

Solving Autism Requires Knowledge of the Reactive Capacity of the Organism

The reactive response of an individual is the whole key to solving the autistic epidemic. The character of toxins rarely determines the reaction pattern of the body. Health is a function of the interplay between the strength of the damaging agent and the strength of the active response of the individual to fight to maintain his balance. Those in modern medicine hardly ever express this understanding.

These ideas don't negate the *Doctrine of Specific Etiology* (specific cause) but relegate it to a less important role in understanding disease. More important is an understanding that disease is more a function of multiple agents acting at the same time. But, **most important is to understand that the reaction of the integrated, whole body is to maintain its health.** Therefore, the *Doctrine of Specific Etiology* is only a part of the disease process and using its theory to find a single cause of autism will reap nothing but failure. That's why modern medicine has no solutions for the problem -- their model is inappropriate for understanding autism.

This new understanding should not only include an understanding of the effects of external agents acting on the body, but also include an understanding of the underlying mechanisms that are responsible for initiating and integrating the responses of the whole body.

In its original form, the *Doctrine of Specific Etiology* focused only on external noxious agents: microbes, poisons, nutritional deficiencies, and radiation. The new model encompasses a broader and more sophisticated perspective. This removes the narrow focus we've had during the past, allowing for a wider and more expansive viewpoint. This **vista envelops not only the action of the environmental agent, but also recognizes the healing force of nature, expressing itself through the symptom responses generated by the integrated, whole body.**

The natural phenomena of disease can rarely be understood in the simple model of immediate cause-effect actions that involve one single cause and one single effect. Disease can only be understood when we consider contributions from:

- 1) ***the total environment and***
- 2) ***the reactions to that environmental challenge by the body.***

In the past, we've reduced each part of the two separate systems to the smallest common denominator and attempted to study responses of this sub-unit, isolated from the whole. This method constitutes a very narrow view and provides little information to assist us in living healthfully in a complex and

hostile environment. When the system is understood as multi-factorial, in respect to both the body and the environment, scientific understanding will begin to close in on unraveling some of the mysteries and complexities of the real world.

What Are You Taking for That?

The most spoken phrase encountered today is “What are you taking for that?” Even among newly introduced strangers, if one is coughing or blowing his nose frequently, the other stranger will ask, “What are you taking for that?”

This expression underlies the current thinking regarding the model that we use for understanding health and disease. Two assumptions are implied in the statement, “What are you taking for that.” First: that the symptom, in this case, coughing or blowing one’s nose, is irrefutable evidence that he has “caught a cold.” Second: that the symptom is a negative response caused by microbes and should be stopped as soon as possible.

Theories, like living organisms, must respond to challenges and either survive or die. They can only survive by evolving and adapting to the challenges and demands that they experience. If we continue to rely solely on the ***Doctrine of Specific Etiology*** as the basis for the formulation of our therapeutic protocols, eventually both humans and the theory will wither and die.

It’s understood that this theory requires extensive review and re-formulation. The theories about disease causation will need a more complete model. **In the new model we must place a priority upon the study of the many reactive and defensive mechanisms the body was born with.** In addition, because of an increased amount of pollution, we need to focus on the magnitude and strength of pollutants acting on the body.

Understanding Differences in Reaction Capacity

I believe that the quantity of pollutants present in the environment is overcoming the reactive capacity of the body to maintain itself. **This is occurring in a subtle way so that neat cause-effect relationships aren’t easily defined.** Individuals will respond to the collection of assaults in both similar and dissimilar ways, making it very difficult to understand the effect of pollutants on the body.

Imagine, two people standing in the middle of the freeway, each possessing a significantly different reactive capacity. Now, picture an on-rushing tractor-trailer, traveling at 100 mph, barreling directly at the two people standing shoulder to shoulder. It’s likely that the magnitude of the impact (stress) will overcome the reactive capacity, not only of the weaker, but also of the stronger, individual.

This is a neat cause-effect action, and fits into the model of the ***Doctrine of Specific Etiology***. But, it represents only a small portion of all the agents that tend to diminish health, and life. It's apparent that our research will have to move away from the easily observable cause-effect relationships toward a deeper understanding about the reactions of the body and the many-fold differences of "capacity-to-react" among individuals.

An important critical area of study is the development of technology that's able to assess the amount of the healing force of nature in newborns. I believe, today, that this is one of the most significant weaknesses of modern-day medicine: the failure to recognize the significant differences in newborns to tolerate stresses.

Vaccinations and antibiotics in one child may be brushed off with ease without that individual incurring any significant diminution in his homeostasis. For another child, the result of the childhood sequence of vaccinations and overuse of antibiotics can lead to a far different result.

Without doubt, science and medicine are now aware of our failure to take control of the "world of microbes" through antibiotics. We are at the dawn of a new age, where we are witnessing the failure of our more than 50-year-old antibiotic experiment, concurrently with an understanding of the limitations of the ***Germ Theory of Disease*** within the broader too-limited theory of the ***Doctrine of Specific Etiology***.

However, we are now at a crossroads: we can move on and expand the new model, or we can remain contracted and continue to try to develop therapeutics based on the narrow formulations of the past century. It will be interesting to see the decisions that society chooses to make.