



*The*  
**Great**  
**FRUITARIAN**  
*Debate!*

**Between Dr. T. C. Fry & Dr. Ralph Cinque**

**Proving that we are not natural vegetation eaters  
& debunking the “faults” of fruitarianism**

**Dr. T. C. Fry**



# The Great Fruitarian Debate

## Between T. C. FRY and DR. RALPH CINQUE

- 🍏 Proving that we're natural fruit eaters, not natural vegetation eaters.
- 🍏 Revealing why the fruit diet is more than adequate in its nutrient complement because nutrient norms are established on skewed and false medical norms based on statistics with diseased people who are not normal.
- 🍏 Fruitarianism tell you how well they're doing on the fruitarian diet.
- 🍏 Revealing that the "faults" of fruitarianism are baseless and unscientifically ascribed.
- 🍏 Showing that fruits are environmentally friendly while all other diets are earth-exploitative and contribute to destruction.

---

A VERY SPECIAL NOTICE TO THE READER: Even though Dr. Cinque and I are, literally at each other's throats in the matter debated here, I assure you we remain the best of friends. Dr. Cinque and I differ on some scores and go at it hammer and tong as in this case. Yet I admire Dr. Cinque's profound scholarship and his ability to do deep and original thinking and, better yet commit it to paper in a meaningful and comprehensible language for the benefit of readers and scholars. I again assure you, that despite the mudslinging and name-calling, we're the best of friends! These amount to intellectual exercises built around very serious subject matters, which we both hope will illuminate your way.

---

**By Dr. T. C. Fry**

©2010 David Klein, Ph.D.

Online Webstore:

[www.vibrancemagazine.com](http://www.vibrancemagazine.com)

# THE BEGINNING OF A VERY ILLUMINATING DEBATE!

---

## Intellectual Dishonesty About Fruitarianism

---

### A FRUITARIAN WRITES *HEALTH SCIENCE*, A PUBLICATION OF THE AMERICAN NATURAL HYGIENE SOCIETY

Dear Mr. Fry,

Enclosed is a copy of my letter to *Health Science* and an answer which they made. You just won't believe how much they edited my letter.

My letter stood up for your irrefutable proofs that humans are frugivores.

*Health Science* says there is nothing in the scientific literature to support that humans are fruitarians even though you cite scientific sources in the lesson including, most importantly, reference to our innate preferences for fruits over all foods should we have to eat raw as we did in nature.

How do you regard *Health Science's* stand?

*Bridget Spies, your student in Louisville, KY.*

The following was published in "HEALTH SCIENCE" for July/August 1995:

## **Fruitarian diet--**

I noticed in the May/June issue of *Health Science* magazine in the "Your Questions" section (p. 22) that Dr. Ralph C. Cinque says that vegetables are actually more important than fruits."

I have read in a correspondence course that humans are natural fruit eaters, and that an all-fruit diet amply furnishes our needs. It states that we can maintain a very high level of health by eating a variety of fruits.

*Bridget Spies, Louisville, KY*

## **ANHS RESPONDS TO BRIDGET**

*The American Natural Hygiene Society does not recommend a fruitarian diet, either all fruit or mostly fruit. There is nothing in the scientific literature to support the fruitarian diet, and the practical experience of the Society is that those individuals who try this approach to diet are not able to maintain a high level of health. The Society recommends a plant-based diet consisting of fresh fruits and vegetables; conservatively cooked vegetables, potatoes and grains; and the variable addition of unheated nuts and seeds.*

**MR. FRY'S RESPONSE:** I have refrained from criticizing the American Natural Hygiene Society and its positions for the past nineteen years that I've been publishing hygienic literature. They do a lot of good on the health scene. When people in the same canoe fight, they're likely to capsize and both sides lose.

Even the literature that is published by American Natural Hygiene Society states that we are frugivores. Though they do not recommend or follow the fruitarian diet, its practitioners will tell you that we are biological frugivores rather than omnivores, graminivores, herbivores, insectivores, carnivores, etc.

Of course, the scientific literature is replete with the evidential bases for our fruitarianism. Only ignoramuses wouldn't know that. And to make a flat statement that our fruitarian nature is not supported by the scientific literature is to display a total ignorance of the scientific literature. In fact, the statements smack of intellectual dishonesty more than ignorance because I know they know better!

Even if there were no scientific literature in support of fruitarianism, does that, *ispo facto*, lend credence to the dietary advocated by the American Natural Hygiene Society?

Anyone who can read the May, 1995 issue of *Discover* about spider monkeys, chimps and humans and deny what a research anthropologist for 20 years says about the human fruitarian disposition would have to be dishonest. The same goes for what is said in the *Scientific American* for March, 1995 about the Bonobos, the apes with many human traits who are more fruitarian than the chimps whose dietary is about 97% fruitarian.

Humans are scientifically classified as frugivores because our structure, physiology, innate instincts and every other criteria reveal that to be so.

Rather than rely upon the intellectual perversions of the ANHS writer who expects us to rely upon the presumed authority of assertion and misstatement, let's rely upon innate human instincts for our answers as to what our biological disposition is.

If you were to offer a baby a baked potato and a piece of watermelon, which do you think it would naturally choose? If you offered it a bowl of cereal and a ripe banana, which do you think it would naturally choose? If you offered it some muskmelon or a collard leaf, which do you think it would take? That which you think it would choose is actually what you, innately, would choose!

There are now thousands of total fruitarians in America. Most do eat some nuts. Personally, I eat a small amount of vegetables and some nuts and seeds. My intake is more that 95% fruits when you consider that red peppers, avocados and tomatoes are fruits. In fact, avocados have the same composition as many nuts (notably pecans) except that avocados are more nutrient-rich and is predigested when ripe.

How a fruitarian diet fails to furnish our nutrient needs has never been substantiated by the literature from ANHS or anywhere else. The fact that fruitarians are so healthy they require less of everything and all nutrients is not on the minds if those who make statements like ANHS via Dr. Cinque. They're into nutrient gluttony and tables of composition. What you see in all this non-fruit fare is not what you get! How heat-deranged complex carbohydrates like potatoes and grains supply any presumed deficiencies

of fruits is not set forth. It appears that we're supposed to accept the *Health Science* recommendations on the strength of say-so alone.

The Nutritional Research Council of the American Academy of Sciences, in their book, *Diet, Nutrition and Cancer*, points out the pathogenic nature of heated starches, fats and proteins. The destruction and derangement of nutrients begin at 118 degrees, a temperature far below steaming and baking. Certainly, it shocks me to think that a writer for *Health Science* can be ignorant of such key knowledge as this.

In his article in the September 23, 1983 article in *Science* magazine, Dr. Bruce Ames pointed out the carcinogens in virtually every vegetable there is, especially potatoes which are plant-based. I'm happy to publish an article about this--from Dr. Cinque of all people!

As the American Natural Hygiene Society position is unnatural and contrary to health science, their use of the title "natural hygiene" in their title is no longer appropriate.

The direction of ANHS away from health science and Natural Hygiene is characterized by the title change of the professional organization under their banner. They now call themselves physicians which term is strictly that of medical practitioners--those who physic, that is, those who give purgatives or laxatives for the constipated and drugs for catharsis.

Throughout my writings and lessons, I have cited ample scientific literature that establishes our fruitarian

disposition. In this arena, I am a world-class heavyweight. I do not yield to puny intellects. The folks at ANHS have cited zilch in support of their position. All they've displayed so far is their particular bias in the matter. I challenge them to trot out their prize intellectual stallions with the data to back up their recommendations. Anecdotal assertions will not cut the ice.

What ANHS does recommend is so great an improvement over the conventional dietary that I wish them every success in promoting it. It's better to be a little sick than a lot sick. However, let's not be so intellectually vacuous and dishonest as to invoke the aura of science in support of a scientifically insupportable position. As some of their spokesmen in the past have characterized it--it's the optimum diet in the face of present reality.

Personally, I go along with Dr. Herbert M. Shelton's masthead, "Let's have the truth though the heavens fall."

---

## **DR. RALPH CINQUE RESPONDS TO MR. FRY'S CHALLENGE**

A Reply to Mr. Fry

*by Dr. Ralph Cinque*

It is quite true that I made the statement in *Health Science* that "vegetables are actually more important than fruits." Here is what I based it on: you could not avoid vegetables for a lifetime and eat only fruits without becoming nutritionally impaired. However, if you were to avoid fruits



and eat only a wide variety of vegetables, you could live very well for a very long time. There are no nutrients contained in fruits that are not found in equal or greater amounts in vegetables. The same cannot be said vice versa. Therefore, vegetables, in their entirety, have more to offer than fruits, in their entirety. I admit that it would be a shame to miss out on the enjoyment of eating fruits, and I have no wish for anyone to do so. I adore fruits and I eat them abundantly. But nevertheless, I still think that vegetables are more crucial to health.

I have often said that there are three screens by which to evaluate diets. The first is philosophy. "What foods are natural to man? What is man's dietetic character? What did humans eat when the race was young? Such questions are interesting, provocative and important. However, they are not the only considerations in studying diet. Mr. Fry attempts to make natural philosophy the only criteria by which to examine the subject. The second is science, that is, the number crunching of nutrition. "What does biochemistry tell us about the human need for specific nutrients, and what is the best way to dismiss the body of knowledge completely. The third is empiricism. "What has experience shown us to be the best diet in terms of objective measurable outcome assessments, (that is, *results*)? Philosophy, Science and Empiricism: this is the triad and true by which knowledge is applied to better human life. All three are worthy of inclusion in any rational inquiry.

Fruitarianism scores high in the first category, philosophy. There is no denying that. But, how does it stack up in the

other categories? Regarding science, I refer you to the awesome text, *Food Reform: Our Desperate Need* by Robin Hur. Mr. Hur devotes a chapter to fruit and nut diets, and here is how he sums up his findings, based on four years of scientific research at the University of Texas, Austin:

"The most likely deficiencies from the fruit and nut diet are vitamin B-12, pantothenic acid, biotin, vitamin K, molybdenum, zinc, selenium and iodine. Shortages of vitamin E, folacin, chromium, and manganese could also occur. And less delicate chosen fruit and nut diets could be low in calcium, iron, riboflavin, niacin, thiamin, vitamin C, and even protein.

Supplementing fruit and nut diets with greens and sprouts can eliminate potential deficiency except vitamin B-12, while a little algae can easily cover B-12 needs. Thus, fruits and nuts, with the addition of sprouts, greens and algae can provide a complete diet and a good one.

(I should point out here that, although Mr. Fry condemns fresh water algae, he does advocate the use of dulse, which is a salt water algae, that is high in sodium, lead and arsenic, and which contains carbohydrates that are completely indigestible by humans. Also, the vitamin B-12 in salt water algae has proven to be completely unusable by humans. Whoever called this grungy seaweed a "weed" knew what he was talking about.)

What about the last category, empiricism? In over 20 years of professional practice, I have noticed numerous problems in strict fruitarians. The most grave have

concerned pregnant women and children. Women who go through pregnancy on all-fruit or mostly fruit diets, give birth to feeble newborns. Tragically, I have seen this happen time and time again, where I usually find out about it after the fact. I can't state strongly enough that an all-fruit diet is not adequate during pregnancy. Don't jeopardize the health and life of your baby. Eat a completely nourishing diet during pregnancy. Moreover, children too do not grow and develop adequately on an all-fruit diet. They remain thin, weak, prone to acute illness, hypersensitive, obsessed with food (they want to eat all the time instead of play--that's the telltale sign). Don't shortchange your children by feeding them only fruit. They will not thrive on such a diet.

I don't doubt Mr. Fry's claim that on many days he, himself, does eat only fruit. But, I also note that, when he does eat vegetables, he eats them in prodigious quantity. I have seen Mr. Fry eat a whole head of broccoli, several leaves of bok choy, several stalks of celery, a whole head of romaine lettuce and several tomatoes at one sitting. Even if he only eats salads two or three times a week, I assure that represents a lot of vegetables. Mr. Fry may say that he is "deviating" the days he eats vegetables, but I assure you that those deviations are what is keeping him alive and in robust health at age 69. Mr. Fry knows as well as I do that at times one does tire of the sweet taste of fruit. By having a non-sweet vegetable meal periodically, one renews one's appreciation for fruit, and it makes the subsequent fruit meals all the more enjoyable.

Mr. Fry's problem is that he is too philosophical. He eats vegetables nearly as much as anyone, and yet he wants to go down in history as the great fruit advocate. But, I have this advice for Mr. Fry and this comes from the heart:

"T. C., there are a great many evils in the world, but vegetables are not among them. Don't waste your energy and creativity declaring war on vegetables. People are still smoking cigarettes. They are still drinking alcohol. They are taking drugs (including street drugs, prescription drugs and over-the-counter drugs) in greater numbers and amounts than ever before. They are still eating artery-clogging meats and dairy products. They are putting horrible fats on their foods, such as butter, margarine, mayonnaise and oil. Go after the real enemies. Hone in on the real villains. Accept that some people will eat more fruits and some people would prefer to eat more vegetables. Let them decide the exact proportions for themselves as long as they make a point to include both. Fruits and vegetables are both wholesome natural foods of the first order. They are equal partners in the glorious mission of providing sustenance to human life. We don't have to decide which one is better. We don't have to choose one over the other. Both are good. Both are first rate. Both deserved to be championed by the likes of T. C. Fry."

---

## **IN RESPONSE TO DR. RALPH CINQUE'S DOWNPLAYING THE VALUE OF FRUITS**

I'm happy to respond to Dr. Cinque's defense of the statement that "vegetables are actually more important than fruits." We are dealing with words that have many and varied meanings. Dr. Cinque elects to defend vegetables as being more important than fruits in our diets by distinguishing between that category of foods which are seed-bearing and ripen and non-woody plants (leaves, stems, vines and stalks) themselves except for root and tubers.

Vegetarians popularly regard everything eaten that's not of animal derivation as vegetarian. This includes fruits. On the other hand, by definition, the word vegetable and vegetarian both derive from a Latin root, vegetus, which means foods that are "animating, enlivening and invigorating."

Plants are popularly regarded as vegetables as distinguished from fruits which are regarded as most seed-bearing products of plant, stalk, vine or tree which produce ultra delicious flesh to entice consumption from biological symbionts with views to getting their seeds distributed.

Humans have been into fruit culture for nearly a million years as cited in the scholarly volume, *THE RECOVERY OF CULTURE*, by Henry Bailey Stevens. Vegetables have been treasured by the human palate to a limited extent only for the past 10,000 years. The most popular

lettuce of today other than head lettuce is called Cos or Romaine lettuce. It was developed in Cos, Greece during Hippocrates time nearly 2,500 years ago. Hippocrates lived and conducted fasts in the Temple of Cos.

We'll have to make a distinction between vegetation and vegetables. Vegetation comprises the bulk of what is popularly referred to as vegetables. Popularly, grains are not regarded as vegetables though part of the vegetarian fare.

Popularly, legumes are not regarded as vegetables though part of the vegetarian fare with this exception: Fresh green beans and peas and bean/pea sprouts are regarded as vegetables.

Popularly, nuts and seeds are not regarded as vegetables though part of vegetarian fare.

In view of the various applications of the word vegetable, Dr. Cinque's use of the term means vegetation in most minds when he really means to include tubers, roots, nuts, seeds, grains and bean family members as well as vegetation.

If by vegetables he referring to vegetation, he loses he contention immediately: About 85% to 90 % of the objectives of eating is for caloric values--fuels which the body can use to energize itself. Vegetation is a negative-calorie trip all the way. The more you eat, the more of the body's energies are expended in their processing and expulsion. Vegetation has no unique nutrients for which it is a mandatory source. And, as it lacks our foremost

need, vegetation is not suited to the human dietary. Further, vegetation digests so poorly that humans derive as little as 2% of the nutrients that it does have.

This takes the substance out of Dr. Cinque's statements that: "Therefore, vegetables, in their entirety, have more to offer than fruits, in their entirety."

Humans are incapable of deriving their primary nutrient requirement from vegetation. Dr. Katherine Milton, an anthropologist of the University of California, Berkeley, spent 20 years studying particularly the howler monkeys and the spider monkeys. What distinguishes the two:

Spider monkeys are 100% fruit eaters.

Howler monkeys are 100% vegetation eaters.

The fruit-eating monkeys have brains that are more than double the size of the vegetation eaters. The spider monkeys are active, invigorated, smart and playful. The howler monkeys are dull, languid, slow-witted and slow-paced. Their body sizes are similar. This is a strong indication of the poor value of vegetation as an item of diet as compared to fruits.

To get caloric values which we need, Dr. Cinque must include non-vegetation not popularly regarded as vegetables: grains, roots, tubers and legumes.

Here, Dr. Cinque has opened a whole can of worms which he cannot defend: He's talking about foodstuffs which by and large are heat-deranged to make them palatable. There's no way he can validly speak of the higher nutrient values of roots, tubers, beans and grains when this is

untrue of vegetables as eaten. I don't think Dr. Cinque means *raw or uncooked* grains, legumes, roots and tubers which humans cannot digest sufficiently to meet their needs.

For instance, in a January, 1995 issue of the New York Times, the eating of vegetables was extensively treated. It was observed that the nutrients of all vegetables were substantially denied their human eaters in the raw state except perhaps raw carrots which yielded up to 30% of its nutrient values if well-chewed. Other vegetables yielded a lot less. Cooking was advised so as to breakdown the cellulose membranes which bound the nutrients. But it was noted that nutrient destruction was extensive if heat is employed. On the other hand, blending was advocated as the best way to get the nutrients from vegetables except that starchy vegetables didn't appeal to the human palate unless cooked. You see, Dr. Cinque has a profound problem in defending his blanket all-inclusive statement.

In the NY Times article, vegetables were compared with fruits which yielded 95% of their nutrients in the raw ripe condition. At best, cooked vegetables only yielded up about 65% of their nutrients even if cooked. And, again, these were considerably deranged by the heat.

