

## **Science Verifies That Humans' Ancestors Were Frugivores**

Recent research by anthropologists shows that we had an arboreal past. Our genetic ancestors were once tree dwellers. At that time, our genetic ancestors depended upon products of the tree, and later upon the fruits of stalk and vine for our sustenance. Dr. Alan Walker, an anthropologist of John Hopkins University in Maryland, has done research showing that early humans were once exclusively fruit eaters. By careful examination of fossil teeth and fossilized human remains with electron microscopes and other sophisticated tools, Dr. Walker and his colleagues are absolutely certain that early humans until relatively recently, were total fruitarians. These findings were reported in depth in the May 15, 1979 issue of the New York Times.

Dr Alan Walker and his associates, anthropologists at John Hopkins University, using the most modern electronic microscopic equipment, state: "Preliminary studies of fossil teeth have led to the startling suggestion that our early human ancestors (Australopithecus) were not predominantly meat-eaters or even eaters of seeds, shoots, leaves or grasses, nor were they omnivorous. Instead they appear to have subsisted chiefly on a diet of fruit. Every tooth examined from the hominids of the 12 million year period leading up to Homo Erectus appeared to be that of a fruit-eater." - NY Times, May 1979

The essence of Walker's research is that even though humans have adopted omnivorous and carnivorous eating practices, our anatomy and physiology have not changed. We remain biologically a species of fruit eaters. The human digestive system has been adapted to a diet of fruits and vegetables for more than 60 million years of development. A few thousand years of aberrant eating will not change our dietary requirements for optimum health. The position that humans occupy in the animal kingdom is that of the Primate order, which means that, from the point of view of anthropology, our closest animal relatives are the anthropoid apes (anthropoid means "resembling man" or "man-like"). This species includes gorillas, monkeys and chimps all of whom are classified as frugivores. From the perspective of physiology, our human biology and digestion most closely resemble our closest cousin in the animal kingdom, the orangutan. Even our DNA genetic material is well over 95% identical. Humans developed on fruits just as simians and other primates in nature. In consequence, some anthropologists and biologists have classified humans as frugivores.

Georges Cuvier

"The natural food of man, judging from his structure, appears to consist principally of the fruits, roots, and other succulent parts of vegetables. His hands afford every facility for gathering them; his short but moderately strong jaws on the other hand, and his canines being equal only in length to the other teeth, together with his tuberculated molars on the other, would scarcely permit him either to masticate herbage, or to devour flesh, were these condiments not previously prepared by cooking."

-- Georges Cuvier (1769-1832), Regne Animal, Vol 1, p73  
[www.iol.ie/~creature/BiologicalAdaptations.htm](http://www.iol.ie/~creature/BiologicalAdaptations.htm)

Carolus Linnaeus:

"To say that humans have the anatomical structure of an omnivore is an egregiously inaccurate statement. The great taxonomist Carolus Linnaeus, (1707-1778), a Swedish naturalist and botanist who established the modern scientific method of classifying plants and animals, classified humans not as carnivores, not as omnivores, nor even as herbivores, but as frugivores. Linnaeus writes: Man's structure, internal and external compared with that of the other animals, shows that fruit and succulent vegetables are his natural food.

A few anthropologists have risen above their biases; one such is Jared Diamond, a professor of anthropology at UCLA. Diamond has written that the notion of man the hunter is a romantic myth: big-game hunting added little to our food intake until after we had evolved fully modern anatomy and behavior. Instead, our earliest ancestors lived on the wild fruit, nuts, seeds and tubers that they gathered. Mr. Diamond puts it succinctly: I doubt the usual view that hunting was the driving force behind our uniquely human brain and societies. For most of our history, we were not mighty hunters but rather sophisticated baboons.

And what food makes up the bulk of baboon diet? Fruit, of course; so for most of their history, humans were fruitarians."-----Rynn Berry  
[www.whale.to/a/frugivore\\_h.html](http://www.whale.to/a/frugivore_h.html)

Herbert M. Shelton:

I do not intend to enter into any lengthy discussion of comparative anatomy and physiology at this place, but will content myself with saying that every anatomical, physiological and embryo-logical feature of man definitely places him in the class frugivore. The number and structure of his teeth, the length and structure of his digestive tract, the position of his eyes, the character of his nails, the functions of his skin, the character of his saliva, the relative size of his liver, the number and position of the milk glands, the position and structure of the sexual organs, the character of the human placenta and many other factors all bear witness to the fact that man is constitutionally a frugivore.

As there are no pure frugivores, all frugivores eating freely of green leaves and other parts of plants, man may, also, without violating his constitutional nature, partake of green plants. These parts of plants possess certain advantages, as has been previously pointed out, in which fruits are deficient. Actual tests have shown that the addition of green vegetables to the fruit and nut diet improves the diet.

[www.soilandhealth.org/02/0201hyglibcat/0...ophy/020126.ch17.htm](http://www.soilandhealth.org/02/0201hyglibcat/0...ophy/020126.ch17.htm)

katason wrote:

About anti-meat scientific studies, the problem is in a monetary system you cannot know if they are not motivated by profit from the currently popular target group of vegetarians.

