



[Low Carb Muscle Forum - LowCarbMuscle.com](#) > [Low-Carb Diet Forum](#) > [Low-Carb Diets and Fat Loss](#)

User Name ☐ Remember Me?

Password

[Register](#)

[FAQ](#)

[Members List](#)

[Calendar](#)

[Today's Posts](#)

[Search](#)

Low-Carb Diets and Fat Loss Getting lean the low-carb way!



Thread Tools Display Modes

September 17th, 2007, 12:53 PM

#1

[AnthonyColpo](#)

Administrator

Join Date: Aug 2006
Posts: 1,024

An Open Letter to Dr. Michael Eades

RE: The Hopelessly Biased "Research" of Dr. Michael Eades

Dear Dr Eades,

I read with interest your recent post on your blog in which you made some assertions regarding the comparative rate of weight and muscle loss on low-carb versus high-carb diets:

<http://www.proteinpower.com/drmike/?p=933#comments>

These assertions are so unscientifically ludicrous as to be laughable.

I'll be honest: After reading that post I am convinced you must either be a shameless charlatan or one of the world's most amateurish researchers.

Unfortunately, as the reader comments at your blog indicate, a lot of people evidently take your unscientific ramblings seriously. This in itself wouldn't bother me a whole lot, but when someone brings up my name on your blog and you tell them that you think I am "wrong" on the calories issue, when it is in fact you that is spewing **total misinformation**, then I have to comment.

I really am starting to get sick of all the heat I am drawing for stating an indisputable fact: **there is NO "metabolic advantage" when it comes to weight loss** (save for a slight increase in lean mass retention and slight increase in fat loss from higher protein intakes, which occurs independently of carb intake).

No-one, and I mean NO-ONE, has ever presented anything even resembling tightly controlled evidence to show me that I am wrong.

I am getting tired of watching smug commentators peddle this metabolic advantage nonsense (and get wildly rich in the process!), while people like myself have to defend ourselves from constant attacks on our credibility simply because we are stating an unpopular truth.

Your comparison of the Keys and Yudkin studies is so amateurish as to be **absurd**. If you are going to come to a conclusion about the comparative effects of two different dietary regimens, you do it by testing those diets in the **same** sample of people, with **similar** baseline characteristics, and living under **similar** conditions...**NOT** by handpicking data from two **different** studies on two **different** continents involving two totally **different** groups of subjects!!

I find it ironic that you chose to cite the Keys study, because your methods invoke memories of his shamelessly biased Six Countries Study that helped kickstart the anti-fat, anti-cholesterol campaign. I find it quite sad that many of your readers, who would no doubt shake their heads in disgust at Keys' farcical Six Countries study, are quite happy to uncritically soak up your equally unscientific comparison of the Yudkin and Minnesota studies:

"Thanks for the great post Dr Eades! Thank you so much for feeding us utterly biased and totally one-sided nonsense! You da man!"

I should be jaded by now, but the human capacity for gullibility never ceases to amaze me. People will believe the most absurd claptrap so long as it supports what they WANT to believe. Meanwhile, even the most impeccably gathered evidence is rationalized away or virulently denounced if it contradicts what people want to believe.

The **ONLY** way to tell how the subjects in Keys' Minnesota Experiment would have fared on a low-carb diet is to have randomized some of them to a **LOW-CARB DIET**! But that was **NOT** done. So instead you go ahead and use data from a study conducted under totally

different conditions with a totally **different** sample of subjects, and arrive at a conclusion that can only be supported by a total disregard for the scientific method.

There was no need for you to conduct such an absurd analysis when numerous studies have been conducted under metabolic ward conditions, which is **the most tightly controlled form of clinical comparison available**.

However, you completely ignore these studies.

Why do you ignore these studies? Is it because they contradict the "*metabolic advantage*" nonsense that people like yourself and Atkins have profited so handsomely from?

Why did you ignore the results of all the tightly controlled comparative metabolic ward studies and instead conduct a selective comparison of a mere two studies that supported your own pre-conceived bias?

The Keys and Yudkin studies were conducted by different researchers on two different continents at two different points in time. Therefore, there was NO standardization of physical activity among the two groups, NO randomization to ensure similar baseline characteristics. Furthermore, while the dietary intake of Keys' subjects was strictly controlled, the intake of Yudkin's subjects was NOT. They were merely given advice and instructions then sent off into the free-living world to follow their assigned diets.

