

When a new controversy spreads about homoeopathy...

II - Perhaps a turning point ?¹...

The content of the recent attacks on homoeopathic doctors makes it necessary...

Each of the actors is affected by it : if it falls to homoeopathic doctors to modify the way they respond to the situation with which they are confronted, it is the responsibility of allopathic doctors not to confine themselves to the refusal to accept to examine in a realistic manner what is happening : it is essential to observe what underlies medical care and what the patients manifest every day so as to form a more appropriate point of view on the matter and not to confine oneself to say that, in the absence of proof, homoeopathy can only be a 'placebo' to eliminate from the scope of medicine.

As regards homoeopathic doctors, the modalities of the putting in place of this 'turning point' can be summed up in a few guiding 'principles' :

To endeavour even harder to see to it that the obligations linked to the profession of a doctor are always fulfilled...

As it is advocated by all the homoeopathic - pluralistic and unicist - schools priding themselves on Hahnemann's teachings, all doctors or authorised treating people must take on the responsibilities and constraints inherent in their positions and support their most essential commitments : diagnosis, somatic examination, checkups of different kinds in accordance with the most modern advances, enlightened choice of the therapeutic approach, individualisation of the latter...

The homoeopathic doctor² is first and foremost a doctor and, if homoeopathy is a training additional to their position, it does not excuse them from what their basic training requires.

To always remind people firmly of the capacity as a doctor³ of every homoeopath, to refuse it to be called into question or any doubt about it to creep into their minds...

To remind people that, in France and in some countries⁴, before one becomes a Homoeopath according to Hahnemann's teachings, one has to be a doctor - or to have had appropriate training in order to be able to use homoeopathy within the context of one's specialised profession (midwife, dentist, veterinary surgeon)...

Homoeopathy is in this case a 'plus' in the medical training and requires additional years of study and practice - which often discourage many newcomers.

Therefore, not to allow any abuse in the way of practising as a homoeopathic doctor.

If one wants to remain within the bounds of the Hahnemannian viewpoint, to differentiate oneself clearly from homoeotherapy becomes essential.

¹ Second part of an article entitled, *When a new controversy spreads about homoeopathy*, homeopsy.com (Doctor Geneviève Ziegel, September 2018).

² - or any treating person authorised to prescribe homoeopathy -

³ A position taken recently, quite rightly and firmly, by the French homoeopathic doctors' unions.

⁴ Notably in Belgium...

Its use of broadened similitude, of viewpoints wrongfully announced as at the forefront of science, and the very Kentian primacy given to the psyche to determine the medicine to prescribe permit to identify it. But it is also important to know what underlies its real bases, which are now more accessible given the translations of texts that had been little known until recently⁵...

Unfortunately, if the clinical and biological examination of the patient, the diagnosis of their pathology concentrating on the finding of *the* curative medicine can be 'forgotten' if not considered of secondary importance, one is no longer within the scope of medicine. Except if the practitioner is not a doctor or, paradoxically, if the latter, although a doctor, **implicitly** leaves this task to another doctor⁶ so as to concentrate **only** on looking for *the* Medicine of the patient without taking into account the various facets of the disorder and of the diagnosis of the illness in question, this poses problems.

To keep in mind, in this respect, that the use of homoeopathic medicines alone cannot give either the capacity as a or the title of homoeopath such as Hahnemann taught⁷.

It is important to stress this.

To yield to no 'fascination' likely to deprive one of one's critical mind.

It engenders 'followers', one of whom one may become without even realising it... Many new theorisations coming from the Kentian trend have this strong capacity to be attractive through the number of people - more often than not non-doctors - subscribing to their points of view.

The diffusion of their theories and their gradual appearance within the scope of the European homoeopathy is confusing for many otherwise informed people. The oldest - close to being or already retired - are perplexed and say that they are 'out of their depth', the youngest try to understand - if not to come to a compromise with - them, and certain of the youngest think they are one of the wonderful facets of homoeopathy... They adhere to them and are fascinated or go...

To state 'scientific' data to back up what one says is not synonymous with 'scientific' value.

It is important to say it again given the difficulties with which homoeopathy as a whole is confronted :

One of its faces formed within the scope of medicine tries to give its approach 'scientifically' credible support. But, **given the current mechanistic paradigm**, it has neither the means nor the capacity to do so ;

The other, free from this concern since it is often made up of non-doctors and spreading more and more, puts forward explanations impossible to take into account either from a scientific standpoint or from that of accordance with the most essential Hahnemannian bases⁸.

⁵ The lack of knowledge of most doctors about the way the prescription of the 'medicine' developed over the centuries and about the specific facet of homoeopathy in its approach to the disorder, that about the way Hahnemann made his practice and experiments change, the impact of Kent's theorisation and of the way it developed according to the country, culture, and context of its use play a part in this.

⁶ Thus going outside the scope of their capacity as a general practitioner...

⁷ To remind people of it permits to avoid confusion.

