

II - HOMOEOPATHY : revolution, evolution, or deconstruction¹ (1)

"Il est temps de parler d'un nouveau dialogue entre l'homme et la nature"²

"Au XXIème siècle, la similitude n'est plus qu'un anthropomorphisme où les signes humains sont projetés selon des affabulations"³

These two quotations already give an idea of the subject that we are going to tackle.

In France, standard unicist homoeopathy is now only practised by a smaller and smaller number of practitioners. In Europe, it constitutes only a negligible part of the prescriptions.

On the other hand, in Brazil, where the Boiron Laboratories - and, with them, a still discreet pluralistic practice - set up long ago, its original form put in place by Kent in the United States has changed so much that it has taken on a totally different face.

And yet it is in that vast country that various forms of homoeopathy - all of them being unicist ones - have developed since the 19th century, reflecting extravagant practices, certain of which have reached us. Even in 1980, certain French doctors talked about them, considering certain of them *'des "Théories pseudo-psychanalytiques" formant un amalgame étrange entre le kentisme et la psychanalyse alors que d'autres qui font intervenir de manière explicite la notion de 'péché originel' dont Kent, bien qu'il n'en parle dans ses écrits annexes a fait une des bases de sa théorisation méritent d'être cités...Parmi eux, les Docteurs Masi au Brésil et le Docteur Fayeton en France seront les seuls évoqués ici dans cet article.'*⁴

Our wish being to state the problematic bases of the theories which gradually appeared and, above all, of those which appear today, we have chosen, to avoid running the risk that anyone might feel stigmatised and also to avoid controversies that would be as pointless as troublesome, not to mention any name. We shall therefore confine ourselves to analysing the theoretical heart of what represents the 'modern' face of homoeopathy.

There are a great many unicists throughout the world :

¹ Second section of a three-part article entitled *The cry of alarm of a scientist about certain faces of today's homoeopathy*, homeopsy.com, April 2018.

² 'It is time we talked about a new dialogue between man and nature.' Ilya Prigogine, *Physique, temps et devenir*.

³ 'Today, in the 21st century, similitude is only anthropomorphism, and human signs are projected according to pure fabrication.' Massimo Mangialavori, *Praxis*.

⁴ ' "pseudo-psychoanalytic theories" forming a curious mixture of Kentism and psychoanalysis whereas others, which explicitly use the notion of "original sin", among which Kent's, although he did not refer to it in his annexed writings, made of it one of the bases of his theorisation, are worth mentioning... Among them, only Doctor Masi, in Brazil, and Doctor Fayeton, in France, will be referred to in this article.' J. Jouanny, J-B Crapanne.

Apart from France and certain European countries, they are virtually the only ones, everywhere else, to practise their way of curing as homoeopaths⁵.

Most of them use Kent's repertory, which corresponds best to their method of looking for the single medicine :

*"C'est que l'élève "de grand mérite" d'Hahnemann n'avait aucune notion des degrés de valorisation des symptômes. La répertorisation est un art et non l'application mécanique d'une sorte de pense - bête..."[...]Il est donc normal que la force vitale ne soit que la vice-régence, une sorte de courroie de transmission entre un gouvernement sous la houlette de la matière grise et le corps matériel. Car cette même matière grise n'a pas la même signification chez les êtres supérieurs et chez les êtres inférieurs. Chez l'homme, elle est le siège de l'âme; âme que ne possèdent pas les animaux."*⁶

Unicists do not readily accept that the base of what underlies Kent's point of view, that is to say, the recourse to the soul, may be mentioned. Many users of Kent's repertory are not aware of this religious aspect or underestimate it. On the other hand, many of them say they are faithful to the 5th edition of *The Organon*, in which Hahnemann laid the greatest stress on the single dose.

I, for my part, have always been surprised that one would lay such stress on one's 'absolute' faithfulness to Hahnemann and at the same time refer to Kent's writings without it posing any problems at all. For there is absolute antagonism between the conception of vital energy of the author of *The Organon* - which concerns only internal mechanisms playing a part in the recovery of the sick person - and Kent's view, which considers that energy the seat of the soul. Hahnemann's position remains the same in all the editions of *The Organon* and yet, I have never heard anyone stress this discrepancy !

In spite of differences in their ways of practising - and while often ignoring each other -, the different representatives of the small world of homoeopathy had always coexisted without many problems. A stir could sometimes be noticed in important international meetings but nothing more⁷.

Under the pretext of evolution, a real revolution and different approaches...

They have been insidiously present for a few years and are about to change profoundly the world of homoeopathy and its mode of practice.

