



The Solari Report

June 18, 2020

The Fallacies of Germ Theory with Dr. Thomas Cowan



Catherine Austin Fitts



Dr Thomas Cowan

Guest: Dr. Thomas Cowan

WebPage: [Dr. Thomas Cowan's Fourfold Healing website](#)

BIO: Dr. Thomas Cowan is a long-time holistic physician living and practicing in San Francisco who specializes in helping people heal through diet and natural medicines. His book *How (and Why) to Eat More Vegetables* describes why eating small amounts of a wide variety of vegetables is key to optimal health. He is the author of *Human Heart, Cosmic Heart*, published by Chelsea Green in 2016, is the primary author of *The Fourfold Path to Healing*, and co-author, with Sally Fallon, of *The Nourishing Traditions Book of Baby and Child Care*. He is one of the founding board members of the Weston A. Price Foundation, and he is trained and experienced in Anthroposophical medicine as well. He is also a passionate and knowledgeable grower of vegetables.

Summary: Dr. Thomas Cowan joins me this week to brief us on the fallacies of germ theory. Whether for the purpose of staying well or navigating the uses of viruses as "bogeymen," this is essential knowledge for everyone.

I first learned of Dr. Cowan when watching his interviews regarding the health risks of 5G and EMF radiation. Inspired, I read two of his books: *Human Heart, Cosmic Heart* (review [here](#)) and *Cancer and the New Biology of Water* (review [here](#)). Speaking of "infections," I find Dr. Cowan's intense passion for understanding the biophysics of life and helping others heal to be thoroughly infectious. You will, too!

Related Reading:

[Book Review: Human Heart, Cosmic Heart by Thomas Cowan, MD](#)

[Book Review: Cancer and the New Biology of Water by Thomas Cowan, MD](#)

[Hero of the Week: April 6, 2020 – Dr. Thomas Cowan](#)

C. Austin Fitts: Ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure to welcome a new guest to *The Solari Report*, Dr. Thomas Cowan. Many of our subscribers have heard or seen him. He's had several videos in recent months during COVID-19, which has rocketed him to another 15 minutes of fame on the internet. I'm assuming that most everybody on *The Solari Report* has had the pleasure of seeing several of his videos.

We have reviewed two of his books, which I cannot recommend to you highly enough. The first review is *Cancer and the New Biology of Water*, and the second is *Human Heart, Cosmic Heart*. I recommend them both to you. We will talk about them at the end. There are many great ideas for people who want to take responsibility for their health, and even I found a couple of new things that were great, and I've been trying them.

I am very excited about some of the material. Now we are going to talk about germ theory and how things got as 'crazy' as they have. I said to Dr. Cowan, "I'm just going to turn the soap box over to you."

Before I do, I would point out that he has been a very successful practitioner and family doctor in San Francisco and has just retired and is moving to New England. I'm hoping that when he gets there sometime in the fall and he is all set up that he will be available for those of you who might like a 'health coach', so to speak. I think that he has retired from medicine permanently, but he has had quite a rich and extraordinary experience. Thanks to his books and all the interviews that he does, they are all available to us.

So with no further ado, Dr. Cowan, thank you for joining me on *The Solari Report*.

Dr. Thomas Cowan: Thank you, Catherine, and please call me Tom. Besides thanking you for having me, I would like to point out that I've actually been a fan for a couple of decades.

I remember the first time I heard you, but I don't know if it was you being interviewed or you interviewing. I don't remember at all what it was, but generally speaking, let's just say that I'm not a big fan of politicians.

I have a little sign that my wife gave me a few years ago that hangs over my desk in my office that says, “Let’s just say that I don’t respond well to authority.”

I heard you, and I remember thinking, “Wow! That woman actually gets it!” But I didn’t do anything about it. (What am I going to do?) I remember having that distinct feeling, and here we are.

Fitts: If you understand germ theory and how it’s been applied, then you really understand the political model.

Cowan: Oh, 100%.

Fitts: It’s the perfect metaphor, and it’s the perfect thing for us to share on our first discussion.

So, let me present you with the ‘soap box’: We need a deeper history and education in the germ theory. If it hasn’t driven you crazy by now, you have a very strong constitution. So help us out.

Cowan: Let’s go from there. The first thing that I would say is that the germ theory, which many people ascribed to in the late 1800’s and Pasteur, actually goes back to even ancient Greek times.

Fitts: Right, Aristotle.

Cowan: It’s for a very simple reason: If you observe the world, which we all do, it appears that people in the same place sometimes get sick with the same thing. So, it’s not at all unreasonable to say that they may be passing something back and forth.

That thought has been there for thousands of years. I would only point out that now is one of the modern proofs that there are viruses and bacteria causing disease. I would also point out that many of us would think that is actually nonsense because, for instance, in Japan in 1945, many people died because somebody dropped a bomb on them. Nobody thinks that was a virus.

It’s the same thing with Chernobyl. Chernobyl had people die, and then it spread. It spread all over Europe, and people got sick. As far as I know, nobody yet thought that was a virus or a bacterium. So, one can’t say that because many people in the same place get sick, that means it’s a virus or even that it’s contagious. So, that is the background.

Then came a bit of a ‘chicken and the egg’ thing. There was a change in human consciousness to a much more economic, materialistic mode of thinking. When I say ‘materialism’, I don’t necessarily mean looking for money, although that is part of it. I mean thinking like Descartes thought that only physical substance exists. I would say that it was a radical departure from how every prior human culture or people thought about life in the world. So, this theory that we are only based on substance is a very radical theory.

So, that was the philosophical background until the 1890’s. Then came some experiments and an invention of the light microscope, and people started seeing these unicellular organisms called bacteria. Then came the theory that some of the diseases that we see – and maybe even most of them – are because these bacteria spread from one person to another and make them sick. That is basically the foundation of the germ theory.

