

Hello all,

I have been eating the natural human dietary regime for over 47 years now. I do not eat anything whatsoever from vegetable sources. The only things veggie I use are spices. My diet is usually 60% fat and 40% protein by calories. I used to eat 80/20 when younger and about twice as much quantity of meat also, but that seems too much energy at my age, which is 71- even though I am very active. I think the body actually becomes more efficient with energy as you age, but I have no way of proving it true. Otherwise, my body today is very like it was at the age of 30. I figure most of what we call 'aging' is due to insulin damage to the collagen and other body structures. No carbs = no insulin. I don't heal quite as fast when injured as I did as a youngster, however. But I have few wrinkles, and my skin is still strong and elastic.

At this point I would like to point out that a zero carb diet does NOT cause ketosis. The body rapidly adapts within a few weeks and begins consuming the ketones from fat metabolism. A fully keto-adapted body excretes no ketones in the urine. A metabolic by product, 'ketone bodies' are actually a special kind of carb, and they substitute for glucose at the structures which use it. They have the added advantage of making you feel good- and well fed.

The body cannot store dietary fat, there is no mechanism for transport across the adipose cell's wall, nor can it 'burn' carbs, which actually are toxic in more than the tiny amount required by the brain and a few other structures. The body converts dietary carbs (all convert to glucose as they are absorbed) into body fat. The conversion mechanism requires insulin which is very tissue-damaging. It is correct to say that dietary carbs are the base cause of both heart blockage and diabetes, (not a disease).

I must warn all of you that it is very unlikely that very many will be able to eat as I do over the long term, or in fact, to follow any diet for long which is much different from the one you were trained to as a baby/child. This is because diet is learned much the same way language, dress and behaviour is, and is buried deep and inaccessible, a part of your acculturation/socialisation. The very thing which makes us human is that deep and almost instinctive complex of behaviour.

It requires a powerful will and a determination to change, in order to succeed in adopting the 'extreme' diet which this website is based on. Even those who are morbidly obese, as powerful a motivation as any I can imagine will have 'cravings' for what I call 'non-food' (all vegetation and carbs) which will eventually prove irresistible. A few may manage to stay on the diet for years, but unless you are prepared to stick with it for maybe ten or more years, you will drift back into eating what I consider poison. For some reason my mum was not interested in forcing me to eat the veggies I hated so, and i was able to eat only what I liked- mostly meat, especially hamburger and the fat those at our table would cut from their steaks. Still I had massive struggles abandoning the 'civilised diet'.

I suggest that no non-food be taken home, none allowed in your fridge or pantry (out of sight is hopefully out of mind). Make a request when seated in a restaurant that the bread bin be removed (but please leave the butter), and when ordering, request that the vegetables be removed from the plate in the kitchen (just say you don't like to see 'good food go to waste').

Even during the years I was soundman for Grateful Dead, I stuck to my guns and remained totally carnivorous. I am restricted by the forums rules (as I read them) from telling about my essay on diet and exercise which is posted on my website.

Basically it states that humans were totally hunting peoples until the end of the paleolithic age. No paleolithic archeological dig has ever produced any food residues from vegetables. Chemical analysis of bones from the digs indicates they are the same composition as the African lion- thus, virtually no intake of vegetation. There were no 'hunter-gatherer' societies until the neolithic, even though some modern HG tribes still made and used typical paleolithic napped-stone tools. The so called Nearthin and Paleodiet thus are both nonsense, true paleolithic people were total carnivores and ate no veggies whatsoever.

In the relatively short evolutionary period since the consumption of vegetables as food there has not been any real adaptation to such low grade low energy, difficult to digest foods. Because we have no adaptation to digesting or processing vegetables as food, they are all basically very bad for us.

We evolved as an active, group-hunting animal. We have a high natural requirement for physical exercise and cannot live long or be healthy without a lot of it.

I hope my post is of some help to others. Just persist. I show that it IS possible to overcome your dietary socialisation.

-Ok.

I see that the old bugbear of 'seeing' only what fits into one's world view still holds strongly amongst some of those responding to my post. I will attempt to clear things up a bit.

My website is: www.thebear.org.

diabowl:

A zero-carb diet is the traditional treatment for diabetes (not a disease) before the development of injectable insulin, first from pigs.

Diabetes is the result of the immune system sensing the widespread tissue damage from insulin, targeting the source cells in the pancreas and destroying them. Insulin resistance type diabetes is the result of the tissues themselves rejecting insulin. Neither form is found in any other animal in nature, man's carnivorous pets fed a grain based diet may also suffer this syndrome.

In the absence of dietary carbs, the body does not need to produce insulin and the diabetes essentially 'disappears'. You will never be told this by a doctor because then you would be free of the need for medical intervention and your daily ration of drugs. All the assorted ills diabetics suffer are actually caused by insulin, cataracts, heart attacks, bad joints, etc. These are the kind of damages done to the tissues by insulin, and the injected kind is a far more powerful damaging agent than the endogenous hormone. Blood monitoring on a zero-carb regime will quickly confirm the stability of blood glucose.

foxgluvs:

Nowhere in my post do I say 'preprogrammed'. I thought I made it quite clear that a person's eating habits, including the composition of the diet is solely determined by that person's mother between birth (and about 8), the same time all the social skills which make us uniquely human ware acquired.

The name of this website is lowcarber.org,, is it not? A low carb diet is 'extreme' relative to the usual western civilised diet. My diet is just the end point of lowering carbs. My statement was not that it took 'far too much willpower', only that it requires strong willpower and great determination.

I am sure that there are a great many things known by anthropologists that you would find 'impossible to believe', however scientific evidence does not require belief, only knowledge. The composition of the materials found in paleo digs as well as bone composition tests are well known and published, I suggest a search on Google. And check the journals of anthropology in a library.

Vitamins. that is easy, there are virtually no sources of any vitamins to be in vegetation (which is why all vitamin supplements are synthetic), but all are found in abundance in meat. For example no source of A other than animal liver exists. The amount of B complex in 30 gm of fresh red meat is more than can be extracted from one hundred kilos of yeast concentrate- once it was done, but at great expense. C is not the only antiscorbutic substance, since a diet of just red meat prevents scurvy (the Inuit diet).

Moderns live a long time in spite of a wickedly bad diet but it is due to medicine. Most paleo people died either of trauma of various kinds in hunting and war, starvation or disease. Lifespan is therefore not a measure of the effectiveness of diet, as even a lousy one can get you to ~30/40. I think you mean nutritious. It is just plain nonsense to claim that there is any basic difference between individual humans so far as body functions, etc are concerned, the biggest cop up in avoidance is 'is ok for you but everybody's different', so please, let's not go there.

bawdywench:

I have eaten nothing but sirloin steaks for months on end, but I do like eggs cheese, many cuts of meat, even organs like liver tongue kidneys and brains (although the Inuit never eat any of them- and most likely neither did the true paleo hunters). Fish and chicken are nice too, in fact I have never 'met' an animal I would not eat. The one meat that needs to be eaten sparingly is liver, which contains a lot of starch (glycogen) and vit. A which is toxic in excess. Excess may be as little as one ounce of the liver of an animal feeding on fish.

Kristine:

Concerning vegetables, there is no 'baby'- it is all just a load of dirty water. Moderns do not eat any raw natural vegetation other than sugary fruit and some difficult to indigestible nuts. All modern veg foodstuff have been extensively modified by selective breeding to reduce to eliminate toxins and still require long cooking, are low in nutrients and cause a growth of harmful bacteria in the intestine, while the fibrous cellulose residues (fibre) scratches the delicate lining and causes mucus and scarring. This reduces nutrition and eventually as you age, this damage will lead to malnutrition even on a good diet. Meat leaves the stomach as a liquid after about 45-60 min, and is totally absorbed in the first foot or two of the small intestine- no scratching and no mucus formation. Human milk is very sweet, hence the 'sweet tooth' is easy to develop if reinforced by lollies as a baby. Without this reinforcement sweets are seldom later sought after. If paleo people actually ate seasonal fruits (quite possible in some places), they ate them where found, no evidence or residue has been found in digs.

The only thing careful about my diet is I don't use salt (a chemical) and I don't cook the meat much, I make sure I eat a lot of fat. Virtually any meat is ok, even

for long periods, it is a matter of personal taste, like- I really like raw oysters and soft shell crabs (and for that matter Aussie mud crabs..)

I eat butter, of course. Mayo is normally made with unsat veg oils and is high in salt. If you like the stuff, which I do, you should make your own from egg yolks, macadamia oil and lemon juice.

I love garlic.

I buy my meat like most people- at a good quality market. Due to where I live, in Australia, I am able to buy meat which is paddock fed (on grass) and not feedlot 'fattened' on grain, which only adds cost. Grain is not a natural food for bovines, and it requires the animal be fed a special mix of bacteria to digest it, also I do not particularly like the taste of feedlot beef.

Cows are NOT generally 'injected with hormones' nowadays due to stringent restrictions on residues in beef exports (usual is to feed a growth supplement for a period and withdraw it well before slaughter), and even those who were, do not have any residues by the time of slaughter, the hormones, which are bovine, do not effect humans anyway- and the amount which is active in the animal is so slight in the relatively portion you would eat as to be measured in nanograms. hormones are not like LSD (effective in micrograms), and it requires a significant amount to have any effect at- that is- if the hormone is a human one, which is not the case with the bovine ones.

All meat is 'organic'- you cannot feed cattle (or other foodd animals like chickens ('organic' chickens suck- they are tough due to growing slower on a all grain based diet, lack plumpness and are tasteless) on chemicals like you can plants.

Paying the premium (often twice the usual amount) for so-called organic meat is like piling up your hard earned and setting fire to it- it is just plain dumb. Actually most organic meat is tough, lack a proper marbling of fat and has nothing to recommend it over normal beef in the nutrition department- save your money so you can buy more food with it.

Chocolate, 100% unsweetened, is ~50% carbs. The xanthenes are what give it a bitter taste (theobromine, caffeine and theophylline). The true (best) human diet is NOT about what 'tastes good'- actually most vegetables taste perfectly awful plain and virtually 100% of babies reject them on first exposure, while all accept meats (human milk and pulped meat are the only foods a newborn can digest- but be careful with the fat content). It is the complex of spices and cooking additives/techniques which make up 'cuisine' (I am a highly skilled cook).

Once habituated to the taste of vegetables, as I have noted, it is so difficult to move away from them that most people will never do it. The excuse is always those stated in the above posts by nancy lc et al. This is just their strong socialisation speaking loud and clear, it has nothing to do what is right, good or nutritious. At birth we have no 'taste' for anything, not even our mum's milk, just a sucking reflex. All food is acquired taste. The common question about 'isn't a diet of only meat boring?', is simply the result of the heavy spicing of most food items. Actually each feed of meat, even unspiced and when it is the exact same cut, smells and tastes heavenly and is consumed with gusto. Food does not have to be used as entertainment, but that is what it has come to be in our modern culture. Meals,

especially in restuarants, are commonly treated as 'showtime'.

I dispute the claim about human coproliths in association with true plaeo- lithic remains- Those have been found only with meso- or neo- lithic sites. My research has not uncovered that claim for the true paleo- period. The claim of many modern 'research' projects are questionable, since financial sponsorship can and does predetermine outcomes.

I don't think books are going to provide a way to understand something like this. No one has previously written about it, because, like doing brain surgery on oneself, examination of our 'instinctive' and unconscious socialisation process is very difficult. Babies will 'trip' inbuilt responses in the adults and other children around them to provide answers and information on skills they need according to their age-window. Children will repeat things taught them seemingly endlessly until they become skilled.

I have been long puzzled about how easy it was for me, and how nearly impossible for virtually everyone else to adopt the all meat diet. After 47 years of this, and I am not bragging when I say that I am a bit above the average intelligence, I have finally come to the conclusions I have made about human acculturation.

For instance read my essay on Children's TV. I worked for many years as a broadcast TV engineer and technician, during which time I had a funny feeling that all was not right with Sesame Street, that it somehow was damaging kids and not really teaching anything, but I could not put a face to what it was. The essay is not about diet, but about the very insidious and hidden destruction of our society which is ongoing today by taking the irreplaceable TIME for learning essential skills amongst our kids away and subsituting the passive watching of TV (the ubiquitous electronic 'babysitter'). If you want some literary insight into how we humans learn as children to become human, read the work of the famous child educator, the Countess Montessori. Hers may be the only written work which can be said to relate in some way to our (also) dietary acculturation.

You need only understand that we have only the most basic animalistic instincts at birth and our early cultural training is fixed so strongly into who we are that it can usually override them all. Failure of acculturation therefore is a very serious and difficult to remedy disaster for humanity.

Hmmm.

'Swallow'? 'Thesis'? Nothing I have written constitutes a 'thesis' (perhaps you meant theorem), it is a recount of life experiences and references to fact.

I guess that the term 'swallow' is humorously related to the subject matter....

Sorry about that, duparc, but my website is NOT commercial in any sense of the word, it is partly a virtual gallery and show site for my art past and present, my music and an online venue for exposing some of my philosophical thoughts to those who are interested. I do not offer anything for sale anywhere on the site. I am at a loss as to what you define as 'commercial'.

'We on this site', Are you the moderator? Did you poll everyone and find that to be the case, or are you just trying to look important. I suggest you not go there. A

low carb diet is what my eating regime is, it is one of the obvious end-points on the scale. Judging by the response, your attitude is in the minority.

I am not interested in attempting to justify any 'long term benefits', I simply am sharing my 47 years of experience with a very effective and healthy diet.

'Predates'? On the contrary, my diet was based on a large body of life experiences, knowledge and research by experts such as Richard Macarness, MD, and Dr Viljhalmur Stefansson- who as is well known was a subject with Dr Anderson in a year long closely monitored all meat diet in 1928 at the Mayo clinic in NYC, which, if you are 75, is prior to your birth. I am definitely not 'stepping outside any social convention'. I would really like to hear just what that term means to you! I guess this sort of information has put your social food-training and concepts under threat. I am sorry, but I can't help you with it.

Finally, although YOU may indeed be guessing (and for that matter, what you define as 'being in good shape' and mine may be miles apart), nothing I have written in my posts or on my site is a 'guess', it is all verifiable fact. I do not deal in guesses nor belief systems.

What has arithmetic to do with dietary fixation?

dodger- The usual grade of 'cooking/baking' chocolate you find on grocery shelves in the US (USDA) may indeed be as you state, but fine quality, European 100% chocolate and high fat cocoa is 40 to 50% carbohydrate, as is shown on the label. Try Belgian Callibrot if you can find it, for a real choc treat. Just be mindful of the carbs-

jandlsmom- I eat anything which is not a vegetable or contains carbohydrates, like milk or yoghurt. Thus any animal will do, and all cheeses- watch the label on cottage cheese, however many kinds have a lot of lactose residue. Menus? actually I don't bother, I just buy what strikes me at the market and if I happen to wind up eating the same cut of meat for days, weeks or months, like finding a great discounted/wholesale special price on whole cryovac'd sirloin strip steak, it does not bother me. Heavy reliance on 'variety' is connected with vegetation, even heavily addicted people cannot stand to eat the same one over and over.

I enjoy cooking, been at it since age 12. So, rather than menus, how about a recipe I developed?

Try this: A large chicken, 4-5 lbs (2.2+ kg). Carefully separate the skin from the meat by passing your hand gently through the evisceration opening in the abdomen- try not to tear the skin.. Make a mixture of 4 oz (100gm) of unsalted butter and the same amount of Philly cream cheese. Mix spices, like curry or chilli powder, 2 teaspoons with the softened (not too soft) cheese and butter to make a uniform paste- I like a spice mix used in Argentina, called Chimi Churi- a spice preparation which I buy here in Oz from Peter Watson in Melbourne Vic. But it is not required what spices you use, try different mixtures. Using a spoon, place the mix through the opening, some on each side, and squeeze it out between the skin and meat to form a thickness of 1/8" (3mm). Take the last bit and smear it over the skin, place on a rack over a pan in a 350F (180C) oven, preferably a fan-circulating one, and roast for 60-70 min. It is hard to stop eating this bird. The drippings make a wonderful gravy. I like this style of chook so much that I often roast two birds at once- two people can completely devastate one between them.

Oops, almost forgot:

How to make mayo- basic instructions may be found in any good basic cookbook, like Joy of Cooking, etc. Use raw egg yolks, beaten well. The oil is slowly drizzled in while vigorously stirring. I don't add any salt, but add a bit of lemon juice. The right ratio of egg yolks to oil has to be found by experiment, to produce a nice texture. It is a bit tricky, so don't give up if your first attempt is not what you expect.

The only good veg oils are palm, coconut and macadamia nut- but only mac is easy to use in mayo, although if you can get a fine quality of palm it may be worth a try. Coconut has too high a melting point. Mac oil gives mayo a nice nutty flavour.

Ok, jandlsmom- but please read carefully my earlier posts and my essays, I think most of your questions have already been seen to.

Eggs are very good food- but not if hard cooked, which denatures the protein. Don't eat raw eggwhite, it has an antivitamin, avidin (antibiotin). I can eat a dozen eggs a day, easy.

Olive oil has a lot of poly-unsats- has a strong, not very pleasant taste, as well. Mac oil is mostly mono-ok, if not in large amounts, and tastes great. Good for frying fish, too. Palm and coconut are both saturated and therefore very good food unlike the rest of the veg oils, which are best avoided.

Smart thing is to stick to animal fat, which is the perfect fuel our body was 'designed' to use (saturated triglycerides are the kind of fat you store). High cuisine was traditionally based on beef tallow, lard and butter, vegetable oils used were few and put mostly on salads. What do you put mayo on? I can find few things other than cold chicken or fish on which it can be used- it is something put on vegetables, bread (andwiches) etc., which are not a part of my diet. I have not used much mayo in a long time. Last major use was for canned tuna, but i gave that away. I think egg 'salad' is about it.

I see acculturation is alive and well, all the comments on vegetation as well as young kids copying mum are to be expected, as the eating of veggies is learned long before speech.

So far as duparc, I am appalled to find his mind so poisoned with his own calcified ego that he chooses to call me a liar. I have no need to lie. Why bother? The way I found the Eskimo/Inuit diet in 1958 is EXACTLY as I have recounted, and I resent narrow minded fools attacking my veracity and honour. No one has to follow my path, I am just trying to share it for those for whom it may be of use. I do not expect anyone to adapt the all meat lifestyle, it is against the basic modern's acculturation as noted, and my experience has verified the difficulty.

Creationist is it? Whew. Superstition should play no part in a modern educated person's life. This is not to say that the Universe is not a conscious entity, only to say that it works perfectly without a humanoid god-figure controlling it, and follows exactly all the rules of science and nature (I suggest reading a little book called the Kybalion). In my mind, the Universe is a constantly created thing which we are part of, and is not a clock wound up once and let go. Everything in Alchemy can be tested in science and science has proven evolution. But this is not really a part of dietary practice other than to say that life is just as conscious for plants

as for animals. Plants are likely to be more conscious due to a lack of an ego limiting and focusing perception due to the need to move around a seek food. It is just that we are not able to understand plants. Some research (Backster) has verified their ability to respond to music and identify threat, etc. Life lives on life, whether an animal eats animals or plants it is the way organic creatures exist, face it. We are what our evolution has made us. If we began and remained herbivorous (which we did not- earliest primates were insectivores), we would be about as intelligent as the other animals which eat plants, like cattle and sheep. The development and maintenance of a large brain and high intelligence, is a very energy intensive undertaking- and is unlikely ever to occur in a herbivore who lives on very low quality, high mass foods- and none have.

I suggest that people coming on to this thread read ALL my posts first before asking about things I have already covered, like dairy, eggs etc. Animal husbandry was a true paleo food solution, and appeared well before agriculture.

Perhaps a better comparison, rather than with the great apes, who are not in the direct human evolutionary line and separated from us over 4 million ybp, but with the tree shrew, which of all the primates of today is still a specialised insectivore. The mountain gorilla is today's largest non-specialist insectivore- massive backs provide the power to strip the bark off grub- infested trees. Captive gorillas didn't accept red meat as food, but ate vegetation on offer, the basis of the formerly held (false) assumption they were herbivores. However they all proved infertile until animal-based food was given to them in an acceptable form to replace their natural food-bugs. The tree shrew (looks like a big mouse with very human-shaped ears) evolved from a precursor insectivore placed earlier in our direct ancestral lineage. That man may have been an opportunist (like the dog) way back is perfectly reasonable, and my explain why, unlike felines both dogs and men are able to manage some vegetation- but we have very little capacity and we pay a price in tooth decay and wear, stomach/intestinal/gall bladder problems, arterial blockage and the auto-immune syndrome, diabetes. Not value for 'biological money' except for short periods of no food animal. I suggest reading about what is now known about apes in the professional scientific journals before making spurious statements about the dietary habits of the great apes, there has been extensive recent research in the literature on dietary habits. By the way- chimps like monkey meat best- and nothing better than a nice fat baboon. They hunt in cooperative groups very like we do.

The false claim about carnivores eating the stomach and/or its contents is an ancient vegetarian hoax. No Inuit would consider eating the stomach of a prey animal as food. Dogs won't eat it and neither will my domestic cat. In spite of being 15 yrs old, and castrated, he loves to chow down on wild baby bunny- he eats the little buggers bones, skull and all, but carefully leaves the furry feet, stomach and intestines in a pile in the middle of a path. My guess is, it is 'bragging rights' he is exercising. How he could know that rabbits are a serious pest here is a mystery

'Dead dairy'- right. The cult of raw-milkers. I would have to say that the cream and butter from a home cow might be a bit tastier, but the major claim raw-milkers make is about the damage heat does to the calcium which is not a part of butter or cream, and many cheeses are made from raw milk in Europe. Pasteurisation by flash-heating and immediate flash cooling of commercially marketed dairy provides protection from a range of nasties and is worth way more than any perceived loss.

Milk (of any animal) is not good for adults, especially low fat or skim- they feature prominently in the market trollies pushed by very obese individuals in all the market I have been in. Children have milk-specific enzyme systems in the stomach up to about 6 yrs, adults do not. Human babies do poorly on non-human milk, the best you can get as a substitute for mum is mare's milk.

Before that human populations were locked into prey availability, vis-a-vis the Inuit- were right up until recent time. Inuit are known to have life-spans to 90+, but most never make that figure due to various kinds of accidents, trichinosis from eating raw arctic predators meat and overall body damage from sometimes lengthy periods of starvation due to scarcity of prey animals.

Of course a meat diet did not and in fact cannot exceed or even reach 70%- it is toxic at high levels. It was ~20% to maybe as high as 50% in times of low fat on the prey available. The all meat diet is NOT in strict terms a 'low carb diet', it is a high FAT diet. It is possible to survive a verylong period on not pretein as well as not carbs, in other words on fat alone- many months can go by. In a shortage of dietary protein the body becomes very conserving of amino acids and if not damaged, does not break them down, but recycles them

Correction (oops)

Of course IN a meat diet, PROTEIN did not, and in fact cannot exceed or even reach 70%- it is toxic at high levels.

It was ~20% to maybe as high as 50% in times of low fat on the prey available.

You mean that direct and repeated implication that I am a liar and have commercial interests in my postings is ok, but requesting the accuser to desist is not?

Sorry about that, perhaps I am just a late comer and don't yet have defense rights.

I do not lie. My story is true and I am just trying to share my 47+ years of eating a very low carb diet with other people like my self who have a serious bodyfat problem.

I always expected to find rejection and denial, including intense and emotional arguments in favour of the accepted but untrue conception that humans evolved as omnivores. I did not expect to be called a liar and a fraud by someone who could not accept that I actually have been on this path as long as I have and found it myself by paying attention to stories told by a famous adventurer. What basis does someone have to go there?

There are many interviews I have given over the years and stories told about me which refer to my strict carnivorous habits.

I only know 3 people who have done the trip for more than a few months, and I do not expect many of the readers of this forum will even get to that place. I have therefore been careful to point out the deep social connection between food and culture- dietary carbs and eating behaviour is fixed in childhood, it is part of your permanent lifestyle. and requires great effort (call it 'will' if you like) to change.

For this reason it is not necessary to defend your diet by accusing me of perfidy, I already accept that you are not going to change, and that most likely all of you will regain the lost bodyfat restricting carbs has brought you. Those who are only very slowly losing fat or have stopped losing probably need to lower the carbs to less than 5gm/day, which I term 'zero carbs'. A diet is not going to give you a normal body to keep, only a permanent change of lifestyle is. Which is the point of my telling you how I did it, that I did with out going past my max of 186 lbs (at 20 yrs. for only 6 mos), and have maintained a nice 6-12% bodyfat for 47 years (and counting). I would weigh 320 lbs or more and probably would not have lived to reach 50 if I had not changed my lifestyle.

I just felt that I needed to let people know that eating nothing but meat works, and not only that but it works fantastically well. You do not need science projects or extensive research into the past to understand what works, a person's life experiences should do it- Stefansson's did it for me. And don't forget all those Inuit...

The majority of Inuit live on land and eat mostly caribou and elk. They also will eat fish and few tribes hunt whales, but the marine animals are mostly taken during the warmer time of year- the tribes that live on or near the ocean will hunt seal by staking out the breathing holes, as do polar bears.

Polar bears, by the way, are the largest bears on the planet and are total carnivores, NOT omnivores. Some monkeys are herbivores.

Fire and napped-stone tools came along at about the same time, and it is this which allowed us to become carnivorous hunters and scavengers. But you don't need to go back into the past to find the truth, your body (not your mind) knows what is right and will respond to the right mix. What is real is what you and your body are like after following your path for more than 10 years- better- for more than forty.

If you ask an Aboriginal man what traditional food is, he will name all the animals he can hunt. If you ask him about other food, he will than tell you about the 'bush tucker' you can eat when you can't find any animals. Both men and women will hunt, but men rarely gather. The Aborigines are modern hunter-gatherers, their prehistory (dreamtime) is not known to science.

Oh, by the way- it is not hard to eat raw meat, cut it small, mash it a bit in the mouth and swallow- Inuit eat a lot of their meat raw. Many of the women have worn down their teeth A(no cavities, however) from chewing on sandy hides when making clothes- it is not always convenient to cook the meat- it is easy to eat it. This is the reason that trichina is a problem in the north.

I don't think that trying to duplicate a diet like the paleolithic hunters ate is very wise and is certainly unnecessary, for one thing we haven't a clue as to what it was other than from the bones etc in the digs.

Dairy is a kind of meat, but whole milk is sugary- with lactose. Cheese, cream and butter are ok. So what if we eat the meat-foods which are available in modern times?

Few of us are likely to go out and hunt for our daily 'crust' (as they say down here).

We ARE modern people, and we have special groups of people who will do the work of getting the meat and making it available to us. My eating plan is simple- I just eat meat- any meat. One to six meals a day, and I don't worry about it- it is all rather yummy. I don't like to cook things much so I don't eat pork, and turkey makes me feel sluggish for hours, so I avoid that one too. I eat a lot of fat, animal fat.

I used to take vitamins, but stopped years ago. After noticing some difficulties in certain weight lifting exercises, I had some tests done and was told by a very competent kinesiologist that I should not take synthetic vitamin supplements, because due to eating the quantity of meat I do, I was suffering from a vitamin B overdose, which was causing some muscle weaknesses.

'I (heart) animals, they're delicious'- from a much-loved bumper sticker.

Actually I wasn't run off, I was in hospital Tuesday/Wed for an operation to repair holes in my eardrums. I got the holes from grommets placed there to relieve blocked Eustachian tubes caused by radiation therapy in '04 for throat cancer- the cancer was killed- but not without some collateral damage. Tubes opened up after a few months, but the grommets did not 'fall out' as I was told they would. As a musician, I have been very upset over my hearing for a while, but I think this is going to work and I will get back what hearing I had, at least. Nothing can fix the roll-off that years of Grateful Dead did to me, of course. And... I used cotton wool in my ears most of the time.

We (the doctors, my son -a vet- and I) think the cancer remained in my neck due to my very low glucose turnover, since most cancers of this kind (stage 4a SCC/tonsil) metastase rapidly. SCC cells are very glucose avid. Another life plus from the zero-carb lifestyle. The specialist who supervised my treatment said my fitness level was very important and helped my recovery. I have to say, this kind of thing is not anything you ever want to undergo. One thing that was interesting was that the radiation makes it impossible to swallow anything, even water, so they wanted me to get aq tube put through my abdomen into my stomach a 'PEG" tube. I resisted and lost weight like crazy- I simply could not swallow enough of anything, even protein drinks with heavy cream, and had the tube put in. Then of course they wanted me to use a prepared liquid meal called Sustegen- carb based of course, which I refused.

I managed to get a nice food processor and made my regular meat and fat meals, turned them into a liquid, and squirted them in with a 60 ml syringe- Takes forever to get enough to eat that way, I can tell you. In the end, I still must make soup-like meals because a nerve was crushed by the tumour and half my throat does not contract to force solids into my esophagus. Nothing tastes the same either (garlic helps), but that is not as bad as not being able to simply chew up and swallow pieces of lovely rare steak. Not to complain, I like being alive and I don't have any kind of fixation on how I eat my food. Oysters are a love from my youth, and I can still chew them up and wash them down ok, So all is not lost.

They said it was very odd I should get this kind of cancer, it is usually a mark of smoking tobacco and drinking hard spirits. But I was exposed to years of heavy tobacco smoke during my days as a soundman- smokey bars and clubs, limos and venues- Garcia for one smoked Camels.

I smoked for a couple of years from about 11, but it made me feel shitty in the

morning and I gave it away. I much prefer cannabis to alcohol, never liked hard liquor and gave away even having the odd glass of wine in '90 when I began lifting weights.

I don't know whether polar bears ever eat any non-meat items, certainly Stefansson did not think they did, and the polar bear is considered an endangered species due to a reduction in prey availability. That some carnivores, especially the canids, the family to which all true bears belong (pandas are not bears but large members of the raccoon family) may eat some non-meat items does not mean they can digest them- and anyway, what does this line of pursuit have to do with what a human eats? I mentioned the polar bear only because one posting said bears were omnivores, but the polar bear is not an omnivore.

...I will answer my own question- it has nothing to do with it, it is simply someone expressing unconscious discomfort at the ideas I am promoting- socialisation strikes again.

The thing which makes humans unique is our society, and our culture. Animals also may have culture, like the Japanese monkeys who learn to wash their food in the ocean from each other and chimps learning to use simple tools from other chimps, and the most extreme, learning (human) sign language from another chimp- but in humans it completely overrides all our instinctive behaviour. The upside is so obvious I don't need to mention it, but the down side is that, like trying to do brain surgery on yourself, it is very hard to understand and change- it is written at too deep a level in our consciousness.

Thanks, folks- for the defense. It IS getting a bit wearing. If a person has nothing real to say, it is best to keep the mouth shut.

No-one knows exactly what the syndrome called scurvy is, but a simple diet of raw (or lightly cooked) meat completely prevents it.

I think people need to recognise that medicine is not a science, but an art, and is based on observations plus a very conservative approach.

The profession of the 'dietitian' is even less scientific, and is basically an organised attempt to justify the common modern diet by various means, such as the 'food pyramid'.

You do not need science to heal, nor to find what works in life. The longer the experience with any given path (like diet) which works, the more likely it is to be right, research or no research.

Cancer has not been shown to be connected to diet- the scare over colon cancer and meat content was related to a mixed diet, and the research is now considered suspect..

A few cancers have been shown to be connected to viruses, and those of the skin with UV exposure in a susceptible individual, but most causes are still mysterious. My developing of the specific kind of cancer was considered very unusual, and I agreed to participate in a project which is looking for causes other than alcohol and tobacco. A sample of normal tissue was taken, as well as cancerous, and I was told they suspect something concerning DNA may hold the key.

Did I understand that there is someone who wishes answers (to unasked questions)? Please define the questions. Oh, and also, please define exactly what you mean when you use the word 'candid'. I may have a different dictionary than you do.

'Acculturation' = Acquiring culture. What you are taught as a baby/child about living as a human being in society, starting at birth and virtually complete by age 8. A kind of social toolkit. Without this we would be just another animal. Our culture is what defines humanity. It is very difficult for any person to change any part of this early training which was burned in heavily. If some of the things we need to know to be human is not learned during the several short, skill-specific 'windows' which open and close as a child ages, in time, that particular skill may never be learned (the rare so-called feral children, which were lost and raised by animals, exhibited varying amounts of disability, some could not learn to talk, some not able to walk upright). Culture includes such things as how to walk, what to eat, how to dress, language, manners and much more.

I suggest a read of the writings of Countess Montessori, who founded the Montessori Schools. They are perhaps the best school for very young children. She defines each learning window so specific things are taught at an appropriate age, where the child is ready. Her teaching methods are very effective.

Anyone on an 'all meat diet' (i.e.-zero-carbs) who is hungry, is eating carbs, it is as simple as that. 'Hunger' indicates low bloodsugar, and once keto-adapted on a strict meat diet the bloodsugar never varies. Therefore, you will not become hungry, even after several days without food. At first, I had to remind myself to eat and it still is a problem on busy days- evening comes and I might realise I haven't eaten since daybreak. I'm never hungry.

'Candid' = Plainspoken. Open. Speaking out on the subject, not prevaricating, even when it is not PC to do so. Suits me right down to the ground.

Correct. You need to think about eating.

On a zero-carb diet, it is a good idea to eat on a schedule of some kind, because there will be no hunger pangs.

It is perfectly ok to only eat one large meal/day, like a three pound steak- but it is likewise just as ok to eat as many as six. If you are working out and trying to gain muscle mass, eat six smaller steaks rather than one or two big ones. I have eaten as much as four or five pounds of steak in a day- and as little as one or two, it matters not- but if you ingest less calories than you are burning, you will lose muscle mass as well as bodyfat. If you ingest more than you need, the body discards the excess- quite different than is the case with carbs.

Meat eaten alone is out of the stomach in about one hour. (vegetation takes 3-4 hours).

The reason you were taught to eat vegetables by your mum is because your mum was

taught to eat vegetables by her mum as a baby, and her mum was taught that before her, and her mum's mum...all the way back to prehistory.

Benefit or no- health or illness- has nothing to do with why we eat what we do, we eat what we do because we were taught to eat that way. In any family the kids will eat what the adults eat and so on infinitum.

Culture is not a plan which some mysterious 'culture elite' have prescribed and agreed upon, it is a set of traditions, evolved in each society over a long period of time, learned by rote and passed down without thought or question from generation to generation. There are many cultures.

Meat is dissolved quickly by the hydrochloric acid your stomach is optimised to produce over 75% of its surface area. Vegetation stimulates the production of certain enzymes which are not quickly made and come from about 25%. The HCl is easy to turn on and turn off, the enzyme systems are not easy, and it is one of the reasons the mixed diet person experiences hunger- the stomach is busy making more digestive juice.

The bit about meat taking a long time and veggies a short time to digest is an ancient fallacy promulgated by vegetarians. Don't believe everything written in some book, there is no law against writing fiction.

This is very basic physiology. Any textbook gives the time of transit of food in the gut. NOTHING takes 12 hrs, if so why would you want to eat lunch a few hours after brekkie? and dinner after lunch?

In high school, I joined the boxing team to learn a bit of skill and get the other kids to stop messing with me- (it worked like a charm). Our coach would feed us a plain rare steak, with fat on, but with no water about one hour before every match. He said it took 45 minutes to leave the stomach, and fifteen to be absorbed into the blood- thus providing a lot of energy for the bout- he was not wrong, we won almost every match. This was in 1949, well before the diet-nazis had taken over. Obviously you would not want to be hit in the gut if there was anything still undigested in your stomach, and boxers always go for the gut.

I have said- I will eat any animal, and I love seafood. I drink about 2 to 4 litres of rainwater a day. Our rain is very pure, we do not have any air pollution in the southern hemisphere because there is virtually no nuclear south of the equator.

he truth is, there is no excuse to eat any carbs at all. Your body has a built-in fat level it will maintain. Without dietary carbs it is very hard to store fat. All dietary fat must be burned, there is no mechanism to store it.

Thus, a person whose bodyfat level is above their 'fat-o-stat' set-point will lose/burn body fat no matter how many calories they eat- i.e., it is not necessary to restrict your food, eat as much as feels good. The body has a limit to the amount of fat you can eat and digest at one sitting, determined by the bile, and once you have eaten that amount, you will stop, but can still eat the lean. Forcing things will work like drinking like castor or mineral oil- it is purging.

Once you reach your proper level, which varies a bit from person to person, but is around 11-15% for men and 18-23% for women, then you only have to eat as many calories as you burn- or a bit more- to stay the same. Only a reduction below daily needs will cause a change. Extra calories without any carbs will not fatten you. To get 'ripped' like a bodybuilder (>5% bf) is very hard, and requires both discipline and a calorie reduction.

Atkins' was on the right road but some of his ideas were wrong- he made up his diet to appeal to people used to eating a lot of vegetation, he couldn't tell the truth that all carbs are the enemy of the genetically obese. I was on my routine for years before his book came out, and I pinned him as a diet-wuss. There is no such things as 'induction' in dietary terms- you eat what you eat and your body accepts what it is, and adapts. Most really heavy people cannot lose the excess body fat they carry if they eat as Atkins suggests.

I sometimes make beef jerky. It can be an excellent snack, but lacks fat and is therefore not a complete food, some supplemental fat is necessary. It can be made into pemmican, a complete food, by adding fat. The instructions are pretty simple, take lean (heavy fat marbling slows drying, and can lead to spoilage) meat, slice to about 1/8" thickness, and dry with heat at 104F (40C) max. This is very important any higher will cause the loss of nutrients, lower will not do the job quickly enough. Never use any salt or other additive, just clean, fresh lean raw meat. I have used a gas oven with a pilot light and the door left ajar, but you must check it empty with an accurate thermometer to be sure it is not too hot. If no pilot, such as in an electric oven, use an incandescent lamp, try different wattages to select the right size. Jerky is dry to crumble in about 8 hours. To make pemmican, powder the jerky and add an equal weight of, not hot (melted) tallow made from rendering beef suet. This is a greasy mass and is not really very palatable as is, but can be added to warm water to make a sort of soup. Jerky should be very dry and not leathery like the commercial junk- which means it is still too wet and will spoil. Pemmican can be kept for up to 30 years so long as it is kept sealed away from air. More information on jerky and pemmican can be found in either Fat of the Land or The US Army Arctic Survival manual 1944, by Stefansson.

I am sorry some respondents cannot seem to accept that I am not on any kind of agenda/promotion when I describe my experiences. I tell only what it is like, and I sometimes refer to things I have read. Perhaps it would be helpful for me to post a short list of pertinent articles I have collected from journals over the years. I will do that, so whomever is interested can go to the library and look them up, or subscribe to the online versions. They are mostly studies of metabolism and one very important one on the proposal of insulin as the prime cause of coronary artery disease.

The simple answer is embodied in the responses of those who have actually gone onto a zero carb regime and kept to it for long enough to become fully adapted. All the 'research' in the world is not going to change what is true and what is not- this is best determined right down at the coal face, by following the path and observing the results

The unfortunate fact is that much of the published research is badly flawed, the result of carefully selecting data (and falsifying data) and asking prepared questions so as to get a desired result- both due to incompetent training in school, and also for financial rewards. A large body of research, the sort which was used to support the low fat diet fiasco was funded by big agriculture. The important products of big ag are the mass produced, low labour cereal grains, oilseed and

sugar, not animal products.

Meat and dairy are very labour intensive, and do not give a high profit return to the primary producers, the best profit is at the end of the line- at retail, the butcher does pretty well.. Thus, there is a high incentive to reduce animal fat, increase vegetable oil consumption and get people to eat grain and sugar. Similarly, the medical profession does not profit from healthy people, so there is no strong motive in the industry to support the truth.

Although many doctors are primarily motivated to help people, still, a good income is always important. The zero carb diet is perfect for diabetics, however that would cut out the need for constant supervision by a physician, and eliminate the need for a very profitable drug, insulin. The drug industry, well known for placing profit in front of any sense of proper conduct, funds a powerful lobby to the medical profession.

quax:

Neanderthal was a hominid. A member of our genus, homo. We do not know that they were different in any major way other than some physical features from other homo species or in fact, if they were indeed a different species (which means 'cannot interbreed')- altogether: A 'hybrid' might not show Neanderthal features- if they were recessive) of that period, their tools were identical- an indication of trade and the sharing of skills. The choice of defining speciation in prehistoric humans is a matter of conjecture based on what is known, and is not 'chiseled in stone', so to speak.

There is some evidence they may have interbred and were absorbed into our genotype (some individuals show features considered as being Neanderthaloid, such as a very prominent brow ridge- musician Jorma Kaukonen is an example), rather than just disappeared.

I am a modern man, and live in the modern world. It is not a part of my path to find and slavishly copy ancient ways. They are only mentioned as an indication of our evolution as carnivores over millions of veggie-free years.

In case anyone has not followed the current scandal over wheat and Iraq, cereals are very lucrative, especially for the US and Europe, both subsidise wheat so heavily that is very profitable indeed. Primary producers of meat have very heavy costs in labour, veterinarian services, land use and degradation, costs of transport- live animals have a high specific value per unit weight, thus investment is high, and they require special higher cost transport. Grain is a stable, bulk commodity like sand or gravel. etc, value is low and thus the amount of investment per unit weight tied up is low. Not only that, but the cost of holding cattle for 90 days in feedlots, accompanied by the need to alter their lumen bacteria and the costs of the grain (not a natural food for ruminants) almost doubles the cost/per pound over grass fattening.

I live in the middle of cattle country, where the grass is exceptionally nourishing and I know the local graziers well- trust me, they all live close to the line, so close that one has opened a butcher shop in order to sell his meat at retail in order to raise his family's income level. Low fat is a huge bonus for Big Ag with its automated planting and harvesting. Whether you want to accept it or not, your data is suspect. Unlike raising grains and oilseeds which is virtually automated, the is no special advantage to being big as a meat producer other than some economy

of scale on land use- it is the labour component which rules the costs. A large mob of cattle needs dozens of men to handle them, whereas thousands of acres of wheat or corn can be planted, fed and harvested by a very few operators. There are no veterinary costs to raising plants, and the product is very stable, keeps well and does not require expensive storage- like energy-intensive refrigeration, nor does it require rapid sale and consumption up on 'harvest'. Why is this so difficult to comprehend? It is so obvious.

I live in a different time zone, so i have a lot to catch up on each morning. Here is a hodgepodge of answers and ripostes.

All essential vitamins and nutrients are found in lean meat and animal fat, including Vit E. and omega 3. Vegetables do not have vitamins to any significant extent, and some vitamins cannot be sourced from any vegetable, like A. Soy is toxic- and a very poor food for humans/children, perhaps dietary deficiency led to the the sweet tooth. Just steaks alone are sufficient for health and longevity, provided there is enough fat on them. You do not need variety in animals nor any organ meats unless you like them. I would suggest going easy on liver, it is starchy can fatten you and poison you with Vit A if you eat too much or too often. Brains are good, as is kidney. but both taste sweet to me.

Dr Macarness, in his (for me) seminal book Eat Fat and Grow Slim put forth the suggestion that those of us who are 'genetically obese' (my term) actually suffer from an inability to process certain intermediates/byproducts of the conversion of glucose to fat, (krebs cycle). He focused on pyruvic acid, which he said built up and inhibited fat burning. The person then falls asleep or otherwise has very low energy after a meal until the glucose clears. I had this problem- after a meal I always wanted to nap. I don't know if he was right or not about what the mechanism was, but treating it like a 'black box' and dealing only with input and output, it describes exactly what happens to me if I consume carbs.

My credentials? You're kidding of course. Credentials for what, issued by whom? My 'credentials' are 47 years of living a zero carb lifestyle and 47 years of having many friends attack and disparage my lifestyle as 'unhealthy', all the while managing to die from things which have either not bothered me or that I have overcome.

I doubt there IS a living 47 yr veteran of veganism. Or even a 27 year one.

Blood sugar is controlled in the absence of dietary intake, by the liver and is dead stable at ~100 mg/dl (there is no way you can have zero blood sugar- it is a necessary nutrient to brain tissue and some other tissues- at that very low level, equivalent of about 5 gms total in the body. Insulin is a very, very body-damaging compound, and is only needed in conjunction with glucagon to control glucose when the diet includes carbs. The ills, both serious and life limiting, ascribed to diabetes (not a disease) are due to exogenous insulin injections. Insulin is not produced in the absence of high blood sugar levels. Prior to injectable insulin diabetic people were able to live long and healthy lives on a zero carb ('non farinaceous') diet. Unsaturated vegetable oils, especially poly's oxidise to organic peroxides, the most powerful 'free radicals' known. These outweigh any antioxidants present in vegetables. Raw egg (white) contains a powerful 'antivitamin' called avidin, which destroys biotin. Light cooking (soft boiled or coddled) destroys avidin.

I make a wonderful zero-carb ice cream with raw egg yolks, heavy cream, lactose-free milk protein and various flavours like vanilla and espresso. I use a very small

amount of aspartame as a sweetener, since ice cream seems to need it. I have two sizes of White Mountain churn. Typical: 16 egg yolks, 2 litres heavy cream (35% mf), one cup water with two heaping tablespoons of a 3 to 1 mixture of calcium caseinate/ion exchange whey (or use lactose free 'total milk protein'- if you can find it), 1/4 teaspoon aspartame (NutraSweet), three cups double short-black espresso, 2 tablespoon of high quality vanilla extract. Use a 6 qt churn with coarse salt and broken lump ice. Don't let the churn go too long, or it will turn to butter. You can skip the milk protein, but the texture will suffer.

The Inuit can be taken as an example in nature that there are no nutritional deficiencies under an all meat diet: All examinations and tests done back when they still lived the traditional life showed perfect health, no dental caries, no CAD, no obesity and no diabetes, plus- barring accidents and severe bouts of starvation and parasites, a very long life to ~90+ yrs..

The eating of wheat by humans is regional, since wheat is the most toxic of the cereal grains. Unless wheat is started very early in life it cannot be tolerated- unlike rice, the least toxic. So 'food aid' sent to many parts of the world is used only as animal feed. This is a distortion, but unlike feedlot grain, the farmers are paid human food prices for the aid input. Animal feed grain is lower in required quality and attracts a much lower price, all producers attempt to sell their grain into the human market, thus massive amounts of money are directed towards human 'grain as food' promotion. The most amazing marketing coup of recent times has been the promotion of the fibrous rubbish cover removed from grain before milling into flour, as human food. Formerly this material was sold to the makers of cardboard, but some marketing genius figured out that a 'scientific study' could be configured to show some kind of benefit from including this nourishing and intestine-irritating trash in food, thus permitting the sale of a cheap waste byproduct at food prices. ABSOLUTELY brilliant.

My figures are different, and I could not decipher the official mumbojumbo on the complex website referenced. No matter. I don't really care what is done with ag products: I eat the way I do because it really works, and I have a bit of problem understanding why others seem to believe all sorts of thing that are published but manifestly do not work, especially in books, by doctors and dietitians. Some books are works of fiction, and all of those are not identified as such.

Everyone knows people who are suffer an allergy to toxic plant matter especially 'whole wheat' and peanuts- which together with rhubarb (oxalic acid) are very poisonous, and even is tolerant individuals are hard to digest. Spinach also contains quantities of oxalic acid, (a blood poison) but nor as much as rhubarb, the green leaves of which can kill if eaten.

Wheat is the major cereal grain of the west, however my remark on quantity used for animal food is total cereal grains. Actually more maize is used to feed pigs than wheat is fed to cattle. Incidentally, wild pigs are not fat, but are very lean, it is the forced feeding of food like corn and skim milk which cases domestic pigs to be so fatty.

My great uncle was a farmer in central KY. He raised Jersey cows and pigs. I remember seeing big glasses of dark yellow, raw milk in the fridge, with some extra added cream floating on top, 1/3 the whole. He separated the cream from milking his cows and sold it once a week to a local ice cream works, and fed the skim milk to the pigs. I asked him why he bothered to separate the cream, since he did not market it fresh and thus got a lower price for it (the buyers used soda to 'sweeten' it),

and he said whole milk caused the pigs to not eat as much, and therefore they did not gain weight as quickly as he wanted, but skim milk had no such effect. The fat in whole milk, you see, satisfied them, and they stopped eating. Skim as well as low fat milk are perhaps the most fattening drinks you can find today, not very sweet-tasting thus leading to vast intakes (it is 'fat free', you see). So is sugar- fat free, that is.

Most cultivated vegetables are highly modified by selective breeding to remove the natural defense-toxins, so much so that tonnes of chemicals must be used to enable them to escape being eaten by 'pests'.

Lisa: I think you have been misinformed. This is common amongst sufferers of diabetes- they use a lot of scare tactics.

I have had many blood tests and 90-120 mg/dl has been labelled as the normal fasting glucose level on the returned results. Type 2 diabetes is actually the result of your body resisting this nasty chemical. Diabetes is NOT a disease, you cannot catch it, and it is not found in any other animal on this planet- the only exception is humanity's carnivorous pets if fed a grain based (dry) diet.

Real diabetes (type 1) is an auto-immune syndrome, wherein the person's own immune system, responding to the somatic damage being done by insulin seeks out the source in the pancreas and destroys the cells producing it. The process leaves untouched the rest of the cells in that important organ. Glucose is a small, simple six-carbon molecule and does not need insulin to enter any of the cells of the body, but only special densely packed specialist cells like those in the brain actually consume glucose for energy and nutrition. Insulin's primary function is to stimulate the uptake and conversion of glucose to fatty acids in the adipose cells, thus reducing high glucose levels after a carb-meal. Insulin is THE major cause of arterial sclerosis- by its ability to stimulate muscle-cell proliferation. This effect is especially bad for smooth muscle like is found in the intestines and arteries. The proliferative cells become scar tissue and that is what causes a loss of flexibility, and blockage of the lumen.

In a study titled 'Atherosclerosis: An insulin-dependent disease?' some interesting facts about the somatic effects of insulin were exposed. Surgically produced 'diabetic' dogs with no ability to produce insulin do not have any problem so long as no carbs are ingested. The study was done on such dogs, wherein they were catheterised in both femoral arteries and a solution of saline was applied by drip to both. A measured amount of insulin to balance their dietary carb intake was added to the saline only in one artery. After only six months the dogs were sacrificed and the arteries excised and studied. There was considerable pre-sclerotic growth found in the one supplied with the insulin solution, and none in the control artery. Hard to deny. The damage to skin collagen by glucose/insulin (stretch marks and wrinkles) is well known. Cataracts and joint damage are likewise long recognised as induced by insulin. The professional diabetes (medical) groups always refer to such damage as being caused by diabetes, which is not true. As noted, diabetes is NOT a disease. Remove dietary carbs and it literally disappears. This historic truth has been suppressed by the drug and medical professions.

I thought I had already covered this misconception: You CANNOT raise your blood glucose level above your normal fasting level by gluconeogenesis, no matter what. Gluconeogenesis cannot and will not even take place so long as there is enough fat intake, period. 'Excess' dietary protein is broken down and discarded, never converted to glucose except in an emergency- such as under heavy and extensive

fasting- and then only after all the stored glycogen in liver and muscle has been converted first. The liver under these circumstances only produces from protein the exact amount necessary to maintain the normal level. Only dietary intake can drive the blood glucose level above your baseline.

Our local cream has ~1 gm/100 ml, so 2 l contains 20 gms. There are not 10 gms of total solids in three cups of my espresso (I grow, roast, grind and brew coffee- I have Rancilio and Conti machines), and the sugars have been caramelised by roasting. My vanilla extract label says it is 0 carb- I don't buy the cheap stuff. Perhaps there may be ~30 gm total, but that is spread out over 3.5 litres of ice cream, or one gm per 125 ml. How close to zero do you want to go?

I love tongue- nice and fatty- and lamb's brains. My mum fed us tongue sandwiches with mustard, and my granny used to serve scrambled brains and eggs- but she used calf brains, I like lamb better, just dipped in duck egg and fried. Duck egg sticks to things much better than chicken egg. I have never liked tripe or chitlins. Basically the only part of an animal I won't eat is the hooves hair and bones.

I am sorry, Lisa, I mis-read the carton- I took the .9 gm/portion figure instead of 100ml- which is 3.1gm. Thus six cartons gives 45 gm which is close to your figure. Even the 60% cream lists carbs as 2.8, with sugars at 1.8.

I call my way zero-carb which is perhaps a bit misleading, as it is virtually impossible in the real world to eat no carbs at all and still have a decent array of food. Many animal-based foods have some small amount of carbs, and some like liver have a lot.. I judge zero-carb as attaining a level of 5gm/day or less. To be practical, zero is only a statement of the ideal.

I questioned only your contention that the level of dissolved solids in three 20 ml cups of coffee is 10 gm, and what portion of the total mix of extracted solids and oils would check out as sugars. By the way, the oils in fresh coffee seem to have an ability to stimulate insulin release. Not the caffeine, nor will defatted instant, only whole brewed coffee. I have had to stick to just one cuppa in the early morning, drat it.

