

Dear Mr Hancock,

The authors of the anti-homeopathy Australian National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) report admit that they fundamentally lied

Further to our letter to you of 18th September comes now a massively significant development from Australia. Described as ‘a serious research scandal of the highest degree’, the authors of the NHMRC Homeopathy review claimed at the time, in concluding there to be no robust evidence for Homeopathy, that they ‘used internationally accepted methods’ and “a rigorous approach that has been developed by Australian experts in research methods”ⁱ.

Blatantly obvious from the start that they did no such thing, the authors of the report have now finally admitted to the Australian Senate that their claims were lies. Yet the *Specialist Pharmacy Service* report, which both your Department and NHS England accepted and acted on, was based largely on the NHMRC report, and on the UK 2010 Science & Technology (S&T) ‘investigation’.

All ‘internationally accepted methods’ of scientific research would have compelled both NHMRC and the S&T to accept swathes of positive evidence for homeopathy, precisely what both were clearly pre-determined to avoid, presumably to satisfy elite vested-interests. Now that both reports are irrefutably not worth the paper they are written on, we are sure you will feel legally obliged to reverse both DoH’s acceptance of the *Specialist Pharmacy Service* report, and therefore necessarily reverse also your resulting decision to withdraw funding of NHS homeopathy provision.

We are well aware your website states; ‘NICE doesn’t recommend that homeopathy should be used in the treatment of any health condition. But both you and NICE omit to say what research permits that claim (unsurprising as no such credible research exists), and fail to give weight to swathes of positive homeopathy evidence, which *Montgomery vs Lanarkshire* ⁱⁱ would appear to compel. For example, the attached Danno et al paper from France lists many conditions for which homeopathy is most consistently effective (crucially including reduction in antibiotic use), all with no loss of clinical results, at an annual saving of 20% (a potential annual saving of c. £25 billion to the NHS with homeopathy expanded to its full extent), massively significant to the UK economy.

Action required

1. Homeopathy is used by an estimated 10% of the UK population, suggesting over six million people to be appalled at your Department’s recent decisions. But they will judge your performance not only on mistakes made, but also on action you take when falsity is admitted. For reasons stated, will you now renounce the *Specialist Pharmacy Service* report, and reinstate, indeed enlarge, NHS homeopathy provision as it was prior to that report? And on grounds of accountability, would you also seek for monies paid to the *Specialist Pharmacy Service* to be refunded to the public purse?
2. Vested interests may provide 25 billion reasons for others still to claim homeopathy is a ‘placebo’, or otherwise of no benefit. But the threat of Antimicrobial resistance has been likened to that of terrorism, and in view of the role homeopathy is every day playing around the world in countering that threat, will you please consult with the Attorney General on what laws are most appropriate to end homeopathy denialism, and inform us of his judgement?

Yours sincerely,



Paul Burnett, Lead Team Communication, Homeopathy International.

CC

Mr Simon Stevens, Chief executive NHS England
Lord Harris and Ms Wendy Martin (NTSB)
Minister of State for BEIS, Mr Greg Clark and Ms V Jeffrey

Attachment

Economic impact of homeopathic practice in general medicine in France; Karine Danno et al.

Endnotes

ⁱ A detailed analysis is available at <https://www.yourhealthyourchoice.com.au/news-features/science-fact-or-fiction-nhmrc-admits-they-did-not-use-accepted-scientific-methods-2/>; accessed 3 October 2018

ⁱⁱ <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1356262216672615>; accessed 3 October 2018