

## THE NATURE OF DISEASE

J. W. PAGE

"Psora," said Hahnemann, "is the mother of all disease." Psora, according to him, opened the way to the venereal diseases, and in combination with them, has produced many unpleasant offspring. Cancer and chilblains, for example, are combinations of psora, syphilis and sycosis (suppressed gonorrhœa); as also are psoriasis and Bright's disease. Tuberculosis and scrofula are combinations of psora and syphilis; erysipelas and arthritis are combinations of psora and sycosis.

Ellis Barker has asked (rather pertinently) if anyone knows what Hahnemann's psora was. The answer is that Hahnemann himself didn't know. All diseases, other than the venereal diseases, he put in an omnibus category, and labelled psora. Psora, then, may have included many diseases, but it seems certain that leprosy and other skin diseases which were prevalent hundreds of years ago figured largely among them.

What conditions first produced psora and thus led to man's troubles I have often wondered. That knowledge is lost in antiquity. No doubt the cause was some deviation from Nature's laws of health.

Can we then reverse the disease process by returning to Nature, i.e. by living open air, natural lives, by eating fresh, raw uncooked foods, by paying attention to rest, cleanliness, etc. The answer is, unfortunately, no. We can do much by these methods to enable the body to keep its diseases in check but alone they will not eradicate them. At every opportunity the latent disease will manifest itself and produce symptoms in the bodily economy.

Fortunately we have, in homœopathic medication, a method of eradicating inherited disease, provided that the

disease process has not gone too far. Homœopathy is, however, an art by no means easy to learn. It requires an extensive knowledge of the symptoms of disease and of a vast materia medica, and a thorough understanding of the patient.

But, the reader will ask, are all complaints due to psora and venereal diseases? What about infectious and contagious diseases? Are these not caused by germs, going about and seeking whom they may devour?

Let us listen to Professor Kent on this subject. (*Lectures on Homœopathic Philosophy, page 58*):

"The physicians will tell you that bacillus is the cause of t.b. But if the man had not been susceptible he could not have been affected by it . . . the tubercles come first and the bacillus is secondary. It has never been found prior to the tubercle but it follows that and comes then as a scavenger.

"The cause of the tubercular deposit rests with psora, the chronic miasm. Bacilli are not the cause of disease; they never come until after the disease.

"Allopaths are really taking the sequence for the consequence thus leading to a false theory, the bacteria theory. You may destroy the bacteria and yet not destroy the disease. The susceptibility remains the same and only those who are susceptible will take the disease." and again at page 59

"The more bacteria, the less poison. A typhoid stool when it first passes from the bowel has a very scanty allowance of bacteria and yet it is very poisonous. But let it remain until it becomes black with bacteria and it is comparatively benign. Why does the poison not increase with the bacteria? You can potentize as I have done, a portion of a tuberculous mass alive with bacilli, and after being triturated with sugar of milk and mashed

to a pulp it will continue to manifest its symptoms in the most potent form. You can precipitate the purulent tubercular fluid in alcohol . . . until no microbe can be found, yet, if administered to a healthy man it will establish the nature of the disease in the economy, which is prior to phthisis. Thus we have the cause of phthisis not in the bacteria but in the virus which the bacteria are sent to destroy. Man lives longer with the bacteria than he could without them. If we could succeed in putting a fluid into the economy that could destroy the bacteria the consumptive would soon die."

Clearly, Professor Kent was of opinion that the germ is the consequence of disease and not the cause. He has been proved correct by the now acknowledged fact that sterile death is possible, i.e. that it is possible to sterilize the blood of bacteria and yet for the patient to die of the disease.

But if germs do not cause infectious diseases, what does cause them? Present day knowledge is insufficient to explain disease in exact terms any more than it can explain the phenomena of taste or smell, but we do know that disease is a disintegration of bodily tissue similar to, say, disintegration by fire in the inorganic world, and similarly contagious. Disease will not attack a perfectly healthy body, the healthy cells being proof against it. It will only attack those susceptible. Even an outside observer like H. G. Wells recognized this. On page 624 of his "*Science of Life*" he writes:

"There are people who can carry typhoid or cholera in their systems and excrete swarms of active deadly bacteria in their faeces and urine without themselves shewing the slightest sign of illness."

Wells was puzzled by this phenomenon, but the explanation lies surely in Professor Kent's theory that the germ is the result and not the cause of disease.

In an epidemic some people always escape although constantly in contact with the disease. Why? There are two possible reasons. First, they may be so healthy that the disease will not affect them. This is the case with only very few people. Secondly, they may be afflicted themselves with a chronic disease which the epidemic cannot oust and supplant, which it would have to do before it could get a hold. This is the case with the vast majority of those who escape. Have we not all noticed how the poor and sickly often escape influenza when the strong succumb?

How does inoculation and vaccination affect susceptibility to disease? These practices consist of the infliction of a disease on the body in the hope that the prevalent epidemic will not be able to suppress it, and so will be kept at bay. But the sufferers are saddled for life with a miasm which leads to all sorts of trouble in after years and is handed down to their children and in many cases causes more suffering and danger than would an attack of the feared small-pox or typhoid, etc.

One conclusion we can draw from our study. The allopathic search for germs and germicides is of academic interest only, and cannot assist one iota in the eradication and cure of disease.

—*Heal Thyself*, July, 1947.