

Short statements and papers we got since April 2002

A documentation in chronological order

Contents

- Sheilagh Creasy (Great Britain), April 2002
K.S. Srinivasan (India), May 2002
Dr. Kurt-Hermann Illing (Germany), May 2002
Dr. Karl Robinson (USA), May 2002
Dr. B.D. Patel (Indien), May 2002
Dr. Christiane Bondzus-Entzian (Germany), Spring 2002 (1st statement)
Dr. Richard H. Pitcairn (USA), May 2002
Dr. Karl-Heinz Gebhardt (Germany), May 2002
Dr. Dario Spinedi (Switzerland), June 2002
Dr. Uta Bestmann (Germany), June 2002
Dr. Gotthardt Behnisch (Germany), June 2002
Dr. Abdur Rehman (Pakistan), June 2002
Dr. Anton Rohrer (Austria), July 2002
Dr. Franz Swoboda (Austria), July 2002
Dr. Bruno Laborier (France), July 2002
Dr. Norbert Winter (Germany), July 2002
Barbara Osawa (USA), July 2002
Dr. Heiner Frei (Switzerland), July 2002
Prof. Dr. Diwan Harish Chand (India), August 2002
Dr. Frans Kusse (The Netherlands), August 2002
Dr. Jean.Claude Grégoire (France), August 2002 (English & French version)
Dr. Rukhsana Kausar (Pakistan), August 2002
Dr. Max Staeudinger (Germany), August 2002
Dr. Dietrich Grunow (Germany), May und August 2002
Dr. Karl von Petzinger (Germany)
Dr. Ullrich D. Fischer (Germany), August 2002
Dr. Christof Zang (Germany), August 2002
Dr. Pia Degenhardt-Fürniß (Germany), August 2002
Heinrich Pennkamp (Germany), September 2002
Dr. Christa von der Planitz (Germany), September 2002
Bernd Müller-Thederan (Germany) September 2002

Dr. Peter König (Austria), September 2002

Dr. Philippe Servais (France), September 2002 (English & French version)

Dr. Alain Horvilleur (France), September 2002

Dr. Thomas Röhrig (Germany), October 2002

Dr. Ralf Jeutter (Great-Britain), October 2002

Dr. Friedrich Dellmour (Austria), February 2003

Dr. Thomas Schreier (Germany), February 2003

Dr. Christiane Bondzus-Entzian (Germany), March 2003 (2nd statement)

Dr. Henning Droege (Germany), April 2003

Dr. Alois Bahemann (Germany), May 2003

Hedi Meusburger (Germany), May 2003

Sheilagh Creasy, Great Britain, April 2002:

...I am delighted to have your contact which reflects my thoughts and feelings...

People such as André Saine and yourselves deserve all the supports you can get....

Good wishes for taking this initiative to rouse apathy, which is desperately needed...

K. Subramanian Srinivasan, India, May 2002:

...First, I'll be happy to be associated with your efforts to clear the weeds so that the genuine will grow.

There have been individual voices raised against the introduction of fantasy and speculations particularly in the homoeopathic *Materia Medica*; however, a united action has been wanting. Perhaps the Vithoukaskas interview and the consequences stimulated an open action instead of isolated dissents.

There is good in everything. I agreed with Vithoukaskas' protests against the 'neo-Homoeopathy' taught by some 'teachers'. However I felt that Vithoukaskas need not have been 'so harsh' and wound anyone. Please see my letter in the *Homoeopathic Links*, Vol. 14, 2/2001, p.6 (Asian Edition) - my name has been totally misspelt in it.

I consider it as totally ridiculous to accept the symptoms of persons who have not taken the 'proving' medicine, or symptoms which appeared (?) after sleeping with the packet of powder of the proving medicine under the pillow! When someone protested to the 'Dream' provings, there were lengthy articles from Kees Dam of Holland and Peter König and Ute Santos of Austria, (see *Homoeopathic Links*) among others. These colleagues exclaim the validity of these and also group provings. The day may not be far when there will be 'mass proving'. Where is Homoeopathy, the medicine for the individual in all these?

After some Seminars, we began to see articles particularly in the *Homoeopathic Links*, which gave many columns of 'mental', 'delusions' 'dream' symptoms as diagnostic of the remedy; then they lumped 'dreams' and 'delusions' together! Then the repertories lumped all the 'Sensation-as-if' with the 'Delusion' rubric! It has all been chaotic in the past decade in Homoeopathy.

But the fever of 'Delusion', 'Dreams', 'Signatures', 'Periodic table' etc. was raging and it seemed to have become fashionable to report cases on those lines only. They forgot the

'genius' of the remedy but spoke of the the 'theme'! Do we find the word 'theme' in any of the works of HAHNEMANN, von BOENNINGHAUSEN, HERING, KENT, DUNHAM, LIPPE, WELLS, P.SCHMIDT etc. These teachers wrote about the 'genius' of the remedy.

The Homoeopathic community was (and still is) under a 'mass hysteria'; if there was a seminar in which someone - Jurgen BECKER, for example - spoke of fairy tales and folk songs - with nothing to do about provings and the source *Materia Medica* - then for a long time it was fashionable to diagnose on the Jurgen BECKER technique! Then cases after cases of 'Scorpion' (in one case the prescriber pointed out that the patient who had been prescribed 'Scorpion' showed the tattoo of a scorpion on his upper arm; that confirm the correctness of the prescription!) Then cases of Hydrogen, Neon, etc. You announce a new medicine and lo! soon there are cases which eulogise this new remedy. Now we see Bamboo in a large number of rubrics in the repertory. 99% of the homoeopaths in India don't have access to these new provings or the medicines themselves and I have had many persons ask frantically where to find the medicine *Lac humanum*, Neon, etc. I tell them to go to Kent Repertory and choose a remedy which has nearly 100 years confirmation - these remedies are available in all homoeopathic pharmacies.

When someone told me that a proving of 'Sea Gull' has been done, I asked 'does it not have several symptom of "flying" (a la Richard Bach) and surely they were there. 'Signature' was fashionable, and therefore the provings contained them in abundance!

What to speak of the voluminous repertories; in a short time 90 pages of 'Mind' became ten times that! The repertory has become a big jungle instead of being a help. And *Materia Medica* were 'built', made up, with the 'rubrics'! How strange and illogical. It is like your selecting words from the dictionary for writing a nice poem or essay. Instead of Provings to *Materia Medica* to Repertory, it became Repertory to *Materia Medica* - the cart before the horse!

Oh! There have been so many caricatures.

See the titles of the articles (Case Reports) in the Homoeopathic Links, compare them with the articles in the old Homoeopathic Recorder. It is an indication of the fantasies, story-telling.

I hope that your, or rather our, efforts to clear the stream will succeed soon.

To understand the spirit of Homoeopathy founded by HAHNEMANN one must read closely and carefully the many essays of HAHNEMANN in the collection 'Lesser Writings', not just the *Organon* and *Chronic Diseases* alone.

We should avoid as much as possible, mentioning names and personal attacks.

On my part I'll certainly do my best to spread here the efforts now being made by us.

Dr. Kurt-Hermann Illing, Germany, May 2002:

Past President of the "Liga Medicorum Homoeopathica Internationalis"

Translation: Dr. Evelyn Asher

...I welcome the initiative you and your two colleagues have taken on behalf of Hahnemann's homeopathy. "Modern tendencies" ignore the very principle of Hahnemann's homeopathy. In the title of the first edition Hahnemann calls homeopathy a "rational healing art" and although that subtitle is missing from the second edition, his footnote to §1 (6th edition) indicates clearly that he has remained faithful to its spirit.

Though the name homeopathy nowadays encompasses (as well as hides) the most varied methods, they are all, without exception, false. For authentic homeopathy requires only the

selection of that remedy whose proving-symptoms match those of the patient. That is, according to the principle: Proving conducted with healthy individuals, applied to the patient according to the principle of similars. All else, such as potencies etc. are secondary principles.

Among the best of the remedy provings are those conducted by Hahnemann and his pupils. Recent provings are questionable, not only because of the often toxic nature of our environment, but also because of a certain superficiality, etc. Regrettably, remedy provings I conducted on colleagues and students did not bring any satisfactory results. But given the brevity of this piece, I cannot address the problem of modern remedy provings.

Theoretical considerations aside, the proper application of homeopathy according to Hahnemann: "Do as I have done...but carefully and accurately" (*Materia Medica Pura*, v.3), has proven itself correct and effective. This has been born out in the case of more than 15000 patients whom I have treated in homeopathic practice, both as panel doctor and privately, over the past 42 years. Furthermore, more than 95% of these patients were treated with single remedies in either low or high potencies, depending upon the case. The remaining 3-5% , such as insulin-dependent diabetics, for example, were treated traditionally.

The homeopathy of Hahnemann is an exact, replicable and verifiable science, which, in my view, belongs in the realm of academic medicine. Only in this way--not through various speculations-- can there be a genuine dialogue with traditional medicine. This, aside from the fact that trouble would threaten from the other side if we ever to stray from the path of science.

I have always tried, in over 90 publications, to follow Hahnemann's course.

Dr. Karl Robinson, USA, May 2002:

Past Editor of "Journal of the American Institute of Homeopathy"

...I want you to know that I stand with you on this issue. I am appalled by many of my colleagues especially in Berkeley, California, and Bombay, India, who keep obsessively proving more and more remedies (and their provings seem questionable) rather than better learn the ones we already have. I, personally, am a Boenninghausen man...

Dr. B.D. Patel, India, May 2002:

Medical Director, Bangalore Homoeopathic Medical Centre

...let me thank you and other colleagues for taking up the cause of Homoeopathy I mean Classical Homoeopathy. In India we are fighting tooth and nail with these new tendencies creeping into the science and diluting it...I am definitely with you...

Dr. Christiane Bondzus-Enzian, Germany, Spring 2002 - (1st statement):

Past member of the managing committee of the "Gesellschaft homoöopathischer Ärzte in Schleswig-Holstein und den Hansestädten"

Translation: Dr. Evelyn Asher

Thank you for the information on the discussion in the U.S. I have read through the many pages. I have also observed that you express a concern that the name "homoeopathy" has been misused to mean something that has nothing to do with homeopathy and, given this, that it will seem to be ineffective, and thus bring about its demise. You want the addressees to line up on one side and sign the attached declaration.

I want nothing to do with the disintegration, fracturing, and division implied by “We are doing real homeopathy, you others false homeopathy.” The manner in which men set themselves in opposition to one another is all too familiar: it gives rise to war since an ideal is erected that reality can never match. There is no ideal homeopathy! Perfection is death! There are general laws discovered by Hahnemann that are acknowledged by all of us. I postulated them as principles in Basel. (To that extent, I find Morrison’s principles another “our materia medica and repertory”). But: has Hahnemann come to an end? Life is a mountain with many paths. If we would know a successful path for EVERY patient, perhaps we could mount the high horse of judgement.

I believe that under the supervision of a facilitator this whole discussion could have been fruitful. PEACEFUL! What we are left with now is a war of religion. And you are letting yourselves be drawn into it.

Whom would you condemn here in Germany? You are aware that I work classically and for many years have taught. But I am not prepared for this conflict. That can only lead in the wrong direction. Whoever was in Basel has experienced the respect and veneration with which even a path like Masi’s may be regarded. For me it is an idealistic, not realistic, path, i. e., it just doesn’t sound right to me. But you shouldn’t be helpers for “dumb” students. We each bear responsibility for the choice of our own path.

