

Marseille,
November 25, 2005

To: The Swiss Study Group for
Complementary and
Alternative Methods in Cancer,
SCAC

CC: Anybody who can read

Object: Hamer's «New Medicine»

Dear member of the Swiss Study Group SCAC,

The present letter is a reaction on a document that can be downloaded from your Internet site at

http://www.swisscancer.ch/dt/content/orange/skak_e.php

by anyone who chooses in the *Documentations* list the option:

[Hamer's «New Medicine»](#)

At the top of the URL referred to above I read:



which I would freely translate in English as :

Do not accept without proof
Do not condemn without knowing

Your discussion of Hamer's «New Medicine» begins with a **Summary** :

After careful study of the literature and other available information, the Study Group for Complementary and Alternative Methods in Cancer (SCAC) and the Swiss Cancer League (SCL) have found no evidence that the assertions of Ryke Geerd Hamer are correct, or that the method of cancer treatment which he propagates is effective. They therefore advise against their use in the treatment of cancer.

I understand that you advise against Hamer's «New Medicine» after a careful study of literature in which you found no evidence that Hamer's ideas might be of any benefit to anybody. As I am very confident that your Study Group is eager to gather information on Dr Hamer and his proposed New Medicine, and because I can give you some information that might help you evolve in your quest for a world with less suffering, I decided to put aside my personal activities for a while and spend some time to inform you.

First of all, and I think this is important to point out, you must know that even so many hours of careful studying all available scientific literature, will not teach you anything about an approach that is not mentioned in science at the moment of your studies. You must understand that Hamer's «New Medicine» is relatively new, as it was brought up for the first time only twenty-five years ago, and that not many people have chosen it as an object for research. For instance, the University of Tübingen in Germany has been asked several times to give it all a closer look, but nobody seems to be interested. In 1986 the Tübinger scientists were even condemned by justice to do a thorough study of Hamer's approach, but even then they refused to do anything. Well, why not? We're all very busy and not everything can be achieved here and now, can it? As a matter of fact, officially spoken nothing is scientifically known about Hamer's «New Medicine» up to today. No official scientific proof is available anywhere on the globe and thus: one can not really accept. But also, in your article on Hamer's «New Medicine» you repeatedly refer to the absence of data so «pour ne pas condamner sans savoir», one should not condemn. Yet when I read your paper, compiled I believe after such a very careful study of the finest literature, I have the impression that disdain is smeared all over the paragraphs. Why? I'm sure it is not done on purpose and I am willing to help you to do some more objective reporting.

After all you must agree that your conclusion:

As long as Hamer fails to present any more convincing evidence for his hypotheses, and while the efficacy of the «New Medicine» remains scientifically unproven, we must strongly advise against his method.

is not compatible with the «Ne pas condamner sans savoir» slogan your banner so fiercely exhibits.

Let's get to the facts.

In the paragraph **Inventor**, the article gives a brief presentation of the person of Dr Ryke Geerd Hamer and as in many, if not all, documents that condemn Hamer's «New Medicine» without knowing, half of the introduction is dedicated to Olivia Pilhar. I read:

The child was finally given emergency medical treatment by court order, against the parents' wishes.

This is true. But it's only part of the truth and as such it lulls the reader into believing the exact opposite of what has actually happened. Your article would be much closer to reality if it also mentioned that this emergency medical treatment has been nearly fatal for Olivia, that she fell in a coma shortly after the chemo session and that two of her ribs were broken during a desperate attempt not to lose her. And that finally, when he became aware that this case was going to blow up in his face, the chief of the medical department gave the child back to her father with the words: «We cannot save the girl, maybe Hamer can, but you must promise not to tell anybody that I said this to you.»

I am confident that you will recognize the crucial importance of this detail as I am confident that you were not aware of it when you did your careful study. Also I am confident that you will add this information to your document to conform to the legal disclaimer in which are mentioned *due care* and *expert knowledge*.

The paragraph **Theory** gives a brief description of Hamer's «New Medicine». It does not give the reader the impression of an objective and impartial overview but it does provide an idea of what it's all about. But you should really reconsider the phrase:

Hamer's full theory is highly complex

That might have been your opinion when you first began your careful study of fine literature but now you know better, don't you? A single sheet of paper format A4 is all it needs to write down an outline of Hamer's «New Medicine» which can be understood by anybody but the highly mentally disturbed, and the full theory is easily accessible to any person ready to invest some of his precious time in the reading of the «Vermächtnis einer Neuen Medizin - Legacy of a New Medicine»

I am confident that you will recognize the crucial importance of this detail as I am confident that you were not aware of it at the time you did your careful study. Also I am confident that you will add this information to your document to conform to the legal disclaimer in which are mentioned *due care* and *expert knowledge*.

In the paragraph **Studies and tests** I read:

No case of a cure of a cancer patient by Hamer's method has yet been published in medical literature. Neither have any studies to this effect been published in the specialised press.