Could it be that it was the flu which raised your blood sugar? Some sort of reaction by your immune system. So long as your body has retained any level of glycogen (the liver usually is about 40% glycogen, plus some is stored in muscles) you will not tear apart proteins for glucose- a simple and rapid enzymatic process cuts the the poly-sacccarhide glygocen into its constitutent mono-sacccarhide units, i.e., glucose. Long, severe fasting is necessary for all glycogen to be depleted, not 48 hrs, let alone 24.

There are no 'unique nutrients' required for humans which can be found in vegetables. Humans live very well indeed on just muscle tissue with sufficient fat. This is a fact and is history, so all the conjecture and theorising in the world will not change it. If the body was able to create glucose on demand from ripping he core out of protein, then why is 100% protein so deadly it can kill you in about a week to ten days? Adding dietary fat or carbs prevents this poisoning. The fact is

gluconeogenesis is rare except under two conditions, severe fasting and recovery from starvation-induced bodyfat depletion on a zero carb diet. Then the adipose tissues are re-built by diverting a small amount of blood sugar which stimulates mild gluconeogenesis.

The statement that glycogen is depleted in 3 days is simple nonsense, the liver holds a vast supply of glycogen and a person who is fully keto-adapted uses so little glucose that glycogen will last for a week or more. My glucose over 47 years has never varied from 100 mg/dl, I do not have mood changes, I am never hungry. My triglycerides are likewise low and stable. I have had blood tests almost monthly over the last few years due to my various problems with cancer etc.

The body does not need any carbs to replenish glycogen, it just does not happen rapidly, but slowly, like raising body fat to a 'safe level' after fasting- it works by gradual, small diversions of glucose. Muscle glycogen is NOT depleted by exercise, that has been proven in studies. I am trying to locate my stash of metabolic papers, which seem to be hiding, I am not very organised, I am afraid.

The inherent proof, if any is needed, that we entered a period of heavy if not total carnivory millions of years ago is imbedded in the development of our huge brain, which required vast amounts of high energy density food intake to be able to afford development and requires similar amounts to maintain it. As most people know, we have a brain much larger for an animal of our size than is the norm. Gathering and eating vegetation does not take a lot of brain power so long as the animal has enough to be alert to predators and an instinct for avoidance behaviour- but predators do need good brains to stalk and outwit their prey.

Sorry, what exactly is meant by 'optimum nutrition'? Sounds like diet-cult talk.

The accepted 'level of (daily) requirement' for all nutrients has been determined empirically, that is- by noting, describing and subsequently relieving the visible signs of deficiencies with supplements. By this criterion, my diet MUST therefore be more than simply ideal and have 'optimum nutrition'. As has been proven over a period of 47 years in which my body has never shown any deficiencies whatsoever, or presented many of the normal signs of aging. I seem to have only aged a fraction of the amount seen in my contemporaries. This is grade A long term empiricism.

Sydney is indeed the most beautiful city on the planet. I visit there a couple of times a year, but live 1500 miles north.

I really don't have many unique recipes, I am what I call an 'instinctive cook'- been at it since age 12, I don't consult a cookbook and often combine things in new ways, especially spices. I do not usually keep track of my meals. I do almost all the cooking at home, my wife owns a store and it seems right to allow her freedom from this chore.

There is a spice genius here in Oz, Peter Watson. His Argentine Chimi Churi spice mix is brilliant with chicken, and his Cajun Blackened Spice is likewise excellent for fish. Lamb is superb with Ras el Hanout. Well worth the trouble of looking into if you like great spices and flavourings. I am a dedicated fan. My wife loves his Roasted Garlic and Chilli vinegarette for salads (she is not a strict follower of my dietary regime).

His contact info:

Rakey Watson Australia Pty Ltd +61 3 9417 0209

I am giving the phone # only, because I don't think it is good practice to post anyone's email address on the forum.

Glycogen is not depleted by exercise, period. The muscles ONLY use free fatty acids complexed with n-acetylcarnitine to provide the energy to reverse ADP to ATP, no carbs are consumed in this process, either as glucose or as glycogen.

The famous 'wall' hit by runners etc., indicates a problem in mobilising bodyfat in a carb-loading individual once dietary circulating fat is consumed. It does not occur in a keto-adapted meat eater.

Once more: My blood glucose level is normal and it has been that way for 47 years. Not 'higher than average'- 100 mg/dl IS normal. If some people nowadays are testing lower, perhaps that is why there is so much depression around- I always feel great- no mood swings and have a very positive outlook on life. I would assume that anything termed 'average' is just that, the midpoint of a range of normalcy. Like the body fat level each person will normally maintain, it is not fixed, but varies over a small range. I have never sought to be or appear 'average'- rather I like to be considered unique, at least in my art and my mentation. Let's just add my rock-stable glucose level to this.

Google? Trust me- I am an expert on 'rabbit starvation'.

The link to medbio.info produces a very conventional description of the way a person functions on a normal MIXED diet containing carbs. Unfortunately it is not valid for a zero- carb or very low carb regime. This should not come as a surprise, because medicine does not accept that anyone could (or would even want to) live on such a regime.

Optimum nutrition is exactly- what? You cannot make a valid statement in assertion without an antecedent for the word 'that'. Bad grammar. What all we strive for? this is not a definition, it is a statement of ideal without defining the ideal in question. I mentioned my physical condition at 71, compared to my contemporaries- which indicates far more than just following a bare minimum of nutrition to avoid deficiency diseases. The entire human population on a 'normal diet' may validly be considered the 'controls'.

You have to do better in your arguments than you have so far, if you want me to take what you say seriously.

I am very much interested in meeting ANY individual who has remained on a zero-carb regime for 47 years, or for that matter, even for 10 years. The lack of additional data does not mean that my data is not valid.

Underfeeding has been shown to enhance longevity. Keep that in mind when considering people who survive into extreme old age.

I guess in the US organ meats (called 'offal' here) must have something of a premium-food reputation. I recently bought a calve's tongue and it was \$6.95/kg, at

the time porterhouse was \$21.90. Liver is usually \$4, kidneys about the same. All these items are always significantly cheaper than any cut of steak. For some weird reason lamb is today priced above beef, whereas 15 years ago it was less than 1/3 the price.

I guess we must agree to disagree, Lisa. I am not here to do battle over fondly held belief systems, just to share what has proven to work in my life.

I am not a scientist, I am an artist, so I give very little credence to most of the published research in diet as well as in other fields, as much of it has been shown to be faked.

For annotated examples of this widespread practice, please read "The Cholesterol Myths' by Uffe Ravnskov or visit the website www.thincs.org

I am searching for my collection of metabolic studies, but so far it has eluded me. Two studies relate to energy source and exercise, both were done with lab rats. One shows by muscle biopsy/analysis that the glycogen in muscle tissue does not vary with exercise, whether anaerobic or anaerobic. The other shows massive gains in endurance over a sufficiently long period of adaptation to a zero carb diet. This study is one of the very few to use a true zero carb diet against a normal rat-chow control in a test.

If lack of insulin will kill type 1 diabetics on a zero carb diet, then how do you explain all the cases in the literature from the pre-insulin period which confirm that removing carbs from the diet caused the sugar to leave the urine, and permitted the person to live a normal life. I first read about this in Macarness- Eat Fat and Grow Slim, however later on I found some other old texts which confirm this diet was a successful treatment. The medical profession in conjunction with the drug manufacturers do not want you to believe you can ever give up using insulin if you are type 1. But- by all means follow your own path. I have yet to meet a type 1 who was open to even considering not taking insulin, they were all scared shitless by their doctors. So I will merely mention it. Check it out if you like. Insulin is a fairly recent drug.

Weight training- yes, it has been 16 years now as of Jan. I began lifting on my birthday at age 55. I ride my mountain bike on a very hilly dirt track for about 30-45 minutes before each workout. The aerobics session immediately prior to lifting gets every warmed up and functioning, and brings the liver online with the enzymes needed by the muscles for optimal activity-muscle cells do not make them, and do not store them in the quantity needed by strenuous exercise.

I lift heavy. I am not very large but I'm as strong as many of the big boys I see in the gym. I basically follow Mike Mentzer's 'heavy duty': brief, infrequent sessions with only few exercises to failure, I do 3 sets of one exercise per body part and divide into a legs/bi's/tri's day and an upper body day (no bi or tri specifics). I lift two days a week only- rest days need to be at least two between workouts. I do crunches and hypers each work out. I gained over 30 pounds of solid muscle in less than three years when I began- probably my genetic limit, as although the shapes of my muscles changed a bit over time, I did not continue to gain mass.

(Sorry frederick)- I have already noticed that you are definitely a carb addict- glycogen is never used as a fuel for exercise- the muscles burn only fat). Glycogen is stored around the body and is used as a fast resource when blood sugar drops- since glucose is not consumed by skeletal muscles it remains in the tissues. I am still searching for the papers I collected verifying this.

Carbs before a workout will reduce your energy- although some people will have a kind of 'boost' from the sudden insulin rush. The muscles run on fat, and once the body starts to store the glucose as fat, it interferes with energy and strength. Carbs weaken you by initiating fat storage activity just when your muscles need the fat for power.

In my 20's I was a ballet student and finally a pro dancer. I discovered the all meat diet shortly after beginning my dance training. My energy and height in jumps almost doubled when I adopted the all meat diet. Endurance on a zero carb regime goes right through the roof. I followed ballet, modern and jazz intensely for over 6 years, abandoning it finally after finding a dancer's pay was just not enough to live very well on, with classes every day, and new shoes every 6 weeks, plus eat a lot since you burn a tremendous amount of calories- dancing is extremely strenuous. The rest goes to rent. I could not afford a car and used a ten speed bike to get around LA. I still love to dance. That was what was so good about working for the Grateful Dead- they were a great band to dance to.

The reason carbs are promoted so vigorously in the magazines, thus in forums, is due to the publishers financial interests- they are all manufacturers of 'supplements' which are always carb-based sugar and starch being far cheaper than protein. The supplements are very profitable and most of them are just rubbish.

Carbs will actually interfere with muscle growth, whereas dietary fat seems to stimulate muscle growth. Vince Gironda fed his clients power drinks based on heavy cream, Arnold Swartzenegger was one of his pupils Fat is very important for energy and for building muscle tissue. In one of my posts I mention my boxing team's practice right before a match of eating a rare steak with fat.

I love my one morning cup of coffee- but not black. I found some time ago that a couple of tablespoons of heavy cream diluted with water will froth up like milk and makes a delicious cappuccino

I have stated my blood glucose levels in terms understood in the US, where the other forum correspondents live. I am not in the UK, but in Oz. Yes, we use the metric system here as does the entire world- except only the USA.

'Standards' are really just estimates and guesswork, and change all the time- usually going down (except for lead). For example the 'preferred' level of blood cholesterol has now been taken to a level which makes 90% of the world's population test over the accepted level- thereby 'needing medication'.

That this has to be drug company nonsense is not understood by people who are addicted to believing in authorities and 'standards'.

That the data shows the 'preferred level' of cholesterol dramatically increases death from all causes is conveniently ignored, even though the same data shows only a statistically insignificant reduction in heart attacks. (www.thincs.org). In addition, the horrible side effects of the statins are downplayed.

The same thing is found in the choice of the 'normal' blood sugar level- it is not simply the observed average of normal people, that is why it has slowly dropped. Not that it really matters, I am not diabetic, and no one in my family has ever been diabetic, in spite of our propensity to obesity. So what is really meant by all this?

I have tested all my contentions over a very long period of time. Most research studies are not done over a long enough time scale to really verify or confirm the results...

Any type 1 diabetic who is not monitoring their glucose level frequently during the day with today's simple technology would themselves be abnormal. Even an 'uneducated kid' would have to know this basic routine is highly imperative...

Such monitoring will immediately reveal whether my suggestions are valid or not-unconfirmed contentions to the contrary.

What I think we have here is just a bold attempt to find verification from others that a person's tightly held belief system is true and correct by quickly rejecting all contrary information. I think this is quite normal for believers of any sort, but since I have not tried to address my self strictly to diabetics, but rather to those who are interested in finding away out of obesity and ill health through diet, it seems a bit extreme to constantly be harping on perceived 'inaccuracies'. Sort of like feeling an obligation to play the cop.

If the intent of these posts is to somehow convince me to change my tested knowledge structure, it is not going to be effective. If I responded to other people's proffered 'wisdom', my foray into the zero carb diet would not have lasted a year.

Hmm: Is this thread now to become a diabetes thread?

This was never my intention. Sorry to disappoint, but please, let's stay on the path I initiated rather than getting sidetracked into arguing about immune system disorders and dangerous syndromes which are not a problem for most people, who are merely looking for a way to have and maintain a normal body-shape and size configuration... ok?

I am sure there are many threads around devoted to diabetes.

I lift at a normal rate. But only do three sets of one exercise per body part. Time spent lifting should only be about 45-60 min.

Absolutely- vigorous exercise is essential for good health as a human. Lions lazy? That is a novel concept. True, they don't run around much if well-filled with meat after a successful hunt, but they, and all carnivores spend a lot of time travelling and searching for prey, then have to be able to run fast and grab hard, fighting with their prey- most animals do not like to be eaten and put up a hell of a fight. The males do a lot of fighting with other males and have to stay strong, or lose their harem- the old saw about the males not hunting is also, alas, false- they always pitch in when a large animal is targeted. Otherwise only a few of the females in the pride involve themselves in each episode of stalking and killing. The

A(ustralian)BC and BBC have produced some excellent programs on various carnivores, many narrated by David Attenborough- and in Oz at least they can be bought on DVD- if any one is interested in following up.

The common domestic tabby sleeps a lot, which may be why they live so much longer than dogs, who run around a lot. We are the same, even most modern hunters walk long distances carrying heavy stuff, and then return with the meat. Besides, heavy exercise makes you feel terrific!

The best thing to help stay zero is to never bring anything you don't want eat home and put away in the fridge or pantry. Likewise any roommates or partners need to follow this. I no longer need any such support, lucky too, as my wife eats a lot of what I consider rubbish. It never looks the least bit edible. In my first years I had problems, so I always asked to have the bread taken always at a restaurant and the veggies left in the kitchen, 'just a plain blood rare steak, with all the fat left on it, please'. I also got the munchies smoking pot, but dealt with it with home made jerky and cheese. I no longer get the munchies, ever- although I do not understand why not.

I did not like most veggies as a kid, true- but I learned to eat most of them as teenager (never could understand how ANYONE could eat a turnip). Through all of this discussion, I have never claimed I did not miss a lot of vegetation that I had learned to eat on starting to eat this way. I did. For years. But I think the turning point came one day when a nicely made salad or dish in a Japanese sushi bar (caution: only eat the sashimi) restaurant looked like a flower arrangement, very pretty but nothing I was interested in eating...

I love raw meat, it tastes great, I only sear the outside to kill anything growing on the cut surface- admittedly, cooking adds a nice, unique flavour also. I prefer to buy large 4-5 kg blocks of meat in cryovac, cutting portions off as I go, keeping the bag closed in the fridge- best temp setting is 2C. Please be aware that fresh red meat is not compatible in the same fridge with raw chicken or fish- both can (and will) cause the meat to spoil quickly. I have four fridges on the property. One is just for meat (and cream).

The three small ones run on 12v, the big one is 240v. Our electricity is generated here from solar and wind, with a diesel back-up. We use 12v DC- legacy of het early days, some lights and the fridges, 24 vDC for the inverter, 120v and 240v/60 Hz AC for everything else. Anything which is made to run on 50 Hz does better on 60. Not the other way around, however. My shop and studio- with kilns and welders, etc need the 9kw Onan genset running.

Two of my collection of rare and endangered papers have turned up.

'Adventures in Diet' by Vilhjalmur Stefansson -in 3 parts- was published serially in Harper's Monthly- I don't know the date of publication, the dates are not on my photocopies. He covers in detail the year-long meat-only dietary study undertaken by himself and Karsten Anderson under the supervision of the Russell Sage Institute of Pathology at Bellevue Hospital in NYC, in 1928.

The other one is from the Journal of the American College of Nutrition 5:417-427 (1986); 'Atherosclerosis: An Insulin-Dependent Disease? Contains 60 references at the end.

These were spare copies, I still have not located my main collection of metabolic studies.

Did I mention that you must never work out without sufficient days off? At least one day minimum in between workouts and the best is two to three. A proper workout micro-damages tissues, and uses up your store of energy reserves- this is what stimulates you to grow stronger/bigger. The day after a workout is used up just restoring you to the state you were in before the last workout, plus maybe part of the next day as well, if you are an advanced trainer and just increased your work load. The second day of (total) rest is when you will gain. You need only work each muscle once a week. A cycle of two and three days off is ideal in most cases. This equals twice a week in the gym. Trust me, I began at 55 and it was a hard go until I had tested all the (misinfo) and found out the truth.

I was even told that it was impossible to gain muscle mass after age 40- by an MD, no less. He did not recognise me a few years later, and was blown away by my new mass. The awful thing was, after spending a considerable amount of time first-off telling me my diet was (nuts) and I was wasting time at my age lifting, he had grown obese. Funny how the truth will out.

On the contrary, eating only meat is great, in fact just eating nothing but NY sirloin steaks for several MONTHS exclusively leads to each one tasting even better than the last (been there, done that). Vegetables ARE boring- tasteless (or slightly bad) for the most part, requiring a dose of spices to make them palatable, and the idea you need a lot of variety at mealtime comes strictly from having learned to eat them.

You see, the body just LOVES the taste of fresh rare (or raw) meat, it's your mind which develops the idea that meals are a form of entertainment and must be changed all the time- A meal of nice, fatty meat is not like a movie- it will bear constant repetition very well indeed. I do rotate meats, not for myself so much as for my reduced carb, mixed-diet wife- I generally do all the cooking.

I don't generally eat before training, although the 'steak plain' that my boxing coach gave us an hour before a match would suit. There is never any 'need' for carbs. Carbs are a no-no at all times and under all circumstances, they are a 'poison'- why eat poison? I eat three times a day, not because I am hungry but because I think that is a good number of times to eat. I generally do eat after my exercise, but it is not a fixed routine. I have said earlier that I eat meat/fat, any kind- including eggs butter and cream. I have no specifics on menus, whatever is easy.

Thanks for the link to Stef's articles, I wish someone had OCR'd and posted his book, The Fat Of The Land. I have a copy and also a master photocopy made from it which I have used to make further copies, but a digital version would be very desirable.

I may still have (somewhere) the letter Stef wrote to me shortly years before his death in 1962, in reply to a letter I wrote to him describing my early experiences in following my all meat dietary regime.

Lions have a simple way to open skulls, they crush them with their jaws.- Mostly they just eat the liver, tongue and skeletal muscles, the rest is scavenged by hyenas and vultures, of course hyenas also have NO problems opening skulls.

I still don't understand how the 'saturated fat is bad for you' idea ever came

along- since we store energy in exactly that format. It should not take the wits of a rocket scientist to deduct that we must be optimised to burn it.

I have come to the conclusion that 5 gm/day is about as close as one can get to 'zero-carbs'. It works very well.

I finally found one stash of articles, not all. I failed to note a few dates on the photocopies of some magazine articles:

'What's the best fuel for muscles?' Jeff Everson- interview With Greg Ellis- Weider's Muscle and Fitness mag, May, not the year.

'Body Fat' by Vincent P Dole, Scientific American, didn't mark the year/month- unfortunate, it has very important information on the fat tissues.

'Dietary hyperphagia in Rats: Role of Fat, Carbohydrate, and Energy Content. Israel Ramirez and mark L Friedman, Physiology & Behavior, June 1990.

'Regulation of Hepatic Fatty Acids Oxidation and Ketone Boldy Production' J D McGarry and D W Foster, Ann. Rev. Biochem 1980 49:395-420.

This batch is not complete, there are several more papers here- somewhere. I am still searching.

I have followed my dietary path for 47 years, it is as natural as breathing now (but it wasn't always). Be sure to eat plenty of fat.

No one is born with a 'taste' for any kind of food- everything is learned, so if you 'crave' veggies or fruit, it is your social *mind* at work, your *body* does not 'crave' non-meat foods.

What is this 'induction' thing?

Thaw? I would never, ever freeze raw meat! Or buy it already frozen. Why bother, since it will keep at 2C literally for weeks. If bought in bulk, cryovac'd, it will keep for months- it gets ever more tender as it ages (enzymatic action).

Sausages can be frozen with little obvious damage. Some fish do not suffer much, others are destroyed- but chicken and all red meat is badly damaged by cell fracture by freezing- the texture and taste goes off. Cooked food can be frozen without much drama. I will drive for two or three hours if necessary just to buy fresh, never frozen fish and chicken. I think it is best to keep freezing restricted to ice cream.

By rest I mean, normal tasks are ok, but no running or lifting. If you are on a zero carb diet, your body runs on the same mix all the time anyway, so eat if you feel like it. Perhaps if you are heavy into gaining mass, you might want to rush out scarf food after you finished the workout- just be sure to allow enough time for the pump to subside and the body to cool down- eating diverts the blood to the intestines, away from the muscles- I don't know, but that may not be the best thing to do right away.

Don't follow ANYTHING you read in the bodybuilding mags concerning food and supplements, it is all a load of rubbish. Even the oft-repeated suggestion you need lots of different exercises to 'properly' build mass in each body part- it is just a

way of getting you to read the magazine so you can 'learn how the pro's do it'. I can tell you exactly how the pros do it- take lots of anabolic steroids. The real 'genetic' champs actually just have a good genetic resistance to the various kinds of problems high doses of these drugs cause the body. Choose an exercise you like for each part and change it if you feel like it like from time to time, but it will not increase your progress to do so, just give you something different to do in the gym. Of course, you must learn the correct form and strictly follow it for any exercise you do. I prefer free weights, which I have at home (a complete well-built and equipped gym, in fact), and when home I rarely use my own machines, but when in a commercial gym, I may try various things out for a change of pace, while still confining myself to just one exercise per part.

Fat is very filling, don't worry, you won't eat too much.

No headaches normally- perhaps with a cold or flu, but I have not suffered from either in many years, even after what must have been severe damage to my immune system from the cancer therapy. I highly recommend getting a yearly flu shot.

Atkins sucks. I said that 30 years ago when his book first appeared. He modified the real truth, (assuming he ever knew it) so his diet would be acceptable to normal, veggie-habituated people. In a small number of cases it sort of works, after a fashion- for a while.

3 cups of vegetables? Really? What nonsense!

Avoid all veggie oils, none of them except palm, coconut and small amounts of macadamia are 'good'. Olive and the rest are really BAD. Avoid commercial mayo, all of which is made with either sunflower, safflower or canola, and is very salty. Eat as much animal fat as you like, plus as much as you like of any and all kinds of meat, fish and poultry. heavy cream has some carbs, so go easy. You should try to reach and stay at 5 gm carbs/day for optimum results. The only physical bit concerning eating sugar and flour is a weird kind of addiction to the insulin 'rush' which apparently is something like the rush that a junky or meth freak gets on taking their drug. I wager you fall asleep after such indulgence. In other words, you are addicted to the result of eating the carbs not to the carbs themselves. You eat things because you were taught as a baby to do so. It is mental, not physical (except as noted).

My teeth, yes. I have all my teeth, basically including the 'wisdoms'. One first molar broke in half a few years ago, perhaps after one of my inlays came loose and a dentist replaced it without properly removing all the old cement. That one was replaced with a crown on an implant. All the rest are fine. I have had no caries at all since 1957. My teeth have very little wear, and are still so sharp I can still make my cheek or tongue bleed every so often when I manage to bite myself.

Before age 23, I managed to get cavities in all my molars (bread), including my wisdoms. I suffered from chronic mercury poisoning from the el cheapo amalgam fillings put in my mouth as a kid until I had all of them removed in the '70's and replaced with gold inlays. Bad restorations in amalgam have led to a couple of root canals. I do not expect to ever have any teeth lost. I refused to have my teeth removed for radiation therapy, in spite if dread warnings of the consequences of caries- I just laughed, since I don't HAVE any caries and will never have any. In any event, even with no saliva my teeth are maintaining themselves perfectly. I brush once a day, at night.

My current very excellent dentist likes to see me every few months since the radiation, but there has been no change at all. Before that I only went in when I had an event, like an inlay coming adrift. My amalgam replacement 30 years ago was done by an old timer, old fashioned restorational dentist, a regular 'tooth artist', who did everything himself, but he used the old style cement, which is slowly coming loose, necessitating the occasional refitting.

I am looking for the study on non-depletion of glycogen with exercise. This study specifically showed no reduction in glycogen after intense exercise- that contention proved to be only an assumption, not based on data. The effect of 'hitting a wall' known to runners is due to carb loading and the accompanying reduction in endurance. Another study in the batch I have not located shows a tripling or more of exercise endurance in rats fed a zero carb diet versus those fed a normal rat-chow diet. Glycogen storage is stable in a person with sufficient fat intake.

Look, I am really not interested in going around and around about one person's fixation on diabetes etc. I am not a diabetic, which is not really a disease, but the result of consuming a high carb diet 24/7. I merely mentioned the lack of a need in a carnivore's body for insulin- in passing. As soon as I find the papers I will post the references. Runners who are fully keto-adapted burn fat from the first step they take and do not 'shift gears'. I assume many here know about Greg Ellis' work on low carbs and exercise. He sent me many of the metabolic papers I have. He is about as dedicated to this path as I am, but is not nearly as strict. Keto-adaptation on zero carbs should be complete in 3-4 weeks.

The truth about exercise is that muscles NEVER use carbs as fuel, only fat, so the process of 'burning carbs is only the process of converting them into fat, which puts a severe load on the body during exercise- eliminate the carbs and endurance skyrockets. (At the risk of offending a few, I must say that Atkins -conventional- contention about burning carbs for fuel is false, like many of his ideas. The rats in the paper I mentioned were tested by having them swim. They were trained and conditioned for a long time during he study, of course. Those on a standard diet never were able to swim much longer than a few hours, but the ones on the true zero carb high fat diet were still swimming after eight hours and the experimenter had to end the session- no telling how long they might have gone on. Thus marathoners and long distance bike riders are severely limiting themselves by carb loading.

High octane? Hardly.

Glycogen/glucose equal 4 cal/gm. Fat is 9 cal/gm. Alcohol is 7, and interferes with enzyme production in the liver. Glycogen is only used as a quick source of glucose to stabilise blood glucose and normally remains stable in the body. Only the brain and a few other tissues need or use any glucose, it is NOT an 'energy source' for skeletal muscles. Don't fret, I have the papers to support all this, and I hope they turn up soon. By the way, the conversion of glucose to fat is inefficient in calorie terms, it produces some heat as waste, about 0.5 to 1 cal worth. Thus, a sweet cool summer drink will actually heat your body, not cool it.

Rapid intense effort (anaerobic) uses ATP, which degrades with muscular contraction into ADP. ADP is reconverted into ATP by a mechanism fueled by fatty acids complexed with n-acetyl carnitine. No carbohydrate is involved. Aerobic activity is fueled the same way.

Why does it feel like I am going over the same ground again? Perhaps a few people have not read all my posts.

One ounce (~30gm) of pecans would have about 10-15 gms of carbohydrates, not 1 not 3. Nuts of all kinds are all nearly half or more carbs- the rest is vegetable oils and some plant protein. They are hard to digest, as well. Nuts are just energy-dense seeds, and seeds must have carbs to sprout.

No, my wife does not eat bread or any sugar, and only very small amounts of pasta- once in a while- or rice. Mostly she eats salads, and a few fruits (we live in the tropics after all). I would say not quite low carb, but very moderate. As noted, it is social conditioning that counts most in what we eat. I encourage her to reduce the carbs, and it is happening slowly. She was a practicing vegetarian when we met 21 years ago, but that did not last past our first dinner date. She asked for a bite of my steak, actually.

...The following is just my opinion, remember- you can be trained young to eat anything, and will then 'love' it. For example, Vegemite, a heavy, very salty, strong tasting concentrated yeast paste- a byproduct of the brewing industry, is eaten by Aussie kids (and adults), like the Yanks eat jam- on toast... Turnips taste, for lack of a better word, nasty- (along with mustard, collard and kale greens, and the cabbage family). I always wondered how they were ever considered edible in the first place- near starvation, I guess. Conditioning rules the palate.

Bathroom problems? You should not have this problem, you must be doing something wrong. The carnivore's diet totally eliminates constipation. I am never constipated unless I must take an opiate like codeine (tramadol is better- and not constipating) or eat too much cheese.

You cannot eat 'straight protein'- it is more than constipating, it is dangerously toxic. Dietary protein content should never go above 40 or so percent and 20% is quite a good percentage, even for a bodybuilder. The diet should include 60-80% fat. Calling any workable diet 'high protein' is misleading.

Coffee in excess can cause a loose bowel, and cheese, which is mostly casein (the basis for library paste) is VERY binding. Try increasing fat and lowering protein and cheese, or add coffee.

A 'protein shake' should be based on heavy cream. My first meal is 60 ml cream, 10 ml water, with three heaping tablespoons of protein powder (90% calcium caseinate, 6% ion exchange whey, 4% egg albumin). I buy all the ingredients in bulk and make up the mixture myself, as all the commercial mixes suck (it is way cheaper this way, too)- either they have soy in them, carbs, or way too much of some cloying synthetic sweetener, or they lack caseinate and thus are too quickly metabolised, thus ineffective. Whey is used up very rapidly- casein lasts for hours. Egg white balances the amino acid profile.

The Krebs cycle is simply a description of the conversion path from glucose to fat, and not a metabolic energy source. Some of us genetic-obese may have difficulty in the step- oxidation of pyruvic acid- Macarness thought so.

I eat anywhere from 60-80% fat a day. I eat at least 2 eggs a day. No cheese, heavy cream, milk except for my shakes. Occasional butter. Some mayo but not lots and what I do eat I make myself.

theBear Wed, Mar-08-06 17:52

Good, try my suggestion on coffee- I llke it with cream.

Basically, you should not suffer constipation on a zerocarb regime with a good balance of fat. Even Stefansson noted this.

theBear Wed, Mar-08-06 17:55

Milk is very carby (~10%) and can be constipating due to the casein, which turns into hard curd (cheese like) in an adult's stomach- perhaps this is your problem. Try making your shakes with diluted heavy cream instead.

MissSherry Wed, Mar-08-06 17:58

Umm that is what I use... Also my coffee I use heavy cream but only 1/2 t a cup.

I am not the typical female though as I do have multiple health problems. I have had lupus for 3 years, diabetes 2 years, plus cancer. Currently I am feeling better then i have in years. I attribute it to my almost non-existent carbs..

Been down to sealevel yesterday to see the ear doc, so this is a long one-

Right- full cream milk here is 4.8gm / 100 ml. Must have been thinking fortified skim or something.

I don't weigh, measure or worry about the amounts I eat, whether it be protein or fat. I eat fat first if I can, until it feels right, and then lean till I feel satisfied. I don't eat anything like as much as I did in my 20's and 30's.

It is quite normal for ignorant people to claim that any diet other than the high carb, high veg one they learned from mum is 'unhealthy'. I doubt anyone would even consider the right diet unless they personally are having great difficulty with bodyfat. Those who are lucky in the genetic sweepstakes are fixed in what the consider is good nutrition. This has been my experience with literally thousands of people who I have told about my lifestyle over the very lengthy period I have been living it. So, deal with diet at your own space and forget about what happens elsewhere- normal weight people never accept our ways- even many of the obese have a hard time with it.

I like coconut cream, but it varies from brand to brand- the best is >30% fat, no carbs. This lovely fatty stuff is very sensitive to heat, and turns to oil very quickly- you just can't heat it at all- add it last. I does not work in ice cream- it turns the whole thing to grease (butter?) as it is churned.

I live where the macadamia is native. We buy it in a 10 litre package from the mac oil extracting mob here in Queensland, it lasts us a year at least- cost: ~A\$8/litre.

Generally in families where the meat is well-cooked, people do not like meat much, and do not eat very little of it.

I feel I am repeating some things over and over: The muscles do not, and cannot 'burn' glucose OR glycogen. The ONLY fuel the body uses is fat to run the muscle's contractions. Eating carbs interferes with fat metabolism, so keto-adaptation

removes this problem- the 'wall'.

The body does do a bit of glucose-making to stabilise glycogen/glucose when needed, just as it will if you are below your native 'fatostat' setting, say you have dropped to around 5%, like a competing body builder- to say at that low fat level requires exact matching of caloric intake to calories burned, coupled with exercise. It is important the the diet supply sufficient protein, of course to spare incorporated protein. In dealing with protein in the muscles etc, one should be aware that the body is constantly breaking down and rebuilding the various protein structures anyway- like a mad mob of tiny housebuilders who dismantle the brick walls and pass the bricks around, rebuilding them as fast as they are taken apart- I have no idea why, but this is how it works. I think this is why you lose muscle mass you gain from exercising, if you don't continue to exercise. The body is very conservative relative to carrying mass, and does not maintain structures like muscle size and strength at levels beyond perceived current 'need'.

I mentioned that I have a paper (somewhere) which pouts to rest the idea that glycogen is used for energy.

I am carb free, I exercise anaerobically by lifting weights. I NEVER get sore muscles the next day- or the day after unless I am forcing a severe weight overload, which causes more severe micro damage to the muscles, and some second-day soreness. So there's the 'practical' proof that glycogen does not deplete with exercise.

Blood triglyceride is an ester, not a sugar. By further oxidation, one-half of a molecule of glucose can be derived from the glycerol moiety, but this tri-hydroxy alcohol represents only a very small percentage of the mass of the triglyceride molecule.

I take three or four ex-large eggs -very soft- with each meal, plus ~60 gm of camembert or brie. It makes the texture of the meat component easier to swallow.

My blood triglyceride level is always at the low end of 'normal'.

People 'eat that stuff' because their family ate them, and they were persistently fed them as babies until they accepted them as food.

I have never said I do not 'like' the usual vegetables people consider food, I learned to eat everything but turnips as a teen (thus my coronary problem). However I gave them away once I learned they are not good food for my body, full stop. I don't even think about them any more. People who wax eloquent about the rapture of eating various veggies are simply showing how very deep running their social conditioning is- to the point it has completely swamped any trace of instinct- instinct is why kids spit out veggies and make a face... People in this category never remain on a strict low to zero carb regime for very long, at least that has been my experience with a large number of 'attemptees'. Their mental state prevents it.

People who eat fibrous things should be aware of the damage this kind of rough, scratchy material does long term to the lining of the small intestine- It irritates it and causes a kind of 'callous' to form, which reduces the ability to extract nourishment from the chyme as it passes through.

Goat, like mutton is tough, kid is not, it is as soft and succulent as lamb...

Meat is not boring to a carnivore, only to a mixed-dieter, to whom all foods are quickly 'boring'.

Carnivores love each and every meal and eat to be nourished, not to be 'entertained'. The low level of gastronomic attraction of vegetables requires a lot of spice and theatre to keep you eating.

No amount of talk or sight of veggies/fruit makes the slightest impact on me- but then, I have had a lot of practice. I have successfully overcome my acculturation, a very unusual thing.

What indeed, did I start, dietary heretic that I am.

Other than as a guide to our lengthy period of evolution under a carnivorous lifestyle, resulting is the loss of tolerance for diet with a high carb/vegetable content, the actual diet of paleolithic people is not really of much value to us in today's modern world. Most of the animals they hunted for food are extinct, and we really do not have any solid data on what they may have consumed but did not bring home.

It behooves late comers to this 500+ posting thread to go back and read the entire thing before putting their foot in a bucket. Virtually every thing used in attack has been answered thoroughly already. Some recaps below:

I have studies which show that NO dietary fat enters the adipose tissues- the study was based on radioisotope uptake, and showed the only adipose radioactivity resulted from the incorporation of tagged glucose. None was found inside the cells from tagged fatty acids/triglycerides. It is impossible for fat to pass across the adipose cell wall, there simply is no mechanism. In order to release stored fat, the adipose cell's wall ruptures and releases the fat directly, afterwards healing. This microscopic rupture is detected as a vague discomfort commonly felt by dieters, and is relieved by eating, especially a carb meal. The fat into storage, an ancient unsupported contention- is false, the body cannot and does not store dietary fat, it must circulate until consumed as fuel.

I am used to a near violent rejection of my words like this, it is more common than you might think, and almost always is full of diet-myth and nonsense. I am not telling anyone how or what to eat and I have made that manifestly clear in my posts, I am simply offering my 47 years of experience in following this path- what you eat and what you think about eating is not subject to your conscious mind's control. In time, and with great effort you may come to accept it, but your 'gut' will not usually completely give up your social dietary conditioning. Some people are so threatened by any assertion that their mum was wrong in what she gave them as a babe and told them was right to eat, that they become agitated, illogical and confused. Sorry about that.

My writings are just an example of what I have discovered in a long time period of reading, thinking and communicating with others. I did not understand for years why no one was able to follow me- I finally figured out the social conditioning aspect and it fully explained everything I have encountered. Attempts to belittle my information or drag me into an argument are doomed to failure, as I have no doubt of any kind about what I have written here as well as on my website.

The totally frivolous and illogical statement that my diet may not be the raison d'etre of my excellent health is like saying that my strength and muscularity may not be due to my spending many years lifting heavy weights in the gym. Right. And I do not like it when people who are not even up on what I have been up to in my

thread, come in like gangbusters- to criticise and attempt to lecture me. Don't get into the shallow place of suggesting 'perhaps this, perhaps that' Especially; what is this nonsense about 'importance of water'- I drink up to four litres a day- I bet the writer does not.

If pigs had wings-or did not cleverly hide them from us, perhaps they might fly. Thus the fact that none have been seen to do so does not mean they can't???

I have only told in this thread about the true state and origin of my diet and its long term overall effect on me, my body and and my health, I have vast experience with friends and acquaintances who are vegans, vegetarians and mixed diet eaters- trust me, they all are, and this in includes some half my age, all in such relatively poor health and physical condition compared to me that this whole idea my diet may not be responsible is truly laughable.

Read, understand and think- before typing.

Boiling goat or any other meat for 1-2 hours will completely destroy any and all vitamins, denature and render difficult to digest all the proteins, and seems like a total waste of good food- if cooking makes it tough, buy kid, or eat it raw. Raw meat is rarely tough- and if the meat is still tough, cut it up with a sharp knife and swallow the bits with minimal chewing- unchewed meat dissolves all by itself in the stomach juices:

There was a soldier in Napoleon's army who suffered a nasty cut in battle to his abdomen. The cut was bound up on the battle field and much later was found to have healed to the skin leaving a slit-like opening into the stomach. The doctors decided not to intervene, and subsequently were able to insert various food items into the soldier's stomach directly- and observe the process of digestion. A whole steak dissolved on about one hour and became a liquid. Vegetables varied from between two to four hours and did not dissolve, just softened and became a kind of mush.

The fresh juice from raw or lightly cooked, rare meat does not contain any blood. Meat will quickly spoil unless ALL traces of blood are quickly removed from the flesh at slaughter. The red colour in meat juice is due to myoglobin, an iron containing compound related structurally to hemoglobin and found throughout muscle tissues. The run-off juice is high in protein and very nourishing- it is chock full of the most delicious flavours.

My direct experience with young babies is that they always instantly take to raw or rare meat, and vigorously reject any and all vegetation. A pediatrician told me at the time of my second kid that a human baby has the ability to digest only two things at birth- human milk and raw meat in paste/chewed up form (so long as not offered with too high a fat level).

At the risk of being repetitious:

Archeological digs into paleolithic people's homesites show zero evidence of fruit or any type of food vegetation residues, like seed, stems or skin. So any grazing of such foods occurred opportunistically and was done where found.

Our physiognomy is due to the development of speech, our mouths are only secondarily used to eat with- talking has preempted and ruled the size and shape of our mouths and oral cavities. The commonly heard and false contention that we have the organs and teeth of an omnivore are just crude vegetarian propaganda which is so wrong that a child without training should be able to demonstrate the fallacy of by comparing

pictures.

Our intestinal structure and length is that of a carnivore- like a big cat, and nothing like an omnivore like the rat or pig.

Our teeth are pure carnivore, they have a continuous enamel coat, are quite sharp, erupt once and do not grow or get replaced just as is the norm for animal of insectivore lineage. They are utterly unlike the complex teeth of herbivores and omnivores- whose teeth grow throughout life.

We really don't have any very 'close' relatives- a term needing definition, as the closest, the pongids or great apes (some of whom like the chimp are good hunters and eat large amounts of meat- mostly monkeys) separated out ~6 million years ago. Of the large genera primates, many are heavy meat eaters, some are widely omnivorous, a few rather short lived monkeys are herbivorous, like the proboscids, and some- like the tree shrew are totally insectivorous..

I have only used the paleo people's limited evidence of diet to show that we went through a multimillion year long period of total carnivory, and we are the result of selective evolution as to the kinds of things we are most suited to use as food, not to bolster or use as the basis of any of my eating habits, which are based on the Inuit and extensive examination and tests done during the period when there were still those who followed their traditional diet... Plus careful awareness of my own body and the effect of foods on it. I have been subjected to complete examinations on a five to ten year basis all my life, I am not a person who avoids the doctor's clinic. I made many medical friends who were very interested in testing and measuring me over the years. By nature I am conservative and very skeptical. The things I have found to be true have been through the fire, so to speak.

Whew, can everyone here on this thread read and understand basic Australian/American English?

Cancer of any kind is not diet or nutrition-related, would that it were- it would make it a relatively simple matter to save millions of lives

...NO: I never said that my cancer could have been, or was due to either an environmental OR dietary factor. It was a total surprise to all the medical people involved, from my GP on up, that I got it at all. The fact is, the staff and experts at RPA said that they had no idea why a person as supremely fit as I was should have presented with this type of cancer at all. They asked me to agree to having my DNA studied as part of research aimed at discovering why some people who do not have any of the pointers, habits or exposures that are known to be associated with tonsillar SCC, still come down with it. My high level of fitness enabled me to come through the most grueling of treatments with my health intact- it takes the body very close to death. In fact, I have not had even a cold since.

I have not eaten ANY significant vegetables since I was 23 years of age, so any putative lack of something important or even useful, or nutritional insufficiencies- due to this path must be nonexistent by the simple and well agreed upon basic reality that all the cells in my body have been replaced seven or eight times during that period, and SURELY even to one so defensive as the complainer, this must be taken as showing that vegetation is either of no use to, or may well be bad for, a human's overall health to ingest in the mistaken idea it is proper food. A firmly held belief-system which runs contrary to observed facts does not make false things true, nor true things false.

My health at present is excellent. Is this due to my lifestyle of no veggies for 47 years? Most assuredly, it is. I have no cancer and I have no other health concerns. My ears are healing nicely after the repair of the grommet-damage.

I don't understand how trying to make ME look unhealthy is going to accomplish anything, it has nothing to do with reality.

Socialisation/accluturation over writes ALL human instincts.

Focus on the KISS principle: We eat what we eat because (and only because) our mothers ate that way, and their mothers and grandmothers, and great grandmothers, ad infinitum, ate that way, no other reason; not nutrition, not health, nothing.

What you love about vegetables is the result of your early childhood food-training, and has ABSOLUTELY NOTHING to do with whether or not the vegetables you are convinced are 'divine' are even good for your body in any way, let alone that we need to eat them. The statement: 'Honestly, it is hard for me to believe humans aren't supposed to eat vegetation' is an opinion only, and not supported by any fact. Belief is superstition, science is tested truth.

I don't 'believe' in anything- I test everything myself to find if it is true.

As many respondents have said in this thread, my path works and it works very well indeed- for all who attempt it, even for those for whom all other ways only work poorly.

Please, let's have no more unsupported, open ended claims used in attack mode. Please give us a complete list of what you are referring to with the statement: 'Veggies are chock full of healthful nutrients'. We would really like to know about all those mystic substances you think are only found in vegetation, and must therefore be missing from an all-meat diet.

In a great many years of studying plants, I have only found medicines, defined as things which heal illnesses and disabilities, and things which change or expand consciousness, not 'nutrients'.

Some cancer is known to be caused by chemical agents, like lung cancer and mesothelioma (asbestos). Some are caused by UV radiation, like skin cancer. Radiation exposure is a known cause, and a few have viral causes (HPV). Many, however are mysterious. I suspect the air pollution mediated by nuclear energy- i.e., tritium decay- the caused of 'photochemical smog, and perhaps others. Lung cancer amongst non smokers is on the rise, particularly in women in the US- home to well over 100 reactors, plus tonnes of waste held in water. Neutrons and the hydrogen in water wind up as tritium, an unstable, radiation emitting isotope: water- *hydrogen* plus neutron = 'heavy' water- *deuterium* plus neutron = 'heavy-(er)' water- *tritium*.... tritium minus beta particle- *electron* plus O2 = helium 3 plus 2 O *atomic oxygen*... 2 O plus 2 O2 = 2 O3 *ozone*. Perhaps this ozone is carcinogenic and perhaps beta particles emitted inside the lung are the thing. Food however would have to be contaminated with something... Vegetables raised as food are fed chemicals and pesticides, which may be carcinogenic, but nothing like that is likely to make it through the animal into its meat.

When I eat out, I ask the waiter to leave all teh veggies in the kitchen, as 'I hate to see food go to waste'. On arrival I may ask the bread dish be removed, but the butter left on the table I don't order any 'meat dish' type food, but rare beef,

fried or roasted chicken, fish or soft eggs. I ask that they not put any salt on the meat (I will return overcooked and/or salted meat to the kitchen).

At 12 years into the path, I was sent to jail for 2 years. THAT was a challenge, not restaurants. Jails are like the military, the food is grease and starch based. At first I traded my veggies with other inmates who did not want meat (Black Muslims will not eat chicken or pork) and thus avoided carbs. I worked my way into the food service and was able to feed my self the way I wanted to. I traded my allowed purchase of cigarettes (2 cartons/wk) for a steak a day- separate from what I gave myself from the general food issue. I did very well indeed. Meat can be found everywhere except in a vegetarian restaurant- avoid these.

I do not recommend drinking artificially sweetened drinks like diet cola for eh simple reason that it maintains a taste and desire for sweet-tasting things, and if you do not reinforce this, it will fade away. After about 10 years on the diet I lost all interest in things 'bad'. Not that I ever was the sort who got 'sidetracked'. I seem to have a remarkable ability to focus 100% of my attention on something for hours to the exclusion of everything else in my environment. I was like this as a small child.

Of course females adopt socialisation more deeply than males, it is the female's role in human society to conserve and teach the 'rules of behaviour' The mother (not the father) teaches the child what to eat.

Loops- Disregard any other advice. Your 'problem' is due to your training, not your diet. The effect of carbs on a person who does not eat them could be just an effect from the 'insulin rush', which can act like a central nervous system stimulant, as seen in many children, and is the reason for the mistaken claim common in advertising that carbs are 'energy food'.

Muscles perform according to the training you give them. Swimming is a low resistance aerobic exercise, distance running is a medium to high resistance aerobic exercise, sprinting is a very high resistance anaerobic exercise. Swimming conditions only your lungs, control of breath and circulation and does not build strength, muscle tone or the kind of endurance which can be transferred to land based exercise. Swimming will stimulate the formation of a uniform layer of fat on your body to counter heat loss.

You can train for endurance (aerobic) or strength (anaerobic) Each uses a different modification of the basic muscle fibre. Each person has a mix of type 1 and type 2, or fast twitch, slow twitch. If you train as a marathoner, you suppress one and enhance the other- if you train as a sprinter, the reverse happens. It is an either/or situation. You cannot be at the same time both a marathoner and a sprinter- there is no free lunch. ALL muscle fibres use the same fuel, fast and slow both burn only fat. NO muscle fibre uses carbs. (Once more) glycogen is not used to do work, only ATP-ADP reduction is used, that is rebuilt by fat. Glycogen does not produce ATP. Glycogen is not depleted with exercise- this is proven and is in the literature. Opinions to the contrary are just repeating fairy tales from the past. Carb intake reduces strength/speed, and likewise reduces endurance/distance.

Do not worry about minerals and other trace nutrients, meat has them all in more than adequate amounts. Supplements, while not necessary are not going to hurt you unless you take them in excess. When I am at a dinner party, I am careful to pick out what I know is just meat and leave the rest, no matter what it is.

Humans have never eaten bones, we cannot digest them and it is a decidedly bad idea to try.

Woo's problem is eating too many carbs, no matter what 'reason' is used as an excuse. Hypoglycemia (low blood glucose) is caused by dietary carb intake. Glucose is stable and constant in a fasting state or in a fat-fed, zero carb, keto-adapted state.

I lift very heavy weights in very short intense workouts, I NEVER eat carbs. I always have heaps of energy. I ride my bike very fast over mountain trails for 30-45 minutes, I always have heaps of energy. Lifting weights has no effect on your glucose. Unless you have some sort of very bad disease or physical disorder, you must be eating sugar or starch in some form to cause your glucose level changes.

Liking veggies has EVERYTHING to do with you socialisation. Socialisation takes the place of (overrides) instinct, and seems to the person socialised to be 'natural and instinctive'- just as you assert. It is an illusion. I have seen some very creative attempts to justify liking/eating veggies in 47 years: this one is the very best so far. Really taking a stretch. Almost in the same box with the classic "it's your blood type".

Again (with feeling)...

Ice cream is: egg yolks, cream, non-lactose milk protein in water, vanilla extract and a tiny pinch of aspartame. For a 6 qt White Mt. churn: 16 yolks, 1.8 litres cream, 250 ml water with 2 heaping tablespoons of a mix of 3 parts calcium caseinate and one part ion exchange whey (not isolate) two tablespoons of high quality vanilla. You can spice it up by grinding up fresh vanilla bean. If you like coffee flavour, add three small cups of short-black espresso. Be careful not to run the machine too long or it will turn to butter.

Humans have classic insectivorous dentition. We have no 'grinding' molars like bovines. Our molars are bug-crushing, cannot grow, have unsealed grooves which quickly admit bacteria, and thus cannot tolerate abrasion and carbohydrates- they wear away and rot. SOME carnivores need and have shearing teeth, (carnassals), Many animals both carnivores and omnivores as well as some frogs(!) and a deer- have long canines (tusks)- these are used always as display and fighting with some utility as holding tools. We have mouths for speech, and tusks are of no aid when you have knives.

Humans make and use knives- and have done so for ~4.5 million years. Enamel meant to wear grows continuously and is shaped in rolls, the layers separated by dentine, such as all ruminants have. Compared to rats and pigs, our teeth have a very thin and fragile enamel coat. Apes are very distant relations, and their teeth are not a good comparison. I am very well educated on anatomy and comparative anatomy. I am not telling stories, and I did not intend to teach ancient diets and I do not intend to lecture the group on body structures and purposes, but I do feel from time to time a need to clear up widespread misunderstandings of structure.

Where have you been? Gorillas proved sterile in captivity when fed on a total herbivorous diet- It was then discovered that in the wild they consume quantities of insects, principally wood-grubs and their massive back musculature is a specialisation to assist pulling the bark from trees to get at the bugs. Once the nature of the animal food acceptable to gorillas was known, zoos have been able properly feed, and to breed them successfully. With as many papers and studies on chimpanzee hunting/gathering behaviour, I am astounded that you do not understand their dietary habits. Then again, what gorillas and chimps eat is not relevant to human diet, which is what my thread is all about.

What is this term ' the meat and egg fast' supposed to mean? A 'fast' means (quite literally) going completely without food, i.e., not eating anything.

Yes, Dean, more myths. Chiropractors are good for putting your back in line, but are mostly charlatans and scams when it comes to everything else. This is why they receive no respect from medicine- most MD's will suffer long with a spinal displacement, rather than be seen visiting a chiro.

There are not four types, only two, fast and slow, and fast do have more mitochondria and can reprocess ADP to ATP faster than the slow ones, but both use only fatty acids. NO muscle fibre needs, or can use glucose. The following statement is the equivalent to describing a flying pig's wings:

"The aerobic fast-twitch fiber is really no longer a muscle, but a bag full of mitochondria with a few contractile fibers remaining. The mitochondria in this fiber are one-third the size of those in the aerobic slow-twitch fiber. These smaller mitochondria can only oxidize the components of glucose, not fatty acids or ketones as the larger mitochondria can". No such thing, I am afraid. Just because you can read something published somewhere does not mean it is true.

Note on cheese, also one of my faves, and something that I consume in every meal- it is VERY constipating if eaten in too high a quantity- this shows up very quickly (and hurts like hell.) Coffee is a good balancer for cheese, as (strong) coffee will give you the runs if taken in too high a quantity. NOTE- This only holds good for someone on a really low carb/zero carb, all meat diet. I think low-carb mixed-diet people (some posts) do not get either effect to any great extent. Since the whole focus of my case here is to elucidate the carnivore, many of you out there may not find some thing of any use in you efforts to find a normal body.