Likewise in the same monetary system it would be hard to find studies that show that eating vegetables and fruits are good for you and sufficient for you to live on. The meat industry wouldn't want it, the dairy industry wouldn't want it, the grains industry wouldn't want it (most of the grain is used as livestock feed) and especially the Pharmaceutical industry wouldn't want it.

Most studies are only done if it is already known beforehand that that study will lead to the ability to sell a product.

DaSaint

We are the new breed!  
Platinum Boarder

Posts: 491

Here are the facts for further dispute:

Comparing the anatomy of carnivores with our own clearly illustrates that we were not designed to eat meat. Starting at the beginning of the digestive tract, our teeth, nails, and jaw structure indicate that nature intended for humans to eat a plant-based diet. We have short, thin fingernails and pathetically small “canine” teeth. In contrast, carnivores all have sharp claws and large canine teeth capable of tearing flesh.

The jaws of carnivores move only up and down, requiring them to tear chunks of flesh from their prey and swallow it whole. Humans and other herbivores can move our jaws up and down and from side to side, a movement that allows us to grind up fruit and vegetables with our back teeth. Those molars are flat and allow the grinding of fibrous plant foods. Carnivores lack these flat molars.

Carnivores swallow their food whole, relying on their extremely acidic stomach juices to do most of the digestive work and to kill the pathogens that would otherwise sicken or kill them. Humans and other herbivores have digestive enzymes in our saliva—unlike carnivores—so our stomach acids are much weaker.

Carnivores have short intestinal tracts and colons that allow meat to pass through it relatively quickly, before it has a chance to rot and cause illness. Humans, like other herbivores, have intestinal tracts that are much longer than comparably-sized carnivores, allowing the body more time to break down fiber

and absorb the nutrients from a plant-based diet. Our long human intestinal tract actually makes it dangerous for us to eat meat, since bacteria has extra time to multiply during the long trip through the digestive system as the meat begins to rot.

In addition to being anatomically ill equipped to digest meat in the short-term, the long-term damage that a meat-based diet wreaks on the human body confirms that we're not meant to eat flesh. The saturated fat and cholesterol in meat can cause heart disease, cancer, diabetes, strokes, or obesity in humans, but not in carnivores.

Dr. William C. Roberts, M.D., editor of the authoritative American Journal of Cardiology, sums it up this way: “[A]lthough we think we are one and we act as if we are one, human beings are not natural carnivores. When we kill animals to eat them, they end up killing us because their flesh, which contains cholesterol and saturated fat, was never intended for human beings, who are natural herbivores.”

Beyond the biological evidence, consider that while carnivores take pleasure in killing animals and eating their raw flesh, any human who killed an animal with his or her bare hands and dug into the raw corpse would be considered deranged. Carnivorous animals are aroused by the scent of blood and the thrill of the chase. Most humans, on the other hand, are revolted by the sight of raw flesh and cannot tolerate hearing the screams of animals being ripped apart and killed. The bloody reality of eating animals is innately repulsive to us, more proof that we were not designed to eat meat.

Humans lack both the physical characteristics of carnivores and the instinct that drives them to kill animals and devour their raw carcasses. We not only survive, but thrive on a meat-free diet. It's time to retire the self-serving myth that humans are meant to eat meat—to do otherwise harms both humans and animals.

*From zeitgeist forum*

How do you feel about arguing that you shouldn't eat meat because it gives you Cancer, Alzheimers and Diabetes?

Is that a better argument?

That's usually my argument.

I don't know who had the above argument. But I can understand why you wouldn't agree with that.

If you think I'm full of it read this book please:

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

The China Study (ISBN 1-932100-38-5) is a 2005 book by medical researcher T. Colin Campbell, Ph.D., and his son, Thomas M. Campbell II. Dr. Campbell is a professor of Nutritional Biochemistry at Cornell University[1] and one of the directors of the China Project[1].

The book examines the relationship between the consumption of animal products and illnesses such as cancers of the breast, prostate, large bowel, diabetes, coronary heart disease, obesity, autoimmune disease, osteoporosis, degenerative brain disease, and macular degeneration. The "China study" referred to in the title is the China Project, a study comparing diet, lifestyle and disease characteristics in sixty five counties in rural China in the 1970's and 1980's conducted jointly by Cornell University, Oxford University, and the Chinese Academy of Preventive Medicine[2].

The authors state a correlation between animal-based diets with disease. The authors conclude that diets high in protein, particularly animal protein (including casein in cow's milk) are strongly linked to diseases such as heart disease, cancer and Type 2 diabetes. The authors recommend that people eat a whole food, plant-based diet and avoid consuming beef, poultry and milk as a means to minimize and/or reverse the development of chronic disease. The authors also recommend that people take in adequate amounts of sunshine in order to maintain sufficient levels of Vitamin D and consider taking dietary supplements of vitamin B12. The authors criticize "low carb" diets (such as the Atkins diet), which include restrictions on the percentage of calories derived from complex carbohydrates.

