



Danny Lennon: Here we are. Trevor, welcome to the podcast my man. How are you?

Trevor Kashey: I am fantastic. How are you doing today?

Danny Lennon: I am good. I'm excited to talk and we finally managed to make this happen, so I've got plenty of stuff that I'm intrigued to ask you about. Before we get into any specific nutrition related stuff, I am very interested to ask a bit more about your background, specifically from what I've been led to understand you had your undergraduate degree at something like 17, correct?

Trevor Kashey: I think I graduated at 18. Yeah, that sounds about right.

Danny Lennon: And during your time in high school was also doing some cell-based research, correct?

Trevor Kashey: That is correct. I was lucky enough to latch onto a mentor when I first started – because I was doing essentially full-time high school and full-time university at the same time, and one of the professors cut some red tape for me essentially because it's not a super common thing obviously. And he put a good word in for me into a local research facility – that was local to me, but it is nationally recognized, and so after an extensive interview process with them I was able to get in essentially as a researcher doing non-small cell lung cancer research working with micro RNAs like gene interference and things like that for cancer cell growth and proliferation.

Danny Lennon: That is super cool and that kind of begs the question of how did this all come about, I mean, what was it that as you were kind of growing up that influenced you so heavily to get into the sciences at a such an advanced level so early in life I guess?

Trevor Kashey: That's an interesting question. So, there are two facets to this. One is that when I was extremely young I watched the cartoon Dexter's Laboratory. Are you familiar?

Danny Lennon: I am very familiar.

Trevor Kashey: Okay, yeah. So, there's like eight, nine, 10, 11-year old kid who has a basement that's the size of a city filled with all if his crazy projects like that was my dream. And secondary to that, I'm sure you are familiar with X-Men mutants that sort of thing where I noticed was I found that a lot of little boys they kind of like wanted to be Wolverine or wanted to be Gambit or wanted to be one of the X-Men and I was like how did they get the metal into his bones. I was definitely more like the mad scientist side of wanting to make X-Men and when I was extremely young, younger than that I think I was introduced somehow to the concept of the 'glow in the dark' monkey and deer that's how I understood it when I was very young. When the Human Genome Project was still a fancy thing and scientists were able to integrate jellyfish DNA into a monkey, and then it became fluorescent, and so all those things combined got me into essentially molecular biology and biochemistry essentially before the age of 10, and then as soon as I met anybody that had any knowledge in it at all I just latched to them and was as annoying as possible.

Danny Lennon: Obviously, there was this big draw to it and this passion to get involved deep into science, but there also has to be another component to some degree whether that's enough interest that you go and study like crazy but also I am guessing because of the age you were doing some of the stuff there has to be whether people call it natural talent or whatever it is that made science at that level accessible to you at such a young age. Is there anything that from your background explains that ability to do that level of stuff which most people would probably consider either not possible but extremely rare?

Trevor Kashey: I agree that. In actuality I think it's more in terms of opportunity rather than competency, because working in a laboratory,

although it does seem pretty fancy on the outside, when you are surrounded by a team a lot of it really is technical work and being able to follow a standard operating procedure, and then you work within a group to identify the data that you gather. So, as a young child more or less working in a laboratory I was able to essentially follow the recipe to go through a rather technical experiment, and then I had a group of people that helped me interpret the data. And so, from a competency aspect in terms of science there is the bench work aspect they call you a technician or I call it basically you're surgeon, and then there is the theoretical aspect where it's do you have the capacity to interpret the data that you produce. And that's where the super advanced side is, and then that's where I had a lot of help. And so, practically speaking working in a laboratory at a young age isn't too crazy, being able to interpret the data that you gather might be. But again if you have a mentor and a team that's willing to help you that's why you have meetings and that's why you have presentations to help basically okay I did all this DNA work, I got this data, I have no idea what the heck it means, and then you sit down and you have a group of people help explain it to you so that from a practical aspect of working in a laboratory that was super helpful for me.

My mother was very good at basically humoring my obsession with science because I think she knew deep down that if she didn't humor my obsession with science I would probably take it to the basement and end up doing – you know what else can you do, right? If I wasn't going to do it in a controlled environment, I was definitely going to do it in a uncontrolled environment, and so she did what she could and I basically just looked out and found some awesome mentors that were able to cut some red tape for me at a young age.

Danny Lennon: So, you mentioned your mother there. Was your family involved in science before that or is it more just a support network that just fostered your interest in science or what's the...?

