

Very dangerous 'lethargy'... Yes ! (2)

III - Yes ! Dangerous and impacting on the future...

Like the article entitled *The cry of alarm of a scientist : Homoeopathy in the 21st century... Revolution, evolution, or destructuration*¹, the work of R.P. Halm², *Cymothoa and modern homoeopathy*, published in the first part of this issue³, denounces the damaging effects of that form of dumbfoundedness which seems, on certain points, to have spread to the world of homoeopathy for some time. Obviously, the latter must now find its way between the positions of the past, the imperatives of the present, and a place in the future...

The constraints and risks added to those hanging over its practice to lessen its possibilities in terms of use in various fields have now also taken on another face.

An effect at different levels...

Yes, very dangerous lethargy if one has chosen to retain of the Hahnemannian approach its capacity to respond to the many aspects of pathologies every day, very dangerous lethargy also if one wants it to continue to play its role as an evolutionary and questioning practice in fields where the standard view brings few responses : iatrogenic effects, particular sensitivity, aid to diagnosis, choice of the molecules that are the most appropriate to the subject⁴, etc.

If it is impossible for the time being to determine the modalities of its action and if, through lack of 'scientific evidence', one persists, despite the number of patients consulting one⁵, in giving it only a 'placebo' effect, with all the pejorative connotations associated with the term⁶, one seems to undervalue completely its capacity to widen the scope of research in an uncommon but not pointless way.

But it must also continue to be practised by doctors or treating people authorised, because of their training, to do so in an appropriate manner in their fields.

An impact on the number of medical practitioners...

The lethargy is all the more problematic as all the necessary conditions seem to be fulfilled so that one begins to ask oneself certain questions : apart from the taking into account of the overall decrease in the number of doctors⁷, that concerning the number of them in the schools open to them (with specificities for midwives, dentists, veterinary surgeons), the parallel rise in non-doctors in certain teachings about homoeopathy is a matter of concern : the direction gradually adopted - whose effects begin to be felt - is not

¹ See on homeopsy.com, April 2018.

² Main founder member, with Professor Madeleine Bastide, of the GIRI (Groupe International de Recherches sur l'Infinitésimal).

³ See on homeopsy.com, May 2018.

⁴ Cf. , on homeopsy.com, the article of November 2011, *Molécules utilisées dans la maladie d'Alzheimer : un problème de type sensible ?* and the book, *De la psychiatrie à l'homéopathie*.

⁵ And whose words seem to be completely neglected if not denied...

⁶ See the book *L'homéopathie face au placebo*.

⁷ - allopaths and homoeopaths -

without the risk of having an impact on the evolution and future of a practice that had remained until a few years ago - at least in France - faithful to Hahnemann's teachings⁸.

The hindrances brought to his practice by the decrease⁹ in the number of strains put on the market¹⁰ and the changes introduced in the mode of teaching used¹¹ certainly play a role but they are not the only ones : the 'modern' approaches that seem to have left out the original principles of Hahnemannian homoeopathy undeniably have an influence on today's evolution.

But perhaps only those who belong to this generation between the past and the new world that is appearing are aware of that...

To face reality...

Whether one confines oneself to making homoeopathy an approach intended for 'bobologie'¹², functional problems, self-medication, or non-medical prescriptions or lets it tread on the dangerous ground of the new theorisations, one runs the risk of a step backwards and the ranking of it among, at best, the 'placebo types of medicine'¹³ or, at worst, esoteric ones - or, still worse, charlatanic ones.

Not to redefine precisely the bases of the Hahnemannian approach, even if it is attached to the unicity¹⁴ or plurality of medicines, not to state clearly its specific foundations makes one run the risk of making it lose, eventually, its efficient face in its essence and evolutionary richness. And yet, transmitted by many renowned teachers who have embodied its different facets¹⁵, it is this face which has permitted its results for over 200 years.

Two problematic aspects are in question...

