

Touch For Health July, 1987

# IS TOUCH FOR HEALTH SCIENTIFIC? IS WESTERN MEDICINE SCIENTIFIC. A PHYSICIST'S VIEW

©1987, Steven Rochlitz, M.A., Ph.D. Cand.

**Abstract:** Western Medical orthodoxy purports to use arguments of scientific logic to support their practices and to refute holistic methods which would include TFH. An actual examination of these arguments and of true scientific philosophy reveals that TFH is scientific while many of the standard practices of Western Medicine are not.

First, we will list three arguments used by Orthodox Western Physicians under the false guise of Science. A knowledge of actual scientific logic will demonstrate that these arguments are specious (false). The theory and results of Touch For Health balancing and Medical chemotherapy (drug prescribing) can then reveal which is scientific.

## MEDICAL ORTHODOXY'S ARGUMENTS AGAINST TFH AND HOLISTIC HEALTH

1. To be a scientific technique, one must know why TFH balancing works. Otherwise it is "anecdotal" and unscientific.
2. To be scientific it is necessary to understand a phenomenon - like TFH balancing - at the microscopic level. A macroscopic understanding is insufficient.
3. Double-blind, statistical studies are both necessary and sufficient to prove scientific validity.

The first argument above demonstrates how poorly Western Medicine comprehends what Science is. Any physicist would refute this argument (as follows) as void of any understanding of scientific logic.

Let us look at perhaps the oldest observed scientific phenomenon - gravity. 300 years ago, Isaac Newton supposedly was hit on the head by a falling apple. He deduced that the same force pulls all objects at the earth's surface to its core and also holds the solar system together. He went on to describe a simple mathematical relationship for the gravitational force between massive objects which also made use of the distance between them. But did Newton know why masses attract with the force they exhibit? Do physicists now know why? The answer both times is categorically NO!

Only recently with remarkably complex theories - first, one called supersymmetry and more recently one called superstrings or the "Theory of Everything" - are physicists beginning to make inroads into the why of gravity. But have physicists dismissed all accounts of gravitational phenomena as anecdotal? Of course not. Men landed on the Moon thanks to Newton's Law of Gravity and baseballs are made to travel the distances they do using the same law. It is a completely fallacious argument, not an argument of science, that one must know the "why's" of a health technique, such as TFH for it to be scientific.

Likewise for argument #2. The author's doctoral advisor in Physics, Professor Max Dresden wrote a paper called "Reflections on Fundamentality and Complexity". He cited several phenomena which could adequately be described at both microscopic or macroscopic levels. For example, temperature may be calculated from large scale hydrodynamic variables such as density and pressure. Alternatively, the molecular level

with its laws of particle interactions would yield the same calculation. While one scale may appear to be (and may actually be) more fundamental than the other, there is a logical relationship between the two scales. And either scale can suffice alone, if need be, to describe appropriate phenomena.

So we don't need to know precisely how TFH works at the microscopic level for it to be demonstrated as "scientific". Of course researchers delving into this matter are heartily welcomed. Undoubtedly new TFH techniques would result. Certainly the future will reveal how TFH works at the microscopic level. The point is, however, we needn't wait for that day. The observable, macroscopic scale we work with is muscle weakness and relevant corrections. This is sufficient.

Lastly, argument #3 states that double-blind, statistical studies are both necessary and sufficient to demonstrate scientific validity. This argument can be rejected immediately. For something to be labeled scientific, all that is necessary is for it to be a consistently repeatable phenomenon, i.e., we set up condition A and we get condition B invariably. This is all that a "law" of nature is.

Let us examine the use of double-blind studies in the literature. Whenever the author has perused the medical, "scientific" literature, e.g., the Journal of the American Medical Association - JAMA he has been shocked and disgusted (as a bona fide scientist) to see the following. About half of these articles purport that double-blind "scientific" studies "prove" a new "wonder" drug to be both safe and effective. Yet the other half of these articles are warnings that last year's or the last decade's wonder drug (which was

"proven" to be safe and effective by "double-blind scientific" studies) has turned out to be **NEITHER!** So how scientific could double-blind studies be? (Of course questions of politics and economics arise regarding chemotherapy.) This type of study is neither necessary nor sufficient to demonstrate scientific validity. Such statistical studies are a cover-up to attempt to support the masking of symptoms with toxic, foreign substances when usually there is a much better, natural methodology available. Of course, there are many modern medical techniques, such as microsurgical reattachment of limbs, that are true triumphs of science and technology. But for most chronic, degenerative, physical, emotional and immunological disease; the impotence of Western Medicine belies its lack of scientific validity.

Thus we conclude that the arguments used by the Western Medical Establishment against holistic health, including TFH are specious and not related to actual science. TFHers may now realize that as TFH works consistently, it is also scientific! Its naturalness, without side-effects makes it even more valuable and scientific. Detecting and correcting energy imbalance is coming closer to cause and effect (which may not be necessary) than is placing foreign substances into a fragile, complex medium - ourselves!

To facilitate use of these arguments by TFHers and holistic practitioners, photocopying of this paper (only) is freely permitted.

### Reference

1. Dresden, M. "Reflections on Fundamentality and Complexity", Institute of Theoretical Physics, S.U.N. Y. at Stony Brook, New York, 1974.