How does Dr. Cinque justify the "plenteous" nutrients of vegetation if they are mostly denied to us or must be mostly deranged by heat against the less plenteous nutrients of fruits which are 95% delivered?

Oh, I know. Dr. Cinque, like the nutritionists, will probably say that cooking leaves most of the nutrients. Even



though deranged, they're still there and nutritionists dishonestly say that cooking vegetables improves their nutrient availability.

This sort of reminds me of a fabled character named Ole. When he was alive he was all there. When he fell into a vat of boiling hot molasses he was still all there but my, what a difference between the performance of living and a dead Ole!

Proteins become completely coagulated and deaminated by the time they're heated to 180 degrees. Of what value are protein foods like beans, grains, potatoes and roots if their proteins are useless?

Of what value are the minerals of vegetables if, upon the breaking of the membranes by heat, the expansion has also disassociated the minerals from their organic context? Do deranged minerals of foods have any virtues over the minerals in sea water, soils, ores and metals? Are not minerals broken away from their organic context already ashes held in liquid state until the water is boiled away? Is it not reasonable to say that cooked food eaters are ash eaters?

Yes, I eat a few vegetables three or four times weekly, these being bok choy, lettuce, collards, kale and selected sticks of celery with, on occasion, carrot juice. But, even so, what I like to eat is irrelevant to the issue. It merely reflects my disposition to have a little vegetation with my fruits.

I repeat what I've said before that we must have "the truth even though the heavens fall."

If vegetables were more nutritious than fruits, they would also be more delicious than fruits. This is the nature of all foods natural to an organism's palate. As to vegetables being more delicious than fruits: No way! Test the palates of babes and children for your answer.

As to fruits being less nutrient dense than vegetables, this is not true as a statement! All you need do is take the solids of vegetables and compare them with the solids of fruits.

For instance, no vegetable, nut or seed even compares with muskmelons and tomatoes in vitamin E content! The solids of tomatoes and muskmelons have more than ten times as much vitamin E as the solids of nuts, seeds or what have you.

The lycopene of tomatoes and other fruits are the most powerful and most usable of antioxidants there are aside from our own body-generated melatonin. Fruits also contain lots of beta-carotene and vitamin C, many multiples more than humans require. And, I repeat, these nutrients have the virtue of being readily available to us from fruits whereas it is hard to obtain them from vegetation.

Dr. Cinque well knows that we do not have to take any vitamin B-12. Just a smidgen of cobalamin measurable in millionths of a gram (for a whole year, moreover!) will be converted by the bacterial intestinal flora from the mouth

to the absorbing colon (cecum) into vitamin B-12 for which we secrete an intrinsic factor to transport it to the liver. The liver usually stores a five-year supply of vitamin B-12.

Dulse, kelp and other raw sea vegetation I've always suggested as "nutrient insurance." Mostly, it's for living at mental ease on nutrient issues, especially trace minerals.

As to vegetables having more minerals than fruits, Dr. Cinque is dead wrong. Not only do the tables of composition bear me out as to mineral superiority of fruit solids versus vegetable solids, but vegetables are raised in "depleted soils" whereas roots of fruit trees go down from 10 to 25 feet where there has been no soil depletion.

What matters is what nutrients vegetables have if you can't really get them anyway except by modern appliances? Getting those nutrients by heating is a liability, not an asset. The experiments of Kouchakoff proved conclusively that heated foods always caused leukocytosis, that is, a proliferation of the white blood cells of the body popularly and erroneously called the immune system. When the body must call out its janitors to cleanup, it's a sure sign of pathogenic substances within.

Invoking Robin Hur's "deficiencies of the fruit and nut diet" is fallacious. Vitamin E is, as cited, more plenteous in fruit solids than a comparable amount of anything else.

There's no vitamin B-12 in grass either, but cattle and other animal products are recommended as a source for B-12 in this country! All the other items cited as being deficient in fruits are simply untrue! You'd have to be a nutrient glutton to say that. When you get enough, that's

all you need! And when you get all you need, that's enough! When you are eating less nutrient dense foods, 95% delivery offsets vegetables with very little nutrient delivery.

Fresh water algae of which Dr. Cinque speaks so highly are irrelevant to the issue of fruits and vegetables but it's an entirely different type of algae to sea algae. He's speaking of what is popularly called pond scum. Fresh water does not have the minerals to yield that sea water has. But the real joker is the fact that much fresh water algae have cyanobacteria which generate anatoxin A, an analog to cocaine! Research which I've documented and which will be published later shows this to be true of the blue green algae he is praising.

Dr. Cinque's charges against fruit-eating as unhealthful fare are simply without foundation! In society's where fruit-eating predominates, health and long-life are the rule instead. Many of us have heard of the Hunzas, Vilcabambians and Abkhasians.

For all this, being a predominant fruitarian does not exclude vegetables, nuts and seeds in the diet.

Dr. Cinque has fallen into a trap in stating that sea algae are indigestible by humans--the Japanese are perhaps the world's greatest users of sea algae and their extensive research shows that it is about 75% digestible.

Moreover, Dr. Cinque has confused salt and sodium.

The body has an RDA for sodium in an organic context to the extent of 300 to 500 milligrams daily--it's a vital

nutrient. The need for salt is zero. Sea vegetation is, indeed, heavy in sodium in a usable organic context. Salt is almost entirely processed out of sea vegetation.

Dr. Cinque asks "What foods are natural to man? What is man's dietetic character?"

This is a good question! And I regard it as a very valid question bearing most relevantly to the issues between us. In support of my position, I will quote from one of my favorite hygienic authors:

The teeth of humans correspond in almost every particular with the teeth of the gorilla and other frugivorous animals. The so-called canine teeth of man are short, stout, and somewhat triangular. They are even less pronounced and developed than those of the gorilla, who never indulges in flesh foods in his natural state. They certainly in no way resemble the long, round, slender canines of the carnivore.

"Regarding the extremities, the herbivora possess hooves, ideally suited to walking about grassy plains. The carnivora possess sharp claws which equip him for violently attacking his prey. Humans, however, like the other frugivores, have soft, pliable, cuplike hands with flat nails that are ideally suited to gather food from trees.

"One of the most interesting comparisons in the study of anatomy is the ratio between the length of the alimentary canal and the body trunk. In the carnivora, the gut is only three times the length of the body. Carnivora require a short, smooth, fast gut because their diet is toxic and

cannot be retained within the intestines for a long period without his being poisoned. In the herbivora, the gut is sacculated and is about thirty times the length of the body. The diet of herbivora is so coarse and fibrous that a long period of digestion is required to break down the cellulose. In humans, as in the monkey, the gut is sacculated and is twelve times the length of the body.

"We also note that the liver and kidneys are proportionately larger in carnivorous animals than in vegetarian animals. This enables the lion to handle the large amounts of protein and nitrogenous waste products contained in his predominately flesh diet.

"Let us now consider the secretions and excretions. In carnivorous animals, the salivary glands are small and the acid saliva which they secrete has little or no effect upon starch. This stands to reason, considering that flesh is virtually starch free. Omnivores, such as the hog, have tremendous salivary glands that secrete copious amounts of starch-splitting enzymes. The salivary glands of frugivores, including humans, secrete an alkaline saliva that contains moderate amounts of ptyalin to initiate starch digestion. This indicated that, although we are perfectly capable of digesting the small amount of starch contained in fresh fruits, nuts and leafy vegetables, humans were not intended to subsist on a diet of highly starchy foods, as so much of the human race presently does. Even a diet consisting predominantly of whole grains and dried, natural legumes can be ruinous because of excessive starch ingestion.

"The gastric juice of the carnivore is highly acid and is capable of preventing putrefaction while flesh is undergoing digestion. The same cannot be said of plant feeders, including humans, whose stomachs secrete a less concentrated and less abundant hydrochloric acid that does not effectively curtail the bacterial decomposition of flesh, a process that begins the moment the animal is killed.

"The tremendous liver of the carnivore secretes a much larger amount of bile into the small intestine than does the liver of a plant feeder. We know that there is a direct relationship between the amount of meat eaten and the amount of bile secreted, indicating the strain that meat-eating places upon the liver. In the case of humans, flesh-eating calls upon the liver to do an extra amount of unintended work which undoubtedly impairs the function of this organ over a long period of time.

"Our last anatomical comparison involves the structure of the skin. All vegetarian animals, including humans, have abundant sweat glands, whereas the sweat glands are atrophied and inactive in all the carnivora.

"From these facts, one must conclude that human dietary adaptations are most similar to those animals known as the anthropoid apes. (The term 'anthropoid' means 'humanlike'.)

Consequently, the natural human diet must be similar to theirs, i.e., fruits and vegetables. Instinctively, humans are attracted to these foods through the sense of sight, smell, and taste. And since these foods are best suited to the

biological adaptations of humans, they are most suitable for furnishing the body with the nutrients necessary to maintain its healthy structure and function." **Dr. Ralph C. Cinque.**

I rest my case.

---

## **THE GREAT FRUIT DEBATE**

### **Dr. Cinque's 3rd submission**

Dear Terry,

No, Mr. Fry! The issue is not whether humans are frugivores, but whether they are *exclusively* frugivorous, as you have maintained in your writings. Can they live on fruit only? Certainly, it is very natural and normal for human beings to eat fruit, and perhaps quite a lot of it. I do not argue with that. In fact, if people want to derive a large part of their caloric intake from fruit, I don't quarrel. But, can people and should people attempt to live on fruit as a sole article of diet? I and countless other doctors and scientists say "No."

My claim that vegetables are more important than fruits is based upon the realization that one could exclude fruit from a strict vegetarian diet (which I don't recommend) and not suffer deficiencies. However, a strict vegetarian diet that was devoid of all vegetables would surely, over time, produce deficiencies. Another way to put it would be to say that no one else ever died from a lack of fruit. But, it may not be farfetched to say that people have, indeed, died from a lack of vegetables.



Your claim that fruits are a great deal more digestible than vegetables is not based upon anything scientific, but rather your own musing about "predigested amino acids, etc."

Likewise, your claim that steaming potatoes and yams and the like produces "toxins" making them "pathogenic fare" is a major delusion. Name one reputable scientist that supports you in that point of view? Let me remind you that there are people who live for years, decades, even lifetimes, eating entirely cooked food. I'm not recommending it, and I'm not saying that they are pictures of health, but how would they live and survive at all if there was a "complete derangement" of all nutrients in cooked food, as you claim? How do our dogs and cats live for as long as they do on commercial pet food (which is thoroughly cooked) if all of the nutrients were destroyed by cooking?

No, Mr. Fry, according to Jane Goodall and others, ripe fruits comprises only a small part of the diet of gorillas. In fact, gorillas are known to prefer chlorophyll-rich green bananas to ripe ones, at which time they are closer to being vegetable than fruit in composition. Why are there no large communities of fruitarian humans anywhere? And again, I say, don't dare suggest that the Hunza's are fruitarians. For Pete's sake, they live in a climate that is about as cold as Canada and they eat large amounts of grain and vegetables. Those with sense realize that no one could live on a diet comprised largely of apricots, whether they are fresh or dried.

You take the liberty of assuming that the minerals in vegetables are largely unavailable while the minerals of fruits are entirely digestible, but that is merely an assumption on your part. The fact that we only absorb a fraction of the minerals in vegetables doesn't matter, because it is factored into recommendations. For example, the advice to consume 1,000 mg. of calcium per day is based upon the expectation that about 20% will get absorbed. In other words, the RDA for calcium is really only 200 mg. But, it is well known that the calcium in broccoli, kale, collards, and bok choy is highly available, more so in fact than most other foods, including cow's milk.

If you know so much about meeting calcium needs, why did all of your teeth go bad at an early age, and why are you chomping down on dentures even as we speak? My father is older than you are and he has every tooth he was ever born with. It is a fair question under the circumstances. Don't you realize that you paid for your years of fruitarianism with your teeth? Is that what you wish for others?

Unfortunately, most commercial fruit trees are short-lived and are shallow feeders. It is the nut trees, that live for decades, that send roots 40 or 50 feet deep to mine the earth. Fruits, for instance, tend to be very low in zinc, whereas nuts are generally high in zinc. Fruits, on the whole, are found to be less mineral-rich than nuts or vegetables.

When you adequately and thoroughly wash dulse, it is not only salt-free, but taste-free, and hence nutrient-depleted.

Furthermore, it is a dirty plant that grows in a dirty environment. No self-respecting human would put such filth in his or her body.

Super Blue Green Algae tastes like fresh-cut alfalfa. It is pungent (strong), but not unpleasant, and only reason why I don't chew the tablets up is because the algae sticks to my teeth and is a nuisance to clean. The algae is unique in that it has a fiber-free glycogen cell wall that makes it 96% digestible, which is higher than other food. Talk about nutrient availability!

The young woman who called me from Michigan recently at 5'8", 78 pounds is the outcome of your brand of dietary extremism, and she was by no means the first. Not long ago, I heard of a 17-year-old girl who was a follower of yours from Mexico City. She was 5'4" and weighed 64 pounds. I know because I weighted her myself. You, T. C. are basically mesomorphic leaning toward endomorphic in your body type, and I have no doubt that you can do well on a high fruit intake. But, for the ectomorphs of this world, the all-fruit diet is an absolute unmitigated disaster. Anyone who takes natural philosophy to an extreme, as you do is dangerous. As I have said many times, nature is not something to put on a pedestal and worship. You claim to be an atheist, but really you worship nature as God.

You are right that fruits are delicious, and once people "discover" fruits, they can really get into eating them. They don't need much coaxing, and that's great. But, to go so far as to condemn every other food, as you have

done on more than one occasion, is wrong, and furthermore, it alienates people. Why do you think that people like McDougall and Ornish and Covert Bailey have such a big followings? It is because they give people programs that they can live with. People read your advice and even if they respect you, they realize they could never adhere to what you say, and they don't even try. The wise course is to emphasize the value of fruits, emphasize the value of raw vegetable salads, emphasize the real villains, and then LIGHTEN UP!

John Robbins says this: If you knew that a boat you were on that was loaded with people was about to tip over, you could move your weight way out to the other side and hope that it will do some good, OR you could get everyone on the boat to take one step to the other side in order to stabilize the boat. Which would do more good? Your way of doing things may attract a few "true believers" who are looking for a guru, but you will never start a health revolution in America (which is your stated goal) as long as you espouse such an extreme dietary program of fruitarianism.

## **TEN QUESTIONS FOR MR. FRY**

1. If the all-fruit diet is so great, why does it have such disastrous effects upon the teeth? You are not the first or only fruitarian who has done dismally with his teeth. Weston Price, the famous dentist-explorer proved that the condition of the teeth reflects the nutritional state of the whole body.

2. If the all-fruit diet is so great, why do pregnant women do so poorly on it, giving birth to thin, feeble and undernourished babies?
3. If the all-fruit diet is so great, why can nursing mothers not produce adequate amounts of quality breast milk when feeding only on fruits?
4. If the all-fruit diet is so great, why cannot children grow adequately eating nothing but fruits? Name one child who has been raised to maturity on nothing but fruit?
5. If the all-fruit diet is so great, why are there not large, or even small, communities of people living on just fruit, communities that encompass all phases and ages of human life and with a history of generations living on just fruit?
6. If the all-fruit diet is so great, why is it that those who have just finished fasting fail to gain weight and strength when they are fed after the fast on fruits only?
7. If the all-fruit diet is so great, why do fruitarians tend to develop severe digestive sensitivities and environmental sensitivities?
8. If the all-fruit diet is so great, why do fruitarians develop weak nails and thin hair?
9. If the all-fruit diet is so great, why do fruitarians have difficulty building muscle even when they do exercise?
10. If the all-fruit diet is so great, why do women fruitarians stop ovulating and often lose their sex drive?

Sincerely, Dr. Ralph Cinque

---

## **THE GREAT FRUIT DEBATE**

### **Mr. Fry Responds to Dr. Cinque's Charges, 3rd Round.**

To further call this a debate and discussion of issues is an insult to the intellect--Dr. Cinque has sunk to or never been above making unsupported statements, mislabeling of my evidence, the skirting of the evidence I document, exercising the powers of accusation and assertions, jumping to conclusions, diatribes, misrepresentations, irrelevancies, and *evasion* of rather than *facing issues*. At the end of his last submission, he submitted ten questions. Practically all are of the "Have you stopped beating your wife?" variety.

Dr. Cinque forgets that I set the issues by challenge. These were:

1. His statement that there is no scientific evidence supporting the frugivorous nature of humans and...
2. That vegetables were more important in the diet than fruits.

We've still had not documentation from him--just his say-so. My citations have been ignored as if they had not been voiced. He has yet to address the documentation I cited in my challenge--in fact he ignores it and says it isn't so. This is a very unscientific attitude and to continue to make assertions in the face of the facts reveals not only intellectual dishonesty but the elevation of obvious gross ignorance to an implied scientific status.

Dr. Cinque continues to insist that cooking foods does not derange and destroy them. Obviously, he is still unaware of the over 100 detailed experiments chronicled in the 1982 book, **DIET, NUTRITION AND CANCER** published by the Nutritional Research Council of the American Academy of Science. At relatively low temperatures, cooking coagulates and deaminates proteins. It deranges minerals. This volume documents that cooked foods result in the creation of teratogens, mutagens and carcinogens. Before Dr. Cinque runs off at the mouth in more irrelevances, he'd better address these facts alone. His seesaw statements have alternately advocated grains and potatoes, vegetation only and, again, the whole gamut of potatoes, grains and now, again, legumes by endorsing in *Health Science* the advocacy of legumes in the diet.

For Dr. Cinque's benefit I reprint an article that I wrote commenting on a discussion of eating raw, cooked and blended vegetables which appeared in the New York Times last March (1995).

