

Evidence-Based Homeopathic Family Medicine: A Special Interview With Dana Ullman

By Dr. Joseph Mercola

JM: Dr. Joseph Mercola

DU: Dana Ullman

JM: Welcome, everyone. This is Dr. Mercola, helping you take control of your health. Today we're going to be exploring homeopathy, which has been around for a long time – hundreds of years. We have one of the experts in the United States, Dana Ullman, who's written quite a bit about it, and really has dedicated a significant portion of his professional life to practicing homeopathy. Welcome and thank you for joining us, Dana.

DU: My pleasure. Real, real deep pleasure.

JM: Perhaps you can give our viewers a history of how you got interested in this field, and a little bit about your journey into health and healing.

DU: Great. My father is a medical doctor. He was a pediatrician and an allergist. There's a little bit of cosmic irony there, because allergy is that use of very small doses of what people are allergic to, to help desensitize them. And then I remember when I was young, my father got me one of those little children's medical kits with a little stethoscope, a little reflex [hammer] that my older brother took to hit me on my head to test my reflexes. It even had a little bottle of sugar pills in it. I've been prescribing these sugar pills ever since.

But it was when I was a junior at University of California (UC) Berkeley, where I was beginning to explore different natural therapies – nutrition, body therapies and botanical medicine – that I got introduced to homeopathy. What ended up happening was a Stanford-trained doctor and a male midwife began to create a group of people to study homeopathy together. This is back in the beginning of 1973. It became three doctors, two nurses, two yoga teachers, a dentist and several laypeople. We met weekly for five years.

Towards the end of that, I was honored to be arrested for practicing medicine without a license. That was back in the 1976. We won an important court case settlement by differentiating medical care from healthcare. We made it clear that I wasn't treating a disease. I was treating a person with a disease. The courts agreed that that was a reasonable interpretation, and that as long as I have written contracts with my patients that differentiate medical care from healthcare, as long as I refer patients for medical care, which is not what I am providing, then it can work out. That was back in 1976. I've been doing that ever since.

JM: Quite a journey.

DU: Yeah.

JM: Why don't you provide us with a definition of what homeopathy is? Because I'm sure almost everyone here has heard the term, but there probably is a number who are not quite familiar with the principles that were developed by Samuel Hahnemann, I believe, in Germany.

DU: Yes. People in Europe are much more familiar with homeopathy, because it's really one of the leading alternative therapies there. Although homeopathy was the leading alternative therapy in America in 1900, in America, where there were 22 homeopathic medical schools, including Boston University, University of Michigan and New York Medical College, [which] was called New York Homeopathic Medical College. Even Ohio State, University of Minnesota, and even the radical University of Iowa – right in the middle of America – were all homeopathic.

What homeopathy is, is it's a type of natural medicine that uses nano-doses, really small doses of plants, minerals, animals and chemicals. We look to find whatever toxicological symptoms that substance causes. Once you know what syndrome of symptom a substance causes in the toxic dose, you can use specially prepared – we'll get into the details of that later – nano-sized doses of that substance to treat that similar syndrome that it causes.

The logic of all that, for those of us who believe in evolution – I assume that's the vast majority of us – those people who believe in evolution believe that our body does whatever it can to survive. Our symptoms are not the result of breakdown. Our symptoms are the result of that doctor inside of us that is trying to defend us and trying to heal us. Our symptoms are part of our defenses.

And the very word, "symptom" means sign or signal, and symptoms are just that. They're signaling us that something's wrong. Instead of turning off that signal, in homeopathy, you turn into the skid. One of the things that each of our driver's education teachers probably taught us is that when you skid, you turn into the skid. Although at first blush, that's hard to understand, the physics supports it. That when you turn into the skid, that's the best way to get control of the vehicle and come to a stop more easily.

JM: Okay. You had referred to it as the original nanomedicine.

DU: That's right.

JM: But I would take issue with that, because "nano" is a very precise scientific term that is basically a billionth.

DU: Yeah.

JM: It's my understanding in homeopathy that many, if not most, of the therapies you're using are far lower concentrations than a billion.

DU: Well, at first blush, you might think that, but let me explain how and why homeopathy is a nanomedicine. The American Chemical Society (ACS) is not a homeopathic organization. It's not a natural organization. It's the chemists of America. They publish a journal called Langmuir.

One of the studies that they published in 2012 was done where they tested six homeopathic medicines, all metals – gold, silver, copper, tin, zinc and platinum. They diluted them in three different dilutions: 1 to 100, six times; 1 to 100, 30 times; and 1 to 100, 200 times.

Now, there's this important principle in chemistry that says that if you dilute something 1 to 100 just 12 times, in all probability, you shouldn't have any of the original molecules left. But here's what actually goes on, because that's just a mathematical estimation. What actually goes on is this – and it's quite amazing – In homeopathy, we use test tubes made out of glass. We made test tubes out of glass because we thought that glass was inert. But guess what, it isn't.

