

# Book Reviews

**Understanding Nutrition**, 10<sup>th</sup> ed., by Ellie Whitney, Ph.D., and Sharon Rady Rolfes, M.S., 990 pp, hardcover, ISBN 0-534-62226-7, student ed., Belmont, Calif., Thomson Wadsworth, 2005.

With more than 1 million sold, this book is a major influence on diet, dieticians, and nutritionists.

The authors assure us that the book is based on the best science available, and that only a Registered Dietician (R.D.) can be relied on for accurate information. An R.D. can be obtained by achieving a four-year degree in a related subject, and then passing an examination given by the American Dietetic Association.

Coverage is intended to be comprehensive, including intake levels for foods and all other nutrients, calorie counting, glycemic index (but not glycemic load), FDA food labels, metabolism, anatomy, carbohydrates and sweeteners, lipids, steroids, proteins, vegetarian diets, energy intake, alcohol, weight management, eating disorders, vitamins, minerals, water, supplements, osteoporosis, physiology (energy balance), pregnancy and infant diets, additives, and toxicants. The influence of food on infections and chronic disease is discussed. There is a section on how to spot misinformation.

Appendices A–I cover hormones, chemistry, biochemistry, protein quality, BMI scales, energy for exercise, carbohydrate exchange lists, extensive food composition tables, and World Health Organization (WHO) and Canadian diet recommendations. There is a glossary, a good index, many photos and helpful tables. The writing is very clear, but contains internal inconsistencies. Many citations appear to support the authors' (and ADA's) positions. Kilocalories (kcal) are correctly used instead of calories.

The authors incessantly promote whole-grain foods and carbohydrates in general, despite the fact that 10% to 50% of Americans suffer from grain allergies. They do not even mention celiac and Crohn diseases, and their causes—grain, gluten, and gliadin allergies, which also lead to several types of cancers.<sup>1</sup> Irritable bowel syndrome is said to be caused by high-fat intake, although other causes, including

grains, are in fact more likely. While “balanced diets” are lauded, the actual diets recommended are high carbohydrate (300 g/day, 60% of energy intake), reduced only to 50% for diabetics, despite extensive uncited findings that glucose control is impossible with such diets. Type 2 diabetes is preventable and treatable with low-carbohydrate diets, which are anathema to these authors.<sup>1,2,3</sup>

One reason is fear of fat, especially animal fat, as supposedly atherogenic, one of the most pervasive messages in this book, ignoring observations in groups such as the Inuit, the Masai, and physicians followed as long as 50 years on a high animal fat diet. It also ignores the Spanish Paradox: Between 1964 and 1991, heart disease deaths fell by 25% in men and 34% in women, and stroke deaths also decreased, while per capita bread consumption fell by 55%, rice by 35%, and potatoes by 53%. During this period, beef and full-cream milk consumption doubled, poultry intake tripled, and pork intake quadrupled.<sup>1,2</sup> Spaniards now live 2 years longer than Americans. Authors also fail to acknowledge that between 1959 and 2004, there were at least 50 articles by researchers seeking to prove a connection between fat intake or cholesterol levels and “heart disease” (cardiovascular disease, CVD), in which none found a positive correlation.<sup>4</sup>

Among chemistry errors in the book is the claim that loss of an electron by a stable molecule gives a free radical, implicated in atherogenicity and carcinogenicity (p 389). Such a loss of a negative charge could also lead to formation of a positive and negative ion pair, not a free radical, which is commonly formed when a hydrogen atom with its electron is removed. This is exactly the reason that polyunsaturated fats are more likely to form free radicals (and go rancid) than are saturated or monounsaturated fats, making them *less* desirable. An excellent study, ignored in the book, compared use of animal fat with olive and corn oils. Patients with previous myocardial infarction or angina were selected. After 2 years, 75% of subjects using animal fats were free of major cardiac events, compared with only 57% of those using olive oil and 52% of those using corn oil.<sup>1</sup>

Cholesterol is such a bugaboo to Whitney and Rolfes that they admit to not a single

direct function of it in the body! Cell and organelle membranes are drawn with no cholesterol present, although it is in fact an essential component. The importance of cholesterol in nerve synapses and brain function is not mentioned, nor is the association of low cholesterol levels with cancer, depression, violence, and higher all-cause mortality.<sup>1</sup>

