EXPOSED: The covered-up dangers behind America's top-selling heart drug

How to keep your heart healthy—without big pharma's "help"

I've written many times about how cholesterol-lowering statin drugs are not only useless for preventing heart disease, but they're actually detrimental to your health. Indeed, they're downright toxic.

In fact, research shows that lowering your natural cholesterol levels too much can actually *increase* your risk of chronic, deadly diseases like diabetes and amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS)—especially if you're older.

And now, some doctors are *finally* coming to grips with the disasters of statin drugs. But they aren't U.S. doctors, who continue to be seduced by big pharma into prescribing these worthless drugs…

That's right—rather, "the British are coming"…this time, to fix the statin mess!

The chair of the British Parliament Science and Technology Committee recently called for a full, independent investigation "by scientists without financial or scientific conflicts" into cholesterol-lowering statin drugs. (Believe it or not, there are actually a few—in the U.K., at least.)[1] And here's what they found…

Despite statins, heart disease is actually increasing

The investigation was requested after receiving a letter from a group of leading physicians and cardiologists,

including the editor of the *British Medical Journal* and the past president of the Royal College of Physicians.[2] (All of whom I met in Philadelphia in 2002, when I directed the U.S. College of Physicians.)

Their letter pointed out that the decades-long campaign to lower cholesterol through drugs (and through diet, like low-fat and vegan approaches) has "completely and utterly failed to curb the global pandemic of heart disease."

More specifically, despite sales of statins predicted to reach an astonishing $1 trillion this year, heart disease remains the No. 1 cause of death in the world. And the U.K. is actually experiencing a significant increase in death rates from heart disease *for the first time in a half century*.[3]

Of course, the U.K. isn't the only country where statin drugs have failed dismally on a national basis. Back in 2013, I reported on a study of 8 million people in Sweden— essentially the entire population— showing that those who took statin drugs had no difference in heart disease rates compared to those not taking the drugs.[4]

The bottom line is that almost all adults in the U.S. and Europe who are considered at risk of heart disease have been taking statin drugs for years. Which means, if these drugs

were of *any* use, heart disease should be going down, not up!

What really causes heart disease—and what doesn't

The British letter states that, among the broader medical community, it still remains relatively unknown that insulin resistance is *the most important risk factor* for heart attacks—as well as for Type II diabetes, which, in turn, is the leading cause of heart disease.

Instead, the mainstream remains trapped in the "flawed" (and failed) model of heart disease "prevention" that promotes cholesterol reduction, low-fat/high-carb diets, and replacement of saturated fats with polyunsaturated fats…even though multiple randomized, controlled clinical trials (RCTs) have never found any heart-health benefit to reducing saturated fat, or replacing it

with polyunsaturated fats (regardless of cholesterol levels).

In fact, the letter states that during the past 30 years, there have been a whopping 44 RCTs that revealed *no benefit* for cardiovascular mortality from various statin drugs—or diets—that lower cholesterol.

And in 2013, a huge dispute erupted in the U.K. when the *British Medical Journal* (BMJ) published two articles highlighting that the mainstream had incorrectly demonized saturated fat and cholesterol for heart disease.

The first showed why there should be *a much greater emphasis on cutting sugars and refined carbs*—as this approach not only helps prevent heart disease, but also insulin resistance and diabetes, as I always point out. And the second article showcased how *industry-sponsored data itself* demonstrated no benefit to statin drugs for the vast majority of people.

The letter also touched on a 2017 study of more than 12,000 people at high risk of heart disease. The researchers found no reductions in heart attacks, strokes or deaths, despite a 37 percent reduction in "bad" (LDL) cholesterol.[5]

The mainstream's low cholesterol mania can actually kill you

Another key point of the British letter is that in two recent studies, traditional low-cholesterol approaches actually caused harm.

People who lowered their cholesterol through low-fat/high-carb diets had an *increase* in death rates when compared with those who didn't lower their cholesterol.

