

Funding the Future

Article URL

Published: January 12, 2026, 6:00 pm

The [Guardian](#) has a headline saying this today:

NHS to begin world-first trial of AI tool to identify type 2 diabetes risk

Exclusive: Two London hospital trusts to trial tool that can predict those at risk up to 13 years before condition develops

I have to admit I think this is really stupid and a massive waste of money.

That is because all that the tool really needs to ask is one question:

* Does your diet almost wholly or mainly comprise ultra-processed food?
That is it. If the answer is yes, then the risk of developing type 2 diabetes is very high.

If the answer is no, the risk is so much lower that the NHS will not have time to worry about you because it is being overwhelmed by people who answer 'yes' to that question.

And before anyone accuses me of being simplistic, I suggest you stand back for a moment and do a little thought experiment.

Suppose the UK's population of dogs had, over a relatively short period, shown a marked increase in the canine equivalent of type 2 diabetes and all the deeply significant related diseases, and this had happened whatever the income of their owners, meaning pure economic factors can be excluded from consideration.

There must, then, either be a simultaneous genetic alteration in the dogs of the world, changing pre-disposition to this illness, or some other factor in play. That genetic change over such a short period is extraordinarily unlikely. In fact, it is so unlikely that the possibility can be dismissed.

We are, then, looking for an external factor that explains this change that is unrelated

to income or the genome. That leaves three options, which are the physical inputs into dogs over the period: air, water and food.

Air quality has risen, broadly speaking, over the last forty years. It is still not great, and there are threats from it, but things like lead have dramatically reduced. So, air is unlikely to be a major factor.

Overall, water quality in the UK has fallen, but this is not apparent in drinking water as yet - and let's assume most dogs, most of the time, drink tap water to make this a proxy for human experience. It is very unlikely water is to blame, then.

So, food could be because food has changed massively. Since the 1970s, there has been an extraordinary boom in:

- * Ultra-processed food, high in fructose
- * The consumption of fast and convenience food
- * Snacking

These have not been controlled by:

- * Required diet control
- * Appropriate exercise

Over that same period:

- * Obesity has risen considerably
- * Type 2 diabetes rates have gone through the roof
- * They are still rising dramatically
- * Related illnesses are of increasing significance

If we are still thinking about dogs, what conclusion would you draw? Might you suggest that the mass-produced dog food that most canines were consuming was the toxin that was poisoning them? I think you might. It would not be rocket science to do so. And then you would demand change to that food to end the cruelty it was creating.

Now, let's think about humans because what I have described is what has happened to us.

Why aren't we concluding it is our food that is poisoning us and making us ill?

Why aren't we worried about the vast amounts of ultra-processed food that will be consumed over the next few days?

What is it that makes us blind to the fact that we are being made ill by what we eat?

And why is it that politicians ignore the obvious fact that this must be the case?

Come to that, why aren't they demanding change?

Could the explanation be that the big food industry - mainly the food manufacturers and the supermarkets - are so heavily invested in that process of poisoning us that they

ensure that the message as to what is happening is drowned out?

The evidence is that excess fructose delivery to the liver results in that organ then transforming that sugar into fat. This then results in the body increasing its intolerance to insulin, which perversely then results in increased insulin production. That then results in increased obesity, inflammatory diseases, kidney disease, and other conditions arising from metabolic illness. And it is also clear that this process is reversible remarkably quickly, which is a message that is being massively suppressed at present, even though it is apparent that many people could end their insulin dependence if only this were to happen in a controlled fashion, including the cutting out of carbohydrates in their diets.

I resist the idea of conspiracy theories as often as I can. On this issue, I cannot. There is a conspiracy. It is not even a theory. It's a fact.

And now we have hospitals saying AI can help solve the problem of type 2 diabetes by identifying who might get it, without in any way suggesting how that might then be prevented, when the real answer is much easier. Take those with type 2 diabetes off ultra-processed foods for a few weeks, and cut their carbs, and see what happens. For many (I am not saying all), their problems will be over. And the NHS could even afford to prescribe the food they need in that case.

The question is, why is the hospital trust keen to manage the symptoms and not suggest a cure? What is wrong when that is what is happening?