Indoor Living and Nature Deficit

Alex Applebee & L. N. Combe

2026

The Caged Primate: Indoor Living, Nature Deficit, and the Biological Cost of Enclosure

Authors: Alex Applebee and L. N. Combe

Date: March 2026

Series: OMXUS Research Papers — Evolutionary Mismatch

Author's Note

This paper exists because of Goal 11: *Monkey bars at every bus stop. Climbing walls on all stairwells.*

That sounds frivolous until you understand what it is actually saying. It is saying: human bodies are designed to climb, hang, swing, balance, and move through three-dimensional space under open sky — and the built environment has eliminated every opportunity to do so. We flattened the terrain. We sealed the ceiling. We removed the trees. Then we built gyms and charged membership fees so people could simulate the movement their environment used to provide for free.

The average human in a developed nation spends 93% of their life indoors. Ninety-three percent. A person who lives to 80 will spend roughly 74 years inside — breathing recirculated air, under artificial light, on flat surfaces, behind glass. Five and a half years outside, total.

We are an outdoor species living in boxes.

This is not a metaphor. It is the finding. Ophthalmologists have documented it (we are blinding our children by keeping them from sunlight). Immunologists have documented it (our immune systems are breaking down without environmental microbial exposure). Environmental psychologists have documented it (our brains cannot sustain attention without nature). Air quality researchers have documented it (we are making ourselves stupider by breathing each other's exhaled CO2 in sealed rooms). Each field discovered the same problem independently and published it in their own journal. Nobody connected the dots.

This paper connects the dots.

The human enclosure thesis — developed at length in the companion paper *The Human Enclosure* — argues that modern built environments fail the same welfare criteria that any competent zoologist

would apply to a captive animal: inadequate space, insufficient environmental complexity, no access to natural substrate, disrupted circadian cycles, social structure deformation. Every zoo in the world knows that if you put a primate in a concrete box with artificial light and no access to the outdoors, it will develop stereotypies, self-harm, immune dysfunction, and reproductive failure. We know this. We apply this knowledge to every species except our own.

Goal 11 is the correction. Not the whole correction — you cannot fix 93% indoor living with monkey bars — but the beginning of one. It says: public space should be designed for human bodies, not just for transit. Stairwells should invite climbing because climbing is what primates do. Bus stops should have bars to hang from because hanging is what shoulders are for. The built environment should assume that the people moving through it are animals — large, bipedal, brachiating primates who spent two million years in trees and on savannahs — and design accordingly.

This paper is the evidence base for that assumption.

— A.A. & L.N.C.

Abstract

Humans in developed nations spend approximately 93% of their time indoors (Klepeis et al., 2001), a figure that has almost certainly increased in the 25 years since it was measured. This historically unprecedented shift from outdoor to indoor living has occurred within two to three generations — a timescale invisible to natural selection but sufficient to produce widespread physiological mismatch. This paper synthesises evidence from five independent research domains — ophthalmology, immunology, environmental psychology, indoor air quality science, and psychoneuroimmunology — to demonstrate that the indoor environment is systematically inadequate for human biological function.

We review: (1) the global myopia epidemic caused by insufficient outdoor light exposure during childhood development (Morgan et al., 2012; Rose et al., 2008); (2) immune dysregulation resulting from loss of evolutionary microbial companions (Rook, 2013); (3) cognitive impairment from elevated indoor CO2 concentrations (Allen et al., 2016); (4) attention depletion in built environments and restoration in natural ones (Kaplan & Kaplan, 1989); (5) measurable health benefits of forest exposure including enhanced natural killer cell activity (Li et al., 2006, 2007); (6) clinical evidence that even visual access to nature improves surgical recovery (Ulrich, 1984); (7) circadian disruption from artificial lighting inadequate for biological timekeeping; (8) vitamin D deficiency as a population-level consequence of indoor living; and (9) the biophilia hypothesis (Wilson, 1984) as an evolutionary framework for understanding why nature contact is not optional but required.

The convergence of these independent findings constitutes a pattern: the modern built environment deprives human organisms of inputs — light, air, microbial exposure, spatial complexity, circadian signals — that their physiology requires to function. The consequences are not subtle. They include the fastest-growing sensory disability on earth (myopia), rising rates of autoimmune and allergic disease, population-level cognitive impairment, epidemic vitamin D deficiency, and the chronic attention fatigue that underlies much of what gets diagnosed as anxiety and depression. These are not separate problems. They are symptoms of a single condition: enclosure.

Keywords: nature deficit disorder, indoor living, evolutionary mismatch, biophilia, myopia epidemic, circadian disruption, vitamin D deficiency, shinrin-yoku, attention restoration, human en-

closure

Table of Contents

1. Introduction: The Species That Moved Indoors
2. The Myopia Epidemic: Blinding Children With Architecture
3. Forest Bathing and Phytoncides: The Biology of Trees
4. The Window Study: Nature as Medicine
5. Attention Restoration Theory: Why Nature Rests a Tired Brain
6. Breathing Bad Air: CO2 and Cognitive Impairment
7. Old Friends: The Immune System That Needs Dirt
8. Nature Deficit Disorder: Richard Louv's Warning
9. Biophilia: E.O. Wilson and the Love of Living Things
10. Vitamin D: The Hormone You Cannot Make Indoors
11. Circadian Disruption: Living Under the Wrong Light
12. The Convergence: One Problem, Five Disciplines
13. Implications for Design: What an Honest Environment Looks Like
14. Evidence Quality Assessment
15. References
16. Appendix A: Cross-References to Related Research
17. Appendix B: Key Statistics Summary

---

1. Introduction: The Species That Moved Indoors

For most of human history, the question of how much time people spent indoors would have been absurd. There was no indoors, not in any meaningful sense. Shelter was where you slept, where you waited out storms. The rest of life happened outside — gathering, hunting, walking, building, talking, fighting, playing. The shift to spending the vast majority of waking life inside sealed, climate-controlled, artificially lit boxes happened in roughly two generations, and we treated it like it was nothing.

The data that put a number on it came from Neil Klepeis and colleagues at Stanford, who published the National Human Activity Pattern Survey in 2001. They tracked a large, nationally representative sample of Americans and found that on average, people spent 87% of their time inside buildings and another 6% inside vehicles. That leaves roughly 7% of a person's life spent outdoors. For some demographics — office workers, the elderly, children in urban areas — the outdoor percentage was even lower.

It is worth pausing on what this means. A person who lives to 80 spends roughly 5.5 years of their entire life outside. The rest is spent breathing recirculated air, under artificial light, on flat surfaces, behind glass.

The Klepeis study is now 25 years old, and there is good reason to think the situation has gotten worse, not better. Smartphone adoption, streaming entertainment, remote work, and the general migration of social life onto screens have all pulled people further indoors. There has been no

comparable large-scale time-use study since, which is itself telling — we are not even tracking this. But smaller studies and time-use surveys from multiple countries consistently suggest that for adults in developed nations, the indoor figure is now closer to 92-93%. The COVID-19 lockdowns of 2020-2021 pushed it temporarily to extremes, but the pre-pandemic trend was already moving in one direction.

This matters because human physiology did not evolve for indoor life. Our eyes, our immune systems, our circadian rhythms, our cognitive architecture, our musculoskeletal systems, our microbiomes — all of these were shaped by hundreds of thousands of years of outdoor existence. Moving indoors did not pause evolution. It created a mismatch. And the consequences are showing up everywhere, in ways that get studied in isolation but rarely connected.

