

## II - To stop keeping a low profile and set the record straight...

We have been far too conciliatory and timorous towards our opponents for a long time.

They are not at all critical of us, which would pose no problem since criticism is legitimate. What they want is the disappearance of homoeopathy, its definitive disqualification and, quite simply, its outlawing, its banning. [...] The first thing they said after the HAS<sup>1</sup> announced their recommendation for the stopping of its reimbursement was that 'it was only the first stage and they wanted to go further. To succeed, like in Canada, in making it impossible for a doctor to practise homoeopathy and in making their practice the cause of their striking off from the register' [...].

Statins alone cost 'Sécurité sociale'<sup>2</sup> € 1,200,000,000 every year. And yet many scientific studies have shown that they are poisonous to the liver, kidneys, brain and even the heart. That they are too often prescribed to patients who will get no benefit out of them. We should therefore 'put our foot down' and dare ask, since scientific studies prove that statins pose a problem, how is it that € 1,200,000,000 are spent on them every year ?

Is it respectable and worthy of encouragement to administer statins, whose dangerousness we now know, whereas to prescribe what Jérémy Descoux (the cardiologist at the head of the opponents of homoeopathy) considers to be a placebo would be criminal ?

In a word, the issue must now be to bring to light the obvious hypocrisy and massive clashes of interests characterising our detractors. We should not at all be ashamed of our practice, which is very useful and effective, not costly for the community and not poisonous. We should not let our opponents impose their unhealthy logorrhoea on us. We should stop it and systematically make them face their contradictions.

### The plunder and then ?

First of all, we should remember and remind everyone that *homoeopathy is 220 years old and has always been faced with many obstacles and constant hostility*. Therefore, we, as homoeopathic doctors, should continue to treat our patients according to our competence, conscience and experience. [...] Regarding the patients, we are sure that they will continue, as much as it is economically possible for them, to get the treatments that are the best for their health from their usual homoeopathic doctor.

We should also continue, by all possible means, to defend *the value, the rigour and the scientific nature of homoeopathy*. But not like before. Not in that shy, timorous and overconciliatory way towards our detractors, which our 'official' representatives have used too much. There is no point in bowing down before the person who wants to shoot you

---

<sup>1</sup> 'Haute Autorité de Santé'. (Translator's note)

<sup>2</sup> The national system for provision of sickness, maternity, child, unemployment, old-age and housing benefits. (Translator's note)

down in the hope that they may be grateful to you for it and give you clemency. I have said it again and again in vain [...] for years.

I see only one form to give to our defence. *Rigorous and respectful firmness and debates with our detractors with total intellectual honesty*, but without the least amount of conciliatoriness towards those who are dishonest.

After the form, the content. I see *only one main line to follow : the complementarity of homoeopathy and standard medicine*. But not timid, embarrassed complementarity, which begs for a minor role, as if homoeopathy was only a small 'plus' brought to the almost all-powerful allopathy. Homoeopathy and allopathy complement each other, somewhat as surgery and allopathy do. *What one can do, the other cannot and to use one when the other is necessary is a mistake and loss of luck for the patient*. Sometimes, both of them must absolutely be combined for the good of the patient. There is therefore no hierarchy between the two but two well-defined fields.

Personally, when I treat a patient with homoeopathy, I do so neither to please myself nor to please them but just because it is the therapeutic option that will give them *the best treatment*. And, of course, when an allopathic treatment is preferable, I prescribe it. We should say that to our detractors and also that, when *they systematically persist, just out of partisan bias, in treating all pathologies with allopathy and ruling out the possibility of using homoeopathy and persuading their patient not to do so, they are at fault and are the only ones who make their patient's chances of being cured decrease*. Of course, this is not aimed at our numerous allopathic colleagues who do not hesitate to refer some of their cases to us, which represents five or six patients in my practice every day. This is only aimed at the 'ayatollahs' of allopathy, whom we must henceforth 'put in their place' as often as necessary, and whom we have too much let insult us without saying anything for years.<sup>3</sup>

Doctor Philippe Marchat

HOMEOLook, homéopathie, science et médecine... blog de Philippe Marchat

May 2019

---

<sup>3</sup> Translated by Pascale Tempka