

Dark Side of Fragrances

Glen O. Brechbill

FRAGRANCE BOOKS INC.

www.perfumerbook.com

New Jersey - USA

2007

“To my parents whose
faith in my work & abilities
made this
manuscript possible”

DARK SIDE OF FRAGRANCES ©

This book is a work of non-fiction. No part of the book may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission from the author except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles and reviews.

Designed by Glen O. Brechbill

Library of Congress

Brechbill, Glen O.

Dark Side of Fragrances / Glen O. Brechbill

P. cm. 317 pgs.

1. Fragrance Ingredients Non Fiction. 2. Written odor descriptions to facilitate the understanding of the olfactory language. 1. Essential Oils. 2. Aromas. 3. Chemicals. 4. Classification. 5. Source. 6. Art. 7. Twenty one thousand fragrances. 8. Science. 9. Creativity. I. Title.

20071027

Certificate Registry # TXu 1-593-092

Copyright © 2007 by Glen O. Brechbill

All Rights Reserved

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

First Edition

About the Book

My book titled the "Dark Side of Fragrances" encompasses an entirely different side of the industry. This side is neither glamorous nor well understood. Issues such as MSC, asthma and cancer are serious, and the cause of the maladies has been linked to the use of cosmetic products and fragrances.

The enclosed articles share one thing in common, and that is they have been well written and researched. News articles on the subject are few since its not part of the business that is enchanting. My book helps to bring out the dark side of the business, and the issues that surround the controversy. Fragrances appear in almost every cosmetic product in use today to disguise unpleasant base odors. It's hard to avoid them. The fragrance industry makes money by selling scents.

The IFRA organization was created by the perfume industry, whos aim is to regulate the use of essential oils. They are folks with good intentions, but are lackeys. Prior to modern chemistry cosmetic products were fragranced predominately with essential oils. Health problems became more prevalent in the twentieth century when petroleum became the source of the ingredients. It's O.K. to ban Linalool and Iso Eugenol, but Di Ethyl Phthalate and Benzyl Salicylate are perfectly fine. Who benefits if the essential oil industry goes out of business? Who can afford the massive regulatory nightmare created by an industry pushing the use of synthetics?

Givaudan Fragrance Corporation (IFRA) - International Fragrance Association

International Flavors & Fragrances

Firmenich Inc.

Symrise

Takasago International

Index

Name of Article	Pages
Copyright	II
About the Book	III
Index	IV - X
Magazine Ads - Do They Have to Smell	11 - 12
Fragrance & Cancer	13 - 15
Is Perfume Sweet Smelling Poison	16 - 18
Bottle Lawsuit	19 - 20
Getting Ill & Fragrances	21 - 23
Cosmetic Chemistry	24 - 26
A Perfumer Who Believes MSC Sufferers are Fakes	27 - 31
Perfume & Allergy	32 - 33
Health Risks Associated with Using Perfume	34 - 36
Infertility Concerns	37 - 38
Think Twice - Before Giving Fragrance as a Gift	39 - 41
Essential Oil - Diluting or Cutting	42 - 46
An Obsessed Perfumer	47 - 48

Phthalates	49 - 50
Breast Cancer	51 - 52
Soap	53 - 54
Beauty & Its Price	55 - 58
Its the Beauty Industries Ugly Secret	59 - 61
Perfume Peddling	62 - 64
IFRA	65 - 68
Sensitive to Perfume	69 - 70
Cleaning the Air of Scents	71 - 72
Offbeat Scents	73 - 74
Springtime	75 - 76
Sweat	77 - 79
Smells & Hell	80 - 82
Cosmetics & Cow Madness	83 - 84
Fine Fragrance Marketing	85 - 86
Sensitive Chemicals	87 - 88
Pirates & Scent	89 - 90
Ash Tray Fragrance	91 - 92
Allergens & Label	93 - 94
Copying Fragrance	95 - 96
Infringement of Patents	97
Cosmetic Ingredients	98 - 99

Dangers of Candles & Fires	100
Chanel's Experience with Escorts	101 - 102
Complex Ingredients	103 - 105
George Bush & Fragrance	106 - 108
Perfume and Danger Sniffing it	109 - 110
Shampoo & its Goo	111 - 113
Dangerous Aerosols	114 - 115
Household Fragrances & Environmental Dangers	116 - 117
Nosey Women	118 - 119
Fragrances	120 - 121
Lost of Smell Due to Age	122 - 123
MCS & The Fragrant Chemicals	124 - 126
Opium - The Fragrance	127 - 129
Ethics & The Use of Rare Plants	130 - 140
Celebrities Smell the Profits	141 - 142
Store Makeup & Bacteria	143 - 144
Shampoo & its Safety	145 - 146
Rich Stink with Wealth, Trump	147 - 148
Skin & Botanicals	149 - 150
Making Fragrances	151
Company Closes its Doors	152 - 153
Flowers to Iraq	154 - 155

Marketing & Ads	156 - 157
Foul Body Odors	158 - 159
Toxic Shampoos Filled With Danger	160 - 161
Multiple Chemical Sensitivity - All About	162 - 163
Celebrity Fragrances Stink	164 - 165
The Doom of Beauty	166 - 168
Air & Trouble	169 - 171
Toxicity of Scent	172 - 173
Stars & their Fragrances	174 - 175
Flowers & Peace	176
Ill Effects to Health	177 - 178
City Employee Sues	179 - 180
Personal Care Product Use & its Dangers	181 - 183
Does Musk in Fragrance Weaken the Body?	184
Beauty & Phthalates	185 - 187
Another Celebrity Scent	188 - 190
Do Cosmetics Cause Infertility Problems?	191 - 193
Cosmetic Dangers	194 - 195
Fabric Softener Dangers	196 - 197
A Horse Scent	198
Debating Chemicals	199 - 201
DJ Wins Lawsuit	202

Sniffing at Problems	203 - 205
Strong Fragrance Can Send People Reeling	206 - 207
Fragrance Decline	208 - 210
Stinking Healthcare	211 - 214
Study Says Bad Smells Can Cause Accidents	215 - 216
Synthetics Harm Marine Life	217 - 218
Sex & Smells	219
Sex Bias	220 - 221
Graduating	222
Perfume Trade Gutting the Bois De Rose Forest	223 - 224
Fragrance & Multiple Chemical Sensitivity	225
Cologne & Smelling Naturally	226 - 227
Cocoa by Chanel	228
Cocaine & Chanel	229 - 231
Celebrity Scents	232
Phthalate Dangers	233 - 234
Remaking Cosmetics	235 - 236
Wasting Money on Expensive Perfumes	237 - 238
Crashes & Air Freshners	239 - 240
Bathroom's Toxicity	241 - 244
New Car's & Their Smells	245
Sex & Fragrance	246

Trademarking Strawberries	247
Branding	248 - 249
Fall Sports & Their Smells	250 - 251
Fragrant City	252 - 254
Deoderants & Cancer	255 - 256
Phthalate's & Their Dangers	257 - 259
Smell of Panic a Natural High	260
Fake Fragrance Problem	261 - 262
Criticism of Fragrance	263 - 264
Breast Cancer & DEP	265 - 266
Cleaner Air without Fragrance	267 - 268
Phone & Smells	269
Stealing Rare Plants	270 - 272
Axe & its Smells	273 - 274
Perfume Allergy	275
Ban Fragrance in School	276 - 277
Softhead's & Expensive Perfume	278 - 279
Are Fragrance Compositions Copyrightable?	280 - 281
Diddy in Trouble Over Copright?	282
Air Fresheners Go Easy	283 - 284
Danger's of Makeup	285 - 287
Avoiding Fragrances	288 - 289

Boycotting 40th Amendment	290 - 291
40th Amendment (IFRA)	292
IFRA & Synthetics	293 - 294
IFRA & Cropwatch	295 - 296
IFRA & Givaudan Concerns	297 - 298
Citrus Ingredients Gone?	299 - 300
Givaudan Restructure's Fragrance Industry (IFRA)	301 - 302
Cosmetic Dangers	303 - 304
Makeup's Toxics	305 - 306
Fake Fragrances	307 - 308
Floris of London & its Fragrance Auction	309
DNA Perfume Are You Stupid!	310 - 311
Air Freshners Toxicity	312 - 315
Chemical Dangers	316 - 317

Magazine Ads -

Do They Have to Smell?

DECEMBER 6, 1989

ON THE THEORY that many people can't stand the smell of their magazines and credit-card bills, a proposal has been advanced in New York State to bar fragrance strips from periodicals and mailings unless the samples are sealed.

"The only hazard New Yorkers should face when opening a magazine is a paper cut, not a migraine headache or severe asthmatic reaction," said State Senator Martin Connor, who has introduced a bill that would require smell-proof sealants.

The bill was debated yesterday in Manhattan by chemically sensitive supporters (one of whom testified through an air mask) and economically sensitive opponents, representing cosmetics makers and promoters with nationwide operations.

No one testified from the Magazine Publishers of America, a New York-based association that represents 850 publications. But its senior vice president, David B. Lee, said after the hearing, "I'm not sure we heard anything that would be regarded as specific evidence that magazines are causing a health problem."

"If it now becomes the job of the state to protect citizens from odor, where does it stop?" Mr. Lee asked.

Senator Connor, a Democrat who represents parts of Brooklyn, Manhattan and Staten Island, became aware of the potency of fragrances last year when his communications director, Amy Solomon, was felled on an Albany-bound train by a woman's magazine with perfume-scented advertising inserts.

"By Poughkeepsie, I had a raging migraine headache," she recalled.

Testimony Behind a Mask

Senator Connor attracted wide notice when he mentioned his bill in a letter to the Dear Abby column.

At yesterday's hearing, Richard Zachary, who suffers from hypersensitivity, appeared in an air mask. "An individual should have the right to decide whether he or she wants to sample a chemical product," he said, on behalf of a New Jersey-based group called the National Center for Environmental Health Strategies.

"It's almost ludicrous to think of an aspirin sample reaching our blood stream without our knowing about it," Mr. Zachary said, "yet that is what happens with the molecules from fragrance samples."

Senator Connor's bill may be amended as a result of yesterday's hearing, and industry representatives evidently hope that the bill will be amended out of existence. "We do not believe that samples cause significant public health risks," said Michael Petrina, a vice

president of the 260-member Cosmetic, Toiletry and Fragrance Association.

"Some small segment of the population will react adversely to every chemical that exists," he said, "if the law required everything that might cause such a reaction to be sealed, everything would have to be sealed."

A vice president of Webcraft Technologies Inc. of North Brunswick, N.J. ("one of the world's leading producers of fragrance and cosmetic sample strips"), said it was up to readers whether the aroma-bearing micro-capsules were released. Typically, this is done by lifting a paper flap that covers the strip.

The Webcraft executive, George Lane, said, "Only through active and purposeful involvement will the fragrance sample release the true fragrance rendition."

Fragrance & Cancer

JUNE, 1995

LIKE MANY OTHER LESBIANS AND WOMEN TODAY, MY LIFE HAS BEEN DEVASTATED BY MAN-MADE POLLUTION. First by CFIDS (Chronic Fatigue Immune Dysfunction Syndrome) beginning fourteen years ago, then MCS (Multiple Chemical Sensitivities) a few years later, and then cancer diagnosed in January 1993. I know all three illnesses were caused by an accumulation of the toxic chemicals and radiation I've been exposed to in my life, every exposure coming from something considered at the time as a normal part of everyday life in twentieth century industrial patriarchy.

Perfume

Now the smell of perfume, of clothes washed in scented detergent and fabric softener, and of all scented products, makes me feel horribly sick. An allergy? A strange quirk of my illness? No, there are poisonous chemicals in those scents, and I'm no longer healthy enough to cope with the toxins, so my body is warning me to keep away from them. But there's no way to keep away because these products are considered a normal part of everyday life, and almost everyone uses them. Even at home I'm made sicker by the fabric softener chemicals venting from neighbors' dryers, from people coming to the door wearing scents, and from mail arriving stinking of perfume from all the perfumed places it's been. Going out is much worse, so I do only necessary errands. Some day, like many others with MCS, I may not be able to go out at all.

Advertisement

It's hard having almost no social life just when I most need it, and sometimes I take the chance of going to a women's event or a bookstore. Imagine how I feel when even at places and events that organizers have advertised as "no fragrances please" there is so much toxic scent in the air that I have to leave. And even as I'm wondering if this is the last women's event I'll ever experience, it hurts overhearing perfumed

women and Lesbians there complaining about "all the rules!" and saying "how PC!" about the "no fragrances" request. It would be easier for them to stop using scented products than it is for those of us with MCS to be so limited and physically harmed by their presence, and they would also be protecting themselves from having MCS in the future.

Lots of Lesbians and women are at immediate risk from scents. For those with asthma, or scent-triggered seizures, or severe MCS or strong allergies, perfume exposure at an event could stress an overburdened respiratory, nervous or immune system enough to cause death within fifteen minutes or so. Lesbians and women undergoing chemotherapy often become chemically sensitive during treatment because their bodies are being loaded with toxic chemicals. Cancer is now epidemic, and unless you already know who has it in your community, you might be sadly surprised at how many Lesbians and women at events you attend either have cancer or are in

remission and trying to prevent a recurrence. Also sadly, if you're not already one of us, you may yet be. Organizers who try to make their events fragrance-free are supporting health, life, and accessibility to community for all of us and their efforts shouldn't be undermined by resistance and complaints. Unlike most other kinds of pollution, this is one kind that we can easily stop as individuals. Instead it seems to be increasing, and most buyers and users of scented products are females, who are especially targeted by advertisers.

I originally wrote the second half of this article for the newsletter of the Women's Cancer Resource Center in Berkeley, California, where I sometimes go to support group meetings. Several times I've had to leave a meeting because a new member came wearing perfume. In every case the woman wearing it was apologetic, and didn't realize that the perfume was dangerous to herself as well as to me.

Cancer-causing chemicals have been found in fragrances, and there are probably many ways we don't know about yet that scented products put us at higher risk for cancer. A few years ago a Lesbian wrote in Lesbian Connection suggesting that using underarm deodorant might increase our risk of breast cancer. Putting toxic chemicals on sensitive skin where major lymph glands exist close to breast tissue can't be

safe. The risk is even higher when armpits have been shaved and the deodorant is applied to broken skin.

Of the many books and articles I've read about healing and preventing cancer, not one mentions the dangers of using scented products. Many Lesbians and women who are making huge changes in their lives to heal from cancer are still using perfumed products for personal care, housecleaning, and laundry because they don't have information about the risks involved. Even when we don't use those products ourselves, friends and other members of our communities are exposing us to all the toxic chemicals they use, including at Lesbian and women's events, without realizing how dangerous those perfume chemicals are. For information about how the perfume industry is trying to prevent public education about the toxins in scents in order to protect their enormous profits, read environmental health newsletters like the two listed below.

Scented Products Pose Health Risk

Because of my experience with MCS and what I've learned about fragrance chemicals, I know that avoiding perfumed products as much as possible is an important part of my effort to recover from cancer. Avoiding toxic scented products is just as important in cancer prevention as avoiding foods

containing pesticides, hormones, and other artificial additives.

Over 4,000 chemicals are used in today's fragrances, and 95% of those chemicals are made from petroleum. Toluene was found in every fragrance sample collected by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for a 1991 report. Toluene has been proven to cause cancer, asthma, birth defects, and nervous system damage, and is designated as hazardous waste. Some other toxic chemicals found in fragrances are ethanol, benzene derivatives, acetone, formaldehyde, methylene chloride, and limonene.

The EPA found chloroform as well in fabric softeners.(1) Paradichlorobenzene, used in mothballs and in many "air fresheners," is also used in pesticides, where it is required by law to be listed as an active ingredient. The law does not require it to be listed on deodorizer labels.(2) Many fragrance chemicals are known to cause cancer, biological mutation, reproduction problems, acute toxicity, central nervous disorders, asthma, and MCS.(3)

What we smell from petroleum-based perfumes are volatile chemicals, which travel through the air and stick to our hair, skin, and clothes; drift into our eyes and breathing passages; move into our lungs, bloodstreams and nervous systems. If you smell it, the chemical molecules are entering your

body. No agency regulates the fragrance industry, and there is no public education about the health risk present in the many products that contain chemical scents.

Not Just in a Perfume Bottle

Besides being in perfumes and colognes, toxic chemical scents are also present in most laundry detergents, fabric softeners, anti-cling drier sheets, dishwashing liquids, disinfectants, "air fresheners/deodorizers," incense, soaps, shampoos, hair mousse and conditioners, hair spray, hair processing chemicals, deodorants, cosmetics, suntan/sunscreen lotions, aftershave, analgesic creams, and lip balms. Even products marked "unscented" often are falsely labelled and actually contain toxic fragrances. Advertisements for most of these products are especially directed to women, and because we're experiencing an epidemic of cancer and other illnesses linked to toxins, it's important for us to be informed and careful consumers. Unscented, safer products are available for personal care, laundry, and cleaning. (Check the resource list below.)

Other toxic products to avoid are all pesticides and herbicides, insect repellent, flea powder or spray, flea bombs, mothballs, nail polish and remover, artificial nail products, and dry-cleaned clothes. Avoid pumping your own gasoline at a service station when you are

going to be with someone who's ill, because toxic fumes lingering on your clothes and body can be especially dangerous to them. It's also best to avoid burning synthetic logs, plastic, cardboard, magazines, newspapers, or other trash in fireplaces or wood-burning stoves. (Even burning clean dry wood increases pollution, but it's the safest choice if you don't have access to gas or electric heating.) Everything you do to protect yourself from toxic exposure also creates a healthier environment for others and makes it possible for you to be near people with MCS and other illnesses without making them sicker.

For those of us with MCS, respiratory illness, or weakened immune systems, exposure to scented products can cause exhaustion, weakness, "hay fever" symptoms, dizziness, difficulty concentrating, headaches, rashes, swollen lymph glands, muscle aches and spasms, heart palpitations, nausea, stomach cramps, vomiting, asthma attacks (inability to breathe), neuro-motor dysfunction, seizures, and/or loss of consciousness. Every exposure also puts us at risk of becoming permanently sicker.

Someone with MCS can become very sick from the smell of fabric softener in your clothes, the smell of "air freshener" clinging to your clothes from your home or car, or from any other scented product you use, not only be perfume you

have put on. What may seem a mild fragrance to you can be excruciatingly toxic to someone with MCS. Even natural fragrances can make some people with MCS sicker, because of the damage previously done to our bodies by toxic chemicals. For that reason it's best to avoid any scented products at all near anyone with MCS, or at any event or place where it's requested that scented products not be worn.

(1) Informational leaflets by Julia Kendall, Citizens for a Toxic-Free Marin. Her sources were: Neurotoxins: At Home and the Workplace (Report 99-827 by the Committee on Science & Technology, U.S. House of Representatives, Sept. 16, 1986), and Lance Wallace, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, (703) 349-8970.

(2) *The Delicate Balance*, Vol. IV, Nos. 3-4, p. 19.

3) Julia Kendall, citing a 1988 study by the U.S. House Subcommittee on Business Opportunities, chaired by Ron Wyden (DOR) and the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health.

Is Perfume Sweet Smelling Poison?

1997 - PUBLICATION DATE NOT KNOWN

THE INFORMATION PROVIDED IN THIS DOCUMENT IS INTENDED TO INTRODUCE THE READER to human health issues related to the widespread use of fragrance products.

WHAT YOUR NOSE CAN T TELL YOU ABOUT THE DANGERS OF PERFUME

Culturally, Americans are enamored with fragrances, unlike our European counterparts. Not only are many of the products we use scented, but many products also have a number of scents from which to choose. Thus, not only can you buy a product, but you can choose between 'spring fresh,' 'mountain fresh,' or 'lemon scented' versions of the product.

Americans also love to wear fragrances. This love of fragrance has allowed advertisers to reach their audience by linking fragrance with a desired quality such as 'sexiness,' or 'freshness,' or 'innocence.' This message is so pervasive that many men and women feel it necessary to wear a fragrance in order to be desirable or feel sexy.

Advertisers and marketers also know that there is a very powerful connection between scent and memory, as well as scent and emotion, and they use this frequently in their promotions. The result is that fragrance is considered a 'normal' component of our everyday lives.

Many consumer products contain fragrances. These products include personal products (i.e. perfumes/colognes, shampoos, conditioners, hairspray, shaving cream, make-up, baby care products, deodorants, soap, feminine products, etc.), and household products (i.e. cleaners, air fresheners, bleach, laundry detergent, fabric softeners, etc.).

Perfumes make their way into our mailboxes as well. Many maga-

zines carry "perfume strip" advertisements which waft their odor into the noses of unsuspecting readers. Some companies use scented stationary for their mass mailings. Nobody seems to think that this use of fragrances is anything by pleasant and harmless.

The problem is that fragrance products are not necessarily harmless, and many can cause some very unpleasant effects.

Few people realize that there are at least 5,000 different chemicals used by the fragrance industry in the manufacture of fragrance products. Nor do they realize that a fragrance product such as perfume may contain as many as 600 individual chemical ingredients.

Of the 5,000 different chemicals used in fragrance products, less than 20% have been tested and reported as toxic. Many of those chemicals that have been tested are regulated by the federal government as hazardous materials. The remaining chemicals have not been toxicity tested, so the health effects

and regulatory potential are unknown.

Of the 150 highest volume chemicals used in fragrance products, more than 100 can be identified in the air of a room using sophisticated testing techniques. Most of these 100 chemicals are known to be toxic.

Technically, the Food and Drug Administration oversees fragrances under the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic act. Although the FDA has jurisdiction, they actually administer very little control over fragrance products, allowing the fragrance industry to police itself. As a result, only about 16% of cosmetic products on the market have been tested for toxicity. Thus, the FDA really knows very little about the health effects of fragrance products because they do not require manufacturers to prove their products are safe. It literally requires an act of congress before the FDA can intervene with the fragrance industry to protect public health interests. However, movements to increase the documentation of adverse reactions to fragrance products with the FDA hopefully will illustrate the need for more stringent oversight of the fragrance industry.

Studies show that fragrance chemicals can cause health effects, primarily at the skin, lungs and brain. Many studies have been conducted to show that fragrance prod-

ucts can cause skin sensitivity, rashes, and dermatitis. In fact, skin sensitivity is one of the best known side effects of fragrances.

Fragrances have also been studied for their effect on people with chronic lung disease, particularly asthma. Study results differ, but some data suggests that as many as 75% of known asthmatics (i.e. approximately 9 million people in the U.S. alone) have asthma attacks that are triggered by perfumes.

Finally, a number of studies have been conducted to show how fragrance affects the brain. Because of the strong connection between scent and memory, we know that fragrance products can cross the blood brain barrier. This is important because it means that fragrance chemicals have the potential to affect, and possibly damage, brain tissue. This kind of effect is called 'neurotoxicity.' For example, Linalool, the most abundant chemical in perfume and fragrance products, is known to cause lethargy, depression, and life threatening respiratory effects.

As an example of how potent fragrance can be in the brain, one study conducted in Japan showed that the fragrance of citrus was more effective in alleviating depression than were prescription anti-depressants. This means that the fragrance has psychoactive properties, which places it in the category of psychoactive drugs (i.e.

Prozac, Valium, Elavil, etc.).

Other studies have shown that fragrances can alter mood and alleviate anxiety and stress. Mood, anxiety and stress are properties that are modulated by natural chemicals in the brain. That means that in order for those properties to change, a chemical change has to take place. The studies indicate that the fragrance chemicals cause that chemical change to occur in the brain.

Fragrance chemicals can enter the body through inhalation and ingestion through the nose and mouth, and absorption through the skin. Once in the body they are absorbed into the bloodstream and transported throughout the body. Individual sensitivity to the effects of fragrance chemicals vary widely from no effect at all to severe symptoms.

Symptoms experienced by some people include:

- headache (migraine especially),
- sneezing,
- watery eyes,
- sinus problems,
- anxiety,
- nausea,
- wheezing (especially in asthmatics),
- shortness of breath,
- inability to concentrate,
- brain-fog, dizziness,
- convulsions,
- sore throat,

cough,
 chest tightness,
 hyperactivity (especially in children),
 tremor,
 fatigue,
 lethargy, and
 drowsiness.

Some critics argue that people who are 'sensitive' to fragrances are actually experiencing an anxiety attack brought on by the memory of one bad experience upon the realization that they have been exposed to a fragrance. Interestingly, many sensitive people find that different fragrances consistently cause different arrays of symptoms, with some fragrances causing no ill effects at all. This experience would tend to discount the anxiety attack theory.

Further, odor isn't the cause of symptoms. Even pleasant (and not necessarily strong) smelling products, and products whose concentration is too low to be smelled, can cause symptoms, while some noxious smelling products may not even elicit a response at all.

Children are even more susceptible than adults to the effects of fragrance chemicals, yet fragrances are added to nearly every baby product on the market. A parent who wears perfume or uses scented products may well be poisoning the air their children breathe. Exposure to fragrances may result in the child having difficulty concentrating,

learning disabilities, hyperactive behavior, and even growth retardation and seizures in extreme cases.

And even if you think that avoiding fragranced products will protect your child, evidence shows that fragrance chemicals can be stored in the body, showing up in breast milk in the nursing mother. A frightening prospect indeed!

Even though there are outward symptoms that can be evident, there may also be symptoms that we can not see. We know that many chemicals can cause birth defects (both subtle, like learning disabilities, and overt, like limb deformities) or make changes in DNA, but it is often difficult, if not impossible, to link those effects to a given exposure.

The effects of many fragrance chemicals on health is still largely unknown. The fact that different fragrances cause different symptoms (or no symptoms at all) may indicate that some chemicals are more toxic than others. But until all chemicals have been tested, we can't know which products are harmful, and which are not. Until the time that all chemicals have been tested and the harmful one removed from production processes, it is prudent to avoid fragranced products as much as possible.

Bottle Lawsuit

MAY 11, 1999

THEY COULD HAVE AVOIDED ALL OF THIS BY TEAMING UP AND CALLING IT ETERNAL ROMANCE.

Instead, Calvin Klein, the designer, sued his rival, Ralph Lauren, over perfume well, actually the bottles.

Both sides agree that their fragrances smell nothing alike, but Calvin Klein, maker of Eternity, is miffed at Ralph Lauren, which introduced Romance last year. Calvin Klein contended the bottle for the new perfume looked suspiciously like Eternity's.

A Federal judge, though, has ruled that consumers are not likely to be confused by the packaging and that surveys Calvin Klein used to bolster its case were flawed and, thus, ineffective. He denied the preliminary injunction Calvin Klein sought in the case, which is pending.

Calvin Klein's fragrance unit, the Calvin Klein Cosmetics Company, and one of its licensees, Conopco Inc., is suing the Polo Ralph Lauren Corporation and L'Oreal S.A.'s Cosmair Inc., a Ralph Lauren licensee.

In its motion for an injunction, Calvin Klein had sought to stop Ralph Lauren from selling or advertising Romance, saying that the bottle and product packaging infringe its trademark. Federal District Judge John E. Sprizzo in New York, rejected the contention Friday.

Representatives for Calvin Klein's cosmetics unit declined to comment yesterday. The company issued a statement saying simply that the preliminary injunction had been denied and that no trial date had been set.

Ethan Horwitz, a lawyer for Ralph Lauren, said the decision "comes down on every point our way." Mr. Horwitz added that Calvin Klein's

assertion that the bottles were identical was the equivalent of saying different makes of cars look alike. "The more educated you are, obviously, you can tell the difference between a Volkswagen and a Cadillac."

Both bottles are rectangular and with silver caps and curved bottles. The Eternity bottle, tall and thin with a curved T-shape cap, has an almost hourglass appearance. The Romance bottle is short and squat, with a flat, square cap.

"Apart from the dissimilarity of the two bottles," the judge said in his ruling, "the likelihood of consumer confusion is also minimized by the differing marking techniques" on the packaging and the prominent "Romance" name on the bottle cap and box of the Ralph Lauren product.

While Calvin Klein maintains that it had developed a distinctive bottle for its \$180-an-ounce perfume, similar packaging apparently has been around for, well, eternity.

In the ruling denying the injunction, the judge said that the Eternity perfume bottle's trademark infringement argument was "weak because, considered as a whole, it is quite similar to perfume bottles used by past and present fragrance designers."

Getting Ill & Fragrances

JANUARY, 2000 PUBLICATION DATE NOT KNOWN

PERFUME IS ALSO KNOWN AS FRAGRANCE OR SCENT AND HAS BEEN USED DOWN THE AGES IN RELIGIOUS RITUALS, as aphrodisiacs and to mask unpleasant odours.

IS THERE A CONNECTION BETWEEN YOUR CHRONIC MEDICAL CONDITION AND Allergy, Food Sensitivity, CHEMICAL sensitivity.

Fragrance Allergy/Sensitivity

In the past fragrances were extracted from plants and natural sources. In the late 1800s the first synthetic fragrances were introduced and since then have been used extensively to mimic fragrances from nature. There are currently around three thousand chemicals used in the manufacture of fragrances. Many of these are petrochemical derivatives. Chemicals used to manufacture fragrances are also used to produce flavourings.

There are thousands of body fragrances on the market today. Fragrances are also found in a large number of perfumed consumer products. These include personal care products, air fresheners, laundry products, detergents, paper tissue products, essential oils, fragranced candles and incense.

Antibacterial products added to air conditioning systems to reduce the risk of legionella or other diseases that can be circulated via air conditioning. Fragrances are present in public areas from air fresheners and commercial cleaning products used on public transport, in public buildings and health care facilities.

Fragrances are now more the norm than the exception. It is difficult to find products, including food, pharmaceuticals and tobacco products that are not fragranced or flavoured.

Are Fragrances Safe?

Little is known about the impact fragrances have on human health. There are individuals in the community who are made ill as a result of exposure to fragrances. Cases of anaphylaxis or allergic shock have been observed following fragrance exposure. Lesser symptoms such as hay fever or rhinitis are reported. Some studies have shown that fragrances are respiratory irritants and many asthmatics react adversely to them. Studies also indicate that fragrances may actually cause asthma. Individuals who are chemically sensitive can become disabled when exposed to fragrances and cannot take part in normal activities. They report symptoms such as migraine, nausea, dizziness, fatigue, shortness of breath, difficulty concentrating and allergy-like symptoms. Studies show that some 15- 30% of the population report sensitivity to chemicals while 4-6% report that chemicals have a major impact on their quality of life. More than 80% of those sensitive to chemicals claimed that

exposure to fragrances is troublesome (Ashford, N and Miller, C 1998J).

The fragrance industry claims that chemicals used in fragrances are used at low concentrations. Ill health is blamed because they are more noticeable than other chemicals. The industry's view is that people who claim they react to fragrances suffer from psychological problems. This view does not take into account that fragrance chemicals are part of complex mixtures of very toxic substances. These same chemicals are present in a large number of frequently used consumer products contributing to an additive effect.

A study by the US EPA identified volatile organic compounds emitted by fragranced products that contribute to indoor air pollution and sick building syndrome. These compounds were found to be toxic and carcinogenic (Wallace, L et al 1995). While some of the compounds identified occur commonly in many fragrances, few fragrance products containing them have been tested for carcinogenicity. In the USA, a report by the Environmental Working Group entitled "Skin Deep" found that around 89% of the 10,500 ingredients in personal care products have not been evaluated. One in three personal care products has at least one ingredient classified as a possible carcinogen. One in one hundred contain probable cancer-causing

agents. Other ingredients eg phthalates are endocrine disruptors that are linked to birth defects. Parabens used as preservatives in underarm deodorants and other personal care products have been linked to breast cancer (www.ewg.org/reports/skindeep/).

Secret Ingredients

The constituents of a fragrance do not have to be disclosed on labels. A formula or composition is protected by secrecy laws. All that has to be labelled is the term 'fragrance'. Individuals who are allergic or chemically sensitive to specific compounds do not have the right to know what is in a product in order to avoid unnecessary exposure. In some cases products labeled 'unperfumed' are perfumed, while other products labeled 'unperfumed' on closer scrutiny of the label contain 'masking fragrance'.

Extensive research has been conducted on skin disorders from contact with fragrance chemicals. Dermatologists use 'fragrance mix' to test for skin allergy. Fragrance mix is a collection of eight compounds, largely essential oils www.dermnetnz.org However, while most research on fragrances has focused on dermal exposure as the primary route of exposure, there is rarely any thought given to inhaled exposure and respiratory testing. Some researchers believe that fragrance molecules can be

absorbed via the olfactory bulb in the nose directly into the brain. There is also an assumption that fragrance only produces a sense of odour. However, fragrance can stimulate the olfactory and trigeminal nerves causing irritation. In turn this results in sensations such as stinging, burning, prickling and tingling. This process is referred to as 'sensory irritation' and can result in neurogenic inflammation.

Many individuals with pre-existing nasal allergy such as hay fever seem to react more strongly to chemical irritants. In the vast majority of people, exposure to chemicals tends to cause irritation rather than allergy. Irritation is less responsive to treatment than allergy, avoidance of chemicals is the only effective solution to the problem.

Child Health

There is a serious lack of research into child environmental health. Children from infancy to adolescence are in various stages of development and are more vulnerable to chemical insults than are adults. Yet many products aimed at infants, children and adolescents are scented in spite of the lack of data on fragrances to prove safety. A recently initiated biomonitoring program in the USA has discovered measurable levels of chemicals in the human body and breast milk eg phthalates (www.cdc.gov/exposure-report/). This raises concerns for

the health of breast fed infants and their future health. Fibromyalgia like pain

Right to Clean Air and a Safe Environment

The fragrance issue is the same as the tobacco smoke issue ie the right to wear fragrances that pollute the air and damage human health over the right to clean air and a safe environment. In the USA there are many places that post notices asking people to refrain from wearing fragrances www.ehnca.org/ehn-hompg/takheart.htm, e.g. University of Minnesota School of Social Work.

ASEHA would like to see the intensity and the life of fragrances reduced so they are not discernable any more than an arm's length from the user. Most importantly that they degrade in a short space of time. ASEHA would also like to see a ban on fragrances as per the cigarette smoking ban.

Some health problems associated with fragrance exposure

Anaphylaxis

Allergic Rhinitis

Asthma and other Respiratory irritation

Allergic Contact Dermatitis

Migrane

Cosmetic Chemistry

JANUARY, 2000 PUBLICATION DATE NOT KNOWN

THE USE OF COSMETICS IS NOT A MODERN PHENOMENON. Ancient Egyptian women used kohl to darken their eyelids, and Cleopatra is said to have bathed in milk to whiten and soften her skin. More than 3000 years ago Greek women used poisonous lead carbonate to achieve a pale complexion, costing some wearers their lives.

Today, cosmetics are big business. According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics, Australians spent A \$ 4.1 billion on cosmetics, perfumes and toiletries in 1998-99. Cosmetic advertising is now targeting a wider audience than ever. Most of us males and females care about our appearance.

What is a cosmetic?

The Australian Trade Practices Act 1974 defines a cosmetic product as 'a substance or preparation intended for placement in contact with any external part of the human body' (this includes the mouth and teeth). We use cosmetics to cleanse, perfume, protect and change the appearance of our bodies or to alter its odours. Products that claim to 'modify a bodily process or prevent, diagnose, cure or alleviate any disease, ailment or defect' are called therapeutics (Box 1, Ingredient labelling). This distinction means that shampoos and deodorants are placed in the category of cosmetics, while anti-dandruff shampoos and antiperspirants are considered to be therapeutics.

What do cosmetics contain?

Most cosmetics contain a combination of at least some of the following ingredients: water, emulsifier, preservative, thickener, colour, fragrance and pH stabilisers.

Emulsifiers

Many cosmetic products are based on emulsions small droplets of oil dispersed in water or small droplets of water dispersed in oil. Since oil and water don't mix, emulsifiers are added to produce the small droplets and to prevent the oil and water phases from separating. Emulsifiers work by changing the surface tension between the water and the oil, thus producing a homogeneous product with an even texture.

Preservatives

Preservatives are added to cosmetics to prevent the growth of microorganisms (eg, bacteria and fungi), which can spoil the product and possibly harm the user. Preservatives used in cosmetics can include parabens, benzyl alcohol and tetrasodium EDTA (ethylenediaminetetra-acetic acid).

Thickeners

Thickening agents such as polymers are often added to cos-

metics to change their consistency. Polymers can be synthetic (eg, polyethylene glycol) or derived from natural sources (eg, polysaccharides). Seaweeds are a common source of natural polysaccharides – carrageenans are extracted from red algae and alginates from brown algae. Cosmetics that are too thick can be diluted with solvents such as water or alcohol.

Fragrances, colours and pH stabilisers

The ingredient list of a cosmetic product might also include chemicals that give a pleasant smell to the product, provide an appealing colour, or adjust the pH (the acidity).

Some types of cosmetics and their ingredients

Moisturisers are generally used to treat dry, scaly skin. Our skin becomes dry when water is lost from the top layer of dead skin cells faster than moisture can enter it from the living layers of skin below (Box 2, Only skin deep?). Moisturisers can correct this problem in two ways: by preventing further moisture loss (occlusion) and by adding substances that increase the water-holding capacity of the skin (humectants). Occlusive moisturisers may contain oils such as isopropyl palmitate, stearyl alcohol or light mineral oil. The oils form a waterproof layer on the skin, reducing evaporation and allowing the

body's natural process of rehydration to return the skin to a normal water level. Humectant moisturisers may contain substances like glycerine or alpha hydroxy acids (fruit acids such as glycolic acid, citric acid or lactic acid), which add water to the top layer of skin.

Shampoos and soaps clean by the use of surfactants (surface active agents). Surfactant molecules have both fat soluble (lipophilic) and water-soluble (hydrophilic) parts. The lipophilic part of the molecule sticks to oil and dirt, and the hydrophilic part allows water to then carry away the otherwise water-insoluble grime. Washing-up detergents work in the same way, although it isn't generally advisable to wash your hair with dishwashing liquid - they are formulated to remove thick grease from plates, not to gently clean your hair!

Water solubility

Or the lack thereof is an important factor in creating lipstick. Lipsticks are generally made by combining a water-insoluble dye with wax and a non-volatile oil (beeswax with castor oil is a common formulation). This results in a substance that is stiff, but will spread easily on your lips. Because it's water-insoluble, the lipstick won't be dissolved by saliva or by the drink you're sipping. Some lipsticks also use dyes which react with the amino acids in the protein

of your skin - this is why some lipsticks appear blue or green in the tube, but turn a deep shade of red when applied to your lips.

Fake tans also change colour on contact with skin. The active ingredient in most fake tans is dihydroxyacetone, a colourless compound that darkens when it reacts with the amino acids in the top layer of skin. The colour change is permanent, but because skin cells are constantly being shed the tan is usually gone after about a week.

Some unintended effects of chemicals found in cosmetics

Unfortunately, sometimes the ingredients in cosmetics can have unintended side-effects. For example, skin allergies (allergic dermatitis) to specific ingredients can be a problem. Allergies to cosmetic products can be due to chemicals such as added fragrances and preservatives. This can lead to a skin rash where the product is applied. If you think you may be allergic to a cosmetic product, it is important to determine which ingredients may be causing the problem. A specialised allergy test, called a patch test, may be helpful in this. Chemicals causing the allergy can then be avoided by reading product labels. Other people, while not allergic to a specific ingredient, may nevertheless find that a product irritates their skin because it damages the outer layers - a condition known as irritant dermatitis.

Exfoliants and skin peels leave the skin underneath temporarily more vulnerable to sun exposure because they remove the outermost protective layer of dead skin cells. Over-washing of hair or skin with soaps and detergents can strip the skin's natural protective oily layer, resulting in dry and scaly skin. Alternatively, excessive use of make-up or oily moisturisers can block pores and aggravate acne.

More serious side effects have been suggested for certain cosmetic ingredients. For example, a recent study was published that linked breast cancer with deodorants. The focus of the study was on parabens, a class of chemicals commonly used as preservatives in deodorants and antiperspirants. While parabens were found in breast cancer tissue, the study did not establish that they were the source of the cancer nor did it identify underarm cosmetics as the source of the chemicals.

A recent US study found that many cosmetics and toiletries used worldwide contained chemicals that were either known cancer-causing agents (carcinogens) or were untested for their effect on human health. More research into the safety of cosmetic chemicals is needed.

In our pursuit of beauty, it is wise to remember that cosmetics can be complex combinations of chemicals. Reading the label and understanding which ingredients

are used in a product are helpful when putting on your best face.

A Perfumer Who Believes

MSC Sufferers are Fakes

MAY 2, 2000

IT'S 6:30 PM AND THIS OLDER LADY (she just turned 84 years old the week before) is putting the finishing touches to her attire. Tonight she is going to City Hall for the monthly Council meeting. She is always looking forward to these monthly dates with her fellow citizens of the Nova Scotia Maritime capital: Halifax. She was born in Halifax and likes to feel a part of her town. Although she doesn't have much to say during the assembly she is too shy and too proper to interrupt debates - she feels almost like it is her civil obligation to participate in the life of her town. As some people enjoy dressing to go to the Opera or to go to a show, she likes to dress for the council meetings. At her age, she doesn't go out much anymore, and the occasions to wear a pretty dress, and some of the jewelry offered by her late husband are pretty rare and the monthly Council meetings are evenings that she treasures. That is until tonight!

In case you live in a cavern and don't read the newspapers, let me recap what happened at that special Council meeting held last March. While she was sitting pretty, listening to the various speeches, someone interrupted, asking that justice be rendered and that the person emanating toxic poisons be ejected from this room. Several agreed with that loud woman (including some quite entertaining characters wearing gas masks!!) and a mini riot started in City Hall. While our good old Grandma turned around to see who brought toxic poisons (quite dangerous and inconsiderate people, you have to admit?), she noticed two Canadian Mounties walking toward her. They got right to her chair, sniffed around like dogs looking for bad smells and said: "Yes, it's her." They helped the old lady get up, escorted her to the door and to her dismay, EJECTED her from the Council meeting at City Hall. The crowd applauded.

Her crime: with her nice dress and jewelry, she always wears a little bit of her favorite perfume! Yes, ladies and gentlemen, you read cor-

rectly, she was wearing perfume. I kid you not, and in Halifax, it is now a crime! Of course, I am sure that when she got thrown out of the building, she stumbled over of a few homeless people, sleeping on the steps of City Hall in their own body fluids, reeking of wine and bad salmon (after all, we are in Nova Scotia!). But it must be fine, because these smells are natural.

When Shaune MacKinay from The Daily News tried to contact her, the "criminal," obviously overcome with shame, said: "I don't want to talk about it, because it was really my own fault." While she might consider herself at fault, the rest of the world (except a few weird people) calls her a victim of the Halifax Hysteria!

The national press noticed the Halifax Hysteria, from the New York Times to The Wall Street Journal. Many of the papers in the nation and most recently, American Spectator magazine are talking about this. Michael Fumento, a senior fellow at the Hudson Institute, a Washington D.C. think-

tank, wrote in his article "Scents and Senselessness" in the above mentioned American Spectator: "Nowhere is the "Holy War" on scent raging as it is in Halifax." In fact, most of the city's public institutions, a number of large businesses as well as public buses now request or demand that employees be "scent-free." Even the newspaper "The Halifax Chronicle-Herald" forbids its 350 employees to use perfumes, aftershave, fragranced deodorants, shampoos, hair gels and even "strong-smelling mouthwash." Listen to the personnel manager from this oh! so-inviting-to-work-there newspaper, talking about this scent-free rule: "It's no different from a business's rule policy, either you abide by it or you don't work here." Yikes! Why don't you take a chill pill, Adolf?

The Telephone Service Center also forbids its 1,400 employees to use fragranced products as well. When employees log on their computers at work, reminders (not to use fragrances) pop up on their screens. Notes are posted in toilets, asking again not to use toiletries! No, I'm not going there! Another touching story coming from our (soon to be former) friends from Canada. In the Halifax-area (wow, am I surprised?) community of Sheet Harbour, a teacher called the RCMP (Royal Canadian Mounties Police) to arrest Gary Falkeham, a 17-year-old student, not because he attempted (as too often nowadays) to shoot someone or detained the

cafeteria's bad cook hostage, no.

The Mounties arrested him because he violated the school's anti-scent policy by wearing Dippity Doo hair gel and Aqua Velva deodorant to class. The teacher, a "self-declared" sufferer from MCS (Multiple Chemical Sensitivity) syndrome claimed that the boy, and his scents, made her vomit, gave her headaches and other kind of miseries. She requested that the boy be charged with assault. What was the assault weapon? Dippity Doo Gel or Aqua Velva? The police are still deciding whether to press charges or not. I have to agree with Michael Fumento, who, writing about this ridiculous incident said that a 17 year old boy wearing Aqua Velva should be arrested! But the bunch of hysterical MCS sufferers are now pushing the envelope a bit too far! Let's see what Washington University Medical Professor H. James Wedner thinks about the MCS sufferers: "As with most mystery syndromes, middle-class white women are most likely to complain of it. Typically, they're well off enough that they can afford to drop out if they're allergic to their entire environment. If you're poor, you simply can't afford to have MCS syndrome." I couldn't have said it better myself!

"Fragrance products worn by people a block away, adversely affect the chemically sensitive,"claims Marin County's

Barb Wilke.

MCS sufferers are very vocal, and try to convince the outside world (outside of their bubble) that they are victims and that we (the fragrance industry) are out to get them! We could start a collection among the written bloopers and printed propaganda, sell it to serious magazines and make more money than an unlucky contestant on "Who Wants to be a Millionaire?" I will now try to entertain you (or make to you cry!) with a few quotes I have discovered in various newspapers, magazines, websites and other sources of enchantment for my sarcastic point of view! "Fragrance products worn by people a block away, adversely affect the chemically sensitive," claims Marin County's Barb Wilke. One entire block? What are the people from Marin county wearing? Skunk juice?

Ms. Betty Bridges from the Fragranced Products Information Network, a Virginia-based association against virtually everything, not only supports Halifax's no-scent policy but also claims victory! Victory for what? We don't know, but she claims it! Let's see what she said about that: "Halifax has struck fear in the heart of the fragrance industry. Halifax has been able to do what the Federal Drug Administration, the European Commission and other regulatory agencies have been unable to do." Could it be because, regulatory

agencies base decisions on fact, research and results; and Halifax listens to a bunch of hysterics, and makes policies without proof of wrongdoing?

Ms. Bridges and her followers (you should visit their website, its funnier than an evening with Eddie Murphy) should know that the FDA, as well as the CTFA (Cosmetic Toiletries and Fragrance Associations), the FMA (Fragrance Material Association), the IFRA (International Fragrance and Raw Material Association) and the RIFM (Research Institute for Fragrance Material) are constantly at work testing fragrance ingredients, making sure that they are safe to use. And all this, at the Fragrance industry's expense. Not at the government's expense.

Check your facts, Ms. Bridges and mostly, base your reactions and comments on facts, not mass hysteria. Ms. Bridges goes a bit further, quoting the late Julia Kendall of Marin County who claimed that: "Symptoms provoked by fragrances include: watery or dry eyes, double vision, sneezing, nasal congestion, sinusitis, tinnitus, ear pain, dizziness, vertigo, coughing, bronchitis, difficulty breathing, difficulty swallowing, asthma, anaphylaxis, headaches, migraine, seizure, fatigue, confusion, disorientation, incoherence, short-term memory loss, inability to concentrate, nausea, lethargy, anxiety, irritability, depression, mood swings,

restlessness, rashes, hives, eczema, flushing, muscle and joint pain, muscle weakness, irregular heart-beat, hypertension, swollen lymph glands and more" MORE? What could be more than that? Death?

In his article, Michael Fumento also reports the quite frightening thoughts coming from Barb Wilke's mind, (the same Barb who said that fragrance could be toxic one block away!): "Multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's, Lupus and Alzheimer's are all neurological disorders. Dyslexia is a neurological dysfunction. Could any of these neurological dysfunctions be caused by exposure to neurotoxic chemicals? Symptoms are often identical to chemical hypersensitivity."

Her reasoning would be almost a logical one if...MCS was something recognized by doctors, but, unfortunately for her, MCS has been widely rejected as a legitimate organic disease by most doctors and researchers across the U.S. and Canada. The American Medical Association, the American Medical Council on Scientific Affairs, the American College of Physicians, the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, and the American Academy of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology have all rejected MCS as a legitimate disease.

In other words, the illness that's taken Halifax, and almost the entire Northern coast of California by sur-

prise may well be a figment of these people collective imagination, in other words, a psychosomatic epidemic. A mania! Denver psychologist Herman Staudenmayer, who has had over 500 alleged MCS cases referred to him, published a paper last year about a woman who was awarded worker's compensation (that's mainly what MCS victims are after!) after she complained of sensitivity to fragrances.

"She complained of seizures, upon exposure to various fragrances, she would show behavioral signs of seizure activity, including muscle jerking, becoming disoriented, non-responsive, and giving classic signs of what she believed a seizure would look like." As she experienced that "seizure," Dr. Ronald Kramer, the article's co-author and medical director of the Colorado Neurological Institute and Epilepsy Center in Englewood, conducted a video electroencephalogram (EEG) to measure the brain patterns. Dr. Kramer and Staudenmayer report: "While she was showing overt signs of "seizure," her EEG was perfectly normal. That just doesn't happen with a real seizure." They also added that the woman was not exactly faking it. Her reaction was a "learned sensitivity." She had been led to believe she should react to fragrances and that should be her reaction. It's not worker's compensation she should receive; it's an Oscar for her performance! It is a

fact that one can be allergic to a given ingredient but to be allergic to all ingredients is not quite serious. We compile about 2,500 different products to create our fragrances and the combination among these products is infinite.

So, as Michel Fumento puts it: "To be allergic to all fragrances is like being allergic to everything beginning with the letter F." How about this advice coming from someone called an "allergist" that we could qualify as a "clinical ecologist" or "environment physician," as are doctors who treat MCS often called. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch quoted an unnamed environment physician saying: "Don't breathe in what you cannot eat" - ? - "Look for biodegradable products at you local health food store" How about compost or cow manure? Could I wear compost or cow manure? And now for the grand finale: "Avoid things that have distinct odors." That last statement will definitely take away the pleasure to wearing manure! Would it be time for me to quit the perfume industry and start a gas mask factory?

"We are, unfortunately, part of a society that gives to whiners and complainers. You will always find a politician or two ready to listen to you and defend a cause that does not exist. Because the mind is sometimes weak and the voice always powerful, the louder one speaks, the more damage one can make and that's how Mass Hysteria

starts."

One last example of bloopers, because my head is spinning from all of these stupid and self-serving declarations: Dr. Joan Gluck, an allergist with the Florida Center for Allergy and Asthma trying to explain why some people are allergic to fragrances to reporter Lisa Sadders, from the Capital-Journal: "Many perfumes are made from plants and flowers and these can be related to allergic plants. Chrysanthemum, which is a base for many perfumes, is related to ragweed.

Someone might have a tremendous problem being around perfume from the middle of August to frost, maybe in the winter, not as bad, because everything is additive. And of course, the manufacturers of perfume will not tell us what is in them." Doctor Gluck, I am flabbergasted! What planet are you from? How can someone advance such fallacy and then try to blame an entire industry for "not telling what we put in perfumes!" You don't seem to need our formulas as you reveal to everyone "chrysanthemum is a base for many perfumes."

How dare you give our trade secrets? Especially since, in my career of 34 years, I have neither used nor seen chrysanthemum oil. Where did you get this information, from a perfumer on Mars? The closest ingredient that could be

related to chrysanthemum is taget oil, also called marigold oil, and, believe me, it is NOT a "base for many perfumes" as you put it. It is an oil that is used very rarely and in minute amounts, because of its strength and not because it's related to ragweed!

What would you do if we gave you our perfumes formulas? Distort the truth and scare the public some more? Because that is where most of the problem resides, when people like you, Betty Bridges, Barb Wilkes and all the other olfactory activists of this world scare the public. You don't have facts; you start rumors and then, contaminate the mind of the masses. Because we are, unfortunately, part of a society that gives to whiners and complainers, you will always find a politician or two ready to listen to you and defend a cause that does not exist. Because the mind is sometimes weak and the voice always powerful, the louder one speaks, the more damage one can make and that's how Mass Hysteria starts.

Michael Fumento agrees that the people from Halifax "are in the grips of a mania, not a genuine physiological response to chemicals in their environment." He also points out that a mania that has, at various times, shown up in Asia and Africa, where, in villages, one of the men believed that his penis was shrinking. After discussing this problem with the other men of the village, they all believed that their

penises were shrinking and even disappearing! To my way of thinking, this is a much more serious problem than allergies to fragrances!

To the people of Halifax, and to those going there - as you cannot use any deodorants - may I suggest, to cover body odors, wear a smoked salmon under each arm...after all, we are in Nova Scotia!

To my fellow non-allergic-to-fragrances-but-allergic-to-stupidity: there is hope. As many of us realize that fragrances are made to make the world a nicer place, at least odor-wise, and not a menace to society, let's build a wall going from Halifax to southern San Francisco and then we'll contain the Mania on that part of the west coast.

After all this negativity, I would like to bring a touch of positive thinking. I would like to quote parts of a beautiful song,

"Desert Rose" from the latest CD by Sting, (definitely politically incorrect, by Halifax's standards):

This Desert Rose

by

Sting

Each of her veils, a secret promise

This desert flower

No sweet perfume ever tortured me more than this

I dream of rain

I lift my gaze to empty skies above

I close my eyes, this rare perfume

Is the sweet intoxication of her love

Thank you Sting.

Perfume & Allergy

DECEMBER 12, 2000

INGREDIENTS IN COSMETICS KNOWN TO CAUSE ALLERGIC reactions in some people are not currently listed on labels, according to a report.

The study, by the magazine *Health Which?*, also found that the way in which some other ingredients are listed can lead to confusion.

More than 10,000 ingredients used in cosmetics are required, by law, to appear on labels.

Perfumes are the commonest cause of contact allergy from cosmetics. Dr Mike Beck, Hope Hospital, Salford. The key exceptions are any of the 2,600 fragrance chemicals which are currently listed under the catch-all term "parfum".

This is despite 24 of these being common triggers of allergic reactions.

In addition, *Health Which?* found most ingredients are listed by their chemical name - an internationally-agreed system - or in Latin which can cause confusion.

There may be problems recognising well known ingredients - for instance, peanut oil goes by the name of *Arachis hypogaea* on cosmetic labels.

Nikki Ratcliff, Senior Researcher for *Health Which?* said: "At the moment if you think you are allergic to fragrance chemicals your only option is to avoid anything which has 'parfum' on the label which means ruling out a huge number of products.

"We welcome the proposed change in the law from the European Commission which would require cosmetics manufacturers to list any

of the 24 fragrance ingredients that can cause allergic reactions.

"But you may still have trouble recognising certain well known ingredients. If in doubt, seek advice from a dermatologist who should be able to tell you exactly what's in a product."

Dermatology

Dr Mike Beck, director of the Contact Dermatology Investigation Unit at Hope Hospital, Salford, told BBC News Online that failure to specify the fragrance chemicals in cosmetics had prevented dermatologists from carrying out work into allergies.

He said: "Perfumes are the commonest cause of contact allergy from cosmetics.

"They contain quite a complicated array of materials, and therefore just putting the word parfum on the label has not helped us to understand why precisely people are becoming allergic.

"We cannot tell which components are causing the problem, or in what concentrations they become active."

Dr Beck said allergic reactions to perfume usually caused a red, scaly rash on the skin.

However, in rare cases extremely sensitive patients might also develop problems with sneezing and breathing.

Advice

Health Which? makes recommendations on how to ensure that make up is safe and hygienic to use.

These include:

Not sharing make-up.

Washing hands before using cosmetics.

Regularly washing brushes and applicators in warm soapy water.

Not using cosmetics on broken or infected skin.

Storing cosmetics in a cool, dry place away from direct sunlight.

Not using make-up if it smells strange or a solution has become separated or discoloured.

Testing the product on a small patch of skin to check for sensitivity.

Following instructions, especially on products such as face masks.

Health Which?

Advised that people who do suffer irritation should seek advice from a doctor, or a skin test from a dermatologist.

The magazine also advises people who suffer a reaction to inform the manufacturer.

The batch code will enable the manufacturer to trace when the product was made.

Trading standards may be able to advise on disputes.

Health Risks Associated with Using Perfumes

JANUARY, 2002 PUBLICATION DATE NOT KNOWN

SENSITIVITY AND OTHER ADVERSE EFFECTS FROM FRAGRANCES ARE HARDLY ISOLATED EVENTS. There are growing numbers of people that are adversely impacted by the widespread use of scented products.

Fragrance:

MATERIALS ADDED TO GIVE THE PRODUCT A SCENT, MASK THE ODOR OF OTHER INGREDIENTS, OR ALTER MOOD AND EMOTIONS. MATERIALS USED MAY BE SYNTHETIC, NATURAL, OR BOTH.

This brochure is provided to help increase awareness of the negative impact fragrances may have on your health and the health of others. The information provided is based on medical, scientific, and industry literature.

The use of fragrance has increased tenfold since the 1950s. The industry sales of fragrance materials used to scent products doubled between 1980 and 1989.

This phenomenal growth means that exposure to the materials used in fragrance has increased as well. Fragrance is added to toiletries, cosmetics, household products, pesticides and many other items. With this increase in exposure, problems associated with fragrance have emerged. Not only has the incidence of adverse health effects to users of scented products increased,¹ there are problems from "second-hand" exposures as well.

Substances used in fragrance are volatile compounds that get into the air and linger. These compounds add to indoor air pollution and contribute to poor indoor air quality. According to the EPA, poor air quality can cause headaches, irritation to eyes, nose, and throat, dizziness, fatigue, forgetfulness and a host of other symptoms. Long-term expo-

sure to air pollutants can contribute to the development of cancer, respiratory conditions, allergies, asthma, chemical sensitivity, and other diseases.

In spite of the ubiquitous exposure, there is little regulation or monitoring of the use of fragrance or the materials that are used in them. Fragrance formulas are considered trade secrets and do not have to be revealed to the public or regulatory agencies. Regulation is fragmented, there are few laws in place, and these are rarely enforced. By all accounts the fragrance industry is primarily self-regulated with very little oversight.

Health Concerns

Fragrance can enter the body through lungs, airways, skin, ingestion, and via pathways from the nose directly to the brain.³

An EPA sponsored literature review grouped fragrance, as second hand smoke, and formaldehyde together as triggers for asthma. Up to 72% of asthmatics cite fragrance

as a trigger .5

Fragrance contributes to indoor air pollution and can irritate the eyes, nose, throat, and lungs.

As much as 15% of the general population find fragrance a lower airway irritant.

Fragrance in the air can cause airborne contact dermatitis.

Research suggests as much as 11% of the general population may have skin allergy to fragrance.

According to the information at the FDA website, fragrance is the number one cause of skin allergic reactions to cosmetics. Scented products often contain several known skin sensitizers.

Common fragrance chemicals like coumarin, methyl eugenol and others are suspected carcinogens.

Musk xylene is a suspected carcinogen. Musk ketone is suspected of increasing carcinogenic effects of the other materials. Musk ketone and musk xylene are found in fat tissue and breast milk.

Synthetic musk compounds may cross the placental barrier.

Synthetic musk and other materials have estrogenic effects.

Materials used in fragrance (such as some phthalates) are sus-

pected hormone disrupters.

Fragrance has neurological effects that can alter blood pressure, pulse, and mood, and have sedative effects.

Other Concerns

80 - 90 % of materials used in fragrance are synthesized, most from petroleum products.

Less than 1300 of the over 3000 fragrance materials in use have been evaluated for skin safety.

Industry testing focuses on skin effects and rarely evaluates respiratory, neurological, reproductive or systemic effects.

The materials used in fragrance are not on the label and do not have to be disclosed to anyone, including regulatory agencies. The only way to avoid problematic materials is to avoid all scented products.

Products claiming to be "Fragrance Free" or "Unscented" may still contain fragrance, which may or may not be listed as an ingredient on the label.

Modern fragrance formulas often contain high concentrations of potent and long lasting synthetic materials with little history of use and little available health and safety data.

Modern formulations are

designed to quickly get into the air and some fragrance chemicals linger in fabric and on surfaces for months.

When a person has an adverse effect from fragrance, it is almost impossible to pinpoint the responsible ingredient.

Virtually every segment of the population has exposure to fragrance.

Fragrance accumulates and persists in the aquatic environment like other persistent organic pollutants such as pesticides.

Fragrance is ubiquitous in air inside and found outside, even in remote areas.

Many fragrance chemicals are on the EPA's High Production Volume List, meaning that over one million pounds are manufactured or imported annually.

Common Fragrance Materials

Acetic Acid, benzyl ester - Target organs: nerves, kidneys; possible carcinogen.

Benzyl alcohol - Central Nervous System (CNS) depressant.

p-Cresol, 2,6-di-tert-butyl - Target organ: lungs; possible carcinogen.

Coumarin - Animal carcinogen.

p-Cymene - Chronic effects: damage to lungs, liver, kidneys; Target organ: CNS.

Di Ethyl phthalate - Possible risk of congenital malformation in the fetus; targets nerves.

Iso E Super -The chemical, physical, and toxicological properties have not been thoroughly investigated.

Musk Ketone - Increases carcinogenic effects of other materials. Found in blood, fat tissue, and breast milk; crosses placental barrier.

Musk Yylene - Carcinogenic in animal studies. Found in blood, fat tissue, and breast milk; crosses placental barrier.

6-Octen-1-ol, 3, 7 - Di Methyl - Extremely destructive to the tissue of the mucous membranes and upper respiratory tract.

Toluene - Target organs: liver, kidneys, brain, bladder. One of nine major starting materials for synthesis of fragrance chemicals.

4-Vinyl Phenol - Toxic. May impair fertility. Toxic by inhalation. Respiratory and skin sensitizer.

2, 6 - Xylenol - Toxic. Harmful by inhalation. Material is extremely destructive to upper respiratory system, eyes, and skin. Corrosive.

Infertility Concerns

NOVEMBER 25, 2002

HIGH LEVELS OF A CHEMICAL BLAMED FOR CAUSING INFERTILITY IN MEN HAVE BEEN FOUND IN SOME OF THE WORLD'S BEST-KNOWN PERFUMES and cosmetics.

Chanel No5, Christian Dior's Poison, Eternity from Calvin Klein and Tresor by Lancome were among 34 toiletries found by a Swedish study to contain di-ethylhexyl phthalate or other phthalates.

The European Commission is proposing a ban on the use in cosmetics of two of the most potent forms of phthalates amid fears they cause genital abnormalities affecting up to 4 per cent of male babies.

These genital abnormalities - which can include undescended testicles and malformation of the urinary tract - are blamed for soaring levels of testicular cancer in young men. Cases of the disease have risen tenfold in the past century. About 1900 British males, some as young as 15, are diagnosed every year. Nine out of 10 cases are cured, but doctors are worried by the trend.

Scientists believe the phthalates could be absorbed into women's bloodstreams through the skin or inhalation.

The Cosmetic Toiletry and Perfumery Association condemned the report as inaccurate. It said: "Consumer safety is the first priority for the cosmetic industry and consumers can have complete confidence in the cosmetic products they use, and in the regulatory framework which ensures cosmetic safety."

Numerous studies on rats and mice have shown phthalate exposure causes genital abnormality. The latest research was conducted by a Swedish government-accredited laboratory for Healthcare Without Harm, a US-based organisation representing 300 consumer pressure

groups around the world.

Researchers at the Analycen lab analysed 34 leading brands of cosmetics and found more than three-quarters contained phthalates, which help prevent loss of fragrance.

The investigation found other forms of the chemical in Tommy Girl perfume, Impulse Body Spray, Nivea Deo Compact, Sure Ultra deodorant, Shockwaves hair mousse and four hairsprays including Elnett Satin, Pantene Pro-V Extra Hold and Vidal Sassoon.

Per Rosander, who wrote the report, said: "What we know about these chemicals is that they cause damage to the reproductive system. That is why they have been classed by the EU as reproductive toxins."

Richard Sharpe, of the Medical Research Council's Human Reproductive Sciences Unit in Edinburgh, said: "If you wanted to produce a list of environmental causes of the reproductive health problems in boys, phthalates would

be pretty near the top of the list."

Actor Julia Sawalha, who played Saffy in *Absolutely Fabulous*, supports the Women's Environmental Network, a backer of the Swedish research. "Chemicals that pose a risk to fertility do not belong in cosmetics, and manufacturers should be made to list ingredients," she said.

The Australian

Think Twice -

Before Giving Fragrance as a Gift

FEBRUARY 12, 2003

THE WAY TO THE HEART IS THROUGH THE NOSE,” asserts Symrise, a leading fragrance manufacturer. But lovers may want to think twice about giving a bottle of cologne or perfume for Valentines Day, say some health advocates. Certain fragrances and their chemical constituents might trigger an allergic rather than aphrodisiac response. And some perfumes contain hidden ingredients that may pose longer-term hazards.

If your love interest suffers from asthma, rhinitis, allergies, dermatitis or a growing range of chemical sensitivities, that bottle of perfume may very well repel more than attract. According to medical specialists, fragrance sensitivity appears to be on the rise.

It's also a growing contributor to indoor pollution in the workplace, says Carrie Loewenherz, an industrial hygienist for the New York Committee for Occupational Safety and Health.

“People often joke about it, people wearing offensive perfumes,” says Loewenherz. But it's no laughing matter, she adds, either for the allergy sufferers or the office managers trying to manage a delicate problem.

Astrid Berg, director of the American Lung Association's Washington State office, agrees, noting that fragrance seems to be an increasing irritant among people with asthma.

“We tend to not think of it as serious until we see someone in acute distress,” says Berg.

Safe enough to sniff? The cosmetic industry insists its products are safe.

“In recent years it has become fashionable to criticize the use of fragrances in our society, suggesting that this use is associated with a variety of negative effects,” writes Peter Cadby of the International Fragrance Association, in a recent journal article. “[But] an adequate review and testing mechanism exists to assure the safety of fragrance materials, and their combination in mixtures, for the consumers of fragranced products.”

However, some health advocates point to growing evidence that perfumes, hair gels and other fragranced products may contain chemicals such as phthalates, which can disrupt hormones. In addition, they point to other compounds that can affect immunity, the nervous system, or play a role in cancer and other health problems.

“Even if the general population isn't likely to suffer acute effects from exposure to fragrances, there are long-term chronic health effects connected to these chemicals that we don't fully understand yet,”

says Loewenherz.

Once distilled simply from flower essences, perfumes today are complex mixtures of natural (botanical or animal-derived) materials and synthetic chemicals. More than 5,000 different fragrances are used in perfumes and skin products in hundreds of chemical combinations, according to the American Academy of Dermatology.

But because the chemical formulas of fragrances are considered trade secrets, companies aren't required to list their ingredients. They need only label them as containing "fragrance."

That's a problem for the medical profession when it comes to allergies, says dermatologist Howard Maibach, a professor of dermatology at the University of California at San Francisco. The large quantity and variety of chemicals can make it difficult to pinpoint causes of allergies or irritation.

Potentially harmful ingredients

The rising tide of fragrances in myriad products, from skin lotions and tissues to cleaning products and candles, is adding to the problem, says Loewenherz. Because some 95 percent of perfume ingredients are synthesized from petrochemicals, they give off volatile organic compounds, known as VOCs, which are

also found in vapors emitted from toxic products like solvents, wood preservatives, paint strippers and dry cleaning chemicals.

VOCs are known to produce eye, nose and throat irritation, as well as headaches, loss of coordination, nausea, liver damage, and harm to the kidneys and central nervous system, according to the Environmental Protection Agency. Some VOCs can cause cancer in animals and are suspected or known to cause cancer in humans.

And while adverse health effects from VOCs typically occur at far higher doses than what would be found in fragrances, they nevertheless can be potentially dangerous in tight indoor spaces, Loewenherz says.

A widespread problem?

Betty Bridges, director of the says that some 72 percent of asthmatics react adversely to perfumes and at least 35 million Americans are afflicted with allergies.

Bridges supported the when it commissioned an independent laboratory to test Calvin Klein's Eternity, one of several fragrances most problematic for fragrance sufferers. Tests revealed that the perfume contained more than 40 compounds, among them diethyl phthalate, an irritant and suspected hormone disruptor that is absorbed through the skin. The lab that con-

ducted the tests, found the chemical made up about 10 percent of the fragrance portion of the perfume, says Bridges. The fragrance also included synthetic musks, which are suspected animal carcinogens and may stimulate human cancer tumors.

Bridges says that while searching the chemical data sheets for compounds in the fragrance, the researchers often found the individual chemicals carried this phrase: "The chemical, physical, and toxicological properties have not been thoroughly investigated."

The presence of these chemicals ought to be more than simply a concern for the chemically sensitive since fragrances are so ubiquitous in our society, says Bridges.

To voice her concerns, Bridges signed a May 1999 petition filed with the Food and Drug Administration, asking for the perfume to be labeled as "untested for safety."

Name brand products tested

Bridges and EHN aren't the only ones concerned about the safety of perfume. Last May, a group of environmental and public health organizations, led by the commissioned a national laboratory to test 72 name brand beauty products for the presence of phthalates, a large family of industrial chemicals that have been linked to birth defects.

Their report, revealed phthalates in about 75 percent of the products tested (52 out of 72 products), including hair gels, deodorants, hair sprays, mousses, body lotions, and in all of the 17 fragrances tested.

Phthalates have also been targeted for concern by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. In releasing its second national “human exposure” study, the CDC found that phthalates were among the chemicals found to accumulate in body organs.

Jim Pirkle, deputy director of science for the environmental health lab at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, said that the agency was “surprised” to find such a high evidence of exposure to phthalates from personal care products in children, especially adolescents.

“It makes us want to do more studies to see if the levels they’re exposed to are comparable to the levels causing problems in animals,” says Pirkle.

Phthalates, which are estrogenic or anti-androgenic, are of concern, said Pirkle, who added that more health studies are needed to determine whether Americans are getting overdosed with these chemicals.

Concerns were heightened in November when Harvard

University School of Public Health investigators found a link between sperm damage and monoethyl phthalate, a compound used to maintain the color and scent in many cosmetic items such as perfumes, colognes and hair spray. But Marian Stanley, manager of the a chemical trade group, says the study results, while worth taking seriously, were at variance with many other animal studies.

Government regulation

The question remains: if there is a significant health risk posed by fragrances, shouldn’t the government be regulating them? Because cosmetics are legally defined as products not intended to affect the body’s functions as drugs are, the FDA does not require any pre-market safety testing of cosmetics or fragrances to the extent that the agency would a drug.

“Only drugs are pre-tested,” says an FDA spokesperson. “Cosmetics are treated less strictly.”

Essentially, protection lies in the hands of the fragrance industry. Glenn Roberts, spokesperson for the Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, an industry-sponsored group that does voluntary testing of chemicals, says safety is insured in a four-step process.

“First, we have a long history of cosmetics ingredients use to go on;

additionally, EPA requires safety testing for any new chemicals; RIFM does its own safety testing of chemicals; and many fragrance and cosmetics companies do their own testing,” says Roberts.

In addition, the FDA collects complaints from consumers, “and from their records, that’s less than 1 complaint per million users,” adds Roberts.

Francesca Lyman is an environmental and travel journalist and author of “Inside the Dzanga-Sangha Rain Forest” (Workman, 1998). She recently finished a report on the health effects of the Sept. 11 attacks titled “Messages in the Dust,” which will be available online at www.neha.org.

Essential Oil - Diluting or Cutting

OCTOBER 11, 2003

As far as adulteration is concerned, producers and distributors of essential oils are frequently painted as “the bad guys”, but it should be pointed out that their oil customers frequently demand oils below the market price while still wanting to be told that they are authentic.

Introduction:

In this climate, the honest oil trader may find it virtually impossible to survive on the margins he is allowed to make (many have already gone bust). For example, in the late 20th Century, lavender oil (*Lavandula angustifolia*) was being sold almost as a loss leader by many French producers as the market was unwilling to pay a realistic price; currently, the aroma industry is dominated by a handful of large and powerful international houses whose corporate buyers often attempt to drive raw material prices to impossibly low levels, not allowing workable profits to be made. This sets the scene for unethical practices.

Essential oils - a definition.

An essential oil (e.o.) is the volatile oil containing odiferous elements of the plant, produced by steam or hydro-distillation of aromatic vegetable plant matter. E. o. components arise via the secondary metabolism of plants and are stored within specialised structures; ideally they are isolated with minimum chemical changes from human intervention. Citrus oils, produced by the mechanical pressing of citrus peels, are also called essential oils, and, according to the International Standards Organisation (ISO), so are dry-distilled oils - such as cade oil (from the branches of *Juniperus oxycedrus*) and styrax pyrogenée (from *Liquidambar* spp).

E.o.'s should be produced by purely physical means, and be 100% pure and wholly derived from the named botanical source - but how are

these standards to be guaranteed? No quality standards for the authentication of essential oils exist in aromatherapy, in spite of the revelations of gross adulteration of aromatherapy oils for retail sale (Health Which 2000). Professional aromatherapy organisations have failed to issue standards, in spite of individual schemes being put forward (Jones 1998) but, in contrast, other essential oil-using industries are served by the following standards.

The Pharmaceutical Trade: British Pharmacopoeia (BP) 2002 is published on recommendation of the Medicines Commission UK. Oils specifications are also published in the European Pharmacopoeia 4th edn 2002 (Eur. Pharm 4th edn); United States Pharmacopoeia (USP); also the pharmacopoeia's of individual nations such as China, India etc. Earlier editions of

The British Pharmaceutical Codex (BPC) contains many essential oil standards still in use today.

Essential Oil Trade: Monographs on individual essential oils (EOA Standards) were produced by the

Scientific Committee of the Essential Oil Association Inc.

Flavourings Industry: Food Chemicals Codex IV (1996, US) produced at the request of the FDA (1992), is widely used for guidance by the food flavourings industry.

Aroma Companies: Many larger established Flavour & Fragrance Houses have their own internal purchasing standards.

Independent Certifying Bodies: International Standards Organisation (ISO Standards TC 54) & Association Française de Normalisation (AFNOR) both have detailed standards for e.o.'s.*

An example is ISO 3515 for Oil of Lavender (2001) which includes minimum and maximum percentages of thirteen substances, and their occurrence in French (spontaneous and clonal), Bulgarian, Russian, Australian and 'other origin' lavender oils. Limits for lavandulyl acetate, for example, are set at 2.0-5.0% in Bulgarian lavender oil by the standard.

Aromatherapy

Whilst it is apparent that the current BP or ISO standards may serve the needs of particular industrial sectors, they do not entirely

address the unique needs of the aromatherapy profession, since:

Holistic aromatherapists demand that "pure" and "complete" oils are used, rather than oils only distilled for periods which are attractive economically, on a yield: fuel-consumption basis (although unnecessary energy 'wastage' may not be seen currently as a particularly "deep green" strategy!).

Many essential oils used in aromatherapy are particular to that industry, and not necessarily extensively used elsewhere e.g. Ravensara aromatica, Rosemary oil verbenone chemotype, Helichrysum italicum ssp.- serotonin etc.

As well as "pure and natural", the words "wild-crafted", "organic" and "clinical grade" are frequently over-hyped descriptor terms used by both aromatherapy and by "naturals" traders, which need more careful definition prior to professional endorsement.

Natural perfumery

Natural perfumers are other potential users of pure essential oils. Grimshaw (1989) discussed "purist" perfumers (who employ no chemically produced or chemically modified ingredients), but also discussed reasons why others may wish to use up to 50% synthetics in formulations. This was, in a way, a prediction today's situation, where-

by aromachology perfumes (worth £611 million for years 1999-2001 according to Mintel Database 2002) contain a proportion of synthetics stipulated by the perfume house, mixed in with the e.o.'s. The alleged psychopharmaceutical effects of these products still depend on the utilization of authentic essential oils in the formulation – as far as marketing claims/hype are concerned anyway. A realistic "in-practice" distinction between mass-marketed aromatherapy perfumes (as opposed to 100% e.o. blends) and aromachology perfumes, other than at a hypothetical level, has yet to be defined, since both commonly employ synthetics. The synthetics content can presumably have either symbiotic, neutral or opposing effects (mood changing etc.) to those claimed for the e.o.'s in the perfumes in question, hence the need for clinical testing of the finished formulations to support advertising claims.

