

DOCTORS, DISEASE, AND HEALTH

DOCTORS, DISEASE, AND HEALTH

*A Critical Survey of Therapeutics
Modern and Ancient*

by

CYRIL SCOTT

AUTHOR OF 'MUSIC; ITS SECRET INFLUENCE
THROUGHOUT THE AGES', ETC.



METHUEN & CO. LTD. LONDON

36 Essex Street Strand W.C.2.

First published in 1938

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to certain kind and broad-minded physicians who have been good enough to take an interest in this book and to set me wise on many points. My only regret is that for reasons that will become apparent I am unable to print their names in a dedicatory form.

C. S.

May 1937

CONTENTS

PART I

CHAPTER	PAGE
INTRODUCTORY REMARKS	ix
I. REASONS FOR WRITING THIS BOOK	3
II. PECULIAR PSYCHOLOGY OF DOCTORS	8
III. IGNORANCE IN THE MIDST OF LEARNING	18
IV. MENTAL MYOPIA OF DOCTORS AND LAYMEN	24
V. THE LURE OF ORTHODOXY	32
VI. THE FOLLY OF SPECIALISM	37
VII. THE ABUSE OF SURGICAL KNOWLEDGE	49
VIII. NURSING HOMES—A MENACE TO INVALIDS	62
IX. RISKS OF RADIOGRAPHY, RADIUM, AND THE CYSTOSCOPE	67
X. AUTOTHERAPY VERSUS COMMERCIAL SERUM THERAPY	73
XI. POTENTIZATION VERSUS INJECTION	87
XII. COMMERCIALISM INDIRECTLY RESPONSIBLE FOR DISEASE	99
XIII. THE GERM FETISH	114
XIV. DR. HAY'S PURGE REMEDY	122
XV. THE CAUSE OF CANCER DISCOVERED BUT IGNORED	128
XVI. MODERN BIO-CHEMISTRY AND THE WORK OF DR. HENRY GILBERT	147
XVII. RELATING OF THOSE WHO HAVE HEALED THEM- SELVES	159
XVIII. HOMEOPATHY	176
XIX. OSTEOPATHY—THE SCIENCE OF ADJUSTMENT	182

PART II

CHAPTER	PAGE
XX. MEDICAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE ANCIENTS	191
XXI. ASTROLOGY IN RELATION TO DISEASE	199
XXII. OBSESSION A FREQUENT CAUSE OF INSANITY AND EPILEPSY	210
XXIII. VARIOUS FORMS OF OBSESSION	215
XXIV. WHAT REINCARNATION EXPLAINS	226
XXV. MISCELLANEOUS OCCULT OBSERVATIONS	236
XXVI. THE SCEPTICAL ATTITUDE	246
XXVII. HARMFUL CONCOMITANTS OF CIVILIZATION AND THEIR AVOIDANCE	253
XXVIII. CONCLUSION	260
NOTE	264
APPENDIX I	265
APPENDIX II	270
APPENDIX III	284

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

This book is written for the lay public; and my object in writing it is a simple one. As, in accordance with the old saying, 'Still water grows stagnant' and hence becomes useless, so does acquired knowledge, unless it flows out into the world for the benefit of others.

For more than half my life I have, as a hobby, busied myself with therapeutics and have examined many and varied systems of healing in the light of reason and free from scholastic prejudices. Thus in the nature of things I am in a position to present the layman with a collection of facts, some conclusions, and a few speculations which apart from other considerations may be instrumental in saving him from much that I consider I myself have been saved. The truth is, we have arrived at an especially dangerous stage in the history of medicine. Not only are we confronted with the conquest of technique over wisdom, but, in the words of Dr. Alexis Carrel, 'we now possess such a large amount of information on human beings that its very immensity prevents us from using it properly'.¹

In view of this it becomes all the more essential to separate the gold of true and valuable knowledge from the dross of dubious theories and assumptions which appear so plausible on the surface but are so illusory and danger-fraught underneath. Moreover, this task is one which only the layman with no preconceived notions, no blind adherence to orthodoxy and no personal axe to grind can safely hope to accomplish. Although I am not

¹ *Man the Unknown.*

prepared to go all the way with Bernard Shaw when he says: 'The truth about the doctor is so terrible that we dare not face it', I am none the less convinced that the truth about the medical profession in general is such that unless we face it we may have to contend with the most serious consequences. Yet what is equally important is that we should know and face the truth about health and disease, regarding which, incredible though it may sound, the average doctor is so astonishingly myopic that laymen and quacks have cured with judicious advice or a few simple remedies diseases for which the profession has no cure at all or has advocated the most drastic, expensive, and mutilative treatments. This is not to say that in the whole of the fraternity there are no wise and enlightened physicians who do not recognize the true cause of disease and how to treat it. On the contrary there are many who command our greatest respect and admiration both as men and savants. Indeed, it is with the discoveries and contentions of these wise physicians of whatever school that we are largely concerned in this book. My only regret is that in putting forward their pronouncements I have been obliged to employ criticism towards opposing notions and certain prevalent practices in a manner which may savour of a hostility which is far from intended. But this has been unavoidable in the circumstances. It is the old story; truth and fallacy can never be compatible, and one must pull down before one can build up. Nevertheless, the critical elements in this book should be regarded as secondary however much they may intermittently figure in its pages. My chief aim has been a constructive one; namely, to show the simple underlying cause of disease and why that cause has been obscured by superfluous and misleading complications of

purely scholastic interest but of little practical value. Furthermore, as the cause of disease is a simple one, so is the method for its prevention and its cure—whatever its name and its nature. But in proof of this I have been obliged to turn to branches of knowledge other than medical. Unless those important factors which may roughly be termed the ‘things of the spirit’ are taken into account, medical science can never be complete and the doctor will search in vain for truth. To the finding of the latter, certain, if simple, aspects of philosophy are essential. But in addition to this a philosophical attitude is required if we are to preserve our judgment and balance amidst that immensity of information about man to which Dr. Carrel referred, and which by its manifold and treacherous allurements has led so many from the paths of simple wisdom and common sense.

PART I

'We move from the complex to the simple, and the obvious is the last thing we learn.'—DR. ELBERT HUBBARD.

.

The prime cause of disease is the absence of substances which should be in the body and the presence of substances which should not be in the body.

.

There was a time when one man's meat was not another man's poison—it has merely become so through generations of faulty feeding.

.

The philosopher who has not learnt to be his own physician is unworthy of the name.

Chapter I

REASONS FOR WRITING THIS BOOK

Authors, especially when their books deal with provocative or unusual subjects, are apt to become the recipients of a large number of personal letters. One type of correspondent feels himself compelled to register his disapproval of this or that statement; another to express praise or even gratitude for enlightenment or solace received; another to ask for further information on given points, and yet another to ask for advice on certain personal problems that distress or bewilder him or her as the case may be. Such requests for advice are frequently accompanied by a brief life-history, and it has forcibly struck me in reading the great number of letters my own books have called forth, how many of my correspondents confess themselves to be the chronic sufferers from varying degrees of ill health. They have either been the victims of ill-advised, useless, and harmful operations, or of unsuccessful treatments which have left them no better or, what is more unfortunate, even worse off than they were before. And so, I write this book partly because I am convinced that the varying degrees of ill health from which the majority of people suffer are largely due to ignorance, credulity, and lack of a judicious and personal effort to obtain and maintain physical and mental health. And by ignorance I mean the result of not taking an intelligent interest in their own body. By credulity I mean the assumption that the prevailing customs in matters of nutrition must be right since they are followed by the majority; credulity, furthermore, regarding the

efficacy of the orthodox medical methods of the present day. Indeed, countless people are suffering from the indirect and disastrous results of a misplaced confidence in up-to-date medical men who, glamoured by their vast accumulation of learning, have turned their backs on wisdom and simple common sense. And not only are the all too confiding patients the victims of credulity, but also the doctors themselves—as among other things I shall attempt to show.

I am fully aware in making this statement that the proverbial disagreement among doctors is to many people a matter for sarcastic amusement, yet these people are none the less dependent on the very doctors they mildly deride. When forced to admit that they are deriving no benefit from a given treatment and then asked why they don't change their physician or set out to cure themselves, they lamely reply: 'After all, one is in the hands of the doctors!' And yet why are they in the hands of the doctors, except for the simple reason that they do not know how to keep themselves out of the hands of the doctors? Moreover, which doctors—those enlightened ones whose method of treatment is based on wisdom and common sense or those who blindly follow the dictates of the latest medical fashion of which the immediate results may, in some cases, be spectacular, but the after-effects disastrous to the patient? Let us not forget that many a man who gets into the hands of the doctors is as indiscriminating as the *nouveau riche* who gets into the hands of the picture dealers. Knowing nothing about true art, and therefore possessing no critical sense, he is easily led into buying a meretricious pot-boiler by a fashionable but indifferent painter which has no intrinsic and hence lasting value and from which any true artist would look away

with horror. And the simile is the more apt because many a wise physician does regard with horror a number of these new-fangled and insufficiently tried-out treatments which nowadays are foisted upon an innocent public.

Nevertheless medicine is reputed to be growing more precise and more scientific; but unfortunately this is for the most part due to its vast increase of scientific appliances rather than to its efficiency. Statistics show, for example, that deaths from cancer and heart disease are greatly on the increase, which does not say much for the vaunted attainments of modern medical science.

Now most people, unless self-dramatizers who for insidious reasons of vanity wish to enjoy a measure of ill health, desire to create more perfectly functioning bodies, and especially if they do not need to spend much time in the process. If they are materialists this desire arises from the perfectly natural wish to be healthy, and for them these pages are written. But they are also written for those who have good reasons for believing that the human body is an instrument of the soul, and who therefore aim at making it as efficient as they reasonably can under the strain and stress of what we are pleased to call civilization. The ancient sages maintained that such efficiency could be accomplished only through one's own efforts; hence we find in most schools of Yoga those specific directions for the achievement and maintenance of physical well-being as preliminary steps towards mental and spiritual evolution. In this book, however, we are not concerned with spiritual evolution as such, but with a survey of therapeutical methods and incidentally some comparison between them and the

teachings of the ancients. For in maintaining in accordance with the ancient Yogic teaching that physical efficiency can only be attained through individual effort such a survey is essential. The more so as by individual effort we do not mean totally and consistently unaided effort. There comes a time in the life of nearly every one when he requires temporarily to seek therapeutical aid. But only if he possesses a certain degree of knowledge is he in a position to discriminate between the type of aid to accept and the type to avoid, as already implied in my simile of the *nouveau riche* and the picture dealer. It must be added that although many people may already make strong efforts towards greater physical efficiency, they fail simply because they do not know how to make the right kind of effort.

Why I as a layman should be in a position to set them wise has already been implied. But there are other reasons. (1) Through my preoccupation with Esoteric Science and my contact with certain initiates I have come, largely through them, to hold a point of view which I think and hope may be of some use or interest to my readers; (2) the writing of a book of this type must be undertaken by a layman, because no doctor could write it without incurring the risk of being struck off the rolls. Apart from this we should remember that it is not the player but the spectator who sees most of the game. Thus, one advantage an honestly inquiring layman may have over the professional is that he is not hampered by too much learning along a given line. Like theologians, a large number of doctors are apt to look for truth within the confines of a given circle, yet many truths have been discovered outside that circle by those who are open-minded enough to seek.

Reverting to my first reason; Esoteric Science, since it deals with the subtler manifestations of Nature, solves many an obscure problem for which orthodox medical science can find no satisfying solution. And how can this be otherwise until the Medical Faculty realizes that Man is more than his physical body—a fact of which the ancients were fully aware? Indeed, I maintain that the ancient Yogic sages and the Ancient Greek physicians knew far more about the true science of Healing than do the majority of our most up-to-date doctors of the orthodox school. I also maintain that the more essentially scientific portions of our contemporary medical knowledge, if not consciously derived from those teachings of the ancients, are at any rate in accord with them. These are facts which among other things I shall hope to prove.

Chapter II

PECULIAR PSYCHOLOGY OF DOCTORS

Every one knows that when we talk of a scientific fact we mean a truth that has been revealed by scientific men as incontrovertible. There are, of course, many such truths in medical science, but as against that there are, as every one further knows, a vast variety of pseudo truths which, far from being incontrovertible, are solely matters for disagreement or at best of opinion. In fact, the truths of one generation become the fallacies of the next, the 'marvellous discoveries!' of twenty years ago the 'exploded idea' of the present day. Thus the less gullible members of the public lose faith and come to believe that in medical science incontrovertible facts are few and far between.

As for the doctors themselves, they present a strange admixture of credulity and scepticism; many of them place an astonishing reliance on the latest medical fad, but are apt to dismiss genuinely indisputable facts either as nonsense, as unproven, or as of no practical importance. For instance, I once remarked to a medical friend of mine that the prime physical cause of disease, whatever form it might take, was auto-intoxication (i.e. self-poisoning), plus starvation (a deficiency of those inorganic salts to be found in vital foods consumed as Nature intended they should be consumed). His answer was, 'I never heard of a more childish explanation of disease.' And yet I had merely quoted the conclusions arrived at by so eminent a physician and surgeon as Sir William Arbuthnot Lane, and by many other physicians in various parts of the world who had independently come to hold the same views.

Nor were those views the most modern and up-to-date. Ignoring for the moment similar pronouncements of the ancient sages, already towards the end of last century Louis Kuhne defined disease as *the presence of foreign matter within the system*. (He called it foreign because it was foreign to the body.) For the truth of his contention, moreover, he maintained there was an infallible test: viz. remove the foreign matter and *the disease itself*—whatever its name and nature—*disappears*. His methods were as simple as they were efficacious. He fed his patients on natural unfired food, rich in inorganic salts and vitamins, though the latter word had not then been invented. For the elimination of the foreign matter he employed steam-baths, sun-baths, and sitz-baths of a specific kind, together with other simple drugless methods.¹ He cured cancer, syphilis, leprosy, tuberculosis, diabetes, heart disease, glaucoma, not to mention the large variety of less formidable complaints to which man is liable. Thousands of patients passed through his hands, and if there was one man who might be said to have presented the medical world with incontrovertible facts, that man was Kuhne.

The only mistake he made, not in his treatment of disease, but in his definition of its cause, was that it was incomplete. Had he been content to say, *There is only one disease which shows itself under different forms*, this criticism would be uncalled for. He maintained, however, that there was also only *one cause of disease*, although he treated it, be it observed, as if there were two. He rid the body of its encumbrance of foreign matter, but at the same time by right feeding he supplied it with those chemical ingredients which are essential to the re-establishing and maintenance of health. In fine, the cause of

¹ See Louis Kuhne, *The New Science of Healing*.

disease is not single but *dual*; by wrong feeding man both overloads and starves the body at one and the same time, and disease under the guise of manifold different forms is the result.

Nevertheless, although the naturopaths and an increasing number of enlightened physicians proclaim this dual cause of disease, the whole trend of the orthodox medical fraternity is to ignore the fact whether individual members may believe it or not. More and more specialists appear in the medical arena, more and more polysyllabic words for diseases and symptoms appear in the medical books; more and more elaborate and expensive treatments become the fashion. The text-books refer to 'incurable diseases', to 'mysterious diseases' with *cause unknown*, albeit not because the former diseases have never been cured, but because the orthodox fraternity does not know how to cure them.

How are we to account for this state of affairs?

A moment's reflection coupled with a little inside knowledge shows it to be partly due to the taint of commercialism (a matter with which we shall deal later), partly to the psychology of doctors in general, and partly to the fact that the medical fraternity is to a certain extent working in the dark.

To begin with, we must remember that doctors are human beings and must not be expected to be free from human failings. With some doctors these failings may manifest as narrow-mindedness and a hide-bound adherence to medical conventions; they are mentally too indolent to move with the times and sift out the wheat of valuable knowledge from the tares of valueless medical assumptions. Conversely, other doctors may be said to move so rapidly and uncritically with the times that they are

as pleased with a new treatment as a child with a new toy. The reason why many a theory, specific, or treatment goes out of fashion is not because it may be valueless but simply because doctors get tired of it. Not able to resist the lure of novelty, they discard the old and useful for that which is presumed to 'go one better'. But unfortunately all too often it merely goes one worse; it suppresses the symptoms of one disease only to give rise later on to another and more grievous one. Kuhne quotes the case of a woman who after a 'successful' operation for bleeding piles began to go blind. The poisons that had found their outlet through the hæmorrhoids went to her eyes. Through subsequent purification of her entire system combined with scientific (i.e. *natural* food) she regained both her health and normal sight without the intervention of an oculist. This once more serves to show the dual cause of disease: but it may also give rise to the very question which may disincline so many doctors and laymen to accept this fact—or theory as they would call it. They may argue: 'If the cause of disease is a duality, why are its manifestations so many and varied? Why with one person should the foreign matter go to the eyes, with another to the lungs, with yet another to the heart, and so on? The answer is one which, although it throws a considerable light on the problem, the medical profession is unlikely to accept for many years. It involves a recognition of one of the occult sciences—Astrology. Not only is the type of body pertaining to each individual predicted in a correctly cast horoscope, but also those diseases from which he or she is likely to suffer. In short, whether the poisons affect either directly or by reflex action the eyes, the lungs or the heart is due to stellar influences. In ordinary

parlance they affect the weakest spot. Our more enlightened (though, according to present-day doctors, less enlightened) forefathers were fully aware of these astrological influences; hence we read in the older editions of *Culpeper's Herbal* that such and such a herb is 'under Venus', Mercury, or other planet as the case may be. Even in recent times we find an exponent of the 'Bio-chemic System of Medicine', Dr. G. Carey, having reason to believe that people born in certain months of the year use up more of one or other of the inorganic salts. And Mr. E. F. W. Powell writes, 'My personal experience suggests that there is more than "just something" in it. The universe is a vast wholeness, and, owing to the laws of correspondences, each individual, each planet, every plant and every mineral can be definitely associated with those things with which they have affinities and which react to similar vibrations.'¹ Mr. Powell is a chemist, and his opinion should be worthy of respect even by the orthodox.

But to return to the psychology of doctors, and what it contributes to the arbitrary nature of medical science. I have found in my friendly association with a number of the more orthodox physicians that if they are too prejudiced or it does not suit them to consider the claims of some enterprising investigator they simply dismiss him as a crank. For instance, Drs. Bell, Forbes Ross, and Sir William Arbuthnot Lane, have thrown a considerable light on the prime physical cause of cancer. Indeed, one may say that to all save those who are not blinded by prejudice they have proved their case. Yet frequently I have heard Dr. Bell consigned with a Podsnappian wave of the hand to the limbo of cranks, while many of the

¹ *Cell Nutrition and Medication.*

present-day members of the medical profession have never even heard of Forbes Ross and take no interest when his name is mentioned. As for Sir William Arbuthnot Lane, he, according to Mr. Ellis Barker, deserves a far greater recognition by the medical fraternity than he has been accorded. One of the reasons may be that he is a free lance, viz. not a member of the British Medical Council; another that the operation he in given cases performs and which consists of removing a certain stretch of the long bowel, is alleged in certain cases to have proved disappointing!¹ At least this is the excuse put forward. In any event, however convincing some of his contentions together with those of Drs. Ross, Bell, and others as to the cause of cancer, they are for the most part conveniently disregarded by the orthodox. This is because the mentality of doctors in general is such that they are as obsessed by dogmas as are many clergymen. It is still, as we shall emphasize later, a medical dogma which may take years to uproot from the professional mind, that the cause of cancer is as yet undiscovered. As to such numerous cures effected by homeopaths, botanic practitioners, naturopaths, they are merely dismissed by the lame reach-me-down argument, 'Wrong diagnosis; it couldn't have been malignant disease!' Precisely—but the reply to that is, 'Well, if it wasn't, then it only shows the incompetency of your orthodox physicians who diagnosed it as such.'

Yet this incompetency would be less pronounced if the dogmatic spirit could be replaced by one of open-minded inquiry. It is significant to note the varying reactions of doctors towards systems of healing with which they are

¹ Cannot the same and far more be said of thousands of other operations?

unfamiliar. In my book, *An Outline of Modern Occultism*, I made a somewhat extensive allusion to the bio-chemic system of medicine. Having found this system very efficacious in curing obstinate afflictions of several of my friends who had unsuccessfully been treated by the profession, I suggested to a number of medical acquaintances that they might study it with advantage. Several of them said they 'hadn't the time'—a euphemism for 'couldn't be bothered'—others pretended they already knew about it but were not impressed (they had, of course, never tried it), while others said they already used one of the salts for certain complaints but had never studied the system itself. But the most instructive reactions—instructive because entirely opposed—came from the only two doctors who actually did adopt my suggestion.¹ The one who both studied the standard work on the subject and put it into practice, informed me that the results were so gratifying that he 'now *cured* his patients with the bio-chemic remedies and merely prescribed harmless palliatives *until* cured'. He also informed me in effect that he had seldom read a more convincing explanation of the cause of various diseases and that the whole exposition struck him as eminently scientific. As against that, the other doctor told me in so many words, that he had never read such unscientific nonsense, and implied that to try out the system would be futile and a mere waste of time. Nevertheless, be it noted, that system was discovered by a doctor (Dr. W. H. Schuessler, of Oldenburg, Germany) his works were translated by a doctor, the standard book on the subject was written by an M.D. and edited by another M.D.

¹ Since writing this chapter I have induced a broad-minded lady doctor to study the system.

Moreover, exponents of it are to be found among the accepted professionals of Germany, France, Italy, and America, not to mention that there is a British Bio-chemic Association. This being so, there is no reason for disregarding it on the plea that it is quackery—a plea often resorted to by the narrow-minded. I am, however, not at present concerned with weighing the pros and cons regarding any particular therapeutical system,¹ I am merely drawing attention to certain human failings in many doctors which taken in the aggregate account for so much that is deplorable and unscientific in medical practice.

But there is another factor which both contributes to and augments these failings. 'The medical profession in England and abroad is organized into a powerful trade union. This medical trade union has its trade-union Press and it is animated by a narrow trade-union spirit. No one who is not a member of the union is allowed to express an opinion on medical matters. He is reviled on principle because he does not hold the trade-union ticket. He is treated as an intruder.'² Thus wrote Ellis Barker some ten years ago.

But have matters improved in the interim? Very little, if at all. And it is a particularly unfortunate thing in more respects than one. The trade-union spirit militates against any individuality on the part of doctors. It prompts them to walk in the beaten track and only to adopt such methods as are recognized by the profession in general, even when many doctors themselves are not convinced of the rectitude of those methods. This is particularly the case in relation to work in hospitals. For

¹ See Chapter XVI.

² See *Cancer, The Surgeon and The Researcher*.

instance, one friend of mine mentioned to me the case of a young girl who was supposed to be suffering from a mastoid abscess. My friend told me that personally he knew the diagnosis was wrong, and his conviction turned out to be correct. Yet he was forced to stand by while a hole was drilled through the girl's skull—in order to find something which was not there! This same friend also told me that during the appendicitis craze he witnessed a large number of operations for alleged appendicitis. Out of that large number only six were genuine appendicitis cases, and out of the six, four could have been cured without the surgeon's knife.

Even in their private practice doctors have little freedom and are often compelled to permit treatments they personally consider useless and even fatal. A general practitioner cannot prevent a cancerous patient from consulting a specialist, and if the latter advocates X-ray or radium treatment the practitioner must agree even though many of his own patients have merely had their sufferings increased by such treatment. Were he to go against the specialist in the matter, the patient's friends and relations would call him to all intents and purposes a murderer. And this despite the fact that radium does not cure cancer, but merely suppresses it in one locality, only for it to break out in a worse form in another, or in the shape of a different disease which kills the patient. I have lost two friends in this way and therefore speak feelingly.

And yet no member of the medical 'trade union' is permitted to warn the public of such facts as these, for he is not allowed to write in any save the recognized medical journals which, of course, the public does not read. Many a wise doctor, for instance, recognizes

nowadays that operations for the removal of adenoids and tonsils are not necessary, but if these doctors should attempt to enlighten the public on this score in the columns of the general Press, they would be struck off the rolls for resorting to an insidious form of advertising. This is a well-known fact. Yet its evils are not fully recognized, for it means that the public is kept in the dark about many vital matters regarding which ignorance may be far from bliss! That certain simple forms of semi-medical advice appear in the papers I am of course aware, but they are written either under a pseudonym or else by a doctor who is not a member of the medical 'trade union'.

To summarize: Doctors may be divided into three classes—(1) Those wise and enlightened ones who realize first and foremost that Nature is the curer of all diseases, yet who are willing to keep an open mind as regards any method by which Nature may be assisted; such doctors may be orthodox in name but not in spirit. (2) Those credulous ones who accept every new theory which happens to take their fancy, and accept it without criticism or adequate investigation provided it is authoritative and stamped by the *insignia* of orthodoxy. (3) Those who are entirely hide-bound and unprogressive and are a mere repository for antiquated text-book learning divorced from wisdom and common sense.

It is a wise man who knows how to choose his own doctor.

Chapter III

IGNORANCE IN THE MIDST OF LEARNING

In attempting to be kind to one set of people one is sometimes compelled to be cruel to another set of people. That many of my readers may not be lured into those disastrous follies into which many of my friends have been lured I am compelled to criticize the medical fraternity in a way which may seem uncharitable. Let me hasten to repeat, therefore, that no spirit of uncharity is intended. I have no personal grudge against doctors—it is their methods, assertions, assumptions, and seeming short-sightedness which I have reason to criticize, and if these attributes are often due to their psychological make-up, that is no cause on my part for intolerance. This asseveration is all the more necessary as we have now to ask ourselves if some doctors are downright dishonest or merely ignorant in the midst of all their learning.

A few years ago my wife met a near relative of a little girl who had developed a mysterious complaint which caused an apparent shortening of one of her legs. Various doctors and specialists had been consulted, but to no purpose. Finally, one specialist advised amputation. My wife's acquaintance was so incensed at this verdict that she determined to try an osteopath. *After one treatment the little girl walked out of his consulting room with her leg perfectly normal.* As the osteopath in question turned out to be a personal friend of ours, when I recalled this spectacular case to him, he merely smiled and said modestly: 'Oh, I remember; it was really quite simple.'

Doctors are credited with knowing at least something

about anatomy, yet in this case, despite all their learning, they were evidently unable to detect the difference between a leg that had really shrunk or had merely been pulled up into the socket for reasons they could not explain. Doubtless they would, if cornered, advance many a learned explanation for this inability to explain! But to the logical if simple layman there is but one convincing proof of the pudding, and that is in the eating. Had the specialist who advised amputation so little knowledge of osteopathy and its possibilities, or was he so prejudiced in its disfavour that he would rather let a child lose her leg than suggest an osteopath should be tried first? I leave my reader to draw his own conclusions. I submit, nevertheless, that it is the duty of every honest consultant who is paid for the best advice he can give to make himself *au courant* with all systems which may benefit his patients. To let personal prejudices intrude can in the circumstances hardly be termed strictly honest. Thus, the foregoing, whatever else it may show, is at any rate a noteworthy example of ignorance in the midst of learning.

Let me now relate another case: that of a pianist friend of mine who so far lost the use of her hand that she was unable to play the piano. Her trouble lasted the best part of a year, during which she tried various treatments, including electricity. One doctor said her trouble was arthritic; another, after an X-ray had been taken, that it might be tuberculous or even cancerous. She went to a Continental spa, where she was treated, but all to no effect. Finally, her own cook persuaded her to try a certain 'quack' by whom she herself had been cured of some grievous and supposedly incurable complaint. This quack advised my friend to hold her wrist

under cold running water for five minutes several times a day and to wrap it round with black silk. She was cured in one week, after ten months of suffering!

Such a case can hardly do otherwise than awaken our scepticism regarding the real utility of that vast array of so-called scientific appliances for which modern medical science is noted. Wise doctors use simple means; unwise doctors, by reason of their peculiar psychology and hampered by their encumbrance of learning, overlook the simple because glamoured by the lure of the complicated. If even with the aid of all our modern medical paraphernalia a number of doctors cannot even correctly diagnose, let alone cure a given malady, where is all the progress of which the medical fraternity so loudly boasts? Can we wonder that the public turn more and more to so-called quacks for assistance where chronic complaints are concerned, and moreover would often do so in regard to acute illnesses were they not dissuaded by apprehensive relatives whose peace of mind they feel constrained to consider? My own experiences and investigations have led me to the conclusion that the methods of many quacks are more inherently scientific than those of the orthodox profession. Instead of being lured into the by-paths of fads, fashions, and theories, wise and honest quacks employ only such treatments, remedies, and methods as have stood the test of years and even centuries. Such quacks as I personally have encountered cure their patients by those principles laid down hundreds of years ago by Hippocrates; the methods may differ somewhat, but the principles remain the same. In this connexion the case of a cousin of mine who had been poisoned by verdigris is instructive.

He had been served tea at a cricket match out of a

copper tea-urn. For several days he suffered from the most distressing symptoms of verdigris poisoning for which he was treated by his doctor. After the acute distress had subsided he found himself for ten years a complete wreck. In his own words, 'You could have knocked me over with less than a feather.' During these years he spent hundreds of pounds on doctors and treatments. To one specialist he even went so far as to put the question: 'I don't ask if *you* can cure me, but I do ask if you think there is any one in the whole world who can?' The consultant expressed extreme doubt. All the same, my cousin continued his search for at least some amelioration of his symptoms.

When I saw him he was in the hands of an eminent colitis specialist. The treatment was based on the most 'marvellous' scholastic theories which had but one drawback—they failed to effect a cure. In view of this not to be ignored disadvantage I persuasively suggested that as he had given the orthodox profession a very fair innings he should try a quack who had cured many of my personal friends of various intractable complaints. Fortunately he raised no objections, was treated by a botanic practitioner of Gower Street and *cured in two treatments*.

In place of the pseudo but recognized scientific methods adopted by the physicians he had unsuccessfully consulted, a genuinely scientific (because efficacious) method was employed, which got rid of the cause of his trouble and consequently of its effects. He was given what is called the *graduated emesis treatment*. The patient, on an empty stomach, drinks a number and variety of non-poisonous herbal decoctions which finally produce vomiting. If one asks, why not simply use a stomach-pump or take a glass of mustard and water? the answer

is that neither of these measures is as scientific or as efficacious, because their effects are too superficial. With the graduated emesis the herbal decoctions draw the accumulation of foreign matter from the various organs into the stomach and then, by the natural process of vomiting, they are thrown out into the bowl. Whereas the stomach-pump serves only to rid the stomach itself of its contents, the herbal emesis rids the liver and other organs of toxins that may have lodged there for years. In the language of mechanics, an engine that is clogged up cannot be expected to run properly. It is the same with the human body; get rid of its cloying and clogging substances and feed it with the right kind of 'fuel', and it will work in a normal and harmonious manner. And this is exactly what occurred in the case of my cousin, whose health became such that he was able to win a number of golf championships and in fact lead the type of active life which suited his particular temperament.

The instructive features of this case of verdigris poisoning lie in the fact that the various doctors and specialists my cousin had consulted were told the original cause of his condition. In brief, they knew he had been poisoned, and even had they not been told, might have divined from the significant grey-greenish colour of his complexion that the poison was still lurking somewhere in his system. Yet despite these indications, either they failed to reason from cause to effect or else, quite obviously, they knew of no means to eliminate the poison.

The methods employed by the botanic practitioner I have mentioned, once again go to endorse Louis Kuhne's contention that disease is due to foreign matter in the organism whatever form the symptoms may take. To treat the symptoms and ignore the cause is in common

logic to be unscientific, yet this policy is adopted by countless doctors and by specialists in particular.¹ As they ignore the prime physical if dual cause of all disease they may and often do seek for secondary causes, many of which they are quite unable to find. In point of fact these secondary causes are often of little importance and are of mere scholastic interest. Had the botanic practitioner, whose career I have followed for wellnigh a third of a century, never been told of the origin of my cousin's long-standing complaint, he would none the less have given him the graduated emesis treatment, since one look at him was enough to see that his whole system was thoroughly poisoned. This same practitioner cured one friend of mine of a duodenal ulcer for which she had been treated by both English and Continental doctors and specialists. Her condition had been so serious that at one time she had had to be nourished solely by means of injections. Yet what after all is an ulcer, whether external or internal, but the result of an impure bloodstream? Rid the blood and body of its poisons and the ulcer disappears. This is precisely and eventually what occurred in the case in point. But to allow the ulcer a chance to heal, slippery-elm food was employed in conjunction with the graduated emesis treatment. The result was a complete and lasting cure without operation.

I could mention a large number of other cures effected by this same botanic practitioner to whom many people go as a last resort and whose methods are in one sense as simple as they are efficacious. But I think I have driven home my point, and shown that ignorance of truly reliable curative methods may exist in the midst of a vast accumulation of scholastic knowledge.

¹ See Chapter VI.

Chapter IV

MENTAL MYOPIA OF DOCTORS AND LAYMEN

One of the most astonishing features of human nature is a total inability to perceive facts which stare one right in the face and have stared one in the face almost from childhood. It is not extravagant to say that nine-tenths of medical history owes its existence to a disregard of one of these face-staring facts, viz. that our gross physical bodies in the truest sense 'are merely a composite of what we eat and drink daily, yearly, as a life habit', and hence that if our bodies go wrong it means that our feeding is wrong. Yet it took the eminent physician who made this statement, years of mental blindness culminating in a physical breakdown and an alleged incurable disease before he arrived at this so obvious conclusion and all it involved. Having arrived at it, he cured himself of all his supposedly incurable ills and is at the present time (1937) perhaps one of the most widely known personalities of the medical world.

But I am not immediately concerned with Dr. Hay's Diet as such, but with the mental myopia of both doctors and laymen alike who (with some noteworthy exceptions, of course) have failed to see that *as we eat, so we become*. And it is a matter of 'becoming', for although a fair proportion of young people are moderately healthy, there are few among their elders who can boast of perfect health; and if they do, it is often to be stricken down the next moment by some fatal illness as a seeming penalty for their unwise boasting.

Now, although I have included laymen in the general

mental myopia, doctors are the worst delinquents, since it is their especial business to understand the human body and to recognize and remedy the very simple and obvious origin of ill health in whatever form. One may of course think that they do understand its origin and only refrain for selfish and commercial reasons from broadcasting the fact that right food is the basis of all good health and wrong food the basis of all ill health; for given this, everything else will look after itself. But, strange though it may seem, the majority of doctors are as ignorant of this fact nowadays as they were twenty years ago. Indeed, the incident and its denouement I am about to relate is still so typical of medical short-sightedness in regard to the most elementary facts, that it serves us as an illustration almost as well as if it had occurred but yesterday.

Some of my readers may or may not have heard of the mysterious and grievous disease which, during the War, attacked the personnel of a German cruiser, the result being that the captain was forced to land his vessel in an American port. All the most learned medical professors and doctors assembled to inquire into the cause of this unaccountable disease, yet despite their thorough examination of the crew they could arrive at no solution, let alone effect a cure. Finally a journalist, who was an expert in food commodities, got himself aboard by strategy, the upshot being that he cured the crew—and what is more, he cured them *without the aid of any medicaments whatever*. The name of this journalist was McCann, and the disease with which the crew had been stricken was beri-beri.

It is instructive to consider why all those learned professors were unable to diagnose this deficiency

disease. Apart from their ignorance of dietetic principles, they were obviously led astray by text-book learning and text-book inaccuracies. According to these, beri-beri comes from eating polished rice. This is a misleading assertion. Though the difference is a subtle one, the sentence should run: beri-beri comes from not eating unpolished rice. Yet even here we have only a half-truth; beri-beri would not attack people who consumed an adequate proportion of whole-wheat. This was easily proved by McCann, who cured the crew by a judicious administration of those ingredients in whole-wheat which have been eliminated by the refining process. Previous to that the crew had for the most part subsisted on white flour and the usual array of foods which constitute the dietary on board a ship. The result was a dietetic deficiency which eventuated in the Oriental disease of beri-beri so frequently to be found among people who live mostly on polished rice. But just because the learned professors could not associate rice and an Oriental disease with the crew of a modern German cruiser they were mystified and helpless. Thus the foregoing serves to prove not only the incompetence of the learned, but that pure invigorating air, discipline and exercise in the form of drill, gymnastics, etc., cannot in themselves ward off given diseases or sustain perfect health. This they can only do when the bedrock is sound—and that bedrock is right nutrition.

We shall, with the aid of statistical findings, enlarge on this subject in a later chapter. Meanwhile we see that the generality of mankind, having overlooked the true and simple cause of all ill health and, like the learned doctors, sought for it in complicated and mysterious origins, now further overlooks another factor which might

easily reveal the truth. That factor is connected with internal hygiene.

If man were a wise and inquiring mortal he would know that the rightness of what he takes into himself may be judged by what proceeds from himself. Yet so ignorant are most people of the most elementary laws of colonic hygiene that they think their nutritional habits are perfectly right and wholesome when they are very much the reverse. Moreover, they do not even know how to judge whether their bowels are in perfect working order or not. Many a man or woman is quite unaware that he or she is suffering from a 'foul bowel' consequent upon wrong feeding, although there is one infallible sign. To quote Louis Kuhne—whose contentions have been independently endorsed by an ever-increasing number of enlightened physicians—'a digestion is normal when the excrements are *light brown, soft and compact, and covered with a mucous coating. . . .* Furthermore, the excrements should never emit an *obnoxious, disgusting odour.*'¹ Yet despite the latter indications, countless people imagine that their bowels are in a perfectly healthy condition because they are able to evacuate them regularly once a day. Investigation has shown, however, that despite these regular habits the walls of the intestines may none the less be coated with old faecal matter due to an insufficient intake of roughage. This in turn gives rise to innumerable diseases for which all too innocent people rush to doctors or specialists who treat the effects without removing the cause, for the latter being too simple, it is never even inquired into—or at best in a very superficial way. Having asked whether the patient is suffering from constipation and having received a

¹ *New Science of Healing.*

negative reply, the doctor is quite satisfied and dismisses the subject as having nothing to do with the particular complaint. If, however, constipation is a symptom, apart from advising some aperient, it is treated as negligible and the patient is left to go on producing more auto-intoxication and to weaken his or her bowels in addition. Wrong feeding having in the first place caused constipation, the wrong feeding is continued and the constipation not cured but only aggravated by unnatural 'remedies' which lose their effect, so that the patient finds him- or herself subsequently attacked by a large number of apparently irrelevant diseases the more difficult to cure because their cause is never suspected.

This is forcibly illustrated by the case of a woman who had suffered from constipation from childhood and had, in consequence, contracted an almost unbelievable list of diseases which no physician could cure. Among them were tonsillitis, stoppage of periods, ovaritis, tuberculosis, neurasthenia, neuralgia, insomnia, albuminaria, colitis, oedema, extreme emaciation, prostration, and paralysis of the legs. Finally, she was taken to Sir Arbuthnot Lane who found her bowel in such a condition that in order to *save* her life and end her terrible sufferings he had to *risk* her life. He operated and removed a portion of her colon, with the result that from being a hopeless invalid she became a strong and healthy woman,¹ free from constipation and all its attendant ills.

Here was a case which had baffled all the doctors, because, as usual, they searched for the complicated instead of for the simple. They had overlooked both the primary cause, wrong feeding from childhood, and the secondary cause, chronic constipation with its resultant

¹ See Ellis Barker, *Chronic Constipation*.

self-poisoning. This was conclusively proved by the fact that as soon as the bowel-stagnation was cured, all her other grievous maladies disappeared of their own accord. Had the patient been fed on a proportion of natural foods from childhood, none of these maladies would have eventuated. Aptly does Ellis Barker point out that our 'Civilization has much to answer for . . . short-sighted chemists, filled with contempt for the supreme wisdom of Providence which has given us a miraculous body and perfect foods for its sustenance, have for decades endeavoured to improve upon the unimprovable work of Nature by providing us with "scientific" foods. And civilized mankind has been foolish enough to take these laboratory chemists at their own valuation, the result being that most people suffer from a thoroughly diseased and degenerated apparatus of digestion and excretion.'¹ Indeed, the effects which accrue from this latter condition are so far-reaching and varied that whole volumes have been and could still be written on the subject. Kraus of Karlsbad, for instance, stated that more than 80 per cent of his 2,269 patients suffering from gall-stones were constipated. Drs. Llewellyn and Jones maintained that 'Chronic constipation is present in almost all cases of fibrositis, and its correction, though often overlooked, is imperative.'² Dr. A. F. Hurst and Dr. Ebstein put forward their convictions that constipation is always associated with asthma.³ Haemorrhoids, according to Lockhart-Mummery, are frequently caused by constipation. In his book, *Diseases of the Rectum and Colon*, Professor J. M. Lynch of New York wrote: 'Those working in institutions for the insane now recognize the importance

¹ *ibid.*

² See Fibrositis.

³ *Constipation and Allied Intestinal Disorders*, A. F. Hurst.

of constipation as an etiological factor to insanity.' Later on he mentions vertigo, pernicious anaemia, cardiovascular disturbances, ovarian pains, disorders of menstruation, functional disorders of the kidneys, acne and other cutaneous eruptions, poor circulation, mental depression and many other major or minor ailments, all of which he maintains are symptoms of constipation or toxemia produced by constipation. This is borne out by a distinguished radiologist, Dr. A. C. Jordon, who went so far as to say that intestinal stagnation and its consequent poisoning of the blood by the products of bacterial action affects every tissue and organ of the body—including the tissues connected with the eyes and teeth. Thus we may point out in parenthesis that the distressing and common affliction known as pyorrhea has its origin in the bowel, and although teeth-extraction may serve to liberate the local poison it does not get rid of the cause of the complaint. The same may be said of that unscientific procedure of putting drops into the eyes for ocular diseases.

Finally, to emphasize the importance of constipation plus toxemia as the pre-disposing cause of innumerable complaints, we may quote Sir Arbuthnot Lane, who stated as long ago as 1913 that 'Auto-intoxication plays so large a part in the development of diseases of the female genito-urinary apparatus that the gynaecologist, in company with other specialists, may also be regarded as a product of intestinal stasis. If women were not imperfectly drained, the gynaecologist would not have been evolved.'¹ As for the part that constipation plays in the development of cancer, with this we shall deal extensively in a subsequent chapter. Meanwhile, in view of the

¹ *Discussion on Alimentary Toxemia.*

number of enlightened physicians whose opinions, beliefs, and contentions have been quoted and merely selected from those of many more, is it a matter for surprise that the generality of mortals, in spite of doctors and treatments, do not find themselves in good health? Yet how can this be otherwise when their doctors are satisfied to ignore these contentions of their wise confreres and thus, ignoring the true cause of disease, only concern themselves with its effects? Doubtless many individuals may contest my former implication and say: 'But I at least am in perfect health.' This optimism, however, is seldom substantiated by the habits of the very speakers themselves. Persons in perfect health do not require to buck themselves up with occasional, not to say frequent, daily whiskies and sodas, glasses of sherry, cocktails, unnecessary cups of tea between meals, or snacks because they 'feel they need something'. All these stimulatory habits are merely the signs of an imperfect state of health; the 'whippings of a tired horse' who is not tired from exertion, but from unnatural fatigue produced by toxemia due to imperfect elimination consequent upon wrong food. The myopia and mental indolence of people is such, however, that when these facts are pointed out to them, they lamely answer, 'What is good enough for most people is good enough for me.' The upshot is that sooner or later, as the result of this *laissez aller* attitude, they find themselves putting money into the pockets of specialists, surgeons, and doctors, after which the trouble begins in earnest, as much of this book will go to prove.

Chapter V

THE LURE OF ORTHODOXY

I put more faith in a quack—provided he be of the non-advertising variety—than I do in accepted members of the orthodox profession. My reason for doing so is based on the most simple logic; the reputation of a quack is solely dependent on the cures he effects, the reputation of an ordinary doctor may be due to the letters he can put after his name. With some types of conventional-mindedness these letters exercise an almost hypnotic influence; they are the emblem of medical respectability just as at one time a top-hat was an emblem of social respectability. The word 'specialist' also has a hypnotic effect on conventional and unenlightened people; it induces them to believe that a specialist is more competent to cure a given list of diseases than an all-round practitioner.

Later on we shall see that this is far from the truth, and that actual facts go to show that the specialist is all too often a man who knows everything about a disease except how to cure it. The orthodox-minded, however, are so convinced of the rectitude of orthodoxy that they will still put their faith in a specialist even if he himself suffers from the very disease in which he specializes. And there are many of these human anomalies, the marvel being that they can get away with such palpable proofs of their own incompetence. Yet the answer is to be found in the unreflective sheep-like characteristics of countless human beings who are content to ask no awkward questions of those who practise under the respectable cloak of orthodoxy. Indeed, they are quite ready to make

excuses for them if they happen to like their personalities. It is, for example, a common thing for women to rave about their physicians and to tell us they have 'at last found a marvellous doctor'; but they continue to remain in poor health all the same. Thus many doctors owe their success, not to their curative abilities, but to their charm of manner which causes their patients to remain faithful to them at the high price of remaining ill. Hosts of elderly women even enjoy remaining ill for the pleasure of receiving sympathy from their doctors—some are not even ill at all, yet their medical advisers are not honest enough to tell them the truth. This is a well-known fact; and one doctor told me he made an income of two thousand a year out of old ladies who had nothing more the matter with them than the desire to talk of themselves and their imaginary ailments.

Yet when all is said, are these ailments so entirely the result of imagination? Rather are they symptoms which have often been known to vanish by proper treatment. Many persons who have gone to nature cure establishments have come away with no further desire to make a hobby of their 'imaginary ailments' and to pay doctors' fees for nothing more practical than insincere sympathy. When their bodies have been purified and their diet altered their whole outlook on life has also become altered. Aptly has it been said, 'As a man thinks, so he is; and as he eats, so he thinks.' Thirty-four years ago I myself was a case in point. Prior to reforming my diet I was a morose and pessimistic individual who found life full of sorrows and who railed at circumstances. Then one day I made the discovery that all sorrows had been in myself and not outside myself. My salvation had been that I still had the sense to see that what was conventional

was not of necessity right—and salubrious. And it was not a doctor who caused me thus to alter my dietetic habits, but a layman who, strangely enough, had obtained his knowledge from a parson. Indeed, doctors warned me that I should have to pay severely for my nutritional peculiarities, while friends and relatives told me I should kill myself with my cures and fads and fancies. Yet now the wise and enlightened school of physicians are advocating the very diet which was supposed to bring about my speedy downfall.

But my disregard of orthodoxy came also to save me from a useless operation. Finding myself one day with a pain over my appendix I was advised by a doctor friend to have it removed. Instead of following this conventional advice I went to an osteopath who laughed at the diagnosis and told me my appendix was perfectly healthy and that by having done certain physiological yoga stunts with too much vigour I had merely put something slightly out of place and so irritated a nerve which runs over the region of the appendix. This happened to be quite true and he cured me in one treatment! Incidentally he told me that the orthodox medical profession had not even acquired a reliable technique for discovering whether appendicitis was present or otherwise and that thousands of appendices were removed when in a totally healthy condition. But although this has now become an open secret, such is the unmerited respect which conventional people pay to orthodoxy that it requires but an M.D. to suspect that their appendix is not all it should be and 'probably causing other troubles', for them to pass into the hands of the surgeon and have it cut out.

