

Re: fats used to replace trans fats are dangerous

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.med.nutrition/2007-03/msg00244.html>

- *From:* monty1945@xxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* 19 Mar 2007 13:53:22 -0700
-

I'll add that my general rule of thumb for baked goods is that it has to be fat free or nearly so (and with very little or no cholesterol), or else the fat has to be at least 75% saturated. If it is, I don't care about "trans fat" – that is not an issue. The unsaturated bonds make such foods unhealthy, not the type of bonds. The old nutritional textbooks make this point, but it's been ignored because the people in charge have an ideological committment to the notion that "saturated fat" causes this or that "disease." In fact, the are not even willing to define "saturated fat" in a way that would allow for experimentation. Lard, now about 40% saturated, is called a "saturated fat," which makes no sense whatsoever. Most such studies really show that those who eat more pork products are less healthy than those who do not, which does make sense (saturated fatty acids have nothing to do with it). On my site, I quote recent molecular-level evidence that explains exactly why such food (pork, "red" meat, and "processed" meat) is so unhealthy. There is also evidence showing that steamed salmon and leftover skinned chicken are very unhealthy.

My free site is at:

<http://groups.msn.com/TheScientificDebateForum->