

“Dare to be wise” - We Accept the Challenge

'Homoeopathy bashing' a favorite passion of critics right since its inception. The latest salvo through "The Lancet" is a fresh all-out effort by the powerful multibillion dollar pharmaceutical lobby who feels the earth sinking inch by inch, day by day from under their feet through a 30% annual increase in sales in the alternative and natural medical sciences, including USA and Great Britain, amounting to over-the-counter sales of 32 million pounds a year. Homoeopathy has grown and refined, but the principles of research are consistent. If these principles were not effective, they would require continuous adjustments.

The issues raised and criticized are the same since the birth of Homoeopathy in 1794, - the same which faced the founder of Homoeopathy when he had a hands down success in the treatment of epidemic of 'Scarlet Fever' with 'Belladonna'.

HERE IS THE MAIN REASON FOR THE BIASED CONCLUSION.

The study was **not a new clinical study** conducted by the researchers themselves, (Dr Matthias Egger et al) but was a study commissioned by the Federal office of Public Health in Switzerland, to decide whether Homoeopathy should be included in the social insurance policy (amounting to billions of \$ to the Government exchequer). Hence the purpose is more ECONOMIC than SCIENTIFIC.

The modus operandi was only a comparative study based on just 8 Homoeopathic and 6 Conventional medicine trials, starting with a biased assumption "that the effects observed in placebo-controlled trials of Homoeopathy could be explained by a combination of

methodological deficiencies and biased reporting". Sound research has not been conducted from this starting position.

Single remedy trials have been utilized which makes research easier, but does not reflect the integrity of this Science, since the placebo-controlled randomized trials is not a fitting research tool for Homoeopathy.

Data of single remedy Homoeopathic trials were examined against data of conventional medical studies.

Single remedy Homoeopathic trials would be analogous to (for example) test the effects of Penicillin for all patients with symptoms of an apparent infection. The quality of the studies would otherwise be excellent in design. However, Penicillin will not work for patients with viral infections or bacterial infections resistant to it or fevers from non-infectious causes and it thus might show benefit only for a subset of patients, ones with true penicillin-sensitive infections. How would penicillin fare in a meta-analysis of studies designed to ignore the intrinsic nature of Penicillin in benefiting patients?

The study is in stark contrast to earlier published studies in the Lancet and British Medical Journal. So far, 3 big meta-analyses of Homoeopathy have been published in the Medical press and all have come to positive conclusions which over-rule the current study. (before or after this study?)

The Lancet also earlier published that a draft report on Homoeopathy by WHO says the majority of Scientific papers published over the last 40 years have demonstrated that Homoeopathy is equal to conventional medicine in treatment of illnesses both in HUMANS and ANIMALS. Why has the media not hyped these facts? Why only the negative study? Earlier researchers have concluded with sufficient credible evidences to establish **Homoeopathy as a regular Science**.

Even in-vitro and in-vivo studies of Homoeopathic dilutions and laboratory experiments have provided evi-



PROF DR ANWAR AMIR MD
93/95 Cadell Road,
Mahim, Mumbai 400 016
Mobile: 9820050750

dence of biological effects on animals, plants and cells and hence disprove the placebo theory. *Nux-vomica* has been able to improve the righting reflex by 44% in mice intoxicated with alcohol. Double blind studies of respiratory diseases in piglets and mastitis in cows showed positive effects.

HOMOEOPATHY WILL CONTINUE TO BE A PROBLEM FOR MATERIAL-SCIENTISTS

- Homoeopathic medicines are ultra-molecular and not even a single molecule of the original solute is likely to be present. Above the 12c potency there is no material substance in the drugs: this is so unreasonable to the material-scientist. There is lack of demonstrable mechanism in terms of Biochemical action, but strong evidence of undefined Biophysical mechanism, which is a subject of research.
- Homoeopathy and Allopathy have very different underlying philosophies and the method of conventional research is designed from the frame work of conventional philosophy.
- Conventional Research does not and cannot take account of the most important feature of Homoeopathy ie Individualization.
- In a study where ONE single remedy is compared to the test group - placebo, only a small number of people in Group B will be helped by that remedy, as selection is not based on Individualization. This small number will not show up in the sort of test accepted by conventional Science.