Dr. Cinque continues to ignore the cited articles in *DISCOVER* magazine of May, 1995 and the *SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN* for March, 1995. He continues to insist quite unscientifically and contrary to science that the gorilla is our nearest relative in nature. In view of the above magazine's publication of the findings, his statements are patently ridiculous.

He has yet to acknowledge Dr. Bruce Ames' article in the September 23rd, 1983 issue of *SCIENCE*, DIETARY CARCINOGENS and ANTICARCINOGENS wherein he

points out the role of phytochemicals in both causing cancer and in combating free radicals, thus being anticarcinogenic.

Dr. Cinque should consult the list of toxins in foods in the FDA's Office of Toxicological Sciences headed by Dr. Fred Scheuplein and note the long list of pathogenic substances to be found in the foods of the marketplace including his vaunted vegetation! It is significant that fruits are not listed with any poisons!

Dr. Cinque ignores totally my simple statement that destroys his whole thesis with vegetation-eating even after he proclaims the relevancy of our natural dietary disposition: If we were natural vegetation-eaters, we would secrete the enzyme cellulase as all vegetation-eaters do!

Gorillas possess only about an ounce of brains per twelve to fourteen pounds of body weight. Humans possess an ounce of brains for every three pounds of natural and normal body weight. The nearest relative to humans must be accorded to the BONONO ape as noted in the *Scientific American* for March. The BONOBOS have many distinct human qualities including compassion. They are 97% fruitarian and about 3% eaters of pith as in sugar cane. They have an ounce of brain matter for each 3-1/2 pounds of body weight.

Dr. Cinque chooses to ignore the significance of Dr. Katherine Milton's 20-year study of SPIDER and HOWLER monkeys and the gross intellectual inferiority of vegetation eaters as compared with fruit eaters. He evidently is not



of the maturity to admit that he is wrong or even could be wrong. I make these two reports a part of this response so there can be no doubt.

On this occasion I will deal specifically with Dr. Cinque's responses on an item by item basis as they arise.

---

## **DR. CINQUE SHEDS SOME LIGHT ON VEGETARIAN FOODS**

### ***About Carcinogens in Regularly Consumed Foods***

Dr. Cinque has written an article about Dr. Bruce Ames' article in the September 23rd, 1983 issue of SCIENCE magazine titled DIETARY CARCINOGENS and ANTICARCINOGENS wherein Dr. Ames points out the role of phytochemicals in both causing cancer and in combating free radicals, thus being anticarcinogenic. I'm happy that Dr. Cinque has submitted a very fine article based on Dr. Ames' SCIENCE magazine article. As it is relevant to this debate, it is published herein.

Dr. Cinque should consult the list of toxins in foods in the FDA's Office of toxicological Sciences headed by Dr. Fred Scheuplein and note the long list of pathogenic substances to be found in the foods of the marketplace including his vaunted vegetation which, believe it or not, his article also incriminates to an extent! It is significant that fruits of the market place are not listed with any poisons except when processed!

Dr. Cinque ignores totally my simple statement that destroys his whole thesis with vegetation-eating *even after*

*he proclaims the relevancy of our natural dietetic disposition:* If we were natural vegetation-eaters, we would secrete the *enzyme cellulase* as all natural vegetation-eaters do!

And his favorite relative in nature is still the gorilla. In this discussion/debate, he is reflecting a gorilla-like disposition. Gorillas possess only about an ounce of brains per twelve to fourteen pounds of body weight. Humans possess an ounce of brains for every three pounds of natural and normal body weight. The nearest relative to humans must be accorded to the BONOBO ape as noted in the *Scientific American* for March, 1995. The BONOBOs have many distinct human qualities including compassion. They are 97% frutitarian and about 3% eaters of pith as in sugar cane. They have an ounce of brain matter for each 3-1/2 pounds of body weight.

Dr. Cinque chooses to ignore the significance of Dr. Katherine Milton's 20-year study of SPIDER and HOWLER monkeys and the gross intellectual inferiority of vegetation eaters as compared with fruit eaters. He evidently is not of the maturity to admit that he is wrong or even could be wrong. I make these two reports a part of this response so there can be no doubt.

On this occasion, I will deal specifically with Dr. Cinque's responses on an item by item basis as they arise.

A. Dr. Cinque's first entree in his latest response is to toy around with the issues that were laid down from the beginning. He now says that the issue is whether humans are *exclusively* frugivorous, as I have

maintained in my writings. Dr. Cinque obviously doesn't read my writings as he can find no such categorical statement! Just as carnivores are sometimes seen to nibble at vegetation, he'll find that humans also have a heavy disposition to consume some nuts.

I have published articles that have said we were *exclusively* and only fruit-eaters for the past million years up until very recent times. The article in point was Dr. Alan Walker's findings relative to fossilized human teeth. This was published in the May 15, 1979 issue of the New York Times. That article is reproduced at the end of this debate. Does Dr Cinque argue with this anthropologist's findings? Obviously, he denies the findings whether or not he knows of them.

Or does he argue with Dr. Henry Bailey Steven's book, *THE RECOVERY OF CULTURE*, wherein he traces human fruit cultivation for the past million years and points up the criteria for our natural frugivorous disposition.

I reiterated that I reprint the material surrounding the New York Times article appearing in its Science sections of May 15, 1979. Dr. Cinque knows about it - he was with me at the time. Further, he wrote the treatise giving the criteria for the human frugivorous settings as reproduced in my first response to him. This article was extracted from a volume in *The Health Reporter Series* (now called *THE BASIC*

HEALTH LIBRARY) entitled THE PARADISE DIET. The front page begins with an article based on Dr. Walker's findings.

- B. He states in this latest response: "Certainly, it is very natural and normal for human beings to eat fruit, and perhaps quite a lot of it." That is a left-handed way of saying we are natural fruitarians because it is natural for us to eat what is natural to our biological disposition. Babies and infants will relish sweet fruits from day one though they should nurse on their mother's milk exclusively under normal circumstances for at least six months. But the same infants will reject vegetables altogether unless sneaked into them through "baby" foods or forced on them by parental bullying later on. I know what physicians say (Dr. Cinque is now a physician too per his organization's unhygienic name change). Most of what they say is precisely opposite to the truth. Physicians still advocate the eating of animal products, especially cow's milk, as a nutritive measure.
- C. Whatever Dr. Cinque bases his claims on that vegetables are more important in the human diet than fruits is not supported by any scientific literature whatsoever! It's strictly his rationale and, as this discussion has pointed out, it's flawed. To make the statement that we can live well without fruits but not without vegetables is strictly invention. I have already cited the Hunzas, Abkhasians and Vilcabambians as consumers of more fruits than everything else combined. McCarrison spent seven years with the

Hunzas back in the 1920s and he attests to this in great detail. There is an American group near Vilcabamba in highland Ecuador that eats mostly fruits. It is headed by a man who calls himself Johnny Lovewisdom.

- D. To say that fruit is deficient in nutrients is to manifest gross ignorance in the matter! I asked that any nutrient which are unique to vegetables over fruits be named. Dr. Cinque named not one. Moreover, I pointed out that, in nature, we'd get more from fruits from which we get virtually all fruit nutrients than from vegetation from which we get very little on account of the lack of essential enzyme cellulase. Most people will not chew their vegetation inordinately as is necessary to get at its nutrients. I again point out that you're bedazzled by tables of composition and nutrient gluttony rather than realistic considerations.
- E. Obviously, any foods we must cook to eat are outside the natural dietary.
- F. Obviously, foods having toxic components as you cite in your article heretofore mentioned are not natural to the human dietary. The first commandment of eating is: "Thou shalt not poison thyself." Obviously, our natural dietary will not poison us.
- G. Obviously, it is self-evident that natural foods of humans must be relished in their raw natural state. Fruits are obviously relished in their natural state. Certainly, vegetables are not relished at all in their raw natural state. A taste for vegetation and

vegetables must be cultivated--we know lots of people also cultivate a taste for anchovies, raw oysters and other "gourmet delights." Perverting the taste does not prove anything except that we can be perverted.

- H. A diet devoid of vegetation totally would not produce the deficiencies Mr. Cinque says. How many fruitarians must I produce from this country, especially in California and Hawaii, that are exclusively fruitarians? Dr. Cinque doesn't see fruitarians because they do not find it necessary to go away from their dietary--they're exceptionally healthy. I'm in daily contact with many of them. Their health and acumen shames cooked food and vegetation eaters. The spider/howler monkey portrayal characterizes the comparison!
- I. I know lots of people dying who're eating vegetables. Among the sickest I know style themselves as macrobiotic and vegan in their dietary. How many wrecks of these outlooks and practices have fasted under my supervision I'd hate to tell you. You know! You get them too. As you well know, most of your clients are suffering from toxicosis/toxemia and not, per se, from deficiencies.
- J. I felt it wise to offer testimony from a fruitarian in Makawao, Maui, Hawaii. There are several fruitarians there. This testimony is printed as a part of this response.
- K. Dr. Cinque states that my claim that fruits are a great deal more digestible than vegetables is not based

upon anything scientific. Here goes Dr. Cinque again. He's denying and ignoring evidence that I've produced. This is outright dishonesty! Of course, his statement that one is just as digestible as the other is refuted by the experts in the article based on the New York Times treatment. It is refuted by the fact that humans do not secrete the enzyme cellulase. Dr. Cinque is the one doing the musing. To not know that fruits are totally predigested in the ripening process exhibits pure ignorance! What transformations in fruits does Dr. Cinque think the ripening processes are about?

- L. Dr. Cinque is the one suffering under major delusion! After he's taken the trouble to read what happens to foods by heating, that is, causing them to be teratogens, mutagens and carcinogens in the human body, he's talking unadulterated nonsense. Name one reputable scientist! There are dozens of them in the book that I suggested, DIET, NUTRITION and CANCER. Over 100 researches are cited and printed in this NRC book. Until Dr. Cinque has done so, his statements are without merit and, if Dr. Cinque has read the book, then he's totally dishonest in the matter! Which is to say that Dr. Cinque is either a ignoramus or a hypocrite in the matter of cooking. He knows, for I've heard him say it, that a calf will die within five to six weeks on its own mother's milk if it is merely pasteurized, that is, heated for 30 minutes at 160 degree Fahrenheit.

- M. Dr. Cinque has stated that what is crucial to this discussion is our natural diet. It certainly is! Is Dr. Cinque claiming as a matter of science that, in our pristine natural state, we ate foods that had to be cooked? As Dr. Cinque knows, we do not secrete enough amylase in the mouth or otherwise to handle more than a teaspoonful of starchy grains or a starchy tuber. Without fire we'd starve on these as we're not natural starch-eaters.
- N. No, Dr. Cinque, Jane Goodall spent her life with the chimps, not the gorillas. It was Dr. Irwin Schaller who spent seven years in Africa studying the gorillas. Neither of us have mentioned the orangutan before. This fellow is a total fruitarian, living in trees eating their fruits months at a time without coming down. Gorillas only live to a little over 30 years of age. The orangutan has been noted to live to well over a hundred years of age in Borneo and other islands in the Malaysian chain.
- O. Dr. Cinque's "chlorophyll-rich" green bananas has a very potent hallucinogen in their skins. It's my understanding that the bananas on a stalk are green whether or not they receive sunshine in their positions on the stalk and that their huge fronds performed the photosynthetic processes that bring to the bananas their nutrient complement.
- P. Has Dr. Cinque ever heard of the Miskito Indians of Costa Rica, Honduras and parts of Nicaragua? These people are fruit-eaters almost totally. They live



from what they can gather from the tropical forests where they live. Of course, Dr. Cinque should know there are societies in Central America, some Caribbean islands and Brazil that live practically totally on bananas and plantains. And he should know there are still fruitarian communities in Java and some of the Malaysian Islands. As far as the Hunzas go, read the man who spent many years with them, Col. McCarrison. Or look at their dietary analysis as done by Dr. Alexander Leaf of Harvard. Of course, they've changed a lot since the time of McCarrison. They've discovered civilization. However, they do not grow much in the way of vegetables and grains. The bulk of their produce comes from highly productive fruit trees. The average Hunza cultivates about a fifteenth of an acre of ground, most of it created on rather steep hillsides.

- Q. That assumption on my part--it's your assumption that it is my assumption--minerals in vegetables are tied up in their membranes unless we chew them practically to no end because we do not secrete the enzyme, cellulase. Read the New York Times discussion in this matter. Tell me I assumed the testimony there to be true and you're the authority that wants to be taken seriously over their testimony.
- R. I'm happy that Dr. Cinque says that 200 milligrams of usable calcium will do us nicely. Calcium in calcium supplements are not utile. Dr. Heaney of Creighton University in Omaha made extensive experiments with women in control groups. He measured the

calcium uptake in women on a diet alone. He measured the calcium updated on a control group who took the same diet but supplemented their diet with calcium carbonate until their recommended RDA of 1,500 milligrams was met. He was shocked to find that those taking the 1,500 grams had 15% less calcium assimilation than those on diet alone. Thank you for this. Of course, those on cow's milk cannot obtain its calcium except from the cecum where the bacteria will have broken it down enough to yield something. We do not secrete the rennin necessary to break down milk's casein package.

- S. As to Dr. Cinque's question, anent my teeth, I assure you that I never had a cavity until I was 28, two years after my marriage to a gourmet Dutch cook. By the time I was 40 I had two bridges, six root canals and about 15 amalgam fillings. Before I learned about Natural Hygiene, I had already lost several teeth. In 1981 I had the amalgams removed and composition materials filled into replace them. This was a mistake too inasmuch as the fillings started dropping out within six months and several of the teeth were no longer viable. My mouth has been a disaster area since I started eating so many delicacies rather than the fruits and vegetables I ate heavily of while on the farm. Doesn't Dr. Cinque know that over 30 million Americans have no teeth of their own--that the disaster derives from the conventional diet rather than the fruit diet? Doesn't he know that 98-1/2% of Americans have fillings, root canals, bridges and

other assorted dental nightmares designed to help them.

- T. I cannot speak for modern fruit trees but I've pulled up dozens of over aged trees from our orchard with a tractor and found them to have tap roots that were well over ten feet long in many cases. It must be my error to assume that fruit trees still send down roots to the subsoil's. I'm sure Dr. Cinque knows whereas my background as a farmer, orchardist and gardener does not befit me in the matter. Most fruit trees are viable for only 10 to 15 years. Yes, it is the nut trees like pecans which send their roots down 40 to 50 feet. As a Texan, that is my favorite nut. I eat ten to fifteen pounds of them a year.
- U. I deal in dulse and what is said about it is absolutely untrue. I know the taste of salt and know it well. When I take a leaf of dulse and chew it, there's hardly enough salt to register. The suggestion that washing dulse removes its minerals is totally absurd. That's like saying that washing vegetables removes their minerals. Saying that dulse is a dirty plant while your pond scum called blue green algae is a angelic plant is outright dishonestly! When I cite the research showing that the "super food" Dr. Cinque is peddling contains not only B-12, but Anatoxin A, an analog of cocaine, he ignores and dismisses it. When I cite the Blue Green Algae Blues as published in the Vegetarian Times for August, 1995, he treats it as falsehood. As to blue green algae being 100% available to takers, so what? With only .6 of a gram

of minerals in the daily intake, there's not enough to have an impact in meeting our nutrient needs. Of course, if Dr. Cinque has a vested interest in selling it, it obviously supplies another deficiency--a financial deficiency.

- V. Dr. Cinque's implication that we need vitamin B-12 from an outside source other than the bacterial flora from the mouth all the way down the intestinal tract from which absorption is made is erroneous--scientists who say this are mistaken--we must bow to Robin Hur and Dr. Cinque. Perhaps Dr. Cinque remembers the baboon experiments wherein over 10 years on a dietary that excluded all vitamin B-12 did not induce a B-12 deficiency. Bacteria create vitamin B-12 in our intestinal tract just as they do in tracts of other animals whose foodstuffs contain no vitamin B-12.

The young woman did not call from Michigan. It was her mother! The young woman was at a resort with her family at the time. Her mother was called and told her daughter appeared to be dying, that she was down to 78 pounds and still losing weight. The mother panicked and called me inasmuch as I was responsible for her spending three weeks here. I called her dietary retraining mentor only to find the young woman had just called to proudly announce that she had just reached 100 pounds on the mostly fruit diet with some nuts and vegetable salads which she was trained to eat.

Janet was just 78 pounds when she arrived to live-in with her mentor, Irene Matus. She left at 89 pounds three weeks later and is now over a hundred pounds. What you did not learn was that Janet went down to 78 pound while eating a junk food diet. In fact, her last supper before going with her hostess was a huge pizza shared by her husband who brought her .

Her dietary retraining consisted in adapting to a primarily fruit diet. When she called to announce that she had reached a hundred pounds, she also confided that she had only cheated on the diet twice and suffered for it each time.

I don't know about the 17-year-old from Mexico City. I've never heard from her. I do know on a personal communication basis dozens of fruitarians in this country. I know of a society boasting over a thousand fruitarians in Australia headed by a Rene Berford. I'm printing the comments of some fruitarians relative to the ten questions. I think that appropriate under the circumstances. Dr. Cinque will have some anecdotal evidence to face--his side of the discussion has been very anecdotal anyway.

Of course, a big following is not my objective so much as an informed and aware following, however big or little. I'd rather be right with very few than wrong with many thousands.

Again, Dr. Cinque is tilting at ghosts. Dr. Cinque has never read anything of mine that advocated exclusive fruitarianism. He's teeing off on a reputation, not reality. I challenge him to read my writings and find where I've ever

recommended anything less than fruits, nuts, seeds and vegetables. Of course, this leaves us still fruitarians for anyone who consumes more fruits than the aggregated of the rest of the diet is properly called fruitarian.

Dr. Cinque sees me as a danger. Isn't it odd that I see him in the same light? Is not dishonesty a danger? Is not misdirecting fellow beings to a nonhuman dietary a danger? Is not trading under the umbrella of "doctor" really a platform for the unscientific tripe he's sprouting?