At the beginning of the 21st century, a famous homoeopath and, moreover, a friend, wrote in a homoeopathic journal that a great discovery that would make homoeopathy evolve had just been made and, given the benevolence shown to it and for want of any

⁵ It must be stressed that, in many countries, the title of Doctor does not necessarily mean that one is a homoeopathic doctor as some colleges of naturopathy give the title of Doctor of Homoeopathy.

⁶ 'The student "of great merit" of Hahnemann had no notion whatsoever of the degrees of valorisation of the symptoms. Repertorisation is an art and not the mechanical application of a sort of aide-mémoire... [...] It is therefore natural that the life force should only be the vice-regency, a sort of communication channel between a government under the leadership of the grey matter and the material body. For the grey matter does not have the same meaning in superior beings and in inferior beings. In man, it is the seat of the soul, which animals do not have.' J.T. Kent, *Lectures on Homeopathic Philosophy*.

⁷ LMHI : Ligue Mondiale Homéopathique Internationale

writings published, I consulted several texts referring to it on the Internet. I confess that I did not understand anything that I read and, above all, was not able to link their contents to my standard notions - whereas the latter have permitted homoeopathy to develop for nearly 250 years. Moreover, I **did not find or notice any negative reaction to those texts. I was therefore very shaken !** And yet this was the beginning of the very progressive change that is gradually spreading across the world of homoeopathy and is shaking up its essential bases.

If it is impossible for me to deal with all these new approaches in detail - this is only an article -, it seems important to me to define their bases and characteristics...

After analysing them and comparing them with Hahnemann's and Kent's approaches, it seems essential to clarify the most important points of those theories which were recently worked out and claim to be extremely modern and in phase with the latest scientific data. As they are about to become 'the norm' in a way, they invade homoeopathy and certain of its schools sufficiently to be distinguished from the Hahnemannian approach and from the traditional unicism practised in France and in a few European countries.

Leaving out their non-application - which is not trivial - of similitude used by Hahnemann and Kent⁸, I shall confine myself to clarifying their flaws and discrepancies as they may appear to every scientist, even the most 'ordinary' one.

As regards the theorisation using Mendeleev's Table :

Very well known, the elements which constitute its basis seem to be, I am afraid, already taught in certain homoeopathic schools. If one looks at things from a scientific point of view, certain discrepancies if not aberrations are quite obvious :

All the elements of that table are arranged according to their atomic weight. The horizontal lines of the table show that the number of electrons - and therefore the number of layers of electrons - increases as one progresses along the line. As for the vertical lines, they group together the elements that have the same number of electrons in their uppermost layers. The shares making it possible to win or lose electrons always concern the last layer of the element in question.

As the horizontal or vertical position of the various elements of the table gives them the ability to constitute a family with similar properties, they were grouped together according to their electronic status, which clarifies the way the families used in many new theorisations were constructed.

However, various points seem eminently questionable :

First of all, the confusion between the physico-chemical properties and the homoeopathic therapeutic properties.

If chlorine, iodine, fluorine, and bromine share something in common - all of them are powerful antioxidants -, what link is there between Iodum, Chlorum, Bromium, and Fluoric acid in their homoeopathic modalities - and even more so as regards their psyche - that is if one wants to prescribe them according to the mode taught by Kent ?

⁸ See Cahiers de Biothérapie, *Regard d'un scientifique sur l'homéopathie actuelle*, numéro 240, mars 2014. *Le Cymothoa et l'homéopathie moderne*.

Furthermore, the very fact of giving the same properties to a family of medicines runs counter to Hahnemann's and Kent's views. Individualisation being central to the homoeopathic approach, this can only pose questions if not problems. Did not Kent himself imply that there would be as many medicines as individuals ? Did not his permanent search for new 'pathogénésies' prove it ?

Moreover, can we, as it has been done, recommend a substance only because, used as medicines, salts may have either their particular properties or the added properties of the two elements making them up ? (Natrum bromatum has thus been prescribed from the combined presence of the psychic signs of Natrum and of Bromatum).

As regards the 'scientific' justification of classifications, a remark seems to be necessary here : great changes have recently occurred about the way those concerning the animal, vegetable, and mineral worlds are tackled. They come from new types of consistency of classification inherent in the progress of molecular biology and of palaeontology etc. New criteria based on phylogeny have been introduced : 'Phylogenetic nomenclature' is mentioned. This subject is still little known. The first books that refer to it date from 2014 : for example, the classification concerning flowers is no longer, as in the past, based on the floral diagrams of plants (their sexual organs) but on completely new criteria, which come from contemporary science.

This has not gone unnoticed by the author mentioned earlier ; he makes of them a useful base for his homoeopathic prescriptions : referring to this new way of seeing classifications, he immediately concludes that, as **all** those concerning the mineral, animal, and vegetable worlds were given the seal of approval of science, their use at the service of his method could only prove its value and permit its extension to all the substances usable in homoeopathy...