Interestingly at that time, and now we’re talking about the 1850’s to the 1880’s, there were numerous people, particularly a person named Antoine Béchamp, who said, “That’s just not true. In fact, these bacteria are just scavengers in nature; they are feeding off dead material, and they don’t cause any disease. It’s the situation of the person.”

So, then you have this debate of germ versus terrain. ‘Terrain’ means the condition of the person or the animal.

Then Pasteur got into this and decided to try to sort this out. Here is the way that I would describe it to people: I would say that almost, to a certain extent, of all the things that I may say, if you want to remember anything, this is the thing to remember.

Let’s look at an example of how this works. We are talking terrain versus germ. So, let’s assume that you have a cow. For whatever reason, you don’t feed the cow properly. So instead of feeding the cow pasture grass like cows are supposed to, you feed it grains and cardboard and dead cow parts and all the other things that we feed cows.

Now you have a sick cow. To top it off, you spray glyphosate and DDT and other worming agents and fungicides and whatever else gets absorbed into the cow’s tissues, which is the whole point. As we know, anything that you poison an animal with, comes out in the milk.

Then you have this poisoned milk, and somebody drinks the milk, and they get sick. Maybe even the cow was sick with diarrhea, and the person drinks the milk and gets sick.

The theory then is that you transmitted something from the milk to the person, and they became sick. Then you look under the microscope, and you see a bacterium called listeria, which is a so-called pathogenic or disease-causing bacterium in the milk. Then you look at the stool of the person who has the diarrhea, and you find the same bacterium. It was as if it was a ‘Eureka!’ moment in history. End of story. We’ve now proven that germs cause disease – and now we’re talking bacteria.

So what is the problem? Well, it turns out that there is another possible explanation, and that explanation is also very simple and very logical. You have poison milk, and the role of bacteria in the world is to digest poisons wherever they are found. So, the listeria are not there as a pathogenic organism; they are there to biodegrade (eat) the poisons in the milk. In fact, they are helping you and the cow get well.

We have two very reasonable explanations. I would only point out that if you look into nature, which is what I’ve tried to do for 40 years as a student of Goethe, he said, “Don’t start with theories; start with observations. If you start with theories, you get blindsided.”

You can’t start with a theory and then try to prove that you are right, although that is what we do, and you shouldn’t do that.

If you look into nature, if you put ‘wonky stuff’ (which is a very scientific term, by the way, meaning bad stuff) into your compost pile, you will get ‘funky’ bacteria. Nobody says that the compost pile ‘has an infection’. Everybody says that the bacteria are biodegrading that, and if you weren’t such an idiot, you would stop throwing that in your compost pile. Fair enough.

It’s the same thing with a pond. If you have a pond and you put poisons in it, you get algae growth. The algae are eating the poisons. They are helping you out because you were ‘dumb enough’ to put poisons in your pond. Nobody says the pond ‘has an infection’.

It’s possible-although I wouldn’t go too far with this-that algae may choke off the pond and kill it, but anybody would say that the problem is the poisons.

As soon as you stop throwing the poisons in, by some miracle – because they don't have any more food – the algae go away.

Getting back to our milk, we have these two very reasonable explanations. One is that it's the listeria (the bacterium), and the other is that it's the poisons and the bad quality of the milk, and the listeria is just eating the toxins. So the question then is: How do you know which one of those is true? I think that is a very reasonable, interesting question. It's very simple. I sometimes ask people to guess, but they don't seem to guess right. It's very simple. All you have to do is isolate the listeria from the milk. In other words, you could feed somebody pure listeria (not listeria in milk), and then you could also feed them the milk without the listeria, or you could even feed them both together. You could see then if they get sick.

If it's the listeria, then it's the bacteria that makes them sick. If it's the milk without the listeria, then it's the milk that made them sick. So, this is what Louis Pasteur did for 40 years. He was the first to be able to do this – sort-of. He basically stole the idea, but he took pure cultures of bacteria isolated from pathogenic sick people, fed them to animals or people, made them sick, did public demonstrations, and became the Fauci of his day because he proved the germ theory and saved humanity. So there you have it.

Except there was one problem. Maybe it wasn't really a 'problem', but he did have the integrity to keep a personal diary. In that diary, he told his heirs never to publish but apparently one of his heirs (like a son-in-law or somebody who 'hated his guts' because he was kind of an 'asshole') published it anyway. In there Pasteur admitted that not once was he able to transmit disease with a pure bacterium – not once. To do these public demonstrations, he had actually to spike it with arsenic and mercury.

Fitts: Oh my God!, he spiked them?

Cowan: Yes, because how are you going to make people sick? He already knew that he couldn't, but when you are famous, you know the rest. Once you get caught in the fraud, you're in trouble and you have to escalate.

He didn't tell anybody, except through his diary. Then, famously on his death bed he said, "The germ is nothing; the terrain is everything," because he realized that he was a complete failure and a fraud.

Here is what I would say to people: As far as I know, and I've spent some time looking into this, and I am in communication with people who have spent decades scouring through the medical literature to find out whether anybody has successfully caused disease by transferring a pure bacteria or virus to an animal or another human being and caused disease, and the answer is no.

I want that to sink in a little with people. At the end of the day, that is the only way to prove this. When you get to, "Well, what happened with measles? What is chicken pox? Why did I get herpes?", I can give you answers to that. But before you get into that – because that can confuse people – you have to go back and say, "If anyone thinks that it's because of a virus or a bacteria, they should be able to give me a reference and show that an isolated bacteria or virus caused the disease," and there isn't one ever.

So what are these other things? Let's just say for now, "I don't know," except that I do know. But let's just say that I didn't know. It still doesn't mean that it's a virus or a bacterium, right? We've already proved that is not the case; it's the milk. So, that is how this got started. Should I keep going?