I'm going to use Dr. Cinque's article titled Man's Natural Diet. It was published in Volume 18 of THE HEALTH REPORTER SERIES (now THE BASIC HEALTH LIBRARY). From its concluding section I quote:

### *The Frugivorous Diet*

"If man is a frugivore, as we have tried to demonstrate, then his natural diet should consist of fruits, nuts, and green vegetables. The inclusion of tender, succulent green leaves, stems and flowers should not be considered a violation of his constitutional nature, as practically all animals in nature consume green foliate of one kind or another. For example, the frugivora consume large amounts of wild celery and other leafy plants along with their fruits and nuts (Ed: here Dr. Cinque is referring to the gorilla as a frugivore.) Whatever else an animal eats, whatever else it is specifically adapted for, some green, leafy food is invariably included in the diet.

## *Fruits Are Appealing Raw and Unseasoned*

"Besides being specifically adapted to his digestive mechanism, fruits are also appealing to man's visual, olfactory and gustatory senses. They require no cooking, no dressing, no seasoning, no utensils, and hardly any cultivation, considering the abundance of wild fruit trees. Could any other food be more natural for us? With the addition of nuts and green vegetables, the fruitarian diet is as nutritionally sound as it is biologically correct."

Fruits are quite adequate in their nutrient complement as Dr. Cinque is falling into the trap of accepting medical norms at face value. This is treated at length in a supporting article at the end.

---

## **RESPONSE TO DR. CINQUE'S TEN QUESTIONS**

T. C. Fry

**As to question one:** I've read Dr. Weston Price's book and he visited several mostly fruit-eating societies on Pacific Islands. His pictures showed them to have perfect dentition whereas he also made pictures of some of their number who were eating imported canned foods and other items of the western diet. It showed that their dentition was poor in all cases. Remember, Dr. Price showed that modern diet was the culprit as compared with native diets no matter what they were, even fruitarian! In our own country 98-1/2% of our people have cavities, fillings, lost teeth and other dental problems. Certainly, 98-1/2% of our people are not fruitarian. You don't have an argument

here for true fruitarians do not have the problem! Most who have dental problems had their dental disasters long before taking up fruitarianism.

**As to question two:** This question only reflects your deep-seated prejudice and ignorance. It is untrue. I'm going to rely on the testimony of a fruitarian mother for this.

**As to question three:** Ditto. You are dead wrong, that's all. You're probably placing blame where it doesn't belong.

**As to question four:** Again, I'm going to rely upon the witness of another experienced person.

**As to question five:** There have been many fruitarian communities and there still are! You simply don't know what you're talking about.

**As to question six:** What would you know about this? Those who have been fasted for less than what would be called complete fasts remain in the eliminative mode for quite some time even though the fast has been broken. You will know that you lose weight in a catabolic state even if you're not fasting. Besides, I advocate the addition of nuts and an exercise program, exertive exercises included, about five days after the breaking of the fast. Sunshine and exercise are absolutely essential to constructive weight gain regardless of diet.

**As to question seven:** All animals including humans are very sensitive to foods to which they are not biologically adapted. This question only indicates your topsy-turvy



thinking in the matter. Remember, the vital organism rejects anything very quickly that is contrary to its biological disposition--unless it has been perverted as are most humans. Again, this only proves your erroneous perspective in the matter.

**As to question eight:** Fruitarians do not develop weak nails and thin hair. I don't know any bald-headed fruitarians. The fruitarians I know have full heads of hair. I took up fruitarianism over 25 years ago and I still have as much hair as I had then. I had hair thinning when I adopted Natural Hygiene at 44-years of age. If you refuse to take the testimonies of Drs. McCarrison and Leaf--changes the truth not a whit about the Hunzas and reflects either your unawareness or bias in the matter.

**As to question nine:** You know me for many years on a frequent contact basis and my musculature was as impressive as yours! It's weight-lifting and similar exertive exercises that place the demand on the body for muscle to cope. While protein is required for muscle development, lots of sunshine, fresh air and adequate sleep are also required. I have, upon my lectures around the country, met fruitarian weight-lifters and they were just as muscled as the rest. Moreover, all weight-lifters I know who are fruitarians also eat nuts and seeds.

**As to question ten:** Your implication that women fruitarians stop ovulating is simply untrue. Don't confuse the cessation of bloody monthly shedding of the endometrium with the cessation of ovulation which invariably continues in women of child-bearing age. As to

sex-drive you imply that having a sex-drive is a biological norm. In nature both men and women had sex-drive only in heat, that is, when the female was ovulating. This is still true today among primate societies. It is true in animals. Giving up sex as an entertainment medium does not mean that you're asexual. What would you know about the intense focus of the reproductive faculties when the organism is distressed by junk foods such that the survival mechanisms are invoked? Why do our young women have the onset of puberty at progressively younger ages, now under twelve on average?

---

OBSERVATIONS AND EXPERIENCES OF  
HYGEIA HALFMOON  
A Total Fruitarian in Hawaii

*"Truth wears no mask: bows at no human shrine; seeks  
neither place nor applause: she asks only a hearing."*  
Redfield

Christopher Columbus had a hell of a time convincing his contemporaries that the earth was round, and today there exists nutritional experts who ridicule the path of fruitarianism. Well, the earth is round and I live on fruit.

Dr. Cinque's malignment of an all-fruit diet which I manage with ease here in Hawaii, and which I have subsisted on in great health for the past ten years, leads me to the observation that he is very biased or very ignorant, perhaps both, and his feelings in the matter expressed through his questions and their implications really borders

on the demented. He does not recognize the truths of fruitarianism though his admissions left-handedly confirm our natural fruitarian deitic disposition. On the other hand, to answer his questions without noting them carefully would be to grant the untrue premises he bases them on. And, I emphasize, they're simply untrue!

**Question one:** Much of the destiny of our teeth is formed prenatally, and is one physiological condition that struggles with its genetic backgrounds. My parents were both denture wearers by the time they reached the age of thirty. My own life has been riddled with the standard American diet up until ten years ago, thus I had the double whammy of a poor beginning through gestation and extreme exacerbation of the problem via poor diet for my first thirty years. Therefore, no blame on my dental situation can be placed on my fruitarian diets. Perhaps without this shift to fruitarianism, I would be soaking my dentures tonight instead of brushing away the sweet residue of papaya from, still, my very own chompers.

**Question two:** All three of my babies were born after I became a fruitarian. Each baby was over six pounds on the scales at birthing. As regards temperament and health, each is an example of absolute perfection. My pregnancies were profoundly powerful as I maintained a high activity level of bicycling, swimming, jogging and dancing right up until the hour of birth, and then I resumed these type activities after attending to birth, while nourishing myself on watermelon, fresh figs, grapes, great Hawaiian bananas, papayas, mangos and the other wonderful fruits they have here.

**Question three:** Dr. Cinque exhibits gross ignorance about fruitarian mothering and nursing. Ten years ago I put my first born to my breast, and I have been nursing daily since then. I nursed my firstborn for more than seven years, and have been tandem-nursing my two youngest for the past fifteen months and the older of the two has now nursed for more than four years. In addition, I've nursed the babies of other babies when left in my care. My body produces milk so prolifically on the fruitarian diet that I must observe that Dr. Cinque does not know the case with fruitarians. I live on Maui and there are other fruitarian mothers here who would present themselves and their experiences as embodiment of the truth that Dr. Cinque drags in the muddy waters of obvious prejudice.

**Question four:** My children are not small but neither are they the hormonized "giants" that characterize almost all our children who get conventional diets. Dr. Cinque should look at the children of vegans and he'll find his attributions to fruitarians embodied in them! They're here too.

My children have never been sick. They don't even know what a doctor's office looks like. They run farther, jump higher, sing louder, and play harder than any children I have ever seen. Their minds are sharp, clear and creative. This, of course, is due mostly to their home schooling and the total absence of TV in their lives. They climb to get our family's daily supply of tangerines and other fruits. They love connecting with their primal selves. They wonder why the neighbors' kids can't come out and

play and only my oldest understands sickness and how it is caused by conventional and cooked food eating. She understands when a mother tells her "Janey cannot come out and play. She is sick and I don't want you to catch it." My children already know that such statements are erroneous. It seems children naturally resonate with the truth. My children have an innate capability to recognize the truth that is a primal reality for the naturally smart. That, my friend; is the highest reward of fruitarianism.

**Question five:** Dr. Cinque's question and its implication that we're not genuine fruitarians by the way he couches his language hangs this lack of fruitarian communities as a discredit to fruitarianism. It is a non sequitur and simply a discredit to Dr. Cinque's knowledge and thinking. I have it on good authority that he is wrong and that fruitarian societies still exist in Bali, Java and other parts of Malaysia. In any event if Dr. Cinque is aware of research about fruitarianism, he knows that we've been virtually 100% fruitarians around our equatorial belts and even in temperate climates for the past million years up until recent times. His implications bears the same relation to what is true as does the dairy industry's motto: "You never outgrow your need for milk."

Like the master bird's remarks in the JONATHAN LIVINGSTON SEAGULL, "Well, this kind of flying has always been here to be learned by anybody who wanted to discover it; It's got nothing to do with time. We're ahead of the fashion, maybe. Ahead of the way that most gulls fly."

**Question six:** I fasted occasionally in conjunction with my adoption of Natural Hygiene and fruitarianism. I am big (5'9") and I was on the heavy side at the beginning. I would lose one to three pounds daily on my fasts until I hit my set-point. Often I went below my set-point. I always came back on fruits and had no problem with gaining my weight back. Fruitarianism has been my ticket to my ultimate personal goals in health and intellectual ability.

**Question seven:** Dr. Cinque implies that a virtue is condemnable as a fault. Me and my children's sensitivities are so attuned to the ideal that anything that is off-taste or smell is readily rejected. To imply that we must be accepting of things and acclimatized to compromising conditions is not only laying the groundwork for our own demise but the robbing of our offspring of their natural endowment and potential. It does not become Dr. Cinque at all to suggest this.

**Question eight:** My experience is precisely the opposite of the question. Both myself and children have long and strong nails. My hair is so thick at 40 that I have finally given up on brushes because they keep breaking in my effort to get them through my forest of auburn hair.

**Question nine:** As a female fruitarian, my concept of fitness does not involve great muscle mass but, rather, a supple, lithe and high-performance body. My program of exercise involves bicycling, dancing, frisbee, horse-riding, swimming, gymnastics and running. I do not know another person, not even other fruitarians, who have as

much physical and mental energy as I do except, of course, my children.

**Question ten:** "Mother Mary, I've got a couple on you in this matter of immaculate conception!" I quit bloodletting over nine years ago but I assure you I can get very pregnant if I am not careful about my relationships.

Anyone who denies human biological realities are playing servant to their prejudices and misconceptions.

Nevertheless, the earth is really round and I really live wonderfully on fruit.

*(Hygeia Halfmoon is the author of several books. She offers PRIMAL MOTHERING IN A MODERN WORLD, HIGHWAY TO HEALTH, and ANATOMY OF AN AMBITION, ACCOMPLISHED. For more information, write her at 21 Makani Road, #1, Makawao, Maui, HI 96768. Her articles are widely published for her lucid and cogently expressed views on birthing, mothering and home schooling. TCF)*

---

## **FRUIT FOR BOUNDLESS ENERGY!**

*By Hygeia Halfmoon*

I was munching happily on a bunch of delicious and crisp red organically grown grapes when a woman walked up to me and said, "I see you everywhere, riding your bike with a baby on your back and your toddler in the bike cart. where do you get all that energy."

I proudly lifted my dwindling supply of grapes and said, "I'm fruitarian!" Needless to say, her next question was...

"But where do you get your protein?"

She was absolutely nonplussed as I reeled off the abundant supplies of predigested proteins that came to us as amino acids in such delightful foods as bananas, guavas, avocados, watermelon, raisins, berries, grapes, honeydews, mangos, oranges, papayas, pears, apricots, cherries, dates, and figs. And this list didn't even take into account the high protein contents of the occasional nuts and seeds that my family includes in its diet.

I absolutely love being a fruitarian family, and I'm so pleased to have this truth for the sake of my children's health. Sure, we fall off the wagon at times and find ourselves acting ridiculous at the checkout counter but, for the most part, we rely on the solid foundation of a fruit diet. As a result of our allegiance to fruitarianism, we enjoy seemingly endless energy.

My family bicycles uphill one hour daily with my one-year-old in the back pack and my three-year-old in the bike cart while my nine-year-old rides her own bike. We work at the stables and ride horses before bicycling another five miles. In the evening, we jog up to three miles, practice gymnastics at the park, and dance to our favorite music.

During this past decade of fruitarianism, I have breast-fed continuously and am presently nursing both my toddler and my three-year-old. The only physical discomforts my children have ever known are those "pay the fiddler"



symptoms of illness what ALWAYS follow their indulgence of cooked and processed stuff they wanted to try.

After a full fun day of physical activity, I have plenty of energy left to home school my three children, play with them until they fall asleep, and then write articles and books until late into the night.

We are deeply committed to this dietary path of fruitarianism, and carrying its salubrious message to others at every opportunity that arises. Our bike cart even hosts a fruit-picker that stands proudly like a flag telling the world that we respect and honor that which sustains us in great health and enduring energy.

(Submitted by Hygeia Halfmoon who is author of PRIMAL MOTHERING IN A MODERN WORLD. If you'd like more information, write her at 21 Makani Rd. #1, Makawao, HI 96768.)

---

## **HYGIENIST OF 40 YEARS RESPONDS TO QUESTIONS AND ARGUMENTS**

*Lucette H. Dingle, Richmond, Virginia*

I am sorry to learn that there's a chasm between Dr. Cinque and you, which should not be. But he is at one level and you are ahead. It can get trying in true leadership.

I **KNOW** that homo sapiens is fruitarian and I am myself never healthier than on fruit. However, on the long ladder from apes to angels there is room for many degrees of

assistance. You cannot teach a pig to sing (an old saying) so he can do his thing for many who are not really able to tackle higher destiny. Evolution is very slow but perfect. That's why it's so slow. There needs to be more and better discourses between those who facilitate healing. I believe it will happen. Furthermore, I know how it will happen. But that's a decade ahead.

Yes, the most highly developed primates are matriarchal (in their respective categories). A dictum of visionaries from every past generation is "Women's stature in a society marks the level of civilization." I am not biased, but men have called wars, invented castes, money, dictated religions, torture, rules of marriage and all other sexual mores, used circumcisions of male babies and female girls (mutilations) to dominate entire populations.

At one time China disabled all infants girls' feet for millennia. It's all the same "good old boy network" in many disguises. Drugs are the latest establishment control mechanism. Females are not superior but they are intrinsically tied to nature's cycles and cannot undo the liaison. Males can and do this at will--the temptation is as strong as the ego.

I am fruitarian but circumstances sometimes deny me the opportunity to be totally so. The summer season I do best.

## **MY RESPONSE TO DR. CINQUE'S QUESTIONS**

Dr. Cinque makes statements in the form of questions. This is not a way to conduct a discussion. You assume the very thing, which you have to prove.

1. Fruits do not destroy teeth. But even the apes are often seen cleaning their teeth with small chewed up branches rich with resin. The Peelu from Pakistan in stick form is an excellent habit. Teeth are formed prenatal. The diet of the mother has a lifelong influence. All junk foods destroy teeth, not fruit.
2. An outright lie! Dr. Cinque should know better. I had 8 very strong babies on a high fruitarian diet. I did also eat others foods out of necessity but my energy levels were always highest on fruit.
3. Another lie of the first rank. I nursed all my babies and did beautifully on fruits and nuts, so long as I had plenty of rest, sunshine, exercise and fresh air.
4. Dr Cinque has a valid point. The fruitarian diet, being superior, lengthens life. The child will mature later and live longer. If you compare a pig to a human, the pig grows faster on grain and roots, but the quality of the life of the human is not to be compared to the pig.
5. There are fruitarian communities! We are systematically murdering some of them in the Amazon. There's a book about it written by a professor at Temple University in Philadelphia.
6. The body is self-adjusting and will intelligently restore energy and reserves of essential nutrients before it stores fatty tissues. Survival in Nature is not weight-oriented. It is energy-oriented and involves

endurance, balance and strength. The body gears for survival, not some petty ideals erected by humans.

7. Dr. Cinque confuses the well documented sentience of animals to sensitivities. The sentient body, animal or human, rejects food and conditions that are alien to its wellness. This is amkar of attunement. It is not a problem.
8. Emphatically not so! The people living on grain glutens (wheat, oats, barley and rye) develop increasing body hair with size and decreasing head hair and get brittle nails. Also, they will suffer with fungus because of the way the body eliminates the toxic debris from a high gluten diet.
9. The higher the intelligence, the less the creatures bases survival on raw muscle. The fruitarian will be more esthetic. Muscle mass will be more specialized. True, there will be better results in given areas, but it will take longer to build quality--it doesn't come cheap.
10. Estrus exists in ALL females of whatever species. Female enslavement drives menfolk who think with their penises. Their aggressiveness and expectations induce frigidity and revulsion in women. It denies the very reality of estrus in women. Refer to #7 above. (Also called oestrus.)

---

## MY EXPERIENCES AS A FRUITARIAN

*Deva Chappell*

I am 42 years old and have been a fruitarian for four years now (January, 1996).

I was stricken with a digestive disorder several years ago and was down to 83 pounds and still dropping.

As a child I was always sick from something or other. Sickesses kept hitting me several times a year after I grew up.

At age 38 I was noting some superb specimens of physical and spiritual health in India and here in Hawaii and was persuaded to go on a fruit diet.

I changed to a fruit, nut and salad diet and started doing lots of yoga and walking. Here in Hawaii that means lots of sunshine on a mostly undressed body and, yes, lots of luscious fruits. My weight jumped up as a results. As rather small-framed female, my weight soon settled at about 110 pounds.

Though these changes made a big difference in my energy, weight and feelings, my muscles were still lacking definition and tone.

