



Jay Hollman

Article

Nutrition in Science and Scripture

Jay Hollman

Diet for the prevention of disease is part of a preventive medicine program. Nutritional science has evolved and currently recommends dietary patterns such as the DASH Diet or Mediterranean Diet rather than specific nutrients. Scientific dietary recommendations are human in origin and designed to improve health, and thus differ from the Old Testament dietary laws which are divine in origin and meant to define a distinctive people. Clean and unclean distinctions do not correspond to what current nutritional science would consider healthy and unhealthy. As New Testament believers, we are no longer under the Jewish dietary laws, but we must be careful about what we eat and where we eat for the sake of our conscience and the conscience of our fellow believers. Individual believers should carefully review current nutritional recommendations and decide before God what type of diet they should follow. Diet should not be a cause for division among followers of Christ. Christians should encourage scientific nutritional science within the church, as well as community gardens and periodic fasting.

It is an awkward moment at the family Thanksgiving gathering when your daughter, returning from her first semester at college, announces that her new boyfriend, who has joined her for the family dinner, is a vegan. A scramble ensues in the kitchen to find food that has not been touched by animal products. In the minutes before sitting down to eat, grandfather, the patriarch of the family, quizzes his granddaughter's boyfriend on his reasons for not eating meat: Health? Environment? Culture? Cruelty to animals? Somewhere in this conversation scientific evidence will be cited. What should be the response of a Christian who has a high view of science and faith?

Christians have interpreted passages in 1 Corinthians, where our body is referred to as a "temple of God," as meaning that we are to promote the health of our bodies.¹ Eating a good diet does lead to

improved health and prevents (or delays) some chronic diseases. The actual value of dietary changes must be placed in perspective. There are other habits such as smoking and cocaine use that are more harmful to health over time than any dietary habit.

Dan Buettner has popularized the concept of "Blue Zones," areas in the world where longevity is common with lower incidences of cancer and heart disease.² One element contributing to a longer life is a diet low in meat and higher in legumes. But longevity in Blue Zones, according to Buettner, is not due only to diet but also to exercising regularly, having a life purpose, experiencing low levels of stress, managing moderate calorie intake, engaging in spirituality, and maintaining strong family lives and social ties. Buettner's data are supported by other social studies. Christ followers living an obedient life should have these characteristics.

While I would endorse such a lifestyle, including a diet low in calories and

Jay Hollman (MD, Oregon Health Science Center, MA in bioethics, Trinity International University) practices and teaches cardiology at LSU Health Sciences Center. He previously served and taught at Cleveland Clinic and also at Ochsner Clinic. Along with ASAer David Dornbos, he has authored a book on the health and environmental problems of meat consumption.

optimal from a scientific perspective (see below), there are three caveats: First, it is important to recognize that there are human diseases that are not related to one's diet: cystic fibrosis and sickle cell anemia are devastating diseases that will shorten lives and are due to a single gene defect. Rheumatoid arthritis and lupus erythematosus are autoimmune disorders that can reduce the quality and quantity of life and are not related to diet.

Second, we should not judge individuals superficially. While some young individuals with early vascular disease have lived a lifestyle that could explain their early chronic disease, others are afflicted by single gene defects in cholesterol metabolism or possess a strong polygenic risk. We should be careful lest we become like the Pharisees in John 9 trying to link an illness to sin. In truth, we all sin and need to be treated with grace. Eating the best of diets does not guarantee a long and healthy life.

Third, from a historical perspective, dietary science and the recommended ideal diet have changed over the forty-five years of my medical practice. In 1988, the National Cholesterol Education Program published its first set of recommendations.³ This led cardiologists to recommend a diet low in cholesterol and fat, especially saturated fat. For this reason, my mentor and President Lyndon Johnson's cardiologist, Dr. J. Willis Hurst, would not eat the eggs and bacon breakfast served on his visits to the Johnson ranch in Texas. It is now known that dietary cholesterol has little effect on blood cholesterol levels.⁴ Low-fat diets are not clearly beneficial. It is now recognized that certain vegetable fats and fat from nuts and marine sources likely are beneficial. Changes in recommendations from nutritional experts as more science becomes available might confuse the public, but it should not surprise us as scientists. It is the nature of science to refine hypotheses and theories as more data become available.