Modern spectroscopy can find that if you take a double-distilled water, which is the highest-grade, pharmaceutical-grade water that is presently known, in other words, they distill it once and then they distill it again. But if you shake it vigorously in a glass container, the bubbles and the nanobubbles – and that is a technical word, nanobubbles – it blanks us against the side walls, and six parts per million of silica fragments fall off into the water. Then what they find is that the vigorous shaking, the 40 shakings, create this turbulence and increase the water pressure to what the head of Stanford's Department of Material Science estimated to be at 10,000 atmospheres due to this vigorous shaking.

What that means is that whatever you're making into a medicine will be pushed into these silica fragments. Then when you dump out the water, 99 percent of the water, to make a dilution, a lot of the fragments cling to the glass walls. This study published in this journal, published by the ACS, found that no matter how many times you did these dilutions, three different types of spectroscopy measured the original gold, silver, copper, tin, zinc or platinum in the water. Guess what. Our body's hormones and a lot of our neurotransmitters operate at nano-dose levels. They actually found nano-doses of each of these substances, no matter how many times they did these dilutions.

JM: Did it matter if it was diluted in the same test tube? Or was it new to alter the observations?

DU: You know, that's a good question. No one's ever asked me that question before. It tells me how smart you are, Joe. Anyway, I'm impressed.

In homeopathy, there's a type of making the medicines where they keep the original test tube, and another type of manufacturing where they use a different test tube. But ultimately, when you're keeping that 1 percent or 10 percent – because sometimes a medicine is diluted 1 to 10. Whenever you see a homeopathic medicine that says 6 X – X is a roman numeral for 10 – that means it was diluted 1 to 10 six times, 12 times or 30 times. When it has a C after it, that's a Roman numeral for centesimal. That means it was diluted 1 to 100.

JM: And there are Ms, which would be 1,000, right?

[-----10:00-----]

DU: If they diluted it, a two C would be 1 to 1,000. But remember, along with the water are some of these silica fragments.

JM: Aren't there M concentrations too?

DU: No. M, yes. M stands for 1,000. That means it was diluted 1 to 100, 1,000 times.

JM: Okay.

DU: And then now we even have 50,000, 100,000 and even more.

JM: Okay.

DU: Over 200 years of clinical experience by tens of millions of patients, we have consistently found that the more these medicines go through this potentization process, the longer they act, the deeper they act, and the less doses are needed.

There's a good explanation for that, by the way. These nano-doses are able to penetrate the blood-brain barrier and go into deeper recesses of the brain and go through simple cellular membranes with much greater ease than larger doses. Because larger doses set off all these alarms, the membrane locks down whenever any foreign substance tries to enter it. Let alone the blood-brain barrier is really a very fine mesh that does whatever it can to avoid large and complex molecules from entering the brain.

These nano-doses are able to sift through cellular membranes and blood-brain barriers with much greater ease. And then once it's inside the brain, the body realizes we've just been infiltrated by lead, silver or gold. It says, "How do I get rid of it?" When a patient has the symptoms of gold or of the substance that they're having, the body then has a powerful immunological reaction that begins to heal.

JM: This dilution, is it done manually or is there a machine component to it?

DU: Originally, of course, it was done manually.

JM: Yeah, of course.

DU: During Hahnemann's day, he even sometimes would employ a blacksmith who would shake it very, very severely. In fact, in Hahnemann's time, he would also bang it against a book. That book was commonly a bible.

Mind you, there's a great story from the bible that I think might intrigue your listeners. We all know the story of Moses. When Moses came down from Mt. Sinai and he saw the Israelites worshipping the golden calf, as you remember, Moses got very upset. What the bible did is the bible got specific, technical and pharmacological. Who would ever think the bible would do that? But let me explain.

What it said it did was Moses smashed the golden calf. He ground it into a powder. Remember, the calf was made out of gold, which is a homeopathic medicine. He then strown it upon the water.

He diluted it in water. And even though they're in a desert, the bible specifically said that he diluted it and put it in water and asked the Israelites to drink the water.

What's remarkable is that, in homeopathy, we use gold for certain physical ailments, including arthritis and just as doctors of the 20th and 19th century use gold shots to treat people with arthritis, we also use it for emotional problems, when people have depression, deep dark depression, and a certain want to break in their will to live. That was, in part, Moses' analysis of the Israelites, that they weren't worshipping God, but they were worshipping a golden calf instead. It's really quite remarkable that the bible got interestingly technical in talking about this process of grinding a mineral and then diluting it in water.

The bottom line is that homeopathy really wasn't made into a medical science and art until a German physician named Samuel Hahnemann came around in the late 1700s and early 1800s. He was the physician to German royalty. He was the author of the leading textbook used by pharmacists of his day. He was an avid experimenter. He kept experimenting to see what toxic substances cause on the human body, and then he would give very small doses.

Initially, he would only dilute them a couple of times. But then after 20 years of using these partially diluted doses, he and his colleagues found the more they did this process of diluting and shaking, diluting and shaking, diluting and shaking, the longer they acted, the deeper they acted, and the less doses were needed. Most of all, the medicines were much safer, because when you prescribe the wrong remedy in this nano-dose, nothing happens. No side effects, no benefit.