I am forwarding instructions on how to access a free copy of [The Fat Loss Bible](#). Before replying to me, I want you to read the book in its entirety, paying extra special attention to Chapter 1.

If you do bother to read Chapter 1, you will observe that it contains a complete review of the evidence from clinical trials comparing low- and high-carbohydrate diets (it also contains a scathing review of the hopelessly one-sided rubbish peddled by your fellow "researchers" Feinman and Fine).

You will see that there have been NINETEEN metabolic ward studies lasting 3 weeks or more comparing lower and higher carbohydrate diets (studies that you and the rest of the metabolic advantage promoters **ignore** with stunning consistency). As Table 1 and the ensuing discussion clearly explain, these studies **COMPLETELY FAIL** to support the existence of a metabolic advantage.

The metabolic advantage exists, not in reality, but only in the minds of folks like Atkins, Feinman and Fine, and yourself.

You will also see that there is NO evidence that low-carb intakes exert any muscle-sparing effect. In fact, all the evidence so far indicates that ketogenic diets INCREASE lean mass loss!

So while your highly selective comparison of 2 **hand-picked** studies appears to portray high-carb diets as rampant muscle wasters, the evidence from metabolic ward studies indicates that these subjects would not have fared any better had they followed a low-carb diet. It is excessive calorie reduction, not carbohydrate, that caused the emaciation seen on the Minnesota study subjects!

Any trainer worth his salt knows that slashing overnight the maintenance caloric intake of all but the most obese folks by a massive 2000 calories per day is going to cause muscle loss - and LOTS of it! The subjects in this study began the semi-starvation period with a mean estimated body fat% of 13.9 (range 6.5 - 26). A good portion of the subjects in this study were quite lean already. Do you know what happens when you take an individual of low to average body fat and drastically slash his calories below maintenance by a whopping 2,000? Regardless of his macronutrient intake, he loses muscle, and bloody fast!

Whether you are following low-carb, medium-carb, high-carb, whatever...engaging in such gonzo caloric reductions is a sure fire route to accelerated muscle loss. But you clearly have little knowledge of this area, something that I will address further shortly.

Your comments also indicate that you know LITTLE about the phenomenon of dietary underreporting. Please retrieve the studies I have shown in Chapter 1 that show dietary underreporting is not the exception but the RULE, and that it is **most pronounced** in those instructed to restrict **fat** and/or **calories**.

Please also read carefully the information about the **satiety value** of low-carb, high protein diets.

If you can put away your prejudices long enough to actually read the book with an open mind, you will realize that the ONLY reason low-carb diets show greater weight loss in SOME trials (there have actually been more free-living clinical trials FAILING to show greater weight loss in the low-carb groups...but for some strange reason, you low-carb 'gurus' never seem to mention these studies...**why is that???**) is because of greater satiety.

In light of the abundant evidence showing the "metabolic advantage" theory to be a load of cobblers, I eagerly await your justification of the following comment:

"I'm very familiar with Anthony Colpo and his work. I think he's a very smart guy and I think he's right on the money on a lot of issues, but I think he's wrong on this one. If you give one group of people a 2000 kcal diet and another a 1500 kcal diet of the same composition, the ones on the 1500 kcal diet will unquestionably lose more weight. If you start changing the diet composition, though, your outcome may change."

Dr Eades, make no mistake, it is **YOU** that is flat out wrong on this one.

Calorie intake, NOT macronutrient ratio, is the final dietary arbiter of weight loss. Yes, you will lose more weight at 1,500 calories than at 2000 calories. But - save for possible extra water, glycogen and/or lean mass loss (which is hardly an "advantage") - manipulating macro ratios will not change the rate of weight loss.

I would truly love to know why you have publicly stated I am wrong when it is you that clearly has NOT done their homework on this one.

Please post your reply in this thread, and feel free to reprint the ensuing exchange at your blog, SO LONG as it is not edited and contains

the exchange in its **entirety**.

And may I make one more suggestion (which I have no doubt you will ignore): STOP commenting on body composition issues when you clearly are NOT familiar with the literature (or insist on ignoring literature that conflicts with your chosen viewpoint).