Fitts: Absolutely.

Cowan: Around 1900 or so is the germ theory. That changes everything; that changes how medicine sees disease. We now have an enemy, and we can kill the enemy. We pasteurize and kill the milk. Everything changes at that point. We now have a very materialistic explanation of the basis of health and illness, and luckily (tongue in cheek) it happens to be a model that lends itself to developing medicines to kill it.

Fitts: Let me intercede and mention one thing: In many instances, it's a way to explain a disease for which an insurance company is not liable. So, if I'm the producer of glyphosate and my glyphosate is causing the milk to make people sick, if it is attributed to a virus – which can be a justification for a new profitable medicine – then I am free of an enormous amount of liability.

Cowan: Absolutely, and there is very clear evidence that that is exactly what happened over and over again.

I don't know if I would say that it's the confusing thing because I don't know that I'm 'confused' anymore, but what is surprising is that there is a saying, "I don't have a dog in this fight." I don't know why people care whether it was the bacteria or the milk. If it's the bacteria, you kill the bacteria; if it's the milk, you stop feeding the cow glyphosate. What is the big deal?

I obviously put that as a naïve question, but scientifically, why should we care? If it's the glyphosate, you stop feeding the cow glyphosate and you continue on, and nobody gets sick. Why does that lead people to say now, "You can't ask that question"?

Fitts: Because I have a situation which can be an economic loss. It can be an economic loss if I have to stop and change, and it can be a big economic loss if I am held liable for everything. If we admit it, then I am liable for all the damage done to date. But instead, if we invent a new drug, then I have a profit opportunity. So, I have taken something which is a loss or a very big loss and converted it into a profit opportunity.

Cowan: It makes sense economically, but it doesn't make sense scientifically.

Fitts: Correct.

Cowan: Scientifically it seems obvious that we would want to know, so whatever it is, you just go from there.

Let's move on with the story. So now they have a light microscope, and they are finding different illnesses, and there is typically – or at least sometimes – bacteria there. So, you see strep throat. If people have a bad sore throat, you look under the microscope and you see strep. They think the strep is causing it, but the reality is that bacteria always – and I can't emphasize that enough – scavenge and biodegrade dead tissue. So, what really happened is you were poisoned or something happened to you, your throat was unhealthy, then you became sick, and the bacteria came to clean up the debris so that you can go on with your life. It's as simple as that.

It's the same thing that happens if you cut down trees in the forest and the bacteria and the fungus eat the trees so that it goes back into life. Nobody thinks that the solution to the forest is to get rid of the bacteria _____

— and the fungus so that they stop eating the dead trees. It would be a mad man who would think that, but here we are.

They started finding diseases where they couldn't see any of these bacteria, but they were sure there must be a microbial or small thing that was causing these diseases. So they postulated, "There must be something smaller than bacteria that is causing the diseases that are making people sick and they can't find the bacteria."

The most prominent case was polio. Polio is a disease of a certain part of the spinal cord which is directly poisoned by two main things: Arsenic and DDT. So, when they started spraying lead arsenic on the sugar cane and the apple orchards, people started getting polio. But they said, "This must be a virus. The virus is too small to see, but we are going to figure out if it is transmissible," because that is the key.

So, they decided to take people who either died or had polio. They took out their diseased brains or spinal cord, and chopped it up in a blender. They didn't purify anything or isolate anything, and they ground it up in a blender, fed it to animals, and no animals got sick. So they said, "That's because there are no animal models of polio," which is weird.

Then they took this diseased brain or spine, mixed it with water, and chopped it up in a blender, and injected it subcutaneously into monkeys and other animals, and none of them got sick. So they said, "These animals are somehow resistant to the virus."

Finally, in 1907, this was the famous proof that polio is a transmissible disease. A man examined a child who had polio; he had a diseased spinal column. He took a piece of it, didn't purify it, and put it in a blender, which resulted in a glob of diseased spinal cord. Then he took two monkeys, drilled a hole in their skull, injected about half of a cup of diseased spinal cord tissue into their brains. One monkey died, and the other became paralyzed.

He held the monkey up by the scruff of its neck and said, "See? We proved polio is a transmissible disease."

Some of you may be hearing or reading this for the first time, and I can imagine that your reaction is, "What the..."

As I like to jokingly say, “I guess that one could say that this proves transmission, but for me, what it proves is that if you are a monkey and somebody is going to come with a drill and drill a hole in your skull and inject about half of a cup of diseased spinal cord into your brain, your best bet is to run because nothing good is going to happen out of this”.

Fitts: I have to warn you that I just finished reading Forrest Maready’s book *The Moth in the Iron Lung* because I continually have it thrown in my face, “The polio vaccine worked,” so I had to build my case to say, “No, it did not. It worked for insurance companies.”

Cowan: They changed the definition, and they got rid of DDT around the same time.

Fitts: But here is the problem: If you get rid of DDT, and you don’t have a vaccine to attribute it to, people are going to figure it out, and you are going to be liable for everything that has gone on before. So, I am sure that that saved them an absolute fortune.

Cowan: That is how the game is played. So, that is the proof of viral transmission. Now we fast forward to the mid 1930’s where the definition of a viral disease becomes: The person is sick, and we can’t find bacteria. There is no proof of anything. There is no proof of transmission, they don’t see anything, they don’t find anything, and they can’t see anything that small. So they change the definition.

In the old days with Koch’s postulates, you had to actually see the organism with sick people and not see it if people weren’t sick. Then you had to isolate it and prove a disease. That never worked. People often say to me, “Tom, you must know as a medical doctor that nobody uses Koch’s postulates anymore; they have been disproven.”

But that is just common sense. If you say an organism causes it, you should be able to see it, and it shouldn’t be there if you’re not sick. You should be able to isolate it and transmit it.

