



DANNY LENNON:

John welcome back to the podcast.

JOHN BERARDI:

Thank you Danny, I appreciate you having me back. I got to say without sounding too, I don't know, like I'm kissing your butt or whatever, but in the PN Community your show is really, really well respected and regarded. A week doesn't go by in one of our private Facebook groups of PN certified coaches or whatever where someone isn't recommending your podcast or saying great things about it or saying great things about something they learned from a guest. So kudos to you on growing this thing, I think I may have first started coming on it in the early, early days, and so it makes me so happy to see how well it's gone and how well received it's been.

DANNY LENNON:

Well, that means a lot to hear John, and to hear that is very kind and, hopefully it's able to provide some useful information to those people in the PN community, so I appreciate you sharing that before we start. As I mentioned in our email conversation a while back, one topic I tend to talk with friends quite a lot about is tribalism and nutrition, and before I maybe plant any of my own thoughts into your subconscious thought process, I'd love to hear your perspective on this, because you seem to be one of the few who has made a

name in the nutrition field whilst remaining relatively, let's say, nutritionally agnostic. So how do you see this issue?

JOHN BERARDI:

My brain goes in a couple of directions with this, so I'm almost thinking of it like I would envision a mind map, for example, and I have a couple of branches of thought on it. I think the first thing is whenever we hear this idea of tribalism, our brain rushes to this idea of nutrition camps, and so, your keto or your plant-based or your whatever, high carb, low carb. And what tends to happen then is we get, as humans, very judgmental and self-righteous of others. So the first place most people go when they hear about this idea of tribalism is, oh yeah, a bunch of stupid other people are doing that. I really like to begin from a place of self-awareness in saying like, wait, am I doing it as well, and is it even a bad thing or is it fundamentally a good thing that has some pros and cons. Again, the place where everyone rushes to is tribalism is bad in nutrition, and then I start like, hey, let's unpack the first assumption – when you think of philosophy or argument, the idea is what are the assumptions that are going into our arguments versus starting to build an airtight argument?

So for me, the first question that I have for myself is, what tribe do I associate with, like, which do you associate with Danny – and I was at an event recently, maybe this will help highlight it a little bit, with a group of world-class coaches from around the world. There's a place in Phoenix, Arizona where some – it's the top track and field training place in the world and coaches from all over, from every sport go to learn there. So you'll see soccer, football, rugby coaches from everywhere going. You'll see football coaches, so American Football coaches, baseball, basketball, track and field. And so we're sitting in this room and one of the topics of conversation was sort of an integrated approach to performance. So in other words, where you are coaches and where you coach, how integrated are the services, the coaching,

therapy, the nutrition, the strength and conditioning, the skill development, and almost universally people complain about how it's not very integrated, how the approaches and the fields and the skills are siloed. And so, we did a poll, why do you think that is, and so then we posted the answers on the board, and literally every person in the room blamed someone else. It's the coaching culture, it's the A-hole coach, it's the funding source. It was always someone not them. And I just don't think that's a useful place to engage in any conversation, and so I think this is what happens.

I've been doing a bit of an experiment on my social media for the last two years. I've been really, really curious, if someone with sort of a balanced perspective on nutrition could post those their thoughtful ideas and get a positive social media response. So I have been sort of like split-testing the same concept posted in a slightly controversial way in a way that demands a taking of sides versus just a thoughtful philosophical way, and the controversial way ends up with around 15 times the engagement. So it's so clear that we enjoy and reward the controversy as a field. And so then I take it down to self, and I go, all right, before I blame the idiots, the unwashed masses for causing this, do I respond in this way. And the answer is generally yes, when I'm flipping through my social media feed, the things that jump out the most to me or the things that I feel most drawn to respond to, to click a like or dislike, to make a comment, are the more controversial things. So I'm like, if we think tribalism is a problem, but I'm not even sure if it is yet, but if we think it's a problem, the solution begins with us, not with pointing the finger at other people, because all you're doing then is creating your own tribe, the "I'm right" tribe and the "you're wrong" tribe.

