

## **PE1376/B**

### **Public Petition PE1376** - Comments on briefing papers:

James McDonald; UK Aspartame Awareness Campaign (UKAAC)

#### **Background:**

The FSA web site has undergone some sanitisation in the last 2 years.

Free Methanol through methyl ester is a not (generally) very well known breakdown product of aspartame of which it constitutes 10% by wt ; the presence of methanol in aspartame and therefore its severe metabolic toxicity has been suppressed by the manufacturer since 1982 and now by the FSA, further denying the public and our Medical Professionals this vital information needed to protect our health.

Through the efforts of the UKAAC in exposing the presence of chronic consumption of free methanol in our diet, it is gravely worrying to find subsequently that COT, FSA and EFSA scientists up until October 2009 had little or no accurate knowledge of the metabolism of neither aspartame nor free methanol – information on the severe toxicity of methanol was publically available (MSDS) at the time aspartame was approved but it was not consulted

#### **Food Standards Agency Study:**

Please note: Without the crucial knowledge of the severe metabolic toxicity of 10% of aspartame the FSA and EFSA have not been in a position to give a credible opinion on the safety of aspartame since 1982. All opinions expressed from then till now must be regarded as unsafe if not null and void.

#### **House of Lords - Parliamentary Questions:**

7<sup>th</sup> April 2010: column WA436 - Q. Baroness Masham of Ilton - A. Baroness Thornton

16<sup>th</sup> Nov 2010: Column WA188 – Q. Lord Clement Jones - A. Earl Howe

17<sup>th</sup> Nov. 2010: Column WA209 – Q. Lord Clement Jones - A. Earl Howe

All these questions concern the pilot study currently being carried out in Hull University.

Because the EFSA Advisory Forum (AF) in May of this year did not endorsed their own scientists recommendations that aspartame is safe and will await the conclusion of the Hull study before considering it further, this study has assumed an importance well past that for which it was intended.

The FSA state in response to the question on the 17<sup>th</sup> Nov. WA209; aspartame is safe to consume yet the EFSA AF in May did not agree. In question WA436 the FSA response was to say the study was nothing to do with anecdotal evidence, this is wrong it has everything to do with it. The very volunteers they are looking for (fast reactors to aspartame) are people who have experienced physical harm through consuming aspartame – anecdotal evidence?

To clarify some confusing information regarding numbers; At the outset the study group planned on recruiting 75 fast reactors and 75 non reactor volunteers, now we see the number required is only

50 of each? Also the study is to be extended for a further 6 months and tests are now to include information regarding aspartame metabolism see Background comments above.

Clearly and by FSA's own admission the study is failing for lack of volunteers - for all sorts of reasons this study was bound to fail. However, the lack of volunteers or other failures of this study does not indicate we do not have a serious health problem from the consumption of free methanol from aspartame in the UK, nor does it in any way "prove" that aspartame is safe to eat in our daily diets.

James McDonald  
UKAAC  
6<sup>th</sup> December 2010