To support a deadly role for dietary saturated fat, Whitney and Rolfes generally rely on secondary sources. Ravnskov's review<sup>5</sup> of the original studies cited by such sources found that their results did not support, or even contradicted, this view of saturated fat. Whitney and Rolfes even tout (p 174) the Seven Countries Study of Ancel Keys, long exposed as a fraud that suppressed data. In addition, they quote (p 176) one publication claiming that a 1% reduction of serum cholesterol level gave a 2% reduction in cardiovascular disease, but not a concurrent publication or many other studies that showed the opposite<sup>5</sup>—for example, that elderly persons with higher cholesterol levels live longer.<sup>1</sup>

Dietary fiber is strongly recommended to prevent both CVD and colon cancer, despite an admission that the research is contradictory (p 124). Whitney and Rolfes do not mention that a 16-year study on 89,000 women and a meta-analysis of 17 studies showed no effect on CVD and a 35% to 50% *increase* in colon cancer.<sup>1</sup>

Wild fish is preferable to farmed fish because the former contains more omega-3 fats, say Whitney and Rolfes, but a recent study shows the exact opposite.<sup>6</sup>

Salt limitation to 6 g/day is recommended “to lower blood pressure.” Very persuasive evidence shows, however, that salt restriction lowers blood pressure in only one-fifth of people, raises it in one-fifth, and has almost no effect in three-fifths. The very large Intersalt trial showed that salt had very little effect on blood pressure, while increasing potassium intake was hypotensive.<sup>2</sup> In 2003, the Cochrane Collaboration agreed with this finding.

Whitney and Rolfes have an extremely negative view of supplements. They recommend them only for pregnant women (p 521). The rest of us are to obtain most vitamins and minerals from food. A mere 75

mg/day of vitamin C in women  $\geq 19$  years old (p B) is plenty, they say, based on plasma saturation, despite the fact that they admit (p E-18) that a plasma assay may not measure content in leukocytes or elsewhere. They ignore copious evidence summarized elsewhere<sup>7</sup> that vitamin C intake of from 250 mg/day up to 6,000 mg/day benefits IQ, CVD, and infections, and that tolerance for vitamin C increases during illness. Chromium (III) as picolinate is disparaged for improving glycemic control and lowering glycosylated hemoglobin in type 2 diabetics, despite persuasive trials.<sup>8</sup> Vitamin E activity is considered to be exclusively from *alpha*-tocopherol; the major isomer in the body, *gamma*, the most effective against CVD, is not mentioned, nor are the tocotrienols.<sup>7</sup>

Coenzyme Q10 is called a “vitamin impostor” with no known use in the human body (p 344). In fact, Q10 is crucial in forming ATP, especially in muscles including the heart. Supplements of Q10 are helpful in alleviating heart failure.<sup>9</sup>

The authors made tiny changes in intakes of many nutrients based on age, sex, and pregnancy, but none for metabolic types. For example, they did not recommend low-carbohydrate diets for people prone to diabetes. More than 130 questionable statements other than those above were found. Therefore, this book is not recommended.

Physicians who ignore recommendations of dietitians may be justified. Calls for courses in nutrition for physicians and other medical professionals, if based on books such as this, might not be worthwhile.

**Joel M. Kauffman, Ph.D.**

Berwyn, Pa.

<sup>1</sup> Groves B. *Trick and Treat: How “Healthy Eating” is Making Us Ill*. London, England: Hammersmith Press; 2008.

<sup>2</sup> Bernstein RK. *Dr. Bernstein’s Diabetes Solution*, rev. ed. Boston, Mass.: Little, Brown; 2003.

<sup>3</sup> Westman EC, Yancy Jr WS, Mavropoulos JC, Marquart M, McDuffie JR. The effect of a low-carbohydrate, ketogenic diet versus a low-glycemic index diet on glycemic control in type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Nutr Metab* 2008;5:36. doi:10.1186/1743-7075-5-36.

<sup>4</sup> Klevay LM. Ischemic heart disease as deficiency disease. *Cell Mol Biol* 2004;50:877-884. doi:10.1170/T583.

<sup>5</sup> Ravnskov U. *The Cholesterol Myths: Exposing the Fallacy that Saturated Fat and Cholesterol Cause Heart Disease*. Washington D.C.: New Trends Publishing; 2000.

<sup>6</sup> Harris WS, Kris-Etherton PM, Harris KA. Intakes of long-chain omega-3 fatty acid associated with reduced risk for death from coronary heart disease in healthy adults. *Curr Atheroscler Rep* 2008;10:503-509.

