

THE GERM THEORY

DR. ROYAL E. S. HAYES, M.D.

The germ theory of disease is the greatest travesty on 'science' that was ever stumbled over during this semicivilized age; the most ghastly medical farce in which the human mass ever played its part; the biggest hoax the medical profession ever took in after but little hesitation and no mastication.

But this is mere assertion. We who thoughtfully appraise sanity in mind and body are not content with that. So let us investigate the pathological anatomy of this specimen of allopathic tradition. We shall investigate in three ways. First, by recalling a bit of history, second by using the test of reason, that is, putting facts in their proper order and sequence and third, by citing from the more recent reports of scientific investigators.

The bit of history referred to is the state of medical theory at the period when the germ theory of disease was hatched. Chemistry and physics had been progressing for many years, but medicine had no science. It was boiling with theories, turbulent in practice and altogether lacking in unifying principle. Moreover, its destructive effects were very apparent. The debacle of faith in 'physic' was widespread and it was no doubt hastened by the fall of a number of high personages under its care. For if kings and princes are not able to buy health from the doctors, but fall into their graves in the attempt, what of lesser people? Medicine as a profession was in a bad state.

For many years before this, scientists had been studying microscopic life faithfully and laboriously as is their wont. Finally, along came Pasteur, a geologist, physicist and chemist. And with him came the notion of using the microscope to somehow fill the urgent need of progress in medicine. Clever man! Perhaps germs cause disease? Who knows? They are usually with it anyhow! And if they are not the cause but only the result, who could deny scientific authority? Presto! Kill the germs and you cure and prevent disease! What a future! We'll kill germs and wipe up disease all over the earth! Hooray! chemists, doctors, pharmacists, purveyors and suppliers all, get busy! And the doctor! He can now shed his solemnity or hypocrisy and take on a busy attitude of cheer. He can now step up to a door with light-hearted assurance! He has something!

Well, it was something. It was capitalized into all sorts of aggressive and protective medical, nursing and domestic supplies, accelerated by the rise of the industrial age. Monopolies were reared and roared in the advertising field of drugs, chemicals and paraphernalia. Health boards 'stamped out,' trampled over people, picked up tax money like mad and got themselves set up as a hierarchy. Foundations arose. Politicians—but never mind, we'll not push through any further. Anyhow, inversely ironical as destiny sometimes is, one great good of vast dimensions accompanied the crusade. At

least the populations learned to clean up, considerably. In fact, the most contagious thing about germs is the fear of dirt that they inspire.

But this again is mere assertion. One should not trust assertion alone. Reason is the real test. It is even the interpreter of science. So let us consider the germ himself. In one respect he is almost human. He must eat and drink to be merry. What *does* he eat? Is he carnivorous or does he sup on normal secretions? Not a germ has ever been caught at these capers yet. He thrives on diseased or waste products, but never has he been known to multiply in normal tissues or normal secretions. If that were possible he would long ago have been the sole survivor and then of course, died of starvation. We track down a rhinoceros and conquer him but it is more difficult to track a germ through normal fluids; and to chase him through normal tissues is, as Mark Twain might say, slightly impossible. It has been tried and deaths have resulted but nothing else happened that has been reported.

Well then, if the germ is not carnivorous, what does he eat? Now just step back a little. You may or may not know that there is a complicated process going on in living organisms termed metabolism. Metabolism means change. Change goes on in all cells of the organism all the time. It consists of constructive and destructive metabolism, that is, taking in and incorporating fresh material and breaking down and sending out worn material. What then, does the germ feed on? Is it reasonable to think that he feeds on living tissue or is it more likely that he lives on waste or dead material? It is a fact that bacteria cannot live on healthy cells but thrive on waste material; and the more the waste the more dense his population becomes.

We can find an analogy in the consideration of intestinal worms. Worms cannot live in normal gastrointestinal secretions because their food is not there. The truth is, certain sets of symptoms suggest conditions that favour the presence of worms. So many patients have these worm symptoms corrected without having seen worms that we must conclude that it is the condition of the patient and not worms that cause the trouble. Other patients do have worms, but when a high potency of a remedy is given the symptoms soon go and the worms too. Now, it would be ridiculous to suppose our high potencies would kill worms directly. Therefore we must on this point conclude that by correcting the condition of the patient the worms are starved out. In fact, they may be observed, softened and disintegrated after the medicine has acted, instead of lively and vigorous where only a cathartic or vermifuge has been used. This is not a proof of the germ fallacy but only an analogous illustration. But is it not more reasonable to suppose that the germ also earns his living by feeding on waste than by 'attacking' living cells? That is one thing that can never happen here or anywhere else. Normal tissue repels all attacks. Never has a culture been made with living tissue.

But there is even more positive evidence that the purpose of germs is to break down and facilitate the elimination of poisonous material. That is, that disease comes first, bacteria later. That alone shows cause and result. Disease

is often far advanced and even destructive before germs have appeared. That fact alone shows the folk tale of Pasteur to be pure invention.

Here is another fact with which to cancel the fable. Bacteria are the feeblest of known living creatures. Lower creatures do not attack the higher, that is effectively, as a genus. The bacterium has no chance at all with a living cell. Even the laboratory protagonist of so-called germ disease provides dead food to make his cultures.