Types of adulteration

There are several distinct categories of adulteration:

1. Addition of single raw materials. This simple form of adulteration can be conveniently divided into two groups:

"Invisibles" – i.e. those materials undetectable by a gas chromatograph (GC) analysis operating under routine conditions to analyse essential oils.

“Visibles – those materials normally detectable by GC

“Invisibles”: an example of this type is the deliberate addition of vegetable or mineral oil to essential oils (Nour-el-Din et al. 1977) - rapeseed oil in the EU is a particularly cheap vegetable oil which has been used for this purpose. Theoretically the “total area” of the detectable components of the oil’s gas chromatogram should be reduced by this latter type of adulteration, creating suspicion for the analyst and the need for further investigation. These adulterant materials may be revealed by aqueous alcohol solubility tests, and their presence further verified by using a different GC column & operating conditions (to detect mineral oil), or by derivatisation (for example the use of a methylating agent for vegetable oils – whereby the volatile methyl esters of the fatty acid components of glyceryl esters are revealed by subsequent GC analysis).

“Visible” diluents in this context include a number of solvents and perfumery materials. For example the following have been found in commercial essential oils: in a few instances resulting in a warning or prosecution by regulatory authorities:

Abitol (a primary hydroabietyl alcohol) – often used for extending resinoids.

Benzyl Alcohol (now classified as a sensitiser by SCCNFP opinion)

Benzyl Benzoate (now classified as a sensitiser by SCCNFP opinion; formerly widely used to extend resinoids)

Carbitol (diethylene glycol monoethyl ether or DEGME)

Diacetone Alcohol

Dipropylene Glycol (DPG)

Dipropylene glycol methyl ether (DPGME) and Tripropylene glycol methyl ether (TPGME) - both of these substances are in air freshener technology.

Herculyl D[®] (hydrogenated methyl ester of rosin)

Isoparä (odourless kerosene fractions often used as a candle perfume diluent)

Isopropyl Myristate (IPM)

Phthalate esters such as Dibutylphthalate (DBP) or Diethyl phthalate (DEP).

Triacetin (the anti-fungal compound glycerol triacetate - a popular food flavourings vehicle). 3,3,5-

Trimethyl-hexan-1-ol.

Use of materials like isotridecyl acetate (ITDA, Fixateur 404), Herculyl D and Abitol, can be moderately difficult to spot,

because the materials may show a myriad of late-eluting small peaks on a GC trace representing their different constituent isomers, which could be overlooked by an inexperienced analyst especially at low levels.

In all the above instances of “visible” and “non-visible” adulterants, the added material is merely a diluent, and makes no odour contribution of its own. Addition of 10-14% of such a material may pass un-noticed if the material is evaluated against a retained standard solely on an odour basis – even by an expert nose – but it will in all probability be revealed by subsequent physio-chemical testing e.g. added vegetable oil in patchouli oil can often be revealed by a solubility test in 90% alcohol at 20°C.

2. The addition of cheaper essential oils and adjuncts.

Blending in cheaper oils to meet a customer’s target purchasing price, or to make additional profit for the producer, is commonplace in the oil trade. Some practices mentioned by Arctander (1960) - for example, the practice of extending of Amyris oil (*Amyris balsamifera*) with Cedarwood oil Virginia (*Juniperus virginiana*) and Copaiba Balsam (*Copaifera* spp.) – are unlikely to fool too many potential customers in these present & more educated times, but other more common adulteration practices still remain, which include:

- Bergamot oil (*Citrus bergamia*): addition of lemon oil, rectified ho oil (*Cinnamomum* spp.) and acetylated ho oil Bitter orange oil (*Citrus aurantium* subsp. *aurantium*): addition of sweet orange oil (*Citrus sinensis*) & orange terpenes, plus trace amounts of character compounds.
- Cedarwood oil Virginia (*Juniperus virginiana*): addition of cedarwood oil Chinese (*Cupressus funebris*). Cinnamon bark oil (*Cinnamomum zeylanicum*): addition of cinnamon leaf oil.
- Cinnamon leaf oil (*Cinnamomum zeylanicum*): addition of clove fractions, eugenol, cinnamic aldehyde etc.
- Clove Bud oil (*Syzygium aromaticum*): addition of clove stem oil & isolates (eugenol) & eugenyl acetate. Fir Needle oils (*Abies* spp.): addition of turpentine fractions, camphene, (-)-bornyl acetate etc.
- Geranium oil Chinese (*Pelargonium* hybrids): addition of adulterated Indian geranium oil (which itself has been known to contain diphenyl oxide!)
- Grapefruit oil (*Citrus paradisi*): addition of orange terpenes or sweet orange oil distilled + minor amounts of (+)-nootkatone & others.
- Lavender oil (*Lavandula angustifolia*): addition of cheaper lavandin (*Lavandula x intermedia*) oil varieties; the addition of spike lavender oil (*Lavandula latifolia*); the addition of ho oil rectified (*Cinnamomum* spp) and acetylated ho or acetylated lavandin oils etc.
- Lemon oil (*Citrus limon*): addition of orange terpenes, lemon terpenes & by-products (e.g. steam-stripped lemon oil). For lemon oil BP, expressed lime or grapefruit oil is added to poor grades to raise the UV absorbance level sufficiently to pass the BP specifications.
- Nutmeg oil (*Myristica fragrans*): the addition of nutmeg terpenes, apinene, limonene, turpentine fractions etc.
- Patchouli oil (*Pogostemon cablin*): addition of gurjun balsam (*Dipterocarpus* spp.); vegetable oils, Herculyn D; patchouli and vetiver distillation residues. The superior Indonesian patchouli oil is often blended with the cheaper Chinese oil.
- Petitgrain oils (*Citrus* spp): addition of other citrus leaf oils & fractions, fatty aldehydes, linalyl acetate, orange terpenes etc.
- Peppermint oil (*Mentha X piperita*): addition of cornmint oil (*Mentha arvensis*).
- Sandalwood oil EI (*Santalum album*): addition of sandalwood terpenes, sandalwood fragrance chemicals etc.
- Rosemary oil (*Rosmarinus officinalis*) addition of eucalyptus oil (*Eucalyptus globulus*) & camphor oil white (*Cinnamomum camphora*).
- Verbena oil (*Lippia citriodora*): *L. citriodora* herb distilled over lemon oil.
- Violet Leaf absolute (*Viola odorata*): addition of spinach absolute (*Spinacia oleracea*).
- Ylang Ylang oil qualities (*Cananga odorata* subsp. *genuina*): addition of cananga oil (*Cananga odorata*), ylang ylang oil tails etc., ylang ylang oil reconstitutions.
- And also addition of these synthetics to “convert” one oil to another:
- Basil oil exotic: add linalol to convert to Basil oil Sweet (Arctander 1960).
- Eucalyptus globulus*: add a-terpineol & others to convert to *Eucalyptus radiata*.
- Geranium oil Chinese to Geranium oil Bourbon: addition of balancing materials (monoterpene alcohols and esters, especially formates), copper chlorophyll (for colour) and fre-

quently a trace of dimethyl and/or dibutyl sulphides.

Tangerine oil (*Citrus reticula* var. tangerine): addition of g-terpinene, dimethyl anthranilate, a-sinesal & perilla aldehyde to convert to Mandarin oil (*Citrus reticulata* var. mandarin).

3. The addition of cheap (nature identical) synthetics to oils that naturally contain these materials. Little detailed guidance has been previously published in this area. The older work of Arctander (1960) mentions a number of adulteration practices, but the sophistication of customer quality control procedures probably means that of the noted practices are now too obvious for today's market. Looking at other published material on adulteration, Singhal et al. (2001) remarks on the adulteration of spice oils by simple additions of single raw materials e.g. the addition of synthetic citral to *Litsea cubeba* oil. My own guide to questionable practices include the following:

Anise oil (*Pimpinella* spp.): addition of technical grade anethol.

Basil oil exotic (*Ocimum* spp.): addition of methyl chavicol & linalol.

Benzoin resinoid (*Styrax* spp.): addition of small amounts of vanillin, benzyl benzoate, ethyl & benzyl cinnamates, benzoic acid etc. to enhance odour (or to pass off

cheaper "Sumatra" grades as "Siam").

Bergamot oil (*Citrus bergamia*): addition of linalol and linalyl acetate.

Bitter almond oil (*Prunus amygdalus* var. *dulcis*): addition of, or passing off benzaldehyde, as the oil.

Buchu leaf oil (*Barosma betulina* & *B. crenulata*): addition to cutters of monoterpene sulphide fractions synthesised from the hydrogen sulphide treatment of pulegone, including p-menthan-8-thiol-3-one.

Cassia oil (*Cinnamomum aromaticum*): the addition of synthetic cinnamic aldehyde, methyl cinnamic aldehyde & coumarin.

Chamomile oil Roman (*Anthemis nobilis*): addition of isobutyl angelate and bisabolols.

Cinnamon bark oil (*Cinnamomum zeylanicum*): the addition of synthetic benzaldehyde, eugenol and cinnamic aldehyde.

Citrus oils: the addition of fatty aldehydes and monoterpene alcohols and esters to terpeneless and folded citrus oils.

Caraway seed oil (*Carum carvii*): the addition of limonene and (+)-carvone.

For balance of extensive article please visit the web site as follows:

www.users.globalnet.co.uk/~nodic/new/magazine/october/october.htm

An Obsessed Perfumer

OCTOBER 30, 2003

IT IS SAID THAT THE AVERAGE HUMAN NOSE CAN PICK UP SOME 4,000 DIFFERENT SMELLS. Many become triggers for memories freshly baked bread, an ex-girlfriend's hair in the warm sun, old socks left for three days in wet boots.

But smells do more than confer pleasure or tell us that meat has turned rancid. In the creepily disturbing and occasionally repulsive novel *Perfume: The Story of a Murderer*, first published almost twenty years ago, Patrick Süskind explores the idea that our ability to smell and the ability of others to smell us is essential to our humanity.

In fact, if one takes the message of this book to heart, the absence of scent and an aberrant and exaggerated sense of smell can lead to social isolation so extreme that it can drive a scentless victim to amorality and murder.

The most gifted human nose recognizes about 10,000 scents. Jean-Baptiste Grenouille, the main character in *Perfume*, has just such a nose. Grenouille can recall every odor he has ever encountered; he smells a worm in an apple, money hidden behind brick, and people blocks away.

Perfume is so full of smells that they seem to rise from the pages of the book.

Süskind seduces the reader's olfactory imagination with sensuous descriptions of jasmine, attar of roses, the Florentine flasks, and copper kettles used to reduce flowers and herbs to their essential oils. The level of detail is remarkable, both for the book's fairly slim size and the apparent lack of repetition.

Set up as a fictional biography, the novel opens in eighteenth-century Paris, where "the streets stank of manure, the courtyards of urine,

the stairwells stank of moldering wood and rat droppings, the kitchens of spoiled cabbage and mutton fat; the unaired parlors stank of stale dust, the bedrooms of greasy sheets, damp featherbeds, and the pungently sweet aroma of chamber pots."

Into this world, Grenouille is born. His mother abandons him, leaving him under a table at a Paris fish market, and he grows up in an orphanage.

As a baby, Grenouille doesn't smell the way babies should ("like caramel"). Although he has an exceptional nose, he himself gives off no bodily odor whatsoever. Still, everyone he meets finds him in some way repellent. "The young Grenouille ... gave the world nothing but his dung no smile, no cry, no glimmer in the eye, not even his own scent."

He learns different smells around him as most children learn the alphabet, or grasp numbers, and he spends his days identifying and ordering the scents in his world.

His obsession with smell is absolute. He doesn't care for people and cares very little about himself.

At the age of 15, Grenouille becomes an apprentice to a Parisian master perfumer and learns the art of dissecting and isolating scents.

One day, Grenouille's nose is assailed by the most wondrous and magical perfume the scent of a girl on the brink of puberty. When he resolves to bottle the maiden's scent, the obsession becomes deadly. Without leaving a trace or a scent, Grenouille escapes the murder scene.

After that first crime, Grenouille understood his destiny: He, Jean-Baptiste, the fishmonger's bastard, was to be "the greatest perfumer of all time." The goal and purpose of his life became nothing less than to "revolutionize the odoriferous world."

For the most part, Süskind holds the reader in suspense through this gripping page-turner.

When Grenouille is beset by demonic dreams, his ambition takes a grandiose and sinister bent as he develops a plan to rule mankind:

"People could close their eyes to greatness, to horrors, to beauty, and their ears to melodies or deceiving words. But they could not escape scent. For scent was a brother of breath. ... He who ruled

scent ruled the hearts of men."

Grenouille's immediate quest is the ultimate and perfect scent—the scent of love that will give him irresistible power over others. With creepy dispassion, Grenouille kills 25 young virgins and wraps their bodies in specially oiled cloths that capture their odors. The result is "an aura more radiant and more effective than any human being had ever possessed before him."

His triumph is brief. Grenouille realizes that "what he had always longed for—that other people should love him—became at the moment of its achievement unbearable."

Much of the novel stays vaguely within the realm of plausibility, but Grenouille's final scene takes a turn for the macabre. The story ends in something of a mess: a hellish orgy of cannibalistic desire.

The book was first published in German in 1985. When critics and readers caught scent of *Perfume*, it became an international bestseller and has since been translated into 37 different languages, including the English translation by John E. Woods, which was Süskind's first book to appear in English.

Perfume has maintained its popularity. This year, the British public has voted Süskind's book one of the nation's 100 best-loved novels as part of the BBC's "The Big Read."

And fans of the novel can look forward to the movie version. After years of hesitation, Süskind has given the go-ahead for a film version of the novel to Munich-based film producer Bernd Eichinger ("The Name of the Rose"). No release date has been set.

Birgit Reinert, a former associate editor of GNN, is a freelance writer who lives in Berlin.

Phthalates

NOVEMBER 18, 2003

Stockholm/London -

TOP BRAND COSMETICS ON SALE IN SWEDEN AND BRITAIN CONTAIN PHTHALATES (pronounced 'thalates'), chemicals hazardous to human health and fertility.

PHthalates USED IN PERFUME MANUFACTURING PROVEN TO CAUSE CANCER IN MICE!

New survey reveals that some cosmetics contain fertility-threatening chemicals.

Four out of five products tested for "Pretty Nasty: phthalates in European cosmetic products" contained at least one phthalate and more than half contained multiple phthalates. The report authors are calling on:

Manufacturers to pledge to remove all phthalates from their products and to clearly label products in the interim.

The European Union to unconditionally ban all phthalates from cosmetics.

Consumers to press retailers, manufacturers and politicians to make sure phthalates are no longer used in cosmetics.

Perfume from L'Oreal and Christian Dior, and hair spray from Wella and Boots all contain phthalates that have just been conditionally banned in cosmetic and personal care products within the EU. The Women's Environmental Network in Great Britain and The Swedish Society for Nature Conservation in Sweden, in co-operation with the

international organisation Health Care Without Harm, tested 34 leading cosmetic products in Sweden and Great Britain for phthalates.

Perfumes, deodorants, hair mousses, hair gels and hair sprays were tested to see if they contained one or several of six different phthalates. A majority of the phthalates spread in the environment, and animal studies have shown they can harm reproductive capacity and foetal development. Effects include birth defects in the male reproductive organs and contamination of human breast milk. One US study found "a substantial internal human dose" of one the banned phthalate, DBEP, in every person tested. Women aged between 20 and 40 years old appeared to have received the highest exposures, up to 20 times greater than for the average person and, in some cases, above the United States Federal safety standard.

Phthalates were found in 27 of 34 tested products (79%), and more than half of the products (53%) contained two or more phthalates.

The amounts vary from a few parts per million to almost two percent of the product's composition. Products like Tresor eau de parfum, Rexona 24 h intensive (sold as Sure in the UK & US), Fructis Style Volume Mousse, and Elnett Satin Hair Spray contained high levels of several phthalates.

"Chemicals that affect animal and human health in this way should not be in cosmetics at all. Many people are exposed to multiple doses every day from the range of cosmetics they use, while workers in the cosmetics and beauty industry face greater exposure," says Helen Lynn, Health Co-ordinator at Women's Environmental Network. "Yet because the manufacturers don't have to list phthalates on the product label, it is impossible for the consumer to avoid them."

Two of the phthalates found, DEHP and DBP, are already banned from children's toys likely to be put in the mouth, and on November 7th the European Commission also agreed they should be removed from cosmetic and personal care products. However, loopholes in the ruling may still allow them to be used for some time.

"The new EU-prohibition for two of the phthalates in cosmetics is an important step in the right direction. But we need to do more to protect people and the environ-

ment from this unnecessary risk. All phthalates in cosmetics and other products can add up to a harm we can avoid if we get all phthalates out of all products," says Per Rosander, Project leader, Health Care Without Harm.

"Our survey shows that several manufacturers also sell products which do not contain phthalates. This means that there are cost-efficient phthalates-free manufacturing processes. Therefore we demand that the cosmetic industry immediately stop all use of phthalates and modify other production processes to end phthalate contamination," concludes Mikael Karlsson, Chairman of the Swedish Society for Nature Conservation.

Phthalates are a group of chemicals that are often used as softeners in PVC-plastic. In cosmetic manufacturing phthalates are used to enhance fragrances, and as solvents or denaturants for alcohols.

This report is courtesy of the Women's Environmental Network - WEN. WEN is a national UK charity and membership organisation which campaigns on environmental and health issues from a women's perspective. It educates, informs and empowers women and men who care about the environment.

Breast Cancer

JANUARY 12, 2004

THE MOST COMMON GROUP OF CHEMICALS USED AS PRESERVATIVES IN COSMETICS AND DEODORANTS HAS been detected for the first time in human breast cancer tissue.

Although the discovery by a British oncology expert points to a link between breast tumors and the chemical group called parabens, it is not clear exactly what the relationship is and many important questions still need to be answered.

The U.S. Food and Drug Administration has called parabens the most widely used preservatives in the United States, common in shampoos, foundations, facial masks, hair-grooming aids, nail creams, and permanent wave products. Different animal and laboratory studies have previously shown that parabens can mimic the actions of the hormone estrogen. That has raised red flags because estrogen is known to fuel breast cancer.

The latest, apparently groundbreaking research takes those findings one step further.

"We have always been assured that parabens could not get into the body . . . This study shows that it does. To my knowledge, no one else has done that," says Philippa D. Darbre, the lead author of the study, which appears in the January/February issue of the *Journal of Applied Toxicology*.

"It's one more nail in the coffin, or one more piece in the jigsaw," Darbre adds.

"It's preliminary, but I think that it's a little worrisome and I think there's definitely enough data here to suggest that more work needs to be done to look at this issue," adds Dr. Bert Petersen, a breast surgeon

and director of the Family Risk Program at Beth Israel Medical Center in New York City. "I don't think it can be dismissed."

A 1984 study estimated parabens were used in 13,200 different cosmetic formulations. Of particular concern are underarm products, such as deodorants and antiperspirants, which are applied topically and absorbed through the skin.

Darbre, a senior lecturer in oncology at the University of Reading in England, has been studying breast cancer for 20 years and has long been interested in parabens but could not get funding for this study.

"I was told I wouldn't find anything," she says. So, she galvanized friends and colleagues in the medical community who helped her gain access to analytic machinery and to breast tissue.

Eventually, Darbre was able to analyze samples of 20 human breast tumors with high-pressure

liquid chromatography followed by tandem mass spectrometry.

In four of the 20 tumors, total paraben concentration was more than twice the average level. The form the chemicals were found in suggests they entered the body topically, not orally, the researchers add.

"We've detected an awful lot of other rubbish in the human body," Darbre says. "This is another one to add to the dustbin."

The Cosmetic, Toiletry and Fragrance Association defends the safety of parabens: "A wealth of data supports the safety of antiperspirants," a statement reads. "The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulates cosmetics and nonprescription drugs to assure their safety. There is no evidence of harm from the use of deodorants or antiperspirants. They are safe, and consumers should not be unnecessarily alarmed."

The study authors acknowledge many issues need to be resolved before any definitive conclusions can be reached. "A lot of questions are begging from this," Darbre says. "Lots of things need to be done. I've set the scene."

Researchers need to determine levels of parabens in normal breast tissue and in other parts of the body. Also, more samples should be examined.

"It would be interesting to see if normal women had very low levels of parabens," Petersen says. "Then you would start to move towards maybe this isn't just an association. There might be a causal effect here."

Darbre hopes her study will spur further investigation. "My hope is that someone else will take this up, or that someone might decide it's worth funding," she says.

More information:

For more on breast cancer, visit the National Cancer Institute or the American Cancer Society.

Sources:

Philippa D. Darbre, Ph.D., senior lecturer, oncology, University of Reading, England; Bert Petersen, M.D., breast surgeon and director, Family Risk Program, Beth Israel Medical Center, New York City; Cosmetic, Toiletry and Fragrance Association statement; January/February 2004 Journal of Applied Toxicology

Soap

MARCH 2, 2004

New York (Associates Health) -

USING ANTIBACTERIAL SOAPS AND CLEANSERS AT HOME MAY not necessarily reduce your risk of getting sick, researchers report.

In a new study, people who used antibacterial soaps and cleansers developed cough, runny nose, sore throat, fever, vomiting, diarrhea and other symptoms just as often as people who used products that did not contain antibacterial ingredients.

Since most common infections, including colds and flu, are caused by viruses, the lack of an effect on symptoms "is not surprising," according to study author Dr. Elaine L. Larson at the Columbia University School of Nursing in New York.

"Consumers need to know that it is more important to keep clean than it is to use a specific antibacterial product," Larson told Reuters Health.

"Perhaps the frequent admonitions we heard as children are more valid now than ever--cover your mouth when you cough or sneeze and wash your hands!" Drs. J. Todd Weber and James M. Hughes of the National Center for Infectious Diseases at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in Atlanta note in a related editorial.

In response to the study, the Soap and Detergent Association and the Cosmetic, Toiletry, and Fragrance Association said in a joint statement: "Antibacterial cleaning and personal care products do what they say they do: they kill harmful bacteria."

The results of the study are not surprising, according to the groups,

since antibacterial products are not intended to be effective against viruses.

The trade organizations' statement notes that antibacterial products, depending on their active ingredients, may be effective against bacteria that cause odor, skin infections, food poisoning and intestinal illnesses.

According to one study, Larson's group reports, approximately 75 percent of liquid soaps and 29 percent of bar soaps in the U.S. contain antibacterial ingredients. But the benefits of antibacterial products in preventing infectious diseases in households are still unproven, they note.

Larson and her colleagues studied 238 Manhattan families who were given almost a year's supply of free soap and household cleaners. Half of the families were given antibacterial products, while the other half received products that did not contain antibacterial ingredients. Families, most of whom were Hispanic, did not know what

type of products they were using.

For nearly a year, the families were closely followed to see how often they experienced a wide variety of symptoms.

Runny nose, cough and sore throat were the most common symptoms, followed by fever, vomiting, diarrhea and skin symptoms. These symptoms occurred just as frequently in people who used antibacterial products at home as they did in people who did not.

Throughout the study, use of antibacterial products did not have a significant effect on any of the symptoms.

The "bottom line" of the study, according to Larson, is that all households improved. During the study, participants had fewer infections and lower bacterial counts on their hands than at the start of the study, she said.

The current report, which appears in this week's issue of the journal *Annals of Internal Medicine*, does not include information about bacterial counts. But in a previous analysis of the results, Larson and her colleagues found that families experienced a drop in bacterial counts whether they used antibacterial or normal soaps and cleansers.

Despite the lack of an effect on symptoms, Larson and her col-

leagues note that antibacterial products may be appropriate for preventing bacterial symptoms, or in other specific situations, such as when a family member has a weakened immune system or has skin or gastrointestinal infections.

The authors note that any potential benefits of antibacterial products need to be weighed against the possibility that bacteria may develop resistance to antibacterial products. Although there is no evidence that this has happened, laboratory tests suggest that it may be possible.

Source:

Annals of Internal Medicine,
March 2, 2004.

Beauty & Its Price

APRIL 27, 2004

FOR EVERYONE WHO TAKES PRIDE IN THEIR GROOMING, California legislators are wrestling with an essential question: Is beauty bad for your health?

ADVOCATES VOW THEY'LL TRY AGAIN WITH A BILL TO REGULATE
CHEMICALS IN PERSONAL-CARE PRODUCTS.

Health and environmental groups are lobbying lawmakers to join Europe in banning certain chemicals from cosmetics and personal-care products.

Their proposal, part of a national strategy, would affect perfumes, lipsticks, skin moisturizers, fingernail polishes, facial makeup, shampoos, hair color, toothpaste, deodorants and various other products.

The California legislation they sponsored, AB 2025, apparently died Tuesday in behind-the-scenes negotiations with the Assembly Health Committee. But supporters vow to regroup and try again - perhaps by amending their chemical crackdown into another bill later this year.

"The idea isn't dead," said Jeanne Rizzo, executive director of the Breast Cancer Fund. "We're not going away."

Supporters contend that many, though not all, personal-care products contain chemicals found by laboratory tests of animals to be capable of causing cancer, birth defects or other health hazards.

The fight targets phthalates, acrylamide, ethylene oxide, formaldehyde and other such chemicals.

Assemblywoman Judy Chu, a Monterey Park Democrat who chairs

the Assembly's powerful Appropriations Committee, introduced AB 2025 in an effort to require manufacturers to disclose all their ingredients and to ban distribution of any personal-care products containing chemicals identified as having caused cancer or birth defects.

"I think it's a very serious issue," Chu said. "The reason we're focusing on these products is because they're so personal - you put them right into your skin, right into your hair, and of course (the chemical) goes right into your body. It's ingested right into your skin."

AB 2025 would have prohibited personal-care products containing harmful chemicals from being distributed in California after January 2006 unless manufacturers could prove to the state Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment that they pose no public health threat.

In prolonged negotiations, however, Chu could not overcome

opposition from Assemblywoman Rebecca Cohn, a Saratoga Democrat who chairs the Assembly Health Committee, which had scheduled a Tuesday public hearing on AB 2025. Behind the scenes, Chu tried to win consensus by proposing to eliminate the ban and simply require manufacturers to disclose to the state all chemicals used in personal-care products. Federal law does not require such disclosure.

When Cohn balked at the amendment, reportedly due to fears that disclosure could spark frivolous lawsuits, Chu opted to abandon AB 2025 rather than fight a fellow Democrat to meet Friday's deadline for pushing such bills forward. "I'm convinced these chemicals need to be banned, but I think we need to make sure this bill is something that's truly thought-out, without any kinds of unintended consequences," she said. Cohn could not be reached for comment Tuesday.

Michael Thompson, spokesman for the Cosmetic, Toiletry and Fragrance Association, said AB 2025 was unnecessary and that "consumers can rest assured that the products they are using are safe."

Opponents of AB 2025 say that requiring reformulation of personal-care products for the U.S. market would be costly and alarmist, based more on politics than science.

Rizzo counters that Europe already is demanding reformulation, that alternative chemicals are available, and that some firms already have agreed to change their products for U.S. customers.

Europe's decision to ban harmful substances in personal-care products was made in February 2003 by the European Parliament and the Council of the European Union. It becomes effective Sept. 11. Laboratory studies have shown that chemicals in personal-care products can be hazardous to the health of animals tested, but government health officials have not found that Americans are putting themselves at significant risk through grooming practices used by nearly everyone.

Neither side can say with certainty what level of exposure, if any, will harm human health. "As an industry, we're very proud of our safety record," Thompson said.

AB 2025 would ban the sale of "safe cosmetics that contain even insignificant amounts of certain chemicals," industry officials said.

Opponents also contend that Chu's bill unfairly singles out the cosmetics industry for regulation when phthalates, for example, are found in products ranging from food packaging to lubricating oils. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration, in April 2001, concluded that "at the present time

there is no reason for consumers to be alarmed at the use of cosmetics containing phthalates."

But Rizzo, of the Breast Cancer Fund, said many Californians use two dozen personal-care products each day and that little is known about cumulative impacts over long periods of time. "It is the responsibility of government to protect our health first," Rizzo said. "And the safest thing to do is to say we're going to eliminate these ingredients from these products until you can prove they're safe."

Both sides on AB 2025 point to conflicting studies to bolster their case.

State and federal agencies are not currently required to test the ingredients in personal-care products for safety before they are marketed. No data is available on the number of personal-care products containing the chemicals in question, but their use is believed to be widespread.

A study two years ago by a coalition of environmental and public health groups found that 52 of 72 off-the-shelf products contained phthalates, a family of industrial chemicals linked to birth defects in the male reproductive system. Supporters of AB 2025 include Friends of the Earth, Sierra Club California, Environment California, the California Labor Federation and Physicians for

Social Responsibility.

The bill was opposed by the cosmetic industry's trade association and by the Grocery Manufacturers of America.

Jim Sanders can be reached at: (916) 326-5538

Finding suggests parabens may be linked to breast cancer.

The most common group of chemicals used as preservatives in cosmetics and deodorants has been detected for the first time in human breast cancer tissue.

Although the discovery by a British oncology expert points to a link between breast tumors and the chemical group called parabens, it is not clear exactly what the relationship is and many important questions still need to be answered.

The U.S. Food and Drug Administration has called parabens the most widely used preservatives in the United States, common in shampoos, foundations, facial masks, hair-grooming aids, nail creams, and permanent wave products. Different animal and laboratory studies have previously shown that parabens can mimic the actions of the hormone estrogen. That has raised red flags because estrogen is known to fuel breast cancer.

The latest, apparently groundbreaking research takes those find-

ings one step further.

"We have always been assured that parabens could not get into the body . . . This study shows that it does. To my knowledge, no one else has done that," says Philippa D. Darbre, the lead author of the study, which appears in the January/February issue of the *Journal of Applied Toxicology*.

"It's one more nail in the coffin, or one more piece in the jigsaw," Darbre adds.

"It's preliminary, but I think that it's a little worrisome and I think there's definitely enough data here to suggest that more work needs to be done to look at this issue," adds Dr. Bert Petersen, a breast surgeon and director of the Family Risk Program at Beth Israel Medical Center in New York City. "I don't think it can be dismissed."

A 1984 study estimated parabens were used in 13,200 different cosmetic formulations. Of particular concern are underarm products, such as deodorants and antiperspirants, which are applied topically and absorbed through the skin.

Darbre, a senior lecturer in oncology at the University of Reading in England, has been studying breast cancer for 20 years and has long been interested in parabens but could not get funding for this study.

"I was told I wouldn't find anything," she says. So, she galvanized friends and colleagues in the medical community who helped her gain access to analytic machinery and to breast tissue.

Eventually, Darbre was able to analyze samples of 20 human breast tumors with high-pressure liquid chromatography followed by tandem mass spectrometry. In four of the 20 tumors, total paraben concentration was more than twice the average level. The form the chemicals were found in suggests they entered the body topically, not orally, the researchers add.

"We've detected an awful lot of other rubbish in the human body," Darbre says. "This is another one to add to the dustbin."

The Cosmetic, Toiletry and Fragrance Association defends the safety of parabens: "A wealth of data supports the safety of antiperspirants," a statement reads. "The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulates cosmetics and nonprescription drugs to assure their safety. There is no evidence of harm from the use of deodorants or antiperspirants. They are safe, and consumers should not be unnecessarily alarmed."

The study authors acknowledge many issues need to be resolved before any definitive conclusions can be reached. "A lot of questions are begging from this," Darbre

says. "Lots of things need to be done. I've set the scene."

Researchers need to determine levels of parabens in normal breast tissue and in other parts of the body. Also, more samples should be examined. "It would be interesting to see if normal women had very low levels of parabens," Petersen says. "Then you would start to move towards maybe this isn't just an association. There might be a causal effect here."

Darbre hopes her study will spur further investigation. "My hope is that someone else will take this up, or that someone might decide it's worth funding," she says.

Makeup -

It's the Beauty Industry's Ugly Secret

APRIL 30, 2004

FOR DECADES, COSMETIC COMPANIES HAVE MADE PRODUCTS CONTAINING CHEMICAL COMPOUNDS that have been linked to reproductive birth defects and cancer. The compounds are phthalates (pronounced THALAYTES) and they help cosmetics adhere without smudging.

PHthalates A COMPOUND IN COSMETICS PRODUCTS HAS BEEN BANNED BY THE EUROPEAN UNION FOR ITS LINKS TO CANCER AND FETAL DEFORMITIES. U.S. HEALTH ADVOCATES ARE PUSHING FOR A SIMILAR BAN HERE AND CHALLENGING COMPANIES IN THE \$29 billion INDUSTRY TO COMPLY BY MAY 3.

The European Union has banned phthalates from all cosmetics and now a coalition of advocacy groups has given U.S. companies a deadline of Monday, May 3 to support a ban.

Three environmental - conscious manufacturers (Body Shop International, Urban Decay Cosmetics and Aveda Corporation) have already volunteered to remove phthalates from all their products. But New York-based Estee Lauder Companies, Inc. (which has annual revenues of \$4.7 billion) and Cincinnati-based Procter and Gamble Company (which has annual revenues of \$40.2 billion) are the only large, multinational companies to follow suit-and they have done so by removing phthalates from one product, nail polish.

Representatives of the \$29 billion cosmetics industry (which is not subject to regulatory approval before putting its products on the market and which does not have to list phthalates on ingredient labels) are balking at the proposed ban.

Industry insiders say levels of the substance are safe and the outcry is all based on tests of animal subjects that do not translate into human risks. They argue that there is no need for them to reformulate their

U.S. products and use substitutes for phthalates, as they will for all products sold in Europe starting in September 2004.

On April 19, Estee Lauder pledged to eliminate the chemicals from its MAC and Clinique nail polish lines, while on the same day, Procter and Gamble promised to remove them from its Max Factor and Cover Girl nail polish lines.

"This is a much bigger issue than nail polish or phthalates," says Barbara Brenner, the executive director of the San-Francisco-based Breast Cancer Action, one of the advocacy groups putting pressure on the cosmetics industry. "It could be the beginning of a revolution in consumer safety. People need to know that some cosmetics contain toxic chemicals and they need to demand that safer ingredients be used."

Industry Minimizes Risks

For their part, many cosmetic industry representatives insist that phthalate levels in makeup do not

pose a hazard to human health. "Science clearly supports the continued safe use of these ingredients," says Gerald McEwan, vice president for science at the Cosmetic, Toiletry, and Fragrance Association, a Washington-based trade group. He invokes studies done by independent researchers and by the cosmetics companies themselves.

Health advocates, however, say a growing body of research indicates that the ingredient is not worth the risk.

A 2000 study at the University of Puerto Rico in San Juan linked phthalates (which are also used to soften plastic) to early puberty in girls. Studies conducted at Harvard University in Cambridge in 2002 and 2003 linked the chemicals to decreased sperm counts in men. Researchers from several different environmental groups say that phthalates, which disrupt hormone function, may contribute to the rising incidence of uterine problems in women, testicular cancer in men and infertility in both sexes.

In May 2002, the Environmental Working Group, a Washington-based advocacy organization, tested 72 cosmetics and found measurable levels of phthalates in three-quarters of them.

Though the levels were minimal, scientists warned that their combined effect could pose health

problems. They pointed to a 2000 study by the Atlanta-based Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, which found that phthalate levels in young women (who represent the bulk of cosmetics consumers) may be 20 times higher than average. The group's researchers called on the scientific community to study phthalates in more depth and to reassess exposure levels that are considered safe.

Intensifying Campaign

The decision to remove phthalates from nail polish comes in the wake of intense lobbying from health and environmental groups.

In March, Breast Cancer Action and 60 other organizations sent a letter to Estee Lauder Companies Inc., the Procter and Gamble Company, Avon Products Inc., Revlon Consumer Products Corporation, Unilever, and the L'Oreal Group demanding that these companies comply with European regulations banning "carcinogens, mutagens and reproductive toxins." The chemicals they're targeting include di-n-butyl phthalate (DBP, commonly found in nail polish) and di(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP, found in perfumes).

The Cosmetic, Toiletry, and Fragrance Association calls the European regulation "unnecessary" and dismisses research on phthalates for two reasons: Phthalate levels in cosmetics are well within

U.S. safety standards and because most studies on the chemicals' ill effects have been conducted on animals and not humans.

Some Human Effects Reported

While it's true that most phthalate studies have been done on mice and rats, adverse effects in humans have been reported.

When Olivia James gave birth to her son Darren seven years ago, she learned he had bright eyes and a dimple on his right cheek. She also learned he had hypospadias, a birth defect in which the urethra fails to extend the whole length of the penis.

Repeated surgeries have corrected Darren's problem. But his mother, now 40 and living in Princeton, N.J., still can't shake the horror she felt when learned about phthalates and realized her son's condition could be linked to the chemicals in the makeup and hair products she used during her 15 years as a professional model.

Every day of her career, James slathered on foundation, eye shadow, lipstick and mascara containing phthalates. In addition to wearing heavy makeup, James also had her hair straightened once a month. Like many hair products aimed at African Americans, the straightener she used contained a high concentration of phthalates.

"American manufacturers argue that no single product has been proven to have a detrimental effect," says James, 40, of Princeton, N. J. "But when you're using 10 or 20 of these products each day, the cumulative exposure does add up."

The cosmetic industry's defense—that it follows safety standards—is coming under fire.

Federal authorities have set the safety level for phthalate exposure at 2,800 milligrams of phthalates per kilogram of body weight per day - a threshold the critics say is too high.

"This standard is based on old studies," says Stacy Malkan, a spokesperson for Health Care Without Harm, an environmental advocacy group based in Washington, D.C. "Information is not only incomplete, but conflicting. The National Toxicology Program lists some phthalates as carcinogens, but other government agencies do not."

Putting Risks on Labels

Health advocates are urging authorities to reform labeling practices and study cosmetic ingredients in more depth.

The federal Food and Drug Administration takes a hands-off approach to cosmetics. Instead of testing products before they hit the

market, the FDA regulates these products only after they are sold, investigating health complaints when and if complaints are filed.

"The FDA says there is no harm until harm is proven," says Malkan. "U.S. cosmetic companies are not required by law to mention phthalates or many other chemical compounds on their labels. Nail polish is actually one of the few products for which phthalates must be listed."

With the nail polish victory behind them, health advocates are demanding that U.S. cosmetics manufacturers starting using the same formulations they use in Europe, where cosmetics are made in factories separate those sold in the United States. In addition, they're calling for further study of other suspect ingredients: parabens (which are in face creams and lotions and have been found in human breast tumors) and formaldehyde (which is found in nail polish and blush and has been linked to cancer).

Health advocates have made some headway in California, where regulators have added the phthalate DEHP to the list of chemicals known to cause birth defects. Later this year, California legislators plan to vote on a bill requiring more detailed labeling of cosmetics and banning all ingredients that fail to meet standards for "safe use."

"Chemicals linked to birth defects and infertility don't belong in cosmetics," says Bryony Schwan, a spokesperson for the Montana-based advocacy group Women's Voices for the Earth. "We demand that manufacturers act responsibly and immediately remove them from the products that we use every day."

Perfume Peddling -

Recruiting Methods Questioned

APRIL 30, 2004

THE NEWSPAPER ADS PROMISE HIGH PAYING, MANAGEMENT JOBS, but the young people who respond end up selling imitation perfume in parking lots. As Trouble Shooter Jaie Avila shows us in this undercover investigation, what seemed like the sweet smell of opportunity, turned out to be a very sour disappointment.

"I looked at the paper and it said 'management trainees, \$30,000 to 40,000 a year, guaranteed paid training,'" Eric Debona says. He's looking at the eye catching ads running in San Antonio newspapers for more than a year. With headlines like "circle me", and "fun job," they promise "serious money" and "no experience necessary."

Debona says the real catch comes later because "you don't actually see what they're doing' until you're already in." He's just one of the hundreds of job seekers who responded to the ads. He says the "fun management job" was nothing but a smoke screen. He ended up hawking imitation perfumes in parking lots.

"If they would have said, 'yeah, here's what you're doing, you have to go out, put it in your car, drive from parking lot to parking lot to parking lot and walk up to people and try to sell them this in the parking lot, I wouldn't have had anything to do with it."

After receiving numerous complaints from people like Eric, the News 4 WOAI Trouble Shooters went undercover. We answered the ad and were told to come to an interview at an unmarked Northside office on Wetmore Road. Inside, we noted loud music played constantly to create a hip, casual atmosphere.

Just as Eric described, our photographer was ushered into an office by a young woman who explains the company is called "Texas Scents Incorporated" or "TSI." The interview says they distribute a line of

knock off fragrances called Scentura Creations.

Here's how the interview went:
Interviewer: "I'm a manager here at TSI. We work alongside another company called Scentura Creations. Have you ever heard of them before?" WOAI Photographer: "No." Interviewer: "They're a fragrance company. We have over 300 worldwide locations, and we're looking to do a big expansion in San Antonio and the surrounding area. So, we need managers and assistant managers."

The interviewer never mentions the job involves selling perfume. She says after a few weeks of training, applicants get their own office, and can make a lot of money.

The interviewer says, "Now income your first year here out of the training program, you're looking at \$30-40,000 in your own location."

Eric tells us it's during that so called training program that new recruits are told to go out and sell

perfume, and that they should start by targeting their relatives. He claims, "They want you to go out and sell to your friends and family, see how you do."

We were invited back for a second interview a few days later. This time the room is filled with other applicants. Again, the speaker gives few details, other than the job will include lots of perks like bonuses and company paid travel.

"If you're a money hungry person you'll make a lot of money during the training program," the interviewer says. "You'll make a hell of a lot of money. We also pay out bonuses."

Eric says there were no bonuses, and the travel usually involved driving your own vehicle to another town to sell perfume. "We went out for the trip, and they say the hotel's paid for but we had to sell the perfume to pay for the hotel."

One claim we caught on tape from the interviewer is, "I've been here 2 1/2 years. I'm making six figures. It's incredible."

On the third interview, we finally meet the man behind TSI, owner Brian Warner. His three hour lecture to applicants is short on specifics, and at times sounds more like a motivational seminar.

"You got to have an open mind, what do you want me to do, atti-

tude," Warner explains. "Do what we tell you to do, even if you question it in your mind."

Eric says Warner tells all new recruits not to listen to family members who may be skeptical about the business. "They tell you straight out that your family will turn on you, they will try to tell you that you're getting brainwashed. They'll tell you the company's bad for you. They tell you straight out, 'don't listen to your friends and family.'"

Day after day we saw Warner in front of the office, sending recruits out to sell boxes of Scentura Creations perfumes. Each bottle sells for \$30. The salesperson only gets to keep \$7 to \$10. The rest goes back to Warner.

"I don't know anybody that made any money," Eric tells us. "I mean, not more than 50 bucks here, 60 bucks there."

Eric says the young salespeople are never told that most cities require a permit to sell merchandise. On one occasion everyone in his car got tickets for selling in Alamo Heights, which they then brought to Brian Warner.

"We all got tickets. He took them and said 'don't worry, I'll take care of this...forget about it. My permit covers all of you,' because he had a business permit to do it, and he made it sound like it covered

each one of us individually, which of course I found out later, wasn't the case." The ticket was never paid and Eric ended up paying off a \$500 arrest warrant, on top of the money he spent for gas.

Companies distributing Scentura Perfumes have been springing up in many cities. Some young recruits have lost more than just gas money, and the hopes of a lucrative career. In Phoenix, two young people were killed in a car accident while on a sales trip for a local distributor of Scentura perfume.

The mother of one of the victims says her son was working long hours, and was under a lot of pressure from the manager of that office. She told Phoenix station KPNX, "It's basically like they're taking young lives and just smashing them into the ground. These kids are all going to fail."

We wanted to get some answers from the man behind the operation here in San Antonio, Brian Warner of TSI. He wasn't as talkative with us, as he is in his perfume selling pep rallies.

News 4 WOAI Trouble Shooter Jaie Avila confronted Warner, "I'd like to ask you about your business. Aren't you misleading these young people, telling them that they're going to be managers earning 40 grand a year, and they end up selling perfume

in parking lots?" Warner lies often work hard, and then get only offered, "No cheated. comment, please leave."

While a judge in Illinois called from time to time has run this ad. Scentura Perfume a "pyramid sales Similar to a company of crooks scheme," there's not much local law enforcement can do. who are running a multi million dollar fragrance house based on another company's efforts. People are trying to make money the old fashioned way everyday. It's the way of the mundo. Like the old saying the squeaky wheel always gets the grease.

Aaron Valenzuela with the Texas Attorney General's office, says they've started tracking complaints from parents. "They're concerned that their children are being exploited in the sense that they are promised you know, high paying managerial type employment and really what they turn out to be is door to door salesmen."

For now, all law enforcement can do is offer the same warning as Eric Debona, before you fall for one of those too good to be true employment ads: "Smack yourself in the head. Think. Take a minute. Stop. I wouldn't recommend anybody going anywhere near that place." Basically, take the time to sniff out what's really going on.

A pyramid marketing level scam of course. If one looks at the photo, and then reads Scentura Creations internet site one can tell right away it is a scam. In order to compound, and then fill one ounce perfume bottles the company would need a large inventory then filling equipment. As in any scam the one's who are in on the deal first make the big bucks. The folks who come in later who believe the

The IFRA

MAY - JUNE, 2004

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE FRAGRANCE INDUSTRY AND THE DERMATOLOGICAL COMMUNITY in the past has not always been perceived as one of partnership. IFRA, the International Fragrance Association, has started a series of initiatives to underline the industry's commitment to market safe products that limit any unavoidable risk to the minimum while at the same time enabling the consumer to choose from a variety of fragranced products. This article describes current projects and future initiatives.

The fragrance industry, unlike most industries, works with numerous raw materials to create its products. The Research Institute for Fragrance Materials (RIFM) database currently contains about 2500 materials used in the creation of fragrance compounds, ranging from natural extracts to purely synthetic fragrance ingredients.

Fragrances have a myriad of uses, from perfuming industrial products like fuel, to household and detergent products, to prestigious fine fragrance products of the fashion and designer world. Since 1973, the International Fragrance Association (IFRA) has worked to ensure the highest levels of safety of the ingredients used by the fragrance industry.

IFRA membership is open to national or regional associations worldwide and has member organizations in North and South America, Europe, Japan, Australia, and New Zealand.

IFRA's communication instrument to its membership is the Code of Practice. Besides general advice regarding the safe use of fragrance ingredients, it contains more than 100 Standards covering individual fragrance ingredients. These Standards reflect the industry standard for fragrances, and are acknowledged as such in legal venues. The Standards either restrict the use of fragrance ingredients by giving max-

imum skin limits, require certain purity criteria or GMP limits (e.g., maximum peroxide levels), or simply ban materials for use in fragrance compounds due to adverse effects. The basis for codification in the Standards is the safety assessment as supplied by the RIFM Expert Panel (REXPAN). REXPAN is a group of industry independent experts that cover a broad range of scientific expertise.

The Code of Practice and the Standards are both available on IFRA's website (www.ifraorg.org). Several documents have been published that in more detail describe the process of setting Standards. These start by reviewing the human health and environmental criteria (1,2) applied in selecting the materials, and choosing the optimal test or tests needed to determine additional relevant safety information. Industry measures are taken to collate information on use pattern and fragrance material concentrations, which are used to estimate maximum-use levels in products (3); this is crucial for a proper safety assessment. Finally, the connection of

multiple endpoints and exposures are made and the determination of the role of the RIFM Expert Panel is published in Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology (4).

It should be stressed that the outcome of the risk assessment by REXPAN is published unchanged in the IFRA Standards; an IFRA Information Letter (IL 649 (5), available from the IFRA Secretariat via e-mail at secretariat@ifraorg.org) confirms this and describes the roles of REXPAN and IFRA in the Standardsetting process. The fragrance industry via IFRA is managing the risk management procedures, but is not dealing with the risk assessment.

Despite the efforts of the IFRA to establish and maintain universal and fair industry standards, many voices from the dermatological community, largely from Europe, have expressed concern about increased rates of reactions to fragrance ingredients, according to their experiences and observations in their own practices and clinics. Differences in interpretation of data and shortcomings in communication have led to a somewhat strained relationship between the two industries. This may also be due to the fact that while the fragrance industry may be regarded as focusing on the upside of fragrances and on ideal situations, the dermatological industry is mainly confronted with the downside of

the business through patients that react sensitively to fragranced products. A status of trust and partnership certainly would best serve both the fragrance industry and the dermatological community, and--even more importantly--would be in the best interest of patients suffering from reactions to fragranced products.

As a first step that should lead to an improved relationship with the dermatological community and underline IFRA's goals including marketing safe products that comply with scientifically well-founded risk reduction measures, keeping the risk of fragrance allergy to an acceptable minimum (as with any allergen, a zero risk is neither possible nor realistic), and offering the consumer a wide range of product choice IFRA has initiated the 'Fragrance On Call' list.

A small segment of the population that uses cosmetic products will experience a skin reaction to a product. Should this happen the user may seek treatment from a dermatologist who, in turn, may seek information from the product manufacturer about the product's composition to help diagnose the specific cause of the skin reaction. If a fragrance ingredient is the suspected cause of a patient's skin reaction, there had been no dialogue process between dermatologists and the fragrance industry designed to make this information exchange simple and transparent. The initiative sum-

marized by the 'Fragrance On Call' list sets out a structured process that allows for prompt provision of information regarding the fragrance ingredients in certain fragrance compounds which are used in consumer products.

This procedure was set in place at the end of 2002 to ensure that dermatologists could obtain necessary information as quickly as possible from the relevant manufacturer. The majority of fragrance manufacturers worldwide have already joined the initiative, with more to follow.

The procedure itself has been published in several dermatological journals (6,8) and may also be found on IFRA's website.

In another joint initiative, IFRA and RIFM have addressed the issue of materials used for patch testing. The fragrance industry regards it as crucial that the materials used by the manufacturers of patch test trays, which will be exposed to patients' skin in order to diagnose materials responsible for adverse skin reactions, represent the most common quality of the material in commerce. The goal of this project is to assist the patch test tray manufacturers in preparing consistent samples used for routine patch testing, ensuring uniformity of the composition of the material, shelf-life, storage conditions, etc. It is the view of the IFRA that there could be no better partner than the fra-

grance industry itself to provide the correct quality of test material; to this end the fragrance industry has offered the two major patch test manufacturers (Hermal and Chemotechnique) controlled samples of fragrance ingredients free of charge (except for some very rare and expensive natural extracts). That project has been initiated in 2003 and is expected to be up and running smoothly by the beginning of 2004.

The fragrance industry has furthermore offered to assist in the selection of appropriate test concentrations for new materials that are intended for addition to the patch test tray. A current example would be some of the 26 materials that via the 7th Amendment to the European Cosmetics Directive are requested for labeling due to their sensitizing potential (for the full list of materials, see Table 1). While the industry is not fully in line with the criteria applied for the selection of the materials, it will do its best in assisting customers and dermatologists with the requirements of fulfilling the Directive. With regard to the industrial customer, for example, this means providing them with reliable information on the presence of any of these 26 materials in a fragrance compound, so that its finished product can be correctly labeled for the consumer. Presence of the material has to be indicated, independent from its source; contributions from essential oils need to be taken into account. 16 materials

out of the 26 do occur in natural extracts that are used in the fragrance industry; two further materials are natural extracts themselves. Calculations are necessary, as administrative cut-off levels for the materials have been legislatively established regarding labeling requirements: for leave-on products presence of a material higher than 10 parts per million (ppm) and for rinse-off products amounts higher than 100 ppm need to be indicated on the label of the finished cosmetic product.

Accurate identification of the offending ingredient would enable a fragrance-sensitive patient to continue to use fragranced products in accordance with the new informative product labeling. To take advantage of this new requirement, dermatologists would have to test each of the listed 26 materials on fragrance-sensitive patients to identify the culprit for a skin reaction. The fragrance industry has therefore offered patch test tray manufacturers all information available regarding irritation or sensitization potential of these materials so that a reasonable test concentration can be chosen; time will tell whether the results satisfy the intention of this legislation.

If fragrance compound is identified as the cause of a skin reaction but extended testing with the 26 single fragrance ingredients does not identify the cause, as a further project IFRA is investigating ways

to assist members and dermatologists in fractionating fragrance compounds for further testing, also to supply them with patches of compound materials in case they are not available in standard series of patch test tray manufacturers.

The IFRA is confident that its active advocacy towards the client industry, the regulators, and the dermatological community will lead to a real state of trust and partnership that will benefit all groups as well as the end users of fragranced products, whether healthy or suffering from product incompatibilities.

Table 1:

List of the 26 fragrance ingredients now required to be labeled on cosmetic products in Europe.

INCI name

Amyl Cinnamal
Benzyl Alcohol
Cinnamyl Alcohol
Citral
Eugenol
Hydroxycitronellal
Isoeugenol
Amylcinnamyl Alcohol
Benzyl Salicylate
Cinnamal
Coumarin
Geraniol
Hydroxyisohexyl 3-Cyclohexene
Carboxaldehyde
Anise Alcohol

Benzyl Cinnamate
Farnesol
Butylphenyl Methylpropional
Linalool
Benzyl Benzoate
Citronellol
Hexyl Cinnamal
Limonene
Methyl 2-Octynoate
Alpha Isomethyl Ionone
Evernia Prunastri
 (Oakmoss) Extract
Evernia Furfuracea
 (Treemoss) Extract

The Focus on:

Section is designed to provide a background on one of the basic areas of our practice - A common condition, subject, or process which we as dermatologists may often deal with, yet might not intimately understand. This new feature will appear each issue as an informative review of a different dermatological topic.

References:

1. Ford RA. et al. Criteria for development of a database for safety evaluation of fragrance materials. *Regul Toxicol and Pharmacol* 2000; 31:155-181.
2. Salvito DT. Senna RJ. Federle TW. A framework for prioritizing fragrance materials for aquatic risk assessment. *Environ Toxicol and Chem* 2002; 21:1301-1308.

Sensitive to Perfume?

JUNE 19, 2004

FRAGRANCES ARE NOW USED IN ALMOST EVERY CLEANING, LAUNDRY, AND PERSONAL-CARE PRODUCT ON THE MARKET. Since people have been using perfumes for hundreds of years. It's reasonable to wonder why the problem of using scents has surfaced only recently.

Until the 20th century, perfumes were made from natural ingredients derived directly from plants and animals, and as fragrances became cheaper and more widespread, they also became more synthetic.

The National Academy of Sciences reports that 95% of the chemicals used in fragrances today are synthetic compounds derived from petroleum, including known toxins capable of causing cancer, birth defects, central nervous system disorders and allergic reactions.

We have been brainwashed by the industry to feel we must cover up our natural scents with toxic chemicals. Many of the same chemicals in perfumes are the same chemicals that are in cigarette smoke.

You would think the government would protect people by attempting to regulate the industries that are causing harm; however, the cosmetic industry is self regulated and isn't required to give formulations, test results, safety data or consumer complaints to the FDA.

When you use perfume or cologne, remember you are using powerful chemicals regulated solely by the industry that sells them. Just because they don't affect you now doesn't mean they won't affect someone in line next to you (giving them a migraine or sinus problems), or that you will always be immune to their effects. These chemicals go directly into the blood stream when applied to our skin, and are also absorbed into the skin from our clothing.

We also inhale these chemical fumes that go straight to our brains

where they can do major harm, and many of these chemical fumes have a "narcotic" effect. ("Smelling Good But Feeling Bad, Synthetic Perfumes, Colognes and Scents Are Turning Up Noses," Green Living Your Health, and "The Health Risks of Perfume and Other Scented Products," emagazine.com - March 2002} Author's comment: These effects from scents can surface days after the exposure, and many people do not connect the strong perfume/cologne smell on the lady or gentleman next to them at the opera to their headache or upset stomach days later.

One of the big toxic offenders is perfume and other scented products. Did you know that many of the ingredients in your perfume are the exact same ingredients found in gasoline????!! The scary thing is that the perfume industry is not regulated at all, and they can put any number of chemicals in fragrance without revealing what those chemicals are, and how they affect humans. We humans are all participating in a giant "lab" experiment against our knowledge and against

our will, and it is making some of us very sick.

{"Multiple Chemical Sensitivity - Environmental Illness,"
www.ourlittleplace.com place.com
- April 2002}

Fragrance-free policies are beginning to take hold in work places across the United States and Canada. Here are just a few examples:

Evergreen State College in Olympia, Washington, asked its employees and students to refrain voluntarily from wearing scented products.

The entire Halifax Regional Municipality in Nova Scotia has a "scent-awareness" program that urges the use of unscented products only.

Alacrity Ventures, a Berkeley, California-based venture-capital firm, not only encourages its employees to go fragrance-free but also uses only unscented janitorial products.

Many businesses, at the request of their employees, are voluntarily creating fragrance-free policies, says Tracie Saab, a consultant with the "Job Accommodation Network," a Morgantown, West Virginia group that educates disabled workers and their employers. These policies are applauded by people with asthma, allergies, and

the controversial disorder called multiple chemical sensitivity, in which even low levels of exposure to chemicals (from pesticides to perfumes) can trigger headaches, fatigue and other symptoms. "It is easier for businesses to enact these policies than to risk legal action somewhere down the line," says Saab.

{"Stink-Free Office Mates,"
Natural Health, Nov./Dec. 2000}

Many migraineurs are so sensitive to fragrance that people wearing perfumes and colognes around them trigger an immediate and severe migraine attack. You can make your house a fragrance-free zone, and if you have a visitor who is either not aware of this or forgets, most of the fragrance can be removed with alcohol wipes if it has been put on the skin and not the clothing.

{"Fragrance Triggers," Teri Roberts: Beating Headaches, on Headaches/Migraines on About.com - Dec. 2001}

Cleaning the Air of Scents

JULY 3, 2004

Paris - France

THE USE OF GOOD SCENTS IS NOT A STANDARD MANAGEMENT TOOL. Yet fragrance has emerged as one of the more annoying and insidious causes of allergic reactions in the modern office, where workers share the air and musky colognes, often in climate-controlled towers with tightly sealed windows.

Consider Ingrid Scherrmann, a former music teacher in a small city in southern Germany, where she conducted regular student concerts for dotting parents. At age 55, she sought early retirement to escape what she considered the sickening scent of various perfumes and colognes.

"It was really complicated," she said of her efforts to fit in after developing an allergy at age 40. "I would attend conferences where someone had fragrances, and I would start coughing for two or three hours. I was always sitting in front of windows in my last years. I liked my profession. I liked working with young persons, but finally I said, cheerio, I have to go."

In some ways, early skirmishes over indoor air quality echo cigarette-smoking battles. The arguments basically come down to a debate over individual rights versus health complaints that can range from migraine headaches to asthmatic wheezing. But it's much harder to win sympathy for a fellow worker's aversion to Elizabeth Taylor's Passion perfume or a dangling pine-sap air freshener.

When it comes to the sense of smell, work culture is undergoing an evolutionary process, said Alan Hirsch, director of the Smell Taste Treatment and Research Foundation in Chicago. "The best thing for the work site has been the elimination of smoke. But now people are notic-

ing smells that were blocked out by cigarettes. So you see this whole movement of having an odor-free environment. I think it's an artificial issue because smells are present anyhow."

In some parts of the western United States and Canada, churches, city government offices and companies have created informal "scent-free" policies to discourage the use of hair spray, perfume and scented deodorants. Alacrity Ventures, a Berkeley-based venture capital firm in California that invests in Internet enterprises, encourages employees to discard fragrances, and its offices are cleaned with unscented products. Even the invitation to the Halloween office party reminds invited guests to leave the perfume at home.

In Utah, a federal court initially ruled in favor of a state tax employee who claimed a disability because her bosses refused to shift her desk away from a co-worker who used heavily scented hand lotion and perfume.

The fragrance-free movement is at a much earlier stage in Europe, where countries like the Netherlands and Ireland are still learning to manage bans on workplace smoking. This month a Dutch government survey found that more than 40 percent of the businesses inspected were breaching the new regulations.

But the impact of aromas in the office can be profound, according to Hirsch: "Unpleasant odors have been found to induce aggression, impair learning ability and create a negative mood, making people pessimistic and decreasing work productivity."

Researchers have tested the power of scents in different settings like hospitals and laboratories to determine whether smell can be used in a calculated way to ease anxieties or even increase learning and memory. Some hospitals now release the clean scent of green apples as patients are submitting to an MRI, or magnetic resonance imaging test. The aroma reduces feelings of claustrophobia, according to Hirsch, who conducted a laboratory study of volunteers placed in coffin-like structures and given face masks infused with scents of vanilla or buttered popcorn.

One theory is that odor is a distraction from cramped quarters, evoking fond memories of fresh air like an orchard or apple harvest. To apply the same principle in a

repressively small office cubicle, Hirsch suggests the scent of fresh cucumber.

But when it comes to personal colognes and perfumes, he urges caution. Women, he said, should not wear any fragrance, because some research has shown that interviewers or superiors react negatively because they feel manipulated by perfume.

Men, however, should study their supervisors. The chief may not realize it, Hirsch said, but a discreet splash of a particular fragrance will immediately create an unspoken connection.

Call it Boss Cologne.

Offbeat Scents

JULY 3, 2004

ORDINARY SMELLS, DALE AIR CAN DO - but the breath of a Tyrannosaurus rex?

“Where do you start?” asked Frank Knight, director of the small British firm that specializes in “themed aromas.”

Most of the smells it creates, like “Granny’s Kitchen” or “Burnt Wood,” are designed to enhance museum visits or call up long-lost memories.

Re-creating the breath of a T. rex for a huge model dinosaur in London’s Natural History Museum posed challenges all of their own.

“We spoke to paleontologists, who gave us a description of the dinosaur. Basically, the bigger the creature, the smellier they were,” said Knight, who is passionate about accuracy. “The dinosaurs would have had open sores from fighting, and rotting meat stuck in the gaps between their teeth. We needed all these features in the eventual odor.”

The T. rex breath turned out to be so revolting that the curators instead opted for a milder swamp smell to evoke the creature’s natural habitat.

Nasty smells are popular Requests for nasty smells come in quite a lot, requiring some unpleasant research.

“I’ve had otter poo on my desk,” said Knight, who created the odor for a zoo’s nature trail, alongside the smell of jaguar urine and rotting flesh. Some jobs are easier on the nose. Dale Air has supplied branches of British travel agent chain Lunn Poly with the scent of coconut oil, aimed at increasing the time customers spend in their stores.

The smell of money Dale Air started life as an air-freshener firm. Then founder Fred Dale, who died earlier this year, discovered a lucrative sideline. He was invited to mix familiar odors from the 1920s for use in retirement homes. These triggered memories and encouraged conversation among elderly residents.

DALE NEVER LOOKED BACK.

Soon museums were commissioning smells such as Dead Roman Soldier’s Armpit and Viking Loo. “My mum used to say that she never knew who she would be going to bed with a horse, or a bear as the smells used to linger on my dad’s skin,” said Fred’s son Robert.

Fred Dale’s favorite project was the Jorvik Centre museum in York, which opened in 1984, boasting Viking smells as its key attraction. Authentic historical smells have since become a much copied feature.

Sarah Maltby, head of visitor attractions at Jorvik, said:

“Competition is such nowadays you have to think how you can capture the imagination of your visitors, and thinking of how to capture all the senses is one of the things you have to do.”

Costly frankincense Dale Air’s most expensive smell to date is frankincense, mixed for a Queen of Sheba exhibition at the British museum. A kilo of the scent lasting for a year cost \$275.70 (150 pounds).

The firm’s team of perfumers identified the chemical components of the smell and mixed up a replica potion.

Most aromas are supplied as liquids and pumped out through various dispensers. A new model still being tested can fill a 250-seat theater. Knight thinks cinemas may also one day waft appropriate scents through the auditorium, but said they should be cautious.

“You’ve got to give people choice. We don’t like forcing aromas on people and you don’t want people going to the cinema and not knowing what they’ll encounter.”

However, people can use their sense of smell to their advantage, and there are some interesting applications.

The firm is testing an aroma dispenser that plugs into a computer and is controlled from the key-

board.

“Say you’ve got help desk staff who are getting tense and frustrated they can press a button to get an aroma to help calm them down,” Knight said.

Most of the firm’s smells, such as the “aromas of football” set, are for pure entertainment.

Smells as entertainment “Footie Pitch” smells of grass, “Trophy Room” smells of wood polish, “Half Time” smells of pies, and “Changing Room” smells of liniment, giving the overzealous football fan or club shop an authentic whiff of the beautiful game.

Knight points out that football pitches are rarely mown the day of a match, so the smell of freshly cut grass won’t do.

“That’s how realistic we are — we find out when they cut the grass.”

Springtime

JULY 6, 2004

When spring arrives, opening your windows and letting in the fresh air is good not only for your state of mind but also for your health, as the EPA has found that concentrations of pollutants inside homes can be two to five times higher than outside.

Ironically, a major source of indoor air pollutants is conventional cleaning products, because they're loaded with fragrances and petroleum-distilled chemicals known as volatile organic compounds, or VOCs, that vaporize into the air.

"There's definitely a cause-and-effect from using petroleum-based cleaning products, especially in poorly ventilated areas. As the chemicals build up in the air space you're working in, the toxicity also builds up," says Mike Vogel, head of the Healthy Indoor Air for America's Homes program.

A Spanish study of over 4,000 women published in November 2003 found that 25 percent of asthma cases in the group were attributable to domestic cleaning work. In the U.S., a 2002 Inform report detailed the negative impacts of cleaning products on janitors' health. Reducing the use of volatile and odorous products, Inform concluded, could improve indoor air and protect health.

Happily, safer alternatives can be bought or mixed from such common household staples as white vinegar and baking soda. Below, some best choices for various tasks.

Laundry:

Laundry detergents and fabric softeners are some of the most heavily scented cleaners. Chemicals known as phthalates, which have harmed hormonal systems and reproductive organs in animal tests, are

common in fragrance formulas because they make the scent last longer. But fragrance residues on clothes can cause skin irritation and provoke allergies, according to Harvey Karp, M.D., a Los Angeles pediatrician.

As an alternative fabric softener, Kat Gasparich, a Manhattan artist and mother of 18-month-old Winter, uses a half-cup of vinegar in the rinse cycle. Since vinegar breaks down uric acid, it keeps her baby's cloth diapers smelling fresh; it also eliminates static cling.

Kat avoids chlorine bleach (also called sodium hypochlorite) due to its caustic fumes and toxicity if swallowed, and doesn't worry about stains. "Besides, in warmer weather, the sun does a great job bleaching them," she says. Sunlight is a natural disinfectant too. To boost your detergent's cleaning power and remove odors, add a half-cup of baking soda or washing soda, two related minerals, along with the detergent. For stubborn stains, try a pre-wash soak in water mixed with either borax, lemon

juice, hydrogen peroxide or white vinegar. Or mix washing soda and water into a paste—wear gloves, as washing soda can irritate skin. Or buy non-chlorine bleaches that contain sodium percarbonate or sodium perborate.

For store-bought laundry products: Look on labels for plant-based cleaning agents or castile soaps instead of petroleum-based surfactants, which deplete natural resources and may contain harmful impurities. The catch-all term "fragrance" may hide ingredients such as phthalates. Look for plant essential oil scents or products that are truly fragrance-free, and don't believe the antibacterial hype! In March 2004, researchers at Columbia University reported that a study of 238 Manhattan households found virtually no difference in the rate of infectious disease symptoms (runny nose, cough, sore throat, fever, etc.) in homes using antibacterial products—including laundry detergent—and those that did not. Best bets:

Seventh Generation

www.seventhgeneration.com,
800-456-1191

Ecover

www.ecover.com,
800-449-4925

Sun & Earth

www.sunandearth.com,
800-298-7861

Bi-O-Kleen

www.bi-o-kleen.com,
800-477-0188

Floors:

My favorite nontoxic floor cleaner is one cup white distilled vinegar per gallon of hot water. I've used this on my wood floors after a large party and it removed sticky residue and killed odors, with no rinsing needed. Or use 1/2 cup borax (like vinegar, a natural disinfectant) and 2 gallons of water. You can add 1/4 cup of any liquid soap for extra cleaning power, but soap should be rinsed.

For store-bought products:

AFM Super Clean concentrated all-purpose cleaner/degreaser .

www.afmsafecoat.com,
619-239-0321

Dr. Bronner's Sal Suds hard-surface, all-purpose cleaner.

www.drbronner.com,
760-743-2211

Ecover Natural All-Purpose cleaner. www.ecover.com,
800-449-4925

Murphy Oil Soap

www.murphyoilsoap.com,
800-486-7627

Sweat

JULY 6, 2004

JONATHAN HAGUE AND JUDY RAHN THINK A LOT ABOUT SWEAT. Perhaps more than any two people on the planet.

The sign in front of their office building in Rolling Meadows, Ill., reads, "Global Technology Center." It could just as well read, "Body Odor Analysis and Improvement."

It is there that their employer, Unilever - the maker of things such as Q-Tips and Lipton Tea - researches, develops and tests its Degree, Dove, Axe and Suave antiperspirants and deodorants.

It is there that Hague and Rahn are consumed, even on a cool morning, by thoughts of clammy underarms and soggy feet.

On this day, they're getting help from 28 women who have swapped their tops for flower-print smocks, stuffed absorbent paper pads under their armpits and agreed to spend 80 minutes in a sultry, windowless room to test the effectiveness of an antiperspirant formula.

As the room's temperature gauge inches toward 100 degrees, with humidity around 35 percent, dewy women turn downright drippy. One, Joan Penchoff, quips: "It's like doing gardening in July."

And, like gardening, this is a huge business. Americans spent more than \$1 billion on antiperspirants and deodorants last year, according to retail tracker Information Resources.

It's why Unilever, Gillette, Procter & Gamble and their fellow sweat battlers spend mightily on research.

A custom fit

They're mixing, stirring, sniffing and cooking up new products that let skin "breathe" and boast "smart" fragrances that, say, work on battling odor and sweat only when you need it, according to Hague, director of product formulation. Hague's teams also make sure solids stay solid and aerosols spritz.

The perplexing thing about perspiration is that it actually is a good thing; it doesn't smell, and it helps regulate the body's temperature, cooling as moisture on the skin's surface evaporates.

"The minute you start sweating, you are cooling yourself down," said Rahn, manager of consumer science. She oversees a staff that handles clinical and consumer testing for antiperspirants and deodorants.

"That's the whole purpose of sweating. As soon as the balance is shifted and we become hot, we need to re-establish that equilibrium, and that is achieved by sweat-

ing," she said.

The body is covered with millions of sweat glands, with two main types: Thermal (eccrine) glands are all over the body, sending moisture through pores in your skin. Another set of sweat glands (apocrine) kick in at puberty and are triggered not by heat but by emotions. They are located mostly in the underarm and groin.

Blame bacteria

Although sweat doesn't smell, when it arrives on the skin's surface and mixes it up with the bacteria, the odor brews. "You sweat all over your body," Rahn said, "but you perceive it in your underarms because it's a closed area."

Deodorants that contain antimicrobials can help eliminate the bacteria on your skin's surface, while the fragrance in the deodorant can help mask the odor, Rahn said.

Antiperspirants, on the other hand, help control sweat by forming gel plugs in some of the sweat glands. They also may contain fragrance and may help eliminate skin-surface bacteria.

Yet even antiperspirants don't completely eliminate sweat, said Rahn, noting that "the most effective product on the market is about 50 percent sweat reduction" and that's only in the underarm area.

Humans have been sweating and swabbing themselves with all sorts of products to help them stay dry for thousands of years.

Yet it has been only in the last dozen years that many of the important stink-producing elements have been identified, thanks in part to George Preti, an organic chemist with the Monell Chemical Senses Center, a Philadelphia based non-profit.

Preti, who studies underarm secretions, has focused his research on odorants (smell-producing elements). One of the culprits Preti has pegged is called 3-methyl-2-hexenoic acid. Another culprit, 3-methyl 3-hydroxyhexenoic acid, was identified by Swiss scientists.

"These are two big offenders," said Preti.

Understanding the elements in our armpits is a step toward solving the odor dilemma. These days, Preti is at work trying to identify more culprits in underarm odor, science that could eventually play a role in some deodorant and antiperspirant innovations - say, products that zero in on a specific odorant.

But wait, there's more

Smell and moisture aren't the only armpit issue, particularly for women who shave their underarms and may deal with dryness, irritation, razor burn, bumps, nicks and

itching.

Hague offers a few ideas about the next frontier for moisture management, including the development of different products for different groups in an increasingly less homogenous America, plus issues related to obesity.

"You never want to stop people from sweating all over their body," Hague said.

"But wet patches on shirts and skin folds that then transfer onto clothing there's nothing active on that, but you can see that there are changes in society that start to make you think, 'Actually, is it all about just the underarm or do we have opportunities elsewhere?'

"For us," Hague said, "it's intriguing." Now you know all about sweat.

What is sweat?

Mostly water, but also sodium chloride (common salt), potassium salts, urea (a waste product containing nitrogen) and lactic acid (a waste product from glucose and fat metabolism). All those salts are why your skin tastes salty when you've been sweating.

How much do we sweat?

A normal body on a cool day produces about a pint of sweat. In extreme heat, the average person

produces about three pints an hour. As much as three gallons a day can be lost through strenuous exercise or during hot weather.

Why do we sweat?

To cool our bodies. The cooling effect depends on how much moisture is in the air: We don't cool nearly as efficiently in Kansas as in places where the air is dry, such as Colorado.

How do you keep your cool?

Keep sweat-prone areas clean to eliminate bacteria. Bathe daily.

Use deodorants to mask odor and fight bacteria; use antiperspirants to also inhibit sweating.

To reduce foot odor caused by sweating, dust your feet with cornstarch before putting on socks or hosiery.

Prevent dehydration by drinking plenty of fluids.

Smells & Hell

JULY 9, 2004

AUSTRALIA IS ONLY JUST WAKING UP TO A NEW KIND OF GLOBAL BATTLE - demands for a fragrance-free environment. Elisabeth King reports.

Ever had to move away from someone who was wearing too strong a perfume because you felt the first inkling of a headache coming on? You're not alone.

The fragrance-sensitivity issue is looming as the new millennium's equivalent of the anti-smoking campaigns of the 1980s. Could we soon be working in a strictly no-fragrance workplace? Or shopping in scent-free stores? It wouldn't be as easy to police as smoking bans, but the growing body of evidence linking allergies and symptoms to a host of smells is poised to present one of the biggest challenges of the next decade for governments and businesses.

It encompasses scents emanating from an array of everyday products, from cleaning fluids to deodorants. Just as people sue companies for the effects of passive smoking on their health, the day could be coming when spritzing on cologne could turn you into a walking health hazard. The storm over fragrance sensitivity, which plays a leading role in the multiple chemical sensitivities (MCS) syndrome, has been brewing for over a decade, but the stakes have become higher since 2000.

In the past three years, a growing number of fragrance-sensitive employees in the US have claimed protection under the Americans With Disabilities Act, which governs employment related civil rights.

Lady Mar, a regular campaigner on chemical poisoning issues in the UK — who appears on the BBC's watchdog program, Face Value — has almost singlehandedly stopped the excessive use of perfumes and colognes in the House of Lords.

In 2003, the European Commission proposed new legislation called Reach (Registration, Evaluation and Authorisation of Chemicals) to identify and govern the uses of all chemicals on the European market. The information produced by Reach will be global and, because of the international nature of the cosmetic and pharmaceuticals industries, its impact will be felt worldwide including Australia.

Dr Mark Donohoe, an Australian specialist on the environment, believes the issue is set to be bigger than the anti-smoking campaign. "Smokers were already in the minority when legislation was finally formulated, and they were easy to spot," he says. "Chemicals are everywhere in modern offices — photocopiers, cleaning fluids, air fresheners, personal fragrances. But, in my belief, what will really clinch governmental action in Australia is that many MCS sufferers are young, talented and vigorous people who would be sorely missed if they were forced to leave the workplace."

