Diet Debates and Purple States

PART 2

The Dr. JOHN BERARDI SHOW

Listen on Apple Podcasts | Listen on Google Podcasts | LISTEN ON Spotify

www.drjohnberardishow.com

Diet Debates and Purple States – Part 2 Transcript

Matt Fitzgerald:

Initially taboos would form around. Don't eat that, it's not good for you, it's toxic. Do eat this. It is good for you. And so those laws, you can see how just over time they would become sublimated, and at some point they were no longer just about food. They were about our tribe doesn't eat that, let that tribe go ahead and eat it and get sick. And we think, in 2020, the age of science and technology that we're doing something radically different, that all of our dietary decisions are evidence-based and rational? Bologna.

Dr. John Berardi:

This is the Dr. John Berardi Show. A podcast that seeks important lessons in a seemingly unlikely place, amid competing points of view. In each episode, I look at fascinating sometimes even controversial topics through the minds of divergent thinkers and together we tease out unifying threads from ideas that may feel irreconcilable. Today's topic, diet debates, part two. In part one of this series we covered what is perhaps the biggest diet debate of the decade plants versus animals for human health and possible ways to reconcile the two. Here in part two, we'll cover two other debates, plants versus animals for environmental health and the ideal macronutrient split looking for common ground among these also. In part one of this series, I concluded that for facilitating personal health, the best available evidence is pretty clear. Eat food, meaning food that is minimally processed, close to its natural state, not too much, which is usually accomplished by eating minimally processed food, and a satisfying mix of plants and animals. To arrive at this place, we essentially split the difference between Dr. David Katz's recommendations.

Dr. David Katz:

Vegetables, fruits, whole grains, beans, lentils, nuts, and seeds.

Dr. John Berardi:

And Dr. Paul Saladino's.

Dr. Paul Saladino:

Meat and organs.

Dr. John Berardi:

Yet, in our first episode, Dr. Katz said something that we probably ought to examine.

Dr. David Katz:

There are no healthy people on an uninhabitable planet, and we are rather blithely and blindly wandering our way in that very direction. And I would go so far as to say, you cannot really call yourself a health professional in 2020, if you don't advocate frequently and fiercely for the health of the planet.

Dr. John Berardi:

From his perspective, food plays an important role here.

Dr. David Katz:

The single largest reason to argue against animal food predominant diets, beautifully articulated in the EAT Lancet report on food, people, and the planet, is that the carbon footprint associated with animal food production is massively higher than plants, water utilization, massively higher. Land use massively higher. Contaminants, pollution, massively

higher on and on it goes, we simply cannot do it at the scale of eight billion hungry homo sapiens or more. And that's where we are now. We will soil our nest and I've got kids, and I think the single most compelling argument against eating animal foods is sure, it might in fact be perfectly good to eat a diet that's richly infused by wild animals like our stone-age ancestors. So, get your bow and arrow, eat antelope, eat deer. 8 billion Homo sapiens cannot do that. The only way for us to eat animal food is to mass produce it, mass producing it has enormous environmental cost.

Dr. John Berardi:

Yet, not everyone agrees that the logical consequence is to simply eliminate animal foods and eat more plant foods. Again, Dr. Paul Saladino.

Dr. Paul Saladino:

So, this is one of the more frustrating straw man arguments that plant-based advocates try to make, and we can unpack it from the beginning. The first thing to realize, and to accept is that there are nearly 8 billion people on the planet, and there is perhaps no way of eating right now that we are currently doing that we'll be able to feed all 8 billion people, a high-quality diet. Okay? So, when they say you can't feed everybody a carnivore diet, I say that's a straw man argument. So, let's talk about ecosystems. So, let's talk about 250 million bison, elk, antelope, pronghorn deer, that were living in North America in 1850, and created some of the most fertile soil in the world that was then mono cropped into oblivion when we brought in agriculture into the middle of the country.

