

# Calorie Counting Madness

Surprising Truths About Weight Loss

By

Dr. Dennis Clark

[FatLossBiology.com](http://FatLossBiology.com)

Copyright © 2014 Starfish Solutions LLC

# Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION  
PERSPECTIVE ON WEIGHT  
OVERWEIGHT VS. OVERFAT  
MYTHS ABOUT CALORIES  
WHAT CALORIES REALLY ARE  
FOOD CALORIE NONSENSE  
A RIDICULOUS COMPARISON  
WHAT IS REALLY IMPORTANT ABOUT FOOD  
CAN YOU OVEREAT?  
REDUCING VISCERAL FAT  
ABOUT THE AUTHOR

## INTRODUCTION

Human metabolism is logical and rational, or at least is supposed to be. Unfortunately, scientists have taken a wrong turn when it comes to calories. The concept of using calories for keeping track of how much to eat has become thoughtless and dogmatic.

This concept has become the foundation for one of the biggest myths ever perpetrated on humanity about dieting. It is known as the Calories In/Calories Out advice that nutritionists, doctors, and health care professionals of all kinds mete out as the bedrock of weight management. Too bad it isn't true.

The good news for you is that, since Calories In/Calories Out advice is obsolete, you don't have to count calories to lose weight. In fact, calorie counting is madness and it won't work.

The purpose for this brief book is to explain what calories really are, why counting calories is irrelevant for dieting, and what approaches to weight management really do work, based on actual human metabolism.

## PERSPECTIVE ON WEIGHT

Using terms correctly is usually important, right? One of the surprises about weight loss is that it is a misnomer. The term is not used appropriately. Let's get a little geeky to find out why.

First off, weight is a physical phenomenon that is a function of mass and gravity. Specifically, it is the pull of gravitation on mass. Scientists don't really refer to the pull of gravitation. We call it acceleration, which is measured as meters per second per second (or per second squared).

Your weight, therefore, is a product of your mass times acceleration due to gravity. As an example, for a mass of 100 kilograms, on Earth that would create a weight of  $100 \times 9.81$  meters per second squared. That means 981 units of weight.

Units of weight in the metric system are called Newtons (N). Can you imagine yourself as weighing 981 N? Where do pounds come in? Normally we would equate 100 kg with 220 pounds, although that is only true on Earth.

Weight and mass are two different animals entirely. Weight, as you see, is a function of gravity. On the other hand, mass is not. Kilograms and pounds are therefore not comparable. Newtons and pounds are. By the way, the English system of measurements has no equivalent of mass.

If you think this is confusing, consider what the British face. They measure weight in stones. Our 220 pound example would be 15.7 stones. Wow...now THAT clears things up, doesn't it?

Think about what all this means for weight vs. mass. You can become weightless in outer space. You can never become massless.

In fact, the (bad) joke is that you can go to the moon to lose weight loss. The moon has about one sixth the gravity of Earth, so you would lose five sixths of your weight. Your mass would still be the same.

Let's stop this geeky stuff for the moment and just reiterate that weight is not the key measure that is important for what we call weight loss. The real key is fat.