

# **The Germ Theory of Disease-- Debunked**

**includes Koch's Postulates & More**

The most important material element of our lives must be our health. It is strongly affected by what we believe about it, and how we learn to treat our bodies.

One might assume that the science behind germ theory is firm, well- proven and true. It isn't.

Medical practice has been a for- profit deal from its beginnings, perpetuated and pushed to the top as go-to in health care by profiteers. Its prominence and dominance is not due to any vetting, voting, or any superiority over other methods whatever. Rater, it is due to the zeal of promoters.

Its never been proven that germs and what we call viruses are the cause of illness. (The definition of a virus reads, in part, inert, dead matter.) Scientists, medical practitioners, doctors and even a High German court have said that diseases are not caused by bacteria or viruses. Contagion is also an unproven assumption. Numbers of people have also been seen to have fallen ill in a specific location due to soil, air or other pollution, electrical disturbances, common conditions and food supply, and many other reasons. ( See article on Contagion)

**Could there be something incomplete in germ theory or perhaps something else beyond it?** The answer is a resounding “Yes!”

**Germ theory** (note it is a *theory*, not a fact.) It is so pervasive that questioning it, to most people, is like saying the earth is flat. They may label the questioner as nuts or worse. We're told that we can “catch” “bad” germs from others and vice versa through direct or indirect contact which causes illness.

This idea-- germ theory-- is foundational to the Western medical system. This belief is so persistent that public health measures have been used to enforce treatments on an unwilling population, violating the right to sovereignty over our own bodies. (aka mandated vaccination).

Germ theory and other medical premises are incomplete, some say even completely off base. Its foundational premise has never actually even been fulfilled by any so-called germ, virus, bacteria or infectious agent.

Early on, germ theory was paired with a scientific model for its proving. If germs really did cause disease, then certain conditions had to exist in order to prove it. If those conditions did not hold true, then the theory was not true, logical or scientific. The four criteria to be met were called Koch's postulates. In the case of germ theory, they have never been proven true. \*

### **The Germ Theory of Disease**

The concept of contagion depends on the belief that the germ theory of disease is correct. That theory of disease is the reigning premise which justifies a tremendous network of modern medical procedures.

#### **Simply stated, germ theory says:**

Diseases are due solely to invasion by specific aggressive microscopic organisms; that is, *a specific germ is responsible for each disease* and such microorganisms are capable of reproduction and transportation outside of the body.

The germ theory was founded on the assumption that disease germs are specific and unchangeable in their biological structure and chemical characteristics. Dr. Rene J. Dubos (eminent modern bacteriologist and 1968 Pulitzer Prize winner) contradicted this assumption by showing that the virulence of microbial species is variable.

### **Bacteriophobia-- Fear of Germs**

Although there have been many dramatic proofs that germs do not cause disease, the

universal acceptance of the germ theory has become widespread, leading to fear of bacteria or bacteriophobia. The present-day practice of killing germs inside and outside of the body with poisons and drugs has resulted in more degeneration. Iatrogenic disease (physician- caused or drug-induced) is the third cause of death in the U.S.. Various programs were initiated to confer "immunity" against specific germs by means of vaccines and serums, resulting in the inoculation system.

### **Germ Theory Discovered and Discarded**

The original proponent of germ theory, Pasteur (circa.1860) discovered facts which were not in accord with his previous conception that disease germs were unchangeable. He found that microbial species can undergo many transformations; this discovery destroyed the basis for germ theory. Since a pneumonia germ (coccus) for example, could change to a bacillus (typhoid germ) and back again-- and, indeed, since any germ could turn into another—and since their virulence could be altered, often at the will of the experimenter, the whole theory exploded.

Pasteur by then had changed his direction. His more mature conception of the cause of disease was that a germ was "ordinarily kept within bounds by natural laws, but when conditions change and its virulence is exalted, when its host is enfeebled the germ was able to "invade" the territory which was barred to it up to that time." This, of course, is the premise that a healthy body is resistant to disease or not susceptible to it. After the change in his outlook, and numerous experiments along this line, Pasteur was at last convinced that *the presence of certain germs is not proof that they are the cause of a disease*. So Pasteur finally reversed his position and acknowledge that germ theory was flawed.

