

Medicus curat, natura sanat

Healing power and vital force as neglected variables in science

Dr. phil. Jörg Berchem

www.Joyful-Life.org

The saying "The physician treats, nature heals" is attributed to Hippocrates of Kos, the Greek physician and philosopher who shaped the history of medicine in Europe like no other, and to whom both physicians and non-physician therapists and naturopaths referred for centuries. One would think that the insight "*Medicus curat, natura sanat*" should have led to a certain humility in medicine. But academic medicine has long since bid farewell to Hippocrates and for decades now has regarded his postulate and equally his Hippocratic oath as a whimsical and naive view that serves more to amuse than to instruct.

On the other hand, academic medicine, without admitting it or even thinking about it any more, has settled for the *medicus curat* and no longer even makes the attempt to pursue healing as the goal of its actions or, as naturopathy does, to create conditions that enable nature to heal. Instead, it is content with fighting symptoms and isolated "pathogens".

So, just as academic medicine has resigned itself to being a "practitioner", it has completely forgotten about *natura sanat*. Academic medicine not only ignores it, but even hinders it to a large extent. It no longer has an eye for the healing power of nature, or it seems to consider chemical processes (e.g. of wound healing) as such, observing and describing everything in an analytically isolating reductionist way.

How did this come about? The reason for this can be found above all in the academisation of medicine and the development of the natural sciences into analytically isolating sciences. It is often forgotten that it is only a little more than a century since medicine began to make exclusive use of the natural sciences or even tried to conceive itself as such.

In society's esteem, too, medicine is now regarded as a natural science. Nevertheless, doctoral theses for the doctor medicus generally correspond more to those of bachelor theses in actual sciences in terms of content and scope. This is by no means a personal assessment on my part, but rather that of the European Research Council, which considers by example the German "Dr. med." in no way equivalent to the philosophical or scientific Anglo-Saxon "Ph. D." (in German this corresponds to "Dr. phil" or "Dr. rer. nat.").¹ The German Science Council also takes such a position.²

Among the sciences, medicine in particular, which claims to place so much emphasis on scientificity, is considered rather unscientific: "Student representative Bertram Otto sees the problem already in medical studies: "A major problem from our point of view is above all the lack

of teaching of scientific skills. This leads to the point that finished doctors do not understand studies, for example, and they overestimate the possibilities of therapies when it comes to treatment. Many medical students come into contact with scientific work for the first time during their doctorate."³

Even so-called "medical studies" are largely devoid of scientific thinking.⁴ They are mostly purely statistical surveys, and notoriously under the influence of financiers, money takers, lobbyists, careerists and political narcissists.

In fact, medicine tends to use the natural sciences rather than being one itself.

This would not be a problem at all - the earth sciences also use physics, chemistry and biology - if medicine in particular did not deal with an "object of research" that can only be inadequately recognised and described with a scientific approach.

For the human being, at least the one who seeks medical advice, is a living organism and also a spiritual being. Life and consciousness, however, cannot be described by the natural sciences.

Moreover, the human being is a wholeness as part of many wholes and of the great wholeness of this earth. However, it is precisely medicine that closes itself off to a holistic view of the world and a holistic view of man.

In order to substantiate these statements, which are difficult to digest and which may be misunderstood by many as an accusation, we must recognise that the human spirit (mind with its conscious and unconscious parts) has two parts: intellect and reason.

Let us quote one of the great German physicists who, like all truly great scientists, was also a philosopher and peace researcher:

"With the German philosophical tradition, I call intellect here the faculty of finite, conceptual, discursive cognition. Intellect can think what a finite, as one says today, purpose-rational will can want. A purposeful will can execute what a clear intellect can think conceptually. Reason is a faculty of mental perception that can see a whole as a whole. The modern world is a world of will and intellect. I believe that the development of this side of human nature has been the task of these last centuries. But the world of will and intellect fails everywhere where it omits, indeed prevents, achievements of reason. And this prevention is a quasi-neurotic defence of the self-power of a collective ego that dreams itself omnipotent in will and intellect." C.F. von Weizäcker (on Bavarian Radio 1970)

So it is intellect that has brought forth the analytical natural sciences and their astonishing achievements. However, in order to use them sensibly or to refrain from using them sensibly, reason is required. This, however, is the subject of philosophy and is not at all accessible to natural science. Purely analysing natural science does not know reason, because reason withdraws from this analysing way of looking at things. This leads to an alarming degree to the present problems which increasingly threaten humanity and which cause these problems through purely scientific thinking and purely rational action.

To expect, they, i.e. the natural sciences and their experts, to solve these problems is down-

right insane, as if we were to ask the arsonist for advice on how to put out a fire.

So if medicine wants to make exclusive use of the natural sciences, it is making the same logical mistake by using the sciences to treat diseases which, to a large extent, these natural sciences and purely analytical thinking have produced.

This analytical scientific thinking is a pure thinking of intellect. However, reason also belongs to the essence of man, which is actually the older part, the part that has guaranteed survival over millions of years and is a characteristic of the entire natural world and reveals itself to us in the deep meaningfulness of nature.

Man must integrate reason into his thinking and also into his science and medicine again, as Goethe once did and demanded. If this does not happen soon, we will no longer be able to control the damage caused by rational science and technology.

Nature is permeated by reason, that is immanent everywhere. Who, being still endowed with reason, can still believe in coincidences, the Big Bang and Darwinism alone? If we look at nature, and today we have unbelievable possibilities to do so through science and technology, we see everywhere how processes interlock and how every animal, insect and bacterium plays a meaningful role in the greater whole.

