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 only is it 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, 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 Antoine de Saint Exupery: “Fifty million people are wrong, but it is still a foolish thing.”

Barbaree has heard of the Black Plague that swept through Europe in the Middle Ages, resulting in the death of nearly a third of the European population, but few people died the five years between 1347 and 1352. What is most interesting, however, is the other two-thirds—the ones who didn’t die. Many of 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 just lucky?

Is it any wonder that we all grew up believing in the medical model of health care? After all, how much better spent would our health dollars be—in treatment, education and research—if the germ theory of disease was true? What if the ‘germ theory of disease’ is not only a single aspect of the cause of disease and, at worst, a theory flawed at its core.

What this tells us is that modern medicine (or Big Pharma, as the pharmaceutical companies with revenues exceeding $3 billion are often called) has based its fundamental premise on a theory that is, at best, quite so cut and dried as we’ve been led to believe. Highly controversial when it was first proposed, the germ theory is now the cornerstone of modern medicine, and its chief proponent, a scientist named Claude Bernard (1813–1878), who argued that it was not the ‘seed’ (the germ) that caused disease, but was instead the ‘soil’ (the human body). Bernard argued that germs are nothing more than opportunistic organisms. It was an argument that persisted throughout their careers, and for his entire life Pasteur was convinced that germs lay at the heart of disease. Only on his deathbed—with Claude Bernard present—did Pasteur finally admit that Bernard was right. In the end, Pasteur came to realize 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 R. J. Haber. Haber was also interested in the cause of disease, but he was convinced that germs were not the cause. A study published in 1869 by Pasteur’s colleague, Louis Pasteur, showed that the presence of germs was necessary for the development of disease. Haber argued that this was not the case, and that the presence of germs was not necessary for the development of disease. Haber argued that disease was caused by the interaction of the body and the environment, and that the presence of germs was not necessary for the development of disease.

Haber argued that disease was caused by the interaction of the body and the environment, and that the presence of germs was not necessary for the development of disease. Haber argued that disease was caused by the interaction of the body and the environment, and that the presence of germs was not necessary for the development of disease. Haber argued that disease was caused by the interaction of the body and the environment, and that the presence of germs was not necessary for the development of disease. Haber argued that disease was caused by the interaction of the body and the environment, and that the presence of germs was not necessary for the development of disease.

The germ theory of disease has been a cornerstone of modern medicine, but recent evidence suggests that it may not be the whole story. Evidence suggests that the immune system plays a key role in the development of disease, and that the presence of germs is not always necessary for the development of disease. The immune system plays a key role in the development of disease, and that the presence of germs is not always necessary for the development of disease. The immune system plays a key role in the development of disease, and that the presence of germs is not always necessary for the development of disease. The immune system plays a key role in the development of disease, and that the presence of germs is not always necessary for the development of disease.