Introductions and background

This was a little while ago now because I just kind of answering questions, but I was kind outlining what we're talking about a bit. But before I kind redo that, do you want to just give a intro to yourself?

Yeah, absolutely. So I joined the military at 18 Air Force after that enrolled into University of Arizona premed. I was a triple major in nutritional science, chemistry and psychology.

In nutritional Science, I started to receive some information that didn't totally Did he just pause for me, or can you comment if you lost him? Oh, yeah, so he cut out.

Okay, accept him again. I just added him, again, he'll be back. Yeah, I'll get him. Anyway, yeah, so as a triple major, pre-med, nutritional science, chemistry, and psychology, after graduating, I just got really curious before going to medical school and started studying Ayurveda and Chinese medicine, shamanism, got into alchemy, the ancient arts of turning gold into medicine and things like that, which is when I started my company Now Alcheme, a form of nano gold that people actually drink for cellular communication.

It helps with neurocognitive disorders and all kinds of things like that. Interestingly, I got really into diet, which is why I'm so passionate about this topic and the dietary guidelines and grains and meat.

I don't want to use the term misinformation, but there's so much information out there and there is so many confusion and distortion.

Debating dietary guidelines and adherence

Yeah. When you offered this conversation, I thought it was really cool of you because not a lot of people actually do that. Most people, you know, they're just like, F you.

I disagree, but not. A lot. Of people are like. Hey, let's talk about it. You know? So I really appreciated that Yeah, no, I'd say, um, the same to you in the sense that, uh, for the success rate of actually turning one of these disagreements into an ID live, you know, when it is something that I'll offer if we're just going back and forth and not get it anywhere.

Um, it's pretty low. So you're one. Yeah. I was surprised. You haven't even gone live in like four, four years. Yeah, so it's not something that I do often.

And so, yeah, thanks for the intro. I think just to kind of outline where it came from, I believe it was on one of Simon Hill's videos. You had commented, and I know you tagged me, you tag Simon.

It might not have been Simon's video. Either way, we were both tagged in there. There was some back and forth in the comments about the guidelines and a couple specific claims really stood out that that i wanted to discuss with you and that was one that you believe that most people do follow the guidelines, we'll say US guidelines as based on the references and whatnot that were shared, and that we'd be better off, this is something that needs to be unpacked a little bit, but better of not following the guideline and instead sort of following our own bodies, so to speak, intuition, et cetera.

And we can get into that. But yeah, I was just curious then, like what, what evidence would there be, because this is contrary to like everything I've seen, that people actually do follow the guidelines?

Yeah. So my idea of, so there's a spectrum of following, you know, and my perspective on the USDA guidelines is more so to be honest, they have infiltrated the health of Americans.

I see the the USDA as a federal organization, that gets a lot of funding from a lotta different places involved in agriculture and farming, as well as pharmacy.

I see the USDA as an organization that has some conflict of interests built into it. Obviously, it's very hard to find concrete evidence of that, but I have done enough research on that to formulate my own opinions on it, I actually even have some names of USDA members that have been found to have over 100 conflict of interests with them, which I can share later on.

But every once in a while, they switch up their group about every five years. And so every Once in awhile, They need to disclose information that might potentially lead to conflicts of information.

What comes through is that there are a lot of Relationships that basically shouldn't be happening between members of the and members pharmaceutical industry and agricultural industry where they're getting paid to basically create.

Research projects, so the is also involved in. research and development and education. So it's almost like a monopoly where they have research, development, education, farming and agriculture, and then even pharmaceuticals and medicine.

And so being a federal agency, but not being funded by the government and being founded by some of the agencies they work with, I see a big conflict of interest there.

And then when I look at things like the food pyramid, which I know is outdated now, but I'm sure that the my plate thing will be outdated eventually too, once enough evidence comes to light that that's not healthy either.

The food pyramids insane, like they literally recommended like cupcakes and sweets at the top, you know, Once a day, it's okay to have a little bit of- Can I just push back on it a bit?

There are certain recommendations that are limits, right? So they say limit, maximum, exit. per day. It's not necessarily you need to eat this or recommending this per-day.

But going back to the initial question, background of the dietary guide, I can grant everything you just said. I could grant every conflict of interest in the world.

The question was, what evidence is there that people are actually following it? That's the key. Exactly. So I use the term Right, so I'm using the term infiltration and I was trying to set that up, but basically the reason I use the terms infiltrations is because grains and sugars are extremely addicting.

And so when I'm saying there's an amount of following, like the food pyramid recommended up to 11 servings of whole grains every day. And it was at the base where the first thing in the morning, at your breakfast, you have your cereal.

That sets people up for failure because grains and sugars are extremely addicting. It spikes your insulin. Four to five hours later, your gonna want more.

So they're setting some people for something that's In a way impossible to actually follow because you're blunting your insulin response and sugars are like drugs where the effect that it has on you lessens over time and especially with daily use.

So it starts with maybe 11 servings. Eleven serving doesn't do for you energetically what it did two years ago and now it's becoming 15 serving or 20 serving.

So, so you're saying that that people were actually, well, we have to understand that the dietary guidelines are, they're more than just grains or whole grains, right?

Obviously, there's a whole bunch of specific recommendations. And if I were measuring adherence and based on the data that we do have, I would probably put the cut off as, like, hitting 80% of recommendations or more as pretty decent adherent.

That said. You know, let's just grant that. Okay. Food pyramid. I can't remember the exact numbers. We'll say 11 servings a day of whole grains. It was sure.

Sure. Let's say 6 plus even what, what evidence is there that Americans are hitting that serving recommendation for whole grain. Well, how many people do you know that don't eat whole grains?

I mean, they're literally the evidence is all around you. Everybody eats whole grain. Here we can look at the guidelines. Once this flips around, we're going to look up the guideline targets.

So this is just for essentially a three ounce equivalent. It's about 97% of people who don' even hit three servings a day, let alone 11. And this from the most recent support or recent report for the dietary guidelines, serving what is the serving of grains.

This is whole grains here. Whole grains. The line is the recommendation, which for a 2000 calorie diet would be three ounces or three serving equivalents per day.

Now if you look at refined grains, they're shooting past three-servings and that's actually bad. It's a limit. They want to limit to less than that. So even on the grain recommendation most people are not hitting the whole grain recommendations and far exceeding the refined grain recommendation.

So this is from NHANES and this what they publish in the actual dietary guidelines report. When they come out with the guidelines, they look at what are the different recommendations we're making, how have people been doing with hitting those recommendations using nationally representative sample.

But I have no idea what this study is or what these people are. What is the demographic? Yeah, so it's across America. So they take representative samples from different parts of America, across American, several tens of thousands.

I mean, I can pull up the exact numbers and they survey them on their regular intake. Let's say you don't need to know exactly, but if someone were to ask you in a week on average, You know, how many servings of XYZ do you consume?

And they'll have specific examples of the types of foods. Most people will be in the ballpark. Like, if you ask me how may serving of whole grains do we eat in a week?

Sure, I might be off by a few, but I'm not going to be eating 20, 30 servings in a week and then say I am eating two, right? There's going be a relative accuracy to those survey questions.

So that's sort of how they do this with people that represent the average American and in huge numbers. And NHANES is like It's at this point, one of the oldest cohorts that's been followed in this sense, and they updated every, I think, two, or maybe every year, but every two years at least.

And like, this is just right in, like if you ever read the guidelines as they are, This is the data they primarily cite for adherence. I mean, it's the nutrition and health I'm sorry, the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey is what it stands for.

Yeah, who funds them? So that one's primarily NIH, I believe. I can double check. The thing about a lot of these studies, is I spend so much time deciphering one study because There's over 30,000 peer reviewed studies that are published on one of my favorite sites, PubMed, every single year.

And to be honest, one the reasons I didn't end up going the Western path was because when I did research

projects with the doctor that I was working for as an undergrad, I saw a lot of corruption in this in the research environment, and it wasn't even conscious.

It was like subconscious corruption. it was, like, I'm being funded. I have a hypothesis. If I don't prove my hypothesis, then it's wrong. And I just wasted tens of thousands of dollars.

i'm going to lose my job as a researcher. and I, just a, lot, of these studies, i have to really understand who these people are, where the funding is coming from, So there's a couple things I would say to that.

For one, I just want to bring back to the question was, what evidence do you have that people are following the guidelines? That has yet to be answered.

But the other part of that is, are you saying that if I'll just, I will pick a meat company, for example, if like a, a meet company funds a study of say, um, meat beef versus.

Soy or something for like muscle gains or whatever. That we would like, certainly, or almost certainly see that the meat comes out on top. Wait, for, can you repeat that again?

Yeah, so like, just for hypothetical, let's say a meat company, a beef company whatever wanted to fund a study comparing meat to soy for muscle gains, right?

Would you say that, oh, the meat companies definitely gonna, that the meats gonna come out on top for sure? No, it might not, but if it doesn't, they're not gonna publish it.

Well, so actually, let me show you that's not the case either. So, um, lemme pull it up here. I've got it right here, So this was a study published in the Journal of Nutrition.

This was comparing meals with beef or plant protein. They used a more processed plant, protein and a whole protein source. Um, we can go into, I mean, people can look up the titles right there.

were, so lean beef here, incomplete or complementary was a mix of navy and black beans with whole wheat bread, and then the single incomplete protein source was black bean or whole-wheat bread.