The Evolutionary Context

Homo sapiens has existed for approximately 300,000 years. For roughly 290,000 of those years, the species lived entirely outdoors. Agriculture began around 10,000 years ago, bringing permanent structures, but even in agricultural societies, the majority of daily life occurred outside — tending fields, herding animals, travelling between settlements. The shift to predominantly indoor living is a product of the industrial revolution (roughly 250 years ago) and accelerated dramatically with electrification, air conditioning, and the post-WWII suburban model (roughly 70 years ago).

In evolutionary terms, 70 years is nothing. It is 2-3 generations. Natural selection has had no time to adapt human physiology to indoor conditions. Every system in the human body — visual, immunological, endocrine, circadian, neurological, musculoskeletal — was calibrated for an environment that no longer exists. The indoor environment is not merely different from the ancestral one. It is deficient in specific, measurable ways: insufficient light intensity, insufficient spectral range, insufficient microbial diversity, insufficient spatial complexity, insufficient airflow, insufficient temperature variation.

The question is not whether this mismatch has consequences. The question is how large the consequences are and whether we are willing to look at them.

The Scale of the Problem

To understand the scale, consider what "93% indoors" means in practice:

- A child born today in an Australian, American, or European city will spend approximately 74 of their 80 years inside buildings or vehicles
- They will receive roughly 1/20th to 1/200th of the light intensity their visual system evolved to expect
- Their immune system will encounter a fraction of the microbial diversity it requires for proper calibration
- They will breathe air with CO2 concentrations 2-7 times higher than outdoor levels
- They will experience temperature variation of approximately 2-3 degrees Celsius daily, versus the 10-20+ degrees their thermoregulatory system evolved to manage
- They will move across flat, uniform surfaces, eliminating the terrain variation that shaped human gait, proprioception, and skeletal loading

Each of these deprivations has consequences. Each has been studied. None has been studied in the context of all the others happening simultaneously to the same organism. This paper attempts to bring them together.

2. The Myopia Epidemic: Blinding Children With Architecture

Ian Morgan, a researcher at the Australian National University, has been central to understanding one of the most dramatic consequences of indoor living: the global explosion of myopia. His work, including a landmark 2012 review in *The Lancet*, documents a pattern that is hard to dismiss as coincidence.

In East Asian countries — South Korea, China, Taiwan, Singapore, Hong Kong — myopia rates among young adults now run between 80% and 90%. In Seoul, one study found that 96.5% of 19-year-old males were myopic. These are not populations that were historically myopic. Fifty years ago, rates in the same regions were 20-30%. Something changed, and it was not genetics.

The initial assumption was that the cause was "near work" — reading, studying, screens. East Asian education systems are famously intensive, and it seemed logical. But Morgan and others, including Kathryn Rose whose 2008 study in *Ophthalmology* was pivotal, found that the key variable was not how much near work children did, but how much time they spent outdoors. Children who spent more time outside had lower rates of myopia regardless of how much they read or used screens.

The mechanism appears to be light intensity. Outdoor light, even on an overcast day, delivers 10,000 to 100,000 lux. Indoor light is typically 100 to 500 lux. Bright light stimulates dopamine release in the retina, which appears to regulate eye growth and prevent the elongation of the eyeball that causes myopia. Without sufficient bright light exposure during childhood development, the eye grows too long, and distance vision degrades permanently.

The dose-response data suggests that approximately two hours of outdoor light per day provides significant protection. Taiwan ran a large-scale intervention trial, adding 80 minutes of mandatory outdoor time to school schedules, and saw measurable reductions in new myopia cases.

The Numbers

The speed of the myopia epidemic makes it one of the clearest examples of environmental mismatch in medicine:

Region	Myopia rate, 1970s	Myopia rate, 2020s	Change
South Korea	~20%	~96% (19-year-old males)	+76 percentage points
China (urban)	~20%	~80-90% (young adults)	+60-70 percentage points
Singapore	~25%	~80% (young adults)	+55 percentage points
Europe	~20-30%	~40-50% (young adults)	+20 percentage points

Region	Myopia rate, 1970s	Myopia rate, 2020s	Change
Australia	~15-20%	~30% (young adults)	+10-15 percentage points

The global projection is that by 2050, approximately 50% of the world's population — nearly 5 billion people — will be myopic, with 1 billion at risk of high myopia and its associated complications (retinal detachment, glaucoma, macular degeneration).

What This Actually Means

What makes this remarkable is the implication: we are blinding our children, literally, by keeping them indoors. Not because screens are inherently toxic, but because their eyes need light that does not exist in any classroom or living room. A problem that looks like it is about technology or education is actually about architecture and scheduling — about the fact that we designed a way of living that deprives developing eyes of a basic physical requirement.

The fix is known. It is cheap. It requires no technology. Send children outside for two hours a day. Taiwan proved it works. Australia proved it works. The obstacle is not scientific uncertainty. It is that schools are designed as indoor environments, and the people who design them do not consult ophthalmologists.

This is the pattern that will repeat across every chapter of this paper: a biological system fails because the built environment does not provide what it requires. The research exists. The evidence is clear. The built environment does not change.

---

3. Forest Bathing and Phytoncides: The Biology of Trees

In the early 2000s, Qing Li, an immunologist at Nippon Medical School in Tokyo, began publishing research on what the Japanese call *shinrin-yoku* — forest bathing. The concept is simple: spending time in forests improves health. Li wanted to know if there was a measurable biological mechanism behind it, and his findings, published across several papers from 2006 to 2010, were striking.

Li took groups of participants on two- to three-day trips to forested areas and measured their natural killer (NK) cell activity before and after. NK cells are part of the innate immune system and play a role in fighting viral infections and surveilling for cancer cells. After forest exposure, NK cell activity increased significantly — by 50% or more in some studies — and the effect persisted for up to 30 days after a single trip. Li also found increases in intracellular anti-cancer proteins (perforin, granulysin, granzymes).

He hypothesised that the mechanism involved phytoncides — volatile organic compounds that trees and plants release into the air. In a follow-up experiment, he had subjects sleep in hotel rooms infused with hinoki cypress stem oil (a source of phytoncides) and found similar, though smaller, NK cell increases. This suggested it was not just the experience of being in nature, but specific airborne compounds that were driving the immune response.

Li also documented cortisol reduction, lower blood pressure, reduced sympathetic nervous system activity, and increased parasympathetic activity after forest exposure.

The Phytoncide Mechanism

Phytoncides are antimicrobial volatile organic compounds emitted by plants — primarily terpenes such as alpha-pinene, beta-pinene, limonene, and camphene. Trees release them to protect against insects, fungi, and bacteria. Coniferous forests produce particularly high concentrations. When humans inhale these compounds, the evidence suggests they interact with the immune system in ways that enhance NK cell function.

The mechanism is not fully mapped, but the working hypothesis involves:

1. **Direct immune stimulation:** Phytoncides appear to enhance NK cell cytotoxicity through increased expression of perforin, granulysin, and granzyme proteins
2. **Stress axis modulation:** Reduced cortisol and adrenaline levels remove the immunosuppressive effect of chronic stress hormones
3. **Autonomic rebalancing:** Shift from sympathetic (fight-or-flight) to parasympathetic (rest-and-digest) dominance improves immune surveillance

The indoor environment contains none of these compounds. Indoor air is a mixture of human exhalations, volatile organic compounds from furniture, paint, and cleaning products (many of which are irritants or carcinogens), recirculated dust, and whatever the HVAC system contributes. The chemical environment of indoor air and forest air are not just different — they are opposite. One promotes immune function. The other suppresses it.