So you see the originator of the rise of germ theory finally reversed his position and acknowledged that germs are not the specific and primary cause of disease, and he abandoned the germ theory. He is reported to have said on his deathbed, "Bernard was right. **The seed is nothing, the soil is everything.**"

Although Pasteur abandoned his early immature theory of disease causation by germs, seeing it to be erroneous, yet it was developed and fostered, and perpetuated by some who saw great profit in it. Later, they pushed it to the forefront by pulling the strings of politics, regulation and so on. This all began around 1880, but the medical misnomers, misunderstanding and error continue today.

**Note that trillions of bacteria live within us at all times.** Its been said that we may have more germs in us than there are actual cells of our bodies themselves. Often, they serve as helpers and aids to needed physiological processes. They're present in health as well as disease, yet this is no proof that they cause any illness whatever. Seen in disease, many researchers believe bacteria are vital aids to healing the illness and ridding us of disease- causing elements.

*In short, in every research and record it is clear that **the presence of specific germs is no proof that they are the cause of any disease.***

**Germ Theory Resurrected--** A Plausible And Tangible Basis For "Medical Science"

Medicine is now claimed to be a science. Before the discoveries and pseudo-discoveries of Pasteur, the field of medicine was a medley of diversified diseases and imaginary causes, treated symptomatically and empirically. Up to this time the evolution of medical thought was a slow transition from superstition. The profession groped blindly about in search of a tangible basis upon which to base their theories and practices.

**"Pasteur gave the profession the germ. Here, at last, was a tangible and basic theory, however dis-proven, which could be developed without a limit.** The microscope made it possible to visualize, differentiate, and classify the organisms. The medical profession seized upon this new theory, since which time practically all medical

investigation has been carried on with the (discredited) germ theory of disease as its basis."

The more complicated a thing is, the more money- making opportunities it offers. Treating every disease differently, as in medicine, adds entire industries (eg., pharmaceuticals) and specialties to their number and more layers of profiteers. Its big business, don't doubt it.

### **One Disease, One Basic Cure**

If the cause and treatment of diseases such as inflammation in the elbow (bursitis) is different from that caused by sinusitis, appendicitis or nephritis, (inflammation of the sinuses, the appendix or kidneys) that suggests more specialties and more treatments as well. Yet if in fact, as natural health sees it, the disease is seen as inflammation or inflammation- related (eg., "itis") in most every case, and the cure is also the same, then treatment is simple. The causes are one and the same with a few unique qualities that are easily adjusted for. The cure then, is one, beginning with the removal of causes, making allowance for the necessary body recovery processes to work unencumbered.

In natural health, disease is seen to have just one cause and that is the toxicity of body tissues. This unity of disease is not understood by those who insist on relating a specific germ to each disease. That method allows for a huge array of specialists, drugs, etc., and thus we see the field of medicine burgeoning and diversifying its many offerings. With an unending supply of sick and disease- susceptible clients, the medical industry and its offshoots have together become among the most lucrative fields in the world.

---

### **Koch's Postulates**

Pasteur finally realized that germ theory was flawed, He reversed his position,

acknowledging that **germs were not the primary cause of disease**. Koch's postulates were the clincher. They provided a clear basis for scientific testing of the theory, The German scientist, Robert Koch, (1843-1910) a bacteriologist, physiologist and one of Pasteur's contemporaries, laid out the proper testing procedure, which is still considered an excellent example of the scientific method. If you read them you will see that they make perfect sense.

Koch proposed four postulates to prove that **for a specific bacteria to be the cause of a disease:**

1. **The specific bacteria must be found in every case of that disease.**

This is not found.

2. **The specific bacteria must not be found when the disease is not present.**

This is not so.

3. **The specific bacteria must be capable of living outside the tissues.**

That viruses and bacteria can live outside the body is unproven.