I joined the YMCA and took their exercise classes. I got what I wanted and more than I expected. My energy levels increased more than ever. My self-esteem rose until I was proud of myself. My biceps and muscles began

to be quite noticeable in my uniform here--briefs, shorts and scanty beach wear.

I spent lots of time outside in the sun while walking and foraging for fruits. My body became so chic that I became the object of much male attention. No one really looked at me until I got to be well over a hundred pounds and started my program at the Y.

I had no idea that focused exercises could make such a difference in one's life. I feel younger now than I did 20 years ago.

Now I am practically a complete fruitarian because I eat so many of the wonderful fruits available here the year around. About 85% of my diet is of fruits. I still eat lots of nuts and an occasional vegetable salad.

As to those questions of Dr. Cinque's about teeth. My teeth are healthier than ever. Dentists are astounded as there's no need to clean them. They say "it's a pleasure to see such beautiful teeth."

I do have a problem. Though my enamel is okay I am very sensitive to citrus fruits--I can't chew them without pain. I can sip their fresh juices, however. I think this is due to my thin base under 12 composite fillings that replace the amalgam 8 years ago.

As to questions 2, 3 and 4 I cannot give any information. I've never been a mother.

Question No. 5 can be answered many ways. Personally, I feel that only the fruitarian diet is suited to spiritual

awareness. I spent a lot of time in India and some of those gurus from whom I learned still very much try to live life as Buddha did. Only fruits make you "pure in thought, word and deed." They have a calling from God whom they love very much. They teach that a fruit diet keeps you full of love, joy and spiritual balance.

About No. 6 I was down to 83 pounds and was ill. I fasted, then went on a fruit juice diet for 5 weeks before switching to fruits only. That was four years ago. I went up to 108 pounds within a few months. I have maintained that weight, give or take a few pounds, ever since. I really don't eat as much as before. I do eat about two avocados a day. I have to exercise a lot because I lose my muscle toning if I don't. This seems to be a blessing as I am forced to keep in shape.

On question 7 I regard everyone as having the same sensitivities though they don't have the same awareness levels. Most people are too dense to understand. One's body determines what it wants and needs. I just have to get it. The environment in 1996 is extremely toxic on many accounts. I'm impressed with how fast my system throws off the unwanted. I am not a deranged environmentally sensitive person. I throw off toxicity extremely rapidly. But I am not about to get stressed out by all this pollution, not if I can help it.

I have always been allergic to dust, hay, cats and some pollens. I wonder why. My 2 fruitarian friends on Maui are not hypersensitive environmentally, either. In fact, the 3 friends that I know that are very environmentally sensitive

to an extreme are all frail. They eat what I regard as highly toxic cooked food diets!

8. My nails and hair are fine. Michael Miller says that his are much better than ever.

9. I do notice that when not flexing, the flesh feels softer than before, but actually, my friends find it appealing to have good muscle tone. The muscles are not hard to build up even though it's hard to maintain good tone unless I constantly exercise. My fruitarian friend, Ilon, has huge muscles of steel, yet when he isn't flexing; his muscles look very soft indeed.

10. I could care less about ovulating and sex drive, quite frankly. The same with Michael Miller. We both feel blissfully pre-puberty now, and it's great. Ilon, however, the other fruit friend, has a sex drive like a rabbit! You can't imagine. I think sex drive is linked to state-of-mind and genetics, not diet. There are cooked fooders who have very little drive.

I do not think one's being heavy into sex is necessary to have a beautiful life.

I like the LOVE DRIVE, in whatever direction the Heart of Nature takes me.

*Aloha, Deva Chappell*



---

## **RAISED HER SON A FRUITARIAN**

I started my program on Natural Hygiene in 1984 with Healthful Living, which I once received.

In that year I quit doctoring my 4-year-old son and started him on the nutrition program Healthful Living advised, a diet of mostly fruits.

It has now been 12 years since my son has been to a doctor for anything other than his school athletic physicals.

My son is a fruitarian and his allergies are completely gone. He is almost 16 years old, 5 feet 10 inches and weighs 155 pounds. He is now at the top of his class and an athlete like you wouldn't believe.

I don't know how I ever came across you but I'm sure it was my prayers. You were a real Godsend.

*ELAINE DUNN, Wallace, Nebraska*

---

## **HOW MY SON BECAME A FRUITARIAN**

I started to receive a subscription to HEALTHFUL LIVING in 1984. At that time my family ate mostly meat. Every meal was built around meat. Little vegetables were eaten and no fruit at all.

My son, Matt, was 4 years old at the time and had tubes in his ears three times. He was constantly in the Doctor's office. I was tired of doctoring as he had now been on

antibiotics for most of his four years of life. It seemed every time they put him on an antibiotic he'd break out with hives and have to go in for a shot for that. He was hospitalized with pneumonia at 3 and his allergies were so bad I dreaded spring when they came on strong. His nose would run incessantly and he'd cough from May through October. He wheezed so much it was as if he really had asthma.

I then took him to an allergy specialist. He did the scratch test and found out he was allergic to mold.

If it wasn't one thing with him, it was another. I didn't nurse him because the pediatrician told me he was allergic to my milk. I now regard that as a cruel laugh. At the time I believed him. Anyway, after being totally exhausted by the problems of my child, I cried out to God and asked for his help.

It was about that time that I received your publication, *Healthful Living*.

I began applying the principles to my son's life. He made a dramatic improvement! I still ate meat except I quit buying cookies and junk food. We started eating food in the right combinations. My son's health improved so wonderfully that he hasn't had an earache since!

Then, about 3 years ago, my son decided to quit eating meat altogether. He was still quite heavy and wanted to lose weight. He was "tired of feeling tired."

In June of 1995 my son began his diet as a fruitarian. He lost weight so fast he went down from 217 to 155 within

five months! His energy levels soared--it was unbelievable that he was the same boy.

His ailments all disappeared.

His insomnia was over with.

His allergies because a thing of the past.

He said, "Mom, I can't and won't change for anybody. I feel terrible if I eat anything else or "bad food" as he calls it. He eats a case of oranges a week which we buy organically for him. I'd say a box of bananas is also eaten every week. Bananas are really his favorite food.

Yes, T. C., without a doubt, you were a Godsend and I pray other mothers learn about the right living principles that you teach. Life will be so much better and easier for them and their children--disease and problems will disappear from their lives and they'll become high-energy and smarter as my son, Matt, has.

My son is now eating lots of bananas, apples, oranges, melons, dates, avocados, tomatoes, red peppers and, occasionally, lettuce, carrots and 12-grain bread.

God Bless You! Keep up the good work.

*Elaine Dunn,*

*Wallace Nebraska*

---

## **GAINS 47 POUNDS ON FRUITARIAN DIET**

*Bridget J. Spies*

My experience in gaining over 40 pounds on a fruitarian diet was a joyous one!

In my mind I didn't know I could eat so much and feel so good. If I ate a plethora of grains and veggies, I couldn't possibly make it to such a level of health! Not to mention weight. Actually, I was 68 pounds when I went to live with Inez Matus to regain my health under her guidance.

Rather than fast me as she did the other guests, she put me on raw fruits, walked me a lot and made me get lots of sunshine. She even put me on a minor weight-lifting program.

And I had to observe her quiet hours and stay in bed all night, at least eight hours in itself, in a well-darkened room.

I came home after three weeks with a program and 15 pounds heavier. I enjoyed this three weeks with my mentor and sometimes Mr. Fry. In another three weeks I reached 100 pounds in my home and now, in January, 1996, I weigh 115 pounds. I look like a human being again.

Thank you Mr. T. C. Fry and Inez Matus for showing and teaching me that you can live on a 100% fruit diet.

I have gained this weight on fruits and fruit only.

## **MY HEAVEN ON EARTH IS NOW REALITY!**

It all began for me back in October, 1992. I was experiencing uncomfortable stomach pains. They would come and go. I was becoming very concerned not knowing what to do about it. I went to the doctors and specialists. Unimaginably, I've even been to the emergency room for various examinations. All specialists said they didn't know what was wrong.

One day I was trying to figure out the dilemma for myself. I went to the library and found a book on health. The name of the book was "FIT FOR LIFE." I read it and followed it word for word. I made the changes advocated there but it didn't change the way I felt physically. In early 1995 I called Mr. Angel Shamaya of the Life Science Institute.

I mentioned the diet I was on at the time. I was eating about 90% soy products. So he informed me how bad it was. I knew I had to eliminate this diet. During the last 3 years I was a heavy eater of soy and soy products because I believed it was a great diet even though it was difficult to eat.

One day my brother was speaking to Angel Shamaya and got the number of T. C. Fry. I was very, very thankful. I told Mr. Fry the situation. I'm 5'2" and weighted only 68 pounds. It was scary. He mentioned to me how to gain weight eating just fruit. I didn't believe him.

As months went by I phoned him again and again. He kept on insisting that fruit, sleep, exercise and sunshine was the answer for me.

Finally, he told me about a lady named Inez Matus who ran her own fasting retreat and did dietary retraining. I finally called her. She told me I was unable to digest and assimilate what I was eating. That was why I was so thin. Since I was too emaciated to fast, she placed me on a total fruit diet, put into the sun a little and often and started walking several miles a day. She gave me some light weights to do a lot of different exercises with.

I went to Pine Grove, Pennsylvania. She had me to do everything she said would get me to wellness and health.

Each day my expectations and achievements were plain joys--I was succeeding! I gained a pound a day!

By the time I was back in Louisville, I had gained 20 pounds.

I would like to thank from the bottom of my heart Angel Shamaya, Butch Spies, my brother, T. C. Fry and, of course, Inez Matus who gave me tender loving care, the inspiration to do what she asked, spelled out my diet for every day, saw that I did all the program and finally got me into preparing my own foods from what she specified.

### **MY EXPERIENCES ABOUT DR. CINQUE'S TEN QUESTIONS**

I'm happy as a total fruitarian to tell you about my experiences of the last eight months as a total fruitarian.

1. It's true that the condition of the internal body may play havoc with the teeth. I also believe that toothpaste, mouthwash, and other cleaners cause problems! When you apply hygienic practices there isn't any need to go see a dentist for a checkup! At least I didn't. Fruit isn't the culprit! As a matter of fact it's what is keep your teeth together. I did have a total of three cavities before I went on the diet. That was two years ago. Now I don't have them anymore. I now use a brush and lots of water--no toothpaste--that stuff is a disaster.

2. On the contrary to Cr. Cinque's question, I know that fruitarian women who get pregnant do exceptionally well. Women who aren't pregnant do well too! The object of pregnancy is to make a pure and clean system for the baby to dwell in. It's true that infants once born are thinner than your "average baby." But they are far healthier! Your so-called chubby babies are usually the loud and crying ones. A baby who weighs five to six pounds at birth is the ideal baby to have--if gives nothing but joys to the fruitarian mother. As the years progress, the baby will develop into a perfect specimen! Also a fruitarian mother will have less discomforts, almost none. There's never any need for abnormal deliveries to induce labor and delivery. Caesarian sections are unnecessary in fruitarian women.

3. A mother who eats of fruits in the raw state will have no trouble producing adequate quantities of high quality milk. Of course you must meet all the other needs of life, especially on sunshine, exercise, sleep and close attention to baby's needs. Dairy products are a disaster for a

fruitarian mother. Herbal teas create all kinds of problems for fruitarian mothers. Drinking lots water is not recommended--mostly fruitarian mothers don't get thirsty anyway. Anything the fruitarian mother does to increase milk production is a sad mistake.

4. I do believe a widespread problem among today's children is "giantism ." This is caused by a stimulating and distressing diet as well as hormones so much in today's foods. The mother eats freely of refined products, hamburgers and pastas, pastries, soft drinks. By the time baby is born, it may weigh 8 to 9 pounds and start growing unnaturally large thereafter. Most people think this a little human monstrosity is healthy. Such a baby will have little stamina and physical strength according to their weight and size. When a fruit baby is put immediately on an exercise program, which it can do, and it can do a lot, it grows fast mentally and develops well.

5. There are lot of fruitarians in this country, especially in California, Florida and Hawaii. There are tribes and societies of fruit-eaters in the Amazon of Brazil. There are also fruit-eating societies in the Southwest Pacific, in Africa, Europe and in Asia and a lot in Australia. But, relatively, fruitarians are still rare.

6. Every person differs during and after a fast. Gaining weight shouldn't be a problem on the fruit diet. Just observe the hygienic program in every detail of our over 30 life needs. The only reasons I can think why a person would not gain weight are emotional problems and hang-ups. But, usually, after a fast that shouldn't have to be



done, such a person becomes "born again" and feels vibrant. Also, don't forget, exercise and light weight-training with lots of sunshine, sleep and raw diet of fruits!

7. Severe digestive sensitivities and environmental sensitivities could go hand in hand. I wouldn't ever blame the fruit. If you are experiencing digestive discomforts, I would recommend a lengthy fast. Or examine how well you practice mental hygiene. Either getting just a little of exercise, sunshine, raw fruit diet, lots of sleep and so on will still do marvels for you.

8. To use synthetic products that are outright harmful such as cosmetics, nail polishes, shampoos and so on will merely "deny you true beauty" as conferred by Mother Nature. The fact that the nails are weak and hair is thin is because the body isn't totally free of the old ways of living. On the fruitarian diet my hair is shiny and lustrous. My nails are strong! There are many reasons your nails could be weak and your hair dull. But fruitarianism is not one of the causes. Maybe you have a metabolic problem. Maybe you aren't getting enough sunshine and exercise. There's also a thing called emotional balance. I suggest that you face up to your attitude and thinking. You should be rationally-directed and give up impulsive thinking and reactions.

9. If a person is exercising and not developing any muscles, it could be there aren't enough weights being used. Nonresistant exercises are very important but you need heavier exercises like chin-ups, jumping jacks, push-ups and use of heavier and heavier dumbbells.

10. Animals in nature weren't meant to bleed during a certain day of the month; so why should human women do so? A "period" is the shedding of the endometrium lining of the uterus. The change from an old to a new one should not cause a blood flow. Healthy people like healthy animals do not experience the embarrassment of blood flow. I do not suffer periods.

Also many women do have the "urge to merge" at all times of the month. This puts the body into a "survival of the species mode." A "feast and famine" mode will also happen. All this messes up the person and often makes them emotional wrecks.

I believe sex is for procreation, not recreation.

*Amen, Bridget Spies*

---

## **OBSERVATIONS AND EXPERIENCE OF INEZ MATUS RELATIVE TO DR. CINQUE'S TEN QUESTIONS**

I'm sorry that I did not sooner respond to you. I thought these questions were a joke. They're not really questions so much as statements in the form of questions. As such they are very biased and reflect gross ignorance about fruitarians and fruitarianism.

I am a fruitarian of only one year but I have now met other fruitarians and was surprised to meet so many in my area- I started out on my own not even knowing there was more than one hygienist in the area and she flew off to California so she could be a better fruitarian. Then I met

this hygienist who worked in a health food store and this opened up a new world of acquaintances to me.

As to his first questions concerning teeth. I must confess that my teeth have been a disaster all my life due to my SAD diet from early childhood. By the time I found Natural Hygiene most of my back teeth had been capped and the rest of my teeth had demineralized to the point of being almost transparent. Since I have become a fruitarian in the last year, my teeth have remineralized and hardened, even one cavity being filled in. I am really looking forward to my next set of teeth. In the mean time I must make do with what I have left.

I know in my heart that, had I known about Natural Hygiene many years ago, I would not have suffered as I have. As my health continues to improve, my teeth are improving too. My whole body was pitifully abused for the 20 years. I was on the operating table so much and on so many drugs that my present reality seems like a miracle. I believe in miracles and expect health miracles for others as a matter of course. I am now responsible for dozens of people realizing superb health. I have guided all to wonderful health by employing the fruitarian diet or directing a fast and then getting my clients onto fruitarian eating.

I have yet to meet a fruitarian pregnant woman nor a child born of a fruitarian mother. I hope to do so some day. My experience in the medical field has been that almost every birth is a disaster with very unhealthy babies being born to very unhealthy mothers on the conventional SAD diet. All

babies had medical problems and I do mean medical-- their problems were almost all medically caused. I've never seen one healthy baby in our maternity ward during my twenty years in the hospital.

I would really be interested in Dr. Cinque's research and statistics about fruitarianism.

As to fruitarian mothers and their milk production, it is my good fortune to have met Carolyn Hughes of Stony Point, New York. She is raising her children as fruitarians and they're all darlings. She is presently nursing and her milk is rich and adequate for her latest child. If Dr. Cinque saw these children he couldn't be anything less than an instant believer in the wonderful results of fruitarianism.

In my short time as a fruitarian, I have seen many gain weight on fruits. I have had no losers under my care. All have gained weight and developed robust energy. My own weight of 118 pounds at 5'8" makes me look like an athlete. I have an abundance of vitality, strength and energy. After my 28 day fast to overcome medical complications over a year ago, I feel better now than I did even as a child.

I have not had any digestive problems since going on the fruitarian diet and I used to have chronic gastritis and diverticulitis. I have come to a high state of health and helped my clients do the same by putting all into a lot of exercise and getting them into the sun a lot. I find that my Ott lights make a great deal of difference in my client's quick recoveries. Right now I have a lady whose breast cancer had a suppurated frightfully until she started

fasting. Her football sized breast is now down to a scabbing little lemon-sized deal about two by two in affected area. The doctors had already given up on her after she refused surgery and chemotherapy.

Our environment is no longer the pristine place that it once was. But I'm happy that its detrimental influences aren't affecting me as badly as it used to.

My hair is shinier and healthier than ever before. I am sure this is due to my change to fruitarianism. My nails are stronger than ever before. I wonder where Dr. Cinque is finding those pitiful fruitarians of which he speaks.

Since eating all fruit, exercising, getting lots of sunshine and doing yoga every day, my body is regaining muscle, strength and endurance. I am better than ever before with added flexibility.