JM: Excellent. Let's go back to the history of homeopathy in the United States. You'd referenced earlier that there were at least a dozen medical schools that actually handled homeopathy in the 1900.

DU: Twenty-two.

JM: But then, to my understanding, John D. Rockefeller – who actually died a few blocks from where I currently live – and Andrew Carnegie got together and decided that they were going to clean things up and get rid of the snake oil salesman and make it more science-based. They provided a funding to the medical schools to get on board if they were going to cooperate, and essentially gain control of a lot of the boards. But perhaps you can give your take on it, because, to me, it was the beginning of the end. Homeopathy just represented one of the forms of natural medicine. Of course, there are many others, but they essentially got wiped out in the 1900s, about 120 years ago.

DU: Right. Actually, Rockefeller was not involved with that one. Carnegie was. The Carnegie Foundation did The Flexner Report.

JM: Yeah. But he's still behind it too. He had some influence with it.

DU: What ended up happening is the head of the Rockefeller Foundation hired Abraham Flexner, who wrote this report. What the report did – In 1900, there were different medical schools. There

were conventional or allopathic medical schools. There were homeopathic. There were osteopathic. There were naturopathic. There were herbalists.

Flexner decided that the only way to really do scientific medicine was, according to the Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, even though, by the way, the dean of Johns Hopkins at the time was William Osler, who was antagonistic to The Flexner Report. Here, Flexner and the American Medical Association (AMA) were trying to make the medicine in American just like Johns Hopkins. The head of Johns Hopkins said, "Don't. Don't do that."

But what ended up happening further is that in 1899, that new president of the AMA became not just the president of the AMA, but the editor of the journal of the AMA. He created the AMA seal of approval on drugs. The way to get the seal of approval, you didn't have to prove safety of the drug. You didn't have to prove that it worked. You just had to do two things. One good thing is you had to say what was in your drug. You didn't want any secret formulas. Bless them for that. But the second thing you had to agree to do is you had to agree to advertise in every local, regional and national AMA publication. In other words, you had to give the AMA a lot of money.

JM: Yes.

DU: This is a brilliant form of bribery. This was what made the AMA rich.

JM: What was the name of the editor? I forgot his name.

DU: That was George Simmons.

JM: Yeah.

DU: He was at the AMA for 25 years. And then they finally realized that guy was a total crook. His protégé took over. His protégé was worse than him, because the protégé took on and created the AMA seal of approval on foods. They did the same type of thing. In fact, the second head of the AMA was the one that actually collaborated with tobacco, and taught them how to advertise using doctors. Of course, when he was finally kicked out of the AMA in 1949, he went to work as a lobbyist for tobacco.

As soon as he was kicked out, by the way, that is when the new editor began to publish articles about the dangers of tobacco, because the AMA originally, for a long time was protecting the tobacco interest, because they were getting a lot of money from them.

JM: Yeah. That's interesting. I don't know anyone who knows the history of homeopathy as well as you do. I'm wondering if you are aware of the homeopathy's position about, that same time, in other natural healing disciplines. Do they all understand that tobacco was pernicious to your health and should be avoided?

[----20:00----]

DU: Generally, yes. Generally, yes. In fact, many homeopaths were not just homeopaths, but created spas that had water treatment and hydrotherapy and nutrition. That wasn't every

homeopath. Because, believe it or not, at the turn of the century, between 15 to 20 percent of medical doctors defined themselves as homeopaths.

JM: This is the 20th century.

DU: 1900s.

JM: Because we do that in the 21st century too.

DU: By the way, earlier than all of this, there's this one bit of history that I want to tell you and your listeners. In 1860, homeopathy was beginning to gain a lot of traction. Homeopathy was already appreciated by the smartest people in America, most of the literary greats – the transcendentalists, from Mark Twain to William James, Emily Dickinson, Louisa May Alcott and Harriet Beecher Stowe – they were all big advocates for homeopathy. But the AMA was so threatened that they wrote something in their ethics code that said that if any conventional doctor simply consulted with a homeopath on a patient, they would lose their membership in the AMA.

In the 1860s, that meant you lost your medical license. Until finally, the homeopaths organized and created a separate medical board. So at least if you got your license revoked from the AMA, you can go to the homeopaths. By the way, we met Walt Whitman into our organization 30 years before the AMA did.

JM: Are you sure they had licensing back then? It was my understanding that that was the development back in the 1900s, not in the 1800s.

DU: No, no, no, no, no. There was licensing, and there were medical boards. I guarantee it.

JM: Okay.

DU: In fact, believe it or not, on the night that Abraham Lincoln was shot, his secretary of state, William Seward, was stabbed, because he was a part of an assassination plot. The assassin got into Seward's house, because he knew that Seward was a big appreciator and advocate for homeopathy. He said that he had a delivery from his homeopathic doctor. That's a very clever way in. As soon as he got into the bedroom, he took out his gun to shoot him, and the gun didn't go off.

JM: Wow.

DU: He took out his knife and stabbed him seven times. The closest doctor to him to treat him was the surgeon-general of the United States. The surgeon-general, who was an allopath, saved his life. And then he received homeopathic treatment. But this general was reprimanded by the AMA for treating a homeopathic patient. Can you get how serious and how crazy that type of obstruction of medical practice is?

