

The last resort?: The point at which modern interventional medicine becomes the appropriate treatment.

Currently we see situations where patients and/or practitioners are either vehemently “anti modern medicine”, believing it to be unnecessarily aggressive and insensitive or conversely those who believe modern medicine is the only answer and that the other stuff is simply “quackery”. From the patient’s point of view the problem lies in being able to understand what really does “help” and to differentiate what actually does heal when faced with the madness of different therapeutic disciplines.

In order to really help a patient the practitioner must be able to diagnose the situation accurately and to refer or direct them to the most suitable approach, *even if it isn't the one which that individual practises*. If a GP was really a “general practitioner” he/she would be able to look generally and broadly, but very often from within modern-medicine the GP has become EP, or “exclusive practitioner”, although this is now changing with patients’ demands. This is not about integrative medicine, but requires a complete understanding of the natural energetics of medicine and so being able to diagnose from a broader perspective than “good” or “evil”.

If we narrow down the main expressions of modern medicine to a broad brush-stroke expression there are two major treatment approaches: surgery and bio-medicinal drugs. When looking at this, it is surgery which needs to be understood as being the mainstay of modern medicine and the basis of the ideology of the whole medical approach even when considering bio-medical drugs and approaches used in psychotherapeutics such as Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT). Drugs and all modern-medical approaches have very specific and very focused purposes but in many ways have side-effects just like surgery. The point is that modern medicine has a *surgical mind-set*, so the question is: when is this approach to the body appropriate? The answer simply is that when a problem become **visible, physical and acute** then that is the most appropriate time to use surgical intervention and its related approaches. Before this time many other methods that are not of this ilk can be used which have a very different approach.

Let’s for a moment look at the energetics of surgery and its relation to other approaches within holistic medicine. In ancient medicine surgery was seen as being outside the normal practice of medicine. While surgery is the strongest form of cathartic medicine, generally medicine does not attempt to draw a lot of energy cathartically away from the body, but rather to cycle the energy and for there not to be much loss or leakage. Still as part of ancient medicine, at certain points when the problem was **visible, physical and acute** in nature, there was the requirement of surgical intervention in order to help the body clear itself of toxicity or to repair the tissues so that further leakage from an injury, let’s say, could not occur. In all of the surgical procedures the approach is to remove or repair damaged tissue and to allow the body the chance to repair itself. This therefore requires a keen skill but not necessarily that of the nature of the energetically-sensitive healer dealing with the living body outside of anaesthesia, but as a person working with the physical tissues and a blade in order to rectify physical manifestations of problems. In the end it is an issue which can be quite mechanical, this is not bad, it’s just what it is. Historically surgery first developed in alignment with the dissection of corpses. Practitioners of medicine from East-Asia were surprised on encountering Western medicine (via the

Spice Route in the 13th century onward) by the level of detail and clarity of understanding of the anatomical insides of the body through dissection that for centuries had been the process of western medicine. This was less focused on in the East, which was more concerned with the energetic understanding of the body that could prevent the physical issues that ensue later on in the development of a problem. The aim was to deal with illness *before* the sometimes-inevitable and very risky situation of surgery became necessary. There is however a long history of surgery dating back to at least 200BC in the East, but this was an extreme measure, although an appropriate one when used.

So while surgery was employed in ancient traditions it was not to the level that it is now explored in the modern West whereby the surgical mind-set of modern-medicine sees *everything* as material. This is something that has constantly been the mainstay of Western thinking for centuries, creating the rigidity and colonial mentality of the Western empire and its narrow-viewing angle. The main difficulty with Western approaches can be seen within the medicine, it is a reflection of everything within the society as is everything else, hollographically a part represents the whole. The difficulty with this ideology is that it is narrow and so can't see itself within the context of everything else, it believes it is seeing the world "correctly" when it is usually seeing part of it and very often only the bits it recognizes. While this has surgical "benefit" because it is focusing on detailed areas and so it can see and cut away a piece of material, this is a mad approach as it fails to notice the whole and so has no anchoring in its direction, it splits things up, and separates one bit from another. But *the body is not made of parts*. From the angle of modern medicine, not only is the body made of parts but everything is! In actual fact nature is made of "wholes". There is actually only One but through the modern-mindset of separation and the believed-real separate "self" or "me" (this is the "human-condition" which we might say is epidemic in the modern-west greater than anywhere else in the world), there is a surgical mentality which rules. This too is the nature of the analytical mind which separates everything into bits, but actually this is an illusion and when contextualized it is recognised as such, and that in fact it's never really "apart" but has just changed form and *appears apart*, and that's all.

