



Where to start? Hyrum asked me to write an article about health. It's such a large topic, this is my third attempt. I suppose I ought to define my boundaries, otherwise, I'll never finish. So, here they are: I choose to focus on chronic, mental, and infectious diseases. These include the members of the top 10 causes of death list (minus #3, which is iatrogenesis, or doctor error), mental issues ranging from anxiety to schizophrenia, and last but not least those illnesses blamed on a microbe, including the scourge of 2020, COVID-19.

You see, those areas are what 90% of health costs are spent on in America according to the CDC. Another way of looking at that statistic, is that those are the areas most poorly served by conventional medical models.

This exercise would be rather crass if I wasn't ready to present an alternative, but as it so happens, I am.

Why are the popular medical models so bad at dealing with these health areas? It seems obvious that many of their remedies are not very successful, requiring multiple, protracted applications, often ending in death. In most businesses such poor performance equates quickly to bankruptcy, but here there is no widely known competitor to which to turn, and reacting or responding to ill health is rarely optional; they have a captive audience. The industry even has a word for this type of care: management, they want to manage your illness, actually your symptoms; in the best case, Nature heals, and you no longer need their management.

Now the cynic may observe that this is a more profitable business strategy than providing a cure, and they are correct. That 90% I wrote of earlier equates to roughly \$10,000 per person ( $0.90 \times \$3.5T$  (2018 data) / 330M people). If trends continue, that number will reach \$24,000 per person by 2030, an amount clearly unsustainable. Keep those figures in mind as I explore the calamity that is the conventional medical model for those specific health areas. It is clear to me we are dealing with when, not if this prevailing system collapses. Better to start researching an alternative now while there is still time.

What the cynic's observation fails to identify however, what is at the core of the general failure of conventional medicine in these areas, is that cause of those diseases is unknown in all cases. That's a bold claim, but research it for yourself. Every chronic and mental illness charity lists "risk factors" in answer to "what causes" this, that, or the other illness. "Risk factors" is a synonym for statistics, a mathematical tool for gleaning conclusions when the data offers nothing direct. Statistics are used as a last resort when a non-answer is unacceptable, but the data doesn't support anything else. The father of nuclear physics, Ernest Rutherford, is quoted as saying: "if your experiment needs statistics, you ought to have done a better experiment". Understand, this is the foundation of conventional medical theory in these areas. Their real answer to the question "what causes this illness?" is: they don't know. Just how effective do you predict any remedy based on "I don't know" will be? This is the answer after a century of research and countless trillion of dollars spent. Maybe



it's just me, but it seems this dog is barking up the wrong tree.

What about infectious disease? They know that, right? Well, they blame these illness on microbes. Why? Well, because microbes are often observed at disease sites. So? Flies are seen at garbage dumps; we don't say flies cause garbage. Ditto police at accidents or firemen at fires. To be causal, there ought to be a rational test to make that determination, right? Well there is: it's over a century old, and it's called Koch's Postulates. Louis Pasteur (not a doctor) promoted the Germ Theory of disease and Dr. Robert Koch (namesake of the German version of the US CDC) created a 4 part test to prove microbial causation. Problem is, to my knowledge, no microbe has ever passed the test, so it's regularly poo-pooed by conventional medical apologists, who never-the-less offer no replacement test. The situation is even worse for that category of microbes called viruses, including the one inducing panic in the majority of the world this year.

A virus is supposedly submicroscopic. What I mean by that is that conventional light microscopes magnify 2,000-2,500 times, max. Even at that enlargement, the elusive virus is too small to be seen. The technology necessary to view something that tiny (electron microscope) wasn't available until roughly 1940. That however did not stop doctors who embraced Germ Theory from speculating that a tiny microbe was responsible for illnesses that exhibited symptoms similar to those they blamed on bacteria and fungi (which are visible with optical microscopes), but for which no bacteria or fungi were present. The first disease blamed on this new hypothesis was yellow fever, in roughly 1900. Between that and the invention of the electron microscope lay a long career's worth of time. Long enough for the newly minted Rockefeller pharmaceutical industry (founded 1901) to establish a sizable financial momentum from which there was no possible escape short of throwing out the whole rotting structure.


