All Drugs Are Condemned

Hygienic Position Verified

Hygienic Review
Vol. XXVII May, 1966 No. 9
Hygienic Position Verified
Herbert M. Shelton

Many times during the past several years I have told my readers that all drugs are poisonous and that it was folly to expend time and money investigating each drug when it is possible to discard them all in one blanket condemnation. I am happy to be able to present some confirmation of the view from authoritative medical sources. I am going to quote from an article entitled, "Toxicology and the Biomedical Sciences" which appeared in the June, 1965, issue of Science, the official organ of the American Association For The Advancement of Science. This article was jointly authored by Bernard B. Brodie, M. D., chief of Laboratory of Chemical Pharmacology in the National Heart Institute; George J. Cosmides, M. D., program director, Pharmacology-Toxicology Program, National Institutes of Health; and David P. Rall, M. D., associate scientific director for Experimental Therapeutics, National Cancer Institute. The high standing of each of these men assures us the last word on the subject.

To begin with they say, "The number and variety of chemicals that affect man has increased at an alarming rate and created a public health problem of major proportions. We are confronted with a profusion of chemicals in the form of industrial and municipal wastes, air and water pollutants, herbicides, pesticides, cosmetics, food additives, as well as drugs administered over extended periods of time, and yet we do not know what these substances do to biological systems. In effect, we are thrust into global experiments for which we are not prepared.

"For some of these hazards, such as automobile exhaust fumes or cigarette smoke, we are unlikely to find more compelling evidence of their deleterious effects. It remains for industrial and governmental bodies to utilize in the public interest all the information now available, and for the scientific community to continue experimentation on the basic mechanisms of their effects and to find ways of preventing or attenuating their hazard.

"There remains, however, a major problem with the vast number of chemical compounds whose possible poisonous effects are not known or cannot be predicted. It is this area which is the subject of our article. "

Then it is that these authors confirm my position that it is futile to test chemical substances, one by one, when it is known that all of them are toxic. Concerning this they say: "It seems futile to record one by one the biological effects of millions of chemical entities without the development of unifying and simplifying generalizations. It is evident that new means must be sought to accelerate the acquisition of new knowledge on the effects of chemicals on living materials, and to develop a system for the rapid dissemination of such information, In this article we outline some of the problems in toxicology and offer recommendations as to how these problems should be approached. "

While it is fully acknowledged by the authors that our modern chemical environment is a mass of toxins, that new toxic substances are being added to our environment daily, they do not offer anything so simple as the discontinuance of air pollution, water pollution, food pollution, and country-side pollution with insecticides, but have taken for granted that the increasing poisoning of our environment is to continue and that the so-called researchers are to continue testing the various

toxins to determine the effects of each. In their article, they practically ignore environmental pollution after the initial admission that it exists and constitutes a serious problem and largely confine their attention to drugs.

Of drugs they say: "Investigations of drugs are frequently complicated by the difficulties of eliciting their subtle, often unusual deleterious effects, and of evaluating these effects against the beneficial actions. Even members of a single species can vary in their response to a particular substance, yet large numbers of people may be exposed to a drug on the basis of toxicity in relatively few animals. "

A recent example of the manner in which human beings are subjected to drug dangers after relatively slight animal testing is that of a new birth control drug, NK-665, manufactured by the Merck Company. While the drug was still being tested on animals, large numbers of women were used in so-called clinical tests on the same drug. When it was found that it produced cancer in the test animals, testing on women was immediately discontinued. Whatever else we may say about drug and drug testing, it does seem that all animal testing should be completed before a new drug is tested on human beings. In saying this I do not mean to be understood as having anything against the animals. I pity these poor victims of "science" the same as I do the poor human guinea-pigs who are submitted to drugging, whether for test purposes or for therapeutic purposes.

I do not put any value in the medical stupidity that drugs that have usual or unusual deleterious effects may also have "beneficial actions. " Drugs are simply poisonous, and the only effects they can have are harmful ones. These authors say: "At present, a potential therapeutic agent is first screened for biological activity in laboratory mammals. If the substance shows potentially useful pharmacological or therapeutic activity, then the toxic effects are determined in experimental animals before the substance is tested in man. Thus the pharmacological and toxic effects exerted by a drug must he predicted from the effects in laboratory animals. Our modern system of drug development, therefore, depends on the assumption of a high degree of correlation between effects in animals and man. That such predictions are often unreliable raises serious questions regarding these tests. "

Concerning this same difference between effects following drugs when given to animals and when given to man, they say: "In the past, variations among species in the response to a drug were attributed to differences in the sensitivity of receptor sites, and the prospects of obtaining data from animals that would be applicable to man were bleak. However, variation in drug metabolism within and between species is now known to be the rule rather than the exception... "

Here again we have these men stupidly referring to the biological activity of chemical substances and to drug metabolism. It is becoming quite common for pharmacologists and physicians to discuss the metabolism of drugs, when they should know that there is no such thing as drug metabolism not any more than there is such a thing as biological activity of chemical components. Loose language of this type indicates loose thinking, or else it indicates a deliberate misuse of terms in an effort to deceive, to create confusion, and in an effort to deceive readers. Another frequent expression of these men of so-called science is "drug receptors. " They regard the various organs and tissues of the body as receivers of drugs when in reality they reject them.