<sup>7</sup> Hickey S, Roberts H. *Ascorbate: The Science of Vitamin C*. Napa, Calif.: Lulu Press; 2004.

<sup>8</sup> McCarty MF. The case for supplemental chromium and a survey of clinical studies with chromium picolinate. *J Appl Nutr* 1991;43:58-66.

<sup>9</sup> Graveline D. *Statin Drugs Side Effects and the Misguided War on Cholesterol*. Merritt Island, Fla.: Duane Graveline; 2008.

**Welcome to Obamaland: I Have Seen Your Future and It Doesn’t Work**, by James Delingpole, hardback, 216pp, \$27.95, ISBN 978-1-59698-588-9, Washington, D.C., Regnery Publishing, Inc., 2009.

*“Sneaking socialism ... is what you’re about to get.”*

*“I rather enjoy ... inequality. It is what makes life interesting and varied.”*

—James Delingpole

*“The first Whig [liberal] was the Devil!”*

—Dr. Samuel Johnson

In *Obamaland*, author James Delingpole advises us that the land we love has been hijacked by a bunch of left-liberal zealots. They don’t have much of an idea about how to fix the economy, but they do know exactly how to ruin your life, and they will.

Over the next “long, weary years” your taxes are going to rise, your standard of living is going to drop, and your liberties are going to be curtailed. The medical care of your Obamaland future is so costly it will eat up the biggest part of your tax dollar, but so terrible that even in your hour of greatest need, you’d rather walk barefoot across hot coals than ever have to use it, Delingpole writes. He believes there’s not a lot we can do to stop the deluge of misery that is going to hit us now that the socialists are in charge.

Obama wants to “spread the wealth around.” This is typical of socialists, who like to pose as class warriors, raiding the wealthy for the benefit of the poor. That means raiding the earnings of the most productive and giving it to the dependents of the state by raising taxes. Leading the charge will be paragons of self-denial—folks like Al Gore, Michael Moore, and the Clintons. But, if we’ve read *Animal Farm*, we know that as for equality, the socialist masters themselves will always be more equal than others.

It isn’t just Obama who’s going to be running the country; it is the whole left-liberal political machine run by people—a smorgasbord of people Delingpole calls incompetents, time-servers, Communists, class warriors, eco-loons, single-issue rabble-rousers, malcontents, and losers—who are not nearly as nice as President Obama. One example is Rahm Emanuel. Delingpole believes that with Obama at the helm and Democrats controlling both houses of Congress, we will see an explosion in just

the kind of multi-culturalism madness that socialist Britain has been suffering for more than a decade.

Delingpole says the Left has good intentions in paving the highway to hell. But its ideology is consistently, overwhelmingly, comprehensively wrong about absolutely everything. For example, you don’t create a successful economy through higher taxes and greater government spending.

He points out that Britain under Tony Blair changed from a thriving capitalist state to a failed socialist experiment. Britain’s citizens woke up after the 12-year Tony Blair party with a screaming hangover: their pockets empty, their savings gone, their property trashed to virtual worthlessness, their streets rife with crime, and their liberties circumscribed by nannying bureaucrats. In just over a decade, a gang of political imbeciles trashed liberties and traditions that had developed over a thousand years. And British citizens didn’t mind. He attributes this to a widespread moral relativism (that is, everyone believes whatever weird variant of reality they want to believe).

The Left rejects the view that free individuals behave in a way that leads ultimately to the greater benefit of all mankind. Rather, it believes that man’s nature is so irredeemably vile that he cannot be trusted on his own to do the right thing, and that our society is riddled with injustice that requires constraint of freedom of the individual through the wise governance of the state. Instead of being progressive, fair, and kindly, the Left’s deeper instincts are pessimism, misanthropy, bullying, and control. At modern liberalism’s core is not love of humanity, but a visceral hatred of it.

The two elements of liberal self-hatred, Delingpole notes, are auto-flagellation and “value relativism”—the idea that all views are equal since history is just a matter of opinion, and that truth is relative. As Delingpole points out, if you believe that everything has equal value, what you’re also saying is that nothing has any value.

Progressive ideas are the worst thing that ever happened to education, in his view. Liberal “reform” of the public school system by educators like Barack Obama’s friend, Bill Ayers, involves twisting of the lexicon, growth of cultural relativism (multi-culturalism), denigration of tradition, rejection of traditional authority, and abandonment of knowledge. It is part of a consistent, well-thought-out, comprehensive, and devastatingly effective program to destroy Western Civilization from within.