So I think about this subject, then I go to, is it bad, and the answer is, obviously, aligning with likeminded people isn't bad. I mean, it's safe, it's interesting, it's important. I mean, we could

look back at evolutionary history as an explanation for why we tend to be this way, but I think why we are that way is less relevant than what to do next, like, we can sit here all day explaining why some people like to fall into a camp and why that biases us against open-minded thinking, but who cares, who cares if it's an evolutionary trait based on survival and the dark terrors of the night and other tribes. But really, what do we do next is the key. And so, we do see a lot of it in nutrition. Why does it feel worse now than maybe it felt historically, and I think it's because of the internet. And again, not because the internet is bad, but because historically, let's say, there was no internet, the only people we could argue with are the 10 people we interacted with regularly in our little town and no one would ever hear that argument. So it's like if a tree falls in the woods with no one to hear it, if tribalism happens in a small town with no one to hear it, did it actually happen? That's what's happened 20 or 30 years ago.

But what's happening now is we can gather bigger tribes and we can so obviously see the oppositional tribes and then there's a huge public forum for us to either, on the positive sense, explore knowledge creation together, or, to just fight and be petty. So the internet has given us access to podcasts like this and all kinds of knowledge, like, if we talk about nutrition knowledge specifically, when I started, to be on the cutting edge of "research", when I was a grad student, I would spend every Thursday, the full day – so when I'd wake up, I'd go to library and I'd go in the stacks, and the stacks were in the basement of the library at my university. And like the journal of applied physiology and nutrition, all these journals you couldn't get online, you had to get them inbound kind of booklets, so the first six months of the year of journals would be bound together, and you'd have to read the latest one. So I'd spend every day, all day Thursday reading through it, so a lot of my early articles were written in that basement of the library.

Now the internet has given us all that, so that's an amazing good, but it's not an unqualified good, because it also gives us the ability to form camps and fight about truth again, but it also gives us the ability to explore truth.

So for me, I think it's fascinating to think about how this fighting is happening in nutrition and health and fitness. But to say that tribalism is bad or negative, I think is too simplistic. I think aligning with likeminded people is really great in some senses, and it also causes, I don't know, some of the more unsavory aspects of the human condition to come out as well.

DANNY LENNON:

So a few things on that that as you spoke I could find myself nodding in agreement with various parts of it, I think one of the important things is questioning at first that gut reaction I think most of us have, and I've certainly had this before as well of using tribalism as almost a derogatory term that we should avoid. And when we think about, I suppose, tribes of course have utility, and when we're not talking about nutrition and talking about this in general we see it as a good thing. If we're talking about humans and how we evolved and human connectedness and all these different types of ideas, we see them as an inherently human thing, that it's beneficial to have tribes and so on. When it comes to things like science and nutrition, there's this problem that crops up that if we are so strongly connected to a "tribe" and in this sense we're talking about maybe an ideology or a group, if that allows too much bias to stand in the way of objective answers, that could potentially be an issue. But the second part that you also bring up is this idea of we always tend to see that in others, and so it's easy to think these people have such a bias, I'm glad I'm one of these science people that doesn't have any biases. And of course, the notion that I have no biases is one of the most stunningly arrogant ideas we could probably hold, right, the idea we don't have biases...

JOHN BERARDI:

But we just know it's not true.

DANNY LENNON:

Right.

JOHN BERARDI:

Yeah, it's right. And what I find fascinating is there's a tribe right now in nutrition that is the evidence based/scientific tribe, like that that is also a tribe. So when people think, oh I see all this nutrition tribalism, they're thinking just in terms of whether you believe in a certain macronutrient split, but they forget that this kind of collective idea sharing happens in other domains, and that on just a slightly different parallel, it could be the evidence-based, or, maybe we'll say even more clearly, scientific tribe versus the experienced tribe. So there are people out there in the world who say science is just behind – and this happens quite often in athletics, and I'm not championing this point of view, I'm just giving it a bit of breathing space – is that, if we waited for scientists to tell us how to eat or train for high performance, it would be 30 years before we could compete in our sport. Because really, it's at the forefront of coaching where we learn these innovations that are winning Olympic medals and things like that. And then of course on the scientific side, it's, well, these are just a bunch of N equals one anecdotes that are at science, and so now you have this fascinating tribalism about whether we are scientific or experiential. And again, it makes sense why we might do that. But to your very first point, the detriment comes when it prevents us from objectively looking at, let's say, truth. And then another question that often pops for me is, but not everyone is actually seeking truth, not that they're seeking not truth or comfort or something else, but it is often scientists and particular types of coaches who are seeking truth but it may not be our clients, it might not be incumbent on them to not be biased. You know what I mean?