Evidence Quality Note

A note on the evidence: Li's studies, while carefully conducted, typically involved small sample sizes (12-15 participants in some cases) and were conducted primarily by the same research group. The findings are biologically plausible and consistent with what we know about plant volatile compounds and immune signalling. But they need — and deserve — independent replication by other labs with larger samples and pre-registered protocols. Forest bathing has become a wellness industry in many countries, and the gap between the marketing claims and the replicated science is larger than it should be. The core findings are promising. They are not yet definitive.

What is definitive is the comparison: the air inside buildings is not forest air. Whatever the exact magnitude of the immune effect, indoor air provides none of it.

---

4. The Window Study: Nature as Medicine

In 1984, Roger Ulrich published one of the most elegant studies in environmental health research. Working at a Pennsylvania hospital, he compared recovery outcomes for patients who had undergone cholecystectomy (gallbladder surgery). Some patients were assigned to rooms with windows facing a small stand of deciduous trees. Others had windows facing a brown brick wall.

The results, published in *Science*, were clear. Patients with the tree view had shorter hospital stays (7.96 days vs. 8.70 days), used fewer doses of strong analgesic painkillers, received fewer negative evaluative comments in nurses' notes, and had slightly fewer postsurgical complications.

The study had a sample size of 46 patients (23 matched pairs), all from the same hospital, all with the same surgery type. It is a small study. But its design was elegant — the room assignments were essentially random (determined by bed availability), and the patients were matched on age, sex, weight, smoking status, and other variables. The consistency of the effect across multiple outcome measures gave it weight disproportionate to its size.

Ulrich's window study has become foundational in healthcare architecture and biophilic design. It did something important: it took the intuitive idea that nature is good for you and showed that the effect was measurable in hard clinical outcomes — days in hospital, milligrams of painkiller consumed. It moved "nature is healing" from folk wisdom into evidence.

Subsequent research has broadly supported the direction of Ulrich's findings. Studies in other healthcare settings, schools, and workplaces have found that natural views, natural light, and the presence of vegetation are associated with better outcomes across a range of measures. The effect sizes are generally modest, but they are consistent, and in healthcare contexts where marginal improvements matter — one fewer day in hospital, one fewer dose of opioids — they add up.

The Implication

Consider what the Ulrich study actually demonstrates: even *looking at* a tree through glass — not touching it, not breathing forest air, not walking on soil, just seeing it — measurably accelerates healing. The visual input alone is sufficient to reduce pain medication requirements and shorten hospital stays.

Now consider that most hospital rooms, most school classrooms, most office cubicles, most bedrooms in apartment buildings do not have views of trees. Many have no windows at all, or windows facing other buildings, car parks, or walls. The cheapest, simplest, most evidence-based intervention in healthcare architecture — put a tree where the patient can see it — is routinely ignored because nobody in the design process asked whether the view mattered.

It matters. Ulrich proved it in 1984. Forty years later, most hospitals are still built by people who have never read the paper.

---

5. Attention Restoration Theory: Why Nature Rests a Tired Brain

Rachel and Stephen Kaplan, environmental psychologists at the University of Michigan, proposed Attention Restoration Theory (ART) in their 1989 book *The Experience of Nature*. Their framework offers an explanation for why natural environments feel restorative and built environments feel depleting.

The Kaplans distinguished between two types of attention. Directed attention is the effortful, voluntary focus required to concentrate on tasks, filter distractions, and inhibit impulses. It is what you use to read a dense document, drive in traffic, or sit through a meeting. It is a finite resource — it fatigues with use, producing what the Kaplans called directed attention fatigue, which looks a lot like what we now loosely call burnout or mental exhaustion.

The second type is involuntary attention, or fascination — the effortless engagement that occurs when something catches your interest without requiring you to concentrate. Natural environments, the Kaplans argued, are rich in what they called "soft fascination": rustling leaves, moving water,

birdsong, clouds, patterns of light. These stimuli engage attention without demanding it, allowing the directed attention system to rest and recover.

Built environments, by contrast, are full of "hard fascination" (advertisements, traffic, noise) and require constant directed attention to navigate. Cities are cognitively expensive. Offices are cognitively expensive. Screens are cognitively expensive. Nature is cognitively cheap — not because nothing is happening, but because what is happening does not require you to manage it.

The Four Components of Restorative Environments

The Kaplans identified four properties that make an environment restorative:

1. **Being away** — a sense of escape from routine demands and settings
2. **Extent** — a sense of scope, of being in a whole other world (forests and coastlines provide this; a potted plant does not)
3. **Fascination** — stimuli that engage attention effortlessly (natural patterns, water, wildlife)
4. **Compatibility** — the environment supports what you want to do, rather than requiring constant adaptation

Natural environments score high on all four. Most built environments score low on all four. An open-plan office is the precise opposite of a restorative environment: you are not away (you are at work), there is no extent (you can see the walls), fascination is hard (noise, interruptions, notifications), and compatibility is low (the environment constantly fights your need to concentrate).

The Evidence Base

The theory has generated a substantial body of supporting research over three decades:

- Walking in nature improves cognitive performance on attention tasks compared to walking in urban environments (Berman, Jonides, & Kaplan, 2008)
- Views of nature from windows improve sustained attention in children with ADHD (Taylor, Kuo, & Sullivan, 2001)
- Even brief exposure to photographs of natural scenes produces measurable cognitive restoration, though the effect is weaker than real nature (Berto, 2005)
- Green space access correlates with lower rates of mental health disorders at the population level (Mitchell & Popham, 2008)

The theory connects to Ulrich's findings, to the myopia research, and to the broader pattern: human cognitive and physiological systems function better when they have access to the environmental conditions they evolved in.

What We Are Doing to Children

The implications for education are severe. We take children — whose directed attention systems are still developing, who have the highest need for restorative environments, who are most sensitive to environmental mismatch — and put them in classrooms. Sealed rooms with fluorescent lighting, no natural ventilation, views of car parks or corridors, plastic furniture, and whiteboards. We keep them there for 6-7 hours. We give them 15-30 minutes of outdoor time (if it is not raining, if they have not been punished by having recess removed). Then we diagnose them with attention disorders and prescribe stimulant medication.

The Kaplans' framework suggests an alternative explanation: the children are not disordered. The environment is. Their attention is not deficient. It is exhausted — depleted by an environment that provides no restoration. The prescription is not methylphenidate. It is a window, a tree, an hour outside.

---

6. Breathing Bad Air: CO2 and Cognitive Impairment

In 2016, Joseph Allen and colleagues at Harvard's T.H. Chan School of Public Health published the COGfx (Cognitive Function) study, which measured the effect of indoor air quality on cognitive performance. They placed knowledge workers in controlled office environments and varied the ventilation rates and CO2 concentrations while testing cognitive function using a validated assessment tool (the Strategic Management Simulation).

The results were dramatic. At CO2 levels of 1,000 parts per million — a level commonly reached in occupied, poorly ventilated office buildings, classrooms, and bedrooms — cognitive function scores dropped significantly across multiple domains, including crisis response, information usage, and strategy. At 1,400 ppm, scores dropped further. The highest-performing condition was a "green+" environment with enhanced ventilation and low volatile organic compounds, where scores were more than double those in the conventional office condition.