If you do not add sugar, whipped cream is the same as fresh pouring cream. It is quite tasty- I love it.

It is the casein in cheese which causes the binding. It makes an excellent glue. Elmer's is an example.

Leg cramps may mean not enough stretching.

(an aside)-

In the current Weekend Australian Magazine there is a badly written article trashing Atkins personally and his diet, calling it a 'fad'. It is full of inaccuracies, gossip and innuendo. A shame, really. I have been thinking about writing a letter, but I have not had much luck in getting my letters to the Australian published of late. I think they don't like the way I question government policy. My most recent effort last week, was to point out that the 'strict conditions' under which Oz sells uranium to the nuclear-armed powers was a total joke- and that Aussie U was being made into weapons all the time. Buyers must only promise not to use an equal amount as is Aussie sourced, from their combined stockpile, in munitions manufacture! I don't think this even includes depleted uranium projectiles.

Odd, I state that we have sharp, cresty molars (didn't you ever bite your cheek or tongue?) and small canines then amazingly, someone cites that as a contradiction? Seriously? Hmmm, I guess some people feel that they must defend their strongly held myths against all comers even if it means using contradiction and illogic and untruth. The references cited confirm my statements. I guess good

reading/comprehension is not a universal. 'Tusks' are a term for prominent teeth, they usually are the canines. As pointed out our insectivore ancestors probably did not have very prominent ones, and we therefore never developed them, instead modifying the mouth structures which favour specialisation for speech.

What you 'have never seen' is not a valid argument nor a substantiation of your belief system. There is no scientific argument against the fact we belong to a remote branch of the insectivores. My teeth are STILL very sharp, since I never was much into chewing abrasive foods. None of my teeth have been lost to caries or wear. I have not had any problems other than mechanical damage with any of them. I harbour no 'misconceptions' about human dentition.

The chook recipe is not about cream cheese topping. I derived it from a traditional Russian recipe for Chicken Kiev, in which flavoured butter is placed in a pocket cut INTO the chicken breast meat. The breast is then breaded and deep fried. The meat becomes soft and melts in your mouth. The cream cheese and butter mix with the spices is placed under the skin, in contact with the meat, the cheese helps prevent the butter-mix from melting to the point of running away inside as well as on the outside. Dill is good- but stronger spices work best.

Salt is not good for a fat burner.

I like a bit of bacon from time to time, but I have a lot of trouble finding bacon which is not heavily loaded with salt. Soaking in water is not a very good solution.

Salt is not good in your food, it is a chemical- and will damage your skin and your kidneys over time. It also interferes with fat metabolism. When I was a dancer, I used no salt in anything, I drank huge amounts of plain water during class, and never had a bit of problem, whereas the other dancers scarfed salt tablets like candy and still had problems- plus their clothes dried out with a heavy salt rime on them. The skin and the kidneys are forced to shed excess salt and cannot quickly stop, however if you eat at least 30 gm of meat a day you will get all the salt you need, the urine and sweat can go as low as a few parts/billion of salt to conserve it.

I never said we had 'carnivore' teeth- if you define that as the dentition of cats and dogs. I also did not say we had 'insectivore' teeth like bats etc. I noted that the primate lineage was insectivorous in deep antiquity and our dentition was derivative of that origin. Our mouth shape and jaw motion is specialised for speech, not chewing or grinding food. Our teeth changed with the development of both speech and the use of knives. Our teeth have absolutely no relationship, in either structure or durability to the teeth of herbivores and fully evolved omnivores like the rodenta.

Sorry, I am not trying to show you as less than you are, but the tooth shape and description I found on your references did nothing to detract from my stand on this, thus the comment on comprehension- I think you selectively choose to observe only the aspects of dentition which serve your viewpoint of us as omnivores.

Unfortunately the human mixed or omnivorous diet in 'recent' times- i.e., prior to today's dentistry- meant that virtually no-one had any teeth left in their head by the age of thirty. Many people, indeed most- died from abscessed teeth. Compare that to the animals whose diet is either herbivorous or omnivorous, who do not have access to dentistry- they live a full lifespan without serious problems from their dentition. Say what you like, you cannot change truth into falsehood nor fables into

reality: If we eat no carbs, our teeth will outlast us- no matter how long we live.

I am not attacking anyone, just asking a couple of reasonable questions based on observed behaviour, both of which have been on my mind for a while now:

Just WHAT is meant by 'Vegetarian Atkins?', other than, of course, an oxymoron?

Does 'Depraved Superhero' mean that you feel you must attempt to show all others as having 'ordinary, non-hero' status... if you can?

Or is this just your way of exhibiting an odd sense of humour on a basically egalitarian and meat-oriented dietary thread?

I have collected many papers over a long period of time that support my contentions. However I live on a very large, only partially developed rural property, which is basically somewhat unorganised and still takes a disproportionate amount of my time to manage.

I have not handled those papers for over 15 years, and it is going to take a bit more time for me to ferret them out from wherever they have gotten to over the years. I am working on it- trust me, I want very much to put all this contention to bed.

I remembered the glowing reference to tongue on Sat while I was shopping, and bought a nice veal tongue. It was A\$ 4.20/kg- equivalent to US \$ 1.43/lb. In the same meat cooler sirloin steak was A\$ 21.00/kg. I just don't see tongue as either expensive or difficult to find, at least here in Oz. Tongue is about the only meat I can take well-cooked, but of course it is only eaten as an occasional treat. Tongue is not quite edible rare- it is so tough it could be used to make shoe soles- the only other cut that tough is beef cheeks- even ground up for burger that cut is TOUGH and very chewy.

Locally here the standard liver is ox, rather than calf . You must search for tender calve's liver. Chickens sold here do not come with giblets, they are sold separately. I have some difficulty finding lamb's brains, and no luck finding calf or ox brains. The organs are called 'variety meats' in the US but 'offal' down here, a term which does not enhance sales.

I am tired of the endless tooth-wrangle. Arguing over evolution and the exact style of our teeth is not productive in the face of empirical, real life experience: All my friends who eat a mixed diet have lost teeth by means other than trauma. Many of those now 60 and older have to wear complete sets of dentures. Everyone who has kept (most of) their teeth brushes immediately after each meal (animals don't brush, yet keep their teeth).

Vegetation contains abrasives, acids, sugars and starches, all of which damage our teeth, especially the fruits- with citrus being the worst. Orange juice and chewable Vit C rapidly dissolve teeth, as does most common soft drinks, even the diet type- due to citric and/or phosphoric acid. Any fruit or vegetable like rhubarb which is tart contains an organic acid. If you are on a n all meat diet and don't eat vegetation or drink lactose/galactose containing dairy, brushing is completely

optional- it is only advisable to do so once a day to remove meat particles from between the teeth, as common mouth bacteria quickly attack it and make your breath smell pretty foul- even though these bacteria do not cause any damage to the teeth like those who feed on sugar and starch do. Brushing with a firm or hard toothbrush has the added benefit of stimulating the gums (feels as good as scratching an itch) and removing dead cells from its surface, thereby helping prevent the all too common gum disease people have. I am unsure if gum problems are diet- related, I have never had any problem with my gums, nor any bone loss in my jawbone or skull.

As a note here: Muscle cells need calcium to function, therefore heavy red-meat consumption supplies calcium in abundance and in the most assimilatable form possible. The way archeologists can easily separate stone-age-diet Eskimo/Inuit skulls from modern Inuit (western-diet) skulls is by the former's extremely dense bone structure (coupled with evidence of no caries).

Animals whose diet is tooth-damaging have the ability to replace teeth or have teeth which grow out continuously. Our teeth do neither, therefore it is reasonable to conclude that the modern diet we eat is NOT the correct one, as I have indicated in the title of this thread.

Now, Let's give the tooth thing a rest, shall we?

I do not like well-cooked liver from any animal. Calves liver or ox liver should have no reticulated mottling on the surface like pork liver does and should have a sweet, mild smell. It tastes best raw. If there is mottling or a metallic smell it will taste bad no matter how cooked. Lamb liver is not good, extremely dry, and has a poor flavour. I never eat pork liver. Chicken livers are very good when barely cooked through, and are still very soft and succulent, not hard and dry. Poach (in water) or saute in butter at a low temperature, about the same as simmering water- I call this 'poached in butter', it is also a good technique for eggs and fish. I am basically very fond of raw meats, the cooking I do is only for adding a touch of different flavour and dealing with surface bacteria if any. I love fresh-cut raw meat and fish. I don't eat raw chicken, but I like it only just barely cooked, and still very soft.

Ah, mussels. very tasty, but.... Main problem with fresh mussels is they quickly go bad- and if eaten in that condition they can make you VERY sick. Marinated mussels like the NZ greenlip are always pickled in a high sugar-content brine.

Candida albicans (monilia/thrush) requires carbs to grow- an 'overgrowth' of this common yeast commensal indicates the presence of starch and or sugar in the diet.

So far as the subject of the necessity or utility of vegetation in diet, I once more call your attention that what you eat is what you were brought up to eat, it has no connection with good nutrition, and it seems to you to be 'instinctive'. Diet is extremely tightly bound into your consciousness at a very primitive level and most people will find it so difficult to abandon or change it, no matter how strongly they accept the intelligence about diet, that they will only be able to partially alter their eating habits and if they can manage the carnivore lifestyle at all, will generally insist on retaining some veggie content. All the arguments I have read on this forum seem to my way of thinking, hopelessly naive, but illustrate perfectly the truth of the above analysis.

So, just accept that your culture is going to rule your life, make whatever adjustments you can handle and try to approach my example if you can, but do not despair so long as you are able to acquire and maintain a normal body form and are comfortable with it. I am still trying to work out how I managed to make this total

transition. If I could do that, it may be possible to show others how it is done, but so far it seems to me as though the way I eat is just totally simple, natural and normal. That this is not so for everyone else has become manifest to me over time.

The Chinese eat anything and everything that will not kill you quickly. If it moves or grows, they will eat it- pets included. Only the French even come close- i.e.- both like to eat tiny songbirds.

Who cares on this thread about soil depletion? I have not seen anything like that criticised, on the thread. Links are not messages. Here is the point:

We are here about diet, particularly a meat-oriented one, which is not dependent on the condition of agricultural soils. Giving any reason for avoiding veggies is quite valid, even if SOME soils used to grow the highly modified plants-as-foodstuffs consumed by moderns are not as bad as most of us think, if we think about it at all, that is.

Now- there are no 'deleterious factors' in any meat, so long as the animal from which it comes is healthy. There are, of course some salt water FISH which are dangerous to eat, either due to defensive toxins or algal blooms. Some fresh water fish in some places may have parasites, but they are not 'healthy'

Bottom like again, is myself, and my experience of better than normal health while eating no vegetation at all for 47 years. I exclude small amounts of garlic and chillies used for spice.

It is not necessary to defend the eating routines and foods that you were trained as a child to eat. No science is needed, no 'reasons' are pertinent. It is what you want to eat and it matters not whether it is either good for you or not, nor even if it is very bad for you, you will eat it. If you look long enough and hard enough you will find somewhere some 'information' to support your contention. But you need to realise, I am not going to fall for fairy tales and dietary myths.

I have a lifetime of watching the same people over nearly a half century on normal mixed diets, both the common ones and all the faddish 'healthy foods' ones, and I have not seen them as being good, nor in any way equaling the effects I have had in my body during such a period. So, say what you like, you have not proven the 'correctness' of your particular dietary viewpoint by applying it over a lengthy period in life, and thus whatever format your ideal mixed diet is, (or the 'balanced' one), as you claim will yield good health and longevity, has not been established by practice and is merely a dream in your head.

OK.

My lovely wife is nearly 17 years younger than I am.

At my age that is a significant difference. Over the years we have been together her diet has made a large accommodation, and is still slowly changing. She has gained bodyfat, true, but is still far slimmer than the average women her age. Perhaps the gain is due to her liking of pasta and rice. Nowadays she only very seldom indulges. She eats squash and a few other high carb veggies sometimes. She also likes pawpaws

(papaya) and other fattening fruits. She always eats some sort of salad with her meals. She likes eggs and eats more cheese than I do. She makes wicked egg salad and chicken salad, but puts celery in both, which I have to pick out- (no carbs, but I think it tastes awful). She is like me in her love of exercise and that may help her health.

I am not in the least interested in the food she likes, so I don't pay any attention to it in the fridge, even after smoking a doobie.

I only seldom say anything any more about what she eats unless I think it extremely carby. Fortunately she has a very good HRT formula which is based on the human estradiol rather than that dangerous pregnant mare's piss-derived one used in that interrupted study. The many estrogens found in other animals like horses, are not found in humans and like any alien hormone either have the wrong actions or have other added actions you may not want. Carbs/insulin is very artery damaging, but the normal female estrogen level seems to give excellent protection, why I have no idea, but I do know that as we evolved women simply never lived long enough to reach menopause.

Other animals can breed as long as they live, and once we could too- but now we live far longer than our bodies have evolved to handle in many ways. Of course estrogen also maintains the sex drive and vaginal lubricity as well as bone density. Even males need enough estrogen (which can be made from testosterone) to build and maintain bone density. I do not know how she will fare in the years to come... I would be far more comfortable if she ate like I do, but I am a realist on diet. She admits my diet is very good and is perhaps the best, but is strongly accustomed to her ways. I am always quite surprised when anyone can manage on it for long enough to make it their own.

Food for humanity: Fewer people would mean room for more food-animals a balanced ocean, land in grasses and trees, water which is abundant and clean. Clean air.

Yes, the truth about diet will out if only you can manage to center yourself and quiet down all that socially induced 'noise'.

A little bit of dissembling:

We are the eaters of cows, and we must NOT eat their food. That is the way of Gaia, the Conscious Planet who has placed us at the very pinnacle of the food-chain-eco-pyramid which is very small at the top. If we had remained where we belonged, rather than stepping down a level or two, not only would we live well and enjoy good health, but there would only be as many of us as the world can support. There would be no crowded struggling cities filled with the desperately poor, no pollution and no destruction of the ecosystem. The planet cannot carry us at the present population level, it is rapidly failing. The worst, most disastrous move we have made, worse even than the wide spread havoc caused by our uptake of the fundamental superstitious religions, is the consumption of vegetation. It has allowed us to infest the planet like ten thousand fleas on a Chihuahua. At least that is how I view it. 5 million, or up to 10 million, maybe- but no more is a good human population level, NOT six thousand million.

OK.

My lovely wife is nearly 17 years younger than I am.

At my age that is a significant difference. Over the years we have been together her diet has made a large accommodation, and is still slowly changing. She has gained bodyfat, true, but is still far slimmer than the average women her age. Perhaps the gain is due to her liking of pasta and rice. Nowadays she only very seldom indulges. She eats squash and a few other high carb veggies sometimes. She also likes pawpaws (papaya) and other fattening fruits. She always eats some sort of salad with her meals. She likes eggs and eats more cheese than I do. She makes wicked egg salad and chicken salad, but puts celery in both, which I have to pick out- (no carbs, but I think it tastes awful). She is like me in her love of exercise and that may help her health.

I am not in the least interested in the food she likes, so I don't pay any attention to it in the fridge, even after smoking a doobie.

I only seldom say anything any more about what she eats unless I think it extremely carby. Fortunately she has a very good HRT formula which is based on the human estradiol rather than that dangerous pregnant mare's piss-derived one used in that interrupted study. The many estrogens found in other animals like horses, are not found in humans and like any alien hormone either have the wrong actions or have other added actions you may not want. Carbs/insulin is very artery damaging, but the normal female estrogen level seems to give excellent protection, why I have no idea, but I do know that as we evolved women simply never lived long enough to reach menopause.

Other animals can breed as long as they live, and once we could too- but now we live far longer than our bodies have evolved to handle in many ways. Of course estrogen also maintains the sex drive and vaginal lubricity as well as bone density. Even males need enough estrogen (which can be made from testosterone) to build and maintain bone density. I do not know how she will fare in the years to come... I would be far more comfortable if she ate like I do, but I am a realist on diet. She admits my diet is very good and is perhaps the best, but is strongly accustomed to her ways. I am always quite surprised when anyone can manage on it for long enough to make it their own.

Food for humanity: Fewer people would mean room for more food-animals a balanced ocean, land in grasses and trees, water which is abundant and clean. Clean air.

Yes, the truth about diet will out if only you can manage to center yourself and quiet down all that socially induced 'noise'.

A little bit of dissembling:

We are the eaters of cows, and we must NOT eat their food. That is the way of Gaia, the Conscious Planet who has placed us at the very pinnacle of the food-chain-eco-pyramid which is very small at the top. If we had remained where we belonged, rather than stepping down a level or two, not only would we live well and enjoy good health, but there would only be as many of us as the world can support. There would be no crowded struggling cities filled with the desperately poor, no pollution and no destruction of the ecosystem. The planet cannot carry us at the present population level, it is rapidly failing. The worst, most disastrous move we have made, worse even than the wide spread havoc caused by our uptake of the fundamental superstitious religions, is the consumption of vegetation. It has allowed us to infest the planet like ten thousand fleas on a Chihuahua. At least that is how I view it. 5 million, or up to 10 million, maybe- but no more is a good human population level, NOT six thousand million.

No problem- it is not worth discussing, IMHO.

Hmmm- 'chillies are very high in vitamin C.'. Really? What constitutes 'high'?

Ok, let's say 2% for argument, likely it is far less, however. At 2%, an average spicing quantity of ~one gm. would provide a massive 20 mg! I use that amount in my foods as a bit of flavour about once a week. Forget about C- it is not needed in a rare or raw meat diet. C may not actually be the best thing to prevent scurvy, a 'deficiency syndrome'- the true mechanism of which is still mysterious.

The 'insulin mechanism' is a part of our excellent 'emergency survival' provisions. Insulin has side effects which damage ALL animals over time, however- herbivores are very short lived whereas carnivores are very long lived.

SOME cancer cells are very glucose-avid and need high levels of it to grow. Glucose does not cause cells to become cancerous, removal of carbs from the diet will not 'cure' any cancer- would that such a fairy tale were true. I might be curious about where anyone could find such nonsense, but I really don't much care, it is so outrageous a claim as to just seem silly.

Several grams of 52% mercury amalgam in your teeth leaking into your body 24/7 is hardly equivalent to a few milligrams of mercury bound up in thiomersal, injected once a year- you are suffering from a propaganda overload.

I suggest the questioner re read my posts as I have said not once but several times here that you are born without a taste for anything, but with a sucking instinct. Human milk is sweet. Get the drift?

So you think that stone age hunting was not intense, protracted physical activity?

I know the prime importance of strenuous exercise because my activity levels have varied a lot and have not been constant nor specific in kind for all of my 47 years in this lifestyle, and all times with reduced or limited exercise brought on discomfort and reduced fitness.

In reading my posts, you first need to understand that what I say is based on long term experience. I do not indulge in conjecture.

Slice the tongue crosswise nice and thin and eat with mustard. Very nicely marbled with fat. Tongue is usually the very first meat a hunter- animal or human- eats on killing prey. Beef tongue's taste is unique, very rich and 'creamy-smooth' in texture, soft but firm, never 'chewy'. Not at all like other beef. It is best to lightly simmer (not boil) it for an hour or so- braising it will turn it in to something like leather, as will rapid boiling.

I have never heard of anyone using a pressure cooker, it runs way too hot (15 psi = 250F).

You MUST peel it at once while still hot/warm, or the heavy rough skin will stick tight like glue and you will have to shave it off. Before it cools, however, it should pull off easily. Keeps best submerged in the water it was cooked in (in the fridge, of course).

You know, I suggest all you non-cooks get a copy of the venerated classic book The Joy of Cooking. It covers just about any and all things people eat and has a lot of

basic info on meats of all kinds. Understand- ALL cookbooks are chock full of carb-intensive recipes. I only suggest it so you can look up and find out information about each kind of meat and the ways peopole traditionally prepare them. Under brains, for instance, it recommends first parboiling all kinds, but I have found that lamb's brains are ok fried without this extra step.

Never look too closely at your food! That is why we invented sauces. Squid heads and tentacles are the best and tastiest part- for some weird reason Americans toss them out- and only eat the rubber-like chewy part which has very little flavour.

I see my answers were not understood or accepted. Perhaps the questions were not clearly enough stated, so the answers based on them were not what was expected, but never mind, let's move on. I am not going to go over it all again, and anyway, it has little to add to this thread.

Why does a necessary hormone for glucose control damage the tissues? Why, if sunlight is necessary for Vit D, does it cause skin damage? I don't think there is an answer to rhetorical questions like this, and what difference does it make? It is what it is, and the best thing is to minimise the exposure, and live with the damage that level causes.

As a case in point, if you suffer a stroke and blood leaks into the brain tissues, why does the immune system destroy great numbers of perfectly healthy brain cells as it cleans up the damaged ones? There are many defensive mechanisms in the body which do some damage as they perform necessary functions, sometimes they cause nearly as much bad as good, but it is what it is, a product of evolution. Perhaps further along the evolutionary timeline our bodies may correct this. I cannot say- it is pure conjecture, not my thing.

'Organisms' in a flu vaccine? The only vaccine today with a live virus is polio. Or do you consider any part of a virus as 'an organism'? How do you expect to go from the mercury in dental restoration to flu shots in one sentence and NOT be taken as pointing out the usual mercurial agent used to invoke an immune response???

I am sorry you feel pain on exercising, perhaps you should find a better trainer. I do not feel pain when I work out, only challenge and exertion. If it hurts, you are doing something wrong. As to why the 'old ones' worked so hard physically in searching for and capturing their prey, well if you don't, you starve. Ever watch kids in a playground? Why would they run around and exhaust themselves if it did not feel so good? I'm sorry, but I interpret your rejection of exercise as good and desirable, as pathological. I also question the direction this line is taking.

Dean, interesting article. A dog is not strictly speaking a pure carnivore, it is more of an opportunistic feeder- thus the slightly longer gut. If he had chosen a panther (obligate carnivore) which is our size, the intestines etc, would have been a closer match. Perhaps this is one reason why dogs were better able (and willing) than cats to adapt to us as our diet changed. Here in Queensland there are packs of feral dogs who feed on the fallen fruit in avocado orchards!

You don't find much carbs in meat, liver is the the exception. Brains have a slightly sweet taste as do kidneys, but I think they are basically very low in

carbs. I am not as sure about sweetbreads, which can be either the pancreas, considered the better kind), or the thymus- in a very young animal.

A note on the pig: This omnivorous animal has notoriously bad dietary preferences/habits- they are fed by the business end of (human) latrines in Asia- ('as happy as a pig in') and often, even in the western world, can be infested with parasites, etc. Pigs have organs with poor taste and texture anyway. Not good for food.

What made the 'high protein' dieters sick? That's dead simple- lack of adequate fat intake. There is actually no such thing as a 'high protein' diet, Protein does not need to be higher than 20% for health and must never go above 50%. There are, therefore, only high-carb and high-fat diets.

Anyone with tooth problems should act at once to fix the problem. Modern dentistry is essentially painless, a good dentist is a good friend. The state of your health is directly connected with them. Teeth are 'limbs'- independent like, say, fingers- with their own blood supply and nerves. Each one is treated by the body as important- trust me, even a wisdom tooth is a good one, and should be looked after. Dentists as a rule consider wisdom teeth as 'expendable'- and want to pull them out (they frighten people with the term 'impacted' which sounds bad but really only means 'not completely erupted through the gum. The covering gum can be trimmed away to fully expose the tooth in most cases. Some people may have mouths too small for all 32 teeth, and to keep them in line and functioning, some or all of the last molars have to go, unfortunately. I had to insist to my dentist that mine be given restoration for the caries I developed as a carb-consuming teen- so I could keep them. One of them has never erupted and is still completely covered with gum- I like to think of it as a 'spare'. I have a functioning tooth in every other location. I have had no caries in 47 years.

I have had one root canal and gold crown from damage done during an amalgam restoration in my 20's, which was not reparable in gold and the nerve subsequently died. I had one more for a tooth which had a broken tooth next to it which developed an abcess which on X-ray appeared to be related to the subsequently root-canalised tooth- this tooth's crack was not discovered at the time, but once into the other tooth my dentist discovered the nerve was still good- it was the one next to it which had broken and caused the abcess- the crack was so fine as to be totally invisible, but was permeable to bacteria, not cariogenic ones- infective ones. I had the broken tooth removed- (the abcess proved resistant to antibiotics- it finally separated in two) and a titanium post and crown installed (gold, of course). All the trouble was in the molars. Once one tooth goes, the rest tend to follow, bridges and dentures are not a good idea. It is very important to take action to keep your teeth, and get permanent implants to replace any lost ones. I have only trauma to threaten my teeth, caries is not a problem with my diet, even if I don't brush...

"Actually lifespan is highly correlated to body mass, metabolism and nutrient flow in the body-not whether you are a carnivore or herbivore."

Common error in understanding: body size rules the overall rate of metabolism/longevity- such as between a mouse versus a large rat, etc. NOT between same-sized carnivores vs herbivores... i.e.: The common domestic tabby lives to 24, but a rabbit, which is the exact same size, lives only to ~6 (in captivity- and far shorter in the wild).

Identical comparisons can be made between the longevity of the big cats and similar-sized herbivores- with the same results.

Do I detect a 'grasping for straws', or is it a simply a case of ingrained contrariness, leading to a need to contradict everything not part of one's own belief structures? Seems the case. Not to worry- relax, I have done my homework very thoroughly.

We can discount the last, the pub article. The second shows size/metabolism, which is established. The first is invalid off the line, since it compares a chicken and an elephant, and metabolism as well as body-design differences impinging on metabolism (especially the lungs) in birds are radically different from mammals. Birds are the last surviving dinosaurs.

I think I am wasting valuable communication time attempting to answer irrelevant questions. I am going to stick to the human diet and what I have experienced as true about it, and the short term and long term effects of what we eat.

(In passing, I do not accept the unannotated lifespans listed on any of the website references, my information- differs. It is a salient fact that there are websites galore on the web which will support literally any idea you can conceive of. So what? Why do you have any interest in various diet regimes- if you are only interested in supporting your own ideas and trashing those which do not fit in with it?)

I live in the present day world. I pay little regard for people whose only goal is to try to duplicate their idea of what the (unknowable) diets of extinct, prehistoric people might have been, or in comparing the highly evolved human body of today with various other species of animal.

Not one person who has posted to this thread has had more than a relatively short time on whatever dietary routine they are following.

I have lived on mine far longer than many people will live for their entire lives. I am a walking, living proof of the efficacy of a totally carnivorous diet and its relationship to ideal body condition and health.

I am trying to share this built-on-stone information, but some days it seems like I am trying to walk into the face of a windstorm.

Skeptics and contrarians: Please pay close attention- I said in the beginning that most readers will never accept and adopt a diet by simply using their mind and intelligence. It will seem for years to be somehow 'not right'. This is because your dietary habits and preferences have been socially 'prewired' in your mind, deep down, in childhood, along with all the things we must learn about our culture and the right way to live as a human being in our society. Socialisation overwrites and suppresses instinct at the instinctual level. It is hard to alter, trust me. I am offering living proof that the payoff from a successful attempt to alter it is worth the effort it takes.

If you prove to be a unique person with a high degree of self-control and a strong drive to alter the shape of your body and the state of your health, I can show the path. Neither I nor anyone else can keep you on it, that is something you and only you can do.

In many cases the ultimate diet format I talk about will not be necessary to achieve an acceptable change, but there are vast side-benefits along my path which remain hidden for a very long time before becoming apparent.

I noticed many years ago that I did not seem to be aging much, and that my body, as I got older began to look a lot different from everyone else my age that I met, no matter whether they were into fitness or just had a good body size and shape naturally. In all cases I began to pull away, and it slowly dawned on me that virtually all the 'standard changes of age' I had accepted as a natural and normal product of simply getting older were not showing up.

So I felt I had a kind of 'obligation' to let other people know about it, hence the essay on my site, and now- my participation in this thread. My approach is to treat the body as a 'black box'. It is an empirical, not cognitive process: If you input this, you can show the output is that, if you change the input, the output changes also. On this basis, you do not have to find out and define what is inside the 'black box' of your body to be able to discover and follow good nutritional practice any more than you need to know how an internal combustion engine works to drive as well as a race car champion.

Understanding and eliminating diet-connected damage and the aging effects it causes IS important, but whether or not cats live longer than rabbits, is not. The fact that our teeth can last longer than we do if diet is correct has nothing to do with what the origins of our dentition can be shown to be- the fact can be demonstrated.

I hope I am making myself clear, as it is very frustrating to try to deal with a lot of unnecessary stuff. We want to see and appreciate the forest- not look too closely at only a few trees. I want to use my precious online time constructively (I live in deep bushland have a lot of work each day). I tend to react- or, if I ignore some posts I feel are completely irrelevant, the respondents then accuse me of avoiding the issues! I feel some 'issues' are non-issues with respect to the direction taken. I am sorry if this bothers anyone, I am enjoying most of that is going on, immensely.

Yes, I am interested in seeing if, by holding this discussion, I can help other people who have naturally heavy constitutions find a way around their acculturation.

Reality checks are very useful.

Anyone who assumes I am not stating most emphatically that the all meat diet is the healthiest way a human can nourish the body has obviously got some sort of mental block going (i.e.: "... not arguing the healthfulness of a carnivorous diet..."). To this I say: Pay better attention. The term 'unnatural' is meaningless with regard to diet which is cultural, and therefore whatever is taught to be considered as food is perfectly 'natural' to humans- we ARE our culture. If it was not unhealthy this forum would not exist.

Five pounds of bodyfat? This represents ~20,000 calories. if you eat nothing at all (total water only fast), and burn a normal 2500 cal/day (17,500,/wk) you will drop 4.5 pounds of pure fat, and the rest of your loss would be water and some lean muscle mass. If you are eating high fat, then a loss of 2-3 pounds of actual bodyfat is a very good result. If your scale says you lost five, then you are showing some water retention loss. I have mentioned that salt interferes with fat metabolism- it also causes water retention and is hard on both the kidneys and the skin. Commercial

mayo contains both high salt and bad (unsat) oils.

Body fat mass is not 100% fat- it is a living and very active tissue. I have a study in my (misplaced) cache wherein tests were done that indicate high body fat mass suppresses thyroid by means of a so far unidentified messenger, rather than a low thyroid causing fatness.

Skin aging is a result of three factors: Due to the multiple function of our outermost surface cover, Many things pass through it- oxygen is absorbed and carbon dioxide released, excess salt and many other substances are shed via sweat (sweating is good). In this regard the skin is like both a lung and a kidney. This is why you should bathe often (not necessarily with soap) to keep the skin permeable, avoid spending too much time in air conditioned places, and not ingest any extra salt. Salt is hard on the pores and ages skin. Insulin damages collagen and is the cause of stretch marks, wrinkles and sagging. Too much sun may induce skin cancers in susceptible individuals, reduces flexibility and also damages collagen.

Superstitious religions are also taught to the very young, so the illogic of religion is buried so deeply that science training- which conflicts with every 'faith'- has little or no effect. It is even true that there are some fine scientists who can actually proclaim themselves to be "Christians" without blushing- even though it is totally anomalous. So, do not play down or underestimate the enormous power of acculturation to override logic and intelligence. A dialect spoken during childhood and adolescence is usually kept always, even after moving to a place where a radically different dialect is spoken. Diet is the same.

This is not to say that a way cannot be found to deal with acculturation, and that is what all this is about- finding that way. I did it but I cannot figure out how and why I managed when others seemingly cannot.

My statements may seem didactic, but that is just my 'way of speaking', it does not mean that I think everything I say is an absolute. I try to keep to what I have experienced, but like everyone else, I instinctively look for an explanation.

Red meat should be fresh, never been frozen, well marbled and only cooked very little on the outside in a hot skillet with melted fat of the same kind. Fat is naturally delicious if fresh, but nasty if it gets old before cooking. Garlic and other spices may be used, but just plain meat should tasted wonderful.

The fat on red meat as well as the lean is about the best nutrition you can find. I do not understand how a person could ever 'lose the taste for', or 'forget how to eat', red meat. My wife was a vegetarian for 11 years when I met her, but on smelling my steak at dinner on our first date, she asked for a bite, and loved it.

I cannot comment on green tea, considered by many to be a panacea. I generally like anything with caffeine in it. I don't think coffee is hard on the adrenals, but you do lose tolerance for it as you age. Nowadays I only drink one cup, early in the morning. If I need or want a little boost later I use NoDoz.

Exercise:

It is not optimum (at any age) to perform heavy exercises more than one, or a max of two days a week. At 58 you simply must take enough time to recover from each workout so you can become stronger and more fit. Walking burns calories, but does nothing much for aerobic fitness- ride a bike (stationary or free ride) or run for that.

Best to do it on the same day, and just before your weight training. Do only your normal activities during the days off. I began lifting for the first time on the day after my 55th birthday, and tried all the different routines, eliminating most until I found what works best. I have 16 years of training experience now, and I think I know pretty well how an older body should best be trained. There is no upper limit on age to train, everyone will benefit from performing concentrated exercise. Naturally the younger you start, the easier it will be- and the health benefits may be greater in the long term.

Gradually increase the weight as you gain strength. I.e., if after ten reps, you can do some more, increase the weight a bit until 7 or 8 is all you can finish. The idea is to get stronger, and the body is essentially very conservative, not adding any more muscular strength than is necessary, so you must challenge your body to get the best value for your effort. Do not do any exercise which hurts during its performance, although it is to be expected that you will have a little (not very unpleasant) muscle soreness for the next day or two. Exercise causes some micro-damage, which stimulates the muscle. Remember to stretch once you have warmed up- this is very important. After working out for several months this soreness will become almost unnoticeable.

Oh, and keep your workouts brief- do only three sets of one exercise for each body part. It helps to have a book so you know the proper form for each exercise- like Gold's Gym or Arnold Swartzenegger's bodybuilding books. Bill Pearl's 'Keys to the Kingdom' is definitely over the top, but has every exercise variation anyone ever dreamt up in it. You do not need a lot of variation, stick to what works. Work into it gradually. Start with one set of each exercise for a couple or three weeks, then move up to two sets. After a couple of months go to three. You will need patience, it takes some time to SEE the results, although you will start to feel great very quickly. Remember- exercise will not make you thin, only a proper diet can do that.

Do you read? I have already said don't bother with this nonsense, as I do not have the time to waste on it (I said I wouldn't, so why am I bothering to even respond?). I have no problem whatsoever understanding exactly what you have said, trust me.

If you are interested in diet, fine, but if you are only interested in loudly beating your own drum- which action has only shown yourself as interested in something else, why not find some other thread to lurk about on.

I know from my extensive personal experience what is true and works and what does not- not because of theories. I see no utility in being tentative or equivocal in what I have to say regarding what has proven true and what has not.

Just like the black box, it matters not what or why something works, only that it does. After 47 years, it gets way beyond conjecture. I am positive, because of how I have lived. If you don't like the truth I am describing about diet and the human body, that is your loss, not mine. And judging from what the rest around here have to say, you are in the minority.

You may 'be in everything', but I'm sorry: IMHO, so far you have contributed zilch of value to our discussion.

theBear Wed, Mar-15-06 20:30

I began my journey of 100,000 steps when I was 23 years and 9 mos old. I did not

attack nor question the veracity of my informant, I wrote to him (Stefansson) and told him about my trip at the time. He answered me, and I was stoked.

At first on the path, I questioned whether vegetation might not have some value, it was only after many years trudging along that it became more and more clear that was not the case, and that vegetation had only body-negative effects in the diet.

It seems that at the age of 23 and 6 mos, and after having discovered that she is also genetically obese (in fact, a lot more so than even I -a truly Herculean effort had to have been made to lose THAT much bodyfat!), my contrarian correspondent might stop and have a look around at the bigger picture and consider that she might well be misinformed about the value of vegetables- and perhaps a bit more as well about life and what it is all about. By 1982 I had already lived my lifestyle for 24 years, but had yet to realise how much I needed more strenuous exercise than just running provided.

I don't really think we should be arguing. 115 is a very good size/weight for a 5'5" female.

By my experience, the scale runs something like this:

Given enough fat to lean:

One kg of red meat is nutritionally equal to two kgs of fowl, or three kgs of fish. This is valid so long as the meat is fresh and not cooked- or at least, cooked very little.

This is a quantity assessment. Which kind you eat the most of may be either a matter of taste or cost.

Vegetables of any kind have few or very poor human-utilisable nutrients, so the term 'nutrient to calorie ratio' is a relatively meaningless non-sequitor.

All carbs are identical: they all become glucose once in the body.

Carbs (glucose)= insulin... Insulin = body damage/fat storage... Simple.

I think we can agree that to avoid food poisoning, chicken should be just cooked (still very moist and soft, it is right when the pink just leaves the meat- no further). Most people dramatically overcook it. Other birds do not seem to have the same degree of dangerous bacterial contamination-hazard, and are traditionally eaten rare.

Fish is best raw (sashimi). According to Stefansson the Inuit do not usually boil or cook fish- they rarely dry it either. (Inuit boil red meat but only until rare). Fishing in the frozen North is only a summer thing, and they stack the catch up for eating later. Some of it becomes pretty stinky before the freeze comes, but they eat it anyway- they consider it a delicacy once it becomes 'ripe' (!). Stef said this is their equivalent of Limburger and other 'ripe' cheeses eaten in Western cuisine. Fish which has been canned is very poor food- once in a while, perhaps, but I find canned tuna is like eating salted felt. No vitamins and the proteins denatured.

Red meat which has been overcook is repulsive to your body, it is only done that way

for your mind. I Have noticed that people who are brought up in a family which cremates the steaks and likes long cooked dishes like pot roast- usually eat very little of it. Once onto an all meat diet, most who try find that as they get further into the trip they want the meat cooked less and less - they progress from medium rare to rare to blood rare to 'bleu'. I really like the way it tastes raw- raw good quality liver, too. Cold raw beef suet is not very palatable, however.

Adding salt to food is not good. If you eat nothing but steaks you will never have any deficiencies.

About protein: The dietary 'profession' lists the so called 'essential amino acids'- 23 in number. These are the ones which cause measurable short term problems- no studies have been made over a long term. In your digestive process, protein is not reduced to amino acids. The proteins are rendered soluble and absorbed as protein, it is in the blood that the protein is reduced to aminos, some strings are not reduced and remain as short amino acid strings. Through long evolutionary pressures, we have come to lack many features and systems that are found in herbivores and true omnivores, like a rat's ability to synthesize vitamins in its intestines, and the bacteria which can convert carotene into Vit A. We also need and use in small quantities- mostly in dense cartilage/fibrous tissues like the intervertebral disks- some protein strings which we cannot build up from basic amino acids, and which are available only from meat, These proteins have configurations we lack the genetic coding for production, and many include some 'non-essential' aminos, as well. One very serious side effect of following a vegan or near vegan diet is back problems- the Seventh Day Adventists have hospitals which specialise in vertebral fusing operations and other repairs for this condition.

Leg cramps are most likely due to insufficient or infrequent stretching, not diet.

Spices help lots of foods- but I don't think non-spice vegetables like avocado have any value in the extremely low amounts that spices are effective in. Guacamole is a very carby vegetable dish, a food-stuff, not a spice, the avocado fruit has no 'fat', but unsat. vegetable oils which are not good for you. Olives are a salty, carby, (usually evil tasting) fruit- not a spice. Hot chillies, cloves, black pepper and garlic are examples of spices.

Correct, vegetables are mostly indigestible cellulose-refuse. There are no 'exotic carbs' in vegetables, only sugars, starches and cellulose. NO carb can be 'absorbed as fat', carbs contain chemically bound oxygen, fats do not- they are hydrocarbons. The organic fatty acids contain oxygen only as a part of the attached carboxylic radical, COOH.

All vegetable carbs other than cellulose (they ALL convert to glucose), once set free of the cell by processing or cooking are absorbable by the human gut. The residue of indigestible vegetable protein and any unabsorbed carbs feed a massive bacterial colony in the large intestines (80+% of feces on a mixed or vegetable diet is dead bacteria). The bacteria may excrete toxins which enter your blood stream. The residue from vegetation is a fibrous, rough material which scratches the sensitive lining of your small intestines and causes a callus to form over time as a defensive reaction. Calluses on the lining of the small intestine interfere with the extraction of nutrients. Vegetables of any sort have nothing whatsoever to recommend them, other than as dire emergency survival fare- to temporarily stave off death from acute starvation.

I have to question the assertion that since you cannot find (rather, have ignored) other examples of the outcome of long term zero-carb diet, you conclude my experience is invalid, 'a single-rat experiment'. But no-one has found a way to make

any rat live for dozens of years, nor have they had colonies of such rats to study either, have they?

In any event, I am far from alone, there have been hundreds of thousands of zero-carb diet people, living that lifestyle over uncounted thousands of years, who show by studies of their remains as well as by studies done in life by Stefansson and many others that they are identical to or better than me in health, lack of degradation of the body, and great longevity, barring trauma and damage from severe starvation. These are the Arctic Inuit. To compare my account of real life experiments with the superstitious and imaginary babble of the 'clergy' is disingenuous in the extreme, and makes the speaker look the fool. If you don't 'buy' what I have to say because it challenges a precious, closely held belief system about diet, well hey- just disregard it, your lack of comprehension is no loss to me- or the others.

In a subject which is culturally, not logically imposed, what on earth is the term 'logical case', supposed to mean, anyway? We are not talking about logic, we are talking about physically demonstrable facts.

I don't care a rat's bum about 'scientifically valid' with regard to a subject charged with emotional and economic bias, in a world where scientific workers routinely lie, alter results and fabricate evidence. My evidence is rock-solid- I am living proof. I have no reason to doubt Stefansson's evidence either. So, can we get back the real world?

Coconut and palm oils I feel are the good veggie ones. They are both primarily saturated fat, and coconut is among the medium chain triglycerides well regarded for rapid absorption and quick energy. They are still not as a good a food as butter and beef suet, however. You can render beef suet in the oven at 250F, draining the liquefied fat (tallow) off the crispy bits. It will be very dry as you remove it from the heat, and can be simply poured into a jar, and closed up. It will keep well at room temp. It is the best one for frying steaks.

I am not sure what is meant by 'grilling'- I have heard this term used for cooking under an overhead flame; spitted over charcoal; and fried on a hot metal plate (sometimes called a 'grill'); and also placed on a wire rack over either a flame or hot coals. Frying very briefly in hot fat in a pan or skillet is best, it is very quick, cooks to a nice brown just the surface and therefore you lose only the smallest amount of vitamins and nutritive value. Beef fat (tallow) is very stable and does not turn or degrade when heated. If it gets too hot it will evaporate (smoke), however.

Salt is an addiction. It is culturally induced induced by the need to add some salt for flavour in vegetables. When I gave up salt, the only food that I ate which seemed to need salt was eggs, but after a few years this passed- unsalted butter made the difference- without that added fat eggs are definitely very bland. Take care to only buy and use unsalted butter. Salt in butter is there as a preservative, thus the level is very high. Unsalted butter is a bit more expensive because only very fresh cream can be used to make it, whereas soured cream, neutralised with soda is used to make 'regular' butter that is then preserved with salt. The very best and tastiest butter possible is made at home by shaking pure cream, and separating the resulting delicious near-white butter from the whey.

Taking in more salt than you body needs is very, very bad for you. If your sweat tastes salty, you have too much intake. Both the skin and the kidneys dump salt, but cannot 'change gears' quickly. Both organs are affected by passing salt. The salt content of sweat and urine can go down to a few parts per million, to conserve the saline balance of the bodies tissues. It only takes about one ounce of any meat/day to supply all the sodium your body requires. for normal saline balance. I sometimes sweat so proficiently that I need to drink 3 or four litres of water in less than an hour. I have no effects of low salt, and my sweat is never salty. I used to watch the other kids in ballet class scarfing salt tabs, while I just drank water, my shirt was very wet, but dried out normal but theirs were rimed with a heavy white salt crust, indicating that the massive excess of salt was simply being dumped. If they did not eat the salt tabs when drinking water, they fainted.

If addicted to salt, just like with any other addiction, when you stop using, you will experience 'side effects', such as everything suddenly seeming tasteless and bland. If you persist, salt becomes vile-tasting, and food without salt very tasty (but not (sodium-deficient) veggies-tasteless by nature, but which we are not talking about here).

It takes several days for your body to stop dumping salt through the skin and kidneys and begin conserving it, so when quitting, be aware of your salt balance- you may experience light headed-ness and the other classic signs of low sodium, if necessary take a tiny pinch- but try to stop all salt as quickly as you can tolerate it. Salt was a significant cause of my grandfather's demise at 91 from kidney failure. I consider it a chemical poison. Only vegetarians have a salt-deficiency in their diet.

I am unsure what a 'slow cooker' is. The healthiest meat is raw, next the quicker minimal cooking is accomplished and the least the mass of the meat is exposed to heat, the better. This criterion points to a quick fry in melted fat at high enough heat to brown the outer layer of the meat and only warm the interior is preferred. The term 'slow cooker' sounds like something designed to process basically indigestible vegetables.

I have not had a cold or flu in about 6 or 7 years, and I never eat veggies- in fact I would suspect the load placed on your system trying to deal with them might actually work to weaken your immune system. If you are feeling a bit down, 5 gm of mineral ascorbates and a bit of echinacea each day should help boost things. Get a flu shot every year- it stimulates your viral-resistance against more than just influenza.

On a meat diet, generally you will poo once a day or less. There simply are no great masses of dead bacteria to void. The mass of waste the body produces is small and generally soft. Cheese is binding, coffee the opposite.

What is 'non-organic' meat? Last time I checked all animals were organic creatures. Once the food is taken in, the animal is the same no matter what type of feed it gets. The meat animal is a fantastic filter. The only thing that is better is grass rather than grain and feed without pesticide residues, which can concentrate in the tissues. People who eat vegetation are at more risk with non-organic VEGGIES, since all edible veggies require being treated with various pesticides to reach a mature state for harvest- the organic ones are usually grown under protective cover to reduce this need.

Animal feed-plants are much less subject to pest predation than the specially bred human-edibles which have the natural protective toxins removed through selective breeding over hundreds, and in some cases, thousands of years.

I could only find a recipe for preparing turtle in Joy of Cooking, I guess between 1931 when the book was written, and today, turtles have become a non-PC food item. I am not referring to sea turtle, only the fresh water kinds.

theBear Fri, Mar-17-06 19:47

'To lose body fat, eat more steak and eggs':

This linked story, while stating some truth, also contains flawed information: It suggests the wrong mechanism for efficacy, i.e., 'spares carbohydrates to later...' which is simply nonsense- carbs are only converted into fat, and cannot provide energy for doing any work with the muscles.

Your desire for various items in your diet has nothing to do with your organs of taste or smell (ever smell a durian fruit? Limburger cheese?). It is learned behaviour, which in some cases overrides a natural impulse of rejection- turnips and radishes are vegetables many like myself find totally repulsive. Hot chillies?

Our taste buds are important early warning detectors of the nature of things taken into the mouth. The bitter taste sense, for instance does not mean that we were destined by nature to like or need Swedish Bitters, it is there to warn you of alkaloids in plants, common defensive chemicals which can be very fatal. Likewise, sweet, salt and sour are not indicators of what you should be taught to like as food, they are there so you can measure and test- some food may have gone bad, if it is sour- milk for instance. Taste buds are simply chemical detectors which every animal has, and are generic in response- not indicators to any specific food liking, that is learned behaviour- cued by taste (and smell). Most of what we view as the taste of something is mostly the smell.

Salt is a simple chemical, sodium chloride, a mineral substance mined from where it has been deposited from weathered rocks or pools of seawater. It can be found contaminated with a wide variety of additional compounds, depending on the source it is derived from. Some kinds may also be toxic- as well as unhealthful, as is pure salt in all its forms. Human commerce in salt began with the use of vegetation as a major item of human food. Only herbivorous animals will seek out and consume salt- because sodium is lacking in all terrestrial plant tissues. Carnivores do not need any salt. Your taste for salt on meat is learned behaviour only.

The taste buds are important as an adjunct to texture as a part of the mouth-feel of food.

As a young child I did not like cake frosting, which is a pure fine sugar and flour mix- very sweet. I thought it tasted 'hot', and refused to eat it. I would only accept a thin lemon glaze on an angel food cake, one of the less-sweet kind of cakes as my birthday cake. I was lucky I guess, but trust me my 'sense' of sweetness was the same as yours. I disliked candy also until my teens.

Even heavily flavoured (but sugar-free) ice cream (smelled wonderful) was detected by my mouth as 'cold library paste' during the period I lost the function of my taste buds due to radiotherapy. Fortunately that passed!

Indeed there is only one biological carb- glucose, everything gets broken down to that. No vegetable is 'good for digestion', all are difficult for the human gut to process, whether pre-rotted by bacteria or not. Even the holiest of all fermented foods, yoghurt, is not good. The fermentative bacteria (contrary to the hype) used

to 'spoil' the milk for yoghurt are not native to our gut, and the lactose is converted into other sugars like galactose which are worse for you in the end they cause some difficulties. Soy is bad, period, although the fermented salt-source is less toxic than other forms even tofu, it is best seriously avoided- the protein content is not the kind your body can use. Protein content in foods is experimentally determined by combusting a sample in a 'bomb' at high temperature. The nitrogen quantity that in the resulting gas is taken as a measure of protein, without regard to what kind, or whether it has human bioavailability.

All 'Health gurus', so far as I can determine are various types of vegetarians, and therefore know absolutely nothing about good health in the human body.

What about George Burns? He smoked and drank his entire life, yet lived to reach 100? I doubt his diet was exemplary, either.

I studied Russian language at same time I studied ballet- my turn-on to ballet was seeing the men dance in the Bolshoi Ballet in 1958. I was not able to talk to the dancers backstage, so I decided to learn Russian as well as dance.

One of the many old Russians I met in the little LA Russian expat community where I lived (in a rented room in the house of Micheal Chechov's widow), once told me the secret of the great ages tribes people in the remote Caucasian region often lived to- alleged to be as long as 158 years in one or two cases. He said that they lived simply and did not overeat. He also said they never ate but one specific thing at any given meal. I mean only ONE thing. Bread alone might be one meal. Cabbage plain would fully constitute one meal. A cut of meat made one complete meal. It was his contention that the human stomach was only capable of digesting a single thing, alone, at a time, and mixing even two things was a bad idea for your health. I could not agree this, it seemed so simple really, and I knew he had lived amongst those people when he was a cossack (soldier)...

Long ago, a situation of surviving a lack of prey animals, may have been how we first came to eat any vegetable. To imagine a variety being available or even try-able at the same time seems unlikely- so just one thing would most likely be collected and be eaten at a time. No one knows.

I did not think to enquire how the Caucasian's teeth responded to their dietary habits, it was not in the top of my mind back then.

Ketone metabolism is not a 'rapid response mechanism'. Full keto-adaptation takes several weeks, and until that has been done, a slowly reducing level of ketones will spill into the urine. Once adapted, the ketones are barely present in the urine, having been used by the body (in place of glucose). (Resist the Monkey's meddlesome nature and accept that you need to learn new things all your life.)

It is rather childlike to concentrate on how often or when one poos. Perhaps it is due to your mum being anal-oriented during your early years, as a result you have too much of your attention focused on body functions which should follow their own natural schedule. My wife can set her clock by her toilet visit each morning, whereas I may go at any time, day or night, everyday or not, makes no sense, but just is the way it is, people differ in small details.

The carnivorous diet has no left-over rubbish and masses of dead bacteria to void

and even if you wind up only going every other day or even less, it is of no consequence. Eating veggies like lettuce while attempting a meat diet will REALLY upset your gut.

I did not appear in that rather awful 1975 Dead movie, and I have dark brown hair (or rather I had then, it is pretty much grey now). I thought the performances were mediocre, the lighting atrocious. The best part IMHO was the animated intro and the various interviews with the band and audience. My period as soundman was the very beginning, from 1966 to '70 and '72 until I built the Wall of Sound system in late 73, which had no 'soundman', per se. The band lasted a long time, but the very best, most fun times, their 'golden age', was '66 to '70.

Strict meat eaters are never constipated, full stop.

Cheese eaters may well be bound up and constipated.

Heavy coffee drinkers may have very loose bowels.

Neither of these is due to meat.

Dietary carbs feed and support vast colonies of intestinal bacteria. It is the dead bacteria which compose over 80% of the bowels content which require frequent evacuation, sometimes as often as every two or three hours- all day and night.

Normal body function is highly variable from one individual to another, and especially so when changing dietary content. A week even is not pathological, so long as it is soft, and not hard.

I mentioned the psychological issue only because I read the same complaints on more than a few posts, therefore I do not feel the comment misplaced, even if it is not understood.

"...But due to my fear of not having..." If this is not an expression of a psychological state, then what is? I was not being arrogant nor 'insulting', only offering a possible explanation. At least in my life, I have only seen an obsession with those functions in children, not adults.