The way this author deals with pharmacological research also includes surprising remarks if one tries to remain critical and does not let oneself be tempted by the mirage of 'something marvellous' which claims to be both rational and scientific :

*"Les prestations n'ont que quelques principes: le remède, la sensibilité de celui qui fait ces essais et l'attention des témoins. Cela conduit à de nombreuses techniques telles que les intoxications, les essais complets, les épreuves de rêve et les essais de méditation. Dans chacun de ces derniers, de nombreuses variantes ou des formes complètement nouvelles peuvent être conçues. Les exemples sont des essais de bain (dissolvant une huile essentielle d'une plante et s'installer dans le même bain), des épreuves d'images (en regardant une plante ou une image de celle-ci en méditant), des tests de pensées."*⁹

In the book of this author on the lanthanides, one can note that the latter constitute a family in the periodic table which includes the 15 elements that go from lanthanum to lutetium. With scandium and yttrium, those elements make up a vertical line of the table and are part of the rare earth elements.

⁹ 'The processes have only a few principles : the remedy, the sensitivity of the person on whom the tests are carried out, and the attention of the witnesses. This leads to many techniques, such as poisoning, full tests, dream tests, and meditation tests. In each of the latter, many variants or completely new forms may be conceived. Examples of these are bath tests (dissolving the essential oil of a plant and sitting in the same bath), picture tests (watching a plant or the picture of it while meditating), thought tests.'

And yet, whereas these pieces of information are supposed to give a reliable face to what is put forward, many of them concerning the essence of the lanthanides and permitting their prescription by contenting oneself with clinical cases - and therefore without the need to use 'pathogénésies' - are presented as coming from meditation... To justify the scientific aspect of his work even more, the author does not hesitate to mention the use of inductive reasoning¹⁰ ...

Other methods of homoeopathic pharmacological research are stated. They concern the symbolic way of expressing oneself - '*notre langage est fréquemment symbolique*'¹¹- and the concept of essence - '*En homéopathie, le concept de l'essence a été exprimé de différentes façons : essence, force vitale, gènus, source, problème principal ou de base, sensation vitale...*'¹².

The Archetype dear to Jung is mentioned afterwards : '*Les archétypes, nommés par Jung, peuvent s'exprimer par plusieurs concepts. Ce sont des éléments fondamentaux de notre psyché, particulièrement lorsqu'il s'agit de la conscience collective, présente en chacun de nous et commun à tous ...*'¹³

It is obvious that such 'experiments' give only imprecise results. Therefore, many homoeopaths have to meet throughout Europe to compare their observations and conclusions and complete the work of the discoverer of the method '*qui leur fournit des diamants bruts qu'il convient de polir*'¹⁴ ...

As regards the problematic if not questionable points that may emerge from those various approaches, several elements appear :

For 200 years, homoeopathy has survived thanks to Hahnemann and to the rigour of his theory and of his method of testing. The criticism of the author of *The Organon* by many followers of the new theorisations is often violent. It goes far beyond known problems such as the impossibility of renewing materia medica because of the loss, by modern doctors, of the methods of observation of patients on account of technological advances. If one has to admit that psychic signs were little developed in Hahnemann's writings, one has to stress that he only mentioned what he observed. Let us not forget either the notions of Psora, Sycosis, or 'Luèse' or many more which he introduced in his theorisation. Esoteric in his way and stripping himself of all scientific credibility through the introduction of the 'original sin' in his theorisation of homoeopathy, Kent, it has to be mentioned, never anathematised the author of *The Organon*. Unfortunately, this is not what is happening today.

And yet, if one thinks about it, many criticisms may be made of those new approaches of

¹⁰ Inductive reasoning is one of the forms of scientific reasoning. The aim of it is to go from a group of particular observations to a general law, with the devising of provisional hypotheses later subject to statistical study. There are no simple deductions. One manages to formulate problems permitting to extrapolate the results only at the end of this process developing in several stages...

¹¹ 'We frequently use a symbolic language'

¹² 'In homoeopathy, the concept of essence has been expressed in different ways : essence, life force, "gènus", source, main or fundamental problem, life sensation...'

¹³ 'Archetypes, named by Jung, may be expressed by several concepts. They are fundamental elements of our psyche, especially when it is about collective consciousness, which is present in each of us and common to all...'

¹⁴ 'that gives them rough diamonds which they ought to polish'

homoeopathy.

If one looks again at the periodic table of which it was about earlier, what does one see ?