Your track record in this arena is rather worrying. Not only are you WRONG on calories, but you clearly have NO idea what constitutes optimal post-workout nutrition. In one of your blog posts earlier this year, you dumped all over someone who recommended carbohydrate consumption immediately after workouts. This is despite the fact that post-workout carb consumption has shown nothing but BENEFITS in controlled clinical trials. Post-workout carbs dramatically speed up the rate of glycogen replenishment, and act synergistically with protein/amino supplements to accelerate muscle protein synthesis, which results in improved muscle and strength gains. Again, all this is discussed in my book (Chapter 13).

You claimed that taking carbs after a workout would suppress growth hormone release, even though all the research so far shows that GH release after PWO carbs remains either unchanged or INCREASES! And when a reader wrote to point this out to you, you proceeded to tell him why he was likely wrong - BEFORE you had read the studies he offered to send you!

Also, in your book *Protein Power* you write:

"Each pound of muscle mass you pack on becomes a fat-burning dynamo, allowing you to increase your food intake without fear of fat gain."

Yeah right! Read Chapter 6 to find out why this is an extremely simplistic and overly optimistic statement.

Seriously mate, you really need to get up to speed on the whole body composition thing. If you have helped anyone lose weight so far, it's only by riding on the coat tails of low-carb's satiating effects. Too bad for all those folks who've been distracted from the number one priority of weight loss - a calorie deficit - and have not been so lucky. And too bad for all those folks who are eschewing the benefits of post-workout carbs thanks to your sadly misinformed ramblings. Impaired glycogen replenishment and lackluster recovery anyone?

I suggest you spend a little **less** time with folks like Feinman, Hahn, and Cordain, who have already established that they care far more for doggedly defending their precious dogmas than respecting sound science. Instead, start digging up the studies I've cited in my book, and get your butt into a REAL gym and start building the body of an athlete, not an armchair expert. You'll find the two have very different nutritional requirements...

Regards,

Anthony Colpo.

PS. If you're wondering why your buddy Fred Hahn writes "Colpo is a jerk", the poor bloke is obviously still bitter about the caning he got here (Fred's the joker posting under the moniker of "serious strength"):

<http://www.lowcarbmuscle.com/forums/...qht=super+slow>

and here:

<http://www.lowcarbmuscle.com/forums/...qht=super+slow>

Like I said, you really should start keeping better company...

PLEASE NOTE:

Participation in this thread is limited to Dr. Michael Eades and yours truly. ANYONE ELSE WHO ATTEMPTS TO POST IN THIS THREAD WILL HAVE THEIR POSTS DELETED ASAP.

NO EXCEPTIONS!

Anthony Colpo

[The Fat Loss Bible.net](http://www.fatlossbible.net)

[The Great Cholesterol Con.com](http://www.greatcholesterolcon.com)

"The greater the ignorance the greater the dogmatism."

Sir William Osler

"Giving money and power to government is like giving whiskey and car keys to teenage boys."

P. J. O'Rourke

Last edited by AnthonyColpo : September 20th, 2007 at 01:09 AM. Reason: Paragraph beginning with "If you can put away your prejudices.." was missing following text: "is because of greater satiety."

September 17th, 2007, 01:10 PM

2

AnthonyColpo 

Administrator

Join Date: Aug 2006
Posts: 1,024 **Re: An Open Letter to Dr. Michael Eades**

The following email has just been sent to Dr Michael Eades via his *Protein Power* web site:

Dear Dr. Eades,

I just read your comparison of the Keys and Yudkin studies at:

<http://www.proteinpower.com/drmike/?p=933#comments>

I must say, you really have outdone yourself - it's been a while since I read such a load of shamelessly one-sided rot.

That, however, is not what motivated me to write. The real trigger for this email is the remark you made to a reader who mentioned my writings, in which you claimed I was "wrong" on the calorie issue. That's a remarkable comment, coming from someone who clearly has not performed even a fraction of the research that I have in this area.

I have posted an open letter to you at the following page:

<http://www.lowcarbmuscle.com/forums/...=5405#post5405>

Before you even think about replying, I suggest you read my new book, *The Fat Loss Bible*. It highlights just what a load of bollocks the metabolic advantage theory truly is.

To access your own copy [access details edited]

Regards,

Anthony Colpo.

Anthony Colpo

[The Fat Loss Bible.net](http://TheFatLossBible.net)

[The Great Cholesterol Con.com](http://TheGreatCholesterolCon.com)

"The greater the ignorance the greater the dogmatism."