They discarded Koch’s postulates not because it’s not accurate or logical; it’s because they never once could prove it, so they essentially said, “We are going to change logic.”

I've tried to think of a good example of this, but it's as if you park your car in the street and then go to bed and wake up, and your wife says, "Is the car still in the street?" In the old days, you would go outside and see if your car was there. Now, when they discarded Koch's postulates, if your wife says, "Is the car still there?" You say, "Yes."

She says, "How do you know?"

You say, "Because nobody would want to steal my car."

"Why don't you look?"

"I'm not going to look because I know that nobody would steal it," even though there is a sign above it in French saying, "If you park your car here, we are going to tow it," but you don't speak French and you didn't see the sign.

You can change the logic, but that is like *Alice in Wonderland*. So we are in the 1930's, and there was another 'Eureka!' moment because they invented the electron microscope, and could see things smaller than a bacterium. So, they used polio (they had a thing about polio) and took the diseased tissue, and killed the tissue, put it under a microscope, and saw this round thing that was, in fact, smaller than a bacterium that had a capsule and had genetic material and proteins. That was, "Oh my God! We found the virus! That is the transmissible thing!"

What was that? Well, it turns out that any time you poison any tissue – bacteria, fungus, monkeys, humans, baboons, rats, you or me – just how you poison your liver with Tylenol, it defends itself by packaging up the poison as genetic material and protein in a capsule, budding it off from your liver cell to get rid of the poison. That is very smart. It's called an exosome, and they were mistaken for viruses.

The point of this is that if you somehow stop an organism from making exosomes, or you notice that bacteria somehow forgot how to make these exosomes, then they die. You have to get rid of the poisons, and they look identical to what we call viruses. So, they thought they saw this transmissible agent.

For the next 20 years, they tried to filter and isolate this so-called 'virus', which wasn't a virus, from disease poison tissue, transmitted to animals or people, and make them sick. It was a complete failure, and they never once could do it.

In the early 1950's, they decided that this thing doesn't work; viruses don't cause disease, and we're done. That lasted for about a year because they proved that these are just normal parts of your cell getting rid of the poisons; they package it up.

It's as if you have garbage in your house, package it up in a garbage bag (at least most people do) and then take it out to the curb. Essentially, what happened is they said, "This garbage bag is the disease, so you had better stop putting your garbage in garbage bags."

The obvious question is: What am I supposed to do with the garbage then? Forget about recycling and all; that is different. But you need to take out your garbage, and if you don't, you get poisoned. That is how you get sick. The body does that. The body is smart, and it takes out the garbage, and we call that a virus. They mistook it for a disease-causing agent. The reason I know that is because they never could make that cause a disease.

Then came the disaster. A man named John Enders said, "I have a different way of proving that viruses cause disease." He said, "I can take somebody with measles that is caused by a virus," which it's not, but that is what he said. "And I can take the snot of somebody with measles. They are sick, and this snot has all of this stuff in it – dead cells and fungus and bacteria and these exosomes/viruses –, and I can centrifuge it, which doesn't purify it but just collects this stuff, and then I can put that on tissue culture like living monkey kidney cells or skin cells from fetuses or cancer cells," because they mostly use those three. "I can take this snot, unpurified, put it on tissue cultures, and nothing happens. So whatever virus was in there was not even powerful enough to kill a monkey kidney cell tissue."

He was given a Nobel Prize for this. He then said, "We have to take this monkey kidney stuff, and we have to starve it, and then we have to poison it with antibiotics and bleach. That will so weaken it, that then the virus and the snot will 'lyse' the cell and make a whole lot of other viruses just like it, and that proves that the virus can kill our tissue."

When you read that for the first time, you say something like, "Are you kidding me?" First of all, it casts doubt. If a virus can't even kill a healthy tissue culture, how is it going to kill the kidneys in you? So in order for it to kill the tissue culture, you have to starve it, poison it, weaken it, and bleach it. Interestingly, all those things produce exosomes. So then you torture the tissue, and it kills the tissue, of course. Then they say, "See, the virus killed the monkey kidney cell."

Then they take that unpurified mass they get at the end, and that is what a vaccine is. They don't purify it; they don't isolate any virus from that. It has all this genetic material, of course, because it has dead cells and whatever viruses and bacteria and fungus and everything, and some of them are grown on cancer cells.

Fast forward: They take this mass that they don't purify, and with the coronavirus virus, they inject that into animals or slit their throat and pour it down their throat, and make some of the animals sick – not all of them – and don't do a control, like: What happens if we just put saline down their slit throat? Or happens if we put lung cancer cells down their throat?

They don't do any controls. Some of the monkeys or hamsters or mice get sick, and they say, "We have now isolated a new coronavirus."

This is 'nuts'!

Fitts: It's very important to give the person a Nobel Prize because then people won't read it carefully. They will assume that everybody went through it. He couldn't have won the Nobel Prize unless it was legitimate, right?

Cowan: Right. This is the paper that people refer to as the isolation and characterization of the measles virus.

Here is another part to that story: A virologist named Stefan Lanka came into this thing. He was a graduate student in biology and virology. He was studying sea algae, and saw this little piece inside the sea algae under an electron microscope, and wondered what it was. He did what a sensible person would do – or maybe this isn't sensible, but this is what he did: He ground up the sea algae, filtered it so that he only had the virus – the small particle – and then characterized it. It took him a couple of years, and was given his PhD for this. He said, "Here is this new virus. It's found in sea algae. It has this genetic material and these proteins and this coding."

From then on, he was credited with discovering a virus inside of sea algae. Then came a very interesting part of his life because he noticed that the sea algae that had this virus thrive, and the sea algae that didn't, didn't live; they were sickly and died.

It hit him that these organisms need these viruses. They are like genetic messengers that are the basis of evolution when you get right down to it, and I can get into that later.