Let me propose that the contending gentlemen SIT DOWN TOGETHER with a facilitator (for example, an organizational set up like B. Hellinger; ...) and find out what it is that unites you and what divides you. (Morrison and others are, however, to be taken seriously.) Only in this way can something positive be left to posterity.

Dr. Richard H. Pitcairn, USA, May 2002:

Past President of the Academy of Veterinary Homeopathy

...I too have been very concerned about the direction homeopathy is taking. It seems that so many people want to practice in contradiction to the principles Hahnemann so carefully discovered. It is presenting as “progress” but my experience is that these approaches are ineffective as so many of my colleagues that have gone to practitioners of the “new methods” are not helped at all. I notice too that the expectations are less. Patients are changed a little and then encouraged to seek allopathic treatment for the remaining problems....

Dr. Karl-Heinz Gebhardt, Germany, May 2002:

President of Honour of „Deutscher Zentralverein homöopathischer Ärzte“; Editor of “Allgemeine Homöopathische Zeitung” (AHZ)

Translation: Penelope Vogt

.... Thank you very much for your letter..., with the very interesting enclosures, which I have studied with great interest. From this it is apparent that within American homeopathy a dispute is looming about the pure teachings of homeopathy, similar to that at the turn of the century and we have to clearly take steps against this endeavour as it has already once caused great damage. It must not be allowed to spread to Germany. I have therefore gladly signed the manifesto.

Dr. Dario Spinedi, Switzerland, June 2002:

Translation: Dr. Evelyn Asher

... Thanks very much for your letter concerning the many currents within homeopathy. Let me make the following observations pertaining to what you wrote: In regard to learning the method there is no better way than Kent's.

The world-renowned homeopath Pierre Schmidt practiced and spread Kentian homeopathy for 50 years. Kent's method is the purest development of the thoughts of Hahnemann. My teacher, Dr. Künzli, also practiced according to Kent for 4 decades and likewise achieved an international reputation.

I had the good fortune to study with Künzli for 15 years and have for the last 20 years practiced according to his methods to my great satisfaction.

Every great homeopath in the world follows Kent.

In the last 15 years I have held numerous seminars and tutorials and spread the method of Kent just as I received it in the tradition of Pierre Schmidt and Künzli.

The seminar participants have informed me over the years that their practice was fundamentally altered after their acceptance of the clear legitimacy of Kent as the most consistent and faithful continuation of the teaching of Hahnemann.

About modern currents in homeopathy let me add the following: If one is fundamentally at home in the praxis of Kent, he can gradually incorporate with profit many trains of thought from other schools; I think particularly highly of the direction taken by Rajan Sankaran as well as many others. But such methods, to be sure, are not suitable for the solid learning of homeopathy, but rather under certain circumstances and in the hands of a practised homeopath valuable enhancements. These are my observations on the theme "A critique of modern developments within Homeopathy"...

Uta Bestmann, Germany, June 2002:

Translation: Dr. Evelyn Asher

Your mail has left me perplexed, sad and angry, and for that reason I have delayed so long with an answer. I am reminded that people again and again stick to the same pattern and, unfortunately, this is the case with the development of homeopathy. Apparently we have not had enough witch-hunts. It certainly seems that we homeopaths must line up behind the one who best plays the game of being more Roman than the Romans. We brag about our "impartial observation", while knowing full well that is possible only in a very restricted sense, since we can not lay aside our individuality made up of personal experience. And what's the purpose, in any case!

We Germans should leave such battles to others, for example, the Americans who are in the process of exercising intolerance throughout the world.

I find it to be the height of hypocrisy to accuse someone of "incorrect thinking" in order to box his ears, while at the same time claiming that it was not intended personally. One is put in mind of the motto: "You are incapable of thinking, my boy, otherwise everything is fine." It would do such people good to discover what their actual motives are and why their real differences with the other side ought to be openly elaborated. The attack always comes from the same quarter. Why do you take part in this?

Do any of those who believe that they understand Hahnemann fully actually believe that he himself would not have made any advances on his own knowledge over the last two hundred years? He certainly would have diligently worked to progress. He not only wrote: "Imitate and imitate exactly," but also "dare to learn (aude sapere)."

Dr. Gotthard Behnisch, Germany, June 2002:

Past member of the managing committee of “Deutscher Zentralverein homöopathischer Ärzte”

Translation: Penelope Vogt

In my lectures, courses A – F during the Detmold week, intensive course in Augsburg and many other opportunities, I advocate Hahnemann’s Homoeopathy theories including his Psora theory, and I have always advocated, together with other lecturers at meetings with Vithoulkas in Alonissos and other international initiatives, that “old “material should be looked into, elaborated and validated.

Apart from this, I support more Bönninghausen’s and Boger’s school of thought that data on reliable remedies should be condensed for as many as possible (ca. 2000 remedies) thus making it possible to differentiate more easily and in accordance with Peter Mattmann-Allamand’s “Oligochrest”- Homoeopathy (Samuel 2001 prizewinner at the yearly congress of the Zentral-Verein, the German homoeopathic doctors organisation, in Hamburg). In this context I’m naturally open to new trials, as long as they are conducted in a serious manner, checked and clinically verified. The same has to be said of the extensive work of Jan Scholten, who correctly used the Periodic Table of the elements as the basis for further knowledge on remedies. This information must also be subjected to a process of re-examination and clinical verification.

The ideas as such should not be damned from the start. The same applies to the intensive work of Masi Elisade and the recently deceased M.L. Sehgal.

Hahnemann’s theories should be and must be used for the basic foundation for further education, but this homeopathy needs intensive research and should pervade the whole scope of nature....

Dr. Abdur Rehman, Pakistan, June 2002:

I strongly support your stand on pure homoeopathy and certainly the views of Dr.Morrison and his cosigners DO NOT REPRESENT homoeopathy as taught and practiced by Hahnemann...

Dr. Anton Rohrer, Austria, July 2002:

Past President of “Oesterreichische Gesellschaft für Homoeopathische Medizin” (ÖGHM)

Translation: Dr. Evelyn Asher

.... Regarding my critique: I wanted to distinguish between wisdom and method (appropriate means).

1) Wisdom: In this matter I am completely of your opinion, and my lecture in Hamburg was substantially in agreement with what you wish to publish in the form of a manifesto. My critique does not in any way touch the substance of your declarations. In the last issue of our newsletter (HIÖ- Homeopathy in Austria) my contribution was briefly criticized and simplistically reduced in this way: "The old homeopathy was good; the new homeopathy is bad." Once again the fundamental point was misunderstood. Is it possible ever to eradicate such misunderstandings? I am certainly pessimistic about the possibility. Whoever has once adopted a paradigmatic viewpoint, generally sticks to his opinion. I might add that it is hardly possible to express oneself more straightforwardly than Hahnemann: "Accordingly, homeopathy is a completely simple, and unchanging medical art in both its principles as well as its procedures. If properly understood, the teaching on which it rests is completely self-

enclosed and only in that way helpful..." (Preface to Organon). Can't one now reproach teachers such as Scholten, Sankaran, Morrison, etc. with having failed to properly understand the teaching? Well, of course one could, but would it really be useful to act on this level?

Here we arrive at point 2, namely what concerns the appropriate means: I have somewhere an emotional aversion to what you refer to as a manifesto and to which you would add the weight of signatories (what I called "lobbying" in our conversation).

You begin with: "With great concern we observe that.." This is the way popes begin an encyclical or a sermon. I consider this an emotionally charged analysis that at this level will be counterproductive. Of much that he didn't hold and especially what he outright rejected my teacher Dorcsi said: "That is the death of homeopathy!" Has it really died? Can this manifesto with so many signatories convince even one of the affected teachers? I am afraid not. But in school-medicine one doesn't conduct scientific analysis in this way, a way characterized by phrases like "great concern." But even if you were to delete this first sentence, the whole thing smacks of an emotional discussion-culture, something that is not the practice in scientific discourse, at least not in Germany--perhaps in America or Canada it may be standard practice. "To declare a position by means of a signature" is what one does in political parties, in church or at the justice of the peace to seal a marriage. For me your declaration has the flavor of a party-membership-movement which in this form I do not wish to join. "We call for a return to the basic principles of homeopathy," this sounds pseudo-religious and is of benefit only to the proclaimer. This combative style does not sit well with me. Besides, why should not Habich, Koesters and Rohwer be able to state with confidence that, which they have to say?

For all homeopaths who did not grasp the fundamentals of homeopathy (as, for example, the one who criticized my contribution in the HIÖ) but themselves believe that they did and are practicing, even teaching (Kent: "It is easy to teach but hard to practice"), all arguments to the contrary are in vain. However, we, on our part, can make sure that homeopathy is taught well; you in your instructional courses in your state, and I in Austria as well as in the courses in Freudenstadt and Augsburg, where I am able to participate.

Dr. Franz Swoboda, Austria, July 2002:

Editor of "Documenta Homoeopathica"

Translation: Dr. Evelyn Asher

Thanks for the reminder... I find it difficult to respond.

I share your concern about homeopathy, but in a somewhat different manner. My homeopathic-political work is based steadily on a single principle: the homeopathic situation should, at the very least, not become worse after my intervention than it was at the beginning. That has never been as easy as it sounds, especially since one encounters judgements whose ramifications cannot be fully seen in advance.

And it is the same for me in terms of your request.

Yes, I share your concern that homeopathy may take a wrong turn. But I am not at all of the opinion that this may be blamed on the colleagues you indict, nor that André Saine is the appropriate man to judge this matter.

But I do have one genuine concern. I will try to express this concern with the necessary simplicity and brevity. I am worried about the failure of communication.

What will be accomplished by a declaration? Should we seek excommunication for the heretics? Were they granted space to defend their position? Will it be the case that debate is

avoided until there are predictably bitter mutual recriminations? This sort of call to arms strikes me as inappropriate.

Difference of opinion can be the source of a fruitful analysis, the beginning of a dialogue, a clarification, and ground-clearing.

Or it can be the beginning of a war--cold or hot. Have you considered this?

Dear colleagues, I share deeply your concern, and value the work that you have done. I would be grateful if you would also share this concern of mine.

Dr. Bruno Laborier, France, July 2002:

...thank you ...for the documents that I read with great care. I agree with your declaration ...

I agree with the content of "Drawing a Line in the Sand", this document seems to me very important for homeopathy...

Dr. Norbert Winter, Germany, July 2002:

Translation: Judith Widderich

...I have to admit that I too feel divided with respect to the present state of homeopathy. I strive to understand homeopathy based on its source literature and it is from this perspective that I can appreciate your concern about current tendencies to water homeopathy down. On the other hand, I have had a look at the kind of discussions presently going on and have come to the conclusion that--apart from a lot of negligible side issues-- there are serious in-depth searchers to be found on both sides. Furthermore, totally contradictory to this I find that discussions (for example in the links or especially on the topic of classical homeopathy) have often deteriorated to intolerable cockfights. That serves no purpose. This is also why I have discarded a multipage letter which I originally wrote in response to your letter. The unilateral publication of personal "statements" unfortunately does not permit a lively discussion at this time because the willingness to really listen to one another is not given.