Trevor Kashey: Yeah. Not even remotely. My mother definitely was – my mother actually has a Graduate degree in Analytical Philosophy, so she is educated and she is intelligent, and extremely far removed from any technical anything. But she essentially instill study habits in me and appreciated where education could take a person, and since I showed an interest in that she just did her damndest to make sure that I had access to all the education I possibly could.

So, from a family-tree aspect you could basically just say that the rest of my family kind of thought that the sun revolved around the earth, so to speak, and I was humored in my obsession with doing this and that my mother essentially understood that if she fostered it that I would blossom, if that makes sense.

Danny Lennon: Right. So, you have your undergrad degree at 18. What age did you start that?

Trevor Kashey: Officially, I started it like 13 or 14, because I was doing concurrent high school and college at the same time, and then when I entered university full-time I finished the remainder of my degree in three semesters. So, I entered university as a junior out of high school, and then I smashed everything together in three semesters and finished it out. And while I was finishing my degree there I started working in another laboratory while I was finishing my undergraduate degree, and then that is the laboratory I ended up working in during my doctoral studies. So, it was a smooth transition for me from a research standpoint.

Danny Lennon: Awesome. So, let's get into that. You moved into a doctoral program what was your area of research that you were looking at, at that stage?

Trevor Kashey: So, strictly speaking it was basically in the realm of biophysics. So, the laboratory that I worked in was actually funded by the Department of Energy, and so I did a lot of biochemical work on redox proteins where I was essentially looking at electron transport – I was looking at how electrons moved around in the cell. So, most biochemists tend to focus on the sexy stuff, the carbon, and I was measuring essentially the chemical reactions from the electron side rather than the protein side. So, watching actual energy transfer during chemical reactions using proteins that has metals bound in them, so basically molecular wires is probably the easiest way to describe that I think.

Danny Lennon: And how did you end up in that field? What was that influenced you to go in there or what opportunity came up that led you to that particular area?

Trevor Kashey: I'm going to be completely candid with you and say I kind of intuited that. I think a lot of people have an interest in an area of research and I really have an obsession with learning more than I have an obsession with learning anything in particular. And from

what I have seen and what I have intuited is that a lot of people have an obsession with a particular area, and will kind of sacrifice their psychological and physical wellbeing to operate in a laboratory that might be toxic. Basically what I am trying to say is like a lot of people will fight tooth and nail to try and maybe get into a laboratory that's world renowned or whatever and really essentially end up hating their lives while they are there, because it is world renowned possibly because the principal investigator is a slave driver.

The mentor that I had gotten when I was in my undergraduate was actually my biochemistry instructor, my undergraduate biochemistry instructor, and he was – I'm getting kind of emotional here, he was actually more like a father to me, and so it wasn't necessarily the subject-matter itself that struck me as much as I jived with this person, with this man, so much that I was able to learn the things that I needed to learn to master my ability to become a scientist rather than obsess about the minutia of the subject-matter I was studying, if that makes sense. Because most all biochemical apparatus, most all biochemical frameworks for experiments they're translatable between laboratories like most protein laboratories use the same equipment, most DNA laboratories use the same equipment. So, I had much more like a practical outlook on this where like I maybe didn't know exactly how I got into this field but I know that my mentor would give me the shirt off his back, and I know that people that went into their fields of interest, a lot of them maybe started and didn't finish or they hated their lives the whole time despite going into a field they thought they would enjoy. Does that make sense?

Danny Lennon: It makes total sense. And as you were speaking it reminded me of some recent conversations I've had with a friend of mine when you kind of peel back and think about what science is or the main value of that is where it's much more important of how you think and how you arrive at answers as opposed to specific facts you know. And I think that kind of speaks to what you were talking about there. You were more interested in learning, you were more interested in that process, and the skills, and the – I suppose things were picking up from the relationships with these people as opposed to a specific fact you might learn about a specific area of the sciences.

Trevor Kashey: That is 100% correct, because I could tell you right now working in a laboratory in a specific field only makes you an expert in that

field insofar as it prompts you to read the research about the stuff you are working on. Because if you read anybody's doctoral dissertation or thesis you read it and you're like man that's like a week's worth of work, but it is 5 years worth of troubleshooting, and so that is the differential here is that can you start a project and can you finish a project and can you figure out the 10 million little kinks over a 5 to 7 year period, so you can graduate. And to me that's what the doctoral process was. That's what becoming a scientist was, and I learned a lot about recombinant electron donors and acceptors, and electro-chemistry and all this other random stuff that maybe doesn't directly apply to what I do now, because those were the types of experiments I was running. But again working in a laboratory on a specific project doesn't necessarily make you an expert on the topic as much as the obsessive reading of the literature surrounding the topic that you are doing experiments on. So, there is a roundabout way of saying that by learning how to be a scientist and by learning from this man to learn how to ask questions, and learning how to take data, look at it objectively, and come to my own conclusions those skills are translatable to any field. And it just so happened that the field I was in dictated that I read this sort of research at that time, and when I transferred fields I was able to take those skills and readily apply them without any issues at all. Does that make sense?