This said, the nature of surgical-based medicine has its place. But if we consider situations where such processes are actually appropriate, it is actually a far smaller percentage than are actually used. This is simply because while there is a focus on this kind of medicine in the modern West, this is often all that is on offer. It's like going to a butcher and asking for carrots, no matter how many times you ask you'll always get meat and not carrots. Advice from the butcher will always be to eat meat, the question is why would the customer expect something else from him/her?

The point is that 90% of the time people in the modern West have mainly chronic problems, but the first port of call for most of those people is to go to their GP That approach deals with and looks at the chronic problem through the mindset of dealing appropriately with the **acute, visible and physical** (which are perhaps 10% of cases). There is a belief that modern Western medicine should be the first port of call, a GP is considered to be the "primary health-carer". But with only a 10 minute slot and the likelihood of being prescribed antibiotics, pain-killers or anti-depressants and an ideology of medicine based around acute-treatment and a surgery-based mentality of looking at things through narrow rather than broad focus, there is a massive problem

in the approach which is coming to be realised by doctors and patients alike. Patients move with their feet and less and less of them now see their doctor as their primary carer. Instead they consider other practitioners as being primary because of a sense of trust and relaxation which occurs which they know instinctively is the root of healing. The difficulty then comes when telling their doctor that they are seeing a reflexologist and convincing them that this is really “helping”. Usually a doctor will look down his/her nose at this choice, dismissing it as merely a “placebo effect” which is still considered “second-class” even though placebos have proven to be as effective and often more so, than prescribed drugs in science’s own double-blind trials. The narrow focus of modern medicine is based in Newtonian-materialism and so this produces the tunnel vision of science.

Surgery is not a preventative medicine, it does not focus on the level of something *before* it occurs physically. Of course a surgeon will tell you otherwise, because their ideology will always be “you should cut it out before it gets to the acute stage”, but in fact many other approaches can help before one gets to “the last resort” which is the expression of the surgical procedure. The difficulty is always in the judgment of this situation, when should one act? Acute means acute, it means that there is a situation **now** which is a problem, acute discomfort, pain or change in the tissues that means visually something is going on that really looks and feels “wrong” and one is in fear about...often these are signs of an acute disorder.

Much of the time Western diagnostics is all about attempting to find the problem before it occurs “physically” through blood analysis and the like, and while this is interesting the mindset is still narrowly focusing on the physicality of the blood and the treatment approach is often still limited to surgically-based medicine which therefore is often inappropriate. It’s like trying to crack a nut with a sledge-hammer because the sledge-hammer is the only tool you have. Modern medicine cannot see outside of its box so it views things through a kind of tunnel-vision. For the patient anything other than this way of thinking by a doctor is far more open, which makes them more “on the edge” than the main-stream. (Please see the brilliance of the new wave of modern medicine from one of its pioneering challengers Patch Adams: <http://patchadams.org/>).

When a change in the blood is noted this should indicate a pre-acute stage and this can be dealt with by other forms of medicine if only Western science would accept that they don't really understand everything! This is yet to come – in the UK the Richard Dawkins and Brian Cox brigade are still on the old soap-box of popularizing science as the “be-all and end-all”, which in itself is misleading and inaccurate as the very foundations of modern science and physics are all the time being questioned. However, few will venture to touch upon that as it will completely change their world view away from the seemingly “safe” narrowness of materialism.

So until there is a Oneness in medicine there will always be divisions and ideas as to what’s what. So in the meantime it is for the patient to trust their senses. When people go to the GP nowadays it is invariably at the acute phases when there are major red flags such as blood in the stools or urine, vomiting or major weight loss etc. These are physical and acute issues which are presenting, but in situations such as mild diabetic conditions, mild heart problems, cancerous tissue which is at the tumour stage but is not aggressively spreading and many other issues, it is clear that much can be done

before there is any requirement for intervention. If there is a readiness for the pattern to open outwards and clear through natural discharge, energetic medicine can offer many methodologies that help the body's natural process of healing to kick-in and clear the damage to tissues from within. Often a broader approach needs to be taken in these situations where it is pre-acute and something does need to be changed, but when it is the right moment.