And this was funded by, let me just show you, This was funded by the National Cowman's Beef Association, a contract of the beef checkoff. Now, if we go to the results, or just the conclusions, the, let's see, isoneutrogenous meals containing a moderate serving of total protein from foods providing complete, which was beef, complementary, which was the beans and navy beans, and wheat, or the incomplete protein, just one or another, do not differently stimulate muscle protein synthesis after a meal and daily.

So this actually does exactly what you said they wouldn't publish. And they published it. I know the owners of Cafe Gratitude. They're a vegan restaurant in Los Angeles.

Right, exactly. Just because somebody is ranching cattle or making money off of beef doesn't mean they're not also making. No, no, this is the national cattleman's beef association.

Their only job is to promote beef. So their only. Job is promote. Beef. And they've, they are publishing a study that shows that beans and whole grains are a better source of protein than beef?

No. They showed that they were essentially equal. Equal. That just doesn't even make any sense. Can you explain the study? Yeah. So basically, do you know what muscle protein synthesis is?

Of course I know. The creation of proteins are, yeah. If you match total protein content, you get the same result. Whereas other studies previously, usually looking at acute responses might show that one is better than the other.

But as a whole, there's no difference. So, and that's what this shows, but like, the point isn't to dive into this study

necessarily. The point is you claimed that that they wouldn't publish a study that did not serve their interests.

This does not served their interest. That doesn't not sort of interest Wait, wait, showing that beef does not outperform beans does serve the National Cattle and Beef Association.

They're not saying that beans outperformed beef though. No. What you're saying they say is that protein is protein. Yes, but they hypothesized that the beef would out perform it.

A lot of people would have hypothesize that and they did themselves, the authors here. Like it's in the paper. That's what they thought would happen. Okay, that's fine.

Yeah, exactly. I'm not saying beans are better than beef. No, but that's what they normally say. And what all of their messaging is across the board is that beef is superior to beans and they didn't show that here.

It's going. So I don't understand what your point is. My point is, okay, if my goal was to promote something, would I not want to make it a bit better?

Yeah, no, sure. No, stop. If this study said beans outperformed beef, then you would have me. I'd be like, yeah, that's really weird, but they're not actually saying that.

Yeah. So, just to be clear, my purpose was just promote product X. and I was publishing a study and the funders had all of this role in the study, would I not make product X look better than the alternative?

I guess it depends on who funded the studies. I would have to do some research on that.

Funding bias, studies, and trust in science

Let's say I'm funding it. It's my product. But do you know who's funded this though? You don't think they might have relationships with other organizations and businesses?

No, the National Cattlemen's Beef Association's role is to promote the beef industry. That is literally their job. Do you work for them? Do know anybody that works for that?

Of course. You're taking other people's words for these studies. That's the thing. It's when you treat science like a religion, just because something is written or because somebody said this was their intention, you don't know who they are.

You are basically treating this like doctrine. No, no. you're trusting other peoples words of this information. Because you know, like you dont know what these people are, but you only know their reputation.

Nope. Just you do not know they're working behind the scenes. They could be working with anybody. So, okay, so let's just say that I wanted to say, you know, the studies on smoking, it's all big government.

They just want us to quit smoking. You know I don't trust the science because who would, would you buy it? Would you agree with me in saying that, oh, smoking is fine then because I just don' trust it.

I'm impressed with science. Not necessarily. No, it depends on what you smoke. The cigarettes that the government tells us not to smoke and that studies have shown are harmful for us.

Well, because of all the chemicals, which is like over a hundred that are put in cigarettes, I would say that they're bad. But hey, that's based on the science, right?

That's We don't want to base on the chemistry. No, that's based on chemistry and biology Science is not a science is a not religion. It's a philosophy and we can't take these this text and treat it like a religion and just think that just because it's written means that it That's what we have to remain open-minded but that no because I No, because I

actually know what a chemical is and because i have treated my own body as an experiment so I can speak from personal experience.

So let's say I experimented, I started smoking and I felt better and thought it was the best thing for me. Would you then say it's good for you? Now at least we're getting somewhere.

If you smoked something and you personally experienced positive benefits, then I would be open-minded to thinking maybe it's good for you if you experience positive benefit.

I'm not going to treat science like a religion. No, but a minute ago you said it would be bad because of the chemicals in it. Now you're backtracking on that because I felt- No I'm not.

That's my opinion. But you are talking about you. I have my own opinion but if you say you experience benefits, I am going to be open minded to thinking maybe it's okay.

And that's why I said science is a philosophy, not a religion. You have to stay open-minded. Well, you didn't say that. No, no, but just to be clear, I mean, that's what we're talking about with like chronic disease risk in general, right?

So let's say I smoked. I felt good, you know, maybe I was losing some weight, mental clarity, et cetera. And I'm like, screw these studies. They're all funded by big government and I don't trust anybody running them.

You know what? I think smoking doesn't cause lung cancer because I feel good. Would you accept that as a reasonable claim to make? What happened when the CDC told us that we need to wear masks?

You didn't answer the question. I'm answering the questions right now. Science every five to ten years goes back and changes its mind with new information.

Which is why you're attaching to research studies, forgetting that research in the future will prove that study wrong. Not necessarily. But it's happened so many times.

No, no, we will adjust. It's not that common that when there's consensus like that, that it flips entirely. Going back to the question, in case of, look, I smoked, lost some weight, mental clarity, felt better.

I don't trust the science because through the sciences, smoking causes lung cancer. Would you agree with me that smoking doesn't cause lung cancer based on that reasoning?

Right, because of the toxins added to and present in the cigarettes, I think that eventually they would probably cause lung cancer because the toxin. So I feel good and the science on those toxins is just science.

Would you say that smoking is unhealthy? Um, yeah, I think I see things in a quantum way. I don't see them in the linear way I. Don't. See things as this is healthy.

This is not healthy I, think there are a lot of factors around it. A lot. Of nuances and we need to look at things holistically to decide what's right for a person.

What if a. Person for whatever reason. is so extremely stressed out that actually having a little bit of nicotine lowers their… I'm talking about lung cancer.

I am too. Because everything is connected, as is the immune system. And if you can lower your cortisol levels, it will also decrease your likelihood of getting cancer, possibly more than smoking would increase it.

So everything is individual. That's what I'm saying. We have to focus on everything individually. Everything is one. You can't treat everybody like the same body.

I am not treating everybody the way I treat the body, obviously there is a spectrum, but just so I can be clear, you think that if, let's say I was stressed out, I started smoking, felt better, lost weight, etc, whatever, You think it might actually lower my lung cancer risk by smoking in that case?

That's within the realm of possibility. Yeah, I actually honestly, yeah, not the synthetic chemicals in this thing. I don't trust the science on the synthetic chemicals, i don' trust it.

i feel good, excellent smoking, lost weight, lower stress, does smoking lower my lung cancer risk in that situation? I believe, I honestly believe that anything is possible and I do believe the mind is more powerful than any research study, which research studies create.

a placebo effect to be honest with the things that doctors tell their patients, which come from the research studies create an entire culture around things.

That a lot of studies are funded to create. And I think that the mind is powerful enough that if you smoked and believed it would decrease your likelihood of lung cancer, that might actually be the case.

So, so now let's push that a step further. Do you think it's more likely that it will decrease my lung, cancer risk, do nothing to it or increase it? Uh, To be honest, that is a hypothetical that isn't possible to honestly answer.

You're asking me to answer a hypothetically. I couldn't responsibly do that. No, hypotheticals are important in these situations to understand where your beliefs are and what you value.

It doesn't have to be real life. Now, if there's certain details that you need to know to help fill out this hypothetical and answer that question, that's fine.

If you know, hey, does this person have a history of X or whatever, we can answer those questions. Let's paint this picture, but I think it's really important for you to answer the question of would it be more likely To decrease do nothing or increase our cancer risk because that's what we use science for.

It's to to understand the probabilities of the outcome. I don't believe that life runs on probabilities. It seems to me like you're more about probabilities than I'm more consciousness.

And I completely respect your stance on the probabilities and the linear, calculative aspect of science, and I love that. But I think there's an aspect consciousness and spirituality and intention and energy that comes into it too.

And there's sort of a harmony between the two of those. So that's why you're still talking about probabilities. You just think that if you believe certain things, if whatever these variables are that you are inserting, you just suggesting that they have an impact.

I'm not inserting variables. Those variables exist whether I believe they exist or not. No, no, I mean, inserting them into the hypothetical. Expanding on the details that are there is what I mean.

So you're essentially saying that these variables impact what the outcome would be. Including all those, including intentions, beliefs, placebo, etc. What do you think is the greatest probability?

I think this is so critical to having a discussion about whether or not science is relevant. Yeah, well, if you really want to. I mean, I'll just, i'll give you a direct answer.

i don't think the question was super direct, but to be honest, personally think that burning something makes it a carcinogen whether you're cooking meat or burning tobacco or whatever it is, that's where carcinogens come from and that is what glycation is.

Tobacco in and of itself, I don't think is a carcinegen, but I think burning things into your lungs is carcenogenic because that what burning does. So that my answer to the question.

