

Larder Lout Clare Hargreaves

Fat or Fiction?

CHRISTMAS IS OVER FOR ANOTHER YEAR AND THE FAT-FREE DIETS HAVE BEGUN (AGAIN). BUT, ASKS CLARE HARGREAVES, ARE WE WASTING OUR TIME WITH SUCH ABSTINENCE? IS IT HIGH TIME WE STOPPED DEMONISING FAT?

WORDS: CLARE HARGREAVES

y friend Jess Vaughan, who farms cows in Gloucestershire, has a great line when selling her gorgeously creamy organic milk at Stroud farmers' market: "It's 96 percent fat-free." Of course, you and I are more used to seeing it called full-fat. But, explains Jess, say that and people look at you as if you're trying to sell them something wicked that will instantly kill them. When in actual fact, four percent is a pretty miniscule percentage.

So why this overwhelming fear of fat? How has it become the dietary demon that we shun above all others? Why are the catch lines 'fat-free' and 'low-fat' proudly plastered over virtually everything we buy at the supermarket? We've all got it in for fat, it seems. My emaciated 90-year-old aunt was recently told by her doctor to avoid eating it. When I submitted a beetroot tart recipe to a women's magazine, I was told it couldn't be described as 'healthy' as it contained a small amount of butter.

A large part of the problem is the name. It happens to be the same as the adjective describing someone who is overweight. That's unfortunate. The implication is that if you eat fat, then you'll become fat. Fat causes fat.

It's a confusion that was seized on by governments and the food industry in

the 1960s onwards. They maintained that fats, above all other foods, were responsible for growing levels of obesity, coronary heart disease and cancer.

We were all sucked into this anti-fat frenzy, including me. My mum was from the West Country and her mum made cheese, so clotted cream and cheddar cheeses were part of our daily supper table. Fatty ends of pork gave flavour to our stews. As a child, one of my jobs was to remove the 'top of the milk' and put it into a tiny silver cream jug for use on puddings. Then, the food police decided that fat was bad for us, so we diligently replaced butter with oils and man-made margarines. The top-of-thebottle disappeared as we switched to semi-skimmed milk. We started eating lean, cardboardy chicken breasts instead of the red meats like lamb and beef we'd happily enjoyed until then.

My fat-reduced diet probably didn't do me any harm (apart from the manmade trans fats in the butter-replacing-margarines – they're now proved to be harmful, and are banned in many countries). But the thing that got lost as we all learned to loathe our lipids was that fact that fats are actually vital for our well being. Nobody's talking about a diet of nothing but butter – just as nobody would sensibly eat a diet of just curly kale, Coca Cola, or anything else. What

experts are saying is that fats are crucial as they provide us with energy, and they form the membranes around every cell in our bodies – our brains are nearly two-thirds fat. They include essential fatty acids (all those Omegas), and carry the fat-soluble vitamins A, D, E, and K; so if you cut out fat, for example by drinking skimmed milk, you're cutting some of your vitamins too. Milk is also a dead handy, and very affordable, source of B12, B2 and calcium.

The other thing that happened was the obesity epidemic. When we stopped eating fat in the 60s fewer than two percent of the UK population were obese. Fifty years on, one in four are. Something else was clearly making us fat, and it didn't take a rocket scientist to work out what it was: processed foods and drinks, laden with refined carbohydrates. Ironically, carbs were the very foods that government scientists had advised us to eat instead of fats. Another irony is that when fats were removed from foods, they were replaced with sugars and other substances to make up the bulk - so many foods ended up being far more fattening than they'd ever been in the first place. (But still the labels continue to scream 'low-fat', or 'lite'.)

David Cameron clearly hasn't got the message yet, as he recently expressed interest in following Denmark with a 'fat tax'. If there had been a tax levied on processed foods, many dieticians nationwide would have thrown a very large party. But a processed food tax wouldn't win many votes from Cameron's friends in the food industry who, surprise surprise, are still preaching the anti-fat gospel. In the meantime, I've decided I'm going for 'real', un-mucked-about-with foods. That includes milk the way the cow made it. And butter. Life just didn't taste the same without it.



