

Dr. David Jenkins

✓ 00:40 The theory is quite new and not necessarily the kind of thing we see in science. I think it's interesting. I think I'd rather say interesting because I'd rather have data to show how it works. What he's done is shown that it works on himself and a few friends. I mean you can make a best-seller out of that but not get everyone to follow.

✓ 1:13 I think it's a new theory. It's not been proved. He's tested it out on himself and a few friends and that's great. And he's got a potential best seller, but that doesn't make for a dietary strategy.

1:45 The theory is an interesting theory. I'm not sure that when people get less food they eat less. And I'm not sure that when people get more food they eat more. I think they eat more whether they've got less or more. I think all that happens is that your desire to eat overrides your distaste for the food when you're really hungry. And when you're not so hungry you'll continue eating. And our society unfortunately eats. We're eating machines. So when we've got plenty of food around we eat. When we don't, we eat what we can.

2:42 I wouldn't know if you get thin when food is scarce simply because you show self-restraint. I think when food is scarce, it is scarce and you get slim. If you put someone in a jail and don't feed them, they get slim. And I think calories in, calories out is really important.

3:25 In an time of famine, the sheer hunger overrides a persons flavour profile. They've shown in POW camps that people eat all sorts things that they never thought they would eat. When cities are under siege, people eat cats and dogs because they are so desperate. People on arctic expeditions eat all sorts of things when they're at the end of their rations. People even indulge in canabalism...and I don't know what the flavour profile is. And I don't know how you build that into the acedemic theory...4:14 but as far as I'm concerned, people are eating machines. There are certain chemicals that may turn them on more and certain ones that turn them off rather less, but I'm not sure that his concept of linking this with the Paleolithic diet holds a lot of water.

4:33 I don't know what works about his idea because I've seen no data but I find it very interesting that he chooses a bland oil as one of his components of his satiety intermeal regime. He chooses something that low glycemc index (fructose vs glucose dialogue...)  
...

6:22 What doesn't work...

7:07 You may eat less if you're taking oil and sugar simply because: 2 things, not a particular palatable concoction...people can vomit...

8:04 It's true that fat will stimulate CCK a hormone that is associated with satiety. So that may be one thing. But fat is not the most satiating of the nutrients. They have a ranking. Protein, carbohydrate and then fat. In terms of your ranking for satiety with a given calorie load for a nutrient.


--- Anderson... Volumetrics... lower GI... that may play into the role

9:51 He's got some very interesting phenomenon. But we've got to see that they're proved. My concern is that people should read the book, I shouldn't say with a grain of salt, but actually do some self-experimentation themselves. I think that the self-experimentation part is the interesting part of the book. Because there I think you've found someone who's found something that works for him. We may not be able to explain it readily in terms of science, but he follows a long tradition. From John Hunter who was the founder in the late 18<sup>th</sup> 19<sup>th</sup> century, the founder of medical science, who did lots of experiments on himself. He infected himself with syphilis.


10:43 The stories about... tells of Roger Bannister. Who did the 3 minute mile. Student in Oxford... studied respiration. The idea of the experiment on yourself and then looking that data and using it for purposes of lifestyle attainment is a very old one. We in fact look to the Glycemic Index of fructose and did it on ourselves. So that's why I was interested that he used fructose and was a self-experimenter. So I think the self-experimentation is very interesting. Because it suggests that here's someone who is perhaps bucking conventional wisdom, trying things on himself, sees what works. And that's great. And if he can find a few friends on which it works even better, because then he makes more friends. But if he writes a good book and many people find it works then this is a success and something that I think something that we'd want to explore further in terms of the scientific underpinnings. But write now it's not clear what the scientific underpinnings are and I think that's the concern.