I don't know the size of the libraries you visited to gather all the information for your careful study, but my medical library is very tiny yet I am in the possession of an important publication in the German language containing eight very thoroughly documented cases of cancer cure according to the standards of Hamer's method. It is called the Celler Dokumentation and it is a complement to the thesis Hamer proposed at the university of Tübingen in 1981. No Tübinger scientist has yet found some time to spend on the study of the thesis, but as it has been presented to them only 24 years ago, there's no reason to worry and I am confident that somebody will have a glance at it one day. Naturally your acquirey of the Celler Documentation will be the end of your desparate search for a medical publication so hereby I provide you all you need to order a copy of the German version:

Celler Dokumentation

eine Dokumentation von acht vorwiegend
urologischen und nephrologischen Krankengeschichten
Zur Vorlage als Komplement im

Habilitationsverfahren von 1981

An der Universität Tübingen
Juli 1994

Amici di Dirk Verlagsgesellschaft - Köln
ISBN 3-926755-07-5

I am confident that you will recognize the crucial importance of this detail as I am confident that you were not aware of it when you did your careful study. Also I am confident that you will add

this information to your document to conform to the legal disclaimer in which are mentioned *due care* and *expert knowledge*.

In the same paragraph **Studies and tests** I read:

The «Hamer foci» on the CT images in Hamer's books have been identified by radiological experts as typical artifacts produced by the radiological device which can appear in a poor-quality CT scan.

«Spiegel» magazine reports an investigation by the authorities in Germany, stating that out of 50 cancer patients who have passed through Hamer's care only seven have survived.

May I ask you a question? Yes? It may not be very polite but I don't know how to put it otherwise:

- Were you drunk when you wrote those lines?

If not, somebody must have hit you on the head with a baseball bat just before you wrote this, or maybe a tough guy with a shotgun told you what to write. I can only guess what's been going on but it must have been something like that because I can not think of any plausible explanation for your inconsequent zigzag logic. Because «No publications are available» you throw out of the window everything that might positively influence your conclusions, after which you start to haul in through your front door any gossip that will negatively influence your conclusion, although «No publications are available».

Can you please show me the scientific publication where radiological experts identify «Hamer foci» as artifacts? There is no official scientific publication on Hamer on either side. No scientific publication accepts Hamer. No scientific publication condemns Hamer. Scientifically spoken Hamer's «New Medicine» is a desert and a no man's land. And since when is «Der Spiegel» anything more than a tabloid? Why the heck do you come up with data from a publication in «Der Spiegel» as if it had any scientific value?

The «Hamer foci» are an important part of Hamer's «New Medicine» and indeed there are rumors that they are only artifacts. I will give you some valuable information on this part of Hamer's «New Medicine». Of course Hamer knows about the artifact theory and in the beginning he was not sure either about how those rings and spots on the CT should be interpreted. Together with SIEMENS a scientific test protocol has been elaborated and radiologists have been invited to assist to the experiment that should finally clear the sky. In the end nobody ever came. Because, said SIEMENS' engineer: «Dr. Hamer, SIEMENS does not want to continue since our clients seem to be very upset about the evidence we are going to show them.»

I am confident that you will recognize the crucial importance of this detail as I am confident that you were not aware of it when you did your careful study. Also I am confident that you will add this information to your document to conform to the legal disclaimer in which are mentioned *due care* and *expert knowledge*.

It is a fact that statistics might give some information about the efficiency of Hamer's «New Medicine». The data from «Der Spiegel» can not be taken seriously of course and I would like to propose you some other data. I read in the paragraph **Providers** :

The «Center for New Medicine» in Burgau, Austria, was closed in 1996.

I conclude that you know about Bergau and also that it was closed by the military. When this happened, the archives of the center have been confiscated by the authorities and everybody was convinced that this would be the end of the «New Medicine» because the dead would speak up against Hamer and his silly approach of diseases. But today the same authorities are stuck with some very explosive information in their drawers. A study of the archives of the Center for New Medicine in Bergau and the whereabouts of the concerned patients during this study disclosed that 6000 of the 6500 patient of Hamer and coworkers were still alive and well five years after treatment. That's about 85 percent. Of patients given up by regular medicine and for whom Bergau was the last hope.

I am confident that you will recognize the crucial importance of this detail as I am confident that you were not aware of it when you did your careful study. Also I am confident that you will add this information to your document to conform to the legal disclaimer in which are mentioned *due care* and *expert knowledge*.

As a conclusion I would argue that we can thumb through the written pages over and over again, add details, change words and phrases and find new information in books and articles written by others, every single day. But in the end the evidence that will provide a definite answer to the question whether Hamer's «New Medicine» is correct, I don't think you should so eagerly look for it in medical literature exclusively. In a book or a magazine or a scientific publication you will only find someone's theory on a subject, not the subject itself. I think you should also try to find out for yourself. Then you can write what you have discovered. From the paragraph **Theory** I understand that you know the details of the New Medicine approach and thus all you need to do is sit down and talk for an hour or two with the first patient who enters your practice tomorrow. Then you will know.

This whole thing about the importance of scientific literature. It makes me think of somebody who just heard on the radio that it's snowing where he lives and who then turns on his TV set to verify, instead of looking out of his window.

I am confident that you will recognize the crucial importance of this conclusion as I am confident that it is the expression of an idea that never occurred to you when you did your careful study of fine literature. Also I am confident that from now on you will discuss for hours with your patients as I am confident that they will give you some clues that you will be eager to add to your document to conform to the legal disclaimer in which are mentioned *due care* and *expert knowledge*.

I thank you for your attention.

Jan Spreen
www.nightsofarmour.com