I consider myself as being very classically oriented and yet I am surprised that some colleagues achieve well-documented cures by using signatures and that even things typical of a drug happen although only placebos have been given etc. Even though I don't plan on changing my direction, it makes me curious. On the other hand, I am taken aback by the fact that authors who share my way of thinking sometimes just theorize and make real-life practicing seem secondary. This is why I am less and less able to feel I belong in one "camp" or another. Therefore, I am sure you can understand my reservation in complying with your request to write a reply.

For you and hence for the sake of all of us I hope that your efforts will prove fruitful, that they contribute to greater care and preciseness in teaching and practice and yet--based on a secure fundament--still allow for the opportunity to be astounded by unknown things. Just like Hahnemann would have done.

Barbara Osawa, USA, July 2002:

Past Editor of "Simillimum"

...my thanks you and your colleagues for organizing this new movement to maintain the integrity of Hahnemann's Homeopathy I have read and agree with André Saine's writings on the subject and very much appreciate the support he gave Simillimum while Peter (Wright) and I edited....

As a former co-editor of *Simillimum*, I tried to find Hahnemannian homeopaths and asked them to voice their opinions and share their cases. I found that these practitioners are truly scattered all over the world. It would be very beneficial to have one organization that recognises Hahnemann's principles, to get together and make an international journal of the highest standard and conduct reliable provings...

Dr. Heiner Frei , Switzerland, July 2002:

President of the Swiss Association of Homeopathic Physicians, SAHP

Your concern about homeopathy is also mine. I think it is very difficult to stop the pseudo-homeopathic ways taken by some.

Anyway, the manifest should be signed by many renowned colleagues, in order to have some effect.

Thank you very much for your valuable work!

In Concern about Homoeopathy

About 100 years before the introduction of new paradigms in the natural sciences (principle of wholeness, subjectivity of observation, equality of matter and energy), Hahnemann invented an art of healing, which corresponded exactly to these new findings, and therefore opened the era of medicine of the nuclear age. His goal of a mathematical reliability of healing is naturally limited by the subjectivity of observation of sensations and the subjectivity of description of symptoms by the patients. This problem remains the biggest obstacle to healing, even when all the rules of homeopathy are meticulously observed.

Triggered by this, speculations, essences, mythological ideas, signatures, etc. were introduced into homeopathy. But they only lead to even higher subjectivity and therefore potentially lower the chances of success in healing.

The problem is, that in homeopathy everyone considers his method to be the best, but only few go through the trouble to evaluate their results systematically, and compare them to what can be obtained when Hahnemann's rules are followed strictly. If the inventors of new methods would do so, they could be astonished of the (negative) consequences of their actions. I refer here to our own prospective evaluation of the rank of symptoms of Hahnemann, Boenninghausen, Hering and Kent in 175 case studies ¹, and to our prospective outcome study of long time follow up results in 50 patients with chronic disease ².

Scientific work always includes the search for more optimal procedures. If new ideas of whatever kind are newly introduced into an existing and well functioning therapeutic system, the change in treating results they cause must always be evaluated. This is a minimal requirement of carefulness. Only the neglect of such carefulness makes it possible for many "new directions" in homeopathy to remain self confident and to further neglect the rules of classical homeopathy.

References:

1. Frei H., The rank of symptoms of Hahnemann, Boenninghausen, Hering and Kent evaluated prospectively in 175 patients. *Zeitschr Klass Hom* 4/1999, 43, S.143-155.
2. Frei H., Long-time follow-up in chronic disease under homeopathic treatment: a prospective outcome study with 50 patients over two years. *Zeitschr Klass Hom* 2/2001, 45, S. 64-71.

Prof. Dr. Diwan Harish Chand, India, August 2002:

President of Honour, International Homoeopathic Medical League

....I congratulate you on undertaking to clarify what must be the true and appropriate method of practicing homoeopathy. And without hesitation I sign the decalration...

Keep up your gallant fight to show what true homoeopathy is even if it's practitioners stray and deviate from it. It was Hahnemann's greatness that he freed us from theorising and "empty speculation" and founded a system on pure experimentations and inductive logic.

The very name homoeopathy means Similia Similibus Curentur and unless based on provings where is the Similia....

Dr. Frans Kusse, The Netherlands, August 2002:

National Vice-President Liga medicorum Homoeopathica Internationalis

Although I understand your concern about the future of homeopathy, I do not agree with your opinion about the new discoveries. So I will not sign your declaration.

Please, take notion of the explanation of my view.

Of course we must be very careful to add new information to our materia medica. New remedies have to be proved before their symptoms have 'the right' to enter our books. But in my opinion cured cases can provide these symptoms very well. And, in my opinion, these symptoms are often of more value than symptoms that only are found in provings. The cured patients are the best provers for that remedy! Many old provings were very poor in producing symptoms and in many of these provings only a few provers produced symptoms. Often just one person gave us the most important information! Many well-known remedies have very poor provings. The knowledge about these remedies comes mainly from 'Masters' (Kent, Boericke, Phatak, Vithoukas etc.).

Jan Scholten, one of the homeopathic doctors that is criticized by André Saine, happens to be a very good friend of mine. So I know how he step by step created his hypotheses. He did not work alone and he was not the first one who looked for a pattern behind the Periodic Table. He combined the knowlegde, experiences and provings of several study-groups and the information of many cured patients. By sharing his experiences with his colleagues he created a large group of homeopathic doctors that tested his hypotheses. When he wrote his books 'Homeopathy and minerals' and 'Homeopathy and the elements' he stated that the contents of this books were still experimental. He invited the homeopathic society to confirm or reject his hypotheses. In the meantime - ten years later -, many remedies that are described in his books are confirmed by cured cases, by homeopathic doctors from all over the world. Magnesium muriaticum is now a first choice remedy in Holland for children that have ailments from the divorce of their parents and Natrium fluoratum have helped many victims of incest in their healing-process.

Of course, the law 'Similia Similibus Curentur' must be obeyed. That is the basis of our art of healing. And provings, cured cases and toxicology produce the symptoms that we can use. The doctrine of signatures alone is - of course - not a basis to select a remedy. To explain a 'remedy-picture' the signature can be helpful. For example, the picture of *Calcarea carbonica* can easily be understood by the signature of the oyster.

In Holland we have a group of doctors that forms the 'Materia Medica Validation group'. This group collects cured cases from all over Holland and tries to extract the common symptoms and characteristics from these cases. These symptoms and characteristics form a solid ground to prescribe a remedy and are good material for teaching-purposes.

The more experimental direction (e.g. Jan Scholten c.s.) is not yet suited to students in homeopathy, but can be very helpful for more experienced colleagues that are looking for a solution for their patients (and have often tried the well-known remedies without result).

Please, try to see that both directions are necessary and by excluding one of both we will bring homeopathy out of balance. We can see the results in regular medicine, that is out of balance by excluding our holistic approach.

Dear friends, try to understand and respect each other and remember: only love can heal and love cures all.

Dr. Jean-Claude Grégoire, France, August 2002:

Past editor of « La Revue Belge d'Homoeopathie »

Translation : Teresa Kramer

(The original French version is enclosed)

I regret to say that I am not in agreement. You say in your declaration: A choice of a remedy that is not based on "clearly comprehensible principles" cannot be called a homeopathic prescription. That is not true. The only definition of a homeopathic prescription is the proof offered by the cured case. A prescription based on "clearly comprehensible principles" does not necessarily lead to a simillimum. Our frequent failures are the proof of that. A remedy which does not cure is not homeopathic, by definition, even if it has been prescribed based on "clearly comprehensible principles". The prescription of a remedy which does not cure--that is, which leads to no result or is suppressive--cannot be called "homeopathic," even if it is based on "clearly comprehensible principles."

On the other hand, whatever the method used for the prescription, if the patient heals, it is because he has received his simillimum and therefore, the remedy was homeopathic and the prescription was homeopathic. Nevertheless, I am nevertheless in agreement with you in saying that practices based on esoteric conceptions such as the Doctrine of Signatures, and others, notably the Christian religion and the Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas (as is put forth by Alfonso Masi Elizalde--I wonder why you have not even spoken of this in all the papers that you sent me) cannot be counted as part of Hahnemannian homeopathy. I have always viewed homeopathy as based on the Organon and on Chronic Diseases, as well as the Philosophy of James Tyler Kent.

My lessons, during the 13 years I have directed the Belgian School of Homeopathy and during my 15 years of teaching, have always been based on these three fundamental works. The articles that I have published in the Belgian Review of Homeopathy have always been along those same lines. Practices based on something other than these three works are not classical Hahnemannian homeopathy, notably French homeopathy, homeopathy based on constitutions, Schuessler Tissue Salts, etc., etc.

Prescriptions based on chemical elements (Scholten) are not either, even if one must recognize that sometimes the simillimum is thus found, when classical methods have failed. In fact, the problem with homeopathy is that, not only is its Materia medica incomplete, the salts composed of several elements such as Sodium nitrate, Zinc phosphate (*Natrum nitricum*, *Zincum phosphoricum*) and quite a number of others, have notoriously insufficient provings--and perhaps none whatsoever. But, among those less-proved or unproved remedies, there must be many truly similar remedies for many individuals. So in spite of the lack of provings, if Scholten's methods permit a patient to be healed, why reject them.

I am not at all a partisan of fanciful homeopathic prescriptions, but I am also against useless quarrels. We have to be aware that we are dealing with a trunk and its branches. The trunk is Hahnemannian homeopathy based on clearly comprehensible principles (i.e. provings, etc) The branches are numerous, and some of them may be related to pure magic, as are the religious branch of Masi Elizalde, theories based on the Doctrine of Signatures, etc. What we must combat are people who try to make their branches appear to be the trunk, as do Masi Elizalde and many others. But to limit one's practice to the trunk is to voluntarily refuse to heal a certain percentage of patients.

Dr. Jean-Claude Grégoire, France, Août 2002 :

Ancien éditeur de « La revue Belge d'Homoeopathie »

Désolé, mais je ne suis pas d'accord.

vous dites dans votre déclaration :

« A choice of a remedy that is not based on "clearly comprehensible principles" cannot be called a homeopathic prescription.»

Ce n'est pas vrai. La seule définition d'une prescription homéopathique est la preuve par la guérison. Une prescription basée sur des "principes aisément compréhensibles" n'aboutit pas nécessairement au simillimum. Nos nombreux échecs en sont la preuve. Un remède qui ne guérit pas n'est pas homéopathique, par définition, même s'il a été prescrit en se basant sur des "principes aisément compréhensibles". La prescription d'un remède non curatif (c'est-à-dire sans résultat ou suppressif) ne peut être appelée "homéopathique", même si elle est basée sur des "principes aisément compréhensibles".

Par contre, quelle que soit la méthode utilisée pour la prescription, si le malade guérit, c'est parce qu'il avait reçu son simillimum et donc que le remède reçu était homéopathique, et donc que la prescription était homéopathique.

Néanmoins je suis d'accord avec vous pour dire que les pratiques basées sur des conceptions ésotériques telles que la théorie des signatures, et d'autres, notamment la religion chrétienne et la Somme de St-Thomas d'Aquin (telle que la préconise Alfonso Masi Elizalde --- je me demande pourquoi vous n'en parlez même pas dans tous les papiers que vous m'avez envoyés) ne font pas partie de l'homéopathie hahnemannienne. J'ai toujours préconisé l'homéopathie basée sur l'Organon et les Maladies Chroniques, ainsi que sur la "Philosophy" de James Tyler Kent. Mon enseignement, pendant les 13 ans où j'ai dirigé l'Ecole Belge d'Homéopathie et pendant les 15 ans où j'y ai enseigné, a toujours été basé sur ces trois ouvrages fondamentaux. Les articles que j'ai publiés dans la Revue Belge d'Homéopathie ont toujours été dans le même sens.