In 1983 my body went into ovulatory failure because of extreme body toxicity. I had a bizarre type of cancer and signed myself out of the hospital before radiation, chemotherapy and surgery. Although I have not regained my ovulatory function, I do not feel this is the fault of my fruitarianism. During my medical career I met lots of women who had ovulatory failure from toxicity, stress and drastic changes occasioned by the "pill" or fertility drugs.

I've been a fruitarian only for the past year and it's been a miracle in my life. I credit it with many remarkable improvements in my life. Like I went from a legally blind status to better than 20/20 vision.

As to decreased sex drive, I don't fit into that category either. Most of today's men turn me off instead of on. I don't think I could bring myself to cohabit with a non-fruitarian. Fruitarians are of a sweet disposition. They have no odors. They are highly intelligent and have better looks.

*Inez Matus, Pine Grove, Penn.*

---

## **CINDY CAMPBELL GOES FRUITARIAN AND RELATES HER EXPERIENCES ON THE DIET**

My first contact with Dr. Cinque was one of rejection. My feelings arising from that would normally color my thinking and make me bitter. But, as a fruitarian, I have become compassionate. I think he is fear-directed and doesn't want to get involved with anyone that will require a lot of effort on his part.

I was desperate. I called him on the phone as I saw his ad. At just over 70 pounds I was looking for help. Ralph actually laughed at me when I told him my weight and said he could not help me. He had a very sharp tongue and criticized me severely in telling me to bug off.

Today is February 17th and it's sunny and really warm here in Maine. It's over 60 degrees. I just got a heavy dose of vitamin D.

Now about Dr. Cinque's questions. I'll start with my hair. Since taking up the all-raw mostly fruit diet, my hair has become so wonderful even my hairdresser noticed the

difference very quickly. She ran her fingers through my hair and was raving about how thick it was now compared to my previous visit 5 months before. It fluffs up and has so much body now; before it just laid flat and was lifeless.

Yes, Dr. Cinque I was one of those sixty-nine pounders that called you for help. You refused me. I asked you how much lower could a person feel than to be refused assistance in what I considered a very critical crisis.

In mid-1995 I finally located and spoke to Mr. T. C. Fry. He was very kind and understanding. He directed me to Inez Matus in Pine Grove, Pennsylvania. I went there. I entered an environment and began my recovery. Environment and caring are very important and played a heavy role in my recovery.

Love was all around me. I felt appreciated. My goals and recovery became a challenge handed to me under her supervision. My recovery was up to me.

Discipline and forethought about what I did was emphasized at every step of the way.

She gave me responsibilities to assume in my care. She left my care in my hands while she advised, guided and made helpful hints.

Exercise was of utmost importance.

Sunshine played such a big role in my recovery that I cannot praise it enough.

Perhaps most important of all, Ms. Matus gave me only fruits, vegetables and nuts. She gave me recipes and I had to make them up myself.

I could sense my body becoming richly nourished from day one on a all raw fruitarian diet consisting of mostly organically grown foods. My heavy foods were bananas and banana ice cream. I ate lots of watermelon and muskmelon. I ate fresh figs, oranges, apples, lettuce, celery, tomatoes, sweet peppers, carrot juice, dulse flakes, nuts, avocados, broccoli, cauliflower, cabbage, jicama, peaches, plums--My diet consisted of much more.

I believe you've got the idea. Well, to make a long story short, on this diet I gained 20 pounds in the six weeks I was with Ms. Matus.

I rebounded 20 minutes per day. I did one hour of yoga, all before breakfast.

I went for a long walk or two every day. I spent lots of time in the sunshine. I lifted light weights. This brought me muscle mass which the likes of I've never seen on my body. I developed very shapely legs, My happiness and smile returned. I felt good. I still feel very good.

Blaming a person's low weight on "following" T. C. Fry is quite an assumption by Dr. Cinque.

Has Dr. Cinque ever heard of anemia? I for one can attest to the FACT that if you are anorexic, then it matters not one little bit what kind of diet you're on because you use food as an escape (drug) and numb yourself which brings on heavy toxicosis. I was anemic too.



I don't understand why Dr. Cinque blames low weight on fruits. His thinking seems to be of the "medical mentality." Diet alone has little to do with the weight loss I suffered. Needless to say, I was not on fruits.

I am young and single and not experienced enough to intelligently deal with Dr. Cinque's other questions.

---

***The material printed below is furnished as documents supporting fruitarianism***

**RESEARCH YIELDS BOMBHELL OF A SURPRISE  
--Paradise Diet Uncovered By Scientist--**

The Prestigious New York Times newspaper, in its May 15, 1979 issue, surprised your editor more by printing an article than the surprise they express by the findings revealed.

The gist of this article concerns research done by an anthropologist, Dr. Alan Walker of John Hopkins University in Maryland.

Dr. Walker has come to the startling conclusion that early humans were fruit eaters--not just fruit eaters but exclusively and only fruit eaters--eaters of nothing by fruit. This comes as quite a bombshell from a noted publication that has a vested interest in a heavy meat-eating society.

By careful examination of fossil teeth and fossilized remains of humans with the aid of electron microscopes and other sophisticated tools, Dr. Walker and other

researchers are absolutely certain that our ancestors, up to a point in relatively recent history, were fruitarians.

Hygienists are not necessarily fruitarians but all will tell you that humans are, by physiology and anatomy, frugivores. A cursory study of biology will reveal this, even if written by meat-eating professors, which most of our biologists are.

The scope of the article is rather far flung. They trace humans through history as expanding to herbage and nuts and, finally, to meat as a full-fledged omnivore.

But the essence of the article is that, though we undertook omnivorous eating practices, our anatomy and physiology have not changed--we remain biologically a species of fruit eaters.

Our dietetic character is established by our disposition toward fruits. Our natural diet has great eye and taste appeal. It passes from the stomach in digestible form in from 10 minutes to 30 minutes after ingestion.

Contrast this with concentrated fat and protein foods which take three to five hours to pass out of the stomach.

We do not have the four stomachs that herbivores usually have. This rules out most herbage.

We have only one starch-splitting enzyme versus a multitude of them in omnivores and starch-eating animals. Our ptyalin is very limited. This rules us out as starch-eaters which includes grains or cereals. We are not graminivores.

Neither are we carnivores. It is repugnant to our thoughts to kill and eat an animal while it is yet warm and bloody, to eat its brains, heart, offal and blood as true carnivores do. True carnivores do not chew meat--they have in their digestive tracts a hydrochloric acid so concentrated, about 1100% more so than ours, that it will digest the flesh from our hands if they swallowed them. But our acids are so weak we digest meat poorly even if we chew it thoroughly. Even then we cannot handle uric acid except at great expense to our vitality and well-being. Cholesterol plays havoc with our circulatory system. So don't think we're natural meat-eaters. We're suffering very dearly for our dietary indiscretions--America has more sick people than any country in the world.

Can you imagine the dismay with which our meat and dairy industry not to mention our extensive junk food industry will view such damaging propaganda? Can you not see how many advertisers will have second thoughts about placing advertising in the New York Times?

Well, it doesn't quite work like that. The junk food advertising in the New York Times amounts to about nil. It is a newspaper that "prints all the news that's fit to print." It serves a cultured aware audience.

But one of the surprising things that came out of this article is its attribution of the harmfulness of our shift from our natural diet of fruits to other items of food that range from eggs and insects to milk and meats, that range from roots to cereals.

I have checked with many Life Scientists in other areas of the country. Not one has seen nary a mention of these universally significant findings. I've examined our local papers. You'd never know about it. After all, our local papers serve the industries that a general knowledge and observance of these findings would destroy outright.

Most Hygienists/Life Scientists do not make sweet fruits their primary item of diet. Few do, though some do. Your editor's diet has been over 95% fruitarian. Tomatoes, bell peppers, cucumbers, avocados, and other such items are fruits.

Actually we all naturally have a "sweet tooth" and it is with reference to fruit-eating that we are frugivores.

When I was a youngster, I was accused of wanting to eat only desserts and leaving the good substantial food to waste. Now I'm intrigued by all-dessert meals! In fact, I eat so many of them now I sometimes go for days with nothing else. Now that the melon season is upon us, plus all the other goodies, I'm afraid my vegetable and non-sweet fruit eating are going to take a back seat. In the just terminating mulberry season, your editor ate only mulberries for two or three days running on several occasions.

The salutary truths contained in these findings will be hedged by most who learn of it. It will be said that fruits do not supply us with sufficient proteins or nutrients or no longer do. Much will be said but this does not negate the truth. It will all be in defense of wrong learning and wrong

notions. Even many Hygienist/Life Scientists will pooh-pooh an all-fruit diet.

If you don't go along with an all-fruit diet, then why not add some greens, nuts and seeds? But you should make your diet of mostly fruit. You'll attain to a high state of health, mental wellbeing and functional vigor. If you eat a salad every second and third day with a protein food, such as nuts or seeds, you'll be assured more than adequate nutriment.

---

**FRUIT-EATERS HAVE BIG BRAINS!  
VEGETATION-EATERS HAVE SMALL BRAINS!  
FRUIT-EATERS ARE HIGH-ENERGY CREATURES!  
VEGETATION-EATERS ARE LOW-ENERGY  
CREATURES!**

*Big Brained creatures fast-witted and smart!  
Small-brained creatures slow-witted and dull!*

That's a wealth of headlines! They embody a cornucopia of revelations! All this is derived from an article on the subject of vegetation-eating monkeys and apes compared with fruit-eating monkeys, chimps and humans.

In **DISCOVER** magazine for May, 1995 there appears an article entitled Gut Thinking wherein its author, Peter Radetsky, presents the results of 20 years of study of primates (monkeys, chimps, apes and humans) by anthropologist, KATHERINE MILTON of the University of California at Berkeley.

The sub headline is: "What makes fruit-eating spider monkeys so much smarter than leaf-eating howlers?" The article reflects that the fruit-eating spider monkeys had 107 grams of brain matter while the same sized monkeys, the leaf-eating howlers, had only 50.4 grams.

Moreover, the spider monkeys were highly energetic and moved a lot because fruits are fast-high-energy foods whereas the howlers were languid and slow because vegetation is very poor energy-yielding food.

This article says quite a bit on the subjects it covers and really says a whole lot more than is stated!

It was noted in the article that vegetation-eating howler monkey mothers alienated and weaned their babies at 12 to 14 months while the fruit-eating spider monkey mothers nursed several years and maintained the familial relation for quite some time thereafter. The same principle was noted with vegetation-eating gorillas compared with fruit-eating chimpanzees and naturally fruitarian humans.

Further, the dumbness and dullness of the howler monkeys were highlighted by their dopiness. Spider monkeys were active, playful and fun-loving. They would sometimes steal the babies of the howler monkeys for kicks. The languid howler mothers didn't know what to do.

Most of the points made are reflected in our headlines though it would be quite wise to read the article if you can!

It's nice to quote Katherine Milton's closing observation: "Everything comes back to diet. It's the pivotal feature, the kickoff. When you get right down to it, the way we behave

had better translate ultimately into groceries--or we're not going to be around to behave that way much longer."

Dare I translate the obvious import of Dr. Milton's statement? She is saying that, "If you don't use it, you lose it!" If you don't exercise your disposition as a fruit-eater at the grocery counter, you become a dull-witted person! Eating a primarily fruit diet is the key to human intelligence, energy and virtues. We're the product of fruit-eating forebears. We'd better continue the tradition or sink into mediocrity.

*(P.S. Those disposed to criticize me are obviously dull-witted non-fruit eaters!)*

---

## **THE BONOBOS, THE APES WITH HUMAN TRAITS**

In the SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN for March, 1995, there is an extensive study of the Bonobo apes. The remarkable feature of this study is the many humanlike traits exhibited by these chimpanzee-like creatures.

Love and mutual appreciation characterize their relationships. They can well be called "the compassionate ape." They do not fight, bluff and contend as chimpanzees do. The social focus revolves around females rather than the males. Children are nursed and carried around for five years while the familial relationship is for life. Lineage is matriarchal as it was with humans up until a few thousand years ago with the advent of the private property system which emphasized male dominance and lineage.

We've heretofore learned from other anthropologists that chimps are about 97% fruitarian in their dietary while spider monkeys are virtually 100% fruitarian. From this article we learn that the Bonobos are virtually 100% fruitarian except on occasion, when observed eating the pith from herbaceous plants--like sugar cane, for instance. Perhaps you know that pith is usually the stalk area of a plant like broccoli where nutrients in their simplest forms are stored prior to usage. The pith contains the nutrient pool for seed and fruit formation. Instead of proteins, the pith contains, like fruits, amino acids. The pith contains simple sugars (monosaccharide's like glucose and fructose and disaccharides such as sucrose) ready for use rather than starches which are a storage form for nutrients and virtually indigestible for both apes and humans. The pith also contains simple fatty acids (monoglycerides) and, in association with it all, ample minerals and vitamins.

There are many unusual humanlike practices among the Bonobos. They frequently walk upright as do humans. And they often have conjugal relationships face-to-face rather than from the rear as in the practice with chimpanzees.

This *Scientific American* article is an interesting study that students of anthropology and the natural dietary of primate mammals (which includes humans) can read with great benefit.



---

## A PROPER DEFINITION OF FRUIT

The word fruit derives from the Latin, *fructus*, which merely means *enjoyment* or to *enjoy*.

The word also means *product*, that is, the result of productive effort.

While fruit is the product of a ripened ovary, the results of ripened ovaries are rarely fruits in the sense that we mean! That definition includes beans and grains. In short, it includes virtually all the seeds in the universe whether they are grass or weeds, or beneficent or toxic, or whatever.

When we speak of fruit we do not mean weed seeds or grass seeds. These are not properly fruits. They are not a product at all but an integral part of the life cycle of their respective plants.

All that we mean by the term *fruit* is the edible portion or the plant *product* created specifically for consumption by a biological symbiont. Fruit is that portion of the seed package produced by the plant or tree that is created as a gustatory delight for the enjoyment of those who partake of it.

Fruits are made delightful to attract consumption by a biological symbiont. By design of an uncanny intelligence in nature, fruits also meet the precise nutrient needs of their biological symbionts. This is true though they vary widely in their appearance, aromas and composition.

When water and fibers are removed, the nutrient values of the solids are remarkably proportional in most fruits!

Fruits have been designed by this same intelligence in nature to insure that their seeds are distributed by this arrangement. Thusly, their kind is reproduced and the species maintained.

My definition of *fruit* is, thusly, an enjoyable *product* of a plant or tree extraordinary to, but within the context of its seed package. The product is designed to invite consumption with the incidental symbiotic benefit of seed distribution and procreation of kind.

This is the ONLY definition of fruit as food that will suffice.

---

## **READER WARNS OF DANGERS OF FRUIT-EATING**

Dear Mr. Fry,

One egregious (*outstanding or notable*) defect with the fruitarian diet that you constantly champion is the irrefutable fact that such a sugary diet assures a high triglyceride blood count.

Triglycerides are blood fats, which travel with cholesterol in packages called lipoproteins. Elevated levels of triglycerides can cause blood cells to adhere (*sludge*), impairing circulation, and possibly leading to heart attack or stroke. They also interfere with insulin activity, and contribute to diabetes.

Fruitarianism, no: veganism, yes.

*Most cordially,*

*Norman Meyerson,*

*Boca Raton, Florida*

**MR. FRY'S RESPONSE:**

Dear Mr. Meyerson,

Your "irrefutable fact" is not a fact at all! You are accusing the body and nature of serious malfunction, improvidence and lacking in the ability to conduct simple physiological processes.

Humans are irrefutably frugivores (if you know your biology and anthropology) and are not subject to the ills you describe from fruit-eating.

I've operated a fasting retreat and two of the foremost grief-stricken nonmeat eaters who were my guests for recovery of health were vegans and so-called macrobiotic dieters.

I know many fruit-eaters but they're disease-free.

As a matter of simple physiology, glucose and fructose are sent by the liver to the circulating blood where insulin picks it up and carries it to the interstitial (intercellular) fluid where cells ingest it. If the cells have more than they can deal with, it is converted to glycogen for future use. If they then have a surplus, the liver then has the job of dealing with it.

The same goes for the liver in dealing with sugars. The body stores about 2000 calories of glycogen before it

begins converting sugars to fats. The fats are thenceforth dispatched for storage in fat cells.

The idea that sugars cause diabetes has been discredited ages ago. The destruction of the beta cells in the Islets of Langerhans in the Pancreas is due to toxin-saturation which deranges them the same as it does bronchial cells when they become engorged with toxic materials. The result there is asthma. Both are degenerative diseases.

When you eat fruits, the appestat (the hypothalamus) shuts down the appetite long before surfeit. Even so, if fats are formed for storage in fat cells from overeating, the body handles them with efficiency and dispatch.

As a vegan you probably take grains, beans, and potatoes as carbohydrates. Has anyone ever told you that, after digestion, they are absorbed as glucose? That the "problem" you describe would like wise apply?

What you're describing is actually an effect of cooked animal fats and proteins in the system. If you have any experience at all with dark-field monitors of living blood, you'd know that the problem you describe is the result of eating lots of animal products and in no way attends vegetarians and fruitarians. Stroke and heart attack result from clogged arteries. Plaque consists of alien (unusable) fats, cholesterol and minerals. Unusable fats and cholesterol combine with inorganic minerals (resulting from heat deranged foods--and ingesting them that way from mineralized water, supplements, enriched foods, etc.), and adhere to arterial walls as plaque as you well know.

If you eat cooked foods you must know that proteins are no longer proteins or amino acids after being heated only as high as 180 degrees. At 118 degrees proteins start coagulating and most have been deaminated by 150 degrees. You must know that we cannot derive benefit from deranged proteins but, instead, putrefactive bacteria have a field day decomposing them, giving you ammonias, methane, ptomaines, leukomaines, indoles, skatoles, hydrogen sulfide, mercaptans and a raft of other poisons to deal with. These carcinogens exact quite a toll on macrobiotic and vegan followers.