JM: Yeah.

DU: But we're doing that today too. We're doing that today subtly and not so subtly. I know you know of other doctors who are harassed by orthodox medicine.

JM: Yeah. No question. Let's go back to – Just a simple question before we go into the FDA and how it's impacted homeopathy. A similar process is Bach flowers, which, I believe, started after Hahnemann –

DU: Oh, yeah. Way after.

JM: Maybe you can discuss the difference between the Bach flowers and other homeopathic remedies.

DU: Actually, he wasn't a German doctor. He was a Scottish doctor. B-A-C-H, he pronounced it [batch].

JM: Okay.

DU: I know we've probably, for a long time – Most Americans call it the Bach flower remedies, but I prefer to call it the Bach flower remedies.

JM: Okay.

DU: He was not just the medical doctor, but also a bacteriologist. A husband-and-wife team of medical doctors who were homeopaths showed him that when they treated their patients, their stool culture bacteria would change. Bach confirmed that with bacterial analysis. What Bach did was he made potentized doses of different bacteria from the stool. This is like the original probiotics. Homeopaths would then inoculate the person with a bacteria that may be missing from their particular stool as a way of seeding it. Homeopaths were onto that in the 1920s.

JM: Yeah. We do it now.

DU: Yeah. It's called fecal therapies.

JM: Fecal transplants. Right.

DU: That's right. But homeopaths did it. I do it regularly with my patients.

JM: The problem is that you have to find a healthy person, which is few and far between nowadays thanks to –

DU: We don't need that, because what they do is they just isolate each of the bacteria. They do it that way. But what I ended up finding is that if a patient was given sulfur, then that patient often had a certain large amount of a certain bacteria in their stools. If they had pulsatility, that was another one. If they had [inaudible 25:39], that was another one.

Bach provided really important experimental evidence, but then he went a step further. That was when he began to use only flowers. He would take the dew off a flower, which was water. He would dilute it further in distilled water. He would take a dose of it and get a feeling for what emotion that particular flower experienced. And then he created his 38 list of Bach flower remedies, and then he created the rescue remedy, which is a mixture of the five of the leading ones.

JM: Okay. Do you use those remedies at all?

DU: I do. I don't use them a lot, because they're not very potentized, so they generally have short-term benefits on a person's emotional and mental health.

JM: Okay.

DU: I try and have deeper acting effect. That is where these higher potency homeopathic medicines can have a longer lasting, deeper effect. At some point I'd want to talk about the research that exists for homeopathy.

JM: Sure.

DU: Because there are over 300 double-blind and placebo-controlled trials published in peer-reviewed medical journals. All too often, the media says that there's no evidence that homeopathy works.

I just wanted to insert that people out there, that there have been studies published in the Lancet, several; the British Medical Journal (BMJ), several; journals like Pediatrics; the Chest Journal; the Journal of Cancer; Journal of Rheumatoid Arthritis; Journal of Rheumatology; the Journal of Pediatric Infectious Diseases and many more. Many of the best journals in the world have published positive studies on homeopathy. Whenever you hear people say that there's no evidence that homeopathy works, they are either misinforming you or directly lying.

JM: Well, that's the standard discreditation strategy.

DU: Right.

JM: It's basically adopted by the major personal relations (PR) firms that are hired by these companies that want to engage in this type of manipulation. It's a very effective strategy, actually.

DU: Right. Repeating a lie often gets people to believe it.

JM: Enough and you can make people believe it. Yeah.

DU: You have to realize that it's a lie, and then you also have to remember that Big Pharma advertises on our TV news so that they can own the news. That's what's happened. That's why even Robert Kennedy, Jr., who's been such a great advocate for vaccine safety, one of his old family friends was Rupert Murdoch. Rupert Murdoch told him, "Sorry. I can't have you on any of our programs, because we're too connected to Big Pharma." That's one reason why we're not

getting accurate information about natural therapies and about the importance of vaccine safety. It's because Big Pharma really runs and owns the news.

JM: Sure. If someone was interested in inquiring more about the studies that you referenced, the hundreds of studies published in these peer-reviewed journals, how would they find those?

DU: Okay. There are many ways. If you connect with me, DanaUllman@homeopathic.com – my website. Also, I just, today –

JM: Homeopathic.com?

DU: Yeah. I'm Homeopathic.com.

JM: Wow. Congratulations.

DU: Finally, there's justice in the world. I'm the right guy to get it.

JM: I think you got that in the mid-'90s.

DU: That's right. I also own HomeopathicFamilyMedicine.com. I've created an e-course that's called "Learning to Use a Homeopathic Medicine Kit." Whether you're a mother, a father or you just want to learn to treat yourself, your friends and family, or whether you're a health or medical professional and you don't want to become a homeopath, but you want to learn how to use some simple remedies.

[-----30:00-----]

This e-course includes an eBook. The eBook itself is almost 550 pages and gives specific references, and even specific links to the studies. And then it comes with a variety of short videos. This is the YouTube generation. People today want to not only read, but they want to hear a video, watch a video to learn.