4. **The bacteria must then be capable of reintroduction** into the organism and **producing that disease.**

---

**As has been repeatedly demonstrated, specific bacteria do not fulfill these requisites. Thus, germs and viruses cannot be said to cause of disease.**

---

### **Koch's Postulates Dis- Proven – and Revised**

The scientific method of confirming that a specific bacteria was the cause of a disease includes also satisfying the following four postulates as true. In the case of germ theory, this could not be done. The postulates were then revised. ( Postulate #4) However with the revisions the theory still defies the scientific method.

**All Four Postulates are Disproven:**

### **Postulate #1 Disproven**

Scientists know that **specific bacteria are not found in every case of a specific disease**. The eminent Canadian physician, Sir William Osier (1849-1919) found that the diphtheria bacillus is absent in 28 to 40% of cases of diphtheria. Green's *Medical Diagnosis* says that tubercle bacilli may be present early, more often late, or in rare instances be absent throughout the disease condition. Koch's first postulate, "the specific bacteria must be found in every case of that disease" is not fulfilled in tuberculosis, diphtheria, typhoid fever, pneumonia, or any other disease. *Specific bacteria are not found in every case of a specific disease.*

### **Postulate #2 Disproven**

Nor is the second postulate fulfilled, because **it is a medically-known fact that bacteria are found in the bodies of humans and animals which exhibit no symptoms of any disease. Also, specific bacteria are repeatedly found when the specific disease is absent.**

### **Postulate #3 Disproven**

Further, **bacteria are not capable of living outside the tissues**; therefore, the third postulate is not fulfilled. Neither Pasteur nor any of his successors have ever induced disease by the inoculation of airborne bacteria, but only by injections from bodily sources. The reason is obvious: germs are dependent on human or animal organisms for their survival.

### **Postulate #4 Disproven**

\* Koch's Fourth Postulate originally read: Introducing germ cultures in a healthy body or organism will always produce signs and symptoms of the disease. **This is not so.**

**Postulates Revised--** To stretch the acceptance of germ theory, the postulates were changed. However, with the revisions (see *Rivers*) the theory still cannot fall into line with the scientific method. The main revision was with #4, which the read: "Introducing

germ cultures in a *susceptible* body or organism produces signs and symptoms of the disease. When the condition of *susceptibility* is introduced, we're back to the same point we have been emphasizing. Again, **although germs are present in illness, that is no evidence that they have caused any disease. Again, the condition of the host is of primary importance in the production of illness.**

---

### **Of Themselves, Germs Are Powerless To Cause Disease**

"The germ alone could no more cause disease than a match alone can produce a fire. Just as the fire. If it is to have any part in causing disease, the microbe must find an organism that produces a suitable soil for its activities. We cannot avoid germs. We must be proof against them.

We can avoid disease only by keeping ourselves in the positive state of health such that bacteria are powerless against us." (February 1972, *Dr. Shelton 's Hygienic Review*),

### **Germs Are Not Enemies**

Bacteria are ubiquitous—they are with us all the time. Life on this planet would be impossible without them. Specific "disease" bacteria are commonly assumed to be the primary cause of specific diseases. These much maligned microorganisms are, in truth, friends and scavengers that need nourishment to reproduce. They go into action immediately when there is a dangerous accumulation of toxic materials which is threatening body integrity. They perform the useful function of "cleaning up the mess" and then resume their more passive state, after their work is done.

**There is no denying the importance of bacteria in the evolution of disease. But they are not the fundamental and primary causes, as so many people believe.** Bacteria are intimately associated with many serious diseases. They contribute secondary or tertiary complicating factors and elaborate certain powerful toxins. They

have factors which add to the primary causes.

**It is the diseased body condition that creates an environment favorable to the mutation of bacteria into those associated with a particular "disease,"** an environment that is favorable to their proliferation and increasing virulence. The initial diseased body condition springs from improper living that begets toxicosis.

There is no denying that in the disease process the work performed by bacteria as scavengers is unpleasant and exhausting to the host. In the view of natural health, some or all of those bacteria are there to gather up the ravaged debris of a toxic body. Thus, they help in cleaning up and moving forward into health and restoration. They are thus necessary for the preservation of health and life. After the cleansing is complete, the organism again makes its energies available for normal activities.