Heated beans and grains yield so many deranged proteins for bacterial putrefaction that they're quite pathological.

The way to overcome plaque and sludged blood is to eat a clean-burning raw food diet! Fruits and vegetables enable the body to overcome cardiovascular problems. Under no circumstances do they cause harm.

Countries where fruits are a predominant part of the diet (Hunzas, Abkhasians, Vilcabambians, many Pacific islanders, Mesquito Indians, etc.) are totally free of the problems you pose!

If you wish to get into documentation, cite yours and we'll continue.

---

## **DISGUIISING VEGETABLES TO MAKE THEM PALATABLE**

In the May 16, 1995, issue of USA TODAY is a health and education column. It's not really a health column though it does, in this issue, praise a lot of fruits shortly to come on the market. Fruits are highly contributory to health.

The lead item praised a new low-fat way to eat veggies.

Recommended as condiments to make the veggies go down pleasantly are Fresh Gourmet's Stir 'n Sauce and Toss 'n Sauce.

As plain tasteless pasta's attraction is in the sauce in which it is served, so, too, vegetable-eating is getting a great boost from sauces which disguise their flavor or even lend flavor where they are tasteless and repulsive.

Of course, this has been so for a long time. What is new is the low-fat feature of the dressing and sauces.

There's a lot of truth in the advice not to eat what you can't relish for its own sake in the raw condition. You don't need a sauce for watermelon, apples, grapes or bananas, do you? But what would grated cabbage and carrots be without a sauce or dressing that makes them into a tasty raw cole slaw?

Of course, so few nutritious items of diet are ingested by most Americans that cole slaw or other raw veggies are a boon in their diet even with condiments, though most condiments are unwholesome and toxic. Practically all the

intake of our fellow countrymen is pathogenic anyway and is disguised with even more unwholesome condiments than are veggies--heated fats for example as in fried foods, chips and a multitude of other junk. That's one of the secrets of the junk food industry--to lend flavor to their tasteless and/or repulsive fare with condiment additives which disguise or alter flavor so that consumers will eat and overeat of it. Corn is as tasteless as pasta and tofu but, with condiments and carcinogenic heated oils, it is a popular snack as chips.

A few years back when Harvey and Marilyn Diamond's book, FIT FOR LIFE, was in its heyday, I received a phone call from a lady who said she gained weight on the diet while her friends were happily losing weight. I questioned her carefully on her intake. She was eating all-raw like the others and her intake was only fruits and veggies--nothing else. She wasn't eating dried fruits which she loved nor nuts and seeds for all were fattening--at least to her mind-set.

I informed her there's no way she could gain weight on fruits and veggies even if she ate twice her caloric needs. Yet she had gained 12 pounds while her fellow fit for lifers had lost 15 to 25 pounds. What was wrong?

I questioned her about her thyroid and other conditions that reflect her metabolic rate--if she was one "who gains weight just thinking about food." No clues turned up. Then I went over every item of her diet again as to amount and circumstances of eating. I again informed her there was no way she could change to such a diet and gain

weight as, when the dietary is improved, the body sheds weight regardless of its caloric intake. Finally, it occurred to me to ask her: "What are you using on your salads for dressing?" "Mayonnaise" was her answer.

How much I asked her? Well not much--she used only a quart jar of it every two or three days.

---

## **SHOULD WE EAT VEGETABLES?**

This subject is very important to most of us. The varied criteria that must be considered for eating leaves, stems, roots and tubers from all perspectives is staggering to most intellects.

In a recent issue of the New York Times there was an article titled "Lightly cooked vegetables beat raw for nutrition" under the byline of Mark Bittman.

Mr. Bittman pointed out that the nutrients of vegetables are largely locked up by their cellulose membranes and high fiber content. He highlighted the fact that, eaten raw, precious few of the nutrients of vegetables like broccoli and carrots could be digested.

Dr. John W. Erdman, Jr., directory for the University of Illinois division of nutritional sciences at Champaign-Urbana, stated that "eating raw vegetables is not the optimal way to get at their nutrients." Dr. Erdman said that we can absorb as little as 1% of the beta-carotene from a carrot that is eaten raw.



Dr. Erdman stated that heating carrots breaks down proteins and fiber and increases the "bioavailability" of nutrients. He noted that heat destroyed much of the vitamin C in vegetables, but that this was offset by gains in other nutrients. This is questionable from the hygienist's perspective for the heat required to expand cells until their tough membranes burst and tenderize their fibrous tissues, thusly making their nutrients freely available, also partially to wholly breaks down, deranges and destroys the nutrients--especially the minerals! Further, it is better to get 1% of prime nutrients than 100% of deranged nutrients that will derange you too!

At a temperature of only 118 degrees proteins start becoming deranged and by the temperature of pasteurization is reached, 160 degrees, most amino acids are deaminated, useless and soil for toxic putrefactive products of bacterial decomposition. Likewise, minerals are deranged and toxic even if still retained within by cooking which most are no matter how cooked. They are pathogenic and carcinogenic as cited in chapter 13, among others, of the book, DIET, NUTRITION, AND CANCER published in 1982 by the Nutrition Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences. The minerals that we require for nutrition become highly toxic after heating.

Iron poisoning and magnesium poisoning are turning up frequently in those who take iron supplements and eat enriched cereals, breads, etc. Magnesium poisoning and subsequent serious illness is the subject of FDA warnings recently. Antacids containing magnesium are listed as the

culprits even though magnesium has an RDA of 500 milligrams daily. The whole difference is between inorganic minerals and organic minerals--the organic is in context with fruits and other foodstuffs whereas the inorganic has been made so by cooking or from use of magnesium from rocks or other sources.

As an example, Dr. Erdman cited potatoes. Only 30% of the potato starch is digested when raw but rises to 95% when cooked. He pointed out that the undigested starch of raw potato is bacterially converted to gas by the time it reaches the large intestine where it causes distention, pain and, as we all know, embarrassing flatulence. Oddly, the same thing happens with cooked potatoes too!

Dr. Erdman stated that cauliflower and broccoli also contain high amounts of starch. This simply is not so. Cauliflower is a low-starch head of florets in the process of setting fats, proteins and starches into seeds that, in a storage form, will survive the rigors of nature until growing conditions again exist. As eaten, most of its nutrients are not set into these storage forms but are mostly in glucose, amino acids and fatty acids which are readily absorbed.

And, too, there is virtually no starch in broccoli. It too, is eaten prior to the setting of its nutrients into seeds in a storage form, that is protein, fat and starch. Prior to creating seeds, broccoli marshals its nutrients in its stalk and florets as glucose and amino acids along with a plethora of mineral and vitamin nutrients.

Dr. Paul Lachance who is chairman of the food science department at Rutgers stated that "Cooking increases the

bioavailability of some nutrients, but you also lose some by cooking. He said that cooking causes the loss of about 50% of vitamin C and about the same for the B vitamins. Further, the many minerals of vegetables are likewise lost in cooking.

Professor Gertrude Armbruster of the nutritional sciences department at Cornell University advised the use of steaming or microwaving with microwaving as being the least destructive of nutrients and their maximum retention. To which your writer comments: "That's a crock!" Microwaving is the worst way to go.

Another method that received Dr. Lachance's approval was cooking in a wok. The light coating of oil on the vegetables helped nutrient retention and insured faster cooking of the vegetables. Dr. Erdman also said that carrots digest better in the presence of oils.

Dr. Lachance also advocated cooking in a pressure cooker without water in contact with the vegetables or cooking in a boil-in-a-bag. The nutrients don't go anywhere he stated.

As an afterthought Dr. Erdman stated that pulverizing vegetables in a juicer has the same effect as cooking--it makes more nutrients bio-available. And, your writer adds, without the nutrient destruction suffered in cooking though, to be sure, there is some loss of nutrients due to oxidation upon exposure of the pulverized vegetables to air.

Breaking up the fibrous vegetables in a juicer and recombining them or blending them thoroughly is far less harmful than cooking even though somewhat harmful.

After all the discussion, the very best method, juicing, was discarded and cooking was advocated, two of the most highly praised methods being the worst!

For instance, wok heating turns the oils used into highly toxic carcinogens! Yes, cooking in a bag keeps all the nutrients in better than other methods. But heated plastics are also carcinogenic and there is some migration of plastic to the food. Further, "retaining the nutrients" merely insures that you get the deranged nutrients and pathogenic debris which will cause leukocytosis and other downline problems if the proliferating white blood cells do not apprehend them.

There is a very important point all these learned nutritionists are overlooking: Even though these methods of cooking retain the minerals, they are nevertheless denied to us as nutrients! The minerals lose their organic context with the heat required for breakup of the fibers and membranes. What you're getting are minerals in a toxic native inorganic state as in rocks, ores, soil, etc. They are inorganic ashes the moment they are deranged from their organic context. The fact that these and other debris and deranged nutrients occasion leukocytosis marks their pathogenicity.

Vitamins are still heat-deranged and destroyed by all cooking methods! Further, proteins are coagulated and deaminated beginning with temperatures as low as 118

degrees Fahrenheit. You get it all, toxic debris and deranged nutrients. Conservative cooking, that is, heating below 200 degrees, causes a lot less problems in the body than the boiling until soggy methods most Americans employ.

Truly, it has been said that he who plays with fire gets burned. Again, it is better to get a small percentage of usable nutrients from raw vegetables than to get most of them so deranged they'll deliver you a real whamo!

But there is a much better way to get vegetables than either cooking or juicing. If you're going to eat them, eat them raw but chew them well! Chewing well is every bit as effective as juicing! And it has enormous benefits as jaw exercises!

That chewing is effective is easily proven!

We can base our proof on alkalinizing power! Alkalinizing power is based on the mineral content of vegetables. Many vegetables like celery, broccoli, bok choy, nappa cabbage, lettuce, spinach, kale and collards have a plethora of alkaline minerals that are very alkaline in their metabolic reaction. If these minerals are barely surrendered as these nutritionists claim, there's virtually no alkalinizing power!

I've had hundreds consult me about heartburn and upset stomach. I advise them to eat whatever of the above vegetables they have on hand instead of taking antacids, most of which have brain-deadening aluminum in them. I advise them to chew thoroughly. A single stem of celery

or stem and leaf of bok choy or nappa cabbage or collards, etc. usually resolves the worst case of heartburn! For those who cannot chew I advise then to blend or juice the vegetable. Same result. Chewed, blended or juiced, the alkalinizing power is about the same as several antacid tablets. If chewing did not make these alkaline nutrients available, they simply would not be effective.

A single carrot has several multiples of our daily need for beta-carotene which the body converts to vitamin A. Whether we chew it, blend it or juice it, we still get enough from about a four to six ounce carrot to meet our need for a whole day. But, of course, juice is much tastier. Carrots, incidentally, contain less than 50% starch with the rest of its non-fibrous carbohydrate being in the form of glucose even though that is locked up in membranous fiber. You wouldn't relish carrot juice if it were starch. Try juicing a potato for comparison. The potato is starchy throughout.

On a nutrient by nutrient basis let's examine their best sources in foods that we relish raw.

Our foremost nutrient is carbohydrates. About 85% of our nutrient needs are for fructose and glucose. This is obtained easily in a predigested form in fruits. In association with fruits we also obtain all other nutrient needs adequately!

Almost all fruits contain the same amount of nutrients when we take another essential nutrient, water, out of the picture. For instance, if we take 100 grams of banana

without water (this represents 400 grams of fresh banana with water) we get the following:

Sugars: 304 utile calories of 76 grams

Proteins: 5 grams of amino acid (not usable as calories as conversion creates a loss.)

Minerals: 3 grams

Fatty Acids: .8 grams

Fiber: 2 grams

Vitamin A: 760 IU

Vitamin C: 40 milligrams

Replete with other vitamins

The banana yields 100% of its nutrients just for chewing and swallowing! It's all predigested and is not locked up in membranes and fibers.

Let's look at watermelon. 100 grams of solids represents 1,400 grams of fresh watermelon with what its famous for-water.

Sugars: 296 utile calories of 74 grams

Proteins: 7 grams of amino acid

Minerals: 4 grams

Fatty Acids: 2.8 grams

Fiber: 4 grams

Vitamin A: 8,200 IU

Vitamin C: 98 milligrams

Watermelon is replete with other vitamins.

We get similar values for other fruits when water is considered a neutral factor.

Why do we eat vegetables in the first place? Do they have any unique nutrients? When we consider the five macronutrients and their best sources, we may discover that vegetables are unneeded by any yardstick!

Let's look at popular vegetable, romaine lettuce and compare 100 grams of its solids with the above. It takes about fourteen and 2/3 pounds of romaine lettuce to comprise 100 grams of solids.

Sugars: Virtually none available

Proteins: 22 grams as protein

Minerals: 15 grams

Fiber: 59 grams

Vitamin A: 31,000 IU (That's 8 times our daily need!)

Vitamin C: 300 milligrams

Replete with other vitamins.

Lettuce is a negative calorie food. While we might eat 3 pounds of watermelon to get our fill, we would hardly eat more than 4 to 6 ounces of lettuce with water content in a salad! Therefore, divide the above figures by about 60 to see what you're getting from lettuce. And, unless you chew the lettuce thoroughly, you're not even getting that.



I love salads, but I like my salads of mostly fruit! In my salads I may have about five to six ounces of lettuce, collards, bok choy or other greens and about a pound of tomatoes and red sweet peppers combined. There is about six to eight ounces of avocado or two to three ounces of nuts or seeds in my salads. Also in my salad there's usually about a tablespoon of lemon juice, a teaspoon of raw vegetable/fruit powder and half a teaspoon of dulse flakes, a heavily mineralized sea vegetable.

As you can see, there are many considerations. Even though I eat vegetables and relish them in my salads, they comprise less than 5% of my intake! For me, vegetables are no big deal on either side of the ledger.

---

## **THE FALLACY OF ACCEPTING MEDICAL NORMS AS NATURAL NORMS**

When considering our nutrient needs, it is wise to learn that the RDAs and medical norms are really pathological norms. To take RDAs and other proclaimed nutrient requirements as gospel in our assessment of human nutrient needs is an error unworthy of observant and thinking individuals on the health scene.

**For instance**, healthy people have resting pulses in the 30s and 40s whereas the norm among conventional-living individuals is proclaimed to be 72.

**ITEM:** 98.2 is said to be the normal human temperature. But actually, this is a low-grade fever as the healthier people have levels in the 96 to 97 range.

**ITEM:** Hematocrits of our foremost athletes are about half those of what is considered medically normal. The possession of red blood cells that are healthy and which hold lots of oxygen reduces the requirement for red blood cells to about half of what a pathological person who has poor quality red blood cells needs to get the greater amount of oxygen required relatively--those with pathology require more of everything.

**ITEM:** White blood cell counts (they're miscalled the immune system) are said by medical norms to be a minimum of 4,300 per cubic millimeter. Anything less than this is considered an indication of AIDS as many hygienists have found out. But how about those who are healthy who have white blood cell counts from 2,500 to 3,500? White blood cells are really the janitors for the body. They keep the fluids and tissues cleansed. When your body is so biologically clean that it does not require in attendance the number of white blood cells that an eater of cooked foods, drinker of mineralized water, users of drugs and toxic substances, eaters of junk foods and foods contrary to our biological disposition, you don't need a huge cleanup crew. The body parsimoniously and conservatively carries in the fluids the number approximating needs. It retains its unneeded white blood cells at the base of the capillaries.

**ITEM:** Healthy people have water requirements of about 60% less than their junk-it-up cooked food eating counterparts. Their natural and normal diets keep them amply supplied with water without thirst except on rare occasion. This is necessarily so inasmuch as humans have no natural water-drinking provisions.

**ITEM:** Growing babies fare well on mother's milk which has only 1% protein or about 7.1% of solids. Grown-ups obviously require less protein. While nuts and seeds have from 9% to 33% proteins via solids, far more than either fruits or vegetables (except collards, kale, soy beans and a others items,) fruits have an average of more than 1% amino acids (they're predigested proteins) and an average of about 5% of solids. One fruit, the papaw of the northern United states, has about 22% of solids as amino acids (protein). American grapes like the concords have about 7% of its solids as amino acids (protein). Oranges have about 7% of its solids as amino acids (protein). Watermelon has about 7% of its solids as amino acids (protein). Muskmelon have about 9% of their solids as amino acids (protein). *Ripe tomatoes have about 17% of their solids as amino acids (protein).* You cannot accuse fruits of being deficient in amino acids (proteins) unless you've lost your thinking cap.

**ITEM:** Turnip greens contain 30% of their solids as protein. But what does this mean if you cannot access them raw except as a very low percentage and, if you can access them cooked, it's of no use as most were deranged when their heat was more than 118 degrees Fahrenheit. Further, turnip greens comes in a package with a deadly

chemical called isothiocyanate and mustard oil, its carrier. Accessing its proteins and nutrients raw is impossible without poisoning yourself. *This is true of virtually all vegetation!* It has a poisonous component designed to ward off predators. Herein is an article by Dr. Ralph Cinque attesting to this.

**ITEM:** Collard greens have the most impressive array of nutrients of all land grown vegetation. But who can eat it raw except by camouflaging it? Even so, it must be digested and precious little of it is digestible raw whereas if it is cooked, mineral, proteins and fats are deranged--even though they're all present in the cooked foods, its much like a dead person--they're all still there in death but not viable.

**ITEM:** We're not vegetation eaters! If we were natural vegetation eaters we'd secrete the enzyme cellulase as does every other natural vegetation eater! And greens would be delicious so much babes would relish them raw. Instead vegetables taste terrible and babes will not touch them--their instincts are very much alive and well and have not been perverted by intellect and the mistakes of nutrient gluttons.