In fact, the letter points out that what most people (including doctors) don't know is that *only* people with *genetically* high cholesterol levels—

greater than 380 mg/dL—are more likely to die of heart disease.

Plus, William Castelli, MD, the lead researcher of the famed Framingham Heart Study, said that back in 1996, unless so-called "bad" cholesterol (LDL) was greater than 300 mg/dL, "it had no value in isolation in predicting those individuals at increased risk of developing coronary heart disease."

So, if your doctor doesn't find that your total cholesterol is higher than 380 mg/dL, or your LDL cholesterol is more than 300 mg/dL, they should stop yacking about your cholesterol levels!

Which leads me to my next point…

The perils of lowering your cholesterol too much

What happens if you *do* lower your cholesterol through statins and diet? Well, the British letter cited evidence showing that people with abnormally low cholesterol—less than 150 mg/dL—do have a somewhat lower risk of heart disease. But they *don't* have a lower death rate…which is what really counts.

And other studies show that low cholesterol is associated with an *increased* risk of cancer and other chronic diseases. So, basically, people with abnormally low cholesterol are just dying of something else besides heart disease. (In other words, of "competing risks".)

Arthur Schatzkin, a late colleague with whom I worked at the National Cancer Institute (NCI) during the mid-1980s, was always very conscious of competing risks. In fact, in an analysis of the huge U.S. National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, Arthur found that lower cholesterol was associated with an increased risk of cancer. But

the NCI quickly buried his findings, so he then focused his attention to other studies.

In addition, there are also deadly diseases associated directly with lowering your cholesterol by taking statins. Shockingly, the British letter states that it's been well-known—but hidden—knowledge among *at least* two drug companies that statins are a direct cause of ALS, the irreversible, neurodegenerative disease that affected Stephen Hawking and Lou Gehrig.

According to the letter, the well-known researcher Dr. Beatrice Golomb and colleagues published a paper showing a *50-times increased risk of ALS* among people taking statins.

Statins are also a clear cause of Type II diabetes, which, as I mentioned earlier, is a leading cause of heart disease—*not* high cholesterol.

And, as I've often reported, statins have other dangerous side effects, including causing *damage to your heart muscle.*

In other words, the list of statin side effects reads like the International Classification of Diseases compendium!

Statins are their own public health epidemic

The truth about statin side effects has been creeping out slowly, partially because big pharma denied access to original data. But in recent years—and as millions of unsuspecting people were pushed to take these drugs—there has been a torrent of terrible toxicities.

For years, big pharma and their medical minions downplayed the problems. They admitted to the well-known muscle damage associated with statins only because they had

to. Because it's *painfully* (literally) obvious and proven (a word I rarely use in regard to science) that statins cause muscle damage.

Nonetheless, big pharma still attempted to minimize the problem, inventing some kind of supposedly "rare genetic susceptibility" to muscle damage. But research shows up to *one-third* of statin users experience muscle cramps, pain, or weakness. That's a lot of "genetic susceptibility"!

And, as I mentioned earlier, a couple years ago, research began to reveal that this muscle damage includes the heart muscle. So statins can actually *cause heart problems.*

There's also the well-known "statin gluttony" effect…when people think taking a useless little statin pill will protect them from heart disease, so they drop the simple lifestyle approaches—like weight-management—that really *will* keep them healthy.

Why your doctor shouldn't be pushing statins if you're past the age of 60

The letter also touched on the relationship between cholesterol and age. It noted that in 2016, a systematic review showed no association between LDL cholesterol and heart disease in people older than 60.

In fact, there was a reverse association with death rates, meaning that the *higher* your cholesterol, the *longer* you will live.

After this review was published, I reported how the *Journal of the American Medical Association* and the American Geriatrics Society began recommending that doctors stop prescribing statin drugs to their older patients.

But not enough doctors have followed

these recommendations. Many defend their cholesterol-lowering dogma to their questioning patients by saying they're just following guidelines. (At the Nuremberg Trials for National Socialist Germans after WWII, their defense was they were "only following orders.")