Elisabeth King

Fragrance Books Inc. @ www.perfumerbook.com

Germany is the only country to have a national health policy to fight the effects of MCS. Donohoe is campaigning for similar regulations here, but he says Australia is still a long way behind Europe and the US in tackling the issue.

"Having said that, there is a growing number of employers in most states who are already instituting fragrance free environments on an ad hoc basis in response to the complaints of individual workers. But after banning the wearing of freshly dry-cleaned clothes, perfumes and over-fragranced cleaning products on a trial basis, they often discover that all of their employees, not just MCS sufferers, feel much better. What started as a temporary policy becomes a permanent one because of the lift in general productivity."

So how do fragrances and chemicals connect? Some fragrance components are organic, but today over 80 per cent are synthetic compounds, a large chunk being derived from various petrochemicals. Over 5000 different fragrances can be found in the products used daily — from health aids to laundry detergents.

And while synthetic compounds have been in used in fragrance products for over a century, perfumed formulations changed in the 1980s with the development of more powerful synthetics that could be used at higher levels.

According to many researchers, this has been responsible for the number of MCS cases multiplying since then.

Meanwhile marketers have rushed to exploit psychological research claiming that individual scents can change our perception of certain products and environments. And perfumed products have expanded to include scented candles, upholstery fresheners and even sweet-smelling air-conditioning systems.

However, fragrance doesn't only enter the body through the nose. It can be absorbed through the skin (some components have been found in breast milk) and ingested by consuming those contained in food flavourings. In fact, many of the world's leading perfume manufacturing companies reap as much and, in some cases, more money from their food flavouring businesses as they do from making eau de toilettes.

It is this blanket use that underpins studies, reports and anecdotal evidence identifying fragrance as a key trigger in health problems such as migraines, asthma and allergies. Other studies have linked them to unrelated conditions, from sinusitis through to dizziness, depression, vertigo, irritability, reproductive problems, hypertension and irregular heartbeat.

According to the report *Pretty*

Nasty — conducted by Healthcare Without Harm, the British Women's Environmental Network and the Swedish Society for Nature Conservation — the latest concern is phthalates. These chemical compounds are found in many cosmetic products including perfumes, hair-sprays, gels and deodorants, as well as toys, flooring materials and pharmaceutical products. Again, they have been in use for years but recent fears were prompted by studies in animals that linked phthalates with birth defects such as testicular atrophy in males, some types of cancer, and their ability to mimic the actions of oestrogen in the body.

In 2003, two types of phthalates used in cosmetics and fragrances were banned in the European Union. Estee Lauder and Procter & Gamble have announced that they will stop using phthalates in cosmetics and some nail polishes although both companies say that they do not believe that they are harmful to humans.

These announcements came just as a bill aimed at the use of phthalates was introduced in the California legislature earlier this year. The bill was rejected, but will be re-introduced. However, cosmetic industry leaders — such as Dr Gerald McEwen, vice president for Science of the US Cosmetics, Toiletry and Fragrance Association — are not convinced that experiments prove the chemicals are dan-

gerous to human health. They say that research animals were exposed to pthalates far in excess of normal human exposure.

Regardless, there has been a call for greater transparency in labelling. At present, fragrance formulations are regarded as "trade secrets" and manufacturers are not required to reveal the chemical make-up of many products.

In 2001, the US Food and Drug Administration acknowledged that there was little research data on how pthalates and other cosmetic fragrance chemicals affect human health.

For further information on MCS, contact AESSRA (Allergy and Environmental Sensitivity Support and Research Association Inc), www.vicnet.net.au/~aessra or P.O. Box 298, Ringwood 3134.

Cosmetics & Cow Madness

JULY 14, 2004

THE GOVERNMENT TOLD COSMETICS MAKERS FRIDAY THEY CAN NO LONGER USE BRAIN AND SPINAL CORD TISSUE from older cattle in lipstick, hair sprays and other products.

The new Food and Drug Administration regulations come in the wake of the first U.S. case of mad cow disease last December. They are aimed at preventing the disease from reaching people, where it can cause a rare but similar fatal condition, variant Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease.

Mad cow - also known as bovine spongiform encephalopathy, or BSE - causes the brains of affected animals to waste away.

Consumer groups complained that the regulations are insufficient, saying the government should also ban the same tissues from younger cattle and extend the prohibition to use in animal feed.

"While the risk is small, if there does happen to be an ingredient from a BSE-infected cow, the consequences would be incredibly drastic," said Rachel Weintraub, assistant general counsel of the Consumer Federation of America.

For instance, she said, cosmetics include sprays that could contain animal protein, which could be inhaled. Caroline Smith DeWaal, head of food safety for the Center for Science in the Public Interest, said it's virtually impossible for a consumer to know from the label whether a banned product is in cosmetics.

The agency and businesses ought to put out lists of products containing bovine-derived material "so people can throw out old cosmetics and purchase new ones that are subject to this requirement," DeWaal said.

Cosmetic manufacturers said they already require their suppliers to certify that the cattle-derived ingredients sold to them are free of materials that carry BSE.

The Cosmetic, Toiletry and Fragrance Association said it is reviewing the new FDA requirements but noted that the agency has indicated in the past that the U.S. cosmetics supply is safe.

"Although our current rules are strong, when it comes to public health and safety we cannot be content with the status quo," Health and Human Services Secretary Tommy Thompson said in announcing the new prohibitions.

The FDA said it will further study the idea of keeping the cattle protein out of feed for animals, a concept it endorsed in January.

Some cattle tissue, notably the brains and spinal cords of animals over 30 months of age, can harbor prions, the misshapen proteins blamed for mad cow. The Agriculture Department earlier this

year banned those tissues and other material, such as skulls and nervous system tissue connected to the spinal cord, from the products it regulates.

Among the new proposals is the removal of the risky materials from all animal feed, including pet food, to control against the possibility that feed containing prions could wind up fed to cattle even though it was meant for other species. The proposal is in line with a recommendation in February by an international review panel created by the Agriculture Department.

Fine Fragrance Marketing

JULY 24, 2004

THE LATEST TREND IN FRAGRANCES ISN'T About seductive scents or eye-catching bottles.

Marketers trying to lift the fragrance industry out of a three-year slump are signing deals with celebrities, hoping to attract devoted fans who want to buy

It's all about the Hollywood star connection.

Marketers trying to lift the fragrance industry out of a three-year slump are signing deals with celebrities, hoping to attract devoted fans who want to buy scents endorsed by Britney or Beyonce.

Elizabeth Arden Inc. signed an exclusive agreement with pop singer Britney Spears to develop and market a line of fragrances and cosmetics. Called Curious Britney Spears, the first fragrance will arrive in stores including Bon-Macy's and Nordstrom in late September.

Singer Beyonce Knowles will be the spokeswoman for Tommy Hilfiger's new scent True Star, while actress Scarlett Johansson will appear in the ad campaign for Calvin Klein's Eternity Moment.

Avon Inc. has nabbed actress Salma Hayek for ads for its cosmetics and new upscale fragrances under three names: Today, Tomorrow and Always. And Estee Lauder Inc. has chosen actress Ashley Judd to be its spokeswoman for American Beauty, a skin care and cosmetics brand it's developing for Kohl's Corp.

Raul Martinez, chief executive and executive creative director of AR, a New York-based advertising

agency, said companies believe a "celebrity face will help." Why not try and advertise exactly what it is instead of making up stories, untruths, and bending fiction and myth into fact?

"It will help bring recognition" to their products, he said. "It could also backfire, if the celebrity isn't properly matched" with a fragrance.

The hope is to copy Coty Inc.'s successful partnership with Jennifer Lopez, whose fragrance Glow by JLO, unveiled in 2002, was the ninth-best selling women's fragrance in department stores last year, according to market research firm NPD Beauty.

Glow was followed by Lopez's Still six months ago. The two brands have totaled \$200 million in sales, exceeding expectations, according to Bernd Beetz, the CEO of Coty.

While Tommy Hilfiger, Calvin Klein and Avon are pairing scents with celebrity spokeswomen for the

first time, Coty and Elizabeth Arden are developing celebrity brands, a riskier strategy. A hot celebrity could quickly turn cold, hurting sales of the product.

"Two years ago, celebrity fragrances did not work. (Lopez) broke the mold," said Beetz, whose company has since tapped Celine Dion in 2003 and teen actresses Mary-Kate and Ashley Olsen for namesake fragrances. Mary with anorexia problems will definitely be a hit with pre teen air heads.

A rare exception has been Elizabeth Taylor's White Diamonds, which has remained one of the most successful celebrity fragrances since its 1991 launch.

Beetz said that, in the past, companies just slapped a celebrity name on the scent, but success now lies in getting closer to the star, from the scent to the packaging. Coty is promoting Glow by offering scent strips with the singer's CDs.

The fragrance industry is hoping to reverse annual 2 percent declines it has suffered since 2001, according to NPD Beauty. Last year, men's and women's fragrance sales at department stores totaled \$2.8 billion.

Part of the industry's problem is an over supply of brands.

"The number of new launches

that has flooded the market in the last 10 years is four times that of prior years," said Timra Carlson, president of NPD Beauty.

But even with high demand, marketing isn't a sure thing; companies hoping to lure customers in their 20s are finding that they need to try new strategies, such as a greater use of the Internet.

"The 16-24 demographic that comprises Britney Spears' fan base is far more elusive; they watch less than two hours a day of TV," said Ronald Rolleston, executive vice president of Elizabeth Arden. "To communicate with them, we've had to be very precise in our choice of vehicles."

Sensitive Chemicals

JULY 20, 2004

Dear EarthTalk: WHAT IS MULTIPLE CHEMICAL SENSITIVITY AND WHAT CAUSES IT?

Sara Morris, Houston, Texas

PEOPLE SUFFERING FROM OTHERWISE unexplainable medical problems such as headaches, fatigue, shortness of breath, and even chest pains may have everyday chemicals to blame. Multiple chemical sensitivity (MCS) is a medical condition whereby such symptoms can be attributed to the combined exposure to synthetic pollutants commonly found in detergents, perfumes, pesticides, solvents, and even some foods and medicines.

While MCS goes by many other names including "environmental illness" and "total allergy syndrome" perhaps none captures the essence of its causes and effects quite as well as "20th century disease."

Between 1940 and 1980, the production of synthetic organic chemicals worldwide increased from fewer than 10 billion pounds per year to more than 350 billion. MCS has been called "an allergy to modern life," literally a physical reaction to many of the common chemicals now widely distributed.

No longer rare, MCS reportedly affects 10 percent or more of Americans. Nevertheless, the medical community rarely takes the condition seriously.

"Because MCS does not fit any of the three currently accepted mechanisms of disease infectious, immune system, or cancer traditional medicine has not known how to explain MCS and so has often labeled it "psychogenic" originating in the patient's mind," writes Dr. Peter Montague in Rachel's Environment and Health Weekly. "This has

left MCS sufferers in limbo. Told they are crazy, or imagining their disease, or making it up, they find themselves passed from physician to physician without any satisfactory answers and often without relief from their very real distress."

According to the federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), "There is insufficient scientific evidence to confirm a relationship between any of these possible causes and symptoms." While OSHA does not verify the legitimacy of MCS, it does offer some relief by regulating the use of cleaning products and other air quality contaminants. But some of the most ubiquitous MCS offenders perfumes and air fresheners are not subject to testing for toxics and therefore remain unregulated.

"It's oxymoronic to talk about perfumes and other fragrances that can be used by people with chemical sensitivities," said Albert Donnay, director of Multiple Chemical Sensitivity Referral & Resources. In order for perfumes

and air fresheners to give off a scent or be effective, he explained, they must contain volatile organic compounds (VOCs). Even "all-natural" products give off some VOCs.

"People with chemical sensitivities have to give up wearing perfume products, and people who do wear perfume need to be sensitive to the needs of people with chemical sensitivities," said Donnay. "It's not much different than smoking; only you can see secondhand smoke."

Pirates & Scent

JULY 24, 2004

CHIC PARISIAN PARFUMEUR'S LANDMARK VICTORY AGAINST SIMILAR DUTCH FRAGRANCE could trigger landslide of copyright actions.

Now you can own a smell: disputed scent is © Lancôme

For some, it's the scent of a new-mown lawn. Others prefer the bewitching aroma of fresh-ground coffee. Still more may remember the heavy bouquet of that exceptional Bordeaux, or the special fragrance of a first love's hair.

Whatever the smell that does it for you, a landmark Dutch court ruling could soon mean that if you can bottle it, you will own it. A scent, every bit as much as a photograph, a painting or a poem, is now subject to copyright.

The ruling, from an appeal court in Den Bosch, has sent the rarefied world of perfume-making into a tailspin.

"If this becomes jurisprudence, it has vast implications," said Cyril Bernet, scientific director of the prestigious International Perfume Institute in Versailles, which trains new "noses" to create the next generation of top fragrances.

The court ruled that the intellectual property rights of the chic Parisian house of Lancôme in its fragrance Trésor had been violated by Kecofa, a small Dutch maker of cut-price perfumes which markets a remarkably similar scent called Female Treasure.

Mr Bernet said that up until now there has been no way to properly protect perfumes themselves - "just their names, brands and packaging" - and the Dutch ruling could trigger a landslide of similar lawsuits elsewhere.

"There's a huge amount of copying in the industry," he said. "Thousands of small cut-price companies deliberately try to imitate the composition of a big-name perfumes. Up until now the legislation in the field has been non-existent, but basically it's like doing a cover version of a song - except without paying a copyright fee."

But Leon Meels, a spokesman for the Dutch firm, said Kecofa was so sure of its competitive right to make a similar, cheaper version of Trésor - a "radiant blend of sensuality, harmony and emotion" that sells for roughly 10 times the price of Female Treasure's ~~€4-€6~~ (£2.60-£4) a bottle - that it will appeal against the ruling to the Dutch supreme court and the European court of human rights.

"Who's to say that two smells are precisely the same?" he demanded. "And who's to say a perfume is an artwork, not just an industrial product using common ingredients like, say, lemonade?"

The battle raises intriguing physical, philosophical and artistic

questions as well as some big commercial ones.

Kecofa, based in the small Dutch town of Kerkrode, employs 70 people and books annual sales of about €10m; Lancôme's parent company, L'Oréal, has 50,000 employees worldwide and turns over €14bn.

Mr. Meels said that the company's profit margins were so small that the cost of paying an extra accountant to figure out its past earnings from Female Treasure would likely be greater than the earnings themselves. The court also ruled that Kecofa should also pay around €25,000 in court fees and other costs.

Perfume makers usually try to defend themselves from cheap copies of their expensive scents by imposing strict secrecy vows on their staff, or even patenting a fragrance as an olfactory invention.

Test cases

In a number of test cases elsewhere in the world, courts have ruled that smells themselves are simply too evanescent and too variable to be protected by copyright, and can by rights only be said to belong to nature.

But in a series of decisions, Dutch courts have decided that Lancôme's perfume - created by the well-known "nose" Sophie Grossman, who dubbed it her "Hug

me" perfume - is composed of an original blend of ingredients that is "not only measurable by the senses but also ... concrete and stable enough to be considered an authored work as intended in copyright law".

The court decided that Trésor had "an original character bearing the personal imprint of its creator", and was thus entitled to copyright. It was careful, however, to extend protection only to "the bottled scent-generating substance" rather than to the airborne scent itself, which was considered too transient to be copyrighted.

Lancôme in Paris declined to comment on the ruling. But the company's lawyers hailed the decision as groundbreaking, saying it was the first time that a court had ruled, on the basis of physico-chemical analysis and the laws of probability, that a perfume was entitled to copyright protection in the same way as a work of art.

"The analysis showed that the two perfumes' had 24 olfactory components in common and that there were only two components of Trésor that had not been used by the defendant," said Pieter de Weerd, an associate with NautaDutilh, the Dutch firm that represented Lancôme.

"In addition, the only component that was unique in the defendant's perfume was a cheap substitute for the musk used in Trésor.

The probability of a parfumeur other than Lancôme independently and coincidentally creating a perfume containing 24 of the 26 olfactory components of Trésor was shown to be about the same as that of winning the lottery every day for 100 years."

For the uninitiated, Trésor's specific olfactory ingredients are listed as: Top Notes Peach, Apricot, Pineapple, Bergamot, Green Note; Middle Notes Rose, Orris, Lily of the Valley, Jasmin, Heliotrope; Base Notes Sandal, Cedar, Musk, Amber, Vanilla, Cinnamon.

"The work of a parfumeur is the work of an artist, choosing from a vast palette of say 3,000 options and coming up with an original creation," Mr Bernet said. "A top nose may create four or five big new scents in his career - imagine how he feels if that work is pillaged by some guy in a lab who takes three months to synthesise and copy something it's taken a lifetime's experience to produce."

But according to Kecofa's Mr Meels, "most perfumes actually have about 150 ingredients, and about 70% of them share the same ones".

To prove its point that perfume is a product like any other, the company says it is busy working on a replacement for Female Treasure that will have "exactly the same odour" and yet be composed of entirely different ingredients.

Ash Tray Fragrance

JULY 29, 2004

POSH AFTERSHAVE THAT SMELLS OF TOBACCO is the latest fashionable men's scent.

After applying one smells like a but, great Christmas gift for that special guy

As Scotland considers a smoking ban in public places, customers at Jenners department store in Edinburgh are coughing up £48 for a bottle of Feuilles de Tabac.

The £37.50 price tag on Fresh Tobacco Flower Cologne is another choker for the anti-smoking lobby.

Feuilles de Tabac, meaning tobacco leaves, is putting the fumes into perfumes.

It is said to smell of fresh cigars and its makers claim it captures the mood of smoke-filled Parisian cafes.

Beatrice Eugenia, a perfumer at London firm Miller Hill, said: 'Feuilles de Tabac is selling very well up in Jenners. It seems to be a popular choice in Scotland.

'It smells quite like fresh cigar and is a very masculine scent. 'It is not meant to smell like smoky British pubs. It is about recreating the Parisian atmosphere where gentlemen will sit for a coffee and smoke in little brasseries.

'We expect it to be bought by refined gentlemen who wish to be part of that culture. It conjures up images of professional men in pin-stripe suits who enjoy fine tobacco.

'It's a comforting fragrance and we see lots of woman buying it.

'People have childhood memories of their father smoking a pipe or cigar and this taps in to those feelings.

'It is also a big seller in Japan and the United States. Now that authorities are starting to outlaw smoking, people are looking for tobacco scents elsewhere.'

However, Maureen Moore, of anti-smoking group ASH Scotland, said: 'These people must be completely behind the times.

'Soon, we are going to be getting rid of smoking in the workplace so you would look a bit stupid coming into the office stinking of this stuff.

'All it is doing is glamorising smoking and that is the last thing we need in Scotland.

'In surveys, the thing smokers hate the most is the smell in clothes.'

The folks in the creative marketing area must be running out of ideas. I mean really who would want to wear a mans cologne that smells like a bar? Besides being gross smoking is just a revolting habit.

Allergens & Label

AUGUST 6, 2004

THE CANCER PREVENTION COALITION TODAY RELEASED THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT BY SAMUEL S. EPSTEIN, M.D., professor emeritus Environmental & Occupational Medicine, University of Illinois at Chicago School of Public Health; Chairman, Cancer Prevention Coalition; Co-author of The Safe Shopper's Bible.

On July 20, the U.S. House of Representatives passed the "Food Allergen Labeling and Consumer Protection Act of 2003," requiring explicit labeling of eight major allergens in food products. This will make life much safer for about 11 million Americans with food allergies. But why has no such action yet been taken to protect more than twice the number of Americans who develop allergies from unlabeled allergens in fragranced products?

Exposure to these allergens can result in "allergic contact dermatitis" (ACD). This can range from mere itching and transient redness of the skin, to swelling, blistering, and ulceration. ACD is usually localized to the immediate area of the allergen-exposed skin. However, it may spread extensively, and require treatment with antihistamines and cortisone, and even hospitalization; fatal anaphylactic shock has been reported as a rare complication. Inhalation exposure to highly volatile fragrance allergens is also recognized as a cause of asthma in children and adults, particularly those with sensitive airways.

Over 5,000 fragrance ingredients, predominantly synthetic, are commonly used in a wide range of products. These include: household products, such as soaps, cleansers, toilet blocks, sanitary wipes and pads, air fresheners and even pesticides; common toiletries, such as shampoos, aftershave, and cologne, particularly for men, and sunscreens, eye, nail products, hair dyes, and perfumes, particularly for women; and formaldehyde or other preservatives in virtually all fragrances and cosmetics.

Some cosmetics, and other fragranced products, are misleadingly labeled "fragrance-free" if they contain fragrance ingredients, but not the whole fragrance itself. Also, some companies misleadingly label their cosmetics as "hypoallergenic" if they do not contain any of the more common allergens.

However, while the "hypoallergenic" label, and other labels such as "allergy tested" and "safe for sensitive skin," have considerable promotional value, they can mean just whatever any particular company wants them to mean. Manufacturers of these products are not required to do any skin testing to validate such claims, nor to substantiate them to the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). It should, however, be recognized that the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act authorizes the FDA to declare any product "misbranded" if there is evidence that it contains harmful ingredients.

According to recent U.S. and Danish surveys, the incidence of ACD has increased by about 10

percent over the last decade. This reflects the burgeoning number of cosmetic and fragranced products being marketed, and their increasing use on infants and children, and by men.

Representative Jan Schakowsky, D-Ill., has reintroduced legislation, "The Safe Notification and Information for Fragrances (SNIFF) Act," to amend the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. This requires that allergens in fragranced products be labeled accordingly. More explicitly, the European Parliament has recently proposed that all products containing 26 well-known allergens should be labeled.

In a damage control response to these legislative initiatives, the industry's International Fragrance Association has agreed that information on allergenic ingredients should be made available, but only on request, to dermatologists for diagnostic purposes. However, this "Fragrance On Call List" action continues to deny the public its undeniable right-to-know of major avoidable causes of ACD. Furthermore, the Association has failed to respond to repeated requests for labeling of fragranced products, stating that they contain no known allergens.

Finally, it should be emphasized that allergens represent the tip of the iceberg of a wide range of other unlabeled toxic ingredients in

cosmetics and toiletries. While the effects of allergens are almost immediate and obvious, those of carcinogens, gene-damaging and hormonal ingredients can be delayed for decades. As such, they are poorly, if at all, recognizable. Clearly, corrective legislation is well overdue for other toxic ingredients, besides allergens.

Copying Fragrances

AUGUST 16, 2004

THE COMMONLY HELD IDEA THAT PERFUMES, recipes and other formulae are the mere sum of their ingredients, and are therefore not protected under copyright law, was recently rejected by the Court of Appeal of Den Bosch in the Netherlands. In a groundbreaking decision, the court ruled that Lancôme's perfume 'Trésor' was copyright-protected.

THE PROBABILITY OF A PERFUMER
OTHER THAN LANCÔME INDEPENDENTLY AND COINCIDENTALLY
CREATING A PERFUME CONTAINING
24 OF THE 26 OLFACTORY COMPONENTS OF TRÉSOR

Physicochemical analysis and the laws of probability played a big role in the decision, which has drawn worldwide attention and reports in hundreds of newspapers, from Taipei to Tallahassee.

As Lancôme's counsel, NautaDutilh succeeded in convincing the court that the blend of ingredients constituted an original work of authorship and that the cheap perfume called 'Female Treasure' produced by defendant Kecofa BV could only be classified as nothing more than a deliberate imitation. The importance of this case is twofold. Not only is it a justified recognition of the creativity involved in making a perfume, but it also shows that IP law is still open to change, and that with thorough legal analysis, in combination with sophisticated research methods, hitherto unthinkable solutions can be reached.

The boundaries of IP have always been a topic of fiery debate. Complaints such as "Where does it all end?" and "It's only about the money" are never long in coming whenever protection is claimed, and obtained, for 'newcomers', such as colour and sound trademarks, software patents and now perfume copyrights. However, it is a misconception to think that protection under IP law should be limited to what is currently protected. The important question is: what is capable of being

protected? With creativity being the criterion, whenever scientific and technical progress make it possible to expand protection for original creations, practitioners and judges should not hesitate to act accordingly.

An unoriginal painting does not enjoy protection, but an original perfume deserves it. In an article about the case (The Guardian, 24 July), Cyril Bernet, scientific director of the International Perfume Institute in Versailles, was quoted as saying: "The work of a parfumeur is the work of an artist, choosing from a vast palette of, say, 3,000 options and coming up with an original creation. A top nose may create four or five big new scents in his career imagine how he feels if that work is pillaged by some guy in a lab who takes three months to synthesise and copy something it's taken a lifetime's experience to produce." A convincing argument.

In this case, the Dutch court circumvented the discussion about the highly subjective and fleeting char-

acter of smells by ruling that the copyright protection of a perfume extends only to the scent-generating substance that is bottled and sold on the market.

The court stressed that the smell of a perfume is too transient and too variable to be copyrighted.

This was probably the first time that physicochemical analysis was used in a copyright lawsuit. It showed that the two perfumes had 24 olfactory components in common and that there were only two components of Trésor that had not been used by the defendant.

Also, the only component that was unique to the defendant's perfume was Gamma Dodecalactone, a cheap substitute for the Musk Keton used in Trésor. The probability of a perfumer other than Lancôme independently and coincidentally creating a perfume containing 24 of the 26 olfactory components of Trésor was shown to be about the same as that of winning the lottery every day over a hundred years.

The highly creative process of developing this perfume was convincingly explained to the court, which decided that Trésor should be considered as having an original character bearing the personal imprint of its creator, thus entitling it to copyright protection in the Netherlands. In view of this and the improbability of the resemblance to

Trésor being coincidental, the court ruled the defendant had deliberately and unlawfully infringed Lancôme's copyright.

It would be too sweeping a statement to claim, on the basis of the above decision, that all perfumes are copyright-protected in the Netherlands. However, some perfumes are the original products of creative minds (or noses) and deserve the same protection against pillaging as other original creations.

Infringement of Patents

AUGUST 24, 2004

CORPORATIONS COULD HAVE MORE PROTECTION FROM INTELLECTUAL-PROPERTY-RELATED LAWSUITS than they might have thought.

The case reportedly involves Federal Insurance, a subsidiary of Warren, NJ-based Chubb Group; two perfume manufacturers, Dana Perfume and Houbigant

In what the National Underwriter Online Property & Casualty News Service called a "precedent-setting decision," a federal appeals court panel has ruled that commercial insurance policies cover claims alleging trademark infringement of brand names for commercial products.

The case reportedly involves Federal Insurance, a subsidiary of Warren, N.J.-based Chubb Group; two perfume manufacturers, Dana Perfume and Houbigant LTEE, LTD; and Houbigant, another manufacturer. Both Dana and Houbigant LTEE were insured under commercial general liability and commercial excess umbrella policies issued by Federal.

Houbigant had agreed to a licensing manufacturing arrangement with the companies, but has since accused the two manufacturers, now bankrupt, of infringing on its trademark by not living up to the terms of the agreement, according to the insurance news service. The company is seeking \$320 million and other costs for litigation from Federal on the policies.

In its decision, reached in July, the Third U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals reversed a lower court decision that held to a general line holding that laws governing patent infringement extended only to infringement of trademarked names and "works of art," the online publication reported.

John Schryber, a partner at Patton Boggs, LLP, in Washington, D.C.,

who represented Houbigant and argued the case before the appeals court, reportedly said the ruling would have "nationwide impact."

The likely effect of the ruling, according to Schryber, would be to force insurance companies to rewrite the language in their commercial liability policies and to expose insurers to lawsuits from existing policyholders who may have been sued for trademark infringement but denied coverage.

A bankruptcy court, overseeing the bankruptcy of the manufacturers, agreed to a settlement in which Houbigant would be paid \$50 million for patent infringement by the other companies, which are now bankrupt. Houbigant was allowed to pursue the balance of what it said it is owed through the manufacturer's insurers. The perfume maker is seeking a total award of \$320 million plus litigation costs.

A spokesperson for Chubb said the company does not comment on ongoing litigation, according to the report.

Cosmetic Ingredients

OCTOBER 1, 2004

New York -

A FULL-PAGE ADVERTISEMENT IN USA TODAY CHALLENGES COSMETICS COMPANIES TO COME CLEAN about whether they plan to remove toxic chemicals that are banned in the European Union from products sold on American shelves. The advertisement was placed by the Campaign for Safe Cosmetics, a coalition of US health and environmental groups.

**ARE KNOWN OR HIGHLY SUSPECTED OF CAUSING CANCER,
IMPAIRED FERTILITY OR BIRTH DEFECTS - SUCH AS THE PHTHALATES
DBP AND DEHP USED IN SOME FRAGRANCE, HAIR SPRAY**

Letters from cosmetics companies released today reveal pattern of dismissing health concerns

This month, a law requiring cosmetics companies to stop using chemicals that are known or highly suspected of causing cancer, impaired fertility or birth defects such as the phthalates DBP and DEHP used in some fragrance, hair spray and nail polish - entered into force in 25 EU countries. Cosmetics companies must remove the proscribed chemicals from products in Europe by next spring.

"Which company do you trust with your daughter?" asks the provocative advertisement, which depicts a young girl applying lipstick. The ad berates industry leaders L'Oreal, Revlon and Unilever for ignoring requests to remove toxic chemicals from American products.

"Today we are releasing correspondence from these companies showing that they have failed to respond in good faith to the legitimate concerns of American consumers," said Jeanne Rizzo, executive direc-

tor of the Breast Cancer Fund, a founding member of the coalition.

"People are putting chemicals on and into our bodies every day, though use of shampoo, deodorant, face cream, hairspray and all of the other bottles, jars and cans that fill our bathrooms. Chemicals linked to cancer and birth defects do not belong in these products, period."

According to the letters released today by the group:

- L'Oreal failed to respond to letters requesting meetings and information about chemical usage, but the company did find the time to write a letter from their lawyers demanding that the Campaign for Safe Cosmetics stop using the slogan, "Because We're Worth It!" - a play on L'Oreal's "Because I'm Worth It!" tagline.

- Revlon sent the Campaign a form letter from an industry trade association, implying phthalates are "perfectly safe" a claim refuted by government panels in several countries.

Unilever failed to respond to repeated requests for dialogue, even though the company's Korean subsidiary has already pledged to remove all phthalates from products sold in South Korea.

Dangers of Candles & Fires

OCTOBER 5, 2004

ILIT SOME CANDLES UPSTAIRS AND WENT DOWN TO MOW MY YARD and went to the store and everything and when I came back my house was on fire," said Shelly Monroe, who is one of thousands of people who have lost their home due to a fire ignited by a candle.

A family of five and a young girl were killed in a heartbreaking fire. The tragedy is now prompting families to plan ahead and take precautions.

While candles bring warmth and fragrance to a home they can also bring danger.

"It's one of the only unregulated open flame devices you'll have in your house," said Jim Hock, spokesman for the Del City fire department.

In fact, over the last 20 years candle fires have more than doubled, making them one of the deadliest fire starters. And, between 1991 and 2001 candle deaths have risen more than 300 percent.

"Right now, the only standard for warning labels or anything like this is voluntary by the candle industry," Hock said.

THERE ARE SOME EASY REMINDERS WHEN BURNING CANDLES IN YOUR HOME:

- a) keep candle within sight.
- b) keep 12 inches away from flammables.
- c) keep away from children.
- d) always keep a burning candle within sight.

e) always keep flammable items at least 12 inches away from the candle.

f) and keep burning candles out of the reach of children.

It's a precaution Shelley said could have saved her own home.

"Maybe somebody won't make the same mistake I made," she said.

Firefighters also urge people not to use candles during a power outage. Instead, they said, use a flashlight.

Chanel's Experience with Escorts

OCTOBER 6, 2004

A TORONTO ESCORT WHO CALLS HERSELF CHANELLE IS BEING SUED BY CHANEL, the international perfume and fashion giant and its Canadian subsidiary, for infringement of its trademarks.

"To me, this is frivolous," said Chanelle, a 39-year-old who asked that her real name not be used. She received the statement of claim yesterday morning and said she couldn't believe it as she read through the legal documents filed by the perfume giant in Federal Court in Montreal.

"It doesn't make any sense," she said. She has 30 days to file a statement of defence and plans to do so.

"I'm going to fight it," she said during a telephone interview.

The dispute between the escort and the perfume company seems to centre on the use of the website address <http://www.sexychanel.com>, which is registered to the Toronto woman. On the site, Chanelle is leaning on a perfume bottle, which the lawsuit alleges infringes on its design trademark. The site offers Chanelle's unspecified services for up to \$10,000 for 24 hours, as well as a gourmet dinner-date package.

Chanelle said that, after being contacted by the company eight months ago, she changed the website spelling to <http://www.sexychanelle.com>. The company approved the changes of the domain name on Feb. 17, in an e-mail to her, she said. As for the offending perfume bottle, she said she changed the shape of it when the company first contacted her. Now, she said she's not sure why she's being sued.

"I want to go public with this to get Chanel to drop this lawsuit and to see how frivolous it is," she said. "How could a billion-dollar company be asking to see my profits because they feel my leaning on a per-

fume bottle has damaged their reputation?"

"I'm not selling perfume. I can understand a company going after another company for selling handbags. But I'm not selling a product. It's me. I'm the product."

The earlier version of the website address still works.

In its statement of claim, Chanel claims the Toronto woman is "dealing in personal escort services under trademarks or trade names including a domain name identical to, or confusingly similar with, some of the plaintiff Chanel S. de R.L.'s registered trademarks."

The documents also maintain that the defendant "has offered for sale a domain name, namely <http://www.sexychanel.com>, which comprises the trademark Chanel." And that "the defendant's activities are causing and are likely to cause serious harm to the plaintiffs."

The allegations have not been proven in court.

Chanel says in the documents that it wants the court to place a permanent injunction on the defendant, restraining her from "offering for sale, selling, advertising and promoting services, including the ownership and use of the domain name www.sexychanel.com, in association with any of the Chanel registered trademarks."

It wants Chanelle to be restrained from "using or owning a domain name as an address or otherwise comprising any of the Chanel registered trademarks or any trademark likely to be confusingly therewith, including `Channel,' `Shanel,' `Chanelle' or `Chanelle.'

It is asking the court to stop the defendant "from depreciating the value of the goodwill" attached to the name.

And most importantly, it wants the courts to order the defendant to give up her rights to the domain name <http://www.sexychanel.com> and transfer them to the fashion and perfume house. The Toronto woman had offered to sell her domain name to the company for \$250,000 (U.S.).

A lawyer with Ogilvy Renault, the Montreal firm representing Chanel in this matter, would not talk about the case, other than to say: "I cannot speak to you because it's a matter under litigation. The document speaks for itself."

Complex Ingredients

OCTOBER 19, 2004

YOUR HAIR IS DRAB. DULL. FINE. GONE. NEEDS MORE VOLUME. Needs less frizz. It needs something.

Maybe it needs cetyl alcohol. Mixed with a dash of propylene glycol, and how about a little butane?

Once upon a time, people lathered, rinsed, never repeated, and went on their merry bad-hair days. Then, science and chemistry specialized the way folks wax and pomade, condition and shine.

About 10 years ago, companies began creating new compounds so they could design products for specific hair types, for curls and fine hair and thick locks alike.

Now, some consumer groups worry about the mix of chemicals that meld into that sudsy rinse every morning. They point to incomplete labeling and little government oversight of the cosmetics and hair industry, accusations the Food and Drug Administration does not deny.

"The FDA needs to define what is safe to put in these products, and come up with standards," says Tim Kropp, a senior scientist with the Environmental Working Group, a nonprofit consumer organization in Washington, D.C., that helped produce a study on problem ingredients in everyday products. "There are no safety standards in place."

Independent analysts and hair-care executives say the products are safe. They say some ingredients may cause irritation in rare circumstances, but the ingredients are not toxic.

"The good news is: Hair-care products are better than ever before," says Paula Begoun, a former makeup artist who writes extensively about the cosmetics industry. "It's really hard to buy a bad product, but

you can get conned by products that are overpriced or bad for your hair."

There are many unrecognizable ingredients on a shampoo bottle label. Propylene glycol (which inhibits freezing). Ethylparaben (a preservative that prevents bacterial growth). Cyclopentasiloxane (smooths the hair). It's hard for a curly-haired girl to figure out whether the ingredients back up what's promised on the label and support the \$25 price tag.

Basically, all shampoos have the same recipe. Lathering agents. Cleansers. Preservatives. And fragrances. So do all conditioners.

OK, maybe most of them don't have butane, a pressurizing agent that helps force the mousse out of the can. (It doesn't harm people, just the environment, Begoun says.)

The government doesn't help consumers figure out the suds either. The ingredients used in cosmetics and hair-care products, unlike pharmaceuticals, have not

been tested, so there's no list of products for consumers to watch for, says Kropp.

"The companies do their own testing, but they don't have to submit data to show it's safe," says Linda Katz, director of the FDA's office of cosmetics and colors.

The government hears about problems from consumers and watches for trends before investigating a particular product.

Most reactions "are just rashes or local irritation," Katz says. "Sometimes people complain that the product just made them look worse."

Environmental groups worry about the cumulative effects of all the products people use, from shampoos and conditioners to floor cleaners.

Tom Natan is a chemical engineer for the National Environmental Trust, an advocacy group that helped conduct a study in May on chemicals in everyday products. The study noted that a lot of the same chemicals appeared in many common products and no one was studying those compounds.

"We don't know very much about these chemicals; no one does," Natan says.

There are some concerns about specific products; phthalates, for

example, are found in fragrances (listed on most hair products as simply "fragrance"). Some studies have found that phthalates have caused cancer in rats. But companies do not have to list the ingredients of products purchased elsewhere, often fragrances or colors, according to FDA regulations.

Then there are the preservatives, the parabens, used to keep products from growing bacteria. Other studies, also in rats, have found a risk of disrupting the hormone system, says Begoun, author of "Don't Go Shopping for Hair-Care Products Without Me."

But even organic products can have some chemical ingredients.

"There is no such thing as a completely natural product," says Begoun, who uses a dark-colored dye on her hair. "Should you avoid products that have parabens or phthalates? No one really knows."

Many consumers say they don't much care what's in the bottle as long as their 'do does what they want it to do.

Victoria McCoy, 31, an interior designer, has ironed, permed, dyed and rolled her naturally thick, wavy, dark-brown hair.

"There was one time I had highlights and they left the bleach on too long and then it turned out I was allergic to the bleach and all my

hair fell out," says McCoy, tressed in a nice, shoulder-length copper-ish-brown tone.

Now she dyes her hair about once a month, and uses fairly inexpensive shampoo and conditioner - L'Oreal Fresh Vive and Suave conditioner (at around \$3.50 and \$1.50 respectively) - and very expensive styling products - Texture's curl creme and Texture shine (\$14 and \$12).

"I finally have the right stylist to cut my hair and these are the products that work well," McCoy says.

About 15 years ago, hair-care products underwent a revolution, partly due to the introduction of silicone. The silicone clings to the strands, taming and conditioning frizzy and dry hair without making it greasy.

"As the baby boomer population comes of age, they have all different kinds of hair issues," says Alan Meyer, vice president of research and design for L'Oreal, a division of Proctor & Gamble. "Younger consumers all want a unique kind of hairstyle, look for products with hold, to spike their hair."

In the '50s, it was all about hair spray and hold. In the '60s, it was natural products. The '70s brought the slicked-back look, and with the '80s came mousse and styling gel.

And then, in the mid-'90s, the number of options exploded.

Now there are shampoos that volumize (for that big-hair look) and ones that thicken; conditioners that detangle and others that calm. Styling products include gels and mousses, waxes and pomades, creams and serums, all for particular hair types.

Although you might need a chemistry degree to decipher the label, generally most alcohols - cetyl alcohol in particular - are fatty acids, used for thickening and coating. Glycerins attract water from the air and make hair feel fuller and give it bounce. Lanolin and other oils make hair feel smoother.

Kiehl's, a New York-based company that promotes itself as using minimal amounts of chemicals, includes an "ingredient glossary" on its Web site so customers can look up what's in their products.

"The key for consumers is to look at the ingredient list, because the first is what's most in the product, and clearly whatever comes at the end, there's not much of it in the product," says Marie-Pierre Stark-Flora, assistant vice president for global product development at Kiehl's.

The Environmental Working Group, which gave risk ratings to thousands of shaving creams,

shampoos, colognes and lotions, says no one shampoo, conditioner or styling product stood out as particularly toxic or worrisome. But hair dyes, especially the dark ones, were of some concern, the consumer group says.

For example, it rated Just For Men Shampoo-In Haircolor in Jet Black as a 9.5 out of 10 on the potential concern scale, because it includes coal tar dye. The dye has been linked to bladder cancer, but there have been no studies confirming a cause-and-effect relationship.

Consumers should be aware of the basics, particularly products to which they may be sensitive or allergic, Begoun says. People with sensitive skin should stay away from products with mint, for example.

"It's difficult to talk ingredients with consumers," she says. "How do you describe a cross-polymer or a styrene or an acrylamide? You could style your hair for the rest of your life and not need to know."

George Bush & Fragrance

OCTOBER 19, 2004

A PRESTIGIOUS PERFUME COMPANY LAUNCHED A NEW FRAGRANCE, and promoted it through a large advertising campaign. However, the fragrance was a failure; and the company's marketing department complained because the fragrance, which was intended to gather the fresh scents of rare flowers, has a stinking smell, since the flowers wither and go through fermentation during the production process, and hence propagate the smell of sewers instead of the aroma of the wilderness. Nevertheless, the production team insisted on persisting with the new fragrance, and convinced the company's president to back it. Finally, the bottle was changed, rather than the fragrance itself.

The failed fragrance is American foreign policy in the Middle East; the marketing team is the State Department, the production team is the neo-conservatives in the Department of Defense (DoD), and the president is the President.

I found myself comparing the U.S. administration's attempts to promote a nasty policy amongst the Arabs and the Muslims, after I read a new report about Al-Hurra Television, which followed Radio Sawa in another attempt by the administration to deride us.

Al-Hurra was launched last February. Radio Sawa was launched in 2002. Hi Magazine, issued by the U.S. State Department, followed them and which assembled some of the best and most experienced Arab journalists. Former Al-Hayat Washington Bureau Chief Mowaffaq Harb, who works in both the TV and the radio, is a craftsman whose experience surpasses his age. Colleague Raphael Calis, who works in the magazine, is one of the best journalists; I have known since high school days, and later at The Daily Star.

There is a fine Arab blend, and Al-Hurra only relies on the efforts of a network made up of 150 journalists and reporters in its headquar-

ters in Springfield, Pennsylvania and around the world. Some 80 journalists, from Lebanon, Egypt, Iraq, Algeria and other countries from the Middle East, work there.

But there is always a "but;" in this case it is "how much could a make-up artist embellish a hideous face?"

These journalists are some of the finest; however, they are not magicians. I have no doubt that they have succeeded despite the difficulties, but Al-Hurra would never compete with Al-Jazeera or Al-Arabiya. Radio Sawa might get a good amount of listeners from various Arab countries, especially amongst the target audience (ages 15 to 29); however, the listeners pounce upon music and shut their ears to politics. Any other talk is BS. Some of Al-Hurra viewers and Radio Sawa listeners are only interested in uncovering the conspiracies manufactured by the Bush administration against Arabs and Muslims. If this is true, then the accurate news that reaches the targeted Arab or Muslim becomes

doubtful because of the source it comes from. Al-Ahram had a cartoon spoofing Al-Hurra, which depicts the screen of Al-Hurra, and a man saying: "A promiscuous channel which is stripped from any truth."

There are pros and cons to the issue, and we try to objectively reveal them.

The idea of an American TV, a Radio station, and a magazine targeted for the Middle East indicates that the U.S. administration is aware of the size of hostility against its policy in the region, and is attempting to solve it. Congress allocated \$62 million for Al-Hurra in its first year (\$40 million for the station specified for Iraq), and there is a budget of around \$52 million for the coming year. As for Radio Sawa, it started in March 2002 with a budget of \$22 million. The U.S. State Department funds the \$4 million budget for Hi Magazine, while the previous figures were cut from the amount specified for the reconstruction of Afghanistan and Iraq estimated at \$82 billion. Senator Joseph Biden, who is a high-ranking Democrat on the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has proposed a legislative project for similar stations broadcasting in Persian, Turkish, and other languages. The expansion needs \$222 million as establishment expenses, \$345 million annually, added to the budget of Voice of America (VOA), which is \$570

million per year.

I do not believe that the expenditure will be beneficial as long as the policy remains the same; because the American administration has several reports showing that the level of hatred for the United States has reached a horrific level amongst the Arabs and Muslims. Moreover, it is not trying to search for the reasons behind this hatred but instead; it is only trying to 'refine' the loathed policy, and changing the bottle, rather than pungent liquid inside it.

Still, the idea is good because we need to know the American policy as its owners see it, not the way we do. If Al-Hurra will not criticize American policy toward us, we do not need another station criticizing this policy but instead we want to a display of this policy to later form our opinion of it.

At least, Al-Hurra is no Fox News and Mowaffaq Harb and his coworkers are wiser than to provoke the viewers, nevertheless, they do not only face difficulties with us alone, since an opposition for the project exists throughout the United States. At the time of launching Al-Hurra, 400 workers in VOA forwarded a letter of complaint to Congress, because Al-Hurra's budget squeezes their own - such as Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, and Radio Free Asia. However, there is no truth in this since Al-Hurra's budget comes

from the reconstruction allocations. The State Department's Inspector General slammed Radio Sawa, claiming that it does not promote democracy and pro-American positions in the Middle East. However, the Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy confirmed that the radio and the TV have succeeded in transmitting a true picture of the U.S. to the audience in the war zone of the "war on terror." They also responded to the fairy tales about it and offered alternatives to extremism in the region. Of the project's proponents is ambassador Edward Djerejian, who led a team that published a famous report on Public Diplomacy, and Norman Pattiz, a member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors (BBG), which oversees Sawa and Al-Hurra.

I only speak for myself since I am not conceited to be speaking in the name of the entire nation. I say that American democracy is great, American values and principles are highly profound and hope to someday possess them. The United States has always been closer to us than any other European country, until we were disastrously struck by blind support of the extremist Israeli policies, which is the reason behind the current hatred... the first and foremost reason, if not the only one. All the reconstruction money will not change anything as long as the policy stays the same.

I began with an example of a

fragrance and I conclude with another similar example; since the United States represents some sort of jug of fresh refreshing fruit juice where the maker tops it off with a spoon of rubbish turning the entire jug in rubbish.

I hope that the administration (Bush or Kerry) will be convinced in changing American foreign policy in the Middle East since it is a spoon of Israeli garbage, which is harmful to the glory of America, its principles, values and humanity. Moreover, our current opinion will not be affected by any radio or television.

Perfume & Danger Sniffing It

OCTOBER 21, 2004

A SNIFF OF PERFUME, AFTERSHAVE, AIR FRESHENER OR DEODORANT CAN TRIGGER A POTENTIALLY DEADLY reaction because of a rare allergy she has developed.

Teenager Kirsty Heywood risks her life every time she leaves home.

A sniff of perfume, aftershave, air freshener or deodorant can trigger a potentially deadly reaction because of a rare allergy she has developed. ...

Contact with aerosol spray leaves her struggling to breathe. She has collapsed in public toilets, on the street, in shops and in an arcade.

Kirsty, 17, has been admitted to hospital 10 times this year after suffering reactions. There she is given oxygen and steroid injections and her heart rate is monitored.

On one occasion in Tameside General Hospital, she suffered an attack after another patient innocently sprayed deodorant near her. Now she is kept in isolation when she is admitted.

Kirsty, from Ashton under Lyne, suffers from asthma and is also allergic to cats and dogs - but the cocktail of medication she takes helps her to stay close to her pet dog Benji.

GASPING

She said: "When I was diagnosed I felt horrible. I was really depressed and it changed my life. But I'm going to carry on - I won't let this stop me."

Kirsty was fit and healthy up to the last day of a Christmas break to

a caravan park in Rhyl last year.

She was bitten by a Staffordshire bull terrier and her family believe it might in some way have triggered the allergy. When the dog's owner later sprayed air freshener in the van, Kirsty started desperately gasping for breath.

Her dad, Wayne, 42, a health and safety adviser with a company in Stockport, gave first aid until she was rushed to hospital.

Kirsty of Lordsfield Avenue, in Ashton under Lyne, has since had extensive tests at Manchester Royal Infirmary and Tameside General.

Her younger sister, Emma, 13, does not have the same condition.

Mum Lorraine, 38, said: "We don't have any deodorants, perfumes, aftershaves or air fresheners in the house because they could kill her."

SINGER

"This has absolutely devastated

us. Every time she goes out the door it's as if she is playing Russian roulette with her life.

"It's such a shame because she will have this for the rest of her life." Kirsty, who was forced to quit a performing arts college course due to her condition, dreams of becoming a top singer. With help from a local artist, she has produced a CD entitled *From the Heart*.

She said: "I love singing Whitney Houston songs and I really want to be a singer."

Judith May, from the chemical sensitivity division of Allergy UK, said: "This is the first time I've heard of a case like this. It certainly is very, very rare.

"We have seen an increase in people suffering allergic reactions to perfume, but nothing like this."

A report earlier this week revealed air fresheners and aerosols in the home can cause diarrhoea and earache in youngsters and depression in their mothers.

A spokeswoman for the Anaphylaxis Campaign and Dr Maureen Dawson, a clinical immunologist at Manchester Metropolitan University, both described Kirsty's condition as extremely rare.

Shampoo & Its Goo

OCTOBER 24, 2004

YOUR HAIR IS DRAB. DULL. FINE. GONE. Needs more volume. Needs less frizz. It needs something.

Maybe it needs cetyl alcohol. With a dash of propylene glycol, and how about a little butane?

Once upon a time, people lathered, rinsed, never repeated, and went on their merry way. Then, science and chemistry specialized the way folks wax and pomade, condition and shine.

About 10 years ago, companies began creating new compounds so they could design products for specific hair types, for curls and fine hair and thick locks alike.

Now, some consumer groups worry about the mix of chemicals that meld into that sudsy rinse every morning. They point to incomplete labeling and little government oversight of the cosmetics and hair industry, accusations the Food and Drug Administration does not deny.

"The FDA needs to define what is safe to put in these products," says Tim Kropp, a senior scientist with the Environmental Working Group, a nonprofit consumer organization in Washington, D.C., that helped produce a study on problem ingredients in everyday products. "There are no safety standards in place."

Something to read in the shower

Here is a sampling of hair-care products with some of the ingredients listed on their labels, not necessarily in order of importance.

Garnier Fructis, Fortifying Cream Conditioner, fine hair Propylene glycol, methylparaben, among other ingredients.

L'Oreal among other ingredients.

John Frieda Brilliant Brunette, Simply Sleek straightening balm Propylene glycol, phenyl trimethicone (a silicone), fragrance, methylparaben, among other ingredients.

Wella Color Preserve, Foam Mask Butane, propane, fragrance, methylparaben, among other ingredients.

The Philadelphia Inquirer

Independent analysts and hair-care executives say the products are safe. They say some ingredients may cause irritation in rare circumstances but are not toxic.

"Hair-care products are better than ever," says Seattleite Paula Begoun, a former makeup artist who writes extensively about the cosmetics industry. "It's really hard to buy a bad product, but you can get conned by products that are overpriced or bad for your hair."

There are many unrecognizable

ingredients on a shampoo bottle label. Propylene glycol (inhibits freezing). Ethylparaben (preservative). Cyclopentasiloxane

(smoother). It's hard to figure out whether the ingredients back up what's promised and support the \$25 price tag.

Basically, all shampoos have the same recipe. Lathering agents. Cleansers. Preservatives. And fragrances. So do all conditioners.

OK, maybe most don't have butane, a pressurizing agent that helps force the mousse out of the can. (It doesn't harm people, just the environment, Begoun says.)

Who's minding the suds?

The government isn't much help. Ingredients in cosmetics and hair-care products, unlike pharmaceuticals, have not been tested, so there's no list of products for consumers to watch for, says Kropp.

"Companies do their own testing, but they don't have to submit data to show it's safe," says Linda Katz, director of the FDA's office of cosmetics and colors.

The government takes complaints and watches for trends before investigating.

Most reactions "are just rashes or local irritation," Katz says.

Environmental groups worry

about the cumulative effects of all the products people use, from shampoos to floor cleaners.

Tom Natan is a chemical engineer for the National Environmental Trust, an advocacy group that helped with a study in May on chemicals in everyday products. The study noted that a lot of the same chemicals appeared in many common products.

"We don't know very much about these chemicals; no one does," Natan says.

There are concerns about specific products; phthalates, for example, are found in fragrances (often listed simply as "fragrance"). Some studies have found that phthalates have caused cancer in rats. But companies do not have to list the ingredients of products purchased elsewhere, often fragrances or colors, according to FDA rules.

Then there are the preservatives, the parabens, used to keep products from growing bacteria. Other studies, also in rats, have found a risk of disrupting the hormone system, says Begoun, author of "Don't Go Shopping for Hair-Care Products Without Me." But even organic products can have some chemical ingredients.

"There is no such thing as a completely natural product," says Begoun. "Should you avoid products that have parabens or phtha-

lates? No one really knows."

Plethora of products

What to look for

Alcohols: Some of them, such as cetyl alcohol, come from fatty acids, which make hair shine and reduce frizz. Others, such as methanol or isopropyl alcohol, can be drying and irritating. If you have dry skin, be careful.

Peppermint/menthol: They smell great but can irritate skin.

Parabens: Used to prevent bacterial growth. They have been found to disrupt rats' hormone systems, but it is not known whether they are harmful to humans.

Phthalates: Often listed simply as "fragrance" on labels, these chemicals have been cited as potential carcinogens. A few rat and mouse studies have linked them to cancer; a link has not been found in humans.

Coal Tar: Used in some hair-coloring products, particularly dark colors, it has been linked in recent studies to various cancers. But according to the Food and Drug Administration, the link remains unclear. The agency suggests that consumers may want to use henna products, which are plant- or acetate-based.

For more information, or to

search specific products, go to www.ewg.org.

The Philadelphia Inquirer

About 15 years ago, hair-care products underwent a revolution, partly due to the introduction of silicone. The silicone clings to the strands, taming frizzy and dry hair without making it greasy.

As baby boomers come of age, they have all different kinds of hair issues, says Alan Meyer, vice president of research and design for L'Oreal, a division of Procter & Gamble.

In the '50s, it was all about hair spray and hold. In the '60s, natural products. The '70s brought the slicked-back look, and with the '80s came mousse and styling gel. Then, in the mid-'90s, the number of options exploded.

Now there are shampoos that volumize (for that big-hair look) and ones that thicken; conditioners that detangle and others that calm. Styling products include gels and mousses, waxes and pomades, creams and serums, all for particular hair types.

Generally most alcohols cetyl alcohol in particular are fatty acids, used for thickening and coating. Glycerins attract water from the air and make hair feel fuller and give it bounce. Lanolin and other oils make hair feel smoother.

The Environmental Working Group, which gave risk ratings to thousands of shaving creams, shampoos, colognes and lotions, says no one shampoo, conditioner or styling product stood out as particularly toxic or worrisome. But hair dyes, especially the dark ones, were of some concern, the consumer group says.

For example, it rated Just For Men Shampoo-In Haircolor in Jet Black as a 9.5 out of 10 on the potential concern scale, because it has coal-tar dye. The dye has been linked to bladder cancer, but there have been no studies confirming a relationship.

Consumers should be aware of the basics, particularly products to which they may be sensitive or allergic, Begoun says. People with sensitive skin should stay away from mint, for example.

"It's difficult to talk ingredients with consumers," she says. "How do you describe a cross-polymer or a styrene or an acrylamide? ... You could style your hair for the rest of your life and not need to know."

Dangerous Aerosols

OCTOBER 25, 2004

FREQUENT USE DURING PREGNANCY AND EARLY CHILDHOOD was linked with diarrhoea and earache in infants and headaches and depression in mothers.

The culprits are volatile organic compounds released by such products, say the Bristol University scientists.

It might be safer to limit use in the home, they told Archives of Environmental Health.

Harmful Effects

Volatile organic compounds (VOCs) are irritants, and indoor sources include solvents, floor adhesives, paint, furnishings and cleaning products.

The researchers followed the health and development of 14,000 children since before birth.

When they looked at levels of VOCs in the homes of 170 of the children and interviewed 10,000 of the mothers about their use of air fresheners and aerosols, the scientists found some concerning trends.

Being cleaner may not necessarily mean being healthier. Dr Alexandra Farrow, lead researcher in homes where air fresheners - including sticks, sprays and aerosols - were used every day rather than once a week, 32% more babies had diarrhoea.

The babies were also more likely to experience earache.

Daily use of aerosols such as polish, deodorant and hairspray was associated with a 30% increase in infant cases of diarrhoea, and also

affected mothers' health.

These mothers who used air fresheners and aerosols daily had nearly 10% more headaches and were about 26% more likely to experience depression.

Lead researcher Dr Alexandra Farrow, now working at Brunel University, said: "People may think that using these products makes their homes cleaner and healthier, but being cleaner may not necessarily mean being healthier.

"Air fresheners combined with other aerosol and household products contribute to a complex mixture of chemicals and a build-up of VOCs in the home environment."

Mounting Evidence

She said pregnant women and babies up to six months might be particularly susceptible to the effects of this, because they spend around 80% of their time at home.

"There may also be implications for other groups who are at

home a good deal, such as the elderly.

"More research is needed, but in the meantime, it might be safer to limit use of air fresheners and aerosols in the home. Squeezing a lemon is just as effective at freshening the air."

Professor Roy Harrison, professor of environmental health at Birmingham University, said: "There is a body of research on VOCs in the indoor environment which links them with those kinds of symptoms - headaches and not feeling so good."

But he said: "The mechanism is not very well understood."

Most of the products could be regarded as non-essential and, therefore, might be avoided, he added.

Dr Chris Flower, of the Cosmetics, Toiletries and Perfumery Association, said: "Cosmetic products such as hair-sprays and deodorants are required by legislation to be safe in normal use.

"Aerosol forms of these products are labelled with advice that they should not be used in confined spaces and current evidence shows these products are safe.

"We shall be looking into the new research by Bristol University

to see whether people are following advice and whether additional advice may be required."

The research was funded by government bodies and charitable research organisations, including the Medical Research Council and the Wellcome Trust, as well as commercial sponsors and US research institutes.

Household Fragrance & Environmental Dangers

OCTOBER 29, 2004

THOSE FRAGRANT SOAPS AND SHAMPOOS WE CASUALLY RINSE DOWN THE DRAIN MAY BE CAUSING LONG-TERM DAMAGE to aquatic wildlife downstream by interfering with the animals' natural ability to eliminate toxins from their system, according to a new Stanford University study published by the National Institutes of Health (NIH).

Writing in the NIH journal *Environmental Health Perspectives*, Stanford scientists described the biological damage that occurred when they exposed California mussels to synthetic musks—chemical compounds that are used to enhance the smell of detergents, soaps, shampoos, air fresheners, deodorants, cosmetics and other personal care products.

"Synthetic musks can be easily produced and are very cheap," said Stanford postdoctoral fellow Till Luckenbach, lead author of the study. "They get into the environment through sewers and drains, but wastewater treatment plants are not equipped to handle them."

In their study, Luckenbach and Stanford biologist David Epel tested six synthetic musk compounds widely used by industry. Their goal was to determine if these artificial fragrances affected the animals' "xenobiotic defense system" a biochemical process that allows cells to get rid of poisons and other foreign substances.

"This is the first line of defense used by all cells," said Epel, the Jane and Marshall Steel Jr. Professor of Marine Sciences. "It consists of a special protein, called an efflux transporter, that's embedded in the cell membrane and pumps out toxins that get into the cell."

For the experiment, gills were carefully sliced from living mussels and placed in water containing very low concentrations of synthetic musks 300 parts per billion or less. After two hours, the gills were

removed and washed.

To see if this short-term exposure affected the animal's defense system, the gills were placed in musk-free water with a special red fluorescent dye. Under normal conditions, an efflux transporter will recognize the dye as a foreign substance and remove it. But if something interferes with the transporter, the dye will accumulate inside the cell, which causes it to appear brighter. That's exactly what the researchers observed, even two days after the gills had been washed clean.

"What we found is that musks are harmful in the sense that they compromise the defense system and let other chemicals in that could be more harmful," Epel said. "The amazing thing is that, even if you wash the chemical fragrance away, there's a long-term effect up to 48 hours after removal."

These results indicate that even short-term events, such as chemical spills and storm-water runoffs, could have long-term effects,

Luckenbach added.

The study also has implications for human health. "People have these same transporters in the blood-brain barrier, the placenta and the intestines," Luckenbach explained. "Perhaps exposure to chemical fragrances could compromise the transporters, making it easier for pollutants to enter the brain, for example."

Concerns about the environmental impact of drug products and synthetic fragrances first surfaced about 10 years ago in Japan and Europe. "They were picking up pharmaceutical and personal care products in the wastewater flowing into rivers," Epel said. "In Japan they found them in mussels and fish and discovered they are somewhat persistent - they don't break down."

Pharmaceuticals, such as estrogens, antibiotics and antidepressants, often pass through the body without being fully metabolized, Luckenbach noted. "A lot of them are just dumped into the toilet, and that's how they get into the environment."

Worldwide production of synthetic musks increased from about 7,000 to 8,000 tons a year between 1987 and 1996, the authors wrote. Use of musk xylene, the most common industrial fragrance, was prohibited in Japan several years ago after traces of the compound were found in human body fat, breast

milk and blood. Germany has placed a voluntary ban on musk xylene, although it's still widely used in the United States, except in lipsticks and other products that are applied orally. One problem for consumers is that, when a product has the word "fragrance" on the label, the actual chemical compound is rarely listed.

"The musks are an example, but this group of pharmaceuticals and personal care products consists of thousands of different chemicals," Luckenbach said.

"One of the assumptions about these chemicals is that they are regarded as environmentally low risk compared to pesticides and oil products," Epel noted. "This is the first study to show that some personal care products in water do have an effect, even in low concentrations. Our results indicate that the effects on the first line of defense might be irreversible or continue long after the event. It's a warning sign. It's a smoking gun. Are there other chemicals out there that have similar long-term effects? Could these be harming these defense systems in aquatic organisms? And could they be having similar effects in humans?"

The experiment was conducted in Epel's laboratory at Stanford's Hopkins Marine Station in Pacific Grove, Calif., and was funded by the German Academic Exchange Service, the National Ocean-

ographic and Atmospheric Administration, the California Sea Grant College and the California State Resources Agency.

Nosey Women

OCTOBER 31, 2004

GLENMORANGIE'S NEW MASTER BLENDER says she was born to the job, writes Rhiannon Batten.

"Lemons, oranges, bergamot to cinnamon, ahh, mandarin, peaches, vanilla" Rachel Barrie, Glenmorangie's chief nose, is swirling 10-year-old single malt round her glass. "It's very reminiscent of peach melba, lemon meringue, pear drops, lemongrass."

In an industry that makes a virtue of its heritage and traditions, Barrie is something of a novelty. First Glenmorangie turned its back on 86 years of family ownership and sold out to French luxury goods giant LVMH. Then it named 35-year-old Rachel Barrie as its master blender.

The first woman to break through the glass ceiling of the whisky blending industry, she claims that she has been made very welcome by everyone, from the Macdonald family who were, pre-LVMH, the majority shareholders, to the blokey veterans working the stills.

"I do think there are more opportunities in the workplace generally these days," she says, shrugging off what less broad-minded industry bods would see as casting against type. "If you have the ability, you're going to get the job you want. Traditionally people would have left school and started off in a distillery, slowly working their way up, but there are more graduates coming into the industry now. There are a lot more females than there were 20 years ago, so the workforce in general is a lot more balanced."

Small, neatly bobbed and energetic, Barrie started off in beer before moving to whisky. Her career took a circuitous route; although she grew up in the prime distilling territory of Inverurie, blending was never really a vocation she had considered. "If you did well at school it was medicine or law. I chose medicine but I realised after stints doing anatomy

and going home smelling of formaldehyde that I could not continue so I changed to chemistry"

It was when Barrie graduated and joined the analytical chemistry department of the brewers Scottish & Newcastle that her nose came into its own. While working on the company's sensory panel, checking different brews for quality and consistency, it dawned on her that she could pick up subtle differences in the aromas of the beers.

The most surprising thing about Barrie's CV is that it took her so long to discover her vocation. And anyone who has heard her eulogise about whisky is in no doubt that she has found it at last.

"When you swirl the glass you release the bouquet. Instantly you notice the scent. It's a wonderful mix," she raves. "Very evocative a French perfumier found 26 aromas in one glass," she adds, drifting off.

All this before she's tasted a drop.

If the ability to pick such a spectrum of scents from a single dram seems unlikely, it is. Barrie has one of the most sophisticated noses in the business. “The ability is innate,” she insists. “You’re either born with it or you’re not.”

It looks as if the industry has been missing a trick for all these years; women tend to have a more defined sense of smell than men. “Experience can have an effect on how you develop the sense,” she explains. “If you’re used to using perfume, cooking, aromatherapy, then you may be more tuned in to your sense of smell.

“It’s the most complex spirit in the world, there are about 90 aromatics,” she continues. “We have a fantastic tool, which we call the flavour wheel.” It looks like a Dulux paint chart, but for smells.

“On the outer circle we have 90 different aromas. You could be describing anything from treacle to smoked fish to vanilla. It could be something specific, Victoria plum skins or green apples. Then you work your way in to the centre and you know that it belongs to one category: estuary, fruity or floral.”

These more generic categories are essential, allowing blenders throughout the industry to speak the same language. But Barrie has a more personal take on the flavour wheel too. “For me the aromatics are like the notes on a keyboard.

I’m also a pianist and on my piano at home there are about 90 keys on the keyboard.

“The 10-year-old Glen morangie is like the lilting top notes, like a Chopin waltz. It never rests in one place. The Ardbeg is more like the deep notes, chocolate. It’s more like the bass, or cellos. Then there’s Bailie Nicol Jarvie, our blended Scotch. With the different malts and grains, it sits in the middle of your palate, and the middle of my keyboard”.

Fragrances

NOVEMBER 4, 2004

Paris -

MOVE OVER ELIZABETH TAYLOR, JENNIFER LOPEZ, BRITNEY SPEARS AND ALL THE OTHERS WHO HAVE TRADED ON THEIR FAME to sell a perfume. There will soon be a new name on the counter: Yeslam.

The recognition factor may seem low, but it is probably better than Bin Ladin, the marketer's nightmare first proposed as a name for the scent.

Back in pre-9/11 days, Yeslam Bin Ladin, a half brother of the world's most wanted terrorist, hatched the idea of bringing out the perfume and a line of other luxury items under the Bin Ladin brand. (Most of the family favors that spelling, he says, to the terrorist's "bin Laden.")

"Bin Ladin is a respected name that has been around for many years," especially, of course, in the Middle East, Mr. Bin Ladin, a 54-year-old Saudi citizen, explained in the ornate lounge of the Plaza Athénée Hotel here this week.

Subsequent events led him to choose his more discreet first name instead, and with Yeslam, "a profound yet gentle message in a bottle for all who long for inner peace," according to the advertising copy, he hopes to prove that not all Bin Ladins are alike.

Mr. Bin Ladin grew up as a sort of anti-Osama, steeped in materialism while his distant half brother steered toward the spiritual and austere. He is a man whose main accomplishments are mostly recreative: he paints, skis and pilots his own plane and is a ranked tennis player in Switzerland. He drives a Porsche.

In 1977 he moved to Jidda to work in the family construction company, but bickering among his half brothers drove him away in 1984. He moved to Switzerland, where he started an investment company, helped sponsor the Geneva Film Festival and financed several moneylosing films. He suffered in the market downturn in 2000 and by 2001 was looking for a new direction.

"When stocks slowed down we thought we needed to diversify," he said. His idea was to create a luxury brand using the Bin Ladin name, still respected because of his father's success but already growing in notoriety thanks to his half brother's terrorist activities.

He registered Bin Ladin as a trademark in Switzerland in March 2001, and in many other countries across Europe and Southeast Asia. He intended to register it in the United States, but Sept. 11 quashed any hope of using the family name.

Now he says it is time resume the project. "I waited three years

and decided I have to continue my life," he said. "It has nothing to do with politics."

As an alternative to the Bin Ladin brand, he switched to his initials, YB, and his first name, which means "to bless" or "to protect" in Arabic. The lettering on the bottle is a facsimile of his handwriting.

He pulls the cap off a bottle of Yeslam for women, sprays some on his palm and rubs it vigorously between his hands and across his cheeks. He is producing a heavier cedar and sandalwood scent for men but prefers the feminine version.

"I have lots of perfume, bottles and bottles," he exclaims, his voice rising briefly from its soft-spoken perch to produce a singular flap of enthusiasm. But he admits that the real motivation for coming out with a scent of his own is that "the margins are huge."

Mr. Bin Ladin grew up in boarding schools in Lebanon and Sweden and graduated from the University of Southern California with a degree in business administration. He said he barely knew his father and even less his notorious half brother. Each of Muhammad bin Ladin's 23 wives had her own home, and most of his 54 children relate to one another more as cousins than as siblings.

The elder Bin Ladin died in a

plane crash when Yeslam was a teenager. He and the other Bin Ladin heirs eventually got about \$40 million apiece from the estate.

During the Persian Gulf war of 1991, some of that money was briefly divided among Swiss bank accounts, over which Mr. Bin Ladin had power of attorney. He also manages some of the family's financial affairs through offshore corporations.

As a result of that financial connection to Osama bin Laden, French and Swiss investigators have questioned him about possible financial links to Al Qaeda. He says he has none.

Mr. Bin Ladin says he has not been back to Saudi Arabia since 1987 and has not seen Osama since about that time. The family disowned its terrorist kinsman after he refused to abandon his campaign against the Saudi royal family, which is responsible for making the Bin Ladin clan rich.

The Yeslam perfume, Mr. Bin Ladin explains, was developed from a century-old French formula that was marketed in the 1920's as Air de Paris.

No existing Middle Eastern brands can compare to the brands in Europe, Mr. Bin Ladin said, spinning a diaphanous vision of Yeslam labels on everything from expensive silk scarves to fancy shower

gel, even a deodorant.

"It was fascinating to come up with a fragrance," he said. "I have a nose, who is Italian and lives in Grasse." Translated to the vernacular, that means he has hired an Italian fragrance expert in the southern French city of Grasse, the Mecca of perfume manufacturers.

Mr. Bin Ladin says the perfume is twice as expensive to produce as the average scent because of its concentration of natural floral extracts, including narcissus. He plans to sell it for about \$30 an ounce.

He recently introduced the perfume at an industry convention in Cannes and hopes to have 60,000 bottles in European and Middle Eastern stores by the end of the year.

"I would love to launch it in the States," he said, then asked with a tentative smile. "What do you think the reaction would be?"

Lost of Smell do to Age

NOVEMBER 6, 2004

I'VE READ THAT YOUR NOSE CONTINUES TO GROW THROUGHOUT YOUR LIFETIME. If that is true, I wonder why it is that as your nose gets larger your sense of smell lessens.

"Your sense of smell declines by about 10 percent between age 40 and 60, and by as much as 50 percent more by age 65," said Dr. Alan Hirsch, neurological director of the Smell and Taste Treatment and Research Foundation in Chicago.

While Hirsch's credentials lend credence to these statistics, personal anecdotal evidence is what first alerted me to this probability.

I have sung in church choirs since I was old enough to be tolerated. I sat by many women during those years. Scores of them wore perfume.

My nose has been assaulted by every variety of fragrance, from cheap dollar store selections to ones that are priced by the ounce and are evidently as precious as gold.

I used to giggle with my teenage friends about the older women in the choir, who we could smell from across the room. Of course, to a teenager, anyone over 28 was old and I do not remember whether the women of loud fragrance were actually seniors.

At the time, we were more amused by the archaic nature of their fragrance than by the fact that we could smell it from some distance away. We did occasionally joke that one lady must be a klutz who habitually spilled her perfume as she was getting ready for church.

As I got older, I began to notice that mature women seemed to have a heavier hand when it came to applying fragrance. I paid more attention at this juncture in my life because I had developed migraine

headaches that are often triggered by any sticky-sweet smell. Most perfumes qualify.

I would change seats in choir to get away from the strong-smelling ladies. As this became more and more necessary, I noticed that most of the women who tended to daub themselves liberally with perfume also had gray hair (or roots) and lots of wrinkles.

Thus, when I read that the sense of smell declines dramatically between ages 60 and 65, I had no trouble believing this fact.

I am hoping that as I age my declining odor detection capacity will be paralleled by a decrease in migraines. After all, there should be some benefit to the loss of smell.

Of course there are definite liabilities. As I age, I am more liable to die from asphyxiation or in a gas explosion if my sniffer is less effective. Currently I am highly sensitive to the smell of natural gas. I can walk into a home and tell if the space heater has a small, non-lethal leak. My nose tells me. Most peo-

ple can rely on their noses to give a similar warning, at least before the leak reaches lethal levels.

I am also more likely to contract food poisoning, but not because I will necessarily become more negligent. Instead, a faulty nose is less prone to warn me that food is tainted. When bacteria start to work on food, it starts to smell bad. Our noses often warn us that food should be discarded long before mold, slime or fuzz give us a visual clue that the food is not fit for human consumption.

Nutritionists advise us to discard food that has been refrigerated for two days. Yet, many of us keep eating food until it starts to smell bad or grow noticeable foreign substances.

If you are over 60, depending on your sense of smell to warn that food is inedible is even less wise. Unfortunately, if you're over 60 you also might have trouble remembering how long something has been in the fridge.

Perhaps seniors should fix smaller portions and either trash their leftovers or trade with another senior. If the trading meals option is used, seniors need to trade right after the meal in question so that no one forgets how long the leftovers have been around.

Dr. Hirsch does offer hope to seniors. He calls it sniff therapy. He

said studies show that if seniors are exposed several times a day to a smell they cannot detect, they will develop the ability to smell it within three months.

I think that I will just start throwing away food as I get older. To me the cure sounds worse than the problem. Can you imagine sniffing tainted bacon three times a day for three months just so you'll know when your bacon has gone bad?

Forget it, Dr. Hirsch. That would be like sniffing skunk secretion several times a day so that you could allow the skunk family living under your porch to keep their home.

MCS & the Fragrant Chemicals

NOVEMBER 14, 2004

IT'S HARD FOR ME TO EXPLAIN WHAT IT'S LIKE TO HAVE MCS because it affects everything I eat and drink, everything I breathe, and every activity that I do throughout each day," says April Carlise. "Before I started having MCS symptoms, I was unaware of all the chemicals that we are exposed to throughout the day. But now that I have MCS, I'm aware of almost every chemical that I see, smell, touch or taste, although some chemicals are odorless, tasteless and invisible."

Carlise says her symptoms vary from overwhelming fatigue, to not thinking clearly, to not feeling emotionally strong. Her reactions may last hours or days. Not always knowing what caused a reaction, Carlise spends most of her time trying to avoid as many chemicals as she can, trying to reduce the strength of chemicals to which she is exposed, and trying to neutralize her reactions.

"When I looked into my eyes, I looked like I was slowly dying," says Carlise, who says she noted toxic-looking rings around her pupils eight years ago. "The blue parts of my eyes were a murkier blue. I didn't know it then, but those rings indicated my body was toxic."

From that point, her symptoms worsened. Passing by someone wearing perfume, passing by scented candles, the aroma of laundry detergents or fabric softeners caused reactions. She immediately left the area seeking a clean space to breathe in what she hoped was clean air, thus lessening the reaction. She says she read extensively and experimented to find things that helped prevent the constant reactions and even neutralize them. Unfortunately, there wasn't always fresh air.

