

II - ANSWER OF A SCIENTIST TO THE MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMY OF MEDICINE AND THE ACADEMY OF PHARMACY ASKING FOR THE STOPPING OF THE REIMBURSEMENT OF HOMOEOPATHY AND OF ITS TEACHING¹.

The following thoughts on 'scientific' research in homoeopathy might give a reason for 40 years of failure linked to the proof of the effectiveness of this type of medicine :

In fact, homoeopathy cannot be adapted to the current experimental science for various reasons :

- 1- Seen from Avogadro's principle, most of the dilutions used no longer contain any molecules. And it is the latter that are currently seen as being the only support for the action of the medicine.
- 2- Homoeopathy takes into account only the signs shown by the patient and their evolution : as each person reacts in their own way and does not necessarily have all the symptoms - exacerbated in some and absent in others - of an illness, it is all the more impossible to make a medicine correspond to an illness.
- 3- The absence of any molecule would justify the putting in place of a new paradigm permitting to grow away from the 'necessarily molecular view'² : many scientists working in the ultramolecular field wish so. But we know that non-molecular information is perceived by man : we can observe that, if some like jazz, others like opera ; whereas everyone receives the information through the same medium, a sound wave, there are differences in musical tastes. They can only be explained by the fact that, despite the same medium, the information is processed in an individual way by the person who receives it. Therefore, it is not possible to confuse the medium with the information...
- 4- The modalities imposed on research work constitute a major brake here : all the experiments carried out on the homoeopathic remedy were so through methods adapted to today's science : only the molecular element was accepted. Consequently, how can one think that may be suitable for homoeopathy ? According to the conventional 'double-blind' method, neither the patient nor the experimenting doctor knows if the remedy taken is a medicine or a 'neutral' substance. This is the opposite of homoeopathy : the experimenting doctor, if they are a homoeopath, must observe the patient's reactions, give them the appropriate remedy according to the symptoms shown and, if necessary, give them a different one after some time according to the new clinical signs. This is obviously totally incompatible with the 'double-blind' method as currently practised. The interpretation of the results as regards homoeopathy would be impossible : is this a

¹ Second part of an article entitled, *Une réflexion sur les modes d'approche actuels face aux 'Fondamentaux' de l'homéopathie* published on homeopsy.com in April 2019.

² 'We believe there is another way. New epistemology is necessary, which must be more balanced and sociologically more sensitive, capable of incorporating the soft individual, social and cultural views of science as well as the hard core of its knowledge...', Helga Nowotny, the Ecole polytechnique ; Peter Scott, vice-chancellor of Kingston University ; Michael Gibbons, Secretary-General, Association of Commonwealth Universities (2003).

case in which two remedies were active or, on the contrary, only one was ? If this is the case, was it the first one ? The second one ? Was it self-recovery ? Strict placebo effect ? Even if, despite that, positive results (not significant - about 10 %) were sometimes found in favour of homoeopathy, it must be stressed how inappropriate to 'non-molecular' elements most of the protocols used for conventional medications are. Therefore, how can one claim to assess the homoeopathic medicine in that way ?

To carry out meta-analyses by applying the current molecular models to them does not make sense either... : they do not prove anything and, if they are assumptions, statistics are not 'proofs'...

On the other hand, we can say again, in conclusion, that many elementary experiments carried out on plants show most interesting results : they run counter to the placebo effect alone frequently attached to the homoeopathic approach.

René Philippe Halm

Doctor of Pharmacy, Doctor of Science, Past President and founder member of the Entretiens Internationaux de Monaco and of the GIRI (Groupe International de Recherche sur les hautes dilutions), author of various articles and publications and of *Comprendre l'homéopathie*, CY, Ed. 2000.³

rp-halm@webstore.fr

³ Translated by Pascale Tempka