I am only attempting to place some information in context when I respond to questions and statements made. I have 'been there and done that', if that supposedly gives me some kind of weird 'superiority', i.e., defines a 'holier than thou attitude' I am very surprised, since I am very egalitarian and have absolutely no pretensions of this sort.

Anyone can eat as I do, but none do, the question I raised and still seek the answer to, is why not? By leaving in a huff rather than considering a suggestion, we get no further along the path. Since I have not seen anyone else post who has any real longevity in low to zero carb diet, I must assume many of the questions are at least addressed to me. Is this arrogance?

If expressing knowledge is arrogance, heaven help those who want to learn.

I have actually been able to codify a lot of my knowledge in the short period of Q & A on this thread, and yet I still have not been able to figure out how I have done

something that virtually no one else has. Understanding and being able to explain this oddity is my goal. Along with offering encouragement to others against the very heavy weight of popular opinion.

I am sorry whenever my comments cause offense, it was in not intended that way.

Sorry to be so late, we just had a powerful category 5 tropical cyclone (hurricane/typhoon) come ashore directly west of our place, and it was still cat 3 as it passed us by. Nearly 10" of rain so far and we had very strong wind. We have serious problems with downed trees, and some storm-induced problems with our electrical supply and other bits and pieces of work we must do to get it all back up and running. I will try to get back to you all more quickly tomorrow, and I may even get a window of opportunity later on today, but it is remote.

You will not show ketones in your urine if there are carbs in your diet, the ketones are reprocessed- into bodyfat.

I would really appreciate it if people who repeatedly ask questions or make statements relating to things I have said would please read all my posts- I have already covered this subject in detail.

Once more: Your body ONLY burns FAT for muscular work, and it burns fat all the time, 24/7. Ketones do not appear in the urine until all carbs are stopped and then the ketones will disappear again in a few weeks as your body begins using them as glucose-replacement rather than converting them, as it does all carbohydrates, into bodyfat (from which they came). BOTH a keto-adapted and carb-eating person will show no ketones in the urine. SOME people have a problem with fat metabolism while insulin is present, and glucose being converted into bodyfat, but not everyone, which is why some (a few) people do not become fat or obese no matter what they eat. Those who have a problem find any effort very hard and may fall asleep until the fat storing process is over. Ketones are a valuable nutrient, and like glucose, only appear in the urine briefly during a dietary change. If they persist, then it indicates a disease-condition.

OK? Am I making my self clear?

Dean.. You can eat the same cut of meat indefinitely, no problem. Variety is for your mind, not your body. meat i a complete food, but be aware that red meat logically has to be the best, since it is from a mammal and thus very, very close in composition to your own body's tissues. I would guess that the way a cat becomes fixated on one food is indication that this is ok, and the cat thus avoids wasting energy pursuing other prey when one is abundant. Cats don' t eat all the prey animal, that is a myth, as anyone whose cat has access to hunt wildlife will confirm. Write me via the address on my website, and I will give you my son Starfinder's e/mail and website, he is a vet and is into our diet. He even has designed proper food for dogs and cats, which he tells about on his website.

I eat plenty of cheese, why avoid it, especially with 'visions'? (Only cheese).

Hunger indicates insufficient fat. Anything called a 'fast' is probably not enough food. Eat all kinds of meat, butter cheese, etc. Make sure you eat fat -slowly- until you can't eat any more, then finish with lean...at each meal. Fat satisfies, and it is filling. Lack of enough fat in a low to zero carb diet is not good. There is no such thing as 'low carb bread' or low carb spaghetti, that is like low carb

sugar or low carb cornstarch? What is a name? Bread is made from starch. Spaghetti is a form of pasta made from starch. I guess that with some inorganic filler you might replace 20% of the carbs, and in comparison with 100% could by a huge stretch be called 'low'. Read the label and let me know how many gms carb in 100.

It is unlikely for most people to lose 2-1/2 pounds of just bodyfat in three days- it represents about 10,000 calories- base metabolism is usually around ~1800, so in three days without doing anything, you burn ~5400. If you run every day, you will burn 600 cal/mile, so in order to lose that fat, you have to run 2-1/2 miles each day. I think you had been taking in salt and carbs and the loss was mostly water.

BetyLouWho Sorry, are you another person who has jumped into the thread which has over 760 posts, without first reading it?

Humans are not omnivores and you 'like' fruit because your mother gave it to you as a baby, plus it is sweet like human milk, the first thing you tasted at birth- what we eat is cultural.

Please- do a search and at least read all my posts before stepping in the bucket again. Oh, and have you ever asked yourself why your progress after all those months 'on LC' is..... zero? The answer is in this thread.

Apes are not humans by a long period of divergent evolution. SOME great apes like to eat monkey meat better than fruit, and if it did not take so much effort and skill to kill the clever little buggers, they might eat ONLY monkey.

Losing a genuine two pounds in the first 3 weeks is a fantastic result. You need not limit your calories so much- if you are obese, you will lose at near the same rate, and some people lose faster by eating whatever amount it takes to satisfy. NO CARBS, however. It will take another 3 weeks to get you keto-adaptation up, then the loss may increase. Once you reach the proper bodyfat % for your height and sex, then to lose more you must restrict caloric content, but not until then. If '63' means 5'3", then a proper female weight for that, with about 23-25% BF should be around 95-105 pounds. At that height 145 is very chubby, 195 obese.

Perhaps you are ingesting carbs unknowingly.

Cat 5 is as strong as they come. We live in a sheltered mountain valley, and the storm was down to cat 3 when it passed by, but our road in and out is blocked with trees, and our phones are dead.

The body's pH is highly buffered, and you are very unlikely to alter it in the manner you are asking about. If you ingest a lot of organic acids, you may shift towards basic, but only very slightly and not for long. Meat, eggs and cheese can not make your body's pH shift. It is a 'vegetarian myth'. There are many of these nasty little hooks floating around pretending to be fact. Meat contains considerable combined calcium- a necessity for proper muscle metabolism- in the most highly bioavailable form- better even than hydroxyapatite (bone mineral).

I have a pretty low opinion of the so called 'paleo diet' mob. (I found it rather humorous that my thread wound up shoehorned into this category.) The form of diet the 'paleo/neanders' adhere to is a modern hunter-gatherer diet. No one knows exactly what old stone age people ate, other than there seems to have been no significant amount of vegetation of any kind- not even fruit- in their diet. We are

not stone-agers of 40,000 years ago, and we need to find our food amongst what is available in the modern world, by choosing proven and effective foods, not by trying to 'reproduce' some fanciful, imaginary pre-historic diet. I can only speak of what I have 'proven' over a period of 47 years, and I will yield ground only to someone who comes forth with that kind of long term, personal ,practical hands-on experience in diet.

Buy a skillet and a hotplate. Buy a plate, knife and fork. Cooking meat is easy. Buy fresh meat at the market. Buy meat with plenty of fat (\$\$\$), or if you can, buy trimmed lean meat (\$\$) and ask the butcher for some suet fat (free or \$) to 'use in cooking' or to 'feed the birds'. The latter technique, buying cuts on special, can make your budget go way further than it does eating the way you currently do. Trust me on this, I did just this for man many years while going to school and while studying ballet.

Freeze the fat if can, or get it whenever you buy meat. A small electric cooler, like a Kompressor Waeco -if you have no fridge access- is a good investment.

'Roast' anything, bought pre-cooked in a restaurant or school food service- is relatively expensive compared to doing your own cooking and is basically not good for your health OR bodyfat. And, hey- take it from me- chicks love guys who can cook (and clean up afterwards).

theBear Mon, Mar-20-06 20:58

My dear rosebud:

I am absolutely sure that you genuinely believe you are 'correcting' my 'incorrect statements'.

However: Did it ever occur to you that it might be YOU who are incorrect? Relying on published studies and data which are, in my opinion- mostly rubbish? If an explanation of a real physical condition does not fit close, long-term observations, it is not acceptable to me.

Please, just leave it be. I don't need or want to have you as my 'truth cop'- you lack sufficient direct experience to make your assertions valid in my universe view.

Your being a medical professional, a nurse- is even more reason for me to find your opinionating... suspect.

In short- your responses in contradiction of my expressed knowledge fail to convince me because in general, you quote established medical dogma rather than speaking either from your own experience, or about scientific research which YOU YOURSELF have performed.

Medicine is an art... not a science. It is filled with dogma and ritual. It resists mightily any change or contradiction.

theBear Mon, Mar-20-06 17:49

No matter how you think ketones (a type of carbohydrate) are dealt with, you do not BURN sugar. You ALWAYS burn fat. You can only STORE sugar as fat. If you consume NO

carbs you will spill NO ketones in the urine- that is, once you have adapted to the lack of carbs. I have played with keto-sticks for a very long time, please, give me a break. So far as your own profiles indicate, not one of you have been eating a close facsimile of the zero carb style for even a couple of years steady and I doubt anyone in this thread has EVER gone low enough and long enough to become keto-adapted. You can read 'scientific' papers until the cows come home, but most if not all on metabolism are badly flawed and practice shows that to be so.

I started this thread not to argue with people over their tenaciously held mythic beliefs about food, which they use to deny the true nature of human nutrition so they can just manage to go along with a partial reform. I did it to provide access to my experience, which shows very clearly what happens to a person if they can persevere and follow this path for a very long time. What you like is cultural, and has no basis in fact or science. It is what you were taught to eat and in my long term experience people will hang like grim death rather than completely drop the carb based foods which are literally killing many of them. SO let's not waste valuable time denigrating the things I say, they work and are excellent 'black box' solutions, whether the details of what goes on inside the 'black box' are correctly known or described is of no consequence in the real world.

 Yes, thank you no-one here was hurt.

If there are ketones spilling in the urine on a steady-composition (unchanging) diet, then there is some sort of problem with the person's metabolism. A very slight purple color on the test stick is not significant.

 Losing a genuine two pounds in the first 3 weeks is a fantastic result. You need not limit your calories so much- if you are obese, you will lose at near the same rate, and some people lose faster by eating whatever amount it takes to satisfy. NO CARBS, however. It will take another 3 weeks to get you keto-adaptation up, then the loss may increase. Once you reach the proper bodyfat % for your height and sex, then to lose more you must restrict caloric content, but not until then. If '63' means 5'3", then a proper female weight for that, with about 23-25% BF should be around 95-105 pounds. At that height 145 is very chubby, 195 obese.

Perhaps you are ingesting carbs unknowingly.

Cat 5 is as strong as they come. We live in a sheltered mountain valley, and the storm was down to cat 3 when it passed by, but our road in and out is blocked with trees, and our phones are dead.

The body's pH is highly buffered, and you are very unlikely to alter it in the manner you are asking about. If you ingest a lot of organic acids, you may shift towards basic, but only very slightly and not for long. Meat, eggs and cheese can not make your body's pH shift. It is a 'vegetarian myth'. There are many of these nasty little hooks floating around pretending to be fact. Meat contains considerable combined calcium- a necessity for proper muscle metabolism- in the most highly bioavailable form- better even than hydroxyapatite (bone mineral).

I have a pretty low opinion of the so called 'paleo diet' mob. (I found it rather humorous that my thread wound up shoehorned into this category.) The form of diet the 'paleo/neanders' adhere to is a modern hunter-gatherer diet. No one knows

exactly what old stone age people ate, other than there seems to have been no significant amount of vegetation of any kind- not even fruit- in their diet. We are not stone-agers of 40,000 years ago, and we need to find our food amongst what is available in the modern world, by choosing proven and effective foods, not by trying to 'reproduce' some fanciful, imaginary pre-historic diet. I can only speak of what I have 'proven' over a period of 47 years, and I will yield ground only to someone who comes forth with that kind of long term, personal ,practical hands-on experience in diet.

Buy a skillet and a hotplate. Buy a plate, knife and fork. Cooking meat is easy. Buy fresh meat at the market. Buy meat with plenty of fat (\$\$\$), or if you can, buy trimmed lean meat (\$\$) and ask the butcher for some suet fat (free or \$) to 'use in cooking' or to 'feed the birds'. The latter technique, buying cuts on special, can make your budget go way further than it does eating the way you currently do. Trust me on this, I did just this for man many years while going to school and while studying ballet.

Freeze the fat if can, or get it whenever you buy meat. A small electric cooler, like a Kompressor Waeco -if you have no fridge access- is a good investment.

'Roast' anything, bought pre-cooked in a restaurant or school food service- is relatively expensive compared to doing your own cooking and is basically not good for your health OR bodyfat. And, hey- take it from me- chicks love guys who can cook (and clean up afterwards).

Actually, at the time he trained at Gironda's gym, his steroid use was very mild, just oral Dianabol, a relatively weak anabolic. 'Monster-maker' drugs came later- and he then turned into a huge, truly freaky mass of muscle. In any event, a proper diet is even more important if anabolics are to be used while training. Most steroid-taking pros have a truly bad idea of what a proper diet for muscle mass development is if you can believe the bodybuilding magazines. I do not know how they do it. A superhuman tolerance to massive amounts of weird drugs, I reckon.

If you can find a first edition (white cover) of Arnold's bodybuilding book, he talks quite frankly about steroids, but edited it out for the second edition (black cover).

After being Reagan's fitness advisor, he figured it was not PC to have just the original book floating around and edited a new sanitised edition to release just before his run for governor of CA. As for PC, if you can find a copy of the classic movie Pumping Iron, check out what they pass around after the competition... So much for hypocrisy in politics... Did Bill C REALLY not inhale?

theBear Mon, Mar-20-06 23:54

Of course. Gironda believed in the then current myth of glycogen-depletion, it is still current amongst the supplement-maker-owned bodybuilding magazines, which make the most money off of selling carby protein drinks.

Careful research has shown that glycogen is not depleted during exercise.

I was searching for my collection of studies, including the one on glycogen depletion. I have to deal with cyclone damage right now, so it may be awhile before I can resume the search. I should not even be dealing with the thread, but feel I

must.

50 gms? I have no idea what people who say they are on a low carb diet are really eating- unless they tell me they are not losing and ask me why, then I ask them to tell me exactly... in fine detail... each and every bit, water included, which passes their lips. Some people do not get fat no matter what they eat, some may lose BF on 100 gm/day- Atkins gave that as one of his 'levels' in the second edition. Some few may be able to tolerate 50 gm or even 20 gm. BUT most who are obese, I mean not just a few kg overweight, need to go down to 5 gm (or less if possible). Ill health? I never followed anyone who was on any LC diet for long enough to evaluate whether it was bad or good for their health- that might take 10 years or more.

Quite frankly I have never known anyone other than a very few who could follow the LC regime even for a full year without returning to their old dietary habits. Those who make it past a year generally have been in the <5 gm regime. Remember, I have been telling people about this way of life for very long time, and have had contact over that period with a great many who have attempted it.

Calculus? Only really noticeable if I am drinking mineralised water, and even that was back before I lost function in my salivary glands. I usually drink/drank only rainwater. Calculus is basically the calcium salts present in saliva depositing on the teeth, it generally requires scraping with a tool to remove- brushing does little even with a hard toothbrush. It is not damaging unless you ingest carbs, which hang in it and feed caries-bacteria, which also get into it. Carnivores can ignore the deposits if they don't mind have cruddy-looking teeth- and perhaps worse breath due to meat-putrifying bacteria which will cause odour, but do not damage the enamel.

In my experience, no one of any age has had problems keto-adapting by going directly to a zero-carb regime. Books are written by people who are still in the cultural/social grip of the belief we must have carbs for health, energy, etc. This is false, and their recommendations are likewise... inappropriate.

Hey, ANYTHING which could increase growth hormone would be a godsend to older people, much of what is 'aging' and slow healing is due to the steady decline in HGH with age. The regrettable fact is there is NO SUCH THING, no matter what the author of a book and/or supplement manufacturers claim. You have to inject daily doses of synthetic hormone to raise your levels by any amount. 1/4 litre of beer? Get serious!

loops- If you eat at least a POUND of red meat a day, trust me, you will get all the Ca you need or can use. The body is very conservative with minerals as well as proteins. If you ate only meat from childhood you would have super-dense bones as did ALL the stone age Inuit. Recommendations for Ca in supplements use data based on chemicals, not bioactive Ca compounds. If you still feel some sort of Ca based fear, then take hydroxyapatite (or chew on bones)- it is better than mineral Ca, but is only a fraction as effective as the bioactive Ca in muscle tissues. The Ca in vegetables is practically worthless, it is as bad or worse than the mineral kind.

However, keep in mind that excess Ca intake is definitely not good for your health. I do not fully understand why so many people on the thread seem to be so paranoid of everything and anything, seeking the most obscure reasons why NOT to become comfortable on this regime. I have eaten this way for nearly a half century. I do not take, nor have I ever, Ca supplements, and my bone density is through the roof- my dentist is completely gobsmacked by my dental x-rays. You do not 'drop' certain vegetable due to toxins, but because they are not (and I mean ALL vegetables/fruits) an optimum food for humans- as is indicated by the title of this thread. That

vegetables can be taken as food, and it will not immediately kill you is not in contention. This is about the great benefits to be gained with a meat-only diet, which has no deficiencies of any kind- other than what might be termed 'entertainment value'. IMHO your 'glitch' is strictly mental and definitely NOT 'genetic'.

Alcohol is a social drug. It is a simple, easy to make and cheap, it is a body and brain damaging toxin- the metabolic waste of the fermenting organism. It is actually a carbohydrate, assigned a value of 7 cal.gm, nearly twice that of glucose, and is fattening. Furthermore, detoxifying it seriously interferes with the liver's normal processes. I gave it away after noting its effect on my weight training, which lasted for three days after drinking a single glass. I never drank much, maybe a single 4-6 oz glass with dinner, twice or three times a week. On testing- by reducing the amount taken to <2 oz, I still found the effect, so I no longer drink any alcohol. I have been informed that it is not PC on this forum to discuss anything 'illegal' so I will just leave it at this.

BMI does not take into consideration that a person's weight is made up of both muscle mass as well as BF. I know many women of 5'2" to 5'3" who look and feel great at that weight range. My wife is 5'6" and when we met she was far from 'skinny'- at 115 lbs. I am 5'6-1/4, and was for a while was 167 lbs at 11% BF, but BMI said I was obese. I wish that the certain few readers would try to only engage in constructive comments rather than- as some individuals seem only to be able- constantly harping over microscopic detail- and trying to show me either as a liar, or badly misinformed. I am not.

A meat diet is far from 'boring (why do you look to your food as entertainment?), Each and every meal of meat , even the came cut from the same animal is as delicious as thr first time- trust me on this, variety is a result of learning to tolerate bad tasting or tasteless vegetables which require rotation and tons of spices.

IF you eat a pound of meat (which includes the fat) it is enough. If you eat just meat alone you will probably eat 2 or 3 lbs.day. Please, people- don't keep constantly looking for excuses not to follow this regime, meat is a complete food, and you can eat as much as you can and it is OK in all respects- no deficiencies occur on a straight meat diet so m=long as the meat is not cooked too much.

Curious, dean- how old were those longer threads?

Would someone please explain to me why I am feeling forced to have to say this? Shouldn't it be obvious?

What Stef really said, was the the Inuit had older looking FACES for their ages- but had the bodies of youths much younger. The Inuit's face is always exposed to the weather and get massive amounts of sunlight directly and reflectively from ice and snow. Good for vit D- but hard on the appearance.

There is literally no such thing as 'acid-alkaline unbalance' in the body- it is nonsense. Your body is so well buffered that the small change in pH due to dissolved CO2 (carbonic acid) is sufficient to induce rapid and intense changed in the breathing rate.

A diet consisting entirely of straight muscle tissues with fat is complete, that

word means it contains literally every nutrient and is sufficient or in excess of the necessary levels for perfect health. I defy you to find ANY example of someone with this longevity and contrary results. If you do not or cannot understand the preceding, then there is little hope for you - on this thread.

Why butt in on a thread with over 800 posts and with reading any of it, try to put forward such egregious nonsense which does none of us, including you any good? Ego? Find some other group to grandstand with, please.

I suggest that before making any more comments on what Stefansson said or wrote, and inaccurate statements about the Inuit, you should actually READ Stefansson's various books and articles. Inuit NEVER eat 'Fermented stomach contents, and their environment is basically tropical and very warm due to their 'perfect' clothes and lodgings. I do not understand why anyone would go to so much trouble to write such long diatribes filled with misinformation, misquotes, myths and downright lies.

Experience in this dietary path:

Also I HAVE EATEN A PURE DIET OF MUSCLE MEAT FOR 47, THAT IS: -FORTY SEVEN- YEARS. I eat nothing vegetal, no greens no fruit no nothing, I am comfortable, very fit and I have a body nearly identical to what I started with at age 23, only stronger and more muscular. I am 71. I have all my teeth.

You cannot simply make stupid, irrelevant contentions on health with ZERO experience on which to draw. You cannot get me to accept any 'research' found on the net or elsewhere as valid where it contradicts experience, and mate, I have LOTS of real life experience. In case you are not aware, the majority of 'research' done and published in recent times is suspect and much of it has been shown to be bogus, containing falsified data, massive editing and restrictive and false fundamental assumptions which form the basis of the studies. Why? MONEY and FAME. You can easily devise a 'study' which would 'prove' that pigs can fly.

If anyone truly believes that we are omnivores, which has no basis in our evolution or body structures, then why are you here?

Note, please- the title of this thread. If a person has any common courtesy, they would first READ the thread, in which all this nonsense has been thoroughly examined, before spouting off.

Bone loss with age is primarily hormonally driven, also related to reduced fresh meat (bio-calcium) in the diet- plus lack of sunlight (or Vit D).

We humans have an remarkable ability to survive almost anything. As a species, we are indeed a truly special animal.

We are today attempting to become a kind of 'opportunistic' feeder, I guess similar to the dog, rat and pig, however unlike those animals, we are simply not as well equipped for the mixed diet. Our limited ability to tolerate and live on a mixed diet, especially when meat-deficient, brings massive health problems to the modern human.

Resorting to short periods of minimal quantities of vegetable foods, eaten in order to survive periods of poor prey availability, beginning in the later part of our paleolithic period certainly was of great benefit for human survival and migration. However that is NOT the optimal or best diet. Unless faced with starvation, we are

all better off avoiding eating mixed.

Stefansson spent many paragraphs, in several of his works describing the extraordinarily thick and strong bones all Inuit people had, especially their skulls, one of the thinnest and lightest for its strength of the human bony structures. How can anyone give a moment's credence to anything said by a 'researcher' who claimed otherwise?

By the way, I have only suffered one fracture in my life, I fell 15 feet onto hard dirt, landing on my hands and bum- from a scaffold while moving a PA system, in 1974, at the age of 39. I broke my left ulna at the wrist joint. It healed very rapidly, I took the cast off in two weeks, the brace off in a month. I cannot even tell it was ever broken.

Last August while tensioning an aerial electric distribution cable on the edge of a roof 12 feet up, the anchor failed and I was jerked off the edge and went straight down, landing on my feet. No damage other than a slightly sprained muscle in my lower back, and one displaced vertebra necessitating a trip to the chiropractor. I have extremely heavy, dense bones at 71- like an Inuit. Could any of you reading this NOT have expected to have broken something?

Vision: I have excellent vision. For whatever reason, other than the astigmatism we all get after reaching the 40's (which has not changed in 30 years), I have noticed I retain a remarkable range of accommodation. I was always short sighted, but now not only can I read without any glasses, at a comfortable distance to hold reading material, but my acuity at a distance has slowly improved to a noticeable degree. I do not need glasses to pass a driving test nor to enjoy a theatre presented movie. The lenses in my glasses are undercompensated, but I rarely use them, as they make near things hard to see. I have no idea whether this is diet, but I do think there is a high probability as I seem to show very few signs of aging everywhere else. My lenses are very clear. My dad had to have cataracts removed in his late 50's, so I doubt it is genetics. He also broke his ankle stepping off a curb at around the same age.

Oprah herself is something of a 'ratbag' and supports lots of bogus and ridiculous ideas, like angels etc. The 'doctor' Is a fraud, and his statement is a ridiculously laughable but sadly persistent vegetarian's fable.

Meat NEVER 'rots' or decays from bacterial action anywhere in your body other than in between your teeth (bad breath, but no decay, if you don't brush and floss)- and that is only because the mouth is a friendly place for all sorts of bacteria to live. Your stomach is sterile, and is so acidic that very few bacteria can survive for more than a few seconds. The notable exception is hylobacter pylorii, the cause of gastric and duodenal ulcers. This discovery was ignored for some time due to the strong belief that the extreme conditions in the stomach 'precluded' any bacteria's survival.

Meat is quickly and completely dissolved in your stomach by HCL, it is then treated with pancreatic enzymes in the intestines and is absorbed COMPLETELY in the first part of the small intestine (in less than 60 cm/2 ft.). The feces of a carnivore is composed almost entirely of the body's waste- and only a very small amount of certain colon-dwelling bacteria (which are protected in the appendix). These bacteria do not thrive unless there is vegetable refuse reaching the colon to feed on, and the removal of one's appendix always leads to some digestive difficulties whenever the diet changes or antibiotics are taken. The appendix is part of our

'emergency' structures to allow us carnivores to tolerate short intervals of surviving on vegetation. It corresponds to the cecum in herbivores, but in a highly attenuated form. Obligate carnivores usually lack an appendix or any other structure to shelter intestinal bacteria.

My remarks on my second child's (I have four- all by different women) mother was referring to a former wife- in 1960, not my present one (of 11 years), with whom I have no children. The woman concerned, was on a near total meat diet during her entire pregnancy and only got pulled into carbs while breast feeding after the birth.

Everyone who read everything I have posted to date, should understand that a fully keto-adapted person is NEVER in ketosis, which is either a disease condition or something that happens briefly for a short time after eliminated carbs- the period referred to as 'keto-adaptation'. NO carbs is THE safest level during pregnancy (and all of life).

People who 'gorge' on fat are eating the single most important nutrient for energy, work and health. This was aided by 'having rarely (usually never) seen a vegetable'- as is resoundingly proven by their noted bad health today on a mixed diet including vegetable sourced foods.

Organ meats cooked or raw are unnecessary, although there is the case for OCCASIONAL intake of liver, raw or slightly cooked. Totally raw muscle tissue is likewise unnecessary so long as MOST of the mass is 'rare' (i.e., raw)- for excellent nutrition. Grass fed or grain fed beef, nutritionally there is no difference, only one of quality and flavour. Just like freezing lowers not nutrition, but quality and flavour.

Fat from your diet, circulating in a body which is carrying excess body-fat stimulates body-fat release, supplementing and thus prolonging the time taken to consume the dietary fat. It also raises the metabolism. Salt interferes with this function, which is the reason not to add any salt to your food. Mother's milk is heavy in sugar for a very good reason: Humans have no effective body hair or fur and therefore no built in protection for loss of body heat through the skin. An adult has a much smaller mass-to-surface area, therefore loses less heat. A tiny baby is very vulnerable to chilling. Add to this the large body and head of a newborn, you see that a fatty baby is going to have a lot of difficulty negotiating the mother's narrow pelvic opening during birth. The lean baby after birth needs to gain a significant fat cover as quickly as possible to survive. Recognition of this basic human necessity is the basis for nearly all cultures adoring fat babies, and classing them as 'healthy', while exhibiting great concern for skinny ones and regarding them as 'sickly' or dangerously undernourished. Nature also provides a first set of disposable teeth ('milk teeth'), not only because of the small size of the baby's mouth, but also so that the permanent teeth are not damaged by the milk diet of infancy. We are the exquisite end result of a very long period of evolution.

Therefore:

Fat baby = Safe and sound.

Skinny baby = Cause for concern.

Fat child: = Sometimes good, sometimes of concern depending on the society.

Fat adult = Not considered a good thing in most cultures.

Good on all of the readers who understand my motive for sharing my life experiences, and the reasons and proofs I found along the way.

No difference- the fatty-acid content of beef suet is not dependent on diet, since the osmotic exchange of fatty acids into and out of adipose tissue is very small.

Omega-3 is animal in origin thus not a component of an ox's diet, vegetables have omega-6, which has never been high on anyone's list for enhancing health. Omega -3 is produced in an animal's body, it is one of the unsats an animal needs- your own body can and will make it also. Today's paper had an article citing a study in the UK which unexpectedly showed NO significant relationship between omega-3 and heart disease. We know suet has plenty, so what's up?

Chemical salt should always be avoided, it interferes with fat metabolism when the body carries an excess (salty sweat and urine). Most cheese has some salt, some have very little- read the label. If you are getting too much, your sweat will taste salty. It takes about a week for the body to stop spilling salt in the urine and sweat. Lightheadedness may indicate insufficient fat intake.

Stef gave a rule of thumb for red meat- the fat should equal 1/6th the volume of the lean to equal 80%. Nicely marbled steaks and 'regular' hamburger mince have about 30% (of cal) fat in the lean- not counting the cover fat.

...A careful read of the article on

<http://www.nutritionandmetabolism.com/content/1/1/2>

reveals that contrary to the assertion, 'glycogen depletion' was not taken as a measure, only oxygen consumption. Glycogen STORAGE was reduced during the first TWO WEEKS and thereafter remained stable- not surprising since much of the reason for holding glycogen in the muscle tissue is the need to quickly remove glucose from circulation- it is much faster to convert glucose into glycogen than for the adipose tissues to convert it to bodyfat. Glycogen is not used up or 'depleted' during exercise, it functions only as quick, emergency source of blood glucose- and that is all. After withdrawal of carbs from the diet, the massive glycogen storage in the liver is also vastly reduced, thus facilitating blood flow through the hepatic vein from the lower body and preventing the 'stitch in the side' so commonly experienced during carb-loaded athletics.

Note: 'VO2max' is maximum oxygen intake and consumption, a measure of exercise efficiency, not glucose oxidation. The reference to glucose was for regular, pre-adaptation diet, not keto-adapted.

It is important to read all the words in an article, not just those you want/expect to see.

No, a very 'human' idea, but it is not correct, the meat does not reflect the feed.

What the animal eats is not going to matter so far as nutritive value is concerned, so long as the animal was healthy. A plant may indeed be dependent on its nutrition, but the animals we use for food have the ability to manufacture in their bodies or with the aid of commensal organisms living in their intestines, many if not all of the nutritive substances they require which may fall missing in their diet. Food animals are herbivores, they live on feed which has the lowest level and format of organic-nutrient value on the planet- they are highly evolved, complex organisms

which are specialised in converting low value feed into high value meat. Any proposal that the nutrient quality of meat is different due to what the animal is fed is only propaganda serving a special interest, like the organic farming mob. There is no nutritional difference between 'organic' meat and any other kind- except of course, the cost per unit to the buyer.

It really doesn't matter which red meat you eat, all are much the same other than texture and flavour. Likewise with fowl. It may matter with fish, they vary in a lot of ways, some are downright deadly poisonous. The flesh of a healthy animal is a complete food, it is not what they eat, only that they eat enough of whatever it is to thrive and be healthy. Variety in food is a human social-concept. A herbivorous animal will eat whatever plant of the specific group they are evolved to eat that is available unless or until that plant's natural protective toxins cause distress.

Sheep bison and cattle are grass eaters. Deer and goats however are browsers, and will eat almost any plant except grass. The problem with grain as food for the grass-feeding ruminants, is that the natural bacteria in each of the various 'stomachs' are not very good at digesting it. Feedlot cattle are fed a bacterial mix which replaces the normal flora with ones which can digest grain. I do not think this is a particularly good idea, but it in no way damages or lessens the nutritional value of the resulting meat.

Atherosclerosis: An Insulin-Dependent Disease? Nestor W Flodin J Am Col Nutrition 5:417-427 (1986).

There are some others. I have not had the time to find my complete file of pertinent articles amongst all the clutter this place has accumulated since the last time I needed them- perhaps as long as 15 years ago.

I understand completely as to what we are doing here, I enjoy all the real questions and contributions... I am criticising only those few who seem only to want to challenge every statement I make, make bold insistent statements in contradiction and demand to be shown 'scientific' proof in the form of published articles in order to accept my experience as fact. I am not a scientist, but I am an avid reader since age 2 and have spent in 47 years, literally hundreds and hundreds of hours in science libraries reading the literature on diet, metabolism and health. Most of what masquerades as 'hard science' is suspect- to be kindly, and some is downright useless. A precious few are true and very good. I did not learn what I 'know' about diet and the human from reading, although it is certainly helpful to find things written which confirm experience, but they are not in the majority- most say stuff I know for a fact is untrue.

I speak from a combination of reading and experience, about 5% the former and 95% the latter.

No, I don't think that any combination or lack of combination of meat is any less or more nourishing than another. To state this another way, you can eat nothing but prime fatty sirloin steaks, three or more times a day for at least ten or more years and have no problems whatsoever. I personally have not done this for longer than about 5 or 6 months, but it was just wonderful- every meal as delicious as the last, until finally the big stash (cryovac'd), bought at a ridiculously low price finally ran out. Variety treats the mind, not the body. It is not necessary in carnivory because any and all forms of meat constitute complete foods in and of itself.

Meat, that is, fat and lean muscle tissue- IS a complete food.

I think where you ran off the track was by transferring your social training to eat a lot of variety because of the low and incomplete food value found in the major portion of the mixed diet- vegetation. If you run the vegetation through an animal intermediary, this problem disappears.

Actually the difference between a light and a French roast is as short as one minute and does not significantly affect the caffeine content. This is another 'urban myth'. A darker roast may even arguably have some carcinogens from the burnt nitrogenous materials in it, in a similar fashion to the production of those found in tobacco smoke...Boiled 'Turkish coffee' like the Arabs drink has less caffeine than filtered, and both have less than espresso, but this is due to the combination of tannic acid (slow to dissolve) and caffeine (rapidly soluble), which produces insoluble caffeine tannate which precipitates out. Caffeine itself (much like aspirin- a semi-natural compound hated by the drug manufacturers since it is so effective but not patentable) has been shown to be of great benefit to the body, a mild mental 'alerting agent' (rather than a true stimulant like amphetamine). It also improves oxygen transport and athletic performance, as well as showing some anti-cancer properties. I would not drink coffee if it had no caffeine in it- the oils and other compounds in coffee cause a mild insulin reaction, Thus- consuming a lot of it is 'fattening' by default...

Yes, fish store mercury in the flesh, in the fat and in the liver, PCB's are stored in the fat and liver. Both contaminants are a serious concern. I try to limit my consumption of wild or farmed-in-the sea fish. I am raising fish in my large farm dam.

Of course, regularity is the hall mark of a carnivorous dietary regime. Constipation is unknown, unless you eat too much cheese, and looseness is due either to excess fat over your bile supply, or too much espresso. Once a day or less is usual, as the fecal mass is simply discarded body-originating waste, not dead bacteria and indigestible vegetable residue.

My remark on the 'new paper' in no way implied any thing like a criticism of anyone else mentioning it. If anyone is that sensitive to simple statements, then by all means, don't stick around, my posts are intended for people who genuinely are interested in the dietary regime.

I eat when I remember to do so, since I personally don't experience hunger. Any time is ok. I think it is good to eat in the morning, but my main meal is in the afternoon or early evening. I sometime have a 'lunch' and sometime not, I have eaten up to 6 small steaks in a day and as few as one large one. Your blood glucose is invariable unless you ingest carbs, and you very quickly digest and absorb your meat/fat. Eating schedules are not a big deal like it is when you eat a mixture of foods which tax your system's limited ability to process and digest. It is always best not to go to bed while still digesting food, an all meat meal should take around one hour or so. The '3 hour rule' is therefore more than adequate. I retire sometime between 9 and 11 and I prefer to eat my evening meal around 5 or 6... I rise around 6:30 to 7 and have a cuppa and a protein powder and cream drink. Heavy food at dawn is just not attractive to me.

I am an unrepentant empiricist, and am not very interested in statistics. I have to admit I haven't a clue as to what the USDA has to say. You know the old saw, however: 'Statistics don't lie, but statisticians do'.

Correct, however, meat is fully absorbed and thus actually a zero-residue food.

50-60% fat by calories is ok. 80% is about max. If you can only find a sandwich shop, ask them for a plate just of whatever meat they have, like rare roast beef and perhaps some fried or boiled eggs and whatever cheese they may have. The only eateries I have been unable to find food at are vegan/vegetarian restaurants, and those fortunately are relatively thin on the ground.

Pemmican is a complete meal replacement in and of itself. I will post a complete guide to preparation next. Avoid anything commercial which claims to be either 'jerky' or 'pemmican'- the are damaged by the commercial food laws requiring the use of excessive heat and adding chemical preservatives, thus are really bad for your health.

The truth no vegan can ever accept is that ALL forms of life, whether plant fungus or animal are conscious. It is just that we animals are unable to communicate or 'hear' the consciousness of plants. Plants on the other hand seem quite able to do so with both other plants and animal in remarkable fashions. There is an orchid that not only looks exactly like a female bumble bee, but also smells like one, leading the males to attempt to couple with the blossom and in process getting the two pollen-masses (pollinia) stuck on their heads. The can't copulate with the flower of course, but then visits another blossom and deposits the load of pollen in a further vain attempt to mate. Since a plant cannot see or smell (or can it?), how could this ever have come about? A few clever scientists like James Backster have found plants do respond to threat, thoughts and music, by hooking them up to galvanic instruments.

I once communed with a great and ancient redwood tree in Muir Woods CA, while under the effects of a strong dose of DMT. Trust me, these giant trees at least are far more 'conscious' and transcendently aware than any animal- including us. All food is derived from living things. There is certainly some compassionate value in the quick death a food animal experiences versus the way in which people treat food plants.

Grass (of various kinds) is quite different in structure and composition to the seeds of grasses, which is what all grain including corn (maize) actually is. The ruminant is specialise by commensal bacteria 'helpers' in its multiple stomachs coupled with re-mastication to digest grass, but not a large percentage of grass-seed. To force the animal to mangle on a high intake of seed, the bacterial soup in each stomach or rumen must be replace by unnatural mixes of other bacteria. That this strategy is successful is self evident or the industry would fail. The animal builds its tissue from what ever is fed to it, and herbivore are capable unlike carnivores and most 'omnivores' to make up any missing bio-materials in their own bodies. Interestingly rats can somehow synthesise missing vitamins in their intestines, and then eat their own droppings to counter deficiencies. THAT is truly impressive. Rats, crocodiles, cockroaches, and ants will long survive on this planet Earth, and will be around long after humanity has joined the dinosaurs.

PEMMICAN- how to make the real stuff.

I HAVE made jerky and pemmican for 47 years. Avoid any commercial 'jerky' or 'pemmican'.

YOU have to make your own, but it is simple, really. The principle is low, controlled heat, no additives like salt or 'marinade' and very fresh meat and fat.

I OFFER the correct way to prepare true pemmican, based on the principles developed by the Native American plains people. It has been done this way for countless generations. I do not recommend making 'holiday pemmican' containing dried fruit- it willnto keep and has far too many carbs.

WE will use beef.

I RECOMMEND bottom round, with very little marbling- marbling makes drying slower, but while it may taste better as a partially dried, short lived and leathery jerky, it is counterproductive for making fully-dried jerky for pemmican.

THE RULE for drying jerky is use only very FRESH, NEVER FROZEN MEAT.

CUT into 1/8' slices/strips, ADD NOTHING.

DRAPE over rack, in oven- with door slightly ajar (adjust).

PLACE an incandescent light bulb of about 100w in the bottom and connect up through an adjustable thermostatic switch, with the sensor placed on the top shelf. Set to hold 104F/40C. Test with a good quality thermometer- jerky is going to be comparatively expensive to make, so you don't want to mess it up.

DRY only at precisely 40C (104F) no more, no less. Dry until dark in colour and very brittle/friable. The commonly seen 'leather-dried' jerky, while it might seem nice to chew on, will not keep very long without refrigeration, and cannot be used to make pemmican. Fully dried jerky is very tasty but is crumbly in texture, not 'chewy'. Store fully dried jerky in an air tight container, and check the smell from time to time for signs of deterioration.

DO not use marrow-fat, it spoils very quickly and will go rancid. If you use 'cod fat', that is, suet from the outside of the carcass it will yield a softer and perhaps nicer flavoured pemmican, but the hard 'kidney suet from around the kidneys will give a firmer and much longer-keeping pemmican, if that is what you are after.

RENDER the suet into tallow by placing 3/4" thick slices on a rack in a pan in the oven at NO MORE than 250F. A higher temperature gives the tallow a burnt smell and taste and discolours the fat, lower temps take forever and may not properly dry out the tallow.

PROPER, long keeping pemmican is an even mix of dried lean and fat, 50/50 by WEIGHT (80/20 by calories). No berries or additives of any kind should be used, as they will cause rapid spoilage and are inappropriate if you are on a zero carb or very low carb diet.

WEIGH a portion of the crispy-crunchy totally dried jerky.

POWDER the jerky thoroughly. It will crumble to a powder very easily if it has been properly and thoroughly dried. It is best to process the jerky while still warm from drying to make sure it is very dry.

COOL the rendered liquid tallow to warm but not uncomfortably warm to your skin.

WEIGH AND POUR an equal weight of the warm liquid tallow onto the dry powdered jerky, mix and compress into a firm greasy mass- excluding all air.

PACK the fresh, soft pemmican into a dry container- fill until all air is excluded

and seal tightly against moisture. It will keep at a cool room temperature, without refrigeration, for up to 30 years if it has been made with kidney suet/tallow. Perhaps less long if from cod suet. Jerky will not usually keep a year- even in a sealed jar. I doubt anyone will be able to store pemmican long enough for it to be a problem anyway- if you like it, unless you have enough ambition to make a lot of it.

TO EAT: Warm up some water (not hot), cut off a lump of pemmican and mash it in the water until you have a warm gruel. It is very greasy and hard to eat dry, but is very tasty as a gruel. To keep all the nutrients, it must never have been subjected to a temperature above 40C/104F. It will feed you as a single food, with no deficiencies in nutrition for a year or more, it even prevents scurvy.

JERKY requires added fat, to balance the protein. Unless you can add fat from another source, it is not good to eat it straight for very long by itself. Alone, lean jerky soon causes dysentery and debilitation from 'protein poisoning' (i.e., 'rabbit starvation').

I have posted my take on the nutritional equivalence of red meat, fowl, fish and eggs/cheese. Any and all red meat is a complete food. Probably fowl is too, but you need twice as much mass to equal. Fish may not be fully complete, depending on species etc, but that is only my conjecture, it still would require triple the mass of red meat to equal. So far as eggs and cheese, I do not consider them fully complete foods in isolation (or only combined with each other), and you would need quadruple the mass of red meat to equal anyway. Even with an assumption they were complete, you simply would have serious trouble eating the equivalent masses each day of the lower-value two...the question really is moot. I don't really feel that posing hypothetical questions is going to carry us very far down the path. I think that all the fiddling around and finding ever more exotic ways to question the validity of meat as a complete food and cast various forms of doubt on the 'values' is counter productive. If you just would stop all the futzing and eat, it will soon become evident. In fact from most of the posts it has done so in virtually all the writer's experiences, only those who are obstinately clinging to non-meat foods are not progressing or are progressing very slowly.

I really enjoy all the interest people are showing my information. I have a vast store of meat-related info, and am happy to share it with everyone. I do apologise for my occasional loss of patience, but after following this 'aberrant path' for so many years, I have heard it all already.

I have managed to find out many of the simple truths hidden down amongst the fine details- things not usually considered by the majority of people. Life is fractal in nature, and like the statement in the Kybalion, 'as above, so below'- almost every aspect of the truth in life can be found on each and every level, beautiful in its balance and amazing in its complexity. I think that is why I became an artist when I discovered quite by accident I had a native talent for making beautiful images from anything with my hands, without any training. I have never liked ugly art. Many fine artists make ugly, confronting art as a way of registering protest, but I can't do that. Protest can be beautiful. The songs of Bob Dylan in the '60's and Ben Harper today are perfect examples of protest in the form of beautiful art.

But I digress....

Sure.

hamburger, chicken, shrimp, fish...

Good.

bacon, ham...

Not good: salt and preservatives, poor nutritional values, no vitamins.

pot roast...

'Pot roast' is not a cut or kind of meat, it is a term for a dish made of very, very cooked/stewed, low quality 'stew' meat-with-vegetables. Not good, contains vegetables and the meal is too well cooked- most of the nutritional value is destroyed.

What about lamb?

Most cuts of meat are tender when raw and not very tough if blood rare, you should not be cooking meat any further than that.

round steak and a good cut of steak once in a while...

My habit, back in my ballet days when I had very little money to live on, around \$50/week for everything including my 10 classes each week and \$50/month for my tiny single apartment (room), was to always check the local newspaper for supermarket meat specials, and travel to each market to buy that cut. Since most people had (and still have) a severe fat-phobia, the meat on special was always trimmed very lean, so I paid only for my lean. I would ask the butcher on duty if he could give me some fat (for free) to use in cooking, they always did, and usually generously, so most of my daily caloric requirements cost me nothing.

and maybe an occasional liver with eggs, cream, coffee, olive oil, mayo and butter...

Mayo and olive oil are not real good for you, mayo is heavy with polyunsats and salt, with some sugar, and olive oil is mostly unsats. You don't need any vegetable oils to be truthful, stick to animal fat. Buy only unsalted (sweet cream) butter.

Do I need to repeat? red meat is a COMPLETE food, you don't have to have variety for your body, it only 'feeds' your mind.

for the rest of my life...would i do ok? would i be 100% healthy? Seriously, give me your assessment..because those are the foods i eat and have available to me for the most part!

I think you just need to be more creative in your search for meat bargains. I consumed up to 5000 cal/day while studying ballet and my cost of food was less than half that of my fellow mixed-diet students. I think I spent about \$30/month, or one dollar a day- and sometimes less. Of course I wouldn't expect to see prices today like those back in 1960, but meat on special should be relatively low by today's standards. I even ate a lot of 'lamb breast'- at 9 or 10 cents a pound it being about half bone was not too bad a deal. I bought 'pot roast cuts' like 'seven bone' or shoulder at around 30cents/pound, it was not tough if cooked blood rare and actually had a very nice flavour, different from sirloin or rib eye. 'Flank' from the belly is very lean and tasty, it is good for making your own hamburger.

Your 'fear' is just your acculturation speaking from the depths of your unconscious mind, telling you, in your mother's voice, to 'eat your veggies' or suffer from some unnamed, perhaps unmentionable form of malnutrition. You can and should simply relax, get on with life and ignore this.

theBear Tue, Mar-28-06 16:18

120 gm/day protein is low but ok but very (480 cal) low in energy. With only 50% fat, you are only consuming around 1000 cal/ day, it is the most extreme starvation-style diet I have yet heard of. You do not need to limit your calories UNTIL YOU ARE QUITE LEAN- in fact the more fat you eat, the faster you lose excess bodyfat... You can go up to 2 gm/day per pound of body weight in protein- common practice amongst body builders. You need to increase your fat to 60% or more, 80% is a common meat diet amount. At 50% you are not getting a daily amount of calories anyway I am not sure of the cause of your high BUN, but it may be you are not dumping your gall bladder completely. You should be aware that gall stones are one of the results of insufficient fat in the diet. 2000 cal at 50% fat needs 250 gm protein to balance. At 80% fat 100 gms will suit. Do your maths. Normal energy requirement is 1800 to 2500 cal/day, more if you exercise. My ballet years saw me consuming 5000/day.

Look up the percentage of fat in fish to find the figures. Many fish if bought whole have fat masses in the body cavity- which is always discarded by the cleaner due to 'fat phobia'. Buy only fresh whole fish which have deep black, velvety, glistening eyes, never cloudy or dull.

Nutrients are lost when meat reaches 104F. This is bleu. The trick is to eat the meat as raw as possible and only cook the very outer layer at a high temp for the very minimum of time to give a flavour, warm the middle slightly and sterilise the cut exposed surface- meat is otherwise sterile if not cut and opened to the air. I do not think any slow method of cooking was used in ancient days- meat was hard to get, and was eaten as soon after the kill as possible. Any uneaten meat- cooked or raw spoiled quickly. Spoiled raw meat is still safe to eat, spoiled cooked meat is not.

Europeans culture (make sour intentionally) fresh cream and make unsalted butter from it, it tastes different and will not keep as well as unsalted sweet cream butter.

Carb intake and low fat is the most likely reason for no loss. I have seen many who cannot lose past a certain point on 20 gm carbs/day. I don't see this happening on 5 gm or less.

'...Thinking a lot'.... Yes.

I think the problem here is too much thinking, and not enough acting- trust your body, not your mind, it has no acculturation. It is totally unnecessary to weigh, measure or analyse your food while on an all-meat diet. I have never done so in all my 47 years on the path.

Stefansson gave us this simple rule:...Choose a nice, marbled steak (for instance) with at least a 1/2 inch thick rim (cover) of fat. Begin by eating more of the fat than lean and eat until you feel you are losing interest in the fat, or have eaten all of it, then finish up by eating as much lean as you like until 'full'- choose a

large steak- over one pound. Save the uneaten meat, if any, for a snack or part of your next meal. Soon the right sized cut of meat will become quite clear. Forget about all this fussy measuring, it will just turn eating into a tiresome chore when it should be a simple and joyful event. Other carnivorous animals don't use scales to measure their food, and the Inuit certainly didn't. Trust your body, it knows.

You see, calories are not important if you are 'obese' or over-fat, the body has a 'normal' fat percentage it will drop down to all by itself. Only if you wish to go lower than your natural set-point will you need to reduce calories to lose more BF on a high fat, zero-carb regime.

The key is to eat 'enough fat' and that is best determined while eating each meal. Measurements are pertinent only on conventional, carb- containing 'diets' which function as 'weight loss' regimes only by limiting caloric intake to less than your energy use.

Avoid peanut butter, it is toxic, very hard to digest (somewhat constipating), and and pretty carby- the oil is unsat-heavy. Coconut meat may also be carby, how much depends on the method of preparation from the seed- many propcessor add sugar. Why eat such stuff? It is not good to stress your insides this way with roughage.

Parasites are found in fresh water fish from the US great lakes, and from some European fresh water locations- the parasite in question is the broad or fish tapeworm, diphyllobrothrium lata. Some coastal pacific ocean species like salmon often carry the cisterciae (resting larval phase) of a parasite of seals, the so-called 'sushi worm'. Properly trained Japanese sushi chefs are trained to find and discard the cisterciae. Sushi worms cannot penetrate the human stomach but cause a kind of ulcer-like discomfort for a few weeks until it dies. I once got some from eating sashimi from the fatty belly part of a salmon I had caught. Otherwise, all salt water fish if very fresh are good raw, as are most farmed freshies. We raise fish here in our dam. If you are in doubt, freezing fish destroys any parasites present.

I rarely use oils- perhaps some mac nut oil with butter for fish. I prefer animal fats. I see no problem with spice mixes, I use many of Peter Watson's brilliant ones. That said, a true carnivore LOVES the plain meat taste, and really needs little in the way of spices- it is just for the occasional 'entertainment' value.

Ok, here is another of my unique recipes- this one is for you egg lovers out there.

The -wich story. A ham 'sandwich' could be called a ham 'breadwich'. In this way you can construct various names for other meaty dishes by substituting something else for the bread covers.

Eggs and cheese can make two kinds of -wich, the cheese eggwich and the egg cheesewich. The eggwich has eggs on the outside, and is a hot dish- the cheesewich has cold poached or fried egg between thick slices of cheese, good for a bag lunch. We are going to describe how to make the first one, usually eaten as a hot lunch or brekky:

In an 8 in (20cm) skillet with butter (Scanpan Ceramic Titanium is best) on low heat, break three eggs and break their yolks.

Add a very light sprinkle of chilli powder (like Texas Gunpowder, which is dried

jalapeña) and fresh grind on a little black pepper (don't over-do the peppers). Other spices can be experimented with, but the two peppers do just fine. Layer on thin slices of cheese, like cheddar, Jarlsberg etc.- enough to cover the eggs.

Break on top, two more eggs and break their yolks. Carefully see to it that the cheese is covered with egg. Add some more butter. Watch closely and when the bottom eggs are just jelled, carefully flip the mass over, cook for a short additional time and serve.

It will take some practice to get it right, but once you do, it is easy and a true delight. It is one of our favourites around here. Properly done, the melted cheese is nicely sealed between two layers of egg, with a pleasant colour on the outside. Kids love it.

In fact- everyone loves a cheese eggwich.

Avoid peanut butter, it is toxic, very hard to digest (somewhat constipating), and and pretty carby- the oil is unsat-heavy. Coconut meat may also be carby, how much depends on the method of preparation from the seed- many propcessor add sugar. Why eat such stuff? It is not good to stress your insides this way with roughage.

