

"The New Medicine a New Natural Science"

by Professor Dr. Hans Ulrich Niemitz

**Expert opinion on New Medicine by Prof. Dr. Hans-Ulrich Niemitz
Advanced Institute of Technology, Economy and Culture of Leipzig /
General study.**

Professional Field: History and Ethics of Technology and Natural Sciences.

August, 18th, 2003

Questions pertinent to the Study

In a letter dated July 23rd, 2003, Dr med. Mag. Ryke Geerd Hamer requested a "scientific response" to the three following questions:

1. Is it possible and permissible for a medicine (such as conventional medicine), which is based only on hypotheses, to declare itself "scientific" even though it has never been subjected to a single verification?
2. On the other hand, wouldn't it be permissible, and compulsory, to declare New Medicine "scientific" (since it is not based on any hypotheses) and "valid" (just by virtue of the 30 verification protocols presented), in conformity with today's best scientific knowledge?
3. In the field of the natural sciences, is it not normal practice to subject a theory to proof, and should this not have been done in the case of New Medicine?

Introduction

In substance, Dr Hamer is asking only two questions which I will answer in reference to cancer only, even though the New Medicine provides theory and explanation for all disease, psychoses and "spontaneous criminality". The two questions are:

- (A) Is conventional medicine scientific and correct?
- (B) Is the New Medicine scientific and correct?

With regard to (A), conventional medicine applies scientific methods (e.g. observation and statistics) but, because of its many hypotheses, or rather, unproven assumptions, it is neither a science (in fact, the mere use of

scientific method does not qualify an activity to be a science or a person to be a scientist), nor a natural science. It does not have one hypothesis-free theory concerning the biological events taking place in the individual "sick person". Conventional medicine can only quote statistical survival chances to cancer patients; it tends to making empty therapeutic promises, heroic intervention ("lottery game") and experimental therapies. At the same time, spontaneous healing remains misunderstood.

On November the 12th, 2001, a little before the death of the Beatle George Harrison, the "Sunday Mail" published the following: "George Harrison is visibly better after radical radiation therapy in New York. The new controversial therapy has been defined by the physician himself as 'a lottery game'". Even one of the richest and most famous people could not find a cure for cancer that wasn't a lottery. How can this be explained? Only with the fact that official medicine is unable to offer any therapy that is not a game of chance.

Therefore, official medicine is not scientific, and not capable of understanding the course of "diseases", and even less of comprehending spontaneous healing. Thus, it is not a science. It is not right, and therefore, according to the best available evidence, must be considered wrong.

Regarding question (B), the New Medicine has a theory, or rather a model, of the carcinogenic event, and of "illness" in general, that is scientific, free of hypotheses, and therefore demonstrable (i.e. capable of being denied; more reference to this further in this evaluation). New Medicine can, in any single case, in a provable way and without hypotheses (of course, after a precise anamnesis), scientifically explain the pathological event. Since this last one is predictable on the basis of the theory, it is possible to make therapeutic suggestions that are constructed scientifically for each individual case. (The complications that can arise during the therapy can be understood and planned for in the therapeutic approach. This must be stated because many newspapers and other media have accused Hamer of describing himself as a miraculous healer and of guaranteeing healing. One has to bear in mind that no physician in the world can foresee, and therefore prevent, the new conflict-shocks that cause cancer; but one can create a situation -- and Hamer does it for his patients -- in which new conflict-shocks are avoided.)

Therefore, the New Medicine is scientific and corresponds to precise criteria of natural science, and for this reason is the surest method to heal people afflicted by cancer.

In regard to question 1

Science

What science is or should be is not completely defined. The lexicon (Brockhaus Enzyklopaedie 2001) states: "Science..., the aggregate of human

knowledge for an epoch...; a collection of findings regarding an area of knowledge interrelated in a fundamental way. ... Science is a methodologically designated knowledge consisting of sentences interrelated in a fundamental sense, inter-subjectively communicable and testable, that satisfies particular scientific criteria (e.g. general validity, capable of systematizing). The uncertainty of the explanation shows itself in the circularity: science must follow scientific criteria. Nevertheless this is clear, regarding an area of knowledge "scientific" means the requirement that the knowledge consist (substantially and methodologically) of testable assertions (or "sentences"). Science generates testable assertions. An assertion or system of assertions can only be considered scientific if the assertion or assertions can be denied – technically speaking – can be tested to determine whether or not they are false. The exact natural sciences are called exact because they only make assertions that can in principle be experimentally falsified in any place or time (technically: can be tested for correctness). Not all natural sciences are based or can be based exclusively on experimentation. Biology, and consequently medicine, must support themselves to a great extent on the observation of "natural" events. When the circumstantial conditions for these observations are equivalent to those of current observations, the current observations can be used as if they were experimental observations.