Dr. Paul Saladino:

So, what we know without a doubt is that animals living on an ecosystem that is grazing animals, ruminant animals, living on grasslands, create more fertile soil then they began with right? This is how you make soil. How do you make dirt? How do you make earth? You put animals in an ecosystem, animals eat plants, they poop and pee on the land. And they then push the nutrients in their poop and pee back into the land. Animals are not nuclear reactors. They're not destroying nitrogen. We have a massive problem. One of the greatest triumphs quote, unquote of the last century was creating synthetic fertilizer. And the reason that was critical was because we had mono crops, all of our lands so badly that we were not going to be able to grow any more food.

Dr. Paul Saladino:

Well, do you know why we need fertilizer that's synthetic, you know why we needed to be able to isolate nitrogen, to make synthetic fertilizer in the 1940s? Because we stopped raising animals on the land. Because we stopped hunting within ecosystems. And anyone who's ever been to a farm that is regenerative, these animals, predominantly beef, but they could be bison. They could be lamb. They could be all sorts of ruminants. They're fed grass from the minute they're born. I guess they get milk then, but they're fed grass throughout their life cycle. They're never fed in a CAFO, a clustered animal feeding operation. They're never fed grain, and they graze on the land and they eat the grass down to the earth and then they move to another field and the grass regenerates, and it comes back even thicker. There's an amazing farm in Georgia called White Oak Pastures that I've been to, along with a number of other regenerative farms.

Dr. Paul Saladino:

And the grass is so thick. The grass is so healthy. Those cattle are doing nothing but improving the earth. I'll tell you, there are birds flying around. There are thousands of animals and ecosystems. There are mice and voles in the ground. There are earthworms and beetles and birds in the air and snakes, and there are ecosystems, okay. It's an ecosystem just like 1850, 250 ruminants in North America. Now that stands in stark contrast to what happens when you monocrop plants. If you grow a plant in a row of lettuce or soy or corn or whatever, we're going to make beyond burgers or

synthetic plant foods for humans out of its dead earth, in order to make that plot of land, they had to till it, which killed thousands, tens of thousands of rabbits, voles, all sorts of things that live in the earth, beetles, worms, bee colonies.

Dr. Paul Saladino:

It's incredibly disruptive to an ecosystem to till the land, not only do you release carbon that is stored in the soil, which goes into the atmosphere, but you destroy tens of thousands of organisms. The only hope that we have as humans is to create ecosystems-based agriculture, which includes both plants and animals. And predominantly the animals are eating grass, which is great because humans don't want to eat grass, nor can we eat grass. So, that's what we need to be doing. And there are great lifecycle analyses of these regenerative farms that show the soil content is increased. We are sequestering carbon into the soil. These cows are carbon negative. They sequester more carbon into the soil than they produced. What very few people understand is that carbon cycles have been happening throughout evolution on this planet for hundreds of millions of years. And that when a cow creates methane by burping, that goes into the atmosphere.

Dr. Paul Saladino:

It's oxidized to carbon dioxide, which is then inhaled by a plant and fixed into carbohydrates, which are then eaten by a cow. It's the same carbon atom that's been going round and round for millions of years. When you burn fossil fuel, you are liberating carbon that is stored in the bedrock of the earth, and that is new carbon in the atmosphere. So, we are not doing the same things here. Plants do not sequester carbon into the soil in the same way that animals do. So, monocrop agriculture is completely not sustainable. So, let's address the last piece of this, which is how scalable is grass fed grass finished regenerative agriculture? It's totally scalable, at least in the United States, right? It's extremely scalable. There are hundreds of thousands of acres of land that are being, they're laying fallow that are not being farmed because they've been monocrop by farmers.

Dr. Paul Saladino:

The conservation revert reserve program is a governmental program that pays these farmers millions of dollars a year to not farm this land. Well, the faster way to regenerate that land is by raising cattle on it and that's being done, but we could save hundreds of thousands of dollars, millions of dollars a year, hundreds of thousands of acres could be used for cattle and 99.5% of cattle are fed grass for 85% of their life. The only reason they go to feed lots and grain finishing is because people want that type of meat that's fattier. And because it drives the price down and you get a better price, there is enough land to raise all of the cattle we are doing today on grass feeding, and there's plenty of land to scale it.

