

I - A confusing terminology¹...

Reflections of a homoeopathic psychiatrist.

'A homoeopathic psychiatrist influenced by Freudian psychoanalysis' would have been even more correct...

The aim of this article is not to make critical observations or engage in any polemic which would be as useless as sterile but to make a simple statement of facts offered to everyone. It now seems necessary, given the way the situation and positions on the Hahnemannian discipline are likely to change², to express a specialist point of view on the modern-looking way of approaching homoeopathy - or what is put under this banner.

Despite the fact that their transmission in the heart of courses on classical - either unicist or pluralistic - homoeopathy is done in ways which are sometimes inconspicuous if not hardly discernible and through lack of truly backed up argumentation, certain aspects of new approaches often calling themselves avant-gardists strangely generate few reactions. Apart from some embarrassed questions or, in the case of many old followers or newcomers to homoeopathy, pure abandonment of what is no longer - or not - understood, it is often an aura of silence and perplexity or, on the contrary, reverent attention which accompanies the way they are expressed.

This is only normal in this day and age: the theoretical alterations that brought about the passage from the single remedy advocated by Hahnemann to avoid any interactions between substances to Kent's Unicist have remained somewhat vague in many people's minds. The transmission of the true reasons for this change was often little or ill clarified, resulting to many in confusion between 'Unicist' and 'singleness' of the remedy and between Kentian points of view and Hahnemannian points of view.

Mistakenly attributed to Hahnemann who, as an experimenter, advocated from the start not mixing substances of whatever origin³, the single-remedy method was advocated by Kent in an absolute way.

We should bear in mind that it had a very different meaning for him : as it was fixed in a prevailing way from modalities present in the psyche⁴, the single remedy for the subject⁵ should, in the absolute, bring 'cure' by treating *the* original illness, the source of **all** illnesses⁶.

¹ First part of a text entitled 'Homeotherapy or Homoeopathy? Homeopsy.com. April 2016.

² On the one hand certain types of homoeopathic supportive therapy are introduced in certain hospitals, notably in oncology, but on the other it is, for still unclear reasons, suspended from courses in Spain and Australia and labelled as 'charlatanism' or, in England, regularly threatened with official classification among placebos.

³ Hence the single remedy...

⁴ Even if its impact was often trivialised - the objection being that all doctors were believers - 'original sin' meant a great deal to Kent, Masi and many active movements in South America then, by extension, later and elsewhere - but in the background - a conflict with the laws of nature or the cosmos...

Whereas Hahnemann, confronted with the problem of chronic illnesses, advanced, in the latest version of *The Organon*, that substances could be taken alternately - which is proved by some of his prescriptions - Kent⁷, by giving a meaning to the disorder and approaching the illness differently for reasons inherent in its theorisation, would stick to the notion of single remedy advocated from the start by his master.

Ill known, seldom taught or cut off from its true origin, this aspect of the problem engenders many misunderstandings. It is all the more an obstacle to differentiating the two ways of thinking since, notably in France - perhaps because of Freudian influence ? - Unicism remained relatively faithful to Kent's teachings⁸ : except for an unclear difference in conception as regards prescription, the Kentian approach was not, at least apparently, so different from the Hahnemannian approach as to stop any unifying dialogue. Moreover, it was indispensable for maintaining a form of cohesion in the face of fierce opponents.

This is how, because of a lack of understanding undoubtedly linked with the difficulty in approaching the texts in the original languages or re-examining the translations - unfortunately, often accompanied by points of view or various interpretations - vagueness remained.

It paved the way for the emergence of new approaches which have diffused their teachings and practices for about fifteen years to end up mixing their points of view with those of certain Kentian practitioners⁹ and therefore posing a problem to a fair number of pluralistic or unicist homoeopaths.

To the newcomers to homoeopathy or those who are interested in it, this is totally confusing...

