Carnivore Tries His Best to "Debunk" Me! @CarnivoreJT Transcript

(Transcripts are generated by AI and may contain errors)

Opening the Carnivore Debate

I've apparently been debunked by a carnivore, and thanks to those of you who sent it my way because I wasn't tagged in it. I wonder why. One response I get from carnibores when I bring up the very consistent link between red meat consumption and outcomes like cardiovascular disease or all-cause mortality is that the rest of the participants' diets were unhealthy, which is why it looks like red meet was the problem, when really it isn't, according to them.

Diet Confounding and Study Adjustments

Well, the studies I cite adjust for their background diets. This study, for example, So he starts by issuing the classic, look at the types of foods that are considered red meat.

Well, yeah, they contribute to red meat intake. So color me surprised when researchers who are interested in evaluating the effects of red-meat consumption look at foods that contain red me.

What a concept. Now, I know some people will use that to say that the impact of Red Meat on cardiovascular disease is confounded by the bread, noodles, etc.

Questionnaire Validity and Data Quality

that it comes packaged with. but I actually addressed that in the video right after the part where he cut it off. I wonder why he did that. They adjust for those variables like refined grain intake which those foods also contribute to.

This helps to isolate the effect of the meat specifically. And when studies actually do separate red meat in a form of steaks from say lasagnas or burgers, you get about the same result.

Further, food frequency questionnaires are validated in a number of ways. This includes 24-hour recalls and weighted food records where people will actually weigh out their food at various points over time to see how well the questionaries correlate with their actual intake.

Interpreting the Risk Results

And the Questionnaires do pretty well. But let's pretend that it actually has good data that goes into this study that you referenced. Let's take a look at the actual results.

See, the results are a 3 to 7% relative risk increase of CVD and all-cause mortality with a less than 2% absolute risk. increase over 30 years. This is where he's being really disingenuous.

He doesn't mention that that three to seven percent increased risk was for two servings a week. Again, my curiosity has me wondering why he didn't mentioned that.

In fact, it was in the very next sentence that he conveniently cut off. And last I checked, carnivores aren't just consuming two servings of red meat a weak.

When we look at daily consumption, risk is substantially higher.

Why the Critique Falls Apart

They go on to further say it is highly unlikely that the increase of a single food group is correlated to a substantial increase in cardiovascular disease and all-cause mortality.

It just keeps getting worse. I will grant that changing intake of a single food group isn't likely to have an earth-shattering effect on one's risk, but it can have and effect.

And again, he removed the very next sentence where the authors note that most people consume these foods enough to matter, not just the measly two servings a week.

Plus, I would add that carnivores are emphasizing the consumption of the food associated with poor outcomes while reducing the intake a number of food groups that actually improve long-term outcomes.

so they aren't just modifying a single food group. So this is really just a terrible attempt at a critique.