

Raw to the Scone: Understanding the energetic of the spectrum of diets and a return to instinctual eating.

When people look at diet, there is often a grand theory that one needs to attempt to swallow, as well as the food. This is half the problem. It is now in vogue for practitioners to tell their clients “*you shouldn't take any advice from anyone, just feel it for yourself, BUT the diet I am promoting is scientifically proven beyond a shadow of a doubt to be “the best”but you can do whatever is right for you!*”.

This hidden message on the part of the practitioner is commonplace and essentially relates to hierarchical control and self-delusion, in an attempt to sell “me” to society and to further the idea that “I” am the one who “knows”. However the energetic medicine of the ancient world had nothing to do with “practising” or “preaching”, it was all to do with instinct. It is a complete misconception of therapists in the modern era who for example believe that ancient Chinese medicine or ancient Indian medicine has a specific “diet” attached. The ancient medicine was to see the nature of a person’s condition and dis-ease and to trigger an exploration of flavours per individual, which would allow for change. In fact the nature of ancient medicine comes from *instinctive behaviour* that is then charted or explained energetically, there is no “good” or “bad” food, no “right” or “wrong” way. There is no focus on the food as being the absolute, whereas today we routinely hear such clichés as “it’s not the food in your life, but the life in your food” or “you are what you eat”. In ancient medicine there is neither an exclusive focus on the food itself, nor on the constitution of the person consuming it, nor on the environmental factors surrounding the person, *all* factors are taken into consideration or in fact are seen as one.

The nature of understanding diet is not separate from anything else, so diet is in relation to the constitution of a person as well as the climate they are in, also the types of work they do and their whole way of life/personality and experience of it. When this is understood there is a huge change in the way we look at food. We need to be able to see that food is a spectrum of energy to be viewed without judgment, from the deep-fried Mars-bar to the raw celery stalk and to understand that this energetic spectrum is delivered through the simplicity of taste and sensation, tasting and sensing with the *whole body* and the whole digestive tract. Secondly we need to look at food preparation in the same way, i.e. energetically, from the deep-fried and the flame-roasted to the steamed and dehydrated. When we start seeing food and its preparation as a spectrum of energetics we can understand from a fundamental level how we can most appropriately connect to what we eat. Also the current pattern of illness relative to the constitution is also a key to being able to see what is appropriate, and just as vital are climate and environmental factors. When all these factors are considered equally then we can have a clear look at food.

There are many diets out there, from protein-only, to raw foods, to carbs-only, to juices-only etc., but before we go into that let’s look at the person who’s going to be eating the food:-

The foundation to all basic understanding of food is to look at the person’s natural constitution. When considering this we can use the ancient ways of looking at body structure and natural energetics and this can be complemented by blood-group analysis or metabolic-diet type analysis in the West. The reason I’m saying it this way

around is because seeing the energetics of the constitution in the way of the ancient understanding is more sensitive and holistic in its approach, whereas the modern methods are *within this* and are more fragmentary and focused on specifics. Blood-group however can be a broad base to look from and remains a very useful tool in understanding the best background point from which to begin to consider “food arenas”. Food arenas are the areas of food one can examine in order to start the process of instinctually sensing food and give one the general direction to track the foods most suitable for our bodies. Some people will be better at digesting protein, others vegetables, this needs to be recognized and investigated because it is a sense, not because it is a theory. So once the field of foods is understood, then comes the process of finding how one eats these foods, which brings us to the debate of cooked or raw.

Some practitioners have in their mind that ancient medicine advocates that “cooked is best”. This is suggested in the most basic of student level TCM text books and is to be found in a surface interest in the subject of nutrition but in fact is a complete fallacy. Actually today “macrobiotics” comes closer to the ancient natural way of “understanding food”, although a macrobiotic diet in itself has lost this original thread of this sense. The macrobiotic principle is actually that of eating what feels instinctively “right”. So the scenario is this: we have the raw foods enthusiast on the left who has just got up early on a Norwegian winter’s morning to pick the Brussel sprouts that have just been warmed by the sun to room temperature, and on the right we have the person who is cooking a breakfast of bacon and eggs and porridge on the stove. Quite simply one doesn't need to use anything other than a sense of smell and a direct feeling of the foods on offer to know what feels right and I’m *not* suggesting which of those may do so. It may well be that here is a sudden rush towards the raw Brussel sprouts, the countertop of raw sprouts or the raw wheat grass that is growing on the shelf, however what *may* remain or not is the draw to the smell, the flavours in the air and the feeling of hunger in the stomach and the want for warmth. Which way do you go? And is it all addiction to go for what you’re “used to”? Of course, there is the difficulty of being addicted to something, but addiction can also come in the form of proclaiming that what is right “for me” is right for everyone else. It isn’t, by nature.

