

# Fasting

Post by "Eikadistes" of August 9, 2019 at 2:42 PM

Being hypoglycemic, fasting becomes dangerous for me within 4-6 hours.

This is a good example of the importance of the individualized, hedonic calculus.

I tend to identify with Cassius, that I associate fasting with Christian monasticism and Indian ascetic practices, which marginalize the importance of the body. Clearly though, there seem to be reasonable applications.

I suspect our general capacity to tolerate *fasting* corresponds with the evolution of hunter-gatherers and agriculturalists. Hunter-gatherers would have had to have adapted to days of movement without significant calorie intake. If we weren't engineered to "fast" at a certain level, we would never have made effective hunters. Similarly, agriculturalists had to wait for the maturation of crops; a dry season could lead to a dangerous decrease in calorie intake. *Fasting* --as a physical act, removed from the theological context--seems to be a trait that many humans would have been forced into through multiple periods of natural history. It seems likely that a large portion of contemporary people have inherited this tolerance.

So, even though my mind associates [ *fasting* = *illness* ], it seems reasonable that others could benefit from whichever physiological switches *click* according to the anticipated response in our bodies--**BINGO**. I didn't even mean to use that word, but, again, it seems automatic to acknowledge that our genetic nature "*anticipates*" the possibility of fasting, and is geared to respond to the emergence of this possibility according to billions of years of genetic "*anticipation*".

Surely, there are some positives to fasting for many.