Les pratiques basées sur autre chose que ces trois ouvrages ne sont pas de l'homéopathie classique hahnemannienne, notamment l'homéopathie française, l'homéopathie basée sur les constitutions, les sels de Schüssler, etc., etc. Les prescriptions basées sur les éléments chimiques (Scholten) non plus, même s'il faut reconnaître que parfois on trouve ainsi le simillimum, lorsque les méthodes classiques ont échoué. En effet, le drame de l'homéopathie, c'est que non seulement sa matière médicale est incomplète, les sels composés de plusieurs éléments comme le nitrate de sodium ou le phosphate de zinc (natrum nitricum, zincum phosphoricum), et bien d'autres, n'ont que des provings notoirement insuffisants, voire nuls. Et pourtant il doit y avoir là beaucoup de remèdes simillimums pour beaucoup d'individus. Mais en l'absence d'expérimentation, si les méthodes de Scholten permettent de guérir un patient, pourquoi les renier?

Je ne suis pas du tout partisan de la fantaisie dans la prescription homéopathique, mais je suis aussi adversaire des querelles inutiles. Il faut bien être conscient qu'il y a le tronc et les branches. Le tronc c'est l'homéopathie hahnemannienne basée sur des principes aisément compréhensibles (les expérimentations pathogénétiques, etc.). Les branches sont multiples et certaines peuvent s'apparenter à de la pure magie, comme la branche religieuse de Masi Elizalde, les théories basées sur les signatures, etc. Ce qu'il faut combattre, ce sont les gens qui essaient de faire passer les branches pour le tronc, comme Masi Elizalde, et bien d'autres. Mais limiter sa pratique au tronc, c'est volontairement refuser de guérir un pourcentage important de malades.

Dr. Rukhsana Kausar, Pakistan, August 2002:

I agree with your views regarding your stand on the principles of homeopathy as taught and practiced by founder of homeopathy. It is my belief that the views of Dr. Morrison and his colleagues are against the fundamental principles of homeopathy.

Dr. Max Staeudinger, Germany, August 2002:

Translation: Dr. Evelyn Asher

(spontaneous comment)... Moreover, I regard the condition of homeopathy in ZV to be less than scintillating. If someone is strong and sure of his business, these new currents would influence only the curious and insecure. I would not label Hahnemann as advocating a rationalistic method of medicine. He himself abandoned that term. Our method is empirical.

Whoever soaks up the deductive effusions of our colleague Scholten, has perhaps not yet understood this. But let me repeat, had our level been higher, the seductiveness of these speculators would have been much less. And one more thing: Perhaps we should set our own house in order. And what do you say to the fact that within the association intoxication is to be determined through Hellinger's method of "Familienstellen" and has found admittance into the continuing education courses.

Dr. Jean-Claude Grégoire, France, Août 2003:

(an English translation will be added)

Désolé, mais je ne suis pas d'accord.

vous dites dans votre déclaration :

"A choice of a remedy that is not based on "clearly comprehensible principles" cannot be called a homeopathic prescription."

Ce n'est pas vrai. La seule définition d'une prescription homéopathique est la preuve par la guérison. Une prescription basée sur des "principes aisément compréhensibles" n'aboutit pas nécessairement au simillimum. Nos nombreux échecs en sont la preuve. Un remède qui ne guérit pas n'est pas homéopathique, par définition, même s'il a été prescrit en se basant sur des "principes aisément compréhensibles". La prescription d'un remède non curatif (c'est-à-dire sans résultat ou suppressif) ne peut être appelée "homéopathique", même si elle est basée sur des "principes aisément compréhensibles".

Par contre, quelle que soit la méthode utilisée pour la prescription, si le malade guérit, c'est parce qu'il avait reçu son simillimum et donc que le remède reçu était homéopathique, et donc que la prescription était homéopathique.

Néanmoins je suis d'accord avec vous pour dire que les pratiques basées sur des conceptions ésotériques telles que la théorie des signatures, et d'autres, notamment la religion chrétienne et

la Somme de St-Thomas d'Aquin (telle que la préconise Alfonso Masi Elizalde --- je me demande pourquoi vous n'en parlez même pas dans tous les papiers que vous m'avez envoyés) ne font pas partie de l'homéopathie hahnemannienne. J'ai toujours préconisé l'homéopathie basée sur l'Organon et les Maladies Chroniques, ainsi que sur la "Philosophy" de James Tyler Kent. Mon enseignement, pendant les 13 ans où j'ai dirigé l'Ecole Belge d'Homéopathie et pendant les 15 ans où j'y ai enseigné, a toujours été basé sur ces trois ouvrages fondamentaux. Les articles que j'ai publiés dans la Revue Belge d'Homéopathie ont toujours été dans le même sens.

Les pratiques basées sur autre chose que ces trois ouvrages ne sont pas de l'homéopathie classique hahnemannienne, notamment l'homéopathie française, l'homéopathie basée sur les constitutions, les sels de Schüssler, etc., etc. Les prescriptions basées sur les éléments chimiques (Scholten) non plus, même s'il faut reconnaître que parfois on trouve ainsi le simillimum, lorsque les méthodes classiques ont échoué. En effet, le drame de l'homéopathie, c'est que non seulement sa matière médicale est incomplète, les sels composés de plusieurs éléments comme le nitrate de sodium ou le phosphate de zinc (natrum nitricum, zincum phosphoricum), et bien d'autres, n'ont que des provings notoirement insuffisants, voire nuls. Et pourtant il doit y avoir là beaucoup de remèdes simillimums pour beaucoup d'individus. Mais en l'absence d'expérimentation, si les méthodes de Scholten permettent de guérir un patient, pourquoi les renier?

Je ne suis pas du tout partisan de la fantaisie dans la prescription homéopathique, mais je suis aussi adversaire des querelles inutiles. Il faut bien être conscient qu'il y a le tronc et les branches. Le tronc c'est l'homéopathie hahnemannienne basée sur des principes aisément compréhensibles (les expérimentations pathogénétiques, etc.). Les branches sont multiples et certaines peuvent s'apparenter à de la pure magie, comme la branche religieuse de Masi Elizalde, les théories basées sur les signatures, etc. Ce qu'il faut combattre, ce sont les gens qui essayent de faire passer les branches pour le tronc, comme Masi Elizalde, et bien d'autres. Mais limiter sa pratique au tronc, c'est volontairement refuser de guérir un pourcentage important de malades.

Dr. Dietrich Grunow, Germany, May and August 2002:

Translation: Penelope Vogt

Statement from 14.5.2002

... I share your criticism of the speculative tendency on homeopathy, I do not, however, agree with what is posed as an alternative.

Re: "scientific nature":

Although homeopathy is based on careful observation, gathering and sorting of information, etc., it is in, its application of the Law of Similars in the healing of the individual patient, an art, not a science. According to Aristotle, science deals with humans as a species, not the individual. Homeopathy is highest individualisation and therefore not science.

Re: "Metaphysics":

Do you not find the principle "similia similibus curentur" very metaphysical? It achieves healing because it is metaphysical.

Do you see where these spokesmen, who want to protect us from the colourful birds of paradise, are leading us? Onto a road which seems to me to be even more dangerous.

Homeopathy is in its fundamental principles, a healing art that can be learned and taught. Yet in its actual application in every new individual case, it is not a reproducible method, it is not

possible to numerically compare series of symptoms, but it is possible to heal “according to easily comprehensible principles” according to the principle of individual correspondence and is therefore a healing art.

Personal statement from 14.5.2002

I believe that the process endangering homeopathy, which is already in full swing, could lead to a similar situation as between the USA and Germany after 1900. This process is the mechanical use of homeopathy (especially by “repertorising”), by merely using learned rules, just uninspired acts, also by the tendency to do without finding a constitutional remedy, which was traditional in organotrophy, but which is also confirmed in Vithoulkas’ “layer” theory.

All this, among many other reasons (e.g. health insurance system) contributes to the danger, also, although not primarily, the speculative tendency, as it, simply because it is speculative, is easy to recognise. Perhaps homeopathy does not go with the times, except as a fad, and does not tolerate (yet) mass propaganda....

Personal statement from 16.8.2002

Homeopathy with its fulfilment of the Law of Similars for healing the individual patient, is an art not science.

Art is creative, something new arises from it.

Science is as a method, a way which, when all rules, prerequisites and laws are correctly followed, certainly leads to a correct solution. It can only work with equal entities, it confirms old facts. 2 plus 2 is equal to 4, not similar.

This difference, between equal and similar, is the difference between science and homeopathy, between method and art. In this difference lies also the individual’s characteristics and everything that it is not possible to physically extract, which is not accessible to science, on which homeopathy and its Law of Similars is based. I have not had negative experiences with the new methods within homeopathy simply because I have not followed them, but take them sometimes as an idea and try to make them come alive in my search for the similar remedy. Their light dies quickly they cannot, as other methods too, compensate for the divine light that helps.

Anton Rohrer writes in his lecture on certainty in finding homeopathic remedies: a failure in practice does not mean that the principle of certainty of healing is wrong.

My answer to that: it is on the basis of this theoretical certainty, that homeopathy can and does heal, if nothing stands in the way, and the “prerequisites are fulfilled”, that we have all devoted ourselves to homeopathy, that is why we all practice homeopathy!

Why then this emphasis on: “when we are by no means certain in practice that healing will take place”?

The range of validity of the Law of Similars is clearly described in the Organon, §153. That is sufficient for the practice. The Law of Similars does not have to be made subordinate to a principle of certainty in healing.

Patients are certainly content when healing takes place. This is our homeopathical mandate, our aim as practitioners. Certainty of healing is the subjective concern of homeopaths, especially when objectivity is claimed. In concrete terms this means: Certainty of healing in homeopathy is expressed by the homeopathic simillimum, for the homeopath himself this turns into self-assurance, which does not help homeopathy just as much as speculative arbitrariness does not.

Something else caught my attention in Anton Rohrer’s lecture: the emphasis on the “degree of

agreement among the first homeopaths (22 from 33 practitioners arrived at the same diagnosis) and not a word about application and possible healing. That is science: Uniformity as correctness!

It is as he writes and – against my own opinion – also applicable today: “After Hahnemann, homeopathy never stood on its own two feet but rather justified itself according to the trends of the time”. Today’s trend is science. It demands a way of functioning in thought and action which excludes everything else which is beyond its system of knowledge. Should homeopaths not have been able to see this best themselves?

In Hahnemann’s era, science was the deed of an alert and courageous individual, often contrary to the system of rule at that time. Today it is the other way around. In principle it is about the claim to perfection, to have something under control which, up to now, was left to Heaven, a higher control. This is insinuated in the talk about certainty of healing. Should, come what may, homeopathy therefore, against all practical experience, be a method which is readily accessible?

Our need for security requires a different answer. Our erroneous prescriptions are, in my opinion, a result of pressure which makes us reach out for all possible aids, not just for “higher understanding”, “central essence”, also for this symptom or that category, which was defined as being important by somebody or other, in the end it is fear.

The “totality” of symptoms, with all “details” and “hard facts”, recognition of the similarity between the patient’s complete symptoms and the remedy’s symptoms, putting the Law of Similars into practice for individual patients, all this is creative and always different.