The point is since the origin of time climate and availability of food have been the main difficulty for humans. To really delve into this we have to go back to the origins of humans, which is more than likely to have been in the equatorial or sub-tropical regions of the world. The original human constitutional type (probably O-blood group) was as hunter-gathers in warm tropical regions of the world. Here the diet was mainly raw foods, freshly hunted and killed or freshly picked from the trees. If ever there was an Eden this was it. Communities were tribal and there was probably little or no conflict. There would have been food in abundance and human numbers would have been levelled off simply through natural causes. Infant mortality would have been high but death after the age of childhood would have been rarer (please see the brilliant work “Sex at Dawn” by Christopher Ryan and Cacilda Jethá). The basis of food consumption was easy, everyone ate the same kinds of foods, all sourced locally, it was the most natural diet. Today this is the basis of the raw-foods dietary movement and also the Neolithic diet that is based on a large consumption of raw foods. Some people are raw vegetarians/vegans and others will eat raw meats also.

However the main problem is that in today's world this is not the situation of the Stone Age. There are of course people living in such communities in the middle of the Amazon but they are completely integrated into their environment, with no generational influence from the Western world, they are in fact still living as they would have done 10,000 years ago! This is truly natural diet. However what happened to humans next changed their whole physiology and their nature. There was a move towards the northern regions of the world and towards cooler and colder climates, which those who like the sun would consider to be absurd, but nevertheless it happened. This situation in fact changed many things, it changed the physiology of the body because unfamiliar foods were found in those different regions. So the chemistry changed, the features of the physical body altered, the skin changed colour to adapt to different light. The whole mechanism of the body changed, clothes were worn to cover the skin and protect from cold. Another adaptation was that these people, being hot-blooded, had to take the sun with them in some form to accommodate that and they did so through the use of fire. Fire became the emblem of life in the cold darkness, it was the central point of warmth, of life, the Mother's warmth and so the hearth and the food preparation of the hearth and the whole ideology was focused on this and has been ever since over thousands of years. The reason that foods had to be cooked is because the physiology of the human had to change from being a tropical-dweller to being a cold-living dweller in a short time in evolutionary terms. Archeologists are finding interesting expressions of this right now: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/science/2012/apr/02/scientists-clue-human-evolution-question>

As changes continued and more farming and agricultural-based communities were produced, natural vegetarians were formed who, instead of being focused in raw meats and raw flesh of fruits and nuts and vegetables, due to migration found less of the abundance of the foods from tropical lands and more of an abundance of other kinds of food. So vegetable foods and grains and meat set in as a secondary rather than a primary, which coupled with the addition of warmth or sun-energy through use of heat or fire also altered the "chemistry" again, forming several other constitutions which can be expressed as the A blood group then the B group and finally the AB group in the last few thousand years. These blood groups are merely energetic signatures, together they form the different energetics of the different peoples of the world. No region has the same diet, no region has the same climate or the same adaptations, it's all uniquely regional energetics. So the land the people are grown from has within it the energy required to grow these people. In today's multi-cultural society there is a mix of this, so a person can have ancestry from Malaysia and Russia at the same time which makes it confusing. What do you eat, the Russian buckwheat dishes or roasted meats, or the mainly raw or very mildly-cooked foods of Singapore?

As always the answers are already in one's sense and fundamentally in the sense of taste. While it's true that in today's society much of the food is so highly sweetened, salted, spiced and drenched in chemicals that we have sometimes lost touch with taste, actually this sense isn't as difficult to re-find as we might think. Foods that are tasty really have a strong and pungent smell and quality that is unmistakable, one can sense and smell and see when the ingredients are full of life and energy, and also we know when they are not. To give a crude visual example, when the picture on a TV screen is fuzzy one has no interest in watching it, no matter what the programme is. When the TV screen is bright and alive, one at least has the possibility of considering

whether it's worth watching/consuming. Tasting simply requires an interest, there is no way of me telling you that honey is sweet and you being able to realize that sweetness unless you actually taste it yourself. Organic, Biodynamic, permaculture based and most powerful of all wild-foods are basically high quality foods and have not be purged modified or injected with high chemicals, but again to prevent this from being a theoretical exercise do at taste test yourself and see if you can taste the difference, very often it is remarkable. Also tasting isn't just the sensation in the mouth, this is an initial an key part of it but the effects of a food are felt at different stages of the digestion and ingestion and all these need to be sense to know if something connects or doesn't....the pain of many western people experience of a vindaloo is one clear example of anti-tasting/ sensing food!

