

Here are the opening lines from an AP article dated 6/09/09
(<http://content.usatoday.net/dist/custom/gci/InsidePage.aspx?cid=azcentral&sParam=30941257.story>)

By Marilyn Marchione, AP Medical Writer

BETHESDA, Md. — Ten years ago the government set out to test herbal and other alternative health remedies to find the ones that work. After spending \$2.5 billion, the disappointing answer seems to be that almost none of them do.

Further into the article is this paragraph: "There's very little basic science behind these things. Most of it begins with a tradition, or personal testimony and people's beliefs, even as a fad. And then pressure comes: 'It's being popular, it's being used, it should be studied.' It turns things upside down," said Dr. Edward Campion, a senior editor who reviews alternative medicine research submitted to the New England Journal of Medicine.

And finally, here is an observation made in the article: That is opposite how other National Institutes of Health agencies work, where scientific evidence or at least plausibility is required to justify studies, and treatments go into wide use after there is evidence they work -- not before.

A similar situation is now before the SEC. Does the SEC bow to much uninformed and other self-interested opinions on the re-implementation of some type of uptick rule or does the SEC hold firm to its well researched and thought out decision to repeal the uptick rule made in 2007? Evidence and reason, or emotion and localized self-interest? It is my sincere hope that the former will prevail.

PS – I would like to add my support to the ideas laid out in the recent comment left by Renee M. Toth, President, National Association of Active Investment Managers. I am not associated with NAAIM.

Respectfully,
Lonnie Suazo