But so you do think, well, for starters, you're then suggesting that you think it would cause cancer, but even this idea that- No, no, first of all, I don't think that it could cause a cancer.

That's not what I'm saying. What I am saying is that burning things is carcinogenic. I will not say that smoking is going to cause cancers. Well, so there's a couple things there.

By saying it's carcinogenic, carcina gens are cancer-causing agents. So you are suggesting that you're creating cancer causing agents and then consuming them.

And second, the knowledge that burning something is carcenogenic would largely be based on scientific research, again, which we don't trust. Yeah. I mean, because you also forgetting that tobacco and nicotine, becomes nicotinamide, repairs DNA, also has health benefits.

so you're talking about yeah that's what i'm saying dude things life is not so linear things aren't so simple you want to put things in a box and say yeah you do you wanna say smoking causes cancer but life doesn't work that way no no because it increases your likelihood of developing cancer it is a causal agent but it's not depending on who you are depending And that's fine.

But the point is that for something to be causally associated with an outcome, it doesn't have to cause it 100% of the time. So, again, that is why it comes back to probabilities.

I just simply want to know. because you sort of muddied the waters by saying it is a carcinogen, but you don't think it would cause cancer. I don' think I mudded the water at all.

And trying to get something through to you that you can't just put something into a box and simplify it as saying A plus B causes cancer, that's just not how life works.

That's what I'm trying explain. So do you think if I just like went up and like snorted some asbestos from old walls that I wouldn't be increasing my cancer rate?

These really extreme examples and I don't even know what the point of what you're asking me. It's even part of the conversation. Let me clarify. So the reason I'm using extreme.

Examples is because I think it demonstrates the issues with your reasoning because it's not that every it is not. what we're discussing, whether it's diet related or whatever, that it is as extreme as smoking or, you know, asbestos or anything.

But the logic still applies, right? If you're not going to trust science or you believe that these outcomes… I'm not saying I don't trust the science.

Please let me finish because I want to explain how I got… Be careful with what you are saying. Saying I don't trust science? That's ridiculous. Well, that's sort of what you suggested throughout the whole time.

No, it's not what I suggested. It's now what i said. You're putting words in my mouth. I'm a scientist. Sorry. So I understand what science is. i'm open-minded about it.

What I am saying is science, is philosophical and it constantly learns more and proves itself wrong and we need to remain open minded. And i am not saying I do not trust it, I say more I dont trust the people that I know behind certain studies is what im saying.

Okay, so you don't trust the people conducting most of these studies. Yeah, because there is human error and there's researcher bias and that is just.

impossible to avoid. So we need to be open-minded with these researches. But what happens when you have consistent results across multiple populations with different samples, different age groups, and different

demographics, with a different background, health history, all pointing in the same direction?

And then on the flip side of the coin, you also have the exact same thing pointing the opposite direction. Yes, we do. We have that with carnivore and with veganism.

No, you don't. This is critical. You're saying we have the same evidence for a carnibor diet as we for vegan diet. What prospective cohort study do we Okay, I will.

I'm just very surprised that you didn't know that. National Institute of Health, PubMed, National Library of Medicine, the Ketogenic Diet of Cardiovascular Diseases, CD, do you want me to name it?

Yeah, yeah, please title the card. So the ketogenic diet, ketogenic is basically meat and cheese based. No, there's still veggies in there. That's not a carnivore diet.

You claimed carnival diet? What I'm talking about is meat-based. Do you concede that there is no prospective cohort study on a carnivore diet, thus a Carnivor diet does not have equivalent evidence to a vegan diet?

The carnivore diet is like, how new? There's not a lot of time to create studies on that. No, new as a side note is irrelevant. What I'm talking about is ketosis.

The Carnivores diet causes ketoses. So, no, I am not. I will talk about autophagy, the benefits of burning fetal bodies, which the carnival diet induces.

So we can infer that by being on the carnivore diet, you're going to get the benefits of ketosis, the benefit of autophagy, and there are tons of studies that prove that ketoses and autrophagies lower the risk of nearly literally every disease.

Your claim was that we have the same evidence for a carnivore diet as we do for vegan diet. We have randomized controlled trials, including meta-analyses of randomized control trials on vegan diets.

Well, first of all, it's clear that I'm talking to a vegan right now. Let's just let people know you are a Vegan, right? Oh yeah, absolutely. That's not hidden.

I am not saying it is hidden, I was just saying this is very clearly a passionate topic. You see, you're going to try to paint it as though I'm being biased here.

I can have a bias, but I also can put that bias aside when reviewing the literature. Now you made a claim that we have equivalent evidence for a vegan and carnivore diet.

If you can't concede that that is not true, then I don't see the point in this discussion. because that is demonstrably false, and you can't provide us…

I just explained that. You didn't want to hear it because of your bias. Your bias is blinding me. No, no, hold on. Carnivore diet causes autophagy or ketosis.

Do you know what autrophagic and ketosus does? You don't wanna face this. That's mechanistic speculation. I'm talking about autopathy and ketosis, which a carnivor diet induces.

And you don' want face it. that's a fact. Absolutely face that and discuss it and go into detail on why mechanisms are superseded by outcomes and all of that, The point is, you claim that there is equivalent evidence.

These studies that you're referencing aren't even on a carnivore specific diet. Can you at least admit that? No, what I'm talking about- So you can't admit, that can you, at, least, admit?

That please just it's so it'd be so much easier if you just answer that question. Honestly, I can admit. That because I

don't know that that's true. I would have to log off and look that up.

So, so you haven't. Even like you should know. No. Well, from my perspective, it seems like a lot because. And I've read a. Lot on. A carnibore. Specific diet, a plant free diet?

Uh, mostly ketosis, which carnivore, well, ketoses causes, you know, the ketosus and carnibor is linked. Again, it's unbelievable that you can't answer that question.

admit that, for one, there are no prospective cohorts or RCTs on carnivore-specific diets, and two, that the references that you provided were not on a carnibore specific diet.

I think what would probably be more beneficial is to address the fact that From the research that I've done, I think that staying in ketosis and autophagy is extremely important.

That's a separate topic. Just chill. I am staying on the topic, just relax. No, no, take a breath. All right.

Smoking, intuition, and risk arguments

What I'm saying is more importantly than answering this you know, question is that autophagy and ketosis as proven by countless studies is extremely important and that we can live in autofagie and kettosis with animal-based products and vegetables.

I'm not promoting a carnivore diet. I didn't say you were. Just to be clear, I never said you weren't. But you made the claim. Right. So I made that word just now.

In this message, which to me means meat based. Okay, and I know you're attaching to the definition of that meaning zero vegetables whatsoever. And that that's not my intention is to say that now I'm not.

No, I don't think that we should be on a zero vegetable diet, or that there are more studies supporting a Zero Vegetable Diet than meat. Now I when I was talking when i was thinking about carnivore, i meant meat based and primarily ketosis and autophagy.

Okay. And then, so now my next question would be, why should we trust any of them? I forget, forget about the fact that it's mechanism. I can answer that question, man.

Yeah, bro. Can I answer the question? experiencing all of these diets, I was vegan for two years, raw vegan, for a year. I did full-on raw carnivore, literally meaning zero grams of sugar, not an apple, nothing for year, like I do these things personally to see how they would affect my biology because I don't trust them.

So to answer the question, yes, we should read these studies and take them as a grain of salt and as suggestion, And then experiment with our bodies. That's what I personally think.

And that's when I say to you, we should follow our intuition. All experience is knowledge, and all knowledge is self-knowledge. The only way to come to health knowledge through experience, personal experience.

So we have to experience these diets and try different things, like trying on clothes to know what they really do. But do I have to smoke to know that it's bad for me?

Right? Like, this just comes back. You're bringing it back to smoking. Why? That's an intense example. What are you talking about? There's a reason. Do I need to jump off a bridge to now what's going to kill me.

That just, we're talking diet. We're not talking drugs. It's just a different conversation. I go on a donut only diet because my body feels like it. Again, you keep bringing up these extreme examples.

The fact that you view these as so extreme but can't answer that question just shows that there's a flaw in your

logic. Yes, they're extreme, but if we were to apply your logical, you need to try everything for yourself.

Forget about the studies. No, you shouldn't apply my logic to everything. You should only apply it to what we're talking about, which is diet. That's a different conversation.

Well, well, it's you're you haven't really provided a symmetry breaker, but let's just go with it. Let's say that I can. But let it let us go to should I try and only donut diet before telling people is probably not a good idea?

That's a ridiculous question, man. No, because you have no symmetry breaker. You're talking about donuts. Yes, yes. We'll provide a symmetry break. What are you talking donuts for?

Get the donut conversation. Are you talk about sugar and fried oil? Yeah. Why? All right, I will answer the question. I'm going to amuse you by answering the questions.

OK. Yeah, do it. It will take two days, and you'll be done. And that's something I feel good. Go on an all donut diet. Two days, three days and you'll know exactly what it does and won't go back.

That's my answer to your question. So let's respond to that. No, no. Mark Hobb, researcher at Kansas State University, actually went on a Twinkie diet.

He did this for like months, 10 weeks. He lost 27 pounds, he improved his blood biomarkers. He actually felt better once he started reincorporating foods.

One of the first foods was meat. Guess what? He started to feel a bit worse. So does that mean that the Twinkie diet is good and something to be recommended?

