

The Mexican Homeopathic Sect

By Arnaldo González Arias

What none of them can deny is that they have stagnated in the discourses of the 19th century; therefore, to call the homeopathy 'science' at present is a complete absurd.

Not long ago I read an article written by Jesus Aguilar Andrade, whose scientific affiliation is not very clear¹, but whose implication with the homeopathy does not leave place to doubts. The article is entitled *Pros and Cons in the Debate About Homeopathy*².

I explain myself.

First, the author affirms that “our intention has not been to demonstrate the efficacy or the effectiveness of the Homeopathy”. This way the author tries to present himself to the reader as an impartial critic, who loves science and truth over all things, and bothers him that there are scientists who want to harm the homeopaths (you would not know for which dark reasons, that the author does not mention).

However, the author contradicts himself, since it would be very difficult – for not saying impossible – that anybody who is not a faithful follower of the homeopathy would have in preparation two projects, quoted by himself in another place.³ Those are: a)

From Hippocrates to Hahnemann, and b) Anti-homeopathy campaigns: How pseudo-skeptics misinform, distort and manipulate the evidence.



Second, and in spite of the 28 sheets of paper that he writes, and the 198 references he quotes, it seems to me that the conclusions of this Mr. Aguilar about Mario Bunge are completely inappropriate in a scientific discussion, for not saying frankly disrespectful. Bunge is a much-respected philosopher on a global scale. It has innumerable articles and texts of philosophy (not less than 20 books), possesses 21 honorary doctorates and 4 honorary professorships in diverse universities of the Hispanic and Anglo-Saxon world and

a Prince of Asturias award, among many others. It is a part of science, that you cannot elude, to learn how respect the predecessors who have done valuable contributions, although you may differ from their conclusions. As the saying says: courtesy does not remove bravery. The disrespect to the merits of others cut out the merits of the disrespectful one (and more when the one who do not show respect has never presented any concrete contribution in any science, as is the case of this (assistant-student-anthropologist-biotechnologist)?²

To qualify the writing of Bunge as “*A fallacious speech or, rather, an example of monumental caricature of the adversary. Or, in other words, an attempt of justifying the exclusion of any knowledge, and, finally, of feeding, from the authority, the denial of any evidence in favor of the Homeopathy*” is more a personal attack than a scientific criticism. To our mind, it becomes obvious that the attack comes from someone eager from accumulating papers doing anything but science, which obviously does not know. Or alternatively, wishing to defend homeopathy against wind and tide, no matter what.

Referring to the "detractors" of the homeopathy this author writes: "for these, homeopathy does not deserve a science status", as if this were a serious sin. However, undoubtedly the true is that homeopathy is not a science, according to what the international scientific community understands for such. (What does the author understand for “science“? It would be interesting to know).

The science is not only the accumulation of data (or papers). It is trying to improve the present knowledge with some contribution, by means of the experimentation and the theoretical reasoning, solidly imbricated one with the other. Between other peculiarities – that the homeopathy lacks – any science is based on the searching of new knowledge and improving the already known; a process of constant approach to reality.



Homeopathy lacks all that. It has attributes of a sect more than of a science, with a founding guru (Hahnemann), and priests who fulfill the rituals established by him in the 19th century without changes. This same priests make a living from selling little balls of sugar, disguised as medicines, to the incautious believers (at good price, surely) preaching that these pellets, thanks to some enchantments (sucusion, infinite dilutions, transmission of ‘energy’ (which?)), will heal and preserve them of all evil, present and future, both psychic and physical, while presenting these enchantments as ‘science’.

What none of them can deny is that they have stagnated in the discourses of the 19th century; therefore to call the homeopathy ‘science’ at present is a complete absurd.

Pedro Etxenique – also a prizewinner of the Prince of Asturias award - has expressed this truth in a very clear and concise way:

- If a physicist of the 19th century were travelling to 2018 it would have to renew all its knowledge.
- If a physician of the 19th century were traveling to 2018 it would have to renew all its knowledge.
- If a homeopath of the 19th century were traveling to 2018 it would not have to renew anything.

It is highly shocking that supposedly scientific journals – or that are meant to be such – (*The Homeopathy of Mexico*) devote themselves to publish this type of articles that have nothing of science. Obviously, then it is worthwhile a call of general of attention about what it is published in such journals.

For more documented information about the homeopathic hoax, see

www.geocities.ws/rationalis/homeopatia/index.htm

Besides, it can be useful to check ‘argument ad nauseam’ in Wikipedia.

¹ Assistant of the degree course in Social Anthropology. Student of biomedical engineering at the Polytechnic University of Cuautitlán Izcalli. Engineering student in biotechnology in the Open university and at Distance of Mexico

² **LA HOMEOPATÍA DE MEXICO**. Volume 87, number 714, July - September, 2018, p. 5-28.

³

<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326834686>