Danny Lennon: Yeah, man I absolutely love this and I think going back to that previous point it really gets to the core of what we should be striving for with aiming to be a scientific thinker is essentially that. It's not this expertise in a narrow field. It's, like you say, learning these things that will apply to many other problems. And from the sounds of it, and you can correct me if I'm wrong, but some of the things you learned during that time it seems like have translated not only into learning other things within science and academia, but pretty much across a broad spectrum of your life experiences. Is that a fair assessment that I'm kind of getting from the way you're talking about things?

Trevor Kashey: I am a born scientist my friend. All of the doctoral process did was give fancy words to the thought processes I kind of already had ingrained into me. So, you are very much correct. I always operated with an extremely strong induction machine, and taking fundamental things and extrapolating out. And that is why I have such a generic obsession with science on a fundamental level, because if you can learn how something works through its most basic components then when you look at the advanced literature

in that topic you can know right away whether or not it adds up, and I find a lot of research and a lot of factoids are kind of viewed in the exact opposite where a person might look at something new and shiny, and try and work their way down to fundamentals to see if it makes sense. But if you have a strong understanding of the fundamental science underlying whatever topic you are reading about then you are able to intuit whether or not the data you're looking at makes any sense right off the bat.

Danny Lennon: Man, I think that applies to nutritional sciences as much as anything, because so often I get that impression of all these debates we see within nutrition a lot of them could be eradicated if people had gone and, like you said, look and understand properly some of those fundamentals. Do you kind of get that sense too when you see – and just how do some of these debates even crop up?

Trevor Kashey: Yes. When you sit back and do some math you realize that these people are literally arguing over two bites of chicken. That is literally what I have seen people argue about, 1.1, 1.2, .9 whatever like dude this is two bites of chicken and it's out of the range of measurement error for typical person anyway, right? So, that's the sort of stuff that like when you end up trying to translate what you find, right, you have theory – I kind of separate this stuff out into three sections, you have theory, right, that's your academic stuff, and then you have programming which is like we're going to take the academic stuff and do some math and see that like okay we're going thread it into a word problem and say in a perfect world this is how the world would operate, and so you go from theory to programming, and then you go to practice which is like here is what you calculated and here is what you're going to get. And you see very early on how insulting that is, and that's kind of tangentially related but basically if you peruse my social media accounts you will see that I don't make any Facebook posts at all. I don't participate in any arguments at all, and what interaction there is on my social media accounts is almost entirely people that are essentially just vouching for my ability to use fundamental science to help them. And that there is very little time or energy spent publicly trying to deal with these minutia that I think if there was a fundamental understanding of nutrition and biochemistry these conversations probably wouldn't even happen.

Danny Lennon: Right. Yeah, I agree. I think there are kind of two elements that I picked up from what you were saying. One is that we could dissolve a lot of the debates that happen if people were operating from the same understanding of these core principles. But the second point that I like is you mentioned around how sometimes we can get so zeroed in on talking about specific numbers that we're pulling from literature and not realizing what that means in a pragmatic sense. And I was only talking recently with a friend of mine about some issues related to public health, nutrition, and messaging in that area and rather than worrying about the number of grams of fiber to recommend someone or the percentage breakdown of mono unsaturated and saturated fat to advice people. For the vast majority of people we should be thinking in food-based recommendations and it's not to say that they're not informed by practice but the communication is a bit different. So, I think we will circle back to some of those ideas. Before that I do want to get into a bit more of this kind of timeline that we've walked through of yours. You've done these doctoral studies, because there's so much from there. I think we could go two routes, one is on the kind of research academic route. I know there are some other things like you've done work with examine.com amongst the number of others. But also very interested in you as a practitioner because so far we've talked of you very much as a scientist, where does the journey for you as a practitioner begin and what are some of those early moments look like?