Sir William Osler

"Giving money and power to government is like giving whiskey and car keys to teenage boys."

P. J. O'Rourke

September 19th, 2007, 10:11 PM

3

AnthonyColpo 

Administrator

Join Date: Aug 2006
Posts: 1,024 **Re: An Open Letter to Dr. Michael Eades**

The invitation has been made, but it looks like Eades is too gutless to stand behind his comments. A reader has mentioned my letter to Eades at his blog, who launches into a long *ad hominem* attack totally void of any commentary on the actual issues I raised. Hey, nothing wrong with a good slanging match, but try and include at least *some* facts! Like most of my critics, he resorts to attacking only my persona, and not my arguments.

Below are Eades' comments and my reply.

Dr. Mike,

You have aroused the beast!!! 

<http://www.lowcarbmuscle.com/forums/...=5415#post5415>

Andy

Hi Andy--

I have aroused the pipsqueak, more like.

A while back Anthony Colpo sent me a complimentary copy of his book on cholesterol. Until then, I didn't really know who Anthony Colpo was. I checked out his website, which I found to be filled with a lot of good information, but I was put off by the vitriol that he aimed at anyone who disagreed with him. It seemed that people would write asking reasonable questions to someone holding himself out to be an expert. Mr. Colpo would then reply to them in an unbelievably hostile way. The poor person who wrote the comment would try to say he/she was sorry for provoking the great and powerful Colpo, whereupon his response would be even more nasty. The commenter would finally get angry and give back whereupon said reader would be

banned from commenting on the site. I see from his treatment of Fred Hahn and mrfreddy in the above link that his modus operandi continues. I suspect that it's all part of his shtick, and that he uses it much as a child does pitching a tantrum to gain attention.

Mr. Colpo reminds me of a friend of mine of whom it is said: he is often wrong, but never uncertain. I can attribute this pigheaded certainty of Mr. Colpo's to his youth and immaturity; I would assume that as he is beaten around by life as he grows older he will be a little less certain and, I hope, a lot more tolerant. Until then, I don't want to have anything to do with him. And I certainly won't respond to his inane attacks on me. If he can't understand what I was trying to say in the post in question, then it's not up to me to be responsible for his education.

I daresay that I have substantially more readers of this blog than does Anthony Colpo of his site and his books, and I have never felt the need to belittle or ban anyone who wrote to me asking a question or making a comment. In fact, of all the comments I have received since starting this blog, I have deleted without publishing only two. And those were two that attacked other commenters in what I felt was a hostile fashion. There is far too little civility in today's world, and I try to do my part to contribute. I've always believed in civility in my personal encounters and in my online encounters and try to stay true to my beliefs. Wallowing around in the mud with Anthony Colpo would definitely not add to the world's supply of civility, so I won't rise to the bait.

So, this is the last I'll say on the Colpo situation. That is other than to point out that Ancel Keys published the Seven Countries Study, not the Six Countries Study. Once I can write off to a typo, twice to...?

Cheers-

MRE

For those who don't have very sensitive BS detectors, let me translate what Eades is REALLY saying with this long-winded diatribe:

"Uh oh, Colpo has caught me out on this one! Damn, what do I do now? If I try to argue with him and defend what I have written, I might end up looking like a fool when he destroys my attempted arguments. And if I don't say anything, then people will think I have something to hide and might interpret that as an admission of defeat.

Hey, here's what I'll do...I'll avoid both the above scenarios by pretending to take the moral high ground. I'll slag off at Colpo, attacking his persona and pretending that I'm too dignified to make a response. That way, I can evade ever having to respond to him, and get that wonderfully pompous "jump on my high horse" feeling at the same time!"

Eades, you can slag off at me all you want, call me all the little pathetic insults you want, but the fact remains:

Your comparison was absurd, you are WRONG, and you had no business claiming I was wrong when it is **you** that clearly has an inferior knowledge base on matters of body composition. Mate, I know it pisses you off when I say this, but I am only stating the facts, and I think what really gets to you is that deep down inside you know that I am right.

And mate, don't worry about my life...I'm the one who can look at himself in the mirror each morning and know full well that he doesn't make his living spinning bulls**t about weight loss to people. I'm the one that can look in the mirror and be proud that I actually practice what I preach, rather than sit at a desk all day penning scientifically absurd nonsense.