### **Diseases Are Not Entities Traveling From One Person to Another**

We hear about infectious diseases, contagious diseases, pandemics and communicable disease. But nobody has even seen a disease travel from one person to another. There is not an iota of evidence that this happens. In 1860, the world-famous English nurse, Florence Nightingale, published a refutation of the germ theory of disease, saying:

"Diseases are not individuals arranged in classes, like cats and dogs, but conditions growing out of one another. It is a mistake to look upon diseases, as we do now, as separate entities, which must exist, like cats and dogs, instead of looking upon them as conditions, like a dirty and clean condition, and just as much under our control. Rather they are the reactions of kindly Nature, coming up against the conditions which we have placed upon ourselves. I have seen with my eyes and smelled with my nose smallpox growing up in first specimens, either in closed rooms, or in overcrowded wards, where it could not by any possibility have been 'caught' but must have begun. Nay, more, I have seen disease begin, grow up and pass into one another. Now, dogs do not pass into cats.

"True nursing ignores infection, except to prevent it. Cleanliness and fresh air from open windows, with unremitting attention to the patient, are the only defense a true nurse either asks or needs. The specific disease doctrine is a grand and twisted refuge of those as now rule in the medical profession.

**There are no specific diseases; there are specific disease conditions."**

Read Companion Article: [Contagion](#)

---

An Alternate, Natural Viewpoint--

The Cause, Nature and Purpose Of Disease

Disease is a process of physiological and biochemical changes within the body, producing certain signs and symptoms which we label as specific diseases. When diseases are categorized as communicable or infectious, it is not really meant that the disease, per se, is transmitted from one person to another. The concept actually is that an assumed cause of disease—virus, bacteria, etc.—is transmitted.

Disease is the result of many causes, most often due to the intrusion of toxins into the body by various methods-- eating, drinking, lack of sleep, exercise and the proper needs of life, etc. The actual process of disease (the fever, the inflammation, etc.) is the action initiated by the body to purge itself of toxic accumulations. But the causes, the processes, and the effects appear to be intermingled. Toxicity causes change in the processes of the body. These changes result in other changes as the body tries to cope. The situation becomes extremely complicated, with constant interaction between causes, processes, and effects.

The fundamental causes of disease, in the natural view, are a result of enervation. Enervation is body depletion and /or exhaustion due to the bankruptcy of nerve energy when the body has expended more than it is capable of regenerating. The general energy level diminishes and functional efficiency deteriorates. We evolve into a state which we call toxicosis—a condition

of body saturation with toxic matters.

Toxicosis, from toxic conditions of the body, implies a disturbance of the blood and tissue fluids, and the accumulation of toxic byproducts of metabolism. In recent years, studies of biochemical pathology have shown this disturbance within the homeostatic mechanism of the body, caused by the accumulation of toxic substances.

Dr. John H. Tilden, a natural health pioneer, in his book, *Toxemia Explained*, (1926) presented "the true interpretation of disease." Habits of living that fail to supply our needs, that exceed our limitations—too much food, insufficient exercise, insufficient rest, and so on—produce inner stresses and a chemical burden the body cannot handle. The causes of disease are multiple and relate to all the facets of our existence—nutrition, exercise, rest mental and emotional factors, relationships with other people—all of life. The most significant causes are those that are related to our fundamental biological needs. Those relating to our fundamental and emotional life complete the total picture. Most of the causes of disease are within the control of the individual.

---

NOTES: Germs Do Not Cause Disease-- Experiments, Proof, etc.

To assume that disease is caused by contagion, as in person-to-person transmitting of illness simply on the idea that similar symptoms arise simultaneously in a community or around the world is not science. Though it seems logical, it is not scientific.

\* Koch's postulates, in the case of germ theory, have never been proven true. Rather, they were modified to "fit" the model in a very unscientific way. That addition, said to justify the theory of germ causation, (Rivers hypothesis) takes the scientific teeth right out of the original theory. They are rarely referred to as they cannot hold water.