Since, as a rule, conventional medicine cannot make potentially deniable assertions for the individual case, it seeks refuge in statistics. Because statistics is mathematics, it is itself scientific, but is not a natural science. (Moreover, the highest goal of the therapeutic art is betrayed because the scientific help required in the "individual case" is denied. Example: the traditional physician informs the patient regarding his or her statistical chances of survival, but this does not assist the patient in the least with knowledge on what could be done to heal.)

Hypotheses are not tested or even testable assertions. If one can only make assertions that cannot (yet or inherently) be proven false, one speaks of hypotheses. In the jargon, a hypothesis is really an assumption, and basically, in the theory of science, it is so as well, namely, an assertion whose truth value has not been established but it serves as assumption to build theory and prediction from (see Brockhaus Enzyklopaedie, 2001). When Isaac Newton presented his theory of gravitation he was asked where gravitation came from. His reply: "I will not advance any hypotheses". He meant that it was open to anyone to test the postulates of the law of gravitation (in modern parlance, to try to disprove it), but that it was a different thing to explain gravitation. Since this had eluded him (he had been unable to formulate assertions that were possible to deny), he stated that it was up to the generations of scientists after him – which they have yet to achieve.

New Medicine, traditional medicine and (non) deniable assertions

Dr. Hamer states, in recognition of this understanding of the theory of science, that he postulates no hypotheses. His assertions are testable for any individual at any point in time, (and in every single case) for all cases of "cancer" and cancer-equivalent diagnoses. This means the possibility exists to deny his assertions in each and every individual case (i.e. to test it for correctness). On the other hand, the hypotheses of conventional medicine, e.g. there is an "immune system" is not a deniable assertion. No one has yet been in a position to observe it directly. The hypothesis that there is an immune system (the assumption that there is one) leads to the construction of theories and of predictions that lead to observable "facts" which are then considered proof. Yet, that these "facts" could prove other assertions (note that science can only recognize denial, but not evidence "truth") is not considered. Conventional medicine does not recognize that the hypothesis "immune system" is absolutely not deniable, and therefore not a scientific assertion. Whether microbes can become active in the body because of the breakdown of the immune system (this is how conventional medicine sees it), it cannot predict the moment of activity and therefore substantiate it "logically". At the same time, "logically" does not mean automatic, or in reality; fairy tales are also logical, otherwise one could not re-tell them; so at best, conventional medicine falls back on statistical assertions, or, microbes become active because of a command of the brain, specifically the organism, because a "special program" has been turned on (this is the view of the New Medicine – it can determine and predict the instant of the initiation of activity for each individual case and also substantiate it: it is the beginning of the second phase of the "special program: the New Medicine is equipped with a psycho-biological model of the organism and therefore has no requirement for statistics). So New Medicine makes potentially disprovable assertions regarding microbes and the initiation of their activity. Conventional medicine, on the other hand, cannot do this. Stated in jargon, one would have to say that conventional medicine delivers a hodge-podge set of pseudo-logical, unprovable, fairy-tale-like assertions (and is therefore unscientific); the New Medicine, on the other hand, offers a comprehensible structure of logical and disprovable (testable) assertions (and is therefore scientific).

The problem of "verification"

The first question states that conventional medicine is based exclusively on hypotheses and that there has never yet been a verification of its hypotheses. Is this true? One has to admit that it is even worse. It has to be recognized that conventional medicine cannot pronounce assertions that can be disproved (thereby losing its claim to be scientific). At the same time, "verification" – and it should be so, our treatment of question 3 will explain why this should be – in itself is impossible. Succinctly speaking, a "verification" means the recognition of a system of assertions (and the implicit model they represent) as true, real or acceptable and justification of the consequent application (in medicine this would mean the application of a therapeutic approach). "Verification" therefore is respectively an ethical, sociopolitical and ultimately a legal question.