Because what if he was on a taco diet before that? What was he eating before the Twinkie diet? Maybe the twinkies diet was a level up from what he's eating.

Does it say? In the study, does it? Oh my God. What if you were on the Tweekie Diet? Oh my god, so let me explain. He was on a relatively well-rounded Mediterranean-style diet as an actual nutrition researcher who ate things like meat, he ate veggies, etc.

And when he went on this Twinkie-based diet… It's calorie in, calorie out. That's all that was. So if eating a Twinky diet leads to him consuming less calories, losing weight, feeling better, does that mean he should stay on the Twinki diet?

No, no, what happened after that? What happened? How long did you feel better for? Like what? He did it for 10 weeks. He only twinkies for ten weeks? Twinkie's and then he peppered in some other ultra processed foods like I'm reading your Doritos Oreos and other treats.

Yeah. Okay, go on. This is well reported. What pharmaceuticals was he on? Let's start with that. Is any of that involved in the study? Because clearly there was something going on there.

Here's the thing. You don't even believe somebody else when they have this personal experience. I don' know that person. I don't know you're reading something that somebody else said that I Don't Know.

How the fuck do I know if he even did it? I DON'T KNOW IF HE DID IT. But here's the thing. You're saying that for one people should try something for themselves.

Now if they try Something that you don' agree with and they feel better, you just don"t believe them. No, no, I didn't say that. I told you earlier that if you said smoking made you feel better, would I believe that it was good for you?

And I said, yeah, if if. You said it. Was good. For you, i would believe it, was. Good for. you. i i did i answered the opposite to that okay well well here you're not believing this person or you believe in something else nefarious is

going on i'm pretty skeptical about this study not going to lie i don't really believe.

That somebody ate donuts and Twinkies for 10 weeks and felt good that from a Mediterranean diet, but there's, I don't believe that study. I'm not going to lie.

That sounds crazy. Yeah, exactly. Exactly. You just don' believe them. So like, what are we supposed to do? Yeah. Because I do have a higher self, a sense of intuition.

And I have the mind to think for myself. But I just believe everything I read. that's what indoctrination is. you can't just belive everything you read because it's peer-reviewed.

I understand that. But the point is, you're just not believing things you don't like, while believing you like and claiming that I'm biased. No, it's not about what's going on here.

It's about resonating with. I have a mind, I can think for myself. Some things I read and I resonate with and some things that I don't. And that's literally what intuition is.

I do believe that people should use their intuition more and stop following things like sheep. That's fine, but that's still not really discussing the point here.

It's the fact that there are so many layers of issues here, for one, you said that most people follow the guidelines. I had no evidence for that. How many people eat grains?

The guidelines recommend eating grains every day. whole grains and processed grains. No, no, there's a minute. You just threw some bar graph up on the screen.

Oh, it's from N Haynes. Cool. So you found something that fit your narrative and you threw it up. And you had nothing that your narratives. I do. It's the fact that everybody eats grains and processed sugars, and they're all getting…

And how many people… Wait, wait, hold on. What's a limit? Ever since the invention of grains, people have gotten more obese. If we're talking about guidelines, can you even tell me…

How about this? How ever since… Sorry, sorry. I'm in the middle of asking a question….the invention, of the USDA, America has only gotten sicker.

I'm in the middle of asking a question here. Can you even tell me what's the upper limit for refined grains in order per meal in them are talking about my plate or just like say 2000 calorie diet.

What is the what is recommended? I think it's like 600 calories on a 2000 out calorie diets. I mean for refined grains because because there's differences between refined and whole.

Holds a minimum target for refined grains. I certainly hope it's zero because anything other than that is corrupt So hope by saying that you hope no, I'm answering tells me you don't know your question.

No, no Look, you're very controlling you ask a lot of questions and if you Don't get the answer you like you rephrase the question i'm, answering your questions so that we can move on.

What I'm saying is that I hope it's zero, and anything more than zero is corrupt. But I didn't ask you what you hoped. I asked you, what it is, because you're talking about people following the guidelines.

You should know the guideline, at least the key factors. Uh, I would assume it was about 100 to 200 calories in refined grains. Um, so per ounce equivalence, uh, it's actually, well, three ounce equivalent, whatever that translates to.

It's given an ounce of equivalent. But the, the fact of the matter is you don't know. I just told you it was about 200 calories. You guessed. That's what I said.

Are you going to, are you gonna follow? Dude, you're, You have a narrative and all you are trying to do is push your narrative. What is it? Why don' you just tell us?

How many calories is? Do you know? It is three ounces. An ounce is. I can look it up. It's not given in calories. Okay, so you don't even know. You asked the question, you didn't know the answer to it.

Now you're telling me you need to look at up to tell me? That's fucking bullshit, man. Come on, how many calories? Hold on. Let me answer. The guidelines are given an ounce equivalence.

So I gave you the ounce equivalent because that's what the guidelines were given. Four calories per gram. How many grams? You think I'm going to do ounce to grams in my head?

It is not that difficult. I mean, calories… So how how much grams is three ounces? Let's see if you can do it in your head. 16 times 1632 so should be 40, somewhere around like 44 times four.

So yeah, 40 times 4. That's about 160, 170 something calories. I was right. It was about 170. No, you weren't. it's 85 grams, three ounces. Right. What's eighty-five times for?

Two, that's a hundred and seventy, what's, eighty five times, four, like I said, a 100. Yeah, it was four calories per gram. Eighty- five grams times.

Four, because we're talking about sugar carbs. Right, so 60 calories more than what I said, which was 200, and you're trying to tell me I don't know. No, you said 100, 200. You're putting propaganda, bro.

I didn't even know! You are not listening to me. Maybe around 200? It's 260, but you are trying… No no no, You said you hope it was zero. Do you understand?

You burn 100 calories walking 15 minutes. Don't let me answer. You said you hope it's zero. I had to ask you three or four times to answer. You think it is around 100 to 200 calories.

It turns out it was 260. 60 calories more than I thought. I would like you to acknowledge that when you told me I was wrong, you were mistaken. You were wrong.

You had to look it up. I was 60 pounds up, you posed the question and didn't even know the answer yourself. Let's just talk about the fact that they shouldn't bring you in there at all.

Dude, dietary guidelines, if they actually cared about Americans and you and me would say zero, they should be recommending any refined sugars. So can you tell me why they are recommending them?

You just told me that was the dietary guidelines. That's the maximum limit. Yeah. Maximum limit should be zero. Somebody can say, no, just hold on. If I say do not consume more than two alcoholic drinks a week, am I recommending alcohol?

You're recommending no more then two because that's how people are going to take it. You say don't consume more than two, you're telling people they can have two a week.

So yes, I will take that as a recommendation. Let me rephrase, because this is actually what the alcohol guidelines say. They say zero is best, but no more that two.

Right, so they're saying it's okay to have no than more two? That's a mistake. Okay, so you think it should just be a hard line? Absolutely none. Get rid of everything.

Yes, that would be really good for America. The reason why America is getting so obese is because the USDA tells people they can have refined sugars and all these sort of things that they shouldn't have.

If they said, if they'd made a heart line, America would a lot more careful and a healthier and they would say, no, these are bad. Because also the problem is these things, refined grains, they're addicting.

They're good with. I would disagree on that, but the other thing, the issue with you saying that people would adhere if they had the cutoff at zero, people aren't adhering currently.

The vast majority of people are exceeding three ounces of refined grains a day. A vast of majority people exceed 10% of calories from saturated fat. Vast majority are getting the majority calories for multi-processed foods.

These cutoffs don't even work that are more modest. You think people will listen if you just had harder cut-offs? Yes, that would help a lot. Yes. They would listen more.

The reason they don't have hard cut offs is because the recommendations are so loose. There's telling people that they can have certain amounts of addictive foods and refined grains are extremely addicting not only chemically but also flavor-wise and so they're going to have more and they know this and like I said in the beginning of our conversation there's an insulin response and when you have a cupcake or a piece of you know candy you get an Insulin response you Get a boost of serotonin from that and it's going To diminish over time and you're gonna need more to Have the same result sugars are the gateway drug and knowing this the USDA should recommend zero but they don't Why do you think that they tell people that can have things that are bad for them, knowing that their addictive?

Because I don't think the evidence is very compelling that those modest amounts within a caloric budget are problematic. But that's like, but you saying that a harder cutoff would lead to lower or majority or most people adhering.

I mean, we're actually seeing an uptick in smoking recently, yet the government recommends none at all. How do explain that? Why do you keep talking about smoking?

We're talking because you're saying people would listen if the government said and not only that, but I don't know that we're seeing you have to prove the statement.

I'm not going to take it. So here's the problem. Prove it, prove your claim. Okay, I understand, and I'm willing to pull up the stats and the trends for that, but what I want to just clarify is that if I go through the effort of pulling it up here, because it's not one of the things I had prepped, which is fine, would you even accept it?

Or would say I have to know the author be his best man at his wedding, etc., etc.?? no you don't need to be the best man at somebody's wedding obviously not that's a joke but like are you gonna say i need Why does that depend on the study?

What are the delineating factors? Because not all studies are honest. Do you not understand this? Have you ever done research with anybody? Yes, I've actually published recently a paper in the Canadian Journal of Cardiology.

