

With great concern Richard Pitcairn, DVM, questions and criticizes the „provings“ of mobile phone and positron as well as their admission to the Materia-medica-library of a homoeopathic software company. The company's attitude that those parts of the library which one didn't like could easily be excluded, failed the core of the problem, i. e. the corruption of the Materia medica and therefore of homoeopathy.

Richard Pitcairn

Positron and MobilePhone

A correspondence between Richard Pitcairn, DVM, and a company of homeopathic software, June 2002

This is a series of emails from me to a representative of one of the homeopathic software companies. It started when one of my students wrote me to ask about a couple of the "new provings" involving mobile phone and positron. It has been edited for clarity:

My first email:

One of my students sent this to me for comment and I am at a loss as to what to say. Are you REALLY including these "provings"? Are you seriously agreeing that someone has done a proving on "mobile phone" and "positron"? Please tell me it is not so.

Richard

Response from software company:

We've added more than 200 new books including very exciting new provings of Box Jellyfish, Condor, Cowrie snail, Dove, Eagle, Falcon, Fly, Ibis, Koala, Llama's milk, Macaw, Mother's milk, Rat's Blood, Raven, Redtail Hawk, Spiderweb, Stingray, Swan, Turkey Vulture, AIDS, Chlamydia, Banyon, Fig, Redwood, Alabaster, Gasoline, Lapis lazuli, Lithium carbonate, Mobile phone, Pearl, Radium bromatum, Ruby, Slate, Tungsten, Positron and others!

We cannot arbitrate or stand in judgement over what goes into our library.

We can provide you with the tools to switch them off. If you don't like a book or a proving or a collection of cases or whatever, simply exclude it from your library and you never need see it.

Positronium was proven by Misha Norland. He is sincere about it. I've heard him present it as well as his cured cases. The person who proved Mobile Phone (poor choice of name) is also a serious homeopath. I guess it is a form of radiation frankly.

Many homeopaths appreciate being given an opportunity to review some of the newer information and then make up their own minds as to whether they use it or not.

I hope this is helpful in allaying your concerns.

My second email:

I am afraid this will not allay my concerns. This is garbage. You may call them serious homeopaths and say they present cured cases but this is not a reason to accept this kind of corruption of our materia medica. How can one say they are proving a mobile phone? First of all, not all phones operate on the same frequency. They switch channels, operate on different parts of the electromagnetic spectrum, exist as different brands. Even if one assumed that the energy could be defined and captured in a liquid to be potentized, how is this done? From what I know about physics, it could not be.

A positron is the opposite of an electron, positively charged instead of negatively. It exists as antimatter and though it is postulated to exist in a quantum vacuum does not exist materially in our universe. There is no way that the prover could collect positrons in order to make a remedy from them. This is crazy stuff.

I am very definitely not satisfied with your statement that you cannot arbitrate or stand in judgment over what goes into your library. If not you, then who? What is your standard? Will you take anything? What if I tell you I have made a potency from Jesus, will you put it in your library? I could go to Rome and get a piece of the Holy Cross and make it into a remedy. Can't you see how ridiculous this is? It is essential that you establish a standard. You can't just add all this stuff in indiscriminately. Surely you can understand this.

What am I to say to my students? I am teaching them that this is a science, that the materia medica is based on careful research and observation, that we should not be using unproven medicines or speculative homeopathy and then this comes across their desks. They are asking me what to think about it. What do I say to them?

Asking the user to eliminate books puts the onus of decision on them, many who will not be able to do it either because they do not know how to use computers well enough or because they are too new to homeopathy to make those decisions.

I really am shocked and have to think seriously about what to do about this.

A final note on your statement that these people "proving" these new remedies are presenting cured cases. Please realize that they do not look cured to me or to other people. What we see are cases presented that are temporarily changed or palliated, not cured. They are not impressive or convincing and there is much concern in the homeopathic community I know about the low standard that is accepted by these speculative homeopaths. I have referred many of my students to these same people before to have them come back with strange remedies like dolphins milk or raven's blood and MOST IMPORTANTLY, not helped in the slightest. It is a very significant problem for those of us that are trying to practice homeopathy in a curative manner to find someone that knows how to use homeopathy without this speculation. It comes up almost daily.

I am sorry to be in such disagreement with you but this is important to me and presents a real problem for me to deal with.

Richard

This did not lead to resolution of the issue, but defined the concern. I am adding one more further email that I sent that expands on the issue of these two provings:

Further email:

Let me explain further.

To me, mobile phone is vague. What electromagnetic frequency is being tested? There is a whole range of frequencies that cell phones use, switching from one channel to another. We have to be much more clear about the source of what we are testing than simply taping pellets to a phone. It is not accurate to just tape pellets to "a cell phone" and expect that to define a specific electromagnetic frequency.

Regarding proving positrons, I know enough to know that this CANNOT be a proving of positrons. Physicist Paul Dirac did indeed suggest there is such a thing and they are thought to exist but there is no way they can be in a vial in a pure form. Granted some positrons may be generated during radioactive decay but also there are electrons, photons, gamma rays and a lot more things. Why should we assume that only positrons were used in the proving? I am quite sure they cannot be isolated from these other things. Does this make sense to you, what I am

saying? To put it another way, it is like proving coffee and then claiming that we did a proving only on caffeine.

I went to the web site link that you suggested would have more information for this positron proving but did not find anything there but a chart of ideas about the psychological attitudes associated with matter and antimatter. No info about the proving or source of material.