Larder Lout Clare Hargreaves

Fat or Fiction?

CHRISTMAS IS OVER FOR ANOTHER YEAR AND THE FAT-FREE DIETS HAVE BEGUN (AGAIN). BUT, ASKS CLARE HARGREAVES, ARE WE WASTING OUR TIME WITH SUCH ABSTINENCE? IS IT HIGH TIME WE STOPPED DEMONISING FAT?

WORDS: CLARE HARGREAVES

y friend Jess Vaughan, who farms cows in Gloucestershire, has a great line when selling her gorgeously creamy organic milk at Stroud farmers' market: "It's 96 percent fat-free." Of course, you and I are more used to seeing it called full-fat. But, explains Jess, say that and people look at you as if you're trying to sell them something wicked that will instantly kill them. When in actual fact, four percent is a pretty miniscule percentage.

So why this overwhelming fear of fat? How has it become the dietary demon that we shun above all others? Why are the catch lines 'fat-free' and 'low-fat' proudly plastered over virtually everything we buy at the supermarket? We've all got it in for fat, it seems. My emaciated 90-year-old aunt was recently told by her doctor to avoid eating it. When I submitted a beetroot tart recipe to a women's magazine, I was told it couldn't be described as 'healthy' as it contained a small amount of butter.

A large part of the problem is the name. It happens to be the same as the adjective describing someone who is overweight. That's unfortunate. The implication is that if you eat fat, then you'll become fat. Fat causes fat.

It's a confusion that was seized on by governments and the food industry in

the 1960s onwards. They maintained that fats, above all other foods, were responsible for growing levels of obesity, coronary heart disease and cancer.

We were all sucked into this anti-fat frenzy, including me. My mum was from the West Country and her mum made cheese, so clotted cream and cheddar cheeses were part of our daily supper table. Fatty ends of pork gave flavour to our stews. As a child, one of my jobs was to remove the 'top of the milk' and put it into a tiny silver cream jug for use on puddings. Then, the food police decided that fat was bad for us, so we diligently replaced butter with oils and man-made margarines. The top-of-thebottle disappeared as we switched to semi-skimmed milk. We started eating lean, cardboardy chicken breasts instead of the red meats like lamb and beef we'd happily enjoyed until then.

My fat-reduced diet probably didn't do me any harm (apart from the manmade trans fats in the butter-replacing-margarines – they're now proved to be harmful, and are banned in many countries). But the thing that got lost as we all learned to loathe our lipids was that fact that fats are actually vital for our well being. Nobody's talking about a diet of nothing but butter – just as nobody would sensibly eat a diet of just curly kale, Coca Cola, or anything else. What

experts are saying is that fats are crucial as they provide us with energy, and they form the membranes around every cell in our bodies – our brains are nearly two-thirds fat. They include essential fatty acids (all those Omegas), and carry the fat-soluble vitamins A, D, E, and K; so if you cut out fat, for example by drinking skimmed milk, you're cutting some of your vitamins too. Milk is also a dead handy, and very affordable, source of B12, B2 and calcium.

The other thing that happened was the obesity epidemic. When we stopped eating fat in the 60s fewer than two percent of the UK population were obese. Fifty years on, one in four are. Something else was clearly making us fat, and it didn't take a rocket scientist to work out what it was: processed foods and drinks, laden with refined carbohydrates. Ironically, carbs were the very foods that government scientists had advised us to eat instead of fats. Another irony is that when fats were removed from foods, they were replaced with sugars and other substances to make up the bulk - so many foods ended up being far more fattening than they'd ever been in the first place. (But still the labels continue to scream 'low-fat', or 'lite'.)

David Cameron clearly hasn't got the message yet, as he recently expressed interest in following Denmark with a 'fat tax'. If there had been a tax levied on processed foods, many dieticians nationwide would have thrown a very large party. But a processed food tax wouldn't win many votes from Cameron's friends in the food industry who, surprise surprise, are still preaching the anti-fat gospel. In the meantime, I've decided I'm going for 'real', un-mucked-about-with foods. That includes milk the way the cow made it. And butter. Life just didn't taste the same without it.