I remember an athlete of mine, a gold medalist, he used to say all the time, he's like, scientists tell me to avoid the placebo effect, I want the placebo effect, I want everything that'll give me an edge to win; so if that pill doesn't work, but I

think it does, and it improves my performance, I'm in. You know what I mean? And again, obviously, that has limited utility, but it's a different point of view. And you mentioned the idea about PN and where PN has stood on these kind of things historically, and my take from the beginning has been there's real value to a certain kind of agnosticism, nutritional agnosticism and informational agnosticism. But PN's take on that has long been, I guess, an extension of my personal belief system, and my personal interest structure which is I find it fascinating to sit in that space between, and go – and as a coach, you kind of have to. If you're a coach and you can't do this, then it's going to be really hard to connect with all kinds of clients. But sit in that space between and just really, really listen and try and understand what people over there are thinking and saying and what their life experiences are like that has led to that, and people over there are saying, or this person sitting right in front of me today – it's been just a great fascination of my life to sit and really try and set down as many judgments as I can, and say, if I were in this person's shoes, what would have led me to believe this. And then maybe even ask them, hey, it seems like you're really doubling down on this belief structure, tell me about your life, tell me about your experiences, tell me about your training, tell me about the things that have happened to you to lead to that. And then you can see that most times, people's belief systems are based on a very internally consistent system, it makes deep sense logically to them. However, if their internally consistent system is wrong, it's based on an assumption somewhere along the way that may be inaccurate.

And it may not necessarily be my job to correct that inaccuracy, because then that leans into the arrogance that you mentioned earlier, oh, I'm just going to fix these poor people who are thinking wrong. So what's the, I guess, antidote here and for whom? And for me the antidote has been this idea of agnosticism, a deep sense of curiosity in the people that are sitting in

front of me or the groups that I'm trying to understand and a legitimate trying to understand them, fully embracing the idea that agnosticism is also a tribe you can find out into. You know what I mean?

DANNY LENNON:

Yeah. I think one of the themes in the answer is this idea of empathy which is often missing in most I think arguments that happen, particularly online, but can often be offline as well, if we are talking about different ideologies, and that empathy would speak to what you said of, well, what led this person to be in this position that they're in, that they've obviously made friends with people in this certain group, they maybe have a business that's centered in it, they feel that this idea or this type of diet has helped them in some way. And so thinking, oh why don't they just look at the facts and kind of denounce what they've been doing is lacking an understanding of how they've ended up there in the first place. And I think just taking some time to think that through is a pretty useful exercise, and one of the most kind of interesting aspects is that, because I've said this to people before, of people who have ended up in the "evidence-based camp" or science camp, that are not, let's say, researchers doing primary work or they're not the world expert in a specific niche, but just identify as being evidence based, but they're still taking information from other people and a lot of that is based on that they think this person is likely telling the truth. And so for them, they may have ended up evidence-based out of just luck that the first person they were exposed to happened to have that position, and so they might actually be right in their conclusions, but how they got there was the exact same way as the person that they're complaining about got to theirs, that they just got, let's say, unlucky to have followed some kind of pseudoscientific guru that sounded really convincing and they just got unlucky that that was the person that they kind of followed, but from there, both of their paths looked the same, and that's how they end up in these



positions. So luck plays, I think a bigger role than some of us tend to think about too.

JOHN BERARDI:

Yeah, and two things jump out for me. One is this idea of empathy. I talked about that social media experiment that I did. This is a perfect example. So if I were to put up a post saying, you know what's missing from this field – empathy. I look around and then I give three examples of how a coach was acting in a non-empathic way. A post like that would get a tremendous amount of response, social sharing, likes, comments, and it is all driven from a place of, yes, look at all the idiots out there who aren't doing empathy; not like me who's the paragon of whatever thing you are saying is good here, empathy, whatever the subject might be about. Yet if I were to do a post saying, here are three questions to ask yourself to prove that you're not as empathic as you think you are – so in other words, not turning it external but turning it internal, so this post is a chance for you to reflect on whether you are as awesome as you think you are – it would receive very, very little attention.