The problem, of course, is that these doctors remain unaware that the "guidelines" for statin use are based on flawed and failed research by scientists who often have strong personal and/or institutional financial ties to big pharma.

The British letter also cites data from John Ioannidis, a Stanford University professor of medicine and statistics whom I've quoted before. According to his research, a shocking *70 percent* of health practitioners fail tests on their understanding of evidence-based medicine—like those 44 studies I mentioned above showing that lower cholesterol is not linked to lower mortality.

Professor Ioannidis' studies also found that "the greater the financial interest in a given field, the greater the likelihood the research findings are to be false." And these failed and flawed recommendations are then passed on to unsuspecting patients—particularly older people who are harmed the most by statins.

Why you need to take your heart health into your own hands

As always, I recommend finding a doctor who's knowledgeable about cholesterol, statins, and heart disease. But at the same time, it's also important for you to take charge of your own health.

And perhaps that starts with saying no to statins…unless your doctor can make a convincing, evidence-backed case as to why you, personally and specifically, need them.

Then, just say yes to a heart-healthy diet and lifestyle:

• Follow a balanced, Mediterranean-style diet that includes plenty of organic fruits and vegetables, full-fat dairy (including butter, milk, yogurt, and cheeses), wild-caught fish, grass-fed and -finished meat, and moderate consumption of red wine.

• Exercise moderately for about 140 minutes a week, total (that breaks down to roughly 20 minutes a day). As always, I recommend getting out in Nature whenever you can, especially as the weather warms up. Walking, hiking, swimming, and gardening are all excellent activities.

• Supplement daily with heart-healthy nutrients like 10,000 IU of vitamin D, a high-quality vitamin B complex with at least 55 mg of B6, 5-6 grams of fish oil, and 150 mg of coenzyme Q-10 (CoQ10).

• Meditate or use other mind-body techniques to lower your stress levels. (For additional guidance, check out my book *New World Mindfulness.* To order yourself a copy, go to the "books" tab of my website, www.DrMicozzi.com.)

I also encourage you to check out my *Heart Attack Prevention and Repair Protocol.* This innovative, online learning tool highlights all of the drug-free approaches for avoiding heart disease and stroke. To learn more, or to enroll today, **click here** or call 1-866-747-9421 and ask for order code EOV3W500.

SHOCKING NEW RESEARCH!
Common chemicals increase risk of heart attack and stroke by up to 45 percent

Two simple steps you can take to keep yourself—and the planet—safe

For many Americans, fresh produce is coming back into season this month (see my article about keeping them fresh, on page 7). So consider this my seasonal warning about just how many of the fruits and vegetables we buy are covered in toxic pesticides and insecticides.

In fact, the vast majority of fruit and vegetable crops are doused in agricultural chemicals that are harmful not only to our health, but also to the health of our environment.

I've witnessed this effect personally over the last four decades. The southeast Florida coast (where I worked as a medical examiner in the mid-1980s) experienced serious die-off of its undersea coral reef (the third largest in the *world*) due, in part, to agricultural chemicals being washed from farmland into the water.

And on the Gulf Coast (where I now reside in my Florida home), the water lacks oxygen because of the effects of agricultural chemicals. This has created a "dead zone"—the size of *Massachusetts*—that kills fish and other marine life.[1] (For more about the danger of dead zones, see the sidebar on page 6).

The direct link between pesticides, insecticides, and chronic diseases

Of course, that's not the only living thing agricultural chemicals can kill. I've written before about studies showing that these toxic insecticides, pesticides, and herbicides (like Roundup®) have a direct effect on humans' risk of dying from chronic diseases.

Many of these studies have—appropriately—focused on how these chemicals can cause cancer. But researchers are also branching out to look at how agricultural toxins affect other chronic diseases, too.

Two new studies show that pesticide and insecticide exposure *substantially increases* our risk of heart disease—the world's No. 1 killer.

One of the studies even found that a supposedly *less*-toxic agricultural insecticide, which is commonly sprayed into the air around us to repel mosquitos and other pests, can *triple* our likelihood of dying from heart disease.