We learn two different ways, by hearing and watching and by reading. This e-course is fine. If you connect up with me on Twitter – Just today, I actually linked to an Italian website that provided a really good summary of the highest quality research in homeopathy. That has shown that homeopathic medicines work better than a placebo.

JM: Excellent.

DU: My eBook, by the way, is called "Evidence-Based Homeopathic Family Medicine." I'm oriented towards teaching people that there's not only personal and historical experience, but there is also a scientific body of evidence. I'm going to send you a free copy of the eBook, Joe, and access to the course.

JM: Yeah. That would be interesting. Let's go now to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), because they have some highly irrational behaviors when it comes to homeopathy. I mean

there's no other better definition than irrational, truly irrational, because on one hand, they're claiming that it's dangerous, and on the other hand, they're claiming there's nothing in it.

DU: Yeah.

JM: You can't have it both ways. It's either one or the other. Why don't you address that and then we'll go into the holistic component?

DU: Once again, I like doing a little bit of history. But the FDA was initially created in the early 1900s. But it really wasn't empowered until 1938, during Franklin D. Roosevelt's reign, where a senator from New York named Royal Copeland wrote the Federal Food, Drugs and Cosmetics (FD&C) Act of 1938, which empowered the FDA to regulate drugs.

Now, Royal Copeland was not just a senator. He was a medical doctor. He was not just a medical doctor, he was a homeopathic physician. He was the dean of the New York Homeopathic Medical College. Before that, he was the mayor of Ann Arbor, where he grew up. He was a professor at the University of Michigan, which had a homeopathic department. A part of this legislation gave recognition to homeopathy on par with the United States pharmacopoeia.

The United States pharmacopoeia and the homeopathic pharmacopoeia were on equal footing. And then in the late '70s, the FDA deemed that homeopathic medicines are primarily over-the-counter drugs. Because they're so basically safe, you don't need a doctor's prescription to use them.

Up until that time, the FDA and the homeopaths had a good working relationship. In fact, up until literally a year or two ago, we had a good working relationship, that our medicines were allowed. There were certain medicines that only medical doctors and naturopathic physicians were allowed to prescribe, because of certain dose issues. We're fine with that too. But the vast majority were over-the-counter drugs.

However, in the last year or two, as a result of pressure brought by Big Pharma and by skeptics of homeopathy, they began to change the regulations. We don't know with specificity what they are planning to do. They're saying now that they're changing it from the present model to what's called this risk-benefit model.

Because their position is that homeopathy provides no benefits, we are all concerned and worried that they're going to find little risks in different things, like they did with Standard or Hyland's Homeopathic, with their teething tablets.

Now, Hylands was using the 12 X of belladonna. To be candid, there's virtually no way that a dose made by, in this case [Hyland's] – Hyland's is the largest homeopathic company in America. Their largest selling product was these teething tablets. This was a way of screwing with them and getting them to stop making that medicine available. I just know thousands of parents that love those teething tablets. I've written about it at your website. I've written about it elsewhere. About how unlikely it was for there to be toxic amounts of belladonna in their formulas. I still feel that way.

JM: Alright. We'll continue this story. Quick question though, with respect to the homeopathic colleges and medical schools, because there was discreditation effort that occurred in 1910 with The Flexner Report.

DU: 1910, yeah.

JM: Then it eventually progressed to the elimination of these medical schools. But you just referenced the physician who implemented that law in 1938 with the FDA. He was still at a functioning homeopathic medical college. I know when I was in school – I think it was at the Hahnemann School in New York.

DU: The Hahnemann Medical College was even teaching homeopathy until 1949.

JM: But they still retain the name, Hahnemann Medical College.

DU: They changed it at one point. And then the public, who doesn't even know about homeopathy, says nobody wants Hahnemann back.

JM: Yeah. Do they still have that name today?

DU: You know, I think they brought the name back. I'm not actually clear on it. But maybe now it's Allegheny something.

JM: And they don't teach homeopathy?

DU: No. They don't teach homeopathy.

JM: I didn't think so. It would be surprising if they did.

DU: Alright. Let me work Rockefeller into this, because you appreciate history. Believe it or not, John D. Rockefeller loved homeopathy. He called it an important and an aggressive step at medicine. He and his entire board of directors only went to homeopaths. Rockefeller's own homeopath died at a young age of 93. He superseded him because he lived to 98.

JM: Rockefeller lived to 98? I thought he was over 100.

DU: No, no. Ninety-eight.

JM: Okay.

DU: Ninety-eight. As it turns out, Rockefeller gave away around 500 million dollars in the first three decades of the 20th century. Five-hundred million dollars at that time is like 500 billion dollars. He wanted half of his money to go to homeopathic institutions. As it turns out, not a single cent went.

I have been trying to find out. I've been in dialogue for a number of years with archivists at the Rockefeller Foundation today. No one has been able to explain to me what the problem was. I think that the head of the Rockefeller Foundation lied to Rockefeller and told him that money was going, and money was never going.

