I'm Going Animal Product-Free for 4 Weeks.

But I'm Not Becoming Vegan — and Here's the Difference.

Let me be upfront about something before we go any further: this article is not an argument that animal products are inherently evil, that farmers are villains, or that the only path to health runs through a field of kale. I want to be careful with my language here, because the moment you say you're cutting out meat and dairy for a month, the world sorts you into a tribe — and the tribe they sort you into often isn't yours.

So here is what this actually is: a 4-week experiment rooted in science, followed by a lifelong shift toward a way of eating that the longest-lived populations on earth have quietly been practicing for generations. And at the centre of it is a fascinating — and often misrepresented — body of research about how the food we eat either feeds or starves the damaged cells already living in all of our bodies.

> *This isn't about ideology. It's about creating the right biological environment — for four weeks, and beyond.*

First, Let's Talk About What Veganism Actually Is

Veganism is a philosophical and ethical position. At its core, it is a commitment to avoiding the exploitation of animals — in food, clothing, cosmetics, and across daily life. That is a deeply held moral stance, and it deserves to be treated as such, not reduced to a trendy diet.

What I'm doing is not that. I am not making a permanent ethical declaration about all animal products in all contexts. I am not suggesting that a farmer raising heritage-breed cattle on open pasture, in a genuine relationship with the land and the animals, is doing something wrong. I'm not pretending that a hunter who takes one deer per year for food is causing more harm than the industrial soy monoculture that replaced the grassland down the road.

The conflation of 'reducing animal products for health reasons' with 'veganism as a lifestyle identity' muddies both conversations. When we're precise about what we mean, the discussion becomes far more useful — and far more honest.

I also want to say clearly: I am not against truly ethical, pasture-raised animal products. An egg from a chicken that has spent its life outdoors scratching in real soil is a genuinely different thing — biologically, ethically, and environmentally — from a product of industrial factory farming. Research consistently shows that grass-fed and pasture-raised animal products have different fatty acid profiles, lower inflammatory potential, and higher omega-3 content than their conventionally farmed counterparts. The problem has never really been 'the cow.' It has been the system.

The Research That Changed How I Think About This

Here is where things get genuinely interesting — and where the science is more nuanced than either side of the culture war tends to admit.

Cancer biology distinguishes between two very different roles in the disease process: initiation and promotion. An initiator is a substance that causes direct damage to DNA — carcinogens like aflatoxin (a mould toxin found in certain crops), the heterocyclic amines formed when meat is charred at high heat, tobacco compounds, and ionising radiation. These are the things that create the first lesion, the first mutation. The spark, if you will.

But a spark alone doesn't burn a house down. What determines whether a pre-cancerous cell grows into a tumour is the environment it finds itself in. This is where the promoter comes in — and this is where animal protein, specifically consumed in excess, enters the picture.

> *Carcinogens start the fire. Promoters decide whether it burns.*

The most significant research in this area comes from Dr. T. Colin Campbell and his team, who spent over three decades studying the relationship between dietary protein and cancer growth. Their work showed that tumour development was dramatically

enhanced by diets containing more than roughly 10% of calories from animal protein — particularly casein, the primary protein in cow's milk — while the same tumours were suppressed when protein intake dropped below the body's minimum requirement for growth. Remarkably, the researchers also found that plant proteins did not produce the same effect, even at higher intake levels.

The key mechanism the research points to is a hormone called IGF-1 — Insulin-like Growth Factor 1. When we consume significant amounts of animal protein, the liver increases its production of IGF-1. In youth, this is partly what drives growth. But in adulthood, elevated IGF-1 has been consistently linked to the proliferation and spread of cancer cells — specifically in colon, prostate, and breast tissue. Systematically reviewing the evidence, researchers have confirmed that animal protein raises IGF-1 concentrations, while plant protein does not produce the same elevation.

One landmark study published in Cell Metabolism followed more than 6,000 people over 18 years and found that adults aged 50–65 who consumed a high amount of animal protein were more than four times as likely to die of cancer during the study period compared to those eating a low-protein diet. The researchers placed the risk on a comparable scale to smoking — a statement bold enough to raise eyebrows, but one grounded in a substantial dataset.