The form accessible to scientific observation always follows a meaningful plan. Beings living on the surface of the earth did not develop eyes by chance, whereupon light came into being. Rather, the light was there and eyes developed to realise this possibility. Only the plan and the possibility of locomotion and walking enable the development of legs and give this sense. So thinking and the mind did not develop from the brain either, but followed it, giving it form.

"As long as man neglects the meaningfulness of nature and its order, wholeness and health, he will be faced with ever more insoluble problems, which the present generation in particular has produced in abundance, in the mistaken assumption that subsequent generations will be better able to solve them. This is precisely what will not happen, since the development of holistic rational thinking can hardly be expected," wrote the physician and medicine critic Karl Kötschau seventy years ago.⁵

Mankind is increasingly becoming *homo technicus*, who believes he can control and improve nature. But this is a great delusion, for the spiritual constitution of man can never be more mature than that which is immanent in nature, the nature of which man is a part. And to act according to such arrogance harbours a huge danger: every disturbance of the natural order also causes corresponding disturbances in man.

We see this very clearly in the worst illness of our time, against which we are naturally powerless, because we ourselves prevent the formation of a higher spiritual constitution of reason, as would be necessary to overcome it. I am talking here about cancer, which is repeatedly referred to as the "scourge of humanity" in our present day. The director of the Cancer Center at the University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Carsten Bokemeyer, says that cancer is "also a scourge of humanity that is inherent in the cells". He also speaks of a "resistance" and claims "cancer cells develop mechanisms with each new therapy to defend themselves against the attack on them." - just as if cancer cells were foreign bodies in the organism, cap-

able of thinking and developing strategies.⁶

The latter may be a logical and consistent assessment from the point of view of an analytically isolating natural scientist: a cancer cell has changed in its genetic material through external or unknown processes, grows and divides uninhibitedly, is not "attacked" by the immune system and is a danger to human organism.

This is a reductionist view from the organ to the tissue to the cell and to what is happening in it. This view is entirely focused on the disease process. As a logical consequence, such cells must be attacked, fought and killed by academic combat medicine. And where sobering resignation sets in, where fighting no longer succeeds, one is at least satisfied with "controlling". The medical director of the German Society for Haematology and Medical Oncology (DGHO), Bernhard Wörmann, says that there are promising new therapeutic approaches for very different types of cancer, but that "controlling" cancer is more likely than "beating" it.⁷

The violent methods of poisoning, irradiating and cutting away are matched by the battle rhetoric of the medical profession in describing cancer:

"It is war. The battlefield is the body. It could be any body, although the old or smokers are more often afflicted than the young and those who avoid poisons. But it can also strike children. Or a young woman in the prime of her beauty. The battle creeps in, so stealthily that you don't realise for a long time how much it is already raging. By the time you notice it, by the sudden shortness of breath, by the exhaustion, by the fact that something has changed on your skin, under your skin, it is often already too late.

"The enemy has made terrain gains, has long since done his work of destruction. He is so fearsomely good at it. Burrows in. Reappears in unexpected places, when you thought he was defeated, he returns on several fronts, stronger than ever. It drives you crazy not to be able to get rid of him. One day, it's been years since you thought you were saved, it's back. Here, the doctor says, and shows you the picture. Sometimes you are too tired to want to rebel any more.

"Siddhartha Mukherjee has followed this story, the story of the war that cancer wages against man, and those counter-attacks with which man tries to put it to flight. 'The King of All Diseases: Cancer - A Biography' is a depressing book because it tells of so many defeats. All the deaths. All the poor patients who have to suffer so horribly under the treatment of their disease that one no longer understands why they still want to live. All the doctors who can do nothing, however great their curative furore, however radical their method of treatment. "⁸

This language, these metaphors, which medicine has not let go of since the beginning of the theory of infection, founded mainly by military doctors, needs to be made aware of its dramatic but also unscientific egocentricity and scaremongering.

There is talk of the "king of disease", just as if disease were a real entity, an observable figure that is defined in itself. A hierarchy is implied, also a malice. There is talk of "destruction", of "the enemy" and of the body as a "battlefield".

And despite billions in research funds, purely scientifically oriented medicine knows nothing but "guns" in the "battle": chemotherapy as cell poison, radiation as "cell cannon", surgery as cutting away and "culling". And yet, in all its violence, medicine is so helpless against this disease that has become so common.

Its behaviour is isolating analytically and it is intellectually logical and comprehensible. And just as rationally logical are their threatening gestures and attacks against those who claim otherwise, who offer other therapies: they should not be allowed to treat cancer, they should not even be allowed to talk about it, above all the alternative practitioners, naturopaths and "other charlatans". Cancer belongs to medicine alone, to "pure science" alone. What is overlooked is that it is above all the natural sciences and the technical implementation of their findings that have made cancer so common:

Toxins in the air, food, water, microwave radiation all around us, radioactive radiation from nuclear power plants, reactor accidents and nuclear weapons deployments for testing. Mutagenic pesticides and substances of concern in just about everything from vaccines to cosmetics, from children's food to toys.

And it is precisely these experts, with great intellect but apparently without reason, who are now expected to solve the problem they have created? It is the same with the so-called "climate catastrophe", "littering" on land and water and even "warmongering". From the analysing scientific experts, by their unrestricted main responsibility for all man-made catastrophes of modern times in joint action with the mind-oriented politicians and megalomaniac big capitalists, are we supposed to hope for the solution of these very problems and also diseases?

Instead, let us look now at the example of cancer through the eyes of a Goethe, holistically and descriptively, and with reason.

