

## I - Room for the opinions of homoeopaths

When almost no journal accepts any opportunity for homoeopaths to make themselves heard or acknowledges receipt of their answer to the members of the Academy of Medicine and the Academy of Pharmacy except by being silent - or answering that it does not publish any text except those accepted by the current scientific committee -, there remains a last resort... It is the one used here : to publish on the Net, and therefore 'make do with what one has got', what comes from their anger, reflection and indignation...

A few homoeopaths will therefore express themselves here and say what no current media authority or decision-maker wants to 'hear' or even listen to... The trial - or the form of travesty of a trial - has already been settled... Death to homoeopathy, let us quickly change the subject and stay in a theoretical world that is restrictive and in many respects outside reality and what the day-to-day Hahnemannian practice may contribute... As Pascale Laville says very correctly in one of the following texts, ' "the mechanisms of the action" of homoeopathy are still mysterious but nevertheless observable'.

The following texts are those of a revolt but also of a sort of realisation. Instead of trying to be accepted and 'recognised' and doing everything we can to correspond to..., since we cannot convince people closed to any line of argument and observable facts, we should now assert our differences and demand a certain amount of respect for our practices... It is essential to refuse to accept any commonplace or slanderous statement conveyed tirelessly by the press or the media... The Italian child who died of otitis probably did so because of a bad doctor or even, perhaps, of a non-doctor given that, in many countries, the title Doctor may be linked to the fact of having studied homoeopathy... One can therefore call oneself a 'Doctor of homoeopathy'... It leads one to expect that the prescriptions will be made mainly by non-doctors or, as Philippe Marchat says, doctors will no longer have the right to make them...

The various points of view expressed here complement each other. Each of them shows in its way the complexity of an issue in which the difficulty in accepting difference and that in listening to other opinions than the current ones intermingle, which spares one any calling into question... Not to transfer to the other one's fear of the irrational, which Hahnemann and Freud, coming from the same country and trained in the same teachings, had eliminated from their theorisations, seems to be too great an effort to make... The art of medicine is in a very difficult position here...

Nevertheless, it must be noted that, if homoeopaths try patiently - if not too patiently - to retain if not find themselves a place in the sun of medicine, those opposed to it seem to be as afraid of losing it... They return to the comfort of the group at the slightest warning sign. The promptness to stop all teaching at university is an obvious example of it... Fear is present... And everyone fears for their credibility... Therefore, one condemns at the first warning sign and the fact that the Australian report was considered to be biased in its results has sparked off no calling into question or even comment... Where are Scientific Rigour and the impartiality of those who relay the information, who 'count their chickens before they

are hatched' and, as Gilles Tisserand says, follow the game of the shareholders instead of those of the children of today and tomorrow ?...

As the colleague signing 'J'accuse'<sup>1</sup> says in a justifiable fit of anger, in what country are we living, or rather, in what world are we living ? If our generation bears the marks left by parents who fought against the rigidity of postulates and what was supposed to be a form of 'purification' in human beings, it forces us to question the younger generation about the trap of any sort of doctrinaire approach, psychological manipulation, confusion of concepts... The lack of critical judgement and the sort of inertia consisting in not having informed oneself sufficiently before drawing any conclusion has now become dangerous...

'When it's confused, it means that it's strange', I have often said to myself... Whatever the medication, can we link the services rendered and the experimental proof of the pharmacological action of a substance or associate the insufficiency of services rendered with the lack of proof ? Is this not a form of confusion of perspectives ? And has not this mode of formulation engendered a form of confusion ? But, as Gilles Tisserand points out humorously, 'Give a dose of Sulphur 15 CH to an eczema sufferer or a subject with psoriasis. A few days later, the state of their skin will have worsened so much that they'll come to see you armed with a gun... And yet it's a thirty-nought dilution...'

Perhaps we might conclude, 'give a dog a bad name and hang him' and ask ourselves one question, to which everyone will reply as they choose : 'What is really behind that form of rage against homoeopathy ???'.<sup>2</sup>

To be continued...

Doctor Geneviève Ziegel

---

<sup>1</sup> 'J'accuse'.

'J'accuse' : title of an open letter from Émile Zola to Félix Faure, President of France, published on 13 January 1898 by the newspaper *L'Aurore*, condemning the imprisonment of Alfred Dreyfus', Oxford Dictionary. (Translator's note)

<sup>2</sup> Translated by Pascale Tempka