Two Vital Perspectives The following article is contributed by two writers, a chiropractor and a naturopath. Each offers a unique and vitalistic perspective.

The germ theory states that diseases are due to specific microorganisms, which are capable of transmission from body to body. Yet although it is widely accepted by medical professionals, forming the basis for billions of dollars of healthcare spending (actually sickness care, but that’s another article), the fact that so many people believe it to be true doesn’t make it so. This is one of the classic logical fallacies: argumentum ad populum, the appeal to the majority, where a thing is stated to be true simply because so many people believe it.

That didn’t work for the belief that the earth was flat, and it shouldn’t work for a theory of disease that is increasingly coming under fire from the scientific community and whose fundamental premise was known to be flawed almost from the beginning. I am reminded of the famous quote by Anatole France: “If fifty million people say a foolish thing, it is still a foolish thing.”
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The germ theory states that diseases are due to specific microorganisms, which are capable of transmission from body to body. Not although it is widely accepted by medical professionals, the basis for billions of dollars of healthcare spending (actually vitamin care, but that's another article, the fact that so many people believe it to be true doesn't make it so. This is one of the classic logical fallacies: argument from popularity, the appeal to the majority, when a thing is stated to be true simply because so many people believe it.

That didn't work for the belief that the earth was flat, and it shouldn't work for a theory of disease that is increasingly coming under fire from the scientific community and whose fundamental premise was known to be flawed almost from the beginning. I am reminded of the famous quote by Napoleon: "Fifty million people in Paris below, it’s still a thing to believe." One might think that someone sitting in a court of law deathbed confessions are given an extra weight, so too should we regard theory that even its most well-known proponent—as Pasteur arguably was—recanted in the end. For the past one hundred years, modern medicine has pursued a theory that is, at best, only a single aspect of the cause of disease and, at worst, a theory flawed at its core.

The germ theory is now the cornerstone of modern medicine, and its chief proponent, Louis Pasteur, a demigod in the medical canon. But is what we remember Pasteur for the last words he said on the subject?

"If the germ theory of disease were true, there wouldn't be anybody around to tell you about it!" —R.J. Palmer, from Conflicts Clarity

I'm not denying that the disease itself existed; it's well-documented. The Bubonic Plague, associated with the bacterium named Versenia pestis, was one of the deadliest pandemics in human history—and one of the most studied. Instead, my argument is against the 'germ theory of disease' itself, the overriding idea in many people's minds that exposure to a germ almost always equals disease, when common sense tells us that this simply is not the case.

Everyone has heard of the Black Plague that swept through Europe in the Middle Ages, didn't they 'catch' the disease? Were they just lucky?

The year was 1348, the victims, sharing a home and meals across the same family table. What about them—why didn't they catch the disease? Were they part lucky?

So, what is most interesting, however, is the other two-thirds—the ones who didn't die. Many times the survivors were members of the same family as the victims, sharing a home and meals across the same family table. What about them—why didn't they catch the disease? Were they part lucky?

As Pasteur said, the germ theory of disease is full of holes, and Pasteur was correct.

Pasture was a scientist named Claude Bernard (1813–1878), who argued that it was not the 'seed' (the bacterium named microorganisms) that caused disease, but was instead the 'soil' (the human body). Bernard argued that this was a scientist named Claude Bernard (1813–1878), who argued that it was not the 'seed' (the bacterium named microorganisms) that caused disease, but was instead the 'soil' (the human body). Bernard argued that the germ was not the only element in determining who became sick and who remained well.

Everyone is familiar with Pasteur's name, but one of his contemporaries and chief opponents was a scientist named Claude Bernard (1813–1878), who argued that it was not the 'seed' (the bacterium named microorganisms) that caused disease, but was instead the 'soil' (the human body). Bernard argued that the germ was not the only element in determining who became sick and who remained well.

What is most interesting, however, is the other two-thirds—the ones who didn't die. Many times the survivors were members of the same family as the victims, sharing a home and meals across the same family table. What about them—why didn't they catch the disease? Were they part lucky?

So, what is most interesting, however, is the other two-thirds—the ones who didn't die. Many times the survivors were members of the same family as the victims, sharing a home and meals across the same family table. What about them—why didn't they catch the disease? Were they part lucky?

The germ theory is now the cornerstone of modern medicine, and its chief proponent, Louis Pasteur, a demigod in the medical canon. But is what we remember Pasteur for the last words he said on the subject?

"If the germ theory of disease were true, there wouldn't be anybody around to tell you about it!" —R.J. Palmer, from Conflicts Clarity

I'm not denying that the disease itself existed; it's well-documented. The Bubonic Plague, associated with the bacterium named Versenia pestis, was one of the deadliest pandemics in human history—and one of the most studied. Instead, my argument is against the 'germ theory of disease' itself, the overriding idea in many people's minds that exposure to a germ almost always equals disease, when common sense tells us that this simply is not the case.