CO2 Levels in Real Buildings

To put 1,000 ppm in context:

Environment	Typical CO2 (ppm)	Cognitive impact
Outdoor air	~420 (and rising)	Baseline
Well-ventilated office	600-800	Minimal
Typical occupied office	800-1,200	Measurable decline
Conference room (1 hour, 6 people)	1,500-2,500	Significant impairment
Bedroom (closed door/windows, overnight)	1,500-3,000+	Impaired sleep quality, morning cognition
Classroom (older building, 25 students)	2,000-3,000+	Severe impairment — this is where children learn
Submarine	5,000-8,000	Navy tracks this; threshold effects documented

Allen's study suggests that we are routinely making ourselves stupider by being indoors. Not dramatically, not in ways that are obvious moment-to-moment, but in aggregate — across millions of decisions made by millions of people in enclosed spaces with inadequate ventilation. The implication for workplaces, schools, and public health is significant, and the fix is remarkably simple: bring in more outside air.

The School Problem

The school CO2 finding deserves its own emphasis. Allen's study tested offices. But schools — particularly in older buildings without modern HVAC — commonly hit 2,000-3,000 ppm during class. That is the environment where we expect children to concentrate, learn, take exams, and develop cognitive skills.

A classroom at 2,500 ppm CO2 is a classroom where every student's crisis response, information usage, and strategic thinking are measurably impaired. This is not speculative. It is what Allen's dose-response data predicts, and it is consistent with a growing body of research on school ventilation and academic performance.

The fix costs almost nothing in many cases: open a window. In buildings where windows do not open, it requires improved ventilation — a capital expense, but a trivial one compared to the cognitive cost of degraded learning across entire generations of students.

We spend billions on education technology, curriculum reform, standardised testing, and teacher training. We do not spend on opening windows. The cost-effectiveness ratio is absurd.

---

7. Old Friends: The Immune System That Needs Dirt

Graham Rook, an immunologist at University College London, proposed the "Old Friends" hypothesis as a more accurate replacement for the popular but misleading "hygiene hypothesis." The hygiene hypothesis, as popularly understood, suggested that modern cleanliness caused allergies and autoimmune diseases — that we were "too clean." Rook's reframing, developed across papers from 2003 onward and articulated clearly in a 2013 *PNAS* paper, made a more precise argument.

The immune system, Rook argued, requires exposure during development to a range of organisms that have been present throughout mammalian evolutionary history — certain mycobacteria, helminths (parasitic worms), lactobacilli, and environmental saprophytes (organisms that live in soil and decaying matter). These are the "old friends." They are not pathogens that make you sick. They are organisms that the immune system evolved alongside and learned to tolerate. Their presence during immune development trains the regulatory arm of the immune system — the part that tells it when not to react.

Without this exposure, the immune system is improperly calibrated. It overreacts to harmless substances (allergies), attacks the body's own tissues (autoimmune disease), or mounts excessive inflammatory responses. Rook compiled evidence showing that the rise in autoimmune diseases, allergic diseases, and chronic inflammatory conditions in developed countries tracked with urbanisation, indoor living, reduced contact with soil and animals, and the loss of exposure to these evolutionary companions.

The Geography of Autoimmune Disease

The epidemiological pattern is striking:

- Autoimmune and allergic diseases are concentrated in urbanised, industrialised populations
- Rural populations, particularly those with ongoing contact with livestock and soil, have significantly lower rates

- Immigration studies show that people who move from low-prevalence to high-prevalence countries develop autoimmune diseases at rates approaching the host country within one to two generations
- The prevalence of conditions like asthma, eczema, type 1 diabetes, Crohn's disease, multiple sclerosis, and food allergies has risen dramatically in developed nations over the past 50-100 years — a timescale far too rapid for genetic change

This is not an argument against hygiene or sanitation. Washing hands prevents disease and saves lives. The point is subtler: the specific microbial exposures that regulate immune development come from the natural environment — soil, water, animals, outdoor air — and indoor living cuts us off from them. A child who grows up in a sealed apartment, plays on sanitized surfaces, and never puts dirt in their mouth (as children have done for millions of years) is missing inputs that the immune system needs to develop properly.

The Amish-Hutterite Study

One of the most compelling pieces of evidence came from a 2016 study comparing Amish and Hutterite farming communities in the United States (Stein et al., 2016, *New England Journal of Medicine*). Both communities are genetically similar (central European descent), have similar diets, similar family sizes, and high rates of breastfeeding. The key difference: Amish farms use traditional practices with close daily contact between children and animals, barn dust, and soil. Hutterite farms are industrialised, with children largely separated from animal environments.

Asthma prevalence among Amish children: 5%. Among Hutterite children: 21%. The researchers found that house dust from Amish homes, when given to mice, was protective against asthma. Hutterite house dust was not. The microbial content of the two dusts was qualitatively different.

The indoor environment is not just missing forest phytoncides. It is missing the microbial ecosystem that the immune system was built to interact with. We sealed ourselves away from the very organisms that teach our immune systems how to function.

---

8. Nature Deficit Disorder: Richard Louv's Warning

In 2005, journalist and author Richard Louv published *Last Child in the Woods*, coining the term "Nature Deficit Disorder" to describe the consequences of children's increasing disconnection from the natural world. It is not a clinical diagnosis — Louv was clear about that. It is a descriptive term for a pattern: children who spend less time outdoors show higher rates of attention difficulties, obesity, anxiety, and depression, and lower levels of creativity and physical fitness.

Louv drew on the research of Kaplan, Ulrich, and others, but his contribution was primarily narrative and cultural. He documented how childhood had changed — how the radius of unsupervised outdoor play had shrunk dramatically over a few decades, how fear of strangers, traffic, and liability had moved children indoors, how screen time had replaced creek time. He described a generation growing up with an unprecedented disconnection from the non-human world.

The Shrinking Range

Research on children's independent mobility documents the collapse:

- In 1970, the average 9-year-old in the UK could range approximately 1 mile from home unsupervised
- By 1990, the range had shrunk to approximately 300 yards
- By 2010, many children were not permitted unsupervised outdoor play at all until age 10 or older
- Similar patterns documented in the US, Australia, Canada, and across Europe

The causes are multiple: fear of traffic (legitimate — car-centric planning made streets dangerous), fear of strangers (disproportionate to actual risk), fear of liability (playgrounds stripped of anything a child could fall from), and the availability of indoor entertainment (screens as default activity).

The consequences mapped by Louv and subsequently supported by research include:

- **Physical:** Rising childhood obesity (correlated with declining outdoor play time), reduced cardiovascular fitness, decreased bone density, delayed motor development
- **Cognitive:** Increased ADHD diagnosis rates (correlation with reduced nature exposure — see Taylor et al., 2001), reduced creativity scores (Kim, 2011 — creativity test scores declining since 1990)
- **Emotional:** Increased anxiety and depression in children and adolescents (Twenge, 2017 — generational analysis showing rising rates), reduced self-regulation
- **Social:** Reduced unsupervised peer interaction, decline in free play (see companion paper: play deprivation)

The Term's Power

The book struck a nerve. It helped catalyse the "children and nature" movement, influenced urban planning discussions, and put a name to something many parents and educators sensed but could not articulate. The term "Nature Deficit Disorder" is now widely used, sometimes too loosely, but the underlying pattern Louv described is well-supported by the accumulating evidence from Morgan, Li, the Kaplans, Allen, and Rook: indoor living has consequences, and children — whose bodies and brains are still developing — bear the heaviest cost.

