

Dear JPHMA,

Welcome to the war of attrition against homoeopathy! Science (contemporary scientific practice – not 'true' science which is the search after knowledge) has been increasingly provocative in its statements about what it sees as the absurdity and medical fraud that homoeopaths peddle. The media, willing henchmen in promoting the sovereignty of technologically driven materialistic science, contributes real power to the subversion.

Yet this battle with homoeopathy is not new. Hahnemann suffered from detractors in his time. Subsequent writers, speakers, teachers and practitioners of homoeopathy for the following 200 years have had to cope with the same. Homoeopaths of all generations have something in common: not one of their critics and detractors has taken any time to study what they are angry, fearful and ignorant about. None of them has taken the trouble to do more than look cursorily at the explanations we ourselves, the homoeopaths, have given out. They base their negative judgements on the theory rather than the long term effects of what we claim to do. Their ignorance of what we do has become bigotry.

Should we be surprised? I think not! It is interesting to read Mr Kanazawa's speech for all its incorrect assertions. He has not done his homework! To start with, he says that homoeopathy began at a time when there were only folk medicine and traditional medicines to treat people; these were medicines that had been handed down for hundreds, if not thousands of generations. Many of them have formed the basis of contemporary medical practice; so highly thought of that we now have to manufacture them synthetically for commercial viability. Secondly, he repeats the old error of stating that homoeopathy could not possibly work as there is no substance left in the remedies by the time they have been potentised beyond the earliest stages of succussion. Well, of course there is no substance! Hahnemann discovered that by separating energy from its source substance the medicine was rendered not only more effective but safe! Thirdly, he repeats the cliché that because water has memory homoeopaths claim that it is capable of carrying the memory of the substance. What has water got to do with it? He should have found out that ethanol is far more commonly

used in homoeopathic pharmacies. Fourthly, he quotes from the report of a committee in the British House of Commons as evidence of the lack of effectiveness of homoeopathy. I wonder if he knows how many politicians, drugs company representatives and anti-homoeopathic scientists were on that committee? Mr. Kanazawa patronisingly commits the first sin of science. He seeks to obliterate a branch of science before understanding it. He has picked unripe cherries from one tree and claims that all cherry trees produce poisonous fruit. Remember Constantin Hering, a journalist sent by his newspaper's editor to break Hahnemann's reputation, who became one of homoeopathy's greatest exponents!

Contemporary science commands vast quantities of money, influences governments and employs huge numbers of people. Medical science is an enormous part of this. Conventional medicine is not in the hands of doctors and nurses or surgeons but under the control of international committees of politicians and representatives of obscenely wealthy drugs companies that have a vested interest in maintaining their supremacy over the public's ideas and beliefs on health and welfare. Anyone who purports to challenge that hegemony is going to call down a firestorm on their heads. And homoeopathy is challenging! Not only does it challenge the enshrined concept of artificial immunisation (worth billions of dollars a year) but also the use of hormone treatments (more millions of dollars), the ever increasing use of antibiotics (more millions) and the spread of other drugs such as statins, steroids and analgesics. Worse, homoeopathy teaches us to throw out the accepted ideas of how illness and disease work on the human body, psyche and spirit. Far worse, science has finally seen all this at a time when medicine is being openly questioned for the many manifest failures it has been unable to reverse: a swelling worldwide army of elderly people entirely dependent on drug regimes to keep them alive; epidemics of diseases such as AIDS, TB, venereal infections and tropical diseases that mutate as drugs fail to halt their progress. Though the voice of homoeopathy is small, it is insistent and its power is cumulative. No wonder the medics and drugs companies are worried.

What can we, in homoeopathy, do about the situation? First of all, do not be intimidated. Our philosophy and practice is being attacked by those who

have declined to test us in the only way that is possible: personal experience.

While science claims the incontrovertible correctness of empiricism, the scientists fail to see that double blind trials in laboratories are no such thing. Double blind trials are vital in chemistry but worse than useless to test homoeopathy. Scientists look for what is 'normal' which is a philosophy that denies the fact that we are all individual and subject to an enormous range of variation. Homoeopaths practise physics; medical science fails to see that by practising chemistry, the practice of physics is not put first.

Physics comes before chemistry; always! (Chemicals cannot react without first being subject to a force that places them in proximity or contact.) Homoeopathy is not susceptible to the double blind trial because there are no fixed norms; there are only those things that are 'similar'!

The second thing we have to do is to trust. We must trust that what each of us has personally found to be true and that we use as the basis of our daily practice is also potentially true for those who think in a similar way or for those who would look for a similar path. It is a path of independence; it is a path of self empowerment; it is a journey towards wellbeing not just a sterile search for the removal of symptoms. We must trust that people who consult us for homoeopathic treatment have sufficient intelligence to decide for themselves what is best for them. We do not practise a medical art that is self-explanatory; there are aspects of homoeopathy that are a mystery despite the efforts of those who have studied quantum physics and attempted to define it in such terms. In truth, we do not know how to tell anyone how remedies work and we make a mistake if we try to explain ourselves 'scientifically' to the scientific community. It is useless to talk to a scientist about the 'increasing power of dilution'; he will laugh in our faces. (By emphasising the word 'dilution' we underline the apparent absurdity of employing the power of the remedy for healing.) We have to trust that one day it will be accepted that the mystery of the electrodynamics of homoeopathy is effective because it is the body's innate ability to heal itself that is initiated by the chosen remedy. The most important idea we can get across to people is that homoeopathy and homoeopaths make no claim to cure anything; the only claim is to have found

a way of initiating self healing.