Items in the mail, magazines, books, clothes, even plastic shopping bags trigger reactions. Cigarette smoke from another tenant smoking on his balcony, or wood smoke from a next-door neighbor, or smoke from a nearby fire, affects Carlise. Bad-air pollution, strong smells of laundry

detergent from one of the other tenants or the Laundromat nearby cause reactions. At some point, Carlise says she also started getting sick from pesticides and herbicides in the foods she ate.

"I'd be really sick, and basically bedridden for days afterward," she says.

About five years ago, pollen allergies added to Carlise's difficulties. Breathing fresh air to neutralize chemical reactions was no longer an option. From April to November, she had to avoid riding the bus into town and taking daily short walks around the apartment complex or on the trails into the woods next to her apartment. She had to keep her apartment windows and balcony doors closed, which kept odors inside. Running the air conditioning with a special filter minimizes some odors when people enter her home to do repairs or stay for a short visit.

The most common odors that people bring in with them and that linger after they leave are different

fragrances like perfumes, colognes, and fabric softeners on their clothes, hair shampoo and hand lotion. Not only do the odors linger in the air, they cling to anything the person touched or sat on and may cling to Carlise's hair and clothes.

"That's why I almost never have company over or go to people's homes," she says.

Over the years, her symptoms progressed from "very mild to very severe." The severity fluctuated depending on her overall health and the exposure.

April Carlise of Dover stands in her apartment, a safe haven from many chemicals that she says have made her sick.

"I have spent years trying to get better. Every time I work hard to get better, I'm exposed to more chemicals, and my overall health worsens," Carlise says. "There are chemicals everywhere, and more and more chemicals are being added all the time. I feel like I'm like the canary in the goldmine.

"I was dealt a double whammy. I live with Chronic Fatigue Syndrome (CFS) and MCS. In 1980, when I was 36, I had two severe reactions to Flagyl, a prescription medication, plus a bad case of the flu, all within one month. I felt my life energy drain out of me. I was bedridden and exhausted. When I stopped taking

the medication, I was left with a severe case of CFS, digestive problems (which I'd never had before) and a mild case of MCS," she says.

An internist diagnosed Carlise with "post viral illness." Carlise disagreed, believing her illness was caused by the medication. She later learned that "post viral illness" was another term for Chronic Fatigue Syndrome.

"CFS may be caused by a virus that the body can't get rid of, so maybe my severe reaction to medication, combined with the viral flu, pushed me over the edge," she says.

Carlise says she never recovered from that catastrophic month. A 1962 graduate from the University of New Hampshire with a bachelor's degree in occupational therapy, Carlise successfully completed her three required internships in a general hospital setting, a psychiatric hospital and a rehabilitation center and then passed the national OTR test in 1967. She began a new life, a new career. All that changed with CFS. Unable to handle a stressful job as an occupational therapist, she worked as a store clerk, a secretary and attempted part-time temp jobs.

"I've gotten better, then relapsed, gotten better again, then relapsed again. My current relapse started in February 1991, when I came down with the flu after a period of declining health, and has last-

ed 13 years," Carlise says who now survives on disability support.

According to Carlise, the three basic criteria for a diagnosis of CFS are fatigue that lasts for six months or more; diminished capacities, by at least 50 percent, to perform daily functions; and the absence of other illnesses to explain the fatigue. She met all the criteria. Furthermore, she had lost a lot of weight, her skin was yellow, and because her digestive problems were so severe, she says she looked like she was about to die.

"Dr. Graciano agreed with my diagnosis and admitted there were no available treatments at that time," Carlise says. (Calls to Dr. Graciano's office were not returned.) "I still see Dr. Graciano and his nurse practitioner. They've written letters for me, regarding my chemical sensitivities, for rental assistance, etc., although they have never mentioned the diagnosis of MCS. They just say that I have a 'complicated medical history, which includes various chemical sensitivities,' and that my health is fragile."

While Carlise says many people with CFS also have fibromyalgia (FM), she adds that symptoms of Gulf War Syndrome the result of exposure to different biological and chemical substances in Iraq in 1991 the "Agent Orange" health problems some Vietnam veterans suffered, the illnesses people suffer

who live near oil, chemical and mining areas, the black lung disease coal miners get, the lung damage done to those exposed to asbestos, and even the possible fallout from Sept. 11, 2001, as workers and residents inhaling toxins from the aftermath are developing debilitating health problems, overlap with those of CFS, FM and MCS.

"I realize that my MCS is a part of the CF syndrome, and can't be separated from it. Some people have CFS for six months; some for three years; and some, like myself, for 24 or more years," she says. "I believe CFS is caused by the body collapsing under the weight of several traumas and the difference in whether a person gets CFS for six months, or three years, or many years, depends on the number of layers of traumas to the person's body. "People who are the weakest, in certain ways, develop MCS first," she continues. "On a physical level, MCS is caused by a person's body becoming 'toxic,' which means their body is overwhelmed by waste products of one kind or another. In a healthy person, the liver detoxifies any incoming toxins very quickly, but in a person with allergies and chemical sensitivities, the body is so overwhelmed with toxins, that they build up in the body, and begin to make the person ill."

Moving to the Dover area 10 years ago, Carlise planned to live in a rented apartment for one year.

She says she's never felt well enough to leave. Almost every time the landlord makes significant property improvements, Carlise says her health suffers. The chemical fumes from new hallway carpeting installed two years ago caused Carlise to be bedridden almost every day for about six months, until the carpet out gassed enough, and the pollen season ended, so she could open the windows daily to air out the apartment.

Then came new windows and balcony doors. Carlise says she hasn't felt as energetic or as well ever since they were installed.

"My worst days are when it's hot and humid, which causes a significant increase in the out gassing of chemicals from different things in my apartment," she says. "Although the apartment managers have been very kind to me and have been as understanding as they know how to be, I constantly research how to protect myself.

"I've read that many people have health problems that they aren't even aware can be traced back to the chemicals in the food they eat, the beverages they drink, the air they breathe, and every activity they do throughout the day. I feel that everyone, whether they have MCS or not, can benefit from becoming more aware of how bombarded we are everyday with chemicals. Most of us just aren't aware of it. I used to be oblivious to it,

too."

Many factors affect this illness - mental, emotional, spiritual and physical. Carlise says she believes the MCS is a reflection of how out of balance her life was and how out of balance humans are with the natural world.

"I think it was Chief Seattle who predicted that Americans would drown in their own waste/pollution and it's everywhere and getting worse all the time. More and more children and adults are developing allergies, asthma, chemical sensitivities, etc., and much of it is related to the amount of pollution that's in our food, our water, and the air we breathe and within our mental, emotional and spiritual bodies. So, to me, it's a combination of the individual (myself) being "toxic" on a physical level, and unable to cope with the chemicals out there, and our culture, which promotes and uses these chemicals," she says.

There is hope. A few years ago, with the help of a homeopathic remedy and nutritional supplements, Carlise says she started to feel better. Her symptoms have slowly become less severe and don't last as long. She's still careful to avoid chemical exposures.

"I've heard of a few people who have gotten significantly better, and I hope to be one of those people," she says.

Opium - The Fragrance

NOVEMBER 21, 2004

AN ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN FOR A NEW CHRISTIAN DIOR PRODUCT HAS DRAWN CRITICISM from a recovery advocacy group that says the ads send a message to young women that being addicted is hip. The following is an "Action Alert" news release from Susan Rook, former CNN news anchor, who is the director of communications and outreach for Faces and Voices of Recovery:

Related Resources:

[Alcoholism FAQ](#)

[What is Alcoholism](#)

[12 Step Info](#)

[Getting Help](#)

[Alcohol Effects](#)

[Other Support Groups](#)

From Other Guides:

[Substance Abuse](#)

Elsewhere on the Web:

[Voices and Faces of Recovery](#)

[Susan Rook](#)

campaign to market a new fragrance and makeup line called 'Dior Addict.' This outrageous marketing campaign:

Exploits a brain disease;

Trivializes the critical public health issue of alcohol and other drug addiction;

Cheapens the hard work of recovery and;

Shows callous disregard for the feelings of parents who have lost a child to addiction.

Faces and Voices of Recovery is coordinating a diverse coalition to launch a protest called: Addiction is Not Fashionable. This initiative includes recovery advocates, parent groups, community coalitions, prevention and treatment providers, faith community, front-line health care providers, members of the fashion, media and entertainment industries and policy makers.

Fashion designer Christian Dior has launched a massive ad cam-

"As a parent who has lost my

own precious daughter to addiction I am appalled that the world renowned company of Dior would use the word 'Addict' for their new line of perfume and cosmetics' says Sharon Smith, president, MOM-STELL. Smith went to the website and had this reaction, "I just cried. How can a company push pleasure, sensuality and energy in an add campaign called Admit it, and talk about getting "Higher" without the simplest of regards for the parents of this country who have watched a child get "Higher", "Admit it", and then become an "Addict" and die as a result. The word strikes fear in parents across this nation. In a time of corporate responsibility, Dior is being totally irresponsible in the choice of words in their new campaign."

Christian Dior Preying on Young Women "They are institutional predators," says Maine Youth Advocate Marty O'Brien, "They are preying on young women to buy into the concept that addiction is hip." According to Richard Brown, MD, University of Wisconsin, "We must condemn the glamorization of addiction for profit. There would be a tremendous public outcry against attempts to profit from glamorizing other terrible diseases like stroke, cancer or AIDS."

Advocates working to prevent drug use among children and adolescents find Dior's glamorization of addiction particularly offensive. Sue Rusche, National Families in

Action says, "Dior's campaign makes it virtually impossible for parents to teach children that drugs and alcohol can hurt them so badly its better not to start." We spend \$200 million of our tax dollars on a media campaign to teach children not to use addictive drugs. How can Dior give the message that being an 'Addict' is 'bold, daring and totally sexy'?

"Since 1944, the National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence has been fighting the stigma attached to addiction and advocating for people in recovery," says Stacia Murphy, the organization's President. "Unfortunately, in one ill-conceived effort to be hip, sexy and cool and sell product the Dior campaign for Addict has made our job more difficult. Addicts the real ones do not always smell terrific, and those who have recovered have done so through hard work and difficult emotional and spiritual growth. Sadly, a perfume named 'Addict' can only cheapen their hard work and contribute to the stigma of addiction."

What You Can Do:

Dior has been asked to pull the 'Addict' campaign and re-name the product. Consumer Affairs representative Veronica Post says the company 'appreciates our concern and feedback' and asks us to 'put it in writing.'

Simultaneous press conferences

around the country on Monday October 21 announced the "Addiction is NOT Fashionable" campaign which will begin with a massive letter writing campaign and an even larger email protest. Media events are planned for: Washington DC, Los Angeles, Miami, Minneapolis/St. Paul and other cities.

We need your help. To participate in the 'Addiction is not Fashionable' campaign please send this action alert to other people you know.

Send letters directly to the New York office of Dior:

DIOR
Attention: Veronica Post
Department of Consumer Affairs
19 E. 57th Street
New York, NY 10022

Please fax a copy of your letter to Faces and Voices of Recovery 703-299-6768.

Or call 212-931-2200, the phone number for the Perfumes division.

Visit the website for the latest information including a sample protest letter, talking points and ideas from other advocates, email Susan Rook, or call 703-299-6760 for more information.

Well thought out marketing campaign. Should earn millions in

extra revenue for Dior.

I am surprised by now that someone hasn't discovered the lost scents of the World Trade Center disaster. Boy would that be a cheesy marketing scam.

A good name would be 9 & 11. Proceeds would go to the families of the victims.

Ethics & Using Rare Plants

NOVEMBER 22, 2004

DESPITE THE EXISTENCE OF COMMODITY SHORTAGES IN THE AROMA INDUSTRY, production and marketing strategies that are sustainable in the long-term are driven more by consumers and organizations concerned about conservation than by raw material producers and resellers. The poverty in which many indigenous peoples are submerged increases the unsustainable use of natural materials. This phenomenon is exacerbated by the unwillingness of large companies to pay fair and equitable prices to these peoples when searching and later making profit of active ingredients found in places such as the rainforest. The author argues for a more ethical and responsible use of raw materials in the aroma industry. He also describes the origin, use and status of important animal and plant aromatic items.

Introduction

The essential oil and aromatic raw materials industry is failing to self-police itself with respect to conserving threatened plant and animal species. Commodity shortages and higher unit prices for certain items signal ever-increasing supply problems. Green policies and any semblance of ecological awareness with respect to these commodities often seem to originate more from the attitudes of consumers than via the raw materials producer and re-seller, in spite of the existent national and international laws restricting or forbidding trade in certain threatened species. It seems that some traders will only stop marketing these valuable commodities when prosecuted, legally prevented, shamed or pressurized into adopting more ecologically sound practices.

The World Conservation Union has now classified 11,167 creatures and 5714 plants as facing extinction (IUCN 2002). It is calculated that loss of species is currently running up to 1000 times its natural rate, thus it seems surely time to examine measures to help conservation strategies for the planet (New Scientist 2002). With this in mind, the October

2002 meeting of the United Nations Convention on Trade in Endangered Species voted in favor of protection of a further number of species, thus there is hope of tough international legislation to preserve biodiversity (New Scientist 2002).

There is a "non-human"-centred argument in environmental ethics, which states that an individual species has an absolute right to exist. Introducing human's interests into the picture complicates the issue, especially where products from threatened species have associated uses as commodities, at which point ideological principles are sometimes overturned. For example, the 1973 Endangered Species Act in the United States, which is based on the assumption that each life form may prove valuable in non-predictable ways, and that each species is entitled to exist for its own sake, was initially welcomed by a majority of the public, but was later challenged by many people, when the habitat of a single unique species was seen to "get in the way" of major industrial development, affecting jobs and liveli-

hoods, and maybe even affecting the way people might vote (Chadwick 1995). As another example, Pakenham (2002) devoted a complete chapter to the case of the eucalyptus forests in Australia. These forests contained enormous *Eucalyptus regnans* trees 350-400 feet high, a wonder in themselves! However, the cutting down of state-owned eucalyptus forests in the Yarra range north of Melbourne has monetarily benefited Australian taxpayers. It is hard to see that conservation can be perceived as effective and ongoing, when local governments adopt such policies of such seemingly negative ecological value.

Biodiversity Conservation, indigenous peoples and the aroma industry.

Slash and burn was practiced for hundreds of years in the tropics in a process of cultivation and fallow rotation (and sometimes management succession) without a great impact in the rainforest (Brookfield and Padoch 1994; Tomich et al. 1998). However, population growth and pressure from big corporations have decreased the amount of land available, and the fallow period has shortened with the subsequent degradation of the land (Tomich et al. 1998). The intensification of slash and burn practices lead to desertification, and agriculture and housing needs intrude more and more on former forest areas. Slash

and burn policies of migrating agricultural practices may affect the pH of the soil, change the viable seed count and soil microflora, damage the root mat structure, and may lead to the degradation of forest areas. Indeed the poverty of the indigenous peoples can make huge demands on the forest reserves, and this effect may be comparable or larger than the effects of logging or other destructive forces.

Another cause of the extinction of species is the gathering of threatened organisms. One of the arguments for non-interventionist policies relates to a fundamental right of peoples to use plants and herbs for religious, medicinal or ritual use. In fact, endemic peoples can easily view the imposition of ecologically reasoned restrictions on these practices as a form of Western scientific imperialism. I am sympathetic to this viewpoint, and would always seek to prevent the more serious threat of commercial exploitation rather than interfere with a more "legitimate" ethnic use, provided that this use does not continue to seriously endanger the species in question, for instance, by the use of sustainable practices to ensure the long-term preservation of natural resources. Sustainable forest development is defined by the International Tropical Timber Organization as "the process of managing permanent forest land to achieve one or more specific objects of management with regard to the production of a continuous

flow of desired forest products and services without undue reduction in its inherent values and future productivity, and without undue desirable effects on the physical and social environment" (Mankin 1998).

But despite the fact that the need for a sustainable management is recognized, indigenous peoples generally gain absolutely nothing from large companies searching for new pharmaceuticals, active ingredients for cosmetics or drugs (e.g., curare and quinine), and agrochemicals in environments such as the rainforest (Prance 1998). No establishment mechanisms exist to reward local communities for the conservation of diversity, and the growth of forest conservation schemes has historically shown scant regard for the ways of indigenous peoples.

It is not all doom and gloom however. Panaia et al. (2000) report that one single plant of the critically endangered *Symonanthus bancroftii* plant was discovered in Ardath in Western Australia, and a recovery program using in vitro micropropagation techniques was started via the resources of Department of Conservation and Land Management (CALM) and the Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority of Western Australia. The plant has now a less precarious outlook, illustrating the role of tissue culture, one of the ex-situ measures proving useful in con-

serving rare and threatened species.

The trend towards exotic botanical extracts as actives in cosmetic products is also a major development and has spawned some interesting associations, such as those between the French Conservatory of Specialized Botanical Collections and producing companies in Madagascar and Brazil. Charges of bioethnic plundering in exotic materials for cosmetics generally are offset by the fact that indigenous peoples may gain monetarily from these exploits. But ethno-botany is now such a buzzword across the cosmetic world, thus it is hard to find out if there is any effective monitoring for the majority of these raw materials, and from personal experience, complete ignorance of the conservation status of these commodities items would seem to be the norm amongst the majority of technical staff of many leading cosmetic companies. Further, it is possible that extensive usage of these exotic ingredients may further damage the fragile ecosystems from whence they came.

What action can we in the aroma world take to contribute to conserving biological diversity? One possible way is not to formulate with, or trade in commodities which origin is a threatened species, until we are far surer that truly sustainable production methods are in place. Dialogue to discuss how this might be done, the

drawbacks of imposed monoculture on cleared forest land, and policies which contribute to species succession is welcomed. Some of these exploited aromatic items are listed below, although the list is far from being comprehensive.

Animal Products

1. Civet. Civet products were used in less enlightened times in perfumery for their animalic notes, finding use in orientals, heavy florals and chypres. Civet paste is obtained from squeezing or scraping the anal glands of the African civet cat *Civetticus civetta* (sometimes classified as *Viverra civetta*), the Indian civet *Viverra zibetha* (from India, Indonesia and Malaysia), the Lesser Indian civet (also known as the Chinese civet) *Viverricula indica* (East and South China) and other civet species. *Viverra civettina* (India), *Viverra zibetha* (India) and *Viverricula indica* (India) are listed under Appendix III of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) (CITES 2003).

De-Sheng (1986) wrote a review article of the civet cat and presented detailed GC-Mass Spectrometry data on the composition of steam micro-distillation-extraction volatiles from civet secretions obtained from the Chinese Civet *Viverricula indica*. Yingkang (1991) described civet paste collection from Hangzhou

Zoological Garden in China and estimated an annual production of 12 kg of civet paste per year from a one-hectare civet farm operated by the zoo. Farms also operate in Ethiopia, Kenya, Congo, Guinea, Senegal and India. Petitdidier (1986) glowingly reported on a visit to Addis Abbaba Research Institute, which controlled the civet quality output from 105 Ethiopian farms. A similar kind of article would be hard to find these days, reflecting how attitudes have changed.

2. Musk. Musk grains/pods are obtained from the preputial glands of the musk deer (*Moschus* spp.). Geist (1999) argues that these timid creatures are really tragulids, the similarity to deer only occurring by convergent evolution. A principle difference is that tragulids have fewer exocrine glands than "real" deer. Example of musk deer species include *Moschus berezovskii* found in Southern China and Northern Vietnam, *Moschus chrysoagaster* found in India, and *Moschus moschiferus* found in China, Mongolia, Himalayas and Korea. *Moschus* spp. populations of Afghanistan, Bhutan, India, Myanmar, Nepal and Pakistan are listed under Appendix I of CITES, while other populations are included in Appendix II (CITES 2003).

Animal musks have had a long history of use in perfumery. Zhong and Hui (1996) reported that China formerly had 90% of the world

"musk deer resources," but that deer populations had reduced from 2.5 million on the 1960's to 100,000 in 1996. Green (1986, 1989) and Wemmer (1998) noted that the economic viability of musk harvesting from either free-range or captive musk deer has not been evaluated. Only small amounts of musk are nowadays used in perfumery - the largest consumers of musk products are China (where various musk qualities are used in traditional medicine) and Japan. Morita (1992) reported that musk is no longer an ingredient of modern Japanese incense.

Traditional musk qualities used in perfumery included: a) musk tonquin from *Moschus moschiferus* deer in Tibet and China; b) musk cabardine from cabardine deer *Moschus sibiricus* and *Moschus altaicus*; c) musk Yunnan of different physical appearance from tonquin; d) musk Bengal (maybe also known Assam musk), usually regarded as inferior; e) musk Siberian from the Shansi mountain regions; and f) musk of Boukharie.

3. Ambergris. Ambergris is a pathological exudate from the sperm whale *Physeter macrocephalus* and only occurs in approximately 1% of the population. The disease is caused by exposure to sunlight and seawater producing this formerly used perfumery material. *Physeter* spp., amongst other whales, are listed under Appendix I of CITES

(CITES 2003). Rice DW (2002) of the National Maritime Mammal Laboratory, Seattle, pointed out, that contrary to the widely held belief that ambergris masses may be found floating in the sea or washed up on shores, harvesting therefore posing no threat to whale viability, ambergris is hardly ever found on beaches but is mainly recovered from whale carcasses

4. Castoreum. Castoreum qualities are ethylic extracts of the accumulated dried material collected via secretory glands in the abdominal pouch of the Siberian beaver *Castor fiber* and the Canadian beaver *C. canadensis* living in Alaska, Canada and Siberia. Russian and Canadian commercial products were available in former times (e.g., from the Hudson Bay Company), and at the present time castoreum products are still available from Internet traders and certain perfumery companies (e.g., some in France). Castoreum was once used in perfumery to give leathery animal notes to chypres and to other perfumes. In spite of progress in understanding the chemical composition of castoreum, no synthetic replacement or reconstitution comes close to reproducing the in-perfume effects produced by the authentic material.

5. Muskrat. Although the species is not threatened, products such as musk zibata were formerly produced from the muskrat *Ondatra zibethicus*, which lives on the

Louisiana marshlands. Hall (1981) reported that in North America muskrat pelts are the most valuable fur pelts in the trapping trade. The perfumery use of muskrat products would nowadays also be regarded as non-ethical.

There are other "animal" products that are not similarly universally regarded as unethical commodities (e.g., beeswax absolute obtained via alcoholic extract of beeswax). The official line is that respectable international perfumery companies do not trade in animal raw materials, as the trade is regarded as unethical, if not actually illegal under CITES agreements. It does not take the trainee in perfumery too long to realize that certain identifiable perfumery companies do not adhere to these criteria, although they risk the attentions of environmentalists and animal welfare groups who might vigorously pursue these miscreants.

An interesting development is the reported banning of the import by the Chinese government on March 2002 of products from Europe (that includes members and non-members of the European Union), Japan and Oman, containing or suspected of containing animal derivatives (Parfums Cosmétiques Actualités 2002). It will be interesting to see if the ban just applies to some cosmetic materials - including fragrance ingredients - or also applies to musk and other ingredients imported for use

in traditional Chinese medicines.

Plant Products

1. Orchid oils. The three commercially cultivated species of the vanilla plant, *Vanilla planifolia* (Bourbon or Indonesian vanilla), *V. tahitensis* (Tahitian vanilla), and *V. pompona* (Guadeloupe vanilla; vanillons; W. Indian vanilla) are not included in this category. Orchids are already sufficiently rare in many European countries to have protected status, and the family Orchidaceae is listed under Appendix II of CITES and Annex B of Regulation (EC) 338/97 (CITES 2003). Some examples of threatened species still use are the ladies slipper *Cypripedium parviflorum* var. *pubescens*, which is used in herbal medicine and is listed in the British Herbal Pharmacopoeia 1983, and *Ophrys insectifera* used in "salep", an ingredient in Turkish delight and ice cream. McGriffin (2000) proposed self-regulatory initiatives to refrain from trading in wild-harvested ladies slipper. He suggested that these initiatives should be put into practice by the herbal industry, all American Herbal Products Association members, and all other individuals and businesses in the horticultural and herb trade.

Many natural perfumes produced by many orchid species are currently being researched by leading perfumery companies (Kaiser 1993). Pain (2001) described the

plant hunting for new perfumes including orchid perfumes in rain forest areas (e.g., Madagascar) by experts from one of the world's largest fragrance companies. Current interest by the media is further reflected in S. O'Connell's article (2001) reporting on the work of Josef Limacher, a perfume hunter working on orchid scents in locations in Brazil. Kaiser (1993) presented an impressive academic account of the chemistry of natural orchid scents from many parts of the world in his fabulously illustrated book. Although the threat of mass exploitation of orchid species is unlikely, close monitoring to protect individual habitats of these beautiful and irreplaceable plants is desirable.

2. Mountain tobacco. Extracts, concretes, essential oils, the dried roots, dried whole plant and dried flowers of *Arnica montana* are commercially offered, in spite of declining plant populations. Due to over-exploitation, *A. montana* is listed under Annex D of the CoE Regulations (EC) No. 338/97 and under Annex V of the EU Habitats, Fauna and Flora Directive (EUROPA 2003). A rare drug, the tincture of arnica flower oil from the capitulum's of *A. montana*, has previously achieved pharmaceutical status in the British Pharmaceutical Codex of 1949. The herb and its products has similarly been official in many National Pharmacopoeias (e.g., Austria, France, Germany, Switzerland and

it is mentioned in the British Herbal Pharmacopoeia of 1983). The market for the dried flowers is believed to be 50 tons per annum and this product is almost totally derived from wild harvesting from Spain and Romania. An excellent review of the status of *A. montana*, including the position with respect both to legal and illegal harvesting in Spain, is described by Lange (1998).

3. Costus. Products such as extracts, concretes, and essential oils are obtained from *Saussurea lappa* (also known as *Saussurea costus*). This species is sometimes mistaken with the herbal plant *Costus speciosus*. *Saussurea lappa* plants, known as kuth in Hindi and in the herb trade, are grown in Kashmir, Sikkim and other areas of the Himalayas, and in Southwestern China. The plant has become endangered and export is banned, the species being included in Appendix I of CITES (CITES 2003). *S. lappa*'s qualities are better known in perfumery as costus absolute, costus oil etc. The plant grows wild, mainly in Jammu and Kashmir (specifically in the Kishenganga and Chenab valleys), but is also cultivated in Kashmir and Lahul. Roots of the plant are used in Ayurvedic, Unani, Siddha and Tibetan medicinal systems. The oil was formerly used in high-class perfumery in small quantities to impart animalic and sebaceous notes, and some would say coupled with orris-like effects. Up to 12

tons of raw material per year are exported from northwest districts of India, in spite of their threatened status, and not being permitted in perfumes because of problems of dermal sensitization associated with sesquiterpene lactones and other sensitizers in costus products. Incorporation into perfumes is against the International Fragrance Research Association Standards, unless specific commercial grades offered can be shown to be non-sensitizing.

Additional List of Rare & Endangered Species

The following are aroma materials from species that I believe to be rare, very rare or threatened in their natural habitats. Some aromatic raw material users may be anxious that the conservation ideal should ensure that not only the morphologically distinct forms are preserved, but also the conservation of chemotypes is given equal weighting.

1. Rosewood oil. Oil from the wood of *Aniba rosaedora*, *A. amazonica*, *A. parviflora* and other *Aniba* species and varieties, is distilled to produce "bois de rose" or Rosewood oil. The present production is mainly from Brazil (the pure oil is only shipped out from Manaus), although formerly was produced also in French Guiana, Surinam and Peru. Time is running out for this important raw material. Replanting deals (i.e. guaranteeing

tree replantation with trade purchases) are commendable in some respects, but will make little impact in the short term due to the long maturation period of the trees. Loss of germ plasm diversity and narrowing of the genetic base is believed to have already occurred through tree over-exploitation to satisfy the demand for essential oil, although efforts to create a germ plasm collection are now afoot. Some encouraging trials for young trees indicate better growth characteristics in cleared areas compared to the relative failure of poly-tunnel trials. The Faculdade de Ciências Agrárias do Para at Belem, Brazil recently identified specific evaluation needs for formal cultivation, including the selection of superior germ plasm, economic studies for production of wood and leaf oils, and optimization management regimes for short-rotation harvesting of trunk wood and leaves. Major purchasers of Rosewood oil to date are believed to have been local outposts of fragrance sector multinationals, who have taken up to 100 tons per annum of oil since the eighties (the present output is believed to be closer to 30 tons). This is in contrast to the Brazilian situation of the nineteen sixties, where fifty or so Brazilian distilleries provided 500 tons per year of oil (Ohashi 1997). A review article by S. Sheppard-Hanger and the author, on possible substitutes for Rosewood oil in Aromatherapy, has just been published (Burfield & Sheppard-Hanger 2003).

Peruvian Rosewood oil from "sustainably grown" *Ocotea caudata* is also being sold into the essential oils market. The history of exploitation of *Ocotea* species has not been good up to now. The over-exploitation of Brazilian Sassafras *O. pretosia* and the valuable South African timber tree *O. bullata* has been such that the latter is a protected species. So much felling of *O. pretosia* in Santa Catarina forests of Brazil has occurred in the last few decades in order to produce Brazilian Sassafras oil that now the transport distances to the distillery are relatively great, and the oil is starting to be uneconomic to produce. Since *O. cymbarum* is often confused with *O. pretosia* has also suffered reduction in numbers from indiscriminate felling. Many *Ocotea* species are slow-growing species and may take up to forty years to mature. If exploitation becomes scaled up the future of *O. caudata* may be uncertain, although some oil customers dislike the inferior odour profile (pine-oil disinfectant like) of some batches of the oil, which makes the increase of *O. caudata* exploitation very unlikely.

2. Amyris oil. Although there is no study that I am aware of to corroborate this prediction, I believe that *Amyris balsamifera* is at risk of becoming extinct in its natural habitat, the Caribbean and Gulf of Mexico, in less than ten years due to over-exploitation. The oil is not greatly valued in perfumery but rather has found employment as an

extender of other oils, or in cheap soap perfumes.

3. Sandalwood oil. Possibly originally introduced from the Timor islands, the parasitic sandalwood trees (*Santalum* species) such as *S. freycinetianum* (Lanal sandalwood) and *S. album* (East Indian Sandalwood) became endemic to Southwest India, often hiding deep in the Southern forests. According to Sahni (2000) some species of *Santalum* were perhaps spread there via birds following their establishment by man on the outskirts of forests or nearby villages. Sahni (2000) also estimated that sandalwoods have been indigenous to parts of India for 23 centuries. There is some evidence that essential oil formation in the heartwood is optimal where trees are grown at between 600 to 900 m. Due to over-exploitation, East Indian and Indonesian oils from *S. album* are not freely available, although some limited production of East Indian sandalwood is taking place. The market price of East Indian sandalwood at the time of writing is £425 per kilo! The production has partly been in the control of the Madras and Mysore state governments, who have attempted to prevent the unauthorized smuggling of oil. However, illegal sandalwood oil has been commonly offered in the oil dealing trade, and in recent years, the industry has largely turned its back and pretended not to notice the practice, and now we may be paying the price. My best

guess is that there are possibly less than 130,000 hectares of *S. album* trees in the whole of India. In Karataka and Tamil Nadu forests trees grow at elevations of up to 1400 m and there is some evidence that oil formation in the heartwood is optimal where trees are grown at between 600 to 900 m. It is probable that 75% of India's sandalwood output comes from the forests of Karnataka, where extensive replanting trials have been carried out, although the market sourcing for this commodity may now focus increasingly on Papua New Guinea. Many replantings in other districts of India have produced viable plants, but with no oil content. Rai (1999) described the plantation techniques used for raising sandalwood from seeds, and container raised seedlings. Many attempts have resulted in failure from insufficient knowledge of the host-parasite relationship, or from mismanagement (e.g., deaths by dehydration, animal scavenging, or human-caused destruction).

Trees are quite susceptible to disease, especially to the mycoplasma spike disease, which affects the principal forests (see Nayar (1988) for a detailed review of spike disease). Mineral and hydrational requirements are provided by the hot, thus spike disease is thought to be aided by the selection of inappropriate hosts for the sandalwood tree. The tree will normally die within 3 years of infection.

There is no national or international genetic germ plasm resource or collection of sandalwoods in existence anywhere. Further, full maturity for trees may take 60-80 years. All of these factors coupled with over-exploitation are putting pressure on other *Santalum* species from which replacement sandalwood oils are being produced. For instance, *S. austrocaledonicum* (sandalwood oil vanuata) and *S. yasi* (Fiji, Tonga) have been so exploited, that numbers of these species are down to a few trees. *S. fernandezianum* was exploited since 1624 for its valuable sweet-scented wood, and according to Lucas and Synge (1978) the last specimen of this species was last seen alive by Skottsberg in 1908. The status of tree numbers of *S. insulare* (French Polynesia), *S. macgregorii* (Papua New Guinea), and *S. ellipticum* (Hawaii) also needs monitoring.

Although East Indian sandalwood from *S. album* reached protected species status in 1995, most of the aroma industry trade press has virtually ignored the topic. Soap, Perfumery and Cosmetics (2002) highlighted the research on the Australian sandalwood *S. spicatum* extract by the Institute of the Pharmaceutical Chemistry in Vienna, in conjunction with an Australian Sandalwood producer (Mt. Romance). The article is largely devoted to extol the virtues of *S. spicatum* "oil", apparently via felled trees from a 1.6 km² area.

Unfortunately the article fails to distinguish the differences in compositional and odor properties between East Indian sandalwood oil and the Australian Sandalwood extract. Webb (2000) described the solvent extract procedure details, which is followed by co-distillation as utilized by Mt. Romance in the preparation of Australian Sandalwood extract.

4. Jatamansi oil. Jatamansi oil is extracted from *Nardostachys jatamansi*, which is found in the Eastern Himalayas, Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim. The once abundant herbal plants described by early botanists (: Gammie A. 1894) have been virtually stripped from the hillsides by herb gatherers in many places now, so the plant is becoming extremely scarce and the perennial only occurs in a few Himalayan valleys, typically at heights of between 3600-4800 m, or even at the higher elevations. Amatya and Sthapit (1994) expressed concern about over-exploitation of the species, calling for increased levels of cultivation. The authors also remarked that although export of the herb itself was not allowed, there is no restriction on exporting oleoresin and essential oil, and the export volumes of these products are often inaccurately reported, to avoid payment of government tax. The trading of *N. jatamansi* only reflects the high levels of commercial exploitation that still occurs with other Himalayan herbs like *Aconitum*

ferox, *Picrorhiza kurrooa* and *Swertia chirata*. Apart from *S. chirata*, these species are disappearing fast. The rhizome from *N. jatamansi* is used in Ayurvedic medicine for the treatment of hysteria and other nervous illnesses. The larger plant *N. grandiflora* which occurs in the same regions that *N. jatamansi* does, achieved CITES Appendix II listing in July 2000, together with *Picrorhiza kurrooa*. *P. kurrooa* is a tonic herb and possibly the most well-recognized Himalayan medicinal herb. It is interesting to note that *N. grandiflora* is said to be often co-gathered with *Valeriana wallichii* according to Traffic International (1999) and that published chemical compositions of essential oils from these species are similar.

5. Chaulmoogra oils. Chaulmoogra oils are extracted from *Hydnocarpus* species from some regions in India (especially the Western Ghats and Karnataka). Interestingly, chaulmoogra oils are fixed oils, often being solid in temperate European climates, but with a history of being traded by the essential oil industry. Their traditional indigenous medicinal use against leprosy has been largely superseded by modern pharmaceutical drugs. Biswas (1956) noted that species of chaulmoogra were ruthlessly and crudely collected and sold outside Nepal, in addition to other species such as *chirata* (*Swertia chirata*), and *kuth* (*Saussurea lappa*). Since then

exploitation has further the abundance of the species. Shankar and Majundar (1997) quoted the Foundation for Revitalization of Local Health Traditions Research Department, which published a first Red Data List of threatened South Indian medicinal plants, in which the status of *H. macrocarpa* was listed as vulnerable. CIMAP (1997) reported that *H. pentadra* is facing genetic erosion and that in general *Hydnocarpus* species are in decline due to habitat destruction.

6. Gentian. Many of the 300 or so *Gentiana* species remain very rare or threatened (IUCN 2002). *Gentiana* extracts have traditionally been used in medicines and flavorings, but species such as *G. tibetica* was formerly used in Tibetan medicinal systems may be so rare that substitutions may have to be made. Kletter and Kriechbaum (2001) note that *G. tibetica* is often confused with *G. crassicaulis* and *G. robusta*, and it may be that plant gatherers are simply looking in the wrong area for the species. The species may occur in Nepal but is confined to southeast Xizang, Bhutan, Sikkim at heights between 2100 to 4200 m. Kletter and Kriechbaum (2001) further recommended that gathering of all three species should never exceed 50% of the total local population of plants, and should only occur during two years in a row followed by one year without harvest.

G. lutea is listed in the Red

Book Data listings for Bosnia, Romania, Portugal, Bulgaria, Albania, Germany, Czech Republic, Ukraine and Poland. It is commonly used as a source material in the preparation of gentian absolute for the perfumery trade, and as a bittering agent in alcoholic beverages, but the more economically important use for the dried roots and rhizome of the plant is to produce bitters to stimulate the digestive system. Lange (1998) estimated the demand for dried roots as being 1500 tons per annum, mainly derived from gathering from the wild in France, Spain, Turkey, Bavaria, Albania and Romania. He also noted that wild harvesting of *G. lutea* in Spain proceeds in contravention of existing legislation.

7. Kenyan cedarwood oil. Known as the East Africa pencil cedar tree, *Juniperus procera* reaches up to 30 m and is found in parts of Ethiopia and central Kenya at 1000 to 3000 m. An oil traded as Kenyan cedarwood oil was formerly produced from distillation of the chipped wood, and was commercially available as a common perfumery raw material up to the mid-eighties. By 1986, *J. procera* was included in the FAO listing of endangered tree and shrub species and provenances (FAO 1986). Ciesla (2002) discussed reasons for the decline of the species, which include the effect of possible pathogens, drying out of forests and human factors such as heavy overgrazing. The

decline lead to the oil production cessation in Africa, and the oil has disappeared from the raw material inventories of perfumery companies. The tree has been introduced into parts of India (the Nilgiris), and waste wood from trees cut down for furniture making may be distilled on a very limited scale to produce oil for local use.

8. Agarwood. Agarwood (also known as aloeswood) is extracted from *Aquilaria* & *Gonystylus* spp., and *A. malaccensis* and other *Aquilaria* species grow in Malaysia and Indonesia and are becoming rare because of the great demand for infected sections of fragrant wood (agaru), which fetch a great price. *A. crassna* is listed as endangered by the Vietnamese government and *A. malaccensis* is protected under CITES. Agarwood trees are felled indiscriminately by roving teams of agaru hunters who search Southeast Asian territories for this very valuable material, in places in which the species are not known to occur. Exploitation from incense makers and other commercial users threaten the continued future sustainability of *A. agallocha* trees (which some workers regard as synonymous with *A. malaccensis*) from Cambodia, Vietnam and Thailand (Barden et al. 2003; and CITES Newsletter 2000). *A. malaccensis* is mentioned amongst 65 listed Indian medicinal and aromatic plants facing genetic erosion by CIMAP (1997), a list that also includes *Gentiana kurroo*,

Sausaurea costus, *Hedychium spicatum*, *Nardostachys grandiflora*, *Gaultheria procumbens* and *Jurinea dolomiaea*. Agarwood formation is maximal in trees older than 25 years old, peaking in trees older than 50 years, thus even though the Department of Forests in Arunachal Pradesh has developed large *Aquilaria* plantations, these measures may not affect the cutting and illegal exporting of this product. Attempts and trials for artificial resin inducement and biotechnological processes for agaru production are planned to be covered at a First International Agarwood Conference which will take place in Vietnam on November 2003. The objective of this conference is to lay the groundwork for collaborative efforts towards preventing *Aquilaria* trees becoming extinct in the wild.

Momberg et al. (2000) provide an insight into the social and ethical issues surrounding the bioprospecting "rush" for agaru in the Kayan Mentarang National Park in East Kalimantan, Indonesia. The authors report for example that the 'nineties boom in agaru collecting featured non-indigenous teams flying agaru out by aircraft. Eventually government restrictions stopped this activity, but only at the point when the agaru forest reserves were exhausted; inexperienced outside collectors felling every *Aquilaria* tree (instead of just infected trees) have added to a worsening situation.

9. Greater wormwood oil. This product is derived from *Artemisia gracilis*, a now rare European alpine plant growing at elevations of 2400-3500 m. The oil was formerly used as a flavoring ingredient in alcoholic beverages and to produce the alpine liqueur Genipy.

10. Anise scented myrtle oil. This oil is traditionally associated with Australia (North East part of New South Wales, specifically the Bellinger and Nambucca valleys). Anise scented myrtle oil is obtained from *Backhousia anisata*, a rare tree rare that grows up to 25 m, although plants are always smaller in cultivation. Briggs and Leigh (1995) list *B. anisata* as a rare or threatened plant, with a geographic range in Australia of less than 100 km. More than 1000 trees of the species exist in natural reserves and Briggs and Leigh (1995) consider the species' status as adequate inside the reserves. Annual production of leaf or branch or bark oil production is not known, although is believed to be minute. Some anecdotal reports state that leaf oils produced from the cultivated plants are inferior in odor profile to wild harvested leaves. The spicy leaves have been used in the Australian bush tucker industry.

11. Hinoki wood oil. Since 1982 the Japanese government has protected *Chamaecyparis obtusa* where the oil is extracted from, and has only allowed the use of trees that have died naturally, or which

have been recycled from the rebuilding of temples. Therefore the oil is produced from the steam distillation of the chipped wood and sawing wastes of the Hinoki tree legally obtained, and buyers should seek documented proof of legality if buying from a Japanese source. There may now also be some limited Chinese production of this oil also.

12. Havoza tree oil. The practice of bark distillation, which produces an oil that smells strongly of aniseed and contains 80-97% methyl chavicol as well as limonene, anethole, and linalol, is threatening the survival of *Ravensara anisata*, the Madagascan tree from which the oil is extracted. There are some signs that this practice is being discouraged and better forestry management is being put into practice (Medicinal Plant Conservation 1997).

13. Siam Wood oil. *Fokiena hodginsi*, first reported in 1908 and now becoming very rare, is used to produce this oil. The oil is rarely encountered commercially.

14. Mulanje cedarwood. Whyte (1892) reported that forest fires were threatening the mulanje cedarwood *Widdringtonia whyte*. However, this African species survived in a ten-mile area until it was replanted from Mulanje Mountains Forest Reserve in the 1960's to former Nyasaland, Tanganyika and Kenya. Now over-used as timber,

sawdust is collected from timberyards and distilled to obtain oil for local use.

15. Origanum oils. Several individual species of *Origanum* such as *O. barygyli* from Syria and *O. dictamnus* and *O. vetter* from Greece are rare or threatened. Several institutions have collected the genetic resources of the genus, which reside in a number of gene banks, and private collections across the world.

16. Himalayan cedarwood oil. *Cedrus deodara* grows on the Himalayan slopes of northern India, Afghanistan and Pakistan, at elevations between 1650 and 2400 m, and has extensively been used in India for building, furniture and railway sleepers. Felled trees are floated down the rivers in the Himalayas to the plains. Oil production is down from former levels of 20 tons, to approx 1 ton per year. The species is listed as threatened (Farjon et al. 1993), and according to Sahni (2000) the tree is the remaining habitat for the threatened and spectacular Western Tragopan (*Tragopan melanocephalus*) in parts of Kashmir, Himachal Pradesh and Pakistan. The oil is widely used in aromatherapy, but little used in Western perfumery where Virginian cedarwood oil Virginia from *Juniperus virginiana* L. is often preferred.

17. *Cedrus atlantica* commodities. The tree is found at an elevation of

1400-2500 m growing on several types of soil in 133,653 hectares of cedar forest in the Moroccan Middle Atlas, Rif Central and Grand Atlas Oriental and Middle Atlas Oriental mountains (Mardaga 1999). While cedarwood Atlas trees are well conserved in specific protected areas, the ecosystem is very fragile, and often the margins are subject to degradation by erosion, demineralization, dehydration, and desertification, occasionally resulting in areas of complete desolation, in spite of heroic attempts by the Moroccan authorities to maintain them. Lawrence (1985) reported that the production of cedarwood Atlas oil was 7 tons, but the availability in recent years has been more limited, probably now to around 1 ton per annum.

18. Thymus oil. Of the 350 distinguishable species of Thymus, the threatened species include *T. moroderi*, *T. baeticus* and *T. zygis* subsp. *gracilis* (Blanco and Breaux 1997; Lange 1998). Although licensed collection may put the brake on international trade on certain Thymus traded items, the use of Thymus species for essential oil distillation within Spain is not monitored, and so the true situation is not clearly known (Lange 1998).

19. Buchu oils. *Agathosma betulina* and *A. crenulata* leaves are steam-distilled to produce the oil. The plants have long been used in traditional South American ethnic medicine, but a major use for the

powerful smelling steam-distilled oil is in flavorings and perfumery to produce a fruity berry (especially blackberry) note. Its diminishing presence in the wild has been the subject of several recent articles. For instance Hoegler (2000) mentioned the poor gathering practices in the face of increased demand that has partially been responsible for the demise of the species, and mentioned the work of Agribusiness in Sustainable African plant Products (A-SNAPP) which has targeted the plant for sustainable development initiatives. African farmers demanded price rises of 30% for buchu oil, a move known as "holding the market to ransom" (Parfums Cosmétiques Actualités 2003).

20. Cinnamomum oils. At the time of writing, the Chinese authorities have seemingly introducing a ban on tree felling of certain species including Cinnamomum because of concerns related to climate change. Ho leaf & wood oils from species such as *C. camphora* L. var. *linaloolifera* and *C. camphora* Sieb var. *glavescens* Hayata, are subject to considerable price rises and supply problems. Zhu et al. (1994) had previously warned of potential problems of exhaustion of Cinnamomum species reserves in China, as no policy of tree replanting currently existed. The future sustainability of this commodity is unforeseeable at present. Another Cinnamomum species, *Cinnamomum tamala*, is listed by CIMAP 1997 as suffering from

over exploitation and habitat destruction in India, such that plant populations are considerably reduced so that it is "nearly threatened".

Just because some aromatic materials are no longer offered, it does not necessarily mean that they are threatened. Unavailable products could be divided into various groups: a) materials no longer available in former quantity due to lack of demand (e.g., *Backhousia citriodora* oil for many years, after the advent of cheap commercially available synthetic citral, and now enjoying modest comeback due to interest in natural perfumery); b) materials which have slipped from fashionable use, but can be obtained with difficulty (e.g., *reseda absolute* from *Reseda odorata*, *woodruff absolute* from *Galium odorata*); c) materials which go short because of huge demand (e.g., *vanilla oleoresin* from *Vanilla* spp.); d) materials which become temporarily short due to climatic or political difficulties (e.g., *geranium oil Chinese* from *Pelargonium graveolens* in 2002).

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Saul Alarcon-Adams for his direction and input to this article.

Literature Cited

Please see internet article for Bibliography

Celebrities Smell the Profits

NOVEMBER 27, 2004

I WAS LEAFING THROUGH A MAGAZINE last week when I came across an ad that stopped me in my tracks. It was for Donald Trump: The Fragrance.

What could that possibly smell like, I wondered? Arrogance and self-promotion? Bad hair and bankruptcy?

Then I realized that in any art of the deal, smell is actually secondary. Increasingly, cosmetics and clothes are marketed by making you feel kinship with the person doing the selling. Think Martha Stewart. Think Michael Jordan. The right star selling the right product can make all the difference. There's a reason Richard Simmons doesn't sell power tools and Ernest Borgnine isn't peddling panty shields.

Donald Trump isn't the only celebrity with a fragrance on the market (although he is one of the few males; actor Alan Cummings also has his own cologne). You can barely turn the page of a glossy magazine without encountering perfume ads for Britney Spears, Paris Hilton or Celine Dione.

Want to feel closer to Jennifer Lopez? Try her Glow perfume. Feeling a little bit Crazy in Love? Spray on some of Beyonce's True Star or Britney's Curious.

The companies behind these high-profile scents are quick to certify their star's involvement. They're asked to sniff aromas until the cartilage in their noses collapses, and given license to suggest a bit more lavender or cinnamon or babbling brook.

Let's face it: No diva worth her salt would put her name on something that can eat through bone.

Celebrity fragrances are nothing new, of course. The Internet is crowded with people trading rare bottles of Cher's Uninhibited (it lasted roughly two years in the mid-1980s), Michael Jackson's perfume in a special hologram package and Elvis' aftershave. Remember Elizabeth Taylor's White Diamonds? If not, you weren't conscious in the early '90s.

What's new is the amount of money to be made from these vanity vapors. Celine Dion's scents have sold roughly \$10 million this year, while J.Lo's Glow and Still are past the \$200 million mark. This may seem like small change given the American fragrance industry's \$3 billion in annual revenues, until you note a 3 percent decline in perfume sales in recent years. The right celebrity can cause beauty products to fly off shelves.

And the right TV show? Walmart is about to find out; it has developed a perfume called Enchantment tied to the All My Children soap opera. I suggested the slogan "A day's drama in a bot-

tle." They didn't return my call. everything you want in a body wash.

Studying the Donald Trump ad got me thinking that maybe I should name a fragrance after myself. I'm not a star and I can't buy and sell people. I like to think of myself as an "everyman" with a wee bit more girth and seasoning.

Then again, I don't have to be somebody to get my own cologne. A growing number of companies will sell you the secret to making your own fragrance or, for a little extra, actually develop one for you. There's a company in England that asks you to fill out an Internet questionnaire, send them \$70, and then builds a scent to suit you.

I was halfway through the survey when I realized peanut butter and patchouli sounds better on paper than in reality. And when they asked for my favorite aromas, I got stuck on macaroni and cheese. That's not a fragrance; it's a sign of mental illness.

Then, of course, there's the problem of a name. You can't just call it "Stuff I like to sniff" and expect people to be enamored. And the best names already have been taken (Eternity, Beyond Paradise, Hai Karate) or ring too true (Sweat Masker). No wonder they test market new products to death.

Maybe, as my friend Ander Murane suggests, I should just call it "Napalm in the Morning." It's

Store Makeup & Bacteria

NOVEMBER 28, 2004

EVEN IN THIS MERRILY METROSEXUAL ERA, there are fundamental differences between men and women.

I asked Irene Malbin, vice president of a 600-member trade group called the Cosmetics, Toiletry and Fragrance Association in Washington, DC, for comment

Take makeup - a product about which I guy-ishly admit I know absolutely nothing.

So imagine how surprised I was to learn that some women try on blush, foundation and other equally mysterious potions from open containers often available for sampling purposes at cosmetics counters.

And I was even more surprised by the results of a recently completed, double-blind study conducted by Rowan University professor Elizabeth Brooks, a physician, and senior Heather Ragozine.

Turns out that, depending on the day of the week, up to 100 percent of between 30 and 50 samples - taken from the open containers on the counters of various Philadelphia-area department stores and/or drug-stores - were contaminated with bacteria.

This despite the bright lights, white lab coats and ambience of pristine-ness that prevail among major cosmetics departments.

(The level of contamination varied from product to product. The "control" cultures, into which sterile swabs with no makeup samples were introduced at the same time, showed no evidence of bacterial contamination.)

Brooks and Ragozine point out that they swabbed, cultured, stained

and examined material from the open samples available to the public, not the sealed containers sold to customers. And they emphasize their findings do not indicate serious illness inevitably awaits those who try on rouge at the mall.

But they note their study does suggest basic housekeeping, hygiene and common sense are sometimes lacking - and are surely in order for buyer and seller alike.

"We saw women take lipstick right off the counter and put it on," says Brooks, 36, a podiatrist who has been an assistant professor of anatomy and physiology at Rowan for six years and lives in Medford.

"Some (salespeople) give you a sponge, but some use their fingers," adds Ragozine, a 21-year-old Marlton resident who plans to go to medical school.

As a condition of being allowed to conduct their research, Brooks and Ragozine agreed not to reveal the names of the retailers that gave them access to their stores.

They did their work over a two-year period at stores in South Jersey, Pennsylvania and Delaware. Products for the skin, eyes and lips were tested, representing 20 brands.

All of the samples taken on Sunday mornings (after the busy Saturday shopping day) were contaminated with bacteria; the percentage of those taken on Saturday, Friday and Wednesday mornings was smaller. Nevertheless, up to 66 percent of the latter samples showed evidence consistent with the presence of yucky little organisms such as *E. coli*.

Given that sales of cosmetics and related products total about \$30 billion annually in the United States, the study has been picked up by United Press International and is beginning to turn up on the Internet on places such as www.aphrodite-womenshealth.com.

I asked Irene Malbin, vice president of a 600-member trade group called the Cosmetics, Toiletry and Fragrance Association in Washington, D.C., for comment.

"We haven't seen the study," she says. "But we live in a world of bacteria. It's a fact of life."

The association is not a regulatory agency. Nor does it gather statistics; Malbin says she's unaware of any other studies, except for a 1989 report by the U.S. Food and

Drug Administration. I couldn't get anyone from the FDA to return my call Friday, but I did find an online reference to that 15-year-old study, which apparently found that "over 5 percent of samples collected (nationwide) were seriously contaminated with such things as molds, other fungi, and pathogenic organisms."

As for the Rowan study, Ragozine calls it "very educational." In the absence of providing customers with individually packaged samples, she says wiping samples with standard antibacterial wipes ought to help lessen contamination.

And Brooks has excellent advice for anyone wishing to test a sample from a common container: Forget putting it on your face. "Just put it on your wrist."

Shampoo & Its Safety

DECEMBER 5, 2004

NEW RESEARCH IS RAISING CONCERNS ABOUT THE SAFETY OF A PRESERVATIVE that is commonly found in shampoos and other commercially available cosmetics. But cosmetics industry officials say the additive has been proven safe over years of use.

Occupational Exposure to Additive Is Bigger Worry, Researcher Says

In laboratory studies, the bacteria-killing agent methylisothiazolinone (MIT) was shown to restrict the growth of immature rat nerve cells. Studies in live animals are needed to confirm the findings. But researchers say the early test tube evidence suggests that prolonged exposure to MIT, or exposure to the chemical at high concentrations, could damage the nervous system.

The research was presented Sunday at the annual meeting of the American Society for Cell Biology in Washington D.C.

Fetal Development a Concern

The biggest potential concern, says lead researcher Elias Aizenman, PhD, of the University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, is for the fetuses of pregnant women exposed to high doses of MIT on the job. The agent is widely used in industrial settings.

"If the data that I am seeing does translate into some sort of neurodevelopmental problem in people, then the risk to the developing fetus of a woman who is exposed to this agent in [its concentrated form] may be significant," Aizenman tells WebMD.

Another concern is that occupational exposure or routine use of commercial products that contain MIT could trigger nerve-damaging

diseases such as Parkinson's or Alzheimer's. Again, Aizenman is quick to point out that there is no direct evidence linking MIT to these disorders. But he adds that live animal studies are needed to clarify the risk.

"It is very difficult to find shampoos and conditioners that do not contain MIT, and it is in many other cosmetics, as well," he says. "I can't tell you that using shampoo is unsafe, but I can't tell you it is safe, either."

A statement issued Friday by the nation's largest cosmetics industry trade group called the University of Pittsburgh research "meaningless for safety evaluation purposes."

A Cosmetic, Toiletry, and Fragrance Association spokesperson pointed out that the level of MIT in shampoos and other commercial products is extremely low.

"The experiments conducted with (MIT) on extracted rat nerve cells in laboratory containers do not

remotely resemble the possible consumer exposure to this preservative," the CTFA statement says.

Aizenman says he became aware of MIT while researching the mechanisms associated with the death of brain cells. He found that the agent activated a novel pathway that promoted cell death in the laboratory setting, and showed in earlier work that adult rat brain cells died when exposed for short periods to MIT at high concentrations.

In their latest work, Aizenman and colleagues exposed immature, developing rat brain cells to very low concentrations of MIT roughly 1/100 of the dose used in the previous study. Low-level exposure for 18 hours was found to slow down cell growth. The higher the dose the brain cells were exposed to, the more effect there was.

Aizenman acknowledges that it is "a big leap" to suggest that MIT exposure in the womb could play a role in the rise of developmental disabilities in children. But he adds that the questions raised by his research need to be answered.

"I would caution that based on our data, there very well could be neurodevelopmental consequences from MIT," he notes. "Clearly, more study is needed, with both scientists and government regulators equally engaged."

Sources:

American Society for Cell Biology
44th Annual Meeting, Washington,
D.C., Dec. 4-8, 2004.

Elias Aizenman, PhD, professor of
neurobiology, University of
Pittsburgh School of Medicine.

News release, Cosmetic, Toiletry,
and Fragrance Association

Rich Stink with Wealth, Trump

DECEMBER 10, 2004

THIS HOLIDAY SEASON, FRAGRANCE COMPANIES ARE LITERALLY TRYING TO BOTTLE AND SELL THE AROMA OF MULTIMILLION DOLLAR BONUSES, private jets, and trophy babes. November saw the launch of both Donald Trump: The Fragrance and Wall Street, billed by its creator, Bond No. 9, as the "world's first financial fragrance."

But the notion that there is some correlation between wearing scents that reek of money and actually making money seems counterintuitive. My line of work and geographic location put me in contact with plenty of millionaires (and thanks to the underinvestment in the commuter rails and New York City subways, much closer contact than any of us would like). Not that I've sniffed too aggressively, but I've never noticed a distinct or recurring bouquet on any of them.

Nonetheless, for the sake of inquiry, I put the scents to a decidedly unscientific test in the marketplace of public nostrils.

Donald Trump: The Fragrance

Who is behind it? Aramis, an arm of savvy cosmetics giant Estée Lauder. We haven't seen it placed in the current season of *The Apprentice* because (shocker!) the series was filmed last summer.

The marketing pitch: Wear this "uncompromising scent," middle managers, and you can be like the Donald! "elegant, masculine, and devastatingly sexy." The Trumpesque bottle it's gilded and resembles a skyscraper captures "Mr. Trump's unparalleled confidence, success and character." It is available exclusively at Federated Department Stores outlets like Bloomingdale's and Macy's. The cost: \$60 for a 3.4-ounce bottle, or \$282 a pound.

What Donald Trump the person smells like: No idea. Given his fear

of germs, perhaps antibacterial soap?

What Donald Trump: The Fragrance is supposed to smell like: The first impression is fruits and vegetables. "Bright citrus notes are sparked with hints of refreshing mint. Cucumber notes, fluid and fresh, are complemented by crisp herbaceous accents of black basil." Next comes a "masculine blend of select green and aromatic notes" that includes extracts from "the sap of an exotic plant" and provides "warm woody undertones." And finally, "herbaceous [again!] and spicy notes drawn from different vetiver notes." (Vetiver is a wild grass found mostly in tropical locales.)

What the "Moneybox" apprentice (6-year-old daughter) says it smells like: women's perfume.

The effect: I open the vial, and the smell of bad debt and over-priced condos wafts through the air. I saunter down Fifth Avenue near Trump Tower, lips pursed, eyebrows fluffed up. Nobody really

gets out of my way. But there are signs that the essence of Trump is seeping through my pores. I pass Tiffany's flagship store and begin to think about how I can barter media placement for a piece of expensive jewelry. Later, as I stop at a bakery to buy a baguette, a middle-aged woman steps aside to make room. Could she be paying deference to the stench of power? Possibly. More likely she was just angling to get a better look at the sourdough loaves.

Wall Street

Who is behind it: Bond No. 9, which is marketing a portfolio of fragrances based on Manhattan neighborhoods: Wall Street, Riverside Drive (hints of lox from Zabar's?), and Nouveau Bowery. (I don't even want to go there.)

The marketing pitch: Metrosexual financial wannabes with cash to burn who are in sync with lower Manhattan's "very up-to-date androgynous frisson" (?) and prefer class to Trump's mass. An exclusive product, Wall Street is not "hooked up to any celebrity" and is available at Bond No. 9's stores and at tony Saks Fifth Avenue. The cost: \$190 for 3.4 ounces, or \$ 894 per pound. "This is the scent to start a bull market. Just be prepared for very friendly takeover bids." Bond No. 9 is giving a portion of the proceeds to lower Manhattan nonprofit Wall Street Rising.

What Wall Street the place really smells like: grilled hot dogs, exhaust from vehicles digging a trench on Broadway, cigarette smoke from the nicotine junkies huddled in doorways. And, in the summer, sweat from the traders who have to wear those jackets no matter how hot it is. Inside, it's not much better. If Wall Street trading floors smell like anything, it's stale food, flat soda, and testosterone with overtones of tasteless jokes and conflicts of interest.

What they say Wall Street the fragrance really smells like: something quite similar to Trump: The Fragrance, actually. Its brisk top notes are redolent of "citruses, fresh cucumber, and sea kale accord a reminder of New York harbor." The midnotes are drawn from the pistachio and bitter orange trees, and the base notes are "sexy musks, vetiver, and ambergris."

What the Moneybox apprentice says Wall Street smells like: carrots.

The effect: I apply the fragrance generously and feel self-conscious. Man enough? I meet with my agent, who says I look like I've lost weight. But isn't it part of his job to pump up the fragile egos of schlumpy writers? Ed. Later, I conduct an interview with an executive whose net worth likely runs in the eight figures. I notice that he is not wearing any fragrance, though his suit is plainly much nicer than

mine. The day brings no takeover bids, friendly or otherwise.

The ultimate conclusion: Of course, fragrances are meant to evoke images and fantasy. But it's clear that pricey scents aren't what Donald Trump and Wall Street titans plaster all over themselves to convey an aura of confidence, wealth, and frisson (androgynous or otherwise). Something tells me odorless brokerage statements and copies of the "Forbes 400" issue would be far more effective.

Skin & Botanicals

DECEMBER 17, 2004

BOTANICAL SKIN CARE PRODUCTS CREATED A NOT-SO-NATURAL REACTION for one Houston woman.

Loophole Allows Companies To Say Products Are Fragrance-Free

Botanical products may sound replenishing, but some dermatologists say a lot of natural products are not the best bet - especially people with sensitive and dry skin.

From avocado, grapeseed, vanilla and apricots, you can find a variety of natural ingredients in your soaps and shampoos. But, are these products good for your skin?

"I was looking for something that would make my hair behave better," Lisa Loya told Local 2.

Loya's choices were endless tea tree oil to ginger mint to shampoos with Hawafena extract.

However, Loya had a severe allergic reaction to botanicals that affected her hands, scalp and back.

"This is absolute misery. It's 24 hours a day, 7 days a week your skin absolutely feels like it's at war with itself," Loya said. "My skin would just split. Your body starts to swell because your just one giant allergic reaction."

Loya is not alone, according to Baylor College of Medicine dermatologist Dr. Ragani Katta.

"If you have sensitive skin or eczema, natural is something you may

actually want to stay away from," Katta said. "I see problems with shampoos, makeup, hand creams."

Katta specializes in skin allergies and said botanical products are big for business.

"You can actually say in the United States that you are a fragrance-free product but if you have botanicals that's considered a loophole," Katta said.

The dermatologist said botanicals are just that fragrances.

"This may smell really good but I don't know how soothing it's going to be," said Katta, who warns her patients to watch out for extracts. "If you look (pointing to ingredient label), the fifth ingredient is pea extract and then there's violet extract."

Katta said extracts could cause redness, itching and irritation in people with sensitive skin.

"If you read the ingredients on products, they're putting all kinds

of plant extracts in things," Loya said.

She now has to examine everything she puts on her skin because "the itching is so severe you can't stop itching."

Katta recommends people with sensitive skin use Aquaphor and Cetaphil. She also tells them to use mild soap, like Dove, when bathing and to apply a mild lotion or cream when the skin is still damp to trap in the moisture.

Finally, Katta suggests using fragrance- and dye-free laundry detergent.

Making Fragrances

DECEMBER 24, 2004

FOLLOW YOUR NOSE ON A FRAGRANT JOURNEY THROUGH THE SCIENCE, HISTORY AND ART OF MAKING PERFUMES. Experiment with countless fragrance combinations on your way to becoming a master perfumer. Learn how your nose and olfactory system work with your brain to sense and recognize smells.

How to Become a Perfumer for \$ 49.95

Play games with your sense of smell and taste. Read about the long history of perfumes and take a peek into the perfume industry today. Discover where natural and synthetic fragrances come from. Use vegetable shortening to extract the fragrant oils from rose petals. Find out what makes a perfume different from a cologne. Design your own perfumes and learn how perfumes are meticulously composed. Train your nose to recognize the components of complex scents. Make a scented potpourri and a sweet-smelling sachet with your homemade perfumes. Design the perfume that suits you perfectly, and surprise your friends with perfumes made specially for them. Perfume Science introduces young perfumers to the biology, chemistry and techniques behind fragrance design. This kit is a complete perfumer's laboratory including 8 high-quality perfume oils, decorative flacons (small bottles) for storing your perfume creations and important tools of the trade. The 48-page full-color manual is full of information about the biology of smelling, the chemistry of perfumes, the fine fragrance industry and the history of perfumes.

Topics and Experiments • Setting Up Your Perfume Laboratory • The Physiology of Smell • Smell Memory & Taste Test Games • The History of Perfumes • Extracting Fragrances from Plants • Where Do Fragrances Come From? • Perfume's Head, Heart & Base Notes • Training Your Nose • Learning to Work as a Perfumer • Composing Perfumes from Formulas • Designing Your Own Perfumes • Fun Facts

about Perfumes • Special Crafts for Your Perfumes • Advice for Safe Experimenting
Contents:

The kit includes these parts:
Experiment Manual • Four Basic Perfume Oils (20 ml each): Lemony, Woody, Flory, Musky • Four Creative Perfume Oils (10 ml each): Orienta, Mentha, Mella, Tropica • Finalio Perfume Finisher (50 ml) • 5 Cotton Pads • 2 Flacons with Caps • Atomizer • Cap for Atomizer • 2 Dropper Pipettes • Book of Smell Strips • 2 Measuring Cups with Lids • 2 Stirrers • Funnel • 5 Mini Flacons with Caps • Perfume Bottle Labels

Ages 30 and up.

Product box dimensions (inches): 14.5x11.5x3.25

Product Shipping Weight (pounds): 5

Great training tool saves casas lots of money.

Company Closes its Doors

DECEMBER 31, 2004

NEW DANA PERFUMES INC. CLOSED ITS MANUFACTURING PLANT THURSDAY AFTER 40 YEARS OF OPERATIONS at the Crestwood Industrial Park, leaving 200 people without jobs.

The perfume company, producer of classic scents such as Tabu, English Leather and Love's Baby Soft, announced last month that the plant would close at the end of the year.

The plant is owned by Dimeling, Schreiber & Park, a Philadelphia investment firm that bought the bankrupt company in 1999.

All inquiries were deferred to Peter Schreiber, a partner with the firm, who could not be reached for comment.

But, the closing of the plant doesn't mean the end of the familiar fragrances, said Al Cowger, executive vice president and general counsel of Dana Classic Fragrance. Dana Classic is a separate company that holds the trademark to the names and formulas of the fragrances and markets, distributes and sells the perfumes.

Cowger said a New Jersey company would take over the bottling operation and the distribution center would be moved to Florida, closer to corporate headquarters. He would not disclose the name of the bottler because the contract is not finalized.

Dana Classic's administrative office, which employs about 35 people, will move to another building in the Crestwood Industrial Park.

"There will be a transitioning of about 30-60 days but our products will not be changing at all," Cowger said.

He did not rule out hope that the manufacturing end of the business

could return to Luzerne County and expressed concern for the displaced workers.

"I find this very upsetting," Cowger said. "A lot of the people here, this was the only jobs they ever had in their working life. It's sad to see the jobs go. I still think there was a chance to save them. But, that activity was out of our hands."

In a three-part operating agreement, the two separate companies - New Dana Perfumes and Dana Classic Fragrances - worked side by side at the 99,000-square-foot, one-story structure to manufacture, bottle, market, sell and ship the products.

The Florida-based Dana Classic owns the Dana trademark and purchased the bottles, supplies and components used in the manufacture of the perfumes. Dana Classic paid New Dana to make the product, fill the bottles and store the inventory. Dana Classic handled all marketing, sales and shipment of the products.

The 200 positions eliminated by the plant's closing are New Dana employees, including about 130-140 workers who are represented by the Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical & Energy Workers International Union.

About 20 workers were kept on to clean up the plant, Union President Jack Keiling said.

New Dana officials promised to provide severance pay after all equipment is sold, according to Keiling.

"I just hope that (New) Dana sticks to their word," he said. "Some people have some accumulated vacation time.

"It was a sad day, there were a lot of tears," Keiling said.

Dana Classic is wholly owned by Isaac Cohen and was formed in January. Cohen is the former president and chief executive officer of New Dana.

Dana was founded in Spain in 1932, the same year that Tabu was introduced.

The company opened the Mountain Top plant in 1963. In June 1999, Renaissance Cosmetics Inc., Stamford, Conn., the parent company of Dana Perfumes Corp., filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection. A month later, Dana Perfumes was sold to Dimeling,

Schreiber & Park for \$29 million.

Renita Fennick, a Times Leader staff writer, may be reached at 829-7246.

Photo Not Shown:

An employee of New Dana Perfumes Inc. enters the Wright Township building on the plant's final day of operation. About 200 workers, including 140 factory employees, lost their jobs.

On the Net:

www.dsppartners.com &

www.danaclassics.com

Author s Notes:

File for bankruptcy that wipes out several hundred million in debt.

Layoff a hundred workers.

Open the company under a new name in Florida with non union workers.

Compensate the upper eschelon who figured out this scam a nice fat bonus.

Eventually ship everything to China to take advantage of a skilled cheap work force.

Corporate greed at its finest.

Brought to you by:

World Trade Organization & the Treaty of Free Commerce and the North American Free Trade Agreement

Do they actually teach how to perpetrate these types of frauds in school?

Possible Courses:

Running a Scam 101

Fraud 235

Espionage 105

Modern Swindles 103

Ponzi Capers 115

Tax Evasion 200

How to Lie Successfully to the SEC by Martha Stewart \$ 29.95.

Has a new gourmet cook book coming out titled: "How to make a gourmet meal on a hot plate". A perfect gift for those spending time with the government.

Flowers to Iraq

JANUARY 5, 2005

YES! THOUSANDS OF FLOWERS TO THE MEN OF THE YEAR! Thousands bouquets of roses, red roses, love roses to the Iraqi Resistance. To the heroes, who are writing shining pages of the history against the most horrifying blood thirsty Hydra in mythology or in documented history. And all is happening, again, in Mesopotamia. All is happening again in Iraq. God bless Iraq for the New Year. Many more flowers to Saddam Hussein, the living martyr who engineered, conceived, planned and put into practice the resistance against the US barbarian invaders in the land of Sinnaar, Sinn, the god full moon.

Sorry and sorry. I didn't want to spoil this occasion by talking about the US jobs. They are so far away from any thing noble. They are so alien to any thing refined, generous and grand. They are so strange from beauty. They slaughter singing birds, they stamp on flowers and their army of gangsters happily kills innocent Iraqis of the age of flowers.

Today, I wanted my most loved Iraqi Resisters to talk to you in a language of flowers. No other language can possibly be more appropriate on this occasion. You have been fighting with your faith filling your hearts the US monster in Mesopotamia, for the last twenty-four months or so. You will for this New Year, get a special present. You will have on your heads, above your black beautiful, Sumerian eyes, on your wheat clouded bodies millions of the river Tigris banks roses petals.

How can I start, how can I dare talk to you? You who abandoned the most precious and the dearest, your souls, your young lives, families and children to carry the cross of your love for Iraq, for the love of the Iraqi plains, Iraq's mountains, its date palm tree groves, its sacred soil.

Pardon me but I can't help it! Allow me to talk about the enemy you are fighting. You have been giving us good news after good news defeating the enemy of mankind. Here I promise you, even the gangsters will have more rapped gifts, not surprise ones I admit, it is a per-

manent wish, and I'll let you do the rest. We wish for the mercenaries US and co. hundred more IEDs and thousands more bullets and many more resounding tactical defeats for Tarzan Abizeid and more confusion, stuttering, and stammering for the pirates boss Bush the silly holy and the stupid lump.

Flowers, flowers, flowers. Rains of flowers. Showers of petals. Clouds of sent and perfume will surround you. Their fragrance will inhabit the martyrs. Their rain of petals will purify Iraq from the invaders filth.

Flower language is different from country to country. Here I will use the French flowers language. The French. Guess why? And let them stuff their bowls with more and more Abu Ghraib freedom fries. They will not be able to understand any flower language, be French, Iraqi or Palestinian! So it is a secret between two lovers, face to face, it is a whisper under a palm tree, on the plains, in the moonlight.

Twenty-four flowers, for the

twenty-four months we saw the Beast being humiliated in the mire of the Land-Of-The-Two-Rivers. This language will say it all and more to greeting you for a new and happy year.

For an affectionate and tender love here are many pansies. I am not a kind of flighty heart. My love is not a timid or a shy love I shall shout it on the minarets of Fallujah. I shall scream it on the Assyrian walls of Nineveh. I beg you to believe me. Here I am hugging in my arms bundles of blueberries. From the very beginning I was in love with you. Now let me declare my love to you all. I love you Iraq. Here are mountains of roses, red roses, and here are with my love, with my tears, with my naked hands, with my prayers, with an embarrassed sigh, with one handful of the soil of Iraq in one hand and in the other a spray of tulips from Nineveh, from Mosul. To tell you how much I love you and to express the joy of my love to you Iraqi resistant fighters please here are a shower of azaleas. For your perseverance I will offer you gardens of anemones! For the nights you don't sleep and the days you never rest, for your outstanding sacrifices, there are plantations of snapdragons. For the purity of your love for Iraq, I will spread on your proud foreheads millions of lilies. For your faith and your fervor, forest of orchids. For your sincerity, and for your loyalty, please accept, bunches of red peonies.

While your enemy is hated from the rising sun to the setting sun, the world over will continue to respect you and to love you Iraqis. So there will be no chamomile bouquets to declare the end of their love for you.

Billions of human beings all around the planet are watching you; they have put all their hope in your courage. They admire your generosity, they shout waving their hands holding a multitude of mauve lilacs screaming in rhyme and rhythm, and our hearts are with you. They kneel in respect for your raging ardor, for vowing your souls for your beloved Iraq and they shower you and spread on your feet perfumed carnations or French marigolds. These people are so proud of you that they are jealous, they would've like to have your might, your devotion, they would've liked to still carry your ideals and be able to give their lives for their principles as you do. I mean a friendly jealousy and they rain on you cyclamens. The whole planet sees nobody but you Iraqi resistant fighters and make you signs with millions of daisies and the other half planet respond singing we love you Iraq and say let's love each other from now on and they will let you have white lilacs fields spreading to the horizons.

For the Tigris and the Euphrates coquetry you loved so much and you still love, lilies of the valleys

will grow by the thousands.

For you the most dignified of all, the martyrs, a faithful souvenir and many bouquets of forget-me-nots. For your shed blood for the multitude of humanity, irises from tender hearts. Your martyrdom offered security and pride to Iraq and we cover your holy tombs, the shrines of your remains, with mimosas. The humanity, will give you rendezvous, with my overwhelming heart, soon very soon, God willing, in liberated Iraq, holding tight against my breath, covered with my tears, overcoming my fears, many fears, fields of gladiolas.

Yes, you can reproach all your Arab brothers who once said we didn't believe you, by offering them sweet peas. These Arabs who were devastated to see Iraq occupied and have doubted one second in your courage and determination, give them a handful of buttercups. As for those who love you immensely in their heart and hide their love because of tyrant regimes and eunuchs kinglets, they will send you soon tons of violets.

And for the living martyr Saddam Hussein twenty five million date palm trees.

Happy New Year Iraq! Happy New Year Iraq!

For 2005 the world says: US Imperialism we wish you a great defeat in Iraq.