---

---

### Koch's Postulates in the Lab-- A Proving Ground

For the new Postulates to be proven scientifically

1. A culture of the specific bacteria must be taken from a diseased animal.
2. It must then be grown in pure culture in a laboratory.
3. The culture must then be injected into a susceptible\* animal-- (originally this read "a healthy animal")
4. It must then cause the same disease via a culture taken from the above animal.

# 4 as listed here is a modification of the original, now requiring the condition of susceptibility\* to establish a causal relationship between specific germs and specific diseases. This modification negates the whole experiment-- And as of this date, germs have not been proven to be the cause of any disease..



\* The book *What Really Makes You Ill?* in over 700 referenced pages looks at the science around the fact that viruses have never been proven to not be a part of our own genetics (the human virome), have never been identified as the definitive cause of illness, and have never been proven to “infect” through contact. Referenced by <https://kellybroganmd.com>

The Bio-Chemical Society of Toronto conducted a number of very interesting experiments in which pure cultures of typhoid, diphtheria, pneumonia, tuberculosis, and meningitis germs were consumed by the millions in food and drink by a group of volunteers. The results: no ill effects whatsoever.". From "The Germ Theory Reexamined" by Bob Zuraw and Bob Lewanski (*Vegetarian World*, Volume 3, Number 11, September-November 1977)

Numerous experiments have tried to produce various diseases by the feeding of germs, without any disease being produced. Such experiments by the U.S. Navy, again without results. Dr. Claunch says:

"These experiments, conducted under test conditions and under government supervision, with such disappointing results, should have knocked the last prop from under the germ theory. They doubtless would have done so if our government doctors had seen fit to make them public property. But alas, they did not. It would have been a great service to the people, but not good business for the doctors and serum manufacturers." Dr. S. K. Claunch, in *Exploding the Germ Theory*, 2. *ibid.* P 25

Even in the primary published literature, there are researchers who question the standard belief that influenza is contagious based on the observation that symptoms arise simultaneously around the world at a rate that can't be explained by person to person transmission

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1292615/> Referenced by <https://kellybroganmd.com>

As far back as 1914, they knew.. Reports in the *Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 1914. Vol. 14, pages 1 to 32, describe experiments by E. C. Rosenow, M.D., of the Mayo Biological Laboratories in Rochester, Minnesota. It was demonstrated that streptococci (pus germs) could be made to assume all the characteristics of pneumococci (pneumonia germs) simply by feeding them on pneumonia virus and making other minor alterations in their environment. When the procedure was reversed, they quickly reverted

to pus germs. In all cases, regardless of the type of germs, they quickly mutated into other types when their environment and food were changed.

MD Kelly Brogan <https://kellybroganmd.com/why-the-current-moment-is-an-opportunity/> states:

“One of the most compelling studies to interrogate the assumptions around contagion and germ theory was conducted by the Public Health Service and the U.S. Navy under the supervision of Dr. Milton Rosenau in 1918 in healthy volunteers at multiple locations. His first volunteers received first one strain and then several strains of Pfeiffer’s bacillus by spray and swab into their noses and throats and then into their eyes. When that procedure failed to produce disease, others were inoculated with mixtures of other organisms isolated from the throats and noses of influenza patients. Next, some volunteers received injections of blood from influenza patients. Finally, 13 of the volunteers were taken into an influenza ward and exposed to 10 influenza patients each. Each volunteer was to shake hands with each patient, to talk with him at close range, and to permit him to cough directly into his face. None of the volunteers in these experiments developed influenza. Rosenau was clearly puzzled, and he cautioned against drawing conclusions from negative results.” His article on this subject in *JAMA ends* with a telling acknowledgment:

“We entered the outbreak with a notion that we knew the cause of the disease, and were quite sure we knew how it was transmitted from person to person. Perhaps, if we have learned anything, it is that we are not quite sure what we know about the disease.”<sup>4</sup> -- Dr. Milton Rosenau

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2862332/> Referenced  
by <https://kellybroganmd.com>