

Why the New Vitamin D Recommendations Disaster For Your Health

Posted By [Dr. Mercola](#) | December 11 2010 | 170,112 views

On November 30, 2010, the Institute of Medicine's Food and Nutrition Board (FNB) updated recommendations for vitamin D (and calcium), which has sent shockwaves through natural health community.

According to the FNB, the new recommended daily allowance (RDA) for pregnant women up to 70 years of age is the same as that for infants and children – a measly 600 IU' overwhelming evidence showing that vitamin D is extremely important for a wide variety of conditions besides bone health, and that most people need about ten times this amount.

In this interview, Dr. Cannell, founder of the Vitamin D Council, and Carole Baggerly GrassrootsHealth, share their concerns about this recent development.

Sources:

- ❖ [The Institute of Medicine, Food and Nutrition Board November 30, 2010](#)
- ❖ [Heike Bischoff-Ferrari and Walter Willett Comment on the IOM recommendations November 30th 2010\[1\]: For adult bone health, low on Vitamin D](#)
- ❖ [Video Transcript - Interview with Dr. John Cannell](#)
- ❖ [Video Transcript - Interview with Carole Baggerly](#)
- ❖ [The Alliance for Natural Health December 7, 2010](#)

Dr. Mercola's Comments:

In their latest vitamin D report, the Institute of Medicine's Food and Nutrition Board found that the only evidence for the benefit of vitamin D they could document was the impact on bone health.

How they could come to this conclusion is truly beyond belief, because there are hundreds if not thousands of studies showing that it benefits dozens if not hundreds of conditions.

Based on their limited findings, the FNB's updated recommended daily allowance for vitamin D is as follows:

Infants 0-12 months	0 IU/day
1-18 years	600 IU/day
19-50	600 IU/day
51-70	600 IU/day
Over 70 years old	800 IU/day
Pregnant women aged 14-50	600 IU/day

As Dr. Cannell points out in our interview, these recommendations do not take into account the amount of vitamin D you need to prevent influenza, heart- or liver- disease, respiratory disease, cancer, or any of the numerous diseases that have a clearly documented link to vitamin D deficiency.

Why should we care about the IOM's recommendations?

Well, as the Alliance for Natural Health states:

"Unless these findings are challenged, the public will accept it as true. Doctors, institutions, the media, and governmental agencies will all parrot these ultra-low recommendations on vitamin D dosage, poo-h-pooing its important therapeutic benefits, and keep the public dangerously deficient in the vitamin.

This will mean more colds, more flu, greater dependence on dangerous flu shots,

weak bones, more cancer, and many more deaths. Some experts calculate that Americans \$4.4 trillion over a decade—about \$1,346 per person every year."

Scientific Evidence Supports FAR Higher RDA for All Age Groups

Dr. Heaney is widely believed to be one of the most prominent and well respected than 400 vitamin D papers in his lifetime, including the 2007 cancer study that prevented with a vitamin D level of at least 40 ng/ml.

Dr. Heaney was also part of the previous FNB vitamin D panel (but not this one future panels). Here's what he had to say about the latest IOM/FNB recommen

"There is an impressive body of scientific evidence supporting levels high recommending. For reasons that are not entirely clear, the panel has disc

The public needs to know that evidence exist so that they can make up th to know that intakes higher than the recommendations are safe.

For me that decision is easy even if the evidence for higher intake were u times their recommendations would carry a good chance for benefit at ess

... Finally, I believe that the presumption of adequacy should rest with vita (40–60 ng/mL) that prevailed during the evolution of human physiology.

Correspondingly, the burden of proof should fall on those maintaining that lower levels. The IOM has not met that standard."

Clearly, the FNB moved their recommendations in the right direction. As Dr. Ca infants, children and pregnant women was tripled, from 200 units to 600 units, about 33 percent. The upper limits were also doubled.

However, these recommendations still leave a lot to be desired.

"What's shocking to me is that the levels they are recommending will not exposed to healthy levels of sunshine," Dr. Cannell says.

A more appropriate way to analyze vitamin D requirements would indeed be to the levels we want to have, because that's what the human genome is designe

"One thing that did concern me is they have 15 vitamin D experts to review to let anybody look at the vitamin D experts' opinions about their reports,"

" Yesterday, we instructed our attorney to try to obtain them under the Fre

Time will tell whether or not that documentation will be released. I too am very were about the FNB's conclusions...

Officially Sanctioned or Not, Higher Vitamin D Levels ARE Beneficial

Please remember that you have the freedom to do your own research and are sanctioned" nutrient recommendations.