The fear is that not everything fits. But should this be our worry when we have done everything within our power?

Leonard Cohen sings in his song: There is a crack in everything, that’s where the light get’s in.

Dr. Karl von Petzinger, Germany, September 1990:

(Personal letter to Dr. Dietrich Grunow, 10th September 1990. - Answer to Dr. Grunow’s question, whether Homeopathy is also a science, apart from its quality as an art.)

Translation: Penelope Vogt

Dear Mr. Grunow,

You ask the question whether Homeopathy – apart from its quality as an art – is also a science because of the “verifiability of proved symptoms in our *Materia Medica*”!

Now, it is not a question of the elaboration of our *Materia Medica* – which should naturally take place under strict scientific regulations! – but it is about actual therapy, i.e. our work at the sick-bed.

When we observe an improvement in one patient’s well-being after administering a remedy, it is not possible to repeat this with exact certainty for another patient. Naturally the success rate will be higher the more the individual symptoms of the case correspond with those of the remedy; but one can hardly talk about certainty in any one individual (!) case. Incidentally, one should not forget that by no means all provers experienced all the symptoms listed in the *Materia Medica*; this means, however, that the symptoms listed in the books need not necessarily fit every patient.

In practice it is like this: if you have a patient suffering from hypertension who is on Briserin and who then experiences a drop in his blood pressure, then almost certainly it is possible to

repeat this without much difficulty with other patients, even if they suffer from hypotension. If, however, you experience this after giving Barium Iodatum, it can by no means be said that this will certainly (!) happen for every patient with hypertension and least of all for every patient. Why? Because healing is an individual and unique process which can certainly not be repeated for each individual (!) case, which is necessary for it to be a science. To repeat with (some) certainty, is only a matter of tackling symptoms or results, however this unfortunately does not have anything to do with healing. Without exaggeration one could say that: supposedly scientific therapy starts where one has given up on the aim of (natural) healing.

I know that that is difficult for contemporary doctors to swallow; but these correlations must first be clearly seen in order to be able to experience the optimum. Healing is an organic process, a process of growth; it is not “made”.

Dr. Ulrich D. Fischer, Germany, August 2002:

General Secretary, Liga Medicorum Homoeopathica Internationalis; Member of the managing committee of „Deutscher Zentralverein Homöopathischer Ärzte“

Translation: Dr. Evelyn Asher

With by this time 20 years experience in homeopathy-education, I know as instructor how troublesome it is to deal with the “modern” evolution of homeopathy. It is often difficult to negotiate with the ephemerality of flashy, “modish” approaches promising instant success in homeopathy, and difficult, too, to demonstrate the virtues of Hahnemann’s studies-- in some ways laborious reading.

In our Freiburg team of instructors--that involves a three year program of continuing education--we have for many years taken Hahnemann’s work as the basis of our instruction. In terms of themes we taught the “Organon” and read the “Chronic Illnesses” among other works. Our group worked through this teaching of Hahnemann in such a way that for the instructors as well as the students the Organon could serve as a standard against which to measure all further developments in the area of miasma-theory. We are well aware of the fact that by employing an old orthodoxy we cannot prevent modern excesses in homeopathy. We succeeded, however, in providing a teachable criterion that is faithful to Hahnemann’s principles, and furthermore, provides our course participants with something against which they can measure further developments in homeopathy.

It is precisely in the last 20 years, the decades of grand development, that the majority of mistakes have been made. In general, as new things were introduced, everyone forgot to continue to teach the original. In this, however, lies an essential part of the solution. Despite all these developments in homeopathy, the instructors should take it upon themselves to find a minimal consensus about what constitutes basic education and clearly differentiate this from associations and speculations.

Encouraging work in this regard has already been made by the European Committee for Homeopathy as well as in the Liga Medicorum Homoeopathica Internationalis, in which representatives of the most important schools world-wide have endeavored to come up with common strategies, definitions, and educational guidelines for deriving what we understand to be a homeopathic doctor, especially the education of the homeopathic doctor as it was understood by its founder. The latest development in this regard is the call by WHO and LMHI to come up with “Guidelines on Basic Training in Homeopathy”. This has already taken place with the participation of all member countries of the LMHI.

Instead of a position statement, let me pass on to you, on part of the league, the first paragraph of the “Homeopathy-Resolution”, which we worked out three years ago, and which represents our position on the subject under discussion:

RESOLUTION ON HOMOEOPATHY

- Liga Medicorum Homoeopathica Internationalis

- A. Homeopathy is a medical system and is defined by the application of the principles--the principle of similars being the leading one--and procedures as described by its founder Samuel Hahnemann in his *Organon of the Medical Art*.

Finally I want to emphasize my desire to remain fundamentally open to homeopathy research and development and to remain active especially when it involves including the hitherto unpublished material of Hahnemann’s actual students and contemporaries in our present-day knowledge. (I have in mind here Boenninghausen among others). I would also like to engage in basic research, studies on the efficacy of homeopathy, or developing international standards for pharmacological testing. Everything is in flux--we ourselves and those things which move us. We should, nevertheless, not substitute anything for the unchanging, basic principles of homeopathy (the principle of similars, AMP, the individuality of both, patient and remedy, the life-principle, potentized remedies, and the teaching about chronic illnesses.)

Dr. Christof Zang, Germany, August 2002:

What is a characteristic symptom in homoeopathy?

Confusion among homoeopathic physicians has reached a dimension, hardly known in the history of homoeopathy before.

Talking to colleagues I frequently meet the statement, that in our time it was not possible to say what Hahnemann really meant when he wrote “...remarkable, special, unusual and peculiar (characteristic) signs and symptoms”. Statements of real and supposed masters of homoeopathy are quoted to define what is a symptom concerning § 153 of the *Organon* is.

Did not anybody read the footnote to § 153 ? “By recording of the characteristic symptoms of the homoeopathic remedies in his repertory Mr. Regierungsrat Freiherr von Bönninghausen has gained great merit, as well as Mr. G.H.G. Jahr in his *Handbuch der Haupt-Anzeigen*, now published the third time, under the title: *Grand manuel*.”

A discussion is not needed what Hahnemann could have meant in § 153. One has just to open the mentioned books and to study the symptoms. Then it will be clear what he meant. Moreover – did Hahnemann at any time criticise Bönninghausen’s way of repertorisation, finding the remedy, analysis and evaluation of symptoms? He also accepted Jahr’s book, otherwise he certainly would have published his criticism at the same place. He did not hold back with criticism.

One possibly could object that Hahnemann did not know the works of Bönninghausen exactly and that he did not know exactly what he recommended. These doubters I would like to invite to read the preface of the *Systematic repertory of the Antipsoric Remedies* and the *Systematic Repertory of the Nonantipsoric Remedies* published by Bönninghausen. The correspondence between Hahnemann and Bönninghausen in the years 1842 and 1843 can also give further information about the cooperation of these men.

The foundations of homoeopathy were created by Hahnemann with great clearness. This advantage should be used in our work. Not everybody, who claims homoeopathy for himself can refer to Hahnemann. Systems different to the basis of homoeopathy have to proof their

validity independently and without quotation to Hahnemann's writings. Whether these parahomoeopathic systems should be called homeopathy is to be considered carefully.

Dr. Pia Degenhardt-Fürniss, Germany, August 2002:

Translation: Dr. Evelyn Asher

...I am glad to support your effort, for I share your skepticism and reservations about the new trends in homeopathy.

Having been in practice for thirteen years, it was only during the last three years that I realized just how speculative and shaky the path my teachers had sent me on really was.

I am angry that for years I stumbled about on this false path, tormented by failure after failure, yet always blaming myself for not knowing enough.

Ever since I have occupied myself with Boenninghausen, reading again and again the Organon and the Chronic Illnesses, as well as studying the Materia Medicae, I have experienced a dramatic change of fate in which my successful treatments have increased appreciably.

Admittedly, such study is essentially drier and duller than the fairy tales of Mr. Sankaran and Scholten, of Mrs. Zaren and Mrs. Coulter, or the "Seghal-Method." I have canceled my subscription to Homöopathic Links, since I discovered that many case descriptions could not withstand the scrutiny of Hahnemannian logic.

I don't doubt that the discoverers of the "mind-trends," by relying on a great deal of intuition, are able to make their method work for them, but what they advocate is not teachable, bringing them dangerously close to being mere pied pipers.

I would wish that beginners in homeopathy might be introduced to something more solid and substantial even if it is drier and duller.

I am left to confess, that after 20 years of medical study and two medical degrees, as well as training in psychotherapy, it was only with the study of the Organon, that I finally found what I had been looking for. I only regret, that I found it so late.

Heinrich Pennekamp, Germany, September 2002:

Since the 1st edition of my computerprogram „REP-Synopsis“ (1992) I warned against the shortcutting of Materia Medica to “Essences”. In the 1st edition of my “Kinder-Repertorium” (1997) I spoke against “day-dreaming” & “popular amusements” instead of true Hahnemannian provings...

Dr. Christa von der Planitz, Germany, September 2002:

Translation: Judith Widderich

...Of course André Saine is right when he denounces the carelessness with which our materia medica is dealt with. Examples such as Mr. Sankaran's, Mr. Scholten's and so forth make it very hard for our efforts to maintain the materia medica as the solid fundament of our work.

There can be no doubt about the fact that Hahnemann's Pure Materia Medica and the Organon constitute the most reliable foundation we have and must build upon. (I also support the idea of teaching students this basic literature during the majority of their first 3 years of study).

Nonetheless I ask myself if we can simply deny a spiritual dimension of homeopathy. It is true that we are presently being swamped with speculations, interpretations of the doctrine of

signatures which are of a much too individual kind and that at this point in time free associations are running wild. However, this problematic development should not lead us to turn a deaf ear to this level of the future of homeopathy.

Homeopathy will continue to develop! Each generation must add to and enrich Hahnemann's legacy in its own appropriate way and in adherence to his principles.

Today it is not only our job to unearth old sources of literature but also to carefully integrate intuitive and spiritual elements into homeopathy--as well as clinical experience. It is only by doing so that we can learn to properly understand our remedies.

The future of homeopathy is just as likely to be endangered by failing to adapt homeopathic method as by accepting all modern trends without criticism. Hahnemann certainly would also not approve of this. (In his time he had to deal with a totally different scientific world, not at all comparable to today's).

Efforts to promote emotional intelligence are now being observed in various disciplines. Homeopathy should also profit from this and it should serve to improve the reliability of our prescriptions by complementing the rational approach.

Of course the question arises as to how we can attain reliable symptoms and separate the chaff from the wheat.

In order to achieve this, a reliable plan of studies must be designed. We need clear criteria and decent case studies before we go on accepting symptoms or new characteristics into our materia medica.

This can only be accomplished by extensive work of a close association of very experienced homeopathic doctors and practitioners. Yet, most importantly: the participating colleagues must not only be experienced but also be known as responsible, self-critical, unprejudice observers. The strict selection of symptoms which are to complement our repertories and materia medicae in the future can only be successful when these prerequisites are fulfilled.

However, I imagine this work to be very much more difficult than carrying out the classical proving of a remedy.