Returning to the raw foods debate. If in the temperate climate of the UK we decide to go towards the Equator, back "home" so to speak, we are moving towards a situation where the energy of the sun is the strongest and imbues everything around it with a natural energy that is hard to find anywhere else in the world. But one needs to be well-adapted to eat and live in this environment without problems (or a plethora of air-conditioners). The skin will need to revert to its darker shades for the energy of the body to be differently placed in order for there to be more energy in the process of cooling the body rather than warming it, and as this adaptation happens (over thousands of years) then there is a natural return to eating of raw foods as a primary.

For the colder countries and environments there is actually less likelihood for humans to thrive so easily overall because there is less warmth from the sun and all of the benefits that come with this, which actually decrease the requirement for a lot of food, so for these colder countries more food is needed and also more warmth added. It is no wonder that the countries driven by alcohol and meat are the temperate populations. The so-called "pioneering spirit" of the Pilgrim Fathers came very much from spirits! It could get them through the coldness, something alcohol is still used for medicinally in ancient medicine.

The nature of indigenous medicine always comes from the singular principle that it has to do what is appropriate, to respond not with the head but with the senses. Recently I read a practitioner declaring that eating greens is a way to become more "conscious". The problems with this are manifold but at the fundamental level it suggests a total separation from the patient, who may be a non-greens-eater but wants to be "more conscious" so therefore greens instantly become a holy grail in order to "achieve" this. Secondly there is this ridiculous notion that a person can "feel it for themselves" at the same time they are also being shown a so-called path to enlightenment and "consciousness" through greenery. Herein the so-called anti-guru reinstates themselves as guru, perhaps without even realizing it. This is simply because when "self" is involved it becomes more about "me liking greens" and converting another person to "my way" than it does about the understanding of wholeness/health. The ancient principle is really to go with the instinct and for many of the ancient human population the instinct was to add warmth to food, or they would never have done this. For them, there was no experiment that was available to assess whether food was above or below the 115 Fahrenheit/46 Centigrade rule, the temperature at which the enzymes of most foods are said to degenerate, there was simply a tasting and a knowing about how to cook and instinctively recognising the

balance of the amount they needed to cook, no more and no less, appropriate to the season, the temperature and to the individual peoples present.

“The cook” was in fact one of the most primary and key functions within the tribe. The herbalist is originally a cook, someone who knows the decoction and the amounts of qualities of energy, including that of fire, pressure or salt, all of which can be used to help break down the ingredients of the raw food enough (as required, or not) to help the digestive system which is within a particular constitution in a particular environment, all perfectly taken into account simply by the good old tongue. (See the brilliant article on the importance of taste from Sam Thayer:

<http://foragersharvest.com/why-god-put-those-bumps-on-your-tongue/>) Just as there is no boundary to diet from the deep-fried Mars-bar to the celery stalk, so there is no boundary in food preparation from raw to cooked. It’s just understanding what is appropriate and recognising that through the use of taste. There may be a situation where the deep-fried Mars-bar is the best thing to eat, but that is rarely the case!

When one has been practising therapeutically for a while, one recognises those people who are fixated on diets and can see no other way, for example a nutritional adviser who has tried out various so-called “cooked food” methods over the years and now recommends raw-foods “from experience” and so re-shapes and moulds his/her patients based on this process. Of course for every nutritionist who’s *tried it all* and may even advertise themselves as having an arsenal of degrees in all kinds of ancient therapy, they will have several patients for whom the raw-foods approach has “worked”, but many who will have tried it and found it unsuccessful and unappealing. The reason is that there is no one-size-fits-all solution. So rather than the hidden agenda, the heavily influenced approach of “go for what’s good for you (but only over here!)”, instead a simple “follow your nose” is enough.