Parasites are found in fresh water fish from the US great lakes, and from some European fresh water locations- the parasite in question is the broad or fish tapeworm, diphyllobrothrium lata. Some coastal pacific ocean species like salmon often carry the cisterciae (resting larval phase) of a parasite of seals, the so-called 'sushi worm'. Properly trained Japanese sushi chefs are trained to find and discard the cisterciae. Sushi worms cannot penetrate the human stomach but cause a kind of ulcer-like discomfort for a few weeks until it dies. I once got some from eating sashimi from the fatty belly part of a salmon I had caught. Otherwise, all salt water fish if very fresh are good raw, as are most farmed freshies. We raise fish here in our dam. If you are in doubt, freezing fish destroys any parasites present.

I rarely use oils- perhaps some mac nut oil with butter for fish. I prefer animal fats. I see no problem with spice mixes, I use many of Peter Watson's brilliant ones. That said, a true carnivore LOVES the plain meat taste, and really needs little in the way of spices- it is just for the occasional 'entertainment' value.

Ok, here is another of my unique recipes- this one is for you egg lovers out there.

The -wich story. A ham 'sandwich' could be called a ham 'breadwich'. In this way you can construct various names for other meaty dishes by substituting something else for the bread covers.

Eggs and cheese can make two kinds of -wich, the cheese eggwich and the egg cheesewich. The eggwich has eggs on the outside, and is a hot dish- the cheesewich has cold poached or fried egg between thick slices of cheese, good for a bag lunch. We are going to describe how to make the first one, usually eaten as a hot lunch or brekky:

In an 8 in (20cm) skillet with butter (Scanpan Ceramic Titanium is best) on low heat, break three eggs and break their yolks.

Add a very light sprinkle of chilli powder (like Texas Gunpowder, which is dried jalapeña) and fresh grind on a little black pepper (don't over-do the peppers).

Other spices can be experimented with, but the two peppers do just fine. Layer on thin slices of cheese, like cheddar, Jarlsberg etc.- enough to cover the eggs.

Break on top, two more eggs and break their yolks. Carefully see to it that the cheese is covered with egg. Add some more butter. Watch closely and when the bottom eggs are just jelled, carefully flip the mass over, cook for a short additional time and serve.

It will take some practice to get it right, but once you do, it is easy and a true delight. It is one of our favourites around here. Properly done, the melted cheese is nicely sealed between two layers of egg, with a pleasant colour on the outside. Kids love it.

In fact- everyone loves a cheese eggwich.

FEW are those who are 'called' and fewer yet are those who are 'chosen'.

I can think of some on this thread who have tried, like Rob, and a few I no longer keep in touch with who also tried it for a while. I think my son Starfinder is honestly trying, he understands the carnivory of humans very well from his extensive veterinary training, but he still finds it hard, and is not always totally strict, like I am today - but on the path, falling off from time to time- just a little as I did. He is only 35.

Everyone who is truly interested in this lifestyle will have an uphill battle against their acculturation. This is compounded by all your friends and family who will go to any end to try to get you to eat as they think you should. This is social again. Never underestimate the incredible power of the human societal culture and everyone's early training, it is what makes us human, and different from all other animals. The only thing more difficult to alter than you early acculturation is your skin colour... Hang in there. If I could do it, anyone can.

Hey- Michael Jackson even managed to change his skin colour.... sort of.

Vitillago? A disease? Nonsense. Must be a brand name for a skin-bleach. All the rest of the Jacksons have very nice coloured skin.

I think what I said was that supplementation on an all meat diet was a waste of money- you do not need any. I said that if you DID take any, to be sure the strength was very low. Basically, every time I take ANY vitamin with B supplement no matter how weak it is, I piss yellow, showing that the body is rejecting it.

Rather than taking 'fish oils', just be sure to eat enough animal fats, they contain all the fatty acids of all kinds your body needs. Red meat/fat is a COMPLETE food. The reason you saw a difference before was most likely because you were not consuming enough fats.

Become comfortable with your food, and stop looking desperately for some excuse to alter the path, or find a supposed 'deficiency' which requires supplementation or frequent variety.

Pan MUST be small 7 or 8 inch MAX. The eggwich has to fit easily on a plate. The egg

has to have thickness, which is why I use 5 ex-large. Try smaller sized eggs, or just 2 and 2. it is supposed to fill you up. Break the yolks and spread the eggs around on the cheese with a fork so the cheese is a completely covered by egg. Omelettes are whisked, and cook like a souffle, fluffy and bland- a totally different dish. You break the yolks and slightly stir them a bit on the bottom layer to make them lie down, and spread out the eggs you place on the top. Make sure the cheese layer stays flat as you add the slices, then the eggs will cover well.

Vegans are starving, and their body craves the meat-taste so much that they have to try to fool it. They are very unaware of the realities of life and living things: They oppose the humane killing of animals for food, but are quite willing to kill the more openly conscious plants in very cruel ways- and like to eat the plant's next generation- the seeds and fruit.

Please note: Fresh coffee is delicious BUT it is insulin releasing. It has the effect of giving you a feeling of fatigue after about 20-30 minutes. In some people it will prevent fat loss or cause a gain even on a zero carb diet. This effect is not caused by the caffeine. I think it may be the oil, but it has not been identified so far as I know, but I can verify that it does occur. I only drink a half-cup of cream-cappucino- early in the morning. If later on I feel like a bit of a lift, I take 100 mg caffeine in a tab, like Vivarin or No Doz, which does not make me tired later.

Slice suet (raw fat) into 1/4"-1/2" slices, lay on a rack in a roasting pan to speed the render. The bit left is called a 'crispy'. The resulting rendered fat is called tallow.

Ooof! 7 eggs is too many- stick to 5 or even 4. A couple of tablespoons of butter (one on bottom, one on top) will suffice. (~1/4 of a 4 oz stick). Eggwicks are to be eaten immediately while nice and hot- they don't make it as leftovers.

Everyone, please! You have to stop analysing your food to death. Mate any meat with any other, and enjoy it. Menus don't matter. What matters is that you enjoy the food and are satisfied when you finish.

Don't say 'I can't afford...' use your brains, check the newspapers, track down the specials, get your fat/suet for free, inquire about deals on quantity.

Buy meat by the block, pieces packed in cryovac, etc. You may be able to get a wholesaler to sell such blocks to you. Unopened cryovac bags will keep for weeks at 2C (36F). If you carefully and minimally slit open one end of the bag and drain off the juices, you can spend a week or more slicing off of it.

Get a good knife and a sharpener. Cut steaks from the block as you eat it, reclosing the cryovac bag with clothes pegs. The meat will keep very well no need to freeze it.

Spend less time thinking and worrying and more time just eating and living.

Cryovac, a vacuum-sealed, heat-shrink heavy gauge plastic method for preserving

fresh meat without freezing, and allowing it to age without losing weight, is used by all meat-packing plants. Very few butchers buy fresh whole sides of beef and cut meat from the hanging carcass, there is too much labour and waste. The boutique butchers who do, charge a premium. I found the the 'air dry' or dry-hung aged meat spoiled too rapidly for me, so I switched to bagged meat fifteen years ago.

Common term in the industry for cryovac'd product is 'boxed'. A box usually contains 4 bags- the individual package is a bag'. In the US, I was buying from a distributor in SF on Bryant St. They had various weights around 15 pounds in sirloin strip- price was around \$5/lb while the same cut sold in the market for \$15. They had several grades, or quality available.

Your local market (and all restaurants) get in all of the meat they sell packaged this way. In the US, it is rare for the bags to reach the retail meat shop before it has a couple of weeks of age on it. If kept very cold, just above freezing the bagged meat will keep and improve for several months. Occasionally it develops a slight sour taste, but once cut, that quickly dissipates.

You can generally buy an unopened bag with a whole sirloin strip, rib-eye or rump ('top sirloin') from the retail shop, usually at a bit lower price than after it has been cut up. However many wholesaler meat distributors, who sell to restaurants as well as markets, will sell direct to you in either bag or box lots at the same price the retailer pays. The meat will keep, and since you are a meat-diet family you will have no problem eating it up. In early Jan we bought five bagged rib eyes- in preparation for our annual summer party. One of them was not eaten, and we kept it until three weeks ago. It took us until yesterday to eat it up- and it was good to the end. No freezing is necessary, so long as you don't open the bag until you need some meat, drain, cut the meat off and squeeze the air out as best you can, roll the plastic and clip it closed with a couple of clothes peg and return to the fridge right away.

Use a spoon to pick up melted fat. Forks won't do the job properly, and as noted, licking the plate is considered poor etiquette.

Bad idea to eat veggies while nursing. Reduces your nutrient intake.

Seattle is the 'home' of that arch-enemy of good coffee: Starbucks The Cremator, King of the Burnt Black Bean. Since they represent the attitude of that whole area, nothing heard from there concerning coffee is valid- in my book.

An 'Americano' is a cream-based cap or latte everywhere else in the US, and that is where I first heard the term, but it is now recognised here and in Europe as well.

An espresso with added water is a 'long black'.

I began roasting in '73, and got my first espresso machine, a Swiss brand, Olympia. I bought my first commercial single group manual machine, a Conti Prestina in '80- I still have it. My recommendation for the home is the terrific Rancilio Miss Sylvia, only obtainable from the local Rancilio distributor or dealer- or online. About US \$450- a steal. 2 Litre tank, high pressure quick acting pumper-type. It heats from dead cold to working temp in less than five minutes. This machine makes the best crema of any machine of any size I have ever used. It has a brass/chrome holder and stainless basket which are the standard commercial size. No aluminium like the usual home-appliance rubbish.

I don't see how I could be a reincarnation of anyone who died in '71, I was born in 1935.

Woops, another late comer who did not read the thread. We have already covered the subject of the great apes and their various diets, from the highly carnivorous chimps to the tree-bark grub eating gorillas. The only HERBIVOROUS PRIMATES are the proboscis monkeys. They are sickly, big-bellied little forest-dwelling animals with spindly limbs, bad teeth and a short lifespan.

We are about 5 million years down along a totally different evolutionary path than all the other primates, great apes included, so all comparisons are invalid. We have spawned a few hominid off-shoots along the way, who apparently tried to become omnivores or herbivores, but all failed.

I use chicken fat (schmaltz) for chicken, lamb tallow for lamb and beef tallow for beef. I collect all excess fat runoff when cooking and save it fr later use. Bacon fat is full of chemicals.

I never eat pork and I don't like the taste of pig-fat, or lard- it has a yukky, unctuous taste. Pig is NOT a 'white meat, if you mean chicken-like. It is a red meat, and wild pig (boar) is never fat, and has as dark a meat as beef and lamb (full of parasites, however). The domestic, piggery-raised pig isn't even allowed to walk around, thus the heavy fat cover and undeveloped muscles. I bet you all buy 'free range' eggs, too- don't you?

Tallow keeps perfectly without refrigeration, whereas fresh animal-sourced foods do not. Use your precious fridge space appropriately. You would not keep a sealed tin of tuna in the fridge, would you? The same goes for pemmican and jerky - these are methods of preserving full-nutrient food without the need for refrigeration.

Sorry, scars are scars. The idea is not to continue to do more damage. Anyone who claims that this or that diet will 'reverse' arterial damage or blockage is lying. In advanced cases of arterial blockage, there is a certain amount of migratory adipose cells in and around the scar tissues, these are the source of the idea that fat or cholesterol 'cause' the condition- they do not. The fat cells in severe, long term arterial blockages in an obese individual MAY reduce slightly if the individual's body fat is reduced WAY down to the 5% BF or lower range, but it is unlikely to make a large difference in increased blood flow through the blocked artery. Arterial blockages, commonly termed (inappropriately) 'plaques' are wholly within the muscular layer and NOT within the interior passageway or lumen of the artery, which is lined with one of nature's slipperiest structures, rivalling teflon in its non-stick properties- NOTHING sticks to it.

Let me give a wake-up call to everyone. You MUST face and deal with the situation asap if you suffer ANY degree of 'chest pains' or 'shortness of breath' on exercise, even climbing stairs. 'Heart problems' will affect EVERYONE eventually on the modern, carb-centric diet.

PLEASE get, at the minimum, a treadmill stress-EKG test to find out if you suffer from cardiac ischemia (insufficient blood flow to the heart muscle). If so, you must have an angiogram- which is an x-ray while a dye is infused into the coronary arteries by means of a catheter entering through the femoral artery at the hip. This is the ONLY way blockages can be fully delineated, MRI and other scanners CANNOT completely show the interior passages and fluid flow patterns in the blood vessels. I do not recommend angioplasty/stents, because they are very dangerous- a friend was killed when his artery ruptured during this procedure, and also because a percentage of these repairs later close up with scar tissue. A bypass done with the modern

technique of off-pump surgery, using arterial (not venous) grafts is a permanent repair.

Absolutely correct- the effect is IN the muscle- it has nothing to do with 'blood flow' (the muscular layer is not 'outside' the artery, it is the middle layer, between the lining of the lumen through which the blood flows and the tough, inelastic outer casing of the artery). Insulin carried in the blood permeates through the arterial wall just as does the oxygen and nutrients which feed the hard-working arterial muscles. Insulin damages the arterial musculature, not the lining. Some bodybuilders who don't completely understand this seemingly 'anabolic action', inject themselves with insulin thinking it will have the same 'proliferative' effect on the skeletal (striped) muscles (it doesn't- just on the smooth type, and that leads to scarring), thus causing serious health consequences.

Nothing known can 'clean out' plaque, it is fatty-permeated scar tissue. If you can find a way to 'clean out' scar tissues in any part of the body, you will make a fortune. Read my previous post- the only remedy for arterial blockage is surgery.

Worrying WILL shorten you life.

SCC of the tonsil is NOT diet-related. My heart problems were CAUSED by my HIGH CARB childhood/teen years- the only reason I did not need a quadruple by age 39 IS my present diet. MY blood glucose is NOT 'borderline diabetic', it is within normal variation. Why make such inaccurate and meaningless statements? All it does is show off your ignorance.

I advise all readers to ignore posts by yakuma.

Unfortunately he has not used his space to post a single thing of value, just constantly presenting his personal myths, falsehoods and fantasies. For your information, 'insulin resistance', or type 2 diabetes, comes from the bodies reaction to the presence of excessive and continuously high levels of insulin, not the absence of it- it is one of the body's two methods of dealing with this damaging hormone, the other way leads to type 1- the destruction by the immune system of the insulin-secreting cells in the pancreas. Diabetes is NOT a 'disease', NO other animal has it, except for the carnivorous pets humans keep and feed on grain based (dry) pet foods.

How can anyone claim this diet is 'harmful in the long run' without any way to know that or to 'prove it' since this seems to be the objection to 47 years of experience, since millions of people lived on it for generations with perfect health (Inuit) and all the 'westerners' who followed and were studied, were likewise in perfect health. Stefansson did NOT follow 'his' diet for more than a few years as a time, returning to it only very late. Stroke is the result of both a genetic weakness in the arterial system and hardening of the arteries (insulin damage).

'... I'm so messed up...'

Yes, mate you are certainly 'messed up'- bigtime.

Meat alone has ALL the nutrients you need, vitamins, minerals etc. Trust me, (or read the thread) you do not need any sort of vegetation. The polar bear is an obligate carnivore. My nick dates from my teens and was due to growing my chest hair

at 17- the kids said I was turning into a... bear. Other bears (which hibernate), are opportunistic feeders, like many canids, rather than true omnivores like rats and pigs.

I said that vitamin C is NOT the ONLY thing which prevents scurvy. Less C means less carbs. Meat does contain sufficient folic, the amount needed for health is measured in micrograms. Eggs cream and cheese do not have enough A to provide the amount needed by an adult, unless you eat really massive amounts- unlikely. Serotonin is not the cause opr cure for insomnia. Try taking melatonin before going to bed, an amount somewhere between 1 and 10 mg should do the trick.

All raw meat is tender- cooking makes some cuts tough, keep it to a minimum, just sear the outside in fat in a hot pan.

What's the deal with wanting to do all these wasteful, useless 'tests'? ... A dragster sets a record in the 1/4 mile, but someone wants to 'measure the adhesion coefficient' of the tires?

Insulin is a dangerous (necessary to deal with excess glucose) and body damaging hormone. I have posted the reference to a paper which shows just how damaging it is. READ IT!

Your are both body and mind. The body LOVES raw meat, the mind has been taught it is not good. People from families who overcook meat usually do not like it very much, and eat it infrequently.

Yes, finish the thread, you will discover that gluconeogenesis never takes place except under very specific circumstances, such as long fasting and starvation.

Protein cannot and must not be the 'major macro nutrient', fat must be. High protein intake is very toxic.

The beginning of the neolithic period (agriculture/grain) saw peoples bodies deteriorate to an alarming degree, no teeth weak deformed bones etc, and until very recent times, deficiency diseases were rampant. Our need for most of the various trace nutrients such as vitamins was not identified until around one hundred years ago. The ancient early paleolithic people and the Inuit (hunters/carnivorous people) left beautiful, sturdy corpses with all their teeth and strong bones.

One month is NOT enough time, even Stefansson found he and his associates needed six months to adjust to the all meat regime. I say, after a full year your acculturation will have faded, and if you can get to ten years you will probably never go back to a mixed diet. A month or ever three will NOT make a difference, that is just 'dieting'- you will regain all the weight and more once you begin eating according to your habits and 'cravings'. The carnivorous regime MUST become a permanent lifestyle to succeed. Your dietary acculturation is VERY deeply embedded and powerful, don't EVER underestimate it.

So Mister 'anorexia' thinks we need some 'tests' also? Why am I laughing?

My 'attitude'? I hate BS- if that is an 'attitude', so be it.

"#1) I could. Not. Crap. Not to save my life. It was awful. By the end I was crying daily-the pain was so bad. I tried everything. My body failed to regulate.

#2) I had TERRIBLE blood curdling dreams at this carb level. I could not sleep. I was anxious.

#3) I could not exercise. At all. If I lifted (which I love) I would grow so dizzy

that I would fall over."

There is a term, 'psychosomatic illness' which describes anomalous responses to normal things, like being constipated on a high fat, zero carb diet and having bad dreams, which of course are strictly psychological anyway. Childhood acculturation is, in some individuals, so deep and intense that any deviation from the training is seen as 'life threatening' and the mind fights it with everything it has. Not to worry, this is very unusual, I doubt many people would have a reaction anything like this, it is the first I have heard of and I have spoken to many thousands of people about carnivorous diets and their experiences..

Historically there were few fruits, all our present tree fruits are highly cultivated, therefore early people could not 'stand under a fruit tree like we can. In any event, no residues of plant-sourced foods have been found in any of the early paleolithic digs, so if fruit was consumed, it was done at the place it was found.

"take nothing but a spear"... PLUS a lifetime of practice in using it to feed your self and your tribe, in the company of a group of likewise highly skilled hunters.... Come on people, get used to the fact moderns have NO CLUE what an evolved hunting society in an age of plentiful prey animals is like. Lets cut the nonsense, shall we?

By 7 months a considerable degree of training in 'food taste' may have been accomplished. However, a baby does not have the gastric ability to digest any vegetable matter until about age 2. The usual result of feeding infants this way is commonly called 'colic'.

Inuit live under extreme conditions and food is sometimes very hard to find, leading to severe bouts of starvation, which is very body damaging. Arctic carnivores are all heavily infested with trichina parasites, and people must kill and eat every animal they can, even foxes and polar bear, thus they had heavy infestations as well. Accidents likewise cause considerable aging effects. An Inuit who avoided all these could live into their late 90's in excellent health. Many autopsies were done on Inuit who died while living the traditional way, there are massive amounts of data available for those who are interested in pursuing this.

George Burns smoked cigars daily, and drank hard liquor all his life and lived to be 100. So what?

I had some 'health crises', which I have described, along with the causes- however I survived my treatment very well indeed, and that was DUE to my excellent fitness and bodily strength. Which continues.

Actually, Dean, the brain's requirement for glucose is nearly 100% covered by the 'ketone bodies' which are produced during fat metabolism, and NO gluconeogenesis will take place on a high fat diet... period. Gluconeogenesis is a fasting process that only begins after the point where there are NO more ketones OR glycogen available. The body always spares protein, and it is only under severe conditions that protein is ripped apart for the glucose spine it contains.

Ok, the attitude of the mum rules the response of her babies to food and everything, with the rare exception of a very strong-willed child. Okinawans, like all Japanese people eat LOTS of fish and rice, rather than vegetables, they do not differ greatly from other Japanese, except for the ratio of fish availability to population demand makes more fish available to them, cheaper.

The QUANTITY of calcium in red meat tissues appears small, but it is many, many

times more available than ANY other source which are very, very poorly absorbed and utilised- the one exception being hydroxyapatite (bone), which is about 1/6th as good as muscle-calcium. Therefore if you eat at least 8 ounces of meat (of any kind, but red is best), per day, you have as much calcium as your body needs. I NEVER take calcium supplements, and I have not always eaten much cheese (still don't, it is too binding), and cream is not a reasonable source of calcium- it has only traces, yet I have VERY dense, strong bones. Inuit ate only the muscle tissues of animals and yet they had THE MOST thick, dense bones and skulls of any human group. Domestic cats and dogs are both known for eating bones, so they may not be as adept as we are in utilising muscle-sourced calcium. Calcium is critical to the work-processes in muscle tissues, and therefore is always present..

Correct, I make many typos as I speed-type. I try to catch and correct all of them.

Under- or mal- is just semantics- it means the same thing.

'Real evidence.. that you can see..'?

I have already stated the manifest truth that 'recent studies' and the like, are just not good enough, most such contentions have historically been proven worthless, and these will certainly follow suit- down the well trodden-trail of pseudo-scientific falsehood. It is an recognised epidemic of vast proportions

That said, vegetation is, however the source of most medicine. Medicine is NOT the same as 'food'.

Correct, I make many typos as I speed-type. I try to catch and correct all of them.

Under- or mal- is just semantics- it means the same thing.

'Real evidence.. that you can see..'?

I have already stated the manifest truth that 'recent studies' and the like, are just not good enough, most such contentions have historically been proven worthless, and these will certainly follow suit- down the well trodden-trail of pseudo-scientific falsehood. It is an recognised epidemic of vast proportions

That said, vegetation is, however the source of most medicine. Medicine is NOT the same as 'food'.

Zappa was truly great, a musical genius. He just could not play music which was popular, he had do zany, often confronting stuff. When he DID do some real R&R it was amazing. I liked him, and his live performances were a real treat, but I found it very hard to listen to his albums more than once. He used to tell me 'acid sucks' whenever he saw me. One day backstage at the (old) Fillmore in SF, he just said 'hi'. I asked him what happened to 'acid sucks' and he said someone had dosed him at a show he did in NY's Central Park, and he had revised his opinion of the stuff. I have no idea whether he ever took it again, he was a 'natural', sort of like that on the natch. It was a great loss to music when he died of testicular cancer- a very rapid killer.

Trust me on this- I have long experience in these sorts of situations: You don't need to eat any carbs at a business dinner or family get-together. Success depends on not making a thing of it, just quietly eat the parts (meat) you want- perhaps fiddle with the veg, etc. without eating them, carry on an active conversation, and no-one will notice- if they do, say something like, you ate a short while ago, or make some other diversion. If you don't continuously avoid all carbs you will not keto-adapt, and the regime will fail.

I warned everyone: To change one's dietary culture is harder than changing your language and dress (almost like...eye colour?). Only if you REALLY don't want the body you now have, will you manage to change at all. You also must realise that any change has to be permanent, 'dieting' not only does not work, it may cause more damage than good.

Once keto-adapted you will no longer be 'hard to live with', but a joy.

I suggest that rather than excerpting a paragraph from this important paper, you should actually READ IT. Then you would learn how the experimental determination on the damaging effects of insulin was done. Flodin does not refer to an 'unusual level' of insulin, the level referred to is indeed 'normal'. Insulin is always high and remains high for a period after a carb containing meal. Normally people consume carbs at all meals and in between- in soft drinks, alcoholic beverages and snacks, thus the 'normal' situation is 'high circulating levels of insulin' all day, every day. The experiment used only the normal amount of insulin needed to exactly balance the experimental subject-dog's carb intake. The paper is a covert condemnation of the modern diet, but is not stated plainly in those terms for reasons of scientific impartiality. I have never heard of insulin referred to as 'the master hormone', or even as 'a' master hormone, that role is assigned to the pituitary hormones alone.

I have very little time to spare for the thread as it is, and adding a 'journal' would mean the end of my engagement. I do not feel like a dietary consultant, just thought that people, especially the obese and overweight ones might like to know what happens when you strictly follow this ancient dietary path over a MAJOR portion of your life. I am just going to have to ignore the ignorant and combative ones who only seek to derail what we are doing here. It is hard, because I just hate 'know-it-all-' especially those who are plain wrong.

The modern diet has carbs in circulation (hence insulin), it for about 16 hours/day or more. This is why everyone has some arterial blockage and other insulin-related problems by middle age.

Pubic (crab) lice are not associated with diet. You need to choose your sexual partners with more care. Find ones who have fewer other partners, or who choose those others more carefully, and who practice better personal hygiene.

We all have the same basic body. The most common and totally specious argument is 'everyone is different'- this is your acculturation grasping for a straw. Some people are fattened more easily than others. ALL are ok on an all meat regime, which also provides other benefits over the long term. Getting to 220 lbs at age 27 means you did not tolerate your dietary choices. Trust me, I do know about all the things you are questioning, and if you can manage to read the rest of the thread, you will most likely begin to understand. I am not surprised you can't, or rather won't, accept what I say, that is due to your early dietary training, which is part of your acculturation.

NO human can 'easily digest' vegetation, we have the guts of a carnivore- you simply cannot eat wild, raw plant life and live on it, without serious digestive and health problems. We have retained enough of the 4 million years ago, pre-hominid primate's digestive equipment (a small partial area of enzyme production in the stomach, and an appendix) to be able to practice modified partial omnivory -at a price-. It is properly a survival mechanism which compensated for the problems of depending on the ready availability of prey animals. The modern diet is simply bad, and an all meat one is very good- for everyone.

Basic rule: carbs are your enemy, fat is your friend.

The most scientific of studies done on melatonin suggested that doses need to be up around 120 mg to actually be effective. You 'read somewhere'? I 'read somewhere' that taking acid would 'force you to stare into the sun and go blind...

No study has shown any danger or harm from any amount of this hormone. Most insomnia is of mental origin. Perhaps you could benefit from yoga, which teaches you how to quieten the mind and helps you center yourself. Melatonin is not like human gonadotropin or testosterone, which influence the pituitary- exogenous melatonin (hormone) intake does not suppress the activity of the pineal.

Wild figs are not edible, I hazard that the trees are not 'wild', but were the result of birds- they ate the figs from a cultivated tree and the tress sprouted from the bird-droppings (this is the normal method figs use to propagate). If the figs are large and plump- not small and hard, the tree is a cultivar. All the fruiting trees you mention are cultivars, not found in the wild. Avocado is a cultivar of a wild tree found in central America- Guatemala and Mexico.

'Tetrahydrocannabinol' is not 'toxic'- to any animal, it is not a chemical defense, but seems to be targeted at man. The plant is the only surviving member of a very primitive plant group, has no living close relatives and is not very successful without human cultivation (the Chinese cartograph for 'ma' depicts a plant under the eaves of house).. THC only effects carnivores. Herbivores, like deer, goats and kangaroos don't notice a thing, and can eat a whole plant and then start on the next. Dogs and cats will become so stoned (not toxic- no dose is fatal) on a very little bit, that they can't stand or walk.

Yes, any and all 'excess' protein is indeed excreted. Protein is constantly being used, to build up, tear down, recycle- and any excess is then excreted, you only really need a few grams- (max of ~30 if you are a 200 pound pro), a day even if you are building massive musculature (Mr Olympia). You cannot/will not make ANY glucose from it unless you are fasting for a long time, or starving. All-meat eaters do not need much glucose- other than amount easily furnished by glycogen- ketones replace glucose.

NOTE:

When glucose is required beyond that from glycogen, or to replenish glycogen, it is produced by GLYCEROL CONVERSION (ketones and glycerol are derived from triglycerides, the standard 'fuel' of the body- they have nothing to do with gluconeogenesis). This is not conjecture. I have definitely said there are some structures in the body that are dependent of glucose, and cannot use ketones (read the thread).

I am thoroughly SCHOOLED in human anatomy and physiology, biochemistry and cultural and physical anthropology, I have a large number of college credits in these subjects as well as physics, chemistry, math, languages, theatre and art. My grade

point average was high B+. I have read since age 2. I have had experiences in, and mastered so many professions, skills and had so many far out adventures in my life it would make your head spin. I resent implications, which are constant, from the less well learned and experienced that somehow I must be wrong, because THEY have read something contradictory.

A paper has already been posted by a reader in this thread showing that gluconeogenesis does not happen except under the conditions I state above. End of story. Read the thread if still are not convinced. Where does this utter nonsense come from? Acculturation dies hard- and fights dirty. Lisa never quits, it may be simply bad mental programming or perhaps she is following some agenda we are not aware of, can't say. Too bad.

Anyone who doesn't drink coffee and 'experiences' hyper- or hypo-glycemia, is NOT on a zero carb diet, simple as that. Give away this 'protein makes glucose' nonsense, it is false and makes you appear just plain stupid.

Protein only is toxic, will make you very sick if done for a period, but does NOT initiate gluconeogenesis after a single meal. Give it away, please. You simply don't know what you are talking about.

Actually insulin is NOT anabolic to somatic working muscles, striped and short-stripped- only to the involuntary, smooth kind found in the intestines and arteries, where the effect is undesirable.

No 'A' and no '3'. Leary was wrong (about a lot of things).

"Bear caused the problem..." What nonsense! I composed the title to accurately represent my firm understanding about the nature of the true food habits we evolved with over 4.5 million years, and have strongly adapted our bodies to, in the process losing many of the necessary things a semi-omnivorous diet requires, and not for any supposed 'hidden agenda'.

In case you had not noticed, I am a very straight talker, even when it may not be 'PC'. I don't bullshit or make radical statements or offer up conjecture. I may not be able to point all of to the many things I have read over the last fifty years, but everything I have read about diet and metabolism has been thoroughly and objectively compared to my experience and either rejected, investigated further and/or accepted.

I will suggest once more: Anyone who lives and breathes the absolute of 'scientific proof' should get a copy of 'The Cholesterol Myths' and/or visit the website <http://www.thincs.org>. So much for the integrity of publications. Have any of those people who continuously spout nonsense in this thread actually read either of these sources? Of course not. Such people ALWAYS discard any results (like many researchers) which do not confirm their original beliefs.

Sure, I can explain why I think it is nonsense. If you had a constant flow of both insulin and glucagon, it would correspond to a metabolic equivalent of driving or standing with the motor running, in gear, with one foot on the throttle and the other on the brakes. This is wasteful, and is not in harmony with the way the body conservatively manages energy, sorry about that. That some kinds of studies may produce data that in a certain context may confirm that idea is of no surprise to me after treading thousands of 'scientific papers' some claiming such preposterous ideas as 'fat burning' requires carbs- the infamous 'fat only burns in the flame of carbohydrates'- an 'axiom' popular with nutritionists- even now.

Lisa: the references you posted are not about normal people eating and adapted to a strict zero-carb regime. Both are about diabetics, the data on Mendoza is about a mixed diet, and he makes the some kind of ratbag statements on gluconeogenesis that you do. No cigar. I really don't care WHAT you believe in, eat however you like, it must work ok for you, but please- keep the bullshit to yourself. I am not advising you to do anything your doctors don't like. We all know that doctors and their profession are only trying to make sure you become healthy and never need their services, that is 'obvious'. I don't mind dissent expressed in the form of questions by people who have already read what has gone before, I only object to arrogant claims of 'fact' by new (and a few old) arrivals that contradict my statements and advocate well-established nonsense.

A note to reiterate my earlier statement about vegetation:

To the know-it-all kid: VEGETABLES are **MEDICINE**, NOT food- get it? Cancer fighting is MEDICINE. Plant toxins are MEDICINE.

Sorry to see someone have so MUCH difficulty with English reading and comprehension, makes me wonder how one manages to acquire so much nonsense from literature (?) with this kind of disability. Talking books, perhaps?

Who would eat a teaspoon (5gm) of black pepper?

Hey, here's an add-on to my 'tasty chook' recipe, My wife brought some fresh oyster mushrooms and I stuffed the lot, plain, into body cavity of the chook and skewered the opening shut before baking it. Mushrooms are more of a garnish than a food, with little food value, but I don't eat more than a tiny amount- sort of like a spice. Anyway, the cream cheese and butter-herb mix soaked into the mushies during the time in the oven, and she said they were just heavenly.

One thing, some of my more avid critics are people who suffer from a diet-induced, doctor-dependent 'disease'- diabetes. That they are not 'normal' does not occur to them, and they feel they must criticise all paths other than their own, doctor certified one, and refute every statement they cannot fit into their world view- especially if it pertains to insulin.

'Objectively tested'? Hah! This is the GOLD STANDARD for all bogus science- check out the 'super objective' research- which led to placing the blame for coronary artery disease on cholesterol and saturated fat. (Cholesterol Myths, www.thincs.org.) This myth has been the ruse used by the drug makers to force the entire human population onto very, very dangerous drugs called statins, by defining , then re-defining as 'dangerous levels', an important blood component, cholesterol-BELOW the normal range.). Or all those 'scientific studies' which spawned the low fat craze. Come on, girls- give it up. You are playing the up-tight cop, but you are just plain wrong about almost everything you claim, you are the victims of the medical/pharmaceutical cartel.

AND: Proteins ARE not 'all broken down' to amino acids 'during digestion', i.e., in the stomach and intestine. Some are not broken down at all, some are cut into short strings, and some are completely reduced to single amino acids. This is enzymatic-action much of which occurs after absorption.

Insulin is not involved in trans-cell membrane protein-transport, or within the cell, or in peptide synthesis- more myth.

As strange as it may seem, there are some necessary proteins which we do not have the ability to construct by peptide synthesis from raw amino acids, and these strings must be obtained directly from animal-sources. If deprived, certain body structures suffer. One of these structures is the intervertebral disk, hence comes the focus on spinal-fusion operations in hospitals belonging to the Seventh Day Adventists. On a deficient diet, the body mines the disks for those protein-strings, thus weakening them. Adventists are often vegans.

Leary was a fool. Drunk with 'celebrity-hood' and his own ego, he became a media clown- and was arguably the single most damaging actor involved in the destruction of the evanescent social movement of the '60's.

Tim, with his very public exhortations to the kids to 'tune in, turn on and drop out', is the inspiration for all the current draconian US drug laws against psychedelics. He would not listen to any of us when we asked him to please cool it, he loved the lime-light and relished his notoriety... I was not a fan of his.

Lipolysis is stimulated by dietary fat when, and only when- you are carrying more body fat than your body 'wants' or needs, a level I have called your 'fatostat'. Your metabolism prefers to use dietary-sourced fat, remember bodyfat comes from glucose conversion only so your body will conserve it if it can, and will replace it if it goes 'too low'- this is the one stimulus for glucose-from-protein- i.e., recovery from severely low levels of body fat from fasting or starvation, on an all meat regime with adequate fat and protein intake, but no carbs.

Once you start to get to a reduced intake of protein and fat, and start to get into heavy adipose fat use, a loss of muscle mass begins. Whether the major reason for loss is due to any level of gluconeogenesis is not clear, it may simply be a mechanism which causes the protein to be dumped rather than being reincorporated- like it will in the case of excess dietary intake.. The fact that you do not lose much muscle tissues so long as dietary fat is high, even in the absence of protein intake, begs the question of loss from any damage.

The body is constantly 'reusing' its protein, the process is continuous and very active, muscles, organs and bones are all in a constant state of flux- hence the possibility of loss if there is something interfering with the process. If you are fasting, on very reduced food, or starving, your level of cortisol will be high, increasing dramatically the rate of tear-down and slowing the rate of rebuild, so you might then excrete perfectly good protein. I honestly don't know how it is lost, but I have definitely experienced it while under treatment for my neck problem, and could not eat enough- plus due to the severe stress of the radiation, I definitely was pushed into a heavy cortisol-area. These are all abnormal situations, and not ones most people will ever encounter. I do advise however, that fasting and severely low caloric intake is NOT a very good idea for your health.

And, hey if the 'war zone' epithet/label is supposed to be a 'death sentence', then why has the number of posts entered while I am in bed gone through the roof? I am struggling to read the thing, and even with being quite terse, my first response in (my) morning (after coffee), reads like like a novel in work.

Carbs of any kind, glucose OR glycogen are NOT used to do work by the muscles. Until you are free of carb intake long enough to fully keto-adapt, which takes from 3 to 6 weeks, you will experience a feeling of lower energy. ANY carb intake, no matter how brief, will derail the keto-adaptation process. Your 'keto-diet' is complete nonsense.

Deer and horse (the most delicious meat I ever ate) are extremely lean and you must have fat from some other source. Only young animals are tender, does are somewhat tougher, and bucks are like bulls, basically so tough and fibrous as to be worthless -beef is always from castrated animal, called oxen or steers. The meat from dairy cows who are past their prime as milk producers can sometimes be bought, it is the most tender and delicious beef of all and well worth searching for. The nutritional value of wild 'game' is the same as any red met, except for the lack of fat. Most wild animals have fairly heavy infestations of various worms, flukes and other parasites- so be careful, if you are going to eat their meat.

Protein spilling in the urine is abnormal, in the feces, it's quite common and normal. Sorry THC is NOT toxic to any animal at any dose, nor does it cause any discomfort or mental effects in herbivores, and has zero effect in protecting cannabis from being eaten by anything, mammal or insect. Please do not make idiotic statements pretending you know what you quite obviously do not. When, where, and for how long have you grown cannabis, mr smarty-pants? Plants demonstrate many adaptations to the animal world which are aimed at assisting with propagation, one of the simplest is fruit. The cannabis plant very successfully chose man. There is an orchid, for instance which looks and smells EXACTLY like the female of a certain species of bumble bee, thereby attracting the male bee to the flower to attempt to copulate with it, and while undertaking this attempt, the bee has the bloom's pollen mass stuck onto his head. The bee soon gives up, but will visit another blossom nearby and deposit the first pollinia and acquire a new one, and so on. Plants, like animals are very conscious living things, and although we cannot understand how they can 'see'; and 'smell' a bee, or know that men will cultivate them for the wonderful mental and health benefits of something they can secrete, nonetheless they can and do.

Grain fed and grass fed beef are nutritionally EQUIVALENT. They differ only in aesthetics like texture, fat colour, toughness and flavour. Is that clear enough? If not then you will have to rephrase your question.

Animal fat is pretty much equal, some tastes better than others, and some people like one kind and not another. Native Americans love deer fat. I don't care for lard, but I like beef, lamb and chicken fat. Tannins are complex chemicals which are pretty insoluble in either water or fat.

It is completely immaterial to our discussion what goes on in an totally abnormal metabolism such as that of a type one (or 2) diabetic. We are not medical people- if you want answers to your questions relating to your abnormal condition, you will have to seek the answers somewhere else. I am not abnormal and I am not addressing myself to that. If your diet had not been wrong, you would not have developed the condition you suffer. Both kinds of diabetes are caused by a bad, high-carb diet.

You cannot use a site online to 'demonstrate' anything. Sorry, but you obviously don't realise that the vast majority of websites are chock full of nonsense. Much more bull than beef. Mendoza reads like a vegan's on health or a Christian missionary describing the wonders of heaven, full of nonsense and false information.

Paleo people hunted many kinds of animals, some were high in body fat, some very lean. In the situation of low fat, they discarded much of the lean. You CANNOT live

on high protein and a 'low to moderate' level of fat. I don't care what anyone wrote, it is a myth: 11% of calories with no carbs will kill you dead in a few weeks, that is DEAD, you know, 'no longer alive'. Protein levels above 50% do not leave enough room for the fat that you have to have. Very little protein is necessary for health, as little as 5% will do for a very long period, it will not help build more mass, however it will maintain what you have.

If this BS keeps up I am out of here, I am not kidding.

theBear Fri, Apr-07-06 23:59

Yes, a fall indeed killed Dr Atkins- from bleeding in the brain. He was in ill health, edemic and had suffered a stroke earlier -so far as I am aware. BUT his 'early' demise was not due to the diet he advocated- as his opponents claimed.

You do need to understand however, that unlike myself, both Stefansson (who did die of a stroke) and Atkins promoted diets they were convinced of the truth about, but had very little real, lifetime experience in following.

I never 'spout nonsense' no need to, that function is well served by you and a few others around here.

theBear Sat, Apr-08-06 02:35

Yes, if you are forced to stand amongst so many barnyard animals- the BS gets pretty deep, no matter how hard you try to shovel it out. Take care not to add to it by quoting online bullshit such as USDA (the 'food pyramid people') as the truth. You are only demonstrating that you have no clue about the truth.

Once keto-adapted, your energy levels will seem to go the roof after the fatigue you experience during the adaptation process. Of course the fatigue is constantly lessening each day, but once you are 'over the hump' you definitely will know it. It may take only a couple of weeks, but more often it is at least three and in some people (I don't know why) it may take longer. The slowest adaptation I am aware of took six weeks, but I really think the cause was 'hidden carbs', like the glucose they add to ultrapasteurised heavy cream, etc.

The terms you use are for different, unrelated syndromes. Cardiomyopathy is a degenerative disease of the muscles of the heart, sometimes due to infection, but more commonly it is due to an inherited genetic flaw. Cardiac infarction is the medical term for what is commonly referred to as a 'heart attack', brought on by a stoppage of the of blood flow to a portion of the heart's muscle. Congestive heart disease is a serious condition in which the heart's drainage begins to fail, leading to a 'pooling of fluid' in and around the heart. It progresses relentlessly, leading to ever increasing difficulty with any exertion, until finally the heart fails from the congestion and associated ischemia. Takes time, and is a truly horrible way to die. Hypertension is one of the results of progressed atherosclerosis. All have various 'causes', it is inappropriate to attempt to target one as the cause of another.

Have you seen a picture of Ray Audette? I have, and I have had correspondence with him. He admits he hasn't a clue what paleolithic peoples ate but is taking the assumption they ate like modern hunter-gatherers. He looks like death warmed over.

But of course he already has a book out there, and cannot (or will not) change it. Excellent Dylan quote.

Sorry, a lack of English reading and comprehension is not an open license to abuse. Read my post, I simply and very clearly stated that he did indeed die as the result of a fall (on an icy street as it happened) Bleeding into his brain was the actual cause of his eventual death, as many people do survive falls and blows to the head) resulted from his fall, I did not say 'he fell because of bleeding in his brain. In the post you refer to I corrected my statement about a stroke, although I do think he may have suffered one in the past, along with his other poor-health issues. You need to take a class in basic English, sweetie.

I will explain why I get so short with the many assertions of so-called 'fact' used to refute my statements.

The ideal in all science is objectivity. Studies should ideally be undertaken openly, and devised in a way which eliminates all variables except the one under investigation. Unfortunately however, research is very expensive and there are very few medical or bioscience research groups which are self-funded.

Research in science and medicine depends upon grants, and although there are some few grants which are given without any restrictions, sadly for the truth- these are the exceptions rather than the rule. The rule is that a donor sponsors research and studies which will produce results in support of the donor's agenda. NO matter how altruistic the scientific worker may be, the choice is research under these conditions or no research at all. If we examine research into cell metabolism the situation becomes very clouded and difficult. Many if not all metabolic processes cannot be duplicated outside the living cell (i.e. 'in vitro' meaning in glass apparatus), and some cells malfunction in cultures separated from the organs they belong to. The immense complexity of the processes of life confounds attempts to isolate and properly describe the various individual processes going on in a living cell. The results of even the most open and unbiased studies may not give any meaningful results in reference back to a living cell in a functioning animal. BUT many of these studies ARE NOT unbiased. It is the use by quotation of this sort of false and misleading information that is making me upset.

I have spent nearly half a century investigating, trying out, comparing and discarding a mountain of such nonsense. But few here in the forum even have a clue as to how this might be done, let alone how to find the obscure papers, nor would they have had enough time to even read through them all. Therefore they accept as gospel anything which in THEIR naive world-view seems reasonable, even the most outrageous claims- like glucose from protein in well fed animal, levels of insulin and glucagon both wrestling to the mat in the blood for 'supremacy', and glycogen depletion, to name a few of the most odious.

My cardiologists, Louis Bernstein, a lovely gently fellow, the best in day in Australia, and referred to by a GP friend of mine in Sydney as 'the doyen of Australian cardiologists', knew about the link between insulin and coronary artery disease. As did my heart surgeon, Matthew Bayfield a superb surgeon. They knew, but did not advise their patients on proper diet, instead I was issued a paper advising me to 'eat plenty of fresh fruit and vegetables, avoid saturated fat and food containing cholesterol' - a recipe with a virtual guarantee for the need of a repeat bypass in a few years, as many in the group I was part of, were there for. I was assured that would not be my fate due to my 'unusual diet'. But why did they not advise my way? For two reasons, one they knew as they said that people would not follow it, and (unspoken) they knew that they would cop it big time from their

medical associates if they did. Poor Dr Bernstein retired a few months after my operation, and suddenly died a year and a half later- from what was discovered to be Creutzfeld-Jacobs disease- the human kind, not the BSE-related variant, known to come from eating infected beef. That he was a heart specialist and not in contact so far as anyone who knew him well like his wife or worked with him in the profession at RPA, he was never in contact with patients suffering this rare malady. Nor was his practice a sort that would have exposed him even if one of his patients was carrying the prion. You need to have contact by ingestion or with your mucus membranes with the brain or spinal cord tissues of an infected human to contract human CJD. Where I am leading with this, is- there are more variables than fixed in all things regarding organic life, and in this case all of what we think, we know about the rare protein induced disease is not adequate to explain this person's infection and death.

While on the subject of medical research and in particular, practicing physicians, ask yourself if you ever go in and pay a fee to your doctor when you feel fit and healthy. Of course not, so why would you expect a professional person ot work hard to reduce or eliminate his clientele? Most of modern society's illls are diet-related ...other than the obvious things like infectious diseases, traumatic injuries, cancer, poisoning by pollutants in the environment and self administered toxins- like tobacco and alcohol. So prescribing good diet would reduce the income. This is so not on. You cannot expect a doctor to make you healthy, only to deal with problems on an acute level, usually with drugs and chemicals, many of which may produce further illls

The battery is what was called a type 505, most likely a 'B'-or "C' type battery which was used to supply voltages in portable battery powered, tube equipment ('A' is for filament (low) voltage supply, 'B' for plate (high) voltage, 'C' for low current grid-bias). If you take the battery's cover off, inside you will find a series-connected string of 15 small, 1.5v 'button' cells.

I don't know the answer to the menopause question on long regime, as I am not a female. I have adequate testosterone, but I don't have as high a sex drive I used to have. This is more likely due to other reasons than simply testosterone levels. Living systems are very complex, on the cellular level there are very few simple answers.

SOME pro bodybuilders (not all) may use multiple-angle exercises today, but in the classic days that was not the usual case at all. One old time coach who has been mentioned here was Vince Gironda. He had very simple routines, and bodies like Arnold's (amazing even by today's standards) were the results. He was no slouch himself in his body's size and shape, other than what I consider inadequate trap development, but that was intentional on his part. He, along with Reg Parks, did not consider prominent upper traps (on top of the shoulders) to be aesthetic, thus did not emphasise heavy shrugs in his routines. Today's champs all show 'loaf of bread' traps. Lest anyone question my bona fides on bodybuilding, I began (regular- 2x/week, brief and heavy) lifting weights in Jan of 1990, at the age of 55. At 8% bf and 138 lbs, I went in two years to 8% and 167 lbs. I am slow in regaining my mass due to the heavy toll on my body from the radiation therapy, which prevented me from working out for a period. Good now, and returning to more or less normal. Currently 5% and 144.

You may be right, only it sounds like a defense of your personal trip raising 'organic meat'. Your products may be great, I can only judge on the basis of the many thousands of pounds of all kinds of meat that I personally have bought, prepared and eaten. The 'organic' meat I have had, of any animal, has not presented it self to me as superior in appearance, fat, tenderness, flavour or price.

I have no negative opinion on the general organic produce market, but it does seem to have a lot of hype connected with it. An animal is a powerful, living system, and can adjust a whole lot better to what it is fed than a plant can. Organic cultivation is definitely the best for producing vegetation (not my kind of food). I also am quite aware that herbivorous animals, which spend most of their waking hours eating, usually will usually try to swallow virtually anything they can swallow. Intelligence is very low in any and all herbivores, although horses and goats are orders of magnitude above chickens and cattle.

'Grass-fed' is an Americanism, we don't have any of that down here. I referred to 'paddock fed or fattened' beef, from bullocks (steers) put out to graze on real, wild grass in large pastureland, not held in an small crowded, expensive, intensive feedlot, US style.

The ponies of Greenland were fed an exclusive diet of fish for about 800 years in the middle ages after contact with the Viking homelands were cut off. The animals seem to have been able to handle it. Of course, the horse is a hind-gut fermenter, not a ruminant.

Oh, yes- just exactly what 'chemicals' CAN you raise animals on? Be sure you understand what the term 'chemical' in the context means (i.e. like plant food). Semantics can be a mine field.

theBear Sun, Apr-09-06 01:47

True, I am only 71, not 89, and have only had 47 years on an all-meat diet. How long have you been eating what you consider a 'healthy diet'? Does it work for you?

I am not talking a diet, but years-long dietary practice, a lifestyle not temporary. I have only defined mine as healthy after nearly 50 years based on the most 'unscientific' kind of criteria: I found that: I am NOT as old in appearance, fitness and mental state those who are years younger than I. But of course, I may actually be an alien, a Martian perhaps, with a totally different body from a human, one which evolved from a totally different animal over millions of years, and therefore data from my life must not be taken as 'scientific evidence'.

If the evidence from my life experience is not scientific, then, pray tell, just what kind of 'evidence' do you suppose it to be?

If you live only in waiting for 'scientific evidence', you may wind up one day very old and feeble and never having had what you surely want, a nice, normal sized body, good health, good teeth and high fitness.

Who said 'nutrients and calories from plant matter cannot be absorbed by the body'?

If you cook the plants, it breaks down the cellulose of the cell wall and sets the meagre nutrients free, and of course they can be absorbed. The cellulose and fibre which form the bulk of the plant-sourced food are of no use, but must pass through and be discarded.

Is this a good, complete source of human nutrition?

No.

Can some people survive for a while on such a diet?

Yes. How well and for how long is questionable. I have known a great many vegetarians, and a few vegans. None were either fit or healthy. They live, but IMHO, at a very low level of subsistence.

How old are your 'models' and how long have they followed their path?

Should you follow their example?

That's your choice.

Some people get a kick out of jumping out of perfectly good airplanes with parachutes they themselves have packed, and wait until they are nearly on the ground before opening them.

My question is: what you doing here? This is especially important in view of the first sentence in my reply.

Chemicals are NOT 'cookie crumbs'. Neither are they 'unnatural' as they can and do occur in nature, and can be mined or extracted. 'Chemicals' refers to compounds like potassium nitrate, urea, ammonia, calcium phosphate, etc, on which you CAN raise plants- but not animals.

AT 200+ lbs your hypothyroid is highly likely to be due to your high body fat suppressing the production of thyroxin in your thyroid. Medication is not the way to fix it, reduction of BF will do the trick, that is unless 40 years of medication has not damaged your organ.

Menstruation is indeed linked to egg production. Only a small number of gametes in the ovaries are destined to make it to ripe eggs, if we had evolved while enjoying a longer life span than about 35 years, human egg supplies would last to that later end, as they do in other animals. The more eggs a woman has which will ripen, the earlier her menses begin and the later her menopause occurs. However, it is not linked with modern longevity. Menopause is hardly 'unnatural', only during the millions of years we evolved very few women ever lived long enough to get there, thus if you live past menopause and want to have a strong healthy body, you have to replace the missing hormones. You will not die if you don't, unless your bones give way from osteoporosis when you get older and you fall, then you probably will die. You don't fall and thus break a hip, the hip suddenly fails from weakened bone structure, then you fall. Usually pneumonia or some other factor will prevent recovery at this point. Without estrogen, bones degrade, nothing else can replace it.

You can eat only the stuff you know is good when dining at a friend's house, I always do, I never eat what other people do, ever. I would suffer even worse than you did, and for what?

You MAY be right. I sad that, so what? I recognise there are many things which may be true, I don't yet know enough in many cases to be sure. You will stop learning once you think you know everything. I learn constantly. Also, I will not make a statement based on conjecture.

Chickens are not herbivores, they are omnivorous, opportunistic feeders which, if allowed to free range, will primarily eat insects and small animals like mice and lizards- other birds, even. Basically anything they can catch. Grain-fed chicken eggs are insipid.