I'm working on another paper that should be published soon. Yes, yeah, you might be you. Might be very lucky to just been around like super, researchers with a lot of integrity.

You might. Be really lucky, but honestly, not a. Lot of them do. And to be honest, a, lot. Of them have researcher bias to actually researcher. Bias is a human construct.

That's nearly impossible to avoid. So that's what I mean by it depends on the study. No, I understand, but how do you determine that? I think that's the critical point here.

That's where the word intuition comes into play. I believe in intuition. Intuition is real. You don't think intuition is

really? Are you a computer? No.

No I'm not saying intuition isn't real, you just have to go on your intuition that, okay. Wait a minute. Do you know what Ashwagandha is? You know what ayahuasca is?

Yes. Do you know where these medicines came from? They came intuition. They come from somebody getting a feeling about something and trying it. That's where true medicine comes from.

It doesn't come form the computer. Doesn't comes form other people's words. There's a Chinese proverb, believe half of what you see and none of you hear.

I believe in that proverb. And you're taking the opposite stance to that. You're take believe everything that you seen here as long as it's peer-reviewed study.

Forgetting the fact that even if it's a double blind study, the researcher, theirself, is probably cherry picking. It's not actually blind unless an independent researcher is interpreting the data, and that's extremely rare.

So I'm not saying that I trust all research in the sense that, I agree with say author's conclusions, but I will give every study like a fair shake. I'll evaluate the methods if the method is solid.

Sometimes authors will try to tweak the wording on conclusions and things to suit biases, whatever, But the results are the result. And that's why I actually hardly even read the intros or discussions to most studies because I wanna form my own conclusion based on them.

That said, here you go with the smoking stats. This was based on Canadian stats. I'm sorry, if they aren't American stats, you see light smoking increasing, moderate smoking, pretty stable, heavy smoking pretty, stable in the last, uh, roughly decade or so, um, or at least up until that was 2011, I should have pulled up the more recent stats sorry I didn't prep it ahead of time.

Um, for men, it's even more so stable but overall smokers and females have increased. I just want to give a shout out to your followers. You have, look, Cheese Black Fitness, he's got 50,000 followers, Rose Edler, your intuition tells me not to eat animals.

I can't believe people like this do exist. This is, you have a very charged audience. I just want to share some love to these people. Thank you all for being here and participating in this conversation and throwing your fire in.

I appreciate your opinions. Yeah, so with that said, what happened in 2020 when the CDC published all these studies saying that, oh, you want to roll your eyes and I know you're going to, but when they published studies, saying masks stop the virus, and then two years later when Dr.

Fauci said actually we were wrong, they don't stop virus. But Dr Faucy, What about the biblical studies? They were science, don't you trust the science?

Sometimes science proves itself wrong? Oh wait, that's right, I have a voice of intuition. There is a higher power. I can think for myself. Wait, no. The overall balance of evidence doesn't support it.

Carnivore, ketosis, and vegan evidence

Yes, wait. No. For myself, i know what's Right for Myself and I know What Doesn't. That's what intuition is and i believe in that. i don' just sit in front of a computer screen all day reading studies published by people i Don't know and then take it as Doctrine take it like a religion.

No, I think that is true because somebody published it. But that's what you're pushing. That's exactly what your pushing everything that you said. You have to back up by a study run by somebody you don't know.

I think there are absolute garbage studies out there, and I will tell you why they're garbage based on the methods, not just because my intuition says so.

Also, when it comes to masking, if you want to go down that route, yeah, the overwhelming balance of evidence suggests that they do mitigate transmission, although not depending on depending the type of mask.

And no, they weren't wrong. The CDC and Fauci came back and actually said on second Yeah, now we realize that masks actually don't stop transmission or slow the transmission.

Actually, it's vitamin D3 that decreases the likelihood of contracting. Oh, did you? Do you not believe in vitamin B3? Because why? I don' believe. Why are you laughing?

Why you're laughing when I say that vitamin d3 decreases, the likely contracting coronavirus by 60% from the sun? Oh my god, because the Mendelian randomization studies have not demonstrated clear benefit.

The largest randomized control trials have no demonstrated a clear benefits. There's like small pilot trials that may have which apparently you trust because of…

What about your intuition? What does that tell you? That's what I want to know. What is your intuition tell about sun exposure and vitamin D and contracting respiratory viruses.

Let's just say somebody told you, hey, you're at risk of contracting a virus. You have the choice of either going outside and working out in the sun or staying indoors all day.

What would you do? What your intuition tell you to do. Well, I wouldn't just listen to anybody on face value like that. Exactly. That's my point. So what would your intuition tell to you?

Go outside or stay indoors? Depends on where viruses. It depends on where the virus is. I would base my decisions on the evidence. Evidence is eternal.

That's what I mean by science is a philosophy. There's never a hard line where it's done, it is in a box, we know the truth. It's not about knowing the truth, I never claimed to know the absolute objective truth.

Oh my god, your whole conversation is about… No, no, it wasn't. Let me explain why. Just smoking causes cancer? Answer that question. You don't believe in truth?

You just contradicted yourself. No I didn't, can I explain? No, I didn't contradict myself. If you let me explain, please without interruption for like a minute going now starting now 60 seconds.

Okay, go ahead. So, so it's not about the objective for reaching the Objective Truth. It's about getting closer to the truth. There are always There's always going to be some questions and we try to narrow that range of uncertainty to get closer and closer to that truth.

Yes, we don't know exactly. Now, when you say does X cause Y, I'm basing that on yes, it increases the probability and they're increasing the having X outcome.

I'm not saying because people misinterpret this. Yes, it will absolutely cause cancer for every single individual person. What I am saying is yes, It can cause a cancer and if you do that, you are more likely to develop cancer.

That's what I said. Okay, that's fine. But I think we should circle back to the dietary guidelines and whether or not those are actually helping people or hurting them.

I think that recommending a certain amount of grains per day, and this is based on my ketosis studies, which I send you some of them. Ketosis and autophagy grains take people out of both ketoses and otophage, both of which help to repair crippled DNA, elongate mitochondria.

Oh, you don't believe this? No, so it's not that I don't believe that these mechanisms take place, it is that they've been shown to over the long term lead to better outcomes in humans.

How long is long-term though? You can look at longterm cohort studies and whatnot over a decade or two, and seeing what the ultimate outcomes are. Are there higher risks or lower risks of cardiovascular disease, of cancers, or total mortality?

That's what I would care about. There are actual cultures who lived on fish and meat, like the Eskimos for example, who have the highest lifespan. No they don't.

They have low life expectancy. You compare Inuit, say, Canadian populations to the other Canadians who aren't necessarily eating great anyway, no, they have about a decade less life expectancy.

Yeah, that is not what I have seen. I don't have those studies on me. But then you're at a standstill because I can go ahead and pull up the Stats Canada data right now comparing Inuit to the neighboring communities and we'll see that it's like substantially lower life expectancy.

In fact, I've never seen a study suggesting that they have longer life expectancies. Like, this conversation, but things, it would be really nice to actually just like, have a conversation without needing to use technology and pull up studies so that we can just, like shared data that.

We've read back and forth. and formulate our own opinions. But what's the purpose? We don't need to cite everything we say. It becomes very difficult in the conversation.

Here's a thing. You're saying that these mechanisms related to keto do X, Y, and Z. Well, I can just say, okay, well, the high carb diet does the same.

Then what? Then the people listening will just have to decide on what they want to determine. Yeah, and that's when personal experience comes in really handy, but you're not interested in personal experiences, are you?

No, no, here's the problem with personal experiments. You can find anecdotes for anything, like the Twinkie Dive, for example. so we can go back and forth with and then you know you're using studies to discredit personal experience no no that was a person that's like it was it a dude who did that like i know that wasn't a study and you don't fuck you, don t know, that guy i have no idea what that study is about like that okay that that s fine but then, you re telling people to trust you No, I'm not telling people to trust me.

I am telling my personal experience and what's worked for me, and I tell people experiment with their bodies so they can develop their own intuition and know what works for them.

But they shouldn't try a Twinkie diet, or a donut diet or smoking or anything else. You keep bringing that study up, so can we go back to that and look at the conclusion?

No, it was just a report. At this point, I'd like to see the conclusions to the study. Can you pull it up? To be clear, there was a researcher doing the Twinkie diet and tracking his own data.

It was not like a published study, okay? So basically, you're talking about BS. Why do you keep bring this BS up. It's a random guy. It is a researcher talking about a study that is not published.

You're bringing random things up to try to prove a point because you know that your point is false. Why are you clinging to this so hard? You are bringing up a study that is null and void.

It's a null-and-void study with nothing backing it. What's my point that's false? The point that that's false is that a person can eat Twinkies and Doritos for 10 weeks and feel better.

That's the false point. I don't believe that. So that just proves to me that you don' actually believe. No, I think you're

trying to prove a false. And you are using a random study based on a guy to try to proof that if it's not true.

Honestly, it discredits you as a doctor. It discredits you as a doctor that you would bring up a study from a random guy that's not peer-reviewed, not based on anything, and try to use that to prove a point.

Why would you do that? Again, can I respond without you interrupting again, just because you keep doing that. I'm not interrupting. This is a conversation.