Trevor Kashey: Okay. This is almost the same timeline my friend. So, my father, I'll just say, he came back into my life when I was like 12 or 13. I'll just use that language, and we had absolutely zero in common like I was a type of kid he'd beat up in high school type of zero in common, right? And since we didn't have anything in common and we spent a couple of days of the week together, we just decided that we would train, and so my father was actually the one that introduced me to the concept of bodybuilding. And it didn't take very long for me to marry my obsession with fundamental science and bodybuilding. And so, my first bodybuilding competition I actually did when I was 15 and there are some photos of that floating around, but my dad came into my life when I was 12 or 13 and we immediately started training, and he showed Arnold Schwarzenegger's encyclopedia of modern bodybuilding you know that old school text. I ate it up. I loved the pictures and didn't really like much anything else. And a couple of years later I did my first show and I was able to apply what I had



learned from like a fundamental, pragmatic and application standpoint to work myself into as good of a contest condition as a 15-year old kid could be. I started dieting at 14 and entered the competition at 15, and so I think that's not necessarily what the practitioner part I studied but that's where my foray into the combination of nutrition and science started to interconnect. I think bodybuilding is quite literally probably the easiest thing for a person in my position to try and connect science with what my father introduced into my life. It was more like okay we're going to train, and then when I started reading about it I realized oh the body is meat because I was obsessed with science you know bombs, go on the dark ink, and making fluorescent monkeys all that sort of stuff, you know making X-Men, and then when I realized I can screw with myself. And I can screw with myself on a fundamental level and there are known things that can be manipulated to yield the results and these things are calculable and measurable. And everything about it could be scientific, and so it really lent itself to basically my obsession with essentially science and biochemistry, molecular biology what I knew about it at the time. My father introducing me to training and the marriage between those two things naturally led itself to what is essentially bodybuilding and competition. Fast-forward a little bit, I had done my second competition in bodybuilding when I was 19, and from there I had transitioned from bodybuilding into Strong Men. And transitioning from bodybuilding into strength sports where in strength sports there is a much tighter community of people, and so I can't really speak for the community in bodybuilding very much I think possibly because of the age I was when I had competed. But when I had transitioned into strength sports there was a local crew, because I lived in Arizona and Arizona was one of the bigger states for strength sports, especially Strong Men. And so, I participated in a forum and some of the guys from the crew that were probably 30 to 45 minutes from my house they extended an invitation and went and trained with them. I ended up transitioning into Strong Men from bodybuilding because quite frankly out of all the sports that I have competed in bodybuilding is the hardest and that is because it is a 24 hours, 7 day a week commitment. I don't care who you are that's exactly what it is if you want to win, and with strength sports there is a much – at least where I was in the strength community at that time, there was a much greater sense of camaraderie and family. The person who is trying to beat you is the one who is trying to get you to also set a PR and beat them, and so essentially that level of trust and bonding I never really got to experience much before. It

essentially didn't take long for them to figure out that I was kind of dorky like I looked apart because I had been training for a long time and I aged almost as precociously as my studies put me basically. I looked like I was the age older of all the people I was in class with. It wasn't like I was a child sitting in the auditorium. I had a beard when I was 13. So, I think a lot of that from like social awkwardness standpoint kind of worked in my favor. Is that basically one day when those guys found out that I had a background in science and that I was analytical with everything that I did, and how it translated into progress in my training and my physique it didn't take long for them to inquire, and so from a practitioner standpoint quite literally I gave and still give away as much as humanly possible. Now, I don't do it publicly because of, you know part of the discussion we had a little bit earlier just kind of a diet tribe, it doesn't really matter how high quality of the information you put out on a public level if the general public doesn't know how to discern what is quality and what is not then you do is serve to add to the noise. And so, I would much rather conserve my time and energy for people who are willing to reach out to me directly where I know I can make an impact. Otherwise, I kind of feel like I would just be standing up on a soapbox competing with all the people to see who could yell the loudest regardless of the quality of the information. So, essentially going back to what we were talking about before, I gave away as much as I possibly could. Not necessarily because I wanted to teach or because I wanted to help them, quite frankly it was more so that I could discuss out loud what I already knew. So, I would figure out holes in my own logic, so I could go fill in those holes on my own, if that make sense. So, when I was interrogated by all the boys about science related things with supplements, hormones, training you know all of the full meal deal and I would think to myself out loud in the Socratic seminar style format. It was more like I said, I would think out loud with other people in the room and I'd be able to identify holes in my own logic. And so, essentially it got to a point to where people would pick up little tit-bits that I threw out and I would get feedback from them and from an anecdotal standpoint it would help fill in the knowledge and logic gaps that I may have had that academic information maybe couldn't fill on a practical level. And so, it basically ended up getting to a point to where I was now having to do so much Q&A all the time with so many people that I essentially just had to commoditize my time, and then becoming a practitioner ended up happening on accident just so essentially I could manage my time.