On the one hand, the form of standardisation and 'simplification' of its teaching : as it is reduced to its essential bases, there is a risk¹⁶ that a form of technical nature will override the way of 'curing' ;

On the other hand, the alleged form of 'modernity' lent to the new faces of homoeopathy : if their prevalence everywhere else and their use by doctors - but, more often than not, by non-doctors - obviously ill introduced to certain of its essential foundations constitutes a spectacularly attractive argument, it proves to be more and more problematic : absent or somewhat evaded diagnoses since they are often only based on the observable symptoms¹⁷, inadequate or inappropriate treatments during chronic illnesses¹⁸,

⁸ And, apparently, in Belgium, where homoeopathy is intended for doctors whereas, everywhere abroad, non-doctors are preponderant for various reasons, most of which are inherent in the Kentian impact.

⁹ - given the imperatives necessary to obtain the product licence in France and the cost linked to it -

¹⁰ Certain of which - because of similitude - , even if they are little used, are essential !

¹¹ - to remain in phase with that which is classically advocated in many medical and scientific disciplines -

¹² From 'bobo', which is in French a child's onomatopoeia for 'physical pain' (Translator's note)

¹³ Cf. what the minister of Health, Agnès Buzin, recently said about homoeopathy, that is, if its real effects are not demonstrated - because of the placebo effect - , it is harmless (still another belief !) and we are confronted with the question of the correctness of its reimbursement given the difficulty of assessing its impact as services rendered !!

¹⁴ Faithfully to the 5th version of *The Organon* ;

¹⁵ Rolland Zissu, Denis Demarque, Emile Illioviçi, Georges Demangeat, Robert Bourgarit, Jacqueline Barbancey, Jacques Jouanny, Michel Guermonprez and many others, who are as important and whom it would be too long to mention...

¹⁶ - found in many fields of medicine -

¹⁷ With the leaving out of the notion of diathesis - not rejected by Kent, even if it was approached by another means.

prescriptions written from prevailing mental signs coming from 'pathogénésies' from more or less risky¹⁹ sources, non-reference to physiology, dilutions that are often high without consideration for the subject's physical and psychological fragility, lack of rigour and often, also, of objectivity obvious in many case studies reported increase the apparently vague and 'non-scientific' aspect of this approach...

An unpredictable evolution...

An element seems important here : after simplified teachings which, in their eyes, are inadequate for their practice, many doctors, notably homoeopaths, often turn to other methods²⁰ : nutritional therapy, herbal medicine, psychotherapeutic techniques, anthroposophic approach and, a new development for a few years now, 'modern' approaches are often used in addition to or even in place of them. Hahnemannian homoeopathy, relegated to the background, is little explored or replaced by a new approach to pathologies : this is borne out by the fact that, if certain theoreticians mention a form of modernisation of its concepts, others say it is completely 'out of date'...

A possible cause...

Linked to an evolution in the more and more standardised transmission not of syllabuses but of knowledge, the lack of reference to a truly personalised teaching seems to have played a role in explaining this transformation : if, in the past²¹, the latter constituted one of the main elements of the transmission of the art of practising by keeping one's interest alive and making one want 'to go further', it seems that the weakening of its impact has not been adequately assessed. Everything is similar and 'equal', everyone receives the same instruction but, if it has that advantage, it is not without its drawbacks...

Substantial effects...

The craze for the 'modern' versions of homoeopathy which have appeared in the last few years seems to come partly from this evolution : the standardisation of the mode of communication of syllabuses²², the new medical approach to the subject, the more and more standardised way of looking at them play a role but they are not the only ones to do so...

The aura of new mentors, nurtured with much publicity and many international lectures widely published on the Net, also plays a role.

It must be stressed that the subtle modification introduced by the gradual insertion of their points of view into certain unicist courses of study - and, by means of this, into the meetings of different trends - is not without deleterious effects on homoeopathy as a whole, especially if one sticks to what was transmitted of it by Hahnemann : if the true bases of the teachings of 'new homoeopathy' are vague and often expressed unclearly, what makes them

¹⁸ Medical training is essential here, if only to make the appropriate diagnosis and to avoid failing to detect a serious disorder against which homoeopathy alone may prove to be inadequate : psychotherapists, if they are not psychologists, must have followed a four-year course of study at university, with professional training, to have a recognised status, otherwise they are only psycho-practitioners - which does not guarantee the quality of their training.