Sometimes of course this won't work, the patient will not be in the right mode for things to change because although the nature of the illness has meant that may have the instinct there is something "wrong" and may even know what to change, it will take too long to let go of long-term tension that has been held within, which would thereby enable the body to recover enough before the onset of that acute stage. As a result the person is between approaches. They will likely need to be based in a longer-term, broader approach to health but at the same time be helped surgically at the acute stage of the symptoms. Surgical is by nature to do with symptomatic expressions, the root of a problem is never in the physical manifestation of an issue unless it is born of the exterior and is a physical injury to the body. Even here one can say that the injury occurred because the body was not strong enough internally to withstand the impact, Superman never had this problem! The point is that the body's natural healing power and relaxed openness and strengthening growth is always the root of medicine and cutting away damaged tissue is always a symptomatic approach. This is also why the surgical mindset of most modern medical drugs is based almost entirely on symptomatic response rather than on what we call in energy-medicine "root treatment".

The point is that all medicine has its uses, like different tool-qualities, it is just about understanding the energetics of medicine and in this way the approach that is "best"-suited to the patient comes forward, sometimes it will be chronic-pre-acute stage and other times it will be on-the-line and other times it will be fully acute and requiring attention with a surgical mindset. The point is that although it is clear that acute medicine may be "the last resort", it definitely should not be the first resort. What this demands is instinctive sensing by the practitioner involved and a process of connection to the patient in discussion of what they feel instinctively and what overall is the naturally appropriate thing to do.

This is not about agendas, not about what the patients or what the practitioner "want" it about *what is* and responding to it. Ignoring the patient is akin to abuse, it is a false belief that "I know better" and this leads to hierarchical domination and a mis-use of medicine in order to prove the doctor/practitioner is "right". In fact the process of healing is really one of change from one state to another, the acute stage of an illness may not occur if it can be let go before, but if it happens, *so be it*, this is not personal. None of the illnesses we see around us are personal, *we are all fingers of the same hand of nature* so there is nothing "I can do" about an illness, very often it is simply what has occurred after a domino-effect of thousands upon thousands of years of the propagation of "me" that then comes out in the manifestation of physical illness. Who's to blame? There is no owned past-life, neither is this life owned by anyone either, one can't blame the past, present or future for what is occurring, one can't even say it's all about "choices" because no-one chooses, in reality there is "no-one", so who is it that would choose? These may seem like a philosophical irrelevance, but when the whole of medicine is based on "myself" and what "I choose", what "I am"

and that this is “my illness” all this mentality is actually part of the human dis-ease of “self” and we have to realise that natural-energetic-medicine is outside of this narrowness and is simply the healing expression of appropriate balance that some natural-healers can provide for other people. It is not through choice that any of this happens. The act of healing is not a choice, it is an occurrence, and even the seemingly material process of doing surgical procedure can have this realization at its background and origin (the Hippocratic Oath in fact!), instead of a blaming of practitioner or patient who are actually One.

For the cancer patient who has had years of traumatic abuse in her background, to be told she has cancer is difficult enough, but to then be told she can “do” something to fix it if she is really “good” and “follows the regime”, makes her think it was because of her “bad” past drinking and smoking and drugs that this all happened and therefore it’s “her fault”, so unless she stops doing these things will not get better. In fact it’s never about the drinking, smoking and drugs that are all ways of her coping with her depression, but is in fact a process that has unravelled through her body. If this is all occurring at the pre-acute stage and she wants to naturally engage with the process, then as the psychology of shame and guilt and fear lets go so will the habits and there might be a return to health that can heal the body naturally. However if this takes ten years then at some time during this healing process she may find herself moving into an acute stage of the cancer changing, in which case surgery is the approach, *where it was not appropriate before, it is now*. Continuing on from this there is no negation of the process of healing which still takes place after the acute stage is over, now with more time allowed from the surgery she is able to heal and return to health. This is just following a natural process. With a major difficult illness such as cancer it is rare for people to be in an immediate stage of readiness to change and this is why at some stage often surgical mindset/intervention is needed. But to suggest that not following a regime is a person’s “fault”, or that old abuse is something they can “do something about” to “fix themselves” otherwise they have “failed”, is ridiculous in both modern or so-called “natural” medicine. This is the idea of so-called medicine using “blaming and shaming” tactics as a method of healing actually increases dis-ease – which is the fundamental sense of being separate and alone.