12:21 I think what you've got is the old series of one subject. And that is very difficult to build a hypothesis on. Once you've build the hypothesis which he has and got a routine that people can adopt, then you really have to see if it works in numbers of people. And once it does, this becomes a phenomenon that needs investigation. Right now it's a concept. We can't really call it a phenomenon. One swallow a summer doesn't make. One swallow doesn't lose weight. So it means that we've got to look at this more carefully.

13:11 I have absolutely no qualms about doing this particular experiment. As you say, it's cheap, it's safe, it's environmentally friendly, what more could you want in terms of a weightloss diet, so hence the term Shang-Ri La, I would agree. I hope it works out for him, we can't tell at present, we don't have the numbers, we don't really have a clear logic for the scientific underpinning. Though he's given us a scientific underpinning, it's not one that many of us in the nutrition field, at this point, feel particularly comfortable with. There are some reasons, the volumetrics, the lower GI is another. But those need to be fashioned a little more closely, and certainly more numbers of people, before that becomes a theory that we can investigate.



14:41 I think everyone wants a diet like this. It looks like an almost magic bullet where you then eat what you would normally and you rely entirely on your senses to guide you. You don't have to show immense restraint. I'm afraid I may sound a bit old-fashioned but I believe that the best achievements that we make are with a lot of strain and a lot of sweat. And I feel happy for people that they may try this because it may work for them. But I'm also somewhat worried that there doesn't seem to be enough grinding of teeth and hardship in the whole thing to make it actually lose pounds. So I don't know, I don't know. I'm not going to prejudge it on that basis. I just have this horrible feeling that everything seems to come with such hardship and work and determination...that something that says it can just do it and do it for you...is Shangri-La.



15:57 My skepticism is probably that it is too easy. And I feel that weight is really such a pervasive problem in our society and people have to have so many strategies and we fail so often ... I've if you like, become jaded and not prepared to accept a bright new idea just on the face of it. I'm very happy to accept a bright new idea when it looks as if it has worked in a number of people in a study that's been done fairly carefully. And if it was shown that just doing this works, I think that all of us would be turning our heads to this particular direction.

SK question on ditto foods.

18:00 I think that's an interesting view. Let me give you another interpretation. I think we've got a far greater range of foods and tastes that are available to us in N.A. than our forebears did. They had some very common foods. Oatmeal for bfast. Tasted the same. Meat and 2 veg. That was basically the main lunch. Breadpudding, fruit. Food was not that palatable. He's right about the packaged foods, I'd agree. The packaged goods represent the enormous amount of competition we've had over the last 100 years from the industrial sector making things that are so tasty ... you must sell more. They must eat more...company becomes big and strong...person becomes big and fat. Now we are thrusting people, stone age people into an environment that they've never been prepared for genetically of all these tremendously good foods to eat and no wonder we eat so much. And the other thing is that we don't exercise...(washing machine example)...bankrupt...electric toothbrush...So put the two together. A hundred years of intense competition in food industry and expend ...prescription for a catastrophe and that's what we're seeing.

21:04 Every set point is overpowered by the palatability of a variety of foods. It's not a ditto. I think they've been very careful..cinnamon...given tremendous variety...you can't find a flavour profile that isn't occupied.

22:30 We've given such a variety...everyone is looking for a new flavour...go and look for new things. Companies are trying to change all the time.

23:38 It's true, there was an uproar when they tried to change classic Coke with new Coke, had to bring it back, there are something that people ... people really want to have new flavours. Oatmeal was homogenous.

24:04 I don't believe that people want a complex flavour everyday. Bland you can take. We have such a lot of things ...that's the problem...

25:31 Cafeteria rats...when you people a variety of foods , they may eat more of them...

27:00 Sarah tries to clarify...reads quote...

28:00 SK

28:30 Nobody

29:54 I don't know if the constancy of profile means anything. I think it's the variety of appealing profiles. That's what is our problem. I don't think the constancy means anything.

30:41 .... Sarah tries to explain again...200 hundred calorie explanation.