The Current Concept of an Ideal Diet

With these caveats, my sense is that current dietary recommendations, if followed reasonably, will maximize the benefit of diet on health. Optimal diet is a balanced diet with vitamins and minerals being obtained from the foods in which they occur naturally. Supplemental vitamins are not needed except in the rare cases of vitamin deficiency disorders. Rather than recommending specific food components, such as how much fat or protein and minimum daily requirements of various vitamins, a dietary pattern is recommended. A full description of these dietary patterns in this article is not necessary as there are many other sources.

Two dietary patterns have been rated for years by dietitians as most healthy: the DASH diet and the Mediterranean diet.⁵ Excellent links can be found to these diets at reliable sites such as the NIH and the Mayo clinic websites.⁶ The USDA changed its recommendation to the public from the more abstract food pyramid to MyPlate, a simpler presentation of nutritional information.

In the scientific literature, I would suggest a review article by Dariush Mozaffarian.⁷ In this article, he summarizes current nutritional recommendations (table 1). I would also suggest two authors who write for a general audience: Michael Pollan and P. K. Newby. Pollan has written several entertaining books: *Food Rules: An Eater's Manual*; *In Defense of Food: An Eater's Manifesto*; and *The Omnivore's Dilemma: A Natural History of Four Meals*.⁸ His recommendations are generally correct: eat real foods, not too much, and mostly plants. However, I would disagree with some of his comments regarding food additives. Newby's book, *Food and Nutrition: What Everyone Needs to Know*, is more scientifically written and covers repercussions on the environment as well.⁹ She includes recipes with her writings and even does cooking demonstrations on YouTube.

Table 1. Summary of Harmful and Beneficial Foods Based on Current Nutritional Research

Health Effect	Types of Food
Most beneficial	Fruits, nuts, fish, vegetables, vegetable oils, whole grains, beans, yogurt
Mildly beneficial	Cheese, eggs, poultry, milk
Mildly harmful	Butter, unprocessed red meats
Most harmful	Refined grains, starches, sugars, processed meats, high sodium foods, trans fat

The placement of each food is based on its net effect on cardiometabolic health. From data in Dariush Mozaffarian, "Dietary and Policy Priorities for Cardiovascular Disease, Diabetes, and Obesity: A Comprehensive Review," *Circulation* 133, no. 2 (2016): 187–225.

Article

Nutrition in Science and Scripture

Good nutrition involves eating more beneficial foods and fewer harmful foods. But there is a danger in trying to make rigid rules. In this regard, modern nutrition recommendations contrast with the dietary laws of the Old Testament. The distinction between clean and unclean as outlined in the Hebrew Bible was complex. You could eat beef but not pork, yet current dietary science would view both as harmful, particularly if they were salted and processed. Many fish such as catfish were unclean as they do not have both fins and scales, and all shellfish were excluded, yet fish and shellfish are considered beneficial by current nutritional science.

Attempts to reconcile Jewish dietary laws with nutritional science fell into disfavor long before nutritional science reached its current level of sophistication. Clean foods are not necessarily “healthy,” and unclean foods are not uniformly “unhealthy.” Most current scholars believe that these dietary rules were given to make the Jewish people a distinctive people who would follow God’s edicts without question. New Testament believers were freed from the distinction between clean and unclean, but they were to make some accommodation to Jewish believers. In Acts 15, the Council of Jerusalem urged Gentile believers to make three dietary concessions to believers who were from a Jewish background: (1) abstain from food polluted by idols, (2) abstain from the meat of strangled animals, and (3) abstain from drinking blood. Compromise in food selection and sensitivity to others is a major theme of the New Testament teaching on diet.

In contrast to clean and unclean, nutritional recommendations are based on science with the realization that the conclusions are tentative. Unlike clean and unclean, nutritional research does make hygienic claims. But the origins of these dietary suggestions are human and not divine. Although I personally believe that the current dietary patterns are close to the best possible diet, recommendations will change slightly as more scientific data become available. It is frustrating to me to have a medical student or social friend quote a soundbite from the news media proclaiming the discovery of some earth-shattering development in nutritional research. Definitive nutritional research requires careful weighing of evidence from animal studies, populations studies, feeding studies, and randomized studies.

Rules-based Christians sometimes have a difficult time distinguishing between the certainty of biblical commands and the conclusions of science which are often presented as relative risk. Deontological believers can err on either extreme: rigid adoption of rules without compromise, or complete rejection because dietary recommendations are not definitive enough.