It's just about you. Can I please respond to the claims you just made without an interruption? Yes. So what you just said proves to me you don't get the point of me bringing that up.

It wasn't to bring up the fact that this guy did this and these were the results and they were so great and the Twinkie Dye is great. That is not at any…

I didn't say that was the problem. Okay, I'm just… I'm clarifying that in no way, shape or form did I bring that as a means to demonstrate the supposed benefits for this individual on a Twinky Dyes.

The point of me bringing that up is that we can't just go off of short term, I tried a thing for a little bit and had certain outcomes to demonstrate anything.

So that is point number one. I can finish without interruption. Is that what I'm getting here? Okay, go ahead and finish. The fact of the matter is you tell people that they should A, try all sorts of different diets or whatever and see what works for them in the short term without really giving much weight to the long-term outcomes there, which are also important.

And when I bring up examples of things that people would try, you just don't believe that they could possibly lead to good outcomes or you don t agree that there would be healthy things to do.

You brought up some random guy from the internet who posted a story about him eating three things in a burrito. It's not a reputable study. I don' t trust the study!

And you bring up a study like that proves you to be an untrustworthy person. So it just does. Anybody with sense can see that you're manipulated. You still don't get it.

Look, look, this is not an attack on your character. But honestly, you are a manipulative person to bring out the study from by a random guy on the internet who ate Twinkies and donuts and try to use it to prove the point that people can't follow their intuition.

That's just ridiculous. So to be clear, again, I am not citing Mark Hobb for any reason other than to… Oh my God. For any other reason than… Did you hear me say that part before you cut me off again?

You literally can't sit through me. You took a long break. I thought you were saying you weren't citing him. Well, please, I'll have to give you a signal when I'm done or something.

So the point was not to bring him up to be like, this guy did this and the results were great or he had great results. It was simply to point out the issues with saying that you hold anecdotes above other things.

Now, we can throw out Markov and the Twinkie example altogether, and I can just give you a hypothetical, or I could point to the… I don't want your hypothetical.

Again, you interrupted me again. I'm just going to… Um, I could bring up a hypothetical or I can bring out the countless examples and anecdotes of people on a vegan diet experiencing all sorts of great outcomes or wait.

I have a question. Again, the USDA recommends me. So can I just ask? Yeah. Yeah, because you're not talking about anything. I'm just about finished. I want to ask you, how can you support the USDA and be a vegan at the

same time?

Because the U. S. D. A recommends meat and dairy. How did that work? Guess what? I am not biased like you like to say I. That's why. If I can finish what I was saying before, it would be great.

Um, actually, I kind of lost track of this. Yeah, you interrupted. I don't know how many times because you weren't saying anything important. Do you think that the USDA guidelines are accurate or not?

That's the point of the conversation. Are they good or are they not accurate? So I'd like to just finish really quick. My point was that I can bring up anecdotes, pro-vegan anecdote.

I could bring anecdots of people on the carnivore diet experiencing absolute garbage outcomes. Just look at Carnivor Cringe on Instagram. And again, you're going to say you don't know these people, whatever, that's fine.

Um, I do know personally people who've experienced great things on a vegan diet. The fact of the matter is we can find anecdotese, these personal experiences, et cetera, for every dietary pattern out there.

That is the point. Who developed lung cancer and then healed it on raw meat diet? So what? I know somebody was vegan for 12 years, got lung cancer, and healed it on an all-meat diet.

That's my point. For every study that proves one hypothesis correct, there's another study the proves the opposite correct. So you have to experiment with your body and use your own intuition.

That is my point. So in these anecdotes, you're excluding outside factors. You're not adjusting for other potential confounders. you are not considering the natural course of disease.

There are so many problems with them. Yeah, I am. Actually, that's exactly what I'm doing. Cut off, interrupt it again. Well, we talk a lot, so it gets hard to have a conversation with somebody who rants.

If you were ranting, No, I'm literally addressing the exact point. And if you rewind how patiently I sat there while you didn't answer the very first question I asked you about the how or what evidence you have for people following dietary guidelines.

I think I am giving you enough time. You actually didn't, but anyways, people can go back and watch. I said that there's a spectrum of following and that they all eat grains and the dietary guidelines recommend grains.

No, speaking of rants, you went on a rant about conflicts of interest within the Dietary Guidelines when answering the question about adherence to the guidelines.

But that's irrelevant to that question. Anyways, that is beside the point. The fact of the matter is you've cut me off repeatedly. Uh, I can't even remember what I was just in the middle of saying there.

Must not have been that important then. Or maybe it was and then I picked up on a more important point. You don't have a good memory because you don' t eat meat.

I don t know. That's why I guess so. Is that it? I remember these studies pretty well. Someone else here doesn't. But anyways… You dont because your sitting in front of a computer screen pulling them up.

If you had such a great memory you wouldn't do that. Most of what I've talked about hasn't been on here. I pulled up the N-Hanes and I pulled the smoking one.

Like that was it. Right. See now… Okay. And you also pulled out the Twinkie diet. Oh, Mark Hobb. Okay. Again, false information you're spreading. It's another example of it.

No, no, it's not. I mean, you have no evidence of that anyway. But anyways, here is the topic and stop talking about

cigarettes because that wasn't part of our topic.

Personal experimentation and the Twinkie example

So this is what's called a reductio. Are you familiar with that term? A what? Reductio? No, I'm not familiar with that. So basically what it is in cases where somebody's making a certain type of claim and they're providing a rationale for it.

You might say something like, um, i believe X because of Y or I don't believe that's because why. But so what I'll do is I will take that Y And I will apply it to another situation to see if you're consistent with that.

If you are inconsistent in the way that you apply your beliefs, then you can just make up anything you want to support anything. And it won't matter. It doesn't if it's consistent.

Like, who decides what's consistent and what is not consistent? No, no, because either it's consistently or not. Consistency is pretty important to who?

That's a perception. So can I, you're all to explain. If I were to say in one situation that I believe, let's just say, I said, I believe studies that are funded by the NIH.

Let me just say that. And then you provide a study that is funded, by NIH, and I'm like, i don't like that and you're like well it's funded. You said you like studies?

Yeah, maybe. Hold on, hold on. Yes, yes I would agree with that But let's say you cite something that's funded by NIH, and I'm like, I don't like that.

And you're like well, why do you like those ones that are funded NIH and you said specifically for that reason, but you don' like these ones? Then I would have to expand on why that is and explain why I am treating those differently.

Right. That's the point. If I have a good, if I haven't actual valid reason, like, oh, in the methods, they did this wrong or whatever, then fine. Th that's acceptable.

But if i'm just like oh I just don't like it. And even though I said I like studies funded by NIH, I don t like this one. All right. I understand. So you, you want me to elaborate more on why I Don't resonate with the Twinkie guys, right?

I can elaborate why there's asymmetrical application. Yes, yes, yeah. Yeah. Or the smoking examples if we want to go more extreme. I mean, is that what you're asking for?

You asked me to elaborate on the Twinkies study to explain why I don't do that because I can do. No, we can. At this point, I don't know how important that is, but I was just trying to explain why I'm bringing up these hypotheticals or these comparisons is to understand why you have a differing sort of application of your beliefs in those two cases, or at least what looks like that from the outside without further elaboration.

That's why. Yeah. Well, for starters, because there's no reliability behind the study, it was just, you know, a random researcher posting an experience that he shared.

And it could be like the liver king where he's like, Yeah, I got big eating raw liver. But he was actually taking steroids, like people do things like that for a credibility for attention, all kinds of reasons.

And I don't know who this random researcher is, but the Twinkie, honestly, the study sounded crazy because I happen to know that the Mediterranean diet is a very healthy diet.

I also happen that living on Twinky's and Doritos is very unhealthy. So the idea of going from a Mediterranean diet to a Twinkie and Dorito diet and feeling better is kind of shady.

And the fact that somebody, here's the main thing that throws my intuition, like my truthdar off, you know, The fact that somebody would even try to do it in and of itself is shady.

Like, why would somebody even think, I'm going to go from this really healthy diet to Twinkies and Doritos and then tell people, hey, guess what? I felt great.

It seems to me like an agenda. So, so he explains, he explained the motivations behind it. So he's a teacher at that university for nutrition as well.

And so the reason he was his students didn't believe that you could actually lose weight, like, or I'm sure some of his student did, but, um, it was just essentially proved to a student that could lose way eating essentially ultra processed food diet.

Yeah, because it's calories. Just to give you that background info on why he did it. That is why we did. Not that he necessarily thought it was good long term.

I'm sure he doesn't think it would be good. But the reason he didn't and by his surprise ended up feeling pretty good doing it, was anyway that. Yeah, I mean, that makes sense because whether you eat, you know, a pound of nails and a pond of feathers is still a pounds.

You know if you're eating a Pound of meat and half a POUND of Twinkies, You're going to lose weight because you are eating less food. So yeah, i mean that make sense.

The feeling great. I mean, I don't really have anything to say about that. Like I said, what else might he have been on? I dunno, there's too many unknowns.

But would it really be shocking though? You think it would be a shock to lose 27 pounds not feeling better? Right, yeah. There could have also just been that, like he might have just feeling good because he's losing weight.