31:26 I wouldn't deny the fact that if people eat foods that are really tasty, that melt in the mouth they'll want more. So I agree with that. You maybe to override satiety and have one more. Choclates...because it tastes really food. I think that it's the variety, not the constancy. Variety of really palatable things that taste tremendously good.



33:13 Can I put it this way. The idea is wonderful. I'm enchanted with the idea, I hope it works, but I cannot see the rosy light at the end of the tunnel. If he can manage to shine the light through the tunnel and come out the other end 40 pounds slimmer or whatever it is, good for him, you know what I mean, and if other people can follow him this is great. I'm just saying that I think looking at the immense problem that we've got with body weight control, the fact that it is one of our preeminent problems of today, the solution that he proposes is so nice, that it truly is too good to be true and I can't see it working without a lot more gnashing of teeth, and sweat and blood and tears and all the things people have to do to show self restraint. If he can make it work by simply a little oil and vinegar..oil and sugar water table spoon, then brilliant. Let's go for it and then all work on what the science is. I'm delighted to show if it works, my nose isn't out of joint and I can't predict it, put it that way, I'm just skeptical because I've been in the game long enough to become skeptical. And I hope it's seen as healthy and not destructive.

35:26...because...we're skeptical...we'd say it wasn't connected to the illness. Too..

35:48 I wish it good luck, with the operative word being wish and the other being luck.

36:00 The set point theory is an old one. It has a lot of complex science that has gone in behind it both in terms of amino acid theory and hormone levels....I think it's very

difficult to bridge the psychology from where he comes and the science from where we come from. I'm not saying the bridge doesn't exist. The tools that he's got rudimentary. And since in academia everyone loves to have a theory and a mechanism, without that nobody does anything, one's left watching cautiously.

A 37:05 The phenomenon is the important thing. If he can prove this phenomenon, who cares about the theory if it can save us all from gaining extra weight, so go for it. But the mechanism is the difficult for me.

37:35 You try it. You do a little self-experimentation.

38:00 People are always looking for what can change the set point. But ones thinking in terms of set point, which is something that shifts up and down that easily. Everyone wants to know about it. Everyone will want to buy into it. Again, we have to see the phenomenon. The theory will not overcome people in the scientific world, with enthusiasm. On the other hand, to show the phenomenon works, then everyone, regardless of mechanism will get enthusiastic.

39:00 Wide shot of sitting. "You've got copious not."

39:24 Does he sound a passionate person? Does he think he needs to put it to experiment.

40:21 That always worries me. I think that when somebody says that, it's self evident to anyone, I really wonder about that. That's because the simplest things undergo big studies....describe NIH...115 million weight loss + exercise... just to see whether that works...

41:05 The day that simple things were not put to study are gone. We actually more enthusiastic to study. In the scientific world, that's not our approach. We think that if it's simple that's even more reason to put it to a study. Go for it.

## TAPE 2

00:30 Do a simple study...

00:55 The horrible truth...Huck Finn

2:06 Nail phenomenon. Just nail it. Then all the academics burrow around in their little warrens. You won't get them active...you really got to make it.

3:15 Why not test fat academics at UC Berk.

6:10 I'm not against this. Long history of self-experimentation. Just happens to not be fashionable these days. Because of the new ethics guidelines. Need to be revise. Certain amount very useful. Have to be dispassionate.

7:00 If it's so jolly simple...get 5 buddies who are overweight...not a big study...just do that to show that it works well. Doesn't have to be massive. Doesn't have to slim down Berk.

8:06 Jenkins reading book. Various shots... good commentary.

9:00 Can see book title.

9:51 Book cover...interesting ideas...mix ideas that you recog...with ideas that are more original and you'd really like to see some proof.\*\*\*

10:29 Reverse shot...see Seth photo.

10:47 Side view...with portrait...

11:20 Changes within a few days. Book cover...

11:31 What did you have to do? And that's it. Book cover...co-author of Freakonomics.