The good news is that there are two simple solutions to help preserve both our health and the health of our planet. I'll reveal them in just a moment…but first, let's take a closer look at this deadly new evidence on the ill-health effects of chemical pesticides and insecticides.

Pesticides linked to a 45 percent increased risk of heart attacks and strokes

The first study is the most recent to

come out of the Kuakini Honolulu Health Program, which has followed more than 8,000 first- and second-generation Japanese-Americans since 1965.[2] (I was offered a position with the Kuakini study in 1979, to continue my research on Asian-American populations, but decided it was best to stay on the mainland at that point in my career.)

Researchers looked at men who were exposed to pesticides through their work. And they found that these men had a shocking *45 percent* higher risk of having a heart attack or stroke compared with men who didn't work with pesticides.

Similar results were also found in the Republic of China (Taiwan) among middle-aged men who had high levels of pesticide exposure.

By analyzing different time periods, the researchers found that the maximum heart attack and stroke risk was during the first 10 years following pesticide exposure. After the full 34 years of follow-up, the link between pesticides and cardiovascular disease was no longer significant.

But at that point, the men in the study were between 78 and 102 years old, and the researchers noted that other risk factors for heart disease had appeared—potentially masking the pesticide risk factor.

The canary in the coal mine when it comes to pesticide exposures

If you think this study doesn't apply to you because you don't work with pesticides, consider this: Exposures on the job reveal health problems linked to chemicals first, because the workers have higher and more continual exposure compared with the general population.

In essence, these people are like the "canary in the coal mine," indicating there's a risk for the general population.

For example, people who worked on golf courses for years have shown increased risk of cancer. The use of pesticides on golf courses is intense and essentially year-round, so health risks show up first among the people who work there. Not to mention, if a worker is exposed to one cancer-causing chemical on the job, he or she is invariably exposed to a dozen or more.

But, as I learned to my great dismay as a forensic toxicology expert witness on a case in 2014, judges can demand data on each individual type of pesticide exposure—and reject what they call a "toxic soup" argument (the combination of all of the different chemical exposures that occur together in reality).

Of course, such data simply does not exist in humans, but that doesn't stop lawyers from asking experts to try to "prove" the impossible. And thus, numerous chemicals continue to be widely used without accountable consequence.

This dilemma is depicted in the book and 1998 film, "A Civil Action." The focus was on the link between childhood cancer and the pollution of the historic Aberjona River, done illegally by W.R. Grace and Beatrice Foods, near my old hometown in Massachusetts during the 1960s and 1970s.

In the film, the law firm of John Travolta (as real-life attorney and author Jan Schlichtmann) attempted to try this case. It bankrupted the law firm and led to increased anxiety (which I had also seen coming for me as a forensic toxicology expert witness in 2014, until my doctor recommended I retire from this kind of practice).

There's no "safe" insecticide

The second study linking agricultural chemical exposure to heart attacks is even more shocking than the first. That's because it has to do with a family of insecticides that farmers and chemists have deemed "safer" than other chemical bug killers. And people use them quite commonly.

These insecticides are known as pyrethroids, and they're sprayed on a variety of crops to kill ants, roaches, mosquitoes, and ticks. According to Consumer Reports, pyrethroids account for 30 percent of the insecticides used worldwide. And they're now the most common chemical used to kill mosquitos in the U.S.[3]

Pyrethroids are typically diffused into the environment, rather than used in insect repellants you apply topically to your skin. But the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention does recommend spraying the chemicals onto clothing to help repel ticks. And they're a common ingredient in lice shampoos and pet flea medications, too.

Pyrethroids are supposedly less harmful to birds and mammals (including humans) than other chemical concoctions because they're related to pyrethrins, which are natural insecticides that come from chrysanthemums.

But pyrethroids are made from synthetic chemicals, so whatever "natural" link they supposedly have no longer exists. In essence, this artificial alteration turns a harmless herbal remedy into a toxin.