In this case, conventional medicine is still lagging far behind in their implemen:

"[P]eople need to remember about this report is that these are recommen without a doctor's advice," Cannell says.

"If you're under the care of a physician, this report is almost meaningless. prescribing the usual dosages that they do; the 50,000 units once or twice that."

So, if what the Vitamin D Council and I have been posting about the health be make sense to you, then you can choose to flat out ignore this new recommen

As Carole Baggerly points out in the interview above, the FNB is recommendin which, based on more appropriate parameters for *optimal* health, signifies a st:

To me, it borders on criminal negligent malpractice to ignore the abundance of levels are far above 20 ng/ml.

This serum level may not even be sufficient to maintain *bone* health, as the IOI

According to a statement issued by Dr. Heaney:

"The statement by the IOM that skeletal health can be maintained at serui should be looked at as the lower end of the acceptable range for bone hee

There have been randomized controlled trials showing major reductions in Fracture reduction does not reliably occur at levels less than 30 ng/ml and

Osteoid seam width, a measure of vitamin D deficiency, only reaches nori is significant evidence above the IOM panel's "adequate" level of 20 ng/m

This is further supported by Drs. Heike Bischoff-Ferrari and Walter Willett. You [recommendations here.](#)

Negative Vitamin D Results Frequently Due to Vitamin A in Cod Liver

Dr. Cannell brings up additional food for thought with regards to some of the studies on vitamin D.

"It's important for people to realize that of the several hundred studies that have been done on vitamin D, most of them are positive, for reasons that I believe has to do with vitamin A.

There is a U-shaped curve in some of the studies, especially the ones that have been done on cohorts that were studied in these papers had their dietary information taken into account. The intake of cod liver oil especially in the Scandinavian countries is a good example.

When you take cod liver oil, you'll increase your vitamin D level but with it you'll also increase your vitamin A level. A number of studies that shows that vitamin A is not a good thing to have at high levels.

That said, the randomized control trials that have been done have not shown a benefit from vitamin D. In fact, most studies that are now using higher vitamin D dosages are showing a benefit.

The Latest Vitamin D Studies Find Even More Health Benefits...

Dr. Cannell's passion is to carefully review the medical literature on vitamin D, showing its benefits. One of the latest studies to be published on vitamin D found that it can help prevent macular degeneration, which many have mistakenly attributed to 'normal aging'.

Dr. Cannell says:

"It turns out that the higher your vitamin D level the less likely it is for that cross-sectional study that indicates that the lower your vitamin D level the more likely you are to get macular degeneration. The reasons you've always been told to stay out of the sun is because you'll get vitamin D."

There is also an interesting new paper about Parkinsonism that suggests that

"So if you know of anyone with Parkinsonism make sure their vitamin D level is between 50-80 ng/ml," Cannell suggests.

This would also hold true for other chronic neurological diseases, such as Alzheimer's.

"That's a really important point," Cannell says. "People are asking me, 'What's the best level of vitamin D?'"

If you're otherwise perfectly healthy, then a level of around 50 is fine... But for Parkinsonism, Alzheimer's, emphysema, or cancer... It's my opinion that the best range of normal.

The rationale for that is that there are a number of studies with cancer now have at the time you're diagnosed with cancer predicts how long you're go of diagnosis prolongs life.

... [I]f you're sick, you want to keep your levels at 80-90 ng/ml."

Why Pregnant Women Need to Take IOM's Recommendations with a

Likewise, there's very compelling evidence backing up the advice that pregnan to and during pregnancy to prevent neurological problems, such as autism, in

There's even evidence suggesting the child is significantly protected from type levels during gestation, and/or if the infant receives sufficient amounts of vitam

Vitamin D deficiency may also contribute to infertility.

From my perspective, with the mountain of scientific evidence we now have on pregnancy it is reprehensible malpractice to not routinely check a pregnant wo

Of course, it is still not the "standard of care" at this point and no physician wil

According to Dr. Cannell:

"[I]f you're thinking of having a child, both parents should take the steps n is pregnant, she's going to need probably 7,000-8,000 IU's a day while she is off breast milk, the infant needs an independent source of vitamin D.

The Food and Nutrition Board now say 400 IU is adequate [for pregnant/la 1,000 IU's is better."

Is there a Hidden Agenda?

Interestingly enough, while the importance of sunlight and oral vitamin D supp patentable vitamin D drug is currently in the works, the Alliance for Natural He

"A pharmaceutical company is developing a patentable man-made vitamin D. And Glenville Jones, PhD, one of the committee members who determ. as saying that under these guidelines, most people "probably don't have v an exaggeration of the public's interest in vitamin D deficiency," is an adv

Might this have anything to do with the IOM's blatant disregard for the evidenc

Carole Baggerly's Take on the IOM/FNB Recommendations

The second part of the video above features Carole Baggerly, the founder of G managing and implementing a massive effort to educate Americans and Canadian consumer and government level.