Bernd Müller-Thederan, Germany, September 2002:

Translation: Penelope Vogt

...I cannot and do not want to judge the new approaches from Sankaran, Scholten and others as I have not looked into them. It is also not likely that this will change in the near future. This is because on the one hand I have enough work studying the "classic" basic information and remedy descriptions and prescribing accordingly. On the other hand it appears to me that these new ideas do not give an answer to the question of how miasmatically heavily burdened cases can be healed in this century. For me the present remedies suffice fully to treat current conditions (better: if I could completely master Boericke, for example)

I agree... in any case that invented remedy descriptions have no place in the repertory: "As our new (homeopathic) healing method does not accept idiotic beliefs and faiths and does not praise or criticise anything without first trying out remedies oneself without prejudice, ..."
(Hahnemann, *Materia Medica Pura*, *Cyclamen europaeum*):

However, I do think that everyone can publish his own opinions as he likes, Are there not obtrusive concepts under the guise of any therapy, which for "normal people" is not normal? (Eugen Roth wrote a nice poem on this subject, see below.) But: nobody is forced to buy these books, read them, and practise by them or even to teach these methods. The problem is described correctly by Saine: the Homeopath is frustrated with his results and staggers from

flower to flower like a butterfly. I have of course experienced this myself and have in the meantime developed a healthy mistrust. I try to bring this experience across in my lessons to colleagues who fully trust Homeopathy.....

New Healing Methods

Being famous depends on one thing:
 Create a system for reasoning!
 Take something crazy and explain:
 For healing, all other things are in vain!
 Any illness can be defeated
 Is the wound with cow-dung treated.
 Reason further, what is more
 Even the Aztecs had it in store.
 If you're mistaken for a fool,
 You need to insist in your tool.
 Then people slowly will begin
 To see reason in your sin.
 Many a disciple you will gain,
 "Strength from cow-dung!" they'll maintain.
 Underline your remedy through scientific act,
 And faithfully preach your tip as fact.
 (*Eugen Roth*)

Dr. Peter König, Austria, September 2002:

"True" Homeopathy

Translation: Judith Widderich

Dear colleagues and friends of homeopathy! In your electronic mail addressed to me (thanks!) you requested a statement and/or support with regard to the ongoing controversy about Hahnemann's "rational art of healing". I would like to comply with this wish in short form: I do not place myself on any one "side", neither in my daily work with patients nor in my function as instructor for homeopathy. This is why, for example, there is room in my work for a correctly understood "signatura rerum" as well as for skilled and strict repertorisation "beyond any speculation." Thus, in my opinion, what we are dealing with here is not an either/or matter rather an issue of both being well-balanced and optimally adapted to the individual patient as well as to the homeopathic healer. I do not at all understand why signatures and "classic" repertorisation should be exclusive of one another. I believe that a signature is perhaps the last and deepest instance of healing--such as is accessible to a traditional (hence not self-appointed!) shaman for example, based on his sources and insights (without repertories!): the healing combination of substance (from nature) and the suffering person due to a special form of similarity. Therefore, the doctrine of signatures and the law of simile do not contradict one another. Symptoms derived from our remedy provings--could they not be grasped as a vehicle for making the signature of things apparent even for us "non-shamans"? Of course, the doctrine of signatures can be misunderstood or not at all, and may even be abused. However, this should not lead us to throw it overboard. In this respect, I can fully understand your criticism toward various homeopathic "crazes" (and their colour bearers). Such a signature-dimension (not described in detail here) of the "homeopathy" method understood with great caution is hence the crowning of our method, reserved only for the experienced and wise practitioner, who knows how to

make optimal use of his fundamental tools. The student of homeopathy may at best only have an idea of this fascinating and thus also dangerous dimension. It is not a "short-cut" to finding the remedy and does not act as a substitute for the knowledge of how to use our repertories and materia medica! Many internal homeopathic issues of controversy would become superfluous--that is if one could agree on a common basis (application of the law of simile and potentized remedies.) For example, Mangialavori has published numerous well documented cases which pay reference to the validity of signatures. The patient alone is the controlling instance, according to whom a method should be allowed to be evaluated as correct or false, not any kind of "theoretical brooding," (as perhaps Samuel Hahnemann would have referred to it). By the way, this is exactly the point which does not allow me to address this dispute any further in detail: It is rare that I can spend afternoons writing, after which I once again urgently have to concentrate my energy on the reality of trying to heal....In closing I would like to quote the Israeli poet Jehuda Amichais, whose words I believe should be applied to this controversy: " No flowers shall ever grow in spring there, where we know it all."

Dr. Philippe Servais, France, September 2002:

National Vice-President Liga Medicorum Homoeopathica Internationalis

Translation: Teresa Kramer

(The original French version is enclosed)

My position on this subject is somewhat complicated. In fact, for 15 years, I have frequently participated, together with groups of colleagues (in France but also within Homeopathia Internationalis of which I am the Secretary General), in reflecting on homeopathic doctrine. While confirming classical Hahnemannian doctrine and applying it rigorously, I have nevertheless found that the theoretical contributions of Elizalde Masi (with whom I have had many discussions and whom I personally introduced here in France) were extremely important. In fact, without even realizing it, a great many homeopaths have been influenced by his thought (the idea of a simillimum for life, his fashion of reviving the Hahnemannian theory of miasms, etc.) I "broke" with Masi when he began to veer off on St. Thomas Aquinas and try to explain everything with the idea of an earthly paradise!! Judging from my clinical cases of chronically ill patients--many auto-immune diseases that I have really been able to heal, I have felt that there were truly remedies which were deeply similar to these patients' states. These remedies were not necessarily ones like Sulphur, Lycopodium or Calc. carb., but rather Spigelia or perhaps Ranunculus. Therefore, together with colleagues from the group I lead in Paris (G.E.H.U.), I have tried to understand more profoundly quite a number of "little" remedies for which sufficiently complete provings do not exist.

Starting with the reviewing of the elements of these provings in great detail, then adding the wealth of cured cases from our daily practices, as well as studies on the source of the substance which is used to make the remedy (botanical, symbolic or traditional sources, etc.) we have tried to come to a deeper understanding of these "little" remedies, and we have proposed hypotheses concerning their subtle essence, their "hard kernel". For a certain number of cases, in view of the good clinical results obtained based on these hypotheses, we have proposed certain conclusions that seem to us to be correct and which "function" very well in practice. (As an example, I am sending you my ideas on Conium!)

Thus, the idea of "themes" for certain remedies seems reasonable to me. Put simply, in view of the enormous and rigorous labor necessary to arrive at serious results, I have no patience with "little nincompoops" who do whatever takes their fancy!! For example, including "free associations", cabbalistic ravings, perceptions of the provers' Significant Others, etc., as some are

wont to do—and there are many others than Sankaran who do so, unfortunately! In the case of Scholten, for instance, what I reproach him with, even more than his studies without provings on remedies that don't exist—I admit that, thanks to him, I once dared to prescribe *Natrum fluoratum* which succeeded marvelously—is his not having a fundamental knowledge of certain basic remedies and his saying strange things—not to say outright false things—concerning for example *Nitricum acidum* or *Kalium carbonicum*.

My opinion, therefore, is that one always has to go forth from the classical bases which are the true and only solid structure in homeopathy, while continuing to attempt to deepen and enlarge one's knowledge, especially of the *Materia medica*. Knowing all the while that the Law of Similars and treating the whole person are the immutable principles...

Dr. Philippe Servais, France, Septembre 2002 :

National Vice-President Liga Medicorum Homoeopathica Internationalis

Ma position sur le sujet est nuancée. En effet, j'ai beaucoup participé depuis 15 ans, avec des groupes de confrères (en France mais aussi au sein d'*Homeopathia Internationalis* dont je suis le secrétaire général) à une réflexion sur la doctrine homéopathique. Tout en confirmant la doctrine hahnemannienne classique et en l'appliquant rigoureusement, j'ai cependant trouvé que l'apport théorique de Elizalde MASI (avec qui j'ai beaucoup discuté et que j'ai introduit en France) était des plus important. D'ailleurs, sans même s'en rendre compte, énormément d'homéopathes ont été influencés par sa pensée (idée d'un *simillimum* pour la vie, manière de "réactualiser" la théorie hahnemannienne des miasmes etc.). J'ai "rompu" avec Masi lorsqu'il a commencé à "déraper" sur St Thomas d'Aquin et qu'il a voulu tout expliquer par le paradis terrestre !! A partir de mes cas cliniques de maladies chroniques (beaucoup de maladies auto-immunes que j'ai pu réellement guérir), j'ai ressenti qu'il y avait vraiment des remèdes qui étaient en similitude très profondes avec des patients. Or, ces remèdes n'étaient pas nécessairement des *Sulphur*, des *Lycopodium* ou des *Calcarea* mais pouvaient être des *Spigelia* ou des *Ranunculus*. J'ai donc, avec des confrères du groupe que j'anime à Paris (G.E.H.U.), essayé de comprendre plus profondément des tas de "petits" remèdes pour lesquels il n'y avait pas de provings suffisamment complets. A partir des éléments de ces provings réétudiés dans le moindre détail + toute la richesse des cas que nous avons réussis dans notre pratique quotidienne + des études sur l'élément "source" de la substance utilisée (botanique, symbolique, tradition etc.), nous avons essayé de comprendre plus profondément ces "petits" remèdes et nous avons proposé des hypothèses sur l'essence subtile, le "noyau dur" de ces remèdes. Dans un certains nombre de cas, vu les bons résultats cliniques obtenus à partir de ces hypothèses, nous avons proposé certaines conclusions qui nous paraissent justes et qui "fonctionnent" très bien dans la pratique. (En exemple, je vous envoie mes idées sur *Conium*!). Donc, l'idée de "thèmes" pour certains remèdes me paraît justifiée. Simplement, vu l'énorme travail laborieux et rigoureux pour arriver à des résultats sérieux, je m'insurge contre les "petits rigolos" qui font n'importe quoi !! Par exemple des "free associations", des délires cabbalistiques, des sensations ressenties par les proches des expérimentateurs etc. comme font certains (il y en a beaucoup d'autres que Sankaran malheureusement !) Pour Scholten par exemple, ce que je lui reproche, plus que ses études sans proving sur des remèdes qui n'existent pas (j'avoue que, grâce à lui, j'ai osé prescrire un fois *Natrum fluoratum* qui a été merveilleux), c'est de très mal connaître certains remèdes de base et de dire des choses étranges (pour ne pas dire carrément fausses) sur par ex. *Nitricum acidum* ou *Kalium carbonicum*. Mon avis est donc qu'il faut avant tout repartir toujours des bases classiques qui sont la vraie et seule structure solide de l'homéopathie tout en continuant à chercher à approfondir et élargir les connaissances spécialement de la *Materia Medica*. En sachant que similitude et globalité sont des principes immuables...

Dr. Alain Horvilleur, France, September 2002:

General Secretary “Organisation Médicale Homéopatique Internationale” (OMHI)

...Your declaration is just fitting the feelings we have at the OMHI (Organisation Médicale Internationale).

We have, for years, taken a scientific and medical position on homeopathy...

Dr. Thomas Röhrig, Germany, October 2002:

Member of the managing committee of the “Deutscher Zentralverein homöopathischer Ärzte”

Translation: Judith Widderich

...A word about the "controversy amongst antimodernists": Recently I was asked to sign a text supporting the unfalsified teachings and practices of Hahnemann and opposing Sankaran's and Jan Scholten's innovations because they lead away from the true idea of homeopathy.

In the first place I am not willing to do this in my function as managing director of the ZV(Central Association of Homeopathic Doctors in Germany) and secondly for personal reasons.

