

Re: The critics agree: you don't need to supplement with "essential fatty acids."

Re: The critics agree: you don't need to supplement with "essential fatty acids."

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.nutrition/2006-03/msg00553.html>

- *From:* "montygram" <nazztrader@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 25 Mar 2006 00:59:48 -0800
-

I did not list my supplement usage, but remember that the vitamin/mineral requirements assume that a certain amount of stress is present. For example, "vitamin E" deals with lipid peroxidation, so if there's not much of that going on, you may not need any supplementation. In some old people who are in very good health and take no supplements, vitamin E levels are found to be optimal.

I do eat an occasional carrot, but again, no fatty acids there. Leafy greens have anti-nutritive qualities, though I do use herbs and spices in small amounts (parsley, basil, oregano, etc.). Legumes should be fermented if you are going to eat them regularly or in large amounts once in a while.

Let's get back to the point of this post: do you need to supplement with "essential fatty acids?"

Now, if you've read my old posts, you know that my meticulous examination of the evidence finds nothing to be gained by doing so, and plenty of risk involved.

However, those who attack these posts make contradictory claims: some say that I am getting plenty of "EFAs" on my diet and cannot be "essential fatty acid deficient" (and thus have had the arachidonic acid in my cells replaced with the Mead acid), while others say that I must be doing terrible damage to myself, despite 4 years of seeing only benefits. This is one reason why I will only get involved in long responses at this point if we have a moderated, academic-style debate, me against one of them at a time.

Thus, at this point I will make clear to those interested that "science" cannot trump logic. They must be consistent with each other. If something is "essential," there must be an amount that is needed that can possibly have a physiological effect, and moreover, there must be symptoms of a "disorder" if one does not obtain this amount.

The professional literature is clear: my diet should not supply enough "EFAs." The professional literature is wrong about "EFAs," as I have shown, but if you want to defend the professional literature on this

Re: The critics agree: you don't need to supplement with "essential fatty acids."

Re: The critics agree: you don't need to supplement with "essential fatty acids."

point, then you cannot do so by disagreeing with it. If it is wrong, then a new hypothesis needs to replace it, and my critics have continually refused to state their position as a scientific hypothesis, and thus, again, there is no point in getting involved in a "point/counterpoint" type of situation with them, unless they agree to a formal debate.

One recently said that he would not state a hypothesis because I don't, which is false (and leads me to believe what I've suspected for a while, that is, he/she only reads parts of my posts). I not only have stated my hypothesis, but have proposed an experiment to demonstrate that it is accurate (which is something scientists are supposed to do after they propose the hypothesis).

Here it is, once again:

Primates, dogs, pigs, rats, and many other mammals will live longer lives if they consume a common lab diet with 30% of their calories coming from fresh coconut oil, as opposed to a diet of 30% canola/safflower/fish oil. Basic vitamin/mineral supplement only. Anyone can take me up on this experimental offer, but you must put the money for all expenses in escrow, and if I am correct, that money will not be refunded to you, but will pay for the experiment. If I am wrong, I will pay for all expenses and you will get your money back.

As I have demonstrated before, all the experiments to date, which have been done on animals, have been flawed. A fat free diet versus a mixed fat diet has been used, or else a high safflower diet is compared to a diet in which safflower oil and fish oil are consumed. They never compare a group of animals, once they reach adulthood and are in good health, that eat fresh coconut oil as their fat source versus any combination of the common highly unsaturated oils of today. Sometimes they look for "markers," but then don't see which animals actually lived longer. My hypothesis is unrelated to "markers." Most people want to live long lives in at least fairly good health and would prefer this to good "markers" and an early death or poor health, so "markers" are only relevant if they correlate with what people want, not what the scientific establishment uses to make itself feel better, to get funding, to receive tenure, etc.

But again, if we just use logic at its most basic, there are only a few possibilities: either my diet is sufficient in terms of "EFAs," in which hardly any American should even consider supplementing, OR "EFAs" need to be consumed in far larger amounts than my present diet supplies, in which case I should have seen symptoms more than 3 years ago (not benefits), OR the "EFA" claim is just a misinterpretation of the evidence (as I have demonstrated in previous posts).

My most persistent critic, "MattLB," insists that my diet is sufficient. Even if we ignore the fact that most nutritionists disagree with him, there is no doubt that if I have replaced the arachidonic acid in my

Re: The critics agree: you don't need to supplement with "essential fatty acids."

Re: The critics agree: you don't need to supplement with "essential fatty acids."

cells with Mead acid, then he is undeniably WRONG. There is no other possibility. Thus, I have made an offer to him (and anyone else): put the money in escrow, then I will do the test to see what my Mead acid level is, and if it is clearly in the "essential fatty acid deficient" range, he will pay for the expenses. If I have a "normal" level of arachidonic acid and/or EPA (the omega 3 analogue), I will pay for the expenses.

This is very simple. One need not be a professor of logic to see that there are only a few possibilities, at most, and that simple experiments can demonstrate who is correct. I am willing to spend my own money on this if I am not correct, but of all the critics, none is willing to take me up on any of these offers.

Perhaps someone who is not biased on this issue would be so kind as to ask these individuals why they have no interest in doing so, but at this point, as I said, I will wait for a moderated debate, rather than write up the same kinds of responses that I already have in many previous threads.

.