And again, I mean, it just highlights the fact that every single subject is a minefield that could lead to us pointing fingers at others and forgetting to consider whether these are the traits that we have ourselves, and that's human nature too. So for me, everything comes back to who am I, how am I being, how can I be more self-aware in situations. I cannot fix the tribalism, if you will, of the world. But I can work on being more objective myself. And if I do that, my life will be markedly better, and perhaps that will rub off on the people near me, and that rubbing off may cause a chain reaction of positive outcomes. The other pathway feels like it might be more impactful, give me a big megaphone and I'll talk about the evils of this, but it rarely ever produces anything but more arguments and more tribalism. So that's why I always come back to, with subjects like this, the finger pointed back itself. It's the most uncomfortable finger pointing you can do, but

it's the only reliable way to level up yourself and quite possibly could have a beautiful ripple effect on the field. So that's kind of comment one.

Comment two has to do with this idea – I love your example of, hey, you just happened to be lucky when you chose the person who might be closest to correct or accurate knowledge, and that person was unlucky, but you're both just doing the following. The question then becomes one of rightness, it's really fascinating to me that we're often seeking that as a primary good, rightness – I want to be closest to a truth, because rightness is good and wrongness is bad, but wrongness teaches us a whole heck of a lot. And so if we're constantly trying to avoid aligning with wrongness and with rightness, the question becomes what's the goal there? Because, as you said, people doing primary work, that's their job. They're paid to discover how the universe works, let's call it, whether it's the universe within our minds, within a muscle cell or outside of our solar system – primary researchers, that's their job. Why is everyone else, whose job that is not, so concerned with alignment, with rightness, and truth? It's something I think we all have to ask ourselves. If that's not your job, if that's not what you're being paid to do, coaching, for example, isn't necessarily a job that needs to be aligned with rightness and truth. Your job needs to be aligned with, let's say, call it a positive outcome. So sometimes getting the language and the biochemical pathway just right may actually interfere with the outcome based kind of goal of your work.

So really, this isn't me taking a side, it's just saying, like, when we think about who we are in relation to tribalism and empathy and rightness and all this, I think it's really important to unpack why we're doing what we're doing. And if your job isn't to find truth, then why are you so concerned with it, why are you willing to fight with people you don't even know over it when it's not even the primary

objective of the work you're being paid to do, or, your stated purpose in the world? And that I think is the question each person has to answer individually, and some of our answers will suggest that we're behaving more emotionally than we maybe ought to and need to, which is often antithesis to what we say we're doing when we're pursuing rightness.

DANNY LENNON:

Yeah, that's interesting, because quite a lot of talk to the friend of mine of how, for the longest time, for many years, I always thought of myself as this incredibly rational person and everything is based on reason and objectivity and this was kind of almost like my thing. And then certain things happen that kind of showed me that's not the case, and you start looking into it, and people told me a bit about – I don't know if you ever read the book Descartes' Error, it's a bit about António Damásio work, and essentially this idea that they talk about, the realization then just hit me that even when we think we are being rational, we're often still, we still made those decisions for emotional reasons but just had the capacity to retrospectively rationalize it. And so we trick ourselves to thinking we're more rational than we actually are, and that's hard for many of us including me to take, because I love rationality and reason, but realizing being that a 100% of the time is impossible.

JOHN BERARDI:

That's right, and I think it's again just part of the fundamental cognitive biases of humans. So let's say you're working with a client and they tell you, hey, my diet's really, really good. And then you actually unpack that and you do some kind of food recall and you realize what's actually happening is they're not actually intentionally lying to you, they just overrate the number of times that they ate well in a week and underrate the number of times they ate poorly. And then, in their mind, the conceptualization is, well, I ate really well this week. So if they eat well once in a day but two times poorly, the once they remember in the two times they forget and not for obvious

reasons. So we would notice that in, let's say, the nutritional recounting of a client, but we would fail to notice that in our own experience with rationality. In other words, we would remember each time we painstakingly reasoned out a decision, and we would forget the five to one times that we didn't, just like our clients would.