Marketing & Ads

JANUARY 6, 2005

When I get a magazine, the first thing I do is turn it upside down and shake out all the subscription post cards.

your skin. Still, I tear each one open, trying to trick my mind into thinking each fragrance is different from the one before. They all smell the same pugh!

The second thing I do is tear open the cologne samples folded into advertisements and give them a sniff. The verdict always is the same. They smell exactly like the entrance to Marshall Field's, Yonkers or any other department store that welcomes you with counter after counter of fragrances.

Cologne samples in magazines always fill my nose with that very distinct smell, which then creeps throughout every page of the publication. It never smells the same as the cologne does from a bottle or, especially, after it is spritzed on your skin.

Still, I tear each one open, trying to trick my mind into thinking each fragrance is different from the one before. But after the first one, they all smell the same. (I've learned you're supposed to sniff coffee beans between fragrances, but I'm not the kind of person who keeps that type of thing around.)

I'm not sure where this marketing scheme originated, but it's brilliant. I know for sure I have fallen victim to buying one or more of those advertised fragrances based on that quick whiff.

They are the reason I have a new bottle of Tommy probably my sixth or seventh bottle of the men's fragrance from designer Tommy Hilfiger -- in my medicine cabinet. It doesn't mix that well with my natural scent, so I rarely use it. In my head, I thought I liked it based on my

earlier magazine sniffing. Now I'm stuck with an entire bottle of expensive cologne and, for some reason, a product loyalty that just won't wash out.

That so-called "free sample" smeared into the glue on the magazine insert really played a trick on my mind, even though I don't really enjoy its smell. My favorite cologne, in fact, is Classic from Banana Republic. A bottle of that particular fragrance costs less than half as much as Tommy, but it never has been advertised in the magazines I read.

For some reason, that must mean a lot to me. Last week, when I went to Banana Republic, I wouldn't even let myself buy a \$12 trial bottle of Classic. That loyalty has not been built into my life. I must not be alone, either.

At places like Bath and Body Works, there are samples of every product available to try. Just this week, one of the workers at the Birchwood Mall store caught me sneaking in the store just to squeeze

a "sample" of my favorite lotion. (Don't worry, I have my own bottle at home. It's definitely not my first bottle of that product, either.)

Smell is our strongest scense and, so it appears, the power of advertising kind of stinks, too. At least it does when it comes to breaking out of habit and buying cologne I actually like.

Foul Body Odours

JANUARY 9, 2005

SOMETHING SMELLS FUNNY. DO YOU SMELL IT? It's like burnt citrus blended with lavender over new acrylic socks worn during a 30-minute run on a treadmill at a gym near the banks of the lower Hudson. Please tell me you smell it. No? Try bringing this newspaper up to your nose and take a good whiff.

Maybe scratching this column will help. You know what? Never mind, it just occurred to me that newspapers have always lagged behind in the scratch-and-sniff technologies.

Nevertheless, what you would be smelling, if you were capable of smelling what I smell, is none other than Donald Trump. Donald Trump: The Fragrance, to be more precise. (Actually, I did smell Trump once in the early '90s right before someone tried to throw me off a balcony at one of his casinos. But that is a story for another day.)

The Donald launched his own brand of cologne in November with the sole purpose to make the entire world smell just like him. It's not as nutty as you might think. (The scent, I mean.) For \$60, you get 3.4 ounces of what I can only assume is one of his bodily fluids in a bottle that looks like Trump Tower. With subtlety at its core, passers-by will be certain to mistake you for one of the richest men in the world (or a bankrupt loser), a television star (or a reality show dink) and/or a middle-aged man with a paunch and golden comb-over.

Shockingly, when asked what attracted them to Trump, not one of his past and present amours like Marla Maples, Melania Knauss or the herd of other nameless models, mentioned his smell.

Clearly, the main question to be asked here is whether or not the EPA will need to be brought in to dispose of this stuff if it turns out to be as successful as Trump Shuttle.

Repeated phone calls to Trump headquarters went unanswered. But sources close to the billionaire/multi-millionaire/millionaire/broke guy confirm he has been behind closed doors 'producing' Donald Trump: The Fragrance for several months. Approximately once every 15 seconds, eavesdropping apprentices hear 'You're fired!' following by the spritz of an atomizer. At least they hope it's an atomizer.

If, shockingly, it doesn't sell, it will likely find its way to a landfill, eventually seeping into groundwater and affecting fish and cattle grazing nearby. If it does sell, we will all smell like a womanizing megalomaniac. (That one hit a little close to home.) Either way, it stinks. Thank God General Electric, which owns NBC which airs 'The Apprentice,' knows a thing or two about contamination and dredging.

Not surprisingly, Trump isn't the only odiferous offender making fragrant fouls. (Nice, huh?) Jennifer Lopez, Celine Dion, Jessica

Simpson, Beyonce, Britney Spears, Paris Hilton, Elizabeth Taylor and Kim Catrall all have their own scents for the masses. And that's just the ladies.

Antonio Banderas, Michael Jordan, Alan Cummings, Boston Rob from 'Survivor' and even the guys from Orange County Choppers have come to the conclusion that they have an odor the whole world could get behind. Even Sean Combs is releasing a fragrance so you can smell like 'P' (Diddy, that is).

All of this brings up an interesting point (about time, huh?): If you could smell like anyone, who would it be? Or, more importantly, should we even smell at all?

According to olfactory experts, smell is the strongest sense tied to memory. Meaning, when we smell something familiar, it can trigger vivid memories. For example, when I smell a certain perfume that my very first girlfriend wore, I have a tendency to fumble with bras for the next two weeks.

But I digress. My point is that aspiring to smell like Donald Trump or Paris Hilton should be recognized as the first step to admitting you have big personal problems. How about we all smell like Ivory Soap for a while? OK, Ivory Soap that has rubbed up against Jennifer Lopez.

Toxic Shampoos filled with Danger

JANUARY 23, 2005

RESearchers at the National Institutes of Health have found a correlation between an ingredient found in shampoos and nervous system damage. The experiments were conducted with the brain cells of rats and they show that contact with this ingredient called methylisothiazoline, or MIT, causes neurological damage.

Which products contain this chemical compound MIT? Head and Shoulders, Suave, Clairol and Pantene Hair Conditioner all contain this ingredient. Researchers are concerned that exposure to this chemical by pregnant women could put their fetus at risk for abnormal brain development. In other people, exposure could also be a factor in the development of Alzheimer's disease and other nervous system disorders.

The chemical causes these effects by preventing communication between neurons. Essentially, it slows the networking of neurons, and since the nervous system and brain function on a system of neural networks, the slowing of this network will suppress and impair the normal function of the brain and nervous system.

These findings were presented December 5th at the American Society for Cell Biology annual meeting.

I have frequently warned readers about the dangers of using brand-name personal care products. The vast majority of these products contain toxic chemical compounds like MIT that contribute to cancer, liver disorders and neurological diseases. In fact, this chemical, MIT, is just one of dozens of such chemicals that are found in personal care products.

Why are these dangerous personal care products allowed to remain on the market? Because the FDA, which is responsible for regulating these products, spends almost no time, money or effort actually investi-

gating the safety of such products. Instead, the FDA spends the vast majority of its time approving new prescription drugs rather than protecting the public against the dangers from such drugs or personal care products like shampoos, soaps, deodorants and fragrance products.

In fact, it may surprise you to learn that manufacturers can put practically any chemical they want into shampoos, even if it is a hazardous chemical listed in the RTECS database of toxicity and even if it is considered a toxic waste chemical by the EPA. The FDA allows all sorts of chemicals to be used in these products, including chemicals that are known carcinogens and that contribute to liver failure and nervous system disorders. How's that for protecting public health?

If you thought prescription drugs were dangerous, just take a look at the toxic chemicals found in personal care products used by virtually all Americans every single day. Americans bathe themselves in toxic chemicals and they do it by

buying and using products made by brand name companies that have premier shelf positioning at convenience stores, grocery stores and discount clubs.

One of the more curious personal care products on the market is Herbal Essences Shampoo by Clairol. Personally, I think this product is a joke because it's trying to exploit the word "herbal" to imply that the shampoo is healthy, even though it is primarily made with the same ingredients as other popular shampoos. The first three ingredients, for example, are: water, sodium laureth, and sodium lauryl sulfate. Big deal, huh? You can find the same three ingredients in 99-cent shampoo at Wal-Mart. Plus, the product contains all sorts of other ingredients that I personally would never allow to touch my skin (like methylchloroisothiazolinone, if you can believe there's actually a chemical with a name that long). Think the color of the shampoo is from the herbs? Think again. Three other ingredients in the shampoo are Yellow #5, Orange #4 and Violet #2.

In other words, this is a shampoo product purchased by naive consumers, in my opinion. People who really know herbs and natural products can only laugh at a product like this. Want a real shampoo? Buy Olive Oil Shampoo from Heritage Products, available at most natural health stores.

The bottom line to all of this, though, is that every week, it seems like we see a new announcement about some toxic chemical found in personal care products that is related to either cancer or neurological disorders. And yet week after week these products are being sold by retailers and consumed in large quantities by the American people who remain oblivious to the real damage these products are causing to their health.

Once again, the solution here is to protect yourself by learning the truth about these products and switching to products made with safe ingredients. There are safe shampoos, safe soaps, safe laundry detergents, dishwashing liquids and even deodorant products. You don't have to expose yourself to toxic chemicals to take care of personal hygiene, because whether you agree with it or not, these disease-causing chemicals are going to remain quite legal in the use of personal care products for many years to come. Why? You can bet that the manufacturers of these products will fight against any attempt to regulate or outlaw these toxic chemicals. That's because the chemicals are convenient for such manufacturers. It's much the same way in which food manufacturers use sodium nitrate in bacon and other packaged meats. It's all about their convenience rather than protecting your health.

So, here's the idiot test for

today: if I was standing on a street corner with a bottle of colored liquid, and I told you that liquid contained a toxic chemical that caused neurological disorders, Alzheimer's disease and birth defects, would you buy that product from me and scrub it into your scalp under warm water?

Of course not. But if you're buying these popular shampoo products, that's exactly what you're doing right now. Such is the power of brand marketing in America.

Multiple Chemical Sensitivity - All About

JANUARY 23, 2005

HOW IT STARTS FOR SOME PEOPLE WITH MULTIPLE CHEMICAL SENSITIVITIES (MCS), the problem begins after accidental exposure to a chemical, perhaps at work. For others, it takes exposure to low levels of chemicals over months or years before symptoms begin.

... People affected describe not being able to stand in line behind people wearing perfume without getting a severe headache, or walk through the laundry detergent ...

The result is sensitivity to many different types of chemicals even in small amounts, and in things that usually don't bother people, such as perfumes, laundry detergent, or cleaning products. This sensitivity isn't an allergy in the usual sense, but like an allergy it causes particular physical symptoms.

THE SYMPTOMS

When someone with MCS comes in contact with a substance to which he or she is sensitive, either by breathing it in, eating it, or touching it, he or she has a physical reaction to it. Each person affected has his or her own type of reaction, which can range from mild and uncomfortable to severe and life-threatening. The most common reactions are headache, fatigue, dizziness, nausea, memory problems, breathing problems, feeling like you have the flu, rashes, and hives. Usually the symptoms fade between exposures, but some people have the symptoms all the time.

THE DEBATE

What exactly causes MCS in other words, what the physical processes are that bring it on is not completely clear. Researchers are

studying how chemical exposure and sensitivity can affect brain chemistry and cause emotional and central nervous system disorders, such as brain inflammation (toxic encephalopathy). Other researchers are looking at the immune system and how reaction to one chemical "crosses over" into a reaction to many chemicals.

However, there is also debate in the medical community as to whether MCS exists at all. Some medical providers feel that the symptoms are the result of panic or anxiety disorders, and that having the symptoms is reinforced by physicians and others who believe it's real. Researchers and others point to the fact that when lab tests, blood tests, etc., are done on patients with MCS, nothing abnormal is found. They also argue that lawsuits won on behalf of employees suffering from MCS are based on bad science and don't prove MCS exists. Psychological counseling, they argue, is the only treatment necessary for MCS.

Yet try telling someone with

MCS that the symptoms he or she is experiencing only happen because he or she believes they will. People affected describe not being able to stand in line behind people wearing perfume without getting a severe headache, or walk through the laundry detergent aisle in the supermarket without having trouble breathing, or being unable to pump gas because they feel dizzy and nauseous.

THE BIG PICTURE

It took several years before "sick building syndrome," a situation in which people working or living in a building become ill from chemical exposure, was recognized and accepted as truly existing. So too with multiple chemical sensitivity. Like chronic fatigue syndrome and fibromyalgia (both of which can coexist with MCS), MCS is finally being recognized by the general public, the media and the U.S. government. Since 1991 MCS could be considered a disability under the Americans with Disabilities Act. Many states have established registries for chemical-sensitive individuals who, for example, will be notified of pesticide applications.

UNDERSTANDING MCS

The next step in understanding MCS would seem to be the establishment of a clearinghouse for scientific information on the disorder (either by a national government or

a private foundation). Techniques for alleviating MCS need to be established and the medical community informed of what proven therapeutic measures exist and where they are available. The public also needs to be made aware of the potential misuse of science by lawyers, salesmen, and others who wish to benefit financially from people suffering from MCS.

There is hope for people with MCS, and as time goes by science will understand even better how to deal with the disorder, and perhaps even eliminate it.

Information for this article was taken from:

Chemical Injury Resource Association of Minnesota. What is EI/MCS?

Gots, R. E. (1995). Multiple chemical sensitivities: Public policy. *Clinical Toxicology*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp 111-113.

Kurt, T. L. (1995). Multiple chemical sensitivities: A syndrome of pseudotoxicity manifest as exposure perceived symptoms. *Clinical Toxicology*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp 101-105.

Nelson, Eric. *The MCS Debate: A Medical Streetfight*. The Free Press, Feb/Mar 1994.

Celebrity Fragrances Stink

JANUARY 25, 2005

LET'S FACE IT. MOST CELEBRITIES STINK - LITERALLY. Celebrity fragrance lines are giving longtime leaders such as Escada, Versace, and Lancôme a run for their money. Some celebs create their own lines, while others join the advertising campaigns of established designers. These Hollywood stars realize that they are name brands, and with the right marketing, they can be infinitely successful. Who wouldn't want to stick their name on a product and collect revenue for doing absolutely nothing?

Currently, Britney Spears, Paris Hilton, Beyoncé, Jessica Simpson, J. Lo, Celine Dion, and Mary-Kate and Ashley Olsen are among the women who have ventured into the fragrance market. Additionally, Antonio Banderas, Donald Trump, and the cast of Orange County Choppers (a reality show on the Discovery Channel about a motorcycle shop) are taking a stab at success with their cologne lines. But why would we want to smell like our favorite celebs? Doesn't that seem a little stalker-like? Lucky for me, I had the opportunity to sample all of these predominantly sickening scents, thanks to Sephora and Marshall Field's.

As I made my way through the extremely bright and colorful fragrance counters, I began my sampling with Tommy Hilfiger's True Star, for which Beyoncé is the spokeswoman. It has a floral scent with "nuances of sweet pea, honeysuckle, and toasted wheat grains" (according to Tommy.com). I was quite impressed by the fresh smell, although when I went to spray a little on the complimentary scent card, I found myself covered from forehead to chin. So beware of the powerful spray (it could seriously suffocate you)!

Next, I ventured over to the display with J. Lo's fragrances namely Glow, Still, and Miami Glow. Glow smelled like glue, Still" smelled like rotten Chinese food, and her newest, Miami Glow, was so over-

poweringly coconut - and vanilla-scented that I was nauseous afterward. She must realize how horrendous her perfumes are, because she feels the need to add a cheap "bonus gift" with every purchase, consisting of either a heinous plastic ring or string bracelet (reeking of Taiwanese sweatshops). Not only are her fragrances way overpriced, but there's also a good possibility that you'll get a complimentary migraine.

After recovering from all of the J.Lo fragrances, I sampled Britney Spears' Curious. I have to point out that the bottle is very cute and old-fashioned, shaped like a blue diamond with a pump and tassel. The smell is "Louisiana magnolia, infused with vanilla-musk" (britneyspearsbeauty.com). This ended up being my favorite scent—although that's quite disturbing to me, considering the "musk" is made from deer genitals (yuck). Anyhow, I'd still say it was the best buy (at only \$39.50!) for its appealing and light quality.

Jessica Simpson's edible fra-

grance lines, Taste and Dessert, did smell delicious, but they made my tongue go numb. I'm also not sure about the slogan: "Wear it, then share it." Sure, she has flavors like "chocolate coconut" and "fresh-baked vanilla," but I don't think I'd want to eat "a subtle bouquet of crisp green." The sales clerk mentioned that mainly 12- and 13-year-olds purchase the three types of Desserts—Dreamy, Creamy, and Juicy (okay, you can't tell me that doesn't sound overtly sexual, especially for a target audience of 12).

Rounding off the women's scents, Paris Hilton's Paris Hilton (isn't the name fitting?) has the scent of "frozen apple with mimosa blossom" (cnn.money.com). It did have a citrus aroma, but it smelled manly and was hard to get off my hands after much scrubbing. Celine Dion's Notes and Mary-Kate and Ashley Olsen's One and Two were clean, soft, and refreshing at unbelievably affordable prices (\$20 and \$12.95, respectively).

As for the colognes, Antonio Banderas' Spirit and the fragrance from Orange County Choppers actually weren't that awful. I wasn't surprised that there was only one bottle left of Spirit. The scent was light and pleasing with a hint of lemon. I also couldn't believe how much I liked the subtle orange scent of the Orange County Choppers.

Donald Trump's cologne, on

the other hand, was enough to make me gag. If success smells like he does (peppery, woody, and sweet all at the same time), I'm reconsidering my desire for success. His fragrance is even worse than his hair. So, guys, stick to Spirit and the Choppers fragrance unless you want women fleeing from you like you've got a flesh-eating disease.

Next time you're wandering through your local department store, take my advice and avoid the celebrity fragrance counters. Even though you may like their music or their acting, just remind yourself that there's a reason why creating fragrance lines isn't their first profession. Besides, how embarrassing would it be to say the new perfume or cologne you're wearing is from Britney, J. Lo, Paris, or, especially, "the Donald?"

The Doom of Beauty

JANUARY 31, 2005

WE SLAP IT ALL OVER, PREENING AND POLISHING IN FRONT OF THE MIRROR BEFORE WALTZING OFF LEAVING A VAPOUR TRAIL OF PERFUME in our wake.

The bathroom cabinet groans under the weight of our assorted beauty and grooming products. What would we all do without our hair mousse and gels, shampoos and conditioners pledging shiny and manageable locks, skin softening and anti-ageing potions, shaving foams, deodorants and sweet-smelling soaps?

All are designed to make us look and feel better. Attractively packaged, backed by multi-million pound advertising campaigns and used at least once every day by millions. Surely they couldn't actually be doing us harm?

Hilery Dorrian is among a growing band of consumers who believes they might.

"Pick up just about any personal care product and you will probably find it contains parabens, which is a preservative with question marks over its safety," she argues. "Studies show it is a skin irritant, others suggest parabens may have more serious impacts on health.

"Sodium laurel sulphate is found in a lot of shampoos - it's a foaming agent - but is also used to degrease engines," she adds. "It's also terribly irritating to the skin, which is why it's only allowed to be used in products that you can wash off.

"Unfortunately, people don't know these things. I think that's wrong."

But, with Edinburgh-born Hilery's help, that may be about to

change. A practising homeopath, she sees thousands of patients a year, all seeking help for a range of complaints. But it is her other role, as founder of a thriving international company offering a natural alternative to what she calls "skincare junk food" that has placed her at the centre of the debate over the chemicals we slap on our skin.

Her company, Barefoot Botanicals, produces natural, plant-based recipes to create skin products that the beauty experts - from Carole Caplin to clothes gurus Trinny and Susannah - are drooling over. Its chemical-free toiletries are sold in health shops and select beauty counters, including Jenners, up and down the country and there is a San Francisco office to process US internet orders.

Yet it all happened by accident, when her young daughter Emily arrived home with lice in her hair.

"When I went to buy something to get rid of them, all I could find were pretty horrible products with things like organophosphate in

them," explains Hilery.

With fellow homeopath Jonathan Stallick, she set about creating a more natural alternative. Drawing on her training in Chinese medicine and homeopathy, she set a pot on the kitchen stove and began to create a nit-beating solution which exasperated parents were soon clamouring to buy.

"My kitchen was very small and there were boxes of ingredients everywhere, pots, people coming in to help measure things using a pipette we'd had to borrow from a chemist friend. It was crazy, but good."

News soon spread and before long they were developing further ranges of chemical-free, 100 per cent plant-based products.

Today, their business sells Rosa Fina skincare, an SOS range popular with eczema and psoriasis sufferers and the Solace range of lip salves and creams for weather-beaten skin.

Business is booming. Yet no-one, not even Hilery, could have predicted that the former pupil of Cranley School - which evolved into St Denis and Cranley in 1979 and, four years ago, became part of St Margaret's School - would end up at the helm of a natural cosmetics business. Her parents had very high hopes for her and her sister, Leona. But while Leona went on to

become a respected Edinburgh-based QC and is now a judge, Hilery dropped out of her Dundee University course in social science after discovering acupuncture.

"My parents were kind of exasperated with me," smiles Hilery, now 46. "But when I heard about acupuncture, it was like a lightbulb being switched on. I dropped out of my course and they weren't very happy."

She found a course in acupuncture at Lemington Spa and moved south from her parents' Edinburgh home.

"Alternative health was very new to a lot of people then," she explains. "Whenever I said I was studying acupuncture, people thought I was saying 'agriculture'."

Today, home is in Redhill, just outside London, and her knowledge of the kinds of chemicals used to make up many of our everyday products has grown as have her concerns. But she insists: "We're not here to trade on the 'fear factor'."

CONSIDERING that human skin absorbs 60 per cent of everything it comes into contact with, it's no surprise that the issue is now under the spotlight: particularly when a recent study into contamination by conservation organisation WWF revealed children as young as nine have higher concentrations

of certain dangerous chemicals than much older relatives.

Among those tested were the Batchelor family, from Trinity. Despite mum Jan, 47, attempting to follow a healthy lifestyle, her 15-year-old daughter Holly had higher levels of chemicals in her blood than her grandmother.

However, the Cosmetic and Toiletry Trade Association insists there is nothing to worry about. "Legislation requires any cosmetic product placed on the market to be safe under normal circumstances of use," says a spokesman. "A safety assessment must be carried out by the company responsible through a professionally qualified safety assessor for each cosmetic product marketed."

"Further control is exerted through a list of substances that are prohibited from cosmetics and another list of ingredients that are allowed only when complying with specific restrictions."

Some believe that doesn't go far enough. Mary Taylor, a campaigner for safer chemicals with environmental organisation Friends of the Earth, explains: "One of the problems with many products is that we don't necessarily know exactly what is in them. And a lot of chemicals have not been fully tested they haven't even gone through the basic safety tests."

"Take perfume. Many personal products contain perfume and many people are allergic to perfume. Yet labels often simply refer to perfume without listing the chemicals used to produce it.

"And it could be that up to 200 different chemicals are covered by the name 'perfume' or 'fragrance'.
"There's a lot of secrecy around and so much ignorance about what chemicals might do to us."

Air & Trouble

FEBRUARY 10, 2005

FIRST IT WAS SMOKING, NOW US CITIES ARE BANNING ARTIFICIAL FRAGRANCES IN PUBLIC PLACES. But, as Kate Hilpern discovers, our love of perfumes really could be making us sick

The effects of fragrance chemicals have become the focus of a new health scare, with campaigns against "passive smelling" becoming increasingly common....

Perfume is the new tobacco. The effects of fragrance chemicals have become the focus of a new health scare, with campaigns against "passive smelling" becoming increasingly common.

For some people, second-hand scent is more serious than second-hand smoke, says to Lindsay McManus of Allergy UK. The onset of symptoms are quicker and can be debilitating, she explains. "Whilst some people might get a mild headache from getting a whiff of perfume from someone walking down the street, others may be very ill for several days."

She reports that a growing number of helpline calls are from sufferers of "fragrance sensitivity", with symptoms including dizziness, fatigue, rashes, hives, watery eyes, sore throat and chest tightness. Fragrance sensitivity has even been blamed for learning disabilities and depression. "Normally the blood expels anything toxic," explains McManus. "With fragrance-sensitive people this may not happen and it can affect the nervous system."

Like many sufferers, Josh Devonshire, 32, believes his condition becomes worse with continued exposure. "I used to enjoy wearing after-shave in my early 20s," he says, "but now I can't even tolerate others around me wearing perfumes, colognes or soap. It's particularly bad in the winter, when the cold weather dries out my nasal membranes and

the chemicals seem to get into my system even quicker."

Department stores, theatres and even aeroplanes have become no-go areas, he explains. "At work, I've asked everyone to make my desk a scent-free zone, but that hasn't worked and, on a few occasions, I've had to go home because my chest feels so tight and I can't concentrate," he says. Medications aiming to deal with allergies don't work, he claims.

The US, as well as Canada, takes the problem far more seriously than Britain does. In Halifax, Nova Scotia, a policy of "no scents makes good sense" discourages the wearing of cosmetic fragrances in municipal offices, libraries, schools, hospitals, courts and public transport. Santa Cruz in California has banned fragrances from public meetings, whilst neighbouring Marin County boasts a growing number of restaurants with fragrance-free sections.

Throughout America, the fragrance-free office has become

prevalent. In the past three years, a growing number of fragrant-sensitive employees have claimed protection under the Americans with Disabilities Act.

It's not just your sexy new eau de toilette that you may find being blamed for causing fragrance sensitivity. Some experts say the condition can be brought on by other products with manufactured scents, ranging from laundry aids through to household cleaners. More than 5,000 different fragrances are in products that are used on a daily basis and they can enter the body through the nose, mouth or skin.

Last month, research found that mothers and their babies are being made ill by products including air fresheners, polish, deodorants and hair sprays. Dr Alex Farrow of Brunel University, who led a study of 10,000 women, found that frequent use appeared to increase the risk of diarrhoea, earache and other symptoms in infants, as well as headaches and even depression in mothers. "What the study doesn't tell us is why and how the fragrances of these products cause these symptoms," she says. "But what it does suggest is that there is an effect. Since more than 40 per cent of families use air fresheners regularly, this is a significant finding."

Betty Bridges, who runs the Fragranced Products Information Network, says the problem has

become worse than ever. "Historically, fragrance has been for luxury and special-occasion use," she explains. "But since the 1970s, it has become a part of daily life. The use of fragrance has increased tenfold since the 1950s."

A further reason for the increase in cases, she says, is indoor air quality. "Homes are much tighter when it comes to insulation and we use many more synthetic fragranced products than we used to."

She believes many people suffer the effects of fragrances but haven't yet made the link. Helen Lynn, the health co-ordinator at the Women's Environmental Network (WEN) agrees. "People see a bottle with nice pictures of flowers or ferns on the front," she says, "but what they are actually getting is a bottle of chemicals - some of which may be toxic."

Since WEN implemented its fragrance-free office-policy a year ago, she says, staff have reported an absence of headaches, streaming eyes and tightness of the chest, as well as having a clearer head.

But not everyone believes fragrance sensitivity is a problem. In fact, it is not accepted as a medical condition by the NHS and many allergists doubt its existence. Dr Adrian Morris, an allergist from the Surrey Allergy Clinic, explains: "You can generally only have a

'type one' allergic reaction to something which contains a protein component, such as house dust, peanuts or pollen. A fragrance chemical doesn't contain protein and can, therefore, only cause an irritant reaction."

Andrew Wardlaw, the president of the British Society for Allergy and Clinical Immunology, isn't quite so dismissive. "Fragrances can... cause irritation in someone who has an underlying allergy," he says. "Someone with asthma could have an attack triggered by a fragrance."

June Harris, a 47-year-old asthmatic, says the fumes of some products notably air fresheners and perfumes are enough to make her start wheezing and, in a handful of cases, have brought on an attack. "I wish we could follow in America's footsteps by taking this issue seriously," she says.

Many believe this will soon be the case. Anja Leetz of the European Environmental Bureau explains that much of the scepticism around fragrance sensitivity in UK medical circles is down to lack of public information about fragrance chemicals and their effects - something that is set to change with forthcoming European legislation.

Fragrance formulas are considered trade secrets, she explains. Manufacturers only have to print "fragrance" or "parfum" on the

label a term that can hide up to 200 different chemicals. "For 86 per cent of these chemicals, there isn't sufficient data," says Ms Leetz. "Without this, we can't do safety assessments and suggest how the chemical industry should be controlled. The new legislation will change this."

The chemical and fragrance industries claim their products are safe, she says, "but at the moment they don't provide proof. Now they will have to".

The problem is that it will be at least two years until the legislation comes in and a further 11 years before all the data is provided, Ms Leetz claims. "In the meantime, we advise people to limit exposure by opening a window instead of using an air freshener and think about what fragranced products are really necessary in their lives."

Betty Bridges seconds this advice. "Economics is a lot quicker than legislation," she says. "If people start demanding products that don't contain fragrances, this will be a far more effective and faster solution than waiting for new laws to come in."

But be wary of products that are labelled "fragrance-free" or "unscented", as these may still contain fragrance chemicals. They may contain a fragrance that is used to cover up the odour of ingredients. The safest bet is to go for the label

"without perfume".

Not to be Sniffed at:

These are some common allergy-causing fragrances used in perfumes and cosmetics. If its label says "parfum", a product could contain any of these

Cinnamic Alcohol - Hyacinth

Hyacinth fragrance found in natural fragrances such as hyacinth oil, cinnamon leaves and balsam of Peru.

Used in: perfumes, cosmetics, deodorants, laundry products, soap, toothpastes and mouthwashes, and also colas, vermouths and bitters.

Eugenol - Clove

Spicy clove odour founds in oils of clove and cinnamon leaf and also in roses, carnations, hyacinths and violets, with antiseptic and fungicidal properties.

Used in: perfumes, cosmetics, hair products, toothpastes and pharmaceutical creams.

Geraniol - Sweet Rose

Rose fragrance present in more than 250 essential oils, including rose oil and lavender oil.

Used in: the most widely used fragrance in perfumes and makeup.

Amyl CinnamicAlcohol - Floral

Synthetic essential oil with intense jasmine odour.

Used in: perfumes, soaps, cosmetics, toothpaste.

Hydroxycitronellal - Muguet

Synthetic fragrance of lily of the valley.

Used in: perfumes, aftershaves, soaps, cosmetics and eye creams.

Oakmoss absolute - Moss

Earthy, woody odour, an essential oil made from tree lichen.

Used in: very common, inexpensive ingredient in perfumes and aftershaves.

Toxicity of Scent

FEBRUARY 11, 2005

ENVIRONMENTAL ACTIVISTS ON MONDAY URGED THE GOVERNMENT TO FORMULATE REGULATIONS that will govern the sale of what they referred to as “toxic perfumes” in the market.

36 perfumes carry scent of death, says Greenpeace

Apart from bringing the issue to the Bureau of Food and Drugs, we would also start meeting perfume manufacturers to discuss a phase-out of hazardous chemicals. ...

This developed as Greenpeace released results of a study which confirmed that several perfumes being sold in the market, have chemicals that are hazardous to one’s health.

The report “Eau de Toxines,” describes how 36 well-known perfumes were tested for two potentially hazardous man-made chemical groups: phthalate esters and synthetic musks. The study was commissioned by Greenpeace and conducted by a Dutch group TNO Environment and Geosciences from the period 2003 to 2004.

“Current legislation fails to regulate our exposure to these chemicals, contained in cosmetics and a host of other products,” Francis de la Cruz, Greenpeace toxic campaigner, said.

Virtually all perfumes tested contained phthalates and synthetic musks. Very high levels of one phthalate (diethyl phthalate, DEP) were found in Calvin Klein’s Eternity for women (22.299 mg/kg, or 2.2 percent of total weight) and Jean Paul Gaultier’s Le Male (9.884 mg/kg, just under 1 percent of weight).

“Meanwhile, high total levels of synthetic nitro-and polycyclic musks were found in Cartier’s Le Baiser Du Dragon [45.048 mg/kg, or

4.5 percent by weight] and the Body Shop’s White Musk [94.069 mg/kg, or 9.4 percent of total weight]. By contrast, levels of nitromusks and polycyclic musks were lowest in Puma’s Puma Jamaica Man [0.1 mg/kg],” de la Cruz noted.

Studies have shown that DEP penetrates the skin and affects the body following each exposure.

“Apart from bringing the issue to the Bureau of Food and Drugs, we would also start meeting perfume manufacturers to discuss a phase-out of hazardous chemicals. Since the presence of these chemicals is rarely indicated on packaging, the public cannot choose to avoid them,” de la Cruz said.

Greenpeace said help is at hand with the proposed EU Registration, Evaluation and Authorization of Chemicals (Reach), which could require industry to phase-out hazardous chemicals and substitute them with safer alternatives.

“However, the proposal has suf-

ferred from intense lobbying by the chemicals industry and the US government. Greenpeace believes Reach will only provide true protection from chemical hazards when it puts substitution principle into effect. This means evaluating a chemical on its intrinsic hazards and replacing it with a safer alternative whenever possible,” de la Cruz explained.

He added that problems with current regulations highlight the difficulty, if not the impossibility, of quantifying human and environmental exposure to these chemicals, and consequently of determining “risk” and acceptable exposure. “With perfumes, for example, our exposure is often repeated through applications over days, months and years and may be further increased by exposure to other consumer products.” Other perfumes which have been cited to have toxic ingredients are Floral Dream by Adidas, Chance by Chanel, Poison by Dior, Envy Me by Gucci, Boss in Motion by Hugo Boss, Polo Blue by Ralph Lauren, True Star by Tommy Hilfiger, She by Armani, Sunset by Naomi Campbell and number 5 by Chanel.

Stars & Their Fragrances

FEBRUARY 18, 2005

IT SEEMS THAT ANYONE WHO'S ANYONE OR USED TO BE SOMEONE OR WANTS TO BE SOMEONE HAS BEEN LURED INTO THE PERFUME BIZ by the most powerful scent of all: money.

It's all the rage, you know. Smell it and sell it.

Of course, one of the first movie stars to tempt our olfactory nerves was Elizabeth Taylor back in the 1980s when she introduced us all to White Diamonds. You know, just before glamour and class flung themselves off the Statue of Liberty.

And there's a good reason why stars of Taylor's caliber don't sell their smells on television anymore. It's because things have gotten a bit more - how can I put this delicately? crass and soulless and, well, slutty.

Now we're stuck with Paris Hilton and her new scent called, duh, Paris Hilton. I mean, come on, couldn't they have come up with something more original like Tacky or Head on a Stick or Huh?

And let me tell you, this stuff is so sickly sweet and fruity, teenage girls are going to be succumbing to the fumes and dropping in the streets. I wouldn't be surprised if scientists find secondhand Paris Hilton fumes to be the leading cause of stupidity among our nation's youth.

Also sellin' how they're smellin' are J. Lo (Glow, Still and Miami Glow), Britney Spears (Curious), Celine Dion (self-titled eline Dion), Beyonce (True Star) and Mary-Kate and Ashley Olsen (also self-titled, and I'm guessing it smells like rehab) among others.

And just this week Sarah Jessica Parker ("Sex and the City") announced she'll be launching her own as-yet-unnamed fragrance. She's

quoted as saying it's good to have perfume handy for those days when you can't take a shower. What a special little piglet she is. Gag.

Even the guys are getting in on the deal. Antonio Banderas has a sexy scent out called Spirit, and Donald Trump has a new cologne out called Donald Trump, the Fragrance. I understand it smells like bankruptcy with just a hint of brimstone.

All these fragrances are flying off the shelf. Why? Because if we can't be rich and famous, we at least want to smell like the rich and famous. We want to reek of our idols and imagine we are somehow connected to them. We are a sick bunch of freaks.

And I think the next step should be fragrances named for the infamous and/or evil.

Think about it. If Robert Blake came out with a cologne right now called Innocent or, heck, even Guilty it would sell out in a day. Ditto for Michael Jackson. But his

would be called Tito Did It.

And how about O.J. Simpson or Charles Manson? You know I'm right. There's no way you're not gonna buy the sweat-laden Guilty or sharply sour Psycho Funk.

As for me, well, I don't wanna smell like someone else. I wanna smell like me. So I've decided to create my own fragrances. One for days, one for evenings and one for special occasions.

For days I'll combine rain water and Febreze with fresh baked cookies and Pledge. I'll call it Mornin' Sugah.

For evenings I'll mix up a brew of cinnamon, cloves, ham, bourbon and fresh peaches. I'll call it Yummy.

And for those special occasions, I think a simple combination of champagne and strawberries dipped in chocolate suffused with a hint of amaretto and brown sugar. This one I'll just call Wilde. Grrrrrr.

Flowers & Peace

FEBRUARY 28, 2005

BEAUTY QUEEN-TURNED-ACTIVIST NELIA SANCHO has found a new role as a bridge for two North Korean prizes that could help in the reinvention of the Baguio Flower Festival.

Sancho is introducing the flower breeds "Kim Jong Il" and "Kim Il Sung" to Baguio and Benguet flower producers. Jong Il is a North Korean breed of peony blossoms that can grow as large as a center table. It was named after the current North Korean president.

"It's actually called a Kim Jong-ilia," said Sancho.

She said Il Sung (or Kim Il-sungia) is a North Korean orchid that was cultured to its precise fragrance, in honor of North Korea's founder and Jong Il's father, Kim Il Sung.

Both floral breeds were introduced during North Korea's 50th founding anniversary in 1998, she said.

Sancho said the flowers could restore the bridge that United States President George W. Bush tried to cut when he declared North Korea part of an "axis of evil" three years ago following the September 11 terror attacks. The Philippines, a member of the US-led coalition of the willing, has standing ties with North Korea, Sancho said.

She said Philippine and North Korean ties have not gone anywhere beyond their initial vow of cooperation, and efforts are being made by the Philippine-Democratic People's Re-public of Korea Friendship Society to "stimulate real exchanges" between the two countries.

Sancho, founding president of the society, said North Korean flower experts are due to visit the Cordillera's cut flower centers in March to promote their country's floral treasures.

She said the city's flower festival was a logical destination to introduce Kim Jong-ilia and Kim Il-sungia, but North Koreans are also drawn to the city because of its huge migrant Korean population.

Many of the Baguio-based Koreans have relatives in North Korea and that is a bond they intend to renew, Sancho said.

The Korean population in the city comes from South Korea, according to the Bureau of Immigration. Many are students, who go seasonally to the city to learn English or to enroll in the city's universities.

But the flowers are not being marketed in the local Korean community, Sancho said.

"These blossoms are ripe for the Philippine market, and I think Benguet's flower industry should get a first crack at its marketing," she said.

Ill Effects to Health

FEBRUARY 28, 2005

REPRESENTATIVES HAS INITIATED A PROBE ON THEIR DISTRIBUTION and sale in the Philippines.

Camarines Sur Representative Luis R. Villafuerte said yesterday the House committees on health and on trade and industry were conducting an investigation of several popular perfume brands available locally.

Villafuerte said the Greenpeace International report, based on a study by TNO Netherlands, an organization for applied scientific research, identified phthalate esters and synthetic musk as being harmful to one's health as they could cause irreparable damage to the body.

He said that in the study, phthalate esters and artificial musk, which are the main ingredients in several popular perfumes, had been found to cause ill effects when they are inhaled and absorbed through the skin.

"The study showed that the chemical poisoning by such exposure to these substances is not acute but chronic, as their traces stay in our body systems and accumulate in the fatty tissues and bladders of living organisms," Villafuerte said.

He said it was also found that phthalate esters had a bad effect on the DNA, sperm and lungs and could also cause damage to the liver, kidneys and testicles.

As for artificial musk, Villafuerte said its accumulation in the body could cause liver damage and could attack living tissues, interfere with brain function and hormone communications.

He said the study further found that artificial musk detected in human fatty tissues and blood could weaken one's immune system.

Villafuerte said the House committees have summoned officials of the Bureau of Food and Drugs (BFAD) and the Bureau of Trade Regulations and Consumer Protection (BTRCP) to shed light on the Greenpeace report.

"The BFAD and BTRCP have already been directed to submit their respective evaluations and recommendations whether or not products containing such alleged toxic chemicals should be allowed to be sold and marketed in the Philippines," he said.

Villafuerte said that should the House inquiry validate the findings of the Greenpeace report, the perfume brands would be altogether banned from the local market.

Villafuerte said the House would probe perfume brands such as Floral Dream by Adidas, In Leather by Aigner, Aqua Naturale, Emporio Armani by Armani, White Musk, Eau de Parfum by The Body Shop and High Speed by Bogner.

He said the list includes BLV

Notte by Bulgari, CK One for Men, Eternity for Men and Eternity for Women by Calvin Klein, Le Baiser Du Dragon by Cartier, Chance No. 5 by Chanel, Poison and Pure Poison by Christian Dior;

Him by FCUK, Fiorucci Loves You, Envy Me by Gucci, Boss by Hugo Boss, My Manifesto by Isabella Rosellini, Classique and Le Male by Jean Paul Gaultier, Nightlife by Joop!, Iris Blue by Melvita, Waterlove by Mexx, Sunset by Naomi Campbell, XS Pour Homme by Paco Rabanne, and Jamaica Man and Jamaica Woman by Puma.

City Employee Sues

MARCH 1, 2005

Norwalk -

AN EMPLOYEE OF THE TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE WITH SEVERE ALLERGIES TO perfumes and other chemicals is suing the city, alleging officials have done little to cut her exposure to irritants in the workplace and that she is being harassed.

Linda Gorman, who joined the staff in October 1995, is seeking an unspecified amount of monetary damages and attorney's fees. Her lawyer, Eugene Axelrod of Employment Law Group LLC in Woodbridge, did not return a phone call yesterday.

According to her lawsuit, Gorman's difficulties began in March 2002, when Town Clerk Andrew Garfunkel hired temporary staffer Kathleen Bohannon, whose perfume made Gorman ill.

Garfunkel circulated a memo asking workers not to wear perfumes or colognes. He later amended the policy to state that scented materials, such as body lotions and detergents, could be used in moderation as long as they could not be detected within 5 feet of Gorman.

Bohannon no longer works for the city, but in October 2002, Lisa Olmstead, who wore perfume, joined the town clerk's office.

According to the lawsuit, Garfunkel and Personnel Director Sara LeTourneau have not accommodated Gorman's needs and she must take daily doses of prescription allergy medication and receive allergy shots.

The city's attorney called the suit "very puzzling and troubling." The suit alleges that Garfunkel refused to send a memo in November

2003, reminding employees of Gorman's sensitivity to fragrances. LeTourneau refused to discuss the matter with employees, Gorman alleges in the suit.

Gorman also claims that, in retaliation, Garfunkel gave her negative performance reviews despite her "above average" efforts; delayed providing her overtime pay; refused to compensate her sick time after she had an allergic reaction after painting was done in the office; and deliberately moved Olmstead's work station "directly outside her door . . . further irritating (Gorman's) allergies and exacerbating her symptoms."

Gorman alleges that when she approached LeTourneau about harassment, the personnel director advised her to "go to counseling (to) learn to get along with Garfunkel."

As part of her lawsuit, Gorman claims that her allergies constitute a disability and she has been discriminated against under the Americans With Disabilities Act.

Garfunkel would not comment; LeTourneau did not return a phone call.

City attorney Jeffry Spahr last night said Gorman's complaint is "very puzzling and troubling. Her claim is she has an allergic condition to scents, but she took a job working with the general public. That seems to be part and parcel of what her job is. To the extent she's claiming she can perform the essential function of her job, I'd disagree with that."

"Are we supposed to put up a sign saying 'all members of the general public can't wear cologne' in the town clerk's office?" Spahr asked.

Last March, Gorman filed a complaint with the Connecticut Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities.

A CHRO spokeswoman yesterday said the commission, after reviewing Gorman's complaint and the city's response, decided further investigation is needed.

But Gorman withdrew the complaint in November before the investigation started and CHRO could issue a finding, the spokeswoman said.

Personal Care Product Use & Its Dangers

MARCH 8, 2005

RESEARCHERS ARE NOW FINDING THAT THE ACTIVE INGREDIENT IN ANTIMICROBIAL SOAPS AND PERSONAL CARE PRODUCTS causes nerve damage. This really isn't surprising: I've been warning readers about this for years. The ingredient is called MIT (methylisothiazolinone), and it is found in antimicrobial soaps, hand soaps, dish soaps and a surprising number of personal care products. People buy these personal care products thinking they're protecting themselves from infectious microbes. They think it makes them immune to viruses and bacteria that might be found in their bathrooms or kitchens, and thus they believe in the mythology of using antimicrobial soaps to create a sterile environment in their own homes.

This mythology has been promoted by the manufacturers of these products who, through clever advertising, propagate the distortion that bacteria on the kitchen counter and in the bathroom are responsible for making people sick. But the reality is that we don't live in a sterile environment anyway: the only thing that prevents you from getting sick is a healthy immune system. We are exposed to bacteria and viruses literally hundreds of thousands of times each day. It is our immune system that takes care of these threats and keeps us safe, not antimicrobial soap.

But many consumers don't understand this. They think that they can make their homes spotless; that they can create a level-4 biohazard clean room in their kitchen by using this antimicrobial soap, and that this will somehow protect them from getting sick. But the reality is that they're giving themselves nervous system disorders while actually promoting the breeding of resistant strains of bacteria. And thanks to the nervous system damage caused by these antimicrobial ingredients, people are probably accelerating Alzheimer's disease by using these products. No doubt, they are impacting the learning ability of their children by poisoning their nervous systems, too.

It turns out that this active ingredient is chemically similar to Agent Orange. That's right, this was the Weapon of Mass Destruction used in Vietnam. And while it's not accurate to say that there's agent Orange in your antimicrobial soap, there is indeed a chemical compound that's similar in its function, purpose, and molecular structure. Is this something that you want to be coating your dishes with? How insane is that?

Yet it's precisely what millions of Americans are doing each and every day that they use these products. They are literally placing a thin film of nerve agent chemicals on their dishes, and then drinking and eating from those dishes. Here, Johnny, be sure to clean up your plate! We washed 'em in something special: nerve toxins!

There are a great number of dangerous poisons in the average American home. The typical pantry is loaded with toxic chemicals. This is something I've been warning about for years, but most people just laugh it off and say "If these

things were dangerous, they wouldn't be legal!" Yet they remain perfectly legal and quite dangerous at the same time.

For example, most people still use dryer sheets in their dryer. These sheets really serve no function other than to spread perfume all over your clothing. They're perfume sheets. And these perfumes are not essential oils harvested from flowers out in a wild field somewhere, they are synthetic chemicals, manufactured in a chemical plant, and many are highly carcinogenic. So after washing their clothes to get out all the dirt, people are then coating their clothes with a product that deposits a thin film of toxic chemicals onto their clothes. In other words, the clothes were cleaner before they went through the washer and dryer. And now that they come out of the dryer, they are dangerous to your health, because now they have been soaked in a toxic chemical cocktail. And people put these clothes on every single day, then walk around and produce sweat which moistens the clothes, and that accelerates the diffusion of such chemicals into their bloodstream through their skin. They do this and then they wonder why they are diseased. They think their laundry is clean because it smells like perfume.

The average American household is a toxic chemical dump. People have antimicrobial soaps, dryer sheets with toxic chemicals,

and then there are people using all sorts of personal perfumes and fragrance products that are also loaded with cancer-causing chemicals. You've got people putting deodorant in their armpits, and that deodorant contains aluminum which promotes dementia and Alzheimer's disease. And if that's not enough toxicity, you can buy air fresheners that will release a mist of toxic chemicals into the very air that you breathe so that you can inhale carcinogenic chemicals directly into your lungs. Beyond all that, we have the shampoos which are also loaded with all sorts of toxic chemicals, and we have the cleaning products that contain solvents which directly promote cancer as well as birth defects. And this isn't even to mention the food supply yet, because the food supply in the average American household contains yet more toxic chemicals. But of course, that's for another article altogether.

So what do you do about all of this? Some people say to me "Mike, you sure are paranoid about all these products." Not really, only the ones that cause cancer and other chronic diseases. I'm fine with all the other products. The thing is, you can't find those healthy products at your regular convenience store or grocery store. You have to go to a health food store or a natural grocer, and you have to know the sources for these products. You have to be smart enough to read ingredient labels and figure out

what's in these products. And then you have to educate yourself by reading articles like this so that you know what belongs in your body and what doesn't. It's not that difficult to understand; it isn't rocket science to figure out that the human body is not a toxic waste dump (regardless of what the consumer products companies try to convince you to believe).

The vast majority of these chemicals I'm talking about are considered environmental hazards by the EPA. And yet it's perfectly legal for manufacturers to put them in their products and indirectly allow consumers to put them into their bodies. You could be arrested if you dumped these same chemicals into a stream -- that would be a violation of federal law. And yet, you put them into your body every single day, and that's not only legal, it's actually encouraged by media coverage, advertisements, department stores, and retailers.

It is perfectly possible, by the way, to live a life free of these toxic products. All you have to do is stop buying the toxic products, throw them out, and start buying products that actually protect your health. You could start with your laundry detergent. Go to the health food store, or natural grocer, and get yourself some laundry detergent that isn't made with all these fragrance chemicals (a good brand is Seventh Generation).

Switch out all your soap: get rid

of all that antimicrobial soap and switch to a product like Dr. Bronner's soap, which is only scented with natural oils like peppermint and almond oil. It's a wonderful soap, and I strongly recommend it. Throw out all those ridiculous brand name shampoos that are loaded with garbage ingredients that actually promote dandruff and hair loss because of all the toxic chemicals they contain. A lot of these products actually cause the very problems they claim to be solving. Throw those out! Go with olive oil shampoo from a company called Heritage Products.

And throw out all those perfumes and colognes, please, people, you are polluting the air for everyone else who actually has olfactory senses remaining. Maybe you can't smell yourself because your nose has been dulled from years and years of use of these products, but I tell you what - everybody else can smell you! And we're tired of it. Take those products, throw them away and try to live a day without smelling like an artificial fragrance factory, for God's sake.

And while you're at it, throw out the antimicrobial soap. Er, wait a minute, that might be an EPA violation. Better call a chemical waste processing facility and see if they can take it off your hands in an environmentally responsible way. Just don't be foolish enough to coat your skin with it.

Does Musk in Fragrance Weaken the Body?

MARCH 16, 2005

SYNTHETIC MUSKS THAT ARE WIDELY USED AS FRAGRANCES in products such as soaps, cosmetics and detergents may reduce the body's ability to defend against toxic compounds, says a study in the January issue of *Environmental Health Perspectives*.

About 8,000 metric tons of synthetic musks are produced worldwide each year.

In laboratory research using mussel gill tissue, researchers at Stanford University's Hopkins Marine Station found that exposure to synthetic musks inhibited the tissue's natural defenses against toxic compounds from California mussels. This effect persisted long after the end of the tissue's exposure to the synthetic musks.

The synthetic musk levels used in this study were several times higher than those found in the environment, the study authors noted. However, these musks concentrate in fats, including breast milk, and remain in human tissue long after exposure. This means that long-term exposure to these synthetic musks could result in tissue concentrations high enough to impair natural cellular defenses in humans, the authors suggested.

"While other studies have shown that humans are constantly exposed to musk compounds, routine toxicology screens have always shown these compounds to be nontoxic. This study's suggestion that they could harm the body's ability to fight other toxicants certainly merits further examination," Dr. Jim Burkhart, science editor for *Environmental Health Perspectives*, said in a prepared statement.

The fragrance industry, in a prepared statement, disputed the findings.

"Fragrances and fragrance ingredients are safe. The ingredients used to make fragrances have been extensively researched, and fragrances have a long history of safe use dating back hundreds of years," Glenn Roberts, executive director of the Fragrance Materials Association, said.

"Nitromusks and polycyclic musks (PCMs) are among the most thoroughly researched and tested fragrance ingredients. Their safety for human health has been extensively tested and affirmed by numerous regulatory agencies and academic scientists around the world. The results in this paper do not impact the safe use of nitromusks or PCMs, nor alter their environmental risk assessment," Roberts added.

MORE INFORMATION:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency outlines exposure pathways of hazardous substances.

Beauty & Phthalates

MARCH 17, 2005

Phthalates -

THE CHEMICALS USED IN SOME COSMETICS, may keep your nail polish hard and shiny and your tresses thick and glossy, but in animal tests they cause birth defects, disrupt hormone systems and lead to reproductive problems.

Those are just a few of the reasons the European Union recently banned them. Now, despite a huge outcry from the \$35 billion cosmetics industry, some California lawmakers are trying to ban phthalates in the U.S.

California Assemblywoman Judy Chu has introduced a bill that would ban the same two types of phthalates as the EU did. In part because the FDA does not conduct pre-market health testing of cosmetics ingredients (nor require cosmetics makers to do so), Chu was moved to present a similar bill last year that would have banned phthalates and other chemicals blacklisted by entities like the International Agency for Research on Cancer, the European Union and the Environmental Protection Agency.

Those efforts were defeated. But if passed this session, Chu's Phthalates Ban Bill (AB 908), would be the first ever phthalate ban in the United States.

"After three decades of extensive studies [on] carcinogens and reproductive toxins, the EU banned two phthalates and those are the two that I am proposing to ban," Chu said in a recent telephone interview. "It is outrageous that American women aren't given the same protections that European women are. How can a whole continent of women be protected yet Americans ignore this?"

Chu says she would also like to make companies list any phthalates on product labels but has set aside that politically more difficult task (the industry argues that rejigging its labeling process presents huge economic burdens and could infringe on trade secrets).

During last year's legislative session, Chu's original bill (AB 2012), would have prohibited phthalates and forced cosmetics manufacturers to disclose to state officials any hazardous chemicals in their products. That bill failed to pass the Assembly Health Committee after intense industry opposition.

"They probably spent millions lobbying against it," says Chu. "They flew people in from New York and spent days and days lobbying members." Supporters of the bill, ranging from the United Food and Commercial Workers to the Breast Cancer Fund were no match.

This time around, the cosmetics industry plans to mount the same kind of campaign.

"We intend to vigorously oppose any similar legislation this year," says Irene Malbin, a spokeswoman for the Cosmetics, Toiletry and Fragrance Association, a trade organization in Washington representing 600 companies such as Revlon and Mary Kay.

The bills come amid growing public uneasiness over cosmetics ingredients, especially after the EU ban, enacted in 2003 and implemented in September 2004, prohibited the use of chemicals, including phthalates, known or suspected of being toxins, mutagens and reproductive toxins.

Activists say the ban, the bills and the issue of phthalates all tell a tale of regulatory lapses, flawed scientific argument, and negligence from a powerful industry that, oddly enough, is the nation's primary arbiter over the safety of cosmetics ingredients.

Jeanne Rizzo, director of the Breast Cancer Fund and director of the Campaign for Safe Cosmetics, hopes the European ban will help give cosmetic safety -- long buried in the environmentalist's in-box -- its overdue day.

"Cosmetics-makers who sell their product in Europe will have to reformulate their products and we are arguing that they use those reformulations here," Rizzo said in a telephone interview from her home in California. By forcing

companies to find safer chemical formulations, and by boosting consumer awareness, optimists say the ban could shift corporate behavior in American markets and stoke political will to regulate.

That could well be true, says Chu. "Last year it was difficult to get attention on this issue because nobody had heard of phthalates," Chu said, adding that Europe's momentum has helped raise awareness among lawmakers.

Already, the EU ban has pushed some companies to change their ways. Responding to the ban and activist pressure, L'Oreal and Revlon said in letters to the Campaign for Safe Cosmetics that they are in conformity with the new law. In a December letter, a L'Oreal senior vice president wrote that the company's products are in compliance with the EU cosmetics directive "no matter where they are sold around the world." And a Revlon spokesperson penned a letter in December stating that "all products sold by Revlon are currently in full compliance" with EU directives.

The story of phthalates is one of an industry on the loose, thanks to failed environmental and health legislation.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, different phthalates have different abilities to produce in animal studies effects such as testicular injury,

liver injury and liver cancer, among other things. But the agency says human impacts "have not been well-studied" even though a 2002 CDC study reported that every one of 289 persons tested for a study on the plasticizer dibutyl phthalate (DBP) had the compound in their bodies.

Despite this, the FDA, by law, can do little. In the agency's own words, "a cosmetic manufacturer may use almost any raw material as a cosmetic ingredient and market the product without an approval from FDA."

The Environmental Working Group, a frequently cited watchdog organization, sums up the issue:

Phthalates are recognized as toxic substances under environmental law, but companies are free to use unlimited amounts in cosmetics. An environmental release of just 10 pounds of DBP must be reported to environmental authorities under the Superfund law. The cosmetics industry, in contrast, puts hundreds of thousands of pounds of DBP into nail polish each year, with no requirements for safety testing or reporting to anyone.

Until states or the federal government exert more regulation, the principal arbiter of cosmetic safety will continue to be the industry itself, in the form of a panel of scientists funded by CTFA, the industry trade group. The Cosmetics

Industry Review panel, or CIR, is staffed by scientists and two non-voting members, one from FDA and one from the Consumer Federation of America. The panel is paid by CTFA to pass safety verdicts on chemicals used by its corporate members.

In 2002, for the second time, the CIR ruled that diethyl (DEP), dimethyl (DMP), and dibutyl (DBP) phthalates were safe. And the level for human risk was found to be 36,000 times lower than the amount that caused no effect level in animals, says Dr. Gerald McEwen, CTFA's vice president of science.

Dr. McEwen, contacted in his office in Washington, stressed that CIR adheres to the same conflict-of-interest standards as the FDA and is staffed by only top scientists who produce peer-reviewed reports. Recent European Union regulations, he claimed, are political in nature, tacked together under public pressure without solid scientific proof. The industry's safety procedures are healthy, he says. He also said the panel has reviewed some 1,200 ingredients used in cosmetics and determined that nine were unsafe for use and taken off the market.

The National Environmental Trust, another watchdog group, is less sanguine. "Because the FDA does no pre-market health testing of chemical ingredients in cosmetics,

for industry to claim considerable safe use over many years is to wholly neglect the fact that we have no publicly verifiable way of knowing such a claim is true," says Nick Guroff, the group's California organizer.

His sentiments are echoed in a report by the Environmental Working Group. After analyzing CIR documents, the group reported that the panel hasn't determined the amounts of DBP that are absorbed in people's bodies from cosmetics. Nor has it determined the full range of products in which DBP is an ingredient.

CTFA's McEwen says cosmetic safety is proven by the rarity of hospital admissions.

"One of the indices of safety is a surveillance of emergency rooms called the Electronic Injury Surveillance," he says. "If you look at emergency room admissions, you'll find that cosmetics are less hazardous than, say, pillows and mattresses."

Activists chaff at such arguments. That people don't stagger into emergency rooms with acute cosmetics poisoning has nothing to do with it. The debate is about the long-term effects of a low-dosage soup of chemicals and, more broadly, lack of control over the industry. "There is not the kind of precautionary review to determine long-term effect of low-doses from mul-

multiple exposures," says Rizzo. "We don't have exposures to one lipstick or deodorant. Every day we face multiple exposure to these things and there is not regulation that looks at that.

"Ask yourself, if these chemicals aren't dangerous, why do salon workers wear masks?"

Kelly Hearn is a correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor and a former science and technology writer for UPI.

Another Celebrity Scent

MARCH 18, 2005

Well, perhaps the glitterati aren't wrinkling their collective nose every time we pass by. But the stars are hoping we'll use our noses to take a whiff of what they're offering.

Do we really smell that bad?

America's celebrities seem to think so.

Seems like you're no one in Hollywood circles unless you're brandishing your own perfume bottle. Britney, Paris and Jessica. J.Lo, Celine, Antonio Banderas and The Donald. And, coming soon to a perfume counter near you: fragrances by Mary-Kate and Ashley Olsen, Cindy Crawford and P. Diddy, not to mention tennis stars Andy Roddick and Maria Sharapova.

Whew, that's a lot of spritzing. Or should that be p-ewwww? With all those fragrances floating around, it's a wonder we can breathe.

But apparently we are inhaling, and for a pretty sum prices average \$39 to \$60 a bottle. Although the marketing-information group NPD Beauty reports that fragrance sales have remained flat with purchases totaling a billion dollars for first nine months of 2004 - celebs are pumping up an otherwise stale industry by adding a splash of glamour and name recognition, according to some analysts.

"Celebrities are bringing people back to the fragrance arena," says Rochelle Bloom, president of the Manhattan-based Fragrance Foundation, a nonprofit trade organization.

It's not just about stars hawking their own fragrances, either; these days, everyone from Nicole Kidman (Chanel No. 5) and Catherine Zeta-Jones (Elizabeth Arden) to Beyoncé (Tommy Hilfiger) and Matthew

McConaughey (Stetson) is shilling other people's scents.

In particular, Bloom says, Kidman's glitzy but sophisticated partnering with Chanel No. 5 was "brilliant."

The recent ad campaign, which included a commercial helmed by Kidman's "Moulin Rouge" director Baz Luhrman, was "romantic and mysterious."

"It made people say, 'I like Nicole Kidman. I think I'll try that fragrance again,'" Bloom says.

Celebrity fragrances aren't new, of course. Elizabeth Taylor helped launch White Diamonds in 1991, but Bloom says it wasn't until 2002, when Jennifer Lopez introduced Glow, that the trend really took off. The fragrance raked in a reported \$80 million and, in 2003, Lopez gave a repeat performance with Still Glow. In 2004, she launched yet another scent, Miami Glow.

If you're picturing Lopez and stars like her hard at work in the

lab, decked out in designer smocks while they test out perfume top notes, think again.

But some celebrities do get involved when it comes to deciding how to develop and sell a signature scent.

Britney Spears took a hands-on approach to the September launch of her Curious perfume, says Tamara Steele, vice president of global marketing for Elizabeth Arden.

From deciding on her favorite scents (magnolia and vanilla musk) and design (blue-and-pink packaging and a vintage-style atomizer) to appearing in TV and print ads and sending text messages to fans, Spears was "totally involved" every step of the way, Steele says.

The result, she says, is a fragrance, package and ad that are "very sophisticated, beautiful and young - very Britney."

Oh, OK.

The appeal of working with Spears was clear and simple, adds Steele, from her office in Manhattan.

"She's a trendsetter and people are interested in all aspects of her life. She's a celebrity, an entertainer (and) a fashion icon.

"Britney just seemed like a per-

fect fit for us."

Likewise, Aramis viewed going into partnership with Donald Trump as a way to capitalize on the business icon's celebrity and reputation.

"Donald Trump is a businessman, a TV personality he's respected and admired and he clearly has an audience in America," explains Robin Mason, vice president of global marketing for Aramis, a division of Estée Lauder.

Although Trump wasn't as involved in the direct development of his men's fragrance "He trusted our expertise and put a lot of the responsibility in our hands" Mason says the "Apprentice" star nonetheless brought his "Midas touch" to the fragrance that launched in November.

"He was very committed to talking about how it should smell and how the packaging should look," Mason says. "He wanted something that was modern, sensual and sexy - something that today's man would wear."

But Dawn Scott isn't too impressed with Trump's latest venture.

"It's OK, but I thought it would you know because he always has a lot of women be more appealing to women," says Scott, who sniffed a quick whiff of the cologne on a

recent stroll past a Macy's counter in Arden Fair mall.

"It just didn't really do anything for me it didn't make me want to smell it again," Scott says.

And if anyone knows about fancy smells, it's Scott, 56, of south Sacramento. With more than 30 fragrances in her collection, Scott says she makes a point of keeping up with the latest scents.

While Scott also turns her nose up at Britney's Curious ("It smelled too sweet, like a little girl's perfume"), she's a fan of J.Lo's Miami Glow.

"It seemed very sensual and gave me a lift," says Scott, who also counts Calvin Klein's Obsession among her favorites. "It just seems very sophisticated."

She'll continue to keep her nose in overdrive and, if she likes what she smells, keep her wallet open, Scott says.

But while industry analyst Bloom predicts that shoppers such as Scott will continue to collect fragrances, she says the celebrity trend will eventually fade.

"My guess is that next year, there will not be as many celebrity fragrances," Bloom says. "It's like reality TV. There will be winners and all the others will fall to the wayside."

About the writer:	ish," "delicate and sexy."	coconut cream and honey.
The Bee's Rachel Leibrock can be reached at (916) 321-1176 or rleibrock@sacbee.com.	Average sniff rating: One nose	What we think it smells like: As if "you've been in the kitchen dabbing frosting behind your ears," although one tester thought it to be "generically girly but not particularly bad."
Sample spritzes of fragrances by the famed	Celeb: Jennifer Lopez Fragrance: Miami Glow	
	Cost: \$42 for 1.7 ounces	
What does celebrity smell like? We took five of the latest celebrity fragrances and put our noses to the test. Here's what we sniffed out.	What they say it smells like: Pink grapefruit, coconut water, passion fruit and black currant.	Average sniff rating: One-and-a-half noses
Celeb: Britney Spears Fragrance: Curious	What we think it smells like: "A warm humid day," "tropical," "spicy" and "on the sweet side, but with a citrus edge."	
Cost: \$39.50 for 1.7 ounces	Average sniff rating: Three noses	
What they say it smells like: The Louisiana magnolia (Spears' home-state flower) and vanilla musk.	Celeb: Donald Trump Fragrance: Donald Trump, The Fragrance	
What we think it smells like: "Something a teenage girl would wear," "very sweet and cloying" yet "pleasing."	Cost: \$60 for 3.4 ounces	
Average sniff rating: Two noses	What they say it smells like: Cucumber and citrus with spicy, peppery accents.	
Celeb: Paris Hilton Fragrance: Paris Hilton	What we think it smells like: "A cucumber salad," "masculine and clear" and "lighter than expected."	
Cost: \$39 for 1.7 ounces	Average sniff rating: Three noses	
What they say it smells like: Frozen apples, peach nectar, Mimosa and jasmine petals.	Celeb: Jessica Simpson Fragrance: Taste	
What we think it smells like: A split decision: One camp found it "cloying," "sweet, sweet, sweet" and "kind of trashy." The other, "girl-	Cost: \$45 for 1.7 ounces	
	What they say it smells like: Tahitian vanilla, white chocolate,	

Do Cosmetics Cause Infertility Problems

MARCH 17, 2005 - PUBLICATION DATE NOT KNOWN

CARCINOGENS IN COSMETICS? PETROCHEMICALS IN PERFUME? If only this were an urban legend. Unfortunately, it's a toxic reality, and it's showing up in our bodies.

Author Stacy Malkan reveals the dangerous truth about everyday products we put in our hair and on our skin.

In 2004, scientists found pesticides in the blood of newborn babies. A year later, researchers discovered perchlorate, a component of rocket fuel, in human breast milk. Today, people are testing positive for a litany of hazardous substances from flame retardants to phthalates to lead.

In her new book, *Not Just a Pretty Face: The Ugly Side of the Beauty Industry*, Stacy Malkan exposes the toxic chemicals that lurk, often unlabeled, in the personal care products that millions of American women, men and children use every day.

AlterNet spoke with Malkan about these toxins and her five-year effort with the Campaign for Safe Cosmetics to get the beauty industry to remove them from its products.

Heather Gehlert: There are so many environmental issues you could've written a book about. Why cosmetics?

Stacy Malkan: I think cosmetics is something that we're all intimately connected to. They're products that we use every day, and so I think it's a good first place to start asking questions. What kinds of products are we bringing into our homes? What kinds of companies are we giving our money to?

It has something pretty interesting in common with global warming too.

It does. I think of it as global poisoning. I think that the ubiquitous contamination of the human species with toxic chemicals is a symptom of the same problem (as global warming), which is an economy that's based on outdated technologies of petrochemicals petroleum. So many of the products we're applying to our faces and putting in our hair come from oil. They're byproducts of oil.

Many cosmetic products on the market right now claim they are pure, gentle, clean and healthy. But, as you reveal in this book, they're far from it. Toxic chemicals in these products are showing up in people. What were some of the most surprising toxins you discovered in cosmetics?

Lead in lipstick was pretty surprising. We (the Campaign for Safe Cosmetics) just released that report last week. Many personal care products have phthalates, which is a plasticizer and hormone disruptor. That's why we started the cosmetics campaign -- because we know that women have higher levels of phtha-

lates in their bodies, and we thought that cosmetics might be a reason. But, I think overall, the most surprising thing was to know that there's so much that we don't know about these products. Many, many chemicals are hiding in fragrance. Companies aren't required to list the components of fragrance. Products also are contaminated with carcinogens like 1,4 dioxane and neurotoxins like lead that aren't listed on the label. So it's difficult for consumers to know what we're using.

Generally speaking, risk assessment involves two factors: a hazard and people's exposure to that hazard. Could you explain some of the unique challenges to assessing risks with cosmetics?

That's a good question. Risk assessment is an extremely oversimplified way of pretending we have enough information to know how much chemicals we can tolerate in our bodies. A risk assessment equation will say, "How hazardous is a chemical, how much are we exposed to it from this one product, and is that harmful?" There's a lot of information left out of that picture: studies that haven't been done to determine impacts on fetuses, the fact that we're exposed to so many of these chemicals in so many places every day, and the fact there have been no or very few studies about chemical mixtures.

In chapter 2, you say that toxic cos-

metics should raise concern for men too, regardless of whether they use any themselves. How so?

Well, men do, first of all, use personal care products. When I ask a group of people what products they've used today, the men will be keeping their hands down and eventually, reluctantly, raising their hands because they're using shampoo, conditioner, deodorant, cologne, lotion.

So it's not just a makeup problem.

No, it's not just a makeup problem. It's all products. And we know that some chemicals in these products are particularly problematic for men. We're all exposed to phthalates, and phthalates interfere with the production of testosterone, and they're linked to health effects like lower sperm counts, birth defects of the penis, testicular tumors.

You've had to struggle with some scary health problems. Tell us about that.

Like many of us, I've had bizarre health problems that nobody can explain: benign lumps in my breasts and thyroid, which is quite common among young women to have thyroid problems. And then also infertility, which is something that's becoming an increasingly common experience for people. And so many of us have heard from our doctors, "Well, we don't know why; we can't tell you why." But I

think that's an interesting disconnect that we're looking at how to treat disease, but we're not looking at how to prevent disease.

You admit in the book that you used to be addicted to makeup and so-called personal care products. Do you think that could be related to the health issues you've had?

Well, who knows, and we can never say what caused what and so that's why risk assessment is not a useful tool to how do I want to say this that's why, in my opinion, we need to get rid of toxins wherever we possibly can in makeup, shampoo and lipstick is obviously a place where they don't need to be. But, yes, I did use a lot of cosmetic products 200 chemicals a day just in those products. And I also grew up in a very industrialized neighborhood near one of the largest incinerators in Massachusetts, near oil refineries. And we really didn't talk about these issues at all.

Do you think part of the problem with creating awareness around this issue is that the effects from toxins are often not that immediate? People don't say, Oh, I've been to this toxic site and now I have a rash all over my body.

Right, and that's what we hear from the cosmetics companies when they say, "Well, my product is safe if used as directed, and you can't prove otherwise." Which is true. We can't say that use of X product

led to X disease because we're talking about long-term diseases with contributing factors. Doctors usually can't tell us why we got cancer, because it could be due to multiple factors in our pasts. We also know that exposures during critical windows of development babies in the womb, even teenagers can lead to later-life diseases.

Can you give me an idea of how many chemicals one product can contain? Earlier you said you were exposed to 200 chemicals a day during your youth, but that's not all from one product.

No, I used about 20 products a day. The average woman in the U.S. according to our survey uses 12 products a day with about 180 chemicals. And men use about six products with 80 chemicals combined. But it depends on the product. Some products have dozens of chemicals -- fragrances can have dozens or even hundreds of chemicals that aren't listed on the label. And even fragrance-free products can have a masking fragrance.

Talk a little about the history of the cosmetics industry. When did it come about and why is it so unregulated?

The cosmetics industry has fought really hard to keep itself unregulated for the last 30 years. It was first regulated under the Food, Drug and Cosmetics Act of 1938. That is a 350-page law with about 1.5 pages

that address cosmetics. But it didn't give the FDA the power to require testing (cosmetic) products before they go on the market. The FDA can't require follow-up health monitoring; they can't even recall products. Basically, the FDA has to prove in court that a product is harmful before it can take action. There were several attempts to regulate the industry over the years, and the most well-known was in the 1970s with Thomas Eagleton, a senator from Missouri. He proposed that cosmetics should be regulated more like drugs, where there's a rigorous testing protocol that has to happen before products go on the market, but that was shot down and co-opted. What the industry has done is propose voluntary regulations every time a regulatory threat arises. And so the system that we have now is an industry-sponsored and run panel called the Cosmetics Ingredients Review Board, which is in charge of determining the safety of ingredients in cosmetics. We found lots of problems with that panel. They rushed through ingredients quickly, they hadn't looked at most of the ingredients or actually used these products and, most of the time, they find things to be safe. Even when they do make recommendations to restrict or eliminate ingredients, the industry is free to ignore them and sometimes does.

You say in the book that some companies have different formulations of the same products. Some, with

harmful toxins removed, go to Europe, and others, with toxins, go to the U.S. Why is that?

Well, it's outrageous, but Europe has much better health protection laws, and they really take a precautionary approach. The European Union has banned 1,100 chemicals from cosmetics that are thought to cause cancer or reproductive harm, and so they take a precautionary approach by saying, "We know these chemicals are hazardous." Nobody argues about that. Instead of arguing about at what level are they safe in products, we need to take them out of the products and figure out how to make products without them. The United States, on the other hand, says, "We need to be able to prove that an ingredient in this product causes harm before we're going to do anything about it. Consequently, there are lots of known toxins in consumer products. It's not just cosmetics. Another example is formaldehyde in kitchen cabinets perfectly legal in the United States. You can buy kitchen cabinets, and they're wafting the carcinogen formaldehyde into your kitchen. You can't sell those cabinets in Europe, in Japan, even in China.

Cosmetic Dangers

MARCH 29, 2005

Imagine reaching for a tube of lipstick or a can of shaving cream and finding this label: "Warning The safety of this product has not been determined."

Many cosmetics and personal care products could bear such warnings if the Food and Drug Administration decides they need them. The agency would act if it determines that their ingredients haven't been adequately tested to assure their safety. It's now working to decide that.

The FDA in February informed the Cosmetic, Toiletry and Fragrance Association, a Washington-based trade group, that manufacturers of untested products may have to add the warning.

There's no hard evidence of any health impact from long-term, low-dose exposure to the kinds of chemicals in cosmetics, said Lauren Sucher, a spokesperson for the Environmental Working group, a private nonprofit research center.

Some ingredients in cosmetics, such as methylpentan-2-one, found in nail polish, haven't been tested. Others, including triethanolamine, used in skin scrubs, are among the chemicals that researchers fear might cause cancer.

Targeted Products

Products that could be in line for FDA warnings, based on the Environmental Working Group's study, include:

Mascara, which can contain ingredients linked or potentially linked to cancer.

Liquid hand soap, which may contain ingredients suspected of raising

the risk of breast and skin cancer.

Hair dye, which can contain coal tar, which has been linked to bladder cancer and non-Hodgkin's lymphoma.

"The bottom line is people don't know what the health effects are of the many chemicals we're putting on our bodies every day," she said. "But consumers do have the right to know who's looking to see whether they're safe."

A study last year by the Environmental Working Group found that only 18 of 7,500 common cosmetics and toiletries had had all their ingredients fully tested for safety. "So we're talking about over 99 percent that have never been fully assessed for safety," Sucher said.

"Companies often do tests of short-term acute exposure to see whether their products make eyes water or skin itch," she said. "Often, however, they're not looking at whether they might cause cancer or birth defects that are long-term and

don't affect the profitability of their products."

Eric Kraus, the vice president for corporate communications at The Gillette Co. in Boston, which makes shaving creams and other personal care products, said: "Gillette products undergo rigorous testing, based on the best available scientific information, to assure that they are safe for use and for our employees to make. For us, this should not be an issue."