Dealing with Dietary Differences

In modern culture, there are many voices calling for dietary change in the American diet that are outside the scientific consensus. Some, as in the example above, recommend the elimination of animal products from our diet. But the vegan diet is not the only form of vegetarianism, although it does have the most restrictive diet. Other types of vegetarianism include pesco vegetarians who eat fish and lacto-ovo-vegetarians who will eat dairy and/or eggs.

There are two references to the vegetarian diet in scripture: Daniel and his friends’ request, “Let us be given vegetables to eat and water to drink” (Dan. 1:12b); and Paul’s reference, “The weak person eats only vegetables” (Rom. 14:2b). It is clear from the context that Paul does not regard a weaker brother as a lesser member of the congregation. Anyone who has tried to eat a vegetarian diet in our culture knows that this takes considerable resolution and perseverance, hardly traits associated with weakness. The reason that these believers would not eat meat was probably not based on what was clean or unclean by Jewish dietary laws but, rather, on the desire to avoid meat from the meat market that might have been offered to idols or meat that was not prepared in a manner consistent with Jewish dietary laws. Similarly, Daniel and his friends in Babylon refused to be defiled by eating meat and drinking wine from the king’s table. Their objection was more likely based on concerns regarding violations to the Jewish dietary laws, than on a desire to be a vegetarian. Paul clearly states that the eating of meat is not forbidden to the believer. But is there any value in vegetarianism?

From a scientific perspective, there is evidence that vegetarians have lower incidences of chronic disease and greater longevity. Studies of California Seventh-Day Adventists demonstrate the incidence of diabetes and hypertension to be 50% to 75% lower

in vegetarian Adventists compared to nonvegetarian Adventists.¹⁰ But diet is not the only difference between vegetarian and nonvegetarian Adventists. Vegetarian Adventists also tend to be more health conscious. Differences in the rate of smoking and the amount of exercise might also be important differences. Since regular exercise reduces the incidence of hypertension and diabetes, difference due to exercise should be subtracted to obtain a better estimate of any difference due to diet. But subtracting differences is not always so simple. For example, vegetarians have a lower body mass index (BMI) compared to meat eaters. A lower BMI is associated with a lower incidence of diabetes and hypertension. But is the lower BMI a result of the diet? There is data to suggest that eating less meat and more fruits and vegetables will result in weight loss.¹¹ If it is the result of the diet, then it would not be proper to subtract the expected difference due to BMI. This short discussion serves as an illustration of how difficult it is to demonstrate the harm of meat eating to health. The short answer is, as table 1 demonstrates, that the predominance of data suggests that red meat, and especially processed red meat, is harmful to health, while poultry and fish are not.

If one is interested in a bottom-line answer regarding meat consumption, it is probably best to read the recommendations of expert panels. Dietary experts, mostly active nutritional researchers, are convened by not-for-profit groups such as the American Heart Association and governmental agencies such as the U.S. Department of Agriculture. These groups analyze the scientific literature, sometimes doing their own meta-analyses. After reviewing the data, they draft recommendations on which they vote. The consensus of these panels, while not unanimous, is that red meat and processed meat consumption should be reduced.

The *2015–2020 Dietary Guidelines for Americans* recommends limiting red meat intake, including processed meat, to one serving per week.¹² The American Institute for Cancer Research recommends limiting red meat consumption to moderate amounts and consuming very little processed meat.¹³ A research agency of the World Health Organization (WHO) has indicated that the consumption of red meat is “probably carcinogenic” and processed meat is considered “carcinogenic” to humans.¹⁴ However, the expert panels are not unanimous. Another panel

of dietary experts, NutriRECS, published their analysis of the data on meat consumption in 2019 and recommended that Americans not adjust their consumption of either red or processed meats because the evidence of harm from meat eating was of a low quality.¹⁵

As an interested outside observer, I would agree that a low consumption of red meat is ideal and processed meat should be almost eliminated. White meat consumption from poultry is neutral or mildly beneficial. Fish, especially oily fish, is a clear positive for the diet. I would say that the science on which these recommendations are made is at least an order of magnitude less certain than the evidence that smoking is harmful to health.

Where does this leave us in our discourse with the vegan boyfriend visiting for Thanksgiving vacation? Romans 14 does not address the consumption as a health issue, but it does make it clear that eating or not eating meat should not be an issue that divides believers. Believers should be sensitive to each other’s scruples. A correct application of Paul’s teaching would be to accept and affirm the young man’s dietary preferences. If this is followed by humble questioning and dialogue, it could be quite helpful in building a relationship.