⁸ Way of seeing similitude, elements governing the choice of the medicine, mode of examination of the signs used, way of approaching and carrying out the 'pathogénésies' for which the group effect seems to be obvious, problematic conclusions and case studies associated with them, somewhat astounding but not always diffused,

Confronted with both the re-emergence of approaches stemming from the alchemical traditions and the current form of 'doctrinaire approach' to knowledge, the homoeopathic doctors from France and from certain European countries may now be in the same situation as Hahnemann : on the one hand, they have the desire to further knowledge by trying to use the most modern scientific and clinical data ; on the other hand, for many of them, that to remove from the area of their practice what comes from the Kentian legacy and makes them run the risk of taking a step backwards... They can only reject a way of thinking which their master himself strongly decried...

Everything happens as if there was, on the one hand - notably in France - the desire to retain links with the 'scientific' world with, therefore, difficulty in accepting that one is somewhat 'marginal' ; on the other hand, obvious 'marginality', which one varyingly acknowledges since 'scientific' explanations are nevertheless stated and used to come to one's rescue, notably in the trends coming from Europe.

To remind people of, if not 'proclaim', the particularity of one's practice with regard to the requirements of the scientific world.

If this is not taken into account, no advance will be possible...

Certain conditions must have been fulfilled beforehand and, if they are not stated and respected, they make any objective approach potentially distorted and therefore the results obsolete and not effective...

If to want to 'prove something scientifically' constitutes the desire of and mobilises a good part of today's homoeopathy, which follows in Hahnemann's footsteps and wants to put in place a therapeutic strategy free from all obscurantism or lack of rigour, this can be achieved only under specific conditions with the participation of homoeopaths **applying the strict similitude taught by Hahnemann** and recognised as such by the scientific world. Unless modifications in the way of approaching things are introduced and real resources are allocated, the mechanistic paradigm makes any advance impossible.

A possible way for homoeopathy of ending the deadlock ?

Being a sort of 'middle way', in practice, it may be summed up in several essential points :

- Not to remove one's difference but to uphold it if not to stress it and proclaim it as an advantage in one's practice...

- To distance oneself clearly and unambiguously from any theorisation that is confused in its propositions, obviously based on 'magic' or pseudopsychiatry, and prides itself on explanations of a 'scientific' nature...

except for the last few years, outside their teaching groups. Rash conclusions, 'magic' if not miraculous aspect, incoherences, points on which broadened analogies and the placebo effect are obvious in them. They are even more so when they are observed by a psychiatrist. Certain 'pathogénésies' reported or on which some case studies described are based are clearly stated as **carried out during 'meditation'**... This leaves one all the more stunned as no reservations seem to be expressed about that fact either by those who state it calmly or by those who learn of it !... The Buddha himself would not have been able to authenticate the absolute value of his conclusions if he had been put in that situation... Did he not even say in substance, testifying to the essential imperfection associated with all human beings, 'I shall only be really the Buddha when all human beings have become Buddhas' ?

- To accept and assert clearly the current impossibility of explaining how the therapeutic genius works...

To remind people that the 'placebo effect' does not explain everything : the medicine has an impact in itself despite the fact that one cannot determine how it acts and one can, under particular conditions, assess certain of its effects.

- To reject all assessment if the precondition of specific experimental protocols is not respected...

It will not be possible to carry out any objective research without this essential preliminary... And the results will only be unsatisfactory or distorted.

- To remind people vigorously that the loyalty to a methodology which brings so many patients together, if it does not constitute scientific proof of its mode of action, constitutes, on the other hand, a sign regarding its effectiveness⁹.

And this is, in various regards, a problem of public health and funds¹⁰ and of respect for the choice of the patients who wish to choose the kind of medicines they will treat themselves with and also for our colleagues who have trained as doctors - and therefore have also taken the Hippocratic oath - and have trained to acquire additional skills...

If only on this account, they deserve at least deontological respect and esteem...¹¹

Doctor Geneviève Ziegel

⁹ Even if, as with those carried out for the subjects treated with allopathy, certain of their aspects may be seen from a strictly scientific point of view, the epidemiological investigations easily prove it.

¹⁰ Low cost, drop in the number of consultations, if only the advice given at the pharmacy, increase in the chemical waste discharged into the water and nature, fact that it has become less possible for the most destitute people to treat themselves as they want to - the reduction of reimbursements partially offset by mutual insurance companies, whose contributions will inevitably increase, will no longer permit them to do so - , increase in spending on what is described as 'bobologie' (from 'bobo', which is in French a child's onomatopoeia for 'physical pain'), decrease in prevention, risk of an increase in the number of undiagnosed pathologies given the lack of medical care or homoeopathic medications dispensed by non-doctors, increase in the number of more expensive prescriptions... whereas synergy between allopathy and homoeopathy permits more appropriate allopathic prescriptions, to give much lower dosages, to determine the diagnosis more precisely, and to widen the scope of research - notably iatrogenic effects.

¹¹ Translated by Pascale Tempka