Dr. Paul Saladino:

And so, let's put first things first. Let's not make the argument that says there are too many people on the earth to feed all the meat that we want to feed them. That's putting the cart before the horse. Let's figure out how humans are supposed to be healthy, and then let our smartest engineers and our smartest forest agronomists and our smartest agriculturalists and our smartest farmers figure out how to do this. And what would happen if we took a lot of the land that monocrop agriculture is growing plants on that are not healthy for humans, there is plenty of land in this country that could be ecosystems-based farming of animals, which is better for humans and better for the land.

Dr. John Berardi:

Yet, the idea that plant-based advocates are in favor of monocrop agriculture is a bit of a straw man argument itself. For example, Dr. Katz, isn't arguing for more monoculture.

Dr. David Katz:

Diet Debates and Purple States – Part 2 Transcript

It's actually much more tenable if we move incrementally in that direction, because the issue is if you haphazardly go from people who are just barely scraping by, in a mixed diet and say, "Okay, let's do a thought experiment. Let's remove the animal food from their diet. What kind of shape would they be in?" You're looking at populations that are protein marginal and amino acid marginal and other particular nutrients they may be deriving principally from animal food sources. And let's just expand the plants, populating their diets currently not improve the quality, but it's all plants now. So, if your diet was corn and a little bit of meat, now it'll be all corn.

Dr. David Katz:

Well, yeah, I mean, you can do a thought experiment where all the results of that are bad. Now, what we need to do is modify. So, we need to move away from monoculture to agricultural systems that are smaller decentralized, and people like Daniel Nierenberg at Food Tank are doing great work, examining different ways to produce food, but also you eradicate massive acreage turned over to monoculture, which is bad for the environment, leads to unbalanced eyes. And you focus on producing a variety of crops, crop rotation, essentially, plant predominant, regenerative, agricultural systems. And by the way, there is room in those systems for some animal food, it's just much less prominent than it is in terms of the global diet. There should be no dogma on the menu. Form should follow function.

Dr. David Katz:

The function of these steps should be to optimize the health of people who were already here. We have to do something about stabilizing the size of the human population, too. That's another discussion and preserving the native systems of the biosphere, so this planet remains viable, but we don't have to distribute everything equally. If there are places around the world where preserving access to meat and dairy is actually going to help people because they are prone to protein deficiency, we should preferentially direct those resources there. We don't have to eradicate them. So, again, I think it's a straw man argument. It's basically let's look at the plants people are eating today. Many people are nutritionally marginal with plants, plus animal food. Let's just take away the animal food and see what we've got. We've got insufficient diets, we've got deficient diets. Therefore, that can't work. That's a straw man version of what we're talking about.

Dr. John Berardi:

Okay. So, notice that while, it's easy to fixate on the differences in their arguments, there's probably some important overlap. Specifically, they clearly agree that monocropping is a problem. Also, they agree that if we hope to do better at feeding and expanding population, we need more sustainable regenerative agriculture that contributes quality food. Now whether the product of that should be mostly plants or mostly animals, no one really knows yet, not from an environmental standpoint or from a human health standpoint, more research and more innovation is clearly needed. Yet, we don't get any further if we conflate the two as Brian St. Pierre director of Nutrition for Precision Nutrition says:

Brian St. Pierre:

I want to be able to talk about them as two separate things, because eating purely for human health and longevity you might get certain answers. And if I'm eating purely for planetary health and longevity, I might come up to a maybe a whole different set of answers, but there's likely some stuff as purely overlapping.

Dr. John Berardi:

And that's likely where policy makers need to land in the overlap. Yet, as individuals, it's difficult to know what kinds of eating decisions will contribute more positively to planetary health.

Brian St. Pierre:

Diet Debates and Purple States – Part 2 Transcript

As an individual eater. I find it challenging to know like, "Oh, is this choice I'm making, is this better for the environment?" You hear all these little tactical things, oh replace almonds with some other healthy fat source that's far less water intensive. Okay, that's good, but how many people, I know this, but does my neighbor realize that almonds are really, water-intensive like, they're eating almonds. I mean, this is full of healthy fats, and if it's plant-based, it must be good for the planet, right? There aren't some really simple heuristics to follow that make it easier to make better choices there. And I think that's the challenge of it. In order to simplify it for the average consumer, you need to create some like relatively easy rules of thumb that people can follow to help them eat more environmentally friendly, right?