So I often love mining the things that were most annoyed with in clients when it comes to our specialty field across the whole scope of our lives; and it's often the things that we get most annoyed with, with our clients, that are the things we need to work on the most in ourselves outside of food and nutrition. So we praise rationality in our coaching or nutritional work or our research work in our day job, but then we fail to apply that rationality across the board in the areas that we are beginners at, where we are working hard and striving towards. And so, it's really fascinating to me, again, just some of these cognitive biases that we have. So then the question just becomes, and this is the danger for thinking people who love exploring all this is how do we live in a world where people are like that, including us, how do we operate. And for me, the only effective way of operating is in this, like somewhat uncomfortable place of always knowing that you can't be certain, of always qualifying that out loud, work for others because that's actually a relationship tool when you do it out loud. you admit the possibility that you don't know everything and it actually greases the social machinery in a super positive way, but also believing that deeply internally, like, I actually don't know. It's impossible for me to know a lot of the things that I base my decisions on in my daily life. And that's okay. I'm still going to move forward, I'm going to try things, my life will be an experiment and it's okay not to have rightness on my side, it's all right to treat it like an experiment, and I think the people that I've met like that are the most interesting people, they are much more likely to have meaningful discoveries and they are

much more likely to have meaningful relationships.

DANNY LENNON:

What it reminds me most of is one of my best friends and actually a coach here at Sigma Nutrition, Ciaran O' Regan, has written a few pieces for the site on uncertainty in the kind of idea within science. But what you just mentioned of realizing that uncertainty and that inability to know these things but still have to move forward, is kind of his key passion area, and he uses the term ignorance navigation, and he's actually – at the moment, he's just started a professional doctorate on this specific topic that he phrases as ignorance navigation and this idea of the only thing we can be certain of is that uncertainty. And I think accepting that first can be a bit uncomfortable, but then once you do it, it's kind of freeing because you could – like you say, you can then move forward from there and realize that the goal isn't to be always without any bias or not attached to any group or to have none of these things we've talked about, but instead it is to know that they're going to happen so can you be self-aware enough to take steps to try and account for that but still be able to navigate through the world.

JOHN BERARDI:

Well, that's it, and actually turn that, as to use your phrasing from earlier, into a feature versus a bug, like, I think precision nutrition has done remarkably well by using that idea as a feature – hey, we don't actually know, here's what the experience seems to suggest, here's what some of the research seems to suggest, we're experimenting and trying, we want to borrow ideas from the carnivore community, we want to borrow ideas from the keto community, we want to borrow ideas from the paleo community, we want to borrow ideas from the Mediterranean community and the plant-based community and the intermittent fasters and the frequent eaters. In other words, if all of them shared some kind of rightness, where would that rightness lie or utility, where would that utility lie, and how can we create a

system that has tolerance for all of them? We've often said, if you want to keto, we will help you keto better; if you want a plant-base, we'll help you plant-base better; and that I think is a feature, not a bug. And that I think recognizes that inherent uncertainty – like, to suggest that there's a singular path to health and wholesomeness is obviously folly. You have met people who follow a divergent set of eating principles and are all healthy, you've met a single person who's done all those divergent set of eating principles and has done well with each of them. So not only is it possible, there's just evidence all over the place, so then how do we be keen observers of all this and integrate it into a system as you mentioned earlier a process that can be helpful to everyone? It's part of my 30 years of work in my pre-precision nutrition and then my precision nutrition days, and boy, wouldn't it be nice to see more of that in the nutrition field?

DANNY LENNON:

Yeah, and I think, for a lot of good coaches, and I'm sure this is one of the tenets that is part of what you would coach people through, of we know intuitively, if I were to ask people from a nutrition coaching perspective, is it better to lay out a plan on day one for someone and let them go away and do that for six months and plan everything out in advance or are you going to assess things weekly make adjustments as you go and change things – everyone would go for option two. Well, of course, you're going to make adjustments as you get metrics back and feedback and so on, and that is part of this navigation of uncertainty that there are things that you can't plan ahead for, so complete top-down planning isn't going to work for that reason, there has to be some bottom-up implications for this. And then, so that's why you're going to have to use these adjustments, because you don't know what things are going to happen. And so, we use in that domain but we tend to not extrapolate out to this bigger idea of we're basically uncertain about everything.