Here’s a sampling of Delingpole’s views on various current topics:

Multiculturalism: This philosophy of self-hating defeatism damages social cohesion. It is the opposite of the “melting pot” philosophy that tries to bring people of all races and backgrounds together. Instead, it is about dragging them apart by emphasizing their differences, “celebrating diversity.”

Affirmative action: This misguided social-healing concept makes a loser of everyone.

Environmentalism: The Great Global Warming Myth, with the complicity of the media, has become the new environmental terror. The propagandists have persuaded millions of people that a creaky film of a dull power-point lecture by a failed presidential candidate is in fact the most urgent, compelling, and important movie in history. Delingpole compares the success of Al Gore’s film to that of Leni Riefenstahl’s Nazi film, *Triumph of the Will*. Delingpole also notes the unacknowledged role of Rachel Carson as one of the 20<sup>th</sup> century’s great mass murderers. Her nonsensical book *Silent Spring*, read and believed by all environmentalists, led to the DDT hysteria.

The Islamist threat: Hussein Mussawi, former leader of Hezbollah, has stated: “We are not fighting so that you will offer us something. We are fighting you to eliminate you.”

For the reasons he explains, Delingpole fears that the socialist bromides that led to President Obama’s election will, in fact, mark the “end of the American idea.” Read this outstanding book, and see whether you agree.

**Jerome C. Arnett, Jr., M.D.**  
Helvetia, W.Va.

**Dissecting Antismokers’ Brains**, by Michael J. McFadden, paperback, 369 pp, \$21.95, ISBN 0-9744979-0-8, Dover, Del., Aethna Press, 2003.

*“A lie repeated often enough becomes the truth.”*

—Joseph Goebbels, Nazi propagandist

*“[L]ong-term risk from normal contact with others’ smoke is virtually nonexistent.”*

—Michael J. McFadden

About 35 years ago Americans were divided into two groups—“smokers” and “nonsmokers”—but the difference was not considered important. Smoking was often accepted and allowed even in college classrooms. Unfortunately, today there exists a state of war between these two supposedly hostile camps.

But the real problem, as author Michael J. McFadden shows, is between smokers and a third, very small but powerful group of activists, the Antismokers. This small group thrives on an endless ocean of money from cigarette taxes (smokers’ tax dollars) and the special “invisible tax” levied directly on smokers through the Master Settlement Agreement (MSA), a deal made between a coalition of states and Big Tobacco (more smokers’ tax dollars). *The Wall Street Journal* has described the MSA as a “legal extortion racket.”

Even though nonsmokers, who make up about 70 percent of the population, generally ignore smoking as a social issue, we now have smoking bans in hundreds of thousands of businesses, in parks, on public sidewalks, and on beaches. Bans have even been proposed for private cars when children are present. These all have resulted from the Antismoking Crusade, whose goal has been the liberal elites’ vision of utopia.

The Crusade has grown from a few scattered extremists in the 1960s to tens of thousands of dedicated, often well-paid lobbyists and activists today. According to McFadden, these activists have exaggerated the dangers from secondary smoke beyond all reason, purely for purposes of social engineering, and have brought injustice to smokers and harm to our larger society.

The Antismokers even today make up only around five percent of adults. McFadden describes nine categories, based on their motivation: 1) the Innocents (the largest group, several million members); 2) the Neurotics; 3) the Truly Affected; 4) the Bereaved; 5) the Victims (a small subset of ex-smokers); 6) the Controllers; 7) the Idealists; 8) the Moralists; and 9) the Greedy.

The Innocents are nonsmokers who, because of massive media campaigns, believe that smokers around them endanger their long-term health.

The Neurotics have developed an almost life-destroying type of obsessive-compulsive neurosis centered on “secondhand smoke.” They suffer intense anxiety and are especially susceptible to the Antismoking Crusade’s suggestion that contact with wisps of secondhand smoke in public places will result in a slow and horrible death. They fear that “toxic particles” may burrow into their clothes or hide in a room where someone has smoked, and later jump out and attack them.

The Truly Affected exhibit strong negative physical reactions to secondhand smoke. Particles of tobacco smoke cannot serve as allergens, but they can act as an irritant and trigger non-allergic respiratory reactions. Some of these reactions have a psychosomatic basis.

