

The Primal Blueprint Podcast – Episode #43: Interview with Jonathan Bailor, Author and Founder of Sane Solution

Topic timestamps:

Why he does what he does: 02:01

If we know what works: 04:13

It's not about calories only: 07:07

We used to die of natural causes: 09:50

Get out of your own way/Humans are robust naturally: 11:42

Familial predisposition cannot be overlooked: 13:50

Hereditary diabetes: 16:13

Scientific issue not a moral issue: 19:09

Operating on a biochemical level: 20:02

Complicated biology made easy: 22:40

How much is thought involved in weight loss? : 24:43

Yo-yo dieting studies: 27:30

Exercise vs. activity: 33:34

Bipedalism: 35:29

Exercise prescription: 37:18

Sane Solution: 38:21

Brad: Hi, listeners. We are so glad to have you back. We have an exciting special guest today. I do mean exciting because I have listened to this guy rock it on podcasts and the positive energy and the information that comes out is very entertaining. We are so honored to have Jonathan Bailor here. Jonathan, are you there?

Jonathan: I am and I am excited to be here to bring positivity and excitement.

Brad: If you don't know Jonathan and you have just come out from under that rock, he is a New York Times bestselling author and the found of sanesolution.com. He is a nutrition and exercise expert and former personal trainer who specializes in using modern science and technology to simplify health. He has collaborated with top scientists for over ten years analyzing over 1300 studies and garnering endorsements from top doctors and scientists from Harvard Medical School, Johns Hopkins, and UCLA. That is what I like about you, Jonathan. You have that plain talk and that enthusiasm but also very steeped in science. I am going to bring in another one of our popular experts on the podcast...welcome, Mark Sisson. Hey, Jonathan Bailor. Thanks for calling me popular. You are the only one that knows that, right?

Mark: Hey, Jonathan. How's it going, man?

Jonathan: Hi Mark. It is a pleasure to talk with you again.

Mark: [00:02:01] Likewise. I want to get in to your background a little bit and what I want to understand in this podcast is why you do what you do.

Jonathan: Good question. It's been a long road. I started out doing what everyone else does. It is a similar story but I think most people in this smarter food quality movement which is we are steeped in the conventional wisdom. I was a trainer and I was making my living telling people to eat less and exercise more. The very seminal moment that I had that was unique to me, though, was while I was a trainer, I had the opposite goal of most of my clients. I wanted to get bigger. I want to be a big college football player so I was consuming about 6000 calories per day in an effort to gain weight. I was between 18 and 21 at this time. I was working with clients who were predominantly female, moms, and grandmothers often and they had the exact opposite goal. They wanted to get smaller so I did what I was taught as a trainer. I put them

on 1200 calories diets and had them do way more cardio than I would ever dream of doing. In that moment, I wasn't getting bigger, and they weren't getting smaller. We were both just getting sick and sad. Like anyone who is in the field of helping people, if you feel that you are not helping and activity hurting them, it would behoove you to take a step back and reevaluate the approach you are using. That's what I did and that is what sent me on this ten-plus-year journey of complete geeking out and hard-core academic research. I was an engineer by trade so I loved reconstructing very complicated technical problems and working with very technical people to make their information accessible to everyone. That is what I did at Microsoft for ten years and that is what I am doing at Biology Now with that same solution. That is how I got so inspired to do this. I saw first-hand that both just eating more doesn't make people bigger, in and of itself. And just eating less doesn't make people smaller, in and of itself. There has to be something more going on. I wanted to figure out what that was.

Mark: [00:04:13] All right. The question that follows, almost obviously, is: If we know what doesn't work, do we know what does work?

Jonathan: It is a lot harder to find out what does work than what doesn't work. There are a lot of ways to build a bridge that will collapse. There are only a couple of ways to build a bridge that will withstand the test of time. I think we are learning more and more and more what works. I think, Mark, as you obviously cover so well in your work, we have a great starting point. We can say, "Look. It's not as if having 70 percent of your population being overweight, has been with us since the beginning of time. It is not as if we used to have 40 million children under the age of 5 being overweight. It is not as if one out of every four people have always been diabetic or pre-diabetic. In fact, it used to be one out of every 4000 people. The earliest recorded rates of obesity in this country were sub-three percent from the early 1900s from military records. So we do know that there is a right approach. We don't know necessarily if there is one right approach for everybody but I think if we just turn the clock back and say, as obvious as it sounds, "What did we do prior to having the problem and can that point us to how to solve the problem now? That can really get us headed in the right direction.