---

9. Biophilia: E.O. Wilson and the Love of Living Things

In 1984, the same year Ulrich published his window study, the biologist Edward O. Wilson published *Biophilia*, proposing that humans have an innate, genetically based tendency to seek connections with nature and other living things. The biophilia hypothesis — later elaborated in *The Biophilia Hypothesis* (Wilson & Kellert, 1993) — argues that this tendency is not cultural preference but evolutionary inheritance: for hundreds of thousands of years, survival depended on attention to natural environments, and the organisms that responded positively to nature (seeking green spaces, water, prospect-refuge landscapes) survived at higher rates than those that did not.

The Evidence for Biophilia

Wilson's hypothesis generates several testable predictions, most of which have been supported:

1. Cross-cultural landscape preferences. Studies across dozens of cultures consistently find that humans prefer savannah-like landscapes: open grassland with scattered trees, water features,

and views to the horizon (Orians & Heerwagen, 1992). This preference appears in children who have never seen a savannah. It is consistent with the East African environments where *Homo sapiens* evolved.

2. Rapid fear acquisition for natural threats. Humans learn to fear snakes, spiders, heights, and deep water faster and more persistently than they learn to fear cars, electrical outlets, or guns — even though the latter are far more dangerous in modern environments (Seligman, 1971; Ohman & Mineka, 2001). This "prepared learning" suggests an evolutionary predisposition to attend to natural threats.

3. Physiological responses to nature. The stress reduction, immune enhancement, and cognitive restoration documented by Ulrich, Li, and the Kaplans are consistent with biophilia: if the organism evolved to seek nature, then nature exposure would be expected to produce positive physiological responses, and nature deprivation would produce negative ones.

4. The persistence of biophilic behaviour in urban environments. Even in dense cities, humans seek parks, keep houseplants, own pets, install aquariums, hang landscape paintings, choose homes near trees, and pay premium prices for views of nature. These behaviours are universal across cultures and persist even when they are costly or inconvenient. They suggest an underlying drive, not merely a learned preference.

Biophilia and Design

The biophilia hypothesis has practical implications. If the human attraction to nature is innate, then the built environment's failure to provide natural elements is not merely an aesthetic shortcoming — it is a deprivation of something the organism requires. Biophilic design — the incorporation of natural elements (light, plants, water, natural materials, views, airflow) into buildings — is not decoration. It is environmental enrichment for a captive primate.

This framing — humans as captive animals in self-constructed enclosures — is developed fully in the companion paper *The Human Enclosure*. Wilson's biophilia hypothesis provides the evolutionary mechanism: we built environments that deprive us of the natural inputs we evolved to need, and we suffer for it in ways that are measurable, documented, and largely ignored.

---

10. Vitamin D: The Hormone You Cannot Make Indoors

Vitamin D is not, strictly speaking, a vitamin. It is a secosteroid hormone that the human body synthesises when ultraviolet B (UVB) radiation from sunlight strikes the skin. For most of human evolutionary history, this was automatic — an outdoor species receives adequate UVB exposure as a byproduct of daily life. Indoor living breaks this system.

The Scope of Deficiency

Vitamin D deficiency is now one of the most common nutritional deficiencies in the world:

- An estimated 1 billion people worldwide have vitamin D deficiency or insufficiency (Holick, 2007)
- In the UK, approximately 1 in 5 adults has serum 25(OH)D levels below 25 nmol/L (deficiency threshold)

- In the US, approximately 42% of adults are vitamin D deficient, with higher rates among Black Americans (~82%) and Hispanic Americans (~63%) due to melanin reducing UVB absorption at the same latitude (Forrest & Stuhldreher, 2011)
- In Australia — one of the sunniest countries on earth — vitamin D deficiency rates have risen steadily, driven by indoor lifestyles and (ironically) sun avoidance messaging
- Northern European countries report deficiency rates of 30-60% depending on season and demographic

Why Indoor Living Causes Deficiency

The physics is simple:

1. **Glass blocks UVB.** Window glass transmits UVA but blocks virtually all UVB radiation. Sitting by a sunny window does not produce vitamin D. You can be bathed in visible light indoors and produce zero vitamin D.
2. **Indoor light intensity is inadequate.** Even if UVB could penetrate glass, indoor light is 1/20th to 1/200th the intensity of outdoor light. The dose is insufficient.
3. **Clothing and sunscreen block UVB.** When people do go outside, clothing and sunscreen (appropriately used for skin cancer prevention) further reduce UVB exposure. The balance between skin cancer prevention and vitamin D synthesis is a genuine tension that public health messaging has not resolved well.
4. **Latitude and season matter.** Above approximately 35 degrees latitude (most of Europe, Canada, northern US, southern Australia in winter), UVB intensity is insufficient for vitamin D synthesis during winter months regardless of outdoor time.

Consequences Beyond Bone Health

Vitamin D's role in calcium absorption and bone health is well-established. Severe deficiency causes rickets in children and osteomalacia in adults. But the vitamin D receptor is expressed in virtually every tissue in the body, and research over the past two decades has linked deficiency to:

- **Immune dysfunction:** Vitamin D modulates both innate and adaptive immunity. Deficiency is associated with increased susceptibility to respiratory infections (Martineau et al., 2017 — meta-analysis showing vitamin D supplementation reduced acute respiratory infections)
- **Depression and mood disorders:** Multiple observational studies link low vitamin D to depression, though causality is debated (Anglin et al., 2013 — meta-analysis)
- **Autoimmune disease:** Higher vitamin D status is associated with lower risk of multiple sclerosis, type 1 diabetes, and rheumatoid arthritis (epidemiological data; mechanism involves immune regulation)
- **Cardiovascular disease:** Observational associations with hypertension, heart disease, and stroke (though supplementation trials have been mixed)
- **Cancer:** Some evidence for protective effects, particularly colorectal cancer (though large supplementation trials like VITAL have shown modest or null effects for many cancer types)

The Indoor Connection

Vitamin D deficiency is, at its core, an indoor living disease. The body has a perfectly functional system for producing this hormone — it just requires sunlight hitting skin. An outdoor species does

not get vitamin D deficiency. An indoor species does. The solution is not primarily supplementation (though that helps). The solution is going outside.

The irony is acute: we moved indoors, became vitamin D deficient, and then created a supplement industry to replace the hormone our bodies would make for free if we spent time in sunlight. We are paying for pills to compensate for the absence of a free resource that we voluntarily abandoned.

---

11. Circadian Disruption: Living Under the Wrong Light

The human circadian system — the internal clock that regulates sleep-wake cycles, hormone release, body temperature, metabolism, and immune function — evolved to be synchronised by sunlight. Specifically, it is calibrated by the intensity and spectral composition of light hitting specialised photoreceptors (intrinsically photosensitive retinal ganglion cells, or ipRGCs) in the eye. These receptors are most sensitive to short-wavelength (blue) light at approximately 480 nanometres — the dominant wavelength of a clear sky.

The Problem With Indoor Light

Indoor lighting fails the circadian system in multiple ways:

1. Insufficient intensity for daytime entrainment. The circadian system requires bright light during the day to properly suppress melatonin and synchronise the clock. Outdoor light provides 10,000-100,000 lux. Indoor light provides 100-500 lux. This is 20-1,000 times too dim. The result: the circadian clock receives a weak, ambiguous daytime signal. It is as if the organism is perpetually in dim twilight.

2. Excessive intensity at night. Before electric light, nights were dark. Firelight and candlelight are dim (5-50 lux) and red-shifted (minimal short-wavelength content). Electric lights, particularly LED screens, provide 50-500 lux of blue-enriched light directly into the eyes during the hours when the circadian system expects darkness. This suppresses melatonin, delays sleep onset, and disrupts the cascade of physiological events that depend on the light-dark cycle.