Brian St. Pierre:

To me, that's the only way it's going to work. And it needs to somewhat align with eating healthy for other goals, right? Just like people don't... If people only cared about the environment, everyone would drive a Prius, right? But that's clearly not what happens because people buy vehicles to serve all kinds of other purposes, right? To do all kinds of other jobs for them. And food is the same way. So there needs to be overlap with, "Okay, oh, and this also serves my health goal, my performance goal, my athletic goal", what have you.

Dr. John Berardi:

I asked Brian how he thinks about all this when it comes to his own diet and his families, and here's what he said.

Brian St. Pierre:

So, I've given more thought to that, and I try to include more plant-based protein foods, for example. So not rely so heavily on meat in my diet. So, we'll have tofu pretty regularly, probably like once or twice a week. It's one of our dinner options. So, I try to be a little less reliant on meat in particular because of potential concerns there, from contribution to climate change and I've had a lot of conversations about we have like, monocropping is a problem, right? But at the same time, like as an eater, I'm not always sure exactly what I can do about that. Right. And so, it's like, "Oh, okay, I'm eating Ezekiel bread", which has all kinds of different grains. Is that better? Is that better for the environment than just eating like a whole wheat bread?

Brian St. Pierre:

I don't know. I'm liking to think it is. They're using like some ancient type grains. Which, in theory, you're going to raise differently, require different inputs than like massive monocrop cultures. But at the same time, that's not always clear to me as an eater exactly what it is I can do. I go to my local Hannaford, right? My grocery store. And it's like, how can I tell how far this tomato traveled to get to me? And that's not always self-evident or easy to do. We need to have these conversations and get policy leaders to make decisions that will help enact whatever that evidence says is going to be most helpful. And how can we use less water, right. How can we start to promote crops that are less resource intensive?

Brian St. Pierre:

So maybe that means eating more beans because they're great cover crops that can then get turned into the soil. They're really helpful in some areas, maybe it's eating more tofu, which I'm okay with. We've found some good recipes. Eating a little less meat, finding other protein sources like crickets or insects that are accepted in a lot of parts of the world. So, my general thought is, as an individual eater, I find it challenging to know like, "Oh, it's this choice I'm making. Is this better for the environment?" And I tried to think broadly and think, okay, I'm not eating a ton of processed food, which has to go through a whole other set of processing and requires more electricity and more fossil fuel use to turn one thing into something else.

Brian St. Pierre:

Diet Debates and Purple States – Part 2 Transcript

So, in my mind, at least, that's helpful. And then I try to eat locally as much as we reasonably can. I don't go to the farmer's market too often, even though we have one here, like the timing of it's just not necessarily incredibly convenient for us, but while I'm at the store, it's like I'm choosing a lot of more organic options might help. Am I overly convinced it's going to make this massive difference? No, but I'm hoping as we have a larger conversation about climate change in a larger conversation about how food fits into that, that there are policy decisions that are made, that'll help change some of the structures going on there that are contributing to it. Right? Because it's a lot of big things behind the scenes that we don't really see.

Dr. John Berardi:

From Dr. Katz's vantage point. He says, it's simple.

Dr. David Katz:

Do I get a Tesla? Can't afford a Tesla. What else have you got? Well, you can eat more plants and less animals. It's the single most actionable thing an individual can do. So, yeah, solar power is great and wind power is great and carbon sequestration and all that, but probably the single most actual thing you can do is do not get a hamburger today, eat beans instead of beef, by the way, that would save everybody a lot of money there's all this fussing about the cost of more nutritious food. But there's one example where you could eat far better, save a lot of money.