And yes, I have supreme confidence in my stance on the fat loss issue, because I have done my research. I form my conclusions by reviewing the evidence in its entirety, not by reading only the papers that appear to confirm what I want to believe.


And I wholeheartedly encourage people to read the links containing Fred Hahn's childish forays into defending his training system, and see who really was being the pain-in-the-ass. I gave Hahn ample opportunity to defend his system in a scientific manner, and he repeatedly failed to do so. That Eades would empathize with Hahn is hardly surprising...they both seem to be of the same questionable intellectual mould.

Dr Eades, after all the millions you've made writing fluff-laden diet books, you may have time to entertain empty-headed malevolents, but I certainly don't. You boast of only ever having removed 2 reader comments from your blog - big deal! Given that most of your readers appear to be gushing admirers who adore you for telling them what they want to believe, that is hardly surprising. Unfortunately, as someone who calls the shots exactly as he sees them with a total disregard for cherished dogmas, I tend to attract a LOT of angry disgruntled yo-yos. Like yourself, these people are full of vitriole but totally void of scientific facts. It states clearly in the rules section of this forum that participation is not extended to those who wish to engage in pointless, circular argumentation. Sorry, but if I have to choose between hitting the library to pull up some studies that actually contain useful facts, or hanging out with friends, or goofing around with my nephews, or going for a blast in my car, or a ride on my bike, etc, etc...or arguing with dickheads, well...it's really not much of a choice!

That is other than to point out that Ancel Keys published the Seven Countries Study, not the Six Countries Study. Once I can write off to a typo, twice to...?

Dr. Eades, thanks for once again highlighting your **extremely poor knowledge** of the literature. For your edification, Keys conducted two "Countries" studies. The first involved six countries (he grouped England and Wales together) and was published in the *Journal of Mount Sinai Hospital* in 1953. This is regarded as Keys' hallmark paper on the diet/heart hypothesis. The Seven Countries Study is the huge epidemiological study whose results were published in *Circulation* in 1970.

Both studies are cited in *The Great Cholesterol Con*, which you acknowledged you received. You obviously didn't read it. You really should - you might learn something. Ditto with [The Fat Loss Bible](#). There is no "typo"...just more ignorance on your part. Like I said, you really ought to refrain from commenting on the literature when you have such a poor knowledge of it.

As for your "pipsqueak" insult, how precious...you open your diatribe with an insult, then proceed to rave on about how civil you are. But I tell you what...why don't you post a photo of yourself with your top off, so that we can all see what a superior, awe-inspiring, uber-masculine physical specimen you truly are! Even better, why don't you enter a masters bodybuilding show and show us just how easily you can blow away men of the same age? No steroids now - you won't need the unfair advantage. After all, you've got a "metabolic advantage" 

ROTFLMAO

Ladies and gentlemen, let the record show that I gave Eades the opportunity to explain his hopelessly sloppy scientific methods and justify his claim that I am wrong on the calories issue, and he has declined.

Like most promoters of the metabolic advantage theory, he is all talk and no science.

Until such time as Eades indicates that he is prepared to discuss this issue in an intelligent manner, rather than throwing weaselish insults at me, this thread is closed.

Now if you'll excuse me, I'm going to go train. You know, that activity that keeps you grounded and helps prevent you from turning into a pompous, holier-than-thou armchair expert.

Anthony Colpo

[The Fat Loss Bible.net](#)

[The Great Cholesterol Con.com](#)

"The greater the ignorance the greater the dogmatism."

Sir William Osler

"Giving money and power to government is like giving whiskey and car keys to teenage boys."

P. J. O'Rourke

Last edited by AnthonyColpo : September 20th, 2007 at 12:24 AM.



« [Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread](#) »

Posting Rules



You **may not** post new threads
You **may not** post replies
You **may not** post attachments
You **may not** edit your posts

[vB code](#) is **On**
[Smilies](#) are **On**
[\[IMG\]](#) code is **On**
HTML code is **Off**

Forum Jump

Low-Carb Diets and Fat Loss



All times are GMT +1. The time now is 08:37 AM.

[Contact Us](#) - [Low Carb Muscle Forum](#) - [LowCarbMuscle.com](#) - [Archive](#) - [Top](#)

Powered by vBulletin® Version 3.6.3
Copyright ©2000 - 2007, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.