First of all, we realise that cancer cells are not foreign cells. They are the organism's own cells and not foreign bodies. But what distinguishes them from healthy cells? As a reminder: we do not look in an isolating, reductionist way, but holistically: we see that these cells have disengaged from the order of the organism. They follow their own plan, leave their intended place and spread out into the space of other cells. In doing so, they increasingly disrupt the order and function of other cells organised in tissue until the organs consisting of them are restricted in their function in a life-threatening way or can no longer fulfil this function. Ultimately, this leads to the death of the organism and thus also to the death of the "degenerated" cells, i.e. cells that have lost their "kind", their order. As painful and macabre as it sounds: through death, the order of the whole is restored, as it were.

Let us now broaden our view not only beyond cells and organs, but beyond the individual organism, even beyond the societies of individual human organisms. And consider the great order of nature of which we are a part. There is, of course, the so-called Gaia hypothesis, which views the Earth as an organism. Then, metaphorically, the plant and animal societies would be the tissues of this organism. Humanity would also be such a tissue and we individual human beings would be cells of such a tissue, embedded in a larger meaningful order.

Let us stay with this wide-angle view and consider the behaviour of humanity and its effect on the earth ... Has humanity not sounded itself out of the great natural order in the same

way as cancer cells sound themselves out of the order of the organism? Are we not, as it were, penetrating places and "tissues" that we are repressing and destroying? Some landscapes, seen from an aeroplane, resemble lesions and erosions of the skin, cities grow like tumours and displace the natural societies living in the order, which (also) included human societies that (did) honour the meaningfulness of the natural order and (did) integrate themselves into it as rational beings. Industrial parks and overexploitation metastasise new offshoots of destruction and poison the organism earth.

Who should now be surprised that cancer - the correct medical term is "neoplasia" (sw. "new formation") - is causing so much trouble for contemporary humanity?

From this holistic view, without questioning the scientific knowledge of the processes at the cellular level and below, a completely different view of cancer and thus inevitably of its therapy with the goal of a cure is the result.

Questions that take into account the wholeness of the organism and its living environment, which also includes the psyche, the social circumstances, and ultimately everything that makes up this human being, would therefore be: What has thrown the cells out of order? What might have thrown this human being out of his life order? And above all: how can order be restored?

Order is peace, order is salvation, is health, and all this can never be established by struggle or coercion - all philosophers know this, but never the natural sciences, as long as they only use intellect and not also reason.

The same applies to the problems that humanity has caused on the earth and for the earth. They can certainly be compared to a disease of the planet. They cannot be solved with intellect. Understanding the problem would not solve it by a long shot. A change of consciousness is necessary. And reason demands a systemic change and not the replacement of "symptoms". Reason demands reintegration into order. We need to bring the sciences and also medicine into reasonable bounds, as well as our lifestyle. In the meantime, we should start very modestly and rediscover the order and meaningfulness of the world and our identity in it.

The same applies to the problems that humanity has caused on the earth and for the earth. They are quite comparable to a disease of the planet. They cannot be solved with intellect. Understanding the problem would not solve it by a long shot. A change of consciousness is necessary. And reason demands a systemic change and not the replacement of "symptoms". Reason demands a reintegration into order. We must bring the sciences and medicine into reasonable bounds, as well as our lifestyle. In the meantime, we should start quite modestly and rediscover the order and meaningfulness of the world and our identity in it.

Even the image of cancer and the cancer behaviour of humankind just described has not yet fully internalised the principle of order in nature; after all, it is only an image that may help us to understand.

However, if we have really consistently internalised the meaningful ordering principle of nature in our thinking, this means that nature is constantly striving for healing. In this respect, however, a cancer cannot then be a falling out of order, but only a symptom of "falling out", a symptom that ultimately tries to maintain natural order and function.

And indeed, cancer cells are obviously an attempt by nature to keep the organism still alive and to protect the great natural order,⁹ thus a symptom of a healing process, as all diseases ultimately are. That this process and its symptoms are not free of suffering and are not always in the sense of the analytically thinking human being with his anthropocentric world view is of course logical. But the world and nature are not anthropocentric. In this day and age, in fact still in the 21st century, one really has to put it this way: the world does not revolve around man; the earth and nature are not there for man, but in fact we and our entire co-world are there for each other in a meaningful way, as parts of nature.

Philosophically at least, the question still arises: if humanity behaves like a cancer towards the earth, as a disease, what symptom is it? What is the earth trying to "metabolise" through human beings? Well, just as the cancer cell, through new abilities, keeps the human being alive for a while, but then also kills him if the behaviour is not corrected or not corrected in time, so perhaps the ability of intellect, the ability of technical and analytical thinking, is to be understood as the last chance for a humanity, a species that is otherwise not very viable, to buy it enough time for a new consciousness to arise. Either this will arise and the symptom will disappear or it will not arise and humanity will destroy itself.

Just as cancer is always a question of life and death, the symptomatology of the destruction of nature by man is also a question of life and death.

The fairy tale of life as a struggle and of the alleged aggressiveness of nature

Virology in particular, but ultimately even the entire pathology of academic medicine, paints a picture of the world as a constantly risky and dangerous habitat in which disease lurks everywhere, as if to attack man. According to this, humans themselves are supposed to have "defence mechanisms" that can "fight" and "defeat" these "attacks" from outside. The immune system is described as an army that recognises, fights and kills "invaders". Other diseases are also said to be "fought" and "defeated". Those who "defeat cancer" are considered particularly strong, like "vaccine medicine", which is falsely claimed to have "eradicated diseases".¹⁰ Those who suffer chronically from diseases, or have difficulty "overcoming" a disease, are considered "weak".

In the rhetorical consequence, one must therefore "protect" oneself from diseases and it is necessary to "strengthen" the immune system (for which there is no evidence that such a thing is possible at all) and make people strong. Large industries live on this idea and the idea that a "strong person" is healthier than a "weak person".

Where does this war rhetoric come from and does it really correspond to the facts, i.e. what we can observe in nature?