Yet if the lure of orthodoxy may prove dangerous to those who have not learnt to discriminate between good

treatments and bad, the lure of *fashionable* orthodoxy may prove even more so. A fashionable doctor is usually one who has attained his position through social influence and who has a capacity for getting on in the social world. This is already a point in his disfavour, because the healing art in its truest sense is an 'all time job' and cannot be coupled with social climbing. Dr. Axel Munthe, in his delightful book, *The Story of San Michele*, pointed this out when he wrote by way of a warning: 'If you come across a fashionable doctor, watch him carefully at a safe distance before handing yourself over to him. He may be a good doctor, but in very many cases he is not. First, because, as a rule, he is far too busy to listen with patience to your long story. Secondly, because he is inevitably liable to become a snob if he is not one already, to let the Countess pass in before you, to examine the liver of the Count with more attention than that of his valet, to go to the garden-party at the British Embassy instead of to your last-born whose whooping-cough is getting worse. Thirdly, unless his heart is very sound, he will soon show unmistakable signs of precocious hardening of that organ; he will become indifferent and insensible to the sufferings of others, like the pleasure-seeking people around him. You cannot be a good doctor without pity.' These are the words of a very humane man whose book owes much of its charm to his great love of birds and animals.

But although wise people may think it expedient to avoid placing themselves in the hands of fashionable doctors, unless they can avoid the orthodox physician altogether they are still up against the evils of medical etiquette. It is not extravagant to say that thousands of patients whose lives might have been saved have died as the

indirect result of medical etiquette, the exigencies of which have become increasingly obstructive since the reign of the specialist. All this is so well known, however, that to enlarge on it were superfluous.

Nevertheless, it is only fair to add that this kow-towing to medical orthodoxy and its evils is on the wane and people are beginning to realize that by multiplying learned ignorance even by a very large multiple it can never be multiplied into knowledge. Indeed, isolated members of the profession have recognized this fact themselves and have warned their confreres by speeches and articles in the medical Press that orthodox methods leave much to be desired and that it is no matter for surprise that the public has lost confidence and is turning more and more towards the unorthodox. As this admission speaks for itself it requires no comment.

Chapter VI

THE FOLLY OF SPECIALISM

We live in an age of specialism, the assumption being that the man who specializes in a disease must be the most competent to cure it. This may in some cases be true, but most often it is the reverse. Indeed, as Dr. Alexis Carrel writes: 'Much harm is caused by the extreme specialization of the physicians. When a specialist, from the beginning of his career, confines himself to a minute part of the body, his knowledge of the rest is so rudimentary that he is incapable of thoroughly understanding even that part in which he specializes.'¹ Thus, in other terms, 'every specialist, owing to a well-known professional bias, believes that he understands the entire human being, while in reality he only grasps a tiny part of him. Fragmentary aspects are considered as representing the whole.'²

What is the obvious result of this? That although the specialist may sometimes appear to cure a particular disease by suppressing its symptoms, he does not cure the patient himself—i.e. restore him to perfect and lasting health. After all, the proof of a cure is not to be found in its immediate effects, but in its after-effects; for the patient who has ostensibly been cured of one disease only to find himself subsequently attacked by another has to all intents and purposes not been cured at all.

From the time of Hippocrates, wise physicians have maintained that there is only one scientific way of treating a disease and that is by treating the whole body; but the

¹ *Man the Unknown*.

² *ibid.*

specialist thinks he knows better and so he ignores the wisdom of the wise and his patients are the sufferers. Indeed, specialism is a medical fashion based on a contradiction of the most ordinary scientific logic; it presupposes, or seemingly does so, that one organ of the body works independently of the other organs or, in colloquial language, that it leads a life of its own. Yet every Tom, Dick, and Harry knows that if his stomach is upset he may have a headache, and that if his liver is upset he may feel 'wretched all over'. In spite, however, of these most elementary and face-confronting facts we find head specialists, liver specialists, stomach specialists, nose specialists, eye specialists, diabetes specialists, cancer specialists, and so on and so forth.

Says Dr. K. T. Morris, 'The patient who goes to a specialist on his or her own responsibility . . . is jumping from the frying-pan into the fire. I knew a patient who went . . . to a famous stomach specialist because of persistent nausea. The specialist gave her a month of expensive rest-cure and special diet without gaining much comfort for her. At the end of that time the question of possible pregnancy was suggested by a woman visitor. She was examined and found to be pregnant. . . . A patient with sciatica may go to many specialists—neurologists, electro-therapeutists, and what not . . . until the family physician called in at last, finds an enlarged prostate gland or a pelvic tumour. A patient with a loose kidney may have her appendix taken out, her uterus fixed up and various other things done by specialists, until her neglected family doctor finally puts a stop to it all.'¹

A case which serves to illustrate the astonishing lack of

¹ *Fifty Years a Surgeon.*

true science in specialism, was brought to my notice by my friend the botanic practitioner previously mentioned. His advice was asked by two throat specialists in consultation regarding a mysterious affliction of the throat from which a young boy patient was suffering, and for which they could find no cure. My friend, after examining the boy, asked a few questions as to his medical history, diet, and mode of living, and it transpired that he suffered from severe and chronic constipation. 'Has it never occurred to you,' my friend asked the two specialists, 'that there must be some connexion between the throat complaint and the constipation?' No, it had not occurred to them. The connexion between the two was soon proved, however, for by dint of cleaning out the entire system and curing the constipation, the throat disease vanished of its own accord. . . . The only thing that can be said for these two specialists is that they were unorthodox and enterprising enough to call in the services of a quack.

I will cite another case which goes to prove that only by treating the entire body may a specific disease be cured. A sufferer from diabetes underwent treatment for a sore on his leg at the hands of an electro-therapeutist of my acquaintance. The treatment is termed the saturation treatment, the effect of which is both to vitalize the entire system and at the same time to increase the eliminative processes. The patient in question was not only in the hands of a diabetic specialist at the time, but also in those of an eye specialist who informed him that an operation for cataract would be necessary. However, after a course of saturation treatments, the diabetes specialist to his intense surprise could find no sugar in the patient's urine, and the eye specialist no sign of cataract. In short, the patient had been cured of both

complaints by a non-specialist who was not even a qualified doctor. I may add that the diabetic specialist suffered from diabetes himself!

But apart from the fact that specialistic methods are only scientific in name but not in truth, there is the danger that specialists may find themselves with the proverbial bee in the bonnet. In Dr. W. H. Hay's words, 'Each sees the thing he most wishes to see in the patient, finds the thing he has been taught to find, and unless super-human this is to be wholly expected.'¹ For example, I know one specialist who is persuaded that everybody suffers from pituitary trouble. I know another specialist who seems to believe that everybody is suffering more or less from arthritis, another who equally believes that every one is suffering to some degree from fibrositis, and so on and so forth. As both these complaints, however, originate in the bowel, this means that people who pin their faith to specialism, would need to consult a bowel specialist in order to be cured of arthritis, rheumatism, or what not. Nor is this so extravagant as it may sound, for if a bowel specialist really knew his business, he would incidentally cure—and perhaps does so for all I know—a number of seemingly irrelevant complaints. As Sir W. Arbuthnot Lane so emphatically maintains, most diseases are the result of poison-absorption from the bowels. Therefore his advice is to get the bowels into perfect working order and a variety of diseases will automatically disappear—that is provided they have not already got too great a hold on the organism; in which case they cannot be cured by disease specialists, but only by health specialists who will treat the body as a whole and cleanse the entire system.

¹ *A New Health Era.*

But the incompetence of disease specialists is not even confined to physical disorders, but may also be seen in relation to mental ones. One doctor friend of mine told me, for instance, that he had diagnosed a certain case as suicidal mania, but since the correctness of his diagnosis had been questioned, the patient was taken to an eminent alienist. The latter disagreed with my friend's opinion and did not advocate restraint in a mental home. Shortly afterwards the patient committed suicide!

How can such a deplorable thing come to pass? Because, as my investigations have gone to prove, specialism is based on a grandiloquent array of learned theories and professional affirmations which are often entirely beside the mark and which only befog the so-called expert instead of enlightening him. Take heart specialists, for example. Ellis Barker, who has cured a number of heart-disease cases after specialists have pronounced them incurable, relates of several in his book, *New Lives for Old*. To many patients he has put the following question: 'Has your pessimistic specialist asked you anything about your diet, your way of living, your exercise, your occupation, etc.?' To which, as a rule, the reply is, 'The specialist has forbidden me to smoke. I must not eat potatoes, I must abstain from exercise, live on a white diet composed of white fish, breast of chicken, milk pudding and milk, and that is all.' Now, regarded from the standpoint of another school of opinions, apart from the milk (which many people cannot digest) the whole diet is as deficient in mineral salts and vitamins as it is possible to imagine. Any ignoramus knows that the heart is a muscle, therefore unless it be provided with a sufficiency of the essential mineral salts, one of which is phosphate of calcium, it cannot be healthy and function as it should;

these mineral salts must be provided in such quantities at a time as conform with Nature's laws: i.e. they must be imbibed by means of food. Yet we notice that the specialists concerned entirely ignored this important fact. Nevertheless, Ellis Barker—a layman be it noted—has proved from personal experience that heart diseases can be cured by means of a few simple homeopathic remedies combined with natural food which supplies the heart-muscle with the necessary mineral substances and brings the whole body into better working order. To quote again from his book: 'The fact that the man has heart disease is of relatively little importance. If the body is given adequate chance, it will patch up the heart and it may go more or less irregularly, but quite satisfactorily, until the patient is 90 or 100. Such cases are known to every medical man. The all-important question is not whether a patient suffers from this or that nameable disorder of the heart, but *why* he suffers from endocarditis, myocarditis—or whatever may be the outlandish official name of the trouble.'¹

Yet unfortunately the *why* is seldom looked for by specialists in the very place it may be found. One man suffered from heart disease or supposed heart disease, because he had formed the bad habit of taking mustard to almost unbelievable excess. When the specialist whom he consulted was informed of this fact, he merely dismissed it as unimportant. A month's abstention from this condiment, however, wrought such a vast improvement in his condition that once again we can only comment on the ignorance and shortsightedness of some specialists. One may, of course, advance the objection that even such a flagrant abuse of mustard could not produce heart

¹ *New Lives for Old.*

disease. But as Ellis Barker, who advised the patient against its use, significantly remarks, 'He looked more like a kidney case than like a heart case, and I concluded that his so-called heart disease was due to abuse of alcohol, condiments . . . or some other irritant.' In fine, Ellis Barker, who is not even a doctor, let alone a heart specialist, showed more useful knowledge and common sense than did a man who spent his life in accumulating knowledge and experience along one particular line. Aptly may it be said that whereas with most people a *little* knowledge is a dangerous thing, with specialists *too much* knowledge is a dangerous thing!

It may be that a sceptical reader would wish to belittle Ellis Barker's achievements by labelling him a controversialist, a 'tall talker', a bragger, or what not. But this form of pseudo-argument will not meet the case. I have seen many letters from grateful patients who have been cured. I have also seen photographs of patients before and after treatment. These photographs, needless to say, are not for advertisement purposes, but have been sent to Mr. Ellis Barker as a help to diagnosis. For it should be mentioned that he had never seen in the flesh a number of the patients he has subsequently cured, the treatments having been conducted by correspondence. Further, I may mention in this connexion, that at one time he never intended to become (shall we say?) a lay physician; the avocation was more or less forced upon him by the vast number of correspondents who begged for help after they had unsuccessfully been treated by doctors and specialists. All this being so, I do not consider myself guilty of an unscientific and unconvincing credulity in citing such cases put forward in his books as may be relevant to my present purpose. After all, Ellis Barker is

not the first writer who has 'miraculously' cured a number of people when the medical profession has hopelessly and ignominiously failed. But of this later on. Meanwhile we will consider the dermatologists (skin specialists) and the injudiciousness of their policy.

Although it is a well-established fact that a skin eruption is simply caused by the efforts of Nature to eliminate certain poisons from the body, many dermatologists apply ointments which merely suppress the symptoms so that the very poisons which are endeavouring to find an outlet are driven inward. This is both harmful and unscientific. As Dr. Macfie wrote in his book *The Romance of the Human Body*, 'The skin is an excretory organ. The dead cells constantly carry off with them . . . many excretory products; and many poisons in the system are excreted in this way. . . . Thus we find gouty eczema . . . thus we find eruptions of the skin in small-pox, scarlet fever, typhus, typhoid, and many infectious diseases.' Why then, seeing that Dr. Macfie merely voiced common knowledge, do we find a large number of dermatologists employing methods which are so at variance with accepted scientific facts? The answer is that the lure of specialism has obtained such a hold on the medical and popular imagination that scientific facts are conveniently relegated to the background. It requires but little logic coupled with the most elementary knowledge to know that all skin eruptions are primarily due to faulty feeding. Yet only the other day I asked a doctor friend whether a certain dermatologist acquaintance of his prescribed a dietetic régime for skin diseases? His answer was in the negative! What is the only inference to be drawn? Namely, that the dermatologist becomes, so to say, a party to a further accumulation of poisons, and then by suppressing the

skin disease with medicaments and ointments, imprisons them in the organism, much to the detriment of the patient. But of this the patient is of course blissfully unaware. When later on he develops rheumatism, catches 'flu' or contracts some other malady, he never thinks to blame the dermatologist for driving the poisons into his system instead of letting them out.

Doubtless there are a few wise dermatologists among a host of unwise ones; and how to distinguish the one from the other is not difficult for those with some inside knowledge of the profession. Taking into account what we have just previously mentioned, it becomes obvious that the wise skin specialist is he who prescribes a natural scientific diet together with medicaments which serve to detoxicate the entire system. If ointments are employed at all, they should be those only which stimulate the skin for the time being into even greater eruptive activity. Unfortunately, however, such ointments are seldom prescribed, because for one thing their effect is at variance with the patient's own wishes. As for dietetic advice, it is most often of the purely negative type. The patient is forbidden to eat this or eat that—in the case of heart disease it is usually potatoes—but he is seldom told that he must eat the other. Nevertheless, unbiased investigation has gone to prove that most skin diseases are primarily due to nutritional deficiencies. When starved of the essential chemical ingredients and necessary bulk and roughage to be found in natural food, man's organs lose their tone, and so fail to perform their excretory functions as they would if properly vitalized. As for dry skin diseases, they are often due to a faulty distribution of moisture in the body. Exponents of the bio-chemic system of medicine prescribe minute

doses of chloride of sodium (common salt) for such diseases.

I was once instrumental in curing by these simple means a case of psoriasis which had persisted for very many years. The story is not altogether without its ironical side, for the patient acted in direct opposition to the advice of two skin specialists she had consulted. She had been indiscreet or, shall we say, frank enough to tell them that some one had advocated infinitesimal doses of common salt, at which they had thrown up their hands in horror and exclaimed, 'Why, salt is the very worst thing you could take!' However, as their remedies had proved unsuccessful, she finally was courageous enough to take mine. Her psoriasis vanished in one day. But I was careful to warn her that as the disease was a deficiency disease, it would assuredly return unless she made a point of taking the remedy from time to time. As a matter of fact, in her case, it was more than a deficiency disease, being partly due to the abuse of salt as a condiment, even though that abuse had been discontinued long prior to her acting on my advice. Thus the remedy had a two-fold effect: on the homeopathic principle that *like cures like*, it banished the symptoms of salt-poisoning and at the same time by supplying her tissues with the particular mineral salt which regulates the moisture in the system, her 'dryness of the skin' was cured.

Not long afterwards, a dermatologist on being told that I had cured a case of psoriasis, significantly remarked: 'Well, if he has found a cure for *that*, he should make his fortune!' And yet all I had done was to suggest a remedy with which every practitioner of the Bio-chemic System is familiar, although he may not specialize in skin diseases.

Specialism and its evils have spread all the world over.

In an article entitled 'Whither Medicine?' Dr. B. Bhattacharyya of Baroda, India,¹ after contending that specialists as a class have become a menace to public health, goes on to say: 'To see the specialist and study him in relation to the special organ in which he has specialized will excite the mirth even of the gods. The dentist, for instance, has a set of false teeth, the oculist cannot do without spectacles, the dietician has the worst digestion possible, and the skin specialist probably has leucoderma.' The writer then proceeds to relate the case of a lady who was suffering from a variety of complaints involving the skin, nose, ear, throat, uterus, and stomach. Being a woman with up-to-date ideas, the upshot was that she placed herself in the hands of four specialists from whom she was concurrently receiving treatment and whose various medicaments she swallowed. These treatments continued for years and the patient became visibly worse. 'Can you call this science?' Dr. Bhattacharyya exclaims. 'My friends call it scientific quackery which the State is encouraging all over the world at the expense of public health.'

In concluding this chapter let me quote from a lecture delivered in the United States by Lord Horder.

'The spread of specialism,' he said, 'and the increased interest of the public in medical matters have both combined to narrow the function of the general practitioner, who is, or who should be, the clinician *par excellence*. . . . I regard this as being no less dangerous to the public than it would be for the passengers of the ship if the captain left the bridge . . . and the chief radio-operator took his place. But I see the equivalent of this being done day after day. Whereas formerly the physician kept control of the case and exercised his judgment in deciding

¹ See Feb. 1937 issue of *Heal Thyself*.

the programme of treatment, he now all too often stands aside and allows his specialist colleagues to take charge, over the shoulders of whom, as it were, he gets an occasional glance at his patient.¹

Precisely; but why does he allow his specialist colleagues to take charge? Either because he does not feel competent to cure the patient himself, or because he has not the courage to try, or because he is not honest enough to tell his patients what they have no wish to hear. Nor is he altogether to blame, for if he told his more self-indulgent patients that they must alter their entire mode of feeding, they would in all likelihood merely go and seek more acceptable advice elsewhere.

¹ 'The Clinician's Function in Medicine', by the Rt. Hon. Lord Horder, from *New York State Journal of Medicine*.

Chapter VII

THE ABUSE OF SURGICAL KNOWLEDGE

William Howard Hay, M.D., has told us in his book *A New Health Era* that it is his 'firm conviction that ninety-nine per cent of all internal operations performed to-day never should have done been, and the other one per cent should have been done by some sure-enough surgeon who has proved that he is qualified to open the body cavities without doing irreparable harm'.

This is the pronouncement of one, be it noted, who practised for many years as a surgeon himself, and in view of what I intend to put forward in this chapter, I think my readers may come to regard it as no great overstatement. Not only have we to face the fact that many surgeons are far less competent than we are led to believe, but that they are often insincere and tainted with the commercial spirit. Thus, Dr. Hay further tells us that one eminent nose and throat specialist admitted to him in private that tonsils, for instance, recover without their removal; yet the same specialist surgeon, that very same day, assured his medical group that if he were persuaded that tonsils could be cured without removal he would forgo all his tonsillectomies—and presumably his fee of five hundred dollars for each operation.

Nevertheless—for I shall refer to these commercial aspects later—no one will be so prejudiced as to deny that surgery has made vast strides. Yet unfortunately just because it *has* made vast strides, the abuse and exploitation of surgical knowledge has come to be one of the most pernicious medical evils of the present age. One

clever but unwise surgeon, for example, remarked to me that if he had the control of things, he would insist that all persons should have their tonsils, their appendix, and their gall-bladder extirpated. When I asked him if he himself had followed his own advice, the answer was—somewhat illogically—in the negative. To admit of medical incompetency by advocating the removal of an organ when it is diseased is bad enough, but to advocate its removal before it is diseased is a gross abuse of surgery as a science, as well as an unflattering aspersion on a medical confrere. It presupposes that if one of these aforementioned organs becomes diseased, no practitioner is clever enough to cure it. This may often be true, but it is uncomplimentary all the same. These surgical abuses also involve the conceited idea that such organs are useless and that Nature does not know her business half as well as the surgeon!

That surgery is invaluable in cases of accident and war mutilations goes without saying, but its employment for the majority of diseases is not only of doubtful wisdom but has proved disastrous in the extreme. This fact in truth is so well known that among Swiss doctors England has gained the reputation of being the country of useless and harmful operations. One Swiss doctor whom I met in Lausanne informed me that his English patients were frequently those who had suffered mutilation at the hands of the surgeons and then had come to him to be cured—*when it was too late.*

And the reason for this state of affairs is not very far to seek. How easy for a doctor when he cannot cure an organ or a disease to cover up his ignorance by saying: 'The only thing for this is an operation.' In this simple way he extricates himself from his dilemma, with a

semblance of knowledge without exposing his incompetency to the patient.

Unfortunately one operation often leads to further operations, owing to adhesions or other after-effects. A near relation of mine who had been mutilated by one surgeon was persuaded into having five subsequent operations all of which proved entirely useless and only served to ruin her nervous system. Yet if these surgeons had possessed that knowledge for which they are credited, or even a little foresight, they would have realized by the state of her tissues that the operation could not be other than unsuccessful. Finally she was persuaded by a non-qualified man to have treatment for the tissues themselves, the result being that when she did undergo a final operation, it proved as much of a success as could be expected. Yet even so, the eminent and dexterous surgeon who performed this final one was misled by certain symptoms which eventuated and wanted to open the patient up again. Indeed he was only prevented by her husband who knew more about his wife's constitutional idiosyncrasies than did the surgeon with all his vast experience of the human organism.

Some ten years ago another close relative of mine was nearly rushed into an unnecessary operation because the doctor-surgeon by whom she was being treated feared a malignant growth in the uterus. That his fears proved ungrounded time has shown. Yet my relation would have submitted herself to the surgeon's lancet had it not been for the intervention of a clairvoyant friend in whom she put more faith than in the doctor's diagnosis. . . . As I pointed out in my *Outline of Modern Occultism*,¹ in all cases of true malignancy, a crab-like parasite may be seen

¹ See Chapter XVI.

clairvoyantly by those who possess the necessary faculties. In the case here quoted no such *elemental* was visible, and my relation was saved the pain and expense of an operation which might eventually have produced the very condition it was intended to cure. For the reader should know that although one school of doctors may be all too ready to advise operations another school is of the decided opinion that it is *scarred tissue* which provides in particular a fertile soil for malignant disease. Although surgeons in their own interest may choose to ignore this fact, experience has proved it to be true. This is especially the case when the system has been poisoned by chronic constipation and starved by a deficiency diet. Far from an operation being the most ready-to-hand remedy, it should always be the last resource.

The abuse of surgical knowledge, however, has resulted in its being all too often the first recourse. Indeed, its abuse has become so pronounced that nowadays even admittedly useless operations are casually dismissed as if the matter was of no importance. A friend of mine was induced into undergoing a serious uterine operation for an alleged poisoned condition which gave her a great deal of pain. When, having recovered from the operation, she found no amelioration of her symptoms, and said so, she was unfeelingly told that 'the poisons must have been somewhere else'. This same friend, although she is but a little over thirty, has already had ten operations, five of them in one year. None of these operations were for accidents, and all could and should have been avoided.

Another friend of mine was operated on for gall-stones. The wound turned septic, and as her ovaries were suspect she was operated a second time long before she was even given the chance to recover from the first operation. The

result was that she died from sheer weakness and shock, as any doctor with the least common sense might have foreseen. In other words she was murdered by learned ignorance and surgical brutality. Had the doctors possessed a knowledge of autotherapy,¹ they could easily have cured the septic condition, and as for the alleged ovarian trouble, hundreds of such cases have yielded to osteopathic treatment. . . . Still another friend of mine was doomed to a life of complete invalidism as the result of a surgical mistake during an operation for appendicitis. After years of suffering she was again operated on with the idea of saving her life. She lived on for a while in continual pain and then died. . . . Many women are operated on for supposed appendicitis when the true cause of the trouble is to be found in the ovaries. This I happen to know from an osteopath who has cured a large number of alleged appendicitis cases by treating them for ovarian trouble. The inference to be drawn from this is that a competent osteopath is a far better diagnostician than are many surgeons: the latter have come to see everything in terms of the knife; the former have no such prejudices.

Another blot on surgery is that in certain quarters it has become tainted with the spirit of commercialism. If patients are rich they are often persuaded into having easily avoidable operations merely to put money into the pockets of the medical profession. Thus, wealthy patients are operated on for complaints for which no surgeon would operate in the case of poor people who could not pay; the latter are cured by treatment only, whether in hospital or elsewhere. This came to my knowledge through the confidential indiscretion of a medical nurse who was so incensed at the way a well-to-do patient under

¹ See Chapter X.

her care was being exploited by the doctors and surgeons that in order to save her from further mutilations she told her the truth. Needless to say, this particular patient was only one victim among many. Another indiscreet nurse revealed the fact that in a small town on the South Coast where she had worked, certain doctors and surgeons, after lamenting that there were far too few operations in the locality, put their heads together to see how the number might be unnecessarily increased.

Although the acceptance of a commission is considered by the more high-minded doctors to be a reprehensible procedure, yet some practitioners are not above this taint of commercialism. The husband, since deceased, of a wealthy woman I know, was nearly induced by his doctor to undergo an operation at the hands of a fashionable surgeon for which he was to be charged several hundred pounds. As he suspected that the operation might not be necessary and that the suggestion was largely a device to get money out of a rich man, he asked the doctor in question to give him a written assurance that he was not financially interested. The doctor, taken aback and looking very shamefaced, refused, and the operation never took place.

It is a noticeable fact that many surgeons themselves have no imagination and have come to regard surgical intervention as almost a matter as trivial as the extraction of a tooth. They quite overlook the shock to the patient's system and the after-effects which may take years to be overcome. Another noticeable fact is that many surgeons are far from brave when they have to undergo an operation, however slight, on themselves. A dentist acquaintance of mine told me he had once to extract a tooth for a very celebrated surgeon, since dead. The latter was in

such an obviously blue funk (to use a schoolboy piece of slang) that, despite the use of a local anaesthetic, he was bathed in a cold perspiration and kept asking: 'You're sure it's not going to hurt . . .?' Even dentists are often far less heroic than some of their patients, and several dental surgeons have admitted to me that they are very nervous when treated by their colleagues.

But to pass on to more important considerations.

In a large number of cases an operation only removes an effect but does not remove its cause. How is it, for instance, that many patients who are operated on for gastric ulcer, in a longer or shorter time develop another gastric ulcer? Obviously and undeniably because they do not, subsequent upon the operation, alter their mode of feeding. Unlike the graduated emesis treatment an operation does not rid the body of its poisons, nor does it of course supply its nutritional deficiencies, it merely gets rid of a local effect—the ulcer itself. In this respect it cannot be termed fundamentally scientific but only a temporary measure. This is a fact which both surgeons and doctors overlook or ignore. After such an operation, which in given very serious conditions may have been advisable, few physicians apparently possess the knowledge, insight, or wisdom to tell their patients that they must henceforth alter their deficient and unnatural diet in order to avoid a recurrence. It seems quite sufficient to say the operation has been a great success and thus leave the patient to believe he has been cured once and for all in accordance with the medical dogma that 'the best cure for ulcer of the stomach is an operation'. In point of fact the best cure is that which is the most lasting, the most painless, the most inexpensive, and the most simple. Moreover, simple cures are very often the most efficacious. One intimate friend of mine

was cured of gastric ulcer by taking black currant jelly with hot water every morning over a given period. It was a layman who advised this treatment after doctors had failed to give her any permanent relief. This was some years ago, and there has been no recurrence—one reason being that after her cure, my friend paid some attention to the science of eating. Many cases of gastric ulcer have been cured by diet alone or in conjunction with the use of slippery-elm food or by the remedies of the bio-chemic system or by homeopathy.

Another complaint for which surgeons are too ready to operate is gall-stones. Yet a friend of mine who had refused operative treatment despite the fact that other treatments had failed, finally cured himself with Dutch Drops (Oil of Haarlem), after which cure he was wise enough to feed scientifically and in consequence has had no further trouble. An operation would have cost many guineas, the simple cure cost him the price¹ of a few bottles of the remedy.

A further example of the effective use of the simplest remedies is to be found in Dr. K. T. Morris's *Fifty Years a Surgeon*. Dr. Morris was operating on a female child for prolapse of the rectum when he discovered that owing to haemorrhage he could not continue the operation. The child was cured shortly afterwards by her own mother who happened to remember the astringent effects of alum in water.

Sometimes the most elaborate, dangerous, and torturing operations are resorted to for ailments which are susceptible of cure by the most simple means. An American friend of mine developed wry neck, for which he consulted specialists in America, in France, in Switzerland, and

¹ Oil of Haarlem costs 5*d.* a phial.

elsewhere. Having undergone an unsuccessful operation in Paris he was finally told that there was but one surgeon in the world who might cure him, but that the operation was somewhat risky and very complicated, and even if it proved successful, convalescence would be long and painful. None the less my friend decided to undergo the operation, but came bitterly to regret his decision—he told me that nothing on earth would have induced him to endure such suffering had he known what was in store. All the same, the operation was regarded as one of the greatest marvels of modern surgery. . . . And now comes the denouement with all its irony. Not long afterwards I mentioned this operation for wry neck to an electro-therapeutic friend of mine. ‘Good heavens,’ he exclaimed, ‘why, only the other day I saw an old woman cured of a long-standing case of wry neck by this vibrator.’ And he showed me a little apparatus invented by a Swedish doctor who had recently been demonstrating its functions in one of our hospitals. Nor is this all. Lest the reader should think there are no other comparatively simple cures for that unsightly and grievous complaint, I may add that I met one woman who had been cured by a quack. This quack, strange though it may sound, maintained that the prime cause of her trouble was to be found in her feet. And the idea is far from irrational. If the balance of the body is thrown out, it reacts on various muscles, etc., which are not corrected until that balance has been restored. Nor must I forget to mention the great number of cures of wry neck that osteopaths have brought about through readjustment.

All of which once again goes to prove that an operation, although it may appear to cure a given disease, merely counteracts an effect but does not get rid of its cause.

This fact is one which many and many a wise physician has pointed out, but as unwise physicians are in the majority, it has been for the most part ignored.

In a previous chapter I mentioned the case of a woman who after an operation for haemorrhoids began to go blind. This is not to say that operations for bleeding piles must inevitably lead to blindness, but it certainly goes to substantiate the fact that an operation by no means is a prophylactic against further ill health. On the contrary, the supposed cure may prove later on to turn out worse than the disease. In fine, I would re-emphasize that all external operations that close up an outlet which acted as a drain for internal poisons are safe only when the patient subsequently adopts a mode of living which insures a more perfect elimination. That the prime cause of a disease is not removed by the surgeon's knife, cancer and its so frequent recurrence go to prove. Ellis Barker¹ quotes the case of a woman who was suffering from malignancy of the breast. Her breast was removed, but later on she developed a cancer in her other breast. For years this woman had been so constipated that she had only had a motion once a week or even once in ten days. This chronic constipation had not been cured or even inquired into prior to or after her first operation. Thus her whole system was vitiated by poisons which, in her case, eventually resulted in cancer. Is it a matter for surprise that surgical intervention only proved a temporary measure since it failed to remove the cause? . . . Unfortunately the orthodox doctor or surgeon, in spite of the overwhelming evidence which has been collected,² does not bother about the possible cause of malignancy, but only about the effect. Parrot-like he accepts the injunction:

¹ See *New Lives for Old*.

² See Chapter XIV.

'Operate for cancer. There is no other possibility of cure.' If we then raise the question of its recurrence, he lamely retorts: 'Either the operation was not properly done or it was too late.' He may even quote statistics, little knowing they have been manipulated by those who do not like to admit of failure. Thus in many cases an arbitrary and unduly short time-limit for survival is set. If the limit is three years, then those who survive the operation for three years are considered as cured even if it is known that they died of cancer during the fourth year. . . .¹

It may have been observed that the cases I have selected and most extensively quoted in this and my previous chapter have been culled from among the circle of my own relatives, acquaintances, and friends. In one respect that is my justification for writing them. I ask myself: If there are so many victims of medical ignorance or unwise advice among those I have personally encountered, how great must be the percentage of victims among the whole population of this and other countries?

But the momentous question is: How can such victimization be avoided in view of what usually happens? Namely, that the patient in his ignorance places far too much credence in surgery, or else, being in a state of both physical and mental weakness has not the will-power to resist the surgeon's all too plausible persuasions. Thus he has but one moderately reliable safeguard to fall back upon, and that is to ask the doctor or preferably two or three doctors whether an operation is absolutely essential to save life. If the answer is in the negative, then he will be well advised to be quite firm and refuse surgical intervention. But in many cases the answer is likely to be

¹ Ellis Barker, *Cancer*.

that an operation, although not absolutely essential, will accelerate the cure and save the patient a lot of pain and trouble. This, however, is seldom true, and many a person who has been induced to believe it has only come in the end to regret his misplaced credulity. Had he placed his faith in Nature instead, the effect would have been very different. Indeed, it is fairly safe to say that as a general rule what can be cured by an operation can also and more safely be cured without an operation; that is, provided Nature is given her chance. The latter consists in abstention from solid food, a complete rest, and the intake of fresh fruit or vegetable juices¹ to purify the system and keep up the strength. Osteopathic treatment is also indicated in a large number of cases; for no disease which appears, however wrongly, to call for an operation would eventuate if all the parts of the body were in perfect position.² This is a fact which the surgeon overlooks in his policy of dealing with effects and not with causes. He forgets that perfect alignment means perfect function; or better said, he does not forget it because he cannot, strictly speaking, forget that which he does not even appear to know. This is why, apart from other considerations, he advises the removal of tonsils, adenoids, ovaries, appendices and other organs, instead of advocating osteopathic treatment which would painlessly and surely restore their proper functioning and so dispense with the apparent necessity of an operation.

And now finally we come to one of the chief arguments against surgery as such. Surgery is a violation of Nature's laws. All Nature's processes are gentle and gradual; only when she seeks to destroy does she use violent methods. Thus, however much one may wish to ignore the fact,

¹ These must not be bottled juices.

² See Chapter XIX.

surgical methods in relation to disease are violent and mutilative methods, destructive of tissue and hence opposed to Nature's beneficent designs. And although Nature may do her best to repair the damage, she never entirely succeeds, for that is beyond her powers. Moreover, not only has she to contend with the mutilation itself but also with the drugs that have been given to assuage the patient's suffering together with the shock the nervous system has sustained. And so, taking all this into account, the sooner that surgery is consigned to its just and proper place in the domain of therapeutics and all illusions regarding it are exploded, the better for mankind at large. Under present conditions (excluding, of course, accidents and some maternity cases from the argument) the fairest thing that can be said is that sometimes it may be essential in order to save a patient's life when he is up against medical incompetence combined with the results of his own ignorance and folly. It may also be necessary where, as the outcome of years of wrong living, an unsuspected growth has suddenly been discovered, the removal of which might give the patient a chance to recover under proper treatment. In such cases an operation would of course not constitute an abuse of surgical knowledge, but an instance of that exalted purpose for which it has been evolved and for which alone it should be employed.

Chapter VIII

NURSING HOMES—A MENACE TO INVALIDS

In Tibet there is a superstition that if a sick person is allowed to fall asleep in the daytime it greatly militates against his cure. In fact, it is regarded as such a serious eventuality that the chief function of a nurse is at all costs to keep the patient awake. One may laugh, of course, at such an absurd superstition, seeing we know that sleep and quiet, whether at night or in the day, are the most essential pre-requisites to a patient's recovery; yet in those very institutions which are supposed to provide all the essential comforts for the sick, sleep and quiet are often the very last things they can obtain.

Instead of being permitted to sleep when and as long as desired, patients are awakened every day at an unconscionable hour for the morning wash-down; though naturally the hour for these ablutions varies in the thousands of different homes. But even so it is a common thing for the patients to be roused between 5 and 5.30 a.m. This routine, often intolerable to the sick man or woman, takes no heed of the amount of sleep a patient has obtained, or whether he has obtained any at all. Frequently it happens that he has been put to sleep by means of medinal or veronal at 1 a.m. only to find himself being shaken by the nurse and dragged back to consciousness long before the effects of the sleeping draught have worked off.

One friend of mine who has been in and out of a dozen nursing homes while suffering from serious stomach trouble, told me that if he did not wake up at an early

hour after taking the prescribed narcotic he was aroused by a firm-handed nurse at intervals of fifteen minutes. If too drugged to take his breakfast at the time which best suited the kitchen department, it was left to get cold and then taken away untouched. In spite of his serious and painful stomach trouble he was served with badly cooked oatmeal porridge, second-rate salty bacon, and soft, thick, half-toasted slabs of indigestible white bread with inferior marmalade. The other meals of the day were equally inferior and unwholesome. And all this despite the fact that a stomach specialist had diagnosed his case as one of duodenal ulcer! I may perhaps add as a strange piece of irony (although it belongs to the chapter on specialism) that in the last of the dozen nursing homes which my friend visited, he found the very specialist aforementioned, himself laid low with the very disease in which he specialized.

Although personally I have never had the misfortune to be treated in a nursing home I have often visited patients and listened to their sorry tales and simultaneously to the proofs of their correctness. Frequently I have sat talking to them with a running accompaniment of chattering, loud-laughing nurses, in the passage but painfully within earshot. In one nursing home I visited, the patient's room was near a pantry in which dishes were washed from morning till night with a loud clatter I would not tolerate anywhere in my own home except in the basement. To this was added the constant clatter of high heels on hard oil-clothed floors and the resonant voices of nurses shouting pleasantries to one another, not only all day but, as the patient informed me, well into the night. In the early morning the same patient, having at last dropped off into a sleep of exhaustion, was awakened at an unearthly

hour by a house-boy polishing the floor, whistling and dropping his tins and brushes.

And for all this the patients are asked to pay heavy fees, and are afraid to complain to the matron or nurses, since they know only too well that if they did, matters would be made even more unpleasant for them than they already are. As for complaining to the doctors, they are never given the opportunity, for a nurse or the matron stands by when the doctor pays his visit, so that all confidences are made impossible. . . . In some nursing homes even the telephone bell can be heard all over the house, which means that the patients are constantly being disturbed by its irritating reverberations. In addition to this the wireless is permitted for the convalescent. In one nursing home recently visited by a relation of mine, no less than five different wireless sets were audible, she informed me, all of them making a conglomeration of noise which even the healthy could not tolerate, let alone the sick.

In view of all this, nursing homes (though there are a few exceptions) merely serve to retard a patient's recovery, instead of accelerating it, and doubtless in many cases may prevent recovery altogether. They are commercial concerns run purely as paying propositions, and they have become a medical fashion which doctors are all too ready to encourage. The plea put forward by surgeons is the operating theatre to be found in such institutions and the conveniences and facilities it provides. But considering all the necessary appliances can be hired from such chemists as cater for operative work, and can be easily transported to the patient's home, the use of the operating theatre is by no means a necessity. Rather is it merely an excuse to extract more money out of the patient who has to pay for its hire.

From time to time the popular Press makes a feature of the grievances and hardships under which the hospital nurse is trained and the inhuman conditions under which she is compelled to work. Nor is it a far cry from the methods employed in training the probationer to the treatment accorded to patients in our nursing homes.

In their training, probationer nurses are scarcely treated as human beings; they are brought up under a rigid military discipline which is instilled into them until it becomes second nature. In consequence they know of no other method wherewith to handle their patients. And before patients are handled humanely and with due consideration the life of the probationer nurse in the big hospitals will have to be revolutionized.

The editor of a leading nursing paper,¹ speaking recently on this question said: 'I am strongly in favour of the contention of Dr. Langdon Brown, Regius Professor of Physics at Cambridge, that the present system of training nurses is due for drastic reform. Because of the strenuous nature of the working conditions and their poor dietary thousands of probationers break down every year and have to resign in the first few months of their training.

'For this reason alone the wastage (of human material) is enormous and accounts for the shortage on hospital staffs. In one big London voluntary hospital recently forty per cent of the probationers broke down and left in the first three months of their training; another four per cent left in the first year. The percentage able to complete the training course was only fifty per cent.'

And that goes on yearly under the very noses of the country's leading doctors and surgeons, as it were in their

¹ *The Nursing Times*.

very professional homes. The hospital régime for which the medical profession is directly responsible causes the physical breakdown and collapse of fifty per cent of the accepted probationer nurses despite the fact that before acceptance each candidate must pass the most rigid medical examination and is therefore, before the training begins, a specimen of perfect physical and mental health. That being so, is it any wonder that the doctor, without any direct interest in improving the standard of public health or the prevention of disease utterly fails to serve the best interests of his patients?

Taking all this into consideration, wise persons will not allow themselves to be lured into nursing homes whatever pretext may be put forward. However humane some individual nurses may be while doing duty in private houses, they become as the result of their training mere machines when faced with the exigencies of nursing-home routine. Consequently the sick person will be well advised to keep out of their hands unless it be in the freedom of his own home. Routine is the very last thing to which sick persons ought to be subjected, for nature should always be allowed to take its course. The seriously sick should be encouraged to sleep when they want and as much as they want, and to eat when they want and as little as they want. A nurse's real duty is to suit herself to the convenience of the patient, but in nursing homes the patient is required to suit himself to the convenience of the nurse and to those who run the institution for the sake of material gain. This is all very deplorable from every point of view and it is to be hoped that before long the Ministry of Health will see fit to take control and insist on those drastic reforms which will safeguard the sick from iniquitous exploitation.

Chapter IX

RISKS OF RADIOGRAPHY, RADIUM, AND THE CYSTOSCOPE

X-ray photographs are supposed to be a wonderful aid to correct diagnosis and operative treatment, but their value is greatly over-estimated, seeing at times they prove highly misleading. Proof of this could be multiplied *ad infinitum*, but the mention of a few cases will suffice. Specialists are far too apt to see in X-ray photographs exactly what they wish or expect to find. A gland specialist who believes that most people suffer, say, from pituitary trouble, seeks to prove this to his patients by showing them radiographs he has himself taken. One woman informed me that having been treated by such a specialist and derived no benefit, she subsequently took the X-ray photographs to another specialist who told her they were out of focus and there was nothing wrong with her pituitary at all.

Many operations have been performed as the result of X-ray photographs which revealed something that did not exist. A surgeon told me he had opened up a man for stone in the kidney which showed on the radiograph but was not to be found in the patient. The latter was of course kept in ignorance of this disconcerting fact and the surgeon pocketed a handsome fee for performing a quite unnecessary operation.

At times, X-ray photographs reveal nothing when something is there. This may occur in connexion with dentistry. A friend of mine was convinced that there was an inflammation at the root of one of her teeth and that

it ought to be extracted. An X-ray was taken, but revealed nothing suspicious. My friend nevertheless persuaded the dentist to remove the tooth, with the result that he had to remove the next tooth as well, since both had abscesses at the roots.

As against this case, another woman who suffered from rheumatism was advised to have all her teeth X-rayed, though they appeared to be in perfect condition. The Harley Street dentist whom she consulted, informed her that they must all come out as the radiograph showed pus at the root of every tooth. Thinking, however, that the verdict was over pessimistic and not wishing to lose an entire set of seemingly good teeth, she made some pretext to delay the operation. Subsequently she consulted an American dentist abroad, to whom she showed the radiographs. The upshot was that he told her she had perfect teeth, all except one which had an abscess at the root and therefore ought to be extracted. . . . In view of this case, one is tempted to ask whether the Harley Street dental surgeon was dishonest or merely incapable of reading a radiograph correctly.

Not so long ago, when the fashion for removing teeth for all forms of rheumatism and kindred complaints was at its height, a dentist friend of mine was consulted by a man whose teeth were suspect and who had been advised to have them all extracted. My friend, however, being an honest dentist, considered such wholesale extraction too drastic a measure and advised his patient an Epsom Salts bath once or twice a week. The result was that he lost his rheumatism and retained his teeth.

Although the removal of bad teeth has certainly cured rheumatism and sciatica, it is a well-known fact that scores of people have had all their teeth extracted without

any appreciable difference to their poor health. Conversely, scores of people have kept their dead teeth in their mouths without any appreciable difference to their good health; the reason being that in a healthy organism Nature puts up its own defences against infection from such natural foreign bodies as dead teeth, provided the roots have been properly treated by a competent dentist. Dental infection is seldom a prime cause of diseases such as rheumatism, arthritis, and similar ailments, but merely a secondary cause which could only operate in an auto-intoxicated organism resulting from putrefying food in the colon. There are cases where arthritis has been cured solely by the daily intake of a harmless disinfectant which acts as a corrective or preventive of intestinal putrefaction. From a most reliable authority I learned that a certain doctor who at sixty was crippled with rheumatoid arthritis not only cured himself completely by such a simple measure but is now at eighty-three a magnificent specimen of youthfulness and sound health.

I have shown that X-ray photographs may at times prove unreliable as an aid to diagnosis. The same mild adjective, however, cannot be applied to X-rays and also radium when employed as remedial agents. People who are innocent enough to submit either to X-ray or radium treatment are running serious risks which, through lack of the requisite knowledge, they are unable to appreciate. Both these powerful yet insufficiently tested measures are extremely dangerous. 'The rash use of X-rays and radium . . . has led to sterility in women and men, the formation of defective offspring . . . and cancerous developments in many cases.'¹ As for treating cancer with X-ray or radium-therapy, the average survival is

¹ Ellis Barker, *Good Health and Happiness*.

between two and three years. Sometimes the patients die ostensibly of something else within less than a month. This was the case with one friend of mine who had or was alleged to have cancer of the throat, and who after having been subjected to radium treatment for ten hours a day! over a period of weeks, was then sent home in an ambulance. He was informed that further treatment could not be given. After no amelioration of his sufferings, he shortly afterwards died from pneumonia, his lung-tissue being unable to stand such intensive treatment.

In the hands of some X-ray specialists who imagine it to be a panacea for anything and everything, even the most trivial complaints have been treated with X-rays, such as a slight rash on the arm. Yet far from curing the complaint it has been known to spread to the chest, throat, and side, so that the patient had become wellnigh distracted owing to the incessant irritation. But the most serious consequences of treating a local rash with X-rays or radium is, that some ten years later a cancer may develop in the very locality which has thus been treated. Or it may be that some other serious complaint may develop, not ten years hence, but shortly after the application.

I may mention the case of a lady of my acquaintance who has been lame ever since she was treated for a small innocuous lump on her foot, which would doubtless have disappeared of itself. As a result of this treatment she has ever since been in constant pain and has to wear a special boot; and all efforts to cure her have proved abortive.

X-ray treatment is often given to women for uterine trouble during change of life. In the case of a friend of mine a paralytic condition eventuated which took years to cure by means of prolonged daily massage.

Radiography, Radium, and the Cystoscope 71

In fine, the dangers of X-ray or radium-therapy cannot be over-estimated—the more so as their baneful effects are frequently both slow and insidious. Doctors may plausibly tell their patients that such dangers only existed in the past when the proper technique to ensure safety had not been acquired, but this is only a half-truth, since facts go to prove that even the most up-to-date technique cannot render either radium or X-rays harmless.