Larder Lout Clare Hargreaves

Fat or Fiction

CHRISTMAS IS OVER FOR ANOTHER YEAR AND THE FAT-FREE DIETS HAVE BEGUN (AGAIN). BUT, ASKS CLARE HARGREAVES, ARE WE WASTING OUR TIME WITH SUCH ABSTINENCE? IS IT HIGH TIME WE STOPPED DEMONISING FAT?

WORDS: CLARE HARGREAVES

y friend Jess Vaughan, who farms cows in Gloucestershire, has a great line when selling her gorgeously creamy organic milk at Stroud farmers' market: "It's 96 percent fat-free." Of course, you and I are more used to seeing it called full-fat. But, explains Jess, say that and people look at you as if you're trying to sell them something wicked that will instantly kill them. When in actual fact, four percent is a pretty miniscule percentage.

So why this overwhelming fear of fat? How has it become the dietary demon that we shun above all others? Why are the catch lines 'fat-free' and 'low-fat' proudly plastered over virtually everything we buy at the supermarket? We've all got it in for fat, it seems. My emaciated 90-year-old aunt was recently told by her doctor to avoid eating it. When I submitted a beetroot tart recipe to a women's magazine, I was told it couldn't be described as 'healthy' as it contained a small amount of butter.

A large part of the problem is the name. It happens to be the same as the adjective describing someone who is overweight. That's unfortunate. The implication is that if you eat fat, then you'll become fat. Fat causes fat.

It's a confusion that was seized on by governments and the food industry in

the 1960s onwards. They maintained that fats, above all other foods, were responsible for growing levels of obesity, coronary heart disease and cancer.

We were all sucked into this anti-fat frenzy, including me. My mum was from the West Country and her mum made cheese, so clotted cream and cheddar cheeses were part of our daily supper table. Fatty ends of pork gave flavour to our stews. As a child, one of my jobs was to remove the 'top of the milk' and put it into a tiny silver cream jug for use on puddings. Then, the food police decided that fat was bad for us, so we diligently replaced butter with oils and man-made margarines. The top-of-thebottle disappeared as we switched to semi-skimmed milk. We started eating lean, cardboardy chicken breasts instead of the red meats like lamb and beef we'd happily enjoyed until then.

My fat-reduced diet probably didn't do me any harm (apart from the manmade trans fats in the butter-replacingmargarines - they're now proved to be harmful, and are banned in many countries). But the thing that got lost as we all learned to loathe our lipids was that fact that fats are actually vital for our well being. Nobody's talking about a diet of nothing but butter - just as nobody would sensibly eat a diet of just curly kale, Coca Cola, or anything else. What

experts are saying is that fats are crucial as they provide us with energy, and they form the membranes around every cell in our bodies - our brains are nearly two-thirds fat. They include essential fatty acids (all those Omegas), and carry the fat-soluble vitamins A, D, E, and K; so if you cut out fat, for example by drinking skimmed milk, you're cutting some of your vitamins too. Milk is also a dead handy, and very affordable, source of B12, B2 and calcium.

The other thing that happened was the obesity epidemic. When we stopped eating fat in the 60s fewer than two percent of the UK population were obese. Fifty years on, one in four are. Something else was clearly making us fat, and it didn't take a rocket scientist to work out what it was: processed foods and drinks, laden with refined carbohydrates. Ironically, carbs were the very foods that government scientists had advised us to eat instead of fats. Another irony is that when fats were removed from foods, they were replaced with sugars and other substances to make up the bulk - so many foods ended up being far more fattening than they'd ever been in the first place. (But still the labels continue to scream 'low-fat', or 'lite'.)

David Cameron clearly hasn't got the message yet, as he recently expressed interest in following Denmark with a 'fat tax'. If there had been a tax levied on processed foods, many dieticians nationwide would have thrown a very large party. But a processed food tax wouldn't win many votes from Cameron's friends in the food industry who, surprise surprise, are still preaching the anti-fat gospel. In the meantime, I've decided I'm going for 'real', un-mucked-about-with foods. That includes milk the way the cow made it. And butter. Life just didn't taste the same without it.