Mark: Right. It is interesting if I go back to my school days, the cliché now is that we had "one fat kid in school." It was an anomaly and all the other kids were, what we would call average. The incidence of obesity was definitely far less than it is today. Even in Southern California where I reside, we sort of have a little bit skewed look on the world because people are in to fitness here more than they are in the rest of America. It is still a huge problem. So you and I have talked in the past about this concept that seems to drive the conventional wisdom that calories in and calories out discussion and the last podcast we did together, I mentioned to you that my take on that was that it was more calories stored vs. calories burned. In other words there were so many nuances to what you ate and how much exercise you did and some of it had to do with, what I would consider, the hormonal effect of food. That is every bite of food that you take in has a hormonal impact on the body with the different hormones that are being called into play. Do you agree with that concept or how is your take on this alike or different from that?

Jonathan: [00:07:07] Mark, you are one of the few people who cover the gray area here very well. Most people want to say, "It's calories in and calories out so why are we even talking about this? So clearly, obvious." No. It is not about calories at all. That is not what I am saying and that is not what you are saying. What we are saying is focusing on calories is the wrong thing to focus on. There are relevant, but they are only marginally relevant when you focus on the right things. The reason that they can actually become counter-productive is they can cause take our focus off that which really matters. So it is not, like you said, that it is calories in and calories out equation doesn't exist. It does exist.

But imagine, let's say, your favorite sports team just lost a game. I live in Seattle so let's look at the Seattle Seahawks. Say they are the defending Super Bowl Champions and on the off chance, they lost a game. There is a press conference after the game. The media is really angry with the coach. They ask the coach, "Why did you lose the game?" The coach looks down and gets a really confused look on his face and looks up at the reporter and says, "Well, the other team scored more points than we did. In the future our plan is to let them score less and we are going to score more." We would look at that coach and you are a fool. We get that. We understand that. We are really asking a different question. The same thing applies when we talk about weight gain.

One more analogy is someone struggling with psychological issues. Imagine they go to a psychiatrist. They say, "I am depressed. I have some personal crises taking place in my life. It has been a struggle." The psychiatrist looks at him like he is stupid. He says, "Look. I have seen happy people. You just need to frown less and smile more. What is your problem?" We understand, yes. But if someone is gaining fat, by definition, they are storing more calories than they are burning. But what we are really asking are deeper questions like, "If someone has 100 pounds of surplus fat on their body, why does their brain ever tell them to eat?" They have an abundance of energy already stored in their body so what we are really asking is why are some people perpetually driven to eat more calories than they "need" and then, there are some people like me (this is how my journey started) who, no matter how many calories we eat, we can't seem to store more than we are burning. That is the real question.

Mark: [00:09:50] Okay. That is the real question. Now in the smarter sciences and in the Sane Solution, do you have an answer?

Jonathan: We can certainly influence the amount of calories that our body burns at baseline. There is a large genetic component. This is not a popular thing to talk about but the research is quite clear that about 45 to 70 percent of our baseline body composition is highly, highly genetically predetermined. It doesn't mean we are hopeless. The way your face looks is really highly genetically predetermined, but it doesn't mean you can't make yourself more or less attractive. It just means you have a hand you have been dealt and you need to do the best with that. So can everyone be 6 feet 5 inches and have a six-pack? Absolutely not. Can everyone be healthy and fit for the long term? Absolutely.

As you talk about in your work, Mark, this is about not getting in your body's way. We have been given this diatribe of we're broken and, unless we intervene, we are going to become diabetic, and we are going to become sick, and we are going to become sick by default, which, of course is ridiculous. The most common cause of death up until the current few generations was "natural causes." We don't hear about that any more but people used to just die quietly in their sleep. Everyone dies of a disease today. That didn't used to be the case. So really if we just don't break our body.....what do you do to keep your car running for 300,000 miles. You just don't do stuff to break it. The car is designed to do that. You just have to give it things it needs to survive. If we can focus our lifestyle on things that don't break our body, the wrong quality of inputs, then will maintain the default state for humanity which is to be healthy and fit long term.