Before concluding this chapter I should warn my readers against another danger, which, if any of them should happen to be suffering from prostate or bladder trouble, they are liable to incur. In this scientific age, scientific instruments multiply to a prodigious extent, and just because they are scientific, we are apt to underestimate their harmfulness. Such an instrument is the cystoscope, the unskilful use of which may do irreparable damage to the bladder. This instrument, even in the hands of bladder specialists, who ought to know better, has been responsible for the eventual deaths of many people who might have been saved by proper treatment. Competent physicians can easily diagnose prostate trouble without the aid of a cystoscope, and what is more important, enlarged prostates can be cured without operation, which in all cases is unsatisfactory and in most cases extremely dangerous. Nevertheless hundreds of old and elderly people are rushed to the operating table, having been persuaded by surgeons and doctors that it is the best thing for their trouble, whereas in point of fact it all too frequently merely results in death from shock or its after-effects.

This is the more deplorable, seeing that if patients were more *au courant* with less orthodox methods of treatments—homeopathy combined with a suitable diet is one—their

lives might be saved. This has been proved to me by a friend who is an electro-therapeutician and gives a painless and drugless treatment for enlarged prostate which up to date has not resulted in a single failure. As this man is no tall-talker but very much the reverse, and as I have known him for many years I can vouch for his integrity. Thus enlarged prostate in itself is not so serious a matter as the orthodox may suppose, provided no injury to the bladder has been inflicted by the use of an instrument—the cystoscope—which may be scientific in name but dangerous in actuality.

Chapter X

AUTOTHERAPY VERSUS COMMERCIAL SERUM THERAPY

There are few people nowadays who do not know that at one time bleeding was a fashion which obtained so great a hold over the medical imagination that patients were bled even when there was hardly an ounce of blood left in them to bleed. Yet the practice of blood-letting began as a useful expedient in cases of full-bloodedness in an age when people over-indulged in port wine and excessive meat eating. But because it eventually became a supposed cure-all for every and sundry complaint, it is now relegated to the limbo of injurious and exploded superstitions. Even in cases of high blood-pressure and the danger of apoplexy from too great full-bloodedness, few doctors dare to resort to bleeding even if it would save the patient's life—bleeding has gone out of fashion and that is enough. But another fashion has come in its place— inoculations, injections—in technical language, vaccine and serum-therapy. This, I need hardly point out, began in a modest and comparatively harmless way as a prophylactic against small-pox.¹ Later it was employed for rabies by the great chemist, Pasteur, and then for diphtheria and tetanus. Now, however, it has assumed such vast proportions that people are injected for every sort of complaint including shingles and chilblains.

'Vogues in treatment come and go, introduced without

¹Dr. Sambon wrote: 'Three thousand years before Jenner, Pasteur, Koch and their successors, the Hindus fought the smallpox by inoculating lymph from the pustules of the zebu calf.'

experimental justification, and accepted without the application of any crucial test, without comparisons between a treated and an untreated series, without inquiries into mode of action or even a display of curiosity as to whether the remedy includes an active principle at all. Sometimes, even, harmful treatments flourish for a time. The others exhibit a waning curve of popularity, and early exalted claims suffer a gradual extinction with little attendant commentary or reflection on the time and money wasted and the disappointed hopes.

‘In the last quarter of a century we have witnessed the therapeutic vaccine craze, based not on experiment and the vast experience of war-time, but on haphazard speculation and ill-considered enterprise. Organisms isolated from the throat, dental sockets, stools, and elsewhere, and hailed as the cause of the rheumatism, the catarrh, the colitis (and sometimes of the undiagnosed anaemia, cancer, tuberculosis, or gout) have been injected in various combination in their millions of millions—the prescription being at last discontinued when it failed, or the patient, after months or years, got better in spite of it. The polypharmacy of the Middle Ages was no more absurd. “Endocrines”, “rays”, exploitations of surgical procedure, injections of chemical substances vaunted to cure influenza and pneumonia, intravenous chemotherapy for septicaemia, have all been allowed to have their day. In each case it has been the same story. The treatment has been launched with no adequate preliminary experiment, without controls, without clinical trials, and employed without criticism and often, alas, without an adequate diagnosis and to the exclusion of a rational conservative

Autotherapy v. Commercial Serum Therapy 75

therapy, which, although not miraculous in its effects, at least has the virtue of encouraging or not delaying natural recovery.³

These words were written by Dr. John A. Ryle (Regius Professor of Physic in the University of Cambridge; Consulting Physician to Guy's Hospital) and printed in that most reputable and orthodox organ the *British Medical Journal*. They are not the words of an anti-vaccinationist, a homeopathist, a herbalist, an osteopath, or a naturopath; therefore they cannot be dismissed as the prejudices of a crank or a quack.

Let us consider the nature of serum therapy and then quote some opinions of other physicians.

Serum therapy as practised to-day may be described as a misappropriation of the ancient but scientific truth that *like cures like*. But although the principle is correct, its all too fashionable and extravagant misapplication is fraught with a number of dangers which have been pointed out by many enlightened physicians—but in vain.

Thus, Dr. L. J. Witts, physician at Guy's Hospital, stated that any patient treated with serum injections incurs the risk of a serum accident; the painful disease of serum-sickness may result with its almost unbearable tortures of skin irritation and swollen joints. Sir Almroth Wright has stated that the entire 'belief in serum therapy rests on a foundation of sand'. Yet Sir Almroth Wright is again no crank or quack, but a pillar of the orthodox medical profession. Another doctor has written that 'terrible and tragic consequences to health and life have all too frequently followed the use of animal serum even when accompanied by the utmost skill in manufacture

and application'. . . . That they occur far more often than is generally realized is frankly admitted by those authorities who from time to time report cases which have come under their observation.¹ Indeed this chapter could be filled with condemnatory quotations selected from the medical literature of every important country in the world. Suffice it, however, if I am content briefly to state the grave dangers inherent in serum therapy which, be it stressed, do not merely come under the heading of remote possibilities, but which have been proved by clinical experience.

In an article headed 'Why I object to Vaccine and Serum Therapy,'² we find these inherent dangers mentioned under three headings, namely *immediate*, *delayed*, *remote*. The *immediate* effects may be sudden collapse; the *delayed* may take the form of rashes, glandular enlargements, pains in the joints, abscesses, cardiac paralysis, etc.; and the *remote* effects may manifest as numerous chronic and intractable types of disease. . . .

For instance, Dr. Benchetrit contended that 'vaccines and sera are principally responsible for the increase of those two really dangerous diseases, cancer and heart disease'. And he significantly added, 'I have been for a long time a serologist and I know what I am talking about'!

Yet in view of such an admission, may we not pertinently ask why does the use and abuse of serums still continue? Because, for one thing, an all too innocent public demands serum treatment under the assumption that it is the most scientific and up-to-date; for another, prodigious commercial interests are involved. One manufacturer admitted that it was 'far more profitable to buy an old worn-out horse and use it for the manufacture

¹ Dr. Beddow Bayly.

² By A. Sarti, in *Heal Thyself*.

Autotherapy v. Commercial Serum Therapy 77

of sera than to win the Derby'. Factory proprietors have been known to buy a horse for £18, use it for serum, and make well over twenty thousand pounds. Love of animals may be a graceful virtue, but to be expected to welcome into one's body organisms derived from an old horse is surely carrying love to an illogical conclusion. Has the doctor who injects the serum the honesty to tell his patient the source of its derivation? Perhaps it is indiscreet to ask. In any case, there is little doubt that the commercial interests involved in serum manufacture have so much to do with its popularity that, as Dr. Beddow Bayly wrote: 'So great is the almost mystical veneration in which antitoxic sera are held by medical science, and so powerful the commercial interests which benefit by their extended use that it has come to be regarded as a breach of medical etiquette to criticize adversely this form of treatment, or to report untoward results of it.' In other words, the medical profession, which should be one of the most exalted in the world, is vitiated by the taint of commercialism, and thousands of innocent people are doomed to suffer that others may be enriched.

Nevertheless, the patient himself is frequently to blame; although many an honest physician may deprecate serum treatment for a variety of chronic ailments, it is the patient himself who forces his hand. 'This coercion'—as Lord Horder has pointed out—'combined with a natural desire on the part of many physicians not to be regarded as out-of-date, may be responsible for much of the increase in vaccine therapy as seen to-day, rather than honest conviction, based upon personal experience. Many of us inoculate our patients because it is expected of us, rather than because we feel it is the best way to cure them.'

And yet I do not wish to be misunderstood; I am here criticizing the abuse of serum therapy, not its judicious employment in cases where the physician in his ignorance knows of no better treatment to suggest. The allopath who finds himself confronted with a case of diphtheria, naturally should not be condemned for employing a serum which he has reason to believe will save the patient's life. True, were he a homeopath, he would prescribe *diphtherium* in a high attenuation to be taken through the mouth. But not being a homeopath he resorts to the same principle, but in a different form. Nevertheless, any one who investigated homeopathy with an unprejudiced mind might come to realize that the homeopathic form is in every way far preferable to that of commercialized serum therapy, for the reason that there are no harmful after-effects. But this is a fact which the allopath has still to learn. Meanwhile he does the supposedly correct thing according to his own lights in injecting serum for diphtheria which, after all, is an acute and dangerous disease. With chronic and minor ailments it is a very different matter, as the newspapers have shown. Within the last few weeks the Press has reported inquests on deaths following injections for chilblains and for depression. The cause of death in the former was given after the *post mortem* as heart failure, due to acute blood poisoning consequent upon an abscess following an injection.¹ Many deaths have been reported after injections for rheumatoid arthritis and other complaints. Nor is this a matter for surprise, since already devitalized and poisoned bodies are thus subjected to yet more poisons, with which in many cases they are quite unable to contend.

¹ See *Heal Thyself*, February 1937, p. 140.

Autotherapy v. Commercial Serum Therapy 79

As Dr. Fergie Woods, M.D., has written: 'The sera and vaccines so largely derived from animal experimentation . . . and injected *in large and frequent doses* [the italics are mine] are nothing more or less than foreign bodies which add more poisonous material to the blood for the struggling vitality to cope with. . . . They aim at removing the *effects* instead of the cause of the disease.' Very often, however, these effects, far from being removed, are only increased. Who does not know of people among his own circle of friends who after a course of injections find themselves worse off than before? And even if others have apparently been cured, what proof is forthcoming that there will be no harmful after-effects either in the comparatively near future or long afterwards? 'The appearance of the signs and symptoms of shock may be delayed months and even years. . . . The long delay frequently results in the manifestation of chronic disease which, as often as not, remains (apparently) for ever unconnected with the cause.'¹

In view of all this, can any person be so credulous as to maintain that serum therapy as practised in its present exaggerated form to-day is in any real sense scientific? Rather is it the prostitution of pseudo-science for commercial ends. Nor is this all. The taint of commercialism may be found in nearly every branch of therapeutics. Whereas formerly the doctor wrote out a prescription and would not deign to advise a patent medicine, he now advises one or more of the countless variety of manufactured drugs, most often of the coal-tar by-product genus. Thus he suppresses fever with a patent drug, gives the invalid a peaceful night with a sleeping-tablet which is supposed to be absolutely harmless, advocates

¹ Dr. J. E. R. McDonagh.

some patent tonic, and finally tells him or her to eat some form of patent food. Indeed, the market has become flooded with patent drugs and treatments which are often useless and for which the doctor has become a glorified species of commercial traveller. Dr. John A. Ryle, from whose article in *The British Medical Journal* I have already quoted, gives four reasons for a justifiable scepticism on his part. He writes, 'The first treatments were launched without preliminary trials; their boons, just like those of any quack remedy in the advertisement pages of the Sunday papers, were proclaimed in advance. Secondly, the claims for these substances were not, so far as I could learn, based upon any animal experiment. Thirdly, their pharmacological or biological actions, whether in animals or men, did not appear to be known, if, indeed, they had any such action. Fourthly, although they were clearly being used quite extensively in practice, in the teaching hospitals they had no vogue. Finally, when I examined charts and cases in which these remedies had been used before my advent I could not discover that anything had been achieved by them.'

Unfortunately, however, although nothing may have been curatively achieved, it does not follow that no harm may have been done. Already last century Louis Kuhne discovered that patients during his treatment excreted drugs which had been administered years previously for the suppression of various symptoms, and which had only added to the general encumbrance of foreign matter within the system. This being so, can we wonder that in an era when young people take harmful drugs for the least headache, attack of insomnia, twinge of rheumatism, or touch of liver, that grievous and dreaded complaints should attack mankind at a far earlier age than formerly

Autotherapy v. Commercial Serum Therapy 81

they did? As Dr. Grimmer has pertinently asked: may not the frequent use of depressants and irritants, by reducing the reacting power of the body 'answer the observed fact that cancer is occurring in younger subjects of each succeeding generation'? And what is more, 'Perhaps the most irritating of irritants and depressants is produced by the almost universal applications of vaccines and serums.'¹

And now, after all these incriminating facts, we finally come to autotherapy, the non-commercialized, scientific and natural method of self-healing by means of secretions taken from and then subsequently imbibed by the patient himself.

Nearly twenty years ago, Charles H. Duncan, M.D., of New York, published his momentous book on autotherapy (or self-healing) after having proved his contentions through actual practice over a number of years. Briefly stated, autotherapy is a method of treating a patient with *unmodified* toxic substances derived from his own body. Writes Dr. George Frederick Laidlaw in his introduction to Dr. Duncan's book: 'Autotherapy is an advance on autogenous (self-generated) vaccine therapy because there are four difficulties . . . that Dr. Duncan's method easily solves. These difficulties are: the offending bacteria or some of them may fail to grow on the culture medium; the autogenous vaccine must be treated by heat and chemicals, both of which weaken its curative power . . . the preparation of the autogenous vaccine requires the help of a skilled bacteriologist and a laboratory; finally and most important . . . in acute disease, the preparation of an autogenous vaccine requires at least twenty-four hours and . . . often longer.' Moreover, as the writer

¹ From a lecture on Cancer, by Dr. Grimmer.

goes on to say, the slightest inattention of the bacteriologist may vitiate the whole product. In the meantime, while the bacteriologist and his assistants are reaping their fees, the patient may have died. In a word, the production of a bacteria-culture with all the uncertainties it involves in the process is unscientific and detracts from its effects as a remedial agent. The reason is that to bring about a cure the very bacteria *with all their poisons intact* must be in exactly the same proportion in which they are present in the patient. Thus the whole laboratory procedure is both superfluous, time-wasting and harmful: all that is necessary, if the secretions are to be injected, is a filter and a hypodermic syringe.

But even so, injection is by no means always essential; as a dog saves himself from infection and cures his sores by licking them, so can human beings obtain the same results by a similar if modified process. Dr. Duncan made this discovery in 1909. A man who had been run over was brought into hospital. Infection had set in despite all available treatments, and his life was despaired of. Dr. Duncan, as a last resort, decided to follow the example of the dog. Taking a few drops of pus from the patient's wound, he placed them into his mouth. 'Within two days the purulent discharge entirely disappeared . . . the appetite improved, the temperature fell to normal, he became cheerful and improved in every way.'¹ Soon afterwards Dr. Duncan had an opportunity of making tests upon three severe cases of infection and the former results were confirmed. Later on he treated hundreds of patients on the same principle, though to camouflage the micro-organisms he sometimes administered them in grape-juice or triturated them with sugar of milk or

¹ *Autotherapy*, by Dr. C. H. Duncan.

Autotherapy v. Commercial Serum Therapy 83

distilled water; the effects, however, were always the same, provided the dosage was properly regulated. In the case of patients who objected to taking their own discharge through the mouth, he used distilled water, a filter, and a hypodermic syringe. But in no circumstances did he permit a culture to be made.

To revert to the self-healing measures adopted by animals. 'That the dog cures his wounds by the mechanical action of the tongue is a time-worn theory that I have disproved,' wrote Dr. Duncan. 'Neither does the dog cure his wounds by any antiseptic qualities of the saliva. But, he cures them by a biological reaction. He simply transfers the germs from the wound to his mouth, by means of the tongue. This causes his body tissue to develop the curative reaction—and nature does the rest.' In proof of this, Dr. Duncan obtained an injured dog for observation and experimentation. He procured a Gordon setter with a deep foot wound, gave the dog a private room in a hospital, then, with the knowledge that if the dog were allowed to lap his foot the wound would heal quickly, he put a plaster cast on the dog in such a way that it was unable to touch the wound with its tongue. Then he dressed the wound daily with antiseptics and sterile gauze, just as he did his human patients.

Infection set in in the dog's foot, and progressed for three weeks until the dog was about to die. He had stopped eating, sleeping and drinking. His eyes were listless and his mouth drooped. The foot had swollen and was filled with pus. At this point, Dr. Duncan took three drops of pus from the wound, and gave them to the dog in a teaspoon. He had to open his mouth widely, tip back the dog's head and let the pus run down his throat. The dog started licking his chops eagerly—something he had not

done for days. Dr. Duncan then drained additional pus from the wound for future treatments. In twenty-four hours, the remaining pus in the wound had dried. The dog was given more pus, from the reserve that had been drained, and in thirty-six hours healthy tissues began to form. In one week, with repeated treatments, the dog was well.

Dr. Duncan and other doctors who followed his system cured a large number of cases of appendicitis, acute gonorrhoea, excoriating leucorrhoea, bronchitis, tonsillitis, laryngitis, hay fever, asthma, pneumonia, uterine haemorrhage, puerperal infection and a variety of other complaints, including acne. He published articles on his results in no less than seventy-nine different medical journals. His method was studied and practised by an increasing number of his confreres¹ in various parts of America, and aroused in them the highest admiration. Thus, to quote the opinions of but a few doctors out of many:

‘Results of treatment with autotherapy have been miraculous.’

‘This is one of the greatest therapeutic advances of the age.’

‘I am saving the women here [in the Philippine Islands] from operation following gonorrhoea.’

‘Autotherapy is the most rational and scientific therapy I know of.’

‘Autotherapy is one of the few things that will endure for all time. . . .’

‘I cured a case of pericarditis followed by acute arthritis of the left wrist and right knee by autotherapy. There

¹ See *The Coronet*, U.S.A., January 1937.

Autotherapy v. Commercial Serum Therapy 85

was a complete disappearance of all pain within three or four days. In ten days the patient was well. . . .’

‘I have used autotherapy in purulent infections and in acute gonorrhœa for the past four years. No treatment equals it . . .’

A doctor in New York declared that he had never seen another remedy act so quickly and beautifully in his life. Finally, to quote from a doctor’s verdict in Indiana: ‘The possibilities of autotherapy appear to be unending.’

All these and many more testimonials together with Dr. Duncan’s book were published nearly twenty years ago. And yet in the face of such unanimous approval doctors pretend to think it more scientific and curative to inject their patients with secretions from an old horse! If animals, instead of being indirectly used for these nefarious purposes, were observed and studied in relation to their habits, much more might be learnt than by cruelly injecting them with the most disgusting and deadly of human diseases. Because Dr. Duncan had the insight to observe one of these habits and to apply it, he gave to the world the science of autotherapy.

Then why—are we prompted to ask—is it not employed by every doctor worthy of the name? Because true science has been ousted by commercial greed. If autotherapy had become popular, serum manufacturers, bacteriological workers and all and sundry connected with their production would have lost their profits. And so, let the reader not be deluded should he wish to cure himself of his ills. Let him realize that if a well tried-out treatment is not universally employed, it is largely because it is too simple and too efficacious to be allowed to become popular. There are other considerations involved. A case, for example, of diseased tonsils

which can be cured by one or more doses of the patient's own discharge robs the surgeon of his big fees, and the doctor of his fees for more frequent visits. Moreover the use of stock (i.e. commercial) vaccines prepared by manufacturing chemists is the lazy man's way of practising medicine. All he needs to do is to diagnose the case and then order the particular stock vaccine—for which, of course, the patient has to pay a heavy price. But, unfortunately, as we have been at pains to show, that price is not merely a matter of money, but often of suffering as well. This cannot be said of treatment with autotherapy. Wrote Dr. Fermer from California: 'After two and a half years of experience in the use of autotherapy . . . I have not had a case that showed any form of injury from the treatment. . . .'

In view of all the foregoing, is it not high time that the public took matters into its own hands? Seeing that doctors cannot be trusted to dictate the right kind of treatment for the patient, the only thing is to reverse the process and let the patient himself dictate to the doctor what form of treatment shall be adopted. If this policy were resorted to, there would be fewer early deaths, fewer epidemics, and less suffering in the world.

Chapter XI

POTENTIZATION VERSUS INJECTION

Looking back into the past, we find some very curious remedies on which our more modern and hence supposedly more enlightened doctors pour their scorn, and it is not always merited. We read, for instance, that 'disgusting substances formerly were used as drugs largely because of the impression they made on the sufferer. Excrement and urine have had a notable place in medicine, and Pliny in his *Natural History* speaks highly of the medicinal virtues of menstrual blood. Urine was an old remedy, but subject to occasional revival; Madame de Sévigné recommended it highly in the 17th century.'¹ The authors, however, who thus write about the 'disgusting substances' used as drugs by our forefathers contrive to forget the equally disgusting substances employed nowadays under the name of science, sometimes with justification but frequently with none. Have not we read that 'organisms isolated from the dental sockets, stools, and elsewhere . . . have been injected in various combination in their millions and millions'?² Why then be so scornful if 'Icetidas pledges his word that quartan fever may be cured' by an act which causes the absorption by the system of menstrual blood, much in the same way as garlic may be absorbed by rubbing it on the soles of the feet? May there, in fact, not be some toxic ingredient in menstrual blood which acts homeopathically but which our modern chemists have not discovered, because even

¹ See Dr. H. W. Haggard's entertaining book, *Devils, Drugs and Doctors*. (Heinemann.)

² Dr. J. A. Ryle; see *ante*.

they think they must draw the line somewhere? Why so many of the ancient remedies for this, that, and the other appear so absurd to us is simply because they were based on the laws of magic—laws which the modern materialist denies. Even so, there was genuine magic and there was spurious magic, viz. magic that was based on scientific if occult laws and magic that was nothing but quackery in the worst sense of the word. If one who is initiated reads through Pliny's large collection of remedies, he will find a vast admixture of genuine magic, doubtful magic, sheer quackery, sheer superstition, and a few scientific medical facts not to be ignored even nowadays.¹ Yet can magic be entirely ignored either? There are some 'old wives' who still effect cures by means that must come under this heading. For instance, I knew a young boy who was greatly troubled by warts, for which the usual remedies had proved ineffectual. At last his old nurse, who still lived in the house, declared she would cure them herself. She took a piece of string, made as many knots in it as there were warts, then buried it in the garden. *As the string rotted away the warts disappeared.* Coincidence, the sceptic will say; but there have been too many such 'coincidences' to warrant that convenient assumption.

We are, however, not concerned in this book with the rationale of magic. Suffice it to say that it is based on certain magnetic currents known to the higher initiates of occultism, but as yet undiscovered by the material scientist. Nevertheless, I venture to add that its re-discovery will not be very far hence. Meanwhile, as we

¹ For instance, much medicinal use was made of seaweed, both as an antiseptic and otherwise. In seaweed, as we all know, is iodine. Nicander recommended it to be taken in wine, and now Dr. Hay recommends it in powdered form as an adjunct to food!

have seen, the medical preoccupation of our forefathers with such fluids as urine and blood was not utterly devoid of sense, for even nowadays many people have been injected with their own undiluted blood, the supposed or actual beneficial effects being ascribed to what is termed 'protein shock'! As, however, I have not to my knowledge come across any one who has received such an injection I am not competent to judge of the matter. Yet with regard to injections of *trituated* blood (viz. 1 drop to 1,000 of distilled water) the position is different. Any one who is really *au courant* with some of the latest phases of medicine on the Continent will know that such injections are given with astonishing results in cases of collapse. My investigations along occult lines, however, have led me to believe that it is far more scientific, because more natural, to swallow in dosage form this highly attenuated (or potentized) drop of blood. In any case, one doctor whom I persuaded to try it subsequently informed me that he believed he had prolonged a woman's life and greatly ameliorated her sufferings by giving her doses of her own blood in this highly potentized form. The case was one of very severe heart disease, and my friend maintained that on several occasions he averted total collapse by these simple means. Had the woman not previously been subjected to X-ray treatment he believed that she might have been permanently cured.

Apropos of this, I may here mention a severe case of carcinoma¹ of the face, with which, owing to my correspondence with the patient and the doctor attending him, I became indirectly associated. The patient, an American living in Chicago and a man approaching seventy, had written to me in regard to one of my books. In his letter

¹ One of the worst forms of cancer.

he told me that he was undergoing treatment for cancer. Arsenic compresses had been applied with a certain amount of success, but the dread disease was far from being cured. I wrote to him and suggested triturated potash combined with a natural scientific diet, though the latter advice turned out to be superfluous. A few weeks later he replied informing me that the potash treatment had proved most encouraging. In the meantime, having heard of the potentized blood injection and drawn the conclusions previously mentioned, I wrote back suggesting he should try it, if his doctors approved. The upshot may be seen from the following:

‘The effect of the blood with the distilled water seems to me to bring to the surface latent afflictions and remedy them. It showed on Dr. Bluth’s machine that cancer was reduced finally to zero. Apparently the remedy works on the finer bodies¹ and the effect steps down to the physical body. Also it seems to balance up the endocrine chain, it boosts my endocrine chain up to . . . that of a man of thirty-eight to forty years. . . . The enclosed chart tells the story. . . . It looks as though . . . my pit cancer is now under control. I enclose two pictures showing it at its worst and now.’²

Later on I received a most friendly letter from one of his doctors, in which he said, ‘Mr. M—— came to me for a re-check on himself after using the potency of blood as you directed. I found that the first thing it did was to stir up all the toxic material in the system. . . .’ The writer then went on to say that subsequently it much increased the glandular activity and began to reduce the

¹ viz.: the etheric, etc., as revealed by the Kilner Screens (see Chapter XXIV).

² The second photograph showed it as all but healed.

carcinoma. He also told me he was 'thrilled' at the revelation afforded by a greater understanding of the use of water. . . . The last letter I received from him informed me that the patient was still doing well, and as that was only some days ago, I have no reason to be pessimistic.

All the same, although the case is instructive, it should especially be emphasized that I lay no claim to have found a new cure for cancer, let alone a universal panacea. If the patient's life has been saved it is largely due to his own efforts and the most commendable broadmindedness on the part of his doctors together with the methods they employed. For one thing they were able to check up on their pathoclast¹ his reactions to the potentized blood, and this proved a most useful guide to the advisable frequency of dosage. They also discovered by this means that he reacted more favourably to a higher attenuation of potash than I had suggested in the first instance. As for the patient himself, he contributed much to his improvement by rigorously adhering to a meatless, natural, scientific diet, rich in vitamins and mineral salts. The necessity for this in all forms of disease has already been emphasized more than once; but in the case of cancer it is absolutely indispensable.

Sceptical readers will doubtless ask, 'How can one drop of blood in a thousand drops of water affect a disease at all, let alone such an "incurable" disease as malignancy?' My own line of reasoning is simple, though whether correct I am unable to say. A course of action may be right in itself and results may prove that it was right, yet the theories we may advance to explain its correctness may be inaccurate or totally wrong. In prescribing the

¹ A diagnosing apparatus originally invented by Dr. Abrams.

intake of blood in its 3^x attenuation I had reasoned that all the diseases of a given individual are potentially in the blood, and as *like cures like* a requisite number of doses of potentized blood should consequently effect a cure. The first part of this reasoning seems but ordinary common sense coupled with the most elementary knowledge. Are we not told that rheumatism, for instance, is due to acidity in the blood, that boils are due to impurities in the blood, and so on? But in addition to these recognized facts my extensive reading has led me to believe that cancer has its origin in the blood and that nobody would develop any form of cancer if their blood was perfectly healthy. This reasoning appears to me quite simple and straightforward. But if I am asked to explain why *like cures like* and why a substance to which a thousand parts of water are added should become so highly potent and powerful for good, I am obliged to say I don't know; I can only declare that it is so, as thousands of homeopaths have proved. There is, however, this much to be said: that Nature herself supplies the body with all chemical ingredients in the most minute doses, for the organism cannot assimilate the necessary mineral salts, etc., in large quantities. And this is just where the allopath and the homeopath so materially differ. In prescribing larger doses of iron, say, for anaemia, the allopath is going contrary to Nature's laws. Hence we find that triturated doses of iron and calcium have often cured anaemia after allopathic doses have failed. Yet the efficacy of the minute dose is not only to be found in relation to mineral salts but practically in relation to all medicaments. Hundreds of homeopathic remedies are administered in the ratio of one part drug to a thousand parts distilled water. Apart from the potency of the

minute dose *per se*, there is apparently in water itself a vital force which has yet to be appreciated. Indeed 'water is a prime essential of life and health. In a sense it is more important in the human economy than food, for though we could exist possibly some weeks without any food, complete abstinence from water would have disastrous results within a few days.'¹ Thus the combination of blood and water may be far more rational and scientific than we have hitherto been apt to suppose.

As for urine, which be it remembered we cited as another of the 'disgusting substances' formerly used as drugs, a good deal might be said to emphasize its efficacy as an autotherapeutic remedy.² We know that in the seventeenth century Madame de Sévigné, who, after all, was an intelligent woman, had apparent reasons for strongly recommending it, while even as late as the eighteenth century a dentist named Fanchard 'who made notable contributions to dentistry, advised his patients to use their own urine as a mouth-wash'.³ Even long prior to that, Benvenuto Cellini in his autobiography wrote that on one occasion he was *faute de mieux* forced to wash in his own urine wounds he had received in a sanguinary encounter. Nor does it appear from the context that the result was disastrous. On the contrary no ill effects, it would seem, accrued.

In short, where there is smoke there is usually fire, which may perhaps on the surface appear to be a curious adage to cite in this connexion. Yet is it so inept? A remedy that was in favour for several centuries must at least have had something to recommend it; for mankind, when all is said, was not at the stage of complete idiocy

¹ Sir Arbuthnot Lane, 'Water Drinkers and Health.' See *New Health Magazine*, August 1933.

² See App. III. ³ H. W. Haggard, M.D., *Devils, Drugs and Doctors*.

before it arrived at our own enlightened (?) epoch. The fact is the ancients have been proved right as regards the virtues of urine as a remedial agent, as was demonstrated by Dr. Duncan, who devoted a whole chapter to the subject in his book on autotherapy. Moreover, many of the cases cited are those supplied by other doctors. For instance:

'Patient, male, aged thirty years, applied for treatment for cystitis [inflammation of the bladder]. There was burning tenesmus and almost constant desire [to urinate]. A teaspoonful of early morning urine one half-hour before meals completely cleared up the case within two days.'

Another case: 'Patient, male, aged twenty-three years. During second week of gonorrhoea . . . developed an acute cystitis. The condition had persisted for about three days. A teaspoonful of his early morning urine three times a day before meals allayed the inflammation within twenty-four hours.'

Many more cases were quoted, all of them being cured by this simple autotherapeutical principle. Among these were two of enuresis (bed-wetting) and one of diabetes mellitus. The latter improved considerably, as long as the patient took the remedy (which was camouflaged in regard to colour and taste) but on being told its nature by an indiscreet parent, refused to take it any more and in consequence grew steadily worse.

Highly potentized urine, however, seems to act even better than when merely diluted with some camouflaging liquid. Dr. T. W. Deachman of Chicago tells of a woman approaching forty years of age who had suffered for over a year from extreme nervousness, incontinence of the bladder, neuralgia, and indigestion, for which the orthodox remedies had been tried without effect. She was finally cured by doses of her urine in the 1,000 c.c.

dilution, with the result that in a remarkably short time she presented 'the very picture of health'.

The potentization of urine possesses two distinct advantages. For one thing, most people strongly object to drinking it even when suitably disguised. But one drop to a thousand of distilled water is so small a percentage that the objection should become negligible. After all, such highly diluted urine is, for instance, far less offensive than phlegm, yet the latter is frequently coughed up into the mouth and instead of being expectorated is sometimes swallowed. But there is another reason in favour of potentization. Undiluted urine, as we shall shortly show, is a very poisonous fluid, and if the doses are too frequently given, some harm may result. With potentization such results are not to be feared provided a very simple rule is observed: *as soon as improvement is noticeable the dosage should be suspended until that improvement ceases.*

We will now put forward certain statements which, in view of the fact that *like cures like*, may help to show why urine should possess such remedial properties.

Goethe has written in *Faust* that 'blood is a very special fluid'; and from an occult standpoint this is true. But investigations have gone to prove that urine is also in many respects a very special fluid. Dr. C. J. Bouchard, Professor of Pathology and Therapeutics in Paris, and Member of the French Academy of Medicine, made some very interesting experiments in connexion with blood and urine which are decidedly relevant to our present speculations. To these researches and findings Mr. Are Waerland has drawn attention in his admirable book *In the Cauldron of Disease*, though at the same time he laments that they have been grossly 'neglected and wantonly

overlooked by those whose business it is to lead and guide us in our daily life'. Whether his lamentations are entirely justified is a moot point, seeing that urine analysis is a measure so frequently adopted by the physician as an aid to diagnosis. The trouble is, however, that the analysis is far too restricted, the analyst as a rule being told merely to look for such substances as the physician suspects may be found. This being so, Professor Bouchard's findings may after all be as valuable as Mr. Waerland implies. I will therefore quote the gist of his contentions:

'As the urine is none other than that fluid which carries the impurities from the blood-stream out of the system, Bouchard regards its toxicity as the best indication of the toxicity of the blood. In fact of all the detoxicating organs he considers the kidneys the most important as is shown by the highly poisonous qualities of the urine. These poisons are to be found in its colouring matter. Moreover, Bouchard resorted to the expedient of injecting normal human urine into the veins of animals, and was thus enabled to measure its toxicity by the fatal symptoms produced.' I should add in parenthesis that when pure water was injected into animals no such symptoms appeared.

As a further result of these experiments, Bouchard demonstrated that the quantity of toxic matter eliminated in twenty-four hours by the kidneys is one half of what is necessary to kill the whole of the body; but as in natural health the elimination is incessant, at every moment of the day, the blood never contains at one time more than a small fraction of poison. In abnormal health, however, the proportion is, needless to say, correspondingly greater. Indeed, according to Bouchard's researches, it is enough

that the poisons in the blood should be but two and a half times greater than the normal quantity *for death to ensue*.

In the light of these contentions—whether we accept them fully or take them with the proverbial grain of salt—is it not obvious that urine must contain either antiseptic or homeopathic qualities (or perhaps both) that must have been well known to the ancients? For instance, Pliny mentions it as efficacious when mixed with ashes of calcined oyster shells as a cure for eruptions and all kinds of running ulcers. ‘It is also,’ he adds, ‘used as a liniment for corrosive sores, burns, diseases of the rectum, chaps upon the body, stings’, etc. But he is careful to say that every person’s own urine is the best for his own case, thus implying the principle which the homeopaths have accepted that like cures like.

Yet although one must respect homeopathy and recognize its thousands of remarkable cures where the allopath has failed, the difficulty of finding the *exact* simillimum is always present. Having found the approximate simillimum in a given herb or drug, we usually find listed in addition a number of symptoms which do not apply to the patient at all. Moreover, in some cases we have to search long and carefully among the vast array of some 2,000 remedies before we discover the symptoms which do apply.¹ Yet might not the potentization of the patient’s own secretions, of which urine is one, solve the difficulty and so reduce homeopathy to a simpler and at the same time a more exact science? It may be that some homeopaths are already doing this, in which case the question is largely superfluous. But what about the allopaths who

¹ This, incidentally, is a reason among others why so many prospective doctors prefer to take up allopathy!—not because it is more efficacious, but because it gives them far less trouble.

still prefer their cultures and their stock vaccines and their belief in subcutaneous injections? Will the day not come when they will be compelled to see, as the homeopath has done since the time of Hahnemann, that potentization is far preferable to the method of producing cultures, and that the intake of remedies through the mouth is more truly scientific, because more natural, than the medical fashion of injecting them into the veins? In any case it is not unsafe to say that during comparatively recent years one important if simple truth has come to light; viz. that from the body itself may be derived the very substances essential to cure it when it is ill. But although this simple truth has ever existed, it has been both obscured and applied in a maze of irrelevant complications. For although 'we move from the complex to the simple, the obvious is the last thing we learn'.

Chapter XII

COMMERCIALISM INDIRECTLY RESPONSIBLE FOR DISEASE

Investigation goes to show that ninety per cent of the ill health from which people suffer nowadays is indirectly due to commercialism. It is responsible for the invention of white flour and white sugar, of tinned meats and extracts of this, that, and the other—all of which are deficiency foods. But by means of commercial advertising, we are led to believe the contrary. Indeed, our life is to a large extent influenced by this commercial advertising; it pays the advertisers themselves and does harm to their victims.

In order to put money into the pockets of the millers, a great advertising campaign was last century set in motion to persuade people that brown flour was injurious and that white flour was wholesome. The position now is that 'the milling interest buys up all the wheat, grinds off all the outside, and hands over the dead, vitaminless flour to the wholesalers. These very often bleach it and add to it various chemicals which are supposed to facilitate baking, to improve the appearance of the loaf, or to make a bigger loaf, to the great injury of the community, which is forced to buy a deceptive article which is attractive to the eye but which is made unwholesome and dangerous to health by the various manipulations it has undergone and by the various chemical ingredients which have been added to it. Some of the flour reaches us in the form of bread which causes disease and rapid death to animals which are fed exclusively on that bread

and water, whereas similar animals fed on wholemeal bread and water will flourish.¹ In short, that the millers should be enriched, countless people are doomed to suffer from constipation and the effects of phosphates-deficiency.

Much the same thing has occurred in connexion with sugar. It is the fashion to eat white sugar instead of brown, simply because in the first instance the sugar-refiners so willed it. An unscrupulous doctor was paid to give out that he had found a 'bug' in brown sugar and therefore it was unfit for consumption in its natural state. The result is of course that millions of people now consume an inferior commodity, believing it to be a superior one. And if these statements should be challenged, I refer the reader to such books as show them undeniably to be facts.²

But this is not all. Commercialism having in the first place caused people to deviate from Nature in one way by inducing them to live on denaturalized food, indirectly forced them also to deviate from Nature in a second way. Being deprived of wholemeal, which among its other properties contains a natural evacuant, hosts of people must needs resort to unnatural and harmful evacuants in the shape of purgative drugs. They had been led by means of propaganda to believe that the husk of wheat was an indigestible and injurious bowel-irritant so they all too innocently proceeded to dose themselves with other bowel-irritants which actually were injurious. And this was continued for as many generations as have succeeded the invention of white flour. Thus the present generation is not only suffering from the effects of its own nutritional

¹ J. Ellis Barker.

² See McCann's *Science of Eating and Are Waerland, In the Cauldron of Disease.*

deficiencies but from the inherited deficiencies of several preceding generations.

I am aware that on first thoughts the idea that constipation is in part a hereditary disease may sound startlingly absurd—for that is my implication—yet if we consider certain facts we may come to think otherwise. The deficiency diet of our forefathers has resulted in an inherent weakness of the whole intestinal tract which in many cases cannot wholly be counteracted even by the most scientific régime. This is borne out by the statements of numerous osteopaths and therapeutic manipulators who in the course of their practice have treated hundreds of patients. One such practitioner informed me that a perfectly healthy bowel is only to be found in approximately two persons out of a million. But this applies, be it noted, to the civilized people only; uncivilized peoples, on the contrary, have such perfectly functioning bowels that an evacuation after each meal is with them the normal thing. And what is more, according to Sir Arbutnot Lane, Dr. Hay, and others, it should be the normal thing with everybody. Yet far from this being the case, countless people owing to the inherent weakness just mentioned or to lack of a natural diet do not even contrive to get an evacuation once in twenty-four hours. The result is that aperients and purgatives are resorted to with a frequency which, instead of improving matters, in the long run only serves to make them far worse. Purgatives neither strengthen the bowels nor cure constipation; they merely debilitate them so that in the end they will not function at all without artificial aid. Thus with a large number of people the taking of some sort of supposedly harmless laxative has become a daily habit. This habit, moreover, apart from its other attendant evils, may lead people to imagine

themselves more constipated than is actually the case. Dr. Sansum in his books has drawn attention to this fact and at the same time shown how the purge-taking habit is formed.

A person, for instance, through wrong feeding or lack of exercise finds himself constipated for two, three, or more days. He then becomes alarmed and takes, say, a good dose of castor oil which thoroughly empties the bowel. The following day he has no motion, which however, does not surprise him in the circumstances, but when two and three days pass without a motion he gets alarmed again and resorts to another purgative. And in this way the habit begins.

Yet if this man were less ignorant about his own body he would know, as Dr. Sansum points out, that with some people it takes four days for the long length of intestine to fill up sufficiently to produce an evacuation. Had he but waited until the fourth day he would probably have had a perfectly normal motion. This was in fact borne out in the case of a friend of mine who admitted to me that he had not had a normal action of the bowels for forty years! During all that time he had taken a purgative every night. And yet by persuading him to take nothing but a few pills of common salt triturated with sugar of milk, (*viz.* one of the remedies of the bio-chemic system) he was cured in *exactly four days*, and his bowels have functioned normally ever since. I should add, however, that I also persuaded him to make bran and seedless raisins a daily article of diet, and to eat wholemeal bread in place of white bread. As my reason for advising *natrum muriaticum* (triturated common salt), it was in order to counteract the excessive dryness of the bowel consequent upon taking so many purgatives.

All the same, turning now from individuals to people in general, I maintain that if the intestinal tract had not been weakened by generations of deficiency-feeding, it would not be necessary to wait four days for a motion after there has been a complete emptying of the bowel whether by means of a high enema or a strong purgative. And in this I am but voicing the opinions of Lane and other authorities.

To revert to the subject of commercialism and food-stuffs. That commercialism should have tampered with bread and sugar which are the most important foods in the dietary of the poor is a disaster which can only be appreciated by those who understand something about bio-chemical laws and intestinal hygiene. Bread was at one time 'the staff of life' of the working classes, the great 'body-builder'; it is now neither the one nor the other. White bread, far from building the body, merely fills it with starch which in its turn produces rheumatism, obesity, indigestion and catarrhal conditions, either severally or all together according to the type of consumer.

Let us turn to simple revealing facts. If liquid is mixed with white flour it becomes a mucilaginous paste which goes bad unless a preservative is added. Inside the body this paste furnishes a breeding ground for germs and bacilli apart from the fact that it clogs up the system, filling the stomach and intestines with slime—in other words, mucus. A convincing proof of this is that when people take the graduated emesis treatment they vomit large quantities of this slime, and the greater the quantity of starchy and unnatural foods they have been in the habit of eating the greater the amount of this slime. Unless the latter is properly evacuated it may result in any such condition as mucous colitis, nasal or bronchial catarrh,

catarrh of the stomach and so on. The importance therefore of not depriving all starchy foods of their natural evacuant ingredients becomes obvious.

And now as regards white sugar; it is an acidity-producing product which also has been deprived of all its valuable mineral salts and therefore has become a totally inferior commodity. Nevertheless, bread and sugar are the two foods from which the working classes should derive their sustenance and health. That they derive nothing of the kind is obvious from the vast number of patients suffering from every sort of disease who fill the hospitals. The percentage of sick people grows ever higher, despite the 'marvels of science', the 'wonders of surgery', the 'complicated appliances', the 'discovery of insulin', the 'millions spent on cancer research', and so on and so forth. In fact, despite the introduction of insulin the death rate from diabetes has increased considerably in all countries where it is used; and as for the cancer death rate, its increase is too heart-lacerating to bear contemplation.¹

Now I do not intend to be trapped into stating a medical inaccuracy; I am not going to state, where the poorer classes are concerned, that all diseases, including diabetes and cancer,² come from eating white bread and white sugar. But I am going to maintain with certain reservations that they do come from not eating wholemeal bread and natural sugar. If we consider that the usual diet of the poorer classes consists almost entirely of meat, boiled potatoes, white bread, and commercial sugar, this conclusion is warranted. Cooked meat in itself is not only deficient in vitamins and mineral salts, but if it is not speedily evacuated, putrefies in the bowel and results

¹ Ellis Barker.

² See Chapter XV.

in that poison-absorption which is one of the chief factors in disease. Thus the consumption of meat is only safe (and even that is not to say it is an ideal food) when it forms part of a diet in which wholemeal bread or, better still, bran figures as a natural evacuant and body-builder. If white bread is used as a substitute for it, the consequences to man are eventually as disastrous as they are to animals. Monkeys if 'fed on bread made from the unrefined wheat thrive indefinitely, but . . . monkeys fed exclusively on a *white bread diet* perish in from five to seven weeks'.¹

Should the objection be raised that men are not monkeys and that animals' food is not man's food, then I may quote the case of one healthy man who tried to live exclusively on white bread and water for a fortnight. It (the experiment) was undertaken in midwinter, and he, for once at any rate, suffered most severely from hunger, constipation, fatigue, weakness, cold, loss of sleep and weight, and almost gave it up in despair of ever lasting out the fourteen days. All the buoyant fitness usually associated with a fourteen days' fast was absent. 'It led me', he wrote, 'to appreciate the challenge made many years later by Dr. Bertrand P. Allinson to Sir Thomas Holder to live "exclusively on a diet of ordinary white bread and water for a month, while he [Dr. Allinson] would keep him company on a diet of wholemeal bread and water, and then write his epitaph"'.²

The aforementioned experiment, together with those on animals, should prove once and for all that whereas wholemeal bread possesses all the constituents to sustain life and maintain health, white bread does exactly the reverse.

¹ McCann.

² James Henry Cook, 'The Staff of Life', an article published in *Heal Thyself*, February 1936.

With regard to boiled potatoes, which form part of the poorer classes' dietary, as all the valuable salts are thrown down the sink their effect as a body-builder and health-sustainer can only be regarded as negligible. The disadvantages of meat in conjunction with white bread we have already mentioned. There remains then but sugar, whether in the form of jam of which the cheaper qualities are often and merely sweetened with synthetic glucose.

The tampering with sugar would have somewhat less serious results if bread had been left intact. But as the valuable constituents of both bread *and* sugar have been refined away the position is doubly serious. As the result of commercialism, the human system is offered in the form of white sugar 'a product from which almost all valuable organic minerals have been extracted, thrown away, or given to cattle in the form of molasses. The result is that the body *cannot utilize this kind of sugar without robbing itself of just those food minerals which have been refined away, and which form an integral part of the juices of the alimentary canal and the secretions of the glands*'.¹

And now if we turn from causes to effects we find a whole host of diseases consequent upon cell-starvation, including decayed teeth, from which the poorer classes suffer to a marked degree. Through not eating whole-meal and natural sugar a calcium deficiency results, in which case the body draws upon the only available source of calcium supply, the lime of the teeth and bones, thereby opening an avenue for the entrance of putrefactive bacteria.² In countries, writes Waerland, where the food is poor in calcium, we find a saying among the peasantry 'that with every child goes a tooth'. This, however, is but a minor evil in comparison with others. In any country

¹ See Are Waerland, *In the Cauldron of Disease*.