What other animals may need, like offal- to be healthy has little or nothing to do with humans. Inuit do not eat offal and they are a very-well studied group or people who have followed the all-meat path for hundreds of thousands of years- Stefansson said the do not eat liver of seals, which is the exclusive food of some tribes, others will eat caribou tongue and heart, but they prefer a few cuts of muscle and will eat nothing but that for expensive periods of time. I eat that way, I only eat offal maybe once in a great while, sometimes two years will pass with no liver (vit A is stored in one's own liver), and no other offal.

I have studied paleo-eating, and you are badly misinformed. DON'T post your myths and nonsense, I do not appreciate it.

You are very new, 'mr 3 posts', and need to read this entire thread. I really don't have the time to repeat myself: Humans do not have the same type of dentition as many kinds of carnivores. We have evolved from primate ancestors- we are in the insectivore lineage and thus do not have carnassals (shearing teeth). We developed excellent knives of volcanic glass 4.5 million years ago. Our faces are not long- we don't have mouths like carnassal-carnivores, our mouths and faces have adapted to speech, thus our canines became reduced down small, and the cusps of our molar and bicuspid teeth have reduced in size, since we don't specialise in eating bugs, and we use knives to cut our meat into swallowable bits.

The problem is that no-one so far has found any 'simple errors of fact', the objectors are only posting nonsense, based on bogus science, compounded by a complete lack of real world experience. The reason for this is also simple: I do not post conjecture.

Candida cannot 'eat through your stomach'. You seem to be psychosomatic with your fascination for this common, usually harmless fungus. Nonsense is of no value here. If you sustain an injury which becomes infected with this yeast, it may become systemic. In this case if you do not respond to intravenous nystatin, you will probably die. If you have genital candidiasis, there are some very resistant strains from Asia which came back with the vets from VietNam in the 60's. This strain mimics genital herpes, right down to the swollen lymphatics and blisters which become painful ulcers. It is very hard to overcome, I know because I had it for a time back then. Eventually it can be done in with tioconazole and/or other antifungals. Lamisil etc., should be trialled. Lamisil is also available as an internal medicine- a few months on it will even get rid of fungal nail infections- permanently. Your problem is due to some abnormality in your constitution, it is not a problem for others- I am sorry, but your advice is worthless.

If you feel great, are not hungry, and have lots of energy, then why bother about what a urine test-strip shows? I think there is way too much reliance on tests, measurements, 'proofs' and obsessive behaviour. You cannot adopt a lifestyle which depends upon adhering to time and mental-energy wasting activities. Follow the rules I have stated about food choices, they are simple and once understood, you don't even have to think about them. Eat, enjoy- and spend your precious, too short time on this plane living and enjoying your life.

It is completely 'normal' for old people (who ALL have calloused intestines), to

lose weight. That is what 'normal' means, in this context- it is what you observe.

Get off it, weird kid, 100mg/dl is completely normal. YOUR blood stats, shown so prominently in your sig, on the other hand- are pathological. Can the nonsense, please, we already know that you like to act the clown and seem the fool. Most likely this is due to your horribly inadequate diet.

How much protein is immaterial. I ate, and still eat- enough. Eat what it takes to satisfy on 80/20, don't worry about numbers. I usually liked around a couple of pounds(1 kg)/day of beef. That works out to about 150-200 gm. You need very little 'extra' protein- (or calories) - to build muscle mass, contrary to what you will read in the supplement-owned mags. Think about who rap;idly mass is added- a few grams/day? say 20 gms- that would give you a pound every 6 weeks, or 15 lbs in a year- an exceptional rate of growth indeed- and would require only about 5 gms of protein/day to create (muscle is only ~1/4 protein). Protein with adequate fat no matter how much does not make you 'hyper'- that is probably just your mind, not your diet. Unless you are using drugs- like anabolics.

There are several current HRT formulas, based on estradiol, which duplicate the human hormone mix very closely. Are getting into another semantics row over what constitutes 'natural? Let go.

You can eat way more than 1.5 kg meat/day- if you can tolerate the fat, NO amount of meat is constipating, but excess fat may give you diarrhea.

The ratio: 80%/20% is of CALORIES, not 'macronutrients'.

Fat is 9 cal/gm. Usually this works out to 15% of the steak should be fat. A one kg steak should have ~150 gm fat, 850 gm lean, and yield about 2500 cal.

Bodybuilders have no clue about how to eat. All of them I have ever met were believers in the most outrageous myths and fairy tales about diet. Most of them get grossly fat while training, then lose almost all of their size while preparing for competition, because their 'highly trained' muscles wind up more heavily marbled with intramuscular fat than a Kobi beefsteak.

You might not be able to eat 300 gm of protein on 80/20. Best I could do was around 5000 cal/day while dancing. As I increased my intake, and I had no problem with a 48 ounce Morton's Steakhouse porterhouse, I di not eat all the fat, I left some, but finished the lean. I previously advise the way you eat on an all meat diet is to eat mostly fat at first, it will soon become unappetizing, but the lean will not- so at that point you switch to lean until you have had enough. All of you are THINKING too much and not living. Measurements and calculations are NOT a part of a lifestyle- only of a temporary 'diet'.

I was not aware of being censored. I have re-examined that post to find and remove everything that I think was likely to be considered 'offensive' to anyone. I will repost it- after this one. I wish that I had been notified, I am always willing to re-edit my posts, which are usually long- and full of important stuff as well as my perhaps ill-advised attempts to limit the BS factor.

No, human life before agriculture was very hazardous- lack of animals (starvation seriously damages the body) wars and accidents, difficulty in childbirth, infections, disease, predators, parasites and other common things meant that very few people lived much past their late 20's to mid 30's. Men had a longer lifespan than women even though they had, and still have more problems surviving childhood (thus a slight bias towards more male births), due to female deaths during

childbirth. After ag, the general health became very poor, and although food was easier, the food itself was bad, so the lifespan did not improve, and may have gotten worse by disease, due to lowered immune response.

Protein in any amount does not damage the kidneys. You need to drink an adequate amount of water. The kidneys WILL suffer on any diet, if you get dehydrated. Bodybuilder.com is as full of dietary myth as Joe Weider's Muscle and Fitness, Flex, Ironman, Musclemag or that awful GNC rag. Yes indeed, high carbs are absolutely great at building intramuscular fat, looks good, big and meaty, but carbs strongly limit any addition of larger muscle fibres (real muscle size). Hardgainers are ectomorphic and cannot train as hard, as long or as frequently as other body types. Some ectomorphs have even been found to do best on ONE heavy duty workout every OTHER week. Read Mike Mentzer's Heavy Duty books, and anything by Alan Jones (founder of Nautilus). Ectomorphs do not get fat like the naturally muscular mesomorphs and endomorph do (I am a meso)- both of whom will add fat at the drop of a carb. Mesos can add muscle seemingly by just thinking about exercise.

If you want to gain quickly, then you must limit workouts to less than 90 min including aerobics, and make sure there are at LEAST two full days off before going back to the gym. Only one exercise per bodypart, short sets 3 only rising weight each set to failure at min of six to less than ten reps on last set. You do NOT gain while working out, in fact, the day after gives you nothing, only the second day is of value, and taking three days off is better, I alternate two and three rest days, which make the same days of the week for legs/bis/tris and for upper body (no isolates on arms). MOST people who do not use drugs gain little or nothing once they 'mature' their muscles because they lack enough rest between workouts, work out for too long each time, and do way too many exercises, at too low a weight. Trust me on this, I have been there, done all that.

I would not dispute that some vegetables may be, relative to other vegetables, 'nutrient dense'. Of course no vegetable is nutrient dense like meat, veggies are two full orders of magnitude less dense, and the 'nutrients' seen by analysis are mostly not very useful to the human body- for example soy beans are 23% protein, but less than 2.5% of this total protein can be used by your body. Worst is 'chick peas', or garbonzos, which test (in a nitrogen bomb) as being 45% 'protein', however the protein is not assimilatable by humans, perhaps 1% of the total can be used. I knew a grad student from India at UCLA when I took Russian language classes there, who had a grant to find a way to modify or treat this legume to make the protein useful as a human food. After working very hard on it for many years, he failed.

Animal fats are well over 90% saturated.

At the risk of offending dogma, Atkins included veg to make the regime acceptable on a cultural level, and the result is that it fails many people. Vegetation is not only toxic to some extent, one bad thing about eating it is that it both feeds and supports the (necessary in a veg diet) growth of putrefactive bacteria in the intestines. In addition, the rough cellulosic fibre (most of the vegetable's mass/volume) scratches and irritates the delicate intestinal lining as it passes through, and causes first, mucus secretion followed by scarring (callous formation). Both limit the intestine's ability to absorb nutrients. This damage is universal over time with a mixed diet and is the cause of the 'perplexing' malnourished condition common in older people.

This inside-callous is not necessary, it is a choice you make. There is a very good possibility that much of my youthful fitness and good health is due to my body's

ability to still, at my age, extract full nutrition from all my meals. Please, if you doubt what I a say, but lack personal experience to the contrary, then either refrain or join an autopsy team and directly examine the intestines of old folks. Let's put it like this, if you use something abrasive on ANY surface ANYWHERE in or on your body, you WILL cause a callous to form. This is called 'logic'. It is a type of mental activity that seems strangely absent from most of the posts I have read since this thread began.

A 'mono' diet of only one thing is not boring- so long as the one thing is a kind of fatty meat. It is vegetation with is BORING, so much so that the trade in spices caused wars. Check out any cookbook, 80-90% of all recipes are ways to disguise vegetables as food. Variety is for the benefit of the mind and to fool the body, which 'hates' vegetables. Only the mind can be trained to 'love' them.

READ carefully: I DO NOT care what any of you eat. MOST of the posters on this thread don't care either. I DO CARE when someone continually beats a drum about stuff that is not relevant to an all meat diet. You will eat, and like, what your mother taught you to eat as an infant, period. It has NOTHING to do with what is good or bad for a human to eat. PLEASE do NOT waste our time explaining your dietary quirks, and why this path is no good. We don't care.

The REAL question for Genesis believers is: If Adam and Eve were the only humans God created, as the first chapters so definitively state, then HOW and WHERE did their sons obtain wives? Myth and fable do not follow logic. Of course, after finding these 'nonhuman' wives, the agriculturist then murdered his husbandryman brother. 'God knows', meat is good, and veggies are not. Figures, there usually is a grain of 'truth' in any fable.

At first I was fanatically strict, for about 6 years. If I had not been so strict, I doubt I could have stayed with it. Then I discovered cannabis and had some falling-off which was intermittent for a time, not serious, but each time I gained fat so quickly- even so little as a half an avocado (fatty fruit? --1/2 carbs!) that I quickly returned to the regime- of course I then had to re-keto-adapt. So many veg foods like nuts seem more fat and protein, that it was a big surprise when I actually looked up and found out that they had massive percentages of carbs. It is surprising how little time- and carbs- will derail your keto-adaptation. For some reason, and for some time now, cannabis no longer causes me to have 'the munchies'.

How indeed did fat become the villain? Ancient wisdom: 'Follow the money'. Simple-bad science, done for money- grants from Big Ag to promote principally- grains, also oil seed products, and sugar. Big Ag is not into meat production, too labour intensive, can't be planted, harvested, stored or transported as cheaply or easily- the only real 'profit' in meat is at the end of the line- only the retailer can double his cost... etc.. You can trust me on this, I live in cattle country.

Many of the vast number of grain-based foodstuffs on market shelves are labelled '97% fat free' or some such irrelevancy.

Human menopause occurs at an age beyond the lifespan of women until very recent times, thus the evolutionary pressure to maintain sexual hormones and reproductive capacity did not exist. Other carnivores can breed nearly right up to death. Medicine has made us live longer, even men, who always lived longer than a childbearing woman, barring accidents etc. So the male hormone declines quite slowly, rather than ceasing abruptly like estrogen production in women. Sex hormones are extremely important for both health and longevity. Every menopausal woman should take HRT, but choose only estradiol, the estrogen natural to humans, plus a progesterone, avoid the others, like the phytoestrogens and pregnant mare's piss -

derived (Premarin), both of which cause big trouble.

The 'five gram rule' may be because this equals the total amount of glucose in your blood at any given time. In an all meat diet, glucose turnover is EXTREMELY slow, so perhaps that is why more than an equal amount/day causes failure of keto-adaptation in many people. I don't know, but this seem like a possible, empirically it is true.

FYI: One of my more interesting 'lost' papers is about the activity of the adipose tissues. Seems as though there is a so far 'unidentified hormone/signalling-substance' (might be nervous- sympathetic or parasympathetic) which is produced by the fatty tissues which interacts with the thyroid gland and seems to control the level os output. This means that the low thyroid seen in overweight and obese people is not the cause, but the consequence of a high BF%. The study showed the rise of thyroid with fat loss and teh drop in thyroid with fat gain. In terms of survival, this makes perfect logic: If you are fat, this indicates that you are well fed and can lay back, you do not need to rush around to get more food. If, on the other hand you are losing fat, then you need to speed things up in order to more effectively pursue and catch more food.

What is 'music' to an elder, may be 'noise' to a youth. ... and vice versa...

The citric acid cycle converts glucose to fat. Enzymes split fatty acids from glycerol, they are transported into the working cells by a complex with carnitine, and are used to reconvert ADP to APT, producing ketone bodies in the process. Just what do you suppose the body does then, with this 3-carbon carbohydrate? Glycogen stores are stable in a keto-adapted body, neither depleted nor replenished. Glycerol is both produced from glucose and is used in reverse to produce glucose: glucose (enzyme) = 2 glycerol - 2 glycerol (enzyme) = glucose. Please, do not continually spout this constant stream of absolute rubbish every time you put your hands on the keyboard. I don't mind your ignorance, it is common, but I do resent you arrogance.

There are a great many kinds of artificial sweeteners, zero carb ones, which do NOT contain any maltodextrins, sorbitol, or any of the other lesser known sugars, some are even protein polypeptides.

Yes, that is the Greg Ellis I have known for about 18 years.

It is an all-meat, high-fat, dietary path.

By the way, although humans cannot digest raw vegetation, not to worry: There are no essential nutrients in them to lose by cooking anyway. Cooking does not damage the carbs- the real reason veggies can substitute as 'food' in an emergency.

I don't understand 'heal' our callous. If you mean the scarring in the intestine, it is the result of an ongoing process so long as you are on a mixed diet. It is irreversible, so the younger you are when you stop the process, the less effected you will be later on, when you grow old.

I used 'callous' as a word of convenience to bring to mind to a process which is similar in some ways but not exactly equivalent to the problem in the gut. Scar tissue is is permanent, unlike the toughened skin you get on your hand from working hard without gloves. The intestines are not skin, but sensitive mucosa, and cannot

toughen up, so they are just slowly damaged.

I am not responding to the BS. I do wonder, why are you here, if you don't think 47 years on a strictly all-meat diet means anything? That, in essence, is the only thing that this thread is about. If you are not interested in my experiences and what I have to say, then please, do us all a favour and fall silent.

I have never heard a reason for 'rabbit starvation' (protein toxicity), I do know however, that it is a demonstrable fact. Many, perhaps most, metabolic actions are poorly understood. You do not need to analyse everything to be able to eat properly. Remember the race car driver?

Brown eggs are laid only by certain breeds. The colour and thickness are both genetically determined rather than being due to nutrition.

Aerobics 20-30 min, do it first to warm up your heart and lungs, warm up the muscles so you can stretch, and get your liver started on producing the enzymes you will need for the hard work. Muscles do not 'adapt' other than by growing stronger. Growth will continue to your genetic end point on the same exercise as long as you periodically increase loading. Changing routines is for your mind- not your muscles, that is an old myth.

Of course if you have had more than my 16 years of weight training, which comes on top of a life of ballet, modern dance, running/jogging, swimming/lifesaving, distance road biking, mountain biking, calisthenics and other stressful exercise regimes, then please- explain your experiences to me and explain how and why they differ from mine. Always interested in experience, but not interested in hearsay.

If anyone wants to exchange more info on exercise, or learn about how I set up my exercise regime, e/mail me. Non-dietary subject matter is taking up too much space and time here.

In the human gut, unlike in the rat, bacteria cannot make Vit B, it comes in more than adequate amounts from meat in the diet. I had to stop the mild B supplements I was using shortly after starting weight lifting (I increased the amount of meat/day). I suffered muscle weakness in my lats from excess B (determined by a kinesiologist).

A salient feature of our early acculturation is that it is not amenable to self-analysis. It is buried at the same level as instinct- which it over-writes. It is what makes us humans who differ from other animals. It gives us culture and supports our society. I therefore expect people to object to what I say. That doesn't change the facts, however.

I avoid preserved food. Kangaroo is very lean- no fat marbling. Most cuts are tough as nails. The tail of a joey is nice. Flavour is good. Crocodile is very nice meat also, but too dear for regular consumption.

One other thing is interesting about my 71 year old body. My eyes are very good, I have a bit of astigmatism, but very good accommodation, I do not need glasses either to drive, watch movies or to read. My wife, 17 years younger, needs glasses for both. All those I know who are her age or older need lenses. I don't, but I do know that insulin causes loss of flexibility in many structures, and induces cataracts etc., in the eyes.

Most Deadheads were/are 'hippies', who as a group have what rates amongst the world's worst eating habits- heavy on the veggies.

'Bred out" = evolution. Evolution over 4.5 million years, in fact.

'High fibre...' = more proof positive that nonsense and bad advice rules the internet.

For anyone who is not up on this, 'good fibre' is the result of 'studies' commissioned by 'big ag' i.e. grain growers and cereal manufacturers, to convince people to eat material which is a byproduct of refining grain: Masses of indigestible cellulose, which were formerly sold as waste to cardboard manufacturers. Added to food, and sold at human food prices, it has been a fantastic boost to the cereal industry's bottom line. Enough said.

One doesn't chew meat, cooked or raw, just cut it into pieces small enough to swallow, mash a few times to add saliva and swallow. If you are having problems visualising how, watch a dog or cat eat.

Eating all meat in jail was dead easy. In the beginning I traded my veggies with others for their meat. Black Muslims won't eat chicken or pork, and are very suspicious of any meat they are given in jail. I as then assigned to work in food service, and I was then in complete control of what I ate. I supplemented the standard daily menu by trading my allowance of tobacco (2 cartons/week) with the butcher for one steak/day- thus I was able to eliminate the very common meals of pork. It is easy for anyone committed to this path to stay strict no matter the circumstances, given the dedication.

I was charged and convicted of a misdemeanor. However I do not consider myself any kind of criminal. The law I was sent to prison for breaking was and still is, 'unconstitutional'. My actions, begun when what I did was perfectly legal, were necessary to assure that I did not have to take unknown substances into my body. I don't care whether others agree with me, but the taking of psychically active substances into one's own body (so long as you do not thereby present a danger to others), is a basic human right, respected over thousands of years and still in evidence amongst tribes like the Huichols and Tarahumara of Mexico. Outlawing one 'recreational drug', alcohol in the US, required a constitutional amendment. The later prohibition of the present 'illegal' drugs was based on the flawed propositions that it was first, a tax issue (the tax stamps the law required were never printed), then it was called a 'health and safety issue, these were ploys presented by former alcohol prohibition enforcement officials after they lost their lucrative graft when Prohibition was repealed.

The prohibition itself has created a massive problem in public health, it has caused thousands of deaths from contaminated drugs, overdoses etc.

Making acid was (and is) very expensive. A very small amount is LOTS of doses. I gave away ~half and sold ~half at a low price to pay for it. I made only a very small quantity over the less than three years that I did it.

The definition of 'criminal' is anything that there is a law proscribing. Definition of a 'law' is: anything that a group of men with lawmaking power say it is. Constitutional and unconstitutional refer to the fundamental document which grants government power and forbids some powers to it. A law in violation of this document either in using or abusing powers is unconstitutional but will remain in force until

declared null by the Court.

The Supreme Court can decide, without appeal or recourse, whether to hear any given case or not. If the case is a challenge to the constitutionality of a law and it is not accepted and decided, that failure does not make that law constitutional. Only if the Court hears the challenge and makes a decision, is it truly defined.

The Supreme Court has rejected without comment every single case ever brought to it which questions the constitutionality of drug prohibition. There are many unconstitutional laws in action in the US.

MY godfather, Stanley Reed, was an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, and I have a pretty substantial knowledge base on the US Constitution.

LOOK FOLKS. I don't want to waste my time participating in a forum which is about doctor's licenses, my past drug activities, Grateful Dead, arguments about questionable 'science 'or anything other than the diet I follow. Comprehend? ONE pertinent item per page... is just not on.

Jack LaLanne is an old friend of mine. He was never a true vegetarian, but he ate a mixed diet very heavy on vegetation. We always disagreed on matters of diet, otherwise we were good friends, I liked the tough little shrimp (<5'4"). By the time he reached my age, he had begun to get some serious physical, and worse, some very serious mental problems, which I think were alcohol-related. He is a basket case at present, if he is indeed still alive- I have not been in contact with him for some time. In the early 60's I shared a house with his business partner, Russ Warner, well known for his bodybuilding photos. He and I met due to our interest in amateur radio, which is how I know Jack. I thought he looked his age, but was pretty fit. He was never greatly muscular, but had trained himself to have one of the greatest endurance condition I ever saw, as I said however- he was dog-tough and had that 'I never quit' attitude.

I see his website shows him alive and well, still doing much the same as he always has. Great, he is a true character.

Ok, here is a shortened version:

You do not have to be an automotive engine designer to drive a race car and win. You do not have to question the role of a universally eaten, irritating material, sent daily through a very delicate structure is causative if you can see the results: malnutrition while on high quality food intake. This is as universal an observation as vegetation is eaten as food. It would be nice to know, but doesn't change things. I do not eat roughage. On rare occasions I have done so, and the result is immediate- cramps, pain and loose bowels with mucus.

I do not know, nor does anyone else, exactly what primitive man ate. I am a modern man, and I know what the Inuit, who are also moderns, ate. I am trying to show that an all meat diet is the best for humans, and I think my experience is no different than anyone else's would be.

I have known two people who announced to me they were becoming 'fruitarians'. One was hospitalised after only 90 days with severe hallucinations which the doctors said were due to severe lack of protein which affected his brain. A very severe deficiency disease is caused by lack of protein, it is called kwashiorkor and is commonly seen in parts of sub Saharan Africa. It took three weeks before he was fit

to leave hospital. The second gave it away after about six weeks, saying he did not feel good. I have only heard of this dietary perversion by hearsay otherwise. It is so extremely nutrient deficient it could not sustain life. Even the famous flying foxes, commonly referred to as 'fruit bats' for their predation on orchard crops, actually eat more flowers for the pollen than fruit- pollen is a very good source of protein for many herbivorous animals, bees are another. I live in flying fox country and hear them nightly nattering away in the gum trees as they fight over the best flowers. What is the obvious conclusion here is that people who claim to be fruitarians are like those who claim to be 'breatharians' (don't eat anything, just live on the air they breathe), liars. Or they are like my friend Mama Cass Elliot who claimed she never ate much at meals. which was true, but what she didn't say was how she gorged herself every night after everyone else was in bed on kgs of things like spaghetti and cake etc.

Meat is a liquid when it exits the stomach and enters the duodenum. This is not conjecture, it was observed by military doctors during the Napoleonic wars (before it was fashionable for researchers to fabricate data). A soldier's abdomen was slashed by a sword in battle and bound up on the scene, but not dealt with further, and healed without proper care, which resulted in the edge of the stomach healing to the edge of the skin-cut. This strange condition, when later discovered (he complained of leaking food when he ate) the doctors quite logically used the opening to study what becomes of various foods when inserted into the stomach. Vegetation became a slurry. But a whole, unchewed, uncut and unaltered steak, fat and all, dissolved within one hour into a perfect liquid containing fat droplets (bile emulsifies fat only after the chyme leaves the stomach..

Liquids don't cause abrasion. The 'western diet' is a mixed diet, and has a lot of indigestible roughage. Since the undigested residues are all vegetable, so how is this to be construed to implicate the postulated role of meat- liquefied and completely assimilated in the small intestine? The way to eliminate abrasion is to eliminate vegetation, pure and simple. Most colonic polyps are harmless, only a few eventually become cancerous.

That you can find something on the internet which says something different from the truth is no surprise.

Arguing over what people who lived 100 thousand years ago ate or did not eat will not produce one single bit of useful knowledge for eating today. The things they ate or did not eat, even if we knew what they were, are no longer around.

Live in the real, present world, and stop looking for new reasons to reject the path, just reject it, as your acculturation insists you do, then go on with your own lives and leave this thread to those who do care, so we can continue to share our real world knowledge without having to read all the nonsense, please.

The 'voice within' is the echo of the voice of your mother instructing you as to what you must eat.

The Island (by international, poor quality telephone connection) interview is VERY badly transcribed and is not even close to much of what I said. I asked for a copy of the tape, but the editor refused, and also rejected my extensive attempt to reconstruct the parts which were truly far fetched. I learned from this experience, and no longer do telephone interviews.

Actually, anyone who is on an all meat diet can feed themselves like a king at around half of what a good mixed diet costs by shopping for meat bargains- and asking for free fat off-cuts. Specials are a popular advertising leader for all

markets.

Chitin, the exoskeleton of insects, is what hair, hooves, fingernails and horn are- and is indigestible to all higher animals, even obligate insectivores. It can be broken down by soil bacteria, and can be digested by many insects.

Here it is, I am not going to repeat my simple rule for eating again:

Eat only from the animal kingdom. Avoid eating carby animal food, like lactose (dairy) and more than a very small, occasional, few ounces of liver.

Do not measure what you eat and do not worry about variety.

Do as little cooking of your food as you can tolerate.

Eat the fatty part preferentially in each meal first, then finish as much of the lean as you want. Leftovers will keep.

You do not need 'recipes' or 'sample meals' to follow.

When away from home, no matter if it is a restaurant, family or friends, or business meal, eat only from the animal kingdom, avoid the rest, practice doing this unassumingly and make pleasant, distracting comments if bailed up on it. Learn to politely refuse alcohol.

Why is this so hard to accept by people who say they want to have a nice, normal body and good health?

Coprolites or shibboleths, makes no difference. The vegetable content of man's diet had to be less less than 2-3% or the bones would have shown it. Besides, who knows for sure what animal those fossils truly came from? Most turds from opportunistic feeders (dogs for instance) as well as humans and other carnivores of a similar size are virtually indistinguishable by appearance (size and shape).

The only serious 'effect' of a bowl of oatmeal every 4 weeks is to totally prevent keto-adaptation. Of course if you do eat the oatmeal without any noticeable effect' your daily carb intake is surely already high enough by itself so no adaptation is taking place anyway.

Caution: When considering a 'study' which shows something like 'DNA damage', you must ask what method was used and what the definition of 'damage' was. More important is to find out whose grant or sponsorship the research team was on.

The presence or absence of a component in diet must be specifically measured and shown in isolation of other variables. If substance A is found to be connected to a change, then unless the absence of that substance was also measured (both in exactly the same mix and conditions), you cannot say the absence will not still give the result, because this has not been measured.

A common error in 'staged' studies is failing to set conditions that are neutral for all components other than the one under study so that there is only a single variable. Even when this is done the results are ONLY valid for those exact conditions, for instance if the study was in a specific mixed diet, then it holds

only for that mix, and not for any other. especially one such as a pure mono-diet. The study has to separate the causative agent from all other components. It may not be one component, but an interaction between the components of the mix. So far as I have found by reading literally thousands of papers, not one has been specific in proof of the claims made in the abstract for a single causative agent.

Indigenous Australians are modern hunter-gathers. Inuit are also moderns, but since no vegetation is found in their environment, gathering as a cultural skill was never acquired (the way all cultural practices are spread- by cultural exchange). Both cultures retained paleolithic stone tools.

Stomach ulcers are caused by a bacterial infection (hylobacter pylorus). No one so far has suggested, let alone shown that this bacteria causes stomach cancer. So far as I know only the asbestos component in the talc commonly used to 'polish' rice, and make it non-sticky, has been implicated in stomach cancer.

Squamous-cell cancer is the most glucose-avid cell type that has been found in the body. Restrict glucose/glucose turnover and it can only very slowly spread. Given good levels of glucose turnover and it becomes one of the most rapid, aggressive and difficult to stop type of cancer known. The cancer's metastasis is severely restricted by low glucose availability- however, to replace glucose that it takes, the body NEVER uses protein- only glycerol (structurally 1/2 glucose) available from fat metabolism, which starts with triglycerides. Protein are degraded ONLY under circumstances related to severe fasting and starvation. The claim that insulin is a 'growth factor' is incorrect. There is an 'insulin-like' growth factor, however even it has been shown to be ineffective in stimulating skeletal muscle growth, something it was heavily touted for by the bodybuilding community.

Long dwell time the stomach is related to the indigestibility of vegetation, and the small area of the stomach's lining which produces veggie-digesting enzymes- 75% is devoted to HCl, which is all that is needed to dissolve meat.. I do not remember all the things the French doctors put in that unfortunate soldier's stomach, but I assume most meats fare similarly to red meat. My old boxing coach only fed us rare (fatty) beefsteaks and hour before a match.

What is it with people who have never even been close to any barnyard animal, claiming our teeth are 'designed like horses and cows'? Anyone who has actually looked into a cow or horse's mouth would die laughing at this statement. Herbivore teeth are shaped like jellyrolls set on end. The enamel and dentine are formed in layers which wrap around in a circle. The tooth grows continually during life, while wearing and decaying. If not enough abrasive food is eaten by an herbivore or some omnivores, the front teeth can grow so long as to interfere with closure of the mouth- a common condition in rodents. In horses the growth rings are used to verify the age of the animal. Hence the old saw, 'don't look a gift horse in the mouth' i.e., check its age.

I have said this already, we evolved our mouth shape for speech. Our dentition is that of the insectivore lineage to which primates belong. Carnassals (shearing teeth located in the cheek area of the jaw) are found in other carnivore lineages, and require the animal have a long muzzle/face - which precludes development of speech. Four and a half million years of knives and fire have reduced our canine teeth to suit the major use for which we put our mouths, which is speech. The specific tooth types of the various mammalian lineages (herbivorous, insectivorous, carnassal-carnivore, etc) each evolved across hundreds of millions of years, not relatively short periods like 4-1/2, which saw only modifications, not radical changes. Our teeth have a rather thin, continuous enamel coat, thus are not protected against wear and bacteria-induced caries, thus they are not suited to abrasive and or

carbohydrate-rich foods (vegetables). Prior to tooth brushes and oral hygiene, people were usually toothless (or dead from an abscessed tooth) by their late 20's or early 30's.

I sleep about 7 hours/night.

On a diet high in carbs, the brain uses dietary--derived glucose. Glycogen is never used for anything but emergency glucose when fasting. Glycerol is rarely present in large amounts since on a high carb diet fat intake is usually low, but is converted into fat like other carbs- and ketones are used in that way as well if the body has dietary carb-sourced glucose in circulation.. In brief, ketones and glycerol are important carbs in a diet without carb intake, not when carbs are present. In the presence of excess carbs, insulin rules and fat is made from them in the adipose tissues, while dietary fat alone is used for muscular work.

This answer is consistent with some papers I have, and is consistent with my own observations of my own body.

Perhaps I am growing tired of answering the same tired old questions so often, even from those who want to follow but seem to think this path has to be complicated. It is so simple as to be laughable.

The point is, if you all cannot stop the bullshit and let this thread grow quiet enough to be removed from the WAR ZONE, I will bail out. I am not going to traipse around the forum, I simply do not have the time as it is, to deal with this one. Some of you are so avid and post so often and much that I strongly suspect you have no life off-line at all.

No one has investigated a diet totally lacking in not only fibre, but all vegetation. Perhaps in a mixed diet, eating some equivalent to cardboard helps in some mysterious way to reduce the incidence of bowel cancer. However without a proper study, my claim that an all-meat diet is intrinsically better still stands.

The common house-cat is used in human anatomy classes as a substitute for the very expensive human cadaver because the internal organs are, in size and shape, relative length of intestines, type of stomach, kidneys, liver etc are nearly IDENTICAL to human. In other words, we have the 'guts' of a carnivore as well as the dentition of one type of carnivorous lineage.

Without keto-adaptation, you will experience a lot of tiredness, fatigue and low energy, and in some cases will 'stall' and not continue to lose bodyfat, or will only lose VERY slowly. It is personal as to whether you consider that to be a 'danger' or not.

Sorry, but I am not going to 'prove' anything, either use Google or take my word for what I say. I have read so much, and so many things in the 69 years I have been able to read, that many things I know about I cannot cite a reference for- other than what is in my memory.

Beaumont may or may not have known about the French soldier, but considering his interest in digestion, it is quite likely he had. I was not referring to Beaumont, but events over 20 years earlier, which took place in France during the Napoleonic wars.

Tales of failure to overcome one's dietary acculturation are the norm. I have

listened to them recounted in great numbers for nearly fifty years. Genetic-obese people will always remain obese- or endure constant hunger to retain less body fat on a carb-containing diet.

It is always like watching a losing battle for me and I wonder sometimes why I still bother to try telling people the truth about humans and our food.

Human molar teeth are of the crushing, not grinding type, to see what a grinding type tooth looks like, examine a horse, goat or cow's molars.

10 commandments? Call it whatever you like I really couldn't care less what you call them, they are the simple rules to aid in following a carnivorous lifestyle, and have nothing to do with superstition or any other religious concept. Anyway, there are only six, but you could add: 'Be sure to drink lots of clean water each day to assure a good state of hydration'. I think any 'tension' here is due to rejection of principles, not the way I delineate them.

I love genuine questions. I hate bullshit. They are different- bullshit consists of nonsensical statements. The salient content of my post is that I do not have time to waste. So long as those who come, ask and not dispute, fine- then I will have enough justification to continue.

Claiming that this or that statement I have made does not jibe with some 'expert' a reader 'believes in', is not on. Demanding 'proof' is not on. Keep that stuff out of your posts, and I am very willing to share my experience in ways to live this extremely contrary dietary-lifestyle, and adjust your behaviour without compromising the path, to the conditions we all face everyday while living inside a general western social setting.

I am not going to sit here and endure a trial over my knowledge, I have nothing to prove, only working wisdom to share.

I sleep in a tent, but we have water, a kitchen with woodstove, gas cooker, electric fan oven, fridges, flush toilet/septic system, a classy tent with a nice queensized bed, and a world-class solar/wind/diesel electrical system. I've lived this way for 24 years.

Sorry, another bit of utter nonsense by someone ignorant of the subject. There are NO 'fruits and berries' in the tundra- where the Inuit live/lived.

Choose cuts of beef based on appearance, you can see the fat in the muscle as marbling- also the thickness and colour of the 'cover' or outer fat is easy to judge. Quality rating is based on fat content in the US, prime is fattest, choice just below that, then good or standard and last- cutter and canner. The recent fat phobia led many markets to switch to low grades- look for a label or ask the butcher.

Of course I stick to my own black box, it is not possible to know anything about anyone else's. Not that that matters, since I only have my own experiences to share.

'Blade' is a cut from the shoulder region, is usually called 7-bone in the US. It is the cut preferred by the Inuit, according to Stefansson. It has a different flavour than sirloin or rib. It is best not to cook it very much, as it becomes very tough, but is tender if bleu.

The gristle in meat is the most precious and nourishing protein of all. A hunter without tools, in a survival mode must make a very hard choice whether to use tendon or sinew from a kill as food- or to form the back of a bow and make a bowstring. I highly recommend that you always seek out and eat any and all of the 'chewy bits'.

Milk of any source is very carby and is not a good food for adults- it is not properly digested after about age six...

Coprolites from which animal? How do they know? There is no visible way to separate human fossilised dung from that of many other animals, such as dogs and pigs, etc.

Boy- you have a lot of gall to attempt to lecture me on cancer!

Especially since you don't know jack about cancer. You have never had any sort of cancer. You are not a medical professional, let alone a cancer specialist. And obviously you have no study background in the subject. I have studied- extensively.

Radiation is the only 'known' source of cancer? That is the dumbest bit yet. I guess that smoking is ok, and of course, asbestos does not cause mesothelioma, and HPV doesn't cause cervical cancer. Where does this quaint variety of arrogant ignorance come from? This is not the first blast of rubbish from this source, either.

SCC cells, as well as those of all the metastasing cancers, can be readily shown to travel progressively along nerves or lymphatics, or by way of the blood stream and establish distant tumours and involve distant lymph nodes- that is established fact, not conjecture as you claim.

Neck cancer is no longer treated with radical neck dissection, only with radiation-combo. The use of a small amount of cisplatin doubles the effectiveness of the radiation. Survivor is the only accurate term for someone in remission, no matter how long it has been since the last cancer cell was found- since the word 'cure' is not traditionally used with respect to cancer.

I am well-qualified to offer good advice on cancer.

theBear Sun, Apr-16-06 23:23

Yes indeed, some cancer types do require large amounts of glucose, specifically SCC. Many types however- do not. The PET scan which uses radioactive fluorine18 -tagged desoyglucose to provide a positron source, is very good at imaging SCC due to its glucose-avid nature. I think the fact my tonsillar SCC remained in my neck even though it was of years standing was due to the lack of glucose-turnover in my body. There is a great deal of speculation as to what factor initiates metastasis. SCC usually is very aggressive and spreads quickly out of the local area.

The lowcarbfluxury site is confusing and misinformative. They misunderstand the Krebs cycle and are dead wrong about oxygen and cancer. Not only not anaerobic, a cancer cell is the premiere AEROBIC cell. Oxygen- in great supply- is absolutely essential to growth in all cancer types So much so that tumours always build lots of new blood vessels to supply it (angiogenesis). After finishing my treatment, I was told I had to wait until they were sure that no cells survived the radiotherapy before they could assign me to hyperbaric oxygen therapy. Saturating my tissues with dissolved oxygen would have caused an explosion of growth in any existing cancerous cells.

So far no cancer- 18 mos since end of treatment. Cells in isolation cannot be found, only larger groups of cells, so each year that passes give renewed hope all are gone. Of course there is always the possibility that the radiation may cause something new- and different. One of the risks.

Soy is toxic and the protein it contains is useless in humans, it cannot be used. I strongly advise NOT feeding anything made from soy to a baby or child. Or to an adult for that matter.

I know about lactose intolerance, but I've never heard the phrase 'casein intolerance'. Allergy to cow's milk is common, but is not due to the casein or whey components. Only to fresh liquid whole milk, not to cream and butter or processed milk. The least allergenic of fresh milk is goat's milk.

I was allergic to cow's milk until about age 11, but had no reaction from evaporated milk (yukky), goat's milk (yum), and buttermilk (ok-good). All of which I drank. We did not know about yoghurt in my family in those days, but that might have been ok. Probably powdered milk is also ok. Some factor in the milk other than the nourishing protein components is the cause.

Tasty Chook is my favourite also.

I have no real knowledge of the design criteria of gas turbine blades, for one thing. Complex microwave electronics design also falls outside my interest area. The design of bicycle, car and motorcycle tyres are a subject of which I have no knowledge. There are a great many things which do not interest me, or have not yet been brought to my attention.

Otherwise, my mind is very like a good, well rounded encyclopedia, always has been. That is the great advantage of being born with a near eidetic memory, an intense curiosity about everything, and acquiring the ability to read at age 2.

Very little which has arisen on this thread is outside my expertise, however. Those few things which have been, I have noted- you can go back and find them if you have the time and are motivated.

Please read the entire post before flying off the handle.

I was VIOLENTLY allergic to fresh COWS milk as a child. This is what she described. Why she termed it 'casein intolerance' I have no idea. Probably a figure of speech. Allergy to cow's milk is very common and usually develops at that same age, I did at 22 months also. Often happens as the child is being weaned off breast milk.

I was NOT allergic to fermented cow's milk like buttermilk.

I was NOT allergic to processed cow's milk like canned evaporated milk.

I was NOT allergic to fresh goat's milk.

THEREFORE I was NOT allergic to the whey or casein proteins in the milk, which are found in all of the milk types that I was NOT allergic to.

I was found to be allergic to 44 out of 48 things I was given a Schick test for.

I did not grow out of the milk allergy until I was 11.

All the rest, (including asthma) I grew out of around the same time, only cat dander- that one persisted into my early 20's, then vanished.

This is called simple deductive logic. Are we clear?

I have previously affirmed the use of vegetation, especially extracts and concentrates as medicine, in fact the only truly 'safe' medicines seem to originate in plants, synthetics are usually very toxic, with serious side effects. That said, vegetable juice is not a concentrated extract of active medicinals, but a raw extract, heavy with carbs. On this dietary regime, carbs are to be avoided, thus water is the preferred drink. Some juices are near hypertonic with sugar- orange juice, for instance.

OK, I am very much aware of gluten as a toxin, in fact if a child is not desensitised to wheat by early exposure, the adult cannot tolerate it. I am also not surprised that casein may also fall into a similar category. I wonder if this may be one of those cruel ways in which nature deals with disabilities, since human breast milk also contains casein, and such a baby would have serious difficulty surviving from day one. I'm sure that raising an autistic child is a very heavy burden.

Soybeans measure by the 'nitrogen bomb' as containing 23% nitrogenous material, interpreted as protein. Of this, approximately 2.5% is utilisable in the human body. This protein is deficient in its amino acid spectrum. Many people experience allergic symptoms to soy products, if your kid doesn't, you are lucky. Egg protein is pretty good, you can buy eggwhite albumin as a powder, perhaps add some to the soy milk. Hopefully he will accept some form of meat eventually.

I have covered most of the questions from kidnobody in previous posts.

Read the 'simple rules'.

Eating the fat preferentially is for adjusting the fat/protein ratio. Calorie restriction and/or 'partial fasting' are neither necessary nor desirable.

You do not have to eat any organ meats other than the occasional bit of liver. In fact, they are inferior to the muscles in food value. Tongue must be over-cooked to be edible. Freezing damages tissues (exception is suet), changes taste and texture, hastens spoilage once defrosted- but does not destroy nutrients. Cook meat VERY briefly, at a high a temp in melted fat. Cooking any meat for ten minutes at any temp over 104F- ruins it (at 104F it will not 'cook', it simply dries into jerky after awhile). Cooked meat is much more difficult to digest and has lost many important vitamins and nutrients. Only sear the outside, the inside should remain uncooked, blood rare to bleu.

Do not eat 'over four hours', it will mess up your digestion. Eat the fat and lean together. Eat as quickly as you can- meat does not need to be chewed up- just mash it between your teeth to coat with saliva, and swallow.

Although one meal a day may suit someone who is not very active, it is detrimental to your social life and will seriously limit any muscular development in the gym- for best growth, six small meals of about 250 gms 80/20 fat/protein by cal. meat/day works best. Brief infrequent and heavy training works best for all types of body.

Whether slow or fast- ectomorphs won't get much muscle size and strength no matter how hard they train, but they are very good at endurance training, much less so at strength and size. The basic body types of ecto, meso and endomorph are actually a continuous scale from very skinny light structured to very heavy structured. Mesos and endos can build very massive and strong muscles, and both excel at strength skills. Mesos are also pretty good at endurance, endos are not. The very strongest is an endo with significant BF, as are all champion Olympic and Power lifters. Intramuscular fat (marbling) seems to give an extra bit of 'leverage' or power. Endo and meso types can become quite obese- with extreme endos capable of reaching 800 pounds of bodyweight on a mixed diet. Most meso's and all endos (I am on the endo side of meso) are what I have termed 'genetic obese', and many of not most must reduce carbs to as close to zero as possible to gain and keep a normal body shape and size.

If you want burger, get yourself a meat grinder- I have a Kitchen Aid 5 qt, with a very good grinding attachment, but a good bench mounting hand crank unit will do the job. Best tasting and most tender burger mince in my experience is made from fat and what is called in the US 'flank steak', the meat from the bullock's belly (rectus abdominus muscle). Burger that you buy in the market is made up from all sorts of off cuts and bits, is not fresh when purchased, sometimes is several days old, is ground up in bulk and handled, etc. I like my burgers very, very rare- but a bit crisp on the outside.

Fat is ok cooked at any temp. Don't use any sweeteners if you can avoid them, they only reinforce and preserve a taste for sugar. I use a tiny amount of sweetener in my ice cream recipe, but I find stevia unpalatable. Like saccharin, it has a bitter aftertaste.

Pigs are a very choice as food, since they very often carry parasites due to their truly disgusting eating habits- they will quickly eat any sort of feces. Pigs are opportunistic feeders- true omnivores and will eat anything that moves. Rats and mice are easily caught, killed and eaten in the piggery, etc. For this reason pork meat always needs to be cooked to the point that it is rendered unfit as food. Personally I don't much like the unctuous taste of the dry, whitish well cooked meat, especially the taste of the lard. Turkey also is off my menu-makes me feel tired. Bacon is too salty and the 'bacon flavour' we all grew to love, is due to the preservative chemical brine it is soaked in during production.

Why wonder about insects unless you are faced with a survival situation? In a strict sense, any animal can be used for food. You will get plenty of calcium and all the other necessary nutrients for vigorous health in just plain red meat, even if all you ever eat is sirloin steaks. You do not need ANY supplement on an all meat regime. Excess calcium intake may cause problems- like kidney stones, intra-joint deposits like bursitis. etc.

Eat whole eggs, not just whites. It is dead easy to eat lots of calories with fat, looks like you are not getting anywhere near enough fat. Meat eaters don't get hungry, but once eating, they usually have no difficulty with appetite, which is a response connected with the body- not the mind. You may be over-cooking your food. Your body will lose interest in over cooked meat or anything else for that matter. red meat should be every day. Canned anything is not real food, only filler, IMHO. Take soft boiled eggs and butter, or cold fresh-cooked chicken, fish or cut up bits of meat as lunch. Make chicken or egg salad, make your own mayo from macadamia nut oil, lemon juice and egg yolks (one yolk per 100-125 ml oil with one teaspoon lemon juice or 100 ml oil, beat the lemon juice and yolks together when smooth, slowly dribble in the oils while beating). Avoid commercial mayo. Peanuts in any form are a very, very bad idea. All nuts are inadvisable, for the carbs, poor quality protein

and rough stuff. Avoid all soy products, soy sauce is heavy salt, and salt interferes with fat metabolism. Yoghurt is carby, and may contain significant galactose, a sugar which can cause digestive problems in some people. The 'good bacteria' marketing bit is a scam, none of the fermenting bacteria used to make yoghurt can survive in the stomach.

What makes someone think that being sound man for the Dead was not BETTER than 'solving the problems of the world? The Dead listened to me, and became the best, most dynamic and exciting band on the planet- the 'world' doesn't give a stuff what anyone says.

Do you really want to solve those knotty problems? Start by eliminating all religions and superstitious cults. Once you have figured out how, and done this, get rid of morality-laws like drug prohibition and anti-gay marriage laws, etc. Then come and ask me for help with what little remains.

Humans are currently in plague proportions on the planet, and are rapidly destroying our ecosystem.

All animals have various natural controls over their numbers, but man has bypassed the usual one of food restriction by scarcity of prey, by moving down the pyramid and eating the food of our natural prey.

We have removed most infectious disease as a cause of death, and limited death from trauma.

Nature usually acts to eliminate the premature, disabled and deformed, but today we try to save them all, and usually succeed, but only at great cost in both economic terms and personal sacrifice.

And no, I am not touting eugenics, only stating the facts as I see them

I don't think the adrenals have anything to do with your difficulty sleeping. Perhaps you need more exercise.

By the way, what do you mean by 'an all meat day'? All days should be all meat days. If not. you are not keto-adapting, and your metabolism will not settle down. Keto-adaptation requires that you avoid all carbs for anywhere from 3 to 6 weeks. Calories don't count- where there are no carbs. It is not the amount of calories you consume, it is the calories your body uses from those you consume. Excess intake is simply discarded. I have eaten over 5000 cal/day while using over 2500. No gain. Stefansson also notes that massive amounts of calories on pure meat can be consumed without gaining any weight.

Butter will not stall you, if you stall it is because of carbs. Perhaps you are eating something vegetable which you are not aware of the carbs it contains. Nor will a small amount of heavy cream stall you- just be sure the cream is not 'ultrapasteurised' which will have glucose added. Dairy, even whole milk, will not contain any hormones which can effect humans. IF you are 114 at 5'2, you are pretty solid, but not obese, but near a normal size. If your 'fatostat' is naturally at your personal set point (between 18 and 25% BF for a female), you will not lose unless you reduce caloric intake to less than your daily needs. This loss will not remain unless you permanently watch yourself. Exercise is good. I would suspect that

your diet has hidden carbs, rather than your fatostat is set high. I also think we do need less food as we age, my son who is half my age eats nearly twice what I do in spite of being the same size- I simply don't want to eat that much any more- I ate like he did when I was his age (35). I am below my fatostat and like that but I have a hard time with eating nowadays, so it is not really something I have to think much about. Really however, measuring is not a good idea, makes eating a chore. Just make sure you eat enough fat, just eat what you want- you are never hungry as an all meat eater anyway, so it should not be hard. I understand perfectly your desire to be nice and lean, very unusual in a female and very admirable. Even 90-95 lbs is a good weight for 5'2", especially if you are muscular. By the way, at 71- I have retained a nice, fat belly, and a six-pack.

I started this thread to share my understanding about the human body, how it works, what we fare best eating and the 47 years of experience travelling along on my dietary path. Some have accused me of not 'learning' from others. That is not surprising. I have not heard anyone yet offer anything pertinent to my path that I have not already been aware of, accepted by experimentation and study or already rejected as incorrect, unworkable or not corresponding to real life. If new knowledge comes along, and is put on offer- I am avid to acquire it. However I do think this will be most unlikely.

Meat rapidly spoils, within hours after defrosting in some cases. 'Ripe' or spoiled RAW meat (carrion) is not dangerous to eat, if you have a taste for truly nasty smelling, bad tasting things, after all, some people just love Limburger cheese. The nutrient content of the meat will of course be seriously reduced by any spoilage, having gone to feed the bacteria. On the other hand, spoiled COOKED meat may not taste or smell all that bad but is very dangerous to your health. Different bacteria.

Most meat-borne parasites like tapeworm cistercia and trichinella larvae require freezing to minus 23C (-15F) and held there for at least three weeks. May not work, however. Best solution- don't buy that sort of meat. So far as I know, there is only one species of trichinella spiralis, and it infects all carnivorous and omnivorous animals, worldwide. It passes between hosts only by the consumption of infested muscle tissues, in humans it concentrates largely in the diaphragm and the deltoids. Why eat any kind of meat that is not clean?

Fire has been around for 4 million years, about as long as glass knives. Over cooked-meat tastes bad. Raw or slightly cooked meat tastes delicious. Easy.

I didn't 'experiment' with drugs, at least- not more than on one or two occasions. I did not 'abuse' any drugs, because that would mean adulterating or wasting them. I did indeed use some very important shamanic substances, currently described by law as 'illegal drugs' and learned more from them about life, death, beauty and art, the nature of consciousness and the reality of the universe than I could have done in twenty lifetimes. No regrets. No time wasted. I gave it away free, by the way- Not that that will make any difference to the self appointed nemesis.

Over population? Yes.

At our present requirements of the environment, we have 60 times the correct human population level, and are ruining the planet at a feverish rate. Many species of fish are no longer found, and the rate of destruction of forests and land desertification is accelerating. I am not interested in YOUR opinion of how many the planet can handle on vegetation as food, we already know that- most of those people live in

abject poverty. I am interested in only what it should be if we ate only correct food for our top position on the food pyramid, lived on a high standard and protected the planet. That level is 100 million max.

No difference in muscles. Only taste. I happen not to like buffalo, if by that you mean real buffalo- or water buffalo, it is awful, no fat and truly nasty flavour, unfit for dog food. If you mean bison, which is not a 'buffalo', I doubt there is any difference so long as you like the taste.

Cast iron makes meat taste like rust. Everything sticks. I use the incredible Danish Scanpan Ceramic Titanium, the only true non-stick non-plastic cookware. It cannot be scratched by metal, and neither fat nor water sticks to it. It is as different from any other cookware as a Ferrari is to a broken tricycle. Teflon sucks, it is easily damaged and quickly deteriorates no matter how expensive the brand. Stainless is a poor conductor, and everything sticks.

The maximum amount at one meal is as much as you can swallow. Just be sure to keep to 80/20.

Rule: eat any and all meat. If you want to eat ten different animals all at once, rock on out. Animal fat is superior to any and all veg oils. Limit mac oil, it is unsat.

Why sweat if you do not need to? Work hard, and don't worry if you don't sweat- obviously you don't need to.

Hey, you need to back off, I have never heard such- you sound like a hypochondriac going on about chlorine and showers.... forget about it. Brita filters out metals and chlorine. OR- buy bottled water.

Oral irrigators recommended... for who? Brush or no brush- the toothpaste makes no difference- I used to use pearl drops in the little upside down bottle, a very good one, especially with a nice hard toothbrush. Now that I have no saliva I use biotene for the enzymes etc. Just a plain toothbrush and water is better than minerals like salt and soda. My tongue doesn't collect stuff. If you cut, slightly mash and swallow your meat, it will go down in one slippery piece, how can anything get onto your tongue?