And yet, what comes from many new approaches and is progressively and insidiously mixed with the most classical teachings of homoeopathy - and favoured by the presence of various modules from different sources which make repertorisation¹⁰ easier - poses problems to a fair number of homoeopathic practitioners¹¹ - whether they (unicist included¹²) have

⁵ Or else, as he also wrote, the similimum for the disorder at that time - although this was for him an extreme and little-recommended solution. This seems to be one more source of confusion from the moment that certain words are taken out of context and the year they were written.

⁶ Hence Unicism...

⁷ A point of view which leads to certain adjustments in practice given the difficulty in determining it and the necessity of prescribing a medicine similar to the disorder at that time, even if it is unsatisfactory, together with the risk, according to the Kentian conception, of eliminating the symptoms, confusing the case and then hindering the search for the similimum for the original illness, etc.

⁸ This is not the case in other countries : Kent's teachings, about which Jacques Baur, a unicist, did not hesitate to say that they would already have deserved another denomination, have been supplemented with various classifying additions. Moreover, as it is not reserved for doctors, homoeopathy has not had - and does not have - to maintain the eventuality of a dialogue with the supporters of official medicine or be confronted with the problems linked with clinical or basic research.

⁹ Who, even if they do not agree with all their points of view or modes of approach, refer, from repertorisations, to their pathogenetic data and ways of understanding psychic modalities? This raises many questions about the way certain experiments were carried out - sometimes in a week - and what was inferred from them...

¹⁰ Which, in a way, automatically legitimises the data, even in the opinion of pluralists.

¹¹ If only by the way of describing certain psyches and mentioning their variants - which have nothing symptomatological any longer but instead are the products of an often subjective conception or a form of interpretation of behaviours chosen - often broadly - analogously to those of plants, plant families, or metal

practised their profession for a long time or are new to it. Surprised or showing admiration for what they may discover about certain faces of what the term 'Homoeopathy' covers, they will ponder.

Often worried about not having enough knowledge or not being able to find 'The right remedy', many of them will therefore be either enthralled or taken aback by what may be announced with a great many cases.¹³

We should note that most of the observations in question have an indisputable psychic or psychosomatic component which is even more obvious in the new approaches... The elements taken from the patient's history and physical observation, biological measures, a backed up diagnosis and the objective proof of the sedation of the symptoms are most often absent. This seems almost logical: the patients select themselves and come to find a solution, through a single medicine, to the problem which causes them various disorders. They generally keep their everyday illnesses for their GPs, even if they are allopaths, unless they try self-medication with various methods...

And yet, given in similitude, dynamised dilutions are not useful only for minor illnesses or active thanks to the miraculous placebo effect alone... Clinical and basic research in this field proves it.

The differentiation of these new approaches from that of Hahnemann's homoeopathy and then Kent's¹⁴ seems necessary.

The fact that the psyche is now to the fore seems to imply that all assertions can be made... except that someone trained as a psychiatrist or a doctor trained in what is linked with psyche dysfunctions can no longer show no reaction to what is now a real problem: what is advanced in these new approaches has been put under the banner of homoeopathy and the Internet revolution diffuses their messages and enthusiastic points of view.

There is therefore a major risk of misinterpretation hanging over what this discipline truly covers and of all those using its precepts being discredited. Neither the respect for those who transmitted the message nor the risk of going back two centuries ago can let this happen, especially as the use of dynamised dilutions proves more and more interesting in many fields: oncology, psychiatry, dermatology, etc.

Together with the reading of clinical cases that are sometimes most amazing if not staggering, the fairly recent definition of the word 'homoeotherapy', which had already been modified and, above all else, very newly attributed to Hahnemann¹⁵, can therefore only

categories - with, on top, the possibility of selecting - this was positively written in an official journal of homoeopathy - the most appropriate description to authenticate the potential prescription made from the psyche... (sic!)

¹² Which is very much denounced by certain practitioners who were trained from the school initiated by Pierre Schmidt in France.

¹³ Which are, it must be said, in no way proof and whose paraded 'cure' sometimes seems, to a little-informed audience, to be a miracle and an application done in a disconcertingly easy way...