Mark: [00:11:42] That is interesting because one of my *Primal Blueprint Laws* is "avoid poisonous things." What you seem to be saying here is that this is more of a question of getting out of our own way and avoiding the bad things than it is trying to discover some magic, all encompassing food that is going to save humanity. In other words.....I look back to the robustness of the human digestive tract and the fact that different cultures around the world can survive on some many different macronutrient breakdown and profiles, and yet each of them seem to have.... particularly in the indigenous people in the blue zone have robust good health well into 70s, 80s, and maybe even into the centenarians. Maybe this has more to do with avoiding the crap than if they found some magic berry.

Jonathan: That is exactly right, Mark. I don't know whether it gets back to materialism or various takes on morality that involves original sin, but if you need to look back on evolution. I know all of your listeners are big fans of that and use it as a template to guide their decisions. It is good stuff. There is no more evolutionarily fit species that has ever existed on this planet than *Homo sapiens*. We have dominated all other species. Think about how sick and how much we struggle today. If, by default, humans were this fragile....dying....and by default we are all going to be 300 pounds and diabetic, we would have never ever gotten to where we are today. We need to look back and say we are actually the most robust species that has ever existed on this planet, as evidenced by the fact that we have completely taken over the planet. How is it that this premier robust species is struggling so much today?

Mark: [00:13:50] You mentioned this recipe that we have that wants us to be healthy and fit and you also mentioned there are some familial predispositions that cannot be overlooked. That gets us back to the quandary that so many people have where they are looking for the one size fits all formula to embrace a lifestyle and dogma that they can follow because they want to do the right thing, and yet, the reality is, as I have said for the longest times, that we all sort of have a range of outcomes. It is not that it is

predetermined, but there are some limitations. I am an ectomorph. I was always going to be a skinny guy, a hard gainer, but my range of outcomes, (I am 5 feet 10 inches) I could have been 5 feet 8 inches and I might have gotten to 6 feet 1 inch. I am suggesting that some of that has to do with the epigenetic factors, the actual lifestyle, the turning off of certain genes and suppressing the mother genes through my formative years and through my growth years that were a direct result of the environment that I surrounded myself with. So we have a range of outcomes. If, like you, I tried my darndest to there is not way I was going to weigh 230 pounds, really, let alone 450, because the familial genes sort of proscribe a range of outcomes. But as that range slides further and further to one side or another, there are people in the 300-400 pound category who are never going to be 125 pounds for the same reason.

Where I am going with this is that recent studies in epigenetics that suggest the heritability of methylation, the heritability of epigenetic factors, I think that is going to be the new frontier for us to examine. In other words, my predisposition for being Type II diabetic, for instance, doesn't necessarily come from a long lineage, it comes from the two most recent generations that either were in a period of famine and set me up so my body wanted to hoard fat and manage sugar differently. Do you know what I mean? Do you know where I am going with that?

Jonathan: [00:16:13] There are such fascinating studies on the immediacy of which just the previous generation, your parents and even your grandparents, can have on your genetic expression. There are some amazing studies. I was shocked to see that these studies took place because while the cost and the intention that was needed to do them was phenomenal. They took people.....a mother and a father and they would have a child. For this first child the mother and the father with the same genetic inputs, the mother was not diabetic or she did not have gestational diabetes. And for the second child..... same father..... same mother..... She did. So she either got gestational diabetes, or she was diabetic, or had metabolic syndrome prior to the pregnancy. They found consistently over and over again, that the child born to the mother who had gestational diabetes, or she was diabetic, or had metabolic syndrome was significantly more likely to struggle with those same maladies as they grew up as their siblings. So same source of DNA, but even a different uterine environment, and you get a different genetic expression.

Mark: There is good news and the bad news. The bad news is it really puts pressure on parents who are considering having children, to live a life that optimizes fitness and health prior to having those children. The good news is, as we have said all along, that just having that predisposition, does not doom you to that fate. It just means that you, more than most, really have to pay attention to what you eat, how much sleep you get, how much sun exposure you get, how you manage stress, and so on and so forth. What I like to say is that some people can get away with more than others. Those who can't get away with it are obliged to really pay close attention to all of the lifestyle elements that are going to cause metabolic syndrome or Type II diabetes. But, again, they aren't doomed to so they just have to pay more attention than most.