So it's really no surprise that pyrethroids have nasty side effects for humans—including headache, vomiting, dizziness, muscle twitching, and even loss of consciousness.[4] Which leads me to

this new study, which found an even more toxic side effect…

The insecticide that makes you three times more likely to die from heart disease

Researchers followed 2,116 men and women (average age of 43) who participated in the U.S. National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey.[5] The participants provided urine samples over a three-year period, and the researchers measured concentrations of a number of chemicals that indicate exposure to pyrethroids.

The researchers discovered that the participants with higher exposures of pyrethroids were *three times more likely* to die from heart disease compared to those with lower exposures. And pyrethroid exposure was more likely to lead to death from *any cause.* The researchers expressed surprise at these findings—even though another study in 2017 also found a link between pyrethroids and heart disease.[6]

My two-step plan to protect yourself from pesticides and insecticides

The sad fact is that these toxic agricultural chemicals are all around us. But there are two easy and effective steps you can take to reduce—or even eliminate—your exposure to deadly pesticides and insecticides.

1.) Eat organic fruits and vegetables. By U.S. law, produce that's labeled organic can't be grown with chemical pesticides, herbicides, insecticides, or fertilizers.

But if you can't always afford to buy organic produce, focus on the fruits and vegetables that are most likely to be contaminated with pesticides. I always recommend checking out the nonprofit Environmental Working Group's (EWG) website, EWG.org, for guidance. They release a "Dirty Dozen" list each year, and the most recent list includes (in order of the most contamination):

1) Strawberries	7) Peaches
2) Spinach	8) Cherries
3) Kale	9) Pears
4) Nectarines	10) Tomatoes
5) Apples	11) Celery
6) Grapes	12) Potatoes

2.) Protect yourself from pests naturally. Wear long sleeves, pants, and socks at dawn and dusk (which is prime mosquito time) and in places where you may be exposed to ticks.

In addition, clean up any standing water around your home, which attracts mosquitos. And repel other insects by keeping compost piles far away from the house.

There are also a variety of common, hardy plants you can grow around your house, patio, and other outdoor areas that act as natural insect repellants, including basil, catmint, chrysanthemums, geraniums, lantana, lavender, lemongrass, marigolds, mint, and rosemary.

You can use essential plant oils as insect repellents as well. Citronella and eucalyptus oils are particularly effective. Just combine 10 to 25 drops of either plant oil with two tablespoons of olive oil—to be applied directly to the skin or used as a spray.

How pesticides and insecticides pollute our water

From my Florida home, I see daily evidence of one of the most dramatic environmental impacts of agricultural chemicals.

Florida has the longest coastline in the lower 48 states, adding up to nearly 9,000 miles (Alaska is first with over 33,000 miles).[7] Florida is also an agricultural breadbasket. So every time it rains (and it rains a lot here!), toxic pesticides and insecticides get washed into the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic Ocean.

Plus, the mighty Mississippi River also drains into the Gulf, carrying runoff from farms in the agricultural Midwest—where use of chemical pesticides and insecticides has become intense.

And if all that weren't enough, the manmade alteration of the natural waterflow of the Everglades (in order to create more agricultural land and coastal development) disrupts the natural, cleansing watershed into the Gulf.

All of this creates a critical environmental issue: dead zones in the Gulf of Mexico, where no plant or animal can thrive.

There was a slow expansion of dead zones during the second half of the 20th century, and then they skyrocketed in the early 21st century. That's when ridiculous federal government mandates started requiring the contamination of gasoline with ethanol, for absolutely no good reason. This ethanol is made from corn—which is now almost all genetically modified (GM) and requires the most intensive use of agricultural chemicals of any major crop. (It's grown in the Midwest and drained into the Mississippi.)

But these dead zones shrunk in 2012, when a major drought in the Midwest kept toxic chemicals from washing down the Mississippi into the Gulf of Mexico.

This is good news, though…that nature can begin to come back so quickly. It also demonstrates the cause and effect connection between agricultural chemicals and the death of our oceans. And now, ever since, restrictions on chemical use on Florida farmlands, as well as limits on local development and efforts at environmental restoration, are yielding positive results.