JOHN BERARDI:

In the interest of sort of trying to explore some more empathic thinking, it's totally understandable why you would then constrain the range of possible adjustments to a more narrow range. And that's what people are doing when they say I coach keto or whatever. What they're saying is that I will outline a starting plan for my clients, I will respond dynamically with them based on their capabilities as well as their outcomes, but only within the range of this macronutrient profiling. You get why that would happen, like, if all possible tweaks in the universe were on the menu, it would be very difficult to decide what to do next. So I get it, however, I think we have to be very thoughtful about the constraints that we put on that response to outcome, and prevent it devolving into superstition versus sort of a more broad-minded, because what, again in Epstein's book, he talks about two kinds of problems, kind versus wicked. Kind problems our problems or circumstances where the rules are well-known, they don't change, and feedback is immediate. So areas where the 10,000-hour rule or where early specialization may be useful are areas like golf or chess where the rules aren't ever going to change and the feedback is immediate. But the domains where things are more complex, where the rules can and do often change, where feedback is delayed such that you can develop superstitions, like you're not actually getting true learning when the feedback isn't immediate, and when the rules have changed between when you did the action and the feedback, and nutrition and fitness coaching is often wicked, not kind, it's not immediate feedback. If you tweak someone's diets in the interest of weight loss or muscle gain, the response comes somewhere down the line, and the rules may have changed along the way, and we know that they do. For example, when you change caloric intake, there's a metabolic response. So there is no better definition of wicked conditions than nutrition and fitness coaching, which is why I think we come up with often superstitions rather than accurate conclusions.

DANNY LENNON:

Yeah, this is a topic I could talk about all day, but you've already been way, way too kind with your time already, John. So before I wrap up with the very kind of final question or so, one thing that I'm going to throw a big question, that I'm sorry for throwing at you, but if there is an overview of your thoughts on this, I'd be intrigued to know because I've been trying to collect ideas on this from many people I respect, and it comes down to the prevalence and rise in say, obesity rates over time, and more importantly, the lifestyle related chronic disease rates that come along with that. From your perspective, are you optimistic or pessimistic about the potential to effectively tackle this?

JOHN BERARDI:

I am pessimistic that the current paradigm will tackle it effectively, but optimistic that some kind of revolution will take place in how we treat or think about this that will reverse the trends. So I'll talk through this by way of analogy, there was a futurist who I believe in the late 60s, early 70s, was predicting that in 10 years' time, the population growth that was happening would lead to worldwide famine, collapse of governments and economic systems, basically just a societal collapse. So this was in late 60s, early 70s, and had written books about it, had loads of people believing, and there was an economist who challenged this, made a bet. And the bet was that in 30 years' time if they would basically track the cost of metals, so the trading price of metals, and if the cost went up, one guy was on the hook to pay the difference, and if the cost went down, the other guy was on the hook to pay the difference – metals being a gauge or some kind of proxy for the cost of resources. So in other words, if society collapsed, the cost of metals would go through the roof; and if it didn't, then the cost would stay the same or go down. And anyway, I mean, obviously, society hasn't collapsed the way that individuals were predicting, the rate of population growth has either flattened out or decreased, but it didn't



happen simply because the forces were all the same, changes in farming practices; certain population control parameters and other things changed the dynamics. There's a lot of discussion about climate change today, and the truth is, it is my belief is that the planet is in real trouble if we don't have some kind of breakthrough in carbon emissions and all the other things like contributing. But I also believe that breakthrough will happen.

So absence of breakthrough, planet screwed; with breakthrough, trajectory will change and we'll just have a new problem to face. I think we've seen this enough times to know that that's probably what's going to happen with obesity and chronic disease here. With obesity, we know it's multifactorial, but generally, we're looking at big shifts in energy balance, as a consequence, probably of societal moves towards less activity and more caloric availability, probably some physiological changes and environmental things are also affecting internal energy balance mechanisms, but the bottom line is this is what's happening. And I don't think just continuing to bang on the personal responsibility drum will ever have any ability to fix this. In other words, we need to get people choosing to move more and choosing to eat less. Personal responsibility, I don't think will fix this. What I think will is some major innovations or policy changes that will lead to or shape the path towards a correction of this sort of chronic imbalance of intake and output. So pessimistic that this current tech is going to do anything, optimistic that there'll be some shifts that change availability of food as well as need for movement.