Jonathan: That is exactly right and I would add to that that those who are blessed with the genetic predisposition that allows them to tolerate it. They can do it. Let's make sure that, if we are those people that we don't take that for granted. Let's make sure that we don't project that on to other people. I hate to admit this, but that is what I did. When I was a trainer, I would think, "What is wrong with these people? Why don't they just try harder? Clearly this isn't that hard. I am skinny. Why can't they just try harder? It is a will power problem."

[00:19:09] It is a really big challenge because just because your Uncle Steve smoked for 90 years and didn't get lung cancer, that doesn't mean everyone should smoke. It also doesn't mean cigarettes aren't bad for you, but in this country, I feel that.....the research that you talk about, Mark....the research that I talk about, the real research around obesity and wellness.....the reason it hasn't made it into the mainstream is people looking don't look at this as a scientific issue. They look at it as a moral issue. If we can just say the reason we have an obesity problem in this country is because 70 percent of Americans are lazy or stupid or both, then we don't have to look at the science. That breaks my heart and I think we are not going to see this obesity epidemic and this diabetes epidemic get turned in the other direction until we take this more empathetic scientific approach that we are talking about here.

Mark: [00:20:02] Right. I always sort of invoke the notion that the human genome in general, the recipe that we all possess in our DNA has us all operating in a biochemical level pretty much the same. We store fat the same way. We all burn fat the same way, using the same chemical pathways. We all have access to a lot of these different pathway choices. It is just the degree to which we go down one path or another that differs among individuals. You are right. There are some people who have had struggles with weight loss because they haven't found the way to optimize that path of burning fat, or optimize a way of building a little bit more muscles and creating a little bit more of an engine up regulating mitochondria so they can burn fat at rest and things like that. And yet, these principles all work the same way from one individual to the other. It is just the degree to which they manifest themselves that really the issue and really the challenge for people to discover on their own.

Jonathan: A great example that I have found to help explain the very true point you just made is to think about eyeglasses. So I have terrible vision. If you understand prescriptions, I am negative 7 in both eyes, which means you take my glasses off and my contacts out, I am running into walls. I have terrible vision. Imagine, Mark, that you and I met up and you said, "Jonathan, my visions has gotten blurry. Can you help me?" I said, "Mark, absolutely I can." I took my glasses off of my head and I put them on your face and said, "See, Mark, isn't that better?" Chances are you would say, "Jonathan, not only is that not better but I am getting a headache. What is wrong with you? Clearly you are completely wrong and this is not the correct approach." Let's take a step back. All human eyes are basically the same. The way any corrective lens works it applies the same scientific principles. The core underlying biology is the same. The core scientific principles used to heal or accommodate that biology is the same, but how we specifically implement that depends on the specific eye or the specific person, in this example in the specific metabolic situation, neurological situation, and gastro intestinal situation when we are talking about eating and exercise for the individual.

Mark: [00:22:40] Speaking of gastrointestinal situation, there has been a lot of talk recently about the biome. The gut biome. This biome is healthy gut. There is a notion that there are 100 trillion cells living in us that are not us but reside there with our permission, and sometimes without our permisWhat is your take on the relative importance of gut health and the gut biome with what you are doing with Sane Solution and Smarter Science?

Jonathan: Extremely important. We simplify a lot of complicated biology by drilling it down to within three areas which is your neurobiology, or what is going on in your brain; your endrochonology, or what is going on with your hormones; and gastroenterology, or what is going on in your gut. The basic reason for that trifecta is that.....you got your brain. We understand that is really important and hopefully we all understand that anything and everything that happens in your body is happening because your brain is telling it to happen. So the brain is very important. I think we understand that.

Hormones are very important. Hormones is essentially the way your brain and other areas of the body and the way they communicate. We are speaking English right now. The way your brain talks to your reproductive organs, for example, is through hormones so it is the language your body speaks. Clearly brain is important and the hormones are important but what we are finding recently is that your gut is what they call your second brain and it is also extremely important because it is, basically, your second brain. A good way to think about this is....why is your brain so important? It is important because it helps you interact with the outside world. It takes in stimulus from the outside world and it internalizes it and you do things based upon that. What is your digestive system? It is taking things from the outside world, internalizing them and doing things based upon that. So you've got your brain, you've got your hormones, and you've got your gut. Those things are communicating with your hormones and those things are helping you to interact with the outside world, to internalize it and make decisions based upon it.