3. Spectral mismatch. Natural light changes in spectral composition throughout the day — blue-enriched at midday, red-shifted at sunrise and sunset. Indoor light provides a constant, unchanging spectrum. The circadian system receives no time-of-day information from indoor light because the spectral signal does not change.

Consequences

Chronic circadian disruption — the condition of living under indoor light — has documented consequences:

- **Sleep disruption:** Delayed sleep onset, reduced sleep duration, reduced slow-wave sleep, disrupted REM architecture (see companion paper: *Sleep Science*)
- **Metabolic dysfunction:** Shift workers (extreme circadian disruptors) have elevated rates of obesity, type 2 diabetes, and metabolic syndrome (Scheer et al., 2009)
- **Cancer risk:** The International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) classified shift work involving circadian disruption as "probably carcinogenic to humans" (Group 2A) in 2007, based on epidemiological evidence of increased breast cancer risk in night-shift workers

- **Mood disorders:** Circadian disruption is both a symptom and a cause of depression. Light therapy (bright light exposure, typically 10,000 lux in the morning) is an evidence-based treatment for seasonal affective disorder and non-seasonal depression
- **Immune dysfunction:** Circadian rhythms regulate immune cell trafficking and cytokine production. Disruption impairs immune surveillance (overlap with Rook's Old Friends findings)

The Connection to Indoor Living

The circadian problem and the myopia problem share the same root cause: insufficient outdoor light. The indoor environment is too dim during the day (disrupting both circadian entrainment and retinal dopamine signalling) and too bright at night (disrupting melatonin production). The organism needs bright days and dark nights. Indoor living provides dim days and bright nights — the exact inverse of what the circadian system evolved to expect.

The fix is the same fix as for myopia: spend time outdoors during the day. Morning outdoor light exposure is particularly effective for circadian entrainment. This is not a medical intervention. It is a return to the conditions the organism was designed for.

---

12. The Convergence: One Problem, Five Disciplines

These findings come from different fields — ophthalmology, immunology, environmental psychology, indoor air quality, microbiology, psychoneuroimmunology, endocrinology, chronobiology. They were not designed as a coordinated research program. The researchers did not collaborate. Their journals do not overlap. Their conferences are separate events. And yet they converge on the same conclusion: the indoor environment that modern humans spend 90%+ of their lives in is physiologically inadequate for the organisms living in it.

System	What it needs	What indoor provides	Consequence
Vision	10,000+ lux outdoor light during development	100-500 lux	Myopia epidemic (80-96% in some populations)
Immunity	Environmental microbial diversity	Sterile surfaces, recirculated air	Autoimmune disease, allergies, immune dysregulation
Cognition	Restorative natural environments	Depleting built environments	Attention fatigue, burnout, ADHD overdiagnosis
Respiration	Fresh air (~420 ppm CO2)	1,000-3,000 ppm CO2	Measurable cognitive impairment
Endocrine	UVB sunlight for vitamin D synthesis	Glass blocks UVB	1 billion people deficient worldwide
Circadian	Bright days (10,000+ lux), dark nights	Dim days (500 lux), bright nights (screens)	Sleep disruption, metabolic dysfunction, cancer risk

System	What it needs	What indoor provides	Consequence
Stress physiology	Phytoncides, natural sounds, green views	VOCs, traffic noise, walls	Elevated cortisol, sympathetic dominance
Musculoskeletal	Varied terrain, 3D movement	Flat surfaces, chairs	Proprioceptive deprivation, postural degeneration

None of this means we should abandon buildings or technology. It means we should stop designing buildings, cities, schools, and workplaces as if the outdoor environment were optional — a nice-to-have for weekends and holidays rather than a biological requirement for daily function. The evidence says it is a requirement. We have simply been ignoring the invoice, and the charges are accumulating in myopia rates, autoimmune disease prevalence, attention disorders, vitamin D deficiency, circadian disruption, and the quiet cognitive impairment of millions of people breathing stale air in sealed rooms.

The Zoological Frame

A competent zoo — one that meets modern animal welfare standards — would never house a primate the way we house ourselves. No accredited zoo would:

- Keep an animal indoors for 93% of its life
- Provide lighting at 1/100th the intensity of its natural habitat
- Seal the enclosure so tightly that CO2 accumulates to concentrations that impair cognition
- Eliminate all terrain variation from the enclosure floor
- Remove all natural vegetation from the animal's environment
- Prevent the animal from encountering the microbial ecosystem its immune system evolved with
- Provide a light cycle that is the inverse of what the animal's circadian system requires

If a zoo did these things, it would lose its accreditation. Animal welfare inspectors would intervene. The public would be outraged.

We do all of these things to ourselves. Every day. In every city. To billions of people. And we call it normal.

---

13. Implications for Design: What an Honest Environment Looks Like

The evidence reviewed in this paper has clear design implications. An honest built environment — one designed for the actual biological needs of its inhabitants rather than for the convenience of developers, the aesthetics of architects, or the cost models of builders — would look different from what we currently build.

Minimum Standards for Human Habitation

Based on the evidence:

1. **Light:** Indoor spaces occupied during daytime should provide access to natural light at intensities sufficient for circadian entrainment (ideally 1,000+ lux at eye level) and retinal dopamine signalling. This means large windows, skylights, and building orientations that maximise daylight penetration. Artificial lighting should vary in intensity and spectrum across the day, approximating the natural light cycle.

2. **Air:** Indoor CO2 should be maintained below 800 ppm in occupied spaces. This requires ventilation rates significantly higher than current building codes mandate in many jurisdictions. Opening windows is the cheapest solution and should be standard in all occupied buildings. Mechanical ventilation systems should monitor CO2 in real time.

3. **Views:** Every occupied room should have a view of vegetation, sky, or natural features. Ulrich demonstrated in 1984 that views matter. We have had 40 years to incorporate this. Most buildings still do not.

4. **Outdoor access:** Schools should provide a minimum of 2 hours of outdoor time per day (the dose-response threshold for myopia prevention). Workplaces should facilitate outdoor breaks. Building design should make going outside easy and intuitive, not an act of leaving the building.

5. **Microbial environment:** Indoor spaces should not be hermetically sealed from outdoor microbial environments. Natural ventilation, indoor plants, green walls, and soil contact surfaces can increase indoor microbial diversity. Excessive sanitisation of surfaces in non-clinical settings should be reconsidered in light of Rook's evidence.

6. **Movement surfaces:** Flat, uniform flooring should not be the only surface available. Stairs should be visible and inviting (not hidden behind elevator lobbies). Textural variation in walking surfaces supports proprioception. Climbing structures, hanging bars, and three-dimensional movement opportunities should be standard features of public spaces and workplaces.

7. **Temperature variation:** The modern habit of maintaining buildings at a constant 21-22 degrees Celsius eliminates the thermal variation that drives metabolic flexibility and brown adipose tissue activation. Some variation is beneficial.

Goal 11: Monkey Bars at Every Bus Stop

This is what Goal 11 is about. It sounds like a joke to people who have never read the evidence. It is not a joke. It is a design specification based on the finding that the built environment systematically deprives human organisms of the environmental inputs they require.

Monkey bars at bus stops. Climbing walls on stairwells. Pull-up bars at train stations. Hanging structures in parks. Balance beams along footpaths. These are not recreational amenities. They are environmental enrichment for a captive primate. They are the built-environment equivalent of the branches, rocks, and varied terrain that every zoo provides for its primates because the alternative — a bare concrete enclosure — produces stereotypies, self-harm, and immune dysfunction.