The origin of these ideas, according to which illness is something like war, are easy to recognise. They stem above all from the medieval idea according to which the world is to be divided into good and evil and God faces a Satan who threatens people and wants to cast a spell over them. The fact that "good" and "evil" here are time- and culture-specific and that morality is a code of conduct in constant flux, shaped by authority or social agreement, is completely overlooked and "good" and "evil" are taken as natural realities, just as they are in

the political propaganda of absolute concepts. This medieval conception led to the belief that illness was a consequence of sin, that it was either God's punishment or a kind of possession by evil. The idea that "the good" and "the right" must constantly fight "the evil" and "the wrong" is the basis not only of the arms industry, but also, to a large extent, of the pharmaceutical industry with all its "anti-medicines" (antibiotics, antifungals, antiviral and inhibitory drugs, painkillers, ... etc.).

This idea merged seamlessly with the emerging idea that diseases were caused by "pathogens", when the idea of the "evil poison" causing disease began to be replaced by the idea of the "evil pathogen". It was certainly helped by the fact that it was mainly military doctors who wrote medical history as pioneers of virology. Their military thinking, their world of battle and victory, but also defeat, not only established the theory of infection, but also had a lasting influence on all medical thinking.

Moreover, European culture had developed into one according to which the natural was considered "wild" and "dangerous". Animals that seemed to be in competition with humans were exterminated in the same way as other cultures, which were called "wild" through prejudice and lack of understanding, were attacked, subjugated, destroyed and slaughtered. Nature may occasionally be romantically glorified in its beauty, but even in Romanticism it was something wild and dark that had to be controlled and subjugated.

Darwin's theory of the "survival of the fittest", commonly understood questionably as "survival of the most powerful", can be seen as the scientific confirmation and justification of human arrogance (certainly not superiority), which is still considered valid today. And this although it is so easy to refute; just think of the dinosaurs, which were certainly the strongest animals we know, and which became extinct, while weak ones such as insects, but also all their prey, persisted, just as bunnies and deer survive just fine today, although their survival is characterised by everything but strength, while wolves and bears are almost extinct or have been wiped out.

Here we see an example of how, through cultural conditioning and prejudice, a scientific theory has been recognised and accepted, even though so much speaks against it. Darwin's quite remarkable theory of "the origin of the species" is not questioned by the realisation that it is not strength but adaptation to natural conditions that determines the development and survival of a species. It is only for humans that we do not seem to accept this new insight. Modern humanity seems to have found its survival and development in the subjugation and adaptation of nature to its unnatural ideals.

Of course, we have long seen that this will not lead to survival, but to inhumanity and endless suffering for humans and the whole of creation, and must ultimately lead inevitably to extinction; nevertheless, nothing has really changed in our belief in strength and struggle, rather we believe that we can continue to subjugate and "defeat" nature through even more technology, through even more refined manipulation (such as genetic engineering and poison mixing). This obsessive delusion, however, as is visible to everyone, does not lead to the development of humans or other species in the sense of a natural and survivable (also worth surviving) development. No astonishing technical achievements can hide this fact, which on the contrary only lead to the atrophy of abilities that are essential for survival, and today we can quite rightly speak of "digital dementia", and humans of the 21st century seem to be charac-

terised by one thing above all, namely the constant denial and lying to others, but also above all to themselves.

It is a common assumption that the evolution of man and his civilisational history is a linear one from "primitive" to "developed". I argue that this is not so. There is simply too much historical evidence of early engineering, higher mathematics and medical skills for us to maintain the thesis that humans have only ever developed their cognitive abilities and collective achievements throughout history into better or more cognitive knowledge and skills. Just think of the pyramids, the cave temples of Ajanta and Ellora, the rock-hewn churches of Ethiopia, the stone walls of the Incas, the statues of the Easter Islands, the Angkor Wat complex in Cambodia ... We are amazed when we judge these cultures only on the basis of their monumental stone buildings that have been preserved, but what knowledge, what skills and possibilities will they still have had that have not been handed down because they left no stone testimony?! - In the medical field, for example, archaeological finds of early skull operations bear witness to enormous anatomical knowledge and surgical skill, and this for a procedure that is one of the most difficult even for modern technical medicine.

Now, back to the assumption that nature is dangerous and violent and a constant threat to man, who must survive or even overcome it only through strength and struggle.

This theory is already refuted by the very existence of man, who has been able to survive and develop comparatively weakly over millions of years, nourished, sheltered and healed by - nature!

The supposed "superiority" and strength of man is solely the result of technological development, and this only began slowly perhaps 10,000 years ago and in connection with the new analytical thinking perhaps only with Galileo and Newton and really unleashed hardly more than 100 years ago.

Nature offers health agents, academic medicine postulates disease agents (pathogens)

Every supposed "poison" in nature has a healing effect when dosed correctly.

Bacteria and other microorganisms lose their "harmful" effect when the environment changes. Viewed holistically, one recognises that the causes of diseases caused by microorganisms usually lie in the environment, lifestyle and adaptation of the organism.

Viruses are usually regarded like bacteria, but they are not living and are something completely different. By observing their occurrence in disease events, they are interpreted monocausally and linearly as causing the disease. As chemical-genetic information carriers, however, viruses are possibly more of a symptom or symptom mediator. Here, too, a completely different picture emerges when viewed holistically.