A certain condition might improve naturally in 10%, conventional treatment in 25% and Homoeopathic treatment in 75% (WOW!) if different Indicated remedies are used and it is possible no individual remedy would be effective in 10% cases. So, although Homoeopathy helped 3 times more, the effectiveness of any of the remedies could not be demonstrated. Even where individualization of remedies is used in research, the quality of individualization is a major variable with a large number of mediocre homoeopaths

and it is impossible to tell whether the individualization in a trial was good or not. Thus, even such studies may use definitions that work against homeopathy.

Conventional research takes account of a single variable, different set of statistical analysis, different definitions of cure and disease.

Homoeopathic research is fundamentally different. You cannot apply the **rules of Soccer to a Cricket match**, as has been done in the current Lancet study.

Homoeopathy has been defending the onslaughts heaped on it due to its quality to focus on issues beyond matter, which is indigestible to scientists with a materialistic view.

We probably need a Newton or an Edison or a Dalton to demonstrate the dynamism in our science, which we are eagerly awaiting— so that materialism sees sense and stops maligning the science.

Thankfully, prominent US research scientists like Dr Iris Bell, Dr Rustom Roy and Dr Joyce Frye have come down heavily in countering Lancets claim showing inherent lacunae and biased assumptions.

THE PROBLEMS WITH HOMOEOPATHY

The major problems have been self created by the practitioners themselves. The drift from the fundamental principles towards “complex remedies” approach, based solely on conventional medical knowledge and indications based solely on patients presenting symptoms and diagnosis, are the root cause to view homoeopathy with skepticism and disdain. This moral erosion, in order to appear modern and the process of adapting itself to conventional medical research has done the most harm, the leverage of which can be taken up by studies as appeared currently in the Lancet .

And sadly enough, these very proponents have been presented as MASCOTS and FACE of homeopathy at the political, administrative, educational and corporate levels, and also the media. Homeopathy is not surviving by stringent marketing strategies, but by its inherent quality itself.



WHAT ARE THE REMEDIAL MEASURES?

We are not shy of any confrontation to prove the mettle of homeopathy. We accept any challenge that may be put forth to us, since the fundamentals of the science have stood the test of time for more than 200 years. Day in and day out homeopaths are witness to the truth of the "Law of Similars."

Real scientific evaluation demands a tool devised to encompass the framework of homeopathic philosophy.

- * Studies should be commissioned with involvement of a team of conventional research workers, social scientists, internationally recognized Hahnemannian homoeopaths of repute and a protocol be devel-

oped suiting the homeopathic philosophy.

Such studies over a period of time be carried out and then the data to be subjected to meta-analysis.

- * A single symptom should not to be taken as a variable.
- * Subjective symptoms like pain, which is a sensation, to be excluded.
- * Objective studies like pneumonias, diarrhea, hemorrhages, COPD's etc to be included in the study.

Such unbiased studies will surely lay to rest all speculations, objections and doubts in the minds of the skeptics.

UNBELIEVABLE BUT TRUE

STRICTLY FOR STUDENTS to create awareness and learn to use Repertory

Dr Hahnemann Homoeopathic Service Trust, Vadodara

OFFERS 30% subsidy on the text book of repertory

Repertory of the Homoeopathic Materia Medica

by Dr J T Kent AM MD corrected, revised and improved by Dr R P Patel

Large Student Edition: 25 x 18 cms: Rs 350/-
Less: Rs 105/- 30% subsidy
Total Rs 245/- + Rs 50/-
(Packing and Postage by Registered post) No VPP.

Free Seminar on Repertory
in February & July
2006 to 2010

Send MO or DD for Rs 295/- (Certificate from the Principle of the college is essential) to:

Assistant Director

Dr R P Patel, Institute of Homoeopathy,
Hahnemann House-Meissen, Atmajyoti Ashram Road,
P O Subhanpura, Vadodara-390023, Gujarat, India

Note: You are invited to visit by appointment
Homoeopathy History Museum, the only one in the
World at above address. Visiting time: 9am-12noon