Mark: [00:24:43] Okay so brain and hormones.....I have been recently much more interested than I was years ago because I tell people we have the diet part down, and the exercise part down, but the brain, the psyche, the past history, the potential psychological trauma, the thoughts in the brain are involved. How much of the mind of an individual and whether it is dwelling on the past or obsessing about the future do you think is influencing ones ability to shed excess body fat?

Jonathan: It would be impossible, in my opinion, to overestimate the impact that your psychology can have on your biology. Look at an extreme anecdotal example. There are cases where schizophrenics, so people with multiple personality disorder. When they switch between personalities....for example, one of their personalities may be pre-diabetic and the other one isn't. So literally, the same "person," when their brain switches between personalities, now this is extreme schizophrenia, they can literally have their metabolic system change in conjunction with their brain. How is that possible? Again, your brain is what regulating the hormones and all these types of things, so if one of your personalities changes the chemistry in your brain and tells it to change the chemistry everywhere else in your body, could we have a stronger vote of confidence that your brain can come completely change and effect your metabolic system? I think not.

Mark: That is pretty interesting. I want you to shoot me a link to that because I want to check into that. That is the kind of stuff that is fascinating me right now particularly as I encounter fifteen percent of the people who stall out in their fat loss journey. They have accessed a substantial amount of help. They have lost a substantial amount of weight. Their energy levels are where they ought to be. They don't get sick ever. By all practical measure, they are healthy and fit but the body still seems to hang on to, even objectively would be considered, too much weight. I am wondering how much of that is resident in the thoughts, the psychology in the brain that is creating some hormonal input that is not allowing the body to release those extra stored calories.

Jonathan: [00:27:30] The brain is also another level here that could be influencing these people. There are all sorts of studies done on the yo-yo dieting and the impact that repeated yo-yo dieting has in perpetuity for a person. These studies are generally done on rodents so simply because it would be illegal to do them on humans because yo-yo dieting is so destructive to your health. No research institution would ever allow people to be subjects in these types of studies. But in these studies they will weight cycle rats. They do what a lot of Americans do. They'll starve them. They'll drop in weight temporarily as long as they can tolerate starvation, and then they'll go back to feeding them a normal amount of food. They won't binge. They'll just say here's a normal amount of food. So these rats are on a yo-yo diet.

What these studies consistently show is that every single time the rat yo-yo diets, the first diet they lose. Yo-yo diet number two they will lose weight slower and they will gain weight back faster than they did the first time they dieted. You look at their basal metabolic rate. You look at basic levels of hormones. You look at various levels of inflammation in their brains. Those have changed. They have fundamentally changed. It might be useful to think of your metabolic system and your neurological system after repeated bouts of starvation induced yo-yo dieting a bit like a bone that you have broken over and over and over again. I have screwed up my knee so many times that there is a giant calcium deposit developing on the left side of it. There is really nothing I can do about it. It is a repeated injury over and over again. After a while it changes the baseline level of functionality in your body.

This is why I get so amped up about calorie counting and starvation dieting approach is that you are still by and large way most common approach that people tackle health and fitness with because they do not work 95 percent of the time. They have been shown to cause permanent damage. I am doing everything right now in terms of my health, but my knee is still screwed up because I didn't do things right in the past. That is heart breaking. We need to avoid that for as many people as we can. I think you see that really graphically on shows like The Biggest Loser where you see people who are tremendously over weight who have yo-yo dieted most of their lives to get to the point they are at now. They go on a show like that out of frustration. Next thing you know they are put into a severe state of deprivation where they are allowed 800 to 1200 calories a day and are forced to burn off theoretically 6000 calories. They lose 100 or 120 pounds over a 90 day period and for all intensive purposes they show up on the final show all fit and trim in their girdle but the next thing you here a year later they gain the weight back and the rapidity at which they gain the weight back. That is what I find heart breaking. That seems to be pretty much a theme throughout these shows that if you come from a history of yo-yo dieting, then you make it even worse with the final assault which is the calorie deprivation and exercise increase to that affect. It can't be good for the body. There is a significant amount of metabolic damage that is done. It is now going to be even more difficult to repair.