He started wondering about these other viruses. Everything that he could see was that viruses are needed for life. Then he went back and looked at this measles synopsis, and he said, “They didn’t filter it. They didn’t isolate it. They didn’t characterize it. They made it up.”

He then offered anybody 100,000 euros if they could prove the existence of a measles virus – not even if a measles virus causes disease, just that it exists.

Fitts: I did not know this.

Cowan: He did it in the German courts because they actually have rules on how to prove things. So a number of people tried to claim the prize, and they actually won in the lower courts because they didn’t have the same rules. So, he appealed it to the German Supreme Court. They had a trial that lasted about a year, and the conclusion was there was no evidence that a measles virus exists.

He proved that because if you go back to this experiment of taking mucus from somebody who has measles, and you inoculate it and kill the tissue and poison it, and in the end, you get another mess of things that has all kinds of stuff in it, and you can’t find any actual virus there. It only has genetic material. Then you piece it together to try to make up this virus, which is what they did with the coronavirus.

So he said, “Let’s do a control. I am going to commission a well-respected university lab, and instead of measles virus, I am going to take the snot of a healthy person. I’m going to inoculate that onto cancer cells. I am going to poison, starve, and bleach the cancer cells.”

It killed the cancer cells in exactly the same way as the mucus with the measles virus, only there was no measles virus; there was degraded genetic material, or maybe exosomes.

The point is that if you do a proper control, you find that this cell death – this lysis of the cell – is an artifact of the experimental procedure; it’s not from the snot.

Fitts: I want to point out that he proved that in 2017. I recently looked it up. That was when he won the case in the Supreme Court, correct?

Cowan: Correct.

Fitts: So, all this ‘hoopla’ about the measles vaccine in the meantime happened subsequent to that.

Cowan: It’s been happening for a while. What happens then is they have this mass of degraded cells that come from fungus, bacteria, exosomes, and maybe viruses that are part of our natural ecosystem. They come from the actual cells that you are growing it on – lung cancer cells, etc. They have this massive genetic material. It has some connection to the original mucus because they put that in there, too, and then they have all these pieces of genetic material. Then they try to piece it together to create a virus. They use computer models and fought over it for 50 years; which piece goes with it and which piece doesn’t.

I want to tell another very interesting piece of this puzzle because there is going to be my prediction; one very central question which I am only partially going to be able to answer about this. This is the story of a person named Kary Mullis. He is a very important player in this because he was a young free-thinking ‘goofball’ chemist, but very smart. He liked to do weird things and go surfing, which is not weird; he was a free-loving guy.

He had this vision that became the PCR test, which is the test that we diagnose AIDS, HIV, coronavirus, Hepatitis C, etc. He was the one who invented the technique of finding genetic material.

He said very clearly, “This test cannot be used to determine that the virus caused the disease. That is not how you can use this test, nor can you use this test to diagnose that this person has a viral disease,” but that is exactly what they use it for, even though the package insert in the HIV or the coronavirus test says, “You cannot use this test for diagnosis.” This is odd because he said that you can’t do that.

You have this degraded material only once, and when you know the virus or the bacteria, then you can genetically analyze it and find pieces of it in a sample. That is what he said you could do. But if you don’t have the original virus or bacteria – which they don’t – then you can’t use the pieces. It is obvious.

He published this, and there is a very interesting interview with Kary. This was in 1996 or so – about 12 years after Montagnier and Gallo announced that they had discovered the cause of AIDS, which was the HIV virus. So by this time, Kary had been given the Nobel Prize in chemistry for inventing this test which has revolutionized virology.

He gave this interview, and he said, “I was asked by a company to write a paper on using the PCR test for HIV. So I said okay,” because they gave him a large amount of money. He said, “The first line of the paper was, ‘HIV is the probable cause of aids.’ I put a ‘1’ next to it because that was the reference. So I looked for the reference, and I looked for it for five years, and I couldn’t find the reference.”

Fitts: I’ve heard this.

Cowan: Here is the important part of this story: Everybody, including me, even though I’ve been doing this for 40 years, when this experience happens, you say exactly what Kary said to himself. He is, a Nobel Prize- winning chemist for inventing a test that revolutionized microbiology. He said to himself, “I must be stupid. I must have missed the paper. So I’m not going to say anything. I’m not going to say that this is nonsense that HIV causes AIDS because I may be wrong. I must be wrong. There must be wise men out there who know more than I do, and I just haven’t met them.”

So, he doesn’t say anything, and he won’t publish the paper because he can’t find a reference.

Finally, 12 years after the announcement, he went to a meeting of Nobel Prize winners, and there is Luc Montagnier who was given a Nobel Prize for discovering that HIV causes AIDS. He went up to him and said, “Finally I can ask the wise man what the reference is.”

So, he says to Montagnier, “Do you have a reference for this?”

Montagnier says, “Yes, there is this paper.”

It turns out that Kary knew that paper. It was on baboons and it had nothing to do with HIV or AIDS.

He said, “Yes, but Luc, that doesn’t have anything to do with it.” So, Montagnier walked away and refused to ever communicate with him again.

At that point, Kary said to himself, “Hey, I’m one of the wise men.”

You have to realize that this man is like a beach bum, but he is brilliant. He realized that he was one of the wise men, and realized that there wasn’t anybody out there who knew; they don’t know.

That is what people go through. They hear this from me, and my guess is that they say, “Yeah, Tom makes perfect sense. There is no viral disease. That’s not how nature works. Nature is a cooperative venture. The bacteria eat our dead stuff, the viruses send message from one to another saying, ‘Here is how to exchange genetic information,’ and all of us work together to create a life of joy and peace.” Except when somebody comes along and says, “That’s not how it works. We are going to put you in jail if you don’t do that.”