**ITEM:** The RDA for calcium is now 1,000 milligrams for men and 1,500 milligrams for women. This is irrelevant for most Americans. To get this, they're getting it from cooked foods, inorganic supplements (mostly calcium carbonate), and other unusable calcium media. In the meantime, the average American is getting by on less than 150 to 200 milligrams of calcium daily in a usable

condition. Further, this calcium is prodigally wasted on the other side of the ledger, a largely acid-end product diet!

**ITEM:** The average American of today is a giant compared with his ancestors, even immediate past ancestors of a mere 100 years ago. This is a pathological norm born of a distressed organism that overcompensates in development and heavy hormone contents of the typical SAD diet--hormones that cause fast and abnormal growth--hormones administered to animals to stimulate fast and gigantic growth from less feedstuffs.

**ITEM:** The gorilla is not the nearest relative to humans. The average gorilla has only a fraction of the brain to body weight ratios that humans have. The Bonobo apes have a brain/body weight ratio on a basis similar to humans and have the most humanlike traits of all the primates other than humans themselves. They're virtually 100% fruit and sweet sap eaters.

**ITEM:** In an article appearing in the May 15, 1979 issue of the New York Times Science Section, Dr. Alan Walker, an anthropologist from John Hopkins University, submitted his extensive research of our human past as it relates to diet. From the condition of teeth which he found in the human heads back well past a million years, he concluded that our human ancestors were fruitarians, *exclusively and only!*

**ITEM:** Many claim that the fruitarian diet is one of deficiencies and pathogens. The claim stands unsupported. Published testimony from Otto Carque, Hereward Carrington and others who visited fruitarian

enclaves testify to unusual health, energy and intellects, precisely what Dr. Katherine Milton, an anthropologist from the University of California, Berkeley, says about the spider monkeys who are fruit-eaters as compared with the howler monkeys who are vegetation eaters. The spider monkeys had 107 ounces of brain matter versus 50.7 ounces for the howlers. Obviously, the fruit diet is far superior from the human perspective than the vegetation diet.

**ITEM:** World class athletes are practically fruitarians! It was noted at the Los Angeles and Seoul, Korea world games and athletic meets that the average athletic participant consumed 16 servings of fruits daily.

**ITEM:** One of the "diseases" of athletes is "enlarged heart." The truth is that the disease is of "undersized" hearts found in the average person. Because "undersized" hearts are the pathological norm, those who are healthy and have naturally normal sized hearts are deemed diseased rather than the extraordinarily healthy.

**ITEM:** Because of our way of thinking and our flawed perspectives, we do not realize that the body providently recycles most of its minerals! For instance, calcium constitutes only about 1,350 grams in a 154 pound man. Yet, at the rate of a realistic 350 milligrams of replacement calcium daily (less than this amount is consumed in a usable condition even though intake may be over a thousand milligrams daily), the body replaces its calcium by new usable intake once every 4,000 days, over ten

years! This means that the body providentially recycles virtually all of the calcium it scraps each day.

**ITEM:** Fruitarians are more than adequately nourished in every aspect of their bodily and mental being by the fruits they eat. A whole new standard of "nutrient needs" must be written for fruitarians. The RDA's are deemed inadequate by nutrient gluttons. But the truth is the NRC has them upped by one third and then doubled! And that's for those of a pathological norm, a very impaired norm at that! Even at the basic norm on which the RDA is calculated is ample in itself for those of a pathological norm. For example, Dr. Mark Hegsted of Harvard has researched the subject of protein needs and states that a 154 pound man really requires only 21 grams of protein daily which is really adequate. This is confirmed when we investigate and find many societies eating such low amounts of protein (10 to 15 grams daily), notably the Carib Indians and some South American fruitarian groups. They have been proclaimed to be in excellent health on a diet of primarily cassava or manioc. For those of a pure and clean physical and mental condition as fruitarians are, fruits are abundantly adequate in their nutrient complement. Those who proclaim them deficient, even now under the current condition of nurture and growth, is deficient in their thinking if, indeed, they are thinking. While you don't have to be a fruitarian to think, a fruitarian's thinking is facilitated to the point of being superior virtually in every matter to which he or she addresses and applies himself or herself. Those with less than pure bodies suffer impaired thinking and fall into

booby trap after booby trap in their outlook, assessment and evaluations in about all matters. Their thinking is pathological no matter how much they're looked up to. The conventional intellect is looked up to as gigantic in stature when it's really only molehill-sized.

**ITEM:** Further, due to our flawed thinking, we do not realize that the body providentially recycles virtually its entire iron turnover. The RDA for iron is about 10 milligrams daily. Yet the body has on hand, for the average man of 154 pounds, only about 4 grams of iron. This means that it takes about 400 days for the iron content of the body to be totally replaced. This is really, for the thoughtful and observant, testimony as to the extraordinarily high providence of the body in recycling its wastes. The red blood cells which are the body's highest user of iron, are replaced on average about every 120 days. On a daily basis, this means that, if the entire RDA of 10 milligrams is needed, the body retains and recycles 99.75% of its iron.

**ITEM:** Nutrient losses from cooking are grossly understated by cooking advocates because of general ignorance about the high destructiveness of heat when applied to a vegetable, fruit, grain, tuber or root. The nutrient may still be around after heating but its presence does not mean it is still a usable nutrient. For instance, proteins begin coagulating at 118 degrees Fahrenheit and are practically all deranged and deaminated by 150 degrees. Minerals become disassociated from their organic context, for practical purposes, the moment their cell membranes are burst. That which deranges the tough



membranes also deranges the more delicate organic context of nutrients. Exposed nutrients readily oxidize in the presence of air and heat. But the biggest minus on the ledger of cooked foods is that, what may have been viable nutritious substances, now become pathogenic substances. For instance, deranged and deaminated proteins readily oxidize and become soil for putrefactive bacteria which, in processing their remains, beget a raft of highly toxic by-products, notably indoles, skatoles, mercaptans, hydrogen sulfide, ptomaines, leukomaines, ammonias and yet other by-products that are pathogenic. Further, disassociated minerals that were, in organic context, usable nutrients, now become toxic debris which causes the body's "immune system" to increase and deploy its cleanup white blood cells to apprehend, surround and eject these non-usable materials. This process of increasing the white blood cells to apprehend increased toxic and morbid materials is called leukocytosis, that is, a proliferation of the "immune system" to clean up a polluted bloodstream, fluids and tissues. Eaters of cooked foods thus get a double whammy that the raw food eater does not suffer.

---

## **WHAT HAPPENS TO FOOD WHEN YOU HEAT IT?**

This is the headline in the newsletter, **SECOND OPINION** for its February, 1996 issue. The material is written by Dr. William Campbell Douglass. He often writes with insight and understanding. He documents his articles quite well.

The treatment he gives the subject is based on Dr. Paul Kouchakoff's researches in the 1930s in Lausanne, Switzerland. The researches are very good. Dr. Kouchakoff did over 300 detailed and fully recorded experiments and their results.

Dr. Kouchakoff based his criteria at what point of heating, processing, additives, purification, stabilization, enrichment, sterilization, refinement and homogenization caused a disease response from the human body.

As to heating, Dr. Kouchakoff listed the temperature points where there was a fairly immediate and pronounced disease response in the body by a radical increase in its janitorial forces, the leukocytes, to apprehend and expel pathogenic substances. Dr. Douglass listed the critical temperatures. They range from 194 degrees to 206 degrees, well below what most foodstuffs are heated to during cooking.

However, new information given in the book published by the Nutritional Research Council of the American Academy of Sciences, considerably revises Dr. Kouchakoff. In their 1982 book, DIET, NUTRITION AND CANCER, the NRC drew upon over 100 experiments with various foodstuffs as well as heating them.

The derangement and pathogenicity of foodstuffs begins with the coagulation of proteins at around 118 degrees Fahrenheit. Calling out extra janitorial forces in the form of leukocytosis is not, I repeat, a valid measure of the pathogenicity of heated foods. By the temperature of pasteurization, most proteins are deranged and

deaminated. Directly, they may not cause leukocytosis at that heating temperature, but the deranged and deaminated proteins and amino acids are soil for bacterial putrefaction and some highly carcinogenic by-products such as indoles, skatoles, ptomaines, leukomaines, mercaptans, hydrogen sulfide, ammonias and yet others.

If you care about your body and your wellbeing, you will take care about what you put into your body! And to achieve health excellence, you'll diligently pursue adequate sleep, lots of sunshine, exercise and make raw foods your dietary.

Dr. Douglass deserves credit for forthrightly presenting these disturbing data.

---

*The article below is a scholarly and well-researched article that, even though it really works out against Dr. Cinque's position on the issues, nevertheless is forthrightly presented for the benefit of readers. Dr. Cinque and I, I reassure you, are the best of friends and hope to remain so.*

## **NATURAL TOXINS IN NATURAL FOODS**

*by Dr. Ralph Cinque*

It should come as no surprise that plants, in general, synthesize large amounts of toxic chemical substances. Plants do this (apparently) as a defense against bacteria, fungi, insects, and other predators.

The plants commonly consumed by humans as food are no exception to this rule. Try as we might, it may be impossible to eat a wide variety of whole natural foods and avoid all the mutagens, teratogens and carcinogens produced by plants. But before you panic, realize that the body has the chemical foods to safely deal with these substance when they are consumed in ordinary amounts. Nevertheless, it makes perfect sense to try to minimize your exposure to these natural toxins, as I will explain.

First, let us consider some examples. Ergot is a deadly mold that grows on rye grain, and its chemical composition is actually similar to LSD. Illnesses triggered by ergotism were common occurrences in Europe in centuries past. Whole communities became ill simultaneously with delirium, hallucinations, and insanity sparked by ergot's effect upon the central nervous system. The toxin also affects the circulatory system, interrupting the blood supply to the arms and legs, torturing its victims with burning and numbness, hence its name: St. Anthony's Fire. Although modern grain storage has reduced the risk, ergotism is by no means impossible today. The fungus will grow wherever rye grain or flour is improperly stored.

Another highly feared and even more widespread mycotoxin is aflatoxin. It is produced by the fungus *aspergillus flavus*, and can grow on grains like corn and rice, nuts and especially peanuts (ED:peanuts are not a nut but a legume). Peanuts gathered and stored under humid conditions can harbor aflatoxin in alarming proportions. Aflatoxin is one of the most potent carcinogens known. It impairs liver function and causes

liver cancer. In Indonesia, where they have the highest per capita consumption of peanuts in the world, they also have the highest incident of liver cancer. Unfortunately, aflatoxin is not destroyed by cooking. When dairy animals are fed aflatoxin-contaminated feed, the danger is very great because the poison rapidly becomes concentrated in milk.

Many vegetables contain goitrogens, which are substances that interfere with the body's use of iodine. These include collards, cauliflower, kale, turnips, rutabagas, and mustard greens. Keep in mind that you would have to eat very large amount of these vegetables in order to experience a problem, and most goitrogens are destroyed by cooking.

Another mineral-blocking substance found in plants is oxalic acid, which blocks calcium absorption. Spinach, Swiss card and beet greens all contain large amounts of oxalic acid, but there are small amounts of it in most fruits and vegetables. A small amount of oxalic acid is also produced in a human metabolism.

Phytates are pathogenic organic phosphate compounds that are particularly abundant in grains, such as wheat, that tie up many minerals including calcium, iron, zinc and copper. Fortunately, the sprouting of grains breaks down phytates.

Hydrazines are natural carcinogens that are especially plentiful in mushrooms. The wild mushrooms contain more hydrazines than the commercially grown ones, but all mushrooms contain some hydrazines.

Furocoumarins are potent light-activated carcinogens that are widespread in plants of the umbelliferae family, which includes celery, cilantro, parsnips, and parsley. Keep in mind that the level in celery can increase about 100 fold if the celery is stressed or diseased.

Potatoes contain a toxic glyco-alkaloid called solanine. When potatoes are diseased, bruised, sprouted or exposed to light, solanine levels can reach highly toxic amounts (and even lethal) to humans. Potato poisonings were common centuries ago.

The huge fava bean, which is a common food in the Mediterranean region, contains the toxins vicine and convicine at a level of 2% dry weight. Certain individuals are especially vulnerable to the toxicity of fava beans because they have a genetic deficiency of the antioxidant glutathione. Interestingly, Pythagoras forbade his followers from eating fava beans.

Isothiocyanate, which is abundant in mustard, garlic, and horseradish, has been shown to cause chromosome aberrations in hamsters and to be carcinogenic in rats. It is especially concentrated in the seed of mustard, hence is in commonly used commercial mustards in pathogenic amounts. Refined isothiocyanate is a powerful pesticide.

Gossypol is a major toxin present in cotton seed, and crude unrefined cottonseed oil contains a considerable amount of it (100 to 750 mg per 100 milliliters). Unfortunately, cottonseed oil is still being used as a cheap baking ingredient in cookies, pies and pastries. This carcinogen makes men sterile.

Lactucarium is a soporific alkaloid found in lettuce, especially when it is old and mature. Have you ever noticed the milky white fluid that leaks from mature leaves of lettuce? That's the lactucarium seeping out. This is the same substance that, in poppies, is refined to opium.

Canavanine is a highly toxic mutagen that is abundant in alfalfa sprouts, comprising 1.5% of their dry weight. Canavanine appears to be the active agent in causing the severe lupus-like-syndrome when monkeys are fed alfalfa sprouts.

Nitrates and nitrites, which are known to cause stomach and esophageal cancers, can accumulate in vegetables, especially when nitrate fertilizers are used extensively. Beets, celery, lettuce, spinach and radishes all contain on average 200 mg of nitrate per 100 gram portion. However, vegetables grown in composted organic solids generally show much lower concentrations of nitrates and nitrites.

It has been estimated by Professor Bruce Ames of the University of California, Berkeley, that the human dietary intake of "nature's pesticides" is likely to be several grams per day--probably at least 10,000 times higher than the dietary intake of manmade pesticides. What can we do about it? There are several things I would suggest:

1. Be aware that cultivated fruits are remarkably low in natural toxins compared with all other plants, including most vegetables. Score one for fruit advocate like T. C. Fry.

2. Young, rapidly-growing vegetables tend to contain few toxins than the older, more mature vegetables. Select young garden lettuce, kale, spinach, bok choy, and collards and you will not only have tastier-vegetables, but safer ones as well.
3. Certain foods are best avoided completely, such as mushrooms. Keep in mind that if you eat mushrooms several times a year it won't matter, but you certainly do not want to be eating them on a regular basis. It should be no big sacrifice for anyone to avoid mushrooms, rye grain, and fava beans as well. I quit eating alfalfa sprouts a few years ago, and I advise you to do the same.
4. It may be best to avoid peanuts in addition. Besides the danger of aflatoxin, peanuts are hard to digest because they contain trypsin-inhibitors that thwart protein digestion. Again, I would say that if you eat peanuts once a month, it won't matter, but do not eat them on a frequent basis. For children who love peanut butter, find a substitute, such as almond butter.
5. Regarding oxalic acid, it is not necessary to avoid spinach and swiss chard completely. Just eat these vegetables in moderation. Adding a few leaves of spinach bolsters the nutritional value tremendously and does no harm.
6. In the amounts that most people eat cabbage-family vegetables, there can be no problem from goitrogens, However, I did meet a man once who ate cabbages by the pound every day, and that is probably not a wise idea.



7. Avoid potatoes that are green or sprouted, and store them in the dark. Remember the old adage: "when in doubt, throw them out." Avoid celery that is bitter or insect-damaged, and do not eat large amounts of celery. For the best protection, store grains and nuts in the freezer.
8. Because of its large content of phytates, it is best to minimize your wheat consumption. If you must have bread, look for the sprouted multi-grain breads.

These are the steps I recommend to minimize your consumption of plant toxins. But realize that this is not a perfect world, and you're not going to be able to avoid these chemicals completely. But fortunately, fruits and vegetables contain vast amount of vitamins, antioxidants and beneficial phytochemicals that help your body neutralize these toxins. Finally, be aware that toxins exist in the highest concentration in animal foods, including meat, fowl, fish, milk and eggs. Unrefined plant food is and always will be the safest, most nourishing food that you can eat.

---

*Reproduced here because Dr. Cinque champions and sells stuff.*

## **MORE ABOUT SUPER BLUE GREEN ALGAE**

Most people do not read the Scientific American, the Journal of Medical Microbiology, Journal of Clinical Microbiology, Nature, or the British medical Journal, Lancet. Neither do I do this anymore.

It turns out the January, 1997 issue of the Scientific American treats extensively of fresh water algae and the deadly poison-creating bacteria to be found in it called cyanobacteria.

An issue of Lancet, June 12, 1993, Vol. 341, pages 1519 and 1520 refers to aphanizomenon flos aqua as having endotoxin common to fresh water algae.

The Journal of Medical Microbiology, Vol. 36, page 381 of 1992 has a article, Cyanobacteria and Human Health wherein it is stated that an endotoxin in aphanizomenon flos aqua is anatoxin-A, an alkaloid analogue of cocaine.

Nature magazine of September 18, 1992, Volume 359, page 110 has an article entitled: Fatal Attraction to Cyanobacteria, which spells out some of the dangers of fresh water algae.

Also, the journal of Clinical Microbiology of June 1990, Volume 28, #6, pages 1103 and 1104 carry an article about some of the endotoxin of fresh water algae as generated by cyanobacteria.

While the harvesters of so-called Super Blue Green Algae tell us about the vitamin B-12 in their "pond scum," a product of bacteria, they do not tell us about the other bacterial products in blue green algae.

Blue green algae are known technically as aphanizomenon flos aqua. Reportedly, its product does,

indeed, make one feel great except for those it makes sick. It yields a drug high akin to a hallucinogen. It contains sub-lethal doses of the cocaine analog anatoxin-A.

Anyway, at \$252 per pound, and a recommended dosage of 1.5 grams a day, blue green algae is not a product of impact in the nutritional field nearly so much as it is a money game medium played by hyped up and avaricious sales people.