



Montreal, May 20th 2012

Mr Schwarz,

Regarding your articles concerning homeopathy published in The Gazette (April 21st, April 28th and May 5th), you claim to want to bring a scientific understanding to the public based on your personal qualities as a scientist and a university professor.

We consider that your articles are very badly and inaccurately documented, biased and prejudiced and that you disgrace the scientific community as well as your own university and profession as a journalist.

We understand and accept that people are ill-informed and that they may question or challenge the homeopathic philosophy and practice. We are ready to meet these challenges, as long as they respect scientific and ethical criteria, which your articles do not meet.

In your quality of scientist and professor, we consider the incredible number of errors, omissions, and manipulation of data as unacceptable and ask that you retract all of your erroneous declarations on homeopathy as erroneous and unfounded.

You will find enclosed a long list of these errors and biased opinions, whether historical, factual or scientific.

We will also notify McGill University and The Gazette of this situation, so that they take whatever measure they deem useful.

We will also notify the various international bodies, which represent homeopathy worldwide, of your articles.

Ignorance leads to prejudice, and prejudice is mankind's worse enemy. We expect from you more rigorous and accurate information.

Yours sincerely,

Ginette Beaulieu
President, Syndicat Professionnel des Homéopathes du Québec (CSN-FP)

ANNEXE A



1660 De L'Événement Bureau 516
Montreal, Québec H3K 0W7
Téléphone : 514-525-2037
Télécopieur : 514-525-2037
E-mail : info@spqh.org



The SPHQ would like to inform you of the main errors :

Historical errors:

1. Homeopathy was never invented by Samuel Hahnemann, but goes back to ancient Greece. Doctors in those times had identified 3 basic therapeutic methods :

- a. Homeopathy, where the remedy is chosen for the similarity of the symptoms it produces with those of the diseased person.
- b. Enantiopathy where the remedy is chosen for the opposition of the symptoms it produces with those of the diseased person.
- c. Allopathy where the remedy is not chosen for any such considerations, but seems to act on the diseased person.

The first two rely on the reaction of the treated organism to the remedy to bring about the cure, the last one relies on the chemistry of the remedy on the diseased organism to operate the cure.

As can be seen, Hahnemann did not invent that. Nevertheless, he turned it into a powerful, coherent and novel therapeutic approach, as he researched and experimented it for nearly 50 years.

2. Hahnemann found mention of this in books he was translating, for he was a very learned person.

3. He starting experimenting in 1796, not in the 19th century.

4. He decided to try taking massive doses of the Peruvian bark cinchona to verify its alleged tonic effects on the stomach, and realized that the bark was creating symptoms of fever, therefore confirming the homeopathic hypothesis. He found out that it could be proven experimentally. He repeated the same experiment on a number of other substances such as St. Ignatius bean, pepper, arnica, arsenic. Only after confirmation of these experiments did he clearly state the law of similars (he therefore did not do what Mr Schwarcz said he did).

5. He experimented Belladonna on an epidemic of Scarlett fever of the Sydenham type (and not sore throat as you state!).

6. He did not start diluting the remedies he was using because of an idea, but just so as not to intoxicate his patients with potentially lethal substances if given pure. He started with just sub toxic dilutions, and because he was still getting signs of aggravation, he diluted further.

7. Hahnemann waited more than 10 years before going public on his work to make sure he knew enough and had experimented enough.

8. The law of similars was the result of long and careful observations during that whole period. He did not theorize it at all. It was the logical explanation to his clinical experiments.

9. The reason Hahnemann did not use cinchona bark specifically for malaria is that he recommended it for fevers of a very particular type, whether malarian or not. As usual in homeopathy, it is not the diagnosis which count to choose the remedy but the actual presenting symptoms of the case which the remedy must match as precisely as possible (Mr Schwarcz is

Syndicat professionnel des homéopathes du Québec (CSN-FP);
514-525-2037; accueil@spqh.org

here not only badly informed but he also jumps to erroneous conclusions when he speculates on his misinformed facts).

About the scientific mistakes :

In the last 10 years, very important discoveries, which Mr Schwarcz seems to be ignorant of (or has decided to overlook), have been made by the scientific community in the field of particle physics and biology.

These discoveries contradict most of his statements about homeopathy.

The first has to do with nanoparticles. It has now been proven that, beyond the number of Avogadro, particles do subsist in solutions. We make reference to, among many publications, the works of Dr Iris Bell of the USA, on the subject.