Yeah, which would then bring me back to like, then, you know, let's say that that's the case. Let's just say, again, I know you don't like hypotheticals, but let say this is the the cases and you what he's saying is true.

In that case, would you suspect that based on the fact that you lost weight and everything that the Twinkie diet would be a healthier alternative? No, because I don't think that weight is all that matters.

And I also don' think the way a person feels is what matters, so no, I think it makes it a healthier alternative. There's more factors to health than how somebody feels and how much they weigh.

So that's super interesting then. Because intuition and feeling are different. Emotion and intuition are not the same thing. Sure, sure. I disagree there.

But let's say intuitively, in this case, he thought that it was the right thing to do and that it would suit him well in the long term. Can you compound on that question a little bit?

So we have the example Twinkie diet, he had some Doritos, whatever on the side, and loss weight felt better, improved actually biomarkers as well, I would say probably due to the weight loss, intuitively he felt that it was the right thing for him to do long-term.

Would that then be a healthy approach for them? I think that when it yes, if he lost weight and his biomarkers improved simply because he Throughout that window, it was probably a healthy practice and when it started to become unhealthy, he probably would have felt and known that.

But what if it didn't? I would say that's a hypothetical and it's very unlikely that he would. That's what I will say. Let's just say he did. No. No, he could have been delusional.

He could've been going through a psychosis. But that's crazy. Again, I literally just told you that emotion and intuition aren't the same thing. We can't follow our feeling.

Intuition and feeling aren' t the samething. I think what you should be asking if you want to know my stance is what is intuition? Do you understand? Sure.

Define it. Yeah. So intuition is an observation. It comes from awareness. it doesn't come from emotion. We have our, you know, our spiritual, or light body, which you, know the chakras, the aura, right?

You're aware of all this, Right? Loosely. Yeah. I would say, yeah. Okay. So we have a chakra meridians from the root chakra, Which develops all of our sex hormones and agonies and all that, all the way up to the crown chakra where the brain, third eye, and pineal gland is.

And between that are all these different energy meridians and an aura that comes out of our heart, which spans about six feet by six feed around the entire body.

And within this entire space, we sense everything, both internally and externally, and this is our awareness. This is where our intuition comes from, where we can start to sense what's healthy, what right and what not.

Emotion and feeling Is very different. A lot of that comes from crazy me a lot. Of it might come from the parasites in our stomach. You know, it could come.

From addictions, you know due to chemical imbalances in a brand. And so just because somebody feels good doesn't mean that they're following their intuition because if they are going through a cognitive decline or if you're going to a Cognitive break.

they might not be in touch with their intuition. They might be able to feel their energy body. And if they're eating Doritos and Twinkies for 10 weeks, it's actually likely that their body would shut down and they would lose touch.

At that point it just becomes an addictive practice. So yeah, I would answer your question by saying no. If he continues to be good, that does not mean that it is necessarily healthy.

But let's say that his intuition, as you described, also points towards it being a healthy practice. If his Intuition, As I described points to that eating Twinkies and Doritos as being A healthy Practice, then there might be something that I don't know about TwINKies And Dorito's and I'm open to being mind blown.

That's really it. If that's your conclusion and that is how you formulate your opinions or your evidence, and again, this would be a case of you being consistent with that in this hypothetical, then I don't think there's anything really to debate there.

I personally think that would a ridiculous way or ridiculous conclusion. Well, yeah, but that would never happen. It's a ridiculous hypothetical. So you're posing ridiculous questions and making ridiculous, hypotheticals that take this conversation way off.

And I honestly think that it's missed opportunity for like a deeper conversation that could have been a lot more productive because you talked about crazy hypothetical Again, the hypothetical is to see if, again, you are consistent with the way that you apply your standards or your beliefs.

And in that situation you were, but that would lead you to thinking that, yeah, it could be healthy long term. Yeah, right. But this debate wasn't about whether or not I am consistent with my beliefs.

Why are you focusing in on whether or not the person on the other end of the debate is consistent, with his beliefs? That wasn't part of our debate. So it's a really critical component to debate, period, right?

So if we're debating a topic like, do people adhere to the guidelines? And we get into a discussion of, oh, I like this

type of evidence, or I liked this kind of type evidence.

We have to unpack why you believe in or you utilize certain types of evidence. And so that's what I'm getting to here, because that that a critical importance.

Otherwise, we're just spewing opposing claims at each other and not getting anywhere, not understanding how we formulate those, why we formulate them.

At the end of the day, if you're inconsistent in applying them, well, then it suggests bias. If you are consistently applying, I actually do really appreciate that.

I respect the fact that you would apply them consistently more so than if and refuse. Yeah, that's fine. I personally feel like we went off track trying to figure out whether or not I'm consistent with my beliefs.

And I don't personally, feel, like that was necessary. But I hope we can get back on track and talk about the dietary guidelines and what's going on in the world and in health and, you know, something more productive.

Yeah, and I mean, from there, like, I still don't think we've gotten an answer to this. This, it's going to devolve back into differences as far as how we apply, or I guess how evaluate the evidence, but I haven't really gotten to the question about how do we conclude that people are following guidelines?

When I literally never did. Yeah. So I did answer that question. Like I said before, I think that there's a spectrum of following and we definitely disagree on this.

I have always consistently allowed for or recommended, whatever word you want to call it, a certain amount of sweets, sugars, refined grains, and that everybody happens to have those things in their diet.

I think that that is a sort of following. They might not be following it 100%. But by eating grains, by drinking and eating pasteurized dairy, which they should not be doing in the USDA is advising people that they have dairy.

But pasteureized because they're outlying raw dairy another poison and then the meat. but where does the meat come from? It has hormones and antibodies and it's raised in fear and all this terrible stuff and people don't have another choice but to get that meat, again, another toxin and then a whole bunch of grains.

So people are for sure following the guidelines to a certain extent, maybe not 100% when it comes to portion, but they're all eating the things that the USDA is requiring them to eat.

And I don't think that the MyPlate and the FoodPyramid and that USDA should be allowing for pasteurized dairy like at all and should suggesting that people eat any sweets and refined grains at like all.

I do not think this should part of it. That is my opinion and I think a lot of is to be honest, yeah, like I said before, it's kind of like a gateway drug, the way that it affects our insulin.

And it inspires people to reach for other things like pharmaceutical chemicals or cigarettes or whatever it is, to make them feel better because the refined grains and the things that the USDA is saying they can eat is making them fell bad.

So I think it a sort of a snowball effect. So, I mean, there's a couple of things there. For one, with adherence to the guidelines, like I don't disagree that there are certain parts within the guide lines that people are somewhat, you know, um, uh, guess consuming.

And that's just simply because, the, guidelines cover like all the main food groups. Of course, people, are going to be eating some from each, each food group to a degree.

What I would be more concerned with when someone says that, that are following the guidance or have been

following, I would look at like, are they hitting at least the majority of the targets?

Are they getting 80% of their targets, for example? Or I mean, that's the number that I threw out. I know that some number has been used in some of literature.

And the numbers felt like the percentages of people hitting those targets is like between 1 and 2%. It's incredibly low.

Guideline adherence, seafood, and study methods

Now, yeah, sure, you can argue that people might be following or people may be consuming X amount of grains. They might consuming an X-amount of meat.

Very little vegetables, although some people are consuming a little bit here and there. But at the end of the day, does that really qualify as following the guidelines?

I wouldn't say so, just because… It's not like a yes or no thing. It is more about how much things. Well, sure, because, I mean, look, the guidelines cover fruits, veggies, they cover meat, poultry, seafood, dairy, eggs, nuts and seeds.

They have soy products, beans, peas. Yeah. everyone's going to be consuming some of those in some amount. Like that's like your whole diet, basically.

That's a vast majority of what people are going be consuming. But just because they happen to consuming, some amounts of these foods, I don't think would qualify as following the guidelines.

Yeah. I would, qualify that as, following loosely. But following, like for example, I don't eat that stuff. I do not follow the guidelines. But you eat meat, right?

I eat fruits and vegetables. Meat, fruits, and veggies are all in the guideline. So by your own definition, you'd be loosely following the guidance. Well, considering I did not eat the grains, which is at least a quarter of the I wouldn't consider a vegan as somebody who follows the guidelines because they don't eat everything that's in the guideline.

In order to follow the guidance, I would say by definition, you have to eat the everything in guidelines. That's what I'd consider following the guide lines.

So because I don t eat refined sugars, So, a lot of people don't eat seafood, seafood consumption isn't super prevalent. Um, like, actually the, the adherence to the seafood recommendation, which is very low to begin with is terribly low.

So would that since people aren't hitting that food group for that category, would, that mean that most people are following the guidelines? I, yeah, if they're not eating seafood at all, like if that's not part of the majority of people.

Yeah. The majority people don't consume it. Well, I mean, the guidelines are, but the, guidelines, are the per daily consumption. But vast majority, people aren't even consuming it weekly, let alone daily.

Okay. Okay, well, that's unfortunate. That's not a good thing. But then, but then by your own definition, like vegans who don't eat meat, yourself who doesn't need grains, would that mean that most people do not follow the guidelines?

No, because I don' know that, can you say most, people don"t eat seafood? Daily, absolutely. What demographic is this from? So it's ages one and up. Yeah.