It is important to note that alternative therapies which have recently formed such as naturopathy are actually a very modern western approach to the use of herbs and supplements as an alternative to modern interventional drugs. It is therefore important to understand that this mentality is still of the ilk of the surgeon and so is acute symptom-focused treatment in the same way as bio-medicine, what in cancer terms might be called “natural chemo-therapy”. That said that there is more of an approach to strengthening the body’s immune system than a focus on outright killing of cells, but the way in which the herbs, supplements and foods are looked at is still focused on parts and is unable to look at the individual and the whole, as the methodology of investigating the herbs and supplements is via the same scientific ideology because western drugs are isolated and synthetically produced.

In a way this kind of approach needs to be seen as allied to modern medicine and as such is within energetic medicine, but this is a partial viewing angle with the surgical-scientific mindset at its centre. Treatment that uses naturopathy as an alternative method of treating acute-stage cancer and other illnesses is really just the natural method of doing something similar by using bio-medicine. Bio-medicine is generally

much more aggressively cathartic, synthetic with more aggressive side-effects, and natural alternatives are generally less aggressive, have less side-effects, are natural in origin and do look to narrowly-strengthen as well as narrowly-“dis-infect” the body. This is the main difference.

We need to understand that modern western medicine fits hand-in-glove with the modern western illness and approach to life. The nature of life is a battle in the modern west and so medicine is militaristic and narrowly focused and this is the same for its naturopathic counterparts albeit to a lesser degree. The point is that either way the modern western way of “fighting an illness” using whatever method, be it synthetic or natural, is still in a sense a surgical removal, it’s still a process of catharsis or clearing. Sometimes it is even the most appropriate action to allow an already tired patient to be affected harshly through synthetic or natural chemotherapy principles simply because it reduces *all* the energy in the body, including the cancerous energy (or other progressive illness) but also the anxious energy which is the root and exaggeration of the growth of the cancer.

It is very interesting that in the West the fundamental principle of therapeutics in the modern era and even historically is about catharsis. Most of the time there was a major interest in cleansing the body. In the East this was not the foundational principle, it was the opposite, it was the nourishing-healer rather than the catharsis that was seen as most key, it was a tonifying-based approach. This is basically because the constitution of the Westerner is very different from that of the Easterner. The physical structure of the Caucasian versus the Asian shows many differences in body shape but fundamentally on the internal organ level the liver is larger in the Caucasian and constitutionally the liver is strongest whereas in the Asian the lung is the strongest. This has repercussions in many different ways but most notably this means the Westerner will have accumulations in the liver and this is a blood level-based situation therefore it’s deep in the body. The Westerner’s nature and constitution is heavier built, it is noisier, more aggressive and generally more hot-toxic by nature and what is eaten are often more meat and high-energy foods. The Eastern nature is opposite, slower, softer, less toxic-overheated but more deficient and cold. Hence the approaches are different. This is a broad generalization of the highest level but it clarifies why the approach to medicine is so different East to West. The Westerner is all about different styles of catharsis, from the deep organ of the liver through to the large intestine and then through the skin, these are his/her main focus. The Easterner however thinks less about catharsis and more about how one can absorb and hold onto energy for long periods of time. This constitutional difference is what actually creates the surgical mentality of the West and the healer-mentality of the East. Therefore the “fighting spirit” of the Westerner sometimes needs to be subdued, even to the extent where much of it is killed-off by the chemo-surgical drugs in order to get to the point where the body is depleted and so can be built up again. Interestingly this was Jung’s ideology of the “ego” in that he assumed that the “ego” had to form and become full and would then slowly let go, and that this was an inevitable process, but only for the Westerner, not everyone needs to go through this process. But it is clear that the nature of the Western constitution is actually the world’s colonial energy, it is the “destroyer of worlds”.

As a result the cancer that lives within us is a reflection of this energetic intolerant nature and mind above body, male above female and adult above child philosophy,

therefore approaches that can literally absorb life-force: surgery and surgically-based medicines being the coldness and most “killing” of all treatments, in order to stop the energy doing what it’s doing. In a way the energy of cancer sometimes needs a very big wall of chemo to absorb all of its aggression, resistance and intolerance and cut it down in size (as well as the healthy energy of course) at which point other approaches such as Eastern healing become something that the body is open to. In fact the Western approach is within the context of Eastern philosophy and medicines but for now this is very difficult for the West to see. This is why Western medicine is often required by Western patients even though it is known to be a poison, the strongest yin is death, the surgical mentality sometimes gets close to this and this can give a person time to bring about a complete change of life that can incorporate some of the healer-approach, so further catharsis is not necessary.