Everything that exists in nature is good, even if we sometimes do not understand exactly what for

As early as 1953, the following principle was formulated by Arnold Toynbee:¹¹ The penetrat-

ing capacity of a part of a cultural radiation is in inverse proportion to the cultural value of this component. This principle applies not only to physical phenomena, but also to biological and to medicine. Toynbee explains by example that the ordered elementary particles that make up an atom of any element that is harmless in itself lose their harmlessness and become extremely dangerous as soon as they are split off from the order. Likewise, any component of a "cultural radiation" can have a destructive effect if it is detached from the system in which it has hitherto fulfilled its function. In the original order, this "culture part" - for example, a bacterium or even a virus - could not cause destruction; for through its proper connection with other parts of the structure, it was limited in its abilities. If, however, it is removed from it or isolated, this disturbance of the order triggers a destructive force which presumably ultimately strives to restore the order, but to this end unfolds a potential which is perceived as destructive and which has a relevant impact. Toynbee's principle is of fundamental importance because it dispels the idea that one can arbitrarily intervene in something that has grown over millions of years into a whole, into a structure of order, rearrange it to one's liking or possibly change it arbitrarily according to one's needs, isolate or change individual things from it, as the isolating linear-causal world of ideas of the natural sciences postulates and carries out. Unheard for decades, the Toynbee principle plays no role in research and application in science. Ultimately, it is merely the scientific formulation of a natural law that all earlier and indigenous cultures and religions have described and observed, knowing that the world is an order (Greek *kosmos* = "order") that must be respected and preserved in all actions and intentions.

The majority of physicians believe themselves to be connected to the "current state of science". But there is no uniform "state of the natural sciences". And there cannot be one, especially not for medicine. Medicine should rather be a holistic "life science" and a "healing science" in order to fulfil its original tasks. But the dogmatic limitation and selection of the methods of medicine has turned the "doctor" into a "technician", which leads him further and further away from his actual task, namely to help and heal. Doctors have become medical technicians who practise a "medical feasibility technique" based on costly methods and apparatuses that are not used to heal but to suppress symptoms and invent diseases. The techniques used largely eliminate any involvement of the living organism or even try to make it the handmaiden of their technology, as in the case of genetic mRNA drugs, which have been poured out on humanity since 2020 disguised as "vaccination" in a mass medication without indication.

When academic physicians speak of "healing" today, for example due to a chemotherapeutic effect, they believe in biochemical cures. But this is absurd and misses the true essence of healing. "Necrochemistry" is what Chargaff called the medical administration of chemical substances, and he is right. Chemistry, physics, the scalpel may alleviate and save, but they do not heal. Only the living organism heals. Healing is an organically holistic phenomenon.

What is life?

How poor all scientific attempts to define life are! They cannot even come close to opening up to life! Metabolism and genetics are supposed to be life? These are only expressions of life, not life itself which cannot be understood with intellect alone.

We believe that natural science can define life? Far from it. Even medicine can hardly distinguish between life and death. Mounting criticism by doctors, including Harvard professor Daniel Wikler, of the common practice of organ donation after brain death shows how help-less medicine really is to define life and death.¹²

"Since any number of physical-chemical states and processes can be observed in all living things, there are numerous scientists who believe that life is ultimately nothing more than a sum of physics and chemistry. This view is based on an astonishing overestimation of the exact natural sciences. The question arises how such a misjudgement of the cognitive power of a large field of science is possible among people who are used to thinking methodically. Natural scientists can add up all the chemical and physical measurements in all possible ways and relate them to each other, but never, never does the slightest thing come into being that is called life. Since not one experimental fact - the only proof recognised by the exact natural sciences - confirms the correctness of the equation "life = chemistry + physics", physicists and chemists are dependent on believing in its existence. But faith is not a recognised means of knowledge for science ... "¹³

The Swisse professor of physical chemistry Thürkauf explains what should be obvious: a reductionist science cannot recognise or describe wholeness:

"The method attempts to reduce the manifoldness of the world to such a measure as to enable the limitation of our intellect to contemplate and order things. Every scientific representation thus represents a reduction of reality, by which we want to designate the wholeness of the world, to the capacity of the intellect. We must be aware of this reduction (...) in every scientific work. Through the application of scientific methods, the university is breaking down into more and more specialised fields in an increasingly divergent process. Because of the diversity of the world, even in its smallest areas, this process of disintegration has no end. Anyone who wants to do science must not be offended by this. Anyone who thinks about it cannot get rid of an unpleasant feeling. The feeling can even become very unpleasant."

And Thürkauf emphasises:

"Nature as such is a closed whole. Separate parts of nature exist only in our imagination. In reality, everything is intimately interwoven with everything else. Nothing is independent. In relation to the phenomenon of life, the methods of the exact natural sciences prove to be inadequate (...) The concept of a part in the sense of a separation does not exist in it. All parts of nature always refer to its wholeness. The division of the natural sciences into parts therefore contradicts the holistic nature of nature."

Of course, reduction and specialisation leads to amazing and often useful excellence. But it also leads to a tremendous narrowing of the horizon if it is elevated to the sole "truth". In fact, reality is never one-dimensional, and therefore no single methodology will ever capture it. Yet there are obviously quite different ways of describing the quality of the world and of

life.

An extreme example is Hildegard von Bingen, who by no means described existing monastic medicine, as some might believe, but visionarily dictated medical phenomena and treatments. She describes "*viriditas*" or "green power" as the life and healing force, not analysing, but describing, feeling and grasping the essence of things.

Anthroposophical medicine, traditional Chinese medicine and traditional Tibetan medicine, to name only the best known and somewhat most recognised, are also non-reductionist analysing systems of medicine.

Nature is perfect. All errors are man's. (Goethe)

Living nature produces only wholes. In its continuous process of creation, it can produce nothing but intact, whole and healthy things. Man, too, came into being as such a whole and healthy being. But man, as the only being we know, has the ability to think, believe and spread untruth.