Okay. Maybe two and three year olds aren't even a lot of fish sticks. One and up. No, no, like one, one till that's what I'm saying. Yeah, that one and from what part of the world, what?

Part of America. What part? Of the state. America, it's nationally representative in America? Yeah again, when you, you throw these statements out there, I really would have to pick apart the study to get a sense of how accurate this is and who and what they're talking about.

They're talking about a very impoverished area that doesn't have access to. Nationally representative. No, it's nationally representative from all over the U. S.

representing the population. According to who? Nobody has ever asked me. I've never been part of a study on whether or not people eat seafood. So who are they asking?

Where is this information coming from? I eat seafood, but nobody's ever asked me that. So they missed out on one person. Maybe they miss out in thousands more.

I don't know what this study is. No, so the NHANES is through like the census, like, you know, census reports that will be done annually, biannually, whatever.

So it's through that that they collect a lot of the NHANES data. And then I believe it is a subset of them, again, spreading it so nationally representative, who they will survey for the dietary stuff.

There's a few details in there I can look up. Again, maybe it was my memory. I don't know, I have to look at the study for exactly the details as we were joking earlier.

The details are actually a really big deal because, like I said, you can use studies to prove any point you want if you hide behind the studies of other people that you don t know.

That's all you're doing is hiding behind studies to try to prove a point. Well, again, when I started talking, you interrupt me immediately or shake your head or laugh or do something obnoxious and rude.

But when you are talking and I start speaking, I'm like the big bad bully that interrupts you, so I would like to actually say something right now if that's okay with you.

Go ahead. You're hiding behind studies and that's something that a lot of people do when they don't actually have the personal experience. For example, have you ever done ketosis for a year?

Have you done that? No. No, so you don't know what it does. You just don' t. All you do is you hide behind literature that was made by people you dont' know.

I have done ketosis for a year, I've done veganism for year. I have personally tried these things. And that is where intuition comes from. It's funny how you get so reactive when you hear things you My point of this debate was to talk about the importance of intuition and the only way to develop an intuition is through personal experience.

You have to try things to know what they're about. you can't just hide behind studies made by people you don't know. So can I respond? As long as you don't say something about smoking cigarettes.

I might, but I'm going to start with something else. You probably will. Can you say a little bit more accurate to our conversation? Yeah, I am. So for one, it's not this idea of hiding behind studies.

For one if we're making claims about people, we are not saying ourselves, or talking about our own experience with someone. The claims are about the people as a whole, the American population following dietary guidelines.

How the hell does personal experience play into that? It's not like you know what every single person or the bulk of the population is doing as far as their diet.

And then second, you just go back to- Can I answer that before you move on? I just want to make one more point. Okay. Secondly, and I know you won't like it, but when you go to, again, You can't trust the studies.

You need to try things. Yeah, I would just back the smoking unless you can provide a rationale for why that should be treated differently. Yeah, but you're not talking about food.

Now you talk about drugs and that's a different conversation. But the logic still applies. So your logic is you should trust the study. That's stupid.

Like saying, okay, studies prove if I jump out of a plane, I'll die, But maybe I should try it myself. You're reaching. I would agree that both of those statements are stupid.

I agree with saying we need to try smoking to know. Hold on. But hold on, I'd say the same thing about diet. You need try a diet to see if it's healthy or not.

It's different because a diet you are you Are what you eat and you can feel what's happening within the moment and the more present you? Are the More you Can Feel what You eat you know how it's affecting your body you Know how It Makes you Sleep how, it Makes You poop how?

It makes you Think Whether Did you Brain Fog or Helps you Focus you, know These Things if You Eat Twinkies for Two Days and Nothing Else You know immediately how that affects your body and this random study from some random guy that you threw out there Yeah, you laugh because you know, it was BS some Random study you throw you can look you find anything on the internet.

We all know that I wanted to have a genuine authentic debate and conversation with you to uncover truth and you're throwing out random studies from Some crazy research on internet that ate Doritos and Twinkies for 10 weeks and to be honest, I think you should be You shouldn't have done that.

That really discredits you. Anyway, the conversation about food is different than the conversations about drugs and jumping out of planes. So let's just keep it to food.

No, to be clear, you didn't actually explain why we should treat those differently. You just said we shouldn't. Yeah. I just explained why. Because it's a slower process.

Well, I sat through your entire explanation. And you don't understand. Um, so you said that, or I said, that saying that we need to smoke to know if it's bad for us or we needed to jump on a plane to, you know, if is bad, for US are both stupid.

I, I set that you address. They're both. Then I would also apply that to diet and saying, in order to no, it died. Okay. So, all right, let me know. I have a question for you.

No, I haven't asked you a single hypothetical and now I don't. Yes. And you can write it down and say that a study went on that proved that living on nothing.

Oh, no. That living. This is hilarious. Good for. You eat nothing but ants. because the doctor told you it was good for you, and every day you feel worse and worse, but the study told that it good you.

My hypothetical for is, do you follow your intuition and the way that is making your body feel, or do continue to do what the doctors told to you to because study said it's good.

So, to be clear, you cut me off again. Are you going to answer the question or not? Because you've asked me a lot of crazy, dumb hypotheticals, and especially for an adult, I would like you to ask her my dumb, hypothetical.

I will answer it. i just want to clarify for everybody here, everyone just saw that, that you caught me often and spoke over, but also- Yes, You're the victim and we're all supporting you.

Go ahead. Answer the questions now. You're just so unclear because there was back and forth there. Your question is, if a study came out showing that eating just ants was good for you and to like, just for sake of

argument, are you, do you mean like they're looking at hard long-term outcomes, cancer?

Yes. Okay. A study that said that, eating ants, was going to be really good. If you lower your risk of cardiovascular disease or whatever it was, and you continued to eat them but felt worse every day.

Would you follow your intuition and your feeling and stop eating them or go by what the study and the doctor said? If I felt like crap acutely, I wouldn't be following that diet.

Absolutely not. Then do you agree? That's my point. That is exactly what I've been trying to say the last hour. You won't let me finish because you know that I don't fully agree.

I would not claim that that I would not claim that, by and large, it is harmful to people. Let's say in the study that the vast majority of people did not experience what I experienced.

I wouldn't then claim on mass that it's harmful for the population, I'd not tell people that they shouldn't be recommending it as a whole. Yes, there are individual differences.

We all know that there are individual differences between people. Some people's guts are swarmed better to certain foods than others, whatever. But generally they're within this umbrella that is associated with good health outcomes.

Closing remarks and plans for a follow-up

And you want to find how can you fit into that umbrella. Exactly. Hatering it towards your own acute needs. Okay, good. We're, we're actually really close right now.

and we're kind of in the same boat, and I would like to address that hypothetical onto grains and the way that I feel about grains, in a way, that grains are actually affecting people, but that people keep eating them because studies and doctors are telling them that they're good for them.

I think grains have been causing obesity, brain fog, diabetes, a lot of other issues, the dietary guidelines have them in there. That is my opinion, my personal experience, and there's actually a lot of studies on ketosis and autophagy that back that up.

But there's also studies on like whole grain intake suggesting positive outcomes or studies. Yes, there is. And the problem is that the USDA, and again, bringing it back to the beginning of the conversation, the USDA collaborates with big ag, big pharma and runs the research and development for a lot of these studies, so there was a conflict of interest there.

That's the Wait, so not necessarily that's why I don't trust these studies. Wait but even okay, but, even if they weren't funded, you still wouldn't trusted.

No, no, not that. If I, if I pull up a study on dietary guideline, adherence and all cause mortality and cardiovascular disease right now that receive no funding, and you would accept.

No, because you're pulling up stuff, I would have to look at them and get back to you. I'm not going to take your word for it. So why don't we do this?

Why don' I provide you and I can pull it up on screen if people want to see it so it's bookmarked here. We'll use this one. So why don't we look at this meta analysis?

This is the latest healthy eating index is a measure of adherence to the U S dietary guidelines and all cause and cause specific mortality. You see the authors.

They're very recent. Um, why Don't We pause here? You go and look that when you ready for, you know, round

two, cause it's been almost two hours now. I do have to leave soon.

Yeah, wow. bro time flies two hours or almost because because we started a bit late but yeah why don't we pick it up with that um afterwards you can let me know what the issues are because this one did not receive any funding none of the authors had conflicts at it yeah that sounds good send me that study and um we'll take it from there Okay, sounds good.

Well, yeah, thanks for for hopping on. Then I know it's been a while. It looks like we have. I wonder, I'll get the stats in a minute as far as how many people were in and out, but it looks, like, right.

Um, looks. Like we were hovering between like 50 and 70 people the whole time. So I, randomly glanced down at the comments and saw some very entertaining things.

so I think that I. Think people got something out of it, which is really important. I enjoyed this conversation with you. It's our first conversation together and it's been nice.

We disagree on a lot of things, but I like you as a person. I think you're very headstrong and passionate. And I appreciate that. So, yeah, I look forward to the next conversation.

Yeah, sounds good. Thanks. Any I'm happy to do another one and just someone's mentioning, like, provide studies ahead, whatever to look at. Yeah, just so you're aware, people are aware we did share in advance, not super far in advanced necessarily, but yeah, we didn't.

So yeah. Next time we'll catch up again and I'll save this and i will collab you on it like you asked. Sounds good, brother. Have a great night.