For example, she was a primary force behind getting Canadian health authorities swine flu last year.

She brings up several shocking facts about the manner in which the IOM/FNB Baggerly, the panel carefully selected the type of data they wanted to review.

"They did not look at epidemiological data at all," she says, "of which there die of all kinds of diseases that are impacted by vitamin D.

... They excluded all kinds of data that would be, in the public health field,

... [T]he agenda was very clearly set from the very beginning, and those choosing to include... knew the outcome would not be favorable for the industry.

Exactly who set this agenda is still unclear. What is clear is that the IOM/FNB recommendations. Clearly, had it been included, it would have been impossible to justify their current recommendations.

Canadian Developments

Carol has been working as a consultant to the Ontario government, primarily promoting vitamin D testing. They have, as of December 1, "de-listed" vitamin D, which means that vitamin D testing is no longer covered as part of their health insurance.

This is a major setback. However, Canadians can still purchase vitamin D tests. Several vitamin D initiatives to help Canadians get their tests at a reduced cost. A study is currently underway.

The Canadian government may use the latest IOM/FNB recommendations as justification for their actions.

However, there's still some good news.

Heather Chappell of the Canadian Cancer Society (CCS) has stated that the current recommendation, which is currently 1,000 IUs per day, based on the vitamin D cancer research recommendations cover bone health only. And the CCS is still concerned about the lack of research on the effects of vitamin D on cancer prevention.

The "Expert" Vitamin D Panel is Not Even Made Up of Vitamin D Experts

So, just who's on the IOM's vitamin D panel?

Contrary to common sense, the panel did not consist primarily of vitamin D experts.

According to Carol:

"They did have a few people on the panel with a little bit of vitamin D expertise (a list of those people is available on www.IOM.edu.)"

Their experience certainly was not in the epidemiological realm at all like you would expect.

What was disturbing to some of our panel, the vitamin D researchers, was that some of the people who volunteered previously on the panel and they were explicitly rejected.

That is disturbing."

Final Thoughts

Again, the position of the Vitamin D Council, [GrassrootsHealth](http://GrassrootsHealth.org) and myself is that the IOM panel recommendation, which is a vitamin D level of **40 ng/ml at minimum**.

In my view, many people still would not be able to reach a therapeutically healthy level of vitamin D, which is the maximum dosage now recommended by the IOM. I've seen people who are taking vitamin D that's going to make a difference in their health.

How Much Vitamin D Must You Take to Reach Therapeutically Healthy Levels?

Dr. Hollis has released preliminary findings of a brand new study that has not been published yet. Carol shares some of those details:

"One of the most significant findings is how much intake it takes to get to a therapeutically healthy level of vitamin D."

For example, there has been a rule of thumb that for each 1,000 IUs of vitamin D you take, you get about 10 ng/mL rise in your blood level.

Well, it doesn't work that way.

What we are finding is that once you get above the age of 30, the amount of vitamin D you need to get a 5 ng/mL rise is considerably less than that.

For example, between the age of 40 and 50, you'd have to take about 2,000 IUs of vitamin D to get a 5 ng/mL rise for each 1,000 IU, not 10 ng/mL.

... *What this means is that people have to take a lot more. It's going to take of the population above 40 ng/mL."*

Some people will clearly need more.

Improve Your Health and be Part of Worldwide Public Health Campaign

*D*Action* is a worldwide public health campaign created by GrassrootsHealth, one year through focus on testing, education, and grassroots word of mouth.

You can participate in the *D*action* study, if you like! Best of all, Mercola subsidizes 5-year sponsorship.

To sign up, and get your discount, follow these instructions:

*When you sign up, **at the beginning of the Payment Options** (The area where CODE assigned to your organization and click Apply:") **on the Order form, please** payment process.*

When you join *D*action*, you agree to test your vitamin D levels twice a year due status to demonstrate the public health impact of this nutrient.

There is a \$60 fee for every 6 months for your sponsorship of the project (Mercola includes a complete new test kit to be **used at home** (except in the state of New York) progress.

When you finish the questionnaire, you can choose your subscription option. You'll be reminding you "it's time for your next test and health survey."

To join now, please follow this [link to the sign up form](#).

I, along with GrassrootsHealth, expect this study will demonstrate the real significance of vitamin D, its value in the *prevention* of many diseases. So please sign up today and setting out to demonstrate that PREVENTION WORKS!

Like

3,074 people like this. Be the first of your friends.