

SAMPLE  
TRANSLATION

NARA PETROVIČ  
HUMAN INSTRUCTIONS  
FOR USE

PUBLISHED BY: SANJE, 2014

TRANSLATED BY: JEAN MCCOLLISTER

ORIGINAL TITLE: ČLOVEK: NAVODILA ZA UPORABO: VSE, KAR  
JE TREBA VEDETI. PIKA

NUMBER OF PAGES: 230

---

## Nara Petrovič: Human Instructions For Use

### Preface

#### WE HAVE FORGOTTEN HOW TO BE ANIMALS

You are probably aware that you can't buy health by buying a book. To tell the truth, you can't buy it by buying medicine either. Balanced natural habits are the sole backbone of health, while artificial habits constitute the substance of disease. Once health is wasted, it can only be earned back—both individually and collectively. That's the key to healing all diseases, as well as the underlying theme of this book.

I have heard many lectures and examined a multitude of publications about unique, outstandingly effective healing methods based on both traditional and modern medical sciences, I have witnessed unbelievable advances in medical efficacy in recent decades, and yet society is clearly becoming increasingly overwhelmed with illnesses.

Our culture and science must be overlooking something! Trying to fix health with drugs, diets and sports doesn't seem to work, especially in the long run and for the majority of modern diseases. Why? My answer may take you by surprise: People have forgotten how to be animals.

The "animality" of human beings is neglected by the experts whose advice you seek and whose medical prescriptions you take. Your health can't be really solid if you don't use your bodily organs in a natural manner—as a human-animal would do it. Since you've forgotten that and covered your natural habits with cultural norms, since you can't use your own self anymore as it ought to be used, no amount of medical treatment can assure you lasting and stable health from early childhood to old age.

The only solution to this problem is accepting and adopting your animality again, reviving the ancient memory still preserved in your genes. When I ask you to become an animal, I'm not inviting primitiveness, crudeness, senselessness, anarchy, I'm inviting you to overcome cultural "humanness" and merge the animal and the divine together into real humanness. So far you have called yourself a "human being" to be distinguished from the rest of life; now try calling yourself an "animal" first to re-establish the lost connection with life. You will thus restore the entirety of your identity as a genuine human being.

## Introduction

### THE POWER OF HOW

This book came into being by defecation. In 2005 I decided to write a witty little article on the harmfulness of sitting toilets—a topic I never encountered in any health magazine or book. It turned out to be the most popular article on health I'd written to date.

The articles that followed were just as thrilling as the first one, examining a wide range of natural habits, analyzing them through unbiased insight into human anatomy. Reliable scientific resources were scarce so I had to rely on traditional knowledge from various cultures and on my own experiences over two decades.

Practicing the natural way of defecation all those years helped me gain trust in the wisdom of the human body. I learned to allow myself to breathe, sit, eat, walk, work, hear, look, etc., according to my body's anatomy.

It wasn't easy at first. In going from knowing what's right to doing what's right I stumbled upon conservative social norms which expected me to silently conform. I started challenging those norms with common sense and rational arguments; I gradually compiled a list of senseless habits and obstinate prejudices which are so ingrained in our culture that they became invisible. Not only do we not question them, we're not even aware they exist!

Until that time I was just as blind to these adverse habits as everybody else. Nobody ever told me it actually mattered how my basic bodily needs are met. It didn't seem possible there could be anything harmful about the way I do casual everyday things. But unraveling my body's inherent wisdom lead me to the conclusion it did matter a lot how I eat, sit, work, defecate, etc.

*#Curious things, habits. People themselves never knew they had them.*

-- *Agatha Christie*

People tend to take their way of life for granted—nowadays this means dwelling in square rooms among chairs and tables and shelves laden with nonfunctional property, staring into electronic screens all day long, moving around in steel carriages, wearing particular clothes for every occasion, evaluating everything with paper bills, eating from plastic plates, defecating into drinking water.

As I realized that most of these modern habits are unreasonable, and many of them are even harmful, I began replacing them with natural habits, thereby gradually transforming my way of life. Years of practice proved beyond any doubt that there is only one healthy way of using the human body, and that is according to its inherent anatomy. For some reason every single culture in the world got carried away from the organic use of the human body as it developed an increasingly complex social structure and system of norms.

Thus seemingly insignificant basic habits got detached from their natural way; anomalous habits crept in one after another, insidiously undermining human health, resilience and wisdom. In the present age the instinct of how to live is covered by thick layers of programmed, involuntary behaviors. There is hardly any awareness of minute and gross repetitive patterns that constitute our hours, days and weeks.