Kraus said he believed that Gillette's product-safety tests included determinations of whether they could cause birth defects or cancer.

There's no federal requirement that the ingredients in such products be tested for safety. But federal law requires that cosmetics with unassessed ingredients include an FDA warning label informing consumers that "the safety of this product has not been determined." Until now, the FDA has relied on the cosmetics industry to police its products.

Sign of Responsibility

Dr. Samuel Epstein, professor emeritus of environmental and occupational health at the Chicago School of Public Health at the University of Illinois and the chairman of the Cancer Prevention Coalition, called the FDA's recent letter to the cosmetics trade group

"the first glimmer of responsibility in several decades."

Janet Bartucci, the vice president for global communications at New York-based Estee Lauder, the cosmetics products company, said she saw no need for FDA intervention. "Because there is so much testing done by individual companies, they haven't had any need to step in."

The FDA declined to comment for this article because it was still reviewing a petition by the Environmental Working Group seeking recalls or warning labels on a wide variety of personal-care products.

The FDA doesn't assess the safety of cosmetics and toiletries before they hit the market, as it does with drugs. The cosmetics industry does its own evaluations through an independent panel of experts whom it appoints. Representatives of the FDA and the Consumer Federation of America, an alliance of public interest groups, attend those sessions.

Since 1976, the panel, known as the Cosmetic Ingredient Review, has found 694 ingredients to be safe and nine to be unsafe. The Environmental Working Group said the panel had reviewed only 11 percent of the 10,500 cosmetic ingredients recorded by the FDA.

"The 89 percent of ingredients

that remain unassessed are used in more than 99 percent of all products on the market," the group's statement said.

The Cosmetic, Toiletry and Fragrance Association, which created the review panel, responded positively to the FDA's letter suggesting stronger federal oversight of its products.

"Even an industry with an exemplary safety record such as ours functions best with a tough cop on the beat and we welcome FDA's action," Ed Kavanaugh, the association president, said in a prepared statement.

In an interview, however, Irene Malbin, the association's vice president for public affairs, called the Environmental Working Group's "Skin Deep" study "completely wrong." She said, for example, that there were no known cancer-causing ingredients in cosmetics, although they might be present with no objections from the FDA in such products as shampoos and hair dyes.

"Cosmetics are safe and consumers can have complete confidence in their products," Malbin said.

The use of cosmetics is a \$35 billion U.S. industry, and the stakes for consumer confidence are high.

Fabric Softner Dangers

APRIL 5, 2005

MANY PEOPLE WILL REMEMBER A FAMOUS TV AD WHERE A WOMAN RACES TO HER WASHING MACHINE, fabric softener in hand, only to arrive just as the wash ends. This woman who "forgot to add the fabric softener" was actually doing herself and her family a favor.

Although they may make your clothes feel soft and smell fresh, fabric softener and dryer sheets are some of the most toxic products around. And chances are that the staggering 99.8 percent of Americans who use common commercial detergents, fabric softeners, bleaches, and stain removers would think twice if they knew they contained chemicals that could cause cancer and brain damage.

Here is a list of just some of the chemicals found in fabric softeners and dryer sheets:

Benzyl Acetate: Linked to pancreatic cancer.

Benzyl Alcohol: Upper respiratory tract irritant.

Ethanol: On the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Hazardous Waste list and can cause central nervous system disorders.

A-Terpineol: Can cause respiratory problems, including fatal edema, and central nervous system damage.

Ethyl Acetate: A narcotic on the EPA's Hazardous Waste list.

Camphor: Causes central nervous system disorders.

Chloroform: Neurotoxic, anesthetic and carcinogenic.

Linalool: A narcotic that causes central nervous system disorders.

Pentane: A chemical known to be harmful if inhaled

How could products with pretty names like Soft Ocean Mist, Summer Orchard and April Fresh be so dangerous?

The chemicals in fabric softeners are pungent and strong smelling so strong that they require the use of these heavy fragrances (think 50 times as much fragrance) just to cover up the smells. Furthermore, synthetic fabrics, which are the reason fabric softeners were created in the first place, do not smell good either when heated in a dryer or heated by our bodies ... hence the need for even more hefty fragrances.

In other words, remove all the added fragrance that endears people to fabric softeners and -- like the cliché wolf in sheep's clothing -- the real smells of the chemical-laced fabric softener and the synthetic fabrics they were designed around may prompt people to shoot their laundry machines and be done with it.

Are "Soft" Clothes Worth It?

Fabric softeners are made to stay in your clothing for long periods of time. As such, chemicals are slowly released either into the air for you to inhale or onto your skin for you to absorb. Dryer sheets are particularly noxious because they are heated in the dryer and the chemicals are released through dryer vents and out into the environment. Health effects from being exposed to the chemicals in fabric softeners include:

Central nervous system disorders
Headaches
Nausea
Vomiting
Dizziness
Blood pressure reduction
Irritation to skin, mucus membranes and respiratory tract
Pancreatic cancer

Soften Your Clothes Safely With These Tips:

Even if you don't feel the effects of these chemicals today, they can affect you gradually over time, and children, whose systems are still developing, are particularly at risk. There's really no reason to expose yourself to these risky chemicals when natural alternatives exist. Not only are they safer for you, your family and the environment, but they're much more economical too:

Add a quarter cup of baking soda to

wash cycle to soften fabric

- Add a quarter cup of white vinegar to rinse to soften fabric and eliminate cling
- Check out your local health food store for a natural fabric softener that uses a natural base like soy instead of chemicals

It's likely that fabric softeners and dryer sheets aren't the only toxic products in your home. Many household products that consumers regard as safe are also full of toxic chemicals. Our past articles on PEG Compounds in Cosmetics and Phenols in Common Household Cleansers are two of the all-time most popular articles on SixWise.com and will make you more aware of the pervasiveness of harmful chemicals that can be eliminated from your home.

SixWise.com provides the Web's most read and trusted personal, family and home safety and wellness e-newsletter at NO-COST, with useful and practical information, statistics and guidance from the world's leading experts on how to best protect yourself and loved ones from illness, injuries, crime, violence, disasters, scams and more. Go to www.SixWise.com now to subscribe to the free SixWise "Be Safe, Live Longer, and Prosper" newsletter.

A Horse Scent

MAY 10, 2005

THIS YEAR'S KENTUCKY DERBY WINNER, THE 50-1 long shot known as Giacomo, made history again today by becoming the first winner of the storied race to launch his own celebrity fragrance, set to hit stores this Friday.

Accompanied by his publicist and a phalanx of marketing advisors, Giacomo unveiled the new fragrance, called Whoa by Giacomo, at New York City's legendary Bloomingdale's department store.

Giacomo's decision to launch a celebrity fragrance caught many in the perfume industry by surprise, since no horse-based scent has ever had mass-market success at the nation's cosmetic counters.

But Jesse Diblanco, who heads up the consumer products division of Team Giacomo, dismisses such nay-saying, claiming that Giacomo is an exception to the rule: "He's not a horse, he's a brand."

Within the racing industry, some observers are voicing their concern that Giacomo's sudden plunge into the world of celebrity culture may hurt his chances of winning the second leg of racing's Triple Crown, the Preakness.

In addition to launching his fragrance, Giacomo has been seen partying in recent days with such staples of the club circuit as Paris Hilton and white-hot teen starlet Lindsay Lohan.

Late Monday night, for example, reporters spotted Giacomo stumbling back to his stall, trailing empty bottles of Cristal champagne in his wake.

Racing insider Dobie Grossman worries that for Giacomo, the Derby success was a case of too much, too soon: "Remember, at the end

of the day, he's only three years old."

Elsewhere, Angelina Jolie announced plans to break up the pending marriage between singer Elton John and longtime boyfriend David Furnish, telling reporters, "I like a challenge."

Andy Borowitz is the author of The Borowitz Report, and the winner of the National Press Club's humor award. For more, go to borowitzreport.com

Reminiscent of the old television show Mr. Ed that I enjoyed as a kid so many years ago.

Debating Chemicals

MAY 18, 2005

THEY'RE IN SOAP. AND HAIR SPRAY. BABY TOYS. HAND LOTION. DEODORANT. VINYL UPHOLSTERY. NAIL POLISH. AND PERFUME. Chemicals known as phthalate esters are so prevalent, in fact, that most personal hygiene products and soft PVC plastics contain some and most Americans have traces of the compounds circulating inside their bodies, according to government reports.

But can they hurt us?

European regulators believe so, and have banned some from children's toys and cosmetics, labeling them "toxic substances." California legislators are pushing for the removal of some phthalates and for better disclosure of product ingredients.

Yet federal officials and product manufacturers insist the risk to humans remains low. Toiletries and cosmetics have been used safely for decades, they say.

Who is right?

In a sense, both sides are, scientists say.

"There's not enough human data to say they are safe and don't cause health effects. But, on the other hand, there's not a lot of human data showing they do," said Russ Hauser, a Harvard associate professor of occupational health, who is among the few researchers to have studied phthalates in humans. Hauser's team found that some phthalates may cause sperm abnormalities.

Phthalates which keep nail polish from chipping and perfumes from losing their scent are without a doubt ubiquitous in American society.

Research results

Research has consistently demonstrated that laboratory animals experience developmental and reproductive problems when exposed to high levels of some phthalates, levels that are usually 100 to 1,000 times greater than those people come into contact with.

"The question is, are the levels humans are exposed to potentially hazardous?" Hauser said.

The answer remains elusive.

The concerns have fueled a flurry of legislation in California this year, with politicians weighing in on the pros and cons of di-(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate and dibutyl phthalate.

One bill, AB 319, would ban phthalates from children's toys and feeding products. A second, SB 484, would require cosmetic manufacturers to report to the state Department of Health Services all ingredients that may cause cancer or harmful reproductive effects.

A third, AB 908, would have prohibited the use of two phthalates in products sold in this state, but it failed to garner enough votes before the Assembly health committee last month.

Even the staunchest of environmentalists are not suggesting a bar of soap or a bottle of nail polish can kill you.

"But I'm not just using one bottle over time," said Jeanne Rizzo, executive director of the San Francisco-based Breast Cancer Fund, which is calling for the voluntary removal of some phthalates from products.

Indeed, the average American woman puts 12 beauty products on her skin each day, according to the Environmental Working Group, a Washington advocacy organization.

Not every soap, shampoo, sunscreen or skin lotion contains a phthalate. But about two-thirds of all personal hygiene products tested do, according to an analysis released by the Food and Drug Administration this month. Hair sprays, deodorants, nail products and hair mousse were consistently found to contain two or more.

And because manufacturers are not required to list on labels ingredients that give a product its fragrance -- a primary purpose of some phthalates -- many consumers will not even know their hand

cream or deodorant contains them.

Widespread exposure

Scientists know that phthalates can enter the human body through our skin, nose or mouth. In fact, of nearly 2,500 people studied by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, more than three-fourths were found last year to have phthalates in their urine, "suggesting widespread exposure in the United States."

While the substances are thought to stay in our system for 12 hours or less, "if you use that product daily or twice daily," Hauser said, "you're going to be continuously exposed."

Women of childbearing age were found in one government study to have elevated levels of phthalates, raising concerns that unborn babies considered especially vulnerable to toxins could be at risk for health defects. "In a perfect world, all those chemicals we're putting on our skin each day could be safe. But we don't know that to be true," said Lauren Sucher, a spokeswoman for the Environmental Working Group. The organization found that 89 percent of the thousands of ingredients used in personal care products have not been evaluated for safety.

Unlike drugs, personal care products are not subject to FDA approval, and the agency generally

does not test them.

But manufacturers are responsible for substantiating the safety of their products, and industry-supported studies have deemed phthalates safe at current concentrations. Even in slightly higher amounts, the substances pose no risk to people, they claim.

Products defended

"Cosmetics are safe, have been safe, will be safe," said Gerald McEwen, vice president of science for the Cosmetic, Toiletry and Fragrance Association. "They have a long history of safe use." Lab rats are not humans, and they don't respond to toxins in the same way that people do, McEwen said.

Research by the Cosmetic Ingredient Review Expert Panel a group supported by the cosmetics industry found that people detoxify phthalates more quickly than rats. And even the most appearance-obsessed Americans aren't exposed to the same levels of the substances as lab animals.

The government has made studying phthalates a top priority. But from the research it has carried out, "we don't have any compelling evidence that phthalates as used in cosmetics pose a safety risk," said an FDA spokeswoman.

Since 1999, the European Union has prohibited the use of

phthalates in children's toys. Last year, a new ban went into place in European countries barring two phthalates from cosmetics, too.

A grass-roots movement is under way in the United States to encourage cosmetic manufacturers to replace potentially hazardous ingredients with safer alternatives within the next three years. So far, more than 100 companies, including Revlon and Estée Lauder, have agreed to do so. Most are small makers of natural products.

“If companies can make personal care products without ingredients linked to cancer . . . or birth defects, shouldn't they? To me, that's just common sense,” said Sucher of the Environmental Working Group.

“I'm willing to sacrifice a bit of the creaminess in my hand lotion,” she said, “if it means it will be free of chemicals linked to serious health problems.”

DJ Wins Lawsuit

MAY 24, 2005

Detroit -

A ONE TIME RADIO HOST WHO SAYS A CO-WORKER'S PERFUME MADE HER SICK has won a \$10.6 million federal jury verdict against her former employer.

Erin Weber, a former DJ at Detroit country station WYCD-FM, said she was fired in 2001 after complaining about her allergy to another host's Tresor perfume. She said the owner of the station, Infinity Broadcasting discriminated against her for a disability caused by the allergy and retaliated after she filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Infinity said it asked the other woman to stop wearing the perfume, which she did, and also modified Weber's schedule so she wouldn't come into contact with her. The company said Weber was fired for not coming to work, the Detroit Free Press reported.

The jury on Monday awarded Weber \$7 million in punitive damages, \$2 million in mental anguish and emotional distress and \$1.6 million for past and future compensation. The six-woman jury in U.S. District Court in Detroit spent eight days deliberating.

"I'm thankful that the jury took so much time to come to the right conclusion," Weber told The Detroit News after the verdict.

Weber, 43, claimed exposure to Tresor described by maker Lancome as a combination of rose, lilac and other scents caused her to lose her voice and take lengthy absences from work. She also said she once "felt an electric shock quell through my entire body" and required heavy medication to combat the effects.

Weber, who now lives in Cleveland, says she been unable to get another job in radio since she was fired in 2001. She says Infinity Broadcasting "blacklisted her" a claim the company denies. She now does freelance voiceover work and can be heard on thousands of Otis elevators all over the country, announcing the number of each floor.

Infinity spokeswoman Karen Mateo said the company planned to appeal.

Sniffing at Problems

MAY 24, 2005

IT'S JUST A SQUIRT OF SCENT TO YOU, BUT FOR OTHERS IT IS HELL. Now with new awareness of perfume allergy, Scots sufferers are hoping a change in the law will help

For thousands of Scots, the modern world has become a threatening environment. On the street, in the workplace, even in their homes there are hazards at every turn. The cause of their distress is unexpected, for these Scots are among the estimated 2% of the population who suffer from a fragrance allergy. As well as those who suffer a clinical allergy, there is also a growing number of people who believe their reactions – including headaches, confusion and stomach pain – are caused by inhaling perfume or chemical additives. For them, perfumes, toiletries, household cleaners and air fresheners present them with daily problems.

Yet this type of reaction to fragrance is not recognised by the NHS as an allergy, or even as a significant illness, though for people such as Alison Inglis, who has a range of conditions including food allergy, chemical sensitivity and electro-sensitivity, her illness is so significant she is no longer able to work. Alison's problems began in 1970, but she is unable to pinpoint the trigger, which she believes might have been her move to a new home in Glasgow, near an electricity sub-station. "In 1970, during my third pregnancy, my hands began twisting in and I started suffering leg pain and balance problems," she says. "My GP said he thought it was multiple sclerosis and a neurologist agreed. But 13 years later, when I was properly tested, they discovered it wasn't MS after all."

Alison's condition deteriorated and she was eventually diagnosed with a number of food allergies, including, nuts, wheat and dairy. Exposure to electromagnetic radiation, in addition to food allergy and chemical sensitivity problems, give Alison burning pains in her head, loss of balance, loss of voice, fatigue and breathing difficulties. She has

had blackouts and has to use a specially-adapted phone from Sweden. She carries an epipen an adrenalin injector for anaphylactic shock in addition to taking antihistamines.

Her GPs are now sympathetic, but Alison says she has been dismissed as "neurotic" in the past. "I'm now more or less housebound. Whether it's perfume or electricity, I'm really stuck. I might get out for a brief walk, but that's about it."

Marion Newman, a medical secretary in central Glasgow, has not been so severely affected, but has to organise her life around scent avoidance. "I don't have anything with perfume in my house," she says. "And that includes toiletries, soap powder, washing-up liquid and air fresheners. These new plug-in fresheners are a real nuisance, as I'm often not aware of them until it's too late. People just don't realise, there is perfume everywhere. If I'm not careful, I become unwell and suffer stomach pains."

Despite the suffering of Alison and Marion, mainstream medical

opinion remains divided about the conditions they say they suffer. Anyone with an obvious and severe reaction, such as breathing difficulties, might be treated in relation to their symptoms; for instance, they might be diagnosed as suffering from asthma.

However, for those with less obvious symptoms, such as dizziness, headaches, joint or stomach pains, there is sometimes a degree of cynicism concerning their problems. Few doctors would deny a patient's suffering, but in this controversial area, the cause of such symptoms may be the subject of debate. There is no evidence of cynicism at Allergy UK, which says calls to its chemical sensitivity helpline have increased since its introduction three years ago.

The organisation argues that for some people, exposure to chemicals such as formaldehyde may have triggered their fragrance sensitivity, and that because of its use in sheep dip, for instance, there are a significant number of calls from farmers. "Some sufferers might just get a bit of a headache after a whiff of perfume," says Lindsey McManus, of Allergy UK. "But others can become quite ill. Many of the people who contact us are very poorly.

"Yet their condition is not always regarded as a real illness, with some doctors diagnosing depression and some people struck

off by GPs. However, though some GPs are becoming sympathetic to patients who present with chemical sensitivity problems, they are not sure how best to progress their treatment. We believe our callers represent the tip of the iceberg and we are campaigning to have the problem recognised in the NHS."

It is recognised in the US, where last month a former radio DJ was awarded £5.79m in a US federal court lawsuit, because she says she was fired after complaining about exposure to a co-worker's perfume. Erin Weber, who had worked at a Detroit country music station, said she had been forced to take lengthy absences from work. She believed her problems with the perfume began after someone spilled nail polish remover in the studio.

This isn't a one-off. Against a backdrop of claims that "perfume is the new tobacco", more fragrance-sensitive employees are gaining protection under the Americans with Disabilities Act. Throughout the US and Canada, campaigns for fragrance-free offices are taking effect. In Nova Scotia, an argument that "no scents makes good sense" actively discourages people from wearing perfume in areas of local authority jurisdiction such as libraries, schools, hospitals, courts and public transport.

In one part of California, there is a perfume ban at public meet-

ings, with some restaurants offering fragrance-free areas. While there have been many Scots affected by contact dermatitis in a variety of industries, there has yet to be significant workplace concern. Though we may not share the compensation culture of the US, this doesn't mean we won't start experiencing the problems. According to Ian Tasker, the STUC assistant secretary responsible for health and safety, chemical or fragrance sensitivity may become part of the complex debate on environmental health.

"Allergy can be a significant problem for many employees, such as healthcare workers who have developed a number of problems due to latex in gloves," he says. "Of course, for them, and for others such as hairdressers or cleaners, there is a direct relationship between their condition and how they carry out their job. The wearing of perfume is different. For a start, it's about one individual's personal choice. However, if a worker were suffering genuine ill-health through being near a fellow worker's scent, then you would expect most employers to attempt to make adjustments to resolve the situation."

The basic complication is that, without medical recognition, the sufferer may have a difficult time convincing health professionals or employers they have a legitimate complaint. "It is a complex area,"

agrees Tasker. "The subject of allergy is becoming an increasing element of my job, but it's an issue which often crosses the border between workplace health and safety, and more general public health." Dr P S Mukherji, of the British Society for Allergy, Environmental and Nutritional Medicine, is seeing more patients at his specialist clinic in Edinburgh. Environmental doctors treat a range of responses to environmental factors. "There are a range of symptoms," says Dr Mukherji, "many of which are similar to ME. Most hospitals and GPs are simply not up-to-date on this."

In March, European legislation came into force requiring cosmetic fragrance manufacturers to list on the packaging any of a special "hit-list" of 26 substances which might be in their products. These 26 are considered the essential allergy culprits, and the new standards are seen as an acceptable compromise by manufacturers who regularly use up to 200 separate ingredients in a perfume.

Chris Flower, director-general of the industry's Cosmetic, Toiletry and Perfumery Association, says research may lead to one or two additions to the core 26 in years to come. "But one concern we have is that it might be extended unreasonably," he adds. For people who suffer fragrance and chemical sensitivity, this legislation might just be the

starting point.

There was a time when potential allergens in scent were simply listed as "perfume". Now a change in European law means there are 26 which have to be listed individually if the concentration is higher than 0.001% for leave-on products (deodorants etc) and 0.01% for rinse-off products (shampoo etc).

What to watch for:

Amyl Cinnamal
Benzyl Alcohol
Cinnamyl Alcohol
Citral
Eugenol
Hydroxycitronellal
Iso Eugenol
Amyl Cinnamyl Alcohol
Benzyl Salicylate
Cinnamal
Coumarin
Geraniol
Hydroxy-methylpentyl-cyclohex-
enecarboxaldehyde
Anisyl Alcohol
Benzyl Cinnamate
Farnesol
2-(4-tert-Butylbenzyl) propionalde-
hyde
Linalool
Benzyl Benzoate
Citronellol
Hexyl Cinnamyl Aldehyde
d-Limonene
Methyl Heptin Carbonate
3-Methyl-4-(2,6,6-trimethyl-2-
cyclohexen-1-yl)-3-buten-2-one
Oak Moss extract
Tree Moss extract

Strong Fragrance Can Send People Reeling

JUNE 18, 2005

Kim Bowmaker and her friend Kathy Pendergast stand in the lobby of the state Senate building waiting to take the elevator to their offices.

It's just before 9 a.m.

Ping.

The doors slide open and the ladies get in. Just as the doors close, they catch a whiff of some serious perfume. Shoved to the back of the elevator, the women can't see "Rose" (not her real name, but her scent), but they know she's there. It's yet another morning they'll suffer from secondhand scent saturation.

"Between the movement of the elevator and the foul air, I feel like I smoked a box of cigars and inhaled all them," Bowmaker tells Pendergast, after making sure she's out of Rose's earshot. The two didn't spot Rose in advance. If they had, they would have watched which elevator she took, and hopped in another or taken the stairs so as not to suffer even a few minutes engulfed in the rose-and-floral fog.

"It's god-awful," Pendergast shoots back. "It's going to follow me all day now."

It's a scene that occurs too often for these women's liking, but it's also familiar for many.

"It's nauseating to be near a person who bathes themselves in perfume," Bowmaker says. "Just as I wouldn't want to inhale the scent that emits from a garbage truck, secondhand smoke or a sewer system, I don't feel I should be subjected to the overpowering aroma of what another person may find pleasantly fragrant."

Not going away

Sweet as they may be, too pungent aromas can bowl you over like a stampede of paparazzi trying to get to Brad Pitt and Angelina Jolie. And they're not going to dissipate anytime soon.

"A lot of people have been wearing this perfume or that cologne for years and years and years," says Colleen Rickenbacher, a Dallas-based expert on manners, etiquette and culture. Several times a week clients which include FedEx, Four Seasons Resorts and the Dallas Cowboys Cheerleaders ask her what to do about this olfactory overload. "It's part of their body, and they have no clue."

When dabbed or sprayed, fragrance enhances the human scent, says Rochelle Bloom, president of the Fragrance Foundation, but keep it in perspective.

Sometimes, though, people don't realize they've overdone it especially as they get older. They lose their sense of smell and apply

more than necessary, says Bloom. Plus, when people wear the same fragrance all the time, they become desensitized. When you don't smell it, you apply more.

The more you spritz or spray on, though, the more people talk about it: to friends, family, co-workers, even a doctor. Basically, grown-ups gab with everyone but the offender the one who needs to hear it.

"It's really, really, really difficult to tell someone that they're scent is a little too strong," says Rickenbacher. She equates it to telling a person they have food stuck in their teeth or their zipper's down. "Initially it could be tremendously embarrassing, but as time goes on they'll appreciate it."

The allergy card

Many times people use the allergy excuse, but it's not really a true allergy in that you don't develop an allergic antibody to the perfume or cologne, says Scott Osur, an allergist at the Certified Allergy and Asthma Consultants in Albany. You can develop a condition called vasomotor rhinitis, though.

"In a simplistic way, it's a sensitive nose," Osur explains. "There are a lot of people whose nerve endings in their nose are sensitive to irritants like cigarette smoke, strong odors, perfume, the aisle with the detergents. It can induce

the sneezing spell and cause the nose to run."

OK, so smelling someone else's scent can't make you ill, but close to it. Once a month or so Bowmaker and Pendergast come across the occasional male co-worker, who also goes a little crazy. That elicits knowing looks across the room, followed by Pendergast's "Does he know he's turning people off by wearing too much cologne? You just need a little bit."

When the women are out together outside of work and they come across someone who went a little heavy on the perfume or cologne, they're reminded of their overdone co-workers and often launch into yet another tirade.

Car reeks

It happens outside of the workplace, too, as Albany's Jeremy Clausi learned. When he picks up his buddies, his car typically fills with more than just people.

"I hate it when my friends overload the cologne and smell up my car," says Clausi, who never actually has told them they went a little crazy. "It's horrible. I have to have the car aired out the following morning."

He's also severely turned off smokers who "try to cover up the odor of Kool Menthol 100's with a bucket of Jovan White Musk." One

bad odor made worse.

Fragrance Decline

JUNE 25, 2005

CLEOPATRA WELCOMED MARK ANTONY IN A ROOM KNEE-DEEP WITH ROSE PETALS. SHAKESPEARE wrote about the Eglantine rose with apple-scented leaves. Victorian women sniffed their violets and nosegays to mask the odors of the street.

Scent may be the most heady garden element of all, but many of our best-loved flowers have lost their fragrance over the last half-century as hybridizers pursued traits like brighter colors, bigger flowers, compact growth or long stems for cutting. Take a whiff of some hybrid red roses, for example, and you'll smell well, almost nothing: an olfactory blank.

"In cut-flower breeding today, the concentration is still on shipability and vase life, and these new flowers have all the romance of an artichoke," said Tom Carruth, research director of Weeks Roses, a wholesale grower based in Upland, Calif.

But as the gardening community grows more sophisticated, and therefore more appreciative of the sensual and the subtle, smell the final frontier of the senses is returning to garden fashion.

More nursery catalogs have begun to include lists of fragrant plants on equal footing with categories like hardy vines and ground covers, and breeders are starting to take notice.

In the fall, Weeks Roses will introduce a rose named after Julia Child (it has a licorice smell) and a purple and lavender rose called Wild Blue Yonder, which has a strong spicy fragrance. Child, who died in August, picked her namesake from a sampling of new hybrids.

In addition, the company says old-fashioned varieties that never lost their scent, like Sombreuil, a white climber from the late 19th century, are enjoying a resurgence.

"People go for the color first," Carruth said by way of explanation. "Then, 99.44 percent of the time, it's to the nose."

It may be surprising how many fragrant flowers are still not promoted, and how many old or overlooked varieties have yet to make a comeback, including native azaleas, bearded iris, clethra and the old-fashioned mock orange.

"Out here the mentality is, if it's bigger, it's better," said Perry Guillot, a landscape architect based in Southampton, N.Y. "Fragrance brings gardeners back to simple earthly delights. It's not just about who can buy the biggest tree. Fragrance is so much subtler. It can be a freshly mowed lawn or a honeysuckle that grew in from a neighbor's fence."

By most accounts, humans can detect only five flavors: sweet, sour, bitter, salty and a fifth flavor, derived from the amino acid glutamate and known to the Japanese as umami. But we can discern some 10,000 distinct smells. Without

smell, flavors would be barely detectable. Remember holding your nose when you took medicine as a child?

Scents may be plentiful, but they are hard to analyze, and even harder to describe. That may account for why smell is often an afterthought in plant descriptions and garden plans.

Scent is invisible, but its placement is crucial. Gardeners probably wouldn't make a planting themed on fragrance, for example, as they would for spring color or dwarf evergreens. They may prefer to sprinkle the smells like punctuation. The lily is an exclamation point; the scent of Carolina sweetshrub floats on the evening air like a question mark: "What's that smell?"

Unfortunately, it's not always easy to find those punctuation marks. After World War II, scent was bred out of roses, for example, as hybridizers worked toward new colors, long stems and durability. Since thick, leathery petals do not readily disintegrate, their molecules do not waft into the air. Instead, they remain imbedded and undetectable until the blossom begins to rot.

In her book *A Natural History of Senses*, (Random House, 1990), Diane Ackerman surmises that scent "seems to be a recessive trait in roses, and two deeply fragrant

parents may produce a petal-perfect but smell-less offspring."

Anticipating the demand for fragrance, David Austin, an English rose breeder, years ago began to cross the hybrid tea roses, desirable for their colors and long periods of bloom, with antique shrub roses, which are known for their fragrance. The company established an office in Tyler six years ago. As a result, the roses are available throughout the United States, and they are enormously popular.

Of course, flower fragrance, like color, did not evolve for our delight alone; scents are sex ploys to attract pollinators in search of nectar. If you smell a petunia during the day, it may have a bit of scent, but at night it releases a rich, heady, lily-and-clove aroma.

Thousands of flowers are pollinated by nocturnal insects and therefore do not release their perfumes until their animal allies are active. Evening-scented blossoms are often white, luminous in the fading light of dusk just as the moths begin their rounds. Many of these flowers have tubular or trumpet shapes that evolved along with moths' long proboscises.

But for human enjoyment, in a world of magazine scent strips and room deodorizers, the garden remains a sanctuary of natural fragrance.

Sniffing your way through the Botanic Garden

The Fort Worth Botanic Garden makes scents on a hot summer day. Its natural aromatherapy cures are waiting and free to anyone willing to slow down and breathe deeply.

Should you need a guide beyond your nose, here are some favorite fragrant flowers chosen for us by botanic garden horticulturist Kathleen Cook.

Stop by the front gate and take in the heady scent of the chocolate daisies (*Berlandiera lyrata*), the light yellow blooms with dark centers.

Take a deep whiff of the flowers of the butterfly bushes (*Buddleia*) in front of the Gardens Restaurant and in the Perennial Garden. The soft scent is reminiscent of vanilla.

Near the restaurant is the Fragrance Garden, in the center of which is the sambac jasmine (*Jasminum sambac*) with its heady sweet scent from its small, white, star-shaped flowers. This is the flower traditionally used to make jasmine tea. "It's worth kneeling down for," Cook says.

While in the Fragrance Garden, lightly rub the leaves of the pineapple sage (*Salvia elegans*) for a heavenly tropical scent. The fennel releases an aroma of licorice.

Pause by the softly scented, sweet garden phlox (*Phlox paniculata*) in the Fuller Garden and in the Trial Garden.

Scattered around are yellow, orange and red day lilies (*Hemerocallis*) with a soft, fresh scent.

The gardens, off University Drive north of Interstate 30, are open free of charge from 8 a.m. to dusk. But during Concerts in the Garden, this weekend and July 1-4, visitors are asked to finish their visits by 5 p.m. (817) 871-7686; www.fwb.org.

Stinking Healthcare

JUNE 25, 2005

WHILE TOO MUCH FRAGRANCE HAS ALWAYS SPELT TROUBLE, especially in a downwind, a coalition of activists and environmentalists has been warning that perfume and makeup are putting women and children in grave risk of cancer and reproductive harm. The reason is that they contain phthalates (the “ph” is silent), a family of colorless oil-like substances that prolong the scent of perfume, make nail polish flexible, and prevent children’s toys from cracking under the pressure of being chewed.

Should you be worried about phthalates in cosmetics and toys?

The “Campaign for Safe Cosmetics” kicked off in Marin County, California on Valentines day with “Operation Beauty Drop,” an educational project designed to make school kids aware that cosmetics containing phthalates and other supposedly deadly chemicals should be swiftly dumped. As Judi Shils, director of the Marin Cancer Project told the Bay City News Wire: “If we make the public aware that the personal care and cosmetic products they are being sold may be promoting cancer, and educate them about healthier choices, the hope is that they will stop buying products that are probably contributing to spiraling rates of cancer throughout our communities.”

Actually, cancer rates are declining; it just looks as if they are “spiraling” because the population of the United States is aging, and cancer is much more common among those over 50 than those under. When you adjust for age, cancer rates have been dropping since 1990. (As for cancer rates in Marin County, they’re comparable to the rest of the country, according to the National Cancer Institute, although some types of cancer are below national levels and falling.)

But paying close attention to the actual scientific data has never been a strong suit of health scare activists, who have been on a mission

to tar phthalates as deadly since 1998, even though almost every regulatory body that has looked at the research has found them to be without risk.

Scare Tactics

In 2000, for example, the Environmental Working Group (EWG) warned that women of childbearing age should stop wearing nail polish because they had higher levels of phthalates in their bodies than the rest of the population and phthalates had been linked to birth defects in animals. In other words, because “high levels” of phthalates damaged animals, the EWG invited people to believe that “high levels” of phthalates in humans must also be dangerous.

But it’s nothing more than a scare tactic to say that there are “high levels” without mentioning that there are no adverse health consequences associated with these levels (the highest of all the estimated exposures was still 400 times below the Environmental Protection Agency’s safety levels,

which are among the most stringent regulatory standards in the world.

Indeed, the “high” exposure levels found by the Centers for Disease Control were congruent with those found by the World Health Organization and the Center for Evaluation of Risks to Human Reproduction, which is part of the National Toxicology Program, and neither of these institutions found any cause for alarm. And while the U.S. National Toxicology Program report on the safety of DBP did find that high doses of DBP led to developmental damage in rats, the authors had “minimal concern about effects to human development and development of the reproductive system from current estimated exposure.”

Unfortunately, that sort of balance tends to be lost when health scare stories start making the news.

Phthalates and Genital Defects

The latest push to have phthalates banned has been driven by research, which claims, if you believe the headline in USA Today, that phthalates “may cause defects in baby boys.”

As astonishing as it may sound, the study didn’t show what virtually all of the media reports said it did. None of the baby boys in the study had defective or malformed genitals. Nor did the researchers

prove that there was a correlation between phthalates (as present in the mother’s urine before birth) and the length or volume of the penis or the size of the scrotum. (See *STATS Media Claims Phthalates (Might) Cause Genital Defects* for a longer critique.)

Instead, they measured something called the anogenital index the distance between the base of the penis and the anus divided by the child’s weight. They found a correlation between a narrow gap and a high level of four out of eight different phthalates, and then noted that rats fed high doses of phthalates (much higher than those absorbed by humans) have both low anogenital indices and genital defects.

So does that mean that much lower doses will produce similar if lesser effects in male fetuses? The study couldn’t say. Nevertheless, the media made it seem as if sexual deformity lies in wait for future generations of boys if we don’t curb phthalate use now, which is something the Massachusetts legislature is currently considering.

Follow the Numbers

One of the problems with activist-driven health scares is that they look at toxicology from only one perspective. Laboratory tests involve giving animals huge daily doses of a chemical to determine its toxicity. But the problem is that

everything becomes toxic if the dose is too high. Instead of looking at the amount of a substance that can be consumed without adverse effect the “No Observable Adverse Effect Level” (NOAEL) health activists pin their fears on cases where animals became ill at very high doses. They assume that we, as humans, metabolize very low doses of a chemical in the same way the animals that became sick metabolized very high doses. But if this were true, the trace amounts of organic arsenic in root vegetables would be lethal.

Not all toxic risks are linear, which means that that as the degree of exposure to a given chemical decreases the risk of cancer or other damage decreases but it does not wholly disappear. Unfortunately health activists seem to believe that the risk from all carcinogens is linear. Most toxicologists, however, understand that such risks can be linear or non-linear. A non-linear risk means that there is a threshold below which trace amounts of the chemical will have no adverse effect (damaged cells will be able to repair themselves). This is why it is important to look at the NOAEL for any chemical before panicking.

For example, the highest concentration of the phthalate DEP found in perfume was 28,000 milligrams per liter, according to the Environmental Working Group. The NOAEL for DEP works out at 750 milligrams per kilo of body-

weight per day, so an adult weighing 70 kilos (154-pounds) could safely, if not happily, ingest 52,500 mg of DEP daily.

Divide this number by the concentration of DEP in the perfume and you could drum roll douse yourself with a half a gallon every day without any ill effect (at least from the DEP you might suffocate yourself and those around you from the stench). And what's more, this is a conservative estimate, as it would mean absorbing every single phthalate molecule in the perfume.

A similar calculation can be performed with DBP, which is present in nail polish. According to research by the Cosmetic Ingredient Review Expert Panel, an independent, non-profit organization charged with monitoring the safety of cosmetics, the highest concentration of DBP found in a bottle of nail polish was 15 percent, which amounts to approximately 1950 milligrams of DBP per bottle.

The most conservative NOAEL for DBP (arrived at by implanting chemicals directly into the stomachs of rats) is 50 milligrams per kilo of bodyweight per day. Thus, our 154-pound human lab rat could consume 3,500 mg of DBP, or every phthalate molecule from 1.8 bottles of nail polish, a day without ill effect. Test the rats by feeding them DBP – and the safety limit for humans rises to 11.8 bottles a day.

Given that even the most noxious lounge lizard couldn't use anything close to a half gallon of cologne a day, why are activists advocating a radical solution to a non-existent problem?

Blame Europe

Health activists protest that because the European Union has banned DBP, it must be dangerous. This sounds compelling, but it displays a rather simplistic understanding of what Europe has actually done. The ban on DBP is a result of legislation dubbed REACH (Registration, Evaluation and Authorization of Chemicals), which requires chemicals to be banned if they cannot be proven safe. This may, on the face of it, seem eminently sensible; but explaining what Europe's embrace of the precautionary principle meant in practice, philosopher Roger Scruton revealed it's essentially paranoid take on the world: "If you think there is a risk, then there is a risk; and if there is a risk, then forbid it."

In principle, this means that anything can be banned on the basis of the flimsiest of evidence; and in practice, legislators are doing just that. Even though a risk assessment by the European Chemicals Bureau in 2003 found that there was no risk to children from the use of the phthalate DINP in toys, a committee higher up on Europe's regulatory food chain over-ruled the report

and recommended a total ban (which will be voted on by the full European Parliament on July 7).

Declaring DBP, DINP or any cosmetic or toy to be dangerous without backing it up with realistic numbers is like shouting fire in a crowded theater because someone has a lighter in their pocket. There is, at present, no reason to believe that normal human exposure is in any way risky just as there's simply no reason to believe that a person with a cigarette lighter is an arsonist. And this is why regulatory bodies outside the E.U. have examined the data on phthalates and found them to be safe as used in cosmetics and toys.

Here's the moral of this story: We have everything to fear if we fear numbers. And if we fear everything, we're not going to take the genuine risks to our health seriously. Risks like smoking. In April, the American Cancer Society warned that over the course of the next year, some 168, 140 Americans would die from cancer brought on from smoking. This statistic is particularly ominous for women for even though cancer rates are generally declining, lung and bronchial cancer rates have sharply increased over the past 30 years.

Activists believe that when it comes to phthalates in cosmetics and toys, the lack of regulation is "shocking." But the real scandal here is that the public is being dis-

tracted by a health scare that has that has yet to show any scary data. Please Note

Given the outrage that accompanies any article that suggests industry is innocent until proven guilty when it comes to chemicals, it should be noted that STATS has not received any money or come under any pressure from industry to write any material pertaining to phthalates. STATS is a non-profit research center affiliated with George Mason University, which examines statistical and scientific misinformation in the media.

Study Says Bad Smells Can Cause Accidents

JULY 8, 2005

THE WRONG SMELL IN A CAR CAN CAUSE SPEEDING, dozing, road rage and potentially even serious accidents, according to a new study.

Having the right smell can help a driver to recognise dangers earlier, stay focused on the road ahead, forgive other peoples' driving errors and even find a bit of romance.

It's astounding how much the smell in a car can affect a driver's mood and actions, said Sue Nicholson, of the RAC Foundation, which reviewed a US study into odours and driving.

Smell is a very powerful sense and could result in a lack of concentration or over-reaction to minor irritations on the road - which can turn into potentially life threatening incidents.

The research identified peppermint and cinnamon odours as being the best cure-all, but the range of smells that can help or hinder driving are enormous. More than any other sense, the sense of smell circumnavigates the logical part of the brain and acts on the limbic and emotional systems.

This is why the smell of perfume can turn men into gibbering idiots and the smell of baking bread can destroy the best intentions of a dieter.

When we bring cars into the equation, the ability of various smells to over or under-stimulate us as drivers can have catastrophic results.

Dangerous smells to be aware of include chamomile, jasmine and lavender, which are all used to treat insomnia and can cause drivers to become over-relaxed behind the wheel. They are also present in many flowery air fresheners.

The smell of fast food, fresh bread or pastry can cause driver irritability, a preponderance to speed and an increased chance of involvement in road rage because they can all make drivers feel hungry and in a hurry to satiate their appetites. The smell of fresh cut grass, pine woods or roadside flowers, while relaxing some drivers, can put others into a nostalgic frame of mind where they daydream of swooping down country lanes and fail to appreciate the speed at which they are traveling.

A combination of leather seats and oil can make some older drivers remember the thrill and sense of freedom that came with their first cars. They could potentially then unconsciously adopt the risk-taking behaviour of much younger drivers. Smells beneficial to driving include:

Peppermint and cinnamon - improves concentration levels as well as making drivers less irritable.

Lemon and coffee - these smells are

good for clear thinking and high concentration levels.

New car smell (a combination of cleaning products and organic solvents) tends to make people concentrate better and also take more care with their driving.

Sea ozone a blast of salty sea air can encourage deep breathing which relaxes the muscles, relieves stress and calms the mind.

Citroen Australia stepped into the odour business by introducing the new C4 small car with a perfume dispenser.

C4 owners can select from a range of nine fragrances including lemon, cinnamon and, oops, jasmine and lavender. Let's hope they stick with the lemon and cinnamon.

Synthetics Harm Marine Life

JULY 11, 2005

SYNTHETIC FRAGRANCES COMMONLY ADDED TO PERFUMES, SOAPS, SHAMPOOS, and dozens of other personal health care products are proving harmful to the marine environment and potentially to humans as well, according to marine scientists.

Also known as synthetic musks, the chemical compounds reportedly compromise a cellular defense mechanism that normally prevents toxins from entering cells. The mechanism is controlled by efflux transporter proteins embedded in cell membranes.

Household Pollutants Disrupting Fish Genes

Hermaphrodite Frogs Caused By Popular Weed Killer?

Toxins Accumulate in Arctic Peoples, Animals, Study Says.

Low Sperm Counts Blamed on Pesticides in U.S. Water.

"Efflux transporters are like bilge pumps in a ship. Another analog is bouncersn these guys at the nightclub," said Till Luckenbach, a post-doctoral fellow at Stanford University's Hopkins Marine Laboratory in Pacific Grove, California.

The transporters recognize and pump out many kinds of toxins from cells, but if too many chemicals are around, the capacity of the transporters can be overwhelmed.

This is a potential danger in the presence of foreign compounds such as synthetic fragrances, Luckenbach said. The fragrances themselves are nontoxic, but by overwhelming the cellular bouncers, the fragrances allow unwanted toxins to slip by and contaminate the cell.

According to Luckenbach, this is a novel mechanism by which a wide range of presumably nontoxic chemicals could have a negative impact on plants and animals.

Together with Stanford biology professor David Epel, Luckenbach demonstrated the effect of these synthetic fragrances in experiments on California mussels.

Mussel cells share properties with some human cells, such as the cells found in a barrier that prevents toxins from entering the brain, Luckenbach said.

"We can't conclude that these [compounds] are having the same effect on humans, but we think it's something we should test," he said. Luckenbach and Epel published their findings this January in *Environmental Health Perspectives*, a journal of the U.S. National Institutes of Health.

Mussel Experiments

According to Luckenbach, wastewater treatment plants fail to

break down synthetic musks, allowing the compounds to spill into rivers and oceans via sewage discharge.

The compounds persist in the environment and have been shown to accumulate in the tissues of fish and other invertebrates.

Despite their pervasiveness, the toxicity and environmental risk of most synthetic fragrances are considered negligible, according to the researchers.

Household Pollutants Disrupting Fish Genes

Hermaphrodite Frogs Caused By Popular Weed Killer?

Toxins Accumulate in Arctic Peoples, Animals, Study Says

Low Sperm Counts Blamed on Pesticides in U.S. Water

The compound musk xylene is an exception. Its use was discontinued in Japan and Germany and banned in the U.S. from lipsticks and other ingestible products. In addition to a direct toxic effect, Luckenbach and Epel wanted to know whether synthetic musks pose an indirect health risk by compromising an animal's "xenobiotic defense system" the process by which efflux proteins remove toxins from cells.

To do this, the researchers

sliced gills off living mussels and exposed them to six synthetic musk compounds in water solutions. Musk concentrations were 300 parts per billion or less. The gills continued to function normally for a week after being sliced off, Luckenbach said. After two hours of exposure to the musk compounds, the gills were removed, washed, and placed in musk-free water with a red fluorescent dye.

Under normal conditions, efflux transporters (the bilge pumps or "bouncers") in the gill tissue recognize the dye as a foreign compound and remove it. If the transporters are impaired, however, the dye can accumulate in the cell.

This is what the researchers observed: Gills exposed to synthetic musks accumulated dye at much higher concentrations than gills not exposed to musks.

"We think these transporters are just overwhelmed. Their capacity is overstretched and they can't work properly," Luckenbach said. The cells, the researchers added, were impaired for up to 48 hours after exposure to the compounds. The finding is troubling, the researchers note, because there are many other synthetic chemicals in the environment that may work in a similar way.

"It's a warning sign. It's a smoking gun. Are there other chemicals out there that have similar long-

term effects? Could these be harming defense systems in aquatic organisms? And could they be having similar effects in humans?" Epel asked in a media statement.

Consumer Beware?

Before this project started, Luckenbach said, he knew nothing about synthetic musks. Now that he's aware of the potential health hazard, he looks at the ingredients in health care products and is surprised by the lack of information he finds. "In lot of cases you don't know what's in the product. They usually say 'perfume' or 'fragrance' but do not specify the compounds," he said. Some products are labeled as synthetic free or made with non-synthetic ingredients like lime, he added.

In a statement prepared in response to the study, the Fragrance Materials Association of the United States, a Washington, D.C.-based organization, said synthetic musks are safe for consumers.

"They are among the most thoroughly researched and tested fragrance ingredients. Their safety for human health has been extensively tested and affirmed by numerous regulatory agencies and academic scientists around the world," the statement reads.

The association did not return a phone call seeking further comment.

Sex & Smells

JULY 26, 2005

THE CONTROVERSY IS WHETHER THE USE OF SEXUAL ADVERTISING IS OFFENSIVE TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC. The purpose of advertising is to convince consumers that products are of use to them in one way or another, but the increasing amount of sexually graphic adverts has become a worry to some people.

Is sexual advertising necessary?

The use of sex in the media is seen by some as totally unnecessary and in poor taste. However there are those who feel that using sex is acceptable or even essential.

Magazines contain many types of print advertising used to sell products in specified target markets. The print advertising in magazines face a controversial issue of whether sexual advertising is offensive to the general public. Sexual images have been used to sell products for decades.

The question is, is it wrong to use sex as a selling tool?

Sexual images can be used to appeal to the consumer of almost any product. Some of the sexual advertisements in magazines are subtle, while others are blatantly obvious.

It is clear that sex is a strong appeal to sell certain products such as perfume or cosmetics.

Television commercials are another media vehicle that has caused controversy in the selling or promoting of products or services. Many commercials aired on television today incorporate sex appeal in the message in some way.

So it seems no matter where we look these days, sex is being used to catch our attention and encourage us to buy certain products and/or services, but it is up to us, the viewers, consumers and general public to decide whether we find it perfectly acceptable or degrading and wrong.

Sex Bias

AUGUST 12, 2005

San Francisco -

THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT RULED THURSDAY THAT THE STATE'S LAW AGAINST SEX DISCRIMINATION applies to a cosmetics executive who refused to fire a sales associate whom the executive's boss had deemed unattractive.

The 4-2 decision marked a significant expansion of legal protection for employees who oppose workplace discrimination, extending the whistle-blower law to workers whose objections may be subtle and to employers whose retaliation also may be undramatic.

The L'Oréal USA Inc. executive who sued in the case contended she was subjected to unlawful retaliation for balking at a discriminatory order to fire a productive worker and hire somebody "hot."

Whether the ruling will require a makeover of hiring practices at the prominent cosmetics and fragrance company remains to be seen.

A trial will decide if L'Oréal did anything wrong.

But the Supreme Court ruling, reinstating the case of Elysa Yanowitz, the company's former Northern California and Pacific Northwest regional sales manager, made it easier for employees to get a trial for asserted violations of the state's Fair Employment and Housing Act.

The decision "sends a message that workers are allies with the court in the battle against discrimination in the workplace and that if they stand up against discrimination, the law will protect them against retaliation, no matter what form that retaliation takes," said Joseph Grodin,

the former Supreme Court justice who argued Yanowitz's case.

L'Oréal did not respond to requests for comment. I wonder why?

The decision was the second in less than a month in which the state's highest court expanded whistle-blower protections. It gave the green light in July to a suit against the state Department of Corrections by two employees who had complained about a warden's sexual relations with other employees. Like Yanowitz, the plaintiffs ultimately left their jobs under strained circumstances.

Yanowitz went to work for L'Oréal in 1981 and was promoted to regional sales manager five years later, earning high marks on performance reviews, big bonuses and increased responsibilities.

Trouble started in the fall of 1997, after division general manager Jack Wiswall allegedly told Yanowitz to fire a dark-skinned sales associate whom he didn't find

attractive. The suit says Wiswall told Yanowitz to "get me somebody hot," expressing a preference for fair-skinned blondes.

Yanowitz claims she asked for an adequate justification to fire the associate.

She ultimately refused to carry out Wiswall's order.

Yanowitz alleges a series of retaliatory acts against her began solicitation of negative information from her subordinates, complaints about her performance, travel restrictions, veiled threats of dismissal.

She went on stress-related disability leave in July of that year and never returned.

Two big issues were decided Thursday whether Yanowitz could qualify as a whistle-blower and whether L'Oréal's asserted actions amounted to retaliation. The Supreme Court said yes to both questions.

In its defense, L'Oréal had argued that Yanowitz never said she was disobeying Wiswall's order because she considered it discriminatory.

The Supreme Court said she didn't have to that her request for adequate justification should have put Wiswall on notice that she was blowing a whistle on discrimina-

tion.

"It is not difficult to envision circumstances in which a subordinate employee may wish to avoid directly confronting a supervisor with a charge of discrimination and the employee engages in subtler or more indirect means in order to avoid furthering or engaging in discriminatory conduct," Chief Justice Ronald George wrote.

George also said Yanowitz could sue for retaliation despite the fact that she wasn't fired or demoted - that illegal employer retaliation can take the form of "subtle, yet damaging, injuries" rather than "one swift blow."

The opinion drew the line at "actions that threaten to derail an employee's career."

Justice Ming Chin, in a dissenting opinion signed by Justice Marvin Baxter, said Yanowitz never blew a whistle and, since L'Oréal didn't know she was complaining of discrimination, the company can't have retaliated for the exercise of a legal right, the dissent said.

Attorney George Howard, who submitted a brief in the case on behalf of the statewide Employers Group, predicted the decision will create more litigation because it will cause uncertainty "in the real world" over which acts are permissible.

He said employers want to know the rules for managing a work force, but "the court didn't give us the bright line I'd hoped."

But attorney Charlotte Friedman, who filed a brief on behalf of a coalition of civil rights organizations, said the court showed "a very profound understanding of workplace dynamics," particularly in defining retaliation.

The justices recognized, Friedman said, "that you can be nibbled to death by ducks" that a series of acts of subtle humiliation can interfere with job performance or future advancement or create a hostile work environment.

Graduating

AUGUST 24, 2005

ARTICLE ARGUING AGAINST GOVERNMENT PLANS TO SEND 50% OF SCHOOL leavers to university due to lack of graduate jobs. Instead vocational and professional qualifications should be promoted.

During the last couple of weeks another batch of twenty somethings will have attended award ceremonies across the country in honour of their graduations. In September, more youngsters will enter the university system. Unfortunately, the future for these wide eyed youngsters may not be as bright as they envisage.

With record numbers of students now attending university, there are just not enough graduate jobs to go around. Data collected by the Higher Education Statistics Agency shows that sixty percent of graduates can expect to have landed a 'graduate job' within six months of graduating. Just what constitutes a graduate job is questionable and the amount of time that it takes to gain these positions is unknown and probably amounts to months as opposed to weeks.

According to the Association of Graduate Recruiters the average graduate salary is £22,000. This may be obtained by the lucky few, but what about the majority? Well, they become statistics, forced to claim unemployment benefit or seek temporary employment. Others enter dead-end jobs, shattering the unrealistic illusions that the government and universities paint.

It's no wonder then, that many graduates are now questioning the value of a degree. It is possible to study virtually any subject from perfumery to medicine, but how many degrees are vocational and actually lead to a job? The answer is very few and a degree should definitely not be looked upon as a passport to a good job.

In fact, many students would be wealthier and just as successful if

they entered employment after school. They would avoid stifling debt and could study towards professional qualifications that were job related. Many graduates study for such qualifications and it is these which help them to gain employment as opposed to their degree.

The government's policy of encouraging all young people to attend university is annually increasing the number of graduates surplus to the requirements of the US economy. Perhaps, the government is trying to delay young people entering the job market in an attempt to hide unemployment. Unfortunately, it is the graduates that are paying the price and having their dreams of a highly paid job shattered. So, as you see the future for many of the graduates of 2005 may be less than bright!

Perfume Trade Cutting the Boise De Rose

AUGUST 30, 2005

UNTIL CHANEL NO. 5 PERFUME WENT ON THE MARKET IN 1921, pau-rosa, or Brazilian rosewood, was just another tree that grew in abundance in the Amazon.

But the enduring popularity of that fragrance, which includes rosewood oil as a key ingredient, began a process that has led both to a black market in the oil and the tree itself being designated as an endangered species.

Worldwide, the demand for perfumes, soaps, balms and scented candles has skyrocketed in recent years, boosted by rising incomes among women and new-age trends such as aromatherapy. Because of rosewood's cachet, demand for the oil far outstrips the legal supply, and some fragrance manufacturers will pay just about anything to get their hands on some.

"That bouquet is unmatched and it makes people act strangely," said Paulo Tarso de Sampaio, co-author of the book "Bio-Diversity in the Amazon" and a scientist at the National Institute for Amazon Research in Manaus.

"Intense exploitation means that all the areas where there was easy access to rosewood have just about been leveled, but still the demand continues to grow."

The European companies, mainly French, that dominate the fragrance industry originally obtained their stocks of rosewood oil from French Guiana, 800 kilometers, or 500 miles, northeast of here. But when the exploitation there grew so intense that the tree was virtually wiped out, they turned next to the Brazilian Amazon.

By the late 1980s, though, the rosewood population in Brazil's east-

ern Amazon had also been eradicated. Alarmed, the environmental protection agency responded by putting rosewood on its list of endangered species.

That measure was meant to stop the depredation. But with the agency unable to enforce its prohibition, much of the rosewood trade became clandestine, pushing prices up and forcing companies like Phebo, Brazil's oldest soap manufacturer, to look for lower-cost synthetic substitutes that are imported from places like China.

"Rosewood soap continues to account for half our sales, but we had to stop using the real thing around 1990," said Roberto Lima, manager of the company's plant in Belém, at the mouth of the Amazon. "We sell nearly four times as much soap as we did back then, but the scarcity of the natural extract has pushed the price to a level that only the big companies overseas can afford."

What happens after drums filled with the fragrant oil leave

mills in the Amazon and are exported, however, is not always clear. Environmental groups say that much of the oil is routed through a handful of brokers, many based in the New York area, but those intermediaries are reluctant to talk about how and where they obtain the product and how they manage to comply with the Brazilian government's strict regulations.

According to academic and industry studies, legal rosewood oil production in Brazil today is barely one tenth of the peak annual output of 300 tons, in the late 1960s. The number of registered mills, which turn rosewood tree trunks into oil through an inefficient process at a ratio of 100 to one, has also fallen drastically, from more than 50 in the 1940s to less than 8.

About six years ago, though, a community group in Silves, a small island town in the middle of the Amazon River, began an effort to try to revive the industry, this time on a sustainable basis. Rather than simply cut down trees and haul away their trunks, the group, called Avive, decided to prune branches and leaves every five years or so, thereby extending the usefulness of individual rosewood trees for decades.

Today the project, which began with money from the World Wildlife Fund and has also been supported by the British and German governments, has 42 mem-

bers, most of them peasant women. They have planted and now are tending more than 3,000 rosewood saplings in the heart of the jungle and distill rosewood oil and manufacture about 1,000 bars of soap a month at a small plant here.

"My husband used to work at one of the mills, and there they take out the tree and leave nothing in its place," said Anéte de Souza Canto, a leader of the group. "Not us. I'm 47 years old and have five daughters, so I'm thinking of the future."

In an effort to further plumb the riches of the rain forest, the group has also begun harvesting other exotic fragrances from trees for soaps and salves, always taking care to replace what they take. "Everything that smells good, we're planting," Marcio Joao Neves da Batista, who operates the distillery that boils leaves and branches into oil, said.

But Avive's task has not proven easy. Jungle lots that the government has placed under the group's care have been razed, with invaders simply cutting down and hauling away trunks from mature trees standing as tall as 30 meters, or 100 feet, that the cooperative had hoped to use in production for years.

According to Sampaio, the concentration of oil in rosewood leaves can be twice as much as that in the trunk. But larger volumes of branches and leaves are needed to

produce the same amount of oil and since that requires extra labor, it is more convenient and profitable for scofflaw lumberjacks and mill operators to stick to the old system.

Higher labor and operating costs also mean a higher price for the finished product. Middlemen have balked at paying that premium so long as illegal supplies are still available, but some users say they would gladly buy the environmentally friendly rosewood oil if only it were made available to them.

Fragrance & Multiple Chemical Sensitivity

SEPTEMBER 4, 2005

MULTIPLE CHEMICAL SENSITIVITIES (MCS) AFFECTS MILLIONS OF AMERICANS, as well as millions of people in other countries where artificial perfumes and pesticides are used. Perfumes are the most ubiquitous of hazardous waste chemicals, since "formulations" changed in the early 80s. Since that time, asthma rates have skyrocketed 80%, and MCS has become a debilitating epidemic. Man-made scents contain hundreds of untested unregulated petrochemicals, solvents, carcinogens, aldehydes, phthalates (suspected of causing birth defects), benzenes (recently linked with leukemia), phenols, narcotics, and most alarming, neurotoxins (chemicals that slowly poison the central nervous system). They also contain chemicals which are known sensitizers, as well as countless chemicals listed on the EPA's Hazardous Waste List.

Please learn more by reading my book, *Get a Whiff of This: Perfumes (fragrances)--the Invisible Chemical Poisons*, by Connie Pitts. Foreword by Rosalind C. Anderson. www.authorhouse.com, www.amazon.com, www.bn.com. I hope you will read the reviews.

You can learn a great deal by reading the following websites: www.fpinva.org, www.ehnca.org, www.nottoopretty.org, www.outlittleplace.org, and www.dldewey.com/perfume.htm for an overall briefing.

The numbers of people with MCS continue to rise--so does breast cancer, all neurological diseases, children's cancers, and the indoor air quality in most public buildings is worse than it has ever been in American history, despite the removal of tobacco smoke.

Advertisement

MCS is a debilitating disease, and no one is immune to its effects. It may happen slowly, then become disabling. There is no cure, only avoidance. Millions of people lose their jobs, friends and end up home-

less. It can happen to anyone. My own personal experience began with becoming sensitive to my perfume. There is no warning label on these deleterious products. After years of repeated exposures to other people's scents, I am now primarily housebound. What is most troubling is knowing that most people continue to use harmful, falsely advertised, products because they simply do not know the health risks, until it's too late.

Cologne & Smelling Naturally

SEPTEMBER 4, 2005

I AM ASSURED BY THE EDITORS OF THIS MAGAZINE THAT "THE DANDY" IS BACK. Of course, this is exciting news. I look forward to the fall season when fashionable men will be primed and groomed like figure skaters, with burgeoning pumpkin cravats and ankle boots sharpened like Eberhard Fabers.

However, young squire, your right to exploratory vanity ends at my nose. Lay off the cologne.

Believe me, I understand the impulse. Males are taught from an early age that, left to our own devices, we smell bad. And, well, we sort of do. Against America's pervasively astringent, odorless backdrop the clean room where hygiene meets mass consumerism any human scent has the faint reek of criminality.

Then there's the psychology of cologne ads, which portray fragrances as something like aromatic Mickey Finns, elixirs that render females horny and stupid. In the Darwinistic dance of sexual competition, men will take any advantage they can get. Pectoral implants, for example.

No wonder we pour it on. The irony is that the most arousing and provocative male fragrance the one that will make women's clothes fly off like you've turned a leaf-blower on them is Dial soap.

Karen Soza has smelled it all. She has worked the men's cologne counter at the Nordstrom in the Glendale Galleria for going on 13 years, long enough for her nose to put in for workers' comp. "We get immune to it," Soza says, with just a touch of been-there-smelled-that ennui.

It's a typical day behind her mirrored and bottle-spiked counter. Two teenagers are trying on cologne one has sprayed the crook of his elbow

and, in an effort to smell it, has his arm wrapped around his face like he's running through a burning building. The other, eager to show off his sophistication, is hyperventilating into the jar of coffee beans. Soza one of the store's "certified fragrance specialists" instructs them, weary and benevolent, an experienced older woman passing on the secret codes pour homme, a madam of the nose.

Men start coming to Soza as boys, often as young as 6 or 7 years old, wanting the same cologne that their dads wear chips off the old block, if the block has top-notes of bergamot and grapefruit zest. Around 16, she says, boys start to assert their own fragrance preferences, a bid for pheromonal identity that's as touching as it is atavistic in its lions-on-the-savannah way.

Soza agrees, young men wear much too much cologne. But not just young men. Older men often suffer a kind of olfactory impotence they can't smell the cologne, no matter how much they put on. Soza has smiled with pleasant astonish-

ment while gentlemen spritz their bald heads until the stuff is running into their ears.

She spends a good part of her day saving her customers from the cologne industry's propaganda. The effective range of cologne is about a hand's width not, as some cologne primers suggest, an arm's length. Cologne should be a surprise, a discovery, a conspiracy shared between a man and a woman in a moment of accidental closeness, say, during the widely practiced but often fumbled air kiss. If people in your office can smell your cologne at arm's length, trust me, they are looking for a way to turn the fire hose on you.

I don't hold with Soza on some of the finer points of cologne wearing. She recommends that customers put it on the hot spots the wrists, the throat, the back of the knees. The back of the knees? Only if you are moonlighting as a call girl.

And I'm very suspicious of the body chemistry theory. The truth is men aren't that complicated. The idea that some cologne clashes with a given man's exquisite natural scent is an invention of women trying diplomatically to tell their husbands or boyfriends that they smell like a French polecat.

It seems to me that not all cologne comes in a bottle. Spruce sawdust, pipe tobacco, Vaseline

Intensive Care hand lotion, camphor desiccant like the kind you put in your toolbox. The smell of horses. I had a girlfriend who adored patchouli oil, and so I spent an entire summer smelling like an Amsterdam coffee house, and I would have rubbed myself with roadkill if she'd wanted.

And don't underestimate the power of cheap drugstore cologne Brut and English Leather and British Sterling and even the antiquarian Clubman by Pinaud. Some women go through life looking for a man who smells like dear old dad.

I don't remember the first bottle of proper cologne I bought, or when, or how I came to know its fragrant mysteries. But I'm pretty sure I have someone like Soza to thank, some woman in a department store who took me by the hand and patiently led me to cologne's sweet bower.

Cocoa by Chanel

SEPTEMBER 16, 2005

QUESTIONS WERE RAISED TODAY OVER WHETHER KATE MOSS'S £1.3 MILLION modelling contracts are in jeopardy after she was caught on camera apparently snorting cocaine.

There is speculation that many of the top brands she represents may be looking again at whether they want her associated with their products.

According to reports Moss, 31, who only two years ago denied taking illegal drugs, faces a doubtful future with at least five big brands. Some are likely to have clauses in their contracts which would allow them to sack her if she brings their products into disrepute.

Cocaine threat to Kate's career

Chanel, Christian Dior, Roberto Cavalli, Burberry and Rimmel all declined to comment.

A 45-minute video obtained by the Daily Mirror apparently showed the supermodel preparing and snorting lines of white powder in a west London studio where her boyfriend Pete Doherty was taking part in a recording session.

Chanel, which uses Moss as the face of its Mademoiselle perfume, would not confirm she was still working for the label. A Christian Dior spokeswo-man, asked whether Moss continued to represent the brand, said: "Good question. I can't answer that." A spokeswoman for Roberto Cavalli, the Italian couturier, said she was not in a position to confirm Moss was still employed by the company.

An H&M spokesman said: "It's very sad. We don't know what will happen at the moment. We are in talks with her agent to find out the facts and will make a decision after that."

Moss is believed to have a personal-fortune of £30million and last year awarded herself a salary of £130,000 and dividends worth £200,000 from her company Skate Enterprises, in which she is the sole shareholder.

The fashion and PR worlds are split over how far the "cocaine" episode will damage her reputation and employability.

PR chief Max Borkowski told the Times: "She has done more to promote the idea of rock chic than anyone else, but there's a difference between flirting with that image and being too closely associated with the sleazy side of rock and roll. You can play with it as long as you aren't nailed, and she has been crucified."

Sources close to Moss, who is in New York for fashion week, said her lawyer woke her to tell her about the allegations and she "laughed her head off". Another source, however, claimed Moss was upset, adding: "She is terrified she is going to lose the Chanel contract."

Cocaine & Chanel

SEPTEMBER 18, 2005

FORGET THE CLOTHES. KATE AND COKE WILL BE ALL THAT THE FASHIONISTAS TALK ABOUT IN VIP AIRPORT LOUNGES, limousines and dressing rooms today, as the most famous models and designers fly in to the capital for the start of London Fashion Week.

Photographs of Kate Moss snorting cocaine have threatened the contracts with luxury brands like Chanel and Dior that earn her up to £4m a year. But an investigation by The Independent on Sunday has revealed what every insider at this week's glittering event already knows: cocaine fuels the fashion industry at every level, from glamorous catwalk to exotic photo shoot.

"Models use coke like truck drivers do," said an industry insider yesterday, "to stay awake and keep working." Another said cocaine was used as a "performance-enhancing drug" in the same way athletes use steroids.

And the model Sophie Anderton, who gave up cocaine a year ago, told the IoS yesterday: "Drugs are so accessible within the industry, and it is very difficult to steer completely clear of them."

Ms Anderton, who dropped to six and a half stone as a result of her former addiction but is now "happy and focused", said: "The enormous pressures to stay thin in the industry almost lend themselves to take a substance well known for suppressing appetite."

Kate Moss, who once said "I never do class A", is said to be distraught at having been photographed cutting and taking cocaine while with her boyfriend, the singer and drug addict Pete Doherty. She has yet to comment, despite reports suggesting that she had been "carpeted" by her modelling agency Storm and was considering entering a drug rehabilitation programme.

Moss has, however, apologised to the clothing firm H&M, which pays her £500,000 a year. "She has assured us it will not happen again and as a result we are willing to give her a second chance," said a spokeswoman. Moss will be the star of the company's Stella McCartney collection, due to launch in November. "We have strict policies for models. They should be healthy, wholesome and sound, and we are strongly against drug abuse. We made this clear to Kate Moss."

There was no comment yesterday from Chanel, Dior, Burberry or Fred of Paris, all of which employ Kate Moss. Rimmel did not comment but her face was still on the opening page of its internet site, which said she epitomised the cosmetic company's "experimental, no-set-rules beauty philosophy".

Her plight will attract sympathy among many of those at the 50 shows this week. "Of course models take cocaine," said a fashion insider, one of the many models, stylists and others in the industry

approached by the IoS. "So do designers. And hairdressers, particularly. It is there at fashion shows, definitely, but it is quite covert.

"If you're looking for a blizzard of cocaine, go on a shoot. They go abroad, and it is like a little family: the model, the stylist, the fashion editor. That's when it really happens. I think it goes with the territory."

"The fashion business has always had this problem trying to deal with self-destruction," said Stephen Fried, who wrote the biography of Gia Carangi. She was widely acclaimed as the first supermodel before becoming a drug addict. She died from an Aids-related illness in 1986. "I have talked to many models who have been sent by their agencies to get cleaned up. I don't think they have a hands-off approach at all."

Mr Fried compared models using cocaine to athletes who take steroids. "These women work incredibly hard. They take drugs for the same reason a truck driver takes drugs. To stay awake and do their job. Like steroids, these are performance-enhancing drugs."

Moss is unlikely to lose all her contracts, said the fashion expert James Sherwood, who spent time with the biggest names in fashion for the book and documentary *Models Close Up*. "Companies want Kate Moss for the whiff of

danger. If she overdoses then so much the better, she will be an icon. I'd have thought it would have made her even more of a commodity. With Burberry she could be in trouble: it's quite wholesome."

London Fashion Week is launched with a high-glamour party at the National History Museum today. Among those expected to attend is Donatella Versace, who announced earlier this year that she had given up cocaine after using the drug for 18 years. "In the beginning I had a great time," she says. "I didn't feel I was addicted. You just feel more awake, more aware. Unfortunately it didn't continue like that." Versace had been confronted by family and friends and agreed to go into rehab.

Naomi Campbell, who is due to model for Julien Macdonald this morning, admitted earlier this year that cocaine had provoked violent outbursts in her. "What is very scary is that you start to feel too confident and you start to feel indispensable."

Kate Moss usually turns up to support her friend Sadie Frost when Frost French presents a show. So will she be there on Wednesday? "Who knows, after this week's episode?" said a spokeswoman for London Fashion Week.

Fashion has long flirted with drug imagery, as Moss knows as

well as anyone. She is paid a reported £500,000 a year by Dior, which has a perfume called Addict. She has modelled for Calvin Klein, which produces Crave. And she was featured in adverts for the Yves Saint Laurent scent Opium. The London-born model was also a favourite waif for designers who opted for a wasted, "heroin chic" look during the Nineties. That trend produced its most dramatic result in 1998 when the designer Andrew Groves produced a show called *Cocaine Nights* that featured a dress made of razor blades and a catwalk strewn with white powder.

Jonathan Phang helped launch the career of Jodie Kidd and many others, and is now a judge on the reality television series *Britain's Next Top Model*. He has also worked closely with Christy Turlington, Jerry Hall and Marie Helvin. "There is no denying that some extremely seedy things go on behind the scenes," he said. "There are some horrible people willing to stoop to any level to exploit beautiful young women."

They may strut the catwalk with confidence, said Mr Phang, but many models are hugely insecure backstage. Some have left their friends behind at school. "I've seen girls working in London during the day, then getting on a plane to Milan for a 3am fitting. Sometimes agents are pressing them to cash in while they are hot property. They are not asking

whether the girls are getting enough sleep and eating properly."

It was hard for a young model to know whom to trust, he said. "The wrong people use and abuse women, and they introduce drugs as a means of control."

Donal MacIntyre, who has worked in the fashion industry as an undercover reporter, said: "Some models have to do lashes of cocaine just to keep the weight off. Some will literally have a piece of toast a day. I talked to lots of models who were relying on cocaine simply to keep the weight off. They need to stay slim and sleek. It is a brutal, brutal trade. Your time at the top is not a long one. It is a lonely trade, too. Plus, cocaine is a party drug; fashion is a party industry."

The drug is as ubiquitous as champagne and hors d'oeuvres at a launch party, confirmed many of the industry insiders the IoS spoke to. "Backstage, at a shoot, just waiting around, people use coke like others drink coffee," said one.

Seven months ago the new Commissioner of the Metropolitan police, Sir Ian Blair, said he was concerned that cocaine was socially acceptable among the middle classes. "There are some who think their weekend's wrap of charlie is entirely harm-free," he said, "but it may not be entirely harm-free for much longer." Sir Ian promised his force would be "making a few

examples of people". But yesterday, as more pictures were published, the Met said it could do nothing.

"If the Metropolitan Police finds or is presented with evidence of someone taking illegal drugs then they will act, no matter who that person is," said a spokeswoman, but photographs were not good enough evidence on their own.

However, that did not impress the former Home Office minister Ann Widdecombe MP. "There would be charges brought against a teenager standing on a street corner of an estate taking drugs, so the same should apply to celebrities," she said.

Another person who is said to be concerned about Moss's lifestyle is the publisher Jefferson Hack, the father of Moss's 3-year-old daughter: there are reports that he may be seeking custody of Lila Grace.

Celebrity Scents

SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

TO PARAPHRASE THE LATE ANDY WARHOL, will everyone have his or her 15 minutes of ... fragrance? These days almost any annoying celebrity merits his or her own scent, in an artsy bottle and sold with a dash of cloying hyperbole. Sarah Jessica Parker's *Lovely* came out last month, described as "feminine," "classic," "romantic" and "everlasting."

Britney Spears has *Curious*. In February Jennifer Lopez put out her third perfume, *Miami Glow*. Celine Dion and Paris Hilton named smells after themselves. Rumors are a Madonna musk is coming.

Sales of celeb scents approached \$100 million last year, part of a \$500 million market for fragrances linked to the famous, as when Nicole Kidman did a TV commercial cuddling up to Chanel No. 5. The trend is so overdone that the actor Alan Cumming all but spoofed it with his eau de toilette, *Cumming*, said to embody "sex, Scotch, cigars and Scotland." Even Donald Trump has *The Fragrance*, with sales of more than \$1 million in its first month last year.

Why can't other barons of business have their own scents, too? Kenneth Hirst, who designed the sleek bottles for Celine's *Belong* and J. Lo's *Still*, has concocted some "business fragrance" themes for Martha and Oprah. We've added three others.

Martha Stewart - *Forever Humble*

Dandelions from prison yard. The green of the bottle is for envy, wealth and gardening. The bottle also expresses Martha's penchant for home decoration for the holiday season.

Oprah Winfrey - *O*

A rich liqueur and a luscious fruit, an indulgence for someone who can have it all.

Bottle has subtle variations in glass thickness to reflect Oprah's fluctuating weight.

Richard T. Clark - Merck

Morning After

Men's medicinal cologne, with hints of bourbon, eucalyptus and tuberose. Unusually large pill-shaped bottle is light and precarious at the same time.

Philip J. Purcell, ex-Morgan

Stanley - *Cactus*

A prickly blend of pear, cedarwood and greenbacks, for the rugged climber. Bottle, fittingly, is shaped like a cactus and has eight thorns in its side.

Larry Page & Sergey Brin, Google

Voracious

Exultant mix of grapefruit, lime, apple and berries, from fields beyond search. Bottle is shaped like a Las Vegas slot machine.

Phthalate Dangers

OCTOBER 5, 2005

PHTHALATES, A FAMILY OF COLORLESS OIL-LIKE SUBSTANCES THAT PROLONG THE SCENT OF PERFUME, make nail polish flexible, and prevent children's toys from cracking under the pressure of being chewed among other uses. This follows on an activist-driven campaign over the past year to have the chemicals banned in the U.S (see *STATS* earlier article "A Health Care that Stinks" for more background).