And so, that ended up happening in that 19, 20, 21-year old range.

Danny Lennon: Right. So, this was driven by these people wanting to get your thoughts on certain ideas, you have these Q&As and you're like okay I need to actually start making people pay for this, otherwise people will never leave me alone. I'll be answering questions 24x7 for every day of the year. From that kind of like you say, kind of forced your had to some degree or at least was the initial spark to get you in as a practitioner. When you first started going down that route and started working with people more formally what was that like, did you enjoy that process early on, did you enjoy it more than you thought you would, did you not? How was that initial period for you as you started working with more and more people in a more formal setting considering that you hadn't necessarily planned to go there?

Trevor Kashey: That's a good question, because I make the joke but it's not a joke that I spent 10 years in the basement staring into a microscope, right? Shooting lasers and looking into microscope and grown cancer and like basically it was frustrating as hell. That's probably the best way to describe it, because I have the data and basically when you start to take your theory and you turn that theory into programming which maybe you could extrapolate as applied theory, and then you take that applied theory and try and translate that to a human that does human stuff. And then, you look at that differential it essentially throws the practicality of any theory out the flipping window. And so, now your job as a practitioner isn't to give a person a perfect program. I used a language that essentially the job of the practitioner is to shrink the gap between intention and intervention. Because the perfect plan is always going to be the most straightforward like Occam's razor, right? And so, now the problem is or the objective is now you have a person who knows what they want, you have a person who knows what they need to do to get there, and now your job as a practitioner is to shrink that gap. And that's where you realize after spending 10 plus years in this field that the academic knowledge that you have almost none of it is applied in terms of creating plans for people, and the value of a vast amount of academic knowledge is to basically know what is worth ignoring. Because like we mentioned before if you have an extremely strong inductive machine, if you have a strong grasp on the fundamentals then you have the capacity to essentially combat everything else that is trying to interject itself into fundamental

reason. Does that make sense? So, it kind of made fun of like oh you spent all this time at school and you don't use it ever, but that's wrong. I use it more than I ever have, because I have to critically analyze every single thing that ever comes out to basically prove to myself that it is not useful because chances are it isn't when you're looking at it in terms of the application to a person. Does that make sense?

Danny Lennon: Yeah. I love this because it almost brings some of this full circle because like you say, it wasn't directly what you learned during your studies that you're doing with people. And I think that's sometimes the problem that with people that I have seen who have done say a degree in nutrition, and it's okay these are things that I have learned off, and these are things I'm going to use with people but it doesn't work that way. But what you've essentially – at least what it seems to me is what's happened is, you've used that scientific process and applied it in this setting with someone. And when we think about what we're trying to do with coaching we can see a lot of parallels with the scientific method, right? I'll have this hypothesis of I think this thing might work, we'll start putting that out, we'll test to see what happens, and we'll collect some metrics on this person, and then if it's not working we need to tweak what we thought was going to happen or if it's working then we etc, etc, and we can kind of see some of these parallels which you've taken from this understanding of being scientific in the way you approach stuff as opposed to I need to have learned all these little pieces of facts that will help this person.

Trevor Kashey: That is exactly correct. So, on the philosophical side where the objective of the practitioner is to shrink the gap between intention and intervention, right, what I want versus what I need to do, shrink that gap. On the other side the more applied scientific calculated side your job is to shrink the gap between observed and calculated. If you shrink that that also ends up shrinking the intention-intervention gap, and so they are opposite sides of the same coin, it is I have a strong fundamental understanding on a physiological and scientific level. On paper this is what should happen. Okay. So, I present the plan as such, the person or the client applies the plan to the best of their knowledge and ability, and this is the output. Okay, and now you have the calculated and observed, and then a savvy practitioner will be able to see the differential between calculated and observed and be able to intuit what is required to shrink the

intention-intervention gap. So, it's kind of heady but does that make sense?

Danny Lennon: Yeah, totally. And I love that you intentionally talk about shrinking the gap, because that gets away from this idea it needs to be this binary perfect or worthless idea, right? It's we're thinking about incremental changes as opposed to step-function changes.