What we're not aware of, we can't change. What we can't change has power over us. Over centuries ignorance of the organic how has crippled the physical health of the entire civilization. Our ancestors considered this knowledge too marginal to have it documented for future generations, and even those bits of it that had been documented got devastated in inter-cultural clashes and destructive wars.

That's why such knowledge is rare in historical records. It can only be reconstructed from bits and pieces that didn't get lost, or from natural habits preserved in remote tribes, or from new research of the organic functions of the human body.

My intention in writing this book was to stir up such research and to encourage readers to take a critical stance towards their present everyday habits, no matter how innocent they may seem. Only when you try something different can you have a choice between the new and the old, and to sensibly say which one is better.

One more thing has to be said at the beginning of this book. Although we're all anatomically pretty much the same, we're also very diverse. Each individual is a unique universe. My experience can't always match your experience, so don't take anything for granted. I am not presenting any kind of absolute realization or scientific axiom, I am merely inviting you to allow yourself to go down into the denied layers of yourself, and to track down the lost bits and pieces of the how of the unique human being that you are.

If you find my writing challenging to your cultural norms, religious beliefs or personal habits, please don't feel offended. Don't forget, I may be wrong. But let experience, not your sheer convictions, be the judge of your practices. Your convictions may change, but the basic anatomy of your body will stay the same. Don't use your reason just to confirm what you already

know, use it to measure what's right. Only stupid laws prohibit people from being what they really are.

*#The universe does not have laws. It has habits. And habits can be broken.*

*-- Tom Robbins*

If you read this book with an adventurous spirit it will point the way out of the maze of complexities created to distract you from what's really important. Your habits, your how, is where the roots of your health and happiness lie.

Once these roots tear apart the plastic pot into which they had been squeezed, they will grow wide in the limitless soil beneath, rootlet merged with other rootlets, strong, nurtured and connected.

What will happen then? Do you really want to know? Then keep your mind open and turn the page...

## Part I

### HEAD AGAINST THE WALL

I used to meander through life not ever wondering how I ought to live. Civilizational habits created a huge wall between me and what I now call natural habits and rhythms. I lost touch with the essence of physical health, thereby breaking down mental, social and spiritual balance as well. Artificial habits are such an integral part of the western lifestyle, I never thought about them in terms of good and bad. I never stopped to consider whether it was sensible to live that way or not.

Many years later I choose habits with insight into human anatomy. I haven't reached any ideal state and I am not trying to; I am merely doing what my experience shows to be right. My life became an experiment which taught me there is no need for us to stop using motor vehicles, mobile phones, computers, electric tools, plastic. What we have to do is to make an end to them using us.

One other thing I learned is: austerity is not a viable solution. Renouncing things you need, or even the things you think you need, is psychologically and socially damaging. It will only make the cravings for those things worse and break relationships. Far better is to see through the cultural blunders of our entire civilization and experience the joy of doing things differently.

Let me illustrate this with a story about our world.

One day I woke up in a strange place. It was a small room with no windows and only one door. I heard loud thumping knocks from the other room. I opened the door and it led me to a large, bright room. To my astonishment, there were people there hitting their heads against the wall.

They all looked at me and I felt awkward – a stranger among big-headed people.

I asked them why they were hitting their heads against the wall, and they explained that this is their way of sobering up in the morning and sometimes in the afternoon too.

I asked, "Wouldn't it be easier to have a cup of coffee or tea?" "What is coffee?" they wondered.

After three days people started noticing that I never hit my head against the wall. (First they thought I was joking!) They kept asking me why not.

By that time I noticed how impaired their sight, hearing and smell were. They had thick foreheads, all right, but what I overheard were complaints about pain in the neck.

I asked them politely if they ever questioned their habit. Did they investigate the relationship between their health problems and their everyday habit?

They got upset and began to defend their habit fiercely, giving logical arguments, scientific proof, experts' opinions, sayings and quotes.

They weren't able to snap out of it. Not because they lacked common sense but because their sense was too common.

*#The greatest pleasure in life is doing what people say you cannot do.*

*-- Walter Bagehot*

Maybe hitting your head against the wall seems too gross and self-harming to be compared with any of our everyday habits. However, when I thoroughly examined the cultural habits of my society I had to admit that they don't fall far behind.