Everybody says to themselves, “No. All these brilliant doctors and virologists cannot possibly be wrong. I must be stupid. I must have missed the paper.”

I’m not saying that I’m different or anything. I thought that for 30 years. I said, “No. This is nuts! I must have missed something.”

Then after a while, it’s like the light goes on in your soul and you say to yourself, “You know what? This is baloney. There ‘ain’t’ no wise men, and I’m going to believe what I see. I’m happy to hear different reasoning, but just because somebody says it, I don’t believe it.” When you do that, you are free.

Fitts: Here is the thing: If you look at the history, if you look at this from the perspective of health, it looks like one thing. But if you look at it from the perspective of the central bankers and their use of the insurance industry for risk management, it makes total sense what they have been doing if what you are interested in is political control.

Cowan: Of course.

Fitts: I want to bring up one story.

Cowan: Just to clarify, that is not what I’m talking about. That’s not science.

Fitts: Of course!

Cowan: I'm here to try to break the spell of people about the science part.

I'm not disagreeing with your analysis of this. Don't get me wrong about that. I'm just saying that the use for me is only: What is the story here? What are the facts?

Then we can get into plenty of explanations, which you are much more qualified than I to talk about. But I just wanted to say this.

Fitts: I totally agree. What I wanted to bring up was Pottenger's cats.

I moved to Tennessee, and live in a farming community in Tennessee. I was surrounded by a couple of bankrupted dairy farms. My cousins are cotton farmers on the other side of me, so I had a dairy farm on one side and a cotton farm on the other. I was trying to figure out the economics because the economics of all the agriculture subsidy and the food stamps looked like it was much more expensive than if you had a local food system.

So, you were spending \$2 to kill \$1. I dug in and I tried to figure it out, and then I heard an incredible presentation by Sally Fallon. I listened to the audio explaining the economics of dairy farms if we were free to sell to our neighbors. It was absolutely brilliant.

One thing led to another, and I had a friend who was taking a nutrition course. He had the extended version of the video on Pottenger's cats. I watched this 20- or 30-minute video that showed three different control groups; one that is drinking raw milk, one that is drinking pasteurized milk, and the third group was drinking homogenized. You see over subsequent generations the health and vitality of the cats.

When you see that –I'm presuming that you have seen that video, correct?

Cowan: Yes. I am Vice President of Weston Price Foundation.

Fitts: So, of course, you've seen that video. Dr. Pottenger was Weston Price's partner at one point in time.

I literally had to lie down and think about it for a couple of hours. What it meant was that they knew. From that time on – which I think was the 1930's – they knew. So that meant that they knew by centralizing and consolidating the milk industry in this way that they were going to significantly debase the health of the American consumer. They were totally clear, but they also made a fortune centralizing and controlling the milk industry. But they knew.

Once you understand that the leadership is 100% clear about what they are up to, plenty of other things make sense. If you look at what they have done with the germ theory, it makes sense. It also explains why things have gotten as ridiculous as they have. To keep the thing going in the face of more and more smart people talking to each other, you have to keep doubling down.

If you watched during the last three months of the absurdity of what is going on, particularly as more and more doctors come forth and explain different aspects of this, it wouldn't surprise me if the reason we have riots is that they had run out of ways to justify people wearing masks.

I think that the predicament is: Now that we are here, it seems like the understanding of how ridiculous this whole situation with the germ theory is, it's beginning to be understood, spread, and go viral.

Cowan: So to speak, yes, we will see.

I don't know if you want me to do this, but at the end of the day I like to give people a bit of an understanding of what I think is happening now genetically.

Fitts: Please.

Cowan: I want to emphasize that the first step in this – at least for me – was to say that this can't possibly be a virus. That is ridiculous.

I don't really want to debate how bad this is and whether there are millions of people dying or thousands or ten or nobody or whatever. I don't really know that; it's complicated.

What I do know is that there is no way to know. The tests are not only inaccurate, but they are completely inaccurate and completely useless. You don't know who has a disease that doesn't exist. So, there are no numbers of who has died from coronavirus because nobody has died of coronavirus. There are no cases of coronavirus. But that doesn't mean that people aren't getting sick. Please don't have anybody misinterpret that I'm saying that nobody is getting sick. I think that some people are.

So, then the question is to forget about the virus and ask: What is happening to them? It is basically two things: One is that they have an overactive inflammatory response. So they are essentially inflaming their tissues, their heart, their blood vessels, their kidneys, and particularly their lungs. So, we have an overactive inflammatory response.

I just want to point out that the reason we have inflammation – and I said this a ‘million times’ – is if you get a splinter in your finger, you make inflammation to get the splinter out. Nobody says that the inflammation is the disease. It's your therapeutic response to being poisoned – in this case by a splinter. So the inflammation is not a disease. It can cause you trouble for sure, but it's geared towards eliminating something. So that is one part of this so-called new disease.

The other part is a component of hypoxia, meaning low oxygen, which a number of doctors on the scene have said, “These people are not dying from pneumonia or anything that we've ever seen as any kind of ‘viral disease’; they are dying of altitude sickness or low oxygen.”

So those are the facts. There is an extremely simple explanation of how this came about. The way that you make a hyperactive inflammatory response is very simple: You inject people with aluminum. That is why they put it in vaccines – to make people have an overactive response so it will look like something happened.

If you have a population that is exposed to aluminum in two ways: 1) Through chronic injections over and over again, i.e. flu shots and all the other vaccines, 2) And then you put nanoparticles of aluminum in the air (otherwise known as chemtrails). Then you have everybody in certain places breathing it into their lungs, and you focus this inflammatory response in their lungs.

That's not to say that there aren't individual situations like, “This place has pollution, and this is glyphosate,” etc. There are many things. Everyone will look different, which they then interpret as a ‘mutated virus’.