There are reasons to abstain from meat beyond any health benefit. Stronger than the health evidence is the evidence that the production of meat, especially the production of red meat, is harmful to the environment. The semi-industrialized production of beef requires much more in land resources and supplemental feed to produce a pound of beef when compared to a pound of meat from either poultry or fish. Even though corn and soybeans are widely used by food manufacturers to produce a variety of processed foods for human consumption, most of the corn and soybeans produced in this country are fed to animals to produce our meat. The effect of heavy meat consumption on the environment is detailed by ASA member David Dornbos.¹⁶ Industrial production of meat has also been linked to practices that compromise animal welfare for profit.¹⁷ One might also abstain from certain meats because of religious reasons. Jews and Muslims agree on little, but they both want the animals they eat to be slaughtered in a certain manner which maximizes the drainage of blood. In short, there are many reasons why one

Article

Nutrition in Science and Scripture

might choose to be a vegan; respectful discussions can be useful.

It is also important for persons on the restrictive diet not to be judgmental of those who do not share their convictions. Paul exhorts both the eater of meat and the abstainer: "Let not the one who eats despise the one who abstains, and let not the one who abstains pass judgment on the one who eats, for God has welcomed him" (Rom. 14:3). Much has changed since the first century. We now know of health consequences of one diet compared to another, and we now know of the environmental consequences of food production. Yet the principle is the same: each of us must look at the data and be fully convinced that we are making the best decisions regarding our own diet. Each of us is accountable to God for our decisions, and another's preferences for food should not be an issue that divides Christians.

Paul's teaching on eating in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10 makes it clear that we need to consider others in what we eat. Eating in an idol temple banquet hall is wrong because it would be participating in the worship of the idol and this might cause a weaker brother to believe that there is something to these idols. Chapter 10 of 1 Corinthians takes the scene to a meal in an unbeliever's house. One is free to eat the meat set before him unless it is said that the meat has been offered to an idol. One should then refuse because of the conscience of the one who made the point that the meat on the table had been offered to idols. It is not stated whether this was the conscience of the unbelieving host or the conscience of a weaker brother in Christ who might also be at the meal. In the case of the weaker brother, eating might cause him to believe that it is possible for a Christian to engage in or condone idol worship. If it is the unbelieving host who describes the meat as having been offered to idols, one should refuse for the sake of the host's conscience. By not eating, the mature Christian would be demonstrating that you cannot participate in any form of idol worship when you worship the Christian God.

The modern application of the two passages in 1 Corinthians is that mature believers should be careful to think of the consequences of their social engagements. They must think not only how it might affect themselves, but also how it might affect fellow believers, including "weaker brothers." Certain public dining venues might be off limits to us or to a

weaker brother who might be joining us for a meal. As the mature Corinthian believer was to avoid eating in the banquet hall of the idol's temple, so, for some believers, it might be off limits to eat the buffet in a casino or to attend a dinner theater where unholy values are exalted in the drama being presented. This does not mean that we avoid eating with unbelievers, noting that the second example in Corinthians takes place in the home of an unbeliever. Our Lord was regarded as a friend of sinners, and he would eat with tax collectors. But it is important that our behavior at such a meal does not lead us or a weaker brother to compromise his conscience. Paul summarizes: "Therefore, if food makes my brother stumble, I will never eat meat, lest I make my brother stumble" (1 Cor. 8:13). And "So, whether you eat or drink, or whatever you do, do all to the glory of God" (1 Cor. 10:31).

In summary, the teaching on eating from scripture is that we are individually accountable for what we eat before God. In this regard, eating is like so many issues confronting modern Christians. What should we do about climate change? Install solar panels or drive an electric car? What type of school is best for our children? Public schools where we participate in the community or private Christian schools where our deepest values will not be ridiculed? Or should we home school where we will be able to exert the most control? The answer for school is complex and is dependent on the options that are available, the disposition of the child, and the availability of qualified teachers. Each of us is accountable to God for how and why we make these individual decisions. Ours is a personal faith with an infinite personal God who guides humble and obedient believers on the many issues that are not core to the faith.

What Should We Do?

Having made the point regarding our freedom in Christ as clearly as I am able, there is still more to the story. As a practicing cardiologist, it is important at times to advise my patients regarding their diet. Similarly, I should also try to do something about the dietary culture that makes it difficult for individuals to follow an ideal diet. We would expect a Christian climate scientist such as Katharine Hayhoe to not only try to reduce her individual carbon footprint but to encourage fellow believers to do so as well. In this regard, I would offer some suggestions.