I was born into a myriad of routines and lived with them all my life; I took their side effects as intrinsic to normal living and social acceptance. But when I took a step back and scrutinized carefully my habits' ramifications, I was shocked by their cumulative effect. So much so that hitting one's head against a wall a few times a day seemed like a harmless folk custom, particularly if all my other habits—as highlighted in this book—were in line with the anatomy of body, mind and spirit.

## 1. Holistic health

What was I to do with the realization that “cultural” social norms

interfered with every single bodily function of the human-animal? I had to try out something differently, more naturally: including breathing, drinking, eating, sleeping, sex, defecation, even standing, sitting, lying down and exercising.

Until then I wasn't aware how much my bodily functions had been altered from their simple, primal form, how metabolism and immunity suffered. My friends bombarded me with anti-propaganda regarding processed food, chemicals, electromagnetic pollution, smoking, drinking, pharmaceutical products etc. but there was hardly any mention of the simple civilizational habits, hidden behind casual everyday items such as sitting toilets, chairs, tables, shoes, toothbrushes, calendars, etc.

Humans may be the most intellectually developed creatures on Earth; however, physically we are still animals. Our anatomy hasn't changed substantially for thousands of years, but our modern lifestyles couldn't be further away from how nature intended us to live. This led me to ask myself: How would human-animals live if there were no cultural biases? How would this affect our (holistic) health?

Scientific, popular and alternative medical literature attempts to define key constituents of health, but they fail to show even an elementary understanding of what the natural anatomy of the human body is, and why supporting the natural use of this anatomy is the key pillar of health.

Most doctors understand that inner and outer imbalances foster diseases, but scientific solutions go only as far as offering models of proper diet and exercise, suggesting avoidance of stress and changing such obviously harmful habits as smoking, drinking and overeating. When it comes to a holistic definition of health—bodily, mentally, spiritually and socially—the cultural bias of most scientists turns out to be too deep to allow objectivity.

Holistic thinking doesn't go well with being an expert, for to become an expert you need to undergo specialization. It's almost impossible to find a doctor capable of getting to the roots of each individual's troubles, which consist of psychosomatic, metabolic, habitual, socially conditioned, and then only bacterially or virally actuated diseases.

The holistic perception of life, as it is defined in various books, is mostly theoretical, sometimes philosophical, sometimes religious, sometimes scientific and sometimes esoteric, but rarely reflected in the practicalities of everyday life.

For quite some time modern medicine focused on isolated issues and attempted to fix them without considering the whole. Real healing is healing the whole. It is impossible to actually heal any part of the whole, if in the process I disturb the balance in any other part—either within or without.

I used to be a naive idealist, believing that people are smart enough to want good for themselves and to avoid the things that would harm them. Years later I am a hardheaded realist



---

who understands why people don't do what's good for them. I am deeply aware of the power of society. I can see when it steers us away from health and by what means.

But should I write about the subtleties of these issues? Or should I merely list what we do wrong and what the consequences are and let the readers draw conclusions? I think it will be helpful to elaborate on the roots of the problem in the beginning of the book— that's why the title of Part One is "Head Against the Wall".

## Natural ethics

A while ago I heard a story about a girl whose mother insisted that she had to chop off the edges of sausages before frying them in a pan. She was told that was how her grandmother used to cook it. The girl was curious as to what the actual reason was. She went to ask her grandmother only to learn that this custom had started with her great- grandmother. She traveled far to get to the old people's home. When she approached the gray lady and asked her why the ends of sausages needed to be chopped off before frying them, the girl was stunned by her reply: "I thought by now you'd get yourself a bigger pan!"

Quite often the prevailing morals don't relate to our everyday reality, they are just senseless repetitions of lifeless habits. Let's put it this way: the how of our ethics is quite often unreasonable. Genuine natural ethics are impossible in a society which insists on people thoughtlessly repeating outdated, meaningless routines—routines we experience at every step: at the table, in bed, on the street, in churches, shops, restaurants, schools, hospitals...

When I tried to step out of line I experienced strange feelings of shame, distrust, self-blame. My head was full of self-punishing thoughts and the main reason for this had to do with my ethical programming, my value system. None of my rational arguments worked when I tried to explain my decision to others. They wanted me to conform to the how of the rest of the society.