The energy that cancer is using up is also in this process, so when the body has less energy the cancer can’t grow either. This occurs in aggressive dietary regimes such as Gerson therapy and also in chemotherapy, both of which can aggressively move the body into a state of energetic deficiency which in time can lead to recovery. This is really applied to patients where the mindset is stuck in fearfulness/anxiety, a situation where the energy is not yet ready to open up naturally allowing a natural letting go. So instead it is about trying to give more time for a patient to be able to go through this process by extending the acute phase and hopefully dipping into the pre-acute and holding this while in the background the more nourishing energetic medicine is focusing on the root of the illness which is always to do with the ideology of a separate “self” (please so many other articles in this section for more expansion on this topic”).

Sometimes the body energy, especially in young patients, “works against” the process of healing because life has not yet reached a point of natural letting-go of the control-state and so allowing healing to ensue. They are often programmed through life processes to be set down a track of annihilation so one can in surgical terms “buy-time” by aggressively fighting the body’s energy and calming it right down. This draws energy away from the person so in a sense they are forced to move into a state of stillness and rest and so potentially recovery, which would not have happened if they had had energy to do what they thought was the “right” thing. This is very difficult because it is not negating the patient’s experience and sense, but is a realization which comes to both patient and practitioner in time that although the approach and everything is “naturally focused” and it’s all okay, it cannot happen until a person lets go of the control. They can’t “do” this, it just happens or it doesn’t, no amount of “attempting” or “trying” gets anywhere, it is usually deeply frustrating, involving incessantly looking for “results” with a pained anguish.

Energetic medicine, which is the root of modern medicine, derives from cultures which did not regard life in the same way. They understood the symptoms as distinct from the origins of the illness. Therefore the mindset was different and the practitioner could help a patient be in touch with the instinctual qualities of rejuvenation more readily as life was more in touch with the senses. In today’s world where the mindset is locked into a narrow-focus pattern from an early age, this means that natural practitioners of the ancient energetic therapies must be aware that their practice only extends to the level at which a person is open to it and there is no way a person who is not open to this can enter into this zone until they are ready to do so.

Not seeing this creates a bullying mentality in this medicine which is actually counter to it and therefore completely useless. Observation and appropriateness is always the response and when something is stuck one should never use force to unstuck it. Often it needs to wear itself out, this is what the chemo and other methods do so these too can be appropriate and one must be open to this. It is only after this that sometimes the more energetic processes can be accessible. Even if the patient thinks there is openness this is not necessarily so, in which case often what is appropriate is to show a patient what is truly happening. True openness is a deep and instinctive process, it cannot be thought-out or believed in, it is either ripe or it isn't, who would blame the tree for its fruit not being ripe?

Nature has a complete counter-balance to everything. Interestingly surgery can be the way nature breaks in to the total feeling of separation to the exterior, by overtly physical means! The "self" creates the total belief that "no-one can get in here" and sure enough this forms a pocket of energy that is this exact expression, in the form of a tumour or some other manifestation. Either that or it's a kind of internal hiding "I'm not going to look into this now and I'm just going to *get on with it*" and so the tension is hidden in the body but sure enough when it is seen surgery brings this to the surface.

Sometimes when emotion and stress has become somatic, i.e. has become physical enough to form a manifestation within the body tissue, then it is a situation that cannot be resolved, or there is not enough time in a person's lifespan for this to be resolved through the unwinding process of the tumour or other manifestation reversing and going naturally into remission, i.e. the tumour being cleared by the body and tension and emotional anguish being released. Sometimes these physical processes are caused by externally ingested or absorbed biological-chemical pollutants without any emotional content at all. When the pattern is produced externally in such a way, via exposure to some kind of bio-chemical damage then the problem is usually much easier to resolve and also tends to be quite acute. When it is chronic and emotionally based or congenital then it is very much harder and it is the chronic illness that is the key issue found in the Western clinical context.