² *ibid.*

where a denaturalized diet is the custom, many serious diseases appear after the birth of a child; for a calcium deficiency is not the only one involved, considering a balance of twelve inorganic salts, not to mention iodine and other chemicals, is necessary to preserve the health of the body. One of the most important of these salts is potash, the lack of which has been proved by Forbes Ross to account for rheumatoid arthritis, morbid growths, and cancerous tissue.¹ For this reason we so often hear the remark, 'So and so has never been well since the birth of Mary or John.' For instance, one woman I know developed arthritis after the birth of a daughter, another became exceedingly corpulent owing to improperly functioning glands after the birth of a son. In fact, hundreds of cases might be quoted to show that the child had taken the necessary mineral salts from the parent, these having never been re-supplied owing to a deficiency diet. Yet although doctors prescribe calcium, they entirely ignore potassium which, as already implied, is one of the most important of all the tissue salts for the maintenance of healthy cell-life.

A further if indirect effect of a demineralized diet is the drink habit to be found among the town-inhabiting poorer classes. Being under-nourished in the most scientific form of the word, the working man finds himself tired and out of sorts and hence in need of something to 'buck him up' so that he can continue his work. And thus it is that the drink habit starts and gets a hold over its victim. The women folk if they do not drink beer, gin, or whisky to excess indulge in frequent cups of tea to cheer their drooping spirits. The tea that the women drink is of the strongest, and the beer that the men drink is of

¹ See Chapter XV.

the most unwholesome; a synthetic beer devoid of those vital elements to be found in good, natural, home-brewed beer.

It may now be appreciated why efforts to increase the national health through better sanitation, better housing, laws against overcrowding, etc., will prove to a large extent abortive unless the food problem is tackled in a scientific way. To enforce external hygiene and to disregard internal hygiene merely shows a deplorable ignorance of the true and comprehensive laws of health. The authorities prohibit to a certain extent the use of preservative chemicals in various kinds of foods, but they do not prohibit the sale of two foods, i.e., bread and sugar, from which the most valuable properties have been extracted and thrown to the pigs. The adulteration of milk is vigorously condemned, but a process which is even worse than adulteration is permitted in the case of the two mainstays of life. True, the authorities may find themselves in a quandary. As commercialism was primarily instrumental in engendering the demand for white bread and white sugar, to go against that demand now would be resented as a gross interference with personal liberty. This resentment would be all the greater because for one thing white bread is cheaper than brown. And this is true if measured solely from the standpoint of actual bulk, but if measured from the standpoint of nourishment and health-maintaining qualities, only half the amount of wholemeal bread is required, as Sir W. Arbuthnot Lane has conclusively demonstrated.¹

And now, in conclusion, I come to my chief reason for showing the part which commercial interests have played in this connexion. I am not concerned with railing either

¹ See *Diseases of Civilization*.

against the authorities, or against the evils of certain aspects of commercialism *per se*, for these are all too obvious. But what I would emphasize are the facts so ably put forward—but with a greater wealth of detail—by Ellis Barker, McCann, and other writers whose statements are irrefutable. As long as the reader is unacquainted with these facts, as long as he believes that there are reasons other than purely commercial ones underlying the demand for denaturalized food, he is apt to dismiss the whole matter as unimportant in spite of the present-time popularity of Dr. Hay's books and the propaganda of the naturopaths. And what is more, many a medical doctor will bear him out in this assumption. 'Unless you are suffering from one or other special complaints, in which case certain foods are harmful, diet is of no importance.' This in effect is what hundreds of doctors and specialists are apt to say. For we have to remember the significant fact that the generality of doctors are primarily interested in disease and its countless symptoms and not in health. They are concerned with curing diseases but not with preventing them. Even the preventive laws of sanitation we owe primarily to laymen and not to doctors. The doctors of a few centuries ago entirely ignored the insanitary conditions of filth in which the population lived and which were responsible for epidemics and plagues resulting in the deaths of thousands of people. To-day there are no plagues, but the effects of faulty nutrition being more tardy and more insidious than those of insanitation are in the long run equally disastrous. In spite of this it is not the doctors *en masse* who come forward with suggestions, let alone demands for food reform, but enterprising laymen who have listened to the contentions of a very few wise physicians regarded by their

confreres as fanatics or cranks.¹ In this way there have come into being the increasing number of Health Food stores and Health magazines, respectively selling and advocating whole wheat commodities and *vital* foods. Yet although the richer classes avail themselves to a certain extent of the latter even the middle classes are still apt to be content with the ordinary conventional English régime, or if they are vegetarians on humane grounds, that same régime minus meat.²

And this finally brings us down to practical matters.

From the many letters I have received from correspondents lamenting their chronic ill health I have discovered that for the most part their diet consisted of those very foods which are no prophylactic against ill health. If the many and varied doctors they consulted had mentioned diet at all, it was—as usual—either to tell them not to eat this, that, or the other or merely to suggest some patent food containing vitamins A, B, C, or what not, which they might *try* in the hope of improving their condition. Such advice, however, though seemingly scientific, is fundamentally unscientific. To live for the most part on vitaminless and demineralized substances and then expect to make good by drinking a cupful of some patent food which may only supply a minute portion of the deficiency is neither logical nor economical. One or two cups of a patent concoction, however supposedly scientific, cannot be expected to counteract the bad or useless effects

¹ One such man was Dr. Robert, Bell who maintained that cancer was primarily due to a denaturalized diet. Another was Dr. Forbes Ross who held the same views, and discovered a specific, to which we shall refer later.

² Unscientific vegetarians subsist largely on macaroni, rice, vegetables unconservatively cooked, bread, biscuits, cheese, etc. And many of them suffer from the effects of excessive starch consumption in consequence.

of a diet of which it may only form a fiftieth part. Indeed, the proportions should be exactly the reverse if people wish to secure as great a measure of health as can be expected under the strain and stress of civilization. A man may eat a few useless if pleasant things without appreciable harm, provided the remainder of his diet be intrinsically conducive to health. In other words, the human body is so constructed that it will tolerate a few unsalubrious articles of food as long as it is supplied with the essential amount of salubrious ones.

And here we see how unwise is that purely negative type of advice so frequently doled out by many doctors. For one thing it is seldom followed, and for another, if followed it is seldom efficacious because it does not touch the real cause of the trouble as we have been at lengthy pains to show. A wise doctor, instead of forbidding certain cherished foods or drinks or smokes, would say: 'You may occasionally have your little special fancies and your little glass of wine and your little smoke, provided your daily diet for the most part consists of wholemeal bread (toasted if preferred), raw fruits (especially apples), bran and seedless raisins with cream, honey, raw salads, conservatively cooked vegetables, etc. Your complaint isn't due to the eating of one particular food which is unwholesome but to the *not* eating as a daily habit the foods I have just mentioned. In plain English, it is not I who can cure you, but only Nature in combination with your own efforts.' To which the patient might object and exclaim, 'But, good heavens! Doctor, I can't digest all these things.' 'No, you can't, *now*,' would be the answer, 'because your whole digestion has been devitalized by the rubbish you *have* been living on. Therefore you must set to work gradually, and it'll be

my business to look after you in the process. Moreover, what you have to learn is that natural foods need to be eaten in the right place and right sequence. But instead of this, an apple, for instance, is eaten at the end of a meal when there is little digestive force left over. Besides which it is seldom sufficiently masticated, follows on a rice or other starchy pudding, causes acidity in consequence and so gives rise to the false verdict that raw fruit is indigestible.¹

But apart from teaching people how to live wisely themselves, doctors should instruct parents how to feed their children. In most cases a wrong diet and its attendant devitalization of the digestion starts very early in life, most children being unwisely fed. Even when there are no other immediate symptoms in proof of this, it becomes apparent from the state of their teeth. One dentist among others informed me that dental decay was the result of our English system of feeding, which in his opinion is an entirely unwholesome one and lacking in those essentials to keep the teeth in a healthy condition. Thus if parents would break away from custom and feed their children scientifically there would be fewer dentists' (not to mention doctors') bills to pay. True, there are nowadays a few enlightened parents who recognize this fact and act accordingly, but much of the good work is undone as soon as their offspring go to boarding-school. Although we English are apt to boast of the healthy lives led by boys and girls at public schools the truth is that the seeds of disease are sown at these institutions. Games and exercises are insufficient to counteract the deplorably unwholesome diet of meat, starch, and denaturalized vegetables on which our British youths and maidens are

¹ See Appendix.

forced to subsist. The fact that schools are so often 'down with flu' or other epidemics should be sufficient, one would think, to prove that games are not everything and that other factors must be responsible for such outbreaks. But this has never dawned on the authorities in their blind adherence to dietetic tradition. It has also never dawned on them that at schools where the practice of excessive masturbation is to be found among boys it is not primarily due to an inherent love of vice but to an irritation or weakness caused by faulty feeding. According to the bio-chemic system of medicine, onanism is often induced by a lack of phosphate of calcium; and what diet could be more deficient in this mineral salt than that of public schools in which raw fruits and salads play little or no part? What use for moralists to moralize about pernicious habits unless some effort is made to get rid of the underlying cause?

In fine, as long as commercialism is permitted to destroy our food values it is useless to complain either of morals or poor health; for it cannot be often enough repeated that the kind of food on which man is fed will largely determine whether he is sick or well—morally, mentally or physically.

Chapter XIII

THE GERM FETISH

The enormous importance given nowadays to the germ question is indirectly due to unnatural habits and not to the deadliness of germs in themselves. As mosquitoes can thrive only in swamps, so can germs thrive only in auto-intoxicated bodies. Wrote Professor Frederic Lee: 'Doubtless, all of us at this moment are carrying each within his own person, the living germs of pneumonia and various minor ailments, while some of us probably possess the bacilli of tuberculosis, influenza, and perhaps diphtheria. This, however, need give us no alarm.'¹

Nevertheless, despite this assurance, germs in themselves do give many people cause for alarm because their poisoned bodies provide a fertile soil for them to propagate and become harmful. And the methods of modern medical science serve to encourage and increase this alarm instead of allaying it by putting forward the truth. The whole policy of modern doctors is to fight germs and kill them with antiseptics and germicides instead of teaching people to purify the substance in which they now thrive but could no longer thrive if that substance were purified. 'The first line of defence' [against germs], wrote Sir George Newman, 'is a healthy, well-nourished and resistant body.' This is true as long as we understand exactly what is meant by a well-nourished body. Hosts of people with what would seem to be excellently nourished bodies are subject to colds, influenza, and other

¹ *Scientific Features of Modern Medicine.*

infectious diseases, while numbers of equally well-nourished individuals die of pneumonia and a multitude of illnesses said to be due to a germ. The reason is that the state of being well-nourished is by no means synonymous with that of being rightly nourished. I discovered this for myself when I was a young man. As long as I lived on the supposedly nourishing conventional English diet of bacon and eggs for breakfast, meat for lunch and meat for dinner, I was every year a victim of influenza. But as soon as I substituted raw fruits, cereals, cheese, and salads for flesh-foods, taking the former at two meals of the day and white meat or fish at one only, I did not have another attack of influenza for twenty-seven years. Even then I attribute the attack to overwork, insufficient sleep, and feeding too much at other people's houses, into which I did not wish to take my 'fads'!

And here we see one of the difficulties which confront us in modern life with its unscientific and unnatural food-habits. Although one may have no objection (based on vanity) to being considered a crank, one does object to refuse, ungraciously, the food put before one by some well-intentioned host or hostess. Sometimes friends who happen to know that one is more or less a vegetarian provide special foods which, however, may only tend to make matters worse. I have occasionally spent long weekends with solicitous friends who in their ignorance of food values have provided me with a dietary consisting entirely of starch. Yet with my type of body nothing could be less salubrious. Starch produces a fertile soil for microbes, apart from the well-known fact that it is conducive to rheumatism, indigestion, and catarrhal conditions. Thus, until a more scientific diet becomes as much a convention as the *unscientific* diet on which people have lived

for several generations, germs are likely to be fruitful and multiply, and more and more germicides are likely to flood the market in order to deal with what is purely an effect and not a cause.

That cause is to be found in a toxic blood stream and one deficient in the essential chemical ingredients to keep what have been termed respectively the scavengers of the body or the army and navy of the body in a virile condition. Thus, Dr. D. F. Harris wrote: 'The chief vital agents concerned in fighting our invisible foes (the germs) are the white cells or leucocytes of the blood. These minute living things are apparently exceedingly sensitive to the presence or the secretions of micro-organisms, for they come out of the blood capillaries shortly after the bacteria have invaded the neighbouring tissues. Their mode of attack is frontal; they literally fall upon the invaders and, swallowing them up bodily, digest them, so rendering them powerless for any further activity.¹ But the pre-requisite to this is that the individual should be in a normal state of health, in which case 'even a large quantity of virulent micro-organisms can gain admission to his body and, owing to the local defences, may be destroyed before damage occurs. Such a repelled invasion causes no symptoms, and the subject thereof will remain unconscious of it.'² This happy state of affairs, however, is by no means invariable; hence we find Dr. Rosenau telling us in his book *Preventive Medicine and Hygiene* that 'the principal causes which diminish resistance to infection are: wet and cold, fatigue, insufficient or unsuitable food, vitiated atmosphere, insufficient sleep and rest, worry and excesses of all kinds.' And he goes on to

¹ *Life and Science*.

² Dr. F. W. Price, *Textbook of the Practice of Medicine*.

say, perhaps somewhat unnecessarily, that 'it is a matter of common observation that exposure to wet and cold or sudden changes of temperature, overwork, worry, stale air, poor food, etc., make us more liable to contract certain diseases'. If Dr. Rosenau had stressed the words 'poor food' and had qualified the little word 'us' by adding 'in our devitalized and auto-intoxicated condition,' his remarks would be nearer the truth and also less obvious. Sudden changes of temperature, stale air, and transient exposure to cold and wet need not seriously affect persons with internally clean bodies. For instance, Upton Sinclair, whose book on Fasting created a stir some years ago, related how, after having detoxicated his whole system by means of a fast, he found himself subsequently in such perfect health that he could lie on damp grass and do other unsalubrious things without the least fear of catching the common cold or getting rheumatism or other diseases so apt with the majority of people to follow upon a chill. Much about the same time as Sinclair's book was published, another layman, named Aird (I have forgotten his initials) demonstrated that if one lived on a perfectly natural diet of raw fruits, raw vegetables, etc., one could imbibe the germs of the most deadly diseases without resultant harm. And this for the simple reason that germs were innocuous in a perfectly healthy (*viz.* clean and vital) organism. Aird, in fact, offered clinically to prove this, provided his provings were published, but his offer was declined by the 'medical trade union' because he was a layman. It was a medical dogma that germs were the cause of all so-termed germ diseases, and the profession as a whole, despite what a few of their crankish colleagues might asseverate, were not going to have a layman appearing in the arena to upset 'established facts'. Was the germ

theory not conclusively proved by observations? Europeans, declared the profession, who go to certain parts of Africa, are stricken down with yellow fever—the result of catching the germs of that disease. Splendid muscular negroes from the same coast, though immune to yellow fever while living in their own environment, are liable to catch measles and consumption and die of them if they go and live in America or come over to England. Besides which, when measles was first introduced into the Faeroe Islands, 6,000 of the small population caught it, while its introduction into the Fiji Islands resulted in the deaths of 20,000 people. Yet even so this does not disprove what Aird was ready to prove by practical demonstration, namely, that germs are a secondary cause of disease but not its prime cause. There is no proof that certain uncivilized peoples are entirely free from auto-intoxication, and hence immune to germ-infection, even though the former may be much less pronounced than with many Europeans, and consequently insufficient to produce such a grievous disease as cancer. Therefore a measles germ might easily thrive in their blood-stream and prove fatal when first introduced. Nevertheless, that measles germs are innocuous in a perfectly pure blood may be seen from the significant fact that children brought up on a fruitarian diet, especially if their parents are also fruitarians, usually escape those diseases incidental to childhood, of which measles is one.

Even the part that exposure plays in rendering the body less resistant to the onslaught of germs is greatly mitigated by frugal fare, as statistics would show if read aright. Pneumonia (a disease also associated with germs) is generally attributed to exposure. Yet the meagrely dressed, meagrely fed, and poorly housed agricultural

labourers, who are often soaked to the skin and who are exposed to all sorts of weather, become much less frequently victims of pneumonia than the well-sheltered town workers.¹ This includes, of course, lawyers and doctors. The reasons are obvious—the agricultural labourer lives on simple homely food, fresh from the land, and little of it, and the continual exposure to pure air, be it cold, hot, or damp, instead of debilitating him, oxygenates his whole system and gives him a long and healthy life.

Said Dr. D. Sommerville: 'The happiest man in the country, perhaps, is the field labourer. He eats wholesome fresh food just taken from the earth, exercises his muscles daily, never has a day's illness, no loss of appetite, lives to be ninety, and dies at an hour's notice as all men should.'² This may be somewhat overstating the case, yet many other authorities are of the same opinion.

And now if we look up the comparative mortality from consumption in regard to field labourers and seamen, we find the number for the former is only 70 whereas the number for the latter is no less than 257. Yet a life on the ocean is supposed on account of its pure and exhilarating air to be the healthiest of all; and as we know, many doctors recommend a sea-voyage as the best cure for seemingly incurable complaints. Why, then, in spite of this, do nearly four times the number of sailors die of consumption as compared with agricultural labourers? Once again the answer is to be found in nutrition. Sailors more than any one else live on denaturalized food. Because of this and despite an abundance of sea air they are unable to combat or render innocuous those bacilli of

¹ See Ellis Barker, *Good Health and Happiness*. Statistics, p. 246.

² *Report of the First International Health Conference*.

tuberculosis which prove harmless to more properly fed individuals, even though the occupations of the latter demand that they should live under far more restricted, i.e. airless, conditions.

This is further borne out by the fact that carmen and carriers who spend most of their day driving around in the open air are much more liable to phthisis than clergymen. Whereas with the former the average mortality is 144, with the latter it is only 45. The reason is that clergymen as a rule live on simple fare, whereas carmen usually drink far too much alcohol and live mostly on meats and white bread. Finally, if we examine the comparative mortality from all causes, we find that clergymen, priests, and ministers are the lowest on the list and carmen the highest, while next to that are seamen in the merchant service.¹

All this is very significant in relation to the germ fetish, the more so if we now consider the fact that barristers and solicitors who carry on their professions in offices and stuffy courts situated in towns are seemingly far less a prey for germs than men who spend their whole lives in germless air on the ocean, beneath the open vault of heaven.

In short, germs in themselves are not the prime cause of disease, but merely a symptom of disease, and the germ theory which has become a medical obsession will need to be greatly modified if it is to be brought into alignment with truth. Even now, enlightened physicians 'admit that too much attention has been paid to germs and not nearly enough to the morbid ground upon which germ life breeds and thrives. Bio-chemists have proved that pure blood is the finest germicide, and it is impossible for the type of

¹ Clergymen, Priests, Ministers	443
Sailors	1,485
Carmen	1,724

bacteria associated with disease to exist in an organism nourished by pure, chemically balanced blood. The cause of disease conditions lies in the morbid accumulations within the body, therefore the cure lies in removing these pathological materials and restoring the life stream to a state of chemical normality.¹ Thus writes Mr. E. F. W. Powell, echoing in effect the words of Louis Kuhne, which, because they were based on correct observation of Nature's laws, remain true for all time, as the future will doubtless show.

But of course all the foregoing is not intended to imply that because germs are harmless in a perfectly healthy organism, war should not be made against germs as such. As long as people do not know how or are not in a position to create germ-immune bodies, naturally every step should be taken to annihilate these invisible invaders. One of the worst breeding grounds for germs is a cemetery, and in view of this, Western civilization would do well to learn something from the Eastern peoples who burn their dead and look upon burial as both unscientific and unhygienic. The practice of burying the dead serves to fill the soil with germs that continue to propagate long after the cemetery itself has come into disuse. Houses built over erstwhile cemeteries, not to mention whole towns built over erstwhile battlefields, constitute germ-laden areas productive of consumption and other grievous diseases. Nevertheless, this could be prevented, when not too late, if the West would consent to learn something from the East and would strew a layer of burnt wood ash over all graves and over all cemetery ground. For burnt wood ash, as well as being an excellent fertilizer, is a powerful germicide—about which more will be said anon.

¹ See *Health Secrets of All Ages*.

Chapter XIV

DR. HAY'S PURGE REMEDY

Dr. Hay maintains that practically any disease may be cured by a thorough purge, followed of course by a natural diet or at best a diet of 'compatibles'. But one must remember in this connexion that the purge as a remedy is a very different thing from the purge as a habit; for the latter, as already mentioned, is greatly to be deprecated.

The object of the remedial purge is not merely to produce a movement of the bowels but to eliminate the serum from the blood-stream, the lymph from the tissues—in short, the toxins from the entire system. According to Dr. Hay, half a pint of concentrated *Pluto water*¹ 'will usually result in the ejection from the bowel of three or four quarts of fluid'. And one of the symptoms following will be a thirst which should be gratified with plenty of fruit juices; the final result being one of heightened alkalinity.

If this should appear strange to the layman, the answer is that the juices of acid fruits become alkaline in the body instead of retaining their acidity. Dr. Hay maintains that a feeling of great relief occurs after this drastic purging and that the more toxic has been the condition the greater the relief experienced. As to how long the purging will need to be continued depends of course on the severity of the case, also the type of patient should be taken into account.

By purging and diet alone Dr. Hay has cured progressive pernicious anaemia, asthma, Bright's disease, diabetes,

¹ Two teaspoonfuls of Epsom salts mixed with two of Glauber salts are equally effective.

rheumatism in its various forms including arthritis, gastric or duodenal ulcer, skin diseases, goitre, tumours, and so on and so forth. Septic conditions of all kinds are cured by this simple method of detoxication and even deep-seated types of blood-poisoning may thus be cured. Nor should pneumonia, erysipelas, typhoid fever be omitted from the list. Further, many cases of nephritis in which the patients have been so weak that they could not walk have after a three days' purge taken walks with enjoyment. As for angina pectoris, that agonizing and intractable disease, it also is cured by the same means; and Dr. Hay maintains that after three days of active purging and a fruit-juice diet all pain on exertion disappears, and subsequently, patients are able to play golf or even tennis 'with no remaining evidence of heart incompetency'.¹

With regard to cases of bleeding gastric or duodenal ulcer, the violent purging of course must not be resorted to for fear of bringing on a haemorrhage, hence the first part of the cure must be effected by fruit juices only, though vegetable juices I am inclined to think might be better in some instances. 'To date, no case of gastric or duodenal ulcer has failed to recover,' says Dr. Hay, *provided*, he goes on to say in effect, that the patient does not resume his faulty nutritional habits; in which case there are recurrences.

Colitis is a stubborn complaint, yet that also yields to the remedial purge plus the correct natural diet. After all, what is colitis other than a catarrhal condition brought about by eating too much starchy food? Therefore the only rational remedy is to clear off the excessive starch and subsequently live on a diet which prevents its excessive accumulation. Dr. Hay informs us that every case of

¹ *A New Health Era*, p. 143.

colitis recovers in from a few weeks to a few months in most instances—although where there has been a long history of deep-seated constipation, even two or three years may be required.

Finally, to mention the common cold, which very few of us are not liable to catch at one time or another; although strictly speaking colds are not 'caught' but are brought about under certain conditions by a deficiency of calcium in the system. 'A cold is the house-cleaning process', to quote Dr. G. W. Carey, 'by which kindly mother Nature rids the body of mucus or non-functional phlegm. . . .' But the latter would not encumber the system if people lived on a right diet which was not deficient in calcium and other mineral salts, and which overloaded the organism. Hence does Dr. Hay tersely remark: 'Colds are not caught; they are accumulated, with the feet under the dinner-table, and in no other way.' The quickest manner of curing a cold therefore becomes obvious—a purge combined with a starchless fruit and vegetable diet.

Nevertheless, although the purge remedy for manifold diseases would appear to be in every sense rational, it is, one must confess, a matter for surprise that Dr. Hay should advocate purging in the case of pregnant women, seeing that there is the grave danger of bringing about a miscarriage. One is in fact prompted to wonder whether his enthusiasm has not in this matter obscured his wisdom? Another point suggests itself. Dr. Hay contends that an evacuation of the bowels is, on the Hay diet, possible after every meal. Yet many people have found that there is not sufficient bulk to produce this desideratum. In such cases a mixture of psyllium seeds and linseed is helpful, to which a little powdered aniseed and a little powder of glucose may be added. A dessertspoonful or more of this

mixture should be swallowed *unmasticated* with the aid of water. In other words—the dessertspoonful of the mixture should first be placed in the mouth, then the requisite amount of water be drunk to get it down. Psyllium seeds are rich in vitamins, and linseed, as every one knows, is rich in oil. The action of this mixture is purely mechanical and lubricating; the seeds swell internally and so produce bulk. People who resort to this expedient as a life habit will only derive benefit from it, whereas people who habitually take aperients merely do themselves harm. Moreover, all evacuants which are not purely mechanical in action soon lose their effect, so that those who resort to them are in a perpetual state of trying one thing after another, only in the end to become alarmed because nothing seems to work. Whether even with the aid of psyllium and linseed some people will achieve a thrice-daily evacuation is doubtful, for apparently the length of bowel varies according to type of body. But where meat consumption is greatly reduced, this is not of such vast importance, as natural food putrefies to a lesser degree in the intestines than flesh food, and hence its retention for a short while is not especially harmful.

The contentions of Dr. Hay go once more to prove the dual cause of disease. They also serve to show that much of the weakness and fatigue experienced by innumerable persons in both moderate states of health and in disease are not due to lack of supposedly strengthening foods but to wrong food and probably too much of it. Referring to cases of nephritis (kidney disease) Dr. Hay remarks: 'Always before coming under treatment an effort had been made to "keep up strength" with foods of all sorts; yet in spite of this free feeding the patients were extremely weak, while after this spasm of intensive detoxication (viz., by

three days' purging) they were stronger at once—and this even without food.¹

Yet on the surface this might seem to be incompatible with the experiences of those who say they feel extremely weak or exhausted after a strong purge. But the obvious reason is that they do not continue the remedial purging for long enough. All they do is simply to loosen a quantity of poisons which have lain dormant in the system, and thereby produce feelings of wretchedness and exhaustion; thus they stop the purging process at the very worst moment for their own comfort. They should, of course, continue the purge until the stirred-up toxins have been eliminated, after which the symptoms of *malaise* and weakness will automatically disappear, as Dr. Hay has proved.

But Dr. Hay also advocates the enema as a valuable purging measure in accordance with the teachings of Yoga. We will deal with this later on, however, in the appendix.

Meanwhile a word may be added with regard to the Hay diet and the doctor's theory of incompatibles. He maintains that proteins and starches consumed at the same meal give rise to digestive disturbances, acidity, and other troubles including, in some cases, obesity. Yet if this be so, how are we to account for the fact that an exclusive diet of milk (which is protein) when combined with potatoes (which are starch) constitutes a well-known treatment for obesity and acidosis? Even a combination of milk and white bread has been found efficacious for these troubles. Nevertheless, before we dismiss Dr. Hay's theories as unproven, the following should be considered. People who take up the milk and bread or milk and potato treatment do so after they have been living on the ordinary

¹ *A New Health Era*, p. 143.

English diet of incompatibles and too many of them at that. Consequently the result of limiting their intake to two ingredients, one of which is rich in all mineral salts except iron,¹ is to give the stomach a much needed rest, and they very soon begin to feel stronger and better. A stomach that has but little of solids to cope with can deal even with incompatibles without producing acidosis and other complaints. This was proved by Horace Fletcher,² who reduced all his food to a liquid state before swallowing it and so re-established his broken-down health. Yet what may be good as a temporary cure may be very inadvisable when adopted as a life habit. Because the milk and potato or milk and white bread cure is deficient in bulk and roughage, its adoption over a long period could only prove deleterious. It is otherwise with the Hay diet, which because rich in vitamins, mineral salts and because providing bulk and roughage can only prove beneficial when resorted to as a life habit. Whether one adopts Dr. Hay's theory of incompatibles or not is of no importance. Hardly anywhere in medicine do we find theories that are not supposed to conflict with other theories; therefore the only safeguard to fall back upon is Nature and her decrees. No one seeing an ox in a field is filled with a desire to take a bite out of its living flesh, but many people long to take a bite out of an apple hanging on a tree, for the apple is Nature's food, but the ox is not. Although the abstention from Hay's incompatibles may be very efficacious, the Hay diet owes the greater part of its success to its natural ingredients. In a word the Hay diet propaganda has served to open people's eyes to Nature's own way.

¹ According to an eminent bio-chemist milk is somewhat deficient in phosphate of iron.

² See Chapter XVII.

Chapter XV

THE CAUSE OF CANCER DISCOVERED BUT IGNORED

A microscopic examination of diseased tissue may no more reveal the prime cause of cancer than a microscopic examination of a raindrop may reveal the prime cause of rain.

The laws of external hygiene have been accepted and enforced, but the laws of internal hygiene have neither been accepted by the majority nor enforced, for the vagaries of human nature prove an obstacle which may take years to overcome. Although the present propaganda for food reform, whether in the shape of Dr. Hay's diet or the Nature cure system of diet has had its results, both of these systems are unlikely to be adopted as life habits. People may take up the Hay diet for a time because its novelty appeals to them, but even though it may prove beneficial they are apt to drop back into their old régime when the novelty has worn off. A similar thing already happens in regard to the Nature cure. People go to some naturopathic establishment, are depured of their toxins, live during their visit on a natural diet, then return to their former dietetic habits when they get home again. The result is that many of them are apt to say, 'It did me good for a time, but only for a time; I can't call myself really cured.' Well, of course not. A permanent cure of any disease or disease in general can only be effected by continuously removing its cause. What would happen if people were merely content to observe the laws of external hygiene for one month in the year, then for the remaining eleven months were to live in the most insanitary

conditions? They would contract some dirt disease and probably die. Yet this is precisely what hordes of people do as regards internal hygiene, to which folly is added the evil of cell-starvation. Can we wonder that the cancer death-rate is on the increase and that cancer research work along orthodox lines has made no headway?

Thus, we come now to consider more fully the problem of cancer, having briefly mentioned it already.

Not long ago a doctor said to me: 'Every man must face the possibility of developing cancer after a certain age.' This good doctor, being of the orthodox school, was unaware of the true cause of cancer and consequently knew not how to prevent it. Obviously he was either not conversant with the convictions of Drs. Lane, Bell, and Forbes Ross, or he was content to dismiss them on hearsay as those of cranks, without having read their books. Had he used his reasoning powers he might have thought it highly significant that cancer does not develop until after a certain age. Why? Because cancer is the final result in certain types of persons of long-continued self-poisoning plus cell-starvation. Hence, young people have not become sufficiently poisoned or their cells sufficiently starved to develop this disease; that is, unless their organism has been vitiated by injections, as we have implied before.

Five men, who stand out among others, have proved what is the cause of cancer, two of them unqualified men and three of them doctors. The names of these men are Louis Kuhne (to whom I have previously referred), Dr. Robert Bell, Dr. Forbes Ross, Sir William Arbuthnot Lane, and finally Mr. J. Ellis Barker, who wrote two monumental books on the subject containing so vast a collection of undeniable facts that only the most myopic and prejudiced could attempt to deny them. Nevertheless, if they

are not denied they are ignored, which is even worse; or better said, they are both ignored and denied, for to ignore a thing is to all intents and purposes to deny it.

To state the prime physical cause of cancer would be merely to repeat what has so often been emphasized throughout this book. Granted then that its prime cause is to be found in an auto-intoxicative and denaturalized diet, there is a secondary cause which plays a most important part in its development. Of the mineral salts that the human organism requires for the maintenance of perfect health, one of the most important is potash, for it is the latter *which keeps the cells in a healthy state, and without which a morbid condition will eventuate*. For this discovery we must largely thank Dr. Forbes Ross.

Now it is more especially potash which is lacking to a dangerous extent in the usual English diet, and Dr. Forbes Ross pointed out in his book on cancer that whenever he was consulted by a patient suffering from tumours, malignancies, or any form of morbid growths, he found it was precisely on this customary English diet that he or she had subsisted. When asked: 'Do you ever eat raw fruit, salads, wholemeal bread?' the answer was always in the negative. The patient had lived entirely on meats, white bread, tea, and a few boiled vegetables, of which the water containing all the valuable salts had been thrown away. Another significant point mentioned in Dr. Forbes Ross's book was this: during fourteen years of his practice, not one of his *regular* patients developed cancer. And he attributed that immunity to the following reason: in place of the sodium which other doctors are apt to include in some of their prescriptions he always prescribed potassium. But this is not all; for he found in the case of those patients outside his regular practice that by administering

potassium salts, cancerous growths would disappear and in many instances the patient would be restored to health.

The value of potassium cannot be over-estimated because of the important part it plays in the eliminative processes. Potassium, according to Dr. Forbes Ross, causes any excess of calcium, magnesium, and earthy substances (he should have included salt) to be excreted through the urine; substances, in fact, which if present in excess may produce not only cancer—although that is the worst—but also arthritis, arterio-sclerosis, high blood pressure, aneurysm, goitre and other grievous complaints. And the proof of this is the fact that all these diseases have in an increasing number of cases been cured by the administration of potassium. Conversely the administration of calcium—that is, if administered in allopathic doses—is apt to prove disastrous. ‘I once had occasion to administer calcium salts’, wrote Dr. Forbes Ross, ‘to patients who were deficient in alkaline minerals. I was appalled at the colossal increase in the growths which immediately supervened. In two to three weeks *the tumours had quadrupled in size.*’¹

Yet here we must tread warily. Minerals given in allopathic doses have a very different effect when administered in homeopathic doses. If this were not so, then the very type of food which Dr. Forbes Ross himself prescribed for the cure of growths would itself tend to cause them. It is just because the calcium, etc., to be found in natural foods is present, so to say, in homeopathic doses that (1) it is assimilable and (2) it is not excessive. We must also tread warily if the thymus gland is dragged into the argument. According to Ross, this gland is closely associated with the behaviour of calcium in the system

¹ F. W. Forbes Ross, *Cancer*.

during that early period of life when it is essential for body-building purposes and does not tend to accumulate to excess. But when (at about twenty-five) the thymus gland withers away, then begins the time when harmful accumulations of both calcium and magnesium are liable in varying degrees to occur and to increase with age, unless counteracted. To these two, however, salt should certainly be added, for not only does potassium eliminate salt excesses, but a large and habitual consumption of salt (which is unnatural, therefore harmful) is stated by some authorities to be a predisposing cause of cancer—or at any rate, of some forms of cancer. As for calcium and magnesium, to which form does Ross allude? If to fluoride of calcium (only to mention one) and to phosphate of magnesium, his contention is not borne out by facts. Far from certain forms of calcium and magnesium being present in excessive quantities, certain diseases which occur in old and elderly people are due to a deficiency in either the one, the other, or both of these salts. Among these are paralysis agitans, chorea, angina pectoris, and many others, all of which have been cured or benefited by the administration of homeopathic doses of phosphate of magnesia. Phosphate of calcium is also frequently indicated.¹ Moreover, one form of calcium, viz. fluor-spar, is indicated for certain kinds of tumours, 'indurated glands, lumpy exudations on the surface of bone, hard swellings, etc'.² For instance one case that came to my notice was that of a woman who suffered from a growth

¹ According to Professor Dubards of the Academy of Medicine, even cancer has been cured in many cases by administering doses of magnesia. In these cases, however, it is likely that Nature has been obliged to drain on the potassium supply and exhausted it, in order to make up for the magnesia deficiency. (See *The Bio-chemic System of Medicine*, G. W. Carey, M.D.).

² *ibid.*

on her neck resembling in form a cluster of grapes. The doctors advised an operation, but she was cured by taking triturated doses of calcium fluoride on the advice of a lay friend.

Nevertheless, although these facts may go to disprove one of Dr. Forbes Ross's less important theories, they do not disprove his main contention that the assimilation of potassium causes the disappearance of morbid and other growths. Thus the chief point to be emphasized is that whereas a deficiency of potassium in the human body may eventuate in cancer, a sufficiency of potassium is a preventive of cancer and many other kindred diseases.

But the assimilation of potash has also certain subsidiary effects which go to show its importance in contributing to the general health of cellular life. 'The administration of potassium renders the nails less brittle and more lustrous. If an elderly person suffering from gout, failure of the heart, or cancer, be made for a certain length of time, say a month or six weeks, artificially to take into his or her body a definite and ordered amount of potassium, the following change in the hair will certainly take place: If the hair be previously white, it will be found that it will for the most part regain its colour. . . . If the hair be previously grey or iron grey, it will become darker. . . . So striking is this change that many elderly lady patients have been accused by their friends and relations of resorting to artifice to produce the resultant darkening. The consistency of the skin . . . also undergoes favourable transformation; it becomes more tight and elastic, with a decided tendency to smoothness and freedom from wrinkles, so common in the skin of elderly persons.'¹

¹ Forbes Ross, *Cancer*.

In view of the foregoing it is highly significant that people who have lived for the most part on a diet rich in potash retain their youthful appearance until late in life. The skin remains fresh and healthy-looking, the contour of the face is not materially changed, and in many cases the figure is unaltered. These signs of general health are to be observed in fruitarians but much less so in vegetarians of that school whose adherents do not bother much about what they eat so long as it isn't the flesh of slaughtered animals. Indeed, many a vegetarian of this school becomes too fat or in one way or another appears to be such a poor advertisement for the cause he advocates that the man in the street is apt to say: 'If that's all vegetarianism can do then give me beef and beer!' All the same, even the humanitarian but unscientific school has of late years mended its ways to a certain extent, but not to that full extent which should entirely exclude cancer from among the list of diseases which may attack individual members of that cult. Nor is the reason far to seek: a diet merely because it is meatless, may by no means be rich in potassium; it may be exactly the reverse.

Now, as potassium is said to be an especially soluble mineral salt, it passes very rapidly through the body, and hence the supply needs to be constantly replenished by the daily consumption of suitable foods. Failing this, then those signs of physical degeneration to which we previously alluded begin to show themselves in one way or another. It is not the moderate eating of flesh-food in itself which causes them to appear, but a deficiency of the required potassium salts in the other food items which form part of the dietary. People who eat meat in moderation are not likely to develop serious diseases, of which the most dreaded is cancer, *provided* at the same time they

consume plenty of raw fruits, especially apples, raw salads, and wholemeal products. On the other hand, the unscientific vegetarian who lives entirely on macaroni and its varieties, on polished rice, stewed fruits, unconservatively boiled vegetables, eggs and white bread, is liable to suffer from any of those complaints which result from potassium-deficiency, even though they are less likely to culminate in cancer because meat-decomposition is not involved. In fine, although cancer is rarer among vegetarians, it is by no means ruled out, and for this reason, among others; eating meat *per se* cannot be accepted as the prime physical cause of malignancy, though it may, and often does, greatly contribute to its development.

Such then were, in effect, the conclusions arrived at by Dr. Forbes Ross. Hitherto doctors, scientists, and theorists had pitched on to all sorts of irrelevancies as suspect. Local irritations produced by rings, pince-nez, dentures, pipe-smoking, etc., are still by some suspected of being the cause of cancer. At one time even tomatoes were suspect. But the theory which prevailed for some years and still obtains in certain quarters is the germ theory. Thus an eminent French surgeon wrote that 'cancer is due to an unknown germ'.¹ And yet when I implied in my *Outline of Modern Occultism* that cancer researchers were fruitlessly seeking for this unknown cancer germ I was reprimanded by one indignant correspondent who told me they were doing nothing of the kind. To which I can only answer: then so much the better.

We may now turn to Dr. Robert Bell's contentions. He maintained that an unnatural flesh-food diet was the cause of malignancy. 'The flesh of dead animals,' he wrote, 'when entering into the dietary, not only undergoes the

¹ M. V. Panchet, *Le Cancer*.

most offensive form of decomposition and gives rise to the most noxious toxins, but also promotes the retention of these within the colon, and so favours their absorption. . . . It is apparent, therefore, that a flesh diet which rapidly undergoes decomposition is not only unsuitable, but it is dangerous, and is to a large extent accountable for the more serious diseases to which the human race is subject.'

In another passage he wrote that cancer is never found amongst the black races in Egypt. These include the Berbevenes and Sudanese, who are all Mussulmans and who live almost entirely on a vegetarian diet. Cancer, however, is fairly common amongst the Arabs and Copts, who form a large portion of the population of Egypt, and who live and eat much more like Europeans, thus clearly demonstrating what an important effect diet has upon this disease.¹ And this statement is borne out by a number of doctors who have practised among the more primitive people in various parts of the world. To quote but one of these doctors: 'I practised in the Cape Province, South Africa, for fourteen years . . . and during that time I do not remember having seen a case of cancer among the natives.'² Further, Sir William Macgregor told an audience of students that during nine and a half years, he saw only one case of cancer in British New Guinea, and that was one of 'encephaloid cancer of the tibia in the person of a Papuan who had *for seven or eight years lived practically a European life, eating tinned Australian meat daily*'.³ Later on Sir William Macgregor went on to say that 'in those rare cases of malignant disease which occur among the Melanesians, the incidence of the disease seems to be

¹ *The Cancer Scourge*.

² Dr. J. R. Love in the *British Medical Journal*, September, 1923.

³ The italics are the author's.

associated . . . with the adoption of a mode of life which assimilates to that of the white man'.

These statements are highly significant and become the more so when seen in conjunction with the vast collection of similar facts which Ellis Barker puts forward in his masterly books on cancer. They do indeed go to endorse Dr. Robert Bell's contention that cancer, like beri-beri, is a deficiency disease aggravated by self-poisoning due to chronic constipation. Voicing this latter conclusion, he said: 'I should like to state, as a matter of a fairly extensive experience, that I have never come across a solitary case of cancer in which the patient had not been a victim of chronic constipation, and I feel confident that cancer is not the only disease upon which an insanitary condition of the colon acts as a potent predisposing cause.' This statement was made nearly twenty-five years ago at the Royal Society of Medicine, and even then, observations had gone to prove that cancer, in Sir William Arbuthnot Lane's words, was 'simply a disease of civilization' consequent upon wrong nutrition. But even now in 1937 the dogma still persists among the orthodox that it is a mystery disease, the cause of which has never been discovered. Just as it was at one time far too simple for the learned professors and scientists to imagine that beri-beri could be caused by wrong food (therefore no less than fourteen scholastic pseudo-causes were put forward) so it is still far too simple to imagine that cancer could have a similar cause, and hence could easily be prevented. As for saying that cancer can be cured, this is regarded as such a heinous offence that the Cantassium Company, which supplies potassium in accordance with Dr. Forbes Ross's formula, has been obliged to omit the word 'cancer' from its advertisements; otherwise no journal will accept

them. Thus the comprehensive but less specific term 'bodily growths' has now to be employed, which is a disadvantage, because people may assume that only non-malignant growths yield to the treatment. This is incorrect, as the prodigious number of unsolicited letters from all over the country have gone to prove. Patients who were condemned by the doctors to die of malignant disease have been saved by taking potassium salts in that most convenient form supplied by the Cantassium Company¹ and also by following at the same time the diet which Dr. Forbes Ross advocated. There is neither mystery nor quack element in the matter. The specific mostly consists of bi-carbonate of potash, phosphate of potash, and citrate of potash together with a little iron and prepared in certain proportions as prescribed by Dr. Ross. (This preparation is sold in disc form for the convenience of consumers.)

Whether Dr. Ross would not have achieved even speedier results with his treatment if the potash had been administered in triturated form is a question which will always be argued between allopaths—presuming they admit of his treatment at all—and votaries of the bio-chemic system of medicine. Although Ross said in one part of his book that potash may be taken without in any way harming the patient he did say in another part that if a severe case demands unusually large doses it is necessary to protect the heart. And this is where the bio-chemic system is more natural and hence more inherently scientific than the allopathic. By giving such of the twelve mineral salts as are indicated for various diseases and by giving them in minute doses, i.e. triturated with sugar of milk, they are more readily assimilated, the whole

¹ Twickenham, Middlesex.

method being more in accordance with Nature's laws and hence never productive of harm to the heart, stomach, or any other organ. Thus, in the case of carcinoma I have previously mentioned and with which I was associated I advised the Forbes Ross formula to be triturated to what is termed the 3^x attenuation; but even so the patient and his doctors found that a still higher attenuation proved more efficacious. All the same, I have no wish to dogmatize and can merely hope that some enterprising physician will experiment along these lines.¹

Meanwhile there is another factor to be considered.

Granted that cancer is due to dietetic sins both of omission and commission, there is no doubt that under the latter heading comes the habitual and excessive consumption of salt. In 1927 the late Mr. Frederick T. Marwood, a layman residing near Blackburn, published a booklet containing some highly significant observations. By way of a title he asks the following questions: 'What is the real Cause of Cancer? Is it the Excessive Consumption of Common Salt, Salted Foods and Salt Compounds?'² Mr. Marwood was, I believe, not only the first to put these questions, but he spent thirty years of research work in a laudable endeavour to answer them. Having read that cancer was very prevalent amongst a certain tribe in Northern India which subsists mainly on salted fish, Mr. Marwood debated whether it was the fish itself or the salt that induced the disease. After collecting all the available circumstantial and statistical evidence he came to the conclusion that the salt was the causative factor. Mr.

¹ A simple method would be to procure some of the Cantassium discs and have them triturated to the 3^x, 6^x, 9^x, or even 12^x attenuation and then let the patient take the resultant celloids very frequently—say every half-hour in severe cases.

² John Bale, Sons & Danielson, Ltd.

Marwood went on to point out how excessive is the consumption of salt in the customary diet of the West and he enumerated the enormous proportion of foods which are either salty in themselves or with which salt is eaten as a condiment. Moreover, this excessive salt consumption has greatly increased of late years and so also, it is significant to observe, has cancer.

Wrote Dr. C. C. Froude, of U.S.A., in his book *Right Food*: 'Salt is irritating and poisonous when taken to excess.' Another American doctor wrote: 'Salt ages people. It is the enemy of good digestion and it is a prolific cause of stomach, kidney and nerve impairments.' These statements become the more significant when considered in conjunction with Mr. Marwood's observations. To quote his own words: 'I have personally investigated over one hundred cancer deaths and in every instance, excepting one, I have found the victims have been abnormally fond of salt and salted foods, or had taken aperient salts¹ daily for many years. The exceptional case was one of a female who was admittedly a "big eater" which, with normal modern diet, implies an extra consumption of salt.'