Conclusion to question 1.

Conventional medicine cannot call itself scientific because it cannot pronounce deniable assertions or it ties itself beforehand in irresolvable contradictions. New Medicine is scientific because it is based on a psychobiologic model that can generate assertions that can be disproved. Since no statement of the New Medicine has yet been disproved, one must therefore declare the New Medicine as more scientific than conventional medicine, which can only work statistically (i.e. incapable of making assertions regarding the individual case!). It should therefore be emphasized that conventional medicine is not a natural science, whether from a content or a methodological point of view.

Regarding question 2:

The answer is: yes, the New Medicine is correct. It is important to note – and this will be explained in the answer to question 3 – that this means regarding it as correct “according to the best available knowledge” (this is an ethical question). Specifically: the assertions of the New Medicine are fundamentally connected, they are inter-subjectively communicable and can be tested in every individual case, and i.e. it satisfies the criteria of natural science (e.g. general validity can be systematized, generates predictions, fundamentally valid and clarifying explanation of former events, deniability).

Conclusion regarding question 2:

Yes, the New Medicine is correct.

Regarding question 3:

In the case of question 3 one must reply with the question: adequate for what? For the confirmation of correctness? The answer to question 2 suffices for that (yes, the New Medicine is correct). Yet, in a strong scientific sense, the truth is that verifications are never sufficient. Therefore, from the purely natural scientific point of view the question is not answerable, since the decision as to whether a theory has been “verified” can never be finally established. Every theory has the character of a model; therefore no theory can be coextensive with reality. Were the latter the case, the theory would become reality and cease being a model. Should a theory not be disproved for a substantial length of time, and should the applications of the alternative competing theories (in this case therapies) consistently give worse results than the new theory, the new theory must be recognized. This is an issue of scientific and ethical wisdom, fairness and honesty. The new theory must be recognized as a clarification and it must be accepted in the application to practical problems, which means that the patients must be allowed to choose freely. For the case of the New Medicine this means that conventional medicine has to allow room for the New Medicine.

Note: what are the facts? Example: metastasis, fact or hypothesis? Herewith a note on the oft ideological character of the "facts", specifically their "correctness": before the advent of the Copernican system, people regarded as a fact that the sun went down in the evening. The model of the earth as that of a floating disk in the middle of the world and the celestial bodies at the same time fastened onto a spherical crystalline surface which enveloped the earth and circled around it, allowed the system to be intelligible. Nowadays, almost everyone knows better, yet only because they are told a different story from childhood on. We still use the word "sundown", even though it does not correspond with the facts. The word continues to drag the old false model with itself, yet no one really minds because everyone knows what is really going on.

The concept of "metastasis" is such, that if the New Medicine becomes accepted, the word will disappear. As a fact, metastasis simply means a second cancer, i.e. a cancer in addition to the one that was already there. Conventional medicine, however, ties the word to the hypothesis that the first cancer somehow – through some kind of inner bodily contagion – causes the second one. The New Medicine does not believe the "second cancer" yet it states that there is no metastasis. It states that every second cancer is initiated by its own particular conflict. Tragically, these are mostly conflicts that can be explained by the diagnosis of cancer (animals seldom show metastases).

The suppositions that cancer spreads in the body through some sort of inner contagion is a hypothesis, i.e. assumption (yet in conventional medicine it has the status of fact). If this inner-bodily contagion existed, all blood transfusions ought to be prohibited on the basis of the danger of infection with cancer. Up to now there is no "cancer blood test", and there is no information available regarding injection of tumour markers to potential blood donors to test for cancer. This demonstrates that conventional medicine itself does not treat the hypothesis of "metastasis" (a fact for it) seriously; it factually contradicts it with each and every blood transfusion, thus contradicting itself (ultimately denying its hypothesis!). A conventional medical man would justify and in fact correctly state that a body to body contagion of cancer had never been observed.

The New Medicine on the other hand consistently argues: every cancer occurrence implies a conflict-shock. Every second instance of cancer is a second conflict-shock. Were this not the case, the opponents of the New Medicine could contradict this (falsify the assertion).