Trevor Kashey: Yeah. The binary thing like I get visceral responses like really bad. And if there is one thing that biochemistry, and biology, and cell signaling, and molecular bio and all that stuff has taught me is that nothing ever, ever really in biology ever is binary. Everything is on a continuum all the time, and that is why I have another little tit-bit that I like to bring up with my clients and that there is a psychological binary and a biological continuum. And if you can be objective with the way that you operate from like a thought process like a cognitive standpoint then you as a person can develop self awareness to say okay is this a psychological binary or part of the biological continuum. Because for example, it's not are you diabetic or are you not diabetic that's an arbitrary cut off based off of some governing body for insurance purposes or whatever. It's more like how diabetic are you? From like no diabetic to so diabetic, right?

Danny Lennon: Right.

Trevor Kashey: Because I make the joke like okay guys I actually have a plan to cure diabetes in millions of people overnight. You know what I'm going to do? I'm going to change the cut off by five points and I just cured diabetes in all the – you know what I mean? And so, when you think in those terms you see the absurdity of psychological binaries, and so as a practitioner you have to be able to see everything on the continuum all the time and that trying to shrink the intention-intervention gap and trying to raise your observed up to the calculated it's an asymptotic function. You're never going to get to calculated. You may overshoot calculated, right, for whatever reason but you're never going to hit calculated and your job is to get it as close to calculated as possible and that is how you can see like on a philosophical level how this is a continuum. The stepwise functions are cute, and it just communicates the – it's really just insulting to the people you work with honestly. That's probably the best way to put it, to treat them like that.

Danny Lennon: Yeah. Couple of things I have to ask off the back of it. One is there from your perspective or your experiences as a practitioner, are there any from an overview level things that stand out to you as kind of general interesting experiences that probably formed a lot of who you became as a practitioner? And if there is any particular of those anecdotes or experiences that spring to mind what were the first ones that hit you?

Trevor Kashey: Yes. What a lot of people don't know is that I actually went through the full Clinical Nutrition Program at the university that I was at. I went through and did the clinical hours in the hospital, I decided to not go through with the licensure for reasons that don't need to be discussed here, but basically I was happy with where I was at. And suffice to say I was not impressed with how clinical nutrition from a philosophical and an application standpoint was happening, and I must preferred honestly my method of working one-on-one with people instead. And as a scientist kind of what I was talking about before where my initial experiences were frustrating as hell, is because this isn't like running an experiment. On paper it is, right? Okay, well I ran this experiment, these are the variables, this is the data, I tweaked this variable, I ran the experiment again, do it ad nauseam you know, okay your project is eventually complete after the umpteenth federation and really people don't think like that. And so, one of the biggest issues that I was running into that was really, really annoying the crap out of me as a scientist but now I swim and I revel in it as a practitioner is the Hawthorne effect. I basically describe it as this, if you are driving down the street and if you see a cop car you slow down, even if you are not speeding you slow down, right? Basically just by virtue of being observed your behavior will change, and as a scientist that bugged a living carp out of me. Because my job as a scientist is like okay I need to know exactly where you're at, so I can take exactly where you want to be, and help construct a plan that goes from A to B. But you're altering your behavior during essentially diagnostic data gathering period then it defeats the purpose of me trying to be empirical with the data to help construct the plan. And so, from a scientific perspective it really irritated me. And now as a practitioner I realize that this is probably the most effective tool you have at promoting autonomous behavior change. That's basically it is that if a person knows that you're watching and a person knows that you care they are going to start to modify their behaviors away from what they know was hurting them into what they think either you want or what they think is better for them.

And it is not going to be perfect, but the reality is it's probably going to be a hell of a lot better than what they were doing before and it was not at the direction of the practitioner. And so, just by virtue of being there and having a person know that you give a damn they're going to start giving a damn about themselves, and there is no amount of academic education that can replace that, none. And that's really what this is all about. You want to shrink the intention-intervention gap with the client, you want to help a client go from where they are to where they want to be give a damn about them and they will start to give a damn about themselves, because people don't need to be educated. People already know what to do, people already know to exercise, people already know to eat vegetables and they're just not doing it. And so, telling a person to do it is just beating a dead horse. It's really why should I do this. Why should I do this? Because somebody cares about me that's why, and that makes me want to care about myself and that I think has been the strongest and most effective tool in my arsenal to help promote autonomous behavior change with quite literally any population I have worked with over the past 10 years. And I just went from being frustrated by it to weaponizing it.

