

Safe and Effective Vaccinations **By Thomas A. Kruzel, ND**

History

The vaccination debate has been around since the early 1800's following the popularization of the germ theory by Louis Pasteur (1822-1895), the inventor of pasteurization. His theory says that there are fixed, external germs (or microbes) that invade the body and cause a variety of separate and definable diseases. In this model, in order to get well, you need to first identify and then kill whatever germ has made you sick.

At about the time that Pasteur was promoting his germ theory; a contemporary by the name of Claude Bernard (1813-1878) was developing the theory that the body's ability to heal was dependent on its general condition or internal environment. Thus disease occurred only when the terrain or internal environment of the body became favorable to germs. A contemporary of Claude Bernard's was Antoine Bechamp (1816-1908) who built upon and extended Bernard's idea, developing his own theory of health and disease which revolved around the concept of "pleomorphism." Pleomorphism is the ability of a microbe to change throughout its life cycle, especially if subjected to a stressor such as an antibiotic. Beauchamp recognized the ability of microbes to do so, becoming, along with Bernard, a critic of the germ theory because of the microorganism's ability to adapt to its new environment. [1]

It was against this backdrop that the competing theories (terrain & germ) gained their followers as well as dissenters giving rise to the debate about vaccination and immunization that still exists to this day.

Because of the germ theory, vaccination against small pox, the most feared disease of the era, began in earnest through out the USA in the late 1800's. But because of the way the vaccines were being produced, (by inoculating cow utters with live small pox virus then harvesting the produced puss and injecting it back into humans) the number of adverse reactions and increasing death rate caused many to decry vaccination as a public health measure. Many Medical, Osteopathic and Naturopathic doctors as well as public figures, politicians and concerned scientists also joined the public cacophony against mandatory and sometimes forced vaccinations.

Starting in 1853 anti vaccine organizations began popping up all over the Western world and Naturopathic physicians were often active members. In fact, the naturopathic publication *The Naturopath and the Herald of Health* most often carried opinion pieces written by physicians from all medical disciplines condemning vaccinations and warning the public about their dangers. The issues discussed then are similar to those being debated today; freedom of choice in health care decisions, abolishment of mandatory vaccination, safety of vaccine preparations, questions about whether vaccination really conveys immunity and accountability of vaccine manufacturers for adverse effects. [2]

Naturopathic physicians were having success treating vaccinatable diseases and noted that their treatments were more successful than vaccinations with considerably fewer side effects unlike vaccinations where the public was developing severe illnesses from vaccines through transmission of infectious agents. This is similar to what is found today with adverse effects of conventional vaccinations being linked to autism spectrum disorders, changes in brain development and neurological function, disruptions of normal homeostatic mechanisms such as bowel function, digestive disorders, sleep patterns as well as development of other diseases. Additionally, reports of complex regional pain syndrome (CRPS), a chronic pain condition affecting the limbs, and postural orthostatic tachycardia syndrome (POTS), a condition in which the heart rate increases abnormally after sitting or standing up, causing symptoms such as dizziness and fainting, as well as headache, chest pain, and weakness, as well as a number of deaths occur following HPV vaccination in women.

The early Naturopathic rejection of vaccination contained several elements that made it popular with the public. The first was hygiene and sanitation, with the naturopathic perspective being that sanitation and hygiene were significantly more important components of preventing epidemics. Secondly, it was “About the Terrain”, the role of the microorganisms in infectious disease being secondary to the environment. Microorganisms exist in healthy people without the presence of disease. This of course negated the germ theory being used to promote vaccinations. Thirdly, the role of infectious disease in the development of what we would today call immune competency. Acute infection provided future immunity against the same disease. The process of acute infection produced a general strengthening of the body that would prevent the future evolution of degenerative diseases. More importantly, naturopaths felt exceedingly confident in managing many of the acute infectious diseases that vaccination was targeted against such as smallpox, influenza, polio, and diphtheria. And lastly, Naturopathic physicians felt that influencing the self-healing systems of the body in a 'suppressive' manner through vaccination would prevent the positive benefits of general and specific strengthening of the body (immunity) and actually impaired the body economy to the point of producing chronic disease.

Naturopathic physicians of that era predicted that if the bodies healing reactions to diseases were continually suppressed, the incidences of chronic degenerative diseases and cancer would increase in successive generations, something that we are seeing increasingly in the modern era.

One of the fundamental flaws in the current vaccination protocol is that they are introduced through the skin rather than through the oral/nasal route. Nature has designed the human organism to attenuate microorganisms in an incremental manner through the oral-nasal route and gastrointestinal tract. Attenuation in this manner allows for the immune system to recognize the offending agent while building the appropriate antibody response.

The natural history of microorganism attenuation is such that evidence of infection does not occur until several days after exposure and is accompanied by fever and the opening of the emunctories, all of which help protect the host. Conventional vaccinations when administered through the skin, largely by-pass this mechanism resulting in a less than complete attenuation of the microorganism. Therefore, vaccinations that can be administered through the oral-nasal and gastrointestinal routes will provide a more thorough and effective inoculation of the host resulting in greater immunity.

Another flaw in the conventional vaccination protocol lies in the fact that infants, whose immune systems require a long period of development, receive so many of them in a short period of time. This can overtax an already fragile vital force as it attempts to grow and attain development of the nervous system, heart, lungs, brain, skin and gastrointestinal system. The infant must expend energy in areas that are as yet underdeveloped in order to accommodate the foreign vaccinations. This has been shown to lead to delays in developmental milestones.