At the centre of the raw-food ideology is “sunlight”. The fact is that food is grown from sunlight, so the more sunlight one consumes in the form of food, the better for the body basically is the essence of it. Firstly let’s get the “energy” ideology clear, *everything is energy*, some energy is too cool for some, too hot for others, it’s all a matter of balance. However the raw-foods principle is that if the sunlight energetically heats the food and it is picked and eaten, born from the sun and the water from the earth, then this will be the “right” way to eat due to the fact that this is the highest energy-level the food has, as it is “alive”, but this is to focus entirely on the food and not on the human who’s eating the food. Eating things that are “alive” is not always the best policy, there are huge numbers of animals that scavenge for foods that died a long time ago. Decay and in fact natural-fire, natural drying out and burning of some plant and animal matter (well above the 46 Centegrade mark) can allow for ingestion whereas this would have been impossible before. The movement to temperate climates where there was literally less sun has caused a problem, dealt with as best as possible by the use of fire. Fire becomes the sun, or the combination of fire, pressure and salt used appropriately in order to cook, not destroy the food. These three ways of preparation help to break down foods enough and also work with what we have rather than eating idealistically based on naturopathic altruism.

Ideology also drives towards ideals that are associated with “saving the planet by being vegan” and other such notions that are based simply on a hierarchical approach. If one eats a tomato from Italy versus one from the UK one can be sure of the

amazing difference in taste due simply to the difference in sun. But as locally grown food is the only possible way to truly reduce energy consumption, then should it really be that all foods are imported from those regions with abundant sunshine to those areas of the world with less? They would have to do it a lot faster than they are at present when tropical fruits and vegetables are picked raw, for ripening en route. None of this is sustainable. None of it is permaculture-based.

For each person for whom raw foods will be appropriate, as far as the world population distribution is concerned, there will be many who cannot tolerate this because their living conditions, i.e. the amount of sun where foods are grown around them locally are simply not enough to provide the energy to break them down internally, no matter how much qi-gong and meditation is done. Understanding the principle that food comes from sunlight is vital, however understanding that the “ideal” energy in the food is when it is raw is a misconception and a Westernized ideology of the principle of energetics from the ancient way of thinking. This looks only at the food (as analysed by fragmentary modern science), and not at the constitution, illness, or any other factors in the process of eating. Often when this happens qi and enzymes will be used in the same sentence! Qi means all of life, it is totally non-exclusive, everything is qi or energy. So when a food is cooked it undergoes change, its substance changes and becomes different to its original form. Strong cooking completely alters the form of the food, lighter cooking does less form-changing, but basically it creates a totally different substance with different properties to make it perfectly appropriate for a specific person at a specific time. The human goes part-way to adapt to the food and the food is adapted to the human, it's a synergy, not a fight. Depending on the person, the season, the work output and numerous other factors, will define the appropriateness of the food and its preparation for that person. Sure, if we all went through re-adaptation (of thousands of years) back to our place of origin and lived in tune with the wet and dry times of the rainforest, there would be far less need for fire, but after thousands of years out of that alignment of the human being “cooked” or “cooled” in different ways/climates by the sun, it is what it is. Energetics is not about Newtonian scientific altruism or any kind of belief system or principle of sunlight formed in the minds of humans, it's about instinctive senses in this moment, this is different for everyone in every sphere of life.

The point is that whereas there is an idealism with raw food, in practice this approach doesn't always work for everyone. While it is helpful for people who are overheated, meaning they already have too much of the heating quality within their body, i.e. too much “sun” or heat, so raw food balances this out, whereas cooking would just add to this. But for those who are cold and tired, who have no energy specifically due to coldness and weakness of the digestive energy, raw foods simply cannot be *smelled or tasted*. While a person who is overheated can actually smell and taste a salad, they know these sensations because there is enough heat to cook the foods internally and so liberate the smell and sensations of the food when its subtlety hits the nose, teeth and tongue. For a person who is cold and tired this doesn't happen, there is a layer of coldness running down the digestive tract, which will mean that cold and raw foods feel unengaging or unappetizing. Heating foods releases their aroma, especially with an added spicy and fragrant taste and with saltiness, this will immediately cause salivation. This is the difference, there is no thought involved, just a natural response.

Of course cooked food can also be addictive. It can be a process of not sensing or even chewing but just a case of shovelling it all down, however this is not really eating but being in a dream state. When it comes to an actual interest in food and an engagement with it the only way is to do this directly, to become engaged in the cooking process, finding out how much heat you need in the food to make it appetizing for you, how much actually tastes good rather than is *supposed* to taste good, sensing what you're addicted to and what you actually truly *like* instinctively. Food follows the seasons of the human being's movement from the equatorial summer to the northern winter, and also in a year the temperate season or the equatorial perpetual summer with intermittent showers. The nature of these climates and seasons and the internal constitution are all part of the picture and come together in the very moment of tasting something.