And now we have to ask ourselves whether Mr. Marwood's significant findings conflict with the contentions of Bell, Ross, Lane, and Kuhne? And surely the answer in the main is, no. For if the excessive use of salt tends to poison the organism and causes an irritation in the tissues, that means it is conducive to an unhealthy condition which in its turn is conducive to the development of cancer. In a word, an excessive intake of salt *unless subsequently eliminated* from the system adds to that encumbrance of foreign matter which Kuhne regarded as the prime cause

¹ The latter contain a proportion of common salt.

of disease. Nevertheless it would be safer to say that an excessive consumption of salt is *one* of the causes of cancer but not the root cause. To maintain the latter is to overlook the important part played by an auto-intoxicative and deficiency diet. If the Indian tribe to which Mr. Marwood referred subsisted mostly on salted fish, that in itself implied a deficiency diet, and the same must probably be said in relation to the hundred cancer cases he investigated in England. I note that on page 12 of his booklet he mentions that in a long experience he does not know of one death from cancer among a large number of people who rarely eat salt; but unfortunately he omits to mention the type of diet on which they habitually lived. My own observations have taught me that people who do not take much salt are usually those who live more or less on a natural diet.

Even so, any modifications which seem to be called for as regards Mr. Marwood's theory do not detract from its original value. Indeed it may have more far-reaching consequences than he in his modesty ever anticipated. When the allopath has learnt that the same disease does not always have the same secondary cause and that the latter may vary with a number of patients, then Mr. Marwood's discovery (since endorsed by other observers) may receive its due recognition. It is possible that such broad-minded doctors who are prepared to accept his theory may be able to effect cancer cures in cases where the patient has been an excessive consumer of salt. The *modus operandi*—combined with other suitable treatment of course—would be to give highly potentized doses of sodium chloride so that like might cure like. But before such methods are likely to be adopted, the whole attitude towards cancer requires to be materially altered.

And so now to revert to proven facts.

Cancer, despite the pernicious dogma to the contrary, can no longer be termed an *incurable disease with cause unknown*. Nor could it rightly be so termed even as far back as the end of last century. If Louis Kuhne cured cases of cancer by naturopathic methods, then cancer was not incurable even then. Louis Kuhne maintained and proved that he could cure all diseases—including cancer—but he was careful to add that he could not cure all patients. And naturally not, for no doctor, whoever he be, can cure all patients even of the most admittedly curable diseases. Hundreds of people have died of influenza, yet influenza is not labelled an incurable disease; neither is bronchitis, nor many others which in a very large number of cases prove fatal. The undeniable truth is that cancer is called an incurable disease for the very simple reason that the orthodox medical profession does not know how to cure it, and is not open-minded enough to learn. One cannot even say that there is only one method of effecting cancer cures, and that one so obscure that no doctor could be expected to learn it. Indeed there are several methods, as witness the fact that both homeopaths and bio-chemic practitioners have a great number of cancer cures to their credit.¹ So also have botanic practitioners, not to mention naturopaths, of whom one of the first and most remarkable was Louis Kuhne. His pronouncements on the subject are so highly significant and instructive that I may select from them, interposing my own comments, even at the risk of overloading this chapter.

'Cancer', he wrote, 'is the last of a number of other

¹ Ellis Barker in his book *Miracles of Healing*, a book dealing with homeopathy, devotes a whole chapter numbering wellnigh thirty pages to cancer cures by homeopaths.

suppressed but uncured diseases which have preceded it.' Elsewhere he points out that one of these diseases was constipation with its attendant evils, not the least of which is the deleterious effects of purgatives. Thus, 'Cancer always follows upon some former diseases, especially sexual diseases such as syphilis. Whether such have arisen directly or indirectly is of no import. The main point is the presence of foreign matter which chooses some path through the body, along which then form, *as a final stage of the disease*, [the italics are mine] those *proliferations, tumours* and gangrenous places which are the horror of mankind.' This tallies with the convictions of Drs. Forbes Ross, Robert Bell, Sir Arbuthnot Lane and many other wise physicians, who maintain that *cancer can only occur in an unhealthy organism*.

'A gentleman', further to quote Louis Kuhne, 'about fifty years of age was suffering from *cancer of the nose*, and had consulted the most celebrated physicians of the orthodox school. They were able to tell him he had cancer of the nose, but they could not cure it, not knowing its nature and cause. . . . My patient had been suffering for years from most severe indigestion. . . . This had quite escaped the attention of the modern scientists, who occupied themselves exclusively with the patient's nose.' (How very typical—to treat an effect but not to bother about its cause.) However, 'the nose and upper lip were completely eaten away, the tip of the nose on the point of disappearing, and the colour of the skin of the nose showed gangrene. There was *obstinate constipation* [italics are mine] and irregular urination. . . .' Kuhne then goes on to say that the patient, by reason of possessing much vitality, responded in a most gratifying way to the treatment. This consisted of a *natural diet* (especially

adapted to the patient's impaired digestion) and of steam baths and friction hip and sitz-baths. But now comes an important point: 'Already on the second day of treatment the internal gangrenous inflammation began to travel downward, becoming apparent by the *sore at the part rubbed* during the friction sitz-bath.' This at first caused the patient great anxiety, but Kuhne was able to pacify him, by pointing out the significant fact, that 'to the same degree as the inflammation had appeared at the seat of friction it had disappeared from the nose. The final result was a complete cure. The nose itself, together with the upper lip, healed . . . without leaving any scars whatever.'¹

Here then is a case of cancer which had been diagnosed as such by the most eminent physicians in a country which is noted for its thoroughness, yet it was cured by a so-called quack without operation and without drugs. Indeed, in Kuhne's subsequent comments on the case, he mentions that the drugs given to the patient for previous diseases had largely been responsible for the cancer which eventuated. These drugs had not only suppressed, instead of curing the disease, but the drugs themselves had remained in the system and were only eliminated during Kuhne's treatment. And the proof of this was that 'the pus secreted smelt at times exactly like the drugs which the patient had taken for certain kidney and sexual disorders from which he had suffered'.²

Kuhne cured cancer of the tongue, of the lip, of the throat, of the breast, and of the uterus, all by the same methods; he also cured many cases of proud flesh. This is not, of course, to say that he had no failures. In cases

¹ L. Kuhne, *The New Science of Healing*, p. 294.

² *ibid.*

where the heart had, by a use of drugs, been irreparably damaged and the vitality reduced beyond resuscitation, Kuhne himself warned prospective patients not to undertake the treatment. But his fame was such, that despite his advice, some of them insisted, with the result that they were unable to overcome the severe crises which were unavoidable. Had Kuhne known of the potassium treatment and combined it with a modification of his own methods, such severe crises would probably have been avoided. In any event, Kuhne proved that cancer is a *curable* disease, if not an easily curable one, and he also proved that it is the final result of self-poisoning either from wrong nutrition alone or from wrong nutrition plus the absorption of poisonous drugs. Even the treatment for cancer with *Colley's Fluid* goes to endorse Kuhne's contentions, as also the fact that cancer is sometimes cured if a severe illness naturally intervenes. For like many wise physicians, Kuhne believed that all illnesses were an attempt on the part of Nature to get rid of or burn up poisons in the body. Therefore, by artificially inducing erysipelas with Colley's Fluid the poisons sometimes work themselves out through that agonizing disease and are thus diverted from the cancerous growth. But the method is far inferior to that which Kuhne employed, not to say extremely hazardous.

Why then have Kuhne's pronouncements—since endorsed, be it remembered, by eminent physicians—been so persistently and wantonly ignored? Why are the public invited to subscribe thousands of pounds a year on the plea that neither the cause of nor a cure for cancer has been discovered? For what purpose is all this money employed save that the researcher may find a 'something' which is of purely scholastic interest and of as much

practical use as is a knowledge of the word 'vitamin' to people who live on vital natural food?¹ Moreover, there are interests involved which cannot be called other than commercial. The admission that a cure for cancer had been found would mean that expensive operations would become superfluous, expensive radium treatment would lose its vogue, and finally that researchers all over the world would be deprived of a means of livelihood. Therefore does the dogma persist that cancer is incurable. Wrote that wise and eminent homeopath, Dr. J. Compton Burnett: 'If you try and fail in curing cancer, you are laughed at; if you try and succeed, you are hated; I have experienced both and so speak feelingly.'

Apart from endeavouring to expose its fallacy, I have implied that the incurability of cancer is a pernicious dogma. My reasons are obvious: it creates a fear-thought in mankind which is both painful and unhealthy. Who at one or another time of his or her life has not suffered from a cancer-phobia? But there are yet greater evils for which the dogma is responsible. A cancer-patient when informed of his condition at once loses all hope, and thus his condition is indeed hopeless in a double and disastrous sense of the word. How is it that Christian Scientists have sometimes cured cancer? Because among other things they have impressed hope both upon the conscious and subconscious mind of the patient.

In fine, every man and woman should know the truth about cancer so that in knowing how to prevent it by living in reasonable accordance with Nature's laws, they may no longer fear it. Let them above all remember that cancer can never develop in a healthy organism.

¹ In proof of this Ellis Barker has written a book nearing 500 pages. See *Cancer; The Surgeon and the Researcher*.

Chapter XVI

MODERN BIO-CHEMISTRY AND THE WORK OF DR. HENRY GILBERT

'Bio-chemistry is the most logical and up-to-date method of treating disease and must ultimately become the future medicine. But we doctors are exceedingly conservative and we shall stick to the old way until compelled by circumstances to adopt the newer and better system of medication.'—Quoted by J. T. Heselton, in *Heal Thyself*, July, 1937.

That this chapter should follow one devoted to the causes of cancer is not inappropriate; for it so happens that since its completion I have had a long interview with a man who, if he were less modest, could boast of his achievements where that dread disease is concerned.

Dr. Henry Gilbert, president of the British Bio-chemic Association, has not only cured many cases of cancer, but many others are in process of being cured by means of his inventions and discoveries in the field of bio-chemistry. In the preface to one of Dr. Gilbert's books¹ J. Stenson Hooker, M.D., writes: 'Last summer I spent several weeks visiting Scarborough House . . . and other places where bio-therapy had been applied so successfully by the author [Dr. Gilbert] of this book. It was a most interesting and profitable experience, for although there were cases of cancer, tuberculosis, arthritis, neurasthenia, goitre, and many other diseases, *all were yielding to the treatment.*² Many patients talked freely of their experiences and . . . every day I heard of people who had been

¹ See *Bio-Therapy*, published by British Bio-chemic Association, Grantham.

² The italics are mine.

completely cured of supposedly incurable diseases.' Dr. Hooker goes on to say that no stretch of credulity was required to accept the stories of these many people, for his own use of the bio-chemic remedies had led to similar results. Finally, he says: 'Since orthodox medicine is so far from satisfactory it behoves every physician worthy of the name to test the possibilities of anything so reasonable and promising as bio-chemic therapy, and also, having proved its great value, to apply it to the best of his ability in an ever-increasing proportion of his cases.'

This is a high tribute and a well-deserved eulogy from an M.D. both to Dr. Henry Gilbert and to bio-therapy as a science.

Bio-therapy (a word coined but a short while ago), is destined to be one of the great remedial sciences of the future. Modern scientists have scoffed at the so-called superstitions of those men who lived in former ages and devoted their lives to the study of alchemy and the finding of what was symbolically called the Philosopher's Stone; yet the dreams of these alchemists are on the way to come true, and it is the bio-chemists who may ultimately reveal their truth. The discovery of the 'Elixir of Life', another alchemical phrase, is not only a possibility but a probability which may be fulfilled by men who know how to search for it along bio-chemic lines; and Dr. Gilbert is one of these men. This fulfilment will not mean the overcoming of death *per se*, but the prolongation of life far beyond the normal three-score years and ten. Such capacity thus to prolong life is latent in all of us, but as yet we do not possess the knowledge to bring it into manifestation. Nevertheless, as every student of occultism is aware, there are certain High Initiates who by reason of that knowledge have retained their bodies for a length of

time which to the lay mind would merely seem incredible. Yet what may seem incredible is not impossible, and Marconi has stated that there is no scientific reason why matter should not renew itself indefinitely and why hygiene and bio-chemistry should not teach mankind to prolong life to a very considerable extent. This was borne out by a High Initiate in Arcane science who maintained in effect that when mortals shall fully understand the true science of living, the average span of life will be 250 years.¹ Even to-day there are Adepts alive whose ages vary from one to several hundred years, and no matter how difficult it may be to accept this statement it is a theoretical possibility. For instance, Dr. J. H. Christopherson, of the City of London Hospital, suggested in so many words, that if the life-sustaining elements were always present a man might live to a thousand years or more. As it is, the human body in parts is apt to deteriorate owing to bio-chemical defects and deficiencies, but recent discoveries in the bio-chemic domain should enable man to counteract such deterioration. Moreover, this newly acquired knowledge, according to another authority, Professor Starling, should enable him 'to achieve the continuance, not of old age, but of youth.'²

Dr. Gilbert regards himself as a chemist and not as a doctor, yet like Mr. Ellis Barker the role of physician has been forced upon him by many to whom the orthodox doctor could give no relief. Among the supposedly incurable maladies for which he has discovered a specific is pernicious anaemia. He found that to administer iron and calcium in accordance with the practice of the original bio-chemists was not sufficient—copper is required also.

¹ See *Outline of Modern Occultism*, (Routledge).

² See 'More Life for All'. Article by George Aldridge in *Restoration*, a journal of Bio-chemistry.

By combining copper with iron in assimilable doses Dr. Gilbert cures pernicious anaemia. He has also found a specific for curing certain kinds of fear. The orthodox physician gives adrenalin for this purpose. Dr. Gilbert's method, however, is more scientific; it obviates the supposed necessity of introducing animal secretions into human beings. Indeed, any beneficial effects which may accrue from such an introduction are apparent only and not actual, since fear or habitual timidity is often the result of improperly functioning adrenals. After all, non-functioning or improperly functioning glands are not *cured* by having their work done for them any more than a lame man is cured by supplying him with crutches. The same thing may be said regarding insulin and diabetes. In place of the former, Dr. Gilbert has compiled, on bio-chemic principles, a remedy which he calls Pancrea. This is the cardinal remedy for diabetes because it contains sulphate and hyper-sulphate of soda with the proper complement of natural physiological elements. 'Insulin presents only one of these elements, and in such large doses that it leaves the body's own laboratory nothing to do. The work is taken entirely out of the hands of Nature, as it were, and thereafter must be done solely by the treatment itself.'¹ In a word, insulin is simply another 'crutch' which serves to cause a further degeneration of the islets of Langerhans² instead of having the contrary effect.

There is no disease, whether it be diabetes, cancer, tuberculosis, arthritis, or any other we may mention, but

¹ *Bio-Therapy*, by Henry Gilbert, D. Bio-Ch., M.B., B.A., etc.

² According to bio-chemists, the degeneration of these so-termed islets of Langerhans is the secondary cause of diabetes; the prime cause nearly always being a deficiency of phosphate of potash and other salts in the system which thus causes their degeneration.

what 'is associated with chemical faults in the body'. Even structural defects, which can be corrected by osteopathy, produce in their turn chemical faults due to improperly functioning organs or to local congestion. This is 'why for purposes of healing, the bio-chemic practitioner thinks of his patients in terms of calcium, potassium, phosphorus, sulphur, and the organic compounds of which the body is composed. He also studies the internal chemistry of the body and the substances manufactured within the living tissues. The body is constantly at work, breaking down, refining, and re-compounding the materials necessary for its maintenance and health. Failure in the smallest detail may produce harmful chemical combinations—auto-toxins. When this happens the body tries to right itself by manufacturing self-curative chemicals—autacoids. The bio-chemist studies these natural self-curatives, the circumstances in which they are produced, the processes which produce them, the further processes which are initiated by them, and the end effect upon the disease, especially in those cases where Nature succeeds in effecting the so-called spontaneous cure. The modern bio-chemic physician assists at the point where this self-healing breaks down. His assistance is both the "nearest-to-nature" and the most scientific of all curative methods.'¹

I have briefly pointed out in a previous chapter that the originator of the first system of bio-chemic treatment was Dr. W. H. Schuessler (or Schüssler) of Oldenburg, Germany. He confined himself to the use of twelve inorganic tissue salts. Both he and his contemporary, Dr. J. Hensel, taught that 'these salts are the stabilizers, the maintenance-materials of the body, and that virility,

¹ Henry Gilbert, *Bio-chemistry and Physiological Remedies*.

sanity, longevity, and freedom from disease depend upon their presence in the body in sufficient quantity.' Hensel further taught that because the customary diet of civilization was deficient in these mineral nutrients, men and women were prone to be enervated, unstable, nervy, and liable to disease. But Hensel was not merely a theorist, for with these salts he cured one disease after the other, and so conclusively demonstrated the truth of his contention that 'physical and mental stability and long life, with freedom from disease, can be secured by feeding the tissues with scientifically prepared mineral nutrients'.

'With modern bio-pharmaceutical apparatus and machinery it is now possible to produce, in a few hundred hours, nutrients which are far more natural to the body than so-called natural (artificially cultivated) foods. These biochemical super-foods represent a triumph of the human mind over matter, for the very stones and dust of the earth are transmuted into life-sustaining health-restoring materials, which marvellously assuage the cell-hunger which manifests as disease. These super-foods form part of the equipment of the bio-chemical physician, but whether he uses these particular products of the bio-pharmacist's skill and machinery, or properly prepared Schüssler tissue remedies, or subtle facsimiles of the newly discovered self-medicines, he never drugs the body. *He only and always feeds the tissues with what they lack.*'¹

Thus it will be seen that bio-chemistry is pre-eminently scientific, and unlike ordinary medicine is not based on the false theory that disease can be cured by administering the most deadly poisons, or by germs fabricated from the secretions of animals. . . . This, by the way, is not intended to be a criticism of homeopathy, which administers

¹ Henry Gilbert, *Bio-chemistry and Physiological Remedies*.

its poisons (on the principle that like cures like) in such infinitesimal doses that no baneful results can accrue. It is, however, a criticism of allopathic methods which are based on the assumption that by adding more poisons to the body one can rid it of those already there.

Now, although it is true that the administration of the original twelve Schüssler remedies have in countless cases worked seeming miracles, they have at other times proved disappointing. This is because the number itself is incomplete and also because the remedies may not have been rightly prepared. There are some spurious tissue salts on the market which are remedies in name only and not in fact, and so of course only serve to bring the bio-chemic system into bad repute, or at best to negate its value as an exact science.¹ But apart from this, as already implied, many discoveries have been made in the field of bio-chemistry since the days of Schüssler and Hensel; consequently, writes Dr. Gilbert, 'those practitioners who still use only the twelve-salts system are lagging a very long way behind their more progressive colleagues'.

To enter into technical details, however, would only make unsuitable reading for laymen; nor is it essential, for in the bio-chemic system of medicine it is the symptoms which indicate the right remedy or tissue salt to administer, and not the name of the disease. For instance, a man may be suffering from a variety of complaints which from the allopathic standpoint appear to have no connexion whatever. Yet the symptoms themselves reveal but one underlying cause; the lack of a particular mineral salt in the system. If that salt be administered, all the variously named complaints clear up, however disassociated they

¹ Apart from Dr. Gilbert's preparations I have found the Twelve Tissue Salts as prepared by Messrs. Epps & Thatcher of 60 Jermyn Street, S.W.1 to be perfectly reliable.

may have appeared. To call particular collections of symptoms by high-sounding names can seldom help to cure the patient but only to make the physician seem more learned. Names in themselves may merely serve to confuse the issue, as every bio-chemist or homeopathic practitioner knows. If a man goes to a specialist and informs him that his disease has been diagnosed as diabetes, let us say, the specialist then prescribes his pet remedy for that disease as such, without inquiring what may have been its original cause. In one case I may cite, a man developed diabetes owing to a great grief he had suffered many years previously. He was finally cured by Ellis Barker, who inquired into his past history, and who then gave him *ignatia*, a homeopathic specific for the effects of sorrow. Another instance of the futility of naming diseases is related by Dr. Gilbert Charette, of Nantes,¹ who in consultation with three other physicians was called to the bedside of a young boy. This boy was suffering from some mysterious complaint which produced a high fever, constipation, and a semi-comatose condition; yet despite these indications all three doctors were unable to name the disease. When Dr. Charette was asked to give his own diagnosis, he replied: 'I have not the slightest idea what to call the disease from which our patient is suffering, but I do know what to prescribe—which is more to the point. It is opium in homeopathic doses.' In four days the boy was completely cured.

Although it must be conceded that to know the name of a disease is often useful, it is sometimes unnecessary and frequently misleading. As Dr. G. W. Carey, author of *The Bio-chemic System of Medicine*, has pointed out, many a condition labelled rheumatism is nothing of the kind.

¹ See *What is Homeopathy?*

The same may be said of many other conditions. In fine, in prescribing the remedy or remedies it is best to be guided by the collection of symptoms and not by the supposed name of the disease. Thus, although Dr. Gilbert in his *Therapeutic Index to Bio-Therapy* names the various remedies in connexion with the various disease-names, he particularly remarks: 'This is a concession for the benefit of those who are passing over from the old school. . . . These are remedies for conditions rather than for names of diseases.'

One of the great advantages of the bio-chemic system, as will be seen from the foregoing, is that each patient, unless mentally incapacitated, can prescribe for himself. This is especially the case with chronic ailments. After all, each person knows his own symptoms far better than a doctor whom he may consult and who cannot be expected in the course of half an hour to understand his entire constitution. It would be different if reliable bio-chemic practitioners were to be found in all localities, but as at present they are few and far between, the patient will do best to rely on his own intelligence. Bio-chemic literature, which can be easily comprehended, is accessible to the general public and is by no means prohibitive in price.¹ But should advice or special information be required, it can be obtained from the British Bio-chemic Association, Grantham.

It may be advisable to state how I originally came into contact with bio-therapy. As an occultist I do not believe in chance, yet the word must serve, for it was a so-called chance acquaintance who first drew my attention to this

¹ *The Bio-chemic System of Medicine*, by G. W. Carey, costs about 16s. and may be procured from Epps & Thatcher, 60 Jermyn Street, London, S.W.1. *Bio-Therapy*, by Herbert Gilbert, costs 10s. 6d. Address: 80 Mortimer Street, London, W.1.

art of healing. Having derived no benefit from doctors, she had cured herself of chronic rheumatism and subsequently cured several of her friends of various ailments by means of the bio-chemic remedies. Before meeting her, although I had vaguely heard of the twelve tissue salts and even seen them in Health Food stores, I had taken no interest in them, for I could not imagine how a few sugary pills could cure all manner of complaints. My scepticism, however, vanished when I came to read Dr. Carey's book on the subject, the final result being that I soon became an enthusiastic lay practitioner myself. It was only much later that I heard of Dr. Gilbert's progressive work. At the house of some friends I met a lady who had been cured by his remedies of a goitre of the very worst kind. She had suffered from this goitre for over thirty years, and no pains or money had been spared in attempts to cure it, but all to no purpose. Then she heard of bio-therapy and Dr. Gilbert.

This lady told me some remarkable stories which I afterwards verified and which serve to show the potency of bio-chemic remedies. A woman whose young daughter was in a mental home, having been certified as insane, asked permission of the authorities to send her some of the remedies. The request was refused. But as it was permitted to send in food the mother hit on the idea of incorporating the remedies in cakes. The result was so astonishing that the patient was subsequently pronounced cured and dispatched to her home. But this is not all: a much older woman with whom the young daughter had shared the cakes was also pronounced cured. The principal tissue salt which had been incorporated in these innocent-looking cakes was phosphate of potash. 'The

grey matter of the brain is controlled entirely by this inorganic salt.’¹

Yet this is not the first time that people unbeknown to themselves have been treated and cured in a similar way by ingenious relatives. Where scepticism or blank refusal has proved an obstacle, the little celloids have surreptitiously been introduced into tea and other beverages. Some diseases may gradually be cured or at least prevented by substituting Dr. Gilbert’s special table salt for ordinary salt. There is no difference in taste, but Dr. Gilbert’s preparation contains all the numerous cell-salts which are needed by the body to fortify it against disease. Like Dr. Robinson of the National Biochemical Laboratory, New York, Dr. Gilbert believes that excess of sodium chloride (common salt) is a predisposing cause of many diseases, including cancer. And as we have previously shown, there is much to be said for this contention. The large consumption of salt which is the prevailing custom is due not to necessity but solely to a desire for stronger-tasting foods. Although common salt is one of the twelve inorganic salts of the body, it is not in general use as a condiment for reasons of health—though some people may so imagine—but because it makes certain items in an unnatural diet more pleasant to eat. Indeed, the fact that salty foods create an inordinate thirst is of itself a sign that the large consumption of salt is unhealthy, for the thirst is an indication that Nature wants to rid the system of it by means of water. (The same thing applies to an excess of refined sugar.) All the twelve inorganic salts are contained in their proper proportion in fruits, vegetables, and salads, but no one thinks to sprinkle their food with, say, phosphate of magnesia or sulphate of

¹ Dr. G. W. Carey.

potash. The singling out of one particular salt, therefore, the consuming of it in unnatural quantities merely because of its strong taste, is neither scientific nor salubrious. Chloride of sodium or common salt becomes a healthy condiment only when mixed in correct proportions with all the other salts, especially with potassium, which ensures its proper elimination. This being so, Dr. Gilbert, by means of his bio-chemic knowledge, has done a service to his fellows in thus producing a perfectly balanced table salt.

Enough has been said regarding the undoubted value of bio-chemistry as both a curative and preventive agent. Yet although a few doctors here and there are enterprising enough to investigate its merits the majority still lag behind. The time is not far hence, however, when the hand of orthodoxy will be forced not so much by the unorthodox practitioner as by the layman. The ever-increasing number of cures effected by simple bio-chemic methods in cases pronounced incurable by the orthodox physician or specialist can no longer be ignored. Either doctors will have to study bio-therapy or somewhat ignominiously be obliged to send their patients to a bio-chemic practitioner. The days of serums and operations are already numbered, and it is the bio-therapist who will finally ring their death-knell.

Chapter XVII

RELATING OF THOSE WHO HAVE HEALED THEMSELVES

A philosopher who has not learnt to be his own physician is unworthy of the name of philosopher. In China people pay their physicians to keep them well; wise people in all countries can learn how to keep themselves well—without self-payment! They have but to accept the maxim expressed in one form or another by all the wise physicians and philosophers of every age—viz., that Nature is both the curer and the preventer of disease.

Why have these facts been persistently ignored by thousands of doctors and why are they especially ignored to-day by the orthodox profession? It is because the facts themselves appear too simple and because the doctors themselves are too arrogant. Only the wise physician admits that Nature knows better than himself; the unwise physician thinks he knows better than Nature. Therefore it is that very few physicians are adept at healing themselves; they are too much imbued with theories, or else too ignorant of vital facts. A friend of mine informed me that his father, who was a doctor, believed almost fanatically in concentrated foods and extracts in accordance with the Liebig school of thought. The result was that he became a martyr to indigestion, headaches, constipation, and other disorders for which he had constantly to dose himself with pills and potions. Despite, or more likely *because* of all his medical knowledge, it never occurred to him that his theories (or rather Liebig's) regarding concentrated food might be at fault, and that

the best way to get well would be to change his mode of living. And this notwithstanding the fact that Liebig's ideas have been exploded. Observation proved that one lot of animals fed on meat extract perished, whereas those fed on the very meat from which the extract had been made, flourished. Facetiously might one be tempted to say, 'The proof of the meat is in the eating.'

It is a noteworthy statistical fact that the highest percentage, not of contagious diseases as one might expect, but of digestive complaints, is to be found among doctors. This shows a deplorable ignorance of how to live wisely. A doctor cannot avoid contact with epidemics, but he can at least regulate his diet in such a way as to prevent disorders of the digestive tract and their consequences. But the trouble is, as I have mentioned before, that the average doctor is so preoccupied with studying disease that he forgets to study health. He has come to regard it as his business to cure disease when it occurs, but not to prevent its occurrence. Indeed, doctors seem to be the slowest of all people to insure their bodies against illness—except of course by such precautionary measures as the use of antiseptics, etc., while pursuing their profession. Instead of being the first to advocate and eat health foods, they are usually the last. When already the naturopaths were first beginning to make their voices heard, I advised a doctor friend of mine in the provinces to alter his denaturalized and demineralized diet; otherwise, as I told him, I saw trouble ahead for himself and especially for his wife. But of course he merely laughed at me for being a crankish and ignorant layman. I was particularly concerned for his wife; she suffered not only from chronic constipation which he could not cure, but had inherited all the dietetic tastes of her mother who had died

of cancer. She had, in fact, inherited the same distaste for all fruits, salads, and brown bread, and consequently never ate them, precisely as her mother had never eaten them. However, I contrived to persuade her to make at least a few reforms as far as she herself was concerned and she has remained a reasonably healthy woman. Her husband, on the other hand, had a very severe illness. But the point of my story is that when I paid a week-end visit many years later, I found on the table a large bowl of raw salad each day for lunch. In reply to my comments on this, she said: 'My husband now insists on salad every day of the year!'

But although doctors as a class are so tardy in adopting wise reforms, occasionally they discover something of value for themselves in their search for personal health. We owe the term 'uric acid' to an ailing little doctor named Alexander Haig, who discovered that he felt better in health if he abstained from meat. Thereafter he began to experiment with dietetics. He found that not only meat but also pulse-foods, tea, coffee, cocoa, chocolate, etc., were unwholesome and made the urine acid. Had he possessed more knowledge he might have known that it was not so much one particular food in itself which created the acid as certain combinations of foods. Nevertheless he coined the term 'uric acid', which subsequently found favour with the doctors and the public. The term has remained, but also the meat-eating which originally inspired it; so that although Dr. Haig's terminology has been gratefully accepted, his advice to refrain from meat has been ungratefully rejected. Not only is meat still consumed in very large quantities, but also meat extracts, which, according to Haig, are very much worse. This is typical; a doctor's terminology and

scholastic explanation regarding some unhealthy procedure go to swell the already overloaded text-books of medical science, but the whole *raison d'être* for such text-book swelling is for the most part ignored.

Yet Haig did a certain amount of good with his scholastic explanations, even though they are both inadequate and not entirely accurate. Just as the vitamin theory has induced some people to eat more natural foods, so did Haig's uric acid theory induce some people to eat less of unnatural foods. Let certain types of mentality be given a quasi-scientific reason for doing or not doing a thing and they will be quite satisfied. Dr. Haig made many converts, including Mrs. C. W. Earle, who created a certain stir in the literary world with her delightful book *Pot-pourri from a Surrey Garden*. This charming and witty old lady devoted the latter part of her life to propagating vegetarianism, and died at a ripe old age, a splendid advertisement for Dr. Haig's theories.

Nevertheless, although doctors now and then may have acquired a certain fame as self-healers and passed on their discoveries to the public as far as their 'trade-union' restrictions permit, the most proficient self-healers have often been laymen. In comparatively recent years four such men stand out with interesting prominence. Their names are Horace Fletcher, Sanford Bennett, Ellis Barker, and Are Waerland. Each of these men found himself in a state of very poor health, and each had consulted doctors to no purpose. Already towards middle age, Horace Fletcher saw himself condemned by the profession to a life of semi-invalidism. Finding that doctors, with all their learned ignorance, their potions and nostrums, were utterly helpless to effect a cure, he determined to set

about it himself, and he took Nature as his teacher. Firstly he determined only to eat when Nature in the form of a natural hunger prompted him to eat. Secondly he determined to masticate and taste every morsel of food so thoroughly that it should be reduced to a condition of fluidity before he swallowed it. His resolve when put into practice worked miracles. Not only did the various complaints from which he had suffered disappear in the most astonishing manner, but he found himself able to break athletic records where men far his junior had failed. He could ride a push-bike for ten hours at a stretch without even feeling stiff afterwards, although previously he had not ridden a bicycle for years. He also found he could endure long-protracted hours of brain-work without any fatigue. And all this on a diet which was practically free from flesh-foods and so small in quantity that most people would consider it hardly sufficient to sustain life. I should add that he only required to evacuate his bowels about once a week or even longer, and that his motions were totally innocuous and in his own words had 'no more odour than a hot biscuit'.

What was the rationale of Horace Fletcher's self-treatment which became known as Fletcherism? Like most highly efficacious things it is very simple. By masticating and insalivating every mouthful of food to a degree far beyond what is usual, all the vital elements in that food are absorbed by the system, and the little that remains as digestion-ash is devoid of toxins and hence cannot produce self-poisoning from the colon. This, according to Fletcher, is because saliva is to a great extent a germicide and also an antacid. But apart from these facts, by eating so little and masticating so much, the stomach requires but the minimum of energy for the

functions of digestion. And these statements are certainly borne out by comparison.

The excretions of persons who bolt their food instead of masticating it are always extremely offensive, and this in itself denotes a marked degree of toxicity. Moreover, after a big meal, such persons are apt to feel sleepy or inert and disinclined for any physical or mental exertion unless artificially stimulated by alcohol, tea, or coffee. In short, the greater part of their energy is required to digest their meal and there is little left for anything else. All of which is in direct contrast to the experiences of Fletcherists as I myself was able to prove. Yet despite its advantages, Fletcherism, if carried out to its fullest extent, has drawbacks which are difficult to avoid unless one leads the life of a hermit. In a well ordered household, meals have to be at set times, so it is almost impossible to eat only when conscious of real hunger. But even so the practice in itself of chewing all foods to a pulp has a wonderful effect on health and physical appearance. I have known people who were ungainly-looking become quite elegant and achieve a complexion that would excite the envy of many a society woman. Fletcher himself, whom I saw when he was over seventy, had such a complexion.

There is one serious flaw in Fletcherism which, however, can easily be avoided. As the bowel is supplied with no roughage to contend with it may finally cease to function at all, as was, I understand, the case with Fletcher himself. Had he made a point, every night, of swallowing *without mastication* one or two tablespoonfuls of bran or linseed he might be alive to-day. As it was, I am told, he eventually died of atrophy of the bowel—though only after some thirty years of phenomenal health.

Fletcher provides an instructive example of a layman

who not only discovered a simple method of achieving perfect health but who once again proves that disease is the result of auto-intoxication and deficiency. On the surface this may seem otherwise, for the reader may argue that Fletcher, since he only had a motion once a week, suffered from constipation. Firstly, however, as he ate but about one twentieth the amount of what most people eat, there was practically nothing to evacuate, and secondly, as his digestion-ash was completely aseptic it could not act as an auto-intoxicative, especially as he had renounced the habit of meat-eating, and therefore had not to contend with the absorption of poisons from flesh-food putrefaction.

Although the term 'to fletcherize' has become part of our vocabulary, Fletcherism itself in its fullest significance has been more or less forgotten. Even in a modified form people cannot be bothered to practise it; they imagine that eating would become so tedious. Yet they are mistaken; eating, provided meat is excluded, becomes twice the pleasure, and there is perfect comfort after each meal. If ailing persons would resort to Fletcherism, remembering, however, to take some bran or harmless roughage every night and to fletcherize everything but that, they would soon find themselves in better health and spirits. Should they not wish to adopt Fletcherism as a life-habit they can do it as a cure. It has this advantage, that they do not need to worry about food combinations and the incompatibility of proteins and starches or starches and acid fruits. When food items are thoroughly masticated and insalivated they will digest perfectly and produce no acidity, no matter what the combination. But the principle of fletcherizing needs also to be applied to all beverages—except water, which is tasteless. For instance, tea, so apt with many people to increase acidity,

when sipped and thoroughly tasted (each sip being sucked like a sweet) not only becomes far more digestible but also loses its sometimes inconvenient diuretic properties. Coffee sipped in the same way is less liable to keep people awake at night: the saliva seems to neutralize the caffeine.

But to pass from Horace Fletcher and his discoveries to those of another remarkable American—Sanford Bennett.

As the result of an arduous, over-worrying business career Sanford Bennett was old and worn out at fifty. His appearance, in the words of his doctor, was 'that of a man who had devoted much attention to his business, to the neglect of his health'. Yet at seventy-two Sanford Bennett was virtually a young man, with the body and face of a young man.

He came of a bad stock, short-lived and consumptive. His father had died at a little over forty. He himself had been a sickly, nervous child, subjected to all manner of dosings, and brought up to regard 'drug stores as life-saving stations'. 'I remained in that belief', he wrote, 'until I had reached the age of fifty, and—broke down.'¹ He goes on to say that he only succeeded in achieving his perfect health and self-rejuvenation after he had discontinued all medicines. According to him, 'health cannot be found in drug store prescriptions, nor can life be materially prolonged by any medical preparations. The solution of the problem lies only in Nature's principal methods of inducing health. . . .' Having attained that health himself he wrote a book showing how others might do likewise.

What was his theory and what were his methods? These have been briefly stated by Dr. C. Renz in his clinical examination which took place after a lapse of eleven years from the first (unfavourable) examination.

¹ See *Old Age—Its Cause and Prevention*, (1927 Edition).

'The success which Mr. Bennett has obtained', wrote Dr. Renz, 'would seem to be a practical verification . . . of his theory that "the secret of health, longevity, and elasticity of the body lies solely in the elimination of dead and worn out cellular tissue, which if allowed to remain in the system would impede the functions and shorten life; and that the only method by which this dead cellular matter can be eliminated is by muscular activity".'¹ Thus, in the well-known adage, 'a man is as old as his arteries'.

But the point is, what sort of muscular activity? Namely, a system of exercises which produce alternately contractions and relaxations of every muscle of the body. These exercises Sanford Bennett practised while lying in bed in the morning. One of his reasons was that exercise in a recumbent position produces far less strain on the heart than when practised in the usual way. Moreover, exercise is best taken before breakfast on an empty stomach. This is obvious, for we all know that anything but mild exercise taken after a meal is inexpedient, and hence many a heart attack has been brought on by too violent exertion at such times, so that Bennett's procedure was both wise and scientific. Naturally, he also advised sunlight, fresh air and judicious feeding as necessary adjuncts to his special system of physical culture, but these alone could not be expected to produce the astonishing rejuvenation that he achieved.

Naturally his system cannot be described here in any sort of detail, those who are interested being advised to read the book from which we have quoted. Suffice it to say that Bennett provided a living proof that health and youthfulness are dependent on the eliminative processes and the preventing or getting rid of that encumbrance of

¹ *ibid.*, p. 45.

foreign matter in the body to which Louis Kuhne so insistently alluded. For I should add that the necessity for internal hygiene, i.e. complete freedom from constipation, was a factor which Bennett emphasized more than once. Yet perfect bowel activity in itself, however conducive it may be to good health, was not of course the sole cause of Bennett's rejuvenation. The latter was largely due to that perfect elimination of calcareous and other deposits in the arteries which unless eliminated are responsible for the disabilities of old age. Thus, because Bennett had evolved the necessary technique to disburden his arteries of such deposits, he succeeded in gradually turning an old young man into a young old man.

Apart from the usual idea that in time the human organism simply wears out, many theories have been put forward as to the cause of old age. A few germ fanatics have even gone so far as to say it is due to a germ! Yet who among these theorists has proved his particular theory by actual facts except Sanford Bennett? The celebrated Ninon de Lenclos had, I believe, no pet theories, yet contrived by exercises to *prevent* herself from ever getting to look old. But Bennett did much more than this; having already looked old he contrived to make himself look so young again that in self-defence he was obliged to explain his *modus operandi* in a book.

The third self-healer I mentioned among four prominent men was, or rather is,¹ that remarkable writer Ellis Barker, to whose books I have often referred and from which I have often quoted.

Ellis Barker, born 1870, is the son of a doctor (since deceased) and although, according to his parents' account,

¹ For Mr. Ellis Barker is not only still alive but, like Bennett, another living proof of his convictions.

he was a strong and healthy infant, he was through wrong feeding destined in later life to become an invalid who 'spent days of despair lying about on beds and sofas' convinced that he was incurable and 'had only a few months to live'.¹ This was his condition when one day (to paraphrase his confessions) he began to wonder whether his faith in that high feeding and medication he had received from his father had not been misplaced, and whether the twenty doctors or more he had consulted ought not to have changed his diet instead of constantly changing his medicines. In consequence of this self-questioning, he began to study the subject and to experiment cautiously with a natural diet. From that moment began his physical regeneration, and from a despairing invalid who could not remain a few minutes on his feet without being thrown by the effort into a profuse perspiration, he became what at sixty-seven he now is, one of the healthiest, happiest, and most active of men.

Speaking of the great change wrought in his entire being by natural food, he says:² 'When in May 1926 the General Strike broke out, I acted as a special constable and had the great satisfaction to find that I, who had been an invalid for years, had more physical strength and endurance than the youngest of my colleagues. After four hours on duty most of them were tired and felt in need of strong tea and a rest. I asked for another spell of duty or went away on long push-bicycle rides. Although I hardly ever get on a bicycle, I can easily cycle a hundred miles a day.'

So much for what a diet of natural foods did for Ellis Barker after doctors had tinkered with him for years, and his own father, a doctor, had brought him up in the way he should *not* go, if the grammatical licence be excused.

¹ See *Good Health and Happiness*.

² *ibid.*

Is it to be wondered at that Are Waerland, whom we shall now consider, headed one of the chapters in his book:¹ 'Between Man and his Health stands the Doctor'?

Prefacing this book, Sir Arbuthnot Lane writes: 'It is the record of a widely read and travelled layman's search for health, and constitutes, as such, a valuable medical and human document. . . .' This is indeed true, the more so as it is the statement of a very wise and broad-minded physician who is not averse to advertising his sanction to a volume which, in Waerland's own words, 'constitutes in its essence the most serious attack hitherto published on the present-day system of treating disease, and consequently on the representatives and supporters of that system'.²

Are Waerland, as his name suggests, hails from Scandinavia. In the days of his young manhood, being endowed with a fine voice and a flow of words, he possessed the ambition to become a great orator, but was attacked by a serious affliction of the throat, and doomed by the doctors never to have his ambition realized. It would seem that Scandinavian specialists are mentally even more short-sighted than those of other countries. Waerland was a mouth-breather; yet not one of the medical men who examined him advised him to alter this bad habit—they had not even noticed it!—Waerland himself was left to discover its evil effects. As soon as he developed the habit of breathing through his nose, his throat got appreciably better. Then he had a relapse due to another bad habit—that of drinking excessively hot liquids. The baneful effects of this habit he was also left to discover for himself. His doctors, as usual, had been content merely to treat an effect without bothering about its cause. They

¹ *In the Cauldron of Disease.*

² *ibid.*

cauterized his throat and gave him all kinds of medicines to swallow, which proved useless. Waerland relates that he consulted every doctor and specialist he came across and made notes of their answers and remarks, most of them striking him as more or less trivial, nonsensical, and parrot-like. He found to his astonishment that they were practically 'all moving in the same groove and apparently quoting from the same books. Any unusual question seemed to bewilder them, to make them look disturbed and, sometimes, even angry.'¹ He finally wrote, 'Doing away with hot food and drinks was the last step taken towards the complete recovery of my voice.'

Waerland's experience should prove useful to many sufferers. Thousands of people suffer from relaxed throats, yet how many specialists think to forbid them excessively hot soups, tea, or other beverages? And this despite the fact that every ignoramus knows that heat is a relaxant.

But although Waerland had cured himself of his throat-trouble he had not cured his entire body of disease itself, and subsequently was destined to go through a severe illness and an operation. After the latter, a wise physician gave him a sound piece of advice: He said; 'Take care of your stomach, my boy, and everything will take care of itself.' And yet (Waerland remarks) he who gave this advice was a martyr to rheumatic headaches which he was totally unable to cure. The worthy doctor evidently did not realize that there are more ways than one of taking care of the stomach, and that rheumatism itself has its origin in the stomach. Had he known what to eat instead of merely what not to eat he would doubtless have cured his headaches. And this is just what among other things

¹ *ibid.*

his patient Are Waerland came to learn, and so transformed himself into the healthy man he is to-day.

Waerland's case goes again to emphasize the fact that mere abstentions in themselves do not insure perfect health. He had never been a gross feeder, he had abstained from all alcohol and tobacco and had cured himself of one affliction by abstaining from hot drinks, yet he had not conquered disease itself. This is because abstentions have for the most part a negative result, whereas only a habitual consumption of the right diet has that positive result which is the bedrock of intrinsic health. This also applies, although to a somewhat lesser degree, to actions. Last century, and even still in this one, we often hear such phrases as: 'You mustn't go out in case you catch cold'; 'you mustn't take above a very short walk in case you get over-tired'; 'you mustn't have the window open in case there's a draught and you get neuralgia', and so on and so forth. All these prohibitions, unless ignored, weaken the system and render it liable to the catching of illnesses instead of fortifying it against them, as every one should know. Invalids who observe such foolish rules only become greater invalids. If they remain in warm rooms and never go out in the cold bracing air their system remains relaxed, unable to withstand east winds, and a prey for microbes. All this Waerland realized and went to the opposite extreme. He wore less and less warm clothing, lived less and less indoors, until finally he lived out of doors altogether, or to all intents and purposes out of doors. He had constructed for himself a small garden-shelter consisting of three walls and a roof—in which he worked and slept. His great idea, though by no means a new one, was to harden the body and increase its oxygen intake to the maximum. In his view, disease

and also old age are due to sluggishness; 'a gradual, involuntary and voluntary slowing down of all our bodily activities. If', he says, 'you always walk gently, slowly, respectably, step by step, you will be an old man at thirty. But if you run at sixty and seventy and eighty, at least once daily for ten or fifteen minutes, you will never know old age. You will keep young until the very last moment of your life. . . .'¹ This may be so, but I should hardly advise old people to start trying it. Such stunts, to use that useful Americanism, have to be commenced very gradually, and even then are likely to prove dangerous unless those who perform them have lived on the type of nourishment which keeps the vital organs, especially the heart, in perfect condition. Sir Arthur Keith's advice that we should once daily perform some feat which will exercise our lungs, muscles, and heart to their fullest capacity is all very well as a theory put forward by an eminent biologist, but if followed when the body is auto-intoxicated from injudicious meat-eating and starved of vitamins and mineral salts, trouble is likely to accrue. How many young athletes injure their heart for life, not because Nature did not intend the heart of man to bear such a strain, but because through generations of wrong feeding not counteracted by, say, twenty years of right feeding, it is no longer in perfect condition? If Horace Fletcher at sixty performed without the least harm to himself athletic feats which outdid the capacity of much younger men, it was because his system was totally free from toxins and his organs perfectly vitalized. This was proved by the fact that he never suffered from stiffness nor muscular fatigue—the latter being due to dioxide poisoning—however long he continued his exertions. And

¹ *In the Cauldron of Disease.*

this goes to endorse Are Waerland's main contentions that the human body can be trained with advantage to do and endure almost anything, provided in the first place it be rightly nourished.