There's one other amazing story that is worthy of mention. We're all familiar with the Sloan Kettering Foundation in the hospital. What people don't know was Charles Kettering was the big advocate for homeopathy. Kettering was vice president of General Motors (GM). Alfred Sloan was president of GM. But Kettering was the inventor. He was the one that developed the electric battery. Delco battery was his company.

Before that, he worked for – Anyway, that's not even the point. He made the car electronic. He was second to Edison on who has more patents than anyone. In 1920, he gave a million dollars to Ohio State University for their homeopathic medical schools research department.

Wouldn't you know it, a month later, one of the key members of the AMA went to meet with the president of Ohio State and gave him an ultimatum saying that unless you return that million dollars back to Kettering, that the AMA would reduce the grade of Ohio State's allopathic conventional medical school. Because Ohio State had a homeopathic medical school and an allopathic one. As it turns out, the president of Ohio State returned the million dollars to Kettering. That was supposed to go to homeopathic research. Once again, a million dollars in 1920 money is like a billion dollars.

JM: Yeah. I was going to say that. Right.

DU: It's a billion dollars.

JM: Yeah. At least 100 to 1.

[----40:00-----]

DU: And there was that much pressure. And then, at a timing, that first three decades where the Rockefeller foundation was pumping money, money, money into medical schools, none of it was going to homeopathic medical schools. But to this day, like I said, we don't know how much Rockefeller knew what he was doing or not.

JM: When did the last homeopathic schools shut down?

DU: In 1949, Hahnemann stopped having the last course in homeopathy. Boston University had their program until the 1930s. By the way, Boston used to be entirely homeopathic. They were the alternative to Harvard. Harvard was the allopathic school. Boston University was the homeopathic. And then some professors from Boston University created the first women's medical school. It was, of course, a homeopathic medical school for women.

JM: Did they teach conventional medicine?

DU: Absolutely. Part of what they did –

JM: It's kind of like osteopathic medicine, where we essentially learn what allopathic medicine does, and in addition to that, we have osteopathic treatment and principles.

DU: That's right. The homeopathic schools would have a similar body of diagnostics. In fact, that's why so many homeopathic medical doctors (MDs) made important contributions to conventional medicine, because they were making contributions to homeopathy, and they were making contributions to conventional medicine. In fact, at Hahnemann, some of the earliest cardiovascular treatments were developed. In Canada, some of the early anesthesia work was done by homeopathic doctors.

JM: Okay. What's the current state of homeopathy with the FDA?

DU: Well, we're waiting for them to actually come out with the specifics of their guidelines. We've written to them, many of us, in detail, making our recommendations. We're now ready for them to respond. All I'm going to say is if they choose to take away many of our important homeopathic medicines – I'm confident that they're not going to take away – They say they're going to maintain most of the homeopathic remedies, but I am worried that they may reduce access to what are called “homeopathic nosodes.”

Nosodes are homeopathic medicines, super diluted, that are made from different bacteria and viruses. As long as they say – You see, right now, only medical doctors, naturopathic doctors and professional homeopaths have access to these nosodes. I'm fine with that. But it would be a real problem. I know many of us would break the law, and we would find means to wish we would be prescribing these medicines. We would just call them something else. We would do something else, but we still need to have access to our homeopathic medicines.

JM: Now, I want to discuss the placebo effect, because you had mentioned earlier the sugar pills. Clearly, that's what they mostly put in. Is it a dextrose typically?

DU: No. Actually, there are some that are lactose, and there are some that are sucrose.

JM: Lactose. Sucrose. Actual sucrose, sugar.

DU: Yeah. Some are sucrose. Now, if anyone is concerned about that, what you can do is just drop a couple of pills in a half a cup of water, stir and then take a sip of the water. Now, you should stir at least for 30 seconds to get it infiltrated into the water. But that's something that you can do. If you have the sugar pill or the lactose pill and you don't want to take that, you can put it in water, dilute it one more time, but you need to stir it for a good 30 seconds.

JM: I was actually referring more to the placebo effect, which is well-documented.

DU: Sure.

JM: I mean, surprisingly so, I've seen research that even patients giving placebos end up – They were told they were placebos. They were told, “This is a sugar pill,” 30 percent of them still get better.

DU: You know, I saw that work out of Harvard. It's an old friend of mine who did that research.

JM: Yeah.

DU: That was fascinating. Ted Kaptchuk.

JM: How do you differentiate what's a placebo effect and the benefits of homeopathy?

DU: Well, you know, when I see my patients – I see most of my patients, by the way, on Zoom and Skype. I see them all over the world. I mail them a homeopathic medicine. You don't have to have a homeopath in your local region. You can find a homeopath, like myself, who uses these modern technologies. I think of myself as – Anyway, this is the modern way. But I take a detailed case of my patients. What's surprising is –

JM: [inaudible 45:28] your history, right?

DU: Yeah. What's surprising –

JM: How long is your history typically?

DU: A minimum of one hour.

JM: Okay.

DU: Minimum of one hour. Sometimes I need another 30 minutes or more in complex cases. But what's fascinating is I then, after the second visit or third visit, say, “Well, what's happening with this secondary symptom or this other tertiary symptom?” They look at me and they go, “Oh, that's right. I used to have that.”