It is the ability to deny and lie, especially even to deny and lie to ourselves, that distinguishes us from all other life forms and leads to all the past and present suffering that we allow and engage in. We deceive ourselves by regarding the human intellect and its possibilities as supreme, by replacing spirituality and religion with natural science and capital.

We are already lying to ourselves by using the word "environment"; because that implies that there is a world around us and that we are something separate. But there is no "environment", there is at most the "co-world", i.e. everything in the world with which we are connected. In this respect, the idea of "environmental protection" is wrong from the start and doomed to failure, because it reinforces the idea that we are as if detached from the world. If we lived integrated into this world and its cosmic order, then our compassion and respect for the "fellow world" would ensure that there would be no "environmental destruction" and thus nothing would need to be protected.

In other respects, language reveals again and again how we use it to interpret things the way we want them to be and how it seems "obvious" or "logical" to us.

Our so-called "health care system" is in fact a "disease treatment system" oriented towards economic growth and profits. This deception is increasingly infiltrating the thinking and actions of everyone, patients and doctors and non-physician therapists.

What we call "pathogens" are in fact often microorganisms and viruses that also occur in the healthy body. For example, the chlostridia that are said to "cause" tetanus are ubiquitous, simply everywhere and also in us. Just as we distance ourselves from nature, we also distance ourselves from illness and look for external factors as the cause.

All the ecosystemic insights of the last decades have passed by our language and our behaviour in a way that makes no sense at all. The world continues to be divided into "beneficial organisms" and "pests", with the latter to be destroyed, just like the evil "pathogens". Nor have we yet banished the words "weeds" and "vermin" from our vocabulary, although growing numbers of organic farmers are showing that it is our relationship to and behaviour to-

wards nature that determines the success of intact poison-free agriculture.

Twists of words are at play everywhere, proving that we have internalised extraordinarily little of the understanding of the nature of the world, of disease and healing, of inner and outer nature. Natural science makes us believe that we have understood, but at the same time it gives us *carte blanche*, so to speak, for absolutely unreasonable behaviour.

If there is a pest in nature, it is the purely scientifically thinking "*homo technicus*" who, in arrogance and naivety, believes that his understanding would lead to reason.

Goethe's theory of nature and its significance for medicine, naturopathy and the healing of the earth

The universal genius Goethe was a critic of the modern natural science that was emerging at the time and a proponent of a holistic science. His science is not a quantitative natural science but a qualitative holistic science. The fact that Goethe was never really taken seriously by natural scientists because of his poetic works, reveals the whole dilemma of a natural science that is becoming more and more self-sufficient. Goethe proves that a clean science is also possible in the realm of the qualitative. His kind of cognition is quite different from that of exact natural science, which sees a process as an example of a general law, which is supposed to be completely derivable from this law. In Galileo's wake, cognition is derived from the experimental, the measuring, mechanically mathematically abstract in logical thinking. But if growth could be derived solely from the chemical constituents of a seed, what is life and what distinguishes it from the dead?

Goethe perceived measurement and experimentation as an unauthorised intervention in nature and thus anticipated the realisation that every such observation has an influence on the knowledge thus acquired, a basic idea of Heisenberg's uncertainty principle, which after all does not describe a measurement error but a principle nature, illustrated by the example of quantum mechanics.

The physicist Walter Heitler, looking at Goethe's epistemology and science, recognises:¹⁴

"There can be no doubt that the path of critical contemplation leads to genuine scientific knowledge, and this in a field that is difficult to access precisely for analytical thinking: in the field of qualities and interrelationships of forms that cannot be grasped quantitatively. Above all, we must agree with Goethe that the 'archetypes', the 'blueprint' etc. are spiritual realities that are accessible to our cognition and that we must regard as part of the spiritual content of natural things ... The Galileo-Newtonian path led to an ever-growing abstraction, to a detachment of science from the human being, in the name of an objectivity that was not understood. Objectivity was only supposed to be what had nothing to do with the human being, and that was believed to be only what could be measured and analysed. As if every access to the world around us did not require a human organ, in this case measuring and abstract thinking! Goethe warned against this abstraction. A world in which the human being no longer appears in the image of thought is no longer an ideal, whole world, no world in which human beings can live (...)

Newtonian science leads directly to today's technology. To a very large extent, it is also pursued today only for the sake of technology. Goethe was by no means averse to the practical application of science (...) But the promoter of technology in the modern sense (...) is not the creator of nature - but Mephisto. "

Goethe's probably most important literary work is indeed dedicated to the doctrine of knowledge: the figure of Faust embodies a plea for criticism and examination of valid knowledge. Faust seeks progress between the Renaissance and the post-Enlightenment. He is a critic of the 16th century and at the same time a critic of the 18th century. His time is one of increasing awareness of human power and the associated turning away from authorities beyond human reason. Science and theology separate. And the genius Goethe recognises the risks that this change in consciousness entails. He sees the danger of a science governed solely by intellect; namely, the loss of reason. This loss did not occur abruptly, but insidiously and steadily up to the present day.

The lack of freedom of medieval science was characterised by its dependence on the nobility and the Church, which only permitted cognition and knowledge insofar as it served to justify their existence and theological interpretations. From this arose Augustine's demand for human self-restraint: the human intellect should subordinate itself to the "*summum bonum*", the "highest good", which was embodied in God.

The revolution of the medieval world view was initiated by Roger Bacon's demand that science should be based exclusively on experience and observation of nature, rejecting any other authority. The dissolution of harmonic cosmology and the necessity of an independent knowledge of nature had already been prepared in scholasticism. The process of subjecting all human experience to rational knowledge began. On the one hand, the streams of gold stolen from Mexico and Peru and flowing to Europe and the plundering of the African continent freed up the means and made possible the leisure to pursue such studies at all; on the other hand, the national production of wealth demanded scientific knowledge and its technical implementations.