We also would like to attract attention to the works of Dr Luc Montagnier, 2008 Nobel prize, who has proven, and his experiments have been since reproduced in a few countries, that high dilutions of a substance do, in fact, retain the information of that substance.

These two references alone indicate how incomplete Mr Schwarcz scientific knowledge is and that if he wish to make scientific statements he should document them adequately.

Previous tests had been made prior, with the testing of beta emission of high dilutions which concluded in the same way.

As far as understanding how it all works, we admit that the action inside the body is not completely understood yet. But we are sure that Mr Schwarcz is aware of the fact that this is true of a great number of allopathic remedies (conventional drugs), and nobody seems to mind a bit! Therefore what exactly is his point? That we should not use something that accomplishes great things without harm if we don't know all the details? Life is among those great things, is he ready to relinquish his for the sake of his unjustified principles?

Placebo effect is the friend of any doctor, medical or otherwise. But the "funny thing" is that the placebo effect seems to be more efficient for homeopaths than for medical doctors.

But beyond this, how does Mr Schwarcz explain the cures of infants, young children, pets, and herds of cattle. Had he taken the time to secure the facts before publishing erroneous material, he would have discovered that number of large cattle owners in Europe and elsewhere have turned to homeopathy because it is safer, faster, and economical to do so. These are not people easily misled: they go only by results, both clinical and economical. Many specialized veterinarians have turned to homeopathy for the same reasons.

The number of practitioners of homeopathy around the world is in the hundreds of thousands, including around a hundred thousand medical doctors. Does Mr Schwarcz believe they are all delusional, or could we consider, by the sheer number, that he is probably mistaken?

Furthermore, in the treatment and cure of chronic diseases, with which allopathic medicine fares so poorly, homeopaths achieve remarkable and documented results. And here, not much room for placebo. Placebo effect is usually of quite short duration, a few days to a few months. But homeopathic cures are often permanent. We do not always find the right remedy immediately for a chronic patient. It may take a few attempts to find the corresponding remedy for the case. Once

Syndicat professionnel des homéopathes du Québec (CSN-FP);
514-525-2037; accueil@spqh.org

found, the right remedy cures. No placebo effect possible here neither as the initial attempts failed.

Regarding Boiron's Oscillocoquinum and remedies fabrication, Mr Schwarcz declarations are also erroneous. We won't comment further since the case has been brought to court of law.

On the subject of meta-analysis, what he declares is completely untrue for it is quite the opposite. We have collected just about all the published material on this subject and have found a general consensus of well documented meta-analysis to validate the results of homeopathy.

Furthermore, the Swiss government has concluded in 2012, in a long study on homeopathy, that this practice was cost effective for their national health system.

Last of all on this subject; the selection Mr Schwarcz chose to display of the remedy base homeopaths use is very curious. Out of the few thousand remedies available to homeopaths, 90% are simply from the mineral or plant kingdoms, and he chose to state only those which could disgust, frighten or amuse the reader. We can see clearly the polemist justification for his choices. When he deliberately selects information and do not state the full facts, he shows how unscientific and biased his discourse is.

Then, to end with a brilliant demonstration of the efficacy of homeopathy, we turn to prophylaxis. An enormous documentation dating back to the 19th and 20th century shows without a doubt that homeopathy was used for the purpose of preventing diseases with remarkable results.

Historically, what first put homeopathy on the map worldwide was its remarkable efficiency in fighting cholera in the 19th century. Later on many epidemic diseases were kept at bay with homeopathy in Europe and in America (typhoid fever, measles, whooping cough, scarlet fever, yellow fever, cholera, influenza and many others, all very serious and deadly diseases). Today, a colleague of mine from the UK was working intensely in Africa on developing a protocol of treatment for AIDS. He recently spoke at an international conference held in Washington D.C. in which he showed very encouraging results.

And in recent years, the Finlay institute in Cuba published a clinical study carried out on more than 2 million people, which proved without doubt the remarkable efficiency of homeopathy in the prevention of the tropical disease leptospirosis, which kills people by the thousands each year.

We do not think that Mr Schwarcz's claim to enlighten the people with his scientific pretenses are valid because his statements are so erroneous and badly documented that he is actually misinforming and misleading people.

Ignorance leads to prejudice, and prejudice is mankind's worse enemy.

If you require references and sources, we are at your disposition.

Syndicat professionnel des homéopathes du Québec (CSN-FP);
514-525-2037; accueil@spqh.org