I understand when there's a placebo effect when a person has a headache. I also understand when a person has some condition that comes and goes. It's like standing at the ocean with a bucket and thinking that you're emptying the ocean even though the tide is going out. You just happen to be there at the right time to make it seem as though you're having an effect. With all my patients, when a patient gets better, I play the devil's advocate for them to really convince me that it was the remedy and not a placebo.

At the other side, when people say, “Oh. I didn't get any effect,” I take out their cases and I ask about this symptom, this symptom and this symptom. In fact, it's happened with my own sister. She had a serious problem. I opened it up to the first thing. All of a sudden, she realized, “Oh, that's right. That went away.” That's one of the ways that I differentiate.

And then the second way, is in about 20 percent of our patients with chronic illness. Our patients' experience was called a healing crisis first, where their symptoms got worse in some shape, way or form in the first 48 hours. And sometimes they re-experience old symptoms that they haven't had in many months, years or even decades. Usually, a placebo doesn't do that. A placebo just has them get better.

We see in homeopathy that the immune response is powerful enough that it can and will make the person uncomfortable. Especially, it brings out skin problems or women might have an early menstruation that will be clotted, because it's almost like they're going through a detox. But when they begin talking about having old symptoms come back, and then I find out that those symptoms were treated in an allopathic way, and thus suppressed.

Because one of the things that people have to understand is that when we say that conventional medicines work, all too often, that's the bad news. That means if they were effective in suppressing a symptom and a disease, and from a homeopathic point of view, the reason why there's more mental illness, and the reason why there's more cancer and heart disease and there's more chronic fatigue and immune dysfunction, is because we treat acute illness in a suppressive way. We treat chronic illness in a suppressive way.

Our body mind is so brilliant that it does whatever it can to defend itself and heal. Whatever symptoms we're having are the best effort of our body at that time to defend ourselves. If we cut off that defense, then it's like the body surrenders, and our bodies gets suppressed and then develops a new serious syndrome.

JM: I'm curious – Typically, what is the frequency of someone who comes in to see you as a new patient? How often are you seeing them?

DU: I usually see patients around once a month.

JM: Once a month. Okay. How long does it take to get them better and what is the percentage of the people who see you are improving?

DU: I would say at least half of my patients noticed significant effects within six months.

JM: Okay.

DU: These are people who have had sometimes lifelong or chronic conditions. Homeopaths' definition of "cure" is so high that we don't even use the word "cure." We provide benefit and reduce main complaint and other complaints, so that the people feel better emotionally and feel better physically. We use the word "freedom" on a physical, on an emotional and a mental level, so that people are not bound and limited to live the life that they want to live.

[-----50:00-----]

JM: Are there any specific illnesses that work better with homeopathic therapies or get particularly good results?

DU: It's hard to say. But respiratory allergies is one of our strong areas. One of the things that some of us, for instance, have access to is homeopathic doses of not just different pollen in different sections of the United States. There are nine different regions. We have 40 different pollens from not just trees, flowers and grasses. And then we have separate formulas for different animals, hair and their dander, which is their skin. We have separate formulas for different mold, separate formulas for dust mites – that's a really common problem – and another one for fragrances and solvents.

Although we, in homeopathy, like to provide what we call constitutional treatment, which is a remedy based on their personal genetic history, their overall personal history and their present symptoms, sometimes we go into the bag and really pick out specific allergens as a way of helping specific ailments. That's another strategy.

JM: The leading causes of death in the United States, the three big ones – I wouldn't number them – but certainly cancer, heart disease and then we've got diabetes and neurodegenerative diseases, like Alzheimer's and Parkinson's. Does homeopathy play a role in the treatment of those courses? I would assume that it would need to be in conjunction with the lifestyle.

DU: I'm not going to go into the details on that because I don't want to wave any red flags.

JM: Yeah, yeah. But you'd have to address the lifestyle issues. It's not like a magic bullet.

DU: Yeah, yeah, yeah. To be honest, the care that I provide is – I call it – adjunctive homeopathic treatment. It's in addition to whatever a person's doing. I admit that most of my patients are doing some conventional medicine, some homeopathy and some other natural therapies, and so do I. I don't discourage people from doing that.

What I do think is that 21st Century medicine is this integrative model. It is the use of these different treatments. It is homeopathy. It is natural therapies, and when appropriate, conventional medicine. But I'd like to remind people that Hippocrates said it best, "First, do no harm." We should exhaust the natural therapies before resulting to the bigger guns of conventional medicine.

And then when we think that conventional medicine is scientific, please know that statistics show that, last year, every man, woman and child in America was prescribed 13 prescription drugs. There's no evidence of safety or efficacy of multiple drugs together. They don't do science that way. Conventional medicine is standing on Jell-O. The evidence base is really limited.

JM: Yeah. You know, those numbers are incorrect, because I haven't taken drugs in years. I'm sure you haven't taken prescription drugs. There are many other people watching this who haven't, so it's a lot more than 13 for most people.