Nutritional Education

Accepting that these nutritional recommendations are not new dietary laws does not mean that they have no value for the formation of godly habits. It is reasonable to promote small group classes within the church that teach scientifically verified nutritional concepts, provided that qualified teachers are available. Many people are hesitant to consider eating less meat because they do not know how to prepare tasty meals without meat as a central item. There may be value in having skilled vegetarians prepare several of their most tasty dishes for all to try.

Community Gardens

Other measures could be tied to the church's unique circumstances. If the church has access to land, a community garden could be planted. There are many such examples of church-sponsored community gardens that are not even attached to the church property. Involving the youth of the church will help them form better dietary habits as those who garden are more likely to eat vegetables. The fruits and vegetables from the garden could be shared with needy church members, neighbors of the church, and the local food bank.

It is possible to dream big. Lawndale Christian Health Center, in partnership with the Chicago Botanic Garden, has taken community gardens to a new level.¹⁸ The Farm on Ogden is an urban garden with greenhouses and an aquaponic garden that grows fresh produce year round and sells it in their indoor market. This is an important addition to an inner-city Chicago neighborhood. Medical educators also provide nutritional classes on site. Equally important, the project provides employment for former drug users and individuals released from prison.

Improved Food Choices

The church and parachurch organizations have often been associated with mass distribution of ultra-processed foods. The premed Christian Medical group at Louisiana State University has an evening meeting every other Monday and serves pizza, partially as an enticement. My son's Christian Bible study program for special needs adults serves hot dogs and bags of chips and cookies at a typical meeting. This option is both inexpensive and convenient and well accepted by members. Having this food occasionally is probably not harmful, but it would be better if we could serve foods more in keeping with the ideal diets such

as DASH or MyPlate to these individuals who often already have a significant problem with obesity. Do we really need donuts or chocolate cake at every Bible study? I believe that we can do better.

Fasting

Finally, the church and individual Christians should take a renewed interest in fasting. In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus tells us how to fast and implies that we would fast when he says in Matt 6:16, "And when you fast ..." Jesus also said that after he was gone his disciples would fast (Luke 5:35). Fasting has been more emphasized in liturgical churches, but it deserves consideration in the evangelical church as well. Bill Bright, founder of Campus Crusade for Christ, wrote extensively in his later years on the value of fasting for spiritual renewal.¹⁹ Since the 1990s, medical science has discovered the importance of fasting for its induction of autophagy. There has been an explosion of scientific papers on the topic. The scientific journal, *Autophagy*, has been published monthly since 2005. The 2016 Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine was awarded to Yoshinori Ohsumi for his work in autophagy.

Periodic fasts from food are good for our physical and spiritual health. Autophagy induced by fasting stimulates cells to clear themselves of defective proteins, intracellular fat, and damaged organelles. Fasting also reduces oxidative stress; thus, fasting improves cellular metabolism, reduces inflammation, and reduces DNA damage.²⁰ Improved intracellular health reduces the incidence of chronic diseases such as cancer, metabolic syndrome, and neurodegenerative disease.²¹

Conclusions

We all long for human disease and the suffering it brings to have a simple cure. Unfortunately, a healthy diet can only do so much to improve health. We are subject to diseases that have little to do with diet. For Christians today, it is reasonable to study the science and choose a diet in accordance with nutritional science. Dietary choices should not become a cause for division within the church. We do need to consider the effect of our own dietary choices and personal habits on our fellow believers. Dietary education, community gardens, and fasting are positive steps that should be considered. However, diet and food should not become an obsession for a believer. "For

Article

Nutrition in Science and Scripture

the kingdom of God is not a matter of eating and drinking but of righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit" (Rom. 14:17). ■