No- not nutrients, freezing only destroys the texture, taste and keeping qualities. Fresh meat will keep in a cold fridge (just barely above freezing) for many days cut and, if in a cryovac bag, for months. Buy a whole sirloin, rib eye, rump, or similar cut in a cryovac bag. Cut the end open, drain off any fluid and slice off steaks as you go. Fold the cut end closed and fasten with a clothespeg and return to the fridge I have eaten off of a 15 lb strip for nearly two and a half weeks, the last tasted better than the first one. There is absolutely no reason to freeze red meat.

Another intense cyclone is passing just north of us, LOTS of rain...

'Real' in the title is correct- and intentional.

99% of pemmican is pure meat. Some people occasionally made 'holiday' pemmican with a very minimal addition of dried berries, but it does not keep well and you have to have access to berries or raisins etc, most pemmican makers did not, and did not use them.

What you are missing is that both of your sources do not have any real problem with their bodyfat. I know Greg Ellis personally and while he talks a good talk, he does not walk it.

Keto-adaptation and 'being in ketosis' are two totally different things. A keto-adapted person shows nearly no urinary ketones, hence is not 'in ketosis', that condition only occurs at low- not zero levels of carbs, and indicates an inability to utilise ketones as a glucose replacement, hence they are dumped via the kidneys. It gives you none of the benefits of keto-adaptation.

I never said that carbs 'would kick you out of ketosis', since you would not be IN ketosis if you were keto-adapting, I said it would interrupt the keto-adaptation cycle and you would have to start all over again. (Reading with comprehension seems not to be a widely exercised option on this thread).

Since carbohydrates are not 'required for energy' (or for that matter, anything else)- they are only used to raise blood sugar, which causes the body to force them into bodyfat. Most fat people become very tired and sleepy when they ingest carbs, rather the reverse of 'energy'. Whether you eat carbs or not, ALL your energy comes (only) from burning fat.

Thanks, tamarian.

Hours. Microwave ovens are one of the absolute marvels of modern applied technology. I have two, one at least is in use every day.

Tallow from beef suet is vastly superior to lard (pig fat).

You can use anything that can be set up to reach and hold exactly 104F (40C). Circulation of air will speed things up. the temperature is critical, a thermostat is required. Any higher destroys important nutrients (like those which prevent scurvy) and any lower will allow the meat to spoil. DO NOT add anything whatsoever to the meat, like salt etc. I used to make jerky years ago, however at a current cost of over \$60 a pound I have given it up. You get around 1/6 th of the weight of fresh lean meat you start with. A simple heater can be made of a 100 watt incandescent lamp and a simple thermostat, place the lamp in the bottom of an oven, the thermostat element on the top rack near the front, with the door cracked this should work just fine.

Depends on what they actually meant by 'ketosis'. The Bellevue study was done in 1928, and all the tests and so forth would have been those available at that time.

I have tested myself with urine test strips and find that once keto-adapted, my ketone level dropped to the point of virtually no purple colour showing (i.e. out of ketosis). The dark purple colour will remain if you continue to intake small amounts of carbs, thus people on low (but not zero) carbs can be said to be in a 'state of ketosis'.

I found the strips to indicate that ketosis was not present, based on the disappearance of the first levels which showing as carbs are cut, but not to near zero. I do not know what the sensitivity of the test is, and perhaps a hospital test even in '28 might have been more sensitive.

Note however that Stefansson was not writing about Bellevue and ketosis at the time of that study. Not until about 20 years had passed did he write the first

version of Fat of the Land, called 'Not by Bread Alone'. He may not have known exactly what sort of tests they did. Perhaps the details of all the tests in the study have been published somewhere, I just don't know.

The problem as I see it is that you are not clear on what keto-adaptation vs ketosis is.

Ketosis is the situation in which ketones are voided in the urine. It takes place within a few hours of blood glucose stabilising and no glucose entering from the diet. At this point many of the body-structures, such as the brain and deep dense tissues like cartilage and tendon will still require glucose and will not take up the ketone byproducts of fat metabolism. So the excess ketones are voided and the necessary glucose is obtained from glycerol and liver glycogen. If carbs continue in small amount, this condition will persist. If however carbs do not reappear in the diet, then the body begins to adapt to using the ketones as food hence the term keto-adaptation. During the period of adaptation, energy levels are subjectively low. As the body begins to run most of the glucose-dependent tissues on ketones, energy increases several fold and some additional benefits are realised, such as a lack of 'hunger pangs', increased endurance time, increased strength, a feeling of well-being, and rapid bodyfat loss. Keto-adaptation takes time, from a very minimum of about 2 weeks in a very remarkable person, to from three to six weeks in most people. This is a very hard but very important first hurdle to overcome in getting comfortable in the all-meat dietary path.

A person in permanent ketosis will feel tired, lacking in energy most of the time, which is why so many will abandon a low carb diet- raising the carb levels until the ketosis vanishes restores things to the way they were before carbs were lowered. So you see, keto-adaptation is a very different situation to being 'in ketosis'.

At the high level of 50 gm carb/day, of course the ketones will disappear, that is high enough to prevent ketosis in first place. Lower from 50 to 20, ketones rise than fall some- between 5 and 20 there are some ketones, but only a partial Keto-adaptation, it takes less than 5 gm/day to fully keto-adapt. Don't bother arguing about whether or not keto-adaptation is desirable. if you question it in the first place you have already lost the plot. Do as you like. (This stuff is just filler- why am I responding?)

I did not say Phinney was 100% correct about everything he said, only about keto-adaptation. Later studies definitively showed no depletion of glycogen during anaerobic exercise, the kind of data he did not elicit in his study- as presented in the article. He was just stating a common belief held at that time, which he had neither confirmed or disproven. The Na and K salt substitution was so that he did not have to wait for the subjects bodies to normalise salt conservation- something which does not occur rapidly enough for his time schedule. Inuit and other meat eaters do not use salt of any kind. Neither do I.

Drink more if you are experiencing 'rapid water loss'.

Folks lets face it, I am the only person you will ever meet who has followed an all meat diet in our cultural setting for 47 years. Since there is no corroboration for any of the things I have found by repeated empirical means to be solid truth, nothing I say is of any value and should be ignored by everyone who feels imposed upon by my views.

This does not mean that it is not true, only that you will never accept it on my word.

Personally I really couldn't care less whether anyone accepts it, I have absolutely nothing to lose by your rejection. I am simply putting in on the 'table' for those with an open mind. Please, don't complain. Go on with your life, forget this thread and continue to eat whatever you like.

Oh yes, the single most specious statement on the planet is 'it works for you because you are 'different' (from ME). And yes indeed- it is a form of abject denial.

I eat very rare or raw meat to prevent scurvy. Preventing this syndrome is why people with an inadequate diet need to take Vit C.

Pet cats, like babies will come to fixate on whatever they are trained to eat, even things which are very detrimental to them. In the wild, fixating on a single prey species saves energy when that prey is in high supply, and of course in the wild no cat will either eat vegetation nor attempt to feed it to its young.

The all-meat diet is FAR from 'boring' it is absolutely wonderful and a constant delight at meal times. When I began I felt guilty at being able to just eat only the very best and most tasty of all the foods I knew- and be healthy at the same time. I have stated already that I began this path because I read in Stefansson's book that Inuit were never fat. I can get fat just by looking at carbs. I cannot stand being even a few pounds over-weight and THAT is how I got on the path, and is why nothing on this earth will ever get me off of it. The side effects of very little aging, etc are a bonus. I never gave the eastern doctrinal veggie-freaks a second glance, all religions seem the same to me- best avoided.

Pigs cleaner than man? Is THAT why they love to wallow in mud and eat feces?

Spinach and rhubarb both contain oxalic acid, which leaches calcium and damages the red blood cells. The green part of rhubarb leaves has killed people.

My rule is: At the birthday party, I will take a small slice of cake and graciously with a modest flair- eat one forkful, then set it aside- no one notices. When the champagne is brought out, I take a glass, make the toast and have one small sip, hold the glass for awhile and set it down quietly. I am as much a social animal as anyone, But I do not allow the following of social graces to overwhelm my path. All this stuff is really only social-ritual, we need to find acceptable ways to engage in it without compromising ourselves, or offending the group.

Why would you want to even consider 'slowing down' bodyfat loss? The faster the better. The body know what is best, and will slow down as it gets closer to you natural 'fatostat setting'. Just be sure you are not restricting your calories, that will cause too fast a drop. That may also explain your sleep difficulty- a body which is restricted in calories assumes it is starving or may soon be, and raises the metabolic rate to compensate (move faster and catch more food). Avoid carbs- bad moderating idea.

I take a 5 mg melatonin tab before bed, and usually sleep 7 to 7.5 hours. Without melatonin I may only sleep 5 or 6 hours- not good because it then fall asleep later in the day. A few days ago I read some research on a large group for people which

indicated that 7 hours is optimum for an adult, those who got either less or more than that had more health problems. I think the 8 hour thing is a myth, as you surmise, 8 is just too easy: 1/3 of 24. However if you still only sleep 5 with the melatonin, and sufficient food intake, and do not fall out later on, then you must be getting all the sleep your body requires.

'Antioxidants' are indeed mostly a health and supplement industry fable. They are mostly harmless common things, but if there is a buck to be made on them, they are right up there in the front line.

If you ingest things which degrade into so called 'free radicals' (correct term is organic peroxides), the major source of which is polyunsaturated vegetable oil, then perhaps they may be of some value, but there is no reason to have any of these powerfully oxidising compounds floating around in your body so long as you are eating a meat-diet. I do not think there is any value in taking any of the stuff you mention.

Cooking destroys many essential nutrients in meat. Cooking should always be very brief and only on the outside cut surface to destroy any bacteria. I love all raw meats, even liver. The more adapted to meat you are the less you like cooked meat at all, and eventually something like pot roast will gag you. Clean fresh raw meat is the most nourishing food there is on this planet. If you (your mind) 'like' well cooked meat it is due to the way your family prepared it, and not what your body wants. As we evolved over the past 4 million years, there was always fire- but fresh meat would have been eaten raw. Of course there was no refrigeration and meat after spending days at ambient temperature is definitely 'improved' by cooking. Only problem with raw eggs is the avidin (anti-biotin) in uncooked eggwhite.

Offer the cat only raw (fatty) meat and nothing else. When the cat becomes hungry enough, he will eat the raw meat. Once that starts, you should not have any further problems. Fixation on a given food in cats will easily give way to hunger.

I never heard of mixing lamb and blue cheese.

Bowel movements are infrequent on an all meat diet, since there is no residue or bacterial colonies in your colon. Once daily or even less is normal.

An all meat diet is not high in protein, it is high in fat. The lean meat has lots of very bioavailable calcium. IF you avoid vegetable oils, which are very oxidising (organic peroxides, sometimes called 'free radicals'), you won't need much in the way of 'antioxidant' activity, and red meat has more than you need anyway. The all-meat diet protects the heart. Cancer is not caused by, or prevented by diet.

Meat is the only practical source of vitamins, the meat-exclusive diet has an abundance of all of them. Fibre damages the intestines. Avoid.

Eat only clean healthy meat and you won't get food poisoning. "Game meat may be unclean, I would avoid it. Salmonella is usually found in spoiled cooked (not raw) foods- and sick chickens. Be sure to buy your food from a good reputable source. If you want more of this sort of info, you should do now what you should have done first- read the thread- I have already covered all the above and more- several times over.

NO this IS an 'all-meat diet' Meat is fat and lean, a meat diet consists of fat 80% protein from lean 20% by calories.

It is not a 'high protein' diet, it is a high fat diet.

Trust me on this, you CANNOT lose 7 pounds of bodyfat in two days, that amount of fat represents 25,000 calories. It is water you are retaining. loss of seven pounds BF in two weeks to a month is normal, no restrictions and no carbs.

The rate of loss does not affect the amount of loose skin, if your skin has been stretched for a long time due to excess bodyfat, it will never return to the size it was, even if you only lose one pound a month- you will need surgery to remove the excess. Skin only stretches for about six months, by the end of that time the skin has grown to reduce the stress on it, and cannot go back- sorry about that, but that is the way it works.

To avoid free radicals avoid unsaturated vegetable oils- Why eat 'poisons' and take 'antidotes'? Added antioxidants may in themselves be detrimental to your health. I would recommend that you have regular checkups if you suffer from such a strong case of paranoia over cancer. I suspect that the use of nuclear energy is the most common source- mining, power plants and warheads, waste products- all these produce vast amounts of tritium and that produces ozone at sealevel which in turn causes what is quaintly called 'photochemical smog'. The closer to any nuclear activity (or in any major city or conifer forest) you live the more likely you will be affected.

Avidin is in excess to the biotin, or it would never have been an issue. Studies show that biotin shortages occur in people who regularly consume raw or unprocessed eggs, due to the egg-white. Body builders do not avoid the yolks for reason of cholesterol (eggs, even a dozen a day will not supply enough of this extremely important nutrient- the body must make most of it), they think that fat makes you fat, and yolks have fat in them (just plain stupid). But that is not surprising, virtually all body builders haven't a clue about diet.

It is indeed important to find a PERMANENT dietary routine, one that you can follow without much thinking for the rest of your life. If your body permits carbs, then you will manage, only your teeth and circulation will be compromised, and that may not be important to you.

No one has ever shown that a human fed on an exclusive, properly balanced fat to protein carnivorous diet is harmful in any way, no matter how long it continued. Any animal can survive in good health on all meat- in fact the medieval Greenlanders fed their horses on nothing but fish for about 800 years and they did just fine according to the records. Last time I checked horses and ponies were hind-gut fermenting herbivores.

I do not think that protein has ever been shown to be damaging to the kidneys, and in any event a meat diet is only moderate protein, from 15 to 20% is best, should never rise to more than about 30%. In fact my kidneys improved after a few years on my path. My paternal grandfather ate a very normal mixed-diet, but high in salt, and died at 91 from kidney failure. Salt and a mixed-diet may not be especially good for the kidneys, contrary to my meat regime. I am a 'country boy', always have been. I have spent a great deal of time living on farms and out in the woods.

Pigs will eat (with relish) ANY feces they can find. MY favorite great-uncle raised the nasty things, so forget about what ever you have heard different. In Asia the normal latrine is fed into a pig-trough.

So far no 'bearisms' have been 'debunked' although some contributors certainly have provided massive pile of nonsense in attempted rebuttal. Also, nothing I have said

on this thread is 'inconsistent'. In fact I am 'compulsively consistent'. Some people seem to have difficulty in understanding what I said, so they project 'inconsistency' rather than understanding exactly what was said. I gave up refuting all the nonsense statements, it is nothing but a waste of time.

Yes, free range pigs definitely eat anything they can catch and/or swallow including lots of insects, rats and mice, lizards, ground dwelling birds, etc. This includes anything buried which is smelly. The wild or feral pig as opposed to the domestic breed is very lean as well- but is riddled with parasites- as are all free range pigs, whether wild or domestic.

Cats will 'eat grass' to barf up something that disagrees with them, as will dogs. This is a case of 'instinctive medication', not uncommon in many mammals. Chickens are also opportunistic feeders (I never saw them eat their OWN feces, [nor pigs either for that matter]- but they will avidly pick the undigested grain out of horse droppings, as will crows) and wild chickens might well be of concern, however the parasites of birds are not like parasites of mammals, and do not affect humans. The US cult, 'Black Muslims' will not eat either chickens or pig, considering both to be 'unclean'.

Humans are not 'obligate' carnivores. We have retained a limited ability to utilise vegetation as (poor) food in times of limited or absent meat availability.

Scanpan Ceramic Titanium- non-teflon, non plastic, very hard (you can use metal implements), nonstick extraordinary (neither oil or water sticks), Danish made pots and pans, are IMHO the ONLY cookware to own. Not cheap, but comparable in price to other gourmet cookwares- but without a peer at any price.

There is NO blood in the meat that you purchase, blood left in meat would cause it to quickly spoil- in a matter of days. The animal is completely bled as it is slaughtered. The thin reddish juice which leaks from cut red meat is a tissue fluid rich in myoglobin, an iron-containing muscle component which gives the meat its red colour. It has no connection with blood.

Hindus do eat meat, only the 'holy' (Brahman) cattle are protected and forbidden to kill or eat.

It is indeed true that on a red meat diet, a human carnivore's feces does not smell- well sometimes a bit of a sourish smell. But not what you expect. Body odor is also very slight.

BO is caused by skin bacteria and poor hygiene, not diet.

Cats do not eat any of the fur or feathers (or internal organs) of their prey. I have a very adept hunting cat here and have observed his eating habits for about 15 years now. He never eats any of the animal's guts, skin or fur. He does not eat the head or feet either. They seem to delight in leaving the part they don't eat, (like my owl always did with her unfinished mouse hams) right in the middle of the path where you walk.

The only hair cats do ingest is inadvertent- their own, from grooming- and that causes gastric distress (hairballs). They do eat the bones but will not have any problems whatsoever on a straight diet of just fatty muscle tissue. They are not like the owl, hawk and falcon, which need animal sourced 'roughage'. They spit up the indigestible refuse in the form of small pellets because only liquid passes into

the short intestine of raptors, and the food-transit time is too short for bones to dissolve. This throwing of a 'casting' clears the stomach and throat of mucus, and is necessary for good health in those carnivorous birds. I had a California Burrowing Owl which lived with me as my companion for 3 years.

Human teeth are very good for eating meat. They are those of our lineage-insectivore. As an aside, the insect-eating bats split off from the early primate branch of the insectivores, and are therefore relatively 'close cousins' in the mammal evolutionary tree, so to speak. Knives came first- then cooking -for meat not so fresh.

Dates and other data are false, in
<http://chronicle.com/temp/reprint.p...q30t37zbdwj34m6>.

Stone knives AND controlled fire both date from ~4 million YBP. And yes, any predator worthy of the name will kill and eat any animal it can capture and overcome. Men are still the prey of competent predators. Our strength, food and survival is by means of our group cooperation in hunting and protecting ourselves.

I have previously noted that the body(not the mind) always prefers raw meat, and as you'll become adapted to an all meat diet you will soon find that cooked meat is not attractive, and you will gradually want to eat it rarer and rarer until bleu and tartare become the most tasty. What I refer to as your 'body' IS your unconscious mind's reflection of what you truly are, minus your conscious mind's overburden of myths and beliefs. Be quiet, and listen to what your body has to teach your conscious mind.

By the way, stretch marks are due to insulin damage of the skin's collagen, which embrittles it as it tries to stretch. Large, quick size gains can be done without any stretch marks, as in pregnancy on a zero carb diet, my second wife proved that. In the short period of pregnancy, the skin just stretches without adding more skin, and quickly returns to normal after birth reduces the body's size- this expansion contraction happens before the skin has had time to grow more area.

Yes, pork is way too lean, no marbling and is dry and tasteless, the fat is all found on the cover. Domestic pig meat is white when cooked, wild or feral pig is very dark, and even tough. Only horse and whale meat is darker and has less fat marbling, but horse is tender... Cows (as opposed to steers), that is, dairy cows- usually are slaughtered for meat after their economic time as milkers is over. They produce the very best, most tender, tasty and well marbled beef.

USDA inspected beef is free of parasites, and the usual one that was a problem was the beef tapeworm, taenia saginata, which has mobile, 3/4 inch long flat, egg-bearing segments which crawl out at night, and make your bum itch. This worm is VERY rare today. Pork is never safe from parasites, has a truly dangerous pork (hydatid) tapeworm as well as liver and blood flukes, and trichinae- not killed by freezing, either- so pork must always be completely cooked- to the destruction of many of its nutrients. Most wild venison is not safe to eat because of liver flukes, blood worms, etc, and must be either well cooked or frozen for a month or so at a very low temperature. Not worth the trouble, considering it is not that good tasting- in my opinion.

NO- stick to good quantities of food, you will lose at the pace your body finds best. Healing will take place much more quickly if you do not stress and derail your body with calorie reduction.

How are multiple posts about cat's toilet habits to be considered 'competition' in a

dietary thread? Clutter of any kind is not competition, it is only time and space wasting. Those so fascinated by all things animal-anal should start their own thread.

Rats and pigs are true omnivores- not herbivores. They both can synthesize missing essential vitamins in their bowels, in this situation, an occasional taste for consuming excrement can explained.

I am unsure what constitutes 'hard cheese'. Overcooked meat or cheese on a exclusive basis for a long period of time would be most unwise.

The following is 3/4 nonsense:

1) cancer of the esophagus

SCC of the tonsil is nothing like esophageal cancer. My specialist thinks my problem may have been due to a lifetime of heavy exposure to second hand tobacco smoke, at home (both parents and my stepsister smoked, my stepmother died of lung cancer) and in the music industry. My cancer was present for 3 or 4 years, growing very slowly and did not metastase out of the side of my neck- most likely due to my diet's extremely low glucose turnover- most SCC of the tonsil is very aggressive and can progress to the stage it can kill in less than one year.

2) cataracts or glaucoma

Nothing of the kind- the truth is very much the opposite, my eyes are so good that I do not need glasses to see distance OR to read. I have the flexibility and accommodation in my lenses equal to someone in their 30's. I can see in near perfect darkness as well.

3) partial deafness

I have a small amount of hearing nerve-damage from years of working with the loudest ever band in Rock and Roll, but it is no different than people of my age have from aging. I presently have some problems stemming from the ill-advised placement of grommets in my eardrums when my Eustachian tubes were blocked. This is a temporary nuisance, but is not 'partial deafness'.

4) heart bypass surgery

A single but serious blockage dating from my high carb teens was finally corrected at the age of 65- my heart is now better than it has been my entire adult life.

It is odd that a layperson of little knowledge (but plenty of ego) would quote false statements about my health and then discount the opinions of the most revered cardiologist and finest heart surgeon in the country who confirmed the blockage was of very long standing- I experience angina when I began strenuous ballet training at 23- the same time I changed my eating habits.

My second wife did her entire pregnancy on zero carb- only minimal weight gain (less than 20 lbs), and no stretch marks.

Muscle cells 'run' on ATP-ADP conversion. ADP-ATP re-conversion is done with FFA's. It makes no difference whether the exercise is anaerobic or aerobic, the muscles

still work the same way. This is like a car- whether in first gear or in overdrive, it still uses the same fuel. Glucose is not a fuel. Glycogen is not a fuel. Neither can be used to translate ADP back into ATP until converted into FFA first. Mitochondria mediate ADP to ATP conversion which is why there are two 'types' (fast and slow twitch) of muscle cells, fibre bundles with more mitochondria have a different response to the two types of work, aerobic and anaerobic. The mix of types in a given muscle can be altered to some extent by training.

I don't eat much if any 'mayo'- only in such things as egg or chicken salad, and then only homemade. Garlic, chillies, pepper and many other spices are not 'food'. These vegetables are like the use of vegetables as 'medicine'. They are added in minute amounts to change the taste of food. It is amazing to me how far off the track those who dislike my way of life will go in order to make themselves appear the fool.

The amount of bleed-off liquid that collects in a cryovac bag is only one or two tablespoonfuls, hardly worth the effort to collect. You should drain it off to the make handling the meat less messy. It is ok to eat it- if you like. You cannot 'miss nutrients from blood' when there is no blood involved. How much, or even whether, blood itself was used as food by 'our (prehistoric) ancestors' is not known today- by anyone.

Aluminium is a lightweight, stable metal with very high heat conductivity. It is not good for your health if it is exposed to the food you are preparing. Avoid any espresso machine which has any aluminium parts exposed to the coffee- many home machines have aluminium filter holders. Scanpans do not have any exposed aluminium on the cooking surface, and the surface is very hard. The manufacturer suggests the use of metal utensils and I have not had any problem with that for all the years I have been using the brand. Any damage or blistering etc, and they replace the pan no charge. IF you try to use a knife to cut things in the pan you may damage it, so use good sense.

Try the different cuts- cook them various ways almost all are tender if not cooked. Consider this a learning experience which will bring you closer to the meat eating routine.

50-50% by weight of PURE protein to fat would work fine- that is how you make pemmican. However fresh lean red meat is only between 16 and 22% protein- the rest is water, so the ratio is approximately 1 to 6.

Contentions which I have ignored and/or not answered are intentional.

People do not have to state a reason for not accepting what I say- it is your prerogative to simply ignore it.

I am only offering my knowledge to those who are interested and accept it. I do not post conjecture or matters of belief. In this respect, I really don't care what any of you think about me- or my statements.

I already answered the pregnancy/all meat question: My second wife did her entire pregnancy on zero carb- only minimal weight gain (less than 20 lbs).

By the way, stretch marks due to rapid size increases are due to insulin damage of

the skin's collagen, which embrittles it as it tries to stretch. Large, quick size gains can be done without any stretch marks, as in pregnancy on a zero carb diet, my second wife proved that. In the short period of pregnancy, the skin just stretches without adding more skin, and quickly returns to normal after birth reduces the body's size- this expansion contraction happens before the skin has had time to grow more area.

Dean, remember what I said about the black box? It is distracting to constantly worry about how and why the body does this or that. Constantly asking which cells use what and why etc., does not help to get you into a new lifestyle, it only makes the whole process very much more difficult- dietary things are of the body- not of the mind. Relax, quieten your mind, eat well- and enjoy life.

Dead animals exhibit a short period of rigour mortis beginning shortly after death, which is indeed due to ATP- once it is all used up- the muscles relax and the body goes limp.

'Who said everyone needs to engage in strenuous activity to have a healthy way of life?'

I said it, early on and very clearly.

I stated the following concept in my initial post putting this thread in motion, as well as on my website essay 'Diet and Exercise'. If you think this is new info you simply have not been paying attention.

I know without any question that regular, stress inducing exercise like running/biking plus lifting weights is absolutely imperative for optimum health, low-stress activities like walking just don't cut it. All carnivores must keep very fit, if not they could not catch their prey. Both endurance AND sprint capacity are enhanced to a great degree on a totally carnivorous diet.

The problem with running is that virtually everyone runs improperly, landing on their heels, thereby causing stress damage to their calves ('shin splints'), knees and hip joints. The proper way to run is to land on the ball of the foot so the calf muscles can do their job of acting as shock absorbers- winning sprinters run this way, as well as do all other animals who run. I trained myself to always land on the ball of my foot by running barefoot. In time I was able to develop my calf muscles so I could run eight miles in this way. I had trouble down here with the numerous sharp bits of hardwood roots in the tracks cutting and bruising my feet, even when wearing the lightweight sprinting style training shoes I favour, so I changed over to mountain biking.

My cats have always run, jumped, climbed trees and raced around a lot- after prey, each other, or just for the fun of it. Cats like owls and other predatory animals sleep in short bursts, whenever there is not much happening- domesticated dogs do this also. It does not add up to '20 hours a day' and is often less than 7-8 hours in total.

Many if not most people are intrinsically lazy- carbs in the normal diet encourage this. Thus all the denial I see in recent posts over the importance of exercise. Once again, I am offering my experience on this. I don't give a stuff whether you accept the importance of brief, infrequent, but stressful exercise or not, it will only affect your OWN health if you don't.

Searching for Scanpan, be aware that they also make stainless ware. An older model of coated ware may still be around, it was discontinued in 2000. Be sure that the bottom is bright, turned aluminium, with a central depressed and coated area about an inch in dia. which says 'Manufactured in Denmark' around the outside, and 'SCANPAN' across the middle on a raised bit, with the words 'Ceramic' above and 'Titanium' below. The 20 cm frying pan is the smallest they make- to get a lid to fit, you need to buy a 20 cm saucepan (2.5 litre). Frying pans go up to 32 cm. There is a whole line and there should be an insert in the box that lists all of the models, both the Classic and Ergonomic- only difference is a fancy handle on Ergonomic and a higher cost, plus fewer models. Classic is the go. If you are used to Teflon, be prepared for a real treat.

Right, the '9.25" pan is actually 24 cm, for which there is no lid. The smaller one and the 26 cm and 32 cm have saucepan lids which fit, the 'saute' pans- which are just deep versions of the frying pans- all come with lids. Most Scanpan products are discounted beneath the RRP, you just have to look around, as different places have different discount policies and each 'sale' offered by a given place may have differing discount percentages from time to time as well. I find reductions on offer from 25% to 50% at stores down here, and only buy from a place when their prices are the best deal.

140F cannot 'sear' anything, only turn it grey. Frying pan with fat is used, needs to be very hot to sear. Why the oven? If roasting, the temp needs to be around 300-350F or you don't get a nice colour on the outside. Fan-circulation ovens, either electric or gas take less time to cook to any given doneness, and given the right pan and rack do not require turning the roasting meat over to cook uniformly. You sear the outside of the meat to sterilise the cut surface only and add a bit of nice taste., not to kill parasites, only very well cooked meat will have the parasites in it killed. Don't buy or eat parasite infested meats like pork and wild 'game' unless you are prepared to cook them 'to death'. Cooking does not change fat except for the taste. All muscles have everything you need, and liver in infrequent, small quantities will provide plenty of Vit A. No extra nutritional value in the other offal, only flavour etc. Heart is short-stripped muscle, it has no fat in it (a little on the outside only), but is no different from skeletal muscles nutritionally. If you like the taste and don't mind the texture (very rare) eat as much as you like. It's ok, but not my favourite. Lamb heart is superior to veal, which is vastly superior to ox heart (tough and chewy, and very large).

I won't use salt in any disguise. I use many if not all spices. The amount of alcohol in the quantity of vanilla extract used for flavouring, is truly minuscule. What is in a few drops of 35%?

\$75 is cheap for good Nike, the brand I like. I will check out the model mentioned next time I am in a major city. (Sydney, mid May). I presently use forefoot-strike sprinter's trainers (\$90) Nike's sizes are surreal and have nothing to do with any other shoe's sizing. They also vary from one model to another, you have to try on any shoe you buy for fit, disregarding the tagged size. I have very broad feet with relatively short toes, so I need to fit my foot's widest part, disregarding the length, unless the shoe comes in widths, which Nike does not. I usually wear a US size 7 or 7-1/2 in a normal street or dress shoe, but take a 6EEEE in a professional ballet slipper. My current flat Nikes are labelled size '9'.

Why 'chew'; fat? Cut small pieces, mash and swallow.

What sort of parasites do you mean by 'have so many already? All parasites which live on or in a human host can be gotten rid of. There is no excuse for anyone living in the first world to get parasites other than the exo-parasites like ticks, fleas and lice and of course- malaria. Especially not the ones transmitted by infested meat.

Overtraining is not only real-- it is very very common. I might even say it is the usual situation for most people I see in the gym and it certainly is the situation for all dancers- I used to take 10, 90 min classes per week.

Getting a proper 'running shoe' is very hard, 99% of all shoes on the market are big bulky, squishy things intended to protect people's legs while running and landing on their heels- which is nearly everyone, amateur and pro- except sprinters.

What is the bit about eating just egg yolks? What is done with the whites? Eggwhite has a good many very important nutrients, especially branched chain aminos. Makes no sense to waste them. I add extra whites I get from making ice cream to eggs when I am having them. Waste not, want not- as the old saying goes.

Buy red meat from a reputable, inspected source, avoid pork and wild game, don't keep a pet cat, and you are very unlikely to ever have any problem with parasites. Raw salmon on the Pacific Coast of the US (sushi worm) and inland freshwater fish (broad or fish tapeworm), especially from the Great Lakes region carry parasites, so cook them. The US (or Australia) is nothing like Hong Kong, and the chance of catching toxoplasmosis in either country from properly inspected market meat is zero. This parasite is most commonly found in cat feces (most common source of infection in the US) and bird droppings from aviaries and chicken farms, and is not common in red meat in first world countries. The tissue cysts in red meat can be detected during proper meat inspection along with many other parasites. The infective cysts are destroyed by freezing, smoking and curing (with chemical salts)- and of course, cooking. The Merck Manual says that '20 to 40% of healthy adults in the US are seropositive', which means they have had contact with the parasite at some point in their lives. The parasite multiplies asexually (by division) in the host, forms cysts and can only breed sexually in the intestinal tract of cats. Cats are therefore out- if you fear this parasite.

No, I did try some Chinese herbals, but by that time the cancer was in stage 4a and was very dangerous- I lost the nerve to my vocal cord and swallowing muscles, and could not eat- I would not have survived without getting treatment known to work, and no matter what you think, there are no known effective 'alternative treatments, and the one I was given was VERY 'conservative' (no surgery) as these thing go, but still was flagged at ~50% survival. Without this kind of treatment (just herbs etc) the survival was 0% With surgery only, the reported rate was ~25%.

Yes, vegans do suffer severe deficiencies.

Soy proteins except for about 2.5%, are ones not utilisable by the human body. Like a petrol car can't use diesel, we need and can use certain proteins, and not others. In the plant world, there are a great many which we cannot use.

No, uncooked meat is just more nourishing than cooked- neither have any significant carbs, which would not be destroyed by cooking in any event, as is easily proven with liver- a very high-glycogen meat.

The problem you are having with exercise is of mental not physical origin, and will disappear with proper training and a quiet mind, as I have already said several

times before. Your unconscious mind simply does not want to give up carbs (socialisation) and is very cleverly inventing psychosomatic 'reasons' to 'need' carbs.

What is wrong with what you define as 'childish narcissistic delusions', if it actually (contrary to your belief) proves to be true and leads to great health, strength and energy? Doesn't matter what 'label' is put on it.

We have had two cyclones pass us this month- Larry, category 5, landed east of us and the eye passed within 5 miles (south) of our place. Monica, category 5, passed just north of us and is presently just passing by Darwin- in the Northern Territory north west of Qld. We got lots of wind both times, more with Larry, and massive rainfall over very short periods both times. Such storms, while they can sometimes be destructive to trees and property, are important to us here and provide important summer/fall rainfall during our 'wet' (season). If we fail to get at least one cyclone in a year, we have a 'mini-drought'. So, since cyclones are actually a necessity and are a fact of life here, most of us are well prepared to deal with the situation.

Our government, federal and state of Queensland are very supportive of us if the shit hits the fan, and has granted everyone who has lost business from the two storms a tax-free grant of A\$10,000 dollars- and most of those who qualify (virtually anyone who asked) have already been given the money. If there was physical damage, the free grant goes up to \$25,000 and a low interest loan is available of up to a half million \$- 10% of which is given as a non-recoupable grant. Contrast this with the US and Louisiana's treatment of those who suffered from Katrina.

<http://www.chefscatalog.com/product/27000-scanpan-classic-7-piece-cookware-set.aspx>

Rickettsia and (I assume you mean) chlamydia are both types of bacteria, not true parasites, although the latter do live inside the cell.

And I am grateful for the observation on the biotin content of egg yolks vs the avidin in the whites, I have tried raw whole egg mixed into my food and it does help with getting the food to go down, and reduces 'cling'- it effectively substitutes for my missing saliva. The cling is worst in my favourite food- beef, so anything which helps me eat more of it is great.

Overtraining is not primarily due to diet, it is due the natural limit of 'exercise tolerance' (at each stage of training) in every individual plus the amount of microdamage to the muscle cells during exercise (intensity and amount/time) and the person's natural limit of time needed for full recovery and recuperation, which lengthens as we age. This process must be completed before any gain in strength or endurance can be made. Of course inadequate nutrition, either in protein, fat or calories will reduce tolerance, lengthen the time to recovery and significantly limit or even completely eliminate any subsequent gains. Thus, the best method of training- for everyone, but especially us older ones- is 'brief, intense and infrequent', the style promoted by Mike Mentzer (in his books on 'Heavy Duty') and Arthur Jones (inventor of the Nautilus machines).

Buy only meat that has been USDA inspected, that is the best way to avoid parasites. If you think you have become infested with something, visit your GP, let him determine what you have- and prescribe the correct treatment for the specific parasite you have become a host for- use real, proven medicine- not 'herbs and mystic chanting'.

I have only had the ubiquitous 'pinworms', and one beef tapeworm, both successfully treated by a doctor. The pinworms are common and are usually gotten from children- anyone can get them at any time. The tapeworm was acquired in '58, from eating raw ground Safeway meat- that ratbag market mob are too cheap to properly hold their meat under cold room conditions for the necessary time to 'age' it, so they force- 'age' it for 72 hours at room temp. The tapeworm's infectious cisterciae are easily destroyed by holding at a very cold, just above freezing temperature under refrigeration for two-three weeks. Any cryovac meat you buy will be aged for at least this amount of time. Today this type of tapeworm is for all practical purposes no longer found in the US or most other developed countries.

Oxygen therapy is hazardous, and adding oxy will not work at atmospheric pressure anyway, it requires pressures of 2.5 times sealevel to be effective and each session must not be undertaken for very long, either. Oxygen is a two-edged sword, it is necessary for life but dangerous at the same time. Hyperbaric is to treat specific problems and must not be continued for many days either. In a strange way, it is like insulin, I guess. Ozone (O3) is twenty times as powerful an oxidant as the normal molecular form (O2), and damages virtually everything it comes in contact with.

I advise anyone who likes to eat meat raw and is afraid of toxoplasmosis to get a blood test. I do not think it very likely that a person would get an infection from eating properly inspected meat (the cysts can be detected during microscopic examination) from a butcher today, however. Even historically it was very rarely ever found in beef.

I have said earlier that I consider all 'game' meat to be very chancy food, due to the many types of parasites it ALWAYS carries. I do not recommend any of it as food.

Oh yes, still around. Unfortunately I live on a rural property which requires that I not spend all day online. I went to the city a four hour round trip, yesterday to see my dentist and ear specialist- the myringoplasty in my right ear has not completely taken, a small hole persists, and I will have to endure another operation. I wish I had been warned of the possibility that the grommet-holes in my radiation-damaged eardrums might not heal, I would have declined the grommets and waited until my Eustachian tubes reopened. Temporarily deaf or not, it would have been far better than having to deal with this situation.

Oddly enough, I fully agree- my initial post is the most important on the thread- and with a careful read, it is quite enough to find and follow this path. Only one addition might have improved it, my list of the simple rules.

There is nothing wrong with eating raw meat, and most of the mass of the meat should in fact be eaten 'raw' (bleu or 'blood rare'). There is no nutritional reason not to sear just the outside of cut pieces of meat- and a great many advantages.

I think that it is not clear that 'ice cream' is the homemade kind made from just

egg yolks and heavy cream without any sugar or vegetable matter and therefore not your common 'ice cream'. Garlic is used VERY sparingly as a flavouring agent- not as 'food'. Onions are a sweet root, and are not good as a 'spice', which has to be quite strong and concentrated in flavour. Garlic, chillies and black pepper, coriander, clove, all spice, nutmeg, tarragon, sage and rosemary, the number of plants used as spices is very long and interesting. None are eaten as 'food'.

loops..Unless you are a Martian or other organic alien, your body will function in harmony with the basic human model for metabolism. Therefore the lack of carbs is not connected with your problems in running or any other exercise. It is your mind that is causing the problems, persist with the regime and your training and forget about all the 'reasons' that you distract yourself with. I am a very active type and back when I was dancing, trust me, any problems with either aerobic or anaerobic exercise from zero carbs would have been obvious and serious. In fact, I had more energy, more endurance and better control of my body (at my level of skill) than anyone else in the classes I took. I ride a bike hard up the hills and down, and lift weights, I have never had anything like that which you describe, nor am I aware of anyone else who has- it is simply a mental (hypochondriac) syndrome your mind has created, and you can get past it--- unless you want to abandon the path, and that seems quite likely considering your strong resistance to any argument presented which is contrary of your belief system. And yes- the mind can be very inconsistent.

Parasites of any kind are considered a health-threat. I have only had two experiences with food borne parasites in nearly fifty years, so I do not consider parasites a threat to following my path. Just avoid 'exotic' meats, or cook them until they are degraded nutritionally- but safe.

IF you DO get a beef tapeworm- just how, is a very good question- perhaps in some third world country with poor sanitation (most such countries, like Mexico cook all meat for a very long time- thus killing parasites), since the steer has to eat the eggs which are discharged in human feces. If you do get one, you WILL know it very quickly- due to the active, egg-bearing segments crawling around on your bum at night. It is not a serious or particularly harmful infestation, and it is VERY simple and easy parasite get rid of. The fish tapeworm is more debilitating and the pork worm is a serious threat because it can infect its host with the hydatid cysts- they can grow immense and can affect the brain. Pork MUST be well cooked, although hydatid tapeworm is easy to find during inspection. Dogs also can get hydatid worms and pass them to children or adults.

Fat is good cooked or not- it is not affected nutritionally.

Brain is not fat. It is nervous tissue, and is mostly protein (grey matter), and of course a fair amount of good old cholesterol in the myelin sheaths of the efferent nerve fibres (white matter).

The USDA is a vary large organisation, and has many roles. One which is bad does not taint the whole organisation. The vets who supervise fresh meat inspection are very competent, and very little infested meat gets by. The bureaucrats who make up nonsense like the Food Pyramid are not competent. End of story.

Dean, you have no idea about toxo, I suggest you get the blood test (I've had the test, I kept an aviary for a while- it came back negative) before shooting off your mouth (yes, 'sniffing' can be 'exposure'- once dried, the cysts can float in the air like dust and be inhaled- all it takes is one dropping somewhere to dry out and crumble...).

Yes, avoid cattle's brains- lamb brains are far tastier anyway, and are almost

always frozen at the abattoir.

For a 'newbie' who enters this long thread without having read it, saying 'hello' is ok. Making false and misleading statements based on shonky references (Zonehome? B17?- is not a vitamin) about such things as 'the brain not using ketones' is definitely NOT ok. triglycerides cannot be 'transported to the adipose tissues, it MUST be converted from glucose within the adipose cells. There is no mechanism for transport of triglycerides in either direction across the cell membrane. DO NOT come here blind and try to lecture me and the thread, you are not qualified. Look and listen, and please, keep your hands off the keyboard until you know where you are. You may just learn some facts about what really goes on in the body. You are assuming that the BG level you have is not optimal- however on a zerocarb diet and fasting that level is what your body is naturally set to maintain. There is a fair range of values found that are completely normal, and are not the result of disease or malfunction. Diabetics are seriously malfunctioning and this statement is not directed at them.

More misinformation- you seem quite good at that: G B Shaw was most certainly NOT a 'vegan', he ate a full dozen eggs as well as dairy- EVERY single day. Stef did not follow the meat diet for very many years, and is not a good example of long term following of the all meat path. Neither is Atkins. All of this has previously been discussed.

ubizmo Thu, Apr-27-06 22:57

Quote:

Originally Posted by theBear

For a 'newbie' who enters this long thread without having read it, saying 'hello' is ok.

I read all of it.

Quote:

Making false and misleading statements based on shonky references (Zonehome? B17?- is not a vitamin) about such things as 'the brain not using ketones' is definitely NOT ok.

Shonky references? Hmm...I cited Donald Walsh, professor of medicine at University of California, Davis Medical School. You cited...no one. And of course I didn't state that the brain doesn't use ketones. Portions of brain tissue can use ketones for energy, and portions cannot. As Walsh states, between 40-60 percent of the glucose that the brain uses when glucose is available can be replaced by ketones; the rest cannot.

Quote:

triglycerides cannot be 'transported to the adipose tissues, it MUST be converted from glucose within the adipose cells.

False.

As Walsh points out, conversion of glucose to TG *can* occur in either adipose

cells or in the liver. "In humans, the liver plays a major role in converting excess glucose into triglycerides, packaging the triglycerides into VLDL and exporting the VLDL to adipose tissue. As a consequence, much of the glucose in excess of that needed to restore glycogen levels ends up as triglyceride stored in the adipocyte."

Quote:

DO NOT come here blind and try to lecture me and the thread, you are not qualified. Look and listen, and please, keep your hands off the keyboard until you know where you are.

I cite sources that can be checked. Walsh is a convenient online source, but you can get the same information from any decent text on metabolism. In contrast, you generally *mention* sources that you seem to recall reading but can't quite put your hands on now.

You've made some claims that are flat-out contradicted by current knowledge of metabolism, such as: Animal fat is 90% saturated; people can manufacture their own omega 3 fats; dietary protein does not stimulate release of insulin; dietary fat cannot be stored in adipose tissue; skeletal muscle cells cannot burn glucose; "A fully keto-adapted body excretes no ketones in the urine."

Concerning the last false claim, you appear to overlook the fact that that there are three types of ketones produced in ketosis, and one of them, acetone, is not used by *any* tissue for fuel and is, in fact, toxic. If you're not excreting it, you're in trouble.

Another point you overlook is the feedback mechanism that governs ketosis itself. An insulin-dependent diabetic who attempts ketosis must do so in a consciously controlled way, whereas a non-IDDM person needn't be so careful. Why is that? Because the IDDM person can go into ketoacidosis, which can be quite fatal. But for the non-IDDM, this isn't a risk. Why not? Because when the ketones in the blood reach a certain concentration, the pancreas makes *insulin* to signal the liver to stop putting out ketones. That is, deep ketosis is itself an insulin-triggering state.

Quote:

You may just learn some facts about what really goes on in the body. You are assuming that the BG level you have is not optimal-

No, I'm not assuming it. It's based on research. There's a difference. If BG is much above 83 mg/dl, the pancreas puts out insulin to lower it. I can provide more references for that if you like. If one goal is to minimize fasting insulin levels--and I think we both agree that it is--then we need to confront the fact that neither your fasting BG nor mine is optimal.

Quote:

More misinformation- you seem quite good at that: G B Shaw was most certainly NOT a 'vegan', he ate a full dozen eggs as well as dairy- EVERY single day.

If so, then I stand corrected. My only point was that it's possible to find individuals who appear to live long healthy lives on just about any diet. That's why rational discourse about these things requires a willingness to provide evidence, not just assertions.

Ayustar Thu, Apr-27-06 22:58

... or you will learn about tape worms and then lose your appetite. Well, he taught me another thing *not about tapeworms* but how to get rid of my appetite, good work!!!

theBear Thu, Apr-27-06 23:32

A diabetic, yes, I knew it. You have already so damaged your body with your bad diet regime that nothing about your metabolism is normal any more. Just the fact that you let your chosen diet do that to your body invalidates your argument. I noted that I am not addressing this thread to diabetics- and none of those so far who have posted on this thread can think clearly about any aspect of diet or the nature of the syndrome (not a disease) they have induced in their bodies.. Don't try to do battle with me using your limited knowledge of diet and metabolism, based on a lack of understanding of the long term aspects of diet and health- you won't win.

And dean, don't 'go there' on me until you have been tested for toxo, you cannot disclaim it- My money is on for your cats to have the parasite. I do not mean you should not keep cats, however prudence should prevail and knowledge is power- find out and prove or disprove the truth about the health of your pets and thereby of yourself. The published advice is that toxo is VERY common in housecats, but does not seriously harm the cats enough to require ridding them of the pest, only that precautions should be taken to isolate the danger and limit human exposure, although most cases may be harmless, sometimes it can be a real problem. Why guess? If you and your cats are free from this organism, then we will all rejoice.

My BG is indeed 'optimal' for my body. Yours may or may not be correct for you, as your body is no longer normal in any way. Acetone is a metabolite of alcohol, not fat. Please do not try to lecture me with your 'belief system', it will not work, and only wastes you time and mine. I did not state that the only place that triglycerides were created from glucose was in adipose tissues, I said that there was no way to get triglycerides into or out of any cell across the cell membrane. This is correct, and neither liver or dietary sourced triglycerides can enter an adipose cell, period- this is not conjecture- it has been shown by radioactive-tagged glucose and triglyceride metabolism.

If you had indeed read teh thread I already stated this and more.

The statement about VLDL transport is specious in the extreme. The release of fat from within an adipose cell is by cell-wall rupture, not trans-membraneous transport. Triglycerides circulate in the blood and in the body fluids until enzymatically broken down to glycerol and free fatty acids, which then are complexed with n-acetyl carnitine and carried into the muscle and other cells for use as fuel.

Please, the fact that dietary fat does not enter adipose cells is not contention, it has been proven by tracing radiotagged fat. Sorry, but your sources are not acceptable. Likewise, you can quote the internet and bogus 'science' results all day long, but that will not cause gluconeogenesis to take place in a full calorie zero-carb regime- full stop. Either look, and don't post- or be aware I do not tolerate bullshit. Why did I think you were diabetic? You said something that I interpreted that way, I appears I misread it, sorry.

The normal range for fasting BG is taken to be the range of 70 to 115. BG has to be taken while fasting, I fasted for periods of from 8 hours to as long as 24 hours before being tested, and trust me there is NO WAY that insulin is 'trying to lower' my BG. 99 is my value, it has never varied, and is what my body has as its standard.

My pancreas is 'set' to that value (to use your term), and that is why it is dead stable. To make a categorical statement that every human's internal subjective clock, fat percentage and/or glucose are invariably identical in all people is to bugged belief- and that is what such a contention is, belief- not science. So please give it away. I live in the real world, not the fantasy world of today's totally suspect 'science documents', with results created and produced to fit the research-grant's money provider.

Glucose is not 'made from aminos' in a zero carb diet.

No, dietary fat CANNOT be sorted in the adipose tissues- not ever, and not under any circumstances. The structure and function of adipose cells does not allow transmembrane-transport of triglyceride, there is not even a mechanism for fat to LEAVE the cell other than by a rupture in the cell wall which ejects a globule of fat into the lymph. PLEASE stop repeating over and over something that is absolutely false. I really don't care what sort of nonsense anyone holds to be the 'gospel truth', just keep it to yourselves, we don't need fantasy and superstition here.

What I say works. It always works, and it works for everyone. It has been thoroughly tested over 47 years and continues to be tested every day of my life. If my statements were false or inaccurate in any way, then it would have become obvious long ago, whereas, in fact everything is exactly as it should be, in perfect accord with the explanations I have given.

Erowid has a copy of rather poor newspaper pic taken as I was being busted. Of course I was not 'happy'- but I was vibrantly healthy. What does this have to do with my diet? Oh, sorry- I failed to consider the source...

I am a Capricorn Wood Dog.

A Scorpio is a Scorpio everywhere on the planet if born during the 30 degree segment of the tropical year which is called 'Scorpio'.

It is the seasons that are reversed.

The constellations are not 'reversed'.

Astrology is about time, and time only- not location, except only that the actual (sidereal) time is dependent on location. Equal division is the only correct house system- since the chart is (once more)- about time, not latitude, not longitude. IN any event the names of each 'sign' are more easily associated with the character when they don't change, it is still the equinox which begins the zodiacal cycle and that is all you have to know- each sign is the same, and no longer has a current relationship with the actual astronomical constellation of that name.

In any event, the actual astronomical star-groups are no longer associated with the astrological Zodiac. The names we use are indicative of each successive 30 degree segment of the tropical year beginning with the vernal equinox, the point in the earth's revolution that the sun apparently crosses the plane of the ecliptic in a northerly direction. Since the equinox precesses in a complete circle in a cycle of 23,000 years, the names used to be changed to reflect the skies. Over the hundreds of thousands of years that people have maintained an oral tradition of astrology this name change had to be done every couple of thousand years. However, writing came along and the oral tradition began to die.

About 2000 years ago, before the tradition was lost, Pliny wrote a book called Tetrabiblos, and he used the names of the constellations located within each 30 degree segment as they were then, and those are the names still used today- even though the (ecliptic) crossing point of the equinox has precessed about 34 degrees since the star groups he noted were correct. In other words, the sign of Aries begins while the sun is actually located in the constellation of Aquarius. It does not matter, the 'character' of Aries is associated with the first 30 degrees after the equinox and that is invariable- the constellations are not involved- as I said astrology is about TIME, and the 'nature' of the manifesting universe- not space or stars. Astronomy is about stars. Astrology is a kind of philosophy- not science.

Ok.... we can't eat that.

Either you engage the arguments or you don't. If you expect to be believed despite evidence that contradicts your statements, and without providing your own evidence, then you're not engaging the arguments; you're posturing.

Quote:

Originally Posted by theBear

Please, the fact that dietary fat does not enter adipose cells is not contention, it has been proven by tracing radiotagged fat.

When you adduce the alleged proof in a way that someone else can check, we can talk about it. That's the whole point of using sources, isn't it?

Quote:

Sorry, but your sources are not acceptable.

They may not be acceptable to you. It's become clear that you don't accept sources that challenge your belief system. Others, who actually bother to check these things, may find them useful.

Do you still maintain that acetone is not produced in ketosis, despite being contradicted by every biochem text on the planet, or are we kicking that one under the rug? Are you still convinced that animal fat is 90% saturated? You still believe that dietary protein causes no insulin response? Maybe you do, but nobody who bothers to do a bit of homework will believe any of them.

You see, the thing that bothers me is that the good ideas that you have, such as the relevance of elevated insulin levels to disease states, get tainted by the errors that you spew. I believe that the single most important thing people can do to promote health and fight the ravages of aging is to reduce their exposure to insulin, and I think you believe that as well. You even managed to provide a useful scientific source on this important issue. That's good but it hurts the cause if you embed it in errors, and that's reason enough to keep pointing out the errors.