This is not an "anything goes" attitude, on the contrary, this is to point out that being dogmatic about a particular dietary regime or ideology is really to misplace your taste. The sense of taste is fundamentally where it all happens, taste is what this is all about, knowing instinctive rather than addictive tasting. This regulates everything the body needs and once one gets a real understanding of taste there is a key direction away from things that are not appropriate, however much wheat-grass they contain, and a move towards things that are appropriate even if they have been roasted in an oven for an hour. The point is that beyond anything else taste shows you what you need, it is one of the 5 pure and infant senses that allow children to follow instinctually the route to take, and children certainly won't always go for raw foods even if they are "trained" to do so.

The process of diagnosis is one of the key ways one can see this situation in action. There is a scenario where the practitioner believes through talking to a patient that he/she has the inappropriate diet because they have heard that this particular diet is too "raw" or too "cooling" or too "cooked" or too "heating" or whatever, but when the patient lies down the practitioner is surprised to find that the digestive system is intact and the energy is strong. Here they have to re-assess the initial diagnosis which was made without verification of numerous touch-based forms of diagnosis like pulse and abdominal palpation etc. (These are part of ancient sense-based diagnostics). However there is another scenario when a specialist diet enthusiast says their patient is getting on really well with their diet, that it's all great and there is plenty of energy and so on, then the patient lies down and the abdomen shows signs of energetic weakness or the pulse is weak and slow. It doesn't matter what one may believe is happening, the reality is that the digestive system is struggling. Herein lies a movement away from senses and all the practitioner can do is to kind of second-guess the instinct of the patient and reflect this back, to see if it resonates. Sometimes it does, unless the patient is completely hooked on the premise of the advertising in which case they will be oblivious. The point is that hypnosis comes in many forms and when practice moves from description to prescription, there are bound to be difficulties associated with patient and practitioner power-balances within treatment, all based on the notion of the "expert" knowing and the patient not, when of course the patient can taste too.

Diet is really only one aspect of the whole. Climate and environment include interpersonal relationships and natural spontaneous child-like expressions, when there are difficulties with these then no matter what your diet is and no matter how vital the

food it will not be digested correctly, you may as well eat hot-dogs. Also the processes of elimination of the body are very powerful. If a person is taking in food products which aren't appropriate but only doing so in small quantity, depending on their constitution they can sometimes make very good use of what they eat and as such eat little, eliminate fully but have no ill-effects. Sometimes simply eating less deals with 90% of the problems, just eating enough allows the body to process better, no matter what the food. Then there is the situation where a person becomes obsessed and food-focused because it appeases a psychological need or as a way of avoiding old emotional issues and this is something that diet alone can't shift. There is the idea that green foods cleanse an over-heated/toxic liver, which is true if the body is open and allowing for things to be digested, however when the body is in a closed-down state the greens have no beneficial effect as the body is in a state of emotional tension.

The notion that if you're not feeling good these foods will help you to feel better is a nice idea, but has very little to do with a person actually going through a psychological difficulty which means all they want to do is eat ice-cream. The point is that when food is sensed and eaten instinctively the person is well and then the food will be right for them. When food is eaten and the person is psychologically hampered then the movement will be more towards addiction or revulsion. So the good ol' nutrition therapist will suggest or "recommend" lists of foods that are useful and ways of eating that are helpful for whatever symptoms the patient may be experiencing but in fact none of these will benefit the root psychological problem. So what then? The only possibility in this present moment that is unhampered by any history, baggage, idea, theory or right-wrong judgmental ideology of raw or cooked, is simply *the taste itself*. When a person finds they don't like what they are eating because they dislike the taste they stop naturally, without the intervention of the nutrition-guru purportedly being able to provide "guidance". All things need to be synergistically understood in relation to diet, diet by itself is like looking at a tomato without its stem, the earth, the climate, the planet and the universe attached. As John Muir, the naturalist said

"When one tugs at a single thing in nature, he finds it attached to the rest of the world."