Nevertheless, Mr. Waerland is something of an extremist, for circumstances do not permit that most people should live entirely out of doors. The problem which faces the majority of persons is how to keep healthy in what Waerland would regard as an unhealthy environment. For when all is said, almost anybody could find perfect health if he or she lived the life of an agricultural labourer. As it is, hosts of English men and women are the slaves of exercise, and by that I would say, they admit that they cannot keep well unless they have their round of golf or what not every day. But this is because, though perhaps unbeknown to themselves, they must needs burn up through physical exertion the toxins produced by their excessive or unscientific diet. Even so, unless actual golf fanatics, they very often do not really want to take exercise, but feel they must, for their health's sake, which is already a sign of an imperfectly functioning body. As Dr. Hay points out in one of his books, the desire for physical exertion, no matter of what nature, should be as natural and spontaneous as that of young animals, who, when the urge is upon them, run and jump about for the mere joy of the exertion itself. Waerland says in effect the same thing. The desire for work, be it manual or mental, and the desire for exercise should be as natural to healthy man, and its fulfilment as pleasurable, as the desire for and partaking of food. Yet as regards food, most people require to have their appetite titivated by an alluring variety in eatables and by all manner of tasty morsels. And as for taking exercise for the mere pleasure of bodily

movement, this is insufficient, and they must play some competitive game to add spice to an exertion which they would otherwise regard as tedious. Not that I am here deprecating the utility and enjoyment of games as such for those who like them; I am merely emphasizing certain contentions of naturopaths and laymen who in the face of unsuccessful medical treatment have, so to say, snapped their fingers at the doctors and cured themselves.

Indeed, it is not the doctors who have been the great reformers, even in such necessary matters as sanitation. For as Are Waerland rightly says (though many people are ignorant of this astonishing fact), 'Scientific sanitation was introduced by "outsiders", by amateurs, in the teeth of the passionate hostility of the medical profession which thought its interests threatened.' Moreover, any one can prove this merely by studying the history of medicine. 'We are liable', said Sir George Newman (Chief Medical Officer of the Ministry of Health) 'to forget the extraordinary contribution which has been made to its advance by scientific workers, who *have not been medical men.*'¹ And he went on to point out, for instance, that Aristotle's influence on medicine remained dominant for centuries. Subsequently the names of Roger Bacon, Galileo, Boyle, and Black, stand out prominently as scientific contributors in the domain of therapeutics. Nor must two famous artists be forgotten, Albrecht Dürer and Leonardo da Vinci. Hereafter the names of five other eminent personages ending with that of Mme Curie were mentioned. Comments Are Waerland: 'It is very brave of a doctor to admit all this and to tell his own colleagues a truth which they hate to hear and love to forget.'

¹ Presidential Address.

Chapter XVIII

HOMEOPATHY

In the course of this book I have mentioned homeopathy and its principles many times. The cures it has effected since the days of Hahnemann run into millions; cures that have been achieved without the injection of disgusting serums or the intervention of the surgeon's skill. Yet despite these convincing facts, homeopathy is in many quarters still regarded as a species of faith-cure by a public which knows nothing about it, and by orthodox doctors who condemn it prior to investigation. Nevertheless an increasing number of doctors have turned from allopathy to homeopathy for the simple reason that they have become convinced of its superiority. They have been courageous enough to discard their former beliefs and to embrace a science of medicine which requires much more application and involves a great deal more trouble on the part of its practitioners than do the ordinary yet ever-changing orthodox methods. Because allopathy is not based on unchanging truths, the allopath is for ever discovering something new, with the accompanying thought that he is 'going one better'. But with homeopathy what was true in Hahnemann's day is true now and will remain so henceforth; consequently it is only just to call it a true science in contradistinction to a pseudo one.

Then why has it not been more universally recognized and adopted? Because, as already implied, the art of homeopathic prescribing requires more time, skill, and trouble than is required in the case of allopathy. To find the drug which provides the exact *simillum* for a number

of perhaps complicated and sometimes apparently irrelevant symptoms is a far more difficult and time-taking task than just to prescribe a text-book remedy for some tabulated disease. Moreover, during the progress of the illness a large number and variety of symptoms may successively appear; all of which require the finding of their exact *simillum* if the patient is really to be cured instead of merely 'patched up'. This being so, it becomes obvious why so many doctors to *be* prefer allopathy to homeopathy; the former involves much less trouble. It is, for instance, much easier to advocate the extirpation of an appendix than to cure it without an operation, and it is much easier to pocket a fee for telling a patient he has but three months to live than to find a means whereby he can be restored to health.

Yet a study of homeopathic literature reveals the fact that homeopaths have cured with their innocent-looking little pillules thousands of supposedly hopeless cases when viewed from the standpoint of orthodox medical knowledge. Should this statement be doubted, let the reader but study *Miracles of Healing* by Ellis Barker to convince himself of the truth. Meanwhile it will suffice for our present purpose if I mention but one case described in the issue of *Heal Thyself* for July 1937.

A married woman, Mrs. F—, residing near London, had suffered from many health troubles. Orthodox physicians had been called in, radiographs taken, and the stomach had twice been examined by means of a barium meal, and also the gall bladder after the oral administration of stypolac. Nevertheless the woman went rapidly downhill, lost a great deal of weight, became terribly jaundiced, so that altogether her condition grew alarmingly serious. At last a London consultant was called in,

who came to the conclusion that she suffered either from cancer of the pancreas or the liver, for which an operation in her weak condition could only prove fatal, and hence that nothing could be done, and that she had, in short, but three months to live. For this discouraging opinion he charged fifty guineas and then departed.

So much for what orthodoxy could achieve. It remains now to be seen what homeopathy and diet, even though in the hands of a layman, were able to accomplish.

As the indirect result of his books, Mr. Ellis Barker's services were fervently requested by a despairing husband. He went to see Mrs. F——, found her in bed (with a nurse in attendance), totally emaciated, white of eyes deep yellow, tongue thickly coated, motions and urine extremely foul, and on her face that expression of desperation which is one of the worst of all diagnostic signs.

His first impression was that she suffered from cancer of the liver or gall bladder. Apart from the symptoms just enumerated she suffered from a surgical mutilation of the bowel. The caecum had been opened and the bowel stitched to the abdominal wall. Through the wound, which had purposely been kept open, the bowel had during a period of eight years been disinfected by means of a syringe—an incredible proceeding, as Ellis Barker remarks.

Although she had lived for years on a putrefactive and deficiency diet, which of course had produced chronic constipation, her doctor had not thought to alter the diet itself, but merely to give medicines of the carbolic acid group with the idea of disinfecting the intestinal tract. In other words, with typical scholastic myopia, instead of getting rid of the cause, he had merely sought to counteract its effects by unnatural means—and had failed.

The first wise thing that Ellis Barker did was to give the poor woman a ray of hope. Although he admitted that her case was an extremely difficult one, he encouraged her by telling her that she seemed to have a fundamentally strong constitution, and he expressed the opinion that within a week she would both look and feel vastly better. He forbade all flesh foods, condiments, coffee, and strong tea, and placed her on a natural diet rich in vitamins and mineral salts. An abundance of bran formed part of the régime; she was also told to drink copious draughts of Vichy Water to stimulate bowel activity and to wash out the poisons from her auto-intoxicated system. Further, to assist the action of the liver and gall-bladder he prescribed (in tablets) pig-bile; a remedy much resorted to by the ancient Greeks and Romans.

He then brought the homeopathic medicaments into play. Suspecting that she really had cancer of the liver, he prescribed *Cholesterin* (a homeopathic reagent for liver cancer), also *Hydrastis*, which acts on the liver, gall-bladder and bowels. This is also a general cancer specific if given in homeopathic form. As there was a suspicion of tuberculosis in her family he furthermore prescribed one weekly dose of *Tuberculinum* in a very high attenuation, and to clear her skin he prescribed infinitesimal doses of *sulphur*.

After one week's treatment there was, as Ellis Barker had predicted, a decided change for the better. The good lady's husband wrote that her colour had much improved, her appetite was good and her motions less offensive; there was, however, a considerable skin irritation—a symptom, by the way, which often accompanies serious liver trouble. To cure this irritation she was given *Podophyllum*, an excellent liver medicine.

The treatment proceeded and the patient steadily improved; nevertheless subsidiary symptoms appeared, from time to time, all of which were dealt with as they arose by the indicated remedies. She had one or two set-backs, largely due to her own carelessness and the injudicious over-taxing of her strength, but in spite of these she was so far restored to health that when Ellis Barker visited her seven weeks after the treatment first began, she was up and about and feeling so well that she wished to go on a cruise to South Africa. She eventually took a trip to the West Indies, and although, according to information received from her daughter, she refused to look after herself in any way, and abused her astonishing energy, she kept wonderfully well. In a word, from a complete human wreck who was only given three months to live, she became a perfectly normal woman, and her cure was effected by a man who had never taken a medical degree, had never 'been through the hospitals' but had, late in life, merely studied homeopathy (mostly from books) together with the rationale of nutrition, and had simply applied an unusual degree of common sense.

One criticism that has been made regarding homeopathy is that it is more efficacious in chronic complaints than in acute ones. But I think this much depends on the practitioner and not on homeopathy itself. My own opinion, since studying autotherapy, is that in acute diseases, homeopathic principles are in some cases best applied by autotherapeutical means, rather than by the homeopathic medicaments. For instance, in cases of pneumonia, Dr. Charles Henry Duncan (with whom I have been in correspondence) has not had a single failure—and that is saying a great deal. Indeed, in the end, autotherapy may prove to be 'a short cut', to obviate the

necessity of giving so many homeopathic remedies in succession in order to cure one patient.

Another point that may be mentioned and has been mentioned by certain bio-chemic exponents is that all homeopathic medicines without exception do not possess a homeopathic action; some of them obviously possess a bio-chemic action instead. That is to say that many of them cure by supplying a deficiency rather than by the principle of like curing like. For instance, as Mr. J. T. Heselton points out after fifty years' experience: several of the bio-chemic tissue salts may be indicated for, say a pain in the small of the back, but as *graphites* (a homeopathic remedy) contains a modicum of all these salts combined, even the first dose will often remove the pain.

Further research will probably bring many significant facts to light along these lines, and when the members of the various schools, instead of being at loggerheads, are selfless, modest, and noble enough to learn from one another and form a unity, then at long last we may look forward to the conquest of disease.

Chapter XIX

OSTEOPATHY—THE SCIENCE OF ADJUSTMENT

The science of osteopathy requires no substantiation from my humble pen, yet before we pass to those occult considerations with which I propose to deal in the second part of this book, a few words on this science of re-adjustment are not inapt.

It is significant that only a short time ago all osteopaths were regarded as quacks by the orthodox fraternity, and are even now so regarded by the ultra-bigoted. Yet how little justification there is for such an attitude may be proved by the fact that to become a genuine osteopathic doctor requires a long course of training and much arduous work.

The name osteopathy was first invented by Dr. A. T. Still of Kansas, U.S.A. Dr. Still discovered and maintained that 'when all parts of the human body are in line, we have perfect health. When they are not, the effect is disease. When the parts are readjusted, disease gives place to health.' And that this contention is in large part true has been proved by the thousands of sufferers who have been cured of a great variety of ailments by osteopathy and by that alone. Yet in spite of the weight of evidence in its favour we find one doctor, H. W. Haggard, M.D., as recently as eight years ago, dismissing this whole therapeutical system as a species of faith cure, and telling the public that it is not based on true scientific principles but on a false theory of disease. 'According to this theory,' he writes, 'all disease is due to partial dislocation of the spine; the misplaced vertebrae press upon

the nerves emerging from the spine, and disease results from this obstruction to the flow of life forces through the nerves. To cure disease it is therefore only necessary to manipulate the spine, twist the neck, and pull the head. The whole procedure is merely the "laying on of hands", but a laying on with impressive force.¹ In these words did Dr. Haggard some eight years ago voice the sneering attitude of the orthodox medical profession towards osteopathy. Previous to that the *British Medical Journal* had commented: 'It appears to observers at a distance that osteopathy and chiropractic are little more than terminological adaptations of bone setting, with the site of the operation cleverly transferred from the knee or ankle, where results, if any, can at least be seen, to the backbone, where they cannot.'

Many more adverse opinions, all showing a most inadequate knowledge of the true principles of osteopathy and all calculated to discredit it, could be quoted from various sources, but the foregoing are sufficient to show that it has thrived in spite of envy, hatred, and all uncharitableness. And the reason is obvious; the layman has taken the matter into his own hands and has refused to be dictated to by the voice of orthodoxy. The sick layman first and foremost desires to be cured, and if an osteopath can cure him, to an osteopath he goes in spite of any belittling views the general practitioner may express. And belittling they are; the present policy on the part of some of the more orthodox doctors being to ascribe osteopathic cures to trivial or irrelevant reasons and to make out that no special technique is required to effect such cures. One physician friend of mine glibly informed me that any doctor can be an osteopath, and

¹ See *Devils, Drugs, and Doctors*, by H. W. Haggard, M.D.

that all doctors who perform manipulative surgery are to all intents and purposes osteopathic practitioners—but of course superior ones because they possess a knowledge of medicine as well as of anatomy! Yet although such talk may delude the unwary, in point of fact, medical knowledge by no means gives either osteopathic knowledge or skill, and the ordinary medical practitioner who thinks to practice osteopathy merely because he is an M.D. is just as much a quack from the osteopath's standpoint as, say, an unqualified herbalist to the fully qualified doctor. How little even the specialist knows of the true technique of osteopathy we showed in a previous chapter when referring to the little girl who was doomed to have her leg amputated and was only saved by osteopathic intervention. And that is only one case out of hundreds where osteopaths have saved patients from disastrous operations. Moreover, if, as my doctor friend implied, many physicians nowadays resort to manipulative surgery, why did none of the doctors and specialists consulted resort to it in that case? They did not even recognize it as a possibility; which goes to prove that the osteopathic knowledge of which some of them boast must be of a very rudimentary nature.

This lack of knowledge also may be seen in relation to certain female complaints. Take, for instance, the case of prolapsus or displacement of the uterus. The lives of several of my personal friends have been utterly ruined by operations supposed to cure this condition. Yet there is an osteopath in London (and I know him intimately and can prove my assertions) who cures uterine prolapsus and displacements solely through manipulation. The surgical procedure (though fortunately wiser physicians are already beginning to see its danger) is to stitch the womb

to the surrounding tissues. What happens then in many cases? The second evil proves worse than the first. As prolapsus of the womb is due to the tonelessness of the surrounding tissues themselves, to attach an organ to an utterly insecure hold is both unsafe and illogical. The only scientific method is to restore the tone and consequently the holding capacity of the surrounding tissues; then once the uterus has been put into place it will remain in place of its own accord. Both these processes can be done by osteopathic manipulation, just as 'Lane's bowel kinks' can be similarly treated.¹

There is another point in favour of osteopathy. In a large number of cases, the osteopath makes the necessary adjustments gradually, which is more scientific because less shock to the system. Thus, where the manipulative surgeon may need to give an anaesthetic, the osteopath avoids that necessity because he employs these more gradual and more gentle methods. Writes Ray. M. Russell, D.O.: 'By passive manipulation towards the normal and by normalizing muscle tension and restoring muscle tone, joint articulation and bony corrections can be made without pain to the patient. It is only when a poor mechanic or an untrained one does not prepare the joint for correction beforehand that pain is felt.'²

There are certain misconceptions in regard to osteopathy which it is my object in this brief chapter to dispel. Some people have said to me that osteopathic cures are not permanent, and that once one goes to an osteopath one must be continually going to him to 'get something put back in its place'. Now although this in a sense is

¹ The bio-chemist treats prolapsus with the indicated tissue-salts alone, though the two methods combined produce speedier results.

² 'Osteopathy—The New Art of Healing.' Article in *Heal Thyself*, May 1937.

true, yet at the same time it is an unjust criticism. For we have to remember that however scientific osteopathy may be, it deals largely with effects and not with prime causes. After all, osteopathy is neither massage nor exercise, and if the osteopath adjusts something which was out of place, how can it 'stay put' unless the patient himself subsequently takes steps to improve the whole muscular tone of his body? This he can do only by exercise and the avoidance of a deficiency diet—in a word, he must build up his entire muscular system. A vast number of people who visit osteopaths are in a flabby condition throughout, but although the osteopath improves that condition, and makes the necessary readjustments, the effect cannot be lasting without the co-operation of the patient. It can, in fact, only be lasting without such co-operation when a misplacement was due, not to muscular flabbiness, but to some sudden or violent movement or unusual stress or strain. In cases of this nature, the osteopath's cures are lasting because he is concerned with a temporary cause and not merely with an effect. And this is just where those who adversely criticize osteopathy require to be put wise; they need to differentiate between what is due to an accident, so to say, and what is due to continuous faulty living. The latter may be indirectly responsible for congestions, bony displacements, constrictions and thickenings of the ligaments, all of which need correction, yet after correction, in the course of time are liable to reappear unless prevented by the patient's own efforts. Those efforts may not only require to be directed towards more scientific nutrition and systematic exercising but also towards counteracting symptoms due to occupational habits. And here in addition to actual treatment the advice of a good osteopath can be of great

value in telling the patient exactly what movements are required as a continuous corrective to such habits.

The arrival of the osteopath in the field of therapeutics has proved an inestimable boon to women. Most menstrual troubles can be cured by osteopathy where all other systems have failed; and there need be no recurrence if the patient herself will subsequently alter her diet and do such exercises as may be prescribed. With regard to pregnancy, enough can hardly be said in favour of osteopathic treatment as a means of insuring safer parturition. This is all the more essential, seeing that there exists an absurd convention among some doctors that no expectant woman should be examined internally. As the result of this prudish piece of etiquette many lives are lost since a great number of women are permitted to give birth to a child when to do so is both disastrous to the mother and to the infant. Such disasters have been averted by osteopathic manipulations both internal and external. Indeed, it is not extravagant to say that the gynaecologist of the future will be the osteopath and not the surgeon.

Wise people go to the dentist every few months to have their teeth overhauled; they would do well also to go to an osteopath every few months to have their body overhauled. This is advisable because with the advent of the cheap motor-car fewer people take adequate exercise and hence are more liable to suffer from bony displacements due to general flabbiness of the muscles. But for such overhauling they should choose their osteopath with discretion, for many a man who calls himself by that name is not a qualified D.O. and merely trades on the ignorance of the public. This is one of the reasons why osteopathy has at times come into bad repute even among those who cannot be said to have any personal axe to grind. These

people have simply got into the hands of an osteopathic quack and have suffered disappointment or even definite harm, which naturally causes them to regard osteopathy in an unfavourable light. Their safeguard is to be found in the letters D.O. which all genuine osteopaths are entitled to use after their names. But even so, we must remember that just as with most sciences and arts there are varying grades of excellence, so must it also be with osteopathy and its practitioners. Moreover, even the most skilled practitioner cannot cure everything, though he may undoubtedly improve a large number of chronic and painful conditions. There are deformities, for instance, of such long standing that they cannot be entirely corrected. This being so, it is always wise to visit an osteopath early in life, a thing to my cost I was unable to do myself, as in my young days osteopathy was all but unknown. But much has changed within the last thirty years, and more and more that is of real value towards the healing of man has appeared in a war-shattered world. Thus, help for the sufferer is to hand, but it remains for him to choose it wisely and with knowledge.

.

I have finished the first part of my book; and if the reader should think I have been unjust to the orthodox profession, I would remind him that I have merely been collecting facts for his benefit, and that if some of them are unpleasant ones I regret that they should be so, but the fault is hardly my own.

And now we must turn to another type of facts which, even though they may be denied by many people, are necessary to a comprehension of truth, since they and they alone explain much that has seemed hitherto unexplainable.

PART II

He who would acquire true knowledge must be humble enough to seek for it where he may least wish to find it.

.

Ultimate truth can only be apprehended when several branches of learning are brought into alignment.

Chapter XX

MEDICAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE ANCIENTS

A large number of discoveries are merely re-discoveries, and this is particularly the case with medicine. Should the reader have any illusions on the subject, they are soon dispelled by a study of such books as deal with the medical wisdom of antiquity. This wisdom was superior to our own, for so far, we have failed to re-discover much which the ancients knew—or we ignore it, which amounts to the same thing. We are too fond of placing knowledge in watertight compartments lest it become tainted with superstitions; yet in what we are pleased to call superstition may be found the key to truth. Indeed, fear of superstition proves a barrier to many valuable re-discoveries. The ancients had no such fear, since for them superstition never existed in our modern sense of the word. Thus they were not blind to facts to which we moderns refuse to open our eyes; they were, so to say, universalists in contradiction to specialists. Because they believed in the soul and its immortality, they also believed in obsession by disembodied entities, and to them this accounted for certain manifestations of disease. But although some of our present-day doctors may also believe in the soul, they dismiss the possibility of obsession as a superstition in which it were foolish and undignified to put any credence. The same applies to astrology which, as we shall see and as we have briefly implied in an early chapter, holds the entire key to the cause of the varying manifestations of disease. In fine, truth can only be re-discovered when man searches for truth in fields where

he least expects and least wishes to find it. Moreover, much to his astonishment, it may even be forced upon him by his own methods of research, as we shall also see when we come to consider the nature of epilepsy and some forms of insanity.

Meanwhile a brief summary of what the ancients actually did know is relevant to our present purpose, for in realizing that they knew as much as we ourselves, we may come to realize that they knew even more than we ourselves, and so think it worth while to investigate their added knoweldge.

To begin with India: Indian medicine reached its height long prior to the Christian era. Of surgical instruments there were at least a hundred and twenty in variety, and even caesarean operations and skin-grafting were practised by the ancient Indian surgeons. The soporific effects of opium, hyoscyamus and cannabis indica were well known. Hypnotism was also employed in surgery. Most diseases were recognized by the Indian physicians, including diabetes which was called honey-urine. As for the association of mosquitoes with fever, this is no modern discovery, since the Hindoos were perfectly aware of the fact; they further knew that rats were responsible for bubonic plague,¹ and all small-pox might be prevented 'by inoculating lymph from the pustules of the zebu calf'.² Practitioners of the ancient science of Yoga possessed a knowledge of the human body far transcending that of our most up-to-date physicians, as witness the astonishing feats which Yogis even now can perform as the result of following that ancient science. Whereas the cleverest of modern doctors does not know

¹ See Garrison, *History of Military Medicine*.

² Dr. Sambon in *Journal of Tropical Medicine*.

the secret of preventing senile decay, a proficient Hatha Yogi has not even a grey hair at 150 years of age.¹ Such longevity is in part produced by perfect internal hygiene and by breath control. Of the latter Mr. E. F. W. Powell writes, that although he has worked until the small hours of the morning producing substances the effectiveness of which he has again and again conclusively proved, he has never found any compound that will accomplish one-hundredth part of the rejuvenating effects fresh air will produce when it has been consciously and rhythmically inbreathed.² And the reason for this becomes obvious to those who understand the nature of *prana*, which may be translated as life, cosmic energy, or vital force. This subtle *prana* is to be found in air, sunlight, and vital foods, and what modern scientists choose to call vitamins are nothing more than differentiations of this *prana* which the ancient Indian sages discovered long ago. Postures and physical exercises also have their place in the science of Yoga, and not one of the many postures of the Yogi is without its therapeutical significance.

Lack of space precludes of course any detailed elaboration of physiological Yoga. In any case it can only be learnt through direct contact with an initiate, and not from books. Nevertheless the rationale of some of the practices set down in the *Siva Samhita* and the *Gheranda Samhita* may dispel certain misconceptions which have arisen as the result, direct or indirect, of a foolish scepticism born of ignorance. Moreover, if the practices themselves cannot be undertaken, a knowledge of the general principles relevant to what we are setting out to prove may be expounded.

¹ See *Raja Yoga*, by Swami Vivekananda.

² *Health Secrets of All Ages*.

The first principle is internal cleanliness. The Yogi aims at a complete purification of the intestinal tract. This he accomplishes not only by means of frequent irrigations but also by swallowing air so as to oxygenize the entire contents of the bowel. And here, as regards the latter process, we see the necessity for the teacher. If most people swallow air (and some do unwittingly) as a bad habit, they merely cause distention of the stomach and flatulence. If the practice is done scientifically, however, and continued with the necessary procedure to force the air down into the intestinal tract, the exercise is of great benefit. There are many and varied exercises to induce increased bowel-cleanliness and activity, all of them calculated to avoid absorption of poisons from the colon.

But in this connexion we must not omit to mention the important role played by a proper diet. If we look at the list of foods advocated by the Yogic sages, we find they are those rich in vitamins and mineral salts, whereas those which are unnatural and tend to putrefy, such as meat, etc., are not permitted. Even condiments are disallowed because of their 'fiery and irritating properties'. All of which goes to show that the discoveries of Lane, Hay, and the naturopaths are nothing new, but facts known to the Yogic sages centuries ago.

Of some of the Yogic breathing exercises, much has been written in various books of late, and the value of deep breathing as a general practice need not be stressed here. All the same, people who attempt to learn the more complicated forms of *pranayama* from books may court disaster. They may not only injure the heart and lungs, but psychic disturbances of a distressing nature may accrue which are very difficult to set right.

With regard to the various postures which form an

important part in Yogic training a few words may be said, for here again we find many misconceptions. Not so long ago, for example, a prominent theosophist told me, in effect, that he considered these postures as useless and unsuited to our present-day type of bodies. But this remark showed a complete ignorance of their rationale. If a modern physician-initiate—and such was my own teacher—can still prescribe many of these postures to his *chelas*, it goes to show that they are still applicable to our present-day organisms. Take, for instance, the posture known as *Siddhasana*, described in the *Gheranda Samhita*. By dint of sitting in this posture, considerable pressure is exerted on certain nerves, with the result that an unusual degree of sex-control is obtained. Another posture has the effect of temporarily inhibiting the circulation in the legs and thus sending an extra amount of blood into the vital organs. A third posture has the effect of ‘flushing’ the brains and so inducing greater mental capacity. Moreover, each posture brings different sets of muscles into play, and thus the postures as a whole are a corrective to the sedentary life of the Yogi.

A further point should be mentioned. Some of the exercises and processes in physiological Yoga are by no means easy, and require much perseverance and fortitude on the part of the pupil. Thus, through his endeavours to learn them, he acquires an increase of will-power and so improves his general character. Through physical control he acquires mental control, for the two are closely associated.¹

Passing from India to Greece, we read: ‘The genius of

¹ Much of the foregoing is taken from an article by the author entitled ‘Yoga and Health’, which appeared in *The Modern Mystic*, February 1937. My thanks are due to the Editor for kind permission to reprint.

Hippocrates is unsurpassed in the history of medicine. He was the first (?) to trace disease to a natural and intelligible cause and to recognize Nature as all-sufficient for healing, and physicians as only her servants.¹ Dr. L. W. Sambon endorsed this view when he wrote: 'In sanitation, in preventive medicine the ancients were . . . our superiors.'² The Greeks were also acquainted with anaesthetics, and we read that a 'draught may be given to human beings before they undergo the pain of the surgeon's knife or cautery. . . . It is noteworthy', wrote Dr. Gould, 'that in the operation for cataract by the Greeks, a mydriatic (causing dilatation of the pupil) was used, and local anaesthesia, as well as general narcosis, was induced.'³

As regards cancer, it was well known to the ancients; the Egyptians treated it with an ointment, the principal ingredients being arsenic and vinegar. Later on, Galen declared that cancer was a constitutional disease and claimed to have cured it with diet and purgatives. For consumption, which he regarded as contagious, he recommended a diet of goat's milk. Celsus did likewise but advocated a sea voyage in addition. Further we find that even the existence of germs is by no means a modern discovery, seeing that Varro wrote: 'Certain living creatures which the eye cannot detect pass by the air through the mouth and nose into the body, and set up grievous diseases.'⁴ Finally we may mention that massage was much practised by the ancients, among many other things as a means of inducing perspiration.⁵

¹ Elliott, *Outlines of Greek and Roman Medicine*.

² *Tropical and Sub-Tropical Diseases*.

³ From an article in the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 1903.

⁴ See Sir T. Clifford Allbutt, *Greek Medicine in Rome*.

⁵ *ibid.*

It will be patent from the foregoing that in the way of new discoveries the modern medical profession has little of which to boast, for as we pointed out, all its discoveries are nothing but re-discoveries. Moreover, many of its fads and fashions existed among the ancients. For instance, with regard to specialists, we read of the Egyptians that 'their extreme specialism of "a doctor for every disease," or at least for each part or region of the body, could only result in haphazard therapy'.¹ Thus it is obvious that not only was medicine in most ages tainted with unscientific follies contravening logic and the laws of Nature, but that, history repeating itself, our orthodox moderns have re-discovered some of the medical vices of the ancients and turned them to bad account. This is in direct opposition to the wisdom of Hippocrates who asseverated the for-all-time scientific fact which the specialists ignore, namely, that 'all organs co-operate in their functions, being united to form an harmonious whole. Every disturbance therefore affects the entire system.'² Moreover, Hippocrates also declared that strength, growth, and nourishment result from right food, and that every physician should be a skilled student of Nature. 'If he wishes to perform his duties properly he should strive to know the relation which exists between the health of men and the articles of food and drink which they consume, as also the effect of the various occupations and pursuits upon the physique.'³ Yet although this anciently expounded advice is followed by our modern naturopaths and by some enlightened physicians, it is ignored by those others who refuse to accept the Hippocratic axiom that Nature is the curer of disease. Consequently

¹ Garrison, *Notes on the History of Military Medicine*.

² Professor M. Neuburger, *History of Medicine*.

³ Hippocrates, *Ancient Medicine*.

they turn from facts to fancies and present us with 'scientific' superstitions more impotent to cure the sick than some of the ancient superstitions on which they pour their derision.¹ Granted, as we briefly pointed out in a previous chapter, that certain superstitions in the worst sense of the word were exploited by ignorant doctors in past ages just as those of pseudo-scientific nature are exploited nowadays, yet there are two kinds of superstitions, those that are based on facts and those that are based on imagination. It is with the former class we will now deal.

¹ For instance, at one time they laughed at the idea of powdered toads being given as a medicine. Yet in the toad there are two large oval glands which yield adrenine and bufagin, the latter being used to increase the tonicity of the heart.

Chapter XXI

ASTROLOGY IN RELATION TO DISEASE

Ultimate truths can only be apprehended when several branches of learning are brought into alignment.

At the beginning of this book I put forward a statement relative to the prime physical cause of disease, and I have throughout its pages endeavoured to substantiate that statement by facts and observations collected from a number of authorities. I defined the prime cause of disease as a duality, i.e. that although disease itself may manifest in various forms, there is in truth but one disease, having as its dual cause self-poisoning and deficiency. Why then does it manifest in so many different forms, say as rheumatism in one individual, as diabetes in another, as consumption in a third, as cancer in a fourth, and so on? And it is just to answer this puzzling question that we require to turn to another branch of learning altogether: to one which the modern orthodox fraternity regards as a superstition, but which the ancients considered of the most vital importance. *In order to understand the various manifestations of disease, we must turn to the study of astrology.*

And let us not be deterred by the fact that astrology has of late come before the public in a manner calculated to detract from its dignity as a science. After all, music, for example, does not cease to be a fine art in itself merely because it has been cheapened by over-repetition or because there is such a thing as low-class music in contra-distinction to that which is termed high-class. Just as music, like clairvoyance, may be employed 'for amusement only',

so may astrology, although the fact is a regrettable one, since it debases this exalted science in the eyes of those to whom it could prove useful.

It is no over-statement of the case to maintain that the type of body of each individual is governed by the position of the planets at the moment of birth; the position of the planets also governs the types of diseases from which he is liable to suffer. As there are twelve signs of the Zodiac *there are twelve types of human beings*; and although these types are subject to modifications, this does not detract from our main contention, since these modifications themselves are due to stellar influences. The particular type of body is determined by what astrologers call the rising sign at birth; the positions of the sun and moon also play important parts in the physical and mental characteristics of the individual concerned. For instance, Virgo (the sixth sign of the Zodiac) if rising, 'gives a neat form of body, and good recuperative power' but it conduces 'to bowel disorders . . . and irregularities of the digestive system . . .'¹ To quote from another book: 'Virgo is one of the signs that confer great length of life, if the perils of early infancy be avoided.' The same author goes on to say that should there be no unpropitious aspects to menace the individual during middle life, a green old age is likely to be terminated by paralysis.²

I have, to begin with, selected the characteristics of Virgo, because they so accurately fit my own case, and there is no experience more convincing than personal experience. Born with Virgo rising and sun in Libra I nearly died in infancy, and was altogether a very delicate child. Moreover, all reputable writers on astrology

¹ Raphael's *Medical Astrology*.

² See *Astrology*, by E. Adams. (G. G. Harrap & Co.)

maintain that Virgo natives always suffer from nervous and digestive troubles but frequently overcome them, as they take an especial interest in matters of health and particularly in diet. And this is borne out to the letter in relation to myself. Indeed, it has been a matter of surprise to many people that a musician should be so especially interested in therapeutics, but were they acquainted with the rudiments of astrology, they would know the reason.

It is instructive to note in many cases what a negligible part heredity plays in the forming of types. Both my father and mother were of entirely different types from myself. My father was a typical Leo native, broad-shouldered and exceedingly robust in all respects. As Leo governs the heart and back he was subject to occasional attacks of lumbago and eventually died of heart disease.

Let us now turn to another sign of the Zodiac, Cancer. Cancerians are of two types, active or passive according to the indications of their horoscope. With the active type the complexion is rubicund, the body somewhat large and badly proportioned, and the physical strength generally great, but there is a decided liability to such diseases as come from self-indulgence. With the passive type, on the other hand, the complexion is pale, and sometimes the face has a bloated appearance, especially in middle life when the whole body is apt to become stout and ungainly. Although Cancerians, when under good aspects, may live long, when under bad aspects they are likely to suffer from diabetes, asthma, bronchitis, gastric troubles, and malignant growths. It is characteristic of those born with Cancer rising that they frequently prefer the very foods which for them are the most harmful.

This is the more unfortunate, as their digestive system is apt to be sluggish and so toxemia with all its attendant evils is more than likely to develop.

As I am not writing a book on astrology, medical or general, it stands to reason that we cannot consider all the twelve types corresponding to the signs of the Zodiac. Suffice it, therefore, if I mention but one other, Taurus, with its constitutional characteristics. Taureans are sturdy in build and liable to become stout in middle life unless a good deal of exercise is taken. As Taurus governs the throat, there is a strong tendency to suffer from such complaints as laryngitis, diphtheria, quinsy, mumps, and diseased tonsils. The excretory system may by reflex action also be affected, giving rise to fistulas and haemorrhoids. As Taurus furthermore sympathetically governs the circulatory system, many Taureans, given certain planetary aspects are apt to die of apoplexy as the result of full-bloodedness consequent upon injudicious feeding and the retention of poisons.

It will thus be inferred that every sign of the Zodiac governs one or more parts of the body, either directly or by reflex. For instance, Sagittarius, the ninth sign, governs the hips and thighs, with the result that Sagittarians may suffer from sciatica and hip disease, while Pisces, the twelfth sign, since it governs the feet, may give rise to gout in the toes or other afflictions of the extremities. A noteworthy fact is that people with this sign rising are particularly liable to catch colds as the result of wet feet, whereas others may get their feet wet without any appreciable harm resulting. I may add that proficient astrologers have as a rule merely to look quite casually at a person's face and figure in order to determine the sign under which he or she is born. If this is not invariably the case, it is

because of certain factors in the horoscope as a whole which cause modifications or blending of types and so make the rising sign more difficult to gauge. But these are, of course, technicalities with which I am quite incompetent to deal. Nor is it necessary, seeing that my sole object in cursorily dealing with astrological science in this book is to emphasize the highly important part it plays in the causation of disease. For however great a mystery to us may be the influence of the stars, in view of what numerous astrologers have written there should remain no doubt in the honest reader's mind that astrology gives the key to a very baffling problem. And yet, how many years may pass before the medical profession will accept that key is difficult to prophesy. So far the profession *en masse* has by no means accepted the dual cause of disease as an irrefutable doctrine; therefore the problem of its so diverse manifestations may not even have occurred to the medical mind.¹ How is it, for example, that Mrs. A., whose life and diet are much like those of Mrs. B., should develop a sarcoma in her breast, whereas Mrs. B. merely suffers from gout in her foot? Questions of this nature many a doctor is content to silence with the convenient observation that people are differently constituted, and that some persons are mysteriously immune from diseases that attack others. Whence this immunity is left an undecided question. Yet astrology answers it to the full. It shows why people born under certain signs are immune from many diseases which may attack people born under

¹ There are exceptions, of course. Dr. Hay, for instance, attributes its diverse manifestations to heredity. Thus, as we may inherit our facial, physical, and mental characteristics from our parents, so may we inherit certain weak organs which will determine the form of disease from which we are likely to suffer. But although there may be some truth in this, it is at best a half-truth, and even then is frequently inapplicable.

other signs. This has been implied, if not emphasized, in all we have considered relative to astrology and disease.

But a knowledge of astrology, if judiciously applied, has not merely a theoretical value; it has also a very practical one. In former times this was so fully recognized, that Culpeper of herbalistic fame went so far as to say that 'to administer physic without a knowledge of astrology is as foolish as trying to light a lamp that is without oil'. And although we must regard this as an over-statement, yet there is no doubt as to the interconnection between the stellar influences and the treatment of disease. This fact will, of course, be challenged by those upon whose credulity it makes too great a demand. For although they are doubtless ready to admit the influence of the moon on the tides, they will argue that to ascribe influences from stellar bodies billions of miles away, and influences, moreover, that diversely affect individuals, is surely to stretch imagination to breaking-point. Let them, however, realize that the Cosmos is a unity and that space and time, as we know them, are illusory, and the mystery, if still mysterious, becomes at any rate logical. Are we not apt to forget that some of the most commonplace facts are still mysteries; that although we may place a seed in the ground, we only know that it becomes a plant but cannot say why? As for the influence of the stars on human affairs, many people are unable to believe it simply because, as yet, it has not become a commonplace mystery, though to the ancients it was so. With the growth of materialism, astrology receded into the background, but it is once again coming to the fore in the hands of bio-chemic practitioners and others. After all, 'Astrology only differs from what may be called the "common sense" view in teaching that the link between man and the solar system

is much more intimate and subtle than the ordinary scientist suspects.¹

Bearing in mind, then, the unity of the Cosmos, we should find no great difficulty in accepting a relation between the twelve most important mineral salts of the body and the twelve signs of the Zodiac. It is true that as astrology is a very ancient science, and bio-chemistry, as we know it, a new one, there is still much to be discovered, and certain conclusions already arrived at may have to be altered, amplified, or modified with the progress of knowledge. But the logic of allocating, at any rate, certain of the tissue salts to one or other of the types becomes apparent if we take as an example Aries, the first sign of the Zodiac, and its corresponding mineral salt, phosphate of potassium. Now Aries rules the head (and face), and in Dr. G. W. Carey's book, *The Bio-chemic System of Medicine*, we read: "The grey matter of the brain is controlled entirely by the inorganic cell-salt, potassium phosphate. This salt unites with albumen, and by the addition of oxygen, creates nerve-fluids, or the grey matter of the brain. Of course there is a trace of other salts and other organic matter in nerve tissue, but phosphate of potassium is the chief factor and has the power within itself to attract, by its own law of affinity, all things needed to manufacture this vital tissue." And now if we consider what astrologers have written relative to people born under Aries, the foregoing becomes doubly significant. They maintain that the grave dangers with which most Aries natives have to contend are nerve and brain troubles, for they are apt to use their brains to the utmost capacity and so exhaust the nerve force. Aries people are also subject to neuralgia and severe headaches, and if the

¹ C. E. O. Carter, *Do the Stars Compel?*

horoscope is an unfortunate one, there is even a liability to brain-fever and apoplexy. In view of these facts the necessity for replenishing the brain with phosphate of potash in assimilable dosage is obvious to those who are prepared to accept the doctrines of the bio-chemists.

We may now take as another example, Capricorn, the tenth sign of the Zodiac, and the chief malady from which those born under this sign are liable to suffer. In view of the fact that Capricorn rules the bones and sinews together with that principle in the muscles which serves to harden them, the danger of rheumatism in the muscles and joints is to be expected unless the horoscope is particularly fortunate. And now we find that phosphate of calcium is the mineral salt allocated to Capricorn. This is highly significant, considering the part lime plays in the formation of bone. Writes Dr. G. W. Carey, 'Bone is fifty-seven per cent phosphate of lime: the remainder gelatine, an albuminous, gluey substance. . . . It is well known to bio-chemists that a proper balance of sodium phosphate is required to prevent an acid condition from prevailing, and under certain conditions, when calcium phosphate for any reason is not present in proper quantity the affinities draw upon sodium phosphate in an endeavour to supply the lack, and thus a deficiency in the alkaline salts ensues which allows an acid condition to prevail, i.e. rheumatism.'¹

When dealing with the cause of cancer I already mentioned calcium fluoride in connection with morbid growths, and it is instructive to note that this particular cell-salt is allocated to Cancer, the fourth sign of the Zodiac. Of this salt Dr. Carey wrote: 'Wherever elastic fibre is formed, be it in the epidermis, the connective tissue, or the walls of

¹ See *The Bio-chemic System of Medicine*.

the blood vessels, there calcium fluoride may always be found. A loss of its power to unite with inorganic matter causes a continued dilatation or relaxed condition of the fibres . . . ' which further causes 'an inability to absorb exudations. Indurated glands, lumpy exudations on the surface of the bone, encysted tumours, hard swellings, etc.', are the result. 'By supplying the lacking calcium fluoride (in assimilable form) the elastic fibres are again restored to their integrity, and functionate properly.'¹ Bio-chemists, however, also treat cancer and morbid growths with potassium combined with other of the salts according to its nature. Which particular supplementary salts are indicated may be found from a study of the patient's horoscope—or better said, the horoscope would prove an aid to their correct indication.

As this chapter is written neither for astrologers nor bio-chemists but solely to try to prove to lay readers the relation between astrology, bio-chemistry and disease, we will not go further in this matter of the twelve signs of the Zodiac and the twelve corresponding salts. What is of far more importance here is to emphasize the value of astrology as a means of indicating which treatment in given cases to adopt and which to avoid. But for this purpose, of course, the entire horoscope must be taken into account. For instance, if certain signs in a particular horoscope are afflicted, then the native would be especially ill-advised to undergo an operation, since it might prove fatal or at best useless and harmful. Again, other signs go to show that drugs are both useless and harmful but that cures might well be effected through electricity or osteopathy or both. Some people, in accordance with the respective indications in their horoscopes, may best respond to hydropathy or

¹ *ibid.*

an abundance of fresh air. Indeed, there are some types which require fresh air more than do any others, as there is always a certain danger of consumption. Equally there are types for which a faulty diet would have more serious consequences than for those born under different signs; therefore a rigorous diet should always be prescribed as the most important part of treatment. As for people born under signs which render them liable to obsession, some form of spiritual treatment is especially indicated. Another noteworthy fact regarding health and astrology is the effect of the stars on the endocrine glands or what have significantly been termed the 'glands of personality'. Thus we read: 'The importance of the endocrine glands in the diagnosis and treatment of disease is becoming more and more recognized. Astrology is an invaluable aid in this work, for each ductless gland responds to the influence of one or more of the planets, and a close scrutiny of the birth chart and major progressed aspects will reveal to the competent astrologer just what glandular unbalance is present, or can be expected to develop as a result of the aspects.'¹

Before concluding this chapter I will mention a case which proves how great can be the practical value of astrology in certain circumstances.

A young lady, pronounced to be insane, was about to be placed under restraint in a lunatic asylum had not an amateur astrologer, who was a friend of the family, intervened. As the result of casting her horoscope and looking into her progressed aspects, he saw that her condition was but a temporary one and that she would be normal again in a few months' time. This being his conviction, he

¹ 'The Endocrine Glands in Astrology', by Mrs. Crawford Alexander, *American Journal of Astrology*, Autumn 1936.

contrived to persuade her mother to have her privately looked after in the interim, instead of sending her to a public institute. His prognostications turned out perfectly correct, and the girl's mother had every reason to be glad that she had taken his advice.

Let us hope that the day is not far hence when the study of astrology will no longer be divorced from the study of medicine. Meanwhile those who desire to keep their health or to restore it if broken, will do well to have their horoscopes cast by a competent astrologer.

NOTE.—My thanks are due to the astrologer, Mr. David Anrias, author of *Man and the Zodiac*, etc., for kindly assisting me to compile this chapter.

Chapter XXII

OBSESSION A FREQUENT CAUSE OF INSANITY AND EPILEPSY

‘Certain data, urgently needed, can be procured with the help of short-lived animals. For this purpose, mice and rats have been chiefly used. . . . Unfortunately rats and mice have only very remote analogies with man. It is dangerous, for example, to apply to children, whose constitution is so different, conclusions of researches made on these animals.’ This citation from that remarkable book *Man the Unknown* to which we have already drawn attention and from which we have already quoted, shows its author¹ to be a scientist of keen observation in a vast field of research, especially if we consider the number of subjects with which he deals. Yet although his insight prompts him to see through the prevalent superstition that vermin and their reactions constitute an analogy to those of human beings, on another page of his book we read, ‘No one has ever observed a soul without a body, or a body without a soul.’ And I would emphasize this assertion to show how unscientific even a great scientist can be when alluding to a subject with which he is obviously unfamiliar. Nor can there be any doubt as to his attitude, seeing that elsewhere he says: ‘Neither the soul nor the body can be investigated separately. We observe merely a complex being, whose activities have been arbitrarily divided into physiological and mental.’

Nevertheless, facts known to hundreds of occultists and spiritualists all over the world entirely disprove these

¹ Dr. Alexis Carrel.

negative statements which are but an echo of nineteenth-century agnosticism—a long since exploded phase of material science in the opinion of all honest investigators. But of course the modern scientific assumption is that the beliefs of occultists and spiritualists are purely superstitious relics of the past, when people were credulous enough to believe in souls independent of bodies and when even great philosophers—Plato for one—could not extricate their minds from such figments of the imagination. And strange to say, even the opponents of this assumption are apt to temper their beliefs with scepticism; for do we not find devout Christians who are prepared to believe in the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth (and even that he was the Son of God) while at the same time they disbelieve his pronouncements as to the nature of certain diseases which (in biblical language) were due to possession by ‘evil spirits’? It is true that some churchmen may get out of the difficulty by saying that 2,000 years ago such a thing was possible but to-day it is possible no longer, yet not only do certain types of clairvoyance prove this assumption to be untrue, but non-clairvoyant observers by means of the Kilner screens, have also proved its untruth. Otherwise stated, cases of obsession may be observed by investigators with no appreciable clairvoyant faculties, so that any play of the imagination is entirely ruled out and consequently their findings can be reduced to a scientific fact. In fine, Jesus and the so-called superstitious beliefs of the ancients were right and the prevailing medical beliefs or rather, disbeliefs, of our moderns are wrong.

This statement is partly founded on observations made by a doctor who at one time was on the staff of the lunatic asylum at Frankfort-on-Main. He told me that with the aid of the Kilner screens he could actually see the

disembodied entities obsessing their victims and producing attacks of violence. He could also see those entities withdrawing at the end of the attacks, when as a result, the patients were left in a state of complete exhaustion. This is not to say that all forms of lunacy are without exception due to obsession, but that obsession is in a large number of cases the cause of lunacy. True, it may be but a secondary cause, since Kuhne was able to cure even insanity by his naturopathic methods, his contention being that it was due to an encumbrance of foreign matter which affected the brain either directly or indirectly; this does not, however, preclude the possibility of obsession as the secondary cause, in that certain pathological conditions render the body an easier prey for obsessing entities.