The Victims have suffered some medical event they ascribe to their smoking. Their anger at Big Tobacco springs from a refusal to recognize their own history of heavy smoking.

The Controllers, because of their insecurity, feel a need to exert tight control over the world around them through the creation of laws and regulations. They also may act as “smoking cops” to report illegal smoking.

The Idealists include members of the medical profession and nonprofit organizations. Their power comes from their credentials as scientists and medical doctors. Some are truly faultless Idealists, but some are dishonest, recognizing that the case against secondary smoke is scientifically flawed.

The last category, the Greedy, are few in number but great in power. Surprisingly, they are not limited to lawyers, but include researchers and members of nonprofit groups who share the more than \$880 million per year that is being spent on “tobacco control” by state governments alone.

A judgment against Big Tobacco is the crown jewel of legal prizes. A single case can yield a lawyer millions of dollars for a few months of “questionably honest” work. In one case a judge in Florida noted: “[If] the attorneys worked 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, for 42 months, they would earn...\$4,416 per hour for each of the 12 lawyers.”

McFadden shows how the Antismokers use thought control to change the thought processes of others. They alter the definitions of words, using tricks, lies, and half-truths, to distort dozens of ordinary English words and scientific terms in order to force their fellow citizens into the elites’ vision of utopia. We learned about this in George Orwell’s *1984*. Informed observers feel as though they have been transported down the rabbit hole and are watching Alice conversing with the Cheshire Cat.

According to McFadden, the Antismokers also use the Big Lie technique. They repeat the same misleading phrases and incorrect arguments over and over again until people eventually believe them. And if everybody believes them, they *must* be true. Unfortunately, a large portion of the public has been taken in by this technique.

An example is the Antismokers’ claim that tobacco smoke has 5,000 “toxic” chemicals. Some of these are found in the exhaled air of nonsmokers as a result of normal body metabolism. Ordinary city water would likely have several thousand of these chemicals in minute quantities. Chemicals encountered in such infinitesimal amounts are toxicologically harmless.

One of the “toxic chemicals” is arsenic. The standard for arsenic allowed in drinking water is 10 ppb, or 5,000 ng for a 16-oz. glass. According to a 1999 landmark

analytical study, a non-smoker would have to sit in a room with a smoker while the smoker smoked 165,000 cigarettes to get the same dose of arsenic that is allowed in one large glass of drinking water.

In addition, the smoking debate has been defined by a powerful media that engineers its reports to the public. McFadden gives two examples. The story of the 1993 EPA report linking secondary smoke to lung cancer received thousands of lines of print in the news and hours of television coverage at the time. Later in 1998, when the federal Judge William Osteen invalidated the report because it was unscientific and misused statistics, the story merited no more than a few dozen lines and virtually no network coverage.

In 1994, an ABC *Day One* report falsely claimed that Big Tobacco was spiking smokes with extra nicotine to make them more addictive. It was probably heard and accepted by 90 percent of adults. But very few learned that ABC quickly withdrew the claims, agreed to pay Philip Morris \$16 million for legal costs, and even apologized for its “mistake.”

The fallacy the Crusaders promote is that ever-wider and more extreme measures against smoking produce only a positive good at no real cost to anyone but the tobacco companies. But McFadden shows that these extreme measures, in fact, have large societal, personal, and financial costs. One of the greatest is the loss of our personal freedom to choose. Another serious problem is the unjust persecution of a vulnerable minority in our society. Programs that involve the use of force are wrong, and discrimination and hate against *any* minority should never be an accepted part of a free society.

McFadden believes that we should confront politicians and insist that the destructive and tragic smoking ban laws be repealed. Exposing their lies and manipulation can destroy the success of those who would dominate us, so that free choice advocates can then restore the balance between smokers and nonsmokers.

The following organizations, which oppose the fake science and mythology upon which the secondhand smoke scam is based, can be found on the Internet: The FORCES International (which has chapters in more than a dozen different countries), Smokers United, NYC C.L.A.S.H., Smokers Fighting Discrimination, Dave Hitt.com, SmokersClub.com, Speak EasyForum.com, FORESTonline.org, and AntiBrains.com.

**Jerome C. Arnett, Jr., M.D.**  
Helvetia, W.Va.

**Shakedown: How Our Government Is Undermining Democracy in the Name of Human Rights**, by Ezra Levant, 216 pp, hardback, \$25.95, ISBN 978-0-7710-4618-6, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, McClelland & Stewart, 2009.