Natural objects and phenomena were to be ordered and measurable. Where this was not possible directly, an experiment had to be arranged in such a way that it could be measured. And this is where the artificial isolation of the phenomena to be explained begins.

"And this is precisely the greatest evil of recent physics, that experiments have been separated from man, as it were, and that one only wants to recognise nature in what artificial instruments show, and even to limit and prove what it can achieve by doing so." ¹⁵

Like Heitler, Werner Heisenberg had also understood Goethe and described "the devil" in science:

"Our world, our thinking, is today permeated and dominated by the symbiosis of Newtonian science and technology. The face of the earth and also of man is and will continue to be changed, mechanised. This science, which is only a partial science, manipulates nature in its image and has taken possession of our thinking. It claims to be everything and is finally preparing to biotechnically manipulate man as

well and possibly make him an object of technology (...) Can one doubt that Goethe's evil premonition was justified? And that Mephisto is indeed at work here? But since technology is so intimately connected with Newtonian science and follows inevitably from it, must we not see Mephisto's bald and extremely clever profile in this very science?"¹⁶

And so Heisenberg already recognises that natural science can only communicate the "correctness" of facts, but not the truths that are valid for life.¹⁷

The meaningfulness of nature

So it is the loss of the thinking of reason and a knowledge of nature in order, wholeness and health that we have to note. The loss of this knowledge leads us to question our inner and outer nature and to disturb its order. But if nature is no longer in order, i.e. healthy, all the beings living in it, plants, animals and human beings, are not either.

"Microcosm = macrocosm" is only a correct equation if "macrocosm = microcosm" is also correct. The knowledge of this equation was originally inherent in all peoples and in European thought it last appeared in medieval religious teachings.

At a time when one began to speak of "primitive peoples" and to "regard" them as "wild" and "primitive", the "hypertrophy of the intellect" (Kötschau) also began, with which the loss of knowledge about the meaningfulness of nature and a natural ethic went hand in hand.

However, the complete human being is only viable in an equally complete and whole world.

The focus on natural sciences and analytically isolating thinking is never holistic, because natural science does not allow us to find moral motives. This only provides us with the wholeness of nature and creation, to which the cultivation of the soul-spiritual and ethical is also bound, as are customs, traditions and culture.

Natural science cannot find meaning in nature, and thus cannot give meaning to human beings. Instead, it formulates and prescribes abstract ideals and meaningless logic.

Theodor Lessing wrote in his "Geschichte als Sinngebung des Sinnlosen"¹⁸:

"All that I have suffered on earth and all that seemed to me malicious and spiteful, fragile and mean, power-seeking or vain, all that I have encountered in my life's journey always in the guise of ideals. In the guise of truth: the lie. In the garb of logic: insanity. In the garb of right: all injustice. In the garb of patriotism: everything that dishonours the homeland. In the garb of the progress of mankind: everything degrading to man. And I never saw a historical perfidy, never a real abomination that was not practised in the name of some ideal. Thus my basic thought became more and more solidified, that the world of the spirit and its norm was only the indispensable substitute world of a life diseased in man, only the means of saving a species that had become questionable in itself, sinking again without trace after a brief waking consciousness, through science of megalomaniacal predatory apes."

The American chemist Erwin Chargaff spoke in a very similar vein in an interview:¹⁹

"Indeed, the world of lies dawned when the natural sciences became a kind of substitute for religion and philosophy. Originating as a branch of philosophy (...) natural science kept itself for a long time within the bounds appropriate to it (...) only slowly did success give rise to claims to exclusivity, to a kind of dogma of infallibility, which in our century led to a veritable dictatorship ... A science that cannot even define its object properly, as biology does vis-à-vis life, should be more modest. But in its modern guise, as molecular biology, it has become the most arrogant of all sciences. It lives - and it lives very well - on giant promises that are not kept or on global explanations that are not conclusive. These often take the form of so-called models (...) Especially in Germany, but also in America and England, the foisting of windy physical models as explanations of the most complicated processes of life has become a flourishing industry."

"I have been told that we work with our brains mainly in order to learn to understand the world better, that is, to learn something in addition which we did not recognise before, and which for this reason enriches or increases us in our humanity (...) This has not been true for a long time! On the contrary, I could imagine that one could really prove that science has contributed to the misery of humanity. Penicillin and all that notwithstanding - these great discoveries were all accidental discoveries, by the way. No one went out to save humanity."

Is Chargaff going too far here in the face of so much vaunted medical progress? If we are honest, we realise that these advances have all led medicine into a combat-technical medicine that intervenes violently in humans, chemically, physically, biologically and surgically. As a result, lives can be saved in emergencies and man lives longer on average as a result. But has he become healthier as a result? The majority now die slower and more miserably with many consumer and old age ailments under the application of industrialised and mechanised medicine. Have we learned anything about life or health and healing through these possibilities? Health has not been the work of human technology and a medicine that uses scientific knowledge for as long as mankind has existed and beyond, but it has always been first and foremost the work and a principle of nature. But modern medicine talks about disease, not about the grandiose and costless miracle of life and the manifold phenomena of healing power.

Just like life, we do not find this healing power in chemical or physical processes of the cell, nor do we recognise it through measurements and experiments. Rather, this healing power has to do with the meaningfulness and form of the world.

"There is a tender empiricism that makes itself intimately identical with the object, and thereby becomes theory proper. This enhancement of the intellectual faculty, however, belongs to a highly educated age," wrote Goethe.²⁰

We seem to be further away from this age than ever before.