Conclusion to question 3

Conventional medicine assumes that its hypotheses are "facts". It can be demonstrated, however, that the "factual system" in conventional medicine is contradictory, mostly constructed in such a way that it is not even potentially

deniable (and therefore unscientific). The system of the New Medicine, on the other hand, is consistent and potentially deniable. For this reason, it is unscientific, unethical and ultimately damaging not to give the New Medicine any room.

Yet, at the same time, it claims the political power and hence "unscientific" protection privileges conferred on a (service) guild. It is the guild privilege that enables the representatives of conventional medicine to settle scientific disputes with impunity outside of science, through political and power means. Conventional medicine can maintain this practically "impossible" situation because non-medical people (as patients or as politicians) will not, i.e. cannot, utilize the constitutionally given freedom of therapeutic choice, because they fear death and the loss of health that would result from abdicating from the conventional therapy pressed upon them by the entire society. And fear is a poor counselor. For children and the dependant, in cases of therapeutic urgency, the contradiction between "science" and "guild" nowadays is resolved in favour of the guild-views, and hence, unscientifically, by forcing the therapy. Parents or guardians who decline the therapeutic choice for their charges on scientific grounds, attempting to withhold its application, are prosecuted criminally. From an ethical point of view, this is an "impossible situation", i.e. unethical, and in this case, unconstitutional.

Conclusion to the commentary:

The claim of conventional medicine, emanating from its "guild" status – hence unscientific—to be the exclusive arbiter in deciding a therapy, and already achieved in the case of the therapy of children, is unconstitutional.

In summary:

According to the criteria of natural science, the New Medicine, given today's scientific understanding and today's best knowledge, must be declared to be correct. On the other hand, conventional medicine is an amorphous mixture of misunderstood (assumed) facts that are not even deniable, and therefore beyond even the possibility of verification. Given the criteria of natural science and given that it is merely a jumble of hypotheses, and in addition, unscientific, conventional medicine should be designated to be false.

Leipzig, Aug 18, 2003

Prof. Dr. Hans Ulrich Niemitz.

Original:  <http://www.pilhar.com>

Follow-up to Prof. Niemitz's letter

Medical and Other Experts Confirm Validity of Dr. Hamer's New Medicine

There are a great number of German-language expert opinions, certificates and testimonials penned by universities, professors of medicine and other disciplines and similar high-level authors which unanimously confirm the findings of Dr. Hamer's New Medicine. These are published in the original version on the 2000 page German-language site www.pilhar.com which covers New Medicine and the case of Olivia Pilhar who was legally forced to undergo chemotherapy and surgery against the will of her parents who wished to follow Dr. Hamer's healing method. If you read German, please search for the term 'Verifikationen' on the above site.

One such detailed testimonial was authored by Prof. Dr. Hans-Ulrich Niemitz of the Hochschule für Technik, Wirtschaft und Kultur (University of technology, economics and culture) in Leipzig, Germany. The following are excerpts from Prof. Niemitz' Final Comments and Conclusion:

"Based on only its professional status, i.e. without scientific grounding, orthodox medicine claims to hold the sole right to determine which therapy should be applied. In fact it has already done so with respect to the therapies administered to children. This claim of orthodox medicine is in breach of our Constitution.

According to scientific criteria, New Medicine has to be declared as true according to the present state of science and to the best of our current knowledge.

Whereas orthodox (conventional) medicine, scientifically speaking, is an amorphous mush, which cannot even be falsified, let alone verified due to its being based on fundamentally misunderstood (alleged) facts. According to scientific criteria, conventional medicine can only be called a hotchpotch of hypotheses, hence unscientific and to the best of human judgment false."

Strong words indeed. When Prof. Niemitz was asked whether he hadn't run into serious trouble after writing his extensive testimonial (dated August 18, 2003) testifying to the scientific nature of Dr. Hamer's New Medicine and the lack of scientific bases of modern medicine, he replied (paraphrased): **"Well, I did get a thorough dressing-down by the dean of the University and another party, but since they were unable to prove that what I had written was wrong, they left it at that."** What a remarkable implicit further confirmation of the validity of Dr. Hamer's New Medicine from the highest scientific levels!