But the question naturally arises, what are these obsessing entities which in the biblical narrative are referred to as evil spirits? The answer is known to all occultists, who are of course familiar with what in occult literature have been termed 'elementals'. . . . And here the lay reader who has not studied occultism is up against difficulties which I fear cannot be dispelled by a few explanatory sentences. To give even a brief survey—if such brevity were at all possible—of occult science would only serve to create confusion in the lay mind. Therefore I can but refer such lay readers as may be interested to my book *An Outline of Modern Occultism*,¹ where they will find reference to the manifold forms of disembodied entities. Suffice it here to say that elementals are a species of parasite composed of matter too subtle to be perceived by the normal eye, but none the less perceptible to clairvoyant sight. That they may also, with practice, become

¹ Routledge.

perceptible by means of the Kilner screens has already been implied. Why such parasites exist at all, is not the point, though it may be learnt from a study of occultism; what concerns all those who are interested in the causation of mental diseases is simply the fact that such parasites do exist and play their part, not only in certain forms of lunacy, but also in epilepsy. Jesus, who was an Initiate and hence gifted with clairvoyant vision, was perfectly aware of this fact and thus was able to cure attacks of epilepsy by banishing the obsessing entity through an effort of will. The patient was consequently no longer under control of the parasite, and hence became normal. Thus epilepsy, and also mania, may be treated from two angles: one is to treat the body so as to strengthen the whole organism against obsession, and the other, as we have seen, is to banish the obsessing entity itself and, if possible, disintegrate it by spiritual means. It stands to reason, however, that the most scientific procedure would be to attack the disease from both angles. As it is, epilepsy is treated to-day by a method which only serves to aggravate it instead of curing it. Bromide, which is a powerful depressant, is prescribed in ever-increasing doses, and luminal, another of the barbiturate group of medicines, is added, so that the patient becomes a veritable repository for these dangerous drugs, which lower the vitality and so increase his or her liability to obsession. Indeed, I have read that since the employment of luminal the ratio of admission to institutions for epileptics has steadily risen; a fact which is no matter for surprise, since the effects of bromide and luminal are accumulative. Yet as against orthodox treatment, both the homeopathic and bio-chemic practitioners have a large number of cures to their credit. So also have the naturopaths. Already last

century, Louis Kuhne stated that epileptic fits are 'but the conclusion of a series of preceding diseases which have been suppressed, or are the result of inherited disorders too often to be traced to the youthful folly of the father'. In the latter case, the suppression by drugs of sexual diseases results in an accumulation of morbid matter which is then transferred to the body of the child and thus provides the foundation for epilepsy.¹ Skin specialists are also frequently responsible for the development of this distressing complaint, seeing that it often occurs after the suppression of eruptions.² Constipation and worms are well-known suspects in cases of epilepsy, but although wise doctors advocate the exclusion of meat from the dietary of epileptics, natural food is deemed of secondary importance by the general run of practitioners. In any event the most important factor which goes to explain the disease is as yet unknown to the orthodox medical man—and that is *obsession*.

¹ See L. Kuhne, *The New Science of Healing*.

² See G. W. Carey, M.D., *The Bio-chemic System of Medicine*.

Chapter XXIII

VARIOUS FORMS OF OBSESSION

There used to be an axiom which ran, 'All swans are white': this was supposed to be an undeniable truth. Then Australia was discovered and also black swans, so that what was once an apparent truth was proved to be an error. People who ascribe to Dr. Carrel's already quoted axiomatic assertion that 'no one has ever observed a soul without a body or a body without a soul' are much in the same position as those who at one time believed that all swans were white. The consequences of their erroneous belief, however, were negligible; the consequences of Dr. Carrel's belief, on the other hand, are obstructive to true scientific knowledge. Unless we are prepared to accept the vast accumulations of evidence regarding personal survival, many problems that might easily be solved remain mysteries, or at best are explained by pseudo-scientific jargon which is supposed to be an explanation but merely makes an excessive demand upon our credulity. Doctors, for instance, have advanced wonderful theories couched in very long words to account for cases of dual personality. Although their theories may in some cases be true, they are far more difficult to believe than the simple and logical phenomenon of intermittent obsession familiar to all clairvoyants. Indeed, the latter, who are able to see the obsessing entities, can only smile at all these learned polysyllabic outpourings to explain so simple and perceptible a fact. To such clairvoyants the learned doctors who thus discourse are like congenital *aveugles*, who never having seen themselves, would foolishly seek to explain vision in

others by some fantastic theory which might satisfy their own minds but could only evoke silent amusement in the normally sighted. Even orthodox religious people are as blind as the material scientists, for although they believe in a soul which survives the dissolution of the body, they are very hazy as to its nature and exact functions. If they do not think it wrong to hold certain spiritualistic views, they may presume that the soul is the disembodied entity which appears at a seance or controls the medium. Occultists, however, are aware that it is only one of the 'subtler vehicles, or sheaths' of the soul which thus appears; usually, in fact, it is the so-termed *astral body* which spiritualists loosely designate 'a spirit' and which is animated by a soul but is not the soul itself. In biblical phraseology we find the designation even less specific, seeing that a variety of disembodied entities were included under the word 'spirit', the implication being, however, that there were good spirits and evil spirits. Under the latter we find those 'elemental parasites' (referred to in our last chapter) as the occult cause of epileptic fits and attacks of violent mania due to obsession. In this chapter we propose to deal with obsessions of a different form which throw a considerable light on certain pathological phenomena.

In the first place it must not be supposed that no reputable doctor or alienist has ever recognized the possibility of obsession as explaining certain forms of lunacy. I would even go so far as to say that many doctors might openly endorse the idea were they not afraid to put forward so 'unscientific' a theory. Be that as it may as regards English doctors who come from a notably conservative race, it has been otherwise with those born in the New World, for I can mention at least two American

doctors who have openly stated their views as to the connexion between the existence of disembodied entities and insanity. Already some years ago Dr. Hyslop, an eminent American alienist, confessed that much against his (shall we say?) scientific inclinations, he was at length obliged to admit that many cases of lunacy were due to spirits taking possession of the human organism. Another American doctor, Carl Wickland, was not only convinced of this fact after devoting some forty years of his life to a study of the subject, but he also evolved a method by which a number of cases were cured. Briefly stated, he would talk to the obsessing entity and induce it to vacate the body of the patient. These entities have sometimes given their full names and the addresses where they lived while on earth.

Capt. F. McDermott writing in a London monthly journal relates that: 'One patient Dr. Wickland was called upon to treat was a refined girl of twenty-two who had developed mania which caused her to swear atrociously, exhibit bad table manners, and refuse to be bathed. It took four women to bath her by force. When the doctor got into touch with the obsessing entity, it turned out to be a man who had not realized he was dead and had been attracted to the girl as a little child. Then, suddenly, he had found himself in her body without wishing to be there, yet without being able to get away again.' Part of Dr. Wickland's technique in banishing obsessions consists in the use of electricity. By means of an electric shock he precipitates the obsessing entity out of the body of the patient. It should be added that he is much aided in his work by his wife, who is highly mediumistic, and whose faculties permit of investigations and results that could not otherwise be possible. Indeed, if all alienists

would only condescend to work in conjunction with a clairvoyant, much would be revealed which now remains obscure.

There are, of course, many forms and degrees of obsession, some permanent, some intermittent, some dangerous as every one knows, others so harmless that they do not come under the heading of insanity at all. In that well-known work of fiction, *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, we see an instance of dual personality or intermittent obsession in one of its most pronounced and most objectionable forms. Here was the case of a perfectly normal man who at times became transformed into a criminal, owing to a controlling force for which he could not account. Sexual perverts with homicidal proclivities belong to the same category, and the murderer of Düsseldorf was obviously such a case of obsession. This man would suddenly find himself impelled to go forth and commit murder, by means of which act he produced the most intense sexual excitement and gratification. Such murderers are the most difficult to detect, since there seems to be no motive for the crime, and because they have no previous criminal history from which to work.

Apart from cases of dual personality in which the subject is obsessed by one particular entity only, there are cases of multiple personality in which several entities control the subject in alternation. This phenomenon is of course very baffling to materialist doctors who refuse to recognize the claims of spiritualists or occultists. Yet, as Capt. McDermott aptly remarks, 'Facts are hard nuts to crack. And where lasting cures are brought about by doctors using spiritualistic methods, in cases which have been pronounced as hopeless by more conservative medical

men, it is surely time for the whole subject to be reviewed in a fair and open-minded manner.¹

We will now consider some cases of obsession which are harmless in their nature, but which occur far more frequently than the uninitiated are aware. These cases came to my notice as the result of my friendship with a very remarkable clairvoyante, since deceased.¹ This remarkable woman, who was in no sense a professional clairvoyante, could see disembodied entities as naturally as most people can see ordinary material objects. One evening as we were dining in a restaurant my attention was attracted by a middle-aged masculine-looking woman at the next table. Her face, by the way, reminded me somewhat of Dante. Commenting on this to my friend, she said, 'I've been noticing that woman myself; she is obsessed by an old gentleman whom I can see overshadowing her.' For some reason this old gentleman was earth-bound and took pleasure in contacting the earth-plane through the body of this strange and sombre-faced woman. The latter was evidently quite unaware of the entity she was harbouring in her aura. . . . Some people are intermittently obsessed by entities who believe they have some important idea or message to give to the world. Many fanatics with fiery-looking eyes and all the insignia of emotional unbalance are, all unbeknown to themselves, obsessed and controlled by deluded entities of a low type who suffer from a power complex or from self-importance. Their victims are to be found among religious fraternities, among Communists, Socialists, Fascists, and Nazis. Where a body of people are worked up by some leader or intense enthusiasm to a pitch of excitement, there is a certain danger of obsession with those who are by temperament

¹ See Note, end of chapter.

unbalanced. Another form of obsession may be brought about by *devas* (nature spirits) of not a very high order. Certain people with no special talent either for poetry or melodious utterance may suddenly develop an inordinate desire to express themselves in verse or deliver themselves of semi-religious sentiments couched in archaic and quasi-poetical language. Such people are to varying degrees obsessed or overshadowed by these *devas*, who control their minds and impress platitudinous moral or occult ideas upon them. The subjects themselves, who know little or nothing about the various types of nature spirits, frequently imagine that their ideas come from a very high source, even though their triviality bears witness to the contrary. Although such forms of obsession may provoke ridicule from more matter-of-fact and balanced friends, they are comparatively harmless. The same cannot always be said of obsessions which may sometimes occur during a long and debilitating illness. For instance, one occasionally hears the remark, 'So and so has never been the same after his illness; somehow he seems to be a different person.' This is supposed to be due to the after-effects of the illness itself, but it is by no means invariably the case. Sometimes it is because the original soul desired to finish its earthly career, and another ego, who wished to contact the earth-plane, has taken over the body. Changes of personality may also occur after an operation in which the patient was obliged to remain for a long time under an anaesthetic. I have, of course, no wish to alarm my readers, so must make it clearly understood that the following remarks are by no means to be taken as constituting a general rule. All the same, in the light of occultism, the administering of an anaesthetic is attended with certain psychic dangers to the patient. Because it

forces out the subtler bodies it may render him or her liable to obsession. It does not of necessity mean that the obsessing entity may take complete control of the body and oust its original owner altogether (though there are such cases), but it may enable that entity to obtain, so to say, a foothold, and hereafter obsess the patient at intervals or even more or less permanently if he or she is a negative type. The result may then be a double personality, an individual given over to strange moods; an individual charming and reasonable at certain times and quite the reverse for no apparent reason at others. In cases where there is a permanent obsession, then of course a wellnigh complete change of character is noticeable. This danger of obsession is another reason why operations should never be resorted to unless absolutely necessary. Nevertheless—and fortunately—people who are compelled to undergo an operation can protect themselves against obsession by resolving to do so before going under, or they can get a friend who possesses sufficient concentration of mind to hold the thought for them, or they can even engage the services of a Christian Science practitioner; the *modus operandi* is not difficult.

A reader who is unacquainted with the rudiments of occult science may here ask, What evidence is there that the 'spirit' or astral body temporarily vacates the physical organism while under an anaesthetic? And the answer is that clairvoyants who have watched an operation have invariably seen this occur. I can, in fact, put forward the testimony of a qualified physician—Dr. Riblet Brisbane Hout of U.S.A. Dr. Hout possesses psychic faculties which enable him to see what is imperceptible to normal sight. Describing what he actually saw while witnessing several operations, he relates of the different manner in

which each 'spirit' behaved while temporarily forced out of its physical envelope. In one case it at first merely hovered over the body in a state of coma, then floated away; in another case it wandered about the room examining the various surgical instruments and general surgical paraphernalia. Neither of these patients, however, remembered anything of their out-of-body experiences when they returned to physical consciousness. This strange fact may seem inconclusive to the lay mind. But we must not forget that it is the brain which remembers, and that unless the technique has been acquired whereby the astral body, while free of the physical, can impress the brain cells, no memory can result. On the other hand it is perfectly possible to will the astral body to perform certain actions either while out of its physical counterpart during sleep or during an anaesthetic. For example, my wife, on one occasion, made up her mind, prior to going under an anaesthetic, that she would in her astral body visit a psychic friend of whom she was very fond. Her friend, who lived in the country, afterwards told her that she had definitely but unexpectedly seen my wife in spirit form, and at the very time (as we took care to ascertain) that the operation was taking place. Such a simple experience as this—and there are numerous similar ones—should help to prove that there is in each one of us an entity which can function independently of the physical organism. However, to prove this more conclusively I may mention the case of a youth I once knew who had the power of consciously functioning out of his body and remembering every detail of his experiences; a fact, by the way, which in his case eventually brought about his downfall. Even while at school, instead of attending to his lessons this youth would float back home in his *astral*, and subsequently

tell his guardian, who lived in the country, all she had been doing in his physical absence. Later on when he procured a job in an office in London, he induced the spirit of an old gentleman, who presumably wished to contact the earth again, to take charge of his body and do his work for him, while he, again functioning in his *astral*, would return to the country and enjoy himself at home. The proof of this was not only that his guardian, who was very psychic, could see him hovering near, but that when he came down for week-ends (in his physical body) he was able to relate how she and the other inmates of the house had been passing the time. In the end, the old gentleman whom he had induced to obsess his body wearied of the experience and bungled his job, with the result that the young man himself was left to pay the penalty. This may read like a tall story, but as I knew the young man himself and I knew his guardian intimately and saw much of her at the time, I can vouch for its truth. Incidentally, we should remember that many Yogis have the power to leave their bodies and function on other planes of consciousness, so that the powers of this young man, if strange, were in no sense unique. The foregoing case, even though it resulted in the young man's downfall, is not without its humorous side. This cannot be said of a number of cases of a very different nature which happened during the war. Many married men returned from the front showing not only a distressing indifference to wives they had previously loved, but an actual repulsion for them. Indeed, some of them returned to their wives as if the latter were complete strangers and their children likewise. Many women gave utterance to the pathetic phrase, 'It isn't merely that my husband doesn't care for me any more, which is dreadful enough to bear, but he's

an entirely different person from what he used to be.' Without knowing it, those women spoke the truth. Many men who came back were, in point of fact, entirely different persons; they had been shell-shocked out of the body and another ego had taken possession. This tragic fact—far from being mere surmise—was revealed by clairvoyant investigation.

But apart from obsessions created by conditions only to be brought about by so wasteful and useless a catastrophe as a war, there are others which manifest in an unaccountable and violent hostility towards persons previously loved. This marked change of personality also shows itself in other ways. Old ladies of the most refined type suddenly take to using the most obscene language; devout spinsters suddenly become blasphemous. Psychoanalysts and alienists have put forward their learned explanations, but these relate to an effect only and not to the cause. Obsession by very degraded types of entities is the prime cause of these distressing manifestations.

We may conclude this chapter on obsessions by considering the part which the latter play in dipsomania and drug habits. Doctors offer very unconvincing reasons as to why drink and drugs get such a hold on certain people. Clairvoyant observation, however, reveals the fact that alcoholism and drug-taking induce a state of negativity which in its turn is conducive to obsession by the 'spirits' of erstwhile drunkards and drug-fiends who seek thus to obtain vicarious enjoyment. This being so, it is no matter for surprise that cures are very difficult to effect, since the medical profession does not recognize the true cause of the disease and consequently does not employ the right methods. It is true that people have been cured; on the other hand many apparent cures frequently turn out to be

but temporary ones. This can again be accounted for by obsession. As soon as the patient leaves the institution where he has been treated and where drink or drugs were unobtainable, he is again obsessed by the disembodied drink-or-drug fiend who has all the time merely been awaiting his opportunity.

In view of all that we have written on this subject, the reader may possibly ask if every one is liable to obsession? And here, as in the cases of certain diseases, astrology comes to our aid. No one is ever likely to be obsessed unless their horoscope reveals afflictions to certain planets. If, however, this is the case, then the subject is forewarned and should certainly avoid alcohol and drugs, as also any dabbling with spiritualism and psychism.

NOTE.—Since writing this chapter a veiled account of the life and activities of the remarkable seer aforementioned has appeared under the title of *Oracle*, by Lucian Wainwright (Methuen). I would advise all those interested in the higher Psychism to read this illuminating book. See also *Music, its Secret Influence Throughout the Ages* (Cyril Scott).

Chapter XXIV

WHAT REINCARNATION EXPLAINS

I have previously alluded to the fact that ultimate truths can only be apprehended when several branches of learning are brought into alignment. We have already seen the light which astrology throws on the various manifestations of disease. We have also seen how pathological conditions may be explained by obsession, which in its turn involves a belief in the soul and its subtle sheaths and hence in personal survival. In short, these facts add their quota to a rational explanation of disease. Yet even so, that explanation is not complete; nor will it be so until doctors and healers are prepared to accept the doctrine of reincarnation and all it entails. Astrology shows that some people are liable to certain complaints whereas others are not, and it also provides the why and wherefore from the purely astrological standpoint. But it does not explain the spiritual cause of such liability or immunity as the case may be: in other terms, it does not explain the spiritual cause of disease as such. This omission goes to show that astrology alone, as a truth-revealer, is incomplete; other facts must be added to make it entirely rational. Let us put the matter in a concrete form. Certain configurations of the stars at a given moment influence to a large extent the life and character—in one word, the destiny—of a given individual. But the vital question is: why should he be born at that particular moment and so be liable to reap that particular destiny? Why should one man, owing to the position of his stars at birth, have a sickly body or weak character to contend with, while another

may have a healthy body and a strong character? Unless these questions are satisfactorily answered we are obliged to fall back on chance, favouritism, and injustice as lame explanations. Yet they have been satisfactorily answered. Thousands of years ago the great Indian sages overcame the difficulty by putting forward the doctrine of reincarnation, and in India, even in these days of machinery and materialism, a man who does not believe in this doctrine is considered every bit as foolish as a man who does not believe that the earth goes round the sun. But what connexion has this doctrine of reincarnation with astrology? A very close one; for just as to a considerable extent a man creates his own destiny during his brief sojourn on earth in this particular life, so does the soul, but to a far greater extent, create its own destiny during its infinitely longer sojourn in the universe itself. *Thus a man's own actions in one incarnation determine the moment he shall be born into the next*, and the difficulties or otherwise with which he will have to contend. His horoscope is simply the programme, in terms of astrology, which he has created for himself by his past actions and is destined to carry out in his present incarnation. But as a certain measure of free will is involved, whether he will carry it out well or badly depends on himself. We may, in fact, take a simple analogy: the subsequent life of a child born in a slum is likely to be very different from that of a child born into a well-to-do family. It would even be safe roughly to gauge within a certain margin the respective and prospective lives of those two children. Yet even so, an erstwhile slum child has occasionally risen to laudable heights and, conversely, many a child born of good family has sunk to deplorable depths. It is the same with children born respectively under bad or good aspects. People

with badly aspected horoscopes have sometimes made outstanding spiritual progress, people with well aspected horoscopes have sometimes made none at all. This is known to many an occultist and theosophist and is mentioned here solely for the benefit of the layman—and because it is part of the philosophy of disease. The *physical* cause of disease we have attempted to expound at some length in the first part of this book, but its *spiritual* cause can only be apprehended if we are prepared, like the Indian philosophers, to carry the law of cause and effect to its logical conclusion.

These philosophers maintain that we are born with a liability to certain diseases in this life, not because there is a God who deals out pleasures or punishments according to caprice, but because of deeds enacted in a past life which have created that liability. Unless we admit this to be so then we must exclude Justice from our interpretation of Life and the Universe. Thus we come back to that useful word 'Karma': viz., the effect of past actions, be they of this incarnation or a former one.¹ And yet, as I implied in one of my earliest chapters, we must be careful, where disease is concerned, to interpret this word wisely. Although with certain types the liability to their corresponding diseases is undoubtedly a Karmic effect, it does not follow that such diseases must inevitably materialize. Indeed, the wise man, being forewarned by the indications in his horoscope, sets about by his own efforts to prevent them from materializing! Instead of giving way to all those appetites which cause auto-intoxication or cell-salt deficiency, he disciplines himself to eat those natural foods which ensure a healthy body. This may be difficult

¹ Both Karma and Reincarnation are dealt with extensively in my book, *An Outline of Modern Occultism*. Reincarnation is no mere theory, but can be proved by those who develop the necessary faculties.

at first, but becomes both easy and pleasant when it has grown to be a habit. One may even venture to lay down the axiom that Karma is only inevitable when we do not know how to counteract it. And this is but a variant of the phrase to be found in many ancient books, viz., 'The fire of knowledge burns past Karma to ashes.' The trouble is, however, that most people do not possess that knowledge, and so diseases attack them or steal upon them like the proverbial thief in the night. Even some of those persons who are forewarned do not bother to be forearmed, and are content to let matters take their course in the hope that the mere drinking of a bottle of medicine will put everything right. But unfortunately serious Karmic diseases cannot be cured in this easy way—and that is what such people have to learn. Moreover, some have learnt it, and in the learning have passed on invaluable knowledge to others. In our chapter relating to those who have healed themselves, we found instances of men whose Karma it was to suffer from breakdowns in one form or another but who subsequently, and entirely by their own efforts, transformed themselves into magnificent specimens of health. Even the knowledge itself for this achievement they gained by their own efforts and not from physicians, who would have merely laughed at them for their credulity or crankiness. Had these men acquired their knowledge and put it into practice earlier in life they would doubtless have prevented those very diseases which they subsequently cured. But obviously it was not their Karma to possess that requisite prophylactic knowledge earlier in their lives. And yet, in one sense, they were, during that period, merely suffering from the Karma of ignorance and that form of credulity I have already mentioned, viz., the assumption that habits of living which are

customary or good enough for the majority are good enough for oneself. Moreover, it is a variant of this same ignorance and credulity which involves thousands of people in useless and harmful operations and injudicious treatments, or perhaps it were more accurate to say that in many cases it is their ignorance and credulity which permits of their Karma being precipitated in those particular forms. Indeed, Karma is so subtle and complex a law that to understand its workings is wellnigh impossible at our stage of evolution. All we can do is to recognize the law itself as such, just as we recognize other laws of Nature which we do not fully comprehend.

Nevertheless, certain manifestations of Karmic law are comparatively simple to understand if given periods of history are considered in the light of occult knowledge, and if we realize that this law of cause and effect operates somewhat after the manner of a boomerang. . . . In our last chapter we dealt with obsessions of various kinds resulting either from shell-shock, drink, drugs, or other causes. Clairvoyant investigation goes to show that many such cases are the after-effects of practising black magic in the past. Indeed, it is well known to occultists that in the days when much black magic was practised it was quite possible by certain reprehensible means for one soul to obtain full possession of another's body. Remembering that 'as a man sows so shall he reap' the resultant Karma of such a theft becomes obvious. Obsessions during the war had, however, a different cause. Sometimes it was a question of an ego willingly yielding up his body to another, for the simple reason that, once finding himself shell-shocked on to another plane, he had no desire to return to a war-shattered earth with its attendant horrors and deprivations. In colloquial language, he had had just

about as much as he could stick and was quite ready to let some one else take over his body and face the consequences.

To revert to the Karma engendered by the practice of black magic, clairvoyance has shown that the parasite which attaches itself to a person suffering from malignant disease has been created in a previous incarnation by means of this nefarious art. Such 'cancer elementals' may often linger in certain habitations and thus explain what have been termed 'cancer houses' and 'cancer localities'. It must be conceded, however, that when whole families die of cancer, their nutritional habits are as much to blame as this cancer elemental. Dr. Forbes Ross mentions one such family consisting of three brothers and four sisters. 'All of them objected strongly to vegetables, all of them preferred boiled meat, they seldom or never partook of fruit, and preferred spirits to malt liquors.'¹ In view of such a constipating deficiency diet it is no matter for surprise that each member of that family should become a victim of the cancer parasite. Moreover, it was obviously their Karma to be devoid of the requisite knowledge how to prevent this disastrous contingency, owing of course to causes engendered in a past incarnation.

This chapter would not be complete if no mention were made of the light which the doctrine of reincarnation throws on the problem of still-born infants. There are cases, most baffling to doctors, of infants being still-born without any apparent cause, yet there is a simple, if occult explanation for this, as clairvoyant research has proved. A soul may at the last moment funk its incarnation, and so withdraw, either because it has come to realize it isn't wanted or for other reasons. I know of one case where

¹ *Cancer: Its Genesis and Treatment.*

this withdrawal was due to peculiar circumstances which resulted in a pronounced discord between the two parents so that the incoming soul—an advanced one—fought shy of being born into so disturbing an atmosphere. Such an idea may seem strange and even unbelievable to those people who are accustomed to think of the soul as having no say as regards when and where it shall be born. But as I mentioned in a previous book,¹ the more advanced the soul, the greater the measure of free will allotted to it. Indeed, advanced souls frequently select their own parents to be, and determine beforehand the hour of birth. They select such and such parents either because they are links from past incarnations or because they desire to inherit certain qualities which only those parents possess; frequently both reasons are involved.

The doctrine of reincarnation also accounts for temporary barrenness. Although a married couple may over a period of years ardently desire to have a child, their desire remains unfulfilled; then, without any apparent reason this condition of sterility comes to an end. In fact, such sterility was not due to physiological causes but to occult ones—no soul was desirous at the time of incarnating into the home of that particular couple.

Not so long ago I found myself in the curious position of being asked to find parents for a soul who informed me that he wished to incarnate. He had been a Greek savant in his last life on earth, and he told me that he was having much difficulty in finding the most suitable type of parents. He said he came in particular to me for assistance because he knew I was versed in matters occult, and might on that account be the more likely to help him. However, as he wished to reincarnate in a political family

¹ See *An Outline of Modern Occultism*.

for the purposes of his future work (he mentioned its nature) and as I do not mix in political circles, I was unable to be of any material assistance. After paying me frequent visits over a period of months in his subtle body, he eventually ceased to appear, having told a friend of mine on 'the other side' that he had found the parents he required. This friend subsequently informed me of the fact—somewhat to my amusement.

There are certain observations which on the surface might appear to contradict the doctrine of reincarnation. How are we to reconcile the backwardness of some individuals destined later on to be great men, with the remarkable precocity of infant prodigies? In other words, if reincarnation is true and genius is always brought over from a previous life and is inherent in the soul, why in some cases does it manifest comparatively late and in others so early? This, however, depends to some extent on the type of body the particular soul has to train for its work. To make this intelligible, one is obliged to put an occult fact in concrete terms. A man may have a house built for himself according to his own tastes, but although he may visit it from time to time to see how the interior decorations are progressing, he may not choose actually to live in that house until all the plaster is thoroughly dry and he is assured of being perfectly comfortable. It is somewhat the same with the soul and its earthly tenement, the body. An advanced soul may not elect to take full possession of his body until it has reached a certain maturity and will respond to a reasonable extent to the desires and capabilities of that soul. This explains the aforementioned backwardness of some potential geniuses. Their outward and visible manifestation is so far merely a shell, an empty garment belonging to the soul but

as yet not worn by the soul. In the case of infant prodigies, on the other hand, the soul may take full possession very early in life. But even here occult research has revealed certain variations. A musical prodigy, for instance, may exhibit phenomenal capabilities where music is concerned but be quite backward in other respects. The reason is that while he is actually engaged with music the soul takes possession of the body, but when no longer thus engaged it withdraws again.

I am aware that all the foregoing observations contravene the popular Christian idea that when a man dies, it is the soul that leaves the body at the moment of death. But this notion does not coincide with facts obtained through clairvoyant research. There are many cases in which the soul has left the body long prior to actual death, though the 'mystic cord' may not have been broken. We find this in the case of old people who become utterly childish, or gaga, as the phrase goes. The organism has so deteriorated that the soul can no longer function properly through it and so takes its departure. Thus, these people for certain Karmic reasons linger on as mere 'shells', to be a burden to themselves or more probably to their relations. When death eventually occurs it is the astral body (of the Theosophists) or the spirit (of the Spiritualists) which leaves the body, not the soul (of the orthodox Christians). The soul or ego, in the nomenclature of occultism, is a much more subtle body or principle than the *astral*, and to confound the two only leads to confusion.

Although somewhat extraneous to the subject, it may be of interest to students of occultism to know that a new technique is being evolved whereby an advanced soul will be able to obviate the necessity of wasting so much time in training an immature body for its eventual use. This

technique is employed even now in very rare cases. A 'spirit caretaker' is put into the body during childhood and boyhood who prepares and trains it to be in readiness for the incoming soul. By this means the caretaker makes good Karma and gains useful experience, and thus unsuccessful experiments are avoided. For such experiments have occurred, i.e. a soul has taken over a particular body, found it unsuitable or unworkable, and been obliged to vacate it. In these cases the body has followed the natural law and died, or else been taken possession of by another soul.

All this may sound strange, fantastic, or even flippant to those who are accustomed to associate such 'things of the spirit' with religious concepts, but just as many scientific concepts have to be altered or modified as we obtain more knowledge, so it is in regard to certain tenets of religion.

Chapter XXV

MISCELLANEOUS OCCULT OBSERVATIONS

Until medical science as a whole recognizes the part that man's *subtler bodies* play in both health and disease, there will always be a missing link in the chain of Truth. For centuries occultists have maintained that the human being is not merely composed of a body plus a soul, but that there are intermediaries between the two, composed of varying grades of subtler matter. This is a subject I dealt with in my *Outline of Modern Occultism*,¹ but for the benefit of the present reader it may briefly be repeated in a somewhat varied form. As each individual possesses a physical body composed of gross matter which grows with nourishment and exercise, so does he possess respectively an *etheric body*, so-termed, an *emotional* and a *mental body*, the development of the latter two *bodies* being dependent on the emotional make-up and mentality of the individual. The *etheric body* is closely associated with states of health and disease, for which reason it has been termed by some occultists 'the health aura'. This vehicle of consciousness is the *body* which may be seen with the aid of the already mentioned Kilner screens. It both interpenetrates and extends a little beyond the physical body and reacts considerably on the latter. Electro-therapeuticians who give sunlight treatment are unbeknown to themselves for the most part treating this *etheric body* or health aura, and had they the essential vision to see and regulate the precise reactions they were producing, the treatment would prove far more effectual. This *etheric body* is now being studied

¹ Routledge.

by one or two enterprising physicians, and Dr. H. Guyon Richards may be mentioned in this connexion together with his interesting book *The Chain of Life*.¹ Dr. Richards has laudably shown himself unorthodox enough to carry on his researches with the aid of one or more clairvoyants, and to check up the results. The remedial agents he employs are for the most part high-potency homeopathic drugs which, although homeopaths are unaware of the fact, *act on the etheric body* and hence react on the physical.

Thus we see, in fine, that the *etheric body*, or *etheric double* as it has also been called, is no mere figment of the imagination, no mere crankish assumption on the part of occultists, but a fact worthy of study by a noted physician and scientist—for Dr. Richards may be termed both.

As the *etheric body* reacts on the physical, so, because of their close interconnexion, does the physical react on the etheric. The emotional and mental bodies also react on the physical; it being well known that grief and shock adversely affect the physical organism. On the other hand, faith, hope, and a philosophical attitude exercise a highly beneficial effect. This is largely due to the vibrations of the subtle interpenetrating atoms of the *emotional* and *mental bodies*, although as yet physicians do not take these into account; they merely see an effect but fail to recognize its entire cause.

It will be understood from the foregoing that the complete aura of the average human being is composed of the three subtler *bodies* we have enumerated plus the soul or *egoic body*, and these are perceptible to the highly trained seer. The Kilner screens, however, reveal but the grosser, comparatively speaking, of these *bodies*; and for this

¹ John Bale, Sons, London.

reason it is as yet not possible to apprehend the still higher ones by the usual scientific methods. But this is of no great importance, for it is with the *etheric double* we are here mostly concerned.

Now, if for some reason the latter is not properly co-ordinated with the physical, certain pathological conditions may occur. This lack of proper co-ordination may be brought about through shell-shock or fright. I may mention two cases of stammering which were entirely due to a fright in childhood, and in both instances, a disruption between the physical and *etheric* bodies was observable to clairvoyant sight. Yet although stammering may be counteracted by certain forms of exercises, the cause remains and can only be removed by a special kind of treatment, the technique of which is known solely to occultists. These latter maintain that the seat of many mysterious nervous afflictions is to be found in the *etheric body*, and also in the *emotional body*.

We may now pass on to a few occult facts connected with 'body-building'.

Those unacquainted with occult science assume that the growth of the foetus is largely an automatic process and that the soul to be born into the world takes no part in that process whatsoever. In the light of occultism this is incorrect and could only be true if there was no such thing as the *etheric double* and its close interrelation with the physical organism. In point of fact, the type of physical organism which is constructed is largely dependent on the quality of its *etheric*, and consequently on the judicious wielding of the atoms of the latter when the new body is being formed in the human matrix. Now, advanced souls possess knowledge which enables them to wield *etheric* matter and hence to take an important part

in the building of their prospective physical bodies. This knowledge constitutes a factor in their spiritual evolution as an increasing measure of free will is allotted to them.¹ Yet knowledge unless combined with practice may prove comparatively fruitless. Thus there are evolved souls who have failed to master this technique of body-building, the result being that they have constructed weak and inefficient organisms which have later on considerably hampered them in their terrestrial lives and activities. Sometimes a soul, having started to build a body, finds it a complete failure and is forced to abandon the attempt. This accounts for certain forms of miscarriages. Yet it is not always a matter of constructing weak bodies but of the wrong type of body. For instance, a soul that has experienced several successive incarnations as a woman, may find it difficult to build a male body, conversely a soul that has experienced several successive incarnations as a man may equally find it difficult to build a female body; the latter being negative and the former positive. This difficulty sometimes accounts for the incongruous masculinity of some women and the femininity of some men. Psycho-analysts may put forward their own explanations, but these deal merely with effects and not with prime causes. Another cause of masculinity and femininity is to be found in the fact that after several successive incarnations as one sex, the soul finds it difficult to adapt itself to an organism of the opposite sex—a matter with which I dealt in my previous book.² Thus lesbianity and homosexuality are sometimes the indirect outcome of this difficulty of adaptation. If the question is asked: why should a soul not always incarnate as the same sex? The

¹ See *Outline of Modern Occultism*, Note 4.

² viz. *An Outline of Modern Occultism*.

answer, briefly stated, is that only by reincarnating as different sexes can certain necessary experiences be gained, for such experiences are essential to the soul's evolution. But to comprehend this fully and to make it appear rational a study of occultism is required.

To revert to the subject of the *etheric double* in relation to body-building, for it throws a certain light on a phenomenon which, when it has been noticed at all, may have proved somewhat puzzling to those concerned. . . . It frequently happens that a man, during his wife's pregnancy, finds himself depleted, out of sorts, or suffering from some minor ailments which may get better for a while and then reappear. Some men, though such cases are comparatively rare, have even felt ill during the whole nine months. The reason for this is that the incoming soul may find it necessary to take substance from its prospective father's *etheric double* and to build it into its own body while the latter is in process of being formed. This, of course, seeing the importance of the *etheric* in relation to health, conduces to a temporary weakness which in its turn may manifest as some variety of complaint. The assumption that all the characteristics which a child may derive from its father are potentially in the male semen is a false one, or at any rate, an inaccurate one; those characteristics are largely obtained from the father's *etheric double* and then co-ordinated with the foetus. Naturally if the male parent is a very robust man with a very powerful *etheric*, a usurping of some of its atoms may not be noticeable. On the other hand, if he has a somewhat weak *etheric* he is bound to suffer in one form or another if some of these atoms are withdrawn. . . . I am indebted for these facts to a very remarkable clairvoyante who had many opportunities of making observations along

these lines, since her husband was a physician and conducted a species of Rest Home. Indeed, her assistance to him was invaluable, as she could see causes and effects imperceptible to normal vision. But I should add that other investigators have independently put forward the same facts.

We have been dealing with the soul in regard to prenatal conditions, i.e. in connexion with the beginnings of physical life. A few words may now be said in regard to that part the soul plays towards the ending of physical life—though what I am about to state only occurs in some cases.

The reader may have observed that healthy people who have wisely regulated their lives and may have lived, perhaps to a ripe old age, suddenly commit some stupidity which ends in their death. Now, although I am aware that certain enthusiastic students of occultism are all too ready to advance occult and quite unfounded reasons for the most trifling occurrences, there is none the less an occult explanation for unnecessary deaths—it is the soul which inspires these otherwise careful-living people to fatal acts of stupidity. Voiced in plain English, the soul says as it were: 'You have lived long enough. You have gained sufficient experience in your present body, and to remain any longer would be merely a waste of time, so the best thing you can do is to die.' The soul then brings force to bear which will carry out its intentions along the line of least resistance. I have known many strong and healthy individuals who, despite the warnings of relatives and friends, have brought about their death in this way, but I was unaware of the underlying cause until, through clairvoyant research, it was brought to my notice. It should be added, however, that the foregoing does not

apply in the case of unevolved souls. There are, in fact, individuals who are so wedded to the body and material things that they will not hearken to the still small voice of the soul, the result being that in some instances, as we mentioned in our last chapter, it departs and leaves but an empty shell—the so-termed *personality* of the Theosophists. This manifests through the physical *emotional* and *mental* bodies, all of which deteriorate when the soul has withdrawn its unifying and vivifying force. It is the soul which gave the personality the *joie de vivre* and without which the spirits are apt to become depressed and the body itself to wilt.

And here we may mention that a temporary withdrawal of the soul often accounts for those periods of depression or creative barrenness, from which all creative artists suffer at times. As many people know, there are weeks and even months in the life of every artist when he feels he will never write another line, or if he is a musician never compose another note. This is because the soul has temporarily departed in search of further inspiration for the next effort. Such inspiration is only to be found on the higher planes remote from embodied existence. Some artists find these sterile periods so unendurable that they resort to stimulants to enliven their drooping spirits. Thus, there have been poets, such as Baudelaire, Edgar Allen Poe, and others, who formed the habit of drug-taking as a means of quickening inspiration, but the effect has only been to taint their creations with low-plane elements—the lugubrious, monstrous, and fantastic. If artists possessed even some knowledge of occultism, it might save them from many pitfalls.

Yet it is equally or even more important that doctors should possess this knowledge, for how can the physician

cure that of which he knows only a part? There are psychical diseases which once they are present cannot be cured by purely physical means. This I have implied in the case of stammering; but there are yet other pathological conditions of a highly complicated nature, the treatment of which requires a special technique involving clairvoyant faculties on the part of the physician. A few physicians have eventually acquired these faculties and in a manner they least expected; by the frequent use of the Kilner screens, the capacity to see the human aura has eventuated even without their aid. One physician, I may mention, developed a species of psychic faculty, following on the employment of Abram's Oscilloclast.¹ This physician, after employing this apparatus over a period of time in order to ascertain which medicament was suited to a given patient, found eventually that he could dispense with its assistance and that in his case a species of divining rod acted just as well. The point, however, I would chiefly emphasize here is that psychic faculties, as the Yogi maintains, are latent in all of us, and it is only a question of time and evolution for them to become more universal. When this occurs it will greatly facilitate the treatment of certain types of psychic maladies.

Music will also play its part, for in the not far distant future a type of music will be evolved which will possess definitely curative effects, as I have mentioned in my book, *Music—Its Secret Influence Throughout the Ages*. Indeed music, although it is not generally known, has a deeply occult influence on mankind, a fact which great philosophers like Plato and Aristotle fully recognized. But the subject is a vast one and is only relevant to this book in so

¹ The diagnosing apparatus which created a certain stir some years ago and which the orthodox profession and the Press did their utmost to repudiate by calling it a 'mystery box'.

far that already in America and other countries music is being employed for the treatment of certain nervous and mental complaints.

Yet if there are hidden potentialities in music, the same may be said of colour, of which the occult effects are also little known. Certain colours if properly applied exercise a marked effect on the blood, on the nervous system, and on the mentality. Blue has a purificatory effect, green a relaxant effect, and orange and yellow a stimulating effect if consciously 'thought into' the body and aura by an effort of will or imagination. I possessed one physician friend who performed remarkable cures by thinking the requisite colours into the aura of his respective patients. By this means he cured not only psychic complaints like agoraphobia, claustrophobia, and others, but also skin diseases of an intractable nature. This man, apart from being a physician, was an occultist and derived his knowledge from an initiate. I am, of course, aware that for some time past, colour has been employed externally, notably in the treatment of small-pox, but it becomes far more effective if employed in the manner I have briefly mentioned.

It will be seen that occult facts contribute much to the explanation of pathological states, and yet, such is still the prejudice against occultism as a science, that doctors with orthodox credentials who employ psychic methods are afraid to reveal the fact to their medical brethren and feel themselves obliged to resort to camouflage. How can there be progress while such a state of affairs is permitted to obtain? Progress, as every schoolboy knows, is impossible, unless it go hand in hand with the spirit of open-minded inquiry. Those who condemn occultism are invariably those who know nothing about it; and I speak

Miscellaneous Occult Observations 245

from experience, for at one time I condemned it myself. Yet every day science becomes more and more occult, and is endorsing in its own terms the very facts which occultists put forward years ago. Why then should medical science not follow in its wake? Because holding it back is, for one thing, the heavy hand of the Medical Council.

Chapter XXVI

THE SCEPTICAL ATTITUDE

The power of mind in regard to health and disease is such that people who are faced with some sort of unpleasant ordeal from which they shrink can actually create a genuine malady without a conscious knowledge of what they are doing. Psycho-analysts have invented a special term for these self-created maladies, but it is not the term itself which is of importance but the facts which have given rise to that term. These facts show the intensely important part the subconscious plays in our lives together with the impressions made upon it by the mind and emotions. This being so, it follows that a sceptical attitude must perforce be far more obstructive to health conditions than the sceptically minded themselves are prepared to admit. And just because of this, scepticism is so difficult to combat that unless one attacks it at its very roots, so to say, there is little hope of its being vanquished. Yet it must be vanquished by those who wish to achieve physical well-being, and for two simple reasons. (1) No one is ever likely to make an effort along a given line if he disbelieves that the effort will prove useful; (2) the brain is so closely associated with bodily functions that wrong thoughts are apt to produce wrong functional action. This is well known, yet, even so, not sufficiently appreciated. Some people still cling to their scepticism in spite of its deleterious effects—another fact to which the psycho-analyst has drawn attention. He has shown that there is in certain people a 'something' which urges them to believe merely what they wish to believe, and conversely

to disbelieve what they wish to disbelieve. With the most vehement though oft-times illogical arguments they will seek to protect their cherished beliefs from the onslaughts of any opponent. They appear to labour under the false assumption that to lose a belief is in some mysterious way a tragedy as painful as that of losing their self-respect or some equally cherished attribute. This clinging to and defending of cherished beliefs is not merely associated with religion, politics and kindred subjects, but also with matters of health and modes of living. I remember, some thirty years ago, when a friend and myself had just derived much benefit from reforming our diet, that we upheld its advantages one evening over the dinner table at a house party. It met with violent opposition on the part of our fellow guests, who maintained that their method of living (the usual English dietary) was by far the most salubrious, and any divergence from it was most unwise. And this in face of the fact that one of our opponents had recently had a stroke which affected his limbs and his speech; another suffered from arthritis, a third from rheumatism, a fourth from severe headaches, and so on. All the same, I remember, we had to withdraw from the combat because we could not very well point to the infirmities of these worthy people as the most palpable disproof of their own contentions. . . . Sometimes it happens that people who are the living disproof of their own theories are so myopic on the subject that they even wish to thrust them down other people's throats. I have a dear but eccentric friend who has tried to persuade me that if only every one would get up at five in the morning as he does, they would have perfect health. But unfortunately for his argument he happened to tell me one day in a forgetful moment that he himself never felt well.

Moreover, I have noticed that sometimes he has got so exhausted before the day is out that he has fallen asleep at the most inopportune moments. And yet, for some mysterious reason, he wishes to believe that such early rising is wholesome—a fact which would only be true if there was no winter and we all went to bed at a reasonable hour, which we do not.

I have reminded the reader of the fact that to attain health the sceptical attitude must be conquered, and one method is to analyse it and understand its origin. Now it is fairly obvious that the disinclination to alter a belief or a disbelief is due to vanity, obstinacy, or fear; in some cases the one or the other, and in many cases all three combined. The consciousness that we hold an opinion which can be proved to be erroneous is wounding to our vanity because it involves the aspersion that we are not as clever as we would wish to be thought. Thus we use every argument at our command to prove that it's the other man who is not clever, and we often moreover become acrimonious in the process. In fact, the intrusion of acrimony may usually be considered a sure sign that our vanity has been wounded. As regards obstinacy, it is too transparent a characteristic to require dissection, but we may safely say that vanity and obstinacy are often closely if subtly allied. As for fear, there is that not uncommon fear associated with the unknown or ill-comprehended; there is that fear connected with the unflattering aspersion previously mentioned, but also the fear that we may have to readjust our entire mental outlook, which of course involves much effort. There is furthermore the fear that the new belief may involve unpleasant contingencies or at any rate contingencies which we may personally regard as unpleasant. And the latter applies to matters of health as

much as to anything else. Self-indulgent people, who do not wish to alter their mode of living, rationalize to the effect that it would be useless to alter it, so that scepticism in their hands becomes a subtle weapon of defence. Of this they are usually unaware, just as they are unaware that scepticism is but another form of credulity.

Although we are apt to regard the sceptic and the believer as a pair of opposites, a little reflection shows that they bear a marked similarity. The sceptic is credulous about one set of facts or theories; the believer is credulous about another—that is the only difference. Otherwise stated, the sceptic is credulous about the negative side of the matter, the believer about the positive. Very often indeed, paradoxical though it may sound, the sceptic is far more credulous than the very man whom he despises for his credulity. The atheist, for instance, sneers at all and sundry who believe that a Supreme Being created the Cosmos, yet he himself is so credulous as to believe that chance created the Cosmos. All of which goes to show that sceptics rarely understand themselves or the true nature of scepticism.

