

I swear by Apollo the Healer, by Asclepius, by Hygieia, by Panacea, and by all the gods and goddesses, making them my witnesses, that I will carry out, according to my ability and judgment, this oath and this indenture.

To hold my teacher in this art equal to my own parents; to make him partner in my livelihood; when he is in need of money to share mine with him; to consider his family as my own brothers, and to teach them this art, if they want to learn it, without fee or indenture; to impart precept, oral instruction, and all other instruction to my own sons, the sons of my teacher, and to indentured pupils who have taken the physician's oath, but to nobody else.

I will use treatment to help the sick according to my ability and judgment, but never with a view to injury and wrong-doing. Neither will I administer a poison to anybody when asked to do so, nor will I suggest such a course. Similarly I will not give to a woman a pessary to cause abortion. But I will keep pure and holy both my life and my art. I will not use the knife, not even, verily, on sufferers from stone, but I will give place to such as are craftsmen therein.

Into whatsoever houses I enter, I will enter to help the sick, and I will abstain from all intentional wrong-doing and harm, especially from abusing the bodies of man or woman, bond or free. And whatsoever I shall see or hear in the course of my profession, as well as outside my profession in my intercourse with men, if it be what should not be published abroad, I will never divulge, holding such things to be holy secrets.

Now if I carry out this oath, and break it not, may I gain for ever reputation among all men for my life and for my art; but if I transgress it and forswear myself, may the opposite befall me. 1

Ladies and Gentlemen, dear Colleagues, Thank you

very much for your participation of this five years' anniversary meeting of CLAMO Czech medical association in Moravia with its headquarters in Olomouc, my native town. We suggested this year to gather on the Cos island (after last year Avicenna's Boukchara) the cradle of the modern Hippocratic medicine : he was the first to determine specific plants to specific diseases, specific treatments, to specific ailments. This empirical medicine is threatened to disappear nowadays.

I will explain :

Yes, the threat is to disappear Hippocratic empirical medicine as the act of medical thinking as a cultural entertainment is being stolen from medical realm, medical corps and medical professionals to political, juridical and financial structures pretending to make the medical care accessible to human masses. It is wrong as in fact it makes the medical entertainment dehumanised and according to one and only idea of financial efficiency. The empirical approach of Hippocrates did not suppress the vertical mystery, but constructed it. He made disappear magic irrationality of disease. A hundred years after Hippocrates, Aristoteles came and founded the testing of hypotheses as a key stone of "experimental" medicine that nowadays is worshipped as the only one possible idea of medicine or science: the experimentation means to produce the same effect in the same conditions but in real life we do not control the real conditions, whilst in the empirical approach and its concept of intervention remains coherent. Nowadays our ideologists try to completely replace the empirical approach by experimentation in science ("scientists") and medicine ("evidence based medicine") : it is a totalitarian menace to medicine and science.

Why and how did we come to this disaster ? There might be many explications varying from the simply positivists' ideas comparing stochastic nature to determined science to extreme Christian charity without any economic consideration. Medicine is still an art culturally defined (made my man) of human healing with intellectual, not craftsmen's nor even less industrial approach. To remain solemn and spiritual I defend today the key cause the disappearance of « sacred », the profound metaphysical mystery. By Apollo, the god father of the western civilisation we swear, but by Insurances we live. Hippocratic determination of plants to diseases has hardly anything to do with nowadays « diagnoses » but the ailments remain the same for more than 2500 years : even for 6

millions years when man stood up and became bipedal. The difference is in the cultural evolution and medical risk perception.

So called « preventive medicine »(the best prevention of life is abortion, isn't it?), mutual insurances that share medical risk, « scientific » bases and collectively run medical care (mass management) are both fruits of this cultural evolution and rolling stones of the mills that gradually destroy the empirical art of medicine as a free individual empirical enterprise.

I would insist on the definition of medical art -it is a compilation of diverse techniques and methods applied OR NOT to an individual patient. This individuality is menaced today. Both patients and physicians are considered as « objects » in a « system ». The physician is considered as a medical care provider acting according to guidelines that become oppressive tolls more that recommendations. But neither a patient nor a physician are freely interchangeable things and nor is any « system » that heals or alleviates a patient . Can we save ourselves and patients and the civilisation form this « industrialisation » of medicine and industrialisation of empathy ? The term was for the first time introduced by Nazi's (Professor Schilling was a director of Max Planck's Institute in Berlin, then Oberartz in Dachau, then hanged) and then recently by Jacques Attali, a chief globalisation. Yes, we can, or at least I hope so !