A real solution to ending dead zones in the Gulf of Mexico and other bodies of water throughout the world is to stop buying, selling, and using mass-produced GM crops that are mono-cultured on mega-farms, and to consume locally grown, organic foods. That's just one reason why I'll continue visiting my local farmer's market this summer—and all year long.

My ultimate "Spring Cleaning" food storage guide

As with many other aspects of our lives, our food-shopping routines have been upended in recent weeks due to coronavirus stay-at-home orders. I particularly miss my trips to the local farmers' market to buy fresh, just-picked, local produce. But at least we can still find fresh fruits and vegetables at our grocery stores—especially if you're not producing (or growing) your own food, as we do with eggs.

The question is, though, if we're only shopping once a week—or even less—how long can our purchases stay fresh?

Plus, with the weather getting warmer, it's a good idea to know which foods need to be refrigerated, which ones can stay out on the counter or in the pantry, and how long food can keep fresh in either environment.

So let's dive right in…

Do your condiments really need to be cold?

Food manufacturers are always paranoid about someone getting sick from their products and suing them, so they err on the hyper-safe side of caution when it comes to their product's storage recommendations.

For instance, most condiment labels recommend they be refrigerated after opening. But some don't actually need to take up space in your fridge at all.

Sure, low temperatures slow or stop microbial action that spoils foods, as well as chemical degradation like oxidation. It's the basic law of thermodynamics. But there are other substances that also help prevent food spoilage.

Remember the stories of how pioneers packed their meat in salt while traveling for months on wagon trains? That's because salt is a natural preservative. So is vinegar, alcohol, honey, and to a lesser extent, sugar.

So if your condiments contain any of these ingredients, chances are you don't have to refrigerate them after all…even after you've opened them.

So let's take a look at the storage recommendations from Consumer Reports for some of the most popular condiments…[1]

Ketchup. Because it contains vinegar, you can keep your opened bottles of ketchup out on the table or counter, just like they do in restaurants. That said, most restaurants go through their condiments quickly. So if you rarely eat ketchup, it's probably best to keep it in the fridge—where it can last six months after opening.

Of course, you need to pay attention to what's in your ketchup besides the vinegar. While the concentrated tomatoes in ketchup are a great source of lycopene and other healthy nutrients, they can also be loaded with sugar. Opt for organic ketchup with no sugar added.

Mustard. This vinegary condiment can last even longer than ketchup—12 months in the fridge, and at least a few months unrefrigerated after opening.

Mustard is one of my favorite no-calorie, natural condiments and it's loaded with nutrients! In fact, the wild mustard plant is the original source for cultivated brassica plants (broccoli, Brussels sprouts, cabbage, cauliflower, and kale).

I particularly like the "kick" mustard gives to a basic salad dressing of olive oil and vinegar, or olive oil and lemon juice.

Mayonnaise. Because this condiment contains dairy, it should be refrigerated immediately after opening. Some say it can only last two months in the fridge, but I've found that good-quality mayonnaise stays fresh quite a bit longer—up to a year.

Mayonnaise can be a great dressing to enhance the taste and texture of healthy foods. There's nothing wrong with adding some good, organic, full-fat mayo in moderation. I've found the Sir Kensington brand to be a healthy source of mayonnaise and other condiments—as it focuses on all-natural ingredients.

Fruit basket vs. fridge: Which is best?

Now that we've talked about a few condiments, let's move onto fruit. Many fruits have what I call "natural packaging"—their skins or peels. This helps keep them fresh longer than "naked" fruits, like berries.

I like to keep all of my fruits out on the counter for as long as I can (check out the chart on page 8 for more specific storage times). I personally believe the taste is better at room temperature, and biting into the fruit won't give your teeth and taste buds a frigid shock. Plus, when fruit is stored out in the open, it's a good reminder to grab a piece at any time throughout the day.

If you want to extend the life of your fruit, you'll need to refrigerate it or freeze it.