There is one form, nevertheless, which has a certain justification. People who have found during their search for health that nothing has done them any good, come to believe that nothing will do them any good. Therefore, they argue, what is the use of trying any longer? And even if they are persuaded to try, the idea of hopelessness intrudes and enters the subconscious, which in many cases at once sets to work to prevent a cure. To tell such people briefly and baldly that they must just have faith is of course foolish in the extreme, but if on the other hand the rationale of faith can be explained to them much good may accrue.

One has been apt to regard faith as a religio-sentimental emotion which has no true scientific basis, but this is a fallacy. Faith in point of fact is, if strong, a very powerful thought-form with cumulative effects that are provable by scientific means. A friend of mine recently made an experiment in connexion with Dr. Abram's oscilloclast, the diagnosing machine to which I have already referred. While a practitioner was engaged in testing a blood-specimen on this apparatus, my friend without informing him, went to the other end of the room and, while pretending to look at some books, held a very powerful thought of perfect health. The result was astonishing; the oscilloclast which had previously registered disease began to register normal, much to the bewilderment of the practitioner. This not only went to show the sensitiveness of the instrument but the power of thought on diseased conditions. Thus the effect of faith, which is but a powerful thought-force, can be demonstrated on an instrument, and so the question of imagination and illusion is ruled out.

Nevertheless, as it is impossible to instil faith into the sceptic there remains the alternative of auto-suggestion, provided of course he can be induced to adopt it and practice it for a sufficient length of time.

Auto-suggestion should really become a life-habit as an adjunct to right-living. But, as with so many things, people take it up for a time, then drop it because they do not obtain immediate results. Others, even though they have obtained such results, get tired of the procedure and discontinue it on one plea or another. How many of those who enthusiastically took up auto-suggestion while Monsieur Coué was alive still continue it nowadays? Very few, for the simple reason that it has lost its novelty. As

for the pronounced sceptic, he argues: 'What's the use of my saying "Day by day in every way I get better and better" when all the time I'm conscious that I'm telling myself a lie?' This superficial argument, however, is based upon a fallacy: for it does not take into account the fact that the effects of auto-suggestion are cumulative. For instance, no reasonable man expects to *feel* better after one dose of a given remedy, but that does not mean that even the single dose is not helping to *make* him better. And it is the same with auto-suggestion; the very fact of reiterating that one is getting better *makes* one get better whether one may immediately *feel* better or not. Thus if people would only realize this simple if subtle truth, they would also realize that they were not telling themselves a lie when using auto-suggestive methods.

And now if we look at the reverse side of the coin, so to say, we find that scepticism in relation to health, or rather ill health, is nothing but auto-suggestion in its opposite form. The sceptic is merely telling himself in effect that 'day by day in every way he is *not* getting better, and probably never will get better'. And so again we see the marked similarity between the sceptic and the believer, but whereas the attitude of the former is destructive the attitude of the latter is constructive.

All the same, Coué pointed out that the full effects of auto-suggestion could not be attained unless the patient adopted measures calculated to prevent self-poisoning. The method he personally advocated was Fletcherism; a system of self-healing to which we have already drawn attention. But whether Fletcherism or a natural diet is adopted, and both are advisable, it stands to reason that unless auto-suggestion is combined with right methods of living, it cannot be fully effectual. Conversely, a very

252 *Doctors, Disease, and Health*

pronounced sceptical attitude will militate against even the most scientific remedial methods of living, for taking into account the effect of mind over matter, it sinks into the very blood and bones and so requires a great deal of dislodging. It is in reality a Karmic effect and has been brought over from a previous incarnation to be conquered in this one by personal effort.

Chapter XXVII

HARMFUL CONCOMITANTS OF CIVILIZATION AND THEIR AVOIDANCE

I have implied in one of my earliest chapters that many people are suffering from the effects (or Karma) of ignorance and credulity—ignorance as to the science of nutrition, credulity in regard to medical orthodoxy with its operations, serums, and poisonous palliatives. And it is both this ignorance and this credulity which I have in the course of this book attempted to dispel. But in addition to these counteractable types of Karma, there is one type from which nearly all of us suffer and which can only be counteracted to a certain degree, and that is the Karma of civilization. Only those who live as hermits away from towns and wrong social habits can entirely escape this Karma and enjoy a hundred per cent good health. Thus, the problem is not how to be a hundred per cent well by withdrawing, like the Indian Yogi, from civilization altogether, but how to preserve a reasonable measure of good health in spite of civilization. And I stress this point because there are few things more annoying than to read a book which makes everything seem so easy save for one thing—the impossibility of carrying it out. It is not of much use to an impecunious patient if a doctor declares that the only cure for him is a trip round the world; similarly it is no use to a town dweller to be told by any author that he must always sleep out of doors, must play two rounds of golf a day, must never walk in streets where the air is vitiated by motor-car fumes, never sit in a stuffy office, never eat vegetables except those grown in his own

garden, and so on and so forth. True, if he did eat vegetables which had not been grown in artificially fertilized soil—another unsalubrious by-product of civilization—he would be all the better for it; but as circumstances do not permit of his having control over such matters, he must do the best he can and leave the rest in the hands of the gods—or better said, in the hands of the Lords of Karma.

Granted then that we cannot escape all of the more harmful effects of civilization, we can with a certain amount of wisdom and common sense escape many of its more harmful concomitants; that is, provided in the first place we are aware that they exist. Although wise physicians have been at pains to show that most of the deadly diseases from which man suffers are diseases of civilization, that does not mean they are the inevitable effects of the latter. Poisonous drugs, the abuse of surgery and serums, the ruin and denaturalization of food through commercialism, mass-production, and artificial manures—all these may be blots on civilization, but they are its to some extent avoidable by-products and not its totally unavoidable effects. We need not consistently eat denaturalized food, we need not suffer pseudo-scientific mutilations at the hands of the surgeon, we need not receive into our blood-stream micro-organisms derived from old horses—that is, provided we have been brought to realize that to do so is injurious. Indeed the very fact that we receive such a warning and act upon it already shows that it is not our Karma to be irreparably damaged by injudicious treatment, whether that warning comes from a book, or an individual, or is the result of our own common sense, knowledge or reasoning powers.

And the *modus operandi* should be so obvious in view of all we have previously considered that I hesitate to enter into details in the main portion of this book, though a few suggestions may be found in the Appendix for those who may be interested or may require them. After all there is such a thing as 'offering uncomplimentary assistance to the reader's wit', and this I have no wish to do. Moreover it would be superfluous for me to add to the large number of easily obtainable books on diet and health which have provided so much evidence as to the root cause of disease and method of cure. The reader need but wisely select one of these books himself and follow its teachings as consistently as his particular type of body, mode of life, and occupation permit. This will of course vary to a certain extent with each individual. As the consensus of wise medical opinion points to the fact that most people suffer from the effects of an excessive protein and starch diet, the ideal would of course be to reduce both these substances to a minimum, and then finally to rule out flesh-foods¹ altogether, since they are too rich in protein, apart from their putrefactive elements. But even where this is possible and advisable, common sense tells us that in many cases—notably those of elderly people, drastic changes may need to be made somewhat gradually;² not because otherwise actual and permanent harm is likely to accrue but because the process of cure may with some people be attended with inconvenient symptoms which might temporarily interfere with their means of livelihood. But apart from this the appearance of such symptoms might give rise to the notion that the reformed diet itself was responsible for them instead of a vitalized

¹ Eggs, cheese (not high), and dried fruits, figs in particular, provide all the protein that is necessary.

² See Appendix I.

Nature's beneficent attempts to purify the body. In order to dispel this illusion I will add to all that has already been put forward in this book two final and important pieces of evidence.

If potatoes, cereals, fish, and meat are boiled for a sufficient length of time the residue will be a gelatinous slime or mucus which soon ferments. On the other hand if fruits and vegetables are boiled down the final result is a syrup which does not ferment. This syrup is termed fruit sugar, and not only is it completely digested by the stomach but it leaves no residue for that process of decomposition which proves such a fertile field for harmful bacilli. One may of course argue that foods are not 'boiled down' in the human body, but the effect is the same, as we showed earlier in connexion with the graduated emesis treatment and all it convincingly proves.¹ But in addition to what the emesis treatment reveals there are the clinical findings of Dr. I. Harris.² His researches have shown that as the result of the customary diet of too much protein in the form of flesh foods, the kidneys have to perform in ten years the amount of work which with correct feeding they would only require to do in ninety years, the result being that they prematurely wear out under the strain. Yet this is not all. Dr. Harris significantly adds: 'The kidney is not the only organ which suffers from excessive protein feeding. The extra cost in energy on the part of the heart and blood vessels in transporting the unnecessary food adds ten per cent more to the daily expenditure of energy. Rich feeding means also the

¹ Some years ago Professor A. Ehret of Switzerland cured a large number of supposedly hopeless cases by feeding them entirely on a fruit and vegetable diet.

² See *Diet and High Blood Pressure*, by Dr. I. Harris, Hon. Physician, Liverpool Heart Hospital.

accumulation of material in the blood which corrodes the blood-vessels. All these facts act and interact with each other in damaging to an increasing extent the vital parts of the body.'

Now although people who lead active outdoor lives and eat foods containing a sufficiency of bulk and roughage are by such means able to get rid to a certain extent of an excess of protein, it is otherwise with the sedentary. For them in fact it is doubly important to live on a diet rich in fresh fruits, salads and vegetables. One reason among others is that all persons who cannot enjoy the vivifying effects of sunlight directly must obtain them indirectly, i.e. through fruits and salads which have been ripened in the sun.

Dr. Josiah Oldfield, one of our great naturopaths, declares that all fruits containing sugar, and all green salads and root vegetables, and nuts which contain starches, fats, and oils, are in reality 'treasures of stored sunshine in these various forms'. When these fruits are digested, this stored-up sunshine is set free and utilized by the cells of the body. The test of sufficiency of sunshine in the organism, he contends, 'is whether you can wake up in the morning with song and gladness'. Dr. Oldfield is a living proof of his own contentions.

Enough has now been said to show that the secret of health is in our own hands if we are only willing to apply it. Nature has always been trying to tell us that secret but we have refused to listen. Said Schopenhauer many years ago: 'You do not understand the language of Nature because it is too simple.' And how true this is. Nature in her great bounty has given us an abundance of herbs and vegetables and luscious fruits, she has given us honey and sugar cane, and has said as it were: 'All these things

are perfect as they are, eat them in their original purity, and you will be well.' But instead of listening to her still small voice and following her advice, man has tampered with her gifts because of commercial greed or because he thought in his unconscious arrogance that he could improve on them. The result has been disease and that vast wilderness of complications and theories and warring opinions known as medical science with its drugs, its unnecessary mutilations, and its poisons. And granted that wise doctors have done a lot of good in the world and that even mediocre doctors have a fair percentage of cures to their credit where they have not too clumsily interfered with Nature, yet preventive measures are always better than curative measures because far more reliable in every way. People who have to send for the doctor can never be certain that he will be a competent one, so the best thing is to avoid having to send for him at all. As Hanfeitse, that old Chinese sage, has written: 'We should not expect people to be good, but we should make it impossible for them to be bad.' In the case of doctors this cannot be done through legislation, but through even surer means. If we avoid the necessity of consulting a doctor we automatically do not expect him to be good and at the same time we make it impossible for him to be bad, i.e. in relation to ourselves. In any event, 'Blessed are those who expect nothing, for they shall not be disappointed.' The object of this book has not been to condemn doctors, but simply to show how we may defend ourselves against their fallacies, which is quite another matter. But even this would be less necessary if the whole of the medical profession would but alter its policy and instead of filling its ranks with disease specialists would provide us with health specialists in their place.

Harmful Concomitants of Civilization 259

Seeing that the word 'doctor' originally meant 'teacher', his true and exalted mission is to teach people how to be well by their own efforts. Just as each one of us must work out his own spiritual salvation, so must each one of us work out his own physical salvation. There is no other way.

Chapter XXVIII

CONCLUSION

'To regard disease merely as a departure from normal health, no matter what form this departure takes, simplifies its consideration so greatly that it does not require medical training to appreciate it fully, nor anything resembling talent to find means for its relief . . .'¹ Yet in spite of this self-evident fact medical science as a whole would have us believe that the treatment of disease is something so mysterious and so complex that it cannot be discovered without a prodigious expenditure of money and labour and a display of learning so profound that even years of study can hardly make it intelligible to the most intelligent. Moreover, that same profession would also have us believe that in order to acquire even a part of such learning it is necessary to resort among other things to the unspeakable barbarity of torturing thousands of unoffending animals. And for what? To discover something which it is not essential to discover, and even if it were, might be discovered by less barbarous means.² In other words, animal experimentation only goes to swell scholastic learning and to prove what needs no proof save for those who are too blind to see. The same may be said of other methods of accumulating proofs. The taking of X-ray photographs, of blood-tests, analysis of urine and faeces—all these expense-increasing measures would be quite unnecessary if doctors knew their business

¹ W. H. Hay, M.D., *A New Era of Health*.

² I am quite aware that animals are chloroformed during vivisection, but that does not decrease the sufferings of those which are infected by dreadful human diseases.

properly and did not remain blind to the true cause of disease. After all, a competent osteopath knows what is the matter with a patient simply by passing his hands over his body, and in this way can tell what organ is not functioning properly. Again, by the science of iridagnosis the expert can detect not only what disease a person may be suffering from but also the drugs which are still producing harmful effects in his system even though they may have been taken and then discontinued years previously. Thus the baneful effects of allopathic doses of quinine, mercury, iodine, bismuth, arsenic, etc., which have been employed to suppress disease-symptoms, are all perceptible in the iris of the eye. Mutilations from accidents or the surgeon's knife are also perceptible, so that urine analysis, blood analysis, and similar proof-producing devices, including exploratory operations, are all superfluous both as regards diagnosis and treatment. And what is the inference that may be drawn? That just as a man's character is revealed in his hand, so are his pathological conditions revealed in his eye. There is no need to turn to animal experimentation in order to gain an understanding of man, for Nature has so contrived that man reveals himself to those who know how to look. But because the savants of medicine fail to appreciate this fact, they persistently look in a direction where nothing of intrinsic value may be found. In short, they work and strive in a world of their own imagining and they pile up complexity after complexity, theory after theory, experiment after experiment, thereby thinking to find a thousand truths in place of the one truth which the less learned have found long ago.

My task is now complete; and when all is said it was a simple one, for I merely set out to try to show that there

are more harmless and saner methods of curing disease and maintaining health than so many of us have been led to believe. The methods of the naturopath, the homeopath, the osteopath, the methods which pertain to the bio-chemic system, as also to autotherapy—all these to which I have drawn attention are as harmless as they are effective, and are based on natural and hence scientific principles. And because of this I believe that patients who are curable at all can be cured by one or other of these methods, provided no irreparable harm has previously been done by the surgeon's knife. But even the effects of this heavy Karma may be counteracted to some extent by a natural diet and the bio-chemic remedies, as my own experience to a certain extent has confirmed. Although I have never undergone an operation I have to contend with the effects of a slight but unadjustable deformity which, even though imperceptible save to the trained faculties of an osteopath, has proved a certain handicap for many years. And yet by dint of regulating my life and living in accordance with Nature's laws I have reduced the effects of this Karma to a minimum and can get through as much work and perhaps even more than many people who are without this disadvantage. And I mention this here because for one thing a none too robust reader may argue: 'It's all very well for you to discourse on health and its easy attainment. But how do I know you haven't been born with a fool-proof body and so have never had any disabilities with which to contend?' And this question, although a superfluous one in relation to myself, is not totally inapt, since there are sturdy but unimaginative people who think and say they have found the secret of true health merely because they themselves are always well and assume that every one else should be

likewise. Yet in point of fact such self-complacent people have contributed nothing to the science of health at all, and are in no position to aid others. It is the erstwhile sick man who, having been forced to find ways and means to cure himself and to select the wise methods from among the many harmful ones—it is he who is the most justified in showing to others the way.

‘Physician, heal thyself; so thou healest also thy patient. Let that be his best help, that he may see with own eyes him who hath made himself whole.’

NOTE

Reference in this book has been made to certain practitioners and the remarkable cures they have effected by their own special methods; but as they would resent any form of publicity, their names have not been mentioned. Seeing, however, that I have written these pages in the hope of being of some assistance to those who may need it, I shall be pleased to give the names of these practitioners to such correspondents as will kindly enclose a stamped and addressed envelope. I would merely add that in the event of my being abroad a prompt answer cannot be guaranteed.

APPENDIX I

It is one thing to convince people of their faulty habits and another to induce them to alter them. The type of dietary I have mentioned in this book may at once strike them as insufficiently varied to suit their taste. They forget that the ordinary English diet is far less varied when regarded in its entirety. Moreover, they fail to realize that a desire for great variety is in itself the sign of a jaded appetite. To an intrinsically healthy person who experiences real hunger the simplest fare may taste like ambrosia. On the other hand, people who feel they 'really cannot fancy this again to-day because they only had it yesterday' show themselves at once to be suffering from varying degrees of toxemia. I have proved this in my own case. Before I reformed my food régime I felt no genuine desire for my meals, but after resorting to a natural diet, found I could eat the same food day after day with complete relish. It is merely a matter of once establishing the habit, which then becomes all the easier as the system gets more and more cleansed of its toxins through those better elimination processes which nature-foods facilitate. For instance, I have a friend who says he never feels well and hungry unless raspberries and strawberries are in season. As he eats large quantities of these delicious fruits, the reason is obvious—they temporarily cure the constipation from which he is apt to suffer, and in consequence reduce his general condition of toxemia for the time being. For the rest of the year this man is content for the most part to eat the usual flesh-food English diet. Could he be induced to eat every day steamed vegetables, raw salads and raw fresh fruits, apples in particular, dried fruits, cream cheese, and honey, he would doubtless feel as well in the winter as he does in the summer. All, or most of these things, should form part of the daily dietary, excepting cheese, which is not required when protein is taken in the

form of eggs or flesh-foods. Yet flesh-foods, be it remembered, do not constitute items of an ideal diet because they tend to putrefy in the intestinal tract, and so cause auto-intoxication; therefore they should be gradually reduced. Indeed, it is wise for elderly people to change their whole diet gradually, for to do otherwise is apt to produce certain symptoms which although harmless in the long run, may, if improperly understood, lead them to think that their reformed diet is merely a failure. What these people—and there have been many—fail to realize is that when we cease to put poisons into our body it attempts to get rid of those already there, and certain symptoms are the result.

But there are other considerations. Some people who have been accustomed to eat meat for years, and their ancestors before them, may find its total exclusion from their diet to be inexpedient: that is why it is never advisable to lay down hard and fast rules for oneself or for any one else, as some fanatical dieticians are apt to do.¹ This being so, wise people are never carried away by some principle which may attract them and which they adopt immediately without judicious experiment and graduation. On the contrary, wise people try things out and make suitable adaptations before going to those full lengths which may seem attractive in theory but because pursued with too fanatical a zeal so often end in disappointment. Besides, in view of what has been proved by medical writers, it is not the moderate inclusion of flesh-food in itself which is invariably productive of disease, but the exclusion of those particular vital foods which go towards its prevention. This is the point which cannot be sufficiently emphasized, even at the risk of tautology. A large part of this book has been written to draw attention to the disease-conducting effects of the customary English diet, and if and when this is admitted, it merely

¹ There are, for example, vegetarians who imagine that all diseases may be prevented or cured by vegetarianism, but in some rare cases this is so far from true that certain sickly persons have been cured of some intractable ailments by turning from strict vegetarianism to a diet which included a certain amount of meat.

remains for the reader to reform his nutritional habits as wisely and gradually as his organism demands and his type of life and occupation permit.

To dot the i's and be practical, there are few people who are not at liberty to choose the food items for their own breakfasts, and so dietetic reforms may conveniently start with that meal. Yet although certain reforms have been already made and so-called breakfast foods have become the fashion, they are not wisely selected, being too starchy and not containing sufficient roughage. Moreover they usually follow on a grapefruit or on orange juice, and are succeeded by bacon and eggs or fish and white bread toast and marmalade. All this, to begin with, is too large a meal on which to start the day when people have been resting all night and have taken no exercise to warrant such an intake of nourishment. This habit of the large English or American breakfast is in itself so unsalubrious that some years ago, Dr. Dewey of U.S.A. cured or greatly improved the health of a number of people simply by inducing them to do without breakfast altogether. But the disadvantage of this is that with many people, breakfast, as already implied, is the only meal at which they may have, so to say, a free hand. It therefore gives them perhaps the sole opportunity in the day of eating those necessary foods which are rich in vitamins, roughage, and mineral salts. This is especially the case with people who, as regards lunch and dinner, are forced to make concessions to the social life and its faulty nutritional habits. Thus a good plan, advocated by naturopaths, is to start the day immediately on rising with the juice of an orange, or even two oranges, in a tumblerful of cold or lukewarm water. Another wholesome beverage is made from equal parts of orange and lemon juice mixed in a tumblerful of water. This combination is highly recommended by some French physicians. Breakfast (half an hour afterwards) should consist of a good tablespoonful of seedless raisins (sun dried but not sulphur dried), with a liberal helping of fine clean bran (to be procured at a health food store) on to

which a little cream may be poured. Wholemeal bread toasted, butter and honey, not marmalade, may end the meal. Although Dr. Hay in company with the late Dr. Alexander Haig is averse to tea or coffee, people are unlikely to carry asceticism so far as to do without these cheering beverages, but one thing is important, they should never be drunk too hot. When this type of breakfast has become a daily habit, far from regarding it as a deprivation, people will eventually find it a most pleasurable meal. If they feel, however, that it is insufficient to satisfy the appetite, a dried fig or couple of figs may be added with advantage, or the amount of raisins and bran may be increased.

With regard to lunch, it should consist when possible of raw salads, raw tomatoes, watercress, and cream cheese, followed by raw fresh fruit or a fresh fruit salad.¹ In order to avoid starch at this meal, Energen rolls and butter may be eaten in place of bread, but if these are not available, then Ry-vita, wheat-vita, or thin wholemeal bread toasted will have to suffice as an alternative. As for dinner, a soup made of vegetable water and flavoured with Marmite or Yeastrel should be taken as a daily habit. For those people who feel they cannot dispense with flesh-foods, fish, fowl, or white meat may follow, but in that case potatoes should be avoided and the meat should be eaten with vegetables and a raw salad,² dressed with lemon juice and *not* vinegar. This salad is highly important and should never be omitted from a flesh-food meal. Dinner should end with fresh fruit or a fresh-fruit salad. If any sweetening is required, honey is the best medium; failing that, medicinal glucose (Torch Brand is the

¹ An excellent device when the making of a fruit salad gives too much trouble is to grate an apple (which makes it more digestible), then add a liberal handful of raisins, on to which may be poured cream to taste. Raisins, according to Dr. Hay, are the only dried fruits which harmonize with fresh fruit.

² Salads should always contain a little parsley. The latter is 'very beneficial to those who suffer from disorders of the urinary apparatus, and is also of value in rheumatism, acidity, weakness of the lungs, catarrh of the stomach, and in fact all catarrhal conditions.' (E. F. W. Powell).

most suitable for the purpose) is a fairly good substitute. Synthetic glucose must on no account be employed, as the latter is not grape-sugar but some harmful concoction.

The value of a good brand of honey as a vital food cannot be over-estimated. I have experimented by eating excessive amounts of honey, and not once have I experienced that symptomatic thirst which occurs after eating an excess of commercial sugar.

APPENDIX II

I

In some of the books on Yoga we find diseases roughly tabulated under three headings: those that are conducive to an excess of wind, of bile, or of phlegm. People who habitually suffer from severe flatulence should avoid starchy foods and those which quickly decompose in the intestines. In place of bread it is wise to eat Energen rolls, or some non-starch bread, but to supply the missing roughage and mineral salts, a tablespoonful or more of, say, Pitman's bran should be eaten daily as a breakfast dish—raisins and cream can be added or cream and honey, but not refined sugar. Marmalade (being very acid) and jams should always be replaced by honey, which is not only rich in vitamins but a natural preservative. If the habitual flatulence is due to chronic constipation, then Dr. Hay's purge treatment is indicated, or a course of 'wash-outs'. After the cure, the Energen rolls may be discontinued and wholemeal bread eaten instead, care being taken to avoid the spongy type of bread which contains potatoes. Dr. Allinson's bread is excellent, especially when served as toast. . . . To avoid recurrence of the trouble the diet should of course always be as near to a naturalized one as circumstances permit. In some cases the mere avoidance of 'incompatibles' (see the Hay diet) is all that is required, provided there is an adequate proportion of natural foods. . . . The bio-chemic remedies for flatulence are as follows:

With pain in the left side: *Kali phos.*,

With colic: *Natrum phos.*, *Natr. sulph.*,

With sluggishness of liver: *Kali mur.*,

With gastric derangements: *Natr. phos.*,

With distention of abdomen: *Natr. mur.*, in some cases, *Mag. phos.*, in others with much passing of flatus: *Magnes. phos.* The best potency for all bio-chemic remedies seems to

be 6^x, though in some cases a higher one is indicated. . . . Flatulence is often due to hasty eating, in which case the cure is obvious.

II

People suffering from an excess of bile should live on a diet specially rich in fresh fruits. Lemons are particularly indicated for all bilious types of persons. I once cured a man of serious liver attacks accompanied by incapacitating attacks of megrim simply by inducing him always to start the day with the juice of a lemon (without sugar) in equal parts water to which a pinch of bicarbonate of potash was added. This has the effect of making the lemon taste less acid and is also good for the complaint.¹ Potash water, which is far more beneficial than soda-water—a doubtful beverage—may be used in place of ordinary water. It helps to increase the elimination through the kidneys and tends to prevent cancer and arthritis. A regrettable fact, by the way, is that the drinking of potash-water rather than soda-water has never become customary, in view of its highly valuable properties. . . . The chief biochemical remedy for excess of bile is *Natr. sulph.*

III

For people who suffer from too much phlegm (mucus) the diet obviously should be one in which mucus-forming foods are reduced to a minimum, as we have pointed out in the text. Here again starchless rolls in place of bread are indicated, with bran as a daily article of diet. All catarrhal conditions, including leucorrhœa, colitis, and congestion of the lungs, are caused by slime (mucus) which, however much some doctors may ignore the fact, must have its origin in the food that is consumed. For how else can it be formed? No

¹ Many sufferers will find this, if taken at bedtime, a far better specific for heartburn than bi-carbonate of soda or any of the much advertised antacid lozenges containing bismuth, which is by no means as harmless as we are led to believe.

substance can come from nowhere! And as the body is kept alive on food there is no alternative. I am aware that congestion of the lungs as such may be cured by operative treatment which serves to drain off the mucus, but unless the patient subsequently alters his diet, the mucus forms again in the course of time and another catarrhal disease is the result. As for mucous colitis, I am also aware that there is a treatment which consists in feeding the patient on nothing but starchy foods, the effect being as it were to paste over an inflamed colon with mucilage. But what about the other symptoms which eventuate as the result of all this starch and its constipating effects? These are left to take care of themselves. . . . The bio-chemic remedies for all catarrhal conditions are determined by the nature of the exudations, and the reader is referred to Dr. G. W. Carey's book on the subject or Mr. E. F. W. Powell's *Cell Nutrition*.

IV

Rheumatism is a very common complaint which the orthodox doctors treat with depressants but for which the only rational treatment is a natural diet free from starch and any excess of proteins. Incompatibles should be avoided. . . . The bio-chemic remedies are *Natr. phos.* and *Calc. phos.*, taken intercurrently. Sexual excesses in early manhood are conducive to rheumatism in later life—a fact of which I believe doctors are unaware. Dr. Hay's three days' purge is a valuable preliminary to diet reform for the cure of all types of rheumatism. Many people have found the Cantassium discs (i.e. potassium) highly beneficial even when there are no arthritis symptoms. I need hardly add that all measures to increase elimination, such as Turkish baths, sunlight, etc., are essential for the treatment of all rheumatic complaints by whatever new-fangled name they may be called. Where there is severe pain and inflammation, such as in lumbago, *Ferrum phos.* is the chief bio-chemic remedy in alternation with

those previously mentioned. . . . We hear much nowadays of the infra-red rays, and I may here incidentally point out that the infra-red lamp is only a glorified variant of the hot brick and brown paper remedy for lumbago. I received this information from a scientist and inventor of therapeutical appliances.

V

Those born between June 22nd and July 24th, which denotes Sun in Cancer, should live on a diet especially rich in potassiums (raw apples are particularly indicated). They would also do well to take *Calc. fluor.* in bio-chemic form; three doses one day in every week. The same applies to people with Cancer rising. But in order to ascertain this they would require to have their horoscope cast.

VI

The orthodox treatment of heart diseases, especially weak heart, is entirely wrong. Digitalis (fox-glove), which the doctors prescribe, is a deadly poison having the most harmful cumulative effects; moreover it does not cure the disease, but eventually kills the patient instead. Bio-chemic remedies coupled with a diet rich in mineral salts and vitamins are the only effective treatment for heart troubles, the remedies to be selected according to the particular symptoms. For dilatation of the heart or blood-vessels the principal remedy is *Calc. fluor.* in alternation with *Ferrum phos.* The former is needed to cure the relaxed condition of the muscular fibres and to restore their contractibility, and the latter to deal with the inflammatory conditions (carditis, pericarditis, endocarditis, etc.). For palpitations *Kali phos.* should be added. The latter is a most valuable heart stimulant in wasting fevers or after rheumatic fever when the heart action is weak. . . . For embolisms (clots of blood) *Kali mur.* is required in alternation with *Ferrum phos.* Where there is poor circulation and coldness

of extremities *Calc. phos.* is indicated, as also where there is palpitation due to flatulence. As for spasmodic attacks of palpitation, or sharp, shooting, darting pains in the heart, *Mag. phos.* is the best remedy. (This is also a specific for angina pectoris.) Palpitation in anaemic and dropsical subjects requires *Nat. mur.* For quick pulse with a slow throbbing pain over crest of the ilium *Kali sulph.* in alternation with *Ferrum phos.* should be prescribed. . . . The question of exercise is very important in cases of a weak heart. Writes Dr. I. Harris: 'Until recently it was believed that a person with a weak heart should have as much rest as possible. This is altogether wrong. The heart muscle, like other muscles of the body, requires exercise. The less it is used the flabbier it becomes. . . .'¹ But of course all exercise should be taken in a graduated form—regularly and not spasmodically. There are none the less some important exceptions. Apart from the fact that common sense tells us that any attack of pain is in most cases an indication that the patient should lie up for a while, a long rest in bed is imperative after rheumatic fever, though if *Kali phos.* is given, recovery is likely to be more rapid than when the disease is treated by the usual orthodox methods. A long rest is also needed after a severe attack of influenza, especially if the malady has been suppressed by drugs. Honey or Barbados sugar is a most valuable heart food, and should be taken freely after the heart has been weakened through any acute illness.

VII

A large number of people suffer from high blood pressure, and here again a diet low in proteins and especially rich in mineral salts is indicated. Mr. Ellis Barker points out that people with high blood-pressure usually have thick blood, and naturally the latter can only be thinned through diet.² Drugs produce no lasting effect. Most people with high blood

¹ *Diet and High Blood Pressure.*

² See *New Lives For Old.*

pressure suffer from constipation and self-poisoning, and live on a diet which is supposed to give them strength but in point of fact only has the opposite effect. What they need, therefore, are the types of food which rid the arteries of their hardening substances and promote frequent bowel actions and elimination via the kidneys without injuring these organs. Such foods are raw apples, salads, bran, and vegetable soups without any meat extract. . . . Of bio-chemic remedies Mr. E. F. W. Powell advises *Ferr. phos.* 6^x, *Calc. fluor.* 9^x, and *Silicia* 12^x; all three to be taken dry or in hot water morning and night. I have mentioned the use of the Cantassium discs in the main portion of this book.

VIII

It has become a trite saying that simple remedies are often the best, but the trite and obvious is so frequently overlooked. The following case is typical. A woman suffered from an unsightly and painful fissure at the corner of her mouth which refused to heal. For this apparently simple inconvenience she had consulted doctors and specialists to no purpose and had spent many guineas in the process. She was finally cured by a dentist for the trifling sum of fourpence—the cost of a little antacid powder to be externally applied. The fissure had not healed owing to acidity; the powder neutralized the acidity and the trouble was soon cured.

Apropos of dentists, acidity, and simple expedients: I once asked a dentist why he did not make inlays of vulcanite instead of gold, which is heavy, expensive, and apt with some people to produce an acid reaction. His reply was that 'it had never occurred to him, but the idea was a good one'. Later on I mentioned it to another dentist, who agreed and said it ought to be mentioned in the dental journals. Both these dentists are very clever men, yet 'out of the mouths of babes and sucklings . . .' And so let us not overlook the simple and obvious if we wish to keep well and save our pockets. Another point is that although we hear of simple remedies or prophylactics

we forget to employ them. I may therefore remind my readers of the following selection from various books on naturopathic methods of healing.

IX

For those who cannot take Turkish baths owing to a weak heart or for other reasons, an Epsom salts bath once or twice a week last thing at night is valuable as a means of assisting proper elimination through the skin. But it is important to get into a warm bed before the skin is completely dry, as this helps perspiration. Such an Epsom salts bath is especially useful in winter when people do not perspire naturally.

Epsom salts employed as a blood purifier and alkalinizing agent are very useful if taken over a long period in the following form: One teaspoonful of Epsom salts and the juice of one lemon to a pint of water. A small wineglassful to be taken every morning.

X

A colonic irrigation once a month should be resorted to by those who can afford it, but otherwise a high enema which they can take themselves will suffice. The best medium for this purpose is an infusion of raspberry leaves which can be procured at a herbal pharmacy. A handful at a time is sufficient. In severe cases of toxemia following on chronic constipation an enema every night for ten days is advisable, then every other day for a fortnight, then twice a week for three weeks, then finally once a month—as a general prophylactic and internal cleanser. The use of a rectal dilator retained for five minutes before taking the enema and re-inserted for ten minutes immediately afterwards is of great value particularly to the nervous system.

XI

Many cases of constipation are due to a nervous contraction of the sphincter muscle or to a prolapsus of the lower

bowel, and in that event a course of rectal dilatation is especially indicated. To obviate the expense of buying a number of various-sized dilators an adjustable metal one may be obtained from any of the better-class Health Food stores. Rectal dilation should, if indicated, be practised over a period of a fortnight or three weeks: last thing at night is a convenient hour, as for one thing it tends to promote a healthy sleep. The dilator should not be retained longer than a quarter of an hour at a time.

XII

People in particular who eat flesh-foods require a bowel disinfectant, and one of the finest is garlic. Although *Garlic Pearles*, which are excellent, may be bought, they are somewhat expensive to take as a life habit, especially as the remedy can easily be prepared by the cook. A few garlic bulbs should be allowed to simmer with a little water for two and a half to three hours, the liquid then being strained and poured into a bottle. Either a few drops of chloroform or of spirits of wine may be added as a preservative. A small teaspoonful of this garlic juice should be taken neat or in a little water every night before retiring. It is not only an excellent bowel anti-septic but is most beneficial for the lungs and chest; furthermore it tends to make chilly people feel warmer. Garlic taken in this form leaves no unpleasant odour in the breath. The Rev. J. Dempsey reports a severe case of colitis cured by drops of garlic juice in water.¹ But apart from its cumulative effect it is the most useful because harmless soporific to be found among Nature's remedies. I have recommended it to many people who suffer from insomnia or are inconveniently light sleepers, and each one of them has obtained the most gratifying results. Those who are chary of taking it on the plea that garlic is indigestible are evidently unaware that it is the pulp and not the juice which causes indigestion. Moreover, the

¹ See *Heal Thyself*, November 1934.

few drops of chloroform added to preserve it act as a carminative.

All the same there are unheroic people who absolutely refuse to take garlic in any form, yet nevertheless would do well to take some internal antiseptic. Charcoal is one, but should be taken in moderation as it has been known to remain lodged in one of 'Lane's kinks', as they are sometimes called, and consequently has given rise to trouble. All the same, when judiciously employed it reduces the toxicity of the urine, as Bouchard discovered, and so proved its detoxicating value. In place of charcoal, three drops of eucalyptus in warm (but not hot) water may be recommended. These can be added to the early morning orange drink, which people would benefit by taking half an hour before breakfast (the juice of an orange in a tumblerful of cold or tepid water).¹ According to Mr. E. F. W. Powell, these drops of eucalyptus oil will do much to cleanse the system and remove morbid matter; it (eucalyptus) sweetens the whole of the digestive tract and is cheaper and far better than most . . . of the much-advertised antiseptics of doubtful composition. For an *external* antiseptic nothing is more effective, strange though it may seem, than natural burnt wood ash. I say natural, advisedly, because tarred wood or the like must not be used. For small boils, pimples, or superficial skin eruptions the ash may be powdered on, but in

¹ Wood ash smeared on the body is useful to ward off undesirable psychic influences. For this reason certain types of Yogi use it, even though it makes them most unsightly objects.

Burnt ash is most valuable as a tooth powder, since for one thing it is rich in potash. The ancients were fully acquainted with the properties of wood ash and used it as a manure, than which there is no better one to be found owing to its great richness in potash. For instance, trees grown in a potash-denuded soil exhibit those excrescences which, some writers maintain, bear a causal relation to cancerous growths in human beings. Other writers, however, deny this, though if they fully comprehended the law of similarities and the unity of the Cosmos they might find less reason to do so. In any case it is regrettable that burnt ash is not used more extensively in place of artificial manures, since if it were, fruit and vegetables would be possessed of far greater health-giving qualities than they are at the present time.

some cases it will require to be made into a paste with a little water.¹ A pinch of Epsom salts is a useful addition.

XIII

In enumerating certain natural and simple remedies, yeast should not be omitted. But unfortunately as with many another valuable simple it has become commercialized and thus we are served with an inferior article under the supposition that it is a superior one. Ordinary baker's yeast taken internally—a piece the size of a brazil nut before breakfast—is a far better specific for boils than all the pseudo-scientific remedies which orthodoxy advocates.¹ Not so long ago, yet before I had studied auto-therapy, this was brought to my notice by a well-known man in the musical world, as the result of my having contracted a boil on the neck due to an infected clipper.² Observing my condition this kindly man took the trouble to write and inform me that for two years he had suffered from a series of boils which his doctor had uselessly treated with external applications, etc. Then one day a stranger stopped him in the street and said: 'I see you've got a boil on your neck; there's only one thing for that—baker's yeast before breakfast every day till cured.' My friend thanked him and took his advice; since when he has had no more boils. I suggested this treatment of yeast to a lady, who found not only that it cured her boils but gave her an increased appetite and altogether bucked her up generally. Needless to say, all really wise physicians know the value of yeast, but even so, not a few of them advocate some commercial brand (of which Phillips is the best) instead of the natural commodity procurable from the baker. I may here add that champagne yeast is yet more efficacious, but difficult to obtain.

¹ Autotherapy is still better, but as yet orthodoxy is tardy in recognizing the fact.

² In Germany it is a rule that all clippers must be passed through a flame before being used on a client, but in England no such rule obtains, so one is liable to be infected.

XIV

Before concluding this category of simple remedies I should point out the value of pure vegetable juices.

Invalids who on account of gastric trouble find it impossible to digest the pulp of either raw salads or fruits should be given the juice of raw carrots or other juicy vegetables. In some cases this has been known to work seeming miracles. By this simple means the body is enabled to assimilate the mineral salts so necessary to re-establish health. It is quite an easy matter to crush the juice out of, say, carrots and cucumbers with an apparatus supplied by Health Food stores and others. Cucumber juice is particularly indicated where there is kidney trouble. As in the case of garlic and onions, though to a lesser degree, the indigestible part of the cucumber is the pulp and not the juice, but even so it is because people will not masticate it sufficiently. Cucumber juice is a corrective to the effects of certain rich foods, and hence there is a certain rationale in serving cucumber with salmon. Apple sauce with duck has also its justification for a somewhat similar reason, though a raw apple salad combined with slices of oranges would be more scientific.

XV

Of the part that the mental attitude plays in regard to digestion, much might be said, but a few words will suffice. Many people, as we all know, are far too preoccupied with fear-thoughts as to what is going to disagree with them and what is not. Yet these same people often find that they can eat the most seemingly indigestible things when invited out, which at home they could not eat without unpleasant after-effects. The reason is obvious; they are amused and distracted when dining at other people's houses, and thus either forget about their digestion altogether or make up their minds to enjoy themselves and let the consequences 'go hang'. And

very often there are no consequences, for the stimulating effects of enjoyment have prevented them from materializing. This proves the baneful yet unnecessary effect of fear-thought, since it can be so easily dispelled in this manner. Now although there is no doubt that all people would materially benefit by following the Hay diet, it has one disadvantage where fanatical and apprehensive persons are concerned. If circumstances prevent them on occasions from rigorously adhering to its principles they at once develop fear-thoughts. But they forget that the effects of the Hay diet, or all natural remedies for that matter, are cumulative and that the more they adhere to them as a general rule the less the harm if they are occasionally obliged to break that rule. Therefore, realizing that the adoption of a natural diet results inevitably in the building of better bodies, the wisest course to pursue is to adhere to it in daily life as far as may be reasonably possible, but apart from that, to 'take no anxious thought'. After all, if people, for instance, are in the habit of going to bed at eleven o'clock, nothing serious happens if now and then they cannot get to bed till midnight—that is, unless they imagine it is going to happen. . . . At which we may leave it, not being desirous of stressing the obvious.

XVI

To pass to the question of exercise. Busy-lived people take exercise—more or less violent—on Saturday afternoons and Sundays and for the rest of the week they take perhaps none at all, because they have no time. Yet exercise to be of any real value must be taken every day. To keep healthy and young, every muscle in the body should each day be several times contracted and then relaxed so as to dislodge any calcareous deposit in the arteries and prevent flabbiness of the stomach and abdominal muscles.¹ The aim should not be to develop great muscles like a prize fighter but to keep the

¹ A Health Motor is a valuable aid to this for those who can afford one.

body in good condition through scientific movements. Personally I find Sanford Bennett's system of exercises the best, as for one thing they can all be done in bed in the morning before rising,¹ a matter to which I alluded in Chapter XVII. But instead of devoting an hour a day to them, as Bennett did, ten minutes will suffice, at any rate at first, unless for some special reason considerable muscular development is required. Even deep breathing exercises can easily be done lying on one's back in bed, although in that case the window should first be opened wide to obtain the maximum of fresh air.

Nevertheless, it is important to add and to stress that the amount of exercise required is greatly dependent on what people eat and also on the astrological signs under which they are born. People born with Sun in Virgo or Virgo rising require far less exercise than some of those born under other signs. Taureans, Pisceans, and Cancerians are liable to develop 'paunches' unless they live chiefly on raw foods and do special abdominal exercises. Yet this unsightly condition need not develop, or can be cured as Hornibrook has proved in his *Culture of the Abdomen*. 'This book', wrote Dr. A. H. Douthwaite in the *British Medical Journal*, 'is a better prescription for abdominal obesity, and also for constipation than any drug or combinations of drugs.' Dr. Douthwaite significantly goes on to point out that 'fat will not accumulate over a muscle which is constantly used'. I am of course aware that improperly functioning glands have much to do with obesity, but this is because they have gradually become poisoned from toxemia, are improperly fed and deprived of the necessary chemical ingredients.² For instance, both goitre and obesity have fundamentally the same cause, though the manifestation is different, for an over-functioning gland is merely due to a deficiency of one kind of mineral salt and an under-functioning

¹ See *Old Age, its Cause and Prevention*, Dodd, Mead & Co., New York, 1927 edition.

² The modern gland specialist gives animal gland extracts to supply the deficiency, but we have still to see the after-effects of such treatments.

gland due to a deficiency of another kind of mineral salt. (Goitre, as we have mentioned, is cured by bio-chemical remedies.) Some fat people may tell one that even if they eat next to nothing they still grow fat. And yet if instead of eating next to nothing (which means they reduce their starches, fats, sugars, and proteins) they would eat adequately of the requisite things to cause proper functioning of the glands in question, they would soon regain their figures, as has been frequently proved. Stout persons who have brought themselves to 'starve' on orange juice and raw salads think they gratifyingly lose weight solely because they no longer eat fattening things, yet this is but a half-truth; they lose weight largely because they are temporarily supplying their glands with the needful chemical ingredients. Dr. Hay proves this by implication when he avers that on a natural diet over-stout people grow thinner but thin people do not become yet more thin, but if anything are inclined slightly to put on flesh. This shows, in short, that obesity is a pathological condition and nothing less. We recognize this fact as regards our pet dogs, but as regards human beings we merely look upon it as an unsightly inconvenience which in its least excessive form we term middle-age spread. That the latter can be avoided I know from personal experience, but it can only be avoided through one's own efforts.

APPENDIX III

The efficiency of urine as a remedial agent has been extolled by a J.P. of Yorkshire in a series of curious pamphlets, now out of print, but kindly lent to me by the author's executors. Mr. Baxter, who died at a ripe old age, declared that he had cured himself of a cancerous growth by applying his own urine in the form of compresses and by drinking his own urine neat. He further declared that he had cured himself of other complaints by these simple if strange means. Mr. Baxter contended that fresh urine is the finest antiseptic that exists, and having made this discovery he formed the daily habit of drinking three tumblers full as a prophylactic against disease.¹ He maintained that if autogenous urine is taken in this way the 'sweeter', i.e. more innocuous, it becomes. He applied it to his eyes as a strengthening lotion, and used it, after shaving, for the complexion. He also advocated its external use for wounds, swellings, boils, etc. As an aperient he declared it to be unsurpassed.

¹ The author can hardly advocate this as a universal practice.

APPENDIX III

The efficiency of urine as a remedial agent has been extolled by a J.P. of Yorkshire in a series of curious pamphlets, now out of print, but kindly lent to me by the author's executors. Mr. Baxter, who died at a ripe old age, declared that he had cured himself of a cancerous growth by applying his own urine in the form of compresses and by drinking his own urine neat. He further declared that he had cured himself of other complaints by these simple if strange means. Mr. Baxter contended that fresh urine is the finest antiseptic that exists, and having made this discovery he formed the daily habit of drinking three tumblers full as a prophylactic against disease.¹ He maintained that if autogenous urine is taken in this way the 'sweeter', i.e. more innocuous, it becomes. He applied it to his eyes as a strengthening lotion, and used it, after shaving, for the complexion. He also advocated its external use for wounds, swellings, boils, etc. As an aperient he declared it to be unsurpassed.

¹ The author can hardly advocate this as a universal practice.

PRINTED BY
JARROLD AND SONS LTD.
NORWICH

PRINTED BY
JARROLD AND SONS LTD.
NORWICH