How ? By adopting worldwide the “old French system”. Indisputably the « public charge » of medicine as a part of mass management is inseparable of our medical work, but the individual, moral, ethical charge since Hippocrates is also inseparable of our art. The big hegemonic states, US and Russia, has both recently adopted a generalised medical care : The Russians quitted the state run unique system, the US introduced Obama's care as a state run guarantee of the access to health care. This evolution is a nightmare or a hope : I see it with hope as both the states will gravitate to the old European Bavarian /French model of freelance enterprising and mutuality. This is keystone of medical and social care in so called in my vocabulary a Greek-Judaeo-Christian space. Let us hope that the French (and the whole Europe) will not destroy the scheme in the meantime as the Bavarians did twenty years ago. Why should Russians or Americans should change today their scornful meaning of Europe? As the impossibility to introduce to very these rigid state or corporation (insurance) run concentration systems the slightest hint of economic efficiency, medical competitiveness, economic enterprising, empiricism, or even humanistic charity will make their administrations to modify these concentration « systems » and introduce the « mixity » (or mix in more correct English) of commercialism and solidarity as it used to exist in Europe since Antiquity and has wrongly been considered in the last 40 years as obsolete.

(Mix means partly private commercial, partly state or insurance run care provided by a freelance professional that has no other oppression than medical ethics, ideally, of course!) By the way, The Russians have already started to introduce the Mix, otherwise facing a medical disaster! The US due to their own history would hopefully alternate Obama's care to stop its complete "public ownership". Only Europe, badly treated since the last century by these two hegemonic superpowers, seems to quit which is the best deal to keep health care affordable and interesting. ...for to introduce an « industrialised model » of medicine which is both moral and intellectual aberration.

Especially after 1989, it seems that European health care has been reconsidered as inefficacy and obsolete : yes, might be so, but in which optic do we see it ? Medicine is not the latest scoop of science (as "capitalists" think) nor a medicalisation of any social problem (as "communists" think). From the « medical » point of view Europe became secondary because it has absorbed both these perverted ideologies and nowadays we are stuck and blocked. The French/Bavarian sector 2 has been closed in 1989 in France and later in Bavaria but it is evidently the most adapted system in a mixed state-run/commercial constellation. In one word : patient pays to a physician of his choice the physician's pay (n%) and he is reimbursed if the physician is recognised as a physician (the pay = a certain amount of 100%) on the basis of a fixed (state run (70%)) and commercial (variable part) (from 30 to 500% <= n). The system seems to be thought the best adapted for the period of open

society and uberisation of the commerce, individualisation of the societies and especially in face to a collapsing concentration state-run health care insurances. And then the complete destruction of medical culture : there are no more « schools » or « methods » just one system and one doctrine : if in the early nineties the Harrisons' principles of Internal medicine that I used to read in several repetitions for my many examinations was considered as a Bible with possibly many exegeses, nowadays, there is no Bible, but obligations/recommendations as if the book was replaced by verses with no other possible explanation. A dogmatic tool of economic government, but not medical one. All French, English, German or Russian classical schools were replaced by one ubiquitous simple-minded Anglo-Saxon, evidence based or more evidently biased medicine that is based on prefabricated scientific proofs with no real individual validity.

« But back to basics » -John Major's words : the disappearance of Greek divinities then the whole sacred transcendental mysticism meant that a Man considered himself equal to Gog(s). Yes, Man might be nowadays immortal thanks to technologies but he is neither eternal as he was born, nor immortal in masses as Mankind. Man is creative agent but he is not a Creator, he produces nothing ex nihilo. The abolition of sacred means that the only one idea, only one procedure, only one technique, only one method, or only one system should be applied to anyone or in any situation not to run the risk of loss of chances to use an only one jurisdiction term. The anti sacred approach eliminates all doubt, all hesitation or tentative of another solution and it is in a fact a tomb of research and renovation. They are sacrificed on the alter on One Only Economic Idea, in our days. It is actually the same ideological principle or paradigm that stopped Avicenna's and Averroes' achievements in Islamic countries or the western evolution during the middle age dogmatism of Saint Thomas Aquinas : just one, only and immobile idea. Thank you for your attention. God save us.