But Here's What the Nuance Police Get Right

The research is not settled, and intellectually honest engagement requires saying so. A 2025 analysis using the NHANES dataset — one of the largest nutritional epidemiology datasets in the United States — found no significant association between either animal or plant protein and all-cause or cardiovascular mortality, and actually found a modest reduction in cancer mortality risk associated with higher animal protein intake. That's a complicating finding, and it deserves to sit alongside the others rather than be quietly ignored.

What this tells us is that the relationship between dietary animal protein and cancer is dose-dependent and context-dependent — not binary. The body of evidence does not say 'animal protein causes cancer.' It says 'excess animal protein, particularly from industrial sources and in combination with other lifestyle factors, appears to create a biological environment more hospitable to already-initiated cancer cells.'

That is a very different statement. And it is one that leaves room for a sensible, evidence-based middle path.

So Why Four Weeks Animal Product-Free?

The reasoning is straightforward: I want a clean baseline.

IGF-1 levels are not fixed. They respond to dietary changes within weeks. By removing animal protein for four weeks, I am creating a period in which my body can lower its IGF-1 production, reduce its baseline inflammatory load, and allow other biomarkers to settle without the confounding variable of ongoing animal protein consumption. I plan to track changes in energy, digestion, skin clarity, inflammatory markers where possible, and general sense of physical wellbeing.

This is not a punishment. It is a deliberate physiological reset — a way of gathering data about my own body before moving into the next phase.

The Blue Zone Approach: Where I'm Heading After

The Blue Zones are the five regions of the world where people consistently live past 100 in good health: Sardinia in Italy, Okinawa in Japan, Nicoya in Costa Rica, Ikaria in Greece, and Loma Linda in California. Researchers studying these populations have identified a cluster of shared lifestyle patterns — and the dietary pattern is not veganism.

Blue Zone diets are overwhelmingly plant-based — legumes, whole grains, vegetables, nuts — but they are not plant-exclusive. Most of these populations eat small amounts of fish, eggs, or locally raised meat on occasion. What they almost universally avoid is the industrialised, processed, high-volume animal product consumption that characterises much of the modern Western diet.

This is the direction I am moving toward after the four-week reset: a plant-predominant diet that does not fetishise the elimination of all animal products, but treats them as an occasional, high-quality addition rather than the centrepiece of every meal. It is, if anything, the most evidence-based long-term dietary pattern we have. And it happens to align with what the cancer biology research actually recommends — not total elimination, but meaningful reduction and a radical shift in proportion.

> *The longest-lived people on earth aren't vegan. They just treat animal products as a side dish, not a main character.*

What I'm Actually Arguing

I want to close by being as clear as I can about the position this article is staking out, because I know how easy it is to misread.

I am not arguing that you should become vegan. I am not arguing that pasture-raised, ethically produced animal foods are harmful. I am not dismissing the nutritional value of animal protein, which is real and well-documented.

What I am arguing is this: the volume and quality of animal products that most of us in the modern world consume is meaningfully different from what the human body evolved alongside, and meaningfully different from what the healthiest populations on earth actually eat. And the research on cancer promotion — imperfect, ongoing, and contested as it is — gives us a credible mechanistic explanation for why excess consumption of animal protein might be doing more harm than we have generally acknowledged.

For four weeks, I am removing that variable entirely. Then I am building something more sustainable, more intentional, and more aligned with what the evidence actually says.

Not a label. Not a tribe. Just a more honest relationship with food — and with what we know about what it does to our cells.

References & Research

Campbell, T.C. et al. — Dietary protein and cancer promotion studies (Cornell University, spanning 1980s–2000s)

Levine, M.E. et al. — 'Low Protein Intake Is Associated with a Major Reduction in IGF-1, Cancer, and Overall Mortality in the 65 and Younger but Not Older Population,' Cell Metabolism (2014)

UCSF Osher Center for Integrative Health — Review of dietary protein and cancer risk (summarised 2020s)

Buettner, D. — The Blue Zones: Lessons for Living Longer from the People Who've Lived the Longest (National Geographic Society)

NHANES-based analysis on animal/plant protein and mortality outcomes (2025)

Systematic meta-analyses on IGF-1 and dietary protein source (various, 2010s–2020s)