Danny Lennon:

Right. When did that come to you or did that just come through learning of working with people and do you remember when that realization hit, and I guess that kind of gets to more of another question of, you've already mentioned that the scientist in you is very prevalent in the way you operate, but I am also wondering how Trevor the researcher differs as a person to Trevor the practitioner after these experiences of working with people?

Trevor Kashey:

That's a good question. So, practically speaking I have probably transitioned – so on the practical level – on the philosophical level I'll always be a scientist, on a practical level I've probably transitioned from scientist to engineer. Where okay I understand the fundamental process, I have enough experience with people, anecdotally I have consumed probably more behavioral psychology material than I have biology material at this point and ended up marrying the two, so that – again this wasn't a binary thing. I would say it has just gone from frustrating to less frustrating to I don't care to this is neat all the way to okay how can I systemize the Hawthorne effect to work in my favor. And it is probably if you consider the beginning of the beginning and right now the end then it was probably close to a linear transition where the middle is the middle. So, it's just something that

annoyed me, and then I just kind of like okay I'll deal with it to okay this is going to happen no matter what, so how can I use this to help somebody instead of trying to fight it.

Danny Lennon: Sure. I wish we could continue this conversation for a lot, lot longer but soon I'm going to have to start wrapping up. But before I get there a few more things I'm interested to really get to Trevor. One is from the perspective of the stuff we've talked about and what you've come to know as a practitioner informed by obviously you and your way of thinking. If you were to try and distill that down into something that could be impactful for practitioners listening, is there either a philosophy or an idea or a concept that you found yourself coming back to quite regularly that you think is useful for those people to hear?

Trevor Kashey: So, this is actually kind of business thing, but I think the business aspect of being a practitioner is conspicuously ignored because people in the health and fitness field are awkward about making transactions because there's a strong dislike of things like selling out, making money, becoming wealthy from essentially being a health expert for whatever reason. And there is a lot of discontent with transactional relationships versus transformational relationships, right? Have you heard of that comparison before like at coaching level? And basically what changed the way I operated as a practitioner was actually fundamentally changed in the way that I operated as a business owner, and that is that a transaction for you as a practitioner is the transformation for the client. And basically what I am trying to say is that making money is okay because the more money you make the more people you're helping, and that's essentially why I ended up charging to begin with. When I was commoditizing my time it wasn't so I could make money. It was because I understood that if people pay that their buy-in increased and the adherence was better. And so, the financial transaction concept of awkwardness in the public eye is kind of conspicuously avoided because it is quite literally considered transactional but just operate with the understanding that when a person pays you it's transformational for them. Even though it might be transactional for you and that is quite literally the start of their journey at that point. It isn't when you give them a plan, it isn't when they first do their check in, it isn't after they read whatever blog post you make them read or whatever. It's as soon as that person signs the dotted line their life has changed and it is your fault and that is when you have to pounce. Because that is literally they have transformed their life at that point. It



might just be a transaction for you as a practitioner, but it is transformation for that person. It is at that point that they have decided to change their behavior because of you, and you have to take advantage of that window as soon as possible to help that person.

Danny Lennon: Yeah. I think taking that responsibility seriously is probably going to lead to all the other things we talked about in terms of caring about people, making sure you're actually invested in their process and so on. So, I love the way that you've framed that Trevor. One kind of final question before I wrap up it's something that I tend to think about for myself quite a lot and given this kind of conversation and the way you think through things I'd be interested to hear your answer. It's what is that I suppose that you do most often to check yourself when it comes to avoiding confirmation bias on topics, if that is a risk in certain areas for you because I know certainly it is for me, and I think people should have some active process for doing so. Again, is there anything that you have ever done and it could be in the past or now that you do as a way of avoiding some of the biases or other cognitive traps that we can fall into?

Trevor Kashey: Okay. I do stuff that makes me uncomfortable. It's probably the easiest way for me to answer that question. I think it's speaking engagement on a topic I know nothing about. I get on radio shows with people I don't know answering questions I have no idea what they're going to ask, knowing that it's going to be given to an audience I've never spoken to, right? I am constantly putting myself in positions where I am as uncomfortable as possible to stretch my boundaries to get into fields and topics I know nothing about where essentially confirmation bias doesn't apply because I have nothing to confirm. Now, I try and use what I know as a learning anchor for the new material I am exposed to, and the new material I expose myself to is maybe tangentially related to the other things that I know. But by and large like one day I might read a textbook on nitric oxide signaling, and the next day I might crack a textbook on psycho-pharmacology and these things are so drastically different on the outside of the tree that I have to try my damndest to find any learning anchor humanly possible to what I currently know versus I am just going to only read about this singular topic all the time, so that I can just peruse it for things I recognize and give myself a thumbs-up. Does that answer your question?