Goethe usually refers to the "great whole" as "organisation", thus expressing his view of an order in nature. Just as the universe is to be understood as a large organised whole, so every being is to be understood as a small whole organised in itself. Spatially, the organisation of every natural being can be represented as a structure, as a shape. Temporally, it is to be per-

ceived and described as a transformation of shapes. Goethe's treatise on morphology accordingly bears the subtitle: "Formation and Transformation of Organic Natures".

Modern *homo technicus* no longer has any feeling or sense for the essence of order, wholeness and health of nature. There is nothing of this to be found in his abstract ego-world, which has disintegrated into its individual parts. And just as he does not understand outer nature, his own inner nature is alien to him.

The commercially technical man with his dogmatic belief exclusively in natural science strives for constant growth and intellectual efficiency. This leads to disintegration and disruption of the natural order.

Nature knows instead of growth: development; instead of efficiency: meaningfulness. The development of all living things is part of their becoming. Such (natural) development is based on the tendency to become a "whole", a "healthy" thing. It always strives to integrate itself into the greater whole, thereby contributing to development, health and wholeness.

Life arises from an order filled with wisdom. Life reveals a creative power that far surpasses human intellect.

Healing is not a human "making" but a natural "becoming". Whereas "making" represents a rigid self-creative struggle through which the isolated human being seeks to dominate, overcome and exploit nature, a living "becoming" of the integrating human being, on the other hand, is nature-creative and peaceful.

The irrefutable principle of *Natura sanat* is a striving of the living nature in and around us. It should be the guiding principle of all diagnostics and therapy in the sense of rational looking and acting, which always has the order, wholeness and health of nature in view.

- 1 Doktor med.ioker; tagesspiegel.de: <https://www.tagesspiegel.de/aerzte-doktor-med-ioker/1833762.html> [accessed 26. Nov. 2016])
- 2 U. Beisiegel: Promovieren in der Medizin. Die Position des Wissenschaftsrates. In: *Forschung & Lehre* 7/09, 2009, p. 491. https://www.academics.de/wissenschaft/promovieren_in_der_medizin_-_die_position_des_wissenschaftsrates_36382.html and Wissenschaftsrat bemängelt Qualität des "Dr. med." - bildungsklick.de - macht Bildung zum Thema. In: bildungsklick.de [accessed 26. Nov. 2016]
- 3 Dr. med. Mühelos: Wert und Unwert der medizinischen Promotion. SWR 2 https://www.swr.de/swr2/wissen/doktormuehelos_broadcastcontrib-swr-21612.html [zuletzt aufgerufen am 10. 9. 2019]
- 4 Berchem, Jörg: Wissenschaft und Wissensmacht — Eine wissenschaftliche Tatsache ist die Übereinkunft mit dem Denken aufzuhören. 2019 erschienen in *wir.Heilpraktiker*
- 5 Kötschau, Karl: der Intellekt als das Ungeheuer unserer Zeit.
- 6 „Besiegbarkeit von Krebs: Mediziner widersprechen Spahn“ auf: BR24. <https://www.br.de/nachrichten/deutschlandwelt/besiegbarkeit-von-krebs-mediziner-widersprechen-spahn,RGwu4FA> (zuletzt accessed 10. 9. 2019)
- 7 „Besiegbarkeit von Krebs: Mediziner widersprechen Spahn“ auf: BR24. <https://www.br.de/nachrichten/deutschlandwelt/besiegbarkeit-von-krebs-mediziner-widersprechen-spahn,RGwu4FA> (accessed 10. 9. 2019)
- 8 Praschl, Peter: Krebs - die Geißel, die uns alle verfolgt. accessed 21.02.2012 auf [welt.de: https://www.welt.de/kultur/literarischewelt/article13879763/Krebs-die-Geissel-die-uns-alle-verfolgt.html](https://www.welt.de/kultur/literarischewelt/article13879763/Krebs-die-Geissel-die-uns-alle-verfolgt.html) [accessed 10. 9. 2019]
- 9 The cancer therapy according to Dr. med. Waltraut Fryda, for example, is based on such thoughts and findings, which - although proven by therapeutic successes in its truth content - is fought and forbidden by academic combat medicine and the dogmatic guideline medicine arising from it.
- 10 Buchwald, Gerhard: *Impfen, das Geschäft mit der Angst; sowie zahlreiche andere Bücher und wissenschaftliche Arbeiten*
- 11 Toynbee, Arnold: *Die Welt und der Westen*; Stuttgart 1953
- 12 z.B. Die Wahrheit über Organentnahme nach Hirntod - Schweizer Ärzte fordern gesetzliches Verbot. in: *Epoch Times*. <https://www.epochtimes.de/gesundheit/medizin/die-wahrheit-ueber-organentnahme-nach-hirntod-aerzte-fordern-gesetzlichesverbot-a2861787.html> [accessed 10. 9. 2019]
- 13 Thürkauf, Max: „Sackgasse Wissenschaftsgläubigkeit“
- 14 Heitler, Walter: „Naturphilosophische Streifzüge“; Braunschweig 1970
- 15 Goethe: „Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre. Aus Markariens Archiv. In: Goethe, Johann Wolfgang (ed. Ernst Beutler), Zürich and Stuttgart 1944ff. Band 8 (2. edition 1961), S. 507
- 16 Heisenberg, Werner: *Goethedenkrede zu Weimar* 1967
- 17 cited from Kötschau, K.: *Zeitschrift für Ganzheitsforschung* I/1978
- 18 Lessing, Theodor: „Geschichte als Sinnggebung des Sinnlosen“; Hamburg 1962
- 19 Chargaff, Erwin: Interview in der Zeitschrift „Nachrichten aus Chemie, Technik und Laboratorium“ I/77
- 20 Goethe: *Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre. Betrachtungen im Sinne der Wanderer*. In: Goethe: Anm. 4. S. 325