It groups together the elements in a logical way according to the number of electrons arranged in layers that can contain 8 of them at the most. An element may have several layers of electrons - the first complete layers each contain 8 of them and the last one - this is what characterises it - a smaller number of them. Therefore, its weight varies, which the classification takes into account. This is an electromagnetic phenomenon...

Moreover, if one observes the modern phylogenetic classifications, plants and animals are classified according to their structure and physico-chemical properties.

And yet it is those different elements that are used, in all the new approaches, to determine their homoeopathic therapeutic potentialities.

No form of scientific rigour can accept that notions coming from pure physical chemistry, from the study of structure, or from electromagnetism are used to deduce from them therapeutic properties conforming to those linked to the homoeopathic medicine !

One cannot go from one approach to the other in this way.

On which criterion would it be based ? Esoteric intuition ? We do not see any other ! But let us admit that we are leaving the domain of science to find ourselves in a totally different world - in which one seldom sees the best but rather the worst... !

Perhaps one more slight difference put forward here, which the theoretician attached to this particular use of Mendeleev's Table and of the mineral, vegetable, and animal classifications does not seem to grasp even though Hahnemann was like Newton. And what does he say, as incoherently as contradictorily : *'Ce dernier (Newton) avec ses lois sur la mécanique a donné à la physique une base solide [...] Ce serait même une insulte de respecter les écrits exacts et le raisonnement de Newton !'*¹⁵

This homoeopath, who presents himself - and is presented - as 'modern' obviously sees himself as a 'true' scientist, a quality that he seems to deny totally to Hahnemann : *'Lorsque nous considérons l'homéopathie comme une science - nous pensions pour notre part que c'était un art de guérir- nous devons respecter les principes scientifiques. En science, les gens n'ont aucune valeur argumentale. Les faits et les moyens de raisonnement sont les déclarations de base et les arguments... Les dogmes des autorités, qu'il s'agisse de Hahnemann ou de Kent ou de quiconque, n'ont aucune place dans la science.'*¹⁶ **He forgets to say that, as regards Hahnemann's way of proceeding, it was absolutely scientific¹⁷.**

In Italy, another famous doctor also claims to apply a type of medicine based on an evolution of homoeopathy.

¹⁵ 'The latter (Newton), with his laws on mechanics, gave physics a solid base [...] It would even be an insult to respect the exact writings and reasoning of Newton !'

¹⁶ 'When we consider homoeopathy a science - we, for our part, thought that it was a way of curing -, we must respect scientific principles. As regards science, people do not constitute arguments. Facts and ways of reasoning are the basic statements and the arguments... There is no place for the dogmas of the authorities, whether they come from Hahnemann, Kent, or from anyone else, in science.'

¹⁷ It must be noted that Hahnemann's work has never been really, if not very seldom, decried by the scientific community. One could only criticise him for one thing, which is still true : we live in a society where the only recognised paradigm is the mechanistic paradigm, which means that, without a molecule, there cannot be action. Even if many physicists and homoeopaths ask for the creation of a second paradigm that can coexist with the present one, the problem still remains unresolved.

Let us say at once - and this changes everything - that the latter has never tried to hijack the world of homoeopathy.

When he uses diluted, dynamised medicines for his research, he does not hesitate to say that he does what could be called 'homoeotherapy'. Besides, he has named his method 'The method of complexity in homoeopathy'.

The problem posed here is quite different : this doctor had always been shocked by the principle of similitude. He considers that the comparison of the symptoms of a patient to those of a healthy person to whom a substance producing similar symptoms has been administered is questionable : even if they have the same disorders, they can be fundamentally very different.

The fact that, according to him, Hahnemann, who talked about a type of medicine of man taken as a whole, attached so little importance to the physical - which is untrue - and mental disorders of the patient disturbed him. This therefore led him to abandon similitude to concentrate only on the observation of the physical and psychic disorders of the patient. When he prescribes a medicine, he observes what type of improvement occurs and does not hesitate to give another medicine if necessary. His criticism of the books on homoeopathy that, for the most part, have remained the same since the 19th century is akin to that formulated many a time by standard homoeopaths or by the assailants of the Hahnemannian approach. He therefore decided to study many strains of medicines : vegetables, insects, including the Arachnida etc. The assessment technique used is not particularly questionable : he grinds the raw material, produces the desired high dilution and carries out clinical observations : each remedy is given to a child, a woman, and a man, the human material supplied by his numerous students. If symptoms occur, the experiment is repeated 3 times and the diluted, dynamised substance is consequently considered to be a medicine.

The work of this doctor is still little known in France, probably because his books are written in Italian then translated into German and English. However, he is internationally renowned and his students are from all over Europe and even from South America¹⁸...

To be continued...

Doctor René-Philippe Halm

¹⁸ Translated by Pascale Tempka