In addition to The Biggest Loser, another example of the consequence of repeated yo-yo dieting. I am sure you have seen this with all the people you have worked with, Mark. Is if you have a heterosexual couple, a

woman and a man. Let's say they are married. The woman, like many in this culture, has been pressured her entire life to eat less, to be less, to shrink into the background, to count calories. If you go on a date to eat less, which is ridiculous. (We'll talk about this on a separate show.) Let's say she has been subjected to that. Let's say she has yo-yo dieted many times. Let's say her husband has never yo-yo dieted because, in fact, he has been told to be a man. Eat more. It puts hair on your chest. So, again, we can talk about that on a separate show.

So let's say in this marriage, the woman is the CEO of the household. She is the one preparing the food and buying the food. Let's say she decides to start eating real food. She does this. She is putting all of her effort into this. As a by-product, her husband is being pulled along for the ride. He is still drinking some beer at night. He is still sneaking a little bit of snack food but he is moving in the right direction accidentally. So often, Mark, I hear that the female in the relationship who has yo-yo dieted anywhere from five to ten times and is trying harder and is objectively doing better will lose weight slower than her husband who is not on track but he has never yo-yo dieted. It is as if they both broke their ankles, but the husband is a thirteen-year old perfectly healthy ankle but the wife's ankle is 75 years old and has been broken six times. So you wonder is it just easier for men to lose weight than women? It is easier for people who haven't had their metabolism broken repeatedly over decades to lose weight than it is for people who have not been so fortunate.

Mark: That is a very interesting revelation and thought. I really haven't featured much in my own thinking so I want the audience to kind consider that for a second. One of the reasons, if you are looking for reasons, if you are looking at a plateau or stall or lack of continuation in the ability to drop weight may be to do more with previous history of yo-yo dieting and some form of set point, shall we say, that the body has readjusted itself to than just that you are not doing it right.

[00:33:34] So we didn't talk about that. We are kind of all over the place here with the concept of weight loss and why it fails in some cases. What is the role of activity and exercise, specifically, but activity in general in your thought process and your programs, Jonathan?

Jonathan: I define activity much like you do, Mark. I think there is exercise and there is activity. Activity is not exercise. So taking the stairs, walking around, being a person, literally....there is a reason we have legs and a reason we have arms. We were meant to use them. That is being active. We should all be active. We should take 10,000 steps a day. I work at a standing desk. The more you can move your body, the better. If you want to be able to walk when you are 85, it is pretty good idea to walk before you are 85. So as much activity as frequently as possible. To my knowledge, I have never seen a study or any sort of research that has suggested that activity is anything but positively related to well being. Okay. That is activity, though. Exercise is a whole different ball game. So exercise at high levels of intensity with low impact really focusing on safety, for short periods of time as a tremendous positive hormonal benefit on the body. It is not a thing about trying to burn more calories. It is about trying to change the hormonal composition in the body. Then we have forms of exercise, sadly, the most popular forms of exercise like waking up really early in the morning and jogging on pavement for two hours and breathing in car exhaust that actually causes a negative hormonal impact on the body. So exercise is very powerful medicine and we need to make sure we are taking it correctly but we should all be active.

Mark: [00:35:29] I like that. I am fascinated by bipedalism and the fact that humans locomote on two feet basically. If you think about it in terms of high-tech, we are basically Segway's. We don't fall over front, back, or side. If you stop and think for a minute how we can balance all day long upright on these tiny little platforms of which we only have two. We don't have three. We are not even a tripod. We are certainly not a quadruped. So bipedalism sort of requires that we are constantly adjusting to the environment. You don't have to do that when you sit or when you are lying down or reclining. Just when you are standing at your desk there is this unconscious adjustment that is happening a thousand times a second where the Segway in you, the gyro motor, is sort of figuring out where you should be relative to gravity and relative to the ground.

Jonathan: And there is a powerful psychology. It ties back to your brain a little bit when you think positions we get into when we want to go to sleep or when we want to be at rest. We generally lie down or we sit

down. I personally have found....this is getting into the realm of anecdote....working at a standing desk, having meetings standing up, being up, being tall.....actually there is a lot of science around standing tall, standing with proper posture. But the way that actually changes your brain, your psychology, in terms of your confidence, your self-esteem, your energy levels, just the psychology of standing is also very encouraging as well.