¹⁹ Meditation, 'pathogénésies' carried out within a week, etc.

²⁰ I have seen it for myself and have been clearly informed of it. (Author's note)

²¹ Before the total transformation inherent in May 1968.

²² - and thus the weakening of this specific contribution which means no teacher will deal with a subject exactly like another...

different from Hahnemann's and Kent's teachings is not put forward... This engenders confusion if not, often, - which can only make today's general picture worse - 'mystification'.

Set out in an attractive way, offering guarantees of reliability through their constant reference to research, to work on cases, not differing from unicist homoeopathy such as first taught, those 'new' and 'extremely modern' teachings not only deprive - from the start - the new registered students of certain essential bases²³, they can only accentuate the present impossibility²⁴ of adding the word 'scientific' to the homoeopathic approach.

In so doing, despite the often 'miraculous' aspect of their alleged results²⁵ - even if their reference to similitude versus Hahnemann is totally ignored - , they can only strengthen the idea that the latter is only a placebo²⁶ and homoeopaths are 'eccentrics' if not charlatans.

The attacks that have occurred recently in France and England show this - and the possible stopping of the reimbursement of medicines will probably only strengthen that point of view - : apart from the impact on the credibility of homoeopathy - despite its undeniable contribution seen every day - , it will no doubt have a most deleterious effect on the demonstration of its effectiveness. Research and its use will only be impacted by it and the situation will only get worse because of the inappropriate use of strains coming from more or less verifiable sources by practitioners not trained in what homoeopathy represents in its principles... The lack of medical training in the diagnosis of the pathology underlying the disorders presented will therefore only reinforce the point of view of ineffectiveness or deception of this mode of approach.

A very difficult situation...

The needs of patients may have an influence on authorities to avoid - perhaps - this disastrous evolution for the maintaining of homoeopathy in the face that it has had for over 200 years but this will not change the nature of the main problem, of which the article of R.P. Halm raises one of the most striking present facets.

Prohibited to doctors and despite the increase in the prices of medicines, homoeopathy is still practised in Canada and Spain²⁷. If, given the use of homoeopathy in the world, this may not pose any problems in economic terms, this is not without making one wonder about what is likely to happen if the number of doctors standardly trained in this approach decreases²⁸ still more and the quality of their practice²⁹ is poorer³⁰ or if not medically-

²³ Undifferentiated similitude of broad analogies, predominance of 'the mind', unobjective - and casual - use of the 'intuitive' approach, different approach from the message of 'pathogénésies', use of data making what is stated seem scientific, confusions in different, yet essential, lines...

²⁴ - at least, in the present state of affairs.

²⁵ - whose analysis those who mention them bear full responsibility for -

²⁶ If the latter, too, has an impact, we know that its effects do not last long...

²⁷ Where it would seem that chemists are ordered to indicate that they do not sell any homoeopathic medicines...

²⁸ Therefore preventing the 'advice' given outside the official medical scope ;

²⁹ - the decrease in the number of strains or dilutions for public use - because of the high cost of the product licences imposed - is the first most problematic stumbling block.

³⁰ - which now seems to make one wonder insofar as additional advanced courses of study are envisaged in certain schools.

trained practitioners think they are able to use it for physical and - why not ? - psychic³¹ disorders...

Moreover, not making things easier for the new recruits of the world of medicine³², the disappearance of strains which, even if they were little prescribed, were most useful, the encouragement to use certain newer ones not listed in the official pharmacopoeia³³ - and in single doses not close together - , the unpredictability of their impact linked to unrecognised similitude - or similitude looked for by, above all, repertorial ways - will not increase the number of prescriptions³⁴.

It looks as if the future is going to be very difficult... And it is worth having a close look at things and calling into question what must be so...

This can only lead to think about the direction in which the future must now be modified...

Several questions must therefore be asked...

'Should homoeopathy keep its place within medicine³⁵ ?'