On the contrary, I agree with Franz Bonsch that in homeopathy we could have something like a paternal problem concerning Hahnemann's personage if we are not careful. I would like to continue examining everything and retaining the good. I do not believe in prohibition of thought. Hahnemann himself tried out and examined all too and changed his manner of prescription time and time again.

Besides, poorly practiced homeopathy just does not work. In this respect the pure teachings do protect themselves. At least patients know who can heal and who cannot. Signature campaigns only stir up conflict.

Dr. Ralf Jeutter, Great Britain, October 2002:

Classically confused – Homoeopathy and modern tolerance

I did my training in 'classical' homoeopathy, and in the first 4 years of my training I assumed that this was the one and only true kind of homoeopathy. The one which operates on the foundations of tried and tested principles, which single-handedly stands against the opportunistic empirical approach of the complexicists, which alone forms a happy marriage of the art and the science. When I hear 'classical' I think of *old, reliable, traditional*, something which survives the ravages of time, all of which gave me faith in my discipline. But at the same time, it turned out that 'classical' goes equally well with 'innovative'. Not only are the classical homoeopaths the guardians of tradition, but also revolutionary experimentalists. The simillimum is not only the goal, but also the way to it should be an emotional and intellectual adventure for the homoeopaths. To be a master has the connotation of high intuition, of near superhuman abilities,, and the masters do not object when they are called 'genius' by their admiring disciples.

My discomfort grew the more I realized that the term 'classical' is a euphemism for relativity, where everything is granted equal importance, which parades under the name of tolerance: Specific questions are answered with imprecision, sometimes things are like this, sometimes like that. Truisms are offered instead of critical discussions: We attract those patients we can heal successfully; if the remedy doesn't work, maybe the patient is not ready to 'let go' of his illness. Spirituality and the homoeopathic discipline are one big hodge-podge; the venerated truth of the Vedas that illness is centrally a false perception of reality, all too neatly becomes

the core delusion and the main tool in analysing a case. Fragments of the endlessly rich mythological tradition are recognized as ‘themes’ in the infinitely complex Periodic Table, in order to establish similarity between an unproven remedy picture and a presenting disease.

Whereas in the beginning I understood ‘classical’ to mean well-proportioned, a balance between ratio and emotion, in the course of time it became more and more equated with arbitrary, misleading, confusing and confused. Seminars of the well-known masters are often spectacles these days (sometimes indeed with liberal use of sound and light effects), case analysis is systematically discouraged, since the presentation is only about understanding the new, unproven remedy. The learners are becoming consumers of a fare, which is neither checked for quality nor for its sell-by date. As learners we chase after every new software, welcome each new ‘approach’, which promises clarity (and always hope for short cuts). But we never do the one thing which would give us a measure to gauge quality and give us back a greatly needed critical rationality. We do not read, let alone study Hahnemann’s writings. We therefore do not know anymore how provings really look like, we have no clear idea anymore of the exact similarity which has to be established between artificial drug disease and natural disease. We therefore have only vague ideas how to establish the image of the disease, piece by piece, in an often extensive anamnesis, and not on the basis of arbitrary similarities. Since we do not know the original remedies anymore, remedies which can still be used in the widest possible range of complaints, we think that we need remedies which are more appropriate for our time. Because we do not read Hahnemann anymore, we do not even know anymore that our thinking is wrong, and that this wrong thinking leads to so many of our clinical failures. What has become of the rational healing art, which heals according to clearly perceptible reasons? What has become of the humble and yet high mission of the physician, who should stay away from empty speculations and elaborate theories?

This skeptical discomfort grew into full conviction after I came across the Andre Saine interview in LINKS 02/2000. Suddenly I saw clearly that we have lost the connection with the tradition, that everything which was before Kent has become a white spot on the homoeopathic map, that we by now prefer that which has not stood the test of time to that which has always been reliable, that we tend to trust the newly acclaimed or often self-styled gurus more than the one real teacher. With a sense of shock did I realize how obscured the view of Hahnemann is by these new trends.

Given this situation it seems only sensible to me to clearly differentiate between the so-called modern classical homoeopaths from the Hahnemannian homoeopaths, because as things stand at the moment, the gulf between these two groups is as wide as it used to be between allopaths and homoeopaths. Should those who speak in the name of tolerance see this as divisiveness, they should at least ask themselves whether homoeopathy became what it was and what it still could be on the grounds of Hahnemann’s tolerance.

Dr. Friedrich Dellmour, Austria, February 2003:

There is something wrong! More and more colleagues appear with new and contradictory teachings, destroying the doctrine of homeopathy – and our presidents and board members are sleeping, are afraid of a conflict or accept it because of wrong tolerance or even welcome the new doctrines!

Something is changing in homeopathy – irreversibly – and I have learned in Köthen, that this is a spiritual fight ! This is a general, global change, the fruits of the spirit of the times, which nowadays seizes more and more people.

There's only one thing for it: be on one's guard, pointing out developments, differences and connections (for those many, who do not know that, students ... how shall they decide a direction without information ?) and holding together.

And never forget: only dead fishes swim with the current !

The declaration is excellently written and I'll be glad to sign it ...

Dr. Thomas Schreier, Germany, February 2003:

Member of the managing committee of the "Hahnemann-Gesellschaft"

To start with: I appreciate it very much to question very critically the pluralism of methods in homeopathy that is about to grow without limits. I think there are some basic principles in homeopathy that have to be observed and to my opinion the further development of homeopathy can only be successful by attending those principles. Additionally I think we have the duty to put our work on reasonable feet ("according to clearly realizable principles"), if we wish to be perceived on the medical field.

Just an example of what I mean: at one of the assemblies of the DZVHÄ (Association of German homoeopathic Doctors) we had the opportunity to hear from two internationally wellknown experts two totally different ways of prescribing remedies in chronic cases: Geukens gives a M or XM, dissolved in water, 5 to 10 times a day, Spinedi a M-potency schematically every 35 days. I appreciate both colleagues very much and I think both have their personal experience with their way of prescribing. Nevertheless there should start a discussion at this point: what is "sure" as to application and repetition of a remedy? And, even more important, what should we teach our students in future?

Classical homeopathy as a method must be able to be taught and learnt, if not, it could disappear in the scrap-heap of medical history. The homoeopathic community has a lot to do to discuss the principles of the method (analysis of cases, choice of the remedy, choice of the potency, criteria for repetition or change of the remedy, the second prescription etc.) "sine ira et studio" (which means also: without vanities) and to put them into words in order to bring homoeopathy safely through the 3rd millennium.

In contemporary homoeopathy it seems as if everybody were allowed and able to do everything...

Dr. Christiane Bondzus-Entzian, Germany, March 2003 (2nd statement):

Past member of the managing-committee of the "Gesellschaft homoeopathischer Aerzte in Schleswig-Holstein und den Hansestaedten"

Translation: Penelope Vogt

If we are not interested in developing homoeopathy further, then it will decline. In Hamburg at the congress of our central organisation in May, Gotthard Behnisch reiterated:

We are just at the beginning when it comes to our knowledge of the real art of homeopathy!

Hahnemann was certainly NOT the best homoeopath, he prescribed sulphur too often according to his Psora theory which is nowadays no longer accepted. He was just at the beginning of his discovery. Bönninghausen, Kent and others have all made contributions, so that today WE have a great fund of knowledge which even now we are not able use in a way which is still not sure enough for the patient and still does not convince orthodox practitioners.

That means for me that: if we are not allowed to do research or experiment so that something reliable crystallises, then we can pack in!

I would like to back up our point of view with a reference to J. Compton Burnett who was light years ahead of us in his treatment of tumours, which can be read in his book “Curability of Tumours by Medicines”, volume 3, p. 15:

“In my judgement they may all be included in the word homeopathy, but there are some who dispute this and say that treatment to be really homeopathic must be purely and solely according to the totality of the symptoms. Well I am bound to confess that I am not infrequently unable to cure tumours by choosing the remedies according to the totality of the symptoms as set forth in the provings of the remedies. If others can, let them come forward with their clinical evidence; and, if their results are better than mine, I will sit at their feet; if, however, mine are better than theirs, let them sit at mine, but *facta, non verba, facts, not words.*”

My practical question is: is it not time to expand our definition of homeopathy when it comes to the choice of remedy, to leave the choice of remedy, which is only based on the totality of symptoms for its strength and dignity, and instead to allow every type of help which can lead to the right choice of remedy, in particular the natural past history of the morbid processes themselves?

In other words: I maintain that the choice of remedy using the totality of symptoms is only one way of finding the right remedy, and sometimes a completely wrong way. It is occasionally possible to find the right remedy using the Doctrine of Signatures and even though it was found in this way, it still works homeopathically; this way of finding the remedy is bad and haphazard, but it is a way. The right remedy can be found using organ testing according to Paracelsus’ methods and the remedy thus found works homeopathically even though it was found in this way.

The right remedy can be found purely hypothetically according to methods Grauvogl and Schüssler, the effect is the same, namely homeopathical. Diluted salt – Natrium muriaticum, can be used to heal sea consumption, coastal neuralgia, coastal headaches and similar problems, and the effect of the remedy is still homeopathical.”

I still believe it is better to discuss with all homeopaths, to ask them about their successes, to retain the best and to build on Hahnemann’s methodical basic principles, rather than to waste strength on dividing, excluding and splitting into “good” and “bad”.

Dr. Henning Droege, Germany, April 2003:

Homeopathic Symptoms

Remedy indications can be put together by every imaginable criteria, for example astrology, pharmacodynamics, divining rod, iris diagnosis, temperament systems, physical types and others. These can always be described as simile prescriptions. For example the indication picture of furosemid is dropsy, heart failure, lung edema, cerebral edema, rattling respiration, hypertonus and so on. If the state of the patient is similar to this remedy picture furosemid is indicated. Correspondingly an astrologic picture can be made up and defined for a remedy. If the state of the patient is similar to that picture the remedy is indicated.

Such indication systems exist not only since the Middle Ages. The chances to cure with them are doubtful.

The merit of homeopathy is the equivalence of remedy proving symptoms in healthy persons and disease symptoms of the patient.

Thus only a certain kind of symptoms can be used for a homeopathic compare of a simile, that is such symptoms that can arise in a remedy proving. These are especially sensations of all kind, sensitivities, imaginations and delusions, hallucinations, needs and aversions, vegetative reactions, behaviour, but also superficial or acute disease symptoms, if derived from severe intoxications also continuing or lethal symptoms.

Some other phenomena can never occur in a proving and therefore cannot be used for a homeopathic prescription. Of course they can be used but that has nothing to do with homeopathy, so that no homeopathic cures can be expected. Among them are hair color or complexion (unless they change), height, sex, horoscope, biography, pathography, class descendance, constellation of upbringing, basic character, name and so on.

Indicating Mind Symptoms

The practice shows that a mind symptom makes the prescription cure if:

- the patient tells or shows it spontaneously (not concluded, asked or interpreted by the physician)
- the patient offers it naively (not worked upon in psychotherapy)
- it is described or observed unprejudicedly and phenomenologically (not relating to a psychological or typological concept with its terminology),
- it is related to the disease or at least any complaint of the patient or if it is a major complaint itself. (not deviating to general topics of life, character traits or biography)
- it seems strange to the patient himself (not being his normal nature)
- it arose by focussing on the patient (not on remedy pictures, rubrics or even psychological, theological, typological theories)
- it is peculiar, unique, incomprehensible, paradox, inexplicable, bewildering, impressing (not well known from other patients, rubrics, psychology a.s.o.)
- it is causal or still present or belonging to a former paroxysm of a still active recurrent disease (not belonging to a former disease or stage of life),
- it is among the proving symptoms (not in types and essences)

(unnecessary to fulfill all criteria together.)