Dr. David Katz:

If most of the time, most Americans ate beans when they otherwise would be eating beef that America could satisfy 60% of the greenhouse gas emission reduction pledge made in the Paris accord individual action could add up to most of the commitment made there with that single food substitution, which by the way, has also been shown in particular in a 2010 paper out of Harvard, by Adam Bernstein and colleagues, that offer major advantages in terms of cardiovascular risk. Just that one substitution of beans for beef, so better for your health, kinder and gentler better for the planet. It's just one example. So, I think making people aware of the opportunity to make a contribution, by the way better economically better for your health, kinder, gentler better for the planet.

Dr. John Berardi:

Yet, I recently read some interesting research suggesting that the biggest way any individual can contribute to say reducing their carbon footprint is to donate to the most effective nonprofits aimed at helping with climate change. Here's how that works. The average carbon footprint in the US which is the total amount of greenhouse gases generated per person per year is about 16 tons. Now, if you were to completely give up three things, and this would be a big ask your car, transatlantic flights and animal foods, you could reduce your total by about six tons, taking it down to 10. However, every dollar donated to the clean air task force, which is a group that lobbies the US government to reduce fossil fuel usage and invest in clean energy innovation has been shown to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by one ton.

Dr. John Berardi:

So, you donating a mere $6 would accomplish the same thing as giving up your car, air, travel and meet for an entire year. So, $16 would help neutralize your entire footprint for that year. $160 would help neutralize your footprint for a decade and 1600 would help neutralize your footprint for a century, if you were to live that long. Of course, this isn't to say that we can fix climate change with money alone or that individual actions don't matter. It's just that they may matter less than large scale societal changes and innovations. And those kinds of changes tend to happen more at the policy level than on our dinner plate.

Dr. John Berardi:

Diet Debates and Purple States – Part 2 Transcript

Okay, I'm going to take a little break here so I can talk about one of our sponsors, Precision Nutrition, while it may feel weird to have another set of nutrition ideas thrown into the mix of this episode. I want to let you know that precision nutrition is different. Their nutrition paradigm is completely agnostic, whether you're plant-based or keto or high carb or carnivore, they can help, but you don't even need to care about the name diets for precision nutrition to help that's because they offer something more, something they call Deep Health. Now deep health is defined as a balanced diet of fresh whole foods, sufficient exercise combined with genuine rest access to clean air and clean water, real human connection and sincere emotional expression, purpose, joy, and using your life in the service of them. So, it's not just about how people eat, although that's part of it.

Dr. John Berardi:

It's also about how they move, think, respond, solve problems, and exist in the world around them. If that sounds deep well, that's the point and it's what's made them the biggest nutrition coaching education and software company in the world. If you'd like to learn more about precision nutrition, including their number one rated nutrition certification program, plus get some incredible free resources to help you eat better, transform your health, maybe even help others do the same, please visit www.precisionnutrition.com\JB, my initials, free stuff awaits plus early access to PNs programs and a nice discount. Again, that's www.precisionnutrition.com\ JB. All right, back to the show. Beyond the plants versus animals debate. Another huge debate that's raged on for decades has focused on the ideal macronutrient split, how much protein, carbohydrate, and fat each person should be getting. And in what ratios. Yet, as Dr. David Katz mentions interest in macronutrient, prescriptions, maybe waning.

Dr. David Katz:

So, the reason that I renounced the macronutrient spaces, it's not helpful. It's very clear whether you're talking about RCTs or you're talking about population level experience, that you can have a really great diet or a really bad diet that is very low in fat or very high in fat. You can have a really great diet and by great, I mean, in every way, that matters, and I'll come to that in just a second or a really bad diet that's very high in carbohydrate or very low in carbohydrate. And so, it really depends, what are the foods? A diet that's made up of a balanced array of wholesome foods to which are kind of animal was natively adapted is apt to serve us well. And a diet that isn't will serve us ill. And you don't get that answer by stipulating a macronutrient threshold specifically with regard to fat and carbohydrate ones that prevail. We're a little more boxed in with regard to protein, but there's a range there too. And that's also not helpful.

Dr. John Berardi:

You'll notice that Dr. Saladino echoes Dr. Katz's statement.