I'm not saying that it's only that; don't misunderstand me. But that is the main thing. You create hyperinflammation by spraying people with nanoparticles of aluminum which get into their lungs. Your lungs protect themselves by making this inflammatory response, which sometimes they get too much of, and it kills them. That is number one.

The oxygen part is that we have very clear evidence going back to 1977 with the CIA doing studies on millimeter waves, otherwise known as 5G. They interfere with the ability of the mitochondria to utilize oxygen, so you get a hypoxic situation in the tissues. And we now know that 60 gigahertz is what they use.

Some people might say, "Tom, they're not using 60 gigahertz," but they are using harmonics of 60 gigahertz, meaning it's like an octave on a piano. You can get one thing to resonate by using the same note of a different octave – I think, although I'm not a musician, but that's what I've heard.

So if you do 2.5 or 5 or 12 gigahertz frequencies, what happens is that it degrades the oxygen in the air, which is already degraded by air pollution and toxins. So it is in fact, as though somebody is breathing air in the top of the Himalayas, and they die of hypoxia and inflammation. That is the whole story; that is the disease.

The thing that is so worrisome about this – and I'm hesitant to speculate, but I think you will appreciate this – is that this means the combination of completely misleading, bogus testing that means nothing, plus the fact that you can make more disease by spraying more and turning up the 5G frequencies. Unfortunately, you can come to the conclusion that the amount of these cases is very controllable. So if you want to say that a country is doing better, download the cycles on the tests, and everybody tests negative now. Then you turn off the 5G, and everybody doesn't get sick. Then if you want them to get sick, you turn it up, you spray more, and you turn up the cycles of the PCR test, and now everybody has the virus. That is a bad situation because then you are 'sunk'.

Fitts: I'll make it a little more complicated. I don't expect you to comment on this because this is economics, but if you look at what was happening; I look at COVID-19 as a currency war.

If you look at what was happening in December and where we were economically, the dollar was starting to come unraveled. If you look at the financial patterns of what they have been up to with COVID-19, —————

— it has been the most miraculous save of the dollar that we've seen, and we've seen plenty of them over the last 20 years. But this is the most miraculous. It almost looks as though the Chinese refused in March to stop taking the dollar.

So there definitely are other incentives going on here, and the reality is that if you look at where they want to go in terms of currency, they want to go to something where they have everybody chipped. We're not going to go into it now, but I just wrote this article called *Injection Fraud*.

If you look at all the different 'creepy' technologies that Bill Gates and his pals have been testing and prototyping and developing to inject their operating system into us. They can go much faster on the new system if they can persuade everybody that this deserves legally and culturally to be treated as if it were some kind of medicine, which it's not.

I keep telling people that an injectable credit card is not medicine. It may be medicine for the central bankers, but not for us.

Cowan: It's 'medicine'. You have to put that in quotes.

I hear you. In fact, just to put a plug in for myself, I think you may have noticed that in the *Heart* book, I actually discuss a little economics – which is the sum total of all the economics I know – on why I thought a fiat currency is a bad idea.

Fitts: It's very bad. Fiat currency is so bad for your heart – unbelievable! It is a constant drain. One of the things that you point out is that steady stress is the worst thing.

There is a wonderful book that a professor from Cornell wrote about the slave trade, but he went deeply into the economics and how it worked, and he came up with a concept called 'The whipping machine'. What they found was that if you systematically applied whipping and violence in a very systematic way, you could get steady increases in productivity. If you look at how the fiat currency works, it is basically a high-tech whipping machine, and it is very, very bad because it is continual stress for the heart. Every time you become more productive, they load a little more on.

You clearly understood it.

Cowan: Thank you, I do my best.

Fitts: I would like to touch on your books before we finish. I absolutely believe that one of the reasons I am so optimistic about things is that if you dig in and look at how a place really works, and the living things within a place, and the people work as a living matter. You say, “We are just going to run the economy that way. We are just going to have life free to work with life,” and the model that you describe in your books.

What you discover is that the existing wealth on Planet Earth is only 1% of what it could be; the wealth potential is so great.

It turns out that tyranny is great for centralizing control, but it fundamentally destroys wealth; it is very wealth destructive. There is no economic reason for poverty if you could be in a living model. The problem is if you look at who is in charge and who controls, they are not going to be in charge and in control if you go to more of a meritocracy.

Since I think that the machine model is going to fail – and if you look at the extremes that they are going to keep it going, it proves how fragile it is – we need a living model. If you read your books, you are really taking it back down to the individual: What are the biophysics of life, and how do we really operate? How does water operate? How does our heart operate? How does our body operate? And how can we have a new model of how we think about our health and how we interact with all life?

I would like you to say a word or two about how you came to write the books and think about all of this.

Cowan: I don’t know, I just think about it.

Fitts: You do?

Cowan: I observe. Forty years ago, I was taught by someone how to look at the world according to Goethe, which is that you just see what is there. Goethe always said that one of the central myths of science is the following, so think about this for a minute, “How do you know if you want to study a living thing like a frog or a mouse? The first thing that you do is kill the frog and cut it up. Who decides that?”

That is what we do. You want to know how your liver works, you take it out, kill it, cut it up, poison it, stain it, and look at it.

He said, “No. Study using a ‘macroscope’. Study the frog by how the frog interacts with flies and beetles and the water and the moon and everything.”

This person taught me how to do that 40+ years ago. I like to joke that people pay me to write this book, so I have to do it, I guess. I wake up in the morning (usually 4 in the morning), and write it up. My wife gets up later and I’ll tell her what I’ve written, and she says, “Did you just make that up?”

I say, “Yes, of course.”

I’m joking a little because I actually do some research and try to make sure it’s true, and I have fact-checkers. So I’m kidding, but I see it; I just see it.

