Cigarette Industry in the Interest of Public Health?, 1997
Special Report: Global Climate Change and Human Health, Oct., 1997
Special Report: Estrogen and Health, 1998
Special Report: You’ve Come a Long Way...or Have You?, March, 1999
Special Report: School Buses and Diesel Fuel, June, 2001
Special Report: The Role of Beef in the American Diet, Jan., 2003

Box 2
What’s the Story: Pressure-Treated Wood, undated (three copies)
Summer Vacation Handbook, undated
Cocaine Facts and Dangers, April, 1990
Lyme Disease, July, 1990
Fluoridation, Sept., 1990
BST Bovine Somatotropin = A Safe, More Plentiful Milk Supply, Sept., 1990
A Status Report Alzheimer’s Disease, Sept., 1990
The Responsible use of Alcohol: Defining the Parameters of Moderation, Jan., 1991
Dioxin in the Environment, Jan., 1991
Laboratory Animal Testing, 1991
HMOs: Are they Right for You?, Jan., 1991
Searching for a Way Out: Smoking Cessation Techniques, 1991
Asbestos, Nov., 1992
Osteoporosis, Aug., 1992
Chronic Fatigue Syndrome, 1992
Panic in the Pantry: Facts and Fallacies about the Food you Buy, 1992
Aspirin and Health, Jan., 1993
Does Moderate Alcohol Consumption Prolong Life?, June, 1993
Eating Safely: Avoiding Foodborne Illness, Jan., 1993
Low Calorie Sweeteners, March, 1993
Diet and Cancer, Dec., 1993
The Efficacy, Safety and Benefits of Bovine Somatotropin and Porcine Somatotropin, July, 1994
Multiple Chemical Sensitivity, Feb., 1994
Priorities in Caring for Your Children: A Primer for Parents, Nov., 1994
Facts about Fats, Feb., 1995
Vitamins and Minerals: Does the Evidence Justify Supplements?, 1995
Update: Is there a Cancer Epidemic in the United States?, Feb., 1995
Chlorine and Health, Aug., 1995
Modernize our Food Safety Laws: Delete the Delaney Clause, Nov., 1995
Does Nature Know Best?: Natural Carcinogens in American Food, 1996
Silicone Breast Implants: Why has Science been Ignored?, Feb., 1996
Biotechnology and Food, Jan., 1996 (two copies)
Irradiated Foods, April, 1996
Health and Safety Tips for your Summer Vacation, May, 1997
Fat Replacers: The Cutting Edge of Cutting Calories, Oct., 1997
Feeding Baby Safely, April, 1997
Colorectal Cancer, June, 1997
Vegetarianism, July, 1997
Lead and Human Health, Dec., 1997
Moderate Alcohol Consumption and Health, Feb., 1999
Traces of Environmental Chemical in the Human Body, Are they a Risk to Health?, April, 1999
Environmental Tobacco Smoke: Health Risk or Health Hype?, May, 1999
Eating Safely: Avoiding Foodborne Illness, June, 1999
Endocrine Disrupters: A Scientific Perspective, July, 1999
Chemoprevention of Breast Cancer, March, 2000
Risk Factors for Prostate Cancer, Feb., 2002
Chemoprevention of Coronary Heart Disease, March, 2002
Cancer Clusters, March, 2002
Facts about “Functional Foods,” April, 2002
Irradiated Foods, May, 2003
Traces of Environmental Chemicals in the Human Body, May, 2003
 Anthrax: What You Need to Know, Oct., 2003
A Citizen’s Guide to Terrorism Preparedness and Response: Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear, 2003
America’s War on Carcinogens, Jan., 2005
Good Stories, Bad Science, July, 2005
Regulating Mercury Emissions from Power Plants: Will it Protect our Health?, Oct., 2005
America’s War on Carcinogens, 2005
Avian Influenza or “Bird Flu”: What You Need to Know, April, 2006
Sugar Substitutes and Your Health, May, 2006
Trans Fatty Acids and Heart Disease, Oct. 2006
Counterfeit Drugs: Coming to a Pharmacy Near You, Aug., 2006
Obesity and its Health Effects, 2009
Biotech Pharmaceuticals and Biotherapy, May, 1998
Issues in Tobacco, June, 1992
Issues in the Environment, June, 1992
The ACSH Washington Record, Winter, 1993
Mise. News Releases, ranging from undated to 1998
ACSH Seventh Annual Report, 1984-1985
ACSH Eighth Annual Report, 1985-86
ACSH Ninth Annual Report, 1986-87
ACSH In Action, 2005-2007
ACSH Advisor Update, Nov., 1998
ACSH Special Release, July and Oct., 1999
Brochures:
Wood as Home Fuel: A Source of Air Pollution, 1984
Low-Calorie Sweeteners: Aspartame, Saccharin, Cyclamate, 1986
Sugars and Your Health, 1986
PCBs: Is the Cure Worth the Cost?, 1986
Pesticides in Your Home and Garden, 1986
Special Holiday Message, 1987
American Council on Science and Health, 1987
Lawn Care Chemicals: What Consumers Should Know, 1987
Diet and Behavior, 1987
Introducing the American Council on Science and Health, 1988
America’s Health: A Century of Progress, 1988
Health Effects of Low-Level Radiation, 1988
Biotechnology: An Introduction, 1988
Lyme Disease, 1988
Pesticides: Helpful or Harmful?, 1988
Diet & Coronary Heart Disease, 1988
Irradiated Foods, 1988
Answers About AIDS, 1988
Cancer in the United States: Is there an Epidemic?, 1988
Introducing the America Council on Science and Health, ca. 1990
New Year's Resolutions for Long Life and Good Health, 1990
Holiday Resolutions, 1991
Resolutions, 1993
1994 Resolutions (three copies)
Introducing ACSH, 1995
Olestra, 1996 (three copies)
Resolutions, 1998
Making Sense of Over the Counter Pain Relievers, 2000
Resolutions for Good Health for the new Millennium, 2000
The Dry-Cleaning Chemical PERC, 2001
The Role of Milk in Your Diet, 2001
Eggs, 2002
Health Claims Against Cosmetics: How do they Look in the Light?, 2005
Teflon and Human Health: Do the Charges Stick?, 2005
Weighing the Benefits and Risks of Your Medications, 2006
Health Effects of Low-Level Radiation, 2006

Box 3 (Note: When brochures or other publications were attached and referred to in correspondence, they were retained in that original order.)
RPU/ACSH Correspondence, 1983-1989
RPU/ACSH Correspondence, 1990-1992
RPU/ACSH Correspondence, 1993
RPU/ACSH Correspondence, 1994
RPU/ACSH Correspondence, 1995
RPU/ACSH Correspondence, 1996
RPU/ACSH Correspondence, 1997-1999
RPU/ACSH Correspondence, 2000-2014