Dr. Paul Saladino:

I want to be very clear that I don't subscribe to a particular macronutrient ratio as the one macronutrient ratio for humans. I think that humans appear to be able to thrive pretty well with a variety of macronutrient ratios. And that's a really good thing because there are certainly times depending on the latitude, when you will not have many carbohydrates available. And so, it's very good that humans can do beta oxidation and make ketones in the liver, and do this and be in ketosis. But I am not so dogmatic about macronutrient ratios.

Dr. John Berardi:

I spoke with Dr. Jason Fung author of the obesity code, and he too shies away from macronutrient prescriptions. Here's why.

Dr. Jason Fung:

Diet Debates and Purple States – Part 2 Transcript

The whole macro split thing, I actually don't think it's a useful conversation either. Because, again, this is the whole point of nutritionism, which is this whole idea that you can break down foods into their macronutrient composition and they will be the same. And again, it's not true. If you take beans and you take flour, like white bread, they're both carbohydrates, but the response of your body is again, completely different. So, for example, if you eat bread, you got amylopectin A, if you eat beans, you get amylopectin C, which is much less digestible and you get different effects, right? If you drink a lot of soda, for example, you have no effect on your satiety hormones, you eat a big pile of beans, all carbohydrate, right? A lot of carbohydrate there, you are going to have an effect on satiety.

Dr. Jason Fung:

So completely different. You eat a pile of beans, you're going to be full. You drink Coca-Cola and have a couple of cookies, you don't feel full, right? So again, completely different. So, this idea that, "Hey, if you simply have the same macro nutrients, it's going to have the same effect on your body", is false. It's just false. And again, in my book, the obesity code, I stayed away from saying 40% carbs or less or something like that, because I don't believe that. I don't think it's true when you need to do is avoid processed foods because processed foods have been changed in a way that our body doesn't really know what to do with. It applies too to refined carbohydrates, for example, and applies to refined oils. I think applies to refined meats too, like eating bologna is not the same as eating grass-fed beef, same thing with refined carbohydrates.

Dr. Jason Fung:

So, you take wheat, for example, now you're not eating wheat berries. What you've done is you've taken away all the fiber. You've taken away all the fat and you've essentially left a hundred percent carbohydrate, but you've done more than that because you've ground it to a very, very fine dust. So, you take flour, you throw it up it stays in the air. It's very, very fine. And what happens when it's very, very fine? Well, your absorption of those carbohydrate is going to be very high, right? So, instead of eating a bean, which has very low absorption, very slow uptake and so on, you've got this very, very fine dust of hundred percent carbohydrate, but didn't exist in nature because you had to process it to get it that fine. Well, that's going to have a different effect on you. It's going to have a different effect.

Dr. Jason Fung:

You've taken away the protein. So, there's no peptide YY. They've taken away all the fat because that's why stuff goes rancid. And therefore, you don't have [inaudible 00:28:48] and you don't have the satiety. You've taken away all the fibers, you don't activate the stretch receptors in the stomach. So, you don't have any satiety. Now you can eat a lot more of that than would be actually good for you. So, when you eat natural foods, there are natural ways that your body's going to respond in order to, for you to limit the amount of foods you're going to get full. So, if you eat meat, for example, you can go to a restaurant and you can, in Texas, they have these things eat 60 ounces in an hour, and we'll give it to your free. They're not giving away a lot of free steak, because you can't do it. You can't eat it. Very few people can eat it because that those natural satiety mechanisms and that's all down to the hormones again. Right? So, it's not about, I think this whole discussion about macronutrients is, in a sense, it's sort of misguided one.

Dr. John Berardi:

After talking to quite a few, two things became clear to me. First, the dogmatic discussion scene around macronutrient splits are sort of a problem of mistaking description for prescription. Let me explain what I mean, macronutrient ratios are often used in the research as one way to describe the composition of a diet that was used in the experiment, for example. What then happens is that people mistake that description for a prescription. And when they do, they miss important details about the actual food that was eaten.