Danny Lennon: Absolutely. Perfect. Before I get to the short final question we round the show on, for people who are looking to know more about your work or about you where is the best places online you can direct them to?

Trevor Kashey: So, if you got to know about me you got to ask me yourself. That's really it. There is a reason why I am not really public about much of anything ever. I am coming out of a bat-cave a little bit, but most of the stuff I do I sign non-disclosures. Most of the people I work with don't want me to be public that I work with them. Most of the stuff that I make is ghost written you know what I mean, and so like basically the people that I work with work with me because of the discretion I have, and so I am more than willing to share whatever you would like to know about me essentially if you extent the olive branch yourself I'll give anybody the time. So that being said, you can go to [trevorkashey.com](http://trevorkashey.com) and there is zero information there except to get on the phone. You can Google around a little to learn a little bit about me, but I am kind of – you'll see two things if you look me up. You will see me being referenced by people who write articles and you'll see other people who have gotten results from the methods that I have. And honestly to me that is based off of the previous part of the conversation we had that is all I care to share, because again I am not a fan of adding to the noise, and so if all you can find when you look me up is that people get results and that some people think I am good at what I do then that's good enough for me. And if you want to get a more in-depth explanation then you could definitely talk to me directly. I hope that answers the question. It's kind of frustrating.

Danny Lennon: No. It certainly does, and I think it speaks volumes when that's the way you can operate by that essentially that code or ethics whatever way people want to frame that, but the way you can drive that interest in your services from that alone I think speaks a lot as well. So, Trevor I am very thankful that we were able to make this happen and I was able to entice you out from the bat-cave for this one. So, let me round off the podcast...

Trevor Kashey: That seems like 5 years in the running, isn't it?

Danny Lennon: Yeah.

Trevor Kashey: ... you know when you asked me before, I know you waited how much time, but you asked me before I was actually on my way out

of the country to do contract work overseas over a year for a foreign government.

Danny Lennon: Yes. I do remember that kind of – you hinted at that, so I was like okay that’s actually a legit excuse, right? So, I didn’t expect that one.

Trevor Kashey: Yeah. Thank you so much for having me.

Danny Lennon: It’s good. I’ll round out the show on this. This is the final question I ask anyone. You can keep it as short and concise as you want and it can be divorced from anything we’ve discussed today. Again, it’s quite a broad question, so take it whatever way you wish but it’s simply if you could advice people to do one thing each day that would have a positive impact on any area of their life what would that one thing be?

Trevor Kashey: Okay. Use positive language and that needs to be disconnected from being positive. Now I think being positive quite frankly is dumb, however, using positive language that is something that is helpful because positive language is inherently actionable. Basically a lot of people know what they don’t want. They say I don’t want to look this way, I don’t want bad grades, I don’t want to be debt, I don’t want this and so if you ask a person what their goal is a lot of times people reply with something that they don’t want. And if you are conscious of your language and speak in terms of the present tense positive and actionable. It doesn’t have to be affirmational, it doesn’t have to be positive in terms of ideals. It’s more like I am going to do this at this time or I am currently doing this at this time. It’s just being careful with the language you use to make sure that it is positive because from my current understanding when you use negative modifiers towards the – if you say like oh it’s not bad or okay I’ll give a classic example here that’s typical like two panel comic where the woman walks out dressed in a dress and she says do I look fat? And the guy says no you don’t look fat. All that person ends up hearing is fat, and so if you change that ‘don’t’ to do and then another word that makes more sense like you look great versus you don’t look fat. Practically speaking what you’re trying to convey is the same thing but in actuality the way the brain interprets that information is much different. And so, if you pay attention to the language that you’re using to make conscious swaps from negative language to positive language you will see

how much more actionable everything you say becomes and your efficiency as a human will skyrocket.

Danny Lennon: Awesome. I love it my man and a perfect way to round this out. I want to take this time to thank you for the time you've given up today for the conversation that I've really, really enjoyed this I must say, and for everything that you've discussed today. It's very much appreciated.

Trevor Kashey: Well, I had a blast. Thank you so much for having me.

**Join Danny's FREE weekly email, the Sigma Synopsis:**

**<https://sigmanutrition.com/sigma-synopsis/>**