The point is that surgery doesn't have to be seen as a "terrible intervention" but just as an intervention that counter-balances, it is part of the energetic-medicine spectrum. It is the coolest medicine, so cold in fact that it is about death, the blade, but death as we know sometimes brings release, and so the process of surgery is very much like a death and rebirth process. This is exactly what going through anaesthesia and surgery is all about, when one thinks things have changed and that whatever "demon" was within has now been cathartically removed. The degree to which something goes inwards is the degree to which something needs to be drawn to the surface. The degree of holding within is equated exactly to the degree of releasing in the end, no matter if this release is death itself which for some situations it has to be. None of this is "good" or "bad", medicine is really only useful when there is a realization of its necessity and also a realization of its context and breadth.

There is no way that a doctor or practitioner of any kind should discount or be disdainful of any modality of treatment, BUT instead needs to understand as many modalities as possible in relation to his or her own and each other, in order to know when referral is absolutely necessary. This is the main problem with practitioners of

modern-medicine because they have such strong belief system in Newtonian-science and to the degree of absolutism attached, which are completely unfounded, yet they discount everything else. This creates a counter-movement of people who “do it all naturally”. The point is that *everything* is natural, even plastic comes from oil, which is natural! When we understand anything it is through seeing its energetics, everything is energy and so to apply appropriate energetics to deal with a problem is the real expression of therapy. This is not a throw-away statement of “whatever works for you” but it is a realization that what “works” is absolutely what is energetically of the balancing resonance with the problem and incorporated mindset of the patient at the time and all of this needs to be taken into account. If a practitioner is blind to the nature of narrow-focused medicine, such as modern-medicine that focuses on the most dangerous symptoms, then they are blind to seeing its beneficial use. If those within narrow-focused medicine cannot see the use of broad-interested medicine aimed at treating the root of the problem then they are blind to this also. The issue is not about integration for they both naturally have completely different views, but is a realization that they are both part of one spectrum, and the spectrum of medicine essentially can no longer be called medicine, it is simply energy and appropriate resonant response.

Those people caught in the trap of believing they are “all of medicine” in its entirety or part of “proper medicine” while the “other side” is considered to be lesser, fake, unscientific or whatever, are simply an expression of the ignorance and arrogance of “self”. The nature of separation is the nature of dis-ease, hence the approach which highlights one thing and has no place for the other is very prejudiced and results in the passing on of a dis-ease process to all who contact this situation. Health is not personal and it is impossible for it to be, there is no such thing as personal health, as no-one is separate from one another. So health is of the whole, not of the part, and as a result what happens to people happens to the whole of us, not the part. This is the nature of what we are living through and medicine can only respond to nature’s own unraveling process, it can’t force it in one way or the other, it can’t choose or decide, it needs to respond from instinct and when this occurs with any illness then there is a possibility of dealing with it.

Death is inevitable, it is a process which can’t be avoided, but holding back from acting on an acute stage of illness or in fact from the act of surgical intervention before the acute stage, or when a patient is simply too weak to heal during the operation or afterwards are causative factors in early death simply because there is not a responding of instinctual sense within medicine. There is no good or bad in this, but the nature of medicine is an instinctual response of wanting to allow something to move to natural resonance in the specific way of connection to another human. This can’t be done by everyone, it is the role of a few people who do this naturally but those people must respond instinctively. Patients can then respond naturally and as a result will also get a sense of what is appropriate even in the most dire of situations. When there is truth being expressed it is known at a deep level, even if a patient is in deep darkness or fear a sense of being seen and understood allows for a sense of non-separation, which is the essence of healing. In this way patients are not left outside the process of healing but are what it’s all about and so surgery is an accepted expression rather than a “must do” or even “last resort”. The point is that appropriate medicine is the sense of Oneness. Healing occurs spontaneously at the point of contact and this can be even at the end of a blade when it is the appropriate time for this to occur.

Medicine is a spectrum of natural expression and this is how to view it, if we only see one angle, whether that be a belief in non-material or a belief in material, we lose part of the picture. Ancient medicine could always see the whole and as a result surgery was part of this whole. The more material yin quality was the foundation of the more ethereal/yang expressions of treatment. It is important to be clear that natural medicine is always inclusive, never exclusive, and then always it is appropriate.

For more on this please see my book “Medical Oneness: The way to unite all forms of medicine” See here: http://www.healthinstinct.org/index.php?main_page=page&id=3

David Nassim
29/6/12