

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE : 12 JANUARY 2003

IS THE USE OF MINERAL OIL, METHYL PARABEN & PROPYL PARABEN IN SKINCARE PRODUCTS HARMFUL?

Many misled consumers and skincare products end-users have the misconception of the use of methyl paraben & propyl paraben and mineral oil in skincare products. Dr. Pierre Chenxu would therefore like to issue this statement to clarify any doubts and misunderstandings on this issue. If you require more information, please email us at us-sales@pierrechenxu.com with any questions on our products.

The fact that some skincare manufacturers and marketers classify methyl paraben & propyl paraben as chemicals and that essential oils are not chemicals shows very clearly that they and their manufacturer(s) have no or shallow knowledge of chemistry. Factually, everything under the sun and in this whole universe is made up of chemicals. Our body comprises and is made up of only chemicals. The water we drink is chemical, the air we breathe is chemical, and the food we consume is all of chemical compounds. Otherwise, scientists should not be classifying the study of behavior of molecules and atoms of matters as chemistry.

The common notion promoted by most skincare companies is that synthetic ingredients are 100% man-made and natural ingredients, on the other hand, are 100% natural from their original form, without undergoing any man-made processes. This, we know, logically cannot be possible.

Most synthetic raw ingredient, if not all, needs also other raw ingredients that are processed from other natural sources to process into their final synthetic raw ingredient to be sold as their final product - which is considered as raw ingredient to their customer who purchased them for further processing into another final product, which can be a finished end-consumer product or semi-finished product.

Likewise, I dare say all natural ingredients are NEVER sold in their real natural form. Anything in its natural form contains lots of waste matters and impurities in them that need some processing to rid them; and in the process of ridding them, there will be some beneficial compounds being rid off as well, either unknowingly or uncontrollably. Next, before the final processed ingredient can be used to further process into another form of product by the customers, there is this shelf-life time span in question. The ingredient will have to be stored in the warehouse until someone orders. The ingredient will then have to be repacked (or already repacked earlier), or have to be shipped to the customer - having to withstand the air pressure (if by air shipment) or the heat through the sea voyage (if by seafreight) for many days. To have a reasonable shelf life, the natural product needs to be

mixed with a base that can help preserve it. The more natural it is, the faster the product will deteriorate if without an effective base to help in its preservation. Next, even if the natural product were to be factory-packed under extreme clean-room and vacuum condition, when it reaches the manufacturer who are using it for their end product formulation, they can't be opening up the bottle/drum of raw natural ingredient in a clean-room and vacuum condition, decant what they need for that batch, and then quickly close it up again, and store away under a perfect condition until the next batching. So, the base used must have strong preservative action. Such a base can never be 100% natural. They are mostly synthetic. So how can a raw ingredient supplier claim that their raw ingredient is 100% natural? In the same light, how can an end product manufacturer claim that they use 100% natural ingredient?

Therefore, in truth, use of only synthetic ingredients is not good, but use of natural ingredients is also not 100% safe. It all depends on how pure that natural ingredient really is. The problem is also, if it is too pure in form, then certain good therapeutical elements in it may have been removed unknowingly or uncontrollably. No quality control check is 100% accurate. Man also cannot outdo God as if they know what's best for the end ingredient. Certain elements they knowingly removed could be just what God has it in there for a purpose only He knows best!

Next, it depends on what other ingredients are mixed/blended together to yield the end product. As mentioned earlier, everything under the sun is chemical. So, in a skincare formulation where 10 to 50 ingredients are mixed/blended to form an end-product, there would always be some chemical reactions among some of them to produce new chemical compounds. So, formulation of an end-product depends very much not on science alone, but also art; and the willingness to invest in the large amount of time to research on the synergistic action of what ingredients to blend in order to yield the best after-use result on the skin, and not on just reading up and parroting on what some researchers have done on chemical/therapeutic properties of single ingredients standing on its own. If a formulator knows only how to do this, then it is no wonder the products they produce and market are all so standard that makes no difference from brand 'A' to brand 'Z' except with different color and sense. And it is no wonder that, despite all their wild claims, most consumers found their skin not improving or even becoming worse after using them. The same goes with mineral oil. It is actually processed oil from the paraffin, a very natural product from the earth. However, if used on its own, it can be very harmful to the skin. But when skillfully blended with other ingredients, it produces such an efficacious result like what our products #14, #31-O, #31-D, etc do.

This ingredient (mineral oil) is wrongfully condemned by people or companies who have their own secret agenda to offer their own alternative ingredients by claiming that if it is used for removing paint and rust, it must be harmful to the skin. If this line of argument is acceptable, then one can also say that since water is used for washing the toilet bowl and the drain, it must be harmful to the skin. Should anyone be questioned on Pierre Chenxu Herbal Skincare's use of mineral oil or any other "chemical substances", the best way to counter remarks is to tell them that we have products that have been using such ingredients for nearly 20 years and no consumer using our end products during this

period of time has reported major negative skin reaction. How many manufacturers dare to claim that their skincare products with so-called "100% natural ingredients" stood the test of real consumers for 20 years without any negative complaints? By that, we mean consumers who bought the products and testified genuinely, and not only a handful of paid human testers to sample their products and giving them positive answers. If these people are paid testers, they will be foolish to give negative answers, for they will not be assigned any more future jobs to be testers. Moreover, it is unlikely that these human samples would want risking their skin for that US\$100 or so to try on an unknown product. Most would just bring home the test products, put them aside for a few weeks, and then submit their report. There's no way for the clinic, which assigned them the testing job, to know if they have really tried the products. Such test clinics (all commercialized) also want more future businesses from companies sending them products for test, and they will not fail to certify that the product is good - often with at least 70% positive results reported.

Are our products harmful just because they contain mineral oil, methyl paraben & propyl paraben? You be the judge...

Dr. Pierre Chenxu

Founder & Formulator of Pierre Chenxu Herbal Skincare Products

Since 1983

© Copyright 2003 Pierre Chenxu Herbal Skincare