We know this. We apply it to every species except our own.

---

14. Evidence Quality Assessment

Honest research requires honest assessment of its own evidence base. The following table summarises the confidence level for each major claim in this paper:

Source	Confidence	Notes
Klepeis (2001) — indoor time	High (direction), Medium (specifics)	Core finding solid; specific numbers outdated by 25 years. No updated replication exists. Current figure likely higher.
Morgan (2012) — myopia epidemic	High	Well-replicated across populations. Strong mechanism (retinal dopamine). Taiwan intervention provides quasi-experimental support. Mainstream ophthalmology consensus.
Li (2006, 2007) — forest bathing / NK cells	Medium	Promising but needs independent replication. Small samples. Single research group. Confounds (vacation, activity, air quality) not fully isolated. Phytoncide hotel experiment is strongest but small.
Ulrich (1984) — window study	Medium-High	Small n (46) but elegant design. Direction broadly supported by subsequent healthcare design research. Multiple consistent outcome measures within study.
Kaplan & Kaplan (1989) — ART	High	Theoretical framework with decades of supporting research. General principle well-established in environmental psychology.

Source	Confidence	Notes
Allen (2016) — CO2 and cognition	High	Controlled study with large effect sizes. Growing independent replication. Real-world CO2 measurements in buildings confirm tested levels are common.
Rook (2013) — Old Friends	High (framework)	Widely accepted in immunology. Strong epidemiological and animal model support. Specific causal pathways still being mapped.
Wilson (1984) — biophilia	Medium-High	Theoretical framework. Cross-cultural landscape preferences and prepared learning provide support. Difficult to test definitively (evolutionary hypothesis).
Holick (2007) — vitamin D deficiency	High (prevalence), Medium (non-skeletal effects)	Deficiency prevalence well-documented. Skeletal effects definitive. Non-skeletal effects (depression, immunity, cancer) supported by observational data but supplementation trial results mixed.
Circadian disruption	High	Mechanism well-understood (ipRGCs, melatonin). Indoor light inadequacy well-documented. IARC classification of shift work as probable carcinogen.
Louv (2005) — Nature Deficit Disorder	N/A (narrative)	Cultural contribution, not empirical claim. Term is descriptive, not diagnostic. Underlying pattern supported by empirical evidence reviewed above.

What We Do Not Know

- **Updated indoor time data.** Klepeis is 25 years old. We are building policy arguments on data from the pre-smartphone era. A large-scale, multi-country time-use study using modern methods (GPS tracking, wearables) is urgently needed.
- **Interaction effects.** Each deprivation (light, air, microbes, movement, nature) has been studied in isolation. We do not know how they interact when all are present simultaneously — which they always are in indoor environments. The combined effect may be additive, synergistic, or in some cases redundant. Nobody has studied this.
- **Dose-response for nature contact.** We know 2 hours outdoors protects against myopia. We know forest bathing trips enhance NK cells. We do not have precise dose-response curves for most of the outcomes reviewed here. How much outdoor time is enough? Does it matter what kind of outdoor environment? These are answerable questions that have not been systematically addressed.
- **Forest bathing replication.** Li's work needs independent verification. The findings are biologically plausible but the evidence base is thin relative to the claims made in the wellness industry.
- **Vitamin D causation.** The association between low vitamin D and various non-skeletal diseases is clear. Whether supplementation prevents these diseases is less clear — large trials have produced mixed results. The distinction between "deficiency as marker of indoor living" and "deficiency as causal factor" has not been resolved for many outcomes.

---

15. References

Primary Sources

1. Allen, J.G., MacNaughton, P., Satish, U., Santanam, S., Vallarino, J., & Spengler, J.D. (2016). Associations of Cognitive Function Scores with Carbon Dioxide, Ventilation, and Volatile Organic Compound Exposures in Office Workers: A Controlled Exposure Study of Green and Conventional Office Environments. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 124(6), 805-812. https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1510037

2. Anglin, R.E., Samaan, Z., Walter, S.D., & McDonald, S.D. (2013). Vitamin D deficiency and depression in adults: systematic review and meta-analysis. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 202(2), 100-107. https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.111.106666

3. Berman, M.G., Jonides, J., & Kaplan, S. (2008). The cognitive benefits of interacting with nature. *Psychological Science*, 19(12), 1207-1212. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02225.x

4. Berto, R. (2005). Exposure to restorative environments helps restore attentional capacity. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 25(3), 249-259. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2005.07.001

5. Forrest, K.Y. & Stuhldreher, W.L. (2011). Prevalence and correlates of vitamin D deficiency in US adults. *Nutrition Research*, 31(1), 48-54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nutres.2010.12.001

6. Holick, M.F. (2007). Vitamin D deficiency. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 357(3), 266-281. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMra070553

7. Kaplan, R. & Kaplan, S. (1989). *The Experience of Nature: A Psychological Perspective.* Cambridge University Press. ISBN: 978-0521341394

8. Klepeis, N.E., Nelson, W.C., Ott, W.R., Robinson, J.P., Tsang, A.M., Switzer, P., Behar, J.V., Hern, S.C., & Engelmann, W.H. (2001). The National Human Activity Pattern Survey (NHAPS): a resource for assessing exposure to environmental pollutants. *Journal of Exposure Science & Environmental Epidemiology*, 11, 231-252. https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.jea.7500165

9. Li, Q., Morimoto, K., Nakadai, A., Inagaki, H., Katsumata, M., Shimizu, T., Hirata, Y., Hirata, K., Suzuki, H., Miyazaki, Y., Kagawa, T., Koyama, Y., Ohira, T., Takayama, N., Krensky, A.M., & Kawada, T. (2007). Forest Bathing Enhances Human Natural Killer Activity and Expression of Anti-Cancer Proteins. *International Journal of Immunopathology and Pharmacology*, 20(2 Suppl 2), 3-8. https://doi.org/10.1177/03946320070200S202

10. Li, Q., Nakadai, A., Matsushima, H., Miyazaki, Y., Krensky, A.M., Kawada, T., & Morimoto, K. (2006). Phytoncides (wood essential oils) induce human natural killer cell activity. *Immunopharmacology and Immunotoxicology*, 28(2), 319-333. https://doi.org/10.1080/08923970600809439

11. Louv, R. (2005). *Last Child in the Woods: Saving Our Children from Nature-Deficit Disorder.* Algonquin Books. ISBN: 978-1565122529

12. Martineau, A.R., Jolliffe, D.A., Hooper, R.L., Greenberg, L., Aloia, J.F., Bergman, P., … & Camargo, C.A. (2017). Vitamin D supplementation to prevent acute respiratory tract infections: systematic review and meta-analysis of individual participant data. *BMJ*, 356, i6583. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.i6583

13. Mitchell, R. & Popham, F. (2008). Effect of exposure to natural environment on health inequalities: an observational population study. *The Lancet*, 372(9650), 1655-1660. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(08)61689-X

14. Morgan, I.G., Ohno-Matsui, K., & Saw, S.M. (2012). Myopia. *The Lancet*, 379(9827), 1739-1748. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60272-4

15. Ohman, A. & Mineka, S. (2001). Fears, phobias, and preparedness: toward an evolved module of fear and fear learning. *Psychological Review*, 108(3), 483-522. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.108.3.483

16. Orians, G.H. & Heerwagen, J.H. (1992). Evolved responses to landscapes. In J.H. Barkow, L. Cosmides, & J. Tooby (Eds.), *The Adapted Mind: Evolutionary Psychology and the Generation of Culture* (pp. 555-579). Oxford University Press.