Returning, however, to the difficulties of extrapolating the effects occasioned by a drug in one animal to another animal, let me quote further from these authors. They say: "In tests of subacute and chronic toxicity, differences between animals and man in rates of drug metabolism are particularly important. Despite a large variability in metabolism, the acute lethal toxicity of many barbiturates (administered intravenously) is almost identical in various mammalian species because of the short time lapse between administration of drug and death, On the other hand, the lethal

toxicity of a drug will vary considerably if time elapses between drug administration and death. A substance metabolized in rats 50 times more rapidly than in man may have the same acute toxicity in both species, but the chronic toxicity may be vastly different because of drug cumulation. Phenyl-hutazone, an antirheumatic agent metabolized much more rapidly in the rat than in man, causes the retention of sodium. Rats given a single dose of drug do not show this effect. To maintain the drug at a plasma concentration that produces sodium retention in man (about 150 ug/ml), the rat must be given a total daily dosage of 400 milligrams per kilogram of body weight compared with the 5 to 10 milligrams per kilogram required in man.

"Much of the research on the teratogenic effects of thalidomide in animals is difficult to interpret. The drug is said to produce a long-lasting sedation in man and the horse but only a fleeting effect in most other species. We know of no studies that relate the plasma concentration to the teratogenic effects. From the short-lived sedative action in the rat, one would suspect that this animal might inactivate the drug much more rapidly than does man.

"Thus, in toxicity studies it is important to compare in the various species the plasma or tissue concentration at which a drug elicits an adverse effect. Until this has been done with a variety of agents we cannot know to what extent species variability in toxicity depends on differences in rate of' drug metabolism or differences in inherent toxicity. "

By drug metabolism and inactivating the drug they mean the same thing. They have in mind only the means employed by the body in defending itself against the "inherent toxicity" of chemical substances that are foolishly introduced into the body.

After all the testing on men and animals has been done, there still remains the variability between men and women. For example, these authors say: "A common cause of toxic reactions arises from 'overdosage' because of person-to-person variability in rates of drug metabolism; the same daily dose of a drug may cure, cause severe toxicity, or have no effects whatsoever... Each person seems to have his own pattern of metabolism for these drugs. (They have previously mentioned certain drugs) The consequences of individual differences in drug metabolism are exaggerated in long-term therapy... "

It may be well to consider a few more statements of theirs concerning the harmfulness of drugs. They say: "Drugs used medicinally may produce adverse effects by causing biochemical lesions and cellular damage, rather than by exaggerating the actions of physiological control systems. "

"Some drugs will invariably produce cellular damage if the concentration in the plasma is high enough. For example, isoniazid at almost the same plasma concentration in animals and man reacts with pyridoxal to produce adverse effects on the nervous system. In fact, isoniazid produces a neuropathy in patients who, by genetic predisposition, (a mere suppositionauthor) metabolize the drug excessively slowly and therefore receive the maximum antituberculous effects of the drug. "

They tell us that certain drugs cause delayed toxic reactions and that cancer production is among the important aspects of chemical toxicity. While certain drugs which are classed as cyto-toxic agents (cellular poisons) cause necrosis of the liver, others produce irreversible but fatal lesions in the kidneys, and certain others produce cataracts. They point out that tissue damage is related to drug accumulation and say that small amounts of some drugs may be retained in the body for months and even years. Thus, if they are prescribed for regular use, they tend to accumulate in amounts that cause great damage and death.

To the intelligent individual it would seem that men, viewing all of these dangers produced by drugs, would warn against their use. But these men issue no such warning. They are medical men

engaged in prescribing drugs and in promoting the use of drugs. Their interest is not in discrediting drug usage but in increasing the drugging practice. Were it suggested to either of these three men that it might be more advantageous to the sick to provide them with helpful things, rather than ply them with destructive chemicals, they would indignantly characterize the one making the suggestion as a member of the "lunatic fringe. " They would be on the alert to protect their racket and would be among the first to denounce as an ignoramus and quack any man who should dare to challenge the validity of a system that seeks to restore the sick to health by poisoning them. Yet there is no more sense in poisoning the sick than there is in poisoning the well. Why should we pollute the human blood stream any more than we should pollute our water supply or our atmosphere? Why should we pollute our cellular structures any more than we should pollute our foods? The growing problem confronting mankind, consequent upon the effort of chemists to take over human life and deal with it as though it could be handled in a test tube, cannot be solved by any amount of drug research. Human life will be safe only when the last physician has been strangled with the guts of the last chemist.

Herbert M. Shelton

Man's Dietetic Character

As a preface to this masterful treatise on Man's Dietetic Character by Herbert Shelton let me say that I believe herein lies the truth of meat eating for man. Meat eating is a bio-immoral habit and a de-evolutionary practice. Only an addict with a pernicious habit to defend can deny the facts. One of the crowning tenets of Natural Hygiene is the marvelous economy of the body. This same type of intelligent economy when applied to things outside the body can and does have positive effect. However there is no economy in meat eating, if we are to propound a philosophy of health to all of mankind that includes this backward habit, there would not be enough meat to go around. Meat is not economical. The purpose of Hygiene is to evolve into always greater spheres of Health and Intelligence, to harken back to an un-enlightened time and adopt the destructive habits then in vogue is to betray the glorious destiny of Mankind. Of course man may survive eating meat, may even appear to thrive on it, but this certainly does not make the practice mans most intelligent choice. The intelligent choice is to see the writing on the wall and recognize meat eating for what it is, a temporary aberration in the development of man. If we control our habits then we can control our biological adaptability as well, so let us use our intelligence and voluntarily forgo the negative for a truly economical state of health. - karl

(Note that this is Karl's opinion and not INHS'. And, this is an early 1944 view by Dr. Shelton. Also read his later view in The Life of Primitives - 1969, webmaster.)