Notes

- ¹If anyone destroys God's temple, God will destroy him. For God's temple is holy, and you are that temple" (1 Cor. 3:16); and "Or do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you, whom you have from God? You are not your own" (1 Cor. 6:19). All biblical references are from the English Standard Version.
- ²Dan Buettner, *The Blue Zones, Second Edition: 9 Lessons for Living Longer from the People Who've Lived the Longest* (Washington, DC: National Geographic Society, 2012).
- ³DeWitt S. Goodman et al., "Report of the National Cholesterol Education Program Expert Panel on Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Cholesterol in Adults," *Archives of Internal Medicine* 148, no. 1 (1988): 36-69.
- ⁴Donald J. McNamara, "Dietary Cholesterol, Heart Disease Risk and Cognitive Dissonance," *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society* 73, no. 2 (2014): 161-66.
- ⁵U.S. News ranked 35 diets with input from a panel of health experts. To be top-rated, a diet had to be relatively easy to follow, nutritious, safe, effective for weight loss, and protective against diabetes and heart disease. "Best Diets Overall," 2020, <https://health.usnews.com/best-diet/best-diets-overall>.
- ⁶National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, "Dash Eating Plan," <https://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health-topics/dash-eating-plan>; and Mayo Clinic Staff, "Mediterranean Diet: A Heart-Healthy Eating Plan," June 21, 2019, <https://www.mayoclinic.org/healthy-lifestyle/nutrition-and-healthy-eating/in-depth/mediterranean-diet/art-20047801>.
- ⁷Dariusz Mozaffarian, "Dietary and Policy Priorities for Cardiovascular Disease, Diabetes, and Obesity: A Comprehensive Review," *Circulation* 133, no. 2 (2016): 187-225.
- ⁸Michael Pollan, *Food Rules: An Eater's Manual* (New York: Penguin Group, 2009); ____, *In Defense of Food: An Eater's Manifesto* (New York: Penguin Press, 2008); and ____, *The Omnivore's Dilemma: A Natural History of Four Meals* (New York: Penguin Press, 2006).
- ⁹P. K. Newby, *Food and Nutrition: What Everyone Needs to Know* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018).
- ¹⁰Gary E. Fraser, "Vegetarian Diets: What Do We Know of Their Effects on Common Chronic Diseases?," *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 89, no. 5 (2009): 1607S-1612S.
- ¹¹An Pan et al., "Red Meat Consumption and Risk of Type 2 Diabetes: 3 Cohorts of US Adults and an Updated Meta-Analysis," *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 94, no. 4 (2011): 1088-96.
- ¹²U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and U.S. Department of Agriculture, *2015-2020 Dietary Guidelines for Americans*, 8th ed., December 2015. Available at <http://health.gov/dietaryguidelines/2015/guidelines/>.
- ¹³World Cancer Research Fund and the American Institute for Cancer Research, "Meat, Fish and Dairy Products and the Risk of Cancer," in *Diet, Nutrition, Physical Activity and Cancer: A Global Perspective*, Continuous Update Project (The Third Expert Report, 2018), <https://www.wcrf.org/dietandcancer/exposures/meat-fish-dairy>.

- ¹⁴Véronique Bouvard et al., International Agency for Research on Cancer Monograph Working Group, "Carcinogenicity of Consumption of Red and Processed Meat," *Lancet Oncology* 16, no. 16 (2015): 1599-600.
- ¹⁵Bradley C. Johnston et al., "Unprocessed Red Meat and Processed Meat Consumption: Dietary Guideline Recommendations from the Nutritional Recommendations," *Annals of Internal Medicine* 171, no. 10 (2019): 756-64.
- ¹⁶David Dornbos and Jay Hollman, *Eat Meat? Evidence of Harm to People and Planet and a Sustainable Food Secure Opportunity* (Ronkonkoma, NY: Rylan Publishing, 2020), <https://store.rylanbooks.com/?s=David+Dornbos>.
- ¹⁷Matthew Scully, *Dominion: The Power of Man, the Suffering of Animals and the Call to Mercy* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2002).
- ¹⁸Farm on Ogden: Food, Health, Jobs. A project of the Chicago Botanic Garden and Lawndale Christian Health Center, accessed May 17, 2020, https://www.chicagobotanic.org/urbanagriculture/farm_on_ogden.
- ¹⁹Bill Bright wrote two books on the topic: *7 Basic Steps to Successful Fasting and Prayer* (Okeene, OK: New Life Publications, 1995), and *The Transforming Power of Fasting and Prayer: Personal Accounts of Spiritual Renewal* (Okeene, OK: New Life Publications, 1997).
- ²⁰Mark P. Mattson, "Challenging Oneself Intermittently to Improve Health," *Dose Response* 12, no. 4 (2014): 600-618.
- ²¹Sarbari Saha et al., "Autophagy in Health and Disease: A Comprehensive Review," *Biomedicine and Pharmacotherapy* 104 (2018): 485-95.

ASA Members: Submit comments and questions on this article at www.asa3.org→RESOURCES→Forums→PSCF Discussion.

*"For the kingdom of God
is not a matter of
eating and drinking
but of righteousness
and peace
and joy
in the Holy Spirit."*

— Romans 14:17