

# Re: Raw or cooked, which is more nutritious

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.med.nutrition/2005-08/msg00234.html>

---

- *From:* "Laurie" <[no@xxxxxxxx](mailto:no@xxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Thu, 4 Aug 2005 14:21:57 -1000
- 

<calypso47@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

[news:42d7d8d4\\$0\\$17237\\$4d5ecec7@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:42d7d8d4$0$17237$4d5ecec7@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

> The raw food example is one such where the assertion is made  
> that cooking destroys nutritional elements and food is best eaten raw, ...  
Biochemical texts agree.

> "Many people believe that fresh fruits and vegetables always contain  
> more nutrients than cooked ones, but cooked carrots have higher  
> levels of antioxidants than fresh carrots. Cooking carrots in the  
> presence of a small amount of oil or butter increases the amount of  
> two antioxidants called beta carotene and phenolic acid.

This approach is called "the quantitative lie". One trivial example is chosen and the implication is that it can be applied globally, when it can not.

"Cooking carrots in the presence of a small amount of oil or butter increases the amount of ..." is intentionally-misleading because the oil will dissolve more of the fat-soluble nutrients and possibly make them more readily available, but what about the other 300 nutritional chemicals in the carrot?

Cooking does NOT "increase the amount of" nutrients. Heat can not create molecules out of nothing.

> Cooking also increases the amount of lycopene you get from tomatoes.  
Nope, it is the solubility in oil.

> Cooking breaks the plant cells open to increase the absorption of these  
> antioxidants and other beneficial plant chemicals.

It also breaks cell walls to make ~10 times as much starch available, and that is the reason for the tendency of people on a high starch diet toward obesity.

> Adding a little

> oil or butter increases absorption of fat soluble chemicals.

But, it does not "increase the amount" as previously claimed. One can readily add oil to a raw salad to get this solubility-effect without cooking.

> Most of the nutrients in food (minerals, proteins, fats, carbohydrates)

Re: Raw or cooked, which is more nutritious

> are not destroyed by heat, ...

Not "destroyed", but rather their biological activity has been severely reduced, or eliminated, by the denaturing of proteins and protein complexes and the oxidation of various nutrients. In addition, hundreds of foreign/toxic Maillard Reaction products and carcinogens are created by cooking.

<http://www.ecologos.org/denature.htm>

> ... and many common foods are unpalatable or unsafe if

> they are not cooked.

Irrefutable evidence that they should not be eaten.

Laurie

---

• *Follow-Ups:*

◆ **Re: Raw or cooked, which is more nutritious**

◇ *From:* Enrico C

• Prev by Date: **Re: q What foods that will not make me tired after lunch?**

• Next by Date: **Re: I know nothing about nutrition and have to feed myself...HELP!!!**

• Previous by thread: **monty's high protein failure**

• Next by thread: **Re: Raw or cooked, which is more nutritious**

• Index(es):

◆ **Date**

◆ **Thread**