So indicating mind symptoms are mostly (in this order):

- (bizarre) interpretations, understanding, subjective experience by the patient of his own disease or cause,
- as-if-symptoms,
- striking behaviour, especially in children and psychiatric patients or in sleep
- true delusions that are told as such
- wishes, desires (the food desires are just a part of that)
- aversions, disgust, fears, dreams

but not:

- my impression of a person (unless it changed remarkably),
- what kind of person the patient is,
- which topics are relevant in a person

- for which qualities he envies god
- which general character traits prevail
- what happened in biography.

About these items there is just an experience of a statistic correlation to certain polychrests so that these aspects can just be confirmatory but never basic for a prescription.

The most reliable method to jeopardize a good prescription is to expect a certain type (physical or mental), a theme, a stereotype of a remedy.

See Organon § 210 with annotation: the prescription is based on the altered state of mind during disease, not on the basic character, even if it looks more abominable to us.

Dr. Alois Bahemann, Germany, May 2003:

...Here is my short comment on the fundamental concepts of classical homeopathy.

Since 1991 I have had a classical homeopathic surgery, since 1998 I have also treated non-privately insured patients. You can certainly imagine how difficult that is under the circumstances of our public health system today. Still, 99 % of the patients receive individual homeopathic treatment, but of course some patients get allopathic treatment as well, if necessary.

Especially in the winter months or when people suffer from allergies there is hardly any time to select the appropriate remedies on the computer or with an alternative method. Selecting is basically done on reflection and after checking in the repertory if the symptoms are unusual. This is, however, not so for first anamneses, because they take about 1 to 2 hours. Without a high amount of intuition, which helps one to find out the patient's character rather quickly, the remedies cannot be found. Maybe 20 % of the patients have symptoms that allow for a systematic search for the remedy. Acute illnesses like otitis, scarlet fever, influenza etc. are an exception, since the symptoms frequently lead to the remedy directly. If during a wave of influenza the genius epidemicus is known, practically all patients need the same remedy. Then the therapy is easy.

In recent years I have intensively dealt with psychological problems. The psychological anamnesis of the patients has thus become more intensive and the success rate of the treatments has considerably increased. Since the anamnesis sheets frequently remain empty with regard to eating habits and other modalities, it is important to understand the patient's psyche, the "thread of his life." In this context the so-called essence of the remedy is crucial.

Vithoulkas is absolutely right! If we have understood the idea of the remedy and if we can recognize it in the patient, then we are successful. There is, of course, the signature of the remedy. The *Materia medica* looks like an incoherent hotchpotch of the different symptoms. But still all symptoms follow a higher order. It is the universal hermetic principle: like top like bottom! What Herr Wichmann writes in AHZ 2/2003 is quite correct: you can see a deer analytically, i. e. its hooves, antlers etc., i. e. you look at its different parts. Still it is possible for some people to see the whole, the essence, the signature. For those people it is possible to find the right remedy.

To understand why a certain remedy is linked to certain symptoms clairvoyant powers like the ones of Rudolf Steiner are needed. We do not have these, therefore we must examine the remedies. But we can also draw a mental picture of the remedy. That can explain some symptoms, which we then need not remember without their connection to the whole system.

Of course, there are many extremists among homeopaths, the so-called "Psychoschwafler," untrustworthy esoterics, who just write down the name of the remedy on a slip of paper which

the patient is supposed to carry with him. This is one of the main reasons why I have cancelled Homoeopathic Links. All those obscure cases, the incomprehensible and incoherent talk are almost unbearable. If a colleague has had 15 successful cases of Haloperidol, then this is not believable. If some one hundred uranium-, plutonium- or even excrementum canium-cases have been treated successfully by a colleague, then some doubts come up, because this is not in line with everyday experience in my surgery.

If Hahnemann expressly rejected the doctrine of signatures, who cares? If he lived today, he would perhaps say: “Who cares what I said yesterday?” Is Hahnemann our guru? The organon is good, but it is not the Bible.

We can take interesting aspects from Vithoulkas, Sankaran, perhaps even Scholten (but with care!). There is, however, the tendency to generalize these ideas, to exaggerate. We must deal with them carefully as experienced therapists, we must not burden beginners with these things, because they cause a lot of confusion.

Last, but not least I would like to mention that I liked Herr Wichmann’s summary in AHZ best. Our whole life is a compromise, each therapist must work hard to find access to his patient and the therapy. The basic rules must, however, be taught in the courses, variations must be allowed.

Dear colleagues, I hope that this e-mail has contributed a bit to the discussion. I hope that you enjoy your work and that we can tolerate each other...

Hedi Meusbürger, Germany, May 2003:

Neither science nor magic – Homoeopathy remains a nature- and life principle

Since I last week, while surfing the Internet found the homoeopathic debate, I have been tormented by deep doubts. Before I was doing great: delighted I found out, while working on my new book “the butterfly concept” I would not have to reinvent the wheel, but there had been a homeopathic group working on butterfly provings. One of the provers is Nancy Herrick, also one of the homeopaths, which have been accused of “unscientific” work.

Now I own a good portion of sceptic and I do not run after every new mode, especially not with homeopathy. On the contrary I always learned the most solid encouragements and the most useful concepts from the old teachers, right at the front Hahnemann himself.

But after having read the provings carefully, I questioned myself, if this was not going backwards! On the one side I am convinced that we have not by far digged up all remedy treasures of our nature, and if we can or not need new provings on the healthy. On the other hand I agree with some “admonishers”, that the “proving instrument human being” comes up with strange things, which miss out the clarity and particulars of the older homeopaths.

Not to judge too early, I decided to inform the only real components in homeopathy about my concerns. I hope for clarification with the following letter, and leave it to my colleges how far it helps them with their clarifications.

Open letter to Hahnemann:

Dear master, dear friend,

I know that I am about 200 years late, to stand face to face with you, but the homeopaths of the 21. Century disturb me so deep, that I have to turn to you personally. Then you are the only one that already knew at your time, what for you left us the great gift of the homeopathic art of healing. Unfortunately you can’t speak a word of power, to give the bastards here and

there a well-meant smack, so they can concentrate on the essential again. Meanwhile you found a broader sight, so you can for sure take care of the needs of your today students!

For me, this is not easy: in the middle of an age, in which the place value of the grading of the natural lost more than in your times; in which the arrogant mental powers of man have been over proportional extended and pronounced science, what at least crafty slave driver of nature can agree on; and after the “soul” the “gemüth” has been replaced by psychology, which increased our understanding of it a lot, so we can now speak better about it then feel it. And not at last is what your student Hering even then announced, came true long time ago: “The doctrine has become a business, that degrades the stand of occupation; the trader make the profit and the harm takes the public.”

This is the world, in which we true homeopaths must find our way. Even this time would need homeopathy for “world health” as bad as never before, do stock markets, pharmacy-industries and a billions-worth health lobbys look down from “above” on their sister “alternative medicine”, in which homeopathy also has been regulated. Certainly we are not as open fought about as in your time, but that is only because we could anyway not claim the “big” research funding.

Nevertheless do the great powers of this health system interfere with your teachings, so far, that they almost high-handedly rule remedy prescribing and production of remedies. And pharmacists, who as a profitable extra income sell “two-minute homeopathy” as complex-remedies, distribute the remedies. Package inserts are made over the heads of homeopaths and tell the patients how to take their remedy. From the self-exempt-right, for which you have fought so hard, modern homeopaths are afraid to talk about...

Because the balance of power is “upwards” closed, the “good” homeopaths are rather occupied with finding out, who the “real” homeopaths are. And while doing this they quote you all the time: your Organon with the life evidence of experience to fill, the only, that can impress the spirit of our time, through your paragraphs against each other and ask themselves now per manifest: are we scientific/rational enough (to get easier to the scientific-fund feeding-troughs?) or are there experience-healers between us, which do not know what they are doing and therefore heal and act intuitive?

A discussion has been sparked off about the new remedy provings. All over in the world are still homeopaths that make an effort against all difficulties, to follow your footsteps. In order to enlarge our remedy treasure and to lift our “remedy-certainty”. Of course they make mistakes – and not too little! No one than you knows better, that while walking forward one may trip and difficulties and mistakes can only be overcome by experience. So I must confess to you, that with this discussion I am as well stuck! I know that this dilemma has nothing to do with you and your homeopathy, but only with us! Because of that my question: how do we psychologized, over stretched sophistricts find back to a nature based experience art of healing?

Not to interpret all the time, argumenting over-wisely to get into a hysterical state when we are confronted with a natural expression, but as you taught us observe unprejudiced!

I would like to take a stand on this! I would have liked to get your advice! Because it is too simple for me to spit again 500 years back and give the blame to the signature healers for our crisis. Even it, understandably, brings advantages to always criticise back or to other sides. To improve the appearance of the irretrievable. Instead it would be exciting to talk about: how to use the new abilities to bring the over wound-up man of the 21. century back down to homeopathic facts!

You would be very surprised, what possibilities one already has nowadays, I little nature-homeopath, can through the internet, comfortable from home, be in touch with other “similar thinking” people, and find “real homeopaths” all over the world.

I can communicate with them and many valuable insights I could gain, and some of my own thoughts have found good responses. Repertorising programmes ease the process of having to go through the books. They make us more secure and justify a remedy prescription by “mouse click”. Information about homeopathic topics reach us worldwide in seconds....

But the faster, more perfect, wider the knowledge gets, the more confused, helpless and orientation-less we get. Then it is good to know that we can always look back at you. Since you used your sure intuition, and built your house of knowledge carefully around it!

I personally am happy, that not everything has been made clear to us, not every room has been finished. I see enough possibilities to lift homeopathic secrets, continue building the house, and put our own experience into the foundation.

Provided that, the homeopaths of our days, leave their narrow either-or point of view and start with a freeing as well as! Because first is much too small for homeopathy! Am I wrong saying, “The science in homeopathy is and remains a natural science and therefore is superior to our limited thinking.“?

With the last we can at least orientate us blurred at the “similar”, but to get close to it, one needs a bigger “sense”, which as well is constricted through comparing knowledge and experience.

I do not “know”, but I believe that you thought us this. And therefore I understand homeopathy as a live-principle¹, which does not only exist in human beings, but in the whole nature. Which principles have been acknowledged and proven by you, before you passed it on to your devoted followers. They are resting on the successes of your first students, and are not trying to use the instrument that you gave us, that outlasts time and needs to be defended and used as needed in time!

How does it help scientifically when I ask you for help today? Nothing – says the rationalist. The “feeler” digged in the treasures of your wisdom, and found a sheet of paper, a handwritten notice, which you wrote in the year of your death 1843 in Paris.

“Time is glimpse“ it says at the end of the German paragraph. And then, in French (translated):

“The biggest, infinite treasure

is a faultless conscience

and a good health.

love of god and the exploration of oneself give the one

and the other gives homeopathy.”

Maybe I can use this as an answer to the principle debate: every homeopath may explore their own conscience and scrutinize themselves merciless, in order to do justice to your heritage!

I for myself will continue to try – even I have not understood everything of your wisdom!

¹ This thought I have followed more detailed in my new book, which is still looking for a publisher “the actual logic”.