People often notice my bare feet and become curious about them. Sometimes I upset the security staff simply by not wearing shoes. Every now and then I am not allowed to enter a shop, an office, a museum, a sacral building. Even if I explain to the guards, calmly and rationally, how harmless my bare feet are, they insist that it is against some code or law or etiquette to be

barefoot on their premises. This is not true, of course, it is pure discrimination. I don't blame them for their ignorance. They are simply expressing our common unwritten ethical code, which allows bare feet on very rare occasions. We all have a sense of when it is appropriate to be barefoot and when it is out of the question and we're expected to conform.

Whoever dares to point out the irrationality of dress codes and other "prescribed" behaviors based on cultural or business "ethics" is reminded that culture doesn't change easily. Those who have the nerve to live out of the box of the socially approved behaviors are seen as queer or dingbats. A reader of my book once told me: "I can accept that you go around barefoot, that you squat on the toilet, that you brush your teeth with a twig, but it is totally unacceptable for me that you don't use toilet paper."

I didn't even ask why.

I've noticed in recent decades how the concept of conforming to nature is surfacing strongly enough to be taken seriously by our civilization. Many people all around the world are aware we have to consider nature and not just exploit it. When the harm that humans did to the environment began to kick back and strike us in the neck, that's when we started thinking about laws to protect it. And when we started thinking about that we also started to notice where we went wrong.

Society can't exist without a natural background and its constituents. I read a story about an atheist scientist coming to God and saying: "There's nothing so special about what you did. I can compete with you in creation!" God said: "OK, let's begin." The atheist replied:

"Right. Take this piece of dirt..." but God interrupted him: "Wait, you make your own dirt!"

Society is nature. Trying to move away from nature and put high fences between groups of people and the rest of nature will only bring harm to both people and the rest of the environment. Human beings need natural forms, sounds, tastes, smells, sensations.

Take all of these away and gray cities will remain with very few items that give satisfaction. Compare living in a block of flats and living in a wooden hut by the forest and you will immediately feel the difference, even in your imagination. It is difficult to scientifically explain all the factors that constitute the difference between those two living conditions. The quality of air, food, working environment are just the surface. Down below lie innumerable factors that can never be measured or experimentally assessed. What can be felt is a different

atmosphere, “vibration,” a different how. Living conditions determine not only health and peacefulness but also philosophical understanding, world view, and the sense of ethics.

Natural ethics begin with the awareness of dependence on nature and on protecting it for the sake of survival of both humans and the nature. If we put society before nature, we degrade both.

Children are usually educated in urban centers; what they get to know there is exclusively society. Natural sciences are nothing but a system of human theories of nature, and not nature as it is, as something experienced directly, spontaneously, intuitively. The educational system prepares children to enter society and perform the function of a small cog in a giant machine (this artificial process is called socialization), it never prepares them to enter and support the natural environment as an individual living being born with unique natural potential. I call this organic process naturalization.

People adopt social manners from their society; to learn natural manners you have to live within nature. Social order and ethical norms are a practical necessity, but they shouldn't exclude natural norms. Actually, the later should be the basis for the first.

For centuries individuals with somewhat higher awareness have attempted to change the world by preaching a holy gospel of absolute ethics laid out by an absolute being, usually called God. However, the message that comes from the mouth of the preacher doesn't register the same in the minds of the people he preaches to; people understand what they are told according to their conditioning. Understanding is hardly ever a matter of choice, especially when it comes to ethics.

For human beings there are only two states of consciousness in which they are perfectly harmless for the rest of nature: living like an animal as our prehistoric ancestors used to live (according to the prevailing historical theories), or living in the awareness of the wholeness of life on Earth, or in the universe. All other states in between these two extremes carry with them a certain degree of hazard for the whole.

I've been thinking about the number of atomic bombs and other weapons on the planet and the intensity of tension between opposing nations; I looked into history and tried to depict how hazardous humanity was to the planet – my conclusion was that the last century was definitely the lowest point on the curve.

With the ecological movement stronger than ever the curve is slowly heading back up towards less harm. Going down was reckless and exploitative—humans aimed at extracting the

maximum gain with the minimum input. To move up will demand special effort and global responsibility.

I can't say how soon this movement will gain real momentum, but I see clearly where it is emerging: in small eco-communities.

The ethical progress of each community can easily be “measured” by *these two factors taken together*: by what their identity gravitates most strongly towards—their individual self, family, kin, city, nation, religion, race, humanity or the entirety of life... and by how receptive they are to simplicity and “animality” (as outlined in this book).

Development of consciousness has been discussed in so many books and from so many viewpoints that there is little need to go much further here. I touched upon this concept right at the beginning of the book because it constitutes the axis of the how of the human-animal.