DU: That's right. No, no. That's the average. That's the mistake.

JM: I know. The averages can be confusing.

DU: Someone's taking all 13 of mine and all 13 of yours.

JM: Yeah.

DU: Sadly, it's our elders. There is elder medical abuse.

JM: The older you get, the worse it gets.

DU: I even call it medical child abuse, when children are given these powerful attention deficit disorder (ADD) medicines, when they really need to explore alternatives, safer alternatives. I see a fair amount of children who are in the ADD, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), the autistic spectrum, and on these various pediatric autoimmune neuropsychiatric disorders associated with streptococcal infections (PANDAS) spectrums. I do see homeopathy providing benefit, but the challenge is that some people these days are just very sick. We can just begin to roll back and create increasing amounts of freedom in health.

JM: Yeah. Just one final comment on the FDA. You had mentioned all the drugs that people are taking, which the FDA has to approve and is loaded with these side effects. Most of them, we don't really have a justification. At best, they treat symptoms, which can be dangerous, as you mentioned. But yet, they're seeking to suppress homeopathic medicines, which certainly don't kill people. Like tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands of people are dying every year from appropriately prescribed medications. And yet they're doing this in the name of protecting the public health.

DU: Here's where your bullshit detectors need to go up. Your bullshit detectors need to go up, because it's so obvious that homeopathic medicines are safe, safer. Anything that is being done to reduce access by health and medical professionals, to the safe medicines, and yet have complete access to so many conventional drugs, which are so dangerous, would be the epitome of a "doctatorship." That's a word I developed. I hope we don't move towards a "doctatorship."

There is what I call "medical chauvinism." There's the assumption that there's only one way to heal people. Then you and I, and I bet every other person listening to this knows that there are other methods. We do need to stand up for ourselves. We're not going to take it. We'll go out even with our pets, our dogs and cats. We'll demonstrate saying, "We don't want conventional drugs shoved down our children's throats, our throats, our dog's throats, our cat's throats or any of our dear, dear animal friends."

JM: Alright. If someone is interested in accessing homeopathic therapy, what would you recommend is the best way to do that? Homeopathic.com.

DU: Homeopathic.com is a good source. Now, the National Center for Homeopathy is the leading organization. They actually have a couple different websites. TheHomeopathyCenter.org is one source. They have an annual conference. They have a bi-monthly magazine. They are doing the most important work.

And then there's a group of mothers in Texas called "Americans for Homeopathy Choice." They've been putting together petitions for homeopathy. I really support their work. What's so

great is mothers are leading the way. We do need to put mothers really in front because they are the healthcare provider in most families. Bless the mothers out there that are strongly advocating for homeopathy and using homeopathy, and then learning how to use a homeopathic medicine kit.

JM: Perfect. Are there any other words you'd like to say before we sign off? Or summarize or emphasize?

DU: I just want to thank all the people before me. I stand on the shoulders of giants. People not just in homeopathy, but in natural medicine. I stand on your shoulders, Dr. Mercola, because you're providing a platform, a microphone, so that we can all learn, and we can all act. We can all be healthier. And then take the benefit of our health and help share them with others.

JM: Yeah. Great. Thank you for sharing your wisdom with us all the years you've been doing this, which is over 40 years now.

DU: Yeah. Since 1973.

JM: That's up there. You've acquired a lot of wisdom in those years. To me, that's one of the tragedies of passing on. It's that unless you are able to share that in some effective way, either by teaching individuals or writing it down and creating videos, then that information gets lost. Thank you for providing a legacy here and helping others to use this effective tool to help so many different illnesses.

DU: One last thing is that I know a lot of people go to Amazon to buy their homeopathic books, medicines and different things, but I want to encourage people out there to, when possible, use homeopathic sources, and use natural medicine sources for getting your medicines. Because we have to support the organizations. We have to support the businesses that are in this field. Because if we don't do that, then when the FDA and other giants begin to attack homeopathy, who's going to be there to help us?

JM: And how does one find those organizations?

DU: Well, I just posted something about how Facebook is beginning to delete certain alternative medicine Facebook pages.

JM: Oh, yeah.

DU: I was disgusted to hear that. I hope that comes to a rapid stop.

JM: No, no. It's not going to. In fact, we're going to be stopping our presence on Facebook very shortly.

DU: Oh, you are.

JM: Yeah, yeah.

DU: Are they putting pressure on you to do that?

JM: No. They'll eventually kick us off anyway, like they did Alex Jones, because we're fake news. Anyway, it doesn't really matter because they're limiting not only our presence and effectiveness on their platform – I think they throttle down your posts to like 10 percent of the people.

DU: No, no, no. They did just that to advertise.

JM: It's getting worse and worse and worse. I mean it's an ineffective platform anyway. It's just another way of control. They and Google are the two big giants that seek to dominate and limit access to this type of information. We're essentially limiting our exposure on both platforms, which is one of the reasons why we're doing Zoom on this interview. We switched off of Google.

DU: Right.

JM: Yeah.

DU: Well, bless you. May we defend ourselves, heal ourselves and heal the world.

JM: Great.

DU: Okay.

[END]