DANNY LENNON:

I love that answer and I think, particularly, to reiterate a point that is at the center of any of these discussions, the idea around personal responsibility in this is one that immediately has to be addressed and say, look, this is not the center of the bullseye, this isn't going to do anything to help this by saying this is about

personal responsibility. And John, before I get to my final question I always run the show on, where can again people get hold of you online, where can they find your work, where is the best places for them to check out you and what you're going on?

JOHN BERARDI:

Sure, actually, the simplest thing for folks if they want to learn more might be to pop over to [johnberardi.com](http://johnberardi.com), I just launched a new website which kind of has all the things that I'm up to, all the divergent things. So folks who want to jump off from there, they can. If they're interested in the career stuff, they can come check us out at [changemakeracademy.com](http://changemakeracademy.com). And if they're interested in the nutrition stuff, they can come check us out at [precisionnutrition.com](http://precisionnutrition.com). But again, if they come see me at [johnberardi.com](http://johnberardi.com), they can jump off to either from there.

DANNY LENNON:

Perfect. And so, with that I'm going to throw at you the question I always end the show on, and this can be completely divorced from anything we've discussed throughout the day so far but it's simply, if you could advise 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?

JOHN BERARDI:

Great question, I always love this one. My answer seems to change every six months or so, and I usually find when I start thinking tactically, it's the wrong direction – meditate or some kind of tactical approach to it. This is going to be actually the opposite of most of the advice that I think people here in health and fitness and even business and career, nowadays we seem to be in the age of action. Everyone's telling you, you got to just take action, you want to get in shape, you got to try something, take action right now and get moving. And same with career in business, I don't love that advice, I think people do need to take action, it is the route of progress and personal and societal. But I also think that, as we talked about earlier, it's really easy to get busy taking

a bunch of actions that will lead to hard work and no outcome. And so, for me, the thing that I think people ought to do each day is carve aside some minutes for thought, for thoughtful reflection and planning. So if it's your nutrition, set aside a few minutes each day to think about how you can make it successful, what actions you will take today; how can I guarantee as Peter Drucker, the famous management writer, professor, would talk about for effectiveness even over efficiency – efficiency is getting a lot with the time you were allotted, effectiveness is getting the right things done the things that matter; and I think the only way to be effective in your nutrition plan, in your career, in your business is to be effective to spend your minutes on the things that matter, and the only way to figure that out is some time in quiet reflection. So that's my advice, the one thing people ought to do daily, quiet reflection, they should think about what the effective things are and the pathway to them, and that will save them a lot of busy work. They will end up, if they have grand plans with their body or their career, they will end up working hard; it would just be great to know that the things that they did while working hard will have mattered. And so that's where I go with this question.

DANNY LENNON:

Amazing. I think, especially nowadays, even those few minutes of quiet reflection we have almost no practice at anymore, because there's never any time where we have to be without any input essentially. There's no longer you're waiting in a queue in a shop where you have a few minutes for only your thoughts, that doesn't exist anymore because you have a smartphone and so on. So I think we almost lose that ability and it becomes difficult, and so, yeah, I am glad for the reminder of it because I don't do it nearly enough myself. So with that John, let me just say first, thank you so much for your time today, it's been an absolute pleasure to talk to you. I've really, really enjoyed this conversation.

Ep 301 John Berardi

JOHN BERARDI:

Thanks Danny. I appreciate it. I thank you for the conversation also. It's been amazing to explore some of these topics with someone that they matter to, that isn't like, hmm, that's an interesting idea, but, I have thought about that a lot, let's dig in man. So that's been a real pleasure. Also congratulations to you on all the great work you're doing, this successful run of this fantastic podcast. Again, some of my colleagues at Precision Nutrition and across the industry, speak of it as one of their favorite ones to do, and I think that's a real testament when your peers are talking about your work as something that they look to as inspiration, and also that they just flat-out enjoy being a part of. So congratulations to you, it makes me super proud to watch your path to this point. And to everyone listening, thank you for spending the time with us today as well, I hope you've got something out of it.

**Are you subscribed to the Sigma Synopsis?**

Get it free here: <https://sigmanutrition.com/sigma-synopsis/>