Quote:

Likewise, you can quote the internet and bogus 'science' results all day long, but that will not cause gluconeogenesis to take place in a full calorie zero-carb regime- full stop. Either look, and don't post- or be aware I do not tolerate bullshit.

On the contrary, you appear to tolerate it well, at least if you're its source. For example, you seem to have the idea that you have authority to instruct people on this board whether or not they can post. You've done this any number of times. But what is that if not bullshit? A self-aggrandizing delusion? Maybe, but the difference between that and bullshit is not really worth bothering about.

Listen, it's perfectly obvious that gluconeogenesis happens on a zero-carb diet, for the simple reason that you don't die on that diet. The brain that is not keto-adapted uses 100-120g of glucose a day. After adaptation, that drops to 40-50g. The red blood cells do not burn ketones, only glucose. There are cells in the retina and elsewhere that are also glucose-dependent. Yes you can get some glucose from ingested triglycerides. Not enough. That's why every study of fasting individuals shows gluconeogenesis. What fasting people have in common with people on a zero carb diet is that they are living entirely on fat and protein. The rate of gluconeogenesis is greatest at the start, yes, but it doesn't fall to zero.

Quote:

The normal range for fasting BG is taken to be the range of 70 to 115.

Yes, but "normal" in this context denotes only what is most commonly observed. In a society where carb saturation is the norm, it's not surprising that the normal range would go that high.

As I said, you may be satisfied with being in the upper end of that range. I'm not, for reasons already provided.

Quote:

BG has to be taken while fasting, I fasted for periods of from 8 hours to as long as 24 hours before being tested, and trust me there is NO WAY that insulin is 'trying to lower' my BG.

I typically test at 20 hours of fasting. I'm not convinced that your BG or mine (93 yesterday) is optimal. In my own case, the fact that intermittent fasting brings it down into the 80s, but all-meat (2 or more meals a day) doesn't, gives me further support for this view.

Quote:

99 is my value, it has never varied, and is what my body has as its standard. My pancreas is 'set' to that value (to use your term), and that is why it is dead stable.

That's fine. We have different standards on this point. I've given my reasons and sources. No need to repeat them.

Quote:

To make a categorical statement that every human's internal subjective clock, fat percentage and/or glucose are invariably identical in all people is to bugger belief- and that is what such a contention is, belief- not science.

Subjective clock? Hmmm... Well, let's see. You *believe* that your BG indicates minimal insulin in your body. The basis for your belief is that it falls in the upper end of the normal range in a population of high carb eaters. At least, that's the only reason you've given so far. I believe that my BG, a bit lower than yours,

is not yet at a level that gives me minimum insulin exposure (though I wish it were). The basis for my belief is the studies adduced in Harrison's Principles of Internal Medicine, and by Bernstein, and by epidemiological studies showing elevated cardiovascular risk as fasting BG goes above 85. I'll let others decide who is hung up on "mere belief" here.

Quote:

So please give it away. I live in the real world, not the fantasy world of today's totally suspect 'science documents', with results created and produced to fit the research-grant's money provider.

So what is it then? You reject all scientific research, including the studies that you occasionally cite, or you only rely on *yesterday's* science?

Quote:

No, dietary fat CANNOT be sorted in the adipose tissues- not ever, and not under any circumstances. The structure and function of adipose cells does not allow transmembrane-transport of triglyceride, there is not even a mechanism for fat to LEAVE the cell other than by a rupture in the cell wall which ejects a globule of fat into the lymph. PLEASE stop repeating over and over something that is absolutely false.

I might make the same request of you. Look, I've already provided ample documentation on this. You've provided none. Walsh describes how the process works, which is NOT by passing intact TG molecules through the membrane. Anyone who is interested in the details can read it.

Quote:

What I say works. It always works, and it works for everyone. It has been thoroughly tested over 47 years and continues to be tested every day of my life. If my statements were false or inaccurate in any way, then it would have become obvious long ago, whereas, in fact everything is exactly as it should be, in perfect accord with the explanations I have given.

The fact that your diet has worked for you (depending on whether one considers your fasting BG to be "working"--I don't) in no way entails that all the beliefs you've acquired about it are true. Yes, we all want to know what works and what doesn't. I think we also have an interest in learning what are the underlying facts and what aren't.

I am spending my valuable time trying to help those who are interested in this path. I work on the black-box approach that is based on input and outcome. Although I have a set of interesting metabolic papers which for some reason have gotten misplaced (as I have noted), I really don't give a stuff what the very contradictory 'scientific research' has to say about what happens in the body. I exhibit very few of the known damage forms from insulin, and therefore the levels that must exist in my body are so low as to be harmless. Whether that is zero as I assume- is also immaterial. I also don't care about the contention that proteins are destroyed for glucose and I question the turn over rate of 50/gm/ day, I consider it to be far less, and in any event it also does not matter. I am here to talk about my life experience, and trying to help others who are interested in acquiring this very contrary eating regime, which goes against the socialisation we humans have imbedded

in our subconscious minds so deeply as to overwrite our basic instincts. So everyone- save your dissertations for someone who cares- I don't. If someone comes along with a similar length of time on a given routine and has something to share, great. Calling for things only read about... is useless and counterproductive.

With respect to breast cancer, I have noticed that the rate of increase is inversely proportional to the replacement of animal fat with vegetable oils, primarily unsat., in the general diet.

I know Greg Ellis and he is one of my sources. He gave me many interesting references, most of which I have misplaced- he follows a similar path, but is not as strict as I am.

I think the idea that meat is not a year-round food is hilarious.

I seem to find the saturated fat thing turning up a lot. For the record, the 90% I mentioned refers to beef kidney suet, which is nearly pure stearic acid triglyceride. Each kind of fat in an animal's body varies, the marrow fat is down near 40% or less sat, the cod fat or 'cover' is about 50-55%. All of these change somewhat with diet, except for kidney fat which is not so much an energy storage as a structural item and must remain very firm and strong. The tallow from kidney suet if saponified, the resulting glycerol removed and the soap neutralised with acid, produces 'stearin', perhaps the best 'candle wax' there is, very hard, clean and slow burning, with the added advantage of being edible.

As an aside, melted lamb (or mutton) tallow is the finest quenching-oil known for hardening steel - it clings to the metal rather than cavitating. Just one of many things I have learned in my adventures as a sculptor and tool-maker.

theBear Sun, Apr-30-06 02:30

it is possible no matter how fat you become nor how long you stayed that way, to lose nearly all of your excess bodyfat through the zerocarb regime, right down to a normal body size. It is true you will have more adipose cells, but they will be collapsed- and insignificant. The skin is another matter, and will hang on you like a loose sheet unless reduced by surgery- but there is no need to remove adipose tissue. The 'fat-o-stat' (as I call it) that everyone has, is based on the percentage of body MASS that is bodyfat, it does not depend on the actual number of adipose cells in the body. If my means of training you gain muscle mass then your total fat mass also will rise to maintain the percentage. Those of us who are 'genetically obese', the endo- and meso-morphs, will always be intolerant of carbs and will always rapidly gain bodyfat if they are present in the diet

I never said that Greg Ellis was 'a source', but that he was 'one of my sources' (for hardcopy information): Back in the late '80's he gave me some hard to find and very important reference papers on metabolism. There is a distinct difference. Greg has a different approach to the values in food than I do, he is much less strict in his routine. He have had more than a few arguments. He knows a lot, but is not able to effectively override his acculturation, His idea of 'low arb and mine are quite different- he eats too much veg and carbs therefore is unable to reduce without caloric restriction. I have noted previously that to go below one's natural 'fat-o-stat' setting (such as getting BF down to less than 5%- for bodybuilding competition) will always require a reduction in calories. His imperious manner is his idea of the best way to increase sales for his various books. These reasons are

why I do not refer to him or his website (as some have asked).

'Easily fattened' = 'genetic obese'.

If you become obese and remain that way over a period of time, the skin cells will multiply and grow into more area to relieve the stretch. Once you lose, there will be a small amount of 'take-up', usually very small unless you were still gaining fairly rapidly when you started to lose, but you cannot remove all that extra area of skin created by the growth over time to accommodate your increased bulk, and it will remain with you unless you resort to surgery. I have seen this in some friends, and trust me, it is NOT a pretty sight. Loose skin is exacerbated by insulin damage to the collagen, which is associated with the weight gain, so cannot be avoided. Taking collagen in the diet (or by injection) is a waste of time and money- collagen is a basic component of many body structures. It is not something separate, and cannot be replaced or renewed from external sources.

Nuts of all kinds are high carb/high fat food. Check the tables if you doubt the carb content. The high carb part rules (same goes for avocados). Not much else but water and bit of fibre- virtually no usable protein.

The depressing mood changes and lack of energy in winter in NYC are a widely recognised condition called 'SAD' or 'seasonal affective disorder' and are due to our evolution in the tropics- we need more daylight than high latitudes such as NYC - near 42 deg N and very far from the equator, provide during the winter months. You can 'cure' it by daily sessions of very bright light, for a period after nightfall, while not arising before daylight- or by providing very bright light immediately upon arising- if before natural light begins. The amount of strong light plus daylight needs to equal 10 to 12 hours. SAD has a strong effect on everything people do when effected by it, cravings for food would be well within reasonable expectation. Everyone living in the US north of about South Carolina (or southern CA) will suffer from SAD to some degree.

Hunting rules designating male animals only are due to two situations- 1. herding animals like deer have an excess of males, one male services a whole herd of females- preserving the females assures a high proportion of animals in the difficult, degraded modern habitat. 2. modern day hunting is not undertaken for meat, but for trophy heads- the upshot of that is a steady reduction in the size of feral deer- the trophy 'rack' from a very large stag is the most sought after, thus the ones which survive to breed are the smaller ones with smaller racks. Young does and fawns are vastly superior as food- the ancients preferred them.

I assure you that all 'food desires' indeed can and do become lost: If you put a pizza down in front of me, I would pick off the cheese and (if any) meaty bits, and ignore the rest. I only respond with appetite or desire- to meat. This did take about ten years to become permanently fixed, however.

Fat cells are indeed the metabolically active part of body fat. Their activity is controlled by the amount of fat they each contain- more fat in more cells = more effect on the thyroid. The percentage with lean mass rule is undoubtedly determined by the endocrine system, my guess is primarily the thyroid, which is signalled by and alters its activity in response to signals from the adipose mass.

Let me assure you all that a rapid increase in muscle size, strength and muscularity (anabolic growth) is very easy while also losing body fat (only)- at a rapid rate. Just eat lots of calories 80/20 (with zero carb intake) and indulge in intense, brief and infrequent exercise. Been there, done that. Works fantastic.

'Kirilian' photography is done with current from a Tesla Coil- a simple source of radio frequency, high voltage current. The voltage is harmless but spectacular. The patterns it makes on photographic paper are determined by the RF conductivity of the item under study, and have no significance other than as a curiosity. Can be great fun at a party, assuming you don't get into trouble (like I did as a kid) with the FCC for the wideband radio noise a Tesla Coil produces.

It is dead easy to eat more than 2 pounds of steak in a sitting on a total meat diet, and do so twice or three times a day- as well. Been there, done that- a lot.

Properly made jerky is NOT 'salty'- any jerky which has a salty taste has been treated with chemical brine and should be avoided. Virtually all store-bought jerky will be like this- food safety laws require it. Such jerky is not only seriously lacking in nutrition, it is somewhat toxic due to the chemical content.

Some tribes of Indians (NA) soaked acorns to rid them of the tannins, not 'nuts' generic. Acorns are nasty tasting as collected, but very starchy- they have a high carb content- the leached acorns were dried and ground to flour and baked into cakes.- sometimes referred to as 'Indian bread'. Other NA tribes grew maize and made their starchy cakes from that. Another very starchy nut is the chestnut. In Oz, the starchiest nut comes from the bunya pine (huge cones loaded with large nuts)- a member of the araucaria genus along with 'monkey puzzle', Norfolk Island pine and hoop pine.

So far as getting fat to 'keep warm om winter'- we evolved in the tropics, near the equator where it does not get cold in 'winter'. Technically there is no winter or summer in the tropics only alternating dry and wet seasons.

People lived some distance south of the glaciers in Europe and Asia during the last glacial maximum (-18000 ybp). No one lived in the Americas until ~11,000 ybp..

Walnuts are very high in polyunsaturated oils, the very worst kind of natural fat there is.

We left Africa way, way earlier than 60,000 ybp. I said only that during the glacial periods we did not live very far north or south- the only exceptions were the various 10,000 year long interglacials- which recur every 115,000 years. The current one is very nearly at an end. Only a few more years at the very most- are left...

Please, hold the nonsense. I am a tropical person, I have lived in the tropics for 24 years. Over the years I have travelled to many places within the tropics and trust me- there are no winters and summers here. In their place there is a dry season and a wet, or monsoon, season. That is the only kind of 'seasonal variation' to be found anywhere in the tropics. Never cold, always quite warm to hot- and lots of daylight every day, year 'round. I very often go without any clothes in 'mid-winter' (more properly mid-dry). I am a bit of an expert on climate (and meteorology) in general and especially on tropical climate. Quite obviously you haven't a clue.

I am certainly not surprised that someone who is manifestly NOT an expert on anything, and who has not shown able to contribute useful information to our thread, would be jealous of those amongst us who are the masters of a few subjects. I pride myself on mastery- and never claim knowledge I do not have.

I only post to this, my thread, due to constraints on the time I have available. This time factor situation is why I usually deal directly and briefly with any attempts to derail what I intended at the start:

I started this thread to share my experiences on a very long path with those who are genuinely interested, not in arguing with people who haven't a clue. To tell the truth, I really don't care what any of those few dissenters think about me. There is not a single one of you who has become qualified by following ANY sort of low carb diet long enough to be valid in criticising what I say. I don't see any value in NOT expressing my viewpoint- especially since I have not read any one else's which is not either harmonious/equivalent to the path, or hopelessly invalid- I am not interested in any other path. I do not consider those few who are misinformed to be 'stupid'- hard-headed and recalcitrant, perhaps, not stupid.

Other than my ice age theorem, which is now in the process of proving itself, everything else on my website is true- based on my experiences, and/or well researched. Why is it so difficult for some to accept that there are people with real talent on the planet living right alongside those who have none? If you do not have talent, It is not your fault, and it certainly is not mine. There is no advantage in criticising and denigrating those who are more fortunate in this respect.

Sorry, the transmigration of people from Asia into North America is not in contention. It occurred after the end of the last glaciation at the beginning of the present interglacial, approximately 12-11,000 years ago. At 30,000 ybp glaciation had not yet peaked (18,000 ybp). There was no passage between Asia and NA for people to follow.

The 'Iceman' is from only ~5000. His society was neolithic agriculturist.

If your mouth feels greasy after eating all-meat, then the solution is to eat the fat early on, and finish off with lean, which will cleanse the mouth of residual fat. I have previously, on several occasions- indicated this is the best way to eat in order to assure the right balance of fat/lean (the 80/20 rule). In 47 years of eating all-meat, I have never had this 'greasy mouth' experience.

One more time: I do not write about conjecture. I write only about the truth in diet and health, based on my 47 years of solid experience.

If someone thinks I am wrong about this or that, that constitutes only their opinion and is NOT fact. I respect everyone's right to have an opinion, whether right or wrong- but I take no value from it if it deviates from, or has the intention of forcing me to deviate from, my purpose. Since I know perfectly well exactly what I am going about here, it makes no difference to me what anyone thinks or says- it is only they who will lose by wasting time here and are causing me to shorten what I have to say of importance just to give effort towards bringing things back on line.

I will advise everyone once more- those who think I am misinformed, ill advised, falsely opinionated or otherwise just plain wrong, to leave us alone- we have heard it all before.

All those who want to follow the path will quickly understand that I only tell the truth, it is dead easy to verify that it works. The dissenters will never follow this path anyway- so it's no loss.

Any contention that I read that I consider beneath consideration I will not respond to- it is a waste of time to refute the obvious (i.e. the specious remark about what/when constitutes 'human').

I am not asking anyone who feels they cannot do so, to follow this fine path. Only those who genuinely want to, and have the prerequisite will power and determination can do it anyway It is obvious that most people will never be comfortable in following this dietary regime, but that is human nature and culture, and I expect it. If you are in this category- as obviously some are, please, let go and find some other thread to sit out your day on.

I make various statements about how things work. I may or may not 'substantiate' them with references. That I don't choose to do so does not make the statements of less value.

I have known for all the 47 years that I have eaten this way that nearly everyone I meet is outraged by the very idea of it and usually will go to nearly any length to 'prove it wrong' and if they had the power, would have tried to me from the path 'for my own good'.

A beautiful example of the kind of 'follow the science' attitude is the disaster of the low fat diet- STILL raging on in the ads for '97% fat free', 'Lowest in fat', ad nauseam.

I also consider the remarks about my bouts with heart and cancer likewise specious. They are only an indication that the accuser has not read, or does not understand what happened. This too, after all the time I spent explaining my specific situation. My diet, far from 'causing' any of my problems saved me two times from either death or serious disability. Cancer such as I suffered is not of dietary origin- but my low glucose turnover diet may have modified its course.

I had the worst kind of high carb diet until 23- hence a single blockage (not four or five) in my coronary artery which, while controlled and limited by my diet, still caused me unrecognised problems all my adult life, and finally had to be dealt with at age 65. Still, I never suffered a heart attack and only developed serious angina after adding on about 35 pounds of muscle mass.

On my website is the essay describing my theorem about the initiation of glaciation (I'll just ignore your confusion about what constitutes a theorem- and your lack of knowledge about the word 'theory', which does not exist in science, only in popular speech). You really do not have a clue about whom you are dealing with, do you?

What does 'underpinning' mean with respect of forty seven real world years of eating a totally carnivorous dietary regime?

My 'underpinning' is the thousands of great meals I have had of the best and most nutritious food known to exist on this planet. I am vibrantly healthy and powerful physically at an age when most men are weak and in ill health. I have great eyesight, and I do not need glasses to read or drive. I have few of the usual signs of aging. I am very active and constantly learning new things. I make art which

constantly improves with each piece, without practice.

What more 'proof' is needed of the efficacy of my claims? I can eat as much as I like and do not gain any bodyfat. I am never hungry. I know that I have virtually no insulin in my body at any time, and I know that that hormone is very damaging. I have constant bloodsugar and triglyceride levels. I do not suffer from colds and flu. I have fun with my life. And I do not find my diet 'boring' in any way.

What more is necessary? If forty seven years of hard knock experience, leading to a remarkable body condition does not qualify me as a proper and valid advisor on diet, then what on Earth will?

Can we please climb out of the schoolyard, leave bullying and bluster behind and get back to talking about the way to eat?

Beef, my all time fave is now down on the list due to difficulty in swallowing even when reduced to a paste for 'soup'. I now prefer veal, lamb and chook. Had lamb's heart the other day, nice and smooth. I think that beef its far and away the best nutrition, it has a lot of fibrous tissues, cartilage- dispersed through the meat. The thing which gives me difficulty is what makes it so good. Irony, again. I don't mix for myself, only for my wife- for whom I usually cook. I can eat the same thing endlessly.

As an aside- I don't want to be 'famous, special, a celeb or or infamous'. I avoid cameras and the media. I refuse to do interviews. I live a quiet life in the bush, away from people and the public view.

During my life, I have done many things. extraordinary, exciting, challenging things, but they were all just things which seemed right to do at the time. I am a person who has considerable talent in numerous areas, and that is not just my opinion. Unfortunately that does attract unwanted attention. I have a well earned reputation of doing very high quality work in all my fields of endeavor. I was not responsible for my first name becoming an entry in the Oxford Dictionary, but it is there- defining quality, purity and strength. I only know it is there because someone wrote and alerted me to it.

I guess it never occurs to people who regard their own lives not to be very interesting, that there are those who live life in a totally different manner to theirs, and therefore experience a different sort of life. That life was not blind chance or imposed on them, it was their choice. I decided to do what I have done, whether it was psychedelics, music or sculpture, radio or building, or even migration to a new country and new adventures. Each opportunity presented itself and was enthusiastically embraced. Try it, you too may then live a bit more interesting a life than you have so far.

Clearly not right.

Tinnitus is not diet related, so far as I am aware. Some drugs like streptomycin can cause it, and of course nerve damage may also cause it. Otherwise it may just be your brain which creates it- that is where 'hearing' resides. I have some- I simply ignore it. I have a bit of nerve damage from the R&R, but my nerves are not far from where they would be expected to be at my age. My current problem is the inadvised insertion of grommets into my eardrums a couple of years ago, which have left me with holes which refuse to heal up. My current work around is to use headphones, which drives the sound straight to the oval window which is where the nerves are,

and effectively bypasses the eardrum and the chain of ossicles. An audiometer test will indicate if there are any serious deviations from normal and that info may help you avoid eq decisions that are not wise. I personally avoid all use of eq. If I am unhappy with the sound, I will change the mic. I cannot tell you how I mix, it is just a talent I seem to have. Other people do not seem to 'hear' things quite the way I do. I have never been able to teach anyone how to do what I do- The can't hear the difference until I make the mix. They are never able later on get to that place by themselves, even after carefully observation. My conclusion is that I can hear something about 'sound in space', that others apparently are not aware of. Probably not in the ear so much as in the way my brain processes the ear's signals.

Birds all exhibit an ability to regenerate the hair cells in their ears.

My taste in music is very eclectic. I like almost all genres (except hip-hop or rap, which I do not class as music, but 'spoken' drama). Sometimes I listen and sometime not, whether working on a project, or working out- I am fine with quiet. Where I live it is so quiet and restful that sometimes even the sound of a voice is distracting.

I once was briefly introduced to George Harrison. A pleasant chap.

bout the end of the last ice age, If anyone still thinks that man walked over to NA from Asia 30 kybp, I recommend finding and examining a copy of:

'The Last Great Ice Sheets', edited by George H Denton and Terence J Hughes, a Wiley-Interscience publication, published in 1981 by John Wiley and Sons.

I have a copy here in my library, but it is hard to find. This is THE definitive study of the extent of the last glaciation- coverage and dates etc. This extraordinary work comes with an extensive set of large charts which depict the limits of ice under both the greatest and the least extent the data supports. The maximum point is taken as 24,000 to 17,000 ybp.

The very act of attacking my statements is a symbol of defeat. It only confirms that the person making the claim is completely unsuited to following the path, and must grasp at straws to verify his or her defection.

The contrary assertions (for all 8) are false, whether you want to accept it or not. I do not accept the expanations on offer to the contrary. I really cannot see what value they have, since the outcome for input fits perfectly according to my statements, whether you consider them true or not. In fact- it is not necessary to know everything which happens in the body, only the relation between input and output. So long as that relationship is stable and consistent, then any 'explanation' you like, is correct. In fact there are no 'errors'- everything I say or have said is consistent with the outcome, 'error' implys that the outcome is not consistent. I think that it is rather unproductive to take out an attack on what I say when the attacker is in basic agreement, but feels an overweening obligation to dissent on details.

I don't 'eat' spices (does anyone?). I use a few in minuscule (normal) amounts to add a bit of different flavour to my food. What is it with people who simply HAVE to criticise so badly they will actually make such a statement? Dairy IS meat. Oh, yes, my health is indeed 'vibrant'- and it is better than the vast majority of people half my age. It is hardly 'average'. And just how do you pretend to know what my health is like?

Not only do I not have 'multiple health problems', I have NO health problems of any kind at present.

By the way, blood glucose level is measure in milligrams (.001gm) per decilitre (100ml)- the total amount in the entire body's blood volume with 99 mg/dl is therefore only about 5 gms- equivalent to a single teaspoonful, and probably just about the amount needed over a 24 hour period...

I can equal Jack Lalannes feat at 70- he only towed a floating (frictionless) boat a mile and a half. Good endurance, but hardly a feat of strength. IN fact jackl was always known for his endurance, never for his strength. He was very short, under 5'4" and turned to bodybuilding as it was- a very primitive sport in those days, to overcome his handicap. Nice chap, friendly and affable, but he had, IMHO, a terrible diet most of the time I was around him: ~1958-63).

Kidney suet is not just 'internal fat' it is a specific internal fat. It is generally 90% sat. Some after rendering can run as high as 98+%- essentially pure stearic acid.

I do not attack anyone, I do not permit the unwarranted attacks on myself to go unscathed, however. Even then, I do realise the attacks are only uncontrollable, unconscious rebellion against the very idea of my dietary routine which is violently offensive to many heavily acculturated people. They cannot control themselves- and in my view are more to be pitied than attacked. What other possible reason would anyone on this thread natter on, post after post after post, about such non-food nonsense as 'crunchy' 'doritos' 'blueberries' 'carrots' 'bananas' 'banana chips' 'coconuts'- ad nauseam? We don't need a lot of filler.

Raw meat is ok. Nearly raw (bleu/blood rare) meat is also ok. Well done meat is NOT ok.

If my thread 'emptied out' meaning that everyone who had a genuine interest, not those who like to tussle, had learned enough- I would gratefully return to the work I have to do which has been neglected.

It is dead easy to eat half or even all of my 'tasty chook' recipe in one go.

I actually do know quite a bit about the design of radial tyres. I was a very early adopter in 1963 of Pirellis for my MGTf-Lotus. My current fave is Goodrich AT. I only have bias-ply on my mountain bike, so far no one has figured out a way to make radial ply's work on a two wheeler.

I lost a nerve in my neck to the tumour which surrounded it and crushed it. The result is half my throat does not contract when I swallow, allowing solid food to move over rather than going down- even with water. The nerve may or may not recover, only time will tell. Reducing meat to a paste and mixing with water like a thick soup works very well (but the taste suffers), raw meat included, but beef has a lot of tendinous tissues and is 'sticky', leaving a coating behind. Other meats vary in this property. I can and do eat some foods by chewing them a lot to produce a kind of rough slippery paste and swallowing with water, like fresh raw oysters and eggs, some sashimi etc. Raw meat is usually very tender. This 'problem is not a health issue, it is a side effect of the treatment and process of having survived a killer disease, and like all diseases, once cured it is gone as a health issue, leaving the trauma I suffered from it and the treatment behind- my health is excellent- better

I am sure, than my detractors.

If you had lost a foot- cut off in an accident, or had a bone broken and healed- would you accept an assertion this indicated 'poor health'?

Stef only lived on an all-meat diet intermittently for a total of about 8 years out of 83 (that leaves 75 years on a normal diet)- I have been on it continuously for 47 years out of 71. The damage my high carb dietary intake, incurred while I ate a 'normal' diet, was a single, simple blockage in one of my coronary arteries, which began causing me mild angina from age 20. I began all meat at 23, so the heart problem predated, and was reduced in growth and severity- by my present diet. Strokes are due to weak blood vessels and Stef's intermittent meat diet excursions were not long enough in duration to have reduced the insulin damage leading to his blood pressure or anything else. Admit it, you have absolutely nothing of value to offer us here, and you cannot even find a valid reason to attack what I say- you are in denial about your own state of health, but cannot accept this dietary path and are projecting you disability outwards. I enjoy excellent health- Give it up.

I eat as much as I feel like, no more no less. I never count calories, they mean nothing to a meat eater. My average caloric intake is therefore- adequate. Currently I am about 5-6% BF and stable..

Chewing meat is not necessary, cut it small and swallow it, chewing only helps get some flavour out, and does not help or hinder digestion. Complete digestion of a meat-only meal takes less than an hour.

60 gm/day of carbs is most definitely NOT 'low carb' even by 'normal' dietary standards- it is in the low region of moderate carb. I would define the very upper limit of 'low carb' at 20gm/day, with many obese people not responding to anything much above 5gm/day.

Insulin is the single most significant (perhaps only) cause of cardiovascular disease. Refer to either of my two earlier posts directing attention to the article 'Atherosclerosis: An Insulin Dependent Disease?' by Nestor Flodin. If anyone takes the time to read this important research paper, please note that the dogs were fed normal dog chow and the amount of insulin infused was only the amount necessary to deal with the normal BG level response to the carbs in the food. This is why CAD is so universal in our society- virtually no one escapes it.

At 5gm/day of glucose turnover, I usually get that amount in cream etc. Otherwise from glycerol. No protein is used, period- GNG of protein simply does not, and cannot occur on this diet- ever. And, please note- any research that says it does is bogus, so curb your indignation, if any.

Many attempts have been made, feeding a normal intake of food on a zerocarb regime to elicit tagged glucose made from tagged proteins in the diet, hence proof of GNG- with zero results. All the theoretical dissertations and bogus research in the world cannot over-ride this sort of evidence, let alone all the rest of the published data disproving its existence. So if 'constant gluconeogenesis' is a part of your 'belief system', and thinking that way does not cause you any problems, then it is perfectly ok for you (the black box), however it is not based on fact anymore than a belief in 'walking on water' can be shown to be based on fact.

My 'assertions' about metabolism are based on a few accurate and honest studies such are few and far between. If not prompted by others, I would not have even mentioned them. However, you are quite right, whether the sun circles the earth, or the earth turns, makes absolutely no difference to anyone or any living thing on the earth's

surface.

The brain works very well on ketones. Maybe better than on glucose.

Rats 'fed a high protein low carb diet' is an oxymoron, there is no 'high protein' diet that an animal can live on. There are two types of extreme diet- high fat and high carb. Protein requirement is around 15 - 25%. More is not necessary or good and sustained values of less than ~15 may incur a reduction in overall health if maintained for a long enough period. In an emergency, any animal can survive on 100% fat for weeks, even months. Higher protein levels may have the consequence of producing an anomalous 'gluconeogenesis' in the omnivorous experimental rats.

Oddly enough, our (human) digestive systems are nearly identical, both in form and relative length- to cats, whose intestines are only 1/8 shorter than ours. We do have an appendix- which obligate carnivores lack. The appendix has no function in the digestion of meat, and no carnivore has one. Our appendix is a reduced form of the cecum- it stores putrefactive bacteria during times of all meat, and is necessary when vegetation is re-introduced to allow the bacteria to recolonise the colon and break down the vegetable residues (fibre) so they can be voided. People who have had their appendixes out have ongoing digestive problems, requiring careful attention to the diet- no problems on all-meat- but arise on an attempt to reintroduce vegetation after a period of abstinence.

The all-important appendix is- in most people- in constant use, and is the one thing we have which allows us to follow the diet we consider 'normal', and is an excellent survival tool even for those of us on the all-meat diet. It is a fully developed organ, and is not in any danger of atrophy in any human group. In an emergency requiring the eating of vegetation, you really would not want to be knocked down by an inability to poo. Eating of seeds and other small, hard indigestible things which can lodge in and obstruct the opening into the appendix, can produce a situation leading to inflammation and very serious consequences. Real omnivores have a much larger, more actively functional cecum, and lack a true appendix.

Feces resulting from eating vegetation is composed of 80+% dead bacteria, whereas on all-meat it is nearly sterile, merely discarded body wastes (and unused nutrients).

Otherwise, there are no significant differences between humans and cats. I am stymied as to where you found a text which said we were 'morphologically so different (from cats)'- the truth is otherwise- as all my human anatomy and animal anatomy books agree. Domestic cats are used in place of human cadavers in many college human anatomy classes because of their virtually identical internal organs. So far as I am aware, only some militant vegans attempt to make a claim that we have 'long intestines'. India's fakirs commonly swallow a string the length of their height. While holding one end between their teeth, the other end exits their bum. This, by no definition can be considered 'long'. Meat exits the stomach after about one hour as a completely absorbable liquid- and is gone in about 40 cm of the small intestine. Vegetation leaves the stomach after about three-four hours and 95% makes it through to the colon. If most of the vegetation is not cooked, it is not absorbable.

General/opportunistic omnivores and herbivores are very different from carnivores- they have adapted to extracting nourishment from raw vegetation in various ways and have the dentition and other attributes necessary- we do not. Our teeth are shaped and evolved along the restrictions of our branch of mammals- the insectivores (modern primate insectivore survivor: The tree shrew). Our mouths and teeth have adapted to the requirements of speech and the use of knives. Funny that a degree in physical anthro would not have included such basic facts. I do understand that most

students nowadays use the internet and other means to cheat rather than attending class and learning the subjects, but really.... Anthropology? Medicine, science and law I can understand- great remuneration awaits.

I use the term 'path' intentionally- to differentiate from 'diet'. The term path means that this way of eating has to be taken on as a permanent, lifestyle routine, and not something adopted temporarily.

Warrior's diet? The Romans fed their 'warriors' exclusively on bread and some vegetables, virtually no meat of any kind. The diet was so veggie that their 'pay' was common salt! The term 'salary' is from sal- the Latin word for salt. And they conquered the known world on that lousy diet. Mama Cass Elliot ate very little during the day and 'feasted' after dark- and gained truly massive amounts of fat by so doing. I know this for a fact- I was a good friend of hers.

Hypothyroidism is the RESULT of being obese. NOT the cause.

Indeed, in the modern world eating is not only hedonist but is considered to be major entertainment. What you like and want to eat is social, a part of your culture and is learned as you grow from birth. It is extremely resistant to change. However it is useful to realise this is all in your mind. Your body (represented by the deep unconscious) prefers an all meat diet over any and all other foods, and does this from the very beginning. The trick to following this path successfully is to learn to listen to and accept the wee tiny voice of your body calling out 'yes!' to you from your depths whenever you eat a meal of meat.

Finally... Yes, there ARE are many 'other paths' than mine.

Some are vegetarian, some are vegan, some omnivore- and so on and so forth.

THIS path, as the title I gave to the thread unambiguously indicates, is about a totally carnivorous path. I am not interested in whether anyone might be satisfied with some other path, that is their business, their problem, and I really couldn't care less. I do care however- very much, about those who do not like the shape of the body they were born with in this life (as I did) and are truly interested in knowing about a way to eat which willl give them a normal one- and is healthy, safe, has no nutritional deficiencies, uses food which is widely available, works for literally everyone, is easy to implement, AND has no downside (other than some purely social difficulties) (plus a very positive upside) over a lifetime of practice- as indicated by my 47 years of experience.

The goal (and result) of following this path impeccably is to never have to do the 'battle of the bulge', ever again. "...have to balance the needs of..." is absolutely PURE acculturation.

I do not understand why someone of this persuasion, and terminally contrary wants to come here and argue about it. Eat whatever you like- it is your culture, and we don't give a stuff. Unless you are genuinely interested in following this path, you should not be posting here, However, that said- you are most welcome as a silent observer. Who knows, perhaps 'the light' may come to you after a while.\

Basically gluconeogenesis is a destructive process in which the body rips the poly-glucose core out of protein molecules (glucose forms the support structure for strings of amino acids) in starvation. These sacrificial proteins are usually sourced from the muscle tissues. This process is very destructive to the tissues and

is only resorted to under extreme circumstances while in a fed state, such as on a no carb intake combined/coupled with insufficient fat intake as well. Starvation and long term fasting brings it on, bigtime.

A zero-carb all meat, 80/20 (by calories: fat/protein) diet delivers the necessary small amounts of glucose from glycerol- while most of the daily glucose requirement (as seen in a mixed diet) is replaced by ketones, which- like glycerol- are by-products of fat metabolism. If you are properly using the ketones in your body as food (glucose replacement) - you will not see them spilling in your urine. Dietary protein is never used to make glucose in a fat-sufficient dietary situation.

Basically you have to be doing something very wrong to experience this process. This is borne out by the lack of muscle loss on a 100% fat diet- the body can strictly conserve protein.

Muscle glycogen (or liver glycogen, or ketones) is NEVER used as a 'fuel' for muscles- either in doing aerobic OR in anaerobic work. The glycogen is only there as storage for quick adjustment of blood sugar levels, and in a zero-carb, keto-adapted diet usually does not vary. Please note, carefully: Muscle contraction (i.e.-the standard skeletal 'motor' of the body) is 'fueled' by ATP-ADP conversion. ADP is re-converted to ATP ONLY by a process which uses FFA's. Properly controlled tests have indicated that muscle glycogen is never 'depleted' during exercise. I have covered this subject previously, I am surprised to still hear that old fairytale about glucose and muscle work.

By the way, amino acids do not contain glucose, nor anything which can be converted into glucose and are NOT what is used in gluconeogenesis. The process requires whole protein chains, which are reduced to amino acids and the glucose core is set free as blood sugar. The hydrochloric acid which is used to liquefy meat does not break proteins down, they are absorbed as is. Reduction to aminos requires different conditions and specialised enzymes not found in the intestines. Absorption of digested meat takes less than one hour, not enough time to reduce proteins to aminos and the glucose released would cause a rise in BG, which does not occur. Much of the protein in food is used as is, or snipped into smaller but still quite long chains once in the blood stream. Very little is reduced down to free amino acids. This is why we cannot live well without meat, some essential protein chains cannot be fabricated in the human body from free amino acids.

I thought I had made it very clear (not once but several times) that I began this thread to share my lifetime experience with the diet we evolved on. I am one of those I term a naturally, or genetically obese person, an endo-tending mesomorph and I early on found that carbs are my most deadly enemy. I have not been fat since age 20- heavily restricting calories until I read about the all meat Inuit diet at age 23. I have found many additional advantages to the zero-carb regime in improved health, low blood pressure, muscular strength, bone density, strong caries-free teeth, etc.

10gm/day of carbs would derail MY diet and cause me to gradually gain BF. I must keep below 5/day. Otherwise if you are above your body's fat set-point ('fat-o-stat'), you can eat as much as 5000/cal a day- even if sedentary, and still lose excess BF.

I am sure there is lots of laughter all around at all the foolish stuff people use to distract the thread from information about this super-antisocial way of eating. I am not addressing the unfortunate lost souls who cannot accept the title of this

thread. I am only still posting in the hope there are still some reading who DO care about this simple method of acquiring and keeping for life a normal human body shape and size. I am most certainly NOT 'wrong', my path works and works perfectly for everyone, so why should I tolerate dissent (read: denial) over the truth?

Surgeons just love to remove the appendix, often doing it while in the abdomen for another reason- since you CAN survive without it and the operation nets them very good income. You should be aware that NOTHING in the human body is not there for a very good reason, we are one of the most well-developed and perfected animals on the planet, ranking right up there with the crocodile- an animal so perfected it has not changed one whit since before the age of dinosaurs.

The texture thing is totally mental. Raw meat is best, the more meat is cooked the more nutrients are lost. As you adapt to a zero-carb diet the less you will be able to tolerate the taste of cooked meat. Your body LOVES raw or blood-rare meat- crisped fat is lovely and a good quality of less cooked fat is also nice- you will gradually grow to like it. The 'revulsion' you may feel for any kind of food is strictly mental/social. The rare or raw thing usually means that meat was always cooked to a crisp while growing up in the family. The gall bladder is damaged by a low fat diet, which prevents it discharging bile daily and causes gallstones to form. You will have to eat more frequently, smaller portions so that you can handle the fat. Medium chain fats can be absorbed with out bile, even from the stomach. Most animal fats contain various amounts of short to medium chain fatty acids, and one vegetable oil, coconut is very high in medium chain triglycerides.

If you eat a mixed diet with alternating intervals of meat and vegetation, or even straight vegetation, the appendix is essential. On a pure meat regime it is not necessary. The primary function of this organ is bacterial storage, not mucus formation, the lymphatics are there to protect your body from escape of bacteria. That protective function is not always enough, especially if the passageway into the colonic cecum is blocked- as by seeds, etc. I personally know several people who have had their appendix removed, including my wife, and all have experienced digestive difficulties and need to take care in what they eat.

Insulin is not a 'protein' per se, it is a high activity hormone which is destroyed by stomach acid- as are a great many biologically active agents. Please, do not trumpet your ignorance

Yes- excess caloric intake over daily requirements on a zero-carb regime is ejected from the body as waste. Uneconomic this may well be. However, it is much easier to eat your meals without having to count the calories. If you are very poor then you might want to go to the trouble of measuring everything- the major difficulty is finding out what the energy requirement actually is for each day. 75% of the stomach surface produces hydrochloric acid, which dissolves meat, and does so very quickly. The enzymes needed for vegetation are slow to secrete, and the remaining 25% of the surface is divided between several enzymatic systems. The pylorus responds to acidity and several other indicators as to when to open and allow the stomach contents to exit into the duodenum. This occurs about 45 min to one hour with a pure meat meal and up to 3-4 hours after an mixed or vegetable meal. Once the stomach is called upon to produce enzyme systems, it continues to do so after emptying, and this can cause distress and 'hunger pangs' experienced in the stomach region. When adapted to straight meat, the stomach relaxes and rests until the next feeding, no matter how long the interval.

Peanuts are toxic, as is wheat (most of the toxins are in the bran and germ). Yes macadamia nut oil is the lowest fluid oil in unsats.

If a person does not like what I have to say, why waste my, and everyone else's time on constant point by point dissension? It will not deter me nor anyone who is seriously interested in getting normal. I already know you are in deep denial about the real diet, so why not let go: Stay fat, get a life.

Interesting: If grass appears to be the same as 'red', you have what is called as red-green colour blindness, the most common kind. Yellow and blue will be the only 'real' colours for you, and you will see lots of 'beige'.

Coronary blockage is due to scar tissues and infiltrated adipose cells to buffer it. While starvation (severe fasting) may collapses the fat cells, nothing in diet will reduce the scar tissue. MY blockage dated from my teens. Of course YOU are more prepared to judge that than both the top cardiologist in Australia at the time, and one of the world's finest heart surgeons? Both confirmed the blockage as dating from my early teen years. Angina has been demonstrated in 10 year olds with congenital conditions. There is no time/age constraint for insufficient circulation to the heart muscles.

Of course you don't think all meat is healthy, that is a salient denial feature of intense, resistant acculturation. Please, don't bother complaining and offering whinging excuses as to why you cannot go this way. I said previously that this path is so difficult that 99.999% of people will never be able to overcome their acculturation and permanently adopt it. You have to have nearly superhuman will power and determination. Most people have neither to any large degree.

People who have bypass surgery are put on a low fat, high carb diet and surprise, surprise! Most require another bypass inside of 5-10 years. When I was in prep for my operation, I met men there for a third and even fourth bypass. Two started with a quadruple at less than age 39. Carbs are truly your deadliest enemy. There are reports of autopsies on very young kids killed in accidents which supports this very early commencement of arterial damage. Children showed the precursors of coronary blockage as young as 9 or 10, serious signs by 15. The autopsies of young (18-20) soldiers killed in Korea already showed established lesions. No Inuit who died after living his entire life on all meat was ever found by autopsy to have even the slightest trace of coronary obstruction.

But the doctors treating cancer DO work on the 'black box' principle- they really don't know exactly how much radiation or chemo (even which chemo) is correct for each case. They know only that if they give you the maximum the body can accept and stay alive they can cure, say, 40% of patients. They know if they give you a considered amount of a certain chemo agent the cure rate can rise to 80%. Each cancer is different, some cannot be done in by the max and some might let go with less than half. This is 'black box' medicine at its purest. Which is why western medicine is better than 'alternative' so far as cancer is concerned- it has proven, 'black box' results.

theBear Fri, May-05-06 21:47

I am not speaking from ground zero based on my own experiences alone. Over the last 47 years I have interacted with literally hundreds of people of all body types and cultures. I have had plenty of 'coalface' experience in diet, exercise and health. I do not feel that I am in any way unqualified to advise any and all people, on the internet or anywhere else, about the reality of the human diet. The point of all this is that my detractors all have zero experience in either dietary practice or

lifetime study and practice. They are merely compulsive, very naive readers. They remind me of children who, having read something 'new' (to them), try to lecture every adult on it that they can find.

I do not care WHAT you have read nor who has told you stuff. I am presenting a working, safe and very healthy long term way to live, enjoy life and food, and easily attain and retain a perfect body shape and size. No one is under any obligation to even try it.

Sorry, the contents of the duodenum cannot be ejected in vomitus. The pyloric valve- which is normally closed, convulses along with the stomach when vomiting- in addition, the duodenum does not have the muscularity to forcibly eject anything against the pressure of the convulsing stomach. Indeed, if the pyloric valve was defective and leaked, the stomach's content would be ejected down into the intestines, not up into the esophagus. Try thinking logically just once.

Yellow matter seen in vomitus is digestive juices, not bile. If fluids did not always flow from high pressure to low, you could not draw water from a tap. The basic laws of physics are very simple- and inviolable.

The anti-scurvy activity of fresh uncooked meat is not due to Vit C, which is not found in meat. How it prevents this deficiency syndrome is not known. Scurvy is NOT a 'disease' and is not 'caused' by a lack of vitamin C.

The root cause of the scurvy syndrome has never been established. Vit C is assumed to be something lacking, but only because it reduces the syndrome when taken.

It is just another metabolic 'black box', and is treatable by either raw/rare fresh meat or ascorbic acid. The meat treatment is well known to people familiar with the Inuit and that includes all Arctic explorers. Stefansson describes the history of the treatment of scurvy by fresh meat very well. The meat does not have to be 'all raw', rare is good enough. The sailors who developed the syndrome were eating nothing but salted meat and hard biscuits- washed down with rum. There is no reason that the simple acidic carb known as vit C per se, is necessary, or is made in the tissues.

Our anorectic detractor needs to type while sitting down, his pathologically low blood pressure causes giddiness when he stands up to post. Or is it his starvation level of triglycerides?

I am constantly amazed at the the lengths (drivel) to which some of the 'denialists' will stoop. (i.e.fluff, who has so far said nothing whatsoever of any value- Get a life, will you?).

Cooked meat is not as soluble in HCL (the digestive juice produced for meat)- as raw meat is.

oy, now I am even getting gratuitous remarks about my relationship to my cancer- from someone without any cancer experience and/or knowledge. Amazing the lengths people in severe dietary denial will go to divert attention from the topic at hand. If you want to really know how I feel about my experience with neck cancer, go back and read what I have previously posted. Incidentally the literature (and my specialists) talks about cancer therapy in terms of 'cure rates', and then lists the chances of survival based on 2, 5, 10, etc. years- by the percentages of treated patients expected to be found in remission. I understand that being presented with

this type of linguistic differentiation is causing you some degree of mental pain. You, like many of the mentally challenged detractors lurking on the thread seem to have a need to assign as low a level of intelligence and competence to me as you suffer yourself (otherwise why stoop so low and avoid the real subject so assiduously). Big mistake.

Incompetence extends right down to self-assessment. It is found in evidence in all the person's outputs. It is obvious even to a casual observer, but is never noticed by the incompetent.

And yes, in one meaning, if you have a badly broken arm amputated, you are then definitely 'cured' - of the condition of having a broken arm. However, the term 'cured' is not properly applicable to cases of trauma, it is a term for the reduction and elimination of a pathological state.

Once more, slowly: YOU DO NOT HAVE TO ACCEPT THIS DIET. YOU DO NOT HAVE TO EVEN ATTEMPT IT. The problem all of you have is purely cultural.

The statement: " I would like to lose that weight, but not to the point of denying myself of EVERYTHING but meat ..."

...Is the purest example of dietary denial based 100% on culture I have heard so far. The truth is, you will continue to struggle and remain fat until and unless your body size and shape as well as your health becomes a strong enough impetus for you to change this attitude. You will then become able to 'deny' yourself your addiction to the wrong food. It is our will power and determination. Don't feel any different, acculturation is the single most powerful thing human, it is what separates us from the rest of the animal kingdom. It completely overwrites intuition. It is far beneath the conscious mind. It takes a serious amount of real will power to overcome and change it.

Yes, I do not expect very many to succeed, but if anyone can manage to get along, I want to be here to support them.

It can be done. Not easy at first, but it is not impossible.

I feel strongly that accepting this path as 'the real human diet' makes your resolve firmer in the face of near universal social opposition.

Nothing I do or say here is random, arbitrary or experimental.

I have misplaced many of my research papers and at the present I am unable to ref the authors and pubs. A pure meat (80/20) diet should in time rectify any mineral unbalances like potassium etc, in a few weeks to months. Potassium pills are an easy temp solution. I would not complain about not tolerating carbs- sounds like a blessing in disguise.

I am spending all (too much) of my spare time dealing with the thread and thus cannot search for the papers.

Say whatever you like- it will not change how the muscles work. I have said before that your sources in re glucose as a power source in muscular contraction are 'bogus': Definition- it looks good, but is not true to real life. I don't understand why you bother spitting out this stuff all the time. Why not just try to eat right

according to your own preferred plan, and get on with your life?

Or are you just addicted to indulging in a bit of public self ego-stroking after the fashion of: "Look folks, see how I can repeatedly refute bear's info again and again using the same tired old data".

Good show. Not.

Insulin is a HORMONE. It is different in structure to the proteins found in food. The word protein is a generic term that covers a large number of organic molecules consisting primarily of complex chains of amino acids, which can be found in more than one physical form. Insulin is rapidly degraded and rendered inactive by stomach acid, the proteins in meat are not hormonally active to begin with, and are not degraded as insulin is, nor are they reduced to amino acids either.

I know you have very knowledge of science and biochemistry, so I think in the interest of fairness you please try to resist your constant impulse to go nattering on about everything I say you disagree with, ok?

Amazing you STILL feel qualified to lecture me on cancer? Either you have a massive twisted ego filled with self importance or you seriously underestimate me and my knowledge on the subject. What gives you expert status?

I think if you read my posts carefully you already know two things: I am completely aware of the cancer I had, and I have an extensive knowledge of it and the methods of treatment. I have also demonstrated my extreme level of interest in my body, nutrition and the way everything in the universe works. Why on earth would a total stranger, and outsider, even consider making such totally specious and inaccurate statements about MY cancer and my relation to it? You must be very unhappy with your lot in life, is all I can say. Relax, you are always going to meet people who are smarter or more knowledgeable than you are.

NO, rosebud- only a very few hormones have a protein-like structure, the most important ones do not. The steroids are substituted sterols, polycyclic molecules with no structural relationship to proteins. The truth is, very few bioactive agents/hormones are similar structurally to proteins most of the most common ones are either aliphatic amines (serotonin, melatonin, epinephrine), cyclical polyrings of various kinds, or have other shapes and structures. Please, don't try to lecture me on subjects you do not know anything about.

My 'poor health'? Please, tell me all about this, it is a total surprise, mr 'knows it all' who is all of 22 yo. How do you know this? The proof if you please, my strength and endurance are not obviously of any value, nor my lack of any kind of flu or colds for over 6 years, that could not be an indication of good health, nor my excellent BF and blood tests- even my thyroid, which after enduring 7000 rads of ionising radiation and is completely normal also doesn't count, but of course none constitutes 'good health in your book, either does it? Nor my perfect teeth and strong gums and bone- means nothing, right?

I'm waiting with 'bated breath for a delineation of the true but hidden indications of my 'poor health and bad diet'.

What do you know about diet, anyway? How many years have you been on yours?

I don't expect an intelligent response.

theBear Sat, May-06-06 01:02

Rosebud, still trying to lecture me?

Give it up, please- the correct scientific term is that insulin has a 'protein-like' structure. Insulin is not a 'protein' per se, but belongs to a class of similarly shaped and composed, polymeric amino acid complexes. You cannot use it as you would the proteins in meat- as a nutrient.

No matter how much YOU 'detest' THIS fact, insulin is NOT the same thing as 'a protein'.

Some of us are just much more efficient in storing carbs as bodyfat. Since this condition seems to more prevalent than not, vis-vis the 'epidemic of obesity and overweight' the authorities are so worked up over- (after having first coaxed it to the present levels with the 'low fat is good' insanity), it may have been of some survival value in the past when food was much more difficult to acquire.

Most animals spend the majority of their waking time seeking, pursuing or ingesting food, whether carnivore, omnivore or herbivore. Man is unique in having more food easily available generally than is needed. It is badly distributed however-some groups have too much, and some are starving.

Ok, I guess it has finally come to the end for me.

The thread has become infested with parasites who take our time but don't contribute anything but noise.

I began this to inform people who have a bodyfat problem about the highly 'unsocial' diet that is our evolution-imposed real diet.

First I encountered those who are addicted to 'some' veggies. Then those who are compulsive counters of calories and readers of 'scientific' studies which contradict my experiences. This was followed by the pedantic control freaks who 'know' that my lifestyle is flawed. After that the parasites who cling to their acculturation and feel obligated to attack and render useless anything which contradicts their belief systems.

The final straw was the ***** who impugned my knowledge of the cancer which threatened my life. This ***** finally brought me to the realisation that I am simply wasting my time wading through a daily pile of hundreds of meaningless unproductive posts to find a genuine question from the few who are really interested in changing their body shape, health and lifestyle.

SO, it has been an interesting trip, thanks to those who CAN follow and have supported me, but I am now departing to leave the thread to the parasites and mercenaries who have stolen it.

Any one who is interested in the path and has any genuine questions on how to implement this controversial way of eating is welcome to visit my website and send me an e/mail.

Goodbye and- 'Thanks for all the fish'.