Another laboratory fact is that these lowest of known creatures cannot alter their environment. But varied environment changes bacteria into various forms accordingly. This is done freely by bacteriologists themselves.

Here is another test that proves that bacteria feed on refuse and not on people. Examine the urine, faeces, and other excreta of a person who is congested with the products of over feeding and drinking, but has comparatively small eliminations. Only a relatively few bacteria will be found. Now get that same person to fast for a week and his excreta will be teeming with bacteria and most of them dead ones. This proves conclusively that they survive only in internal filth. Many bacteriologists are now giving up the idea that germs are the cause of disease. But the rank and file of commercial and medical men are trudging cheerfully along the well worn path.

A new fashion in germ theorizing is not that the germs cause disease but that their excretions cause it. Is this a prop to keep Pasteur's monument from toppling over? As a theorem it is, in the light of what we have gone over, more screwy than any previous invention. But taking it seriously, if we can, how do they know? They do not. In their experiments they never separate the bacteria from excreta but inject both; and in susceptible subjects death has been caused thereby. But never mind that of course. If the bacteriologist would like a more reasonable hypothesis why not note that bacteria are secondary to disease and like worms, fulfil their normal purpose? Not as parasites *per se*, but as scavengers; for it is a proven fact that human toxins are more destructive than germs or their excreta.

Coming now to purely scientific investigations, we have important testimony that germs do not cause disease. One important report is *Hygiene Laboratory Bulletin* No. 123 from the Bureau of Public Documents, Washington, D.C., to be obtained for twenty-five cents. Here are a few extracts cut to space, which latter is, I confess, getting scarce. Ten volunteers were inoculated with secretions from the nose and throat and with blood from typical cases of influenza. Results negative. Thirty men were inoculated by spray, swab or both of the nose and throat. Thirty negative results. Ten volunteers were placed close to selected patients with flu and exposed by being coughed in the face. The exposure continued thirty minutes. No symptoms were developed. Fifty volunteers were subjected to the same procedure at another location. Results negative. One hundred and eighteen sailors were inoculated, swabbed, sprayed and dosed with cultures of the most virile strains of flu possible to obtain and observed seven days. Not a symptom. Here I would

say aside that I doubt that no harm resulted eventually from these experiments, but that they must, after an interlude of nonreaction, have worked out as chronic disease. This opinion is strengthened by the vision of the pale faces, thin bodies, soft muscles and checked development of children who are brought in awhile after having been inoculated with 'preventative,' in comparison with children who have not been favoured with up-to-date pediatric and official 'care'.

But as to the above experiments, where are the doctors? I mean the allopathic doctors. And where are the drug chemists and biologists? Why, they are busy trying to destroy germs. Why disturb the national economy? The financial crisis would be dreadful. But they should be in better business. Let the germs do their work. Germs ferment the toxins making it easier for the sick body to expel them. If not expelled metabolism contracts, circulation is blocked, organic function is stalled and death ensues. Live and let live applies even to germs.

Russian scientists who worked many years on the problem of infection have proved technically that poisons, biologic and others, used as agents of infection do not cause disease directly but that disease depends primarily on the condition of the individual. That is, it depends on his tendency to disease. The microbes appear later. This experimental technique is too involved to be described here but is described thoroughly in a scientific article by Dr. W. W. Young in the *Journal of the American Institute of Homoeopathy*, May 1942. To put the findings briefly I quote, viz.: "There is first a disturbance of the nervous system in part or in whole which *destines* the animal (human) in a purely individual way. The microbe comes later and finds fertile soil". Also, "Sickness may and does progress in the absence of microbes or it may terminate favourably in their presence". This principle accords with the well known fact that some people (or animals) will go through an epidemic unscathed, others will be touched lightly, others severely but make good recoveries, others survive with chronic effects and still others die. Individual inheritance and condition together with time appoints and determines fate.

Although scientific facts like these could be related *ad libitum*, proofs of this medical fallacy are already beyond dispute. But it will be a long time before allopathic fallacies are swept aside to make way for dynamic methods of treatment. It took two hundred years for Newton's principles of motion to get around. Specious propositions are born without difficulty but die long and hard. People yet think by believing, which is really no thinking at all. Then they will use all the powers of mind to defend the belief. The will to doubt, to reserve opinion, to question, is abjectly, disgracefully feeble.

Now my hearers (or readers) say, and rightly, if germs are not the cause of epidemic diseases, what is? The explanation is not easy because we are here approaching ground that is not familiar to many. The 'cause' is twofold, each fold having many divisions. There is first, the individual latent tendency or as it is often termed, the constitutional susceptibility. This is

made up of inheritance and the impress on one's life of what has gone before. The second or exciting cause is made up of the influences of heat, cold, atmospheric changes and many other environmental influences. The greatest of these, but the least recognized, is the play of magnetic forces upon life, changing in intensity and qualities with the progress of time. Our states of health and our fates are bound up in the three principles of heredity, environmental reactions and time.

Homocopathy is thus a practical semi-mysticism which gives special consideration to these individual problems. But the germ theory of disease, so far as informed and thoughtful people are concerned, is dead; and it is high time it was buried.

—*The Homoeopathic Recorder*, May 1947