Diet Debates and Purple States – Part 2 Transcript

Dr. John Berardi:

And the second thing that became clear to me is that most leading thinkers agree humans can thrive under a wide range of macronutrient intakes, as long as a couple things are true, protein needs are met, most of the diet comes from high quality, minimally processed food sources and overeating is kept in check. Yet, in spite of all the evidence, in spite of the fact that most experts agree that a wide range of macronutrients can support health, many people have a hard time leaving behind their affinity for a particular macronutrient split. For some like Brian St. Pierre, it may feel like these sorts of brand loyalties are a function of results.

Brian St. Pierre:

Obviously, it's struck some type of chord in them, like maybe eating this way, really worked for them. And you see that a lot, right? Where people buy into an approach because they saw tremendous results. And it's like, "Well, man, it must just be that no one else gets this. And I've got to spread this gospel to the rest of the world. They've got to understand like how much this works."

Dr. John Berardi:

But, as Matt Fitzgerald, author of Diet Cults points out, it likely also has something to do with identity.

Matt Fitzgerald:

In Diet Cults, I make the point that, I take sort of historical perspective, and I make the argument that morality as a phenomenon did not always exist. Certain animals have sort of, a biologist would tell you, have a proto-morality. Well, that's sort of where we started out. And if you go way back eons, when life was much simpler, no cell phones and all that. Well, where would morality have started? Where would it have gotten its foothold? I argue it was probably very likely in food. Initially, humans were the story of an ever-expanding dietary repertoire, right? Our ancestors left the trees. Well guess what? Different foods were on the ground. What we did a lot of is try foods and see what they did to our bodies. And there were a lot of experiments that obviously would have gone awry.

Matt Fitzgerald:

And so, you had sort of initially taboos would form around, donate that, it's not good for you, it's toxic. Do eat this, it is good for you. And so those laws, you can see how just over time they would become sublimated. And at some point they were no longer just about food. They were about our tribe doesn't eat that, let that tribe go ahead and eat it and get sick. And we think in 2020, the age of science and technology that we're doing something radically different than all of our dietary decisions are evidence-based and rational? Bologna. We're still up to the same whole games. And not that it's a bad thing. It's okay to have your identity interwoven with your food choices, but it's best to recognize that that is in fact what we're doing. And that's why it's only to be expected that the major dietary battles taking place today are to an extent proxy Wars for politics and ethics and morality and identity as well.

Dr. John Berardi:

This, again, brings us back to the same place, values. Truly, if you look closely enough, most nutrition debates are not based on clear human health data, but on values and on identity-based decision-making. Okay, so this is where we're going to end part two of this three-part series. In part one, we covered what is perhaps the biggest diet debate of the decade plants versus animals for human health and possible ways to reconcile the two. In part to what you just listened to, we covered two other debates, plants versus animals for environmental health and the ideal macronutrient split, looking for common ground among these also. And in part three, we'll cover a new concept called agnostic healthy eating that offers a refreshing way to think about good nutrition without adding more dogma to the menu. So, I hope

you'll come back and listen to the last part of this series. My goal is to help you look at nutrition in a new way, so you can make better eating decisions for yourself and better guide the decisions of those around you.

Dr. John Berardi:

Before we end, I want to make sure you don't miss out on something. Editing this show was sad for me because I did in-depth interviews with each of the guests, most of them lasting 90 minutes or more, and we had to whittle them down, which means a lot of insights were left on the cutting room floor. However, we're making those full interviews available right now for you totally free at the Dr. John Berardi show website. These interviews really are treasure troves of information, and to access them as well as the transcript of this main episode, you just listened to pop over to www.drjohnberardishow.com. Also, one more thing, if you like what we're doing with the show, please consider reviewing it on Apple Podcasts, clicking that little subscribe button on Apple, Google, or wherever you listen to us, also makes a difference. So, reviewing and subscribing, it helps a lot. Thanks for considering

Dr. John Berardi:

Before signing off. I'd like to thank our production team, Marjorie Korn, my research partner, and co-writer on the show Martin. DeSouza our producer and the team at Sound On Studio who take care of our sound management design and editing. You can learn more about them at soundonsoundoff.com and thanks to you for listening.