Fat chance of that happening; it's easier to rationalize your way around apparent contradictions than admit you were wrong. Ayn Rand once observed: "Contradictions do not exist. Whenever you think that you are facing a contradiction, check your premises. You will find that one of them is wrong". Here are some observations of virus theory contradictions for you to ponder:

- AIDS symptoms are seen in people who test positive and who test negative for HIV.
- Some people who test positive for AIDS never exhibit any symptoms - this is a general observation of "viral infections" in general, including COVID-19. Those unfortunates are branded carriers, with all of the social stigma that carries. It never seems to occur to many that perhaps the test is nonsense. Far easier to say they are asymptomatic, and bury the discrepancies in an endless pile of risk factors and other constructs born from the attempt to shield the inadequacies of Germ Theory (immune system, genetics).
- The symptoms of polio are better explained as poisoning (from a class of insecticide which includes DDT). The polio vaccine was introduced in the spring of 1955, 3 years after the



reported peak in reported polio cases. Those reported cases were already in a free fall by then. Could that have anything to do with the fact that that class of insecticide was banned in 1951? Similar histories exist for many anti-viral vaccines.


- The skin disease measles is also blamed on a virus. A prize of €100,000 was offered by microbiologist Stefan Lanka to anyone who could prove that claim, and although an attempt was made to collect, the challenge was rebuked by a Bavarian high court in Jan 2017. You would think if measles were indeed viral in nature, that proof of such would have lightened Dr. Lanka’s wallet by now. A measles vaccine has been in production since 1963, surely the science behind it is iron-clad?
- Spanish Flu deaths peaked simultaneously in New York City, Paris & Berlin 3 weeks after Germany declared a truce. Intercontinental travel was relatively slow 100 years ago, and travel between warring states was and is practically non-existent. The common denominator here is that news of the cease-fire traveled instantaneously over telegraph, the European and American continents having been connected in that manner since 1860. I contend that the Spanish Flu is better explained as the repair symptoms of a mass resolution to a global territorial conflict.



*Vaccines did not eradicate Polio.*

Since the panic for our 2020 “pandemic” is justified by previous outbreaks, the mother of all being the aforementioned Spanish Flu, what happens if these symptoms, are not caused by a microbe? What happens if there is no such thing as an infectious disease, that the phenomenon has a better explanation, one that does not require the invention of a virus boogeyman? How would that devastate the mask industry? And how then is the bankruptcy of millions (including the related increases in violence, addiction, and suicide) by lockdown justified? I mentioned earlier I was ready to present an alternative to the conventional medical model, that I wasn’t just piling on to be mean. As a matter of fact, I have written a book about just that. Visit [A Critical Look At](#) to learn more. There are many free resources there, and my book explores all the topics of this short introduction article. I suggest exploring the “disease is different” tab first if my proposal is new to you.

Hyrum’s Note



After reading Mark's book, I asked him to write an article for AnxietyPub.com. The topic of health fits perfectly into the *Real World* theme of these articles. Successfully navigating through this life requires an understanding of how to achieve optimal health and how to avoid personal biological disasters. As Mark explains in his book, the medical establishment bases most of its hypotheses on the following fiction:

Fighting symptoms restores health (allopathy).

The body makes mistakes.

The body cannot heal itself.

Psychological trauma cannot produce abnormal health conditions (disease).

The purpose of these articles is to help us optimize our life experience. No one can achieve success by basing their decisions on fiction. Acting on the false premises, above, usually leads to a decrease in health and more dependence on the medical industry's *management*. Mark's book introduced me to fascinating concepts. The health of the physical body is inexorably linked to the mind, and we must allow our body to heal itself.