Homeopathic Nosode Vaccinations and Immune Protocol

The use of homeopathic medicines in the treatment of infectious disease has been around since they were introduced, over 300 years ago by Samuel Hahnemann MD. In fact it was the success of homeopathic medicines during an epidemic of Scarlatina in Germany in 1801 that brought rapid recognition to an emerging medical therapy.

The use of homeoprophylaxis, (using substances that can cause a disease to prevent the disease from taking hold) has been used since the 1800's and has amassed an excellent record of success. As an example; in Cuba, mass immunizations, using Leptospirosis nosode and Bach Flower remedies for the prevention of Leptospirosis which happens seasonally in Cuba during the monsoon season. In 2007 for example, 2.5 million people were immunized with Leptospirosis 200c nosode given 2 weeks apart, and a further dose of 10M given after hurricane Ike struck Cuba. Cuba has had dramatic success with homeoprophylaxis in the treatment of Leptospirosis. Before the use of the nosode, 2000 people were affected every year, but since the start of the "nosode immunization" less than 10 are affected annually.

Additionally, in 1974, during a Meningococcal outbreak in Brazil, 18,640 patients were given Meningococcinum prophylaxis while 6,430 received no treatment. The treatment group reported 4 cases to 32 cases in the no treatment group which is 23 times more effective than no treatment. [3]

Evidence as to nosode effectiveness has also been collected during controlled studies in the laboratory. In 1932, Chavanon published that 45 children had changed from Schick test positive to Schick test negative (demonstrating antibody formation to Diphtheria) after being treated with the nosode Diphtherinum. Patterson and Boyd repeated this test in 1941, and 20 of 33 children treated converted to Schick test negative. Roux again repeated the study in 1946 with similar results. [3]

Why use a Homeopathic Immunization Protocol?

The use of homeopathic preparations in the treatment and prevention of diseases goes back over 300 years. It has been ours, as well as others' experience that they are safe and effective. In Australia, Isaac Golden PhD reports that out of over 1300 children who were administered generalized homeoprophylaxis for multiple diseases, approximately 10% had side effects although the majority were very mild and brief. [4] It has been our experience that far fewer reactions occur and usually consist of a low-grade fever or skin eruption that lasts for about 24 hours, then subsides. We consider these rare reactions as a positive sign that a disease miasm is being addressed and do not see it again when the nosode is administered the following year. A miasm is an inherited trait that is passed from generation to generation.

It has only been recently that research, through the use of new technology, has been able to determine how homeopathic medicines affect the human organism. It is now known that homeopathic preparations act as source nanoparticles that mobilize hormesis and time dependent pharmacological effects upon biological systems to stimulate adaptive and readjust homeostatic cellular mechanisms. Hormesis is a biological phenomenon whereby a beneficial effect (improved health, stress tolerance, growth or longevity) results from exposure to low doses of an agent that is otherwise toxic or lethal when given at higher doses. The ability of the organism to adjust to this stimulus determines the outcome response resulting in reversal of cross-adapted maladaptation's that underlies the disease process or inability of the organism to resist disease development. Because of this response, systemic resilience of the organism improves, restoring homeostasis as well as immunity against further disease.

We have been using homeopathic nosodes for immunizations for over 30 years now and with rare exception, have not had any children come down with the disease they have been vaccinated against. In those rare cases, the disease experienced was of shorter duration and less intense than in conventionally vaccinated children. Statistically, children who undergo a conventional vaccination schedule are much more likely to develop the disease they have been vaccinated against than those who undergo the homeopathic protocol. As an example, a recent out break of measles in California was largely among vaccinated children. This occurred because of the pleomorphic nature of viruses and bacteria, which change as they make their way through the population. Conventional vaccines are unable to compensate for these changes whereas homeopathic nosodes, that affect the body on a deeper level, are able to convey immunity even in the face of microorganism pleomorphism. As previously mentioned, it is the environment or terrain, not the organism that dictates whether one will get an infectious disease or not.

We recommend that the homeopathic nosode protocol begin at about 1 year of age following the cessation of breast-feeding. Until that time, breast milk contains everything needed for immune system development, but as well, the infants' immune defense. The nosodes are administered once a day for 2 days after which we wait 5 days to see if there is a reaction. After all of the nosodes (7) are completed, the same protocol is undertaken

the following year. This is done until about 12 years of age by which time most of the immune system has developed the cellular memory needed to sustain the person throughout their life. If during the year, the child is exposed to a previously vaccinated disease, we recommend that another dose of the corresponding nosode to be administered as a precaution.

Homeopathic immunizations/vaccinations are safe and effective and convey life long immunity. They do so in a manner that affects the human body on a deep level and are not subject to changes in microorganisms as they go through their own life and adaptive cycles. The homeopathic nosodes used in this protocol work on the terrain in order to help the body resist infective agents that act is given the opportunity.

References:

1. ¹Snider, P. , Zeff, J., Pizzorno, J., Sensenig, J., Myers, S., Turner, R. N., Warren, D. (Eds.), Kruzel, T. (In press). *Foundations of naturopathic medicine* Prophylaxis and Immunization
2. Czeranko, S Editor Vaccination and Naturopathic Medicine – In Their Own Words
NCNM Press 2015 Portland, Oregon
3. Todd A. Hoover, MD Epidemic Diseases And Homeopathic Prophylaxis: Fact Or Fiction
4. Golden, I Vaccination & Homeoprophylaxis? A review of Risks and Alternatives
6th Edition Golden, I IGP 2007