Larder Lout Clare Hargreaves

Fat or Fiction

CHRISTMAS IS OVER FOR ANOTHER YEAR AND THE FAT-FREE DIETS HAVE BEGUN (AGAIN). BUT, ASKS CLARE HARGREAVES, ARE WE WASTING OUR TIME WITH SUCH ABSTINENCE? IS IT HIGH TIME WE STOPPED DEMONISING FAT?

WORDS: CLARE HARGREAVES

y friend Jess Vaughan, who farms cows in Gloucestershire, has a great line when selling her gorgeously creamy organic milk at Stroud farmers' market: "It's 96 percent fat-free." Of course, you and I are more used to seeing it called full-fat. But, explains Jess, say that and people look at you as if you're trying to sell them something wicked that will instantly kill them. When in actual fact, four percent is a pretty miniscule percentage.

So why this overwhelming fear of fat? How has it become the dietary demon that we shun above all others? Why are the catch lines 'fat-free' and 'low-fat' proudly plastered over virtually everything we buy at the supermarket? We've all got it in for fat, it seems. My emaciated 90-year-old aunt was recently told by her doctor to avoid eating it. When I submitted a beetroot tart recipe to a women's magazine, I was told it couldn't be described as 'healthy' as it contained a small amount of butter.

A large part of the problem is the name. It happens to be the same as the adjective describing someone who is overweight. That's unfortunate. The implication is that if you eat fat, then you'll become fat. Fat causes fat.

It's a confusion that was seized on by governments and the food industry in

the 1960s onwards. They maintained that fats, above all other foods, were responsible for growing levels of obesity, coronary heart disease and cancer.

We were all sucked into this anti-fat frenzy, including me. My mum was from the West Country and her mum made cheese, so clotted cream and cheddar cheeses were part of our daily supper table. Fatty ends of pork gave flavour to our stews. As a child, one of my jobs was to remove the 'top of the milk' and put it into a tiny silver cream jug for use on puddings. Then, the food police decided that fat was bad for us, so we diligently replaced butter with oils and man-made margarines. The top-of-thebottle disappeared as we switched to semi-skimmed milk. We started eating lean, cardboardy chicken breasts instead of the red meats like lamb and beef we'd happily enjoyed until then.

My fat-reduced diet probably didn't do me any harm (apart from the manmade trans fats in the butter-replacingmargarines - they're now proved to be harmful, and are banned in many countries). But the thing that got lost as we all learned to loathe our lipids was that fact that fats are actually vital for our well being. Nobody's talking about a diet of nothing but butter - just as nobody would sensibly eat a diet of just curly kale, Coca Cola, or anything else. What

experts are saying is that fats are crucial as they provide us with energy, and they form the membranes around every cell in our bodies - our brains are nearly two-thirds fat. They include essential fatty acids (all those Omegas), and carry the fat-soluble vitamins A, D, E, and K; so if you cut out fat, for example by drinking skimmed milk, you're cutting some of your vitamins too. Milk is also a dead handy, and very affordable, source of B12, B2 and calcium.

The other thing that happened was the obesity epidemic. When we stopped eating fat in the 60s fewer than two percent of the UK population were obese. Fifty years on, one in four are. Something else was clearly making us fat, and it didn't take a rocket scientist to work out what it was: processed foods and drinks, laden with refined carbohydrates. Ironically, carbs were the very foods that government scientists had advised us to eat instead of fats. Another irony is that when fats were removed from foods, they were replaced with sugars and other substances to make up the bulk - so many foods ended up being far more fattening than they'd ever been in the first place. (But still the labels continue to scream 'low-fat', or 'lite'.)

David Cameron clearly hasn't got the message yet, as he recently expressed interest in following Denmark with a 'fat tax'. If there had been a tax levied on processed foods, many dieticians nationwide would have thrown a very large party. But a processed food tax wouldn't win many votes from Cameron's friends in the food industry who, surprise surprise, are still preaching the anti-fat gospel. In the meantime, I've decided I'm going for 'real', un-mucked-about-with foods. That includes milk the way the cow made it. And butter. Life just didn't taste the same without it.