Scientists like Mr Kanazawa must be respected for their learning but not for their arrogance in assuming that there is nothing of any merit in a system of treatment that is alive and well in many countries of the world. Abraham Lincoln said that you can fool all of the people some of the time and some of the people all the time but not all of the people all of the time. Is it possible that Hahnemann was able to start a revolution in medical thinking that has been able to fool so many people in so many parts of the world for over 200 years? Would Hahnemann, a polymath of quite extraordinary brilliance, have troubled himself with perpetrating such a fraud? Would there be libraries around the world full of books on homoeopathy and in so many different languages? Would there be pharmacies on all five continents dedicated to the production of homoeopathic medicine if there were not something of value in homoeopathy? Would there be over 20 colleges of homoeopathy in Britain alone and many more in other European countries, India, the Americas, the Antipodes and, the for the past decade, in Japan? Would homoeopathy have taken such a short time to flourish in Japan if there were not people anxious to become its aficionados? What hubris to think that all these generations of people were and are not just wrong but ignorant and stupid and gullible enough to be influenced by venal practitioners of a fringe medicine! And what lies we practitioners must be prepared to tell those who would ask what homoeopathy can do!! All those cases of people who have become well – were they all invented? How unwise of these scientists to rely on their intellects to judge us instead of their powers of intelligent discrimination!

Mr Kanazawa avoids the trap most of his colleagues fall into: that homoeopathy has nothing in it yet it is dangerous. He does this by side-stepping the issue remedies themselves. He tells us that if we rely on homoeopathic treatment we may be missing out on effective conventional treatment and thus put ourselves in danger. He remains ignorant of how many people come to us after having sought conventional treatment and being disappointed. He dismisses the fact that animals and babies are good examples of effective homoeopathic treatment by saying that "it is humans

who judge the effect". Yet he would, no doubt, be quite content with the human judgement of fellow scientists who make assessments based on experiments on animals permanently caged in laboratory conditions. He would be happy with the text books that tell him of scientific facts established in the past and which, one day, will be qualified by the phrase "It was once thought that...but it is now known that...."

For those who fear the onslaughts of bigotry, take heart! Nothing ever comes of what is less than the truth. Mr Kanazawa is a victim of his own chosen profession's extraordinary success. Look into the history of modern medicine since the industrial revolution! It is very instructive. You will see just how quickly and constantly medicine has changed over nearly 300 years and is still changing. The success of contemporary medicine is based on only a relatively very few years of research. Despite that research there are still very questionable practices that go on.

It is less than 100 years since mercury and other poisonous substances were still being used as medicines. Less than a 100 years! What am I saying? They still use mercury in vaccines! We are assured of the safety and necessity of chemo and radiotherapy but every packet of drugs carries a paper listing the known side effects, some extremely dangerous, and every dose of radiation insidiously affects the human body to some degree, often permanently. We are being criticised by purveyors of a very inexact science and one that has the potential to do us great harm...but they have a lot of money and a lot of political influence and they have engendered a lot of fear in an unsuspecting public. The practice of chemical medicine (I do not include surgery here) is a race against time; its practitioners are always looking for the next thing that 'works' only to find that the discoveries are unstable. Conventional medicine is always unsatisfactory because it does not take account of two things, both essential ingredients: the causation of negative energy and the human spirit.

I have a patient who is a scientist; he works as an astronomer and astrophysicist but is trained in the broader discipline of physics. He told me that he has often been ridiculed by his colleagues for visiting a homoeopath. He always tells them that he cannot explain how homoeopathy

works but that his symptoms (which included heart problems and chronic ear infections) have only gone away since using homoeopathic treatment after years of no success whatever while on drug therapy. He adds that those who criticise his choice should answer his two questions: "Who am I and why am I here?" He says that science has failed to answer the great philosophical questions of all cultures and all times and should therefore wait before claiming that it has the solutions for the human condition. He is not the only scientist I treat. I have also treated surgeons, nurses and other specialists. I know of other homoeopaths who have psychiatrists, general practitioners and nuclear physicists in their diaries. My son's first patient after he qualified was a local doctor who sees him for regular treatment. She is not only an enthusiast for homoeopathy but spent many years teaching homoeopathy to doctors.

Do not be intimidated. Trust that what you are doing for yourselves is right for you and for those who seek your help. Know that you are practising a system of medicine that is not invasive and that does no harm to the psyche or the spirit of the human body and encourages the physical body to eliminate anything that is no longer viable. Be aware that the only harm that practitioners of homoeopathy can do is by ignorance and neglect. Homoeopathy will survive but it will survive better if we all ensure that we never stop learning, that we put the welfare of patients first, that we know when a situation is beyond our capabilities, that we recognise when surgery or conventional medical intervention is necessary and if we only speak about homoeopathy when we are asked to. Homoeopathy is a quiet practice best carried out between two individuals. It does not need to be bruited abroad. It finds its own people. It requires no advertisement beyond the positive results of a good prescription. As Hahnemann tells us, it is a method of seeking the gentlest possible healing. Life is too short and precious for us to engage in verbal battles with those who do not learn our language.

I have written at length, for which I apologise but I feel that practitioners of homoeopathy need all the support they can get. The one thing that undermines homoeopathy more than anything else is fear. If you practice homoeopathy as it should be practised then you will know that there

is no fear to be felt. Wait for the pendulum to swing; it always does and as it comes it sweeps away anything but the truth.

With my most sincere good wishes to all pioneers of homoeopathy in Japan,

Colin Griffith.