To freeze fruit, peel it, cut it into pieces, and seal the pieces tightly in freezer-safe plastic bags. Label the bags with the date so you know how

long they've been stored.

Citrus fruits aren't great frozen, but they have the advantage of being long-lasting on their own—especially if you keep them out of the sun after picking, so that they don't dry out.

Citrus peels are loaded with natural oils that protect against microbes, insects, and spoilage. (That's why lemon and citrus oils are also natural, non-toxic insect repellants—plus they smell great, so keep that in mind when you go outside this summer.)

Cantaloupes and peaches are also long-lasting fruits. According to the website www.StillTasty.com (an excellent resource for storage times for many foods), these fruits stay fresh in the fridge for three to five days. And they can be kept frozen for up to a year.

Bananas can be kept out on the counter for nearly a week. Contrary to popular lore, they can also be kept in the refrigerator during hot weather for up to a week. In addition, they can last three months in the freezer.

I learned this personally years ago when I was doing fieldwork in Southeast Asia. I visited the Dole banana and pineapple plantation in Mindanao, the large, southern-most island in the Philippines. They gifted me a trunk-load of bananas just picked from the edge of the jungle. When I got back to my apartment, I had no choice but to fill my entire refrigerator with bananas— literally!

The fridge—originally from the U.S.—had been salvaged from a local junkyard by a Chinese junk dealer (so to speak) named Jack Tan. He spent days tinkering with it to get it running it again.

The bananas kept for weeks, for as long as I could continue managing to eat them. (And so did many of the tropical insects, which for days, kept

Safe storage times for popular fruits and vegetables			
Fruit/Vegetable	**Counter/Pantry**	**Refrigerator**	**Freezer**
Apples	5-7 days	1-2 months	10-12 months
Bananas	2-5 days (or until ripe)	5-7 days	2-3 months
Cantaloupe	1-2 days (or until ripe)	3-5 days	10-12 months
Citrus fruits	1 week	3-4 weeks	3-4 months
Grapes	1 day	7-14 days	10-12 months
Peaches	1-3 days	3-5 days	10-12 months
Strawberries	1-2 days	3-7 days	10-12 months
Broccoli	Keep refrigerated	3-5 days	12-18 months
Carrots	Keep refrigerated	3-4 weeks	10-12 months

Source: www.StillTasty.com

flying out when I opened the door!)

Storage times for vegetables, dairy, meat, and seafood

Many vegetables last even longer than fruits. Remember hearing about root cellars, where root crops like carrots and tubers like potatoes and turnips were kept in cool, dark spaces under the house for months at a time?

Well, if you don't have a root cellar handy, most vegetables last for weeks in the fridge. And you can freeze many vegetables for up to a year, except for lettuce and potatoes. (Follow the same freezing process as I recommended above for fruits.)

When it comes to dairy, butter and cheeses are best served at room temperature. In fact, in France, cheeses are usually not refrigerated at all, but kept on the counter or on the table under a glass dome.

The French eat cheese at almost all meals, as part of a healthy Mediterranean-style diet (which the U.S. nutrition "experts" always fail to mention when referencing this diet, since it doesn't fit with their

false narrative about foods). So cheese really doesn't stay around long enough to go "bad" in France.

But if you prefer to consume other full-fat dairy at some meals, you can store your butter and cheese in the refrigerator for a month after the "sell by" date on the package. Or you can freeze it for up to 12 months.[2]

Likewise, when it comes to meats, raw chicken can be kept frozen for a year, and stored for two days in the fridge when thawed. Uncooked beef can also be kept frozen for up to 12 months. Pork (including bacon and ham) can be frozen for six months. And wild-caught fish and seafood stays fresh in the freezer for three to six months.[2]

Despite these recommendations, you can—and should—also rely on your senses to determine if a food is nearing its expiration date. If it looks, smells, or tastes bad, toss it. Or if it seems less than fresh out in the open, move it into the refrigerator or freezer.

Citations for all articles available online at www.DrMicozzi.com