

The 'hospital scene'
already makes me
nauseous, but



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

The few seconds after being born, when as a baby you still have your eyes shut, are probably the best seconds of life.

Not because it is such a pleasurable moment, because personally imagining the 'hospital scene' already makes me nauseous, but because in those seconds, there were no experiences or associations yet, so there was no chance of gaining knowledge in these few seconds. However, life continued and so did knowledge, where we define knowledge as the condition of knowing something gained through experience or association. When growing up, more and more things get familiar and start to seem normal, which create a feeling that you can rely on these things and be certain about them, a sense of confidence. However, always experiencing only a little of a much bigger world, causes a lack of conviction when new enters, because unfamiliar 'new knowledge' will once become familiar 'old knowledge'. Whatever this 'new knowledge' may be, it changes your look on the old. This extra knowledge can seem more normal than the old and little you knew, which reduces your faith in the old little you knew. Therefore, when experiencing the new, the old is questioned. It has always been said that history writes and repeats itself, which actually means that mankind itself writes history unconsciously.

Stories about history are always based on sources which are found, because without evidence there is no proof. A source always carries a piece of history with it, which enables us to define what happened years ago and based on this, history can be written. However, this is can often lead into the 'probably possible' history. When there is only one source about a certain period of time, it is easy to conclude with confidence that whatever that one

<https://assignbuster.com/the-hospital-scene-already-makes-me-nauseous-but/>

source tells happened, when in fact possible unfound sources may tell that something different happened. By only having one piece of information about a certain event, it's likely to conclude whatever the source tells happened. However more sources give us more perspectives of the event, which may change the whole story. Therefore more knowledge about history, questions the fact what really happened in the past. To illustrate this more clearly, an example can be found in two diaries written during WW2.

The first one entitled 'Backfisch im Bombenkrieg' is written by Brigitte Eicke, who wrote about the events during WW2 as a German teenager. The second one is the famous diary of Anne Frank, common known as 'The Diary of Anne Frank', or in Dutch 'Het Achterhuis'. By not taking into account all the different things we now nowadays about the horrible events during WW2, these two diary posts make it look like a completely different world. When looking at the diary post of Brigitte, a lot similarities with the current state of our world can be found. Brigitte's world revolves around going to the cinema with her friends, where a power cut pauses the film in the middle or going to the hairdresser and leaving with a 'not so fashionable' haircut, something which could happen in the daily lives of everyone. The Jews are only mentioned once in the entire diary.

So when taking into account this diary as only source about WW2, it looked like this period of time wasn't that horrible at all, not at all actually. In contrast to that is the diary of Anne Frank, a Jewish girl who was hiding in Amsterdam from the Nazi German. In Anne's diary entries, she describes the world as a horrible place for the Jews. Anne and her family weren't allowed

to go to a normal school anymore, or to work, but later on they were also obliged to go to a working camp and had to hide.

The whole family, except for Onno Frank, doesn't survive Auschwitz. So when taking into account Anne's diary, the world is described as a horrible place and not a place to live anymore. When putting these works next to each other, two completely different worlds are illustrated, which makes it questionable which one is the truth. Therefore, more knowledge causes doubt in the truth. Even though more information about the historical events makes it more difficult to distinguish what happened in our past, it can be easily structured if a distinction is made between primary and secondary sources. More sources usually provide more and unknown information, but these sources do not always have to provide real information, which means some sources just lead to a lot of confusion and no real useful information, which therefore make it difficult to find one main idea. However, more sources do give more perspectives and provide extra information. Therefore it is important to only focus on primary sources, an original source of information about the topic, written at that specific moment in time.

By only looking at primary sources, secondary sources are banned out, which means that a lot of not useful information and knowledge is banned out as well. This leaves the sources with accurate data and a more representative image of what has happened. This means that there are still a lot of different sources, but they only provide the primary information. Taking into account only primary sources, more information give a clearer vision of what has happened and therefore do provide a confident feeling. However, getting rid of the secondary sources is more difficult than it seems.

<https://assignbuster.com/the-hospital-scene-already-makes-me-nauseous-but/>

Often the distinction between primary and secondary sources is very difficult, which makes it difficult to get a good selection. Added up to this, there are also a lot of documents which in first instance seem to give great insight in history, but later seemed to be false. An example of this is the Tanaka Memorial, which was said to be a Japanese strategic planning document, but later was proved to be anti-Japanese hoax. This makes it even more difficult to check what really happened in history and creates even more doubt when finding out to be false. This added up to all the primary, secondary but also not found sources makes the pile of historic work very big. Therefore it is very difficult in terms of History to create little knowledge, which makes it very difficult to create any sense of confidence of our past. Last, to make things even more complicated, let's not forget that our history grows everyday with new knowledge. Where we go back with 'History' to our past, this also happens with the nutrition of us as human beings, also known to be placed under the area of knowledge 'Human Sciences'.

Food is a basic necessity for human beings, but has never been defined the way it should look like. This is because food is a very personal thing. It all started with the 'Hunters and collectors', the people from the stone age who hunted for meat and ate that.

When there wasn't enough food they moved to another place. This was their daily habit and the only thing which existed back then. With this little knowledge they survived and this created confidence. Throughout the years this pattern changed. Nowadays the way we eat is based on what is broadcasted on the television, findable online or you just eat what your mother cooks. It's not about surviving anymore, it's about choosing. There is <https://assignbuster.com/the-hospital-scene-already-makes-me-nauseous-but/>

such a wide variety available that it is almost impossible to know what to eat best. The more information we get about food, the more we think to know about it, while in fact we've lost reality.

Therefore, too much knowledge about nutrition, food and what to eat pops up the question what is good for mankind and therefore creates a sense of doubt. A well known phenomena for this is Orthorexia, where only the super healthy foods are still eaten. This habit of eating very healthy is in fact very harmful and unhealthy for the human health. People who suffer from Orthorexia have lost reality in a world with a lot of food, whether this is in books, blogs or in the local supermarket.

There is such a big offer that it is almost impossible to decide what is still healthy for the body. Another cause of the overload of knowledge in the food industry is the change in labels. Something like 'white' bread which was, but still is, part of the daily meals of many families, is in reality not healthy at all. Added up to this there are thousands of dietists, books and the newest technology who all claim to know what is best for the body. Due to this a overload of information about nutrition, doubt about what is still healthy is caused which makes people insecure. This insecurity can eventually pass into Orthorexia.