Canadian “Human Rights” Commissions have a conviction rate even higher than that of U.S. federal courts. Until the Alberta commission took on Ezra Levant, it was virtually 100 percent in federal Section 13 “hate speech” crimes. The only exception was the Canadian Nazi Party, which “got off scot-free on the quaint technicality that it did not, in fact, exist.”

Levant “won,” but the battle lasted 900 days and cost him about half a million dollars. In a real Canadian court, the loser has to pay the other side’s costs. But with HRCs throughout Canada (Levant doesn’t like to dignify these kangaroo courts with the name “human rights”), the prosecution is at taxpayers’ expense, and the defendant is on his own.

As Levant writes, “Even an acquittal... is a punishment. The process becomes the penalty.” It reminds one of hospital sham peer review, or an American licensure board investigation.

For 30 years, HRCs persecuted targets too poor to fight back. Then a couple of miscalculations occurred, the other being the attack on Mark Steyn, who authored the foreword to *Shakedown*. Steyn’s international bestseller *America Alone* had been excerpted in Canada’s best-selling magazine, *Maclean’s*.

Although HRCs started as well-intentioned bodies devoted to the civil rights of the powerless, these tribunals invert the principles of common law. Real human rights, such as to a fair trial and a presumption of innocence, are discarded in favor of the ersatz right not to be offended—if one belongs to certain approved victim groups.

Most complaints brought to HRCs would immediately be thrown out of a court. Levant details many absurdities: for example, a ruling that a McDonald’s restaurant had to accommodate an employee who couldn’t wash her hands often enough. Then there are outrages: a rape crisis center was forced to hire a trans-sexual man as a counselor, regardless of the feelings of the already traumatized women clients. Otherwise, he would be bereft of “economic, social, political and cultural engagement” with the culture around him.

To keep funds flowing to the bureaucracy, HRCs have resorted to marketing campaigns, encouraging people to complain more about each other, and teaching new immigrants that bigotry lurks in every coffee shop. Worse, its own employees engage in vicious hate speech themselves, to try to entrap people. They

encourage racists and anti-Semites to organize, and be “dangerous.”

“Sometimes there are so many anti-hate bureaucrats online at once, each pretending to be a neo-Nazi, that they bump into each other in the same chat group,” Levant writes. They have even illegally hacked into a private citizen’s Internet account to cover their tracks.

The HRC pseudo-courts have powers denied to real police. They can kick your door down without a search warrant, and demand that a building’s occupants answer all questions that are asked and produce everything that is requested.

The harm done by HRCs does not end with the harassment of ordinary citizens, and the extortion of oppressive “damages” to soothe hurt feelings. Fundamental freedoms of thought, religion, and speech are threatened. “Hate messages” can mean anything that a bureaucrat perceives they *might* mean, and can be censored at whim. Rev. Stephen Boisson, who condemned homosexuality in a letter to the editor, not only had to pay \$7,000 to a reader who allegedly “suffered,” but has been subjected to a total, lifelong ban on “disparaging” homosexuality, even from the pulpit.

Censorship by the HRCs is a potent form of “lawfare”—a form of “soft jihad”—by Islamists who want to shut off any unfavorable references to their religion. “Defamation” translates to “blasphemy.” This was the point of the complaint against Levant, for reprinting in the now-defunct *Western Standard* the Danish cartoons depicting Mohammed that radical imams used to incite bloody riots. The strategy is to use the West’s legal system against itself, exploiting post-colonial guilt and cultural self-doubt. With all the ranting about Islamophobia, there is no time to talk about the persecution of Christians or apostate Muslims in Muslim countries.

Levant brought a video camera to his interrogation, and he uploaded the footage to YouTube. Within 10 days, 400,000 people had viewed it. It changed the terms of the debate, from whether the magazine should have printed the cartoons (only 70 percent thought so) to whether it had the right to do so—and whether the government had the right to grill an editor about his innermost thoughts.

Study *Shakedown* to learn how Levant mobilized an “army of Davids” to fight the government Goliath. Watch him turn the tables on a low-level bureaucrat in his interrogation (see [www.EzraLevant.com](http://www.EzraLevant.com)). To defend private medicine, we need the power of the blogosphere in our arsenal too.

**Jane M. Orient, M.D.**  
Tucson, Ariz.