It is only through instinctive senses that there can be a return to natural health and natural cooking. If for you that means eating raw that's great, but it certainly won't be good for everyone and nor will cooked foods, very often it is about finding a balance that suitable for you and the energy output of the body, being sure to realize that what your body wants to do physically is what one needs to follow not what one would *like* the body to do. If your body is powerful and strong it often needs a lot of physical movement, if it is more slender and less expressive then it may have a slower expression, this isn't a choice, it's what there is. This is just the same as the "work" we do, it's not necessarily what we "want to do", it's just what we actually can do with natural ease. We need to realize that when we allow life to be life, then the route of least resistance is the route that leads us to connection with everythingness, not towards resistance or idealism.

The key, as always, is to investigate for yourself the ways of the indigenous populations of these cooler regions who were living there, *all* of these peoples use fire and live mainly on cooked food in winter and usually a mix of raw and cooked in the summer, and in a warmer climate follow the indigenous practices there, where a

majority will use a mix of raw and some cooked foods. A long-term researcher into diet who sees things deeply and cuts out the idealism is Steve Gagné, please take a look at his work for a totally opening way to view the energetic of food for yourself without the dogma. Mainly focused in triggering common senses, his work is freeing, inspirational and touches the essence of food as the life-blood of health:

<http://www.stevegagne.com/>

In the modern world we believe that life is about choosing, but actually there is no choice made, as there is no “me” to make it. This is actually a process of letting go, which then allows the body to do what it wishes, the instinctual function of what to eat and even how to prepare it is embedded as a pure natural direction. Eating food raw or using fire-tools to break down the tissues of the foods to make them more accessible to a body in a cold climate, or with a cold internal climate, is simply the extension of the stomach function externally, just as a mother might crush and soften harder food for a baby’s initially weaker digestive system. The human adult is no longer a baby but when it is out of its original environment of warmth and heat and light it is a very vulnerable animal in comparison to those more adapted to their environment of coldness. We don't need to go far in order to realize the answer to the question of why humans are naked-apes, we are because we stand, and the hair on the head is the only solar protection we need as there is very little surface area of a standing human that is in direct sun-contact. Secondly the only naturally-clothed human is the one who lives outside of the tropics, where there is a requirement for more fur. Outside of the heat we are like a babe in the woods and fire is a precious companion in the times of winter darkness. If “raw” was applied to clothing and heating or in fact lack-there-of, the winter time would bring a whole new sense of coldness with it.

Sometimes instead of believing that ancient understanding has “lost the plot” one would do well to realise maybe one has misunderstood a fundamental principle and has thereby missed the point. Ancient medicine as expressed in Ancient Greece, the medicine of the Pythagoreans and later Hypocrites and onwards, the medicine of India called Ayurveda and Classical Chinese medicine, and all the indigenous peoples of the world, holds a singular principle in appropriate food for a particular person. This understanding does not come from a group of idealists regarded as being the bane of their society but in fact from those who hold a thread of living natural instinct that has been a constant source of inspiration for millennia, no sages or gurus or even traditionalism here, just plain common-sense.

When we are not governed by rules, be it raw vs. cooked, meat vs. veg, or steamed vs. fried, then we actually enter into the true nature of engaging with food with a pure sense of experimentation and connection. Many people will suggest experimentation but then will also tell you what to experiment with, thereby aligning themselves with ideology that is dogmatic rather than free and open. The expression of health-instinct is simply a reflection, there are no answers here, just descriptions. Everything is left open-ended, inevitably it has to be because any point of view has an edge to it but the circle has no edges.

And this I know, moreover, that to the human body it makes a great difference whether the bread be fine or coarse; of wheat with or without the hull, whether mixed with much or little water, strongly wrought or scarcely at all, baked or raw - and a

multitude of similar differences; and so, in like manner, with the cake (maza); the powers of each, too, are great, and the one nowise like the other. Whoever pays no attention to these things, or, paying attention, does not comprehend them, how can he understand the diseases which befall a man? For, by every one of these things, a man is affected and changed this way or that, and the whole of his life is subjected to them, whether in health, convalescence, or disease.

- On Ancient Medicine By Hippocrates (part 14)

(<http://classics.mit.edu/Browse/browse-Hippocrates.html>)

Everyone has a healer in him or her; we just have to initiate its expression. The natural healing force within each one of us is the greatest force in health. Our food should be our medicine. Our medicine should be our food. But to eat when you are sick, is to feed your sickness. - Hippocrates (460-377BC)

David Nassim

26/04/2012