Should it make sure that it remains practised only by doctors and authorised treating people (midwives, surgeons, dentists, etc.) trained in its practice ?

This is the first question that any practitioner - whether they are a doctor or a medically-trained person - must ask themselves.

If it is the case, can one run the risk of reducing it to a form of 'bobologie' or to 'functional' medicine and of forgetting all its other potentialities ?

Can we afford to deprive it of its evolutionary potentialities in specialised fields (dermatology, psychiatry³⁶, endocrinology, ophthalmology, otorhinolaryngology, stomatology) even though everything still remains to be adapted and improved with time and experience and new avenues of research can be envisaged, even in allopathy³⁷ ?

The present situation may presage it...

Provided things are quickly 'put back on an even keel' by enunciating what is possible, denouncing what is unrightly considered as such, and avoiding confusions of different types.

A change must be initiated

³¹ - which I have noted, with the prescription of inappropriate very high dilutions ! - not safe to anyone who is aware of the impact of certain substances whose effects, not visible at first, are not without effects, sometimes from a distance and at an unsuspected level at first glance (Author's note).

³² Certain of whom may well be downhearted and therefore - which has been seen in the last few years - little inclined to persist in a way that is so complex and also more and more uncertain.

³³ - and therefore produced and used outside the scope of French legislation concerning medicines - which may pose problems !

³⁴ - given, what is more, in often single doses not close together...

³⁵ For my part, I will unhesitatingly say yes !

³⁶ About which it has been clearly said - which proves to be totally untrue - : 'It does not work'.

³⁷ Particular intolerance to medicines, synergism of effect, selection of more appropriate allopathic medicines thanks to a more refined diagnosis. Cf. article on homeopsy.com

If, to many practitioners³⁸, the history of and the manner in which the concepts have developed do not seem essential and may appear pointless and 'outdated'³⁹, it is important that, as they remain in the ignorance of their true substance, they should assess the dangers threatening their practice and its - their - future.

The formulas or simple solutions suggested are in line with the present time, like magic and the miraculous but, **unless one agrees to become a prescriber of homoeopathic medicines and not a homoeopath**⁴⁰, this cannot last... Can one run the risk of going backwards, by successive bounds, and of going back, on the one hand, to that time when one often confined oneself to 9 CH at the most and did not venture into specialised fields⁴¹ or, on the other, to the time **prior to that of Hahnemann**, when alchemy, broad analogies, and the Doctrine of Signatures were law ?

The apparent 'lethargy' enunciated - if not denounced - here is dangerous...

Probably linked to a form of sideration coming as much from the lack of awareness of the way homoeopathy has developed⁴² as from the gradual - if not insidious - way the new theorisations have spread, it is problematic both to homoeopathy and to the health of tomorrow's populations.

The oversimplification of what is transmitted of it is as risky for its maintaining as an approach based on theorisations founded on principles which Hahnemann himself decried.

The possibilities of treating oneself in a better way can only suffer because of those two prospects.

Whether people live in a 'rich' or 'poor' country, they will be in the same boat and subject either to the scientific view⁴³ - about which we know that it imposes the same treatment on everyone indiscriminately⁴⁴ - or to practices from another age, in which self-proclaimed soothsayers and gurus - if not charlatans or inveterate ignoramuses - pullulate...

It is essential to maintain homoeopathy in its most standard form...

What results from this in terms of convincing clinical results is worth stating and defending fiercely because of its permanence and, also, of an evolution in phase with the world of modern medicine.

Its specificity must be defended and **the criteria by which it is assessed - if this is possible - , appropriate ;**

The attacks of which it is the subject must be firmly denounced as they are accompanied by **glaring lack of knowledge about what constitutes its basis.**

If its effects cannot be reproduced, it is simply because it makes a subject, not a 'body as an object', play a role... This is its specificity... and one knows how important it is that, if one

³⁸ - but perhaps this, too, is a matter of time and generation -

³⁹ And yet... !!!