2: If it is better for humans to only eat plants, then why do we have the teeth for eating meat?

Do we have the teeth for eating meat?

Can you show me exactly how you find that we have the teeth for eating meat?

I'll show you why we don't:

Herbivores (like the cow) have 24 molars, eight jagged incisors in the lower jaw and a horny palate in the upper jaw. Their jaws move vertically, laterally, forward, and backward, enabling the herbivore to tear and grind coarse grasses.

Omnivores (like the hog) can have tusk-like canines allowing them to dig up roots.

Frugivores (like the chimpanzee) have 32 teeth: sixteen in each jaw including four incisors, two cuspids, four bicuspids, and six molars. The cuspids are

adapted for cracking nuts, and the uniform articulation of the teeth enables the frugivore to mash and grind fruits.

On the contrary, carnivores (like the cat family) have markedly developed canines that are long, sharp, cylindrical, pointed, and set apart from the other teeth. Fangs and sharp pointed teeth that penetrate and kill, that rip and tear flesh, are a feature of all true carnivores (except certain birds). The powerful jaws of the carnivore move only vertically, and are ideal for ripping and tearing flesh that is swallowed virtually whole and then acted upon by extremely potent gastric juices.

That brings us to stomach form and size:

In the carnivore the stomach is a small, round sack designed to dissolve flesh quickly and then pass it on for removal.

In plant eaters (particularly ruminants) stomachs are complicated adjoining sacks with ring-like convolutions.

The frugivore stomach (including in humans) is oblong and is characterized by folds called rugae which serve to retain food for relatively long periods.

Organ sizes of various species also markedly vary. The liver and kidneys in the carnivore are much larger than in vegetarian animals. A lion's kidney is twice the size of a bull's, and not much smaller than the elephant's. This allows the lion to handle large amounts of protein and nitrogenous waste products contained in its natural flesh diet. The carnivore's huge liver secretes larger amounts of bile into the small intestine than does the herbivore's liver. There is a direct relation between the quantity of meat eaten and the amount of bile secreted. Meat-eating therefore, places a strain on the small liver of humans which impairs the organ's function over a long period of time.

When you place humans on a diet for which they are NOT naturally adapted, this places unnatural stress on the organs of elimination. Humans have never adapted to the carnivorous diet that is high in animal products. The human liver is smaller than the carnivore's and as a result, we cannot detoxify the poisonous products inherent within animal foods such as uric acid (discussed below). Our kidneys are also smaller and become diseased from overwork caused by a diet high in animal protein.

**Stomach Acid:**

The hydrochloric acid concentrations of various species are an additional determinant of their natural diet.

A carnivore's gastric juice is highly acidic, serving to prevent putrefaction while flesh undergoes digestion.

Plant-eaters however, secrete a much less concentrated and less abundant quantity of hydrochloric acid that does not curtail the bacterial decomposition of flesh: a process that begins at the animal's moment of death. Flesh is digested in an acid medium within the stomach.

Humans secrete a very weak concentration of hydrochloric acid relative to the carnivore, and little of the protein-splitting enzyme pepsinogen. Carnivorous animals have concentrations of these flesh-digesting secretions 1100% greater than do humans. Lions can rip off and swallow your hand whole and quite readily digest it.

Let's look at intestinal length. (this will explain why it stinks so bad when you go to the toilet.)

Among the various species throughout nature, the length of their particular alimentary canals also differs greatly in relation to their natural food. The gut of the carnivore is 3-6 times the length of their body. They require a short, smooth, fast-acting gut since their natural flesh diet becomes quite toxic and cannot be retained within the intestine for long without poisonous putrefaction taking place.

The gut of the herbivore is sacculated for greater surface area, and is 30 times the length of their body. Its herb and grass diet is coarse and fibrous, requiring longer digestion to break down cellulose.

The length of the omnivore's alimentary canal is generally 6 times its body trunk size.

The gut of the frugivore (like humans) is also sacculated and is 12 times the length of its body. The length of the adult human alimentary canal is about 30 feet. The human digestive tract is about four times as long as the carnivores.

The intestine of the carnivore is short and smooth in order to dissolve food rapidly and pass it quickly out of the system prior to the flesh putrefying.

The human digestive tract is corrugated for the specific purpose of retaining food as long as possible until all nutriment has been extracted, which is the worst possible condition for the digestion and processing of flesh foods.

Meat moves quickly through the carnivore's digestive tract and is quickly expelled.

The human lengthy intestine cannot handle low-fiber foods including meat and dairy very quickly at all. As a consequence, animal foods decrease the motility of the human intestine and putrefaction almost invariably occurs (as evidenced by foul smelling stools and flatulence), resulting in the release of many poisonous by-products as the low-fiber food passes through, ever so slowly. In humans, eventual constipation may develop on a meat-centered diet. Colon cancer is also common, both of which are rare or non-existent on a high-fiber diet centered around raw fruits and vegetables.

So when you were saying that we have teeth to eat meat. Was that based on something? Or was that more like your opinion?