Larder Lout
Clare Hargreaves

Fat or Fiction?

CHRISTMAS IS OVER FOR ANOTHER YEAR AND THE FAT-FREE DIETS HAVE BEGUN (AGAIN). BUT, ASKS CLARE HARGREAVES, ARE WE WASTING OUR TIME WITH SUCH ABSTINENCE? IS IT HIGH TIME WE STOPPED DEMONISING FAT?

WORDS: CLARE HARGREAVES

y friend Jess Vaughan, who farms cows in Gloucestershire, has a great line when selling her gorgeously creamy organic milk at Stroud farmers' market: "It's 96 percent fat-free." Of course, you and I are more used to seeing it called full-fat. But, explains Jess, say that and people look at you as if you're trying to sell them something wicked that will instantly kill them. When in actual fact, four percent is a pretty miniscule percentage.

So why this overwhelming fear of fat? How has it become the dietary demon that we shun above all others? Why are the catch lines 'fat-free' and 'low-fat' proudly plastered over virtually everything we buy at the supermarket? We've all got it in for fat, it seems. My emaciated 90-year-old aunt was recently told by her doctor to avoid eating it. When I submitted a beetroot tart recipe to a women's magazine, I was told it couldn't be described as 'healthy' as it contained a small amount of butter.

A large part of the problem is the name. It happens to be the same as the adjective describing someone who is overweight. That's unfortunate. The implication is that if you eat fat, then you'll become fat. Fat causes fat.

It's a confusion that was seized on by governments and the food industry in

the 1960s onwards. They maintained that fats, above all other foods, were responsible for growing levels of obesity, coronary heart disease and cancer.

We were all sucked into this anti-fat frenzy, including me. My mum was from the West Country and her mum made cheese, so clotted cream and cheddar cheeses were part of our daily supper table. Fatty ends of pork gave flavour to our stews. As a child, one of my jobs was to remove the 'top of the milk' and put it into a tiny silver cream jug for use on puddings. Then, the food police decided that fat was bad for us, so we diligently replaced butter with oils and man-made margarines. The top-of-thebottle disappeared as we switched to semi-skimmed milk. We started eating lean, cardboardy chicken breasts instead of the red meats like lamb and beef we'd happily enjoyed until then.

My fat-reduced diet probably didn't do me any harm (apart from the manmade trans fats in the butter-replacing-margarines – they're now proved to be harmful, and are banned in many countries). But the thing that got lost as we all learned to loathe our lipids was that fact that fats are actually vital for our well being. Nobody's talking about a diet of nothing but butter – just as nobody would sensibly eat a diet of just curly kale, Coca Cola, or anything else. What

experts are saying is that fats are crucial as they provide us with energy, and they form the membranes around every cell in our bodies – our brains are nearly two-thirds fat. They include essential fatty acids (all those Omegas), and carry the fat-soluble vitamins A, D, E, and K; so if you cut out fat, for example by drinking skimmed milk, you're cutting some of your vitamins too. Milk is also a dead handy, and very affordable, source of B12, B2 and calcium.

The other thing that happened was the obesity epidemic. When we stopped eating fat in the 60s fewer than two percent of the UK population were obese. Fifty years on, one in four are. Something else was clearly making us fat, and it didn't take a rocket scientist to work out what it was: processed foods and drinks, laden with refined carbohydrates. Ironically, carbs were the very foods that government scientists had advised us to eat instead of fats. Another irony is that when fats were removed from foods, they were replaced with sugars and other substances to make up the bulk - so many foods ended up being far more fattening than they'd ever been in the first place. (But still the labels continue to scream 'low-fat', or 'lite'.)

David Cameron clearly hasn't got the message yet, as he recently expressed interest in following Denmark with a 'fat tax'. If there had been a tax levied on processed foods, many dieticians nationwide would have thrown a very large party. But a processed food tax wouldn't win many votes from Cameron's friends in the food industry who, surprise surprise, are still preaching the anti-fat gospel. In the meantime, I've decided I'm going for 'real', un-mucked-about-with foods. That includes milk the way the cow made it. And butter. Life just didn't taste the same without it.