I feel that going through the most harmful stages is a part of the evolution of consciousness, and thus of ethics. Towards the end there comes acceptance of all the goodness that was present in all stages, and reconciliation with all the badness; without pride and arrogance, without blame and guilt. You can't accept who you are now if you don't accept who you've been before. The circle gets sealed when your divinity and your animality meet. That's when holiness stops being a social designation and becomes a spontaneous expression of ingenuity without any names; one who claims to be a saint is not. Ultimately ethics lose a rigid form and become a dance.

Nature doesn't need strictly formulated definitions to be ethical. What we call good and evil are only waves of life. Interfering with the waves is the common denominator of all the harm that people cause to the whole. Conscience is given to us to sense right from wrong in order to balance our intentions and behaviors with the natural order.

Complex social forces draw human beings away from the natural order. Societies construct dozens of unnatural rituals, norms, morals etc.; so they lose touch with the waves of life. Thusly is born evil.

Nature knows birth, health, youth and happiness, but it also knows death, disease, old age and pain. The first four represent beginnings, ability and prosperity, while the last four represent end, waning and suffering, but that doesn't make them good or bad. Human perception and interpretation make them such. Admittedly, all organisms have a survival instinct that prefers the first four over the last four, and this is natural; problems occur only within social ethics.

When a doctor prolongs the life of a dying patient this is not necessarily a sign of virtuous humaneness: it can just as well be blind following of customs, habits and fears by both the doctor and the patient.

There are as many variations of social ethics as there are people on the planet within various societal patterns. Some contrasting views simply can't be reconciled on the level of social ethics, and conflicts are nothing but a logical consequence. Just take a look at the polemics on abortion, euthanasia, polygamy, genetic engineering, religious morals, etc. It is not difficult to notice that the debates become quite heated when some small issue has a strong meaning for the identity of a culture or religion, even as nobody gets that emotionally affected by huge issues that are either new or marginal and thus don't represent the identity of a society.

*#Jews and Muslims have more in common than any other religion ever. Neither Jews nor Muslims eat pork or celebrate Christmas, they both use 'hrr' in the pronunciation, they both yell on the phone when there's no emergency. The only difference between Muslims and Jews is that Jews never like to spend any money and Muslims never have any money to spend.*

-- Ahmed Ahmed

People tend to cling to their convictions, they go to war for them, and they even use scientific discoveries to defend them. Still, cultural variations are good. Folk customs and habits are like colorful spices that make individuals and communities distinct and interesting! However, it should be admitted that they are just additions, ornaments to what human beings basically are. Harmless ornaments are perfectly acceptable, but when they interfere with the normal functioning of the human body, or when they are used to harm others, any reasonable person would agree they should be shunned.

*#Never try to reason the prejudice out of a man. It was not reasoned into him, and cannot be reasoned out.*

-- Sydney Smith

If we see everything, both alive and inert, as a big whole, parts of which are very intricately interconnected, then it is ethical to contribute to any part of the whole and unethical to cause more harm to it than what's necessary for our own survival.

When I think of natural balance and true prosperity I feel it is of utmost importance to understand our true needs and to take from the environment only as much as we actually need, not more. That is the basic rule of the natural ethics.

For sustenance and wholesome growth we need very little, but in the present lifestyle the list of “vital necessities” includes electricity for all the devices we use, fuel for all the machines, complex infrastructure, telephones, computers, cars, chemicals, medicines, fashionable clothes. The growing human population consumes more and more every day, thus burdening the planet far beyond its natural regenerative capacities.

The rules of natural ethics can't be violated without destructive consequences. Current human civilizations can go on destroying the planet for only a limited time, because this destruction unavoidably brings the destruction back to the civilization. I have heard cynics say that the Earth can manage without people but people can't manage without the Earth. I must disagree. Human beings are the agents of the intelligence of nature, an intrinsic part of all life; it is only when we use intelligence over nature that the destruction begins.

When trying to coin a concise formula of natural ethics to use as a guideline in my own life, this is what I came up with: *take only as much as you really need; don't harm anything unnecessarily.*

When I look around I see all living beings (except humans) abiding by this simple rule. And they don't spend their lives fearing death! It's true they instinctively keep fighting for survival till their last breath, they might even impulsively cause a lot of death, but they know nothing about the fear of eternal condemnation that poisoned the human mind centuries ago. The fear still lingers while its object has changed—we don't fear hell anymore as our ancestors did, our frightful demon is nonexistence. We only pretend to be reconciled with it, but we're not.