Without directly endorsing the studies claiming a link between phthalates and male genital deformation, the *WSJ* suggested that we should be nervous: Phthalates are everywhere, and male infertility is on the rise. Stop the production and distribution of materials using phthalates, so goes the reasoning.

Only there's a problem: the studies cited in the article are far less conclusive than the paper suggests. The *WSJ* cites two human studies that conclude there is a link, describing their experiments in detail. But it buries the mention of two studies that failed to find a link among comments doubting their validity, and, at the same time, avoids spending any time describing the studies' methodologies. The result is a skewed picture of a controversial topic that guides the public towards the belief that most of the evidence points toward a causal relationship, namely, that phthalates are a threat to male reproductive health.

The first study cited (by Swan et. al. and published in the *Environmental Health Perspectives*) found that "baby boys whose mothers had the greatest phthalate exposures while pregnant were much more likely than other baby boys to have certain demasculinized traits," according to the *WSJ*. But *STATS* examined this study carefully and found some methodological problems, as well as a clear misinterpretation of the results by the press. The baby boys were not "demasculinized" in any way: the boys had a smaller anogenital index, which is a measure of the distance from the anus to the scrotum, adjusted for

weight. In rats, under high doses of phthalates, this anatomical change also occurs, as does damage to the reproductive systems of the rats. In humans, no damage to the reproductive system was measured at all. And the shortened anogenital distance was well within normal ranges for baby boys.

In addition, the study failed to follow a couple of important statistical principles. The burden of proof to show a correlation between two things (such as high phthalate level and small anogenital index) is measured by what is called the "p-value". This value is a measure of how likely it is that we would see the data from the study purely by chance and not because there's an actual correlation (or a causal relationship) between the two. The same principle is behind the idea that, if you flip a coin ten times, you might get three heads and seven tails. Can you conclude that the coin is biased? Depends on how unlikely it would be to get the skewed results. In the case of the Swan study, the p-value is calculated incorrectly they did not take into

account the fact that they tried to correlate the anogenital index with several different phthalates. When you try to associate a measurement with several different possible correlates, you have a higher chance of “finding” something that is really just a chance relationship.

Other problems with Swan's study include a limited sample size from only two locations in the U.S. This makes it very difficult to control for external factors that may be the real “cause” of the anatomical difference measured in the study, rather than phthalates.

While the chips are not in on phthalates, remarkably few studies are looking into how phthalates get into our system. How are phthalates used in “construction materials, clothing, toys and furnishings... adhesives, waxes, inks, cosmetics, insecticides and drugs,” as well as perfumes and medical devices, making their way to our babies, our urine, and our sperm? In some cases this might be obvious, such as swallowing pills with a phthalate-containing coating, but in others (such as that found in nail polish), the entry into the human body is not clear at all.

Yet the argument against phthalates is having an impact on industries that do not produce materials meant to be swallowed. Scary sound-bites, such as the result that preemies exposed to medical tubing have phthalate levels five times

as high as babies not exposed, are trumping reports of the follow up study, which concluded that these same babies did not subsequently have any fertility problems. The high stakes involved in the phthalate debate make it all the more important that the media give a balanced view of the scientific evidence.

Editor's note -

STATS will look at the underlying arguments made in the Wall Street Journal series on the risk from trace amounts of chemicals in food, consumer products and the environment - and the toxicological disputes that can skew the appearance of risk - at a later date.

Remaking Cosmetics

OCTOBER 19, 2005

Cosmetics -

Everything from soaps and shampoos to makeup and perfume are a \$35 billion industry in the United States. American consumers might be surprised to learn that cosmetics manufacturers are not required to test a product for safety before putting it on the market.

But that may be changing. A new California law is the first to require that cosmetics companies disclose potentially toxic ingredients.

The weekend is a busy time at cosmetics counters at shopping malls across the United States. That's where Carrie Hetges, 17, takes a seat for a free makeup session with Kristin Milan, product consultant with Benefit cosmetics. "Look up for me dear! We are going to give you a nice natural glow," she tells her customer. When Carrie tells her she isn't going anywhere special today, Kristin Milan says simply, "Every woman should be pampered."

Cosmetics consultant Kristin Milan with teen client Carrie Hetges. Kristin Milan pampers Carrie's face, eyelids, eyelashes, eyebrows and lips. Minutes later the young blond, blue-eyed teen looks in the mirror and likes what she sees. "It's really a new me," she says, "My boyfriend I think will like that."

In rapid succession, Kristin Milan applies nine products to Carrie's face. On average, American women use nine products from hand lotion to toothpaste each day. While the U.S. Food and Drug Administration says these products must be safe and their ingredients labeled, the FDA has not set a safety standard. The industry which sponsors a product review panel largely regulates itself.

Jane Houlihan, with the Environmental Working Group, a consumer advocacy organization, says people have a right to know the health risks associated with the products they use. In a recent study, EWG analyzed ingredients in 14,000 cosmetics. "We compiled those in a massive electronic database and then compared it systematically against government and academic lists of suspected health effects from these chemicals," she says.

Shopping for lipstick

Ms. Houlihan says the industry's review panel has tested only 11% of the 10,500 ingredients in these products. "That means the vast majority of what we are using on our bodies everyday has not been assessed for safety publicly," she says. "We also found many products that do raise concerns progesterone, placenta ingredients that are hormonally active that could affect our hormone system, ingredients that can effect reproduction or a healthy pregnancy."

JAN HOULIHAN

A new law in California makes it the first state to require manufacturers to disclose known or suspected carcinogens or ingredients that could affect developmental or reproductive health. Jane Houlihan applauds the new law, but says the industry must do more.

"It doesn't make sense to use carcinogens, reproductive toxins, developmental toxins in personal care products when there are alternatives," she says. "We need to see companies proactively make formulation changes to safer ingredients. And I think the California law will encourage that."

DAVID STEINBERG

A statement from the Cosmetic, Toiletry, Fragrance Association the leading industry trade group says the California law is "damaging" and "will do nothing to increase public safety." Industry analyst and columnist David Steinberg sums up the industry position: "California has been losing manufacturing jobs in the cosmetic industry for about the past 20 years. That is going to accelerate," he says.

Mr. Steinberg says the law requires checking to see if cosmetics contain any of 50,000 chemicals. "We are right now doing computer studies to see if any of them are showing up in cosmetics," he says, "and we are not finding very

many of them. This bill is a joke. It is not making anyone safer. It is creating bureaucracy. And would you show me one person who was injured by a known ingredient in cosmetics that has caused cancer or reproductive toxicity."

Getting a manicure and nail polish Jane Houlihan with the Environmental Working Group says the proof comes from scientific studies: "A growing body of evidence shows that people who use dark hair dyes for long periods of time for years in their life face increased risks of bladder cancer," she says. "We have new evidence in the area of phthalates. These are common plasticizers. They are used in fragrances and nail polishes. And, a new study this year has shown that baby boys exposed to phthalates through breast milk or in utero through their mother's exposures have impaired reproductive development."

Jane Houlihan says new research will help consumers make better choices. She calls on the industry to set meaningful safety standards for their products. The Cosmetics, Toiletries and Fragrance Association faults the EWG study and says consumers should not be alarmed. Safety decisions, the Association president says, must be based on "sound science and not on misleading rhetoric and Internet rumor."

Wasting Money on Expensive Perfumes

OCTOBER 19, 2005

THE ROMANS BELIEVED PERFUMES WERE APHRODISIACS. Only now are various scientific studies beginning to prove these ancient beliefs true. The Romans used perfumes lavishly, and made wide use of musk in their perfumes. The musk they used was from the anal glands of the Ethiopian civet cat. Research today shows that musk closely resembles the smell of testosterone, the male sex hormone, which both men and women have as part of a healthy and responsive libido.

Musk can also be obtained from a sac in the abdomen of the male musk deer. Due to protests from animal rights groups, and the extreme cost of real musk, synthetics are widely used today. Musk is used as a fixative and a base 'note' in many perfumes. Perfumiers use the musical analogy of 'notes' to describe a perfume's effect. Base notes, acting as fixatives, prolong the scent of a perfume on the skin, and add an earthier fragrance to the composition of the perfume that complements the usually floral top and middle notes. When you smell a perfume in a store, you smell the top note first, which lasts mere minutes, the middle note second, which lasts a few hours, and the base note last, which can last days. Thus, a musky perfume will mark you with a certain *je ne sais quoi* for a few days.

Scent, Sex, and the Nervous System

In olfactory studies conducted at Toho University in Japan, Professor Shizuo Torii demonstrated the influence of the scent of floral and herbal essential oils on the sympathetic branch of the nervous system. Sexual arousal and response is controlled by the two parts of the sympathetic nervous system. The sympathetic nervous system prepares us for physical action or emergencies, and the parasympathetic nervous system generally stimulates the opposite responses. The parasympathetic nervous system is dominant during arousal, until the intensity of arousal builds, and then the sympathetic nervous system begins to flood

the bloodstream with adrenaline until orgasm takes place.

Torii found that the parasympathetic branch of the automatic nervous system was influenced by the scent of essential oils made from sandalwood, marjoram, lemon, chamomile and bergamot. The action of the sympathetic nervous system was increased by the scents of jasmine, ylang ylang, rose, patchouli, peppermint, clove, bois de rose, and clove. An ideal aphrodisiac, then, would be a combination of these scents possibly the ones you find most appealing. You can buy the essential oils in health food stores. They are very concentrated, however, and they need to be diluted. You can put a few drops of essential oil into a carrier oil like jojoba oil, olive oil or even just canola oil.

Are Expensive Perfumes Alluring or a Waste of Money?

It's not the only time a study like this has been done. Nancy M. Booth, professional perfumier and author of *Perfumes, Splashes and*

Colognes: Discovering and Crafting Your Own Personal Fragrances, remembers that the same test was done by Glamour magazine with uncannily similar results. “They did a multiplicity of tests on men, to see which ones evoked a sexual response,” she says, “and cinnamon buns, pumpkin pie, and licorice were the scents that men responded to.”

But what woman wants to smell like roast beef or pumpkin pie?

Common Sense, Aphrodisiacs, and Perfumes

“Your sense of smell is the strongest of your five senses. There is a memory center in your brain called the smell print. If someone enjoys someone else’s fragrance, and then they smell it again, even if it is years later, they will remember it. It is like a fingerprint but it is a smell print. Fragrance is very powerful and it evokes very emotional responses in people,” says Booth. “I’ve had people follow me in Home Depot and say, ‘wow, what are you wearing’. It shows you that on every level people are very aware of smells.” She advises that when trying to find a perfume to work as an aphrodisiac, make sure that both you and your partner are equally enamoured with it.

“I bought a perfume that was just wonderful,” she recalls. “And I came home, and my husband said,

oh, who’s wearing the cat pee? So you have to be sure it’s something that someone else’s nose appreciates as much as yours.”

First, you have to figure out which fragrance families you and your partner like. In the fragrance families for women, there’s floral, fruity, citrus and spicy, which are self-explanatory. There is also ‘green’, which is more or less the scent of freshly mowed grass; modern, which is made up of chemical scents that have no natural equivalent; and chypre, a fragrance formula inspired by the Mediterranean isle of Cypress. There is also oriental, the ‘heaviest’ fragrance family, which includes wood, resin, and musk scents. ‘Obsession’ by Calvin Klein is an example of an oriental. The newest family of fragrance is ozone-oceanic: think sea-spray. As well as the families mentioned above, there are a few different families in men’s fragrances, such as leather and lavender.

“Knowing the person you are trying to attract and what fragrance families they like makes a big difference,” says Booth. “One couple, it was her birthday. And she really liked this lemon-lime (citrus fragrance family). So he bought the lemon-lime. A few weeks later he came up to me and he said, ‘do you have any of that lemon-lime with you?’ And I said, ‘why?’ And he said, ‘I got lucky.’”

Expensive perfumes, then, can

work very well in the bedroom if they are attractive to both partner’s noses. However, there’s nothing that says a few drops of essential oil in vegetable oil won’t work just as well. That’s also an excellent massage oil.

Crashes & Air Fresheners

OCTOBER 24, 2005

CAR AIR-FRESHENERS COULD ACTUALLY CAUSE CAR CRASHES, according to a Bahrain-based aromatherapy expert. That is because they can cause sleepiness, headaches, irritability and even depression in drivers, says Spa Arabia Concepts managing director and spa consultant Betsy Mathieson Abdulrahman.

"Chemicals are all around you and car air-fresheners are among the worst," she told the GDN.

"We are being bombarded with chemicals, but car air-fresheners are worse because of the enclosed space.

"We should also be aware of chemicals in wrappers and packets in our cars.

"Multiple Chemical Sensitivity (MCS) is something we should all be aware of, as chemicals are found in food wrappers and cleaning products."

Mrs Abdulrahman referred to a survey conducted by a doctor in the UK, which showed a link between depression and the use of chemical air-fresheners.

The study examined 50 clinically depressed patients who were suffering from anxiety and hyperventilation - and all used air-fresheners.

While using the air-fresheners they complained of nausea, irritability, insomnia, headaches and depression, but once they stopped using them their symptoms vanished.

A study conducted in 1999 by Bristol University, UK, also highlighted the negative effects of chemical air-fresheners.

It looked at the effects of spray and chemical plug-in air-fresheners on 14,000 women during their pregnancy and on their babies six months after birth.

The study was divided into two groups: the first used chemical air-fresheners on most days, while the second was not exposed to them at all.

It found that 25 per cent more of those in the group exposed to air-fresheners suffered from headaches, while 19pc more had post-natal depression.

Meanwhile, 30pc more babies under six months suffered ear infections after being exposed to chemical air-fresheners, while 20pc more had diarrhoea.

"There is nothing natural in these types of air-fresheners, they are full of man-made chemicals, or if they do have anything natural in them it would be a drop of an essential oil along with 30 chemicals," said Mrs Abdulrahman.

"MCS is real because of all our environmental pollution - you walk into the department store or the toilet and all of these fragrances are forced upon you."

As an alternative to chemical air-fresheners, Mrs Abdulrahman recommends those made from essential oils.

However, she advised drivers to be careful what type of essential oil they choose for their cars - as some such as lavender can have a sedative effect.

A report by the RAC, UK, also showed that air-fresheners and car smells impacted on driver behaviour.

It found that the smell of a car could cause dozing and road rage, but could also improve concentration and clear thinking.

Among other things the study showed that camomile, lavender and jasmine, which are often presented in many flower-scented air-fresheners, could cause drivers to become over relaxed.

It also showed that food and wrappers in cars could cause irritability, hunger and give rise to speeding and road rage.

However, smells such as peppermint, lemon and cinnamon were shown to improve concentration.

"When driving, don't use lavender or things that will make you too relaxed," said Mrs Abdulrahman, who has been working with aromatherapy oils since the mid-1970s.

"You need to have your instinct about you so you can have black pepper, eucalyptus, bergamot, peppermint or tea-tree oil.

"Tea-tree oil is also anti-viral and kills airborne viruses.

"If you need energy, or want to be awake, take rosemary. It works on the memory banks of the brain."

Bathrooms Toxicity

OCTOBER 24, 2005

EARLIER THIS YEAR, THE US FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION (FDA) DID SOMETHING AMAZING. It issued an unprecedented warning to the cosmetics industry that it was time to inform consumers that most personal care products have not been safety tested.

Where the US goes, the UK inevitably follows. If the FDA starts the ball rolling by flexing its muscles, it is possible that in the not too distant future 99 per cent of personal care products could be required to carry a caution on the label: "Warning: The safety of this product has not been determined."

What concerns scientists at the FDA and at environmental health organisations throughout the world is the "cocktail effect" the daily mixing of many different types of toxins in and on the body and how this might damage health over the longer term.

On average, we each use nine personal care products a day containing 126 different ingredients. Such "safety" testing as exists looks for reactions, such as skin redness, rashes or stinging, but does not investigate potential long-term problems for either humans or the environment. Yet the chemicals that go into products such as shampoos and hand creams are not trace contaminants. They are the basic ingredients.

Absorbed into the body, they can be stored in fatty tissue or organs such as the liver, kidney, reproductive organs and brain. Cosmetics companies complain of unfounded hysteria, but scientists are finding industrial plasticisers such as phthalates in urine, preservatives known as parabens in breast-tumour tissue, and antibacterials such as Triclosan and fragrance chemicals like the hormone-disrupting musk xylene in human breast milk. Medical research is proving that fragrances can trigger asthma; that the detergents in shampoos can damage eye tissue; and that hair-dye chemicals can cause bladder cancer and lymphoma. An

even greater number of substances in personal care products are suspected to present potential risks to human health from this known effect on animals.

If these problems had been linked to pharmaceutical drugs, the products would have been taken off the market. At the very least, money would have been spent on safety studies. But because the cosmetics industry is largely self-governing, and because we all want to believe in the often hollow promises of better skin and whiter teeth, products containing potentially harmful substances remain in use and on sale. Think it can't be that bad? Consider what goes into some of the UK's most popular toiletries.

Olay Regenerist

What they claim: Instantly improves the appearance of fine lines and wrinkles.

But watch out: To work, the product needs to be well absorbed, so Regenerist contains penetration enhancers like disodium EDTA.

But these also drive toxins deeper into the skin. Watch out for hormone disrupters such as ethylparaben, methylparaben and propylparaben and potential carcinogens such as polyacrylamide, triethanolamine (which can form cancer-causing nitrosamines), and the artificial colours CI 16035, CI 19140 and PTFE (Teflon). Regenerist contains the sunscreens butyl methoxydibenzoylmethane (B-MDM) and ethylhexyl salicylate; not enough for an SPF rating, but potentially enough to irritate skin.

Clairol Herbal Essences Shampoo Dry/Damaged Hair

What they claim: A totally organic experience.

But watch out: It looks and smells appealing because it is coloured using four potentially cancer-causing dyes (CI 17200, CI 15510, CI 42053, CI 60730) and perfumed with synthetic fragrances that are known neurotoxins and skin irritants. Among its detergents, sodium lauryl sulphate can irritate skin and permanently damage eye tissue, and sodium laureth sulphate and cocamide MEA can be contaminated with 1,4-dioxane, a hormone disrupter associated with breast cancer. Cocamidopropyl betaine, another detergent, is a penetration enhancer, as is the solvent propylene glycol and the preservative tetrasodium EDTA; all allow other chemicals to penetrate more

deeply into skin and bloodstream.

Johnson's Baby Softwash

What they claim: Best for baby, best for you.

But watch out: Children's skin is thinner and more absorbent than adults', so is a less effective barrier to chemical toxins. The rates of eczema and allergies among children are on the rise and the early introduction of toiletries on to sensitive skin may be a factor. When soap does the job, why expose your child to skin and eye irritants such as sorbitan laurate, cocamidopropyl betaine and acrylates/C10-30 alkyl acrylate crosspolymer, or PEG-150 distearate, PEG-80, PEG-14M and sodium laureth sulphate that can be contaminated with the carcinogens 1,4 dioxane and ethylene oxide, or hormone disrupters such as parabens? In addition, there's nothing here that naturally moisturises the skin - only synthetic polymers (plastic-like substances) like polyquaternium-7 and polypropylene terephthalate that coat it, merely giving the impression of smoothness.

Calvin Klein's Eternity

What they claim: What the world needs now is love.

But watch out: Perfumes are made from the same neurotoxic solvents found in glues and adhesives and volatile chemicals common in

garages and factories, albeit in much smaller concentrations. Eternity contains a staggering 41 ingredients, about 80 per cent of which have never been tested for safety in humans. The rest are known neurotoxins, allergens, irritants and/or hormone disrupters. Still think perfume is sexy?

Lynx Dry

What they claim: Spray more, get more.

But watch out: Lynx Dry contains three types of neurotoxins: solvents such as PPG-14 butyl ether; the propellants butane, isobutane and propane; and synthetic fragrance chemicals. It contains a preservative BHT (butylated hydroxytoluene), which has been linked with cancer, and PEG-8 distearate, which can be contaminated with the hormone-disrupting carcinogens ethylene oxide and 1,4-dioxane as well as polycyclic aromatic compounds such as benzene and benz(a)pyrene. Aluminium zirconium tetrachlorohydrate GLY and aluminium chlorohydrate work by clogging pores, but long exposure to aluminium-containing deodorants raises the risk of diseases such as Alzheimer's.

Colgate Total

What they claim: 12-hour fresh breath and antibacterial protection.

But watch out: Conventional

toothpastes often contain irritating detergents like sodium lauryl sulphate, which can cause sore gums and mouth ulcers, and abrasives like hydrated silica, which can erode tooth enamel. Total contains a glue-like substance, PVM/MA copolymer, that sticks the active ingredients to teeth. Saccharin, a known carcinogen in animals, is also found. The colouring CI 42090 (banned in Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Norway, Switzerland and Sweden) causes cancer in animals. Total contains Triclosan, an antibacterial agent that can in certain circumstances combine with chlorine in tap water to produce chloroform gas, which is easily absorbed into the skin or inhaled and can cause depression, liver problems and cancer.

Gillette Mach 3 Shaving Gel

What they claim: The best a man can get.

But watch out: Helped by a global advertising campaign featuring David Beckham, Gillette shaving products have carved their way into the male psyche. If he thought about the ingredients, would the "epitome of the well groomed man" be so keen to promote the product? Mach 3 gel contains skin irritants such as triethanolamine, palmitic acid glyceryl oleate, three potential carcinogens (polytetrafluoroethylene (Teflon), BHT, CI 42090) and three central nervous system toxins or pollutants (isopentane, parfum

and isobutane).

Clairol Nice N Easy

What they claim: Natural-looking colour with complete grey coverage.

But watch out: All hair dye sold in the EU containing phenylenediamines, resorcinol and/or 1-naphthol must carry a warning: "Can cause an allergic reaction. Do not use to colour eyelashes or eyebrows." Other hair dye ingredients - including coal tar dyes, 4-chloro-m-phenylenediamine, 2,4-toluenediamine, 2-nitro-p-phenylenediamine and 4-amino-2-nitrophenol - have proven carcinogenic in at least one animal species. In humans, intensive longer-term use of permanent hair dye is associated with breast, ovarian and bladder cancer, non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, multiple myeloma and rheumatoid arthritis.

Radox Bubble Bath

What they claim: Soothes emotions, cleanses the body.

But watch out: Soaking in hot water increases skin permeability and helps vaporise chemicals in products, making them more easily inhaled. Radox Relax contains potential skin irritants (sodium lauryl sulphate, cocamidopropyl betaine) potential carcinogens such as the preservative combo methylchloro-isothiazolinone and methylisothiazolinone and synthet-

ic dyes, and hormone-disrupting ethylhexyl methoxycinnamate. It contains perfume ingredients that are capable of irritating (coumarin, benzyl salicylate, limonene) and disrupting the central nervous system (butylphenyl methylpropional, alpha-isomethyl ionone, linalool).

Nivea Body

What they claim: Feel the essential care.

But watch out: Along with semi-synthetic fatty acids and waxes, Nivea Body contains denatured alcohol and glycerine, which can dry skin with repeated use. It also contains several estrogenic preservatives (methylparaben, butylparaben, ethylparaben, isobutylparaben, propylparaben), contact allergens (phenoxy-ethanol, linalool, citronellol, hydroxyisohexyl 3-cyclohexene carboxaldehyde) and a potential carcinogen (limonene). Film-formers like dimethicone keep undesirable ingredients next to the skin longer. About one-third of the listed ingredients are fragrances that are known irritants and sensitizers of human skin; chemicals that, with repeated exposure, can trigger allergic reactions.

Clearasil 3-In-1 Deep Cleaning Wash

What they claim: Clinically proven to help fight spots.

But watch out: A mix of strong detergents and surfactants (sodium lauryl sulfate, cetyl betaine, distearyl-dimonium chloride and steareth-21), chemical exfoliants (salicylic acid) and solvents (glycerin, alcohol, menthol) that are capable of removing the skin's natural oils, and synthetic skin conditioners for repairing some of the damage inflicted by the other ingredients. It contains two potential carcinogens (BHT and disodium EDTA) and fragrance ingredients among the most commonly reported contact allergens in the EU (behenyl alcohol, limonene benzyl salicylate, linalool and hexyl cinnamal). These so consistently lead to skin problems that they must now be listed separately on labels within the EU.

Listerine Teeth & Gum Defence

What they claim: Kills the germs that cause plaque and bad breath.

But watch out: This mouthwash is 21.6 per cent alcohol. Alcohol dries and changes the pH of the mouth and throat and long-term use of alcohol-containing mouthwashes increases the risk of mouth and throat cancers. Listerine also contains a mild detergent, poloxamer 407, that is soluble in liquids at low temperatures but turns to a gel at higher temperatures (ie, body temperature). That makes it a film-former, "glueing" other ingredients on to the surfaces of the mouth for

longer. Fluoride in quantity is poisonous if swallowed, and the sweetener saccharin causes bladder cancer in animals. Finally, synthetic colours, aromas and flavours are made from volatile solvents that can alter the basic flora of the mouth and may cause dermatitis.

Pat Thomas is health editor of The Ecologist. Her series 'Behind the Label' appears in the magazine every month

(www.theecologist.org)

New Car's & Their Smells

OCTOBER 26, 2005

THAT NEW CAR SMELL, IS THE MOST EXPENSIVE FRAGRANCE IN THE WORLD," says gfn.com's gay financial expert Andrew Tobias. It can also be hazardous to your health.

Researchers have conclusively linked that fragrant new-car smell to a toxic cocktail of harmful chemicals emanating from fresh plastic, paint and upholstery.

Just sitting in a new car can subject riders to toxic emissions several times the limits deemed safe for homes or offices, according to a study by Australia's Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization.

"We find new car interiors have much higher volatile organic compounds levels than any building we've researched," announced research leader Steve Brown, who noted the problem tends to dissipate after about six months.

The fumes leached from glues, paints, vinyls and plastics in the passenger compartment can trigger headaches, sore throats, nausea and drowsiness. Prolonged exposure to some of the chemicals, like formaldehyde, can lead to cancer.

Earlier this year, Japanese car makers addressed the issue by agreeing by 2007 to cut cabin levels of 13 volatile organic compounds, or VOCs, including possible cancer-causing agents styrene and formaldehyde, to match Japanese Health Ministry guidelines for air quality in homes.

Toyota, Nissan, Honda, Mitsubishi and Mazda are rolling out cars in compliance and touting the lower VOC levels as a key selling point, reports the Associated Press.

Toyota spokesman Paul Nolasco told the press, "Cutting down on the things that lead to these smells is only something that can be better for you."

In the U.S., the Washington-based Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers, which represents nine carmakers including General Motors Corp., Ford Motor Co. and Daimler Chrysler AG, says it doesn't follow the issue of VOCs.

Sex & Fragrance

OCTOBER 26, 2005

THE SECRET TO STEAMING THINGS UP IS INEXPENSIVE, doesn't require a prescription, and comes straight from Mother Nature. It's scent, and a growing body of scientific research shows that scent-producing pheromones play a key role in attracting sexual partners.

That's right the secret to a night of wild, uninhibited passion could lie in the pumpkin pie that you baked or the vanilla candle you burn on the night table.

"Sexual drive is a very primitive drive," explained Dr. Christine Richards, an instructor at Heaven Scent School of Aromatherapy in London. "Smell goes straight to the brain, and if you're smelling something you like, you can easily get aroused."

The most commonly believed and studied claim is that women are attracted to a man's sweat. But it is important very important for men to understand that keeping your dirty gym clothes in your car won't turn you into every woman's fantasy.

According to a study conducted by the Social Issues Research Centre (SIRC) entitled "The Smell Report," there are two types of male pheromones. One is found to be a turn-on for most women, while the other is a guaranteed deterrent.

"Androstenol is the scent produced by fresh male sweat and is attractive to females. Androstenone is produced by male sweat after exposure to oxygen i.e. when less fresh and is perceived as highly unpleasant by females (except during ovulation, when their responses change from 'negative' to 'neutral')," according to Kate Fox, director of the SIRC and author of the study.

But all hope isn't lost for all you men out there who don't feel at

home on the field/court/rink. The culinarily-inclined can also benefit from pheromones. Many scents of common foods and food combinations have been shown to increase sexual stimulation, including black licorice, cinnamon buns and a pumpkin pie/lavender combination.

In a study conducted by Dr. Alan Hirsch of the Chicago-based Smell and Taste Research Foundation, women reacted most feverishly to a scent combination of licorice and cucumber. They were least aroused by the smell of cherries and charcoal barbeque smoke.

What turned men off? According to Hirsch, men were least aroused by the scent of cranberries. So ladies, when you're cooking Thanksgiving dinner, hold the cranberry sauce, but make extra pumpkin pie.

One key to remember for scent success is to use essential oils, not synthetic, chemically manufactured oils and fragrance, according to Richards. Only essential oils can produce physiological stimulation.

Trade Marking Strawberries Fails

OCTOBER 27, 2005

AN ATTEMPT TO TRADEMARK THE SMELL OF RIPE STRAWBERRIES was thrown out by European Union judges yesterday.

A Paris company, Eden, tried to trademark the smell and a picture of a strawberry for a range of soaps, face cream, stationery, leather goods and clothing.

It argued that strawberries might taste differently but they all smell alike.

But the court said sensory experts had found they could have up to five distinct scents. "This means ... the different varieties of strawberries produce significantly different smells," the judges ruled.

They went on: "There is no generally accepted international classification of smells which would make it possible ... to identify an olfactory sign."

However, they agreed that, in some cases, a trademark for a scent could be allowed.

Only one scent has so far won EU trademark protection: the smell of freshly cut grass. A Dutch perfume company registered it in 2000 and uses it to make tennis balls smell good.

Branding

NOVEMBER 2, 2005

THE SMELL OF ARMPITS, DIRTY LAUNDRY, AND SOILED DIAPERS are all now highly sought-after scents, as companies, pursuing smelly-branding have all lined up, excited for having exclusive rights to aromas which they can use to bring odor to their lifeless products. Like, peachy-smelly-bras or chocolate-smelly-underpants and so on.

All of a sudden, there is a rush to secure a copyright on any distinct smell from our daily lives, and exclusively use it in conjunction with a branded product or a service. Like the smell of bread in a hot oven at the bakery to be used by a sandwich maker, or like the smell of Gouda cheese and the notorious whiff of dirty socks, to be exclusively used by a shoe maker.

Ridiculous Attempts

So here it is. This is what happened to the most recent aggressive attempts by Paris-based company, Eden Sarl, who tried very hard to get the smell of strawberries exclusively copyrighted for products of soap, stationery, leather goods and clothing.

Initially, EU Trademark agencies refused their earlier applications, so they took it to their regional second-highest courts. They too, rejected Eden Sarl's application. So what's all the fuss?

The smell of armpits, dirty laundry, and soiled diapers are all now highly sought-after scents, as companies, pursuing smelly-branding have all lined up, excited for having exclusive rights to aromas which they can use to bring odor to their lifeless products. Like, peachy-smelly-bras or chocolate-smelly-underpants and so on. There are some not so pungent odors, like apples, bananas and oranges, but all the attempts for exclusive use have failed.

The Sensory Expansions

This brand new frontier is said to be giving a big boost to odorless products. The general idea is that by using smell as an exclusive sensory tickler, now considered by many, a stroke of branding genius, marketers can bring life to their already dead brands. Sounds very sensory, but in reality, it's time to smell the coffee.

According to the practitioners of these trendy branding jockeys, every corporation is supposed to have their own distinct branded smell. Remember the fumes and the steamy whiffs when you enter a sausage factory, a Laundromat, beauty saloon or funeral parlor.

Now just wait for the exclusive and powerful smell of a bank, where every branch smells the same. Perhaps the smell of a fish store, or a realty office with a smell of a rose-garden, with soft music all aimed to hypnotize the customer. What about the smell of a hotel? Should it smell like an airport or the last diesel taxi? The desperate

hours of the desperate branding are already here. You not only need to hear and see the collapse, but now you can smell the rat too.

Branding Limitations

When there is no proper name brand identity, and there is no sophisticated cyber-branding game plan, then there is certain panic to find dumb and dumber things to do and keep the branding circus going in all directions.

According to BBC reports, the EU courts stated "Strawberries do not have just one smell. This means that the different varieties of strawberries produce significantly different smells." Surely, we now need some wine tasters and keen noses.

On the strawberry issues, the company wanted this aroma exclusively for their product lines, just like the way some companies attempted to claim exclusive corporate colors, which indecently holds no water either and no longer a winning case, as there are only few colors and billions of companies and products. Blue is no longer exclusive to IBM, but equally used by ten thousand other computer companies. What worked in the fifties, as an exclusive color idea, is no longer valid in the post-millennium market. Don't you smell trouble here?

Exclusive Noses

As part of a new craze for smelly-branding, hip brand managers are desperately trying to project a sensory message with an exclusive aroma. Checkbooks are being scented, clothes are pre-perfumed, and cars are wildly sprayed. Now you know why massage oils are scented, and how aromatherapy became so popular.

For perfume companies, this was a normal thing to come out with an exclusive fragrance, and to sell it as an expensive branded perfume or cologne. But now, for branding to rush after the generic smells from the public domain and claim them exclusive for their product lines, is a short lived gimmick of a tricky branding attempt by the feeble few marketers and their nasal clogged minds.

Any brand can develop any original fragrance and use it just like any fashion brands have already done so successfully, but to say that the smell of the ocean and sea salt is exclusively copyrighted to a tire company is really having the creative noses buried in merde! Phew, that's some aroma.

Fall Sports & Their Smells

NOVEMBER 11, 2005

OF ALL THE FIVE SENSES, SMELL IS EASILY MY FAVORITE. My reactions to different smells vary a great deal. For instance, when certain girls walk by me with some kind of incredible perfume or whatever scent it is girls wear these days, I will immediately become interested in meeting them. Sometimes a certain smell such as my chocolate chip cookies in the oven (yes, I bake cookies), makes me hungry. This is because we often associate scent with something we enjoy. Our sense of smell is called "olfaction."

Certain people's olfaction is stronger than others. It was under my suspicion that through my olfaction I could better understand fall sports and the various smells that these athletes gleefully give off. I set out and researched the Washington University fall sports teams. I smelled various articles of clothing, pieces of equipment, and the occasional sweaty person. I decided that it was better to simply rate each sport's overall stinkage. My results were very interesting.

Football is the fall frontrunner for overall raunchy scent. According to defensive back freshman Tommy Bawden, "Our shoulder pads are what smell the worst, and that's pretty much because we wear them everyday and they are never washed. Eventually as a football player, though, you get used to it."

I indeed took a brisk whiff of a random football player's pads and nearly passed out. I was either high or could not breathe; I could not decide. I thought about Bawden's comments about getting used to the smell. I thought about the people that haul manure everyday-do they get used to that smell as well? I therefore had to give football an overall 8.7 (10 being the worst smell) due to the fact that every time I went into the varsity locker room during my research, I was reminded of my one devastating whiff by 50 or so shoulder pads resting at the top of the lockers.

Soccer for both men and women described their smells to me. Junior Meghan Marie Fowler-Finn claims that when the girls wear practice pennies (those stylish red jerseys you would throw over your t-shirt in high school gym class) a day after wearing them in the rain, the pennies emit a horrid aroma.

"It smells as if something small like a little gray squirrel got into the pennies and died the night before," commented Fowler-Finn.

Matt Fenn, a junior goalie, claims that his goalie gloves have a very strong odor.

"My goalie gloves are part of the worst smell I have ever smelled in my life. I wash my hands twice after every game, and they still smell," said Fenn. "Their smell is comparable to a wet sweaty shirt that was left in a dark place for a month."

Although Fenn and Fowler-Finn gave me a good case to rate them higher than football, I decided

to give them a 7.37 for a couple reasons. I did smell Fenn's gloves, and alone they get a 13.2 (on scale from 1 to 10), but since there is only one goalie during a game, his gloves are part of a less frequent smell associated with soccer. The penny jerseys are not part of the soccer team's game uniform, so therefore the dead animal stench did not pull them to the top.

Volleyball was a sleeper on the stank scale. I theorized that volleyball would be the most decent smell and would probably average out at about 4.1. This prediction came with the few things I know about women's volleyball. The uniform consists of a tight shirt and tight semi-shorts. With this in mind I imagined that any bad smell would slide off the surface of the uniform and disappear into the stratosphere of the well-kept athletic center.

Sophomore Kathy Leeper informed me, however, of another part of every volleyball player's game attire- kneepads.

"We wear them to every practice and game, and after wearing them so often the smell just does not leave, no matter how many washes the knee pads go through," explained Leeper.

Leeper also went on to say that some girls on the team have worse-smelling kneepads than others. I did get a chance to smell some kneepads during my research and

they were indeed quite pungent. Pungent indeed. I therefore gave volleyball a 7.01.

Cross country comes in last on the stank scale for a few reasons. When I asked sophomore runner Michael Nasuta what part of the sport smells, he responded by saying, "The groin region after running usually omits a strong stench." He described the smell as "the smell of pure man." Whether or not I had to smell this pure man stench is not important.

Cross country, unlike any other sport, runs in big open areas with fresh air. I realized that every sport probably has the same groin smell, which I believe can also be referred to as body odor. Since cross country has nothing unique about their uniforms that make them smell more or less, I had to give them a 4.0. The 4.0 rating is basically the generic rating I give to people after they work out.

During the past few weeks of research I learned a lot about my olfaction. The smell of cut grass, crops being harvested, the fragrance of leaves on a wet fall day can all bring back memories. The smell of the men and women's varsity locker room makes me pinch my nose in disgust. In the end I realized not to get mad at fellow students when they say that Washington University fall sports stink, because they may mean it literally. At least I do.

Fragrant City

NOVEMBER 17, 2005

IT MAKES SENSE THAT A CITY MASSING TOGETHER 8 MILLION PEOPLE, the world capital of the arts and finance and entertainment and diplomacy, the teeming center of countless cultures and histories and myths, should be known for a multitude of smells both foul and fair.

.. VERONIQUE FERVAL, DIRECTOR OF FRAGRANCE DEVELOPMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL FLAVORS AND FRAGRANCES, SAYS THAT NO MATTER HOW MUCH WE COMPLAIN, New York's subways ...

On one level, we're all inured to it. To the fishy smell on the streets in Chinatown and the dank slaughterhouse runoff that's still between the cobblestones in the Meatpacking District. The dog piss in the alleys, the rotting food in garbage bags waiting to be collected and the salty sea air that sometimes wafts over downtown to remind us we live in a port city.

Of course there are the food smells coming from restaurants and street carts, the Indian and Thai spices, the spicy burritos, the souvlaki steak and pretzels cooking on the vendor's grill and the roasting nuts. It is a constant sensory overload that we learn to ignore, until some out-of-towner points out the stink of the ginkgo trees in Central Park on a fall day. New Yorkers noticed, though, when a sweet smell of unknown provenance covered the city a couple of weeks back.

Whether one thought it was caramel or freshly baked pie, it was its very unusualness that perked everyone up from Staten Island to the Upper East Side.

"For some reason I thought it was my girlfriend's hair, and I asked her why her hair smelled like maple syrup; it was pretty strong," recounts Rich Chapple, who noticed the sweet odor from bed at midnight.

We are so used to tuning expected smells out, developing our anosmia, that when an unexpected one emerges, it throws us.

For some, the sweet smell struck fear. One friend of mine theorized at the time that it was some kind of chemical weapon, or at least something dangerous and toxic, but tests by the police department revealed nothing dangerous in the air. A piece in *The New Yorker* was more cynical, theorizing (perhaps in jest) that it might have been an elaborate ploy by real estate agents to improve sagging housing values. Some thought it might be a quick change in the weather affecting the trees. The jury is still out on the cause, but even chocolate maker Jacques Torres was reportedly questioned in the official inquiry.

The subway has its own smells. Each station has a distinctive aroma. Some stations aren't particularly bad, with just the dank wear of rust and dirt, while others have notorious smells.

A recent NY1 report pointed

out a particular station, the 51st St./Lexington Ave. stop on the 6, E and V, where a specific underground hallway besieges thousands of passengers daily with an odor that smells like something between a clogged toilet and a dead body.

The MTA says the odor is the result of a broken water pump that has left standing water to collect in an elevator shaft for at least a year. The agency said they would fix it about a month ago, but the stink is still there. A similar smell can be found in certain corners of the Union Square station.

An unscientific poll of people I know revealed that almost everyone has a gripe against a particularly smelly subway station. I'm told that walking towards the R on the Canal St. station is putrid, the Brooklyn Borough Hall station reeks of dirt-infused bleach and that several 7 stations in Queens are plagued by the smell of pigeon shit. "It is as if the same sandwich has been rotting there since the dawn of time," says one friend of the uptown platform on the 125th St. A, B, C and D.

There are, though, some neutral odors and even good ones in the subway. The 16th St. entrance to the 14th St. F stop always smells of freshly cooked bacon, while a "fantastic chocolate smell" lingers around the Bond/Hoyt St. and Carroll St. stations.

Veronique Ferval, director of fragrance development for International Flavors and Fragrances, says that no matter how much we complain, New York's subways smell better than those in Paris, where "there is more of a scent of sweat and perfumes on the Metro because there is no air conditioning. At the same time, people's hygiene here is also better compared to Europe, so often there are clean and subtle fragrances on the train. Sometimes you can smell people's detergent."

When I went to investigate many of the other subway smells, most struck me as sort of mundane; the usual choking sweetness outside Perfumania, the pleasant sugar and honey smell of the street around bakeries and the noxious industrial smell of mechanic shops along 3rd Avenue in Brooklyn; paint thinner, hydraulic fuel, gasoline. Even the steam coming out of the grates in the street and the burning smell of electricity near some manholes weren't so unusual.

Some were bad but kind of weirdly reassuring. The air pushed out of vents near hospitals and the interiors of buses on cold, stormy days (wet wool meets sweat). The incense burning at Union Square is awful, but it's always there, as is the smell of hookah pipes near the Middle Eastern places along Steinway St. in Astoria and the grease vents outside the diner on 101st and Broadway.

Rayda Vega, a perfumer at Quest International, says New York is a particularly odorific city because of the volume of garbage produced daily.

"No other city in the United States has the amount of garbage put out in the street for pickup," observes Veda. "This gives New York a very 'ripe' smell after 10 at night, except on Saturday night, when the garbage is saved up for Sunday."

Ferval says this kind of garbage smell is particularly bad during the summer, when New York's humid climate makes it more susceptible to odors hanging in the air, leaving heavy, pungent aromas to exacerbate and fester and intensify. But she notes that there are always fragrance respites.

"There are extreme negative smells, but New York also has extreme positives," says Ferval. She says that the city's good smells can be characterized as "sugary" as opposed to Paris' "buttery." She advocates a walk along the West Side Highway for the breeze from the ocean, or a stroll through Chelsea Market to cleanse palates of foul scents.

Upon returning home to Omaha or Dubuque, it's likely many tourists tell their friends about the intensity of the smells in the five boroughs. The rich, heavy aromas may, in fact, be one of the reasons

that they think the city's fun to visit
"but I wouldn't want to live there."
For many of us, it is our sense of
smell that orients us and gives
streets distinction and sense of
place.

And maybe because of this,
when I'm out in the country, breath-
ing fresh air that smells vaguely
like pine and away from the heavy
city, I often can't sleep.

Deoderants & Cancer

DECEMBER 5, 2005

IF YOU'VE CHECKED OUT THE BACK OF YOUR ANTIPERSPIRANT LATELY, you might have noticed something different: new labels required by the Food and Drug Administration. They point out that antiperspirants are "drugs" containing "aluminum" ingredients that's what stops the sweat.

The aluminum is also what concerns some people, including Dr. Kris McGrath.

"I personally feel there is a very strong correlation between the underarm hygiene habits and breast cancer," McGrath tells CBS News correspondent Sharyl Attkisson.

McGrath, an immunologist and instructor at Northwestern University, has been intrigued by a potential breast cancer link since medical school.

It got personal when his wife a frequent shaver and antiperspirant user got breast cancer.

"She was diagnosed with breast cancer in 1987," McGrath says. "She died in 1989."

People who don't believe in a link point to this 2002 study that finds no connection.

But it didn't take into account how often a woman shaved and used antiperspirant, which McGrath considered crucial. So he did his own study of breast cancer patients and found this: The more these women shaved and used antiperspirants, the sooner they got breast cancer.

Is he trying to say all cases of breast cancer could be linked to

antiperspirants and shaving?

"Absolutely not," McGrath says. "Breast cancer has existed since Hippocrates. But when you plot the sales of antiperspirant deodorants with the incidence of breast cancer in the United States, they both have grown in almost a parallel fashion."

It's not conclusive proof, but enough, McGrath says, to call for large-scale studies.

Rumors of a link between antiperspirants, shaving and breast cancer have circulated for years, but had been written off as an urban myth by most people including the FDA's Web site which calls it a "...false...scary stories..." CBS News tried to ask the FDA whether the case really is closed, but they wouldn't let Attkisson interview any of their experts.

Instead, they seemed to shift from the "myth" status, telling CBS News: "FDA is aware of concerns that antiperspirant use (in conjunction with underarm shaving) may

be associated with increased risk of developing breast cancer. FDA continues to search scientific literature for studies examining this possible adverse drug effect. Unfortunately, there are many publications that discuss the issue, but very few studies in which data has been collected and analyzed. Overall, the studies (containing data) are inconclusive in determining whether antiperspirants, in any way, contribute to the development of breast cancer. FDA hopes that definitive studies exploring breast cancer incidence and antiperspirant use will be conducted in the near future."

The billion-dollar antiperspirant industry says the products are undeniably safe.

"Has this issue been definitively laid to rest?" Attkisson asks John Bailey, a director of cosmetic chemistry as the cosmetic toiletry and fragrance association.

"I think the products are safe and I think that the best science is being applied to making that determination that they're safe," Bailey says.

"But you're not saying yes or no," Attkisson says.

"It's not a yes or no answer," Bailey replies.

The National Cancer Institute and American Cancer Society agree

a link can't be conclusively ruled out. But they say there's no reason to throw out your antiperspirant in fear. Read the Cancer Institute's fact sheet.

McGrath advises his patients to consider the uncertainties. At least one of them thinks the government ought to go public and admit the breast cancer antiperspirant myth might not be a myth after all.

"I think the government should take an honest stand and say if they're not sure, so that women have the right to know and that they can make their own choice," says Michelle Bibergal.

Phthalates & Their Dangers

DECEMBER 11, 2005

ONE YEAR AGO, MICHELE HAMMOND AND HER HUSBAND, JEREMIAH HOLLAND, sat together at their dining room table, contemplating some frightening lab results for their two children.

Their son, Rowan, a rambunctious, towheaded toddler, had some of the highest levels of flame retardants in his blood of anyone measured on Earth.

And their daughter, 5-year-old Mikaela, was close behind.

The question at the time was whether these children were unique: Did something in their home or life lead to such unusual numbers, or might most children have higher-than-expected levels?

It is hard to say, because even today Rowan and Mikaela remain the only two young children in the United States to have been tested for such compounds.

A year later, however, new exposure estimates and more data about these chemicals in our environment make the answer clear: They are not alone.

The science suggests that for this flame retardant, polybrominated diphenyl ethers, or PBDEs, levels in children throughout the United States are higher and possibly much higher than their parents.

And parents, particularly in California, already have the most flame-retardant blood in the world, so high the most-exposed are near levels causing fertility and sexual defects in lab rats, according to one analysis.

"What we are seeing here is very serious," said Ake Bergman, pro-

fessor of environmental chemistry at Stockholm University in Sweden and one of the first scientists to alert the world to the threat posed by PBDEs.

"If in fact you have exposure the first few years that is exceeding the parents' exposures, this may have this may have implications for brain development."

A year later The Berkeley family was part of a newspaper investigation of our "body burden" a chemical legacy, picked up from our possessions and imprinted in our brain, blood and fat cells.

Scientists suspect synthetic chemicals plastic, flame retardants, pesticides, even the chemical precursors for nonstick frying pans taint the blood of everyone alive today.

It's the result, they say, of nearly 50 years of reliance on synthetic chemistry without a full understanding of how these compounds interact with our environment.

The amount of these chemicals in our bodies is vanishingly small; so minuscule scientists had trouble seeing it just 10 years ago. Now researchers suspect some of the compounds impair our health.

The Oakland Tribune tested the Hammond-Hollands for traces of five metals and four classes of chemicals: PBDEs; their banned cousins, the polychlorinated biphenyls, or PCBs; plastic additives known as phthalates; and an exotic chemical family, perfluorinated acids, used to make Gore-Tex, Teflon and other nonstick and waterproof products.

The investigation found all but arsenic in their hair, blood or urine. In many cases, the children's concentrations were higher than the parents'. But the PBDE results confronting the Hammond-Hollands at the dinner table went far beyond what even scientists expected.

PBDEs are a family of chemicals astonishingly effective at slowing fire in foam and plastic.

They permeate everything from seat cushions and drapes to carpet padding, TV sets and computer casings. National demand was 36,500 tons in 2001, nearly 80 percent of the world market and almost double demand in 1990.

The fear among scientists is that they act like PCBs, the banned electrical insulator known to linger

for years in the body and cause brain, thyroid, kidney and liver damage. Levels have leapt exponentially in humans during the past 20 years, doubling and then doubling again.

Banning compounds:

Europe banned the source of compounds in 2001. California and several other states followed starting in 2003.

The amount of PBDEs in Michele and Jeremiah was fairly normal for Californians about 100 parts-per-billion. A typical level in the United States is closer to 40 ppb, but in California with stricter fire safety laws the norm sits closer to 80 ppb, according to recent state data.

For perspective, a bucket of popcorn salted at such a concentration has just one-third of a grain of salt.

The two children, however, landed in a class by themselves. Mikaela measured 500 ppb. Rowan had nearly 700 ppb.

For Jeremiah and Michele, news that those figures may not be unusual comes as relief. For the rest of us, scientists say, the information becomes a concern of unknown but worrisome proportions.

Some recent findings:

Children likely ingest 100 times the PBDEs their parents do, based on a Canadian model published this summer.

Breast milk is a major pipeline for these chemicals. Many of the PBDEs concentrate in fat.

Using estimates published earlier this year, 21/2-year-old Rowan, who still breast-feeds, likely gets 130 ppb PBDEs from his mother every day. Not all gets absorbed. For newborns, the number would be even higher though with the effects of PBDEs so uncertain and the benefits of breast milk so clear, scientists strongly urge mothers to continue breast-feeding their babies.

And although researchers see big differences between the body burdens of breast-fed and non-breast-fed infants, that difference diminishes rapidly as they grow and is gone completely by their teens, Birnbaum said.

House dust is a huge reservoir of PBDEs, for reasons not fully understood. And young children such as Mikaela and Rowan ingest twice as much dust as adults, according to EPA estimates. Adjusted for their smaller bodies, that means children take in nearly 10 times the PBDEs as their elders, pound for pound.

Levels continue to rise, particularly in the United States. Seventeen years ago, the typical level in the nation was 5 ppb. Samples from the late 1990s put California's norm at 42 ppb, half its present-day mark.

In May, scientists reported that two adults picked at random in New York had the highest concentrations ever found in a human: one at 4,000 ppb, the other at almost 10,000 ppb.

Those levels, particularly for the highest exposed, exceed concentrations harming animals.

A study published last month by Tom McDonald, a former toxicologist with the California Environmental Protection Agency, examined the body burdens of animals showing defects from PBDE exposure.

He concluded rats start to see impaired male fertility and ovary cell development at 230 ppb, behavioral change at 660 ppb and dampened thyroid activity at 5,700 ppb.

Smell of Panic a Natural High

DECEMBER 13, 2005

HOW, I WONDER, COULD YOU BOTTLE A FRAGRANCE WHICH CAPTURED THE VERY ESSENCE OF SWINGING LONDON? Let's not worry about why - though the news that there is now a range of air fresheners that reproduce the peculiar smells of the Japanese city of Osaka does offer a kind of precedent. If there were to be an aroma that summed up our bustling capital, what would it be? The smell of a day-old Happy Meal being run over by an approaching District Line train? A faint hint of shoe-borne dog-shit that seems to follow you around? Eau de bendy bus? A heady mix of the three?

Perhaps, but for me the quintessence of the urban experience will always be the ongoing clash between raw aggression and unbridled doziness. For this reason, my preferred scent has to be the intoxicating bouquet of freshly panic-bought petrol. Here the phrase "panic-bought" serves the same purpose "line-caught" does when used to describe sea bass: an evocative detail which speaks in the latter instance of bearded old salts in an open boat, and in the former of an early evening fist-fight between a marketing consultant and a taxi driver on a fluorescent-green forecourt. And why is such a fragrance so Londony? Because in London, all petrol is purchased this way.

Of course it's not strictly accurate to call it panic-buying when it happens every day. At the weekend police were once again urging London drivers not to panic-buy their fuel in response to the Buncefield fire, but I think this was simply a case of crisis-induced police-hysteria. They fear that panic-buying will, if unchecked, lead to shortages, and so they panic. They deploy junior officers to a nearby petrol station to investigate. There they find a 20-car queue and people punching each other and think: aha! Panic-buying! Just as we feared! But this is not panic-buying.

The true reasons for the phenomenon are manifold, but chief among them is a failure on the part of roughly half of London's motorists to realise that in a modern, 16-pump forecourt, with its free-swivelling

nozzles and overhead-suspended hoses, it doesn't matter which side your petrol cap is on any more. If you get the wrong side the hose will still reach. Add to this the fact that the other half of London's motorists know this only too well and you get the classic combination of needlessly long queues and lots of pent-up anger. Can you smell that anger now? Can you smell it on me? That's because I dabbed a bit of unleaded behind each ear this morning.

I know what you're thinking. You're thinking that all petrol smells the same: panic-bought, impulse-bought, London-sourced, even the cheap stuff you get in Spain. And you're right. London could just as easily be evoked by the sharply contrasting fragrances of expensive coffee and free newspaper, or the sweet tang of gum chewed by the previous occupant of a minicab, or the particular aroma of a small corner shop into which no more than three schoolchildren are ever allowed at one time. In truth, I'm just trying to avoid the obvious answer, which is piss.

Fake Fragrance Problem

DECEMBER 13, 2005

IN BRAZIL, THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF CAMPINAS, UNICAMP, HAS DEVELOPED A NEW TEST TO identify pirate of fake perfumes, a problem that costs the industry millions in lost revenues every year.

Unicamp's Chemical Institute has developed the test around very simple principles that provide accurate results in the space of just two minutes, the Brazilian Toiletry, Perfumery and Cosmetic Association, ABIHPEC reports.

Fake cosmetics is a growing problem of global proportions. In Europe alone, EU customs authorities have reported that seizures of counterfeit cosmetic products, including fragrances, jumped by 800 per cent in the period 2003 - 2003, with the main hubs for the trafficking of such products found in Eastern Europe and China.

Unicamp researcher Rodrigo Catharino, who has headed up the project at the university's Sao Paulo-based research facilities, says that the test takes a snapshot of the perfume's composition, revealing the outstanding characteristics of the compound.

He adds that all that has to then be done is to compare the results with the original formulas. Replicating the exact composition of a fragrance is a task that few counterfeit producers would have the resources to carry out.

The scientist believes the test might allow authorities in Brazil, as well as internationally, to inspect the perfumes easily and without having to make a considerable investment, something that has proved difficult to do until now.

"The test is performed with a mass spectrometer, a device already in use to prove the origin of several products. All we need is a data base of

the original perfumes' composition", he said.

Currently the identification of authentic cosmetic products is restricted to security tags and labels. One of the leading providers of such solutions is US-based firm Microtrace.

It provides tagging solutions for a variety of consumer industries, including cosmetics and toiletries manufacturers. Its Microtaggant Identification Particle technology relies on microscopic encoded particles, incorporated into the packaging to act as virtual 'fingerprints'.

Although this has proved to be one of the most effective solutions in the fight against cosmetics piracy, it is not the cheapest solution. Catherino says that other packaging identification systems for cosmetic products have not proved to be a deterrent, as pirate products have been developed to even copy intricate holographic safety stamps.

Although the research on the detection system was completed

this summer, Catharino says that he wants to work towards making this a popular way to fight the problem of fake fragrance products, ultimately benefiting both consumers and manufacturers.

Criticism of Fragrance

DECEMBER 19, 2005

SEE, I WAS SEARCHING desperately for two things a gift for my wife and something to mock when I saw an ad for a new perfume.

Something stinks today and, lucky for me, it's this column.

It's Carlos Santana, a scent inspired by the Grammy-winning guitarist -- and probably not the distinctive aroma that surrounded him at the original Woodstock.

Gosh, I thought, what woman wouldn't want to smell like an aging rocker?

Then I did some online shopping and realized Santana is hardly the only celebrity or the only odd choice on a perfume bottle.

I found fragrances from Baryshnikov and James Bond, Britney Spears and Barbie Super Model (the last two are different people).

Heck, there's even a SpongeBob SquarePants scent. Mmmm, is that a really hot babe or another serving of lox?

I mean, to steal a term from perfumer Christian Lacroix, it's Bazar.

It's all about image, of course. That's why you'll find scents called Rhumba, Samba and Mambo. But no one's ever going to say, "Gee, you smell great. Is that Square Dance?"

But because perfumers must fill a ton of tiny bottles, some inevitably go astray with product names.

One firm makes Alien ideal if you're dating E.T.

There's Coty Wild Musk, just in case you're into oxen.

And if you're fleeing a crime scene, don't leave a whiff of DNA by Bijan.

Some names are packed with emotion.

Like, um, Emotion.

Others are perplexing.

Jean Louis Scherrer offers Immense. To my surprise, it doesn't come with a roller.

And Calvin Klein dreamed up Eternity Moment, which seems like a contradiction until you realize he also offers a perfume that's actually called Contradiction.

Some scents go together well like Madness and Mania, or Chemistry and Equation.

Then again, I'd buy Fracas or Fragile, but not both.

I was taken aback by Caesars, a

perfume from casino-operator
Caesars World. I bet it's a subtle
blend of florals and tobacco smoke.

Or am I thinking about the
man's fragrance someone dubbed
Cigar?

Another surprise was Doulton,
the scent rolled out by china-maker
Royal Doulton. You mean my wife
could smell like a gravy boat?
Wow!

With a few names, I'm just sus-
picious.

Does Elizabeth Arden's Fifth
Avenue really capture the essence
of bus fumes?

And a perfume named for ten-
nis player Maria Sharapova sup-
posedly includes Wimbledon grass.
I'd be more impressed if the little
bottle grunts when you spray it.

For a few products, I'd like to
help with their ads:

Puma Man: For guys who
should shave more.

Swiss Army: It smells kinda
neutral.

And Quorum: So you can get it
on at your next council meeting.

None of this helps with my gift
selection, though.

I'd buy Attitude, but my wife

has plenty of that.

Instead, I'm torn between Amor
Amor and Anais Anais.

She's remarked several times
on my tendency to repeat myself,
so either would be perfect.

A very favorite Chaos, reminis-
cent of the mess in Iraq.

Just perfect.

Breast Cancer & DEP

DECEMBER 24, 2005

ASK A MAN TO KEEP A SECRET, and he'll announce to everyone he meets that there is something he can't talk about.

Men do not do subtle.

Tell a man that the suggested dress attire is laid back and casual, and he'll show up in flip-flops and a Speedo.

Give a guy a couple of beers and a dance floor, and what comes to mind is electrocution.

So when marketers began hyping various men's body sprays, washes and lotions as being irresistible to women, well, the male response has been predictable:

They've been buying the stuff by the vat, rationalizing that if a little bit of these fragrances will help you get a girl, then crop-dusting yourself down with a lot of the stuff will help you get a lot of girls.

This is why more and more men are walking around these days smelling like they have been dragged through wild flowers, dipped in the ocean and then waterboarded in rain-forest fruit pulp.

Men just do not do well with fragrances, which is why they should probably not be allowed to purchase anything from the scent family without a prescription.

Nor, should they be permitted to apply anything from the scent family to their bodies with the possible exception of foot powder - without proper supervision.

No, men are much better off teetering along the edge of funky. Give

them a shower and Speed Stick, and they should be good to go in most circumstances.

The only time men should resort to outside aromatic agents is in situations where they have not had a chance to shower and their natural state may violate human-rights or chemical-weapons treaties.

What is ironic about the current male obsession with fragrance-ization is that it may mask the natural scents that can actually attract women.

From what I have been reading, our bodies produce these odors called pheromones. And pheromones which are kind of complicated but seem to work like airborne Spanish Fly can make us appear appealing to members of the opposite sex.

A couple of key things to keep in mind about pheromones are:

Unless one has undergone bloodhound tracking training, a

human can't consciously smell them.

And, in terms of appealing, we're talking about initially appealing.

All the pheromones in the world aren't going to help if you're middle-aged and still living with mom, or your pick-up line includes stamp collecting.

Another interesting thing about the attraction power of pheromones is that we usually smell best to a person whose genetically based immunity to disease differs most from our own.

Which, call me sentimental, does kind of take the romance out of it.

Cleaner Air without Fragrance

JANUARY, 2006 PUBLICATION DATE NOT KNOWN

AS MANY AS 50 MILLION PEOPLE IN THE UNITED STATES suffer from Allergic disease (AMAI).

People Who Report Reactions:

In 1998, it was estimated that 26.3 million Americans have been diagnosed with asthma in their lifetime (ALA of Texas).

The Institute of Medicine placed fragrance in the same category as second hand smoke in triggering asthma in adults and school age children (FPINVA, By Design).

Up to 72% of asthmatics report their asthma is triggered by fragrance. Asthmatics and others that are negatively impacted by fragrance often have difficulties working, obtaining medical care, and going about activities of daily living because of others' use of scented products (FPINVA).

Approximately 12.6% of the population suffers from multiple chemical sensitivity (MCS), a condition in which they experience reactions from exposure to low concentrations of common chemicals..." (Adams). [MCS is] marked by multiple symptoms in multiple organ systems (usually the neurological, immune, respiratory, skin, 'GI,' and/or musculoskeletal) that recur chronic-ally in response to multiple chemical exposures. MCS Symptoms commonly include difficulty breathing, sleeping and/or concentrating, memory loss, migraines, nausea, abdominal pain, chronic fatigue, aching joints and muscles, and irritated eyes, nose, ears, throat and/or skin. In addition, some with MCS show impaired balance and increased sensitivity not just to odors but also to loud noises, bright lights, touch, extremes of heat and cold, and electromagnetic fields (MCRR).

It is estimated that more than 5.2 million [with MCS] may lose jobs as a result (Adams).

For the average person, breathing in fragrances from perfumes, colognes, hair sprays, deodorants, air fresheners and/or cleaners can just be a little annoying, ". ..but for a growing number of others, these smells, called 'emissions of volatile organic compounds,' can be a form of torment that throws their bodies into reactive overdrive. One whiff of a chemical cocktail...can result in a vast array of debilitating symptoms" (Ephraim).

"Even if the general population isn't likely to suffer acute effects from exposure to fragrances, there are long-term chronic health effects connected to these chemicals that we don't fully understand yet," says [Carrie] Loewenherz [an industrial hygienist for the New York Committee for Occupational Safety and Health] (Lyman).

Perfume Information:

Perfume formulations changed

sometime around the late 70s and early 80s. Today, they are approximately 95-100% synthetic (man-made) (Pills, Featured Author). Using crude oil or turpentine oil as the base material, synthetics are usually derived from chemical reactions (Bridges).

Perfumes, colognes, and many other scented products contain an abundance of harmful chemicals, many of which are listed on the EPA's Hazardous Waste List. They also include numerous carcinogenic chemicals, neurotoxins, respiratory irritants, solvents, aldehydes, hundreds of untested and unregulated petrochemicals, phthalates (which can act as hormone disrupters}, narcotics, and much more (Pitts, Featured}.

By design, fragrances are composed of materials that Quickly get into the air. Once in the air, these materials pose serious health concerns for many with asthma, allergies, migraines, chronic lung disease, and other health conditions (FPINVA, By Design}.

Approximately 95% of chemicals used in fragrances are synthetic compounds derived from petroleum (USHR}.

Petroleum based chemicals are being found to cause significant attritional effects to the nervous system and immune system after prolonged exposure. Illnesses identified in the medical research

include adult and child cancers, numerous neurological disorders, immune system weakening, autoimmune disorders, asthma, allergies, infertility, miscarriage, and child behavior disorders including learning disabilities, mental retardation, hyperactivity and ADD (attention deficit disorders} (Pressinger and Sinclair}.

In 1991 a study performed by the EPA] Identification of Polar Volatile Organic Compounds in Consumer Products and Common Microenvironments, found numerous chemicals commonly used in fragrance products, including, among others: acetone; benzaldehyde; benzyl acetate; benzyl alcohol; camphor; ethanol; ethyl acetate; limonene; linalool; methylene chloride, one or all of which, or in combination with one another, cause, when inhaled, "central nervous system disorders, dizziness, nausea, incoordination, slurred speech, drowsiness, irritation to the mouth, throat, eyes, skin, lungs and GI tract, kidney damage, headache, respiratory failure, ataxia, and fatigue, among other symptoms and illnesses. " Material Safety Data Sheets on each chemical confirm these findings (Dewey).

Fragrance Regulations:

More than 80 percent of the chemical ingredients in these products have never been tested to see if they are poisonous to humans. Some have been tested only mini-

mally (LA).

By all accounts, the fragrance industry is primarily self-regulated. Safety tested before marketing is not required and ingredients used in fragrance formulas do not have to be disclosed even to regulatory agencies. In general fragrance is a very low priority among regulatory agencies and there is little monitoring of compliance or enforcement of laws that are in place. There is a self-regulatory system in place within the fragrance industry. Compliance with recommendations are voluntary and rarely monitored (FPINVA, Facts and Fiction).

The fragrance industry has traditionally been a very secretive industry. For decades secrecy was required to protect fragrance formulas from being copied by others. Fragrance formulas are considered 'trade secrets' and do not have to be revealed to anyone, including regulatory agencies. The secrecy of the industry has lead to tremendous problems in terms of regulation, monitoring, and impact on those that have problems from fragrance (FPINVA, By Design).

The Cosmetic Regulations state that within 10 days after starting to sell a product, a list of ingredients must be provided. 'Fragrance' is considered a specific ingredient, and no disclosure of the potentially hundreds of chemicals within the fragrance is required (QGBS).

Phone & Smells

JANUARY 5, 2006

MOVE OVER RING TONES AND VIDEO TONES, 'COZ SMELL TONES are the next generation ringtones. Instead of a ring, your mobile phone could soon be emitting odours when you receive an incoming call or SMS.

The technology is already available in Japan, where charms attached to the phone emit fragrances like jasmine, wild berries, English tea and Indian curry.

The technology releases a burst of fragrance for five seconds after the arrival of a call or SMS and the inventors claim that it relaxes the users.

The smell tones can even be personalised. The most popular choice of smell tone for the boss seems to be that of rotten cabbage!

Stand-up comedian Vir Das is tickled by the idea of smell tones, "I would love to get it. Though, I don't know if it would work each time, specially if you keep rotten cabbage for your boss and you get a call in a crowded room."

Actress Archana Puran Singh opts for foodie smells for her mother, "I'd keep onions for my mother, since she reminds me of food."

To VJ Cyrus Sahukar, it is the smell of skunk, burnt rubber and burnt sausages that he would keep for his enemies. "I love the idea of attacking people without them even knowing about it, by giving them a bad smell tone. But for all the people I like, I'd keep lemongrass, apples and cinammon."

Stealing Rare Plants

JANUARY 16, 2006

A TOP SCIENTIST HAS BEEN JAILED FOR SMUGGLING MORE than 100 "priceless" orchids -the world's most desired flower -into Britain.

Pharm-aceutical researcher Dr Sian Lim, 32, was caught smuggling some of the rarest species of the beautiful, fragrant and delicate plant into Britain from his native Malaysia.

The illegal trade, dubbed 'orchidelirium', threatens to destroy some species entirely. Thousands of pounds can be exchanged for each of the flowers admired for their sensuous shape and heady scent.

Amongst the flowers recovered was one species that only grows in small numbers in a remote area of a national park in Sarawak in Malaysia.

Six of the flowers the most spectacular of the group are so rare they are on the brink of extinction and can only be found on the slopes of Mount Kinabalu on the island of Borneo.

Two of the flowers were only discovered in 1997 in the remote Indonesian island of Sulawesi and are believed to be extinct because of illegal collection. They are so rare that the orchid expert at Kew admitted he had never even seen one.

In all 126 specimens seized from Dr Lim fall into the CITES' "Category A" which means they are banned from all trade.

A renowned collector, Dr Lim grows rare orchids in two greenhouses in the garden of his home in Putney, south west London, and exhibits at international shows.

He admitted 13 charges of smuggling rare orchids into Heathrow

Airport, but denied doing it for commercial gain despite the thriving black market.

He claimed he had been offered the plants for sale in Malaysia and that he only brought them back to Britain with him at the last moment because the climate there was too hot.

But after a trial at Isleworth Crown Court, Dr Lim's claims were rejected by Judge Richard McGregor Johnson who jailed him for four months.

The Judge told Lim: "I am satisfied you did bring in these orchids with a view to commercial gain. It is essential that the courts make it plain that such behaviour for gain will not be tolerated in order to discourage other who might be tempted to follow in your footsteps."

He accused the doctor of having a "cavalier attitude" to the regulations and added: "I do not accept your evidence in its entirety."

Orchid biologist Dr David

Roberts, of the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, said after the case: "Illegal trade can push some rare orchids towards extinction.

"Many orchids are threatened through habitat destruction, but some, often the rarest, are also at risk from over collecting for international trade. Illegal trade is rapidly pushing those species towards extinction."

Dominic Connolly, prosecuting, explained that because wild orchids are now an endangered species they are covered by the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) under which most trade is banned or regulated with special permits.

Mr Connolly told the court: "The international trade in orchids is a multi-million dollar industry, but the majority of this trade is in cultivated hybrid plants.

"Legal trade in orchids taken directly from the wild is very limited with many countries banning their export. As a result there is an illegal trade and they are often offered for trade under the counter at orchid shows."

The orchids found by customs officers in Lim's luggage at Heathrow when he flew in from Malaysia on June 2, 2004, included "some of the most sought-after orchids in the history of orchid collection - some of the most rare in

the world."

Rejecting Dr Lim's claims, Mr Connolly said that since June 2003 he had been issued with 399 CITES permits to import 8,980 plants - 7,932 of which were actually imported and that the purpose given on each application form was "trade."

Lim had sold plants at various international orchid shows, including those in London and Newbury, acting for Creative Orchids or Orchid Inn.

Mr Connolly said the number of plants imported was consistent with commercial use and not personal collection.

After the plants were seized at Heathrow they were taken to Kew Gardens for inspection.

Mr Connolly said: "It was immediately obvious that a significant proportion of the consignment was of wild origin for which no permits had been obtained."

He said it was impossible to put a value on the illegal plants as "relevant experts have never heard of or seen this species offered for sale as mature plants."

He added: "Many of these plants are essentially priceless as they are rarely offered for sale and are worth as much as someone is prepared to pay for them."

Lim, who is head of research and development at Medpharm Ltd - described as a "spin-off" company from Kings College, London University - claimed that when he completed the CITES permit applications, he simply used the Malaysian export permits as a template and was unaware the "T" in the purpose box stood for "Trade."

He claimed he did not trade in orchids and the fact that his name appeared on some of the show literature was because he acted for friends living in other countries. He said he was not employed by either Creative Orchids, Far East Agriculture or Orchid Inn. Lim, of Oakhill Road, Putney, said that his hobby helped to relieve stress.

The international trade in orchids has grown rapidly in the past 20 years, and now involves up to a billion of the plants a year. The vast majority of that is legal and has made orchids the UK's most popular house plant. But the illegal trade continues and although small by comparison, does enormous environmental damage.

The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) is also known as the 'Washington Convention' after the place where it was negotiated in 1973.

The Convention is administered by the United Nations Environment

Programme (UNEP) and came into force in 1975; since then 169 countries have signed up to the Convention.

Orchids are found all over the world but about 70% are found in the tropics. There are some 25,000 species of orchids.

One of the plants confiscated by Customs included *P. (Paphiopedilum) rothschildianum*, named after the eminent Victorian orchid grower Baron Ferdinand de Rothschild. Of all the species in the genus *Paphiopedilum* this is one of the rarest in nature.

Despite extensive searching for over 100 years it has been located only in a small number of sites on Mount Kinabalu in Borneo, Malaysia.

Another was *P. sanderianum*, one of the most striking of all orchids and easily recognisable by its long drooping petals which can grow to a length of more than a metre. It was first discovered in Borneo in 1885 but did not survive long in cultivation, probably due to its very specific habitat requirements.

In the wild it grows on steep limestone cliffs in areas that are shaded for most of the day. It was rediscovered in 1978. It is only known from a national park in Borneo.

A third was *P. gigantifolium*, readily identified by broad glossy green leaves which can grow up to 60cm long and 12cm wide. It grows just in river gorges in the Sulawesi, Indonesia. Only discovered in 1997, it is now thought to be extinct in its original locality due to over collecting and may be extinct in the wild.

Dr Roberts added: "I was particularly concerned to see *Paphiopedilum gigantifolium*, an orchid I had never seen before, as this species was only described new to science in 1997."

"The plants now belong to Customs. If and when they are handed over to Kew we will be in touch with the likely countries of origin to determine the future of the plants."

Axe & Its Smells

JANUARY 17, 2006

THAT HISSING YOU HEAR EVERY MORNING BEFORE SCHOOL ISN'T A CLUTCH OF SNAKES. It's the smelly sound of the latest, can't-miss chick magnet concoctions male body spray.

The names change. Even the smells change.

But adolescent desperation is depressingly constant.

If you're no longer in touch with the hormone-drenched teen years, it's possible you haven't heard about the trend but there's no way you couldn't have smelled it.

Walk down a school hallway, roller rink or mall hangout, and it hangs as heavily as the fear of rejection before prom night. A not-so-subtle aroma, sort of fruity, sort of gym-socksy like the time you left your lunch-bag and gym shorts in the back window of the Datsun for a week. Intriguing at first whiff, downright nauseating as you get closer. Well, you know the old saying: One man's smell is another man's stink.

In Fayetteville, that smell is most likely Voodoo, a variation of the body spray Axe. It's the most popular of the sprays, according to local merchants and consistently empty shelf spaces in megastores. Axe and its competitors Tag and Bod Man have also found success in the young military market.

According to industry reports, Axe's ascension locally mirrors its national success. Last year, A.C. Nielsen reported, Axe passed traditional men's fragrances Old Spice and Right Guard as the top men's deodorant.

How exactly it can be called deodorant is open to speculation. It's more of an odor mask, sort of a Glade for the glandularly active.

This isn't the first time a product has preyed on the insecurities of young adulthood. It doesn't take much of a memory to remember the pungent promises of Hai Karate ("Be careful how you use it!") Canoe, British Sterling and Old Spice. Certainly any product that an old sea salt could slather on and still get the girl had to be effective.

It's likely if there was a caveman hawking a fragrance called T.rex, there was a market for it.

According to The Washington Post, Axe emerged a generation ago as Lynx, a European product that festooned the dance halls of Europe with its particular pungent smell.

American men, still deep in the Old Spice tradition, weren't ready to embrace something as sissified as body spray. They wore after-shave, and a few might dab on a cologne after hours.

That changed when product creator Unilever began a tongue-in-cheek campaign that featured hand-

some young guys having to fight off ravenous females because, presumably, they were wearing Axe.

Gillette released Tag about a year later, with an even more aggressive horde of females. Researchers told them that teen guys liked the notion of having crazed, beautiful women stalking them did they really need to pay someone to tell them that?

So, Tag took on Axe, and they've waged a pungent campaign in the halls of America's classrooms ever since. Both have been given away on college campuses, including a shipment that found its way to Fayetteville Technical Community College last year.

The sprays have found a home among young males because of their ease of use and low price. It takes the funky edge off a pickup basketball game or long marching-band practice.

Above all, it's a can of hope for about the same price as a couple of manga comics. Even though most guys can't do much about their looks, or height, or car, or whatever the heck it is that's keeping the girls from kicking down the door, they can sure do something about how they smell.