17. Rook, G.A.W. (2013). Regulation of the immune system by biodiversity from the natural environment: An ecosystem service essential to health. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(46), 18360-18367. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1313731110

18. Rose, K.A., Morgan, I.G., Ip, J., Kifley, A., Huynh, S., Smith, W., & Mitchell, P. (2008). Outdoor Activity Reduces the Prevalence of Myopia in Children. *Ophthalmology*, 115(8), 1279-1285. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ophtha.2007.12.019

19. Scheer, F.A., Hilton, M.F., Mantzoros, C.S., & Shea, S.A. (2009). Adverse metabolic and cardiovascular consequences of circadian misalignment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(11), 4453-4458. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0808180106

20. Stein, M.M., Hrusch, C.L., Gozdz, J., Igartua, C., Pivniouk, V., Murray, S.E., … & Sperling, A.I. (2016). Innate Immunity and Asthma Risk in Amish and Hutterite Farm Children. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 375(5), 411-421. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1508749

21. Taylor, A.F., Kuo, F.E., & Sullivan, W.C. (2001). Coping with ADD: The Surprising Connection to Green Play Settings. *Environment and Behavior*, 33(1), 54-77. https://doi.org/10.1177/00139160121972864

22. Ulrich, R.S. (1984). View through a window may influence recovery from surgery. *Science*, 224(4647), 420-421. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.6143402

23. Wilson, E.O. (1984). *Biophilia.* Harvard University Press. ISBN: 978-0674074422

24. Wilson, E.O. & Kellert, S.R. (Eds.). (1993). *The Biophilia Hypothesis.* Island Press. ISBN: 978-1559631471

Appendix A: Cross-References to Related Research

This paper is part of a larger body of research within the OMXUS project examining the mismatch between human evolutionary design and modern built environments. The following companion papers address overlapping and intersecting domains:

Direct Dependencies

Paper	Location	Relationship to This Paper
The Human Enclosure	`../human_enclosure/`	The parent thesis. Argues that modern built environments fail zoo welfare criteria when applied to the human animal. This paper provides the nature-specific evidence for that argument: light deprivation, air quality failure, microbial environment loss, circadian inversion. The Human Enclosure frames the architectural and systemic critique; this paper provides the biological substrate.
Play Deprivation	`../play_deprivation/`	Directly overlapping. The shrinking range of children's outdoor play (documented by Louv and by play deprivation research) is both a cause and a symptom of indoor living. Play deprivation research documents what children lose when moved indoors; this paper documents what the indoor environment fails to provide. The myopia epidemic, attention fatigue, and nature deficit disorder appear in both papers from different angles.

Paper	Location	Relationship to This Paper
Sleep Science	`../sleep_science/`	The circadian disruption chapter of this paper is the bridge. Indoor light is simultaneously too dim during the day (insufficient circadian entrainment, insufficient retinal dopamine for eye development) and too bright at night (melatonin suppression, delayed sleep onset). The myopia epidemic and the sleep disruption epidemic share the same root cause: the indoor light environment fails both the visual and the circadian systems. Sleep science documents the downstream consequences; this paper documents the upstream cause.

Related Papers

Paper	Location	Connection
Movement and Endurance	`../movement_endurance/`	Indoor environments eliminate terrain variation, stairs, and movement opportunity. Flat surfaces, elevators, escalators. The musculoskeletal deprivation of indoor living is a chapter this paper touches (proprioception, climbing) but does not fully develop. Movement/endurance research provides the biomechanical detail.
Barefoot and Minimal Footwear	`../barefoot_shoes/`	Indoor flat surfaces provide zero textural variation for foot proprioception. Sensory deprivation at the ground level. This paper discusses movement surfaces briefly; the barefoot research documents the specific proprioceptive and biomechanical consequences.
Inflammation, Depression, and the Gut-Brain Axis	`../inflammation_depression_gutbrain/`	Nature exposure reduces cortisol and inflammatory markers (Li's forest bathing data). Vitamin D deficiency from indoor living connects to depression via inflammatory pathways. Rook's Old Friends hypothesis connects microbial exposure loss to chronic inflammation. The gut-brain axis paper documents the downstream inflammatory cascade; this paper documents the environmental deprivation that initiates it.

Paper	Location	Connection
Loneliness Physiology	`../loneliness_physiology/`	Indoor isolation compounds social isolation. Putnam's social capital decline correlates with the move indoors and onto screens. Indoor living is not just a biological deprivation — it is a social one. The loneliness paper documents the physiological consequences of social disconnection; this paper documents the environmental conditions that facilitate it.
Health and Diet	`../health_diet_book/`	The Kitava islanders — the population with arguably the best-documented metabolic health outcomes — spend most of their time outdoors. The health outcomes attributed to diet may be partly attributable to light exposure, movement patterns, microbial environment, and circadian alignment. The diet-health relationship cannot be properly understood without controlling for the indoor/outdoor variable, and almost no dietary research does this.

The Integration Point

These papers are not a collection. They are facets of a single argument: modern human environments are defective enclosures. Each paper documents a different dimension of the defect — light, air, microbes, movement, sleep, play, food, social structure. The convergence across independent research domains is itself the strongest evidence. No single study proves the thesis. The pattern across dozens of studies, from dozens of labs, in dozens of countries, across half a dozen disciplines, does.

Appendix B: Key Statistics Summary

For reference and citation. All figures sourced from the references listed in this paper.

Statistic	Value	Source
Time spent indoors (US adults)	87% in buildings + 6% in vehicles = 93%	Klepeis et al., 2001
Years of 80-year life spent outdoors	~5.5 years	Calculated from Klepeis

Statistic	Value	Source
Indoor light intensity	100-500 lux	Multiple sources
Outdoor light intensity (overcast)	~10,000 lux	Multiple sources
Outdoor light intensity (direct sun)	~100,000 lux	Multiple sources
Outdoor time needed for myopia prevention	~2 hours/day	Morgan et al., 2012; Rose et al., 2008
Myopia rate, South Korea (19-year-old males)	96.5%	Morgan et al., 2012
Myopia rate, South Korea (1970s)	~20%	Morgan et al., 2012
Global myopia projection (2050)	~5 billion people	Holden et al., 2016
NK cell increase after forest exposure	50%+	Li et al., 2007
NK cell effect duration	Up to 30 days	Li et al., 2007
Hospital stay reduction (tree view vs wall)	7.96 vs 8.70 days	Ulrich, 1984
CO2 in outdoor air	~420 ppm	Current atmospheric measurement
CO2 threshold for cognitive decline	~1,000 ppm	Allen et al., 2016
CO2 in typical classroom	2,000-3,000 ppm	Multiple building studies
Vitamin D deficiency (global)	~1 billion people	Holick, 2007
Vitamin D deficiency (US adults)	~42%	Forrest & Stuhldreher, 2011
Vitamin D deficiency (US Black adults)	~82%	Forrest & Stuhldreher, 2011
Asthma prevalence, Amish children	5%	Stein et al., 2016
Asthma prevalence, Hutterite children	21%	Stein et al., 2016

This paper is part of the OMXUS Research Series. It serves Goals 11 (movement infrastructure), 12 (education redesign), and 14 (preventable disease) of the OMXUS project.

The species that evolved under open sky sealed itself inside. Then got sick. The evidence says: go outside.