Our sense of identity has always been strongly determined by our social function, our occupation; it always corresponded to the means of production and consumption in a particular society. The present consumerist society makes people perceive their identity as something separate from everything else. No object in our reality is outside the ever expanding net of supply and consumption.

The system tries to break apart everything it finds into smaller and smaller pieces, to refashion it, re-mold it, put it together in new artificial forms and sell it. This fragmentation of reality strongly influences our sense of identity. That's why we are not able to perceive the holistic character of the universe and our natural role in it. Our ethical understanding becomes perverted as well, and ultimately we can't even sense what is normal and what is abnormal.

## Normal?

In the textbook *Pathology, Pathological Physiology and the Basics of Internal Medicine I* read the following lines: “Ordinarily everything that isn’t ‘normal’ is considered as ill. How is the normal state determined? Normal values (of any factor) are those average values that have been measured in large groups of people. Certain small deviations from average values are still normal.”

I can agree with the first part which basically says it’s not normal to be ill, but I can’t agree with the rest. If to be normal (and thus healthy) means to fit inside the average, then it is healthy to have regular headaches, colds, seasonal flus, it is healthy to be chronically ill after the age of forty or fifty and to use dozens of medications daily to fight high blood pressure, periodontitis, osteoporosis, diabetes, ulcers, cancers and hundreds of other “modern” diseases. All this is perfectly normal for average citizens of “developed” countries. According to this definition

it is abnormal to shine in full health and vitality at the age of eighty or even a hundred; not to mention eight or ten.

*#Of all the self-fulfilling prophecies in our culture, the assumption that aging means decline and poor health is probably the deadliest.*

*-- Marilyn Ferguson*

From my research I concluded that diseases are not just those bodily conditions that are sufficiently abnormal to attract the attention of general physicians’ diagnoses. Health ends much earlier than diagnoses begin.

Even WHO defines “health as a state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity.” In the book *100% Health* Patrick Holford defines health as an organism’s functioning in its full capacity, and the ability to positively adjust to changing circumstances in life. Other definitions of health include the ability to maintain inner balance (homeostasis), to be socially and economically productive, to attend to one’s true needs in harmonious interaction with the environment, etc.

All these definitions make sense from the perspective of a socially standardized understanding of health. But taking into account our intrinsic biological characteristics, our human-animal anatomy, such definitions prove inadequate. Their basic measure of health is not the balanced existence of the human being with the natural environment. Such an existence

can be achieved and maintained only if all our needs are met in the particular way that is “programmed” into our body, otherwise we won’t be able to maintain the balance for long.

*#To me good health is more than just exercise and diet. It’s really a point of view and a mental attitude you have about yourself.*

*-- Angela Lansbury*

There is of course no ideal state of health that would apply to everybody. Nothing ever stays fixed for long, everything fluctuates, transforms, flows. Health is therefore always relative. We saw how difficult it is to find a concise yet all-encompassing theoretical definition of normal health, but the problems become even worse when you take a look at diagnostic practice.

Go to the doctor and check it out for yourself. You might have a stiff spine and joints, limp muscles, blocked intestines, a weak immune system, bad teeth, poor circulation, a number of allergies, lung problems, impaired sight and hearing, you might be very sensitive to cold and heat, moody, emotionally lost, unable to be really creative, etc. but the doctor you visit won’t encourage you to act on these immediately, if you are still able to go to work every day and perform your casual duties at home.

I can understand the doctor: he has lots of work with the “serious” patients. The measures rarely precede the symptoms (fever, inflammation, nausea); they usually invite worrisome diagnoses in Latin (furunculosis, coccidiosis, scrofulosis). In the absence of clear symptoms the doctor will prescribe general “preventive” pills, perhaps direct you to some therapy and reproach you regarding your diet, exercise, smoking and drinking.

Do you see anywhere in this description the underlying proposition that health is the well-being of the organism, functioning at its full capacity? Of what use is fixing the roof and facade if the foundation keeps on rotting? What is the foundation of your health, anyway?

I would say the foundation is your everyday habits. Your habits are the canvas of your reality. However, the present lifestyle makes this foundation very unnatural and unhealthy.

Later on in the book I will elaborate on the key elements that give shape to the foundation of natural well-being. From this a new definition of health will spring up. But before we get to that I should explain why I find the previously mentioned definitions of health inadequate and why our perception of what it means to be healthy and normal is so distorted.