¹⁴ Perhaps they should simply be named and considered 'other', as the terms Homeotherapy or extrahomoeopathic therapies suggested when they appeared.

¹⁵ Which, after some research and checking with different sources well-informed about all the written work by Hahnemann and Kent, is totally wrong.

attract attention¹⁶ as regards the way it illustrates the evolution of homoeopathy since Hahnemann, then Kent, up until today.

Homoeotherapy...

Still present on the Net not more than a year ago at the same time as that of extrahomoeopathic therapies, its definition¹⁷ has been updated : without expanding on what the word refers to, someone apparently informed of the newest teachings claimed with as much vigour as conviction that it had been given by Hahnemann himself¹⁸.

In the background and by a form of shift in meaning, the way this term is used and accompanied by apparently the most modern of explanations¹⁹ in order, as it were, to suggest its use instead of that of homoeopathy - or either of them - is not at all insignificant: it divests the Hahnemannian approach of its very essence to reduce it to the prescription of diluted and dynamised medicines.

If the ignorance of this Internet user can be an excuse for what she asserted, the way she said it with certainty was not apparently hers. She obviously recited what she had 'heard' and remembered from teachings to give it legitimacy since it was linked with Hahnemann himself as if, just beneath the surface and in the background, it was suggested - and therefore proved - that, even to the latter, only the substance, with its dilution and dynamisation, mattered... which is not the case...

We cannot help but refer to Jacques Derrida, who said that the unconscious of the person writing was, beyond the words used and what they suggested, totally received by their reader: the backed up statement of this Internet user, who was obviously not a doctor, and her insistence on hinting that the term had been suggested by Hahnemann - as if the message that wanted to be transmitted was present - can only raise questions... In point of fact, it had been totally received and transmitted.

On the other hand - since it is undoubtedly not clarified as regards its hidden meaning - its sudden emergence is in no way insignificant: used, as it were, with the Master's 'stamp', it justifies all practices using the diluted and dynamised granules. From a shift in words to a shift in meaning, it can give them a form of seal and entire legitimacy of denomination by linking them with their first source²⁰.

Homoeopathy = Homeotherapy : if we do not go further, we eliminate at the same time what concerns the Hahnemannian methodology and the principles that are linked with it as regards similitude and the symptomatological approach of modalities... Anything will then be accepted as regards the choice of analogies, the approach to the patient, the place of

¹⁶ As I on no account want to stigmatise anyone but instead give a personal point of view recommending judiciousness and reflection, I have deliberately chosen not to cite the first source that engendered this article and to confine myself to say what seems to me essential to the understanding of the face of homoeopathy today.

¹⁷ Present on the Net only two years ago and apparently coming from Canada, it has suddenly disappeared.

¹⁸ Since they are used as examples and as a starting point for my progression instead of its whole content, I did not think it was worth detailing them any longer for fear of shifting the emphasis of my reflections and wandering from the main points that they aim at studying.

¹⁹ Which, it must be said, are somewhat vague if not confused - and even somewhat inchoate...

²⁰ We should bear in mind in this respect that anthroposophy, which also uses diluted and dynamised granules, does not consider it belongs to homoeopathy and its bases are defined in a very precise - and totally different - way.

physical signs in comparison with the psyche, and vice versa, and this, strictly respecting the Hahnemannian point of view...

The problem is not this fallacious assertion - which will deceive only those who have not studied the question - but it is instead to bear in mind the necessity to be careful to back what we say and not to take words out of their original context to give them another meaning or legitimise theoretical statements. It is also not to take at face value what is asserted or popularised in a more or less accurate way.

Anything can be advanced, provided it is done so clearly and does not mean using explanations that might be unconfirmed if their reality and theoretical validity have not been checked... It is important to stress that the situation has changed because of the Internet revolution, which generates many transformations : certain texts disappear while others appear and the messages which are linked with them often take on very quickly the appearance of truths, with all the risks of being conveyed as such and becoming *the* truth.²¹

To be continued...

Doctor Geneviève Ziegel,

April 2016

²¹ Translation by Pascale Tempka