⁴⁰ Can one keep a building in good repair by caring only about its foundations and neglecting what may make it possible for its walls to be still standing ? Conversely, can one neglect its essential foundations and load-bearing walls and only take an interest in the appearance of its walls, even if they are attractive ?

⁴¹ Notably psychiatry...

⁴² - lack of translations, inadequate information about the Kentian theory, confusion between Unicism and unicity of the medicine, etc.

⁴³ One may wonder about the motives behind the determination of those who defend its views... Would what appears irrational to them bring so much danger to them ? Or else, supported by the prevailing thought, do they feel themselves to be the guardians of an established - by whom ? - order ?

⁴⁴ - and, often, without an appropriate and refined diagnosis, notably in psychiatry. Because of the DSM...

wants to provide 'scientific' **proof** of the results proposed, what is put forward should on no account and at no level be controversial⁴⁵.

Its approach cannot be compared to or put at the same level of conceptualisation as allopathic medicine.

Whether it is considered as it is beginning to be, as a type of medicine in its own right intended for common ailments or as additional treatment in serious pathologies, it has a place.

Therefore it seems important to defend this point of view without trying to find scientific justification that is questionable or does not meet the current criteria to be considered acceptable⁴⁶.

If all the conditions are not fulfilled⁴⁷ so that it may be so, it will not succeed, which will only make the shadow of 'placebo' or of charlatanism continue to hang in the air...

But patients are the guarantors of the effectiveness of what Hahnemann taught. Perhaps this should be repeated and this particularity defended...

Principles...

In order to remain a way of curing, homoeopathy must therefore be practised by treating people capable of not contenting themselves with applying pre-established treatment protocols or ready-made formulas but of individualising their responses, understanding their power and, no matter what people say, the known or still little-known dangers... One cannot therefore act recklessly and behave rashly by giving high or very high dilutions without anticipating what might result from it⁴⁸ in a frail subject or 'responding type': only adequate knowledge at different levels makes it possible and if so, with great caution.

Indicated in true similitude, the homoeopathic medicine is, it must be said again, active in itself: even if, for the moment, the manner in which it acts defies all comprehension and raises many theories, its effects do not result more - or less - from the placebo effect than a standard medication⁴⁹. Therefore a rigorous methodology combined with appropriate assessment protocols must be applied to any job aiming to assess its effects.

One cannot therefore refer to any scientific aspect if one bases one's judgement on an 'artistic'⁵⁰ perception which uses case studies aiming to confirm its correctness...

A future is still possible...

Even if the reading of the article of R.P. Halm on Cymothoa which paralyses many aspects of today's homoeopathy gives a most worrying picture of the situation, if only through what it makes one think about, it brings change for the future.

⁴⁵ Which, as it is beginning to be expressed at last, is very far from certain given the specificity of homoeopathy.

⁴⁶ - even if we are aware that, even if collected in a 'standard' manner, even for allopathic medicines, many data prove to be constantly questioned in the light of new data.

⁴⁷ Which certain homoeopaths and scientists are beginning to state at last...

⁴⁸ Can we know if they are not going to mobilise the organism in areas that do not need to be, with consequences that are unpredictable or linkable to the effect of the medication? Did not Hahnemann himself advise to give only the medicine which the organism needs?

⁴⁹ The experiments carried out on plants and animals easily prove this.

⁵⁰ As J.T. Kent said.

If the description resulting from it is a reflection of the world caught between an evanescent 'Tuberculinisme' and a 'Luèse' which is as sclerotic as no more adapted, one should conclude that Cymothoa has probably not totally instilled its poison yet, since the worrying picture of what has been gradually put in place for the last few years has now come into the open in all of its faces...

Let us hope that everything will be done so that the number of homoeopathic doctors, whether they are specialists or not, will not decrease more and homoeopathy will go further than vacillating between an oversimplified practice and a use based on a form of 'cosmic delirium' associated, sadly, with most inappropriate 'scientific' explanations - at least, as one would say if one did not want to be overly pessimistic or completely intransigent - in the present state of affairs...⁵¹

Doctor Geneviève Ziegel

⁵¹ Translated by Pascale Tempka