Mark: [00:37:18] Do you have a standard routine that you prescribe for people that you work with when it comes to the exercise part?

Jonathan: It depends on where people are starting. Certainly a 22-year-old male cross fitter will be told different things than a 75-year-old 350-pound female. There are common principles that would apply to both individuals but exercise physical movement is so goal-specific, Mark. Think about how a shot-putter would train as compared to a pole-vaulter or a marathon runner compared to a sprinter. So the way you move your body very much depends on the outcome you want from that activity. If the activity is just general wellness, that would be a much different prescription than the ability to flip as many tires as you can in 60 seconds.

Mark: [00:38:21] Right. So we have talked a lot about different aspects of fitness and health today. Maybe this is a great segue into your new program of Sane Solution. Tells us about Sane Solution. How did it arise and what are you offering people?

Jonathan: Earlier in our conversation, Mark, we talked about how despite your amazing efforts, despite my efforts, despite the efforts of everyone in the wonderful primal/paleo and ancestral communities, we are sadly just a drop in the bucket when it comes to mainstream change. To put that in perspective...a lot of people listen to the show. This calorie starvation model, just try harder.....clearly is not the way to go. But look at the one company in the world that really owns market. It is a company called Weight Watchers. Weight Watchers doesn't really have their own diet. All they do is provide a set of tools and systems that help people count calories. A lot of corporations use them. They aren't really taking a side. They just give you tools to help you count calories. Weight Watchers has a market capitalization of \$1.5 billion dollars. They employ about 28,000 people in thirty countries. So that clearly shows that change can happen. Weight Watchers has had market success, but, sadly, they are promulgating an approach that is the best we can do in the 1960s but we can do a lot better now.

What we are trying to do with Sane Solution is essentially providing Weight Watchers 2.0. It is that simple. It is saying what if you were to say I want to develop an agnostic set of tools. It is not picking any specific diet. It is just saying give me the best current science has to offer and give me the best interaction design that science has to offer and look at how people are communicating nowadays. So let's put modern technology and modern biology on the forefront and let's develop a set of agnostic tools that can help people and corporations and groups improve the quality of the food they are eating in a fun game-like social fashion rather than to focus on reducing the number of calories they are consuming regardless of the source. So everything that the Weight Watchers would provide, for example, we provide calorie-counting apps. We provide a food quality app. Weight Watchers provide support groups that help you to count calories more effectively. We provide support groups that help you improve food quality more effectively. We are just really trying to say we want to provide an agnostic set of tools for people for whom food quality works better than calorie counting. Now they have their saner Weight Watchers in what we call the Sane Solution.

Mark: That sounds great. Now is there a fitness component to this as well?

Jonathan: Not currently but there will be. By 2015 our focus is really on some amazing patent pending technology around qualifying various foods and various meals. We really are focusing on the nutritional components first and once we can make a difference there and raise some more capital, then we can go into the fitness arena.

Mark: Like I say 80 percent of your body composition is determined by how you eat. That is always the first place to go. So where can people find out about Sane Solution?

Jonathan: So go to SaneSolution.com. You can sign up for free. We are in Beta right now and for free you can try every element of the system, and then, of course, there is a premium option available where if you upgrade to premium your mobile application, for example, will automatically upgrade with functionality. Your online program will automatically upgrade in place with a bunch of new features and functionality. There is a free thing that everyone can try at SaneSolution.com. If they like it and want more, they can upgrade to premium.

Mark: Sounds awesome. Good luck with that. Jonathan, is there a thought that you would like to leave our audience with today?

Jonathan: The simplest way that I can distill all the experiences I have had in the past fifteen years is that it is quality not quantity. I think that applies to things way beyond food. I think it applies to human relationships. I think it applies to productivity in the workplace. And I think it applies to happiness. Let's focus on improving quality. Focus on quality first rather than worrying so much about quantity.

Mark; I love that. I love that. It applies to the entire lifestyle. Brad: I appreciate you guys coming on the Primal Blueprint podcast. Jonathan, good luck with your work at the Sane Solution. Thank you, listeners for being with Jonathan Bailor and Mark Sisson and we'll talk to you next time.