Fitts: You are working with scores and scores of patients over long periods of time. You are like the Sherlock Holmes of health.

Cowan: And I ask for help from ‘I don’t know who’. I don’t know exactly how this all happened, and I don’t want to pretend that I do. I just know that if I talk to my angel and say, “Look, I don’t know how these viruses were discovered,” the next day in my inbox I get an email, “Here is how viruses were discovered by Stefan Lanka.”

Fitts: Have you ever wondered what you might do with one of Rife’s microscopes if you could get one?

Cowan: I would love one, but I want a real one – not the phony one.

Fitts: That would be marvelous.

Cowan: If you know of one, send it over!

Fitts: We know that you’ve retired as a practicing doctor, but you are going to move. You will feasibly be open in the fall. Hopefully you will be some kind of health consultant or coach. You are still working on exactly how that is going to work.

How do we find you? How do we keep up with you?

Cowan: Frankly, I can't be part of this thing anymore. I like to tell these goofy stories.

My wife and I were talking to somebody, and they said, "Tom has been going at this for a long time."

My wife said, "It's amazing that they let him go for this long!" And it's true.

They don't want me, and I don't want them. It's better off that I do it some other way.

The amazing thing is that I have more things to tell people about how to create wellness and vibrant life. I now have a vortexing crystal apparatus that you can water your plant or take a shower under. It actually makes suction just like the heart sucks the blood up from the body.

How do I know that? You will see this on my website. Let me tell you this. My whole thing is to forget about what you think is real, and just put your hand here. You put your hand under a faucet or a hose, and the water pushes your hand away because that is what water does. Then you put this apparatus that has an internal vortexing crystal made of gold that creates this torus. I don't exactly know the whole thing, but they say it creates suction like the heart. They actually modeled it after Schauburger's water-moving principles.

With the hose, you turn it on, you put your hand on the outlet, and your hand sticks to the vortexing device because it's sucking it back into the hose.

I've shown this to many people, and they feel it and say, "That can't be."

Fitts: Why do they say that it can't be?

Cowan: Because that's not what happens when water comes out; it pushes it away.

I say, "Forget about what can't be because your hand is telling you everything your experience says it is." So, let's just have fun and say we don't know, and then we try to figure it out.

In other words, the answer to your question is: I'm not going to practice – or at least I hope not. I have so many things to tell people about.

I have a new website, www.DrTomCowan.com. We are going to put our vegetable device on there, and we are going to talk about water and electromagnetic fields. I found out a way to build houses. There is just a whole life that is waiting to happen.

I hope people follow us, contact me, and send me ideas because we are just getting started here.

Fitts: Let me tell you why this is so exciting to me: I'll only talk financially. When you look at a family balance sheet and financial statement, the only intelligent, rational way to manage all the different financial risks that they are dealing with is to disintermediate corporations out of their life.

For instances, I always use the example of a client I had ten years ago who was always complaining that her water bill was going up, and she wasn't pleased with her dividends on her stock market. I said, "This is very easy. Sell your stocks and build a well. Just intermediate the amount on both sides."

I'm continually working with clients. Everybody is different, given their skills, where they live, and what is going on. Still, the only rational thing financially for people to do is to dramatically disintermediate large companies out of their lives, whether it's by food or shelter or energy. This makes them much more resilient. Number one, start by very proactively investing in your own health – whether it's your food or various forms of detoxing or building your immune system.

Cowan: Food and water.

Fitts: Exactly. And sun; the sun is very big, too.

Cowan: Sun, food, and water. I would love for you to talk to my son, Asher. He is running these businesses, and he would love to speak with you about it.

Fitts: I would love to talk to him about it. It's extremely urgent.

I started about a year or two ago saying, "Who is your farmer? Who is your rancher? Where is your food coming from? You aren't going to be able to buy it in the store. The things you buy in the store is not safe. So, you are going to have to reinvent how you get your food completely."

I've been pounding on it for a couple of years. Some people have been taking it seriously, but finally in the last three months, I can't tell you how many people have come back and said, "Oh my God! What do I do?"

Cowan: Everybody has to grow their own food. You have to make your own power. And it turns out that you can make your power out of water. I'll tell you about that someday.

The world is not what we were told. There is an entirely different reality out there, and it's much more fun. You can't be controlled. Well, you could, but we don't want it to be controlled.

It's all about individuals with freedom deciding and choosing their own path.

Fitts: Right, and when you choose life and let go of the material model, there is plenty of life that can show up and give you a huge amount of energy. But that is another conversation.

I want to get everybody to read the books. What is the website where we can get the books?

Cowan: Right now, it's going to be at www.DrTomCowan.com. Yesterday, it was www.HumanHeartCosmicHeart.com. It may still be that now – I don't keep up with that sort of thing. But one of those two will work.

Fitts: You can't say what, but we are hoping that you have a book coming out by the end of the year. Is that true?

Cowan: Yes, and it is about all these things that I've talked about.

Fitts: Wonderful! Well, we are huge fans of yours here at *Solari*. We can't thank you enough for everything you've done. We are really excited to be part of your next amazing career.

We will hear from you when you arrive on the East Coast.

Cowan: Thank you very much, Catherine. I really appreciate this.

Fitts: Have a wonderful day.

Cowan: You, too.

Fitts: And tell your son to call me or email. We are in ‘cahoots’.

MODIFICATION

Transcripts are not always verbatim. Modifications are sometimes made to improve clarity, usefulness and readability, while staying true to the original intent.

DISCLAIMER

Nothing on The Solari Report should be taken as individual investment advice. Anyone seeking investment advice for his or her personal financial situation is advised to seek out a qualified advisor or advisors and provide as much information as possible to the advisor in order that such advisor can take into account all relevant circumstances, objectives, and risks before rendering an opinion as to the appropriate investment strategy.