And brother, do they smell.

"Every morning, my boy assumes the position," said

Fayetteville mom Donna Tappendon. "He sprays the underarms, the neck, the back, the crotch. There are days he and his friends smell like a French whore."

The instructions on the can's back, just below the promise of "a seductive, longer-lasting fragrance," instruct users to hold the can about 6 inches from the body and "spray all over."

They also warn would-be Don Juans not to spray anywhere near open flame, since the first ingredient is alcohol, so forget about that candle-lit romantic interlude.

Even the scent names reflect their motives: Tag comes in a variety of scents, such as First Move, After Hours and Lucky Day.

They all seem to work just fine on TV. How do females in the real world react?

A random survey of local high school girls reveals that the sprays have indeed been noticed, though not universally appreciated. The guys, they say, tend to believe that if a little of the stuff is good, a whole lot is better. And no matter what the advertisements say, good grooming habits seem to rank higher than a magic smell from any spray can.

In some schools nationwide, principals have had to ban the products they were driving girls crazy

not with lust, but with headaches and sniffles. Cumberland County hasn't had to make such limitations, school officials say, but they try to limit the use of sprays to help those with allergies to perfume.

"We haven't had any reports of crazed girls driven wild by the stuff," added communications director Wanda McPhaul.

The spray companies have competition. Shoe maker Adidas, Cool Water, Curve all have joined the fragrance bandwagon. There are still the traditional colognes for young adults. For those who really want to go old-school, the stray bottle of Hai Karate and James Bond still pops up on eBay.

You can still find Canoe, if you know where to look.

There's no telling how long the fad will last. Eventually this generation will realize what their Hai Karate-drenched dads found out: The right girl doesn't come around for a can of low-priced spray.

The years will go by, and the names will change.

But the search for the sweet smell of success will endure.

Perfume Allergy

FEBRUARY, 2006

A TEENAGER WITH A RARE ALLERGY TO PERFUME says employers won't give her a job because of her condition.

Kirsty Howard, 18, is desperate for work but every application she has sent in has been rejected.

On her application forms she has to declare that she suffers from a life-threatening form of anaphylaxis.

Any contact with aerosol sprays leave her struggling to breathe and she needs to be rushed to hospital.

So far the teenager has had 16 attacks and was even forced to quit her college drama course after other students allegedly sprayed perfume near her.

Kirsty, of Lordsfield Avenue, Ashton said: "In the end I just never went back. I was gutted I loved my course but it wasn't worth it.

"I was having attack after attack and spending up to two weeks in hospital after each one.

"Since then I've been trying to find a job, but it's so difficult.

"I'd love a job because I hate sitting around doing nothing. But I've applied for loads and not heard anything back. The only reason I can think of is it's because of the anaphylaxis."

After being diagnosed at 15, Kirsty had a tough time coming to terms with her condition and admits being so depressed she didn't want to leave the house.

But the keen singer is back on track now after winning North West Female Vocalist 2005. She sang at the Christmas lights switch-ons in Stalybridge and Hyde and is also making a name for herself as a wedding singer.

She added: "I was really depressed about it for a while but then I just thought, 'it's there now and I'm going to have to deal with it'. I can't lock myself in my room forever.

"I'm concentrating on my singing for now and I'm doing lots of weddings and dinners. I made it through to the second round of the X-Factor and I'll be going back every year until I convince Simon Cowell!"

Ban Fragrance in School

FEBRUARY 1, 2006

Washington -

PERFUME, COLOGNE, AFTERSHAVE AND DEODORANT ARE TEMPORARILY BANNED at the Twin Valley High School.

On Friday, a teacher is believed to have suffered an allergic reaction to some type of perfume, which required a trip to the emergency room.

School officials quickly sent a letter to all parents, stating that "It is essential that for the time being, from this point forward and until further notice, that no one wears any [perfume, aftershave, cologne or deodorant] to school or uses them in the building."

"The basic intent of us sending the letter," said Principal Frank Spencer, "was to stabilize the situation in the short-term. We're now working to find a solution. But to not do something would not have been responsible."

Spencer is working with Superintendent Peter Wright. Wright said that they are meeting with legal counsel early today.

"We're trying to see what kind of responsibilities we have to both employees and students," said Wright.

"We want to be sure we're following the letter of the law," said Wright. "And we want to be realistic and fair about it."

Wright said he believed the teacher's health was protected under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which was designed to eliminate discrimination on the basis of handicap for any program receiving federal money.

Wright said that any accommodations made under the act were financed at the local level.

The administration's letter continues, "We understand and appreciate that in some cases this means changing habits that are long standing, however, it is a necessary move on our part at this time.

"And student(s) determined to be intentionally violating this ban will be subject to disciplinary action which may include removal from the school community for specified periods of time."

Students at Twin Valley High School Tuesday were largely supportive of the administration's ban.

"If wearing perfume is going to hurt [the teacher], I'll give it up for a few months," said Aysa Elliott, 15. "She'd give it up for us."

Elliott said she had already purchased new deodorant "just to be safe."

T.J. Szirbik, 16, disagreed. "It's

our civil right to wear deodorant," he said. "I think if a teacher can't handle public conditions, she shouldn't work in a public facility."

Sarah Waterman, 15, "could really care less" about the ban.

"She's a wicked nice woman. And it's only perfume and really strong shampoos," said Waterman. "It's only going to be for a short time, anyway, until we can find a way to maintain it."

Allen Gilbert, of the Vermont Chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union, said that a school generally can regulate the behavior of its students.

Softhead's & Expensive Perfume

FEBRUARY 3, 2006

IMPERIAL MAJESTY, WHICH COSTS \$215,000 A BOTTLE, is the most expensive perfume in the world. Would it smell as sweet at any other price?

Actually, yes. Imperial Majesty is a limited edition of a Clive Christian signature scent. Sold simply as No. 1, the fragrance is priced at \$2,150 an ounce. But the reason Imperial Majesty costs so much is that Christian, a British designer-turned-perfumer, poured 16.9 ounces of No. 1 into a Baccarat crystal bottle, stuck a five-carat diamond into the 18-carat gold collar and unveiled it at Harrods in London and Bergdorf Goodman in New York City this past holiday season.

Of the five bottles released for sale (the others were kept for Christian's archives), three have sold.

That's actually not as crazy as it sounds. There is a glut of new fragrances being dumped on the market from not only perfume makers and fashion houses, but also celebrities and movie stars--many of which scents have a shelf life as long or short as the celeb who introduced them. From Paris to Britney, there were over 500 fragrance launches in 2005 alone. Feeling overwhelmed, people are not buying more perfumes, but they are willing to spend more on ones they like. According to The NPD Group, a Long Island-based market research company, the U.S. fragrance industry grossed \$2.8 billion in sales in 2004, the last year for which annual numbers exist, up only 1% over the prior year.

"If you look at the fragrance market, the category has been fairly static in terms of growth. It hasn't grown enormously over the last few years," says Paul Austin of Quest International, a fragrance house that has collaborated with such iconic brands as Hermès, Yves St. Laurent, Christian Dior and Karl Lagerfeld.

"A lot of women now go to a perfume shop and say, 'What's your newest perfume the one that you haven't shown anyone? I want it no matter what it costs,'" says Virginie Morel, a spokeswoman for the International Fragrance Association, which has offices in Brussels, Belgium and Geneva, Switzerland. "Fragrances from the big houses have been tested a lot to please the most amount of people, and women don't want to look like their next door neighbor. Do you?"

"If you get a niche perfume, you won't smell like anyone else," she adds. "There's a demand for unique things, and it's a fact that people are more willing to pay."

Elisabeth Noel Jones, a fragrance, cosmetics and hosiery buyer at Bergdorf Goodman, agrees that customers are increasingly knowledgeable--and demanding--when it comes to perfume. "I'm moving away from things that are available at Barneys, Bendel, Bloomingdale's, Lord and Taylor, Saks and Macy's," says Jones. "Our customer is in the know, and she

doesn't want something that can be recognized walking down the street."

In the perfume industry, Christian isn't the only vendor smelling a profit. Last June, the Guerlain boutique on Champs Elysée in Paris launched a service called Le Parfum Sur Mesure, a personal consultation which takes between six months and a year and allows a customer to create her own perfume with the help of the store's fragrance director. After that, no one else can buy it, but Guerlain will keep some in stock in case she ever runs out. The cost? €30,000, or about \$36,000.

Even outside the rarified department stores and boutiques of New York, Paris and London, the fragrance industry is a powerful force. The European fine fragrance sales forecast for 2004 was €4.1 billion, or \$4.9 billion, says Kate Greene of Givaudan, which has developed fragrances for Ralph Lauren (nyse: RL - news - people), Elizabeth Arden, Giorgio Armani and Calvin Klein.

But Austin estimates that the high-end perfume market only constitutes about 1% of overall sales and warns that, "There isn't always a direct relationship between the price of a fragrance and the beauty of its impression." Of course, sometimes, there is. It takes 200 very rare ingredients to make one drop of "No. 1," including the

ylang-ylang flower from Madagascar, Tahitian vanilla, ancient Indian sandalwood, and Florentine orris (ground iris root), which can cost hundreds or thousands of dollars a pound.

Just in time for Fashion Week in New York City, Forbes.com has compiled a list of the Most Expensive Perfumes. To find out which perfumes were the priciest, we worked closely with Bergdorf Goodman, whose cosmetics inventory is legendary, and other upscale international department stores, fragrance houses and boutiques. Most of the perfumes on our list are "parfums," which means they are pure and concentrated, making for a higher production cost. In addition, many of the perfumes listed come in ornate or limited-edition bottles that contributed to the price, whether they're made of Italian Murano glass, like Bulgari's Pour Femme, or have a diamond on the neck, like No. 1.

We listed the perfumes in order of most expensive per bottle, not on a per-ounce basis. We did indicate how many ounces come in each bottle, so you can do your own price-per-ounce calculations. Finally, we did not include custom-order or by commission perfumes, like Guerlain's Le Parfum Sur Mesure, or Henry Dunay's Sabi, which at \$30,000 an ounce would certainly have made the list otherwise.

All perfumes listed are available for sale at Bergdorf Goodman, except for Baccarat's Les Larmes Sacrées de Thebes, which is available at Harrods.

[Click here for the slide show.](#)
Want to track news by this author or about this industry? Forbes Attache makes it easy. [Click here.](#)

Are Fragrant Compositions Copyrightable?

FEBRUARY 10, 2006

ASCENT IS A WORK OF ART JUST LIKE A PAINTING OR A SYMPHONY, A FRENCH COURT HAS RULED in a case seen as a major victory in the battle against copycat fragrances.

THE SMELL OF MAJOR PERFUMES CAN NOW BE PROTECTED.

After decades of failed attempts to copyright a particular perfume, cosmetics giant L'Oreal finally persuaded the court that its perfumes were entitled to the French *droits d'auteur* (authorial rights) that protect their creators from imitation for 70 years.

"It's an important step, as until now perfume owners could only fight against counterfeiters who imitated a name, the packaging or a perfume bottle," said Denis Monégier du Sorbier, a lawyer for L'Oreal.

The company filed for charges against Dubai-based perfume firm, Bellure, which distributes its perfumes from Belgium, after it discovered that the company was selling near-identical copies of 13 of its major perfumes.

In the past, the big perfume houses have brought copycat companies to court on charges of unfair competition or brand imitation when packaging or names are almost identical. Recent brand imitations include Chenal No 5, Samara instead of Samsara or Temperature instead of Fahrenheit.

But Bellure had changed the packaging and names sufficiently to avoid prosecution in these areas: L'Oreal's Tresor became Valeur, Romance was sold under the name of Cheek to Cheek and Miracle became Pink Wonder.

So L'Oreal decided to attack it on copying the smell of the perfume.

A 1975 ruling had concluded that perfume was a chemical mixture but not a work of art like a novel.

But in 2004 L'Oreal scored a partial victory by getting a court to conclude that "a fragrance is the creation of an original bouquet of odorous products chosen for an aesthetic goal, and thus constituting a work of the mind".

But the court threw out the case, saying that there was no proof that the Bellure perfumes were exact replicas of the L'Oreal originals.

Undeterred, L'Oreal broke down a copycat perfume into its constituent smells through chromatographic analysis.

It found in the case of one perfume that 50 out of the 52 elements were the same. Last month, the court ruled that the "olfactory architecture" was almost identical, and ordered Bellure to pay damages of 1.5 million euros (£1 million). Bellure has yet to say whether it will appeal.

The ruling was welcomed by the industry's nez the perfume maestros whose noses smell out new fragrances. Sylvaine Delacourte, of Guerlain, said: "We put one to two years into creating a new fragrance. I am a designer and a nez, the guardian of Guerlain's name and signature. This is a welcome result."

Diddy in Trouble Over Copyright?

MARCH 13, 2006

THOUGH HIS UNFORGIVABLE COLOGNE IS FLYING OFF THE SHELVES, Sean "Diddy" Combs may soon be in legal trouble for infringing on the trademark of another fragrance.

According to the United States Patent & Trademark Office, Diddy was denied the Unforgivable trademark because the cologne's name was too close to Unforgiven, a women's fragrance launched by French perfumer Jacques Evard.

The document dated January 12, states, "The examining attorney refuses registration under Trademark Act Section 2, because the [Unforgivable] applicant's mark, when used on or in connection with the identified goods, so resembles the mark in [Unforgiven] U.S. Registration No. 2,951,186 as to be likely to cause confusion, to cause mistake, or to deceive."

The application for Unforgivable's trademark was filed on July 11, 2005 while Unforgiven's application was filed on June 1, 2005. Unforgiven's notice of publication was put out January 25, 2006. There's no word whether Unforgiven or Evard plans to take legal action.

Aside from strong sales, Diddy's Unforgivable has had a bumpy road to date. This past January, Midwestern department stores opted not to run the cologne's sexually suggestive ad. The ad featured Puff lying in bed with two other women, hinting at a ménage a trois.

Diddy is no stranger to lawsuits. This past August, Gregory Hilderbrand filed a complaint that Diddy's "It's Not Just A Label, It's A Lifestyle" slogan borrowed from his "It's A Lifestyle" slogan. Hilderbrand, who puts the slogan on his clothing, claims he's sold \$325,000 worth of merchandise from 2001 to 2002.

Hilderbrand's suit sought for Diddy to stop using the label, to recover his profits from the label and unspecified damages.

Things have not been all bad for Diddy. As SOHH previously reported, the mogul is preparing a return to reality TV. Diddy is set to produce the celebrity cooking miniseries, "Celebrity Cooking Showdown."

Ever have a lover do something unforgivable? If so, share your story with our Unforgivable blog.

Air Fresheners Go Easy

MARCH 18, 2006

TRYING TO IDENTIFY OFFENDING CHEMICALS IN HOUSEHOLD PRODUCTS ISN'T EASY. Most packages don't list ingredients, in part because the fragrance industry can protect formulas as trade secrets.

The Research Institute for Fragrance Materials evaluates ingredients in air fresheners and other scented household and personal products and provides safety assessments with the guidance of dermatologists, pathologists, toxicologists and environmental scientists.

"Formulators of air-care products carefully choose ingredients with low toxicity," the Consumer Specialty Products Association writes in a consumer Q&A on its aboutair care.com Web site. "They extensively test both the ingredients and the finished product to ensure that exposure levels from normal product use and potential misuse are below the level that would pose risks." In short, trust us.

"People believe the government protects them from all chemicals on the market, but unfortunately, that's not true," Annie B. Bond, author of "Home Enlightenment," a book on natural alternatives to synthetic home products.

A 2004 study by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's National Risk Management Research Laboratory tested plug-in air fresheners, which contain the chemicals pinene and limonene, among others. The EPA concluded that the air fresheners, combined with ozone, could create a harmful indoor formaldehyde-related smog. Ozone sources include outdoor air on a high-ozone day or an ozone-generating air-cleaning machine.

"If you are concerned about indoor air, you should not introduce any extra chemical sources to your home, and that includes volatile organic compounds and ozone," Frank Princiotta, director of the EPA's Air

Pollution Prevention and Control division, said in the report.

The U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission is the primary regulator of air fresheners and other nonpesticide household products. In its guide to indoor air quality, the commission concludes that "organic chemicals are widely used as ingredients in household products. Paints, varnishes and wax all contain organic solvents, as do many cleaning, disinfecting, cosmetic, degreasing and hobby products.

"Many organic compounds are known to cause cancer in animals; some are suspected of causing, or are known to cause, cancer in humans."

What's a consumer to do?

The Consumer Product Safety Commission recommends eliminating potential sources of indoor air pollution or at least improving ventilation.

Use fragrance-free products that are truly free of fragrance. Additional

chemicals sometimes are used to mask fragrances.

Order unscented magazines. Most publishers will accommodate the request.

Be alert to key words on product labels caution, corrosive, danger, poison, flammable or strong sensitizer.

Be kind of sensitive guests by going easy on fragrances when they visit.

Find natural ways to keep your home smelling fresh without chemicals. Throwing open windows sounds natural, but think again. "The fresh air could be full of pollen and mold," said Dr. Lawrence B. Schwartz of VCU Medical Center's rheumatology, microbiology and immunology division. -- Julie Young

Dangers of Makeup

SEPTEMBER 27, 2006

BY THE TIME WOMEN WALK OUT THE DOOR IN THE MORNING, AFTER SLATHERING, SPRITZING OR SMEARING themselves with toner, moisturizer, eye cream, foundation, blush, eye shadow, eyeliner, mascara, lipstick, gloss and perfume, they may have put enough chemicals onto their bodies to be hazardous to their health. Many of the chemicals in makeup have been linked to cancer, hormone imbalances and skin irritation.

According to the Environmental Working Group, a nonprofit environmental research organization, which conducted an assessment of more than 1,000 cosmetic brands, less than 1 percent are made from ingredients that have all been evaluated for safety. "Some products contain carcinogens, reproductive toxins and other chemicals that may pose health risks," notes the group's Web site.

The Food and Drug Administration does not review cosmetic ingredients for their safety before they come to market, nor does it have the authority to recall hazardous products.

According to the Campaign for Safe Cosmetics, a program of the Marin Cancer Project that helps raise awareness about cancer-causing chemicals in cosmetics, the average consumer (including teens) uses 15 to 25 cosmetic and personal-care products a day. These products will contain about 200 chemicals that have been added to preserve, dye and emulsify the products. Some are the same chemicals used in industrial manufacturing to soften plastics, clean equipment and stabilize pesticides.

One widely used group of synthetic chemicals, parabens (alkyl-p-hydroxybenzoates), are used as antimicrobial preservatives in more than 13,000 cosmetic products. The Environmental Protection Agency states that all parabens methyl, propyl, butyl have been proved to interfere

with the function of the endocrine system, and these endocrine disruptors are stored in our body's fatty tissues. The Center for Children's Health and the Environment at Mount Sinai School of Medicine in New York says endocrine disruptors have been suspected of contributing to reproductive and developmental disorders, learning problems and immune system dysfunction in children.

This is especially alarming considering that young girls are starting to use cosmetics earlier and more often. According to a 2004 cosmetic industry report by market research firm Mintel International Group, 90 percent of 14-year-old girls say they use makeup. The survey revealed that 63 percent of 7- to 10-year-olds now wear lipstick; more than 2 in 5 girls in that same age group wear eye shadow or eyeliner, and almost 1 in 4 uses mascara.

The European Union recently passed a law banning the use of suspected CMRs -- carcinogens, mutagens or reproductive toxins --

in any cosmetics sold in the 25-member EU. The major U.S. cosmetics companies that sell abroad have had to reformulate their products to conform to EU safety guidelines, but most haven't changed the formulas they sell here. Avon, the self-proclaimed "company for women," hasn't signed the Compact for Safe Cosmetics, a pledge to remove carcinogens and other harmful ingredients from beauty products.

However, on Sept. 5, bowing to pressure from environmental groups and European lawmakers, Orly International and OPI Products, two top beauty-salon brands, started selling reformulated nail polishes without the chemicals dibutyl phthalate (DBP, a plasticizing ingredient used to increase flexibility in nail polishes), formaldehyde and toluene, which have been linked to cancer and birth defects. These chemicals are banned by the EU but have not been targeted for removal in this country by the FDA. Avon has removed DBP from its polish formula, and Sally Hansen, the No. 1 nail polish brand sold in drugstores, plans to start selling similarly reformulated products in 2007.

"We are reacting here to changing consumer trends and a changing regulatory environment," said Bruce MacKay, vice president for scientific affairs/R&D of Del Laboratories, the maker of Sally Hansen. "In high concentrations in

lab experiments, these materials may be of concern, but there is no body of evidence that says this particular ingredient is not safe in the concentration in which it is used in nail products." Health advocacy groups say that when it comes to chemicals that affect human health and the environment, better safe than sorry should be the guiding principle.

Reading labels won't always help you avoid these chemicals because the beauty industry doesn't always disclose every ingredient in its products. For example, phthalates (pronounced tha-lates) are rarely mentioned on labels, so there's no way to tell whether they've been used. Phthalates keep your mascara from running, stop your nail polish from chipping and help fragrances linger. There's evidence that exposure to phthalates can harm the development of fetuses and children. According to the Breast Cancer Fund, hundreds of animal studies have shown that phthalates can damage the liver, kidneys, lungs and the reproductive system, primarily of male offspring.

Health Care Without Harm, an umbrella organization of dozens of environmental and health groups, lab-tested 72 cosmetics by major brands such as Revlon, Calvin Klein, Christian Dior and Procter & Gamble and found phthalates in 52 of their products.

The best way to protect your-

self is to read labels (use a magnifying glass if necessary) and be suspicious: Words like "natural" or "hypoallergenic" look reassuring, but they're basically meaningless. The FDA has no control over these labels. Products called "natural," for instance, may include synthetic dyes and fragrances. "Hypoallergenic" just means that the most common irritants are left out, but other problematic chemicals might still be in the mix.

"Fragrance-free" or "unscented" means a product has no odor, but synthetic ingredients are often added to mask odors. Products without the word "fragrance" on their label should be OK. Cosmetics labeled "organic" must contain 70 percent or more organic ingredients (grown without the use of pesticides), but read the ingredient list carefully. It's important to choose products from trusted cosmetic and body care companies that use natural, certified organic, non-toxic and nonsynthetic ingredients.

Bay Area examples include Juice Beauty, Grateful Body, Benedetta and Max Green Alchemy (MGA). Other companies include Dr. Hauschka, Jurlique, Iredale, PeaceKeeper Cause-metics, Gabriel, Zuzu, Burt's Bees, Lavera and Honeybee Garden, which makes a water-based nail polish that peels off and has no odor.

While chemicals in any one product are unlikely to cause harm,

here's the bottom line: We are repeatedly exposed to synthetic chemicals from many sources each day. So even a small change, like switching to a nontoxic lipstick, might make a difference in your health.

To avoid

According to the Safe Cosmetics Campaign, avoid the following chemicals in cosmetics whenever possible:

Butyl acetate

Butylated hydroxytoluene

Coal tar

Cocamide DEA/lauramide DEA

Diazolidinyl urea

Ethyl acetate

Formaldehyde

Parabens (methyl, ethyl, propyl and butyl)

Petrolatum

Phthalates

Propylene glycol

Sodium laureth/sodium laurel sulfate

Talc

Toluene

Triethanolamine

Source: Safe Cosmetics Campaign/Marin Cancer Project

Avoiding Fragrances

JANUARY, 2007 PUBLICATION DATE NOT KNOWN

THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES REPORTS THAT 95% of the chemicals used in fragrances today are synthetic compounds derived from petroleum, including known toxins that can cause cancer, birth defects, central nervous system disorders, asthma and allergic reactions. (Medical News Today, 23 Dec. 2006, "Chemical Sensitivities and Perfume).

While you may like the smell, fragrances can harm you and others around you--because they contain many of the same toxins as in cigarette smoke, including solvents like benzene, toluene and formaldehyde.

Approximately 100,000 newer chemicals are in commercial use that didn't used to be in our air. "Injust 26 seconds after any exposure to chemicals, they can be found in every organ of the body" (US Dept. of Health).

Fragrance Facts

Fragrance chemicals give off volatile organic compounds (VOCs) that are fine particulates. "Particle pollution has been linked to hospital admissions, emergency room visits for respiratory problems, and to premature death." (Facts about Indoor Air Pollution, American Lung Association current brochure).

EPA Material Safety Data Sheets showed that 20 of the most common chemicals found in many fragrances were on the EPA's Hazardous Waste lists. These carcinogens and nervous system depressants and stimulants include acetone, benzene, benzyl acetate, benzyl alcohol, ethanol, limonene, and terpenine. ("The Health Risks of Fragrance Ingredients").

Air fresheners contain chloroform, and are on the "Top 10 Killer

Household Chemicals" list. (US. Govt. Environmental Protection Agency of Pesticides and Toxic Substances, Washington, DC 20660).

"Safe", "Natural" or "Organic" do not necessarily mean safe or fragrance-free.

The fragrance industry is unregulated and doesn't have to disclose what is in their products, except to say "fragrance". If the ingredient list says "fragrance", the product contains toxic fragrance chemicals.

Short - Term Effects

Fragrance is in the same category as secondhand smoke in triggering asthma in adults and school age children, according to the Nat'l Institute of Medicine. (Environmental Health Network of California).

Approximately 87% of asthmatics cite fragrances as a trigger. ("Facts about Indoor Air Pollution and Your Health", American Lung

Assn. handouts).

Asthma episodes, even fatal asthma attacks (American Lung Assn.).
.Eye, nose and throat irritation
.Headaches and nausea.

SIDS (sudden infant death syndrome) can result from short term exposure.

Fragrances contain respiratory irritants, which can trigger allergies, migraine headaches, nausea, sore eyes, sore throats, and irritated nasal passages.

"Brief exposure to hair sprays produce acute bronchi-constriction in healthy people", (Study by Cancer Institute & New England Journal of Medicine).

Absenteeism from school and work from asthma episodes.

Asthma is the number one cause of school absenteeism (ALA). .Fragrances can cause both fatigue and insomnia.

Long - Term Effects

Asthma, COPD, and other lung diseases.

Damage to liver, kidneys and central nervous system. .Birth defects, which are increasing at an alarming rate.

Phthalates in fragrance chemicals have hormone-disrupting prop-

erties that are implicated in the alarming increase in genital defects, especially in baby boys, and reduced sperm count in males of all ages (DND Daily News Central 26 Nov. 2005). Phthalates can also cause infertility.

Neurological and developmental disorders, such as autism, MS, Parkinson's Disease,

Asberger's syndrome, and ADD.

Cancer: Many synthetic fragrance chemicals are carcinogenic. Even essential oils, while derived from "natural" sources, become terpenes in the milling process. Like turpentine, terpenes are very toxic irritants.

Common Products Containing Toxic Fragrances

Scented laundry detergent.

Scented fabric softeners .

Plug-in and other air fresheners.

Essential oils.

Scented candles.

Potpourri.

Antibacterial soaps .

Scented soaps and lotions.

Hairsprays and gels .

Perfumes and colognes.

Citronella insect repellents.

Warning

"Natural", "Unscented" or "Organic" does not mean "safe"!

If "fragrance" is listed as an ingredient, the product is generally not safe.

Fragrance-free products can be found at most whole foods stores.

Unscented laundry detergents can be found at most grocery stores.

Boycotting 40th Amendment

FEBRUARY 15, 2007

BOYCOTT CALLED TO HALT ADOPTION OF INTERNATIONAL FRAGRANCE ASSOCIATION'S (IFRA) 40TH AMENDMENT by UK-based Watchdog Organization Cropwatch Gains Momentum with Online Poll and Petition. Online poll by Perfumer and Flavorist newsletter P&Fnow shows a landslide for Cropwatch with 85.1% of the vote.

USA - based Artisan Natural Perfumers Guild joins in effort to Demand Opening the Process Up for Public Input and Review of the Process before thousands of small perfumery and toiletry businesses are adversely affected by restrictive, unfair compliance standards.

MIAMI SHORES, Fla., February 15, 2007 (SOAPWIRE) On February 7, 2007, fragrance and flavor trade magazine Perfumer & Flavorist released the results of an online poll showing 85.1% of readers in favor of boycotting proposed fragrance industry guidelines that will heavily limit the use of natural essential oils in perfumes and cosmetics.

Compliance with these guidelines (the IFRA 40th Amendment) requires that listed essential oils and naturally occurring constituents be kept to certain minimal levels in consumer products. At the core of the Amendment are safety issues in regard to skin reactions. The ANPG and Cropwatch fully support sensible safety guidelines to protect the consumer, but do not believe IFRA has proved that many of the essential oils affected present the supposed risk, nor have they allowed input from the impacted concerns, especially small businesses.

Although IFRA guidelines are only mandatory for their members, they have become the industry norm globally. Consequently, the livelihood of many small businesses is being threatened by an organization that does not represent them. Adhering to the complex measures not only requires sophisticated computer software, which most small natural products businesses do not possess, it also unfairly targets natural

ingredients. Without a level playing field, these small businesses cannot be expected to compete. Approximately 200 essential oils will be controlled by IFRA if their 40th amendment is ratified.

Previous IFRA guidelines have been responsible for the reformulation of many classic perfumes, essentially destroying works of art that existed in liquid form. It is asserted that perhaps a warning label would have sufficed in allowing the original perfume, scent intact, to remain on shelves. Just as demand for natural toiletries and fragrances is growing worldwide, the 40th Amendment could do damage from the level of growers, distillers, up to suppliers and manufacturers. The end result may be the destruction of businesses and the absence of genuine naturally scented shampoos, creams, lotions, perfumes and soaps from store shelves.

To illustrate how the existing and proposed regulations from IFRA do not make sense, ANPG President Anya McCoy recently

blogged on Peanuts vs. Perfume. Peanuts can kill susceptible people, yet their sales are unrestricted: Some perfumes may cause a rash, yet the International Fragrance Association's (IFRA) 40th Amendment wants to severely limit the public's access to them. Consumers are allowed to make informed decisions about peanut products, yet with IFRA and EU (see the related FAQ) guidelines and regulations in place, consumers will no longer have the freedom to make informed decisions about which scented products they wish to use. Access to aromatherapy essential oils may also be limited. The ANPG believes the amendment may be unreasonable because the measures are based on questionable scientific premises, and they are decided behind closed doors without any possibility of public discussion or debate. Since the call for a boycott was proposed two weeks ago by little-guy Cropwatch, 549 people have signed an online petition, backing the challenge to the Goliath IFRA. <http://www.ipe-titions.com/petition/ifra40/signatures.html>

Therefore, the ANPG joins Cropwatch in asking for a moratorium on the IFRA 40th amendment, until these issues have been fully addressed. We ask that a review of the scientific methodologies that were used in the original determinations of skin sensitization be examined, that the compliance requirements be reviewed, and that

warning labels on products be considered in place of prohibition or restriction. Guild Founder, noted natural perfumer and author Mandy Aftel, and Guild President, perfumer Anya McCoy will be working with others in the industry to challenge the IFRA stance and open the amendment adoption process to the public.

40th Amendment (IFRA)

MARCH 2, 2007

SEVERAL MAGAZINES & WEBSITES CONTINUE THE CROPWATCH BOYCOTT OF IFRA'S 40TH AMENDMENT STORY. Clare Henderson writes a very fair & sensible account of the issues at cosmeticsbusiness.com. Perfumer & Flavorist give an account of why (under pressure from IFRA) they removed the Cropwatch vs. IFRA poll result, and publish an astonishing letter from Jean-Pierre Hourri of IFRA. Tony Burfield of Cropwatch indicates that Jean-Pierre has failed to do his homework in attempting to dismiss the Cropwatch phenomena, and gives an account of a Perfumers life under fragrance over-regulation at [which carries on at basenotes.net](http://basenotes.net).

Meanwhile, as the end of March 2007 deadline for submission of material to the SCCP to indicate that Tea Tree Oil is in fact safe to use in Cosmetics, a flurry of papers on alleging negative health effects for essential oils have emerged. Several commentators have remarked that this timing is not co-incidental, and that the non-investigative journalism featured by science reporters who have merely copied such stories to UK newspapers, is no co-incidence either. One such account, featuring a dubious hypothesis by Derek Henley & chums, allegedly linking Lavender oil and Tea tree oil in applied cosmetics to gynecomastia in 3 young boys, published in the New England Journal of Medicine is featured in an article by ATTIA, who are demanding that the article is withdrawn. This can be seen at <http://www.attia.org.au/articles/attia%20response%20gynecomastia%20allegations%20feb%202007.pdf>

Other articles splashed across UK newspapers lately, and requiring further examination by Cropwatch before any further comment, include a link between the reduction of hirsutism in women and drinking spearmint tea several times/day [Akdoan M., Tamer M.H., Cüre E., Cüre M.C., Körolu B.K. Deliba N. (2007) "Effect of spearmint (*Mentha spicata* Labiatae) teas on androgen levels in women with hirsutism."

Phytotherapy Research 10.1002/ptr.2074] and an allegation that tea tree oil users could fact increased health risks from MRSA if used at less than 4% (Taylor J. (2007) Metro 16.0.07. p7), based on an article the abstract of which can be seen at <http://jac.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/abstract/dk1443v1>.

IFRA & Synthetics

MARCH 2, 2007

THE IFRA HAS SUGGESTED THAT THE MANY BENEFITS OF USING SYNTHETIC INGREDIENTS within fragrance production outweighs the use of natural ingredients coinciding with the controversial revision of its code of practice last year.

The association has used its annual 2007 winter update to encourage the use of synthetic materials, suggesting that the ingredients are more stable and less susceptible to price fluctuations within the market.

Indeed, the IFRA has stated that although natural ingredients are given to more variations, therefore exciting to 'play with', the benefits of synthetic ingredients are more pronounced because their performance is more easily concerned backing up recent concerns by lobby groups that the Code of Practice is discriminating against natural ingredient use.

A spokesperson said, "The notes that come from synthetic sources either come from plants that are so fragile oils cannot be extracted from them, such as the lily of the valley. They also represent totally novel smells, such as the Aldehydes, without which Chanel 5 wouldn't have been created".

The marine note Calone was also cited as being influential in the development of well-known fragrances such as Escape or L'Eau D'Issey Miake. However, the IFRA did show awareness of the role that natural ingredients play within the fragrance industry, stating that "They are a complex blend of molecules that as such do not represent a single note but actually represent a blend of different smell, each with specific tonalities".

"They are, in effect, a mini perfume unto themselves. They are richer and provide more complexity to a fragrance than single aroma chemicals such as the synthetics".

Despite this admission, lobby groups such as CropWatch will no doubt see this latest news as further evidence that IFRA is outwardly biased against the use of natural ingredients within the fragrance industry.

The IFRA code of practice was first introduced in 1973 to properly regulate and provide products that are safe for use by the consumer and for the environment and is said to reflect the current state of development regarding today's scientific and business environment.

It was mooted for revision in October 2006 after the association called for the inclusion of new policies essential for the fragrance industry and to update it with the latest market knowledge.

The adoption of the new policies such as the new Quantitative Risk Assessment (QRA) method for fragrance sensitizers, the Compliance Programme, and the potential skin effects of oral care products were an important part of the revised code of practice.

However, lobby group Cropwatch claims that the revised code of practice discriminates against natural products being used in fragrances and favours synthetic ingredients, with the IFRA responding by stating that natural products must also be regulated heavily as they are not deemed safe based solely on their sources.

IFRA & Cropwatch

MARCH 13, 2007

International Fragrance Association (IFRA) -

WHILE IN MIDST OF CONTROVERSY ABOUT DRAWING UP NATURAL AROMATICS GUIDELINES for Potential European Union (EU) Adoption into Regulation, Charged With Hiding Agenda by Manipulating Online Article

In "IFRA Promotes Synthetic Ingredients in Fragrance", an article which first appeared on March 2, 2007 in *Cosmetics Design-Europe*, it was subsequently discovered on March 6, 2007, that a major rewrite had occurred that completely change the wording regarding the naturals vs. synthetics debate they are currently in with Cropwatch, an independent watchdog of the natural aromatics industry. Many of the IFRA "voluntary guidelines" have been adopted into law by the European Union, and the natural aromatics industry is concerned that this latest backpedaling on the conflict is a bad sign of journalistic manipulation to come.

It is believed that a blog that highlighted the original bias against naturals caused IFRA to get the reporter or editor for *cosmeticsdesign-europe.com* to change the article, creating a credibility and ethics problem for both IFRA and the publication, in the eyes of the naturals industry. The blog article appears at <http://anyasgarden.blogspot.com/2007/03/its-synthetics-stupid-to-quote.html>

The lead paragraph of the *cosmeticsdesign-europe.com* article, still available on Google, originally read:

IFRA has suggested that the many benefits of using synthetic ingredients within fragrance production outweighs the use of natural ingredients coinciding with the controversial revision of its code of practice last year.

Here is what the rewrite states:

IFRA has suggested that the many benefits of using synthetic ingredients within fragrance production are equally as important as that of natural ingredients - coinciding with the controversial revision of its code of practice last year.

Here's the original second paragraph, which apparently has not been Googled:

The association has used its annual 2007 winter update to encourage the use of synthetic materials, suggesting that the ingredients are more stable and less susceptible to price fluctuations within the market.

But the changed new version now is very different:

The association has used its annual 2007 winter update to encourage the use of both synthetic and natural materials, suggesting that synthetic ingredients are stable and less susceptible to price fluctu-

ations within the market.

This is the second scandal that IFRA has been associated with in the past month in their offensive against Cropwatch and the natural aromatics industry.

First, IFRA had Cropwatch's landslide win in a poll on Perfumer and Flavorist magazine reopened, then, by the admission of the editor of P&F, the entire issue of the poll convinced P&F take it down two days later. <http://www.perfumerflavorist.com/newsletter/5957641.htm>
l

Jean Pierre Hourie, the current Director General of IFRA, was most recently at the helm of Quest, a synthetic perfume company, owned by Imperial Chemicals. Quest has recently been purchased by Givaudan, and the company is focused on developing synthetic molecules for the fragrance industry. From their website <http://tinyurl.com/37jrxw> : "Most of the materials are patented specialty chemicals that were first developed at our research centers. Thanks to a continuous effort Givaudan has become a leading company in term of new molecules patents. "

"It is now becoming obvious to the natural aromatics industry, that IFRA wants it stifled, and that the organization no longer represents their interests. Conversely, the natural aromatics industry has enjoyed

a 20% annual increase in sales in the past few years, while the synthetics fragrance sales only managed an annual gain of less than 4%.

IFRA & Givaudan Concerns

APRIL, 2007

ON-GOING INDUSTRY MISGIVINGS THAT THE INTERNATIONAL FRAGRANCE ASSOCIATION'S (IFRA) recent 40th amendment directly alienates smaller businesses has prompted the president of the association to retaliate against such accusations.

IFRA announced the 40th amendment of its voluntary Code of Practice earlier this year, including the revised Quantitative Risk Assessment (QRA) policy that now requires more intricate testing on all ingredients used within fragrance manufacturing.

The complexity of implementing the QRA caused industry lobby groups, who are mainly concerned with natural ingredient manufacturing, to raise concerns that smaller businesses do not have the ability to wade through 'the unnecessary red tape' caused by the amendment.

Jean-Pierre Hourri, president of the IFRA, spoke to CosmeticsDesign to give his stance on the matter, "The first thing to remember is that the IFRA represents over 90 per cent of the industry, and the amendment was not developed in isolation, but with full support of many IFRA members, and individual bodies".

"The QRA was developed to better benefit the end consumer and methodically refine fragrance manufacturing to further reduce the risk of dermatological problems as a result of fragrance wearing" he continued.

With fragrance manufacturers now required to test on 11 different levels as opposed to one, industry insiders have suggested that the fragrance industry will now be overrun with larger corporations who have the capital available to implement the scheme.

In turn, it is alleged that this could lead to the end of smaller per-

fumers who rely heavily on the current consumer trend for natural and organic products and do not have the time and manpower to undertake the policy, but will also be frowned upon if they do not adhere to IFRA's voluntary Code of Practice.

Hourri retaliated to this query, stating, "The revised Code of Practice will no doubt cause much more work for smaller businesses and they will have to look more in-depth at their fragrance manufacturing. However, it is by no means impossible and, if done correctly, is perfectly manageable".

He continued to say that an upcoming 42nd amendment, set to be announced in April, will further benefit these smaller businesses with new policies set to allow an additional year for companies to reformulate fragrances that do not fall in line with the amendment - setting the deadline of 2009.

The new amendment will relate to 30-40 ingredients and is said to allow manufacturers in the fra-

grance industry to 'know the rules for QRA scheme in advance, and abolish the step-by-step approach' that threatened to upset the industry further.

The independent watchdog for the aroma trade, Cropwatch, is currently campaigning to boycott the recent 40th amendment to its voluntary code of practice with a new online petition.

At present the petition has over 700 names on it, mainly consisting of smaller independent fragrance companies who share Cropwatch's view over the uncertainty of their future if they are made to abide by the new regulations.

The petition, hosted on numerous pro natural cosmetic websites, encourages members of the IFRA to leave the organisation in favour of the Cropwatch boycott, which accuses IFRA of 'creating a hostile environment' for the aroma trade due to the restrictive legislation about to be enforced.

However, according to the IFRA, Rexpan, an independent panel of experts that has no commercial ties to the fragrance industry and consists of toxicologists, pharmacologists, pathologists, environmental scientists and dermatologists, reviews all findings from the Research Institute for Fragrance Materials (RFIM) and bases its knowledge on existing data.

However, press reports state that this is part of the reason why much of the aroma trade is moving out of the heavily legislated European market, angered that individuals with no experience within the cosmetics industry are able to oversee the way fragrances are created.

The code of practice was first introduced in 1973 by IFRA to properly regulate and provide products that are safe for use by the consumer and for the environment and is said to reflect the current state of development regarding today's scientific and business environment.

It was mooted for revision in October 2006 after the association called for the inclusion of new policies essential for the fragrance industry and to update it with the latest market knowledge.

Citrus Ingredients Gone?

APRIL, 2007

BANNING CITRUS OILS FROM PERFUMES would be a drastic move from which perfumery would never recover. But according to a communication written on 4th April 2007 by Sabine Lecrenier, Head of Unit for the Cosmetics Sector to Cropwatch (attached to this newsletter), this unthinkable step is precisely the outcome which the EU Cosmetics regulators have decided upon by placing a restriction on certain furano coumarins (FCFs) such that their content in finished cosmetics cannot collectively exceed more than 1 ppm, in line with the previous recommendations of the 2001 SCCP Opinion & SCCP Opinion 0942/05. In our view, this once more confirms the Brussels anti-naturals fragrance ingredients machinery is operating in over-drive, becoming a vendetta of scandalous proportions.

Executive Summary

In spite of the fact that this is potentially the most serious situation that the perfume trade has ever faced, any open resistance to this move is likely to be weak. The (confessed trade independent) SCCP / DG Entr. personnel do not have an authoritative overview of the fragrance industry and do not fully comprehend the implications of the regulations that they help impose on the cosmetics trade. IFRA and EFFA are part of the problem too, becoming alarmingly right-wing/authoritarian and threatening member companies with severe measures if they do not follow their Codes of Practice, which feed into the EU Cosmetic Directives. A non-scientific Cropwatch survey of the attendance of professional perfumery organization meetings shows a membership increasingly dominated by regulatory affairs personnel rather than perfumers. The significance of these measures on the perfumery art will be totally lost on these types of technical employees. And as we have previously proven, the trade press is largely loyal to IFRA and panders to the interests of corporate dinosaurs, and not to interests of cosmetics consumers. The trade essential oil organizations have angered many

essential oil producers by their obedient submission of technical data to EU regulators, which has enabled progressive forms of restrictive legislation to be passed against the very trade that they are supposed to represent.

It may very well be the case that industry as a whole chooses to ignore this legislation as being completely destabilising & unworkable. Cropwatch has to work on a worst possible scenario, and therefore we consider that it is only the sophistication of the fragrance consumer lobby itself that offers any real hope of true resistance & reform. Cropwatch is therefore launching the Campaign for real perfume hoping for consumer support to counteract what we have to see as philistine regulatory crimes against the perfumery art.

A Brief Historical Note on Citrus Oils in Fragrances.

Citrus oils are absolutely vital ingredients in perfumes. Citrus colognes were originally constructed by immersing various plant

materials in alcohol, the alcohol concentrated by distillation, distilling the major part off (often down to one third of the original bulk), and citrus and other oils were added e.g. as in the popular fragrance type: Millefleurs.

These early perfumes were somewhat unstable and prone to oxidation due to the high monoterpene hydrocarbons content (Simonis 1984), but the development of concentrated & terpeneless citrus oils was said to overcome these problems.

Unless specifically treated, many essential oils derived from species of the Apiaceae & Rutaceae (including citrus oils, angelica & a few others) will contain a furanocoumarin (FCF) content apparently even those labeled FCF-free.

Although FCFs may be associated with beneficial properties in specific situations, there are concerns that some may be associated with photo-toxic &, some suggest, possibly photo-carcinogenic reactions, although this situation is hardly new.

To our certain knowledge people have been putting perfumes containing FCFs on their skins for more than 600 years for example the lemon peel & angelica containing (and therefore FCF containing) Carmelite Water was formulated in 1379 at Abbaye St. Juste.

Certainly by the mid 1500s citrus oils were widely produced & used for fragancing such that individual fragrances based on mixture of citrus oils were developed (e.g. Eau de Carmes). By 1709 we have the example of major citrus oil perfume deployment in Eau de Cologne (4711) by Gian Paolo Feminis, the story of which needs no introduction from us.

Slightly later, the use of citrus oils is demonstrated in Eau Imp~ale (Guerlain 1861) created by Guerlain for Emperess Eugenie (wife of Napoleon III). Nowadays many publications recount the early uses of these materials in the perfumery art, such as that of Burfield (2002) & Williams (2004).

Felix Buccellato wrote an excellent review of the importance of citrus oils to the development of Western perfumery over the last eight of nine decades which can be found at

Please visit Cropwatch web site for balance of article.

Givaudan Restructures Fragrance Industry

APRIL 12, 2007

CONTINUING ITS PLEDGE TO REFORM THE FRAGRANCE INDUSTRY WITH ITS REVISED CODE OF PRACTICE, the IFRA has released a revised Quantitative Risk Assessment booklet in a bid to educate the industry further on the recent 42nd amendment.

It is the second edition of the booklet, which was first released by the association early last year in relation to the then 40th amendment.

In conjunction with the booklet the IFRA is also holding a workshop in the US in June encouraging all members and non-members to attend in order to fully review the implications of the 42nd amendment and its implementation times.

The 42nd amendment has extended the number of standards set on the basis of dermal sensitization - covering 14 new standards with 19 new materials, 'which cover most of the fragrance ingredients that require so-called 'allergen labelling' in Europe'.

The IFRA has pitched the booklet as a way to educate fragrance suppliers and users on the new amendment, and the extended implementation times designated, following industry confusion over what materials actually need to be tested.

Jean-Paul Houri earlier commented to *CosmeticsDesign-Europe* that the new amendment would help to clear up certain industry misgivings that the code of practice discriminates against the smaller perfumers who do not have the time or money to wade through 'the unnecessary red tape'.

Relating to 30-40 ingredients the new amendment is said to allow manufacturers in the fragrance industry to learn the rules for the QRA scheme in advance, abolishing the step-by-step approach' that threat-

ened to upset the industry further.

The booklet goes into depth detailing how the new standards will be set and how existing IFRA standards will be handled.

In order to give manufacturers further comfort regarding the future of the fragrance legislation the booklet also discusses what practices may be considered for inclusion in the voluntary code of practice in the future.

First introduced in 1973 the code was initiated to properly regulate and provide products that are safe for use by the consumer and for the environment.

It is said to reflect the current state of development regarding today's scientific and business environment.

However, it was mooted for revision in October 2006 after the association called for the inclusion of new policies essential for the fragrance industry and to update it with the latest market knowledge.

Since the inclusion of the QRA many organisations, such as the independent watchdog for the aroma trade Cropwatch, have stated that the IFRA actively discriminates against smaller perfumers who rely heavily on the current consumer trend for natural and organic products and do not have the time and manpower to undertake the policy.

Indeed, the watchdog has gone so far as to create a petition to boycott the amendment, which at present has over 700 names on it.

These names mainly consist of smaller independent fragrance companies who share Cropwatch's view over the uncertainty of their future if they are made to abide by the new regulations.

Cosmetic Dangers

MAY 3, 2007

THEY HAVE TO PUT TONS AND TONS OF MAKEUP ON YOU BECAUSE of all the lights," said Olivia James, former model.

THEY'RE BANNED IN EUROPE BECAUSE OF SAFETY CONCERNS, BUT THEY'RE STILL WIDELY USED IN THIS COUNTRY. SOME CLINICAL STUDIES LINK PHTHALATES TO CANCER AND BIRTH DEFECTS AND A FEDERAL LAB IN RTP IS REVEALING WHY YOU SHOULD BE CONCERNED ABOUT THE BEAUTY SECRET.

James spent 15 years living the glamorous life.

"You know you've got someone working your hair, and you've got someone working your face," James said. "There's someone painting your nails."

James was a New York model.

"Not just your face but your body was covered with a lot of corrective makeup, whether that's foundation, concealer, um, very thick consistency, um, to make it look as perfect as possible," said James.

She thinks all that makeup was filled with chemicals called phthalates, and she's convinced it led to a birth defect in her son, Darren. Something called hypospadias when the urethra does not form correctly.

"I felt very guilty, as a mother," she said. "You want to do everything you can to have a healthy happy child."

Dr. Earl Gray is a researcher in RTP. In his lab, he's found evidence phthalates produce the very birth defect her son has.

We've studied about 13 or 14 different phthalates and of that group

eight of them are positive for these kinds of effects," said Dr. Gray.

Gray works with the EPA. He's doing some of the world's leading research on the impact of phthalates.

"There are also a lot of studies, human epidemiological studies, that have shown associations between phthalate exposures and cancers," he explained.

Those studies show a connection to breast cancer and testicular cancer.

In 2005, FDA researchers tested 48 different products everything from body lotion, hair spray and deodorant to nail polish, body wash and shampoo.

They looked for four different phthalates and found them in a total of 32 products or 66 percent, but the same study said there was no basis to regulate phthalates in the U.S. at that time.

"I think consumers would have

a very difficult time in deciding the products to not use, to avoid," Gray said.

That's because Dr. Gray said phthalates aren't always included on the label.

In Europe, it's easy to avoid phthalates. Two of them have been banned since 2004. Cosmetic companies have reformulated their products.

"I personally take offense to that, that you can reformulate it for another country but you know, you can't do it for us, our money is green just like anyone else," James said.

Burt's Bees is a natural cosmetics company headquartered in Wake County. Burt's refuses to use phthalates.

"I do believe it's putting people at risk because there's enough evidence through a lot of research that they are carcinogens," said Celeste Lutrario, Burt's Bees.

Lutrario spends a lot of time in the lab as head of research and development. She said it's harder to make products without phthalates, but it's the right thing to do.

"They don't need to be in them, and the fact is Europe has formulated without them, we've formulated without them, so they don't need to be in the products," said Lutrario.

A trade group called The Cosmetic, Toiletry and Fragrance Association disagrees.

It says: "The use of phthalates in cosmetics and personal care products is supported by an extensive body of scientific research and data that confirms safety."

The FDA and EPA have examined phthalates used in cosmetics and have not restricted that use.

But Dr. Gray says that could change. Federal officials are now scrutinizing his research. "The EPA has, is beginning, to do risk assessments on some of the phthalates."

For now, James is on her own crusade to convince people to stay away from phthalates. "Whenever I'm in the store, and I see the young girls they're putting the makeup on. They're trying them on, and you see pregnant women, and they're putting makeup on and I just want to shake them."

Three cosmetic companies have recently announced they're removing phthalates from their nail polish. They are Essie, OPI and Sally Hansen.

This isn't just a concern for women.

In 2005, the CDC found breakdown chemicals from two of the most common cosmetic phthalates in almost every member of a group

of 2,800 people.

An advocacy group said it has obtained ingredient lists for nearly 15,000 personal care products.

In January, Consumer Reports tested eight perfumes, and it said the products all contained phthalates.

Makeup Toxicity

JULY 1, 2007

WHEN YOUR PERSONAL-CARE PRODUCTS COULD CAUSE CANCER, that's a little too personal.

Most of us use 15 or more cosmetic and toiletry products each day, such as shampoo, skin cream, deodorant, sunscreen, nail polish and perfume. The personal-care products used by Americans contain 10,500 different chemicals, according to the Seattle-based Toxic-Free Legacy Coalition.

Only 11 percent of these chemicals have been assessed for health and safety by any U.S. government agency, says the coalition, and one-third of all personal-care products contain at least one chemical linked to cancer. Some chemicals in these products also have links to birth defects and other health problems.

Chemicals in cosmetics that pose health risks, according to the Coalition, include suspected and proven carcinogens such as formaldehyde and coal tar, phthalates (alleged endocrine disrupters) and neurotoxins such as lead and mercury.

Many problem ingredients do not appear on labels. Under current federal law, the cosmetics industry largely regulates itself. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) does not require cosmetics manufacturers to have their products pre-approved before they are sold, to report cosmetics-related injuries or to file data on ingredients.

The Cosmetic, Toiletry and Fragrance Association, a major industry trade group, insists that concerns over health risks are unwarranted, stating, "FDA statistics confirm that cosmetics are one of the safest categories of products used by Americans today."

Check your makeup

Several encouraging developments have occurred recently. An online cosmetics-safety database for consumers, called "Skin Deep," underwent a major makeover in May. This update made it more comprehensive and easier to use.

Highlighting ingredients that may pose safety risks, this ambitious database maintained by the nonprofit Environmental Working Group (EWG) lists ingredients in 25,000 products. That's still only one-quarter of the personal-care products on the market. But you will probably find data about several products you use. It might even inspire your own cosmetics-purchasing makeover.

Europe REACHes out

In the European Union, a new law known as REACH (Registration, Evaluation and Authorisation of Chemicals) created the European Chemicals Agency on June 1. The law requires companies to register product-safety

information with the agency, and will likely result in new bans of chemicals.

Even before REACH, Europe had already banned more than 1,000 ingredients in cosmetics, compared with just eight cosmetic ingredients outlawed in the U.S., according to Consumers Union.

Some cosmetics companies market different versions of products, with the U.S. versions containing chemicals not allowed in the E.U. But as this becomes more difficult for manufacturers, both logistically and from a public-relations standpoint, more companies will likely remove targeted chemicals from their American products.

U.S. laws to become stronger?

Congress may soon consider making U.S. chemical regulations stronger, in response to Europe's REACH. Activity has already begun on the state level. The California Safe Cosmetics Act of 2005 requires, among other provisions, that manufacturers report the use of potentially unsafe ingredients.

A similar bill in Washington state did not make it out of committee this year. The Toxic-Free Legacy Coalition expects related legislation will be reintroduced in Olympia in 2008.

The cosmetics industry has

responded to the increased scrutiny of its products by developing a Consumer Commitment Code and emphasizing the role of its Cosmetic Ingredient Review program.

What you can do

To reduce the likelihood of risks from your personal-care products, consult the "Skin Deep" database and follow these additional tips:

Use caution with problem products. The EWG has identified hair dye, nail polish, "sunless tanning" products, "anti-aging" potions and skin lighteners as product categories with significant potential problems.

Reduce use of fragrances. Manufacturers rarely disclose fragrance ingredients. Fragrances may contain neurotoxins and trigger allergies, says the EWG. Even products marketed as "unscented" often include a masking fragrance to cover chemical odors.

Be skeptical of product claims. Cosmetics manufacturers don't have to verify terms such as "natural" or "organic."

Keep it simple. In general, the fewer ingredients, the lower the risk.

Fake Fragrances

AUGUST 3, 2007

ASKING A CHINESE COMPANY TO MANUFACTURE A PRODUCT, or outsource a component from China could mean one thing: **ASKING FOR TROUBLE.**

In the age of globalisation, almost every consumer product is assembled from parts and components supplied by vendors from a number of countries. Manufacturers have largely become assemblers or product integrators.

As China provides the cheapest manufacturing solution to companies worldwide, it has become the world's largest factory.

When a Dubai-based perfume manufacturer asked a Chinese factory to outsource the production of perfume bottles for his future consignments, he did not know what he was getting into.

"I simply ordered him to manufacture the colourful bottles in which we pour expensive oriental perfumes and sell to our customers," said the perfumer at an exhibition at the Dubai World Trade Centre.

"He gave me a good price, more than half the then current price. He promised to deliver exactly the same and well in time, which was what I was looking for at a trade fair.

Revelation

"As per the contract, he began to deliver goods on time and I continued to pay him."

However, a few months later, the same bottle was made available to his competitors.

"My competitor was selling his perfumes in the same bottle, that gave the impression that the products were the same. After a brief inquiry, we found that the supplier was the same Chinese trader. This is what they do to you," he said.

Although this model of outsourcing appears to be somehow convenient to most multinational companies, it comes with a large risk: Piracy.

In reality, it boils down to only one thing: Production of fakes.

That's what is happening to global brandowners. Global brands are losing billions of dollars in revenue as someone in a Chinese factory decides to channel those to the grey market.

Dubai's traders are also not an exception. "China continues to be a haven for counterfeiters and pirates. According to one copyright industry association, the piracy rate remains one of the highest in the world, more than 90 per cent, and US companies lose over \$1 billion

in legitimate business each year to piracy," according to the US Embassy in China.

"On average, 20 per cent of all consumer products in the Chinese market are counterfeit. If a product sells, it is likely to be illegally duplicated. US companies are not alone, as pirates and counterfeiters target both foreign and domestic companies."

The fact that a fake Rolex is sold at 10 ringgit in Kuala Lumpur or 50 baht in Bangkok is not new. What is new is that one can now buy it for Dh10 to Dh15 in selected locations in the UAE.

Threat

The influx of fakes and counterfeits are a growing threat to global trade. The threat originates mostly from China and some Southeast Asian countries like Malaysia.

In 2005, between 85-93 per cent of music CDs, business software, entertainment software, and movie DVDs in China were pirated.

"Those levels weren't significantly higher and couldn't be much higher in 2002, when China joined the WTO," US legislator Sander Levin was quoted in a recent report as saying.

Piracy had cost the US entertainment industries \$2.6 billion in

2005 alone.

Globally, countries and regulators are trying to contain this threat. The GCC market happens to be the latest casualty.

As the region's economies gradually integrate, the penetration of fakes is creating a major problem.

Saudi Arabian officials have now openly began blaming some of the UAE's emirates for not doing enough to combat piracy, resulting in a spat.

The influx of fakes could really pose a threat to the region's businesses which have largely remained clean.

However, nothing is cheap in life. As the saying goes, even cheaper products comes with a price!

Have your say

Do you know anyone who buys or sells fake goods? Have you ever bought pirated items? Why? What do you think is a major influence in the rising number of pirated items being smuggled into the region?

Floris of London & its Fragrance Auction

OCTOBER 4, 2007

Press Release -

For more information please visit
www.florislondon-usa.com ...Floris
London- The Art of Fragrance

To help spread the word about National Breast Cancer Awareness this month, Floris London is auctioning off a classic men's fragrance collection for a very special cause.

Floris London is currently hosting a special eBay auction of the last 60 bottles available in the US of their exclusive and prestigious No.89 men's fragrance, and will donate 25% of the proceeds to the Susan G. Komen for the Cure breast cancer foundation.

Sought by men the world over requests for the elusive No.89 have been great, and this sophisticated and provocative scent has been worn by many celebrities, including James Bond in the 007 novels and star Daniel Craig in Casino Royale. Richard Branson was delighted when he recently received a fresh bottle of No. 89 from us at a party in New York City celebrating the launch of his new Virgin America airline.

To place a bid, please go to <http://search.ebay.com/Floris-No-89>

About Floris London

For over 275 years, the Floris London name has been synonymous with superior and distinctive fragrances for men, women and home. Floris London's current Chairman John Bodenham is an 8th descendant of company founder Juan Femenias Floris, and their flagship store is still located at its original 89 Jermyn Street address in Mayfair London. Other Floris fragrances include: Night Scented Jasmine, evocative of sumptuous and romantic Mediterranean evenings; Florissa, the true essence of an English garden; and Seringa, a modern, assertive scent and the adornment of pure elegance.

DNA Perfume are You Stupid!

OCTOBER 16, 2007

DNA HAS APPARENTLY BEEN AROUND FOR BILLIONS OF YEARS IN ITS CURRENT FORM IN VIRTUALLY ALL FORMS OF LIFE, but the testing for exclusive matches met with its greatest public exposure during the OJ Simpson trial sparking a fragrant idea in the subconscious of Entrepreneur, Carlton Enoch, now CEO of My DNA Fragrance.

DNA FINGERPRINTING AND EXCLUSIVE IDENTITY MATCHING INTRODUCED DURING THE OJ SIMPSON TRIAL SMELLED LIKE A GREAT IDEA FOR ENTREPRENEUR CARLTON ENOCH, WHO HAS SPENT THE LAST 9 YEARS DEVELOPING A UNIQUE FRAGRANCE LINE BASED ON DNA BLUEPRINTS.

When asked how he came up with the concept for My DNA Fragrance, a unique new fragrance line which creates one-of-a-kind fragrance formulations based on individual DNA blueprints, Mr. Enoch responded, "I was applying fragrance one morning while watching the OJ Simpson trial when DNA fingerprinting was introduced. The idea of creating something that was uniquely mine based on my own DNA fascinated me. I knew I had a great idea and was interested in creating something totally exclusive and individual in the area of fragrance."

My DNA Fragrance brings a revolutionary and unique new concept in fragrance formulation to the perfumery process, which has not changed since antiquity, making signature fragrance a reality for consumers that are increasingly demanding exclusivity in the products they purchase.

In every interview Enoch is inevitably asked the curious question, "How do you do it? He smiles candidly and responds, "It's no secret that all perfume houses closely guard their fragrant formulations. Much like McDonald's secret sauce and Coca-Cola's special soda formulation, we too have a secret."

Enoch's secret has quickly garnered interest from fragrance distributors in Australia, China and Armenia proposing exclusive retail distribution rights for the introduction of the exclusive fragrance, which is currently only available online.

Customer responses to the newly launched fragrance have been favorable, as the testimonials pour in praising the company's product and its service.

"I just wanted to tell you that I had major success with your DNA-Fragrance. Everybody was asking me, where I got that scent from. Much much better than any other scent I have bought before! For that I wanted to thank you from the bottom of my heart." Patrik Switzerland– Switzerland

"Thank you, this has been excellent service and it is very much to your credit that you have been so proactive to help us. I can not sing your praises too highly to my friends." Steve United Kingdom

First time customers will receive a DNA home collection kit to lightly swab the inside of their check and return it to My DNA Fragrance's lab in the provided self-addressed envelope. Soon afterwards they will receive their choice of 4 oz of cologne or perfume and a copy of their DNA profile. First time cost for perfume is \$189.98 and for cologne is \$159.98. Refills are between \$89.99 and \$59.99.

With more than 30,000 designer fragrances on the market today, My DNA Fragrance has pioneered a revolutionary new path in the production of fragrance creating biologically seductive liquid treasures that caress the secret desires of the mind in a world seeking individuality and exclusivity. Your fragrance is in the bottle, but the Scent is in You. www.mydnafragrance.com.

Author's Notes:

Let me get this straight. You take a swab of your DNA from your cheek. Then send it to DNA Fragrances for a fragrance match. I mean are folks really that lame.

Check out the companies web site. In order to analyze your DNA at the very least they would need a sophisticated Gas Chromatography computer including chemists.

Keep in mind everybody's DNA is unique. No two individuals would smell the same even utilizing

the exact same fragrance.

The data that is being gleamed-off of you is actually being sold to unknown third parties. What they are doing with it is placing the information into a national data bank for a quite scary future hidden agenda.

Believe that I am incorrect. Do you own a cell phone? Verizon Wireless sells everyone's personal data to a company called Intelius. For a fee they will sell your personal information to anyone.

Air Fresheners Toxicity

SEPTEMBER 27, 2007

A TEST OF AIR FRESHENER PRODUCTS RECENTLY CONDUCTED BY THE NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL found that 12 out of 14 popular air freshener products contained a chemical known to be harmful to the health of humans. Phthalates, known to cause reproductive problems and hormone disruption in humans, were found in virtually all air freshener brands, including several Walgreens-branded air fresheners that the popular retailer has now pulled off its shelves.

KEY CONCEPTS: TOXIC CHEMICALS, AIR FRESHENERS AND CANCER.

Neither the FDA nor the EPA conducts any safety testing or spot checking of toxic chemicals in air freshener products. Essentially, consumers could be exposed to any number of toxic airborne chemicals from air freshener products, with no warning whatsoever. The safety of chemicals used in these products is utterly ignored by the FDA in much the same way that perfumes and cosmetic products containing cancer-causing chemicals are routinely ignored by the agency. The FDA makes virtually no effort to protect American consumers from cancer-causing or hormone-disrupting chemicals in tens of thousands of consumer products, and were it not for the efforts of consumer advocacy groups and environmental protection groups like the NRDC, no one would be protecting consumers at all. (U.S. government agencies usually have to be sued by groups like the CSPI or Public Citizen before they will take any pro-consumer action...)

Only two products tested by the NRDC Febreze Air Effects and Renuzit Subtle Effects contained virtually no detectable levels of phthalates, yet the twelve other products tested positive for the chemical even though some were labeled "unscented" and none of them listed phthalates as an ingredient. Some products were even labeled "All natural!" (Which just goes to demonstrate, yet again, that the "All natural" claim is meaningless.)

Walgreens pulls its air freshener products

According to the NRDC, the air freshener products with the highest levels of detectable phthalates were Walgreens Air Freshener, Walgreens Scented Bouquet, and Ozium Glycolized Air Sanitizer. Walgreens has since pulled its air freshener products from its shelves, apparently out of this newly revealed health concern.

Four consumer advocacy groups (and environmental groups) are now filing a petition with the EPA and Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC), calling for the agency to start testing air freshener products for this toxic chemical. The four groups include the Sierra Club, Alliance for Healthy Homes and the National Center for Healthy Housing.

All this brings to mind an important question: Why hasn't some government agency taken steps to test these toxic chemicals in air freshener products before?

Toxic products for the home are found everywhere right now.

The sad truth is that you can walk down the aisle of just about any popular retailer (Walgreens, Wal-Mart, etc.) and find literally hundreds of different products that contain dangerous chemicals, many of which are well known to promote cancer. These chemicals are openly added to laundry detergents, skin creams, cosmetics, pet products, household cleaners, car cleaners, dish soap, perfumes, shampoos and many other products regularly used by consumers. Of course, most consumers have no idea they're consuming cancer-causing ingredients, and most retailers seem to have no interest whatsoever in testing their products for dangerous chemical substances.

Why was Walgreens selling products if it didn't know what was in them? And what about retailers like Wal-Mart, Costco and Sam's Clubs? Aren't they also aware that many of their consumer products contain cancer-causing chemicals?

The sad truth is that most brand-name consumer products contain at least one toxic chemical, and that's true for food as much as it is for home care products. Unless you're shopping at a health food store and buying truly natural, organic, unscented and environmentally responsible products, you can bet there are toxic chemicals all over your home (and in your body)

The average American consumer uses close to 100 toxic chemicals before she even leaves the house in the morning. Many of those chemicals are encountered in the morning during showering, shaving, skin care, hair care and application of cosmetics. Other chemicals are encountered in breakfast foods, including bacon, sausage, processed milk, breads and other processed foods. By the time the average consumer leaves their home in the morning, they've already poisoned their liver, pancreas, kidneys, heart, lungs and brain. A typical American consumer has over 300 different synthetic chemicals in their body right now. Is it any wonder degenerative disease rates have skyrocketed in the U.S. over the last several decades?

Lots of chemical contaminants now emerging

I think the U.S. population is suddenly waking up to the fact that the vast majority of popular products marketed to them and sold at retailers are, in one way or another, dangerous to their health.

People have suddenly come to realize that brand-name dog food is so toxic that it will kill your dog, that toys from China contain dangerous levels of lead, that perfume products can contain as many as 21 different cancer-causing chemicals

and that even popular laundry detergent products wash your clothes in a toxic brew of synthetic chemicals and artificial fragrances. Sites like NewsTarget and the Organic Consumers Association (www.OrganicConsumers.org) are, of course, trying to do something about this by educating consumers. We've even gone out of our way to acquire thousands of kilograms of natural laundry detergent to replace the toxic, brand-name detergents sold in stores (watch for an announcement in the next two days, or click here to see our new soap nuts product). Our aim is to eliminate chemicals in 500,000 loads of laundry in the next 90 days, protecting consumers from cancer and protecting the environment from the downstream toxicity caused by the use of commercial laundry detergents (which are dangerous to aquatic ecosystems).

The bottom line to all this is that corporations are selling consumers a cocktail of toxic chemicals found in tens of thousands of different products, none of which are effectively regulated by any government agency. Across the industry, there seems to be no concern whatsoever for the safety of consumers, and that's why everything from pet food to perfume is now manufactured with chemicals that are well known to cause cancer, infertility, neurological disorders and many other serious health problems.

Believe me: The discovery of phthalates in air freshener products is just the tip of the iceberg. What other chemicals lurk in these same air freshener products? And can you imagine all the toxic chemicals found in high-fragrance shampoos, nail polish, makeup remover and dryer sheets? When the truth comes out about those products someday, consumers are going to be shocked to discover just how toxic their homes (and bodies) have become thanks to the relentless use of synthetic chemicals by commercial product manufacturers.

This stuff gets absorbed into the food at the grocery store!

Oh, and here's another huge "Wow" realization that, I guarantee you, nobody else is talking about these days: Many of these toxic fragrance chemicals escape from their product bottles, circulate in the air at grocery stores, and get absorbed by other food products sold in the same store.

I'm not kidding: That's why the peaches I once bought at Costco smell like Tide laundry detergent. It's because the peaches have soaked up some chemicals from the Tide! It's why fresh produce sold at grocery stores sometimes tastes like soap, or why water sold in cheap plastic jugs easily soaks up fragrance chemicals and tastes like Bounce dryer sheets. Any food item you buy from a retailer that sells toxic cleaning products is,

itself, slightly toxic.

Right now, nobody is talking about this. This risk of chemical cross-contamination hasn't even been admitted to by mainstream scientists, the FDA, the EPA or any government agency. And yet it's a huge issue that impacts virtually all consumers; even healthy consumers who think they're reading labels and making smart shopping choices. If they're buying food or beverages under the same roof as a store that sells garden pesticides, toxic air fresheners, chemical-soaked dryer sheets or other products containing dangerous chemicals, then they're buying chemically contaminated food!

It's yet another reason to buy from local farmers' markets or co-op stores. Support Community-Supported Agriculture organizations (CSAs) and grow what you can yourself, in your own back yard, where the food goes from your garden to your plate, without being subjected to toxic chemicals in the air. And get some detox products to get rid of these chemicals. Some great sources include Heavy Metal Detox from www.DetoxMetals.com and Metal Magic from www.BaselineNutritionals.com (another interesting product is Natural Cellular Defense which I recommend through a friend Jason Groode at [//www.mywaio-ra.com/195399](http://www.mywaio-ra.com/195399))

Trust me on this issue: We've

only heard the beginning of all this. Just wait until scientists someday wake up and start realizing that virtually everything sold at most retailers is contaminated with toxic chemicals even when those chemicals are not added to the products during manufacturing! Just remember this:

Products sitting on the shelves at retailers exchange molecules. Fruits and vegetables absorb molecules in the air, and solvent chemicals can go right through plastic containers. When you buy something at a store, you're buying a little bit of everything in the store! It's another reason to stop shopping at retailers that sell pesticides, toxic soaps, laundry products, solvents and cleaners. Get your food from a FOOD store, and make sure it's real food (not that processed garbage).

By the way, you can read the original NRDC press release at:

www.nrdc.org/media/2007/070919.asp

About the author: Mike Adams is a natural health author and technology pioneer with a mission to teach personal and planetary health to the public. He has authored more than 1,500 articles and dozens of reports, guides and interviews on natural health topics, reaching millions of readers with information that is saving lives and improving personal health around the world. Adams is an honest, independent

journalist and accepts no money or commissions on the third-party products he writes about or the companies he promotes. In 2007, Adams launched EcoLEDs, a maker of energy efficient LED lights that greatly reduce CO2 emissions. He also launched an online retailer of environmentally-friendly products (BetterLifeGoods.com) and uses a portion of its profits to help fund non-profit endeavors. He's also the founder and CEO of a well known email mail merge software developer whose software, 'Email Marketing Director,' currently runs the NewsTarget email subscriptions. Adams volunteers his time to serve as the executive director of the Consumer Wellness Center, a 501(c)3 non-profit organization, and enjoys outdoor activities, nature photography, Pilates and adult gymnastics.

Chemical Dangers

SEPTEMBER 27, 2007 - PUBLICATION DATE NOT KNOWN

GRIST, AN ONLINE PUBLICATION covering enviro issues with a pro-green bent, had this series on parenting and protecting yourself and your wee ones from potentially dangerous chemicals that wind up in all sorts of consumer goods. They focus on chemicals that mimic hormones, which can affect learning, development, fertility and all sorts of rather important stuff.

Also this week, the Natural Resources Defense Council released its own research on the presence of phthalates in air fresheners (phthalates are chemicals used in plastics and fragrances and one of the chemicals highlighted by Grist).

NRDC, Sierra Club, Alliance for Healthy Homes and the National Center for Healthy Housing also filed a petition asking the Environmental Protection Agency and the Consumer Product Safety Commission to more strictly regulate the air freshener industry.

From Jane Kay at the San Francisco Chronicle:

Scented sprays, gels and plug-in fresheners offer no public health benefits yet contain harmful chemicals linked to breathing difficulties, developmental problems in babies and cancer in laboratory animals, according to the petition sent to the two federal agencies.

Air fresheners from Walgreens had some of the highest levels of phthalates and in a rather surprising move, the company pulled them from their shelves vowing to do testing and reformulation to cut the phthalates.

Keep in mind some of these chemicals are found in items specifically targeted to little kids. So Washington enviro groups are holding an event next week in Olympia where they're accepting kid items for test-

ing from legislators and their staff.

Here are the details from their press release:

Groups Sponsor Free Toy Testing For Toxic Chemicals
Legislators and Media Invited to "Bring Your Kids' Toys to Work Day"

What: The Washington Toxics Coalition and the Toxic-Free Legacy Coalition are sponsoring a free toy testing day for legislators and their staff at the State Capitol in Olympia. Toxics experts will be testing toys brought in by legislators, staff and members of the media using a special tool, called an XRF Analyzer, which can detect toxic heavy metals like lead and cadmium as well as PVC (vinyl). Members of the media are invited to bring up to three of their children's toys for testing too.

A staff scientist from the Washington Toxics Coalition will be available for a short demonstration and questions at 11:30 on Thursday, September 27, 2007.

When: Thursday, September 27, 2007 11:30 am - 2:00 pm

Where: The First Floor Briefing Room of the John L. O'Brien Building

safety issue. SEATTLE PI obviously shows a common and unfortunate lack of attention to detail and a fear of all 'nasty chemicals' that are hard to pronounce.

The kinds of products that can be tested include: Plastic, wood, or metal toys, especially those that are painted; Costume jewelry; Items that may be PVC (vinyl) - including rain coats, plastic teething rings, rubber duckies and other bath toys, diaper covers, bibs, and mattress covers.

Posted by Lisa Stiffler at September 21, 2007 4:24 p.m.

Categories: Consumers and the environment, Toxics

Comments

#54308 Posted by unregistered user at 9/26/07 11:44 a.m.

I'm in the "evil industry" so I can't post my name.

Many of us heard of this 'science' over the last 5 years.

The IFRA has commented on many valid fragrance concerns, even to the point of demanding removal of certain fragrance ingredients because of LACK of data. Phthalates had not been a part of the last 42nd Amendment.

This sounds like a fund-raiser issue for NRDC more than any real