

As a satisfied recipient of homoeopathic treatment on many occasions, I am deeply concerned to hear of a further attack on this methodology by those who have never experienced its benefits. This method of treatment has a large following in Australia and around the world. There is a considerable literature.

I do not in any way deny the benefits that surgery and pharmaceuticals can have, and have benefited greatly from them when the need arose.

People often turn to homoeopathy after all other treatments have failed. When cured, their doctors often then pronounce the case to be 'spontaneous remission'. However, there are some doctors who use homoeopathy themselves or refer to homoeopaths.

Most homoeopathic treatment requires diagnosis of the whole person. Not just "what's wrong" but how did you get this way, and how does that fit with who you are. Even the best GPs don't have much time for this depth of investigation. In most cases, homoeopaths have to take time to understand their patient and find the correct remedy, and they will refer a patient to a GP if they think it necessary. **Recent research shows that pharmaceuticals give varied results and reactions because of the differences in genetic makeup of the patients. Holistic medicine sees this as fundamental to treatment.**

Far from 'unethical', homoeopaths would have to be among the most ethical of doctors, based on the concern they have for their patients, the time they devote to them (often an hour session) and their perseverance despite the scepticism they encounter and the low fees they charge – which can't be 'bulk-billed'.

Homoeopathic annals are filled with comments from satisfied patients such as myself. It is unconscionable to deny a treatment without side effects, relied on by so many people, in favour of pharmaceuticals whose side effects can be extreme, can include death or reduced life span, and are often not acknowledged for ten or more years (e.g. Vioxx). Furthermore, there are frequent studies showing that these pharmaceutical drugs do not actually have the effect they are alleged to have – only the side effects. As a very simple example, while aspirin can help a person experiencing a stroke, research shows it doesn't work as a prophylactic, only causes stomach and kidney problems. Just today, we hear that over-the-counter ibuprofen increases your chance of a heart attack.

As to proof, if 200 years is not enough, there have been double-blind trials and even laboratory tests *in vitro*. However, every proof is forgotten or dismissed by those whose minds are already made up. The common argument used is "homoeopathic medicines don't contain anything but water". However, the man who won the **Nobel prize in 2008 for discovering the connection between HIV and AIDS, Dr Luc Montagnier**, is devoting himself now to proving the mechanism of homoeopathy. This is believed to involve a property of electromagnetic '**memory in water**'. There are others engaged in similar research who have proven positive results under the most stringent conditions, *far*

beyond the usual ‘double-blind’ testing (Prof. Madeleine Ennis, Queens University, Belfast).

The principles involved are now well demonstrated as seen in the PMC (National Institutes of Health) article summarised below.

BMC Complement Altern Med.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3570304/> 2012; 12: 191. Published online 2012 Oct 22. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1186%2F1472-6882-12-191>

Summary:

Research indicates that homeopathic remedies (a) contain measurable source and silica nanoparticles heterogeneously dispersed in colloidal solution; (b) act by modulating biological function of the allostatic stress response network (c) evoke biphasic actions on living systems via organism-dependent adaptive and endogenously amplified effects; (d) improve systemic resilience.

Discussion:

The proposed active components of homeopathic remedies are nanoparticles of source substance in water-based colloidal solution, not bulk-form drugs. Nanoparticles have unique biological and physico-chemical properties, including increased catalytic reactivity, protein and DNA adsorption, bioavailability, dose-sparing, electromagnetic, and quantum effects different from bulk-form materials. Trituration and/or liquid succussions during classical remedy preparation create “top-down” nanostructures. Plants can biosynthesize remedy-templated silica nanostructures. Nanoparticles stimulate hormesis, a beneficial low-dose adaptive response. Homeopathic remedies prescribed in low doses spaced intermittently over time act as biological signals that stimulate the organism’s allostatic biological stress response network, evoking nonlinear modulatory, self-organizing change. Potential mechanisms include time-dependent sensitization (TDS), a type of adaptive plasticity/metaplasticity involving progressive amplification of host responses, which reverse direction and oscillate at physiological limits. To mobilize hormesis and TDS, the remedy must be appraised as *a salient, but low level, novel threat, stressor, or homeostatic disruption for the whole organism*. Silica nanoparticles adsorb remedy source and amplify effects. Properly-timed remedy dosing elicits disease-primed compensatory reversal in direction of maladaptive dynamics of the allostatic network, thus promoting resilience and recovery from disease.

Homoeopathy is not perfect, it does depend on the training and experience of the practitioner, but what treatment doesn’t? Certainly pharmaceuticals do! I do not believe

that the health funds would ever have accepted homoeopathy unless it lowered the payout in insurance costs – just as the funds have paid for many other forms of alternative treatment, all of which are under attack because they reduce the market for Big Medicine and Surgery. At the same time, of course, they reduce significantly the Medicare cost that we taxpayers have to fund!

Incomprehensibly, the NHMRC quotes the UK Parliamentary study that was a total fabrication by three MPs and was NOT passed by the UK Parliament.

Homeopathy does not have a lot of money to fight continuous legal battles the way the pharmaceutical companies do (even so, these companies are frequently found guilty of fraud and fined relatively small amounts that hardly affect their profits).

Big business can easily outgun ordinary people who ask only the freedom to live their own lives based on their own experience and belief.

I urge you strongly to ensure that the fundamental human right to choose our own medical treatment is not denied in Australia.

In terms of the current TGA proposal, I ask that you:

Option 1: Keep homeopathy regulated the way it is.

Option 2: Require scientific evidence for high level claims (addendum to Option 1).

Option 3: Exempt homeopathy from listing (as long as this allows for continued use with low level claims and recognition of its Worldwide Traditional use as a medicine, otherwise, I ask that the TGA reject it).

X Option 4: I ask that the TGA completely reject this option as it is contrary to the evidence that is continuing to grow world-wide, and contrary to other government decisions globally.

Kind regards