

# BETWEEN FACES OF THE PAST AND NEW THEORISATIONS : HOMOEOPATHY IN 2017 <sup>1</sup>

## II - A gradual change in conceptions

### In France :

The spreading of the Hahnemannian approach outside its original points and the appearance of Kent's points of view quickly signalled a change in treatment, whose effects were gradually put in place.

If the Kentian theorisation and methodology prevailed in the United States before they spread to South America, in fact, it was in France that, although they were somewhat misunderstood<sup>2</sup>, they experienced the least important changes.

Even if the real foundations<sup>3</sup> of the 'Unicist' practice were present in the background and were, even not long ago, made more or less conscious and taught<sup>4</sup>, the original Kentian aspects had been implicit for a long time.

As a matter of fact, apart from a school claiming to adhere to his ideas, Kent's impact is often minimised or dismissed.

Is this due to the role of Freud's thought<sup>5</sup>, because of all the reservations which have been linked to it about religion or what was linked to it ? One may wonder.

The methodology advocating the 'unicity of the medicine' is still not well distinguished from 'Unicism'. The invocation of the 5<sup>th</sup> version of *The Organon* is often the only explanation for the unicity of the medicine.

The dialogue was therefore maintained<sup>6</sup> with the 'pluralists'<sup>7</sup> until, as gradually as unexpectedly, a new breakthrough in Kent's thought occurred a few years ago.

It has been accompanied for two or three years by the reappearance of old practices coming from South America - even if the latter were, and still are, strongly decried by many 'Unicists' heavily influenced by P. Schmitt's<sup>8</sup> thought.

It is therefore important to analyse what happened in America after the appearance of the Kentian message.

---

<sup>1</sup> Second part of a talk given in Castelnau-le-Lez during the inauguration of the 'Centre Madeleine Bastide', June 2017, and published on homeopsy.com in July and August 2017.

<sup>2</sup> - even if Pierre Schmitt did not deny their real points of view expressed clearly in his pieces of writing stating the origin of the real disease,

<sup>3</sup> Attributed to the conformity with the teachings of the versions of *The Organon* published while Hahnemann was alive.

<sup>4</sup> In view of the small spreading of the translations, their often doubtful quality, and the changes sometimes made to the original texts.

<sup>5</sup> Freud (1856-1939).

<sup>6</sup> With separate teachings but common annual meetings.

<sup>7</sup> Based on the - posthumous - 6<sup>th</sup> version of *The Organon*.

<sup>8</sup> Swiss homoeopath originating, in France, the unicist trend.

## In the United States

In spite of the understandable infatuation of the milieu marked by religious influence - and also, probably, by the spreading of the Jungian points of view<sup>9</sup> - , the probably more uncertain side of the results linked to Kent's thought<sup>10</sup> was a source of growing problems.

Homoeopathy was gradually regarded with suspicion : the conjunction of schools of thought sullied by 'the irrational' and 'not scientifically acceptable aspects' and a different conception of vital energy<sup>11</sup> probably played a role<sup>12</sup>.

The broadening of the Hahnemannian similitude which brought about the introduction of accounts of dreams - and not themes - compared analogically with those of the patient - or with things they have said - in order to define the subject's mentality, the Flexner Report which, from the post-war years, tried to give again a more 'rational' turn to medical approaches<sup>13</sup>, the scientific points of view, the rejection of the traditional types of medicine and psychoanalysis gradually marked the falling into disrepute and then the official rejection of homoeopathy in the United States<sup>14</sup>.

It is still present today<sup>15</sup>.

Coming from Kent's thought and making this fact worse, more and more marked and extensive gradual drifts consequently appeared :

## In South America

To **Elizalde A. Masi**, the 'original sin', central to the choice of a medicine, led to the Thomistic classification of its consequences, with epithets which were compared to the subject's mentality.

To **Tomas Pablo Paschero**<sup>16</sup>, won over by the Jungian approach of pathologies, medicines came from a miasmatic classification seen as too static and rigid : used at the various stages of the psychological evolution, they were brought to a similitude to the subject's mentality.

Later on, their progressive spreading to various European and Asian countries gradually engendered various changes :

The 'original sin' was, according to cultures and countries, replaced by the loss of the link with 'Cosmic Laws'.

---

<sup>9</sup> Carl Gustav Jung (1875-1961).

<sup>10</sup> Whose centring on the 'mental state' was more marked.

<sup>11</sup> To be distinguished from the vitalism of Barthes, which explains that an organism is 'alive' only thanks to the presence in it of the energy which animates it.

<sup>12</sup> To Hahnemann, it simply showed the capacity for reaction of the organism whereas, to Kent, it bore the marks of a dysfunction linked to the original sin.

<sup>13</sup> Many doctors trained on the job during the war had not actually studied medicine.

<sup>14</sup> Whereas, in 1914, whole hospitals treated patients according to the Hahnemannian approach, there was not a single one left in 1945.

<sup>15</sup> With even lawsuits against homoeopathy.

<sup>16</sup> An Argentinian homoeopath (1904-1986).

## ***Little by little, there have been new approaches, coming from various countries***

They have in common :

- *The loyalty to Kent's theorisation*, that is to say :

- A single medicine ;
- The 'mental state' put at the heart of research - the somatic aspects are present but somewhat minor ;
- Larger and larger production of 'pathogénésies'.

- *The moving away from his precepts* :

The similitude advocated by Hahnemann - and to which Kent adhered - has been replaced by broader and broader analogies :

- The disorder is compared to ways of behaving attributed to a family of plants or a group of metals from elements taken from the Kabbalah, mythology, alchemy ;
- The content of dreams is widely observed so as to draw from it signs about the subject's mentality or compared to the dreams expressed in 'pathogénésies'.

## ***Progressively, the extension is not the prevalence...***

Stemming from Kent's thought and though decried by French unicists, those approaches are gradually gaining ground.

Their spreading to various countries and the number of practitioners who take pride in following them<sup>17</sup> have become an intangible guarantee of what they expound, hence their more and more marked influence in France, even at the heart of schools traditionally associated with Pierre Schmidt's teachings.

The increase in the number of 'pathogénésies' and numerous forms associated with them is accompanied by the more and more marked repertorisation without constant reference to *materia medica*<sup>18</sup>.

Even if the taking into account of the Kentian premises and an evolution with regard to Kent's practice appear in them, differences become clearer and clearer...

The scope of the analogies has been extended and has taken on aspects which, if they are similar on some points, may turn out to be as various as different.

## ***Divergences between those new approaches***

Coming from Kentism but also post-Kentism, they concern certain points :

To **George Vithoukas** : the somatic element is to be considered but the medicine mirrors a disruption of vital energy to be corrected at the right level, otherwise one might

---

<sup>17</sup> Most of whom, it must be said, are not doctors.

<sup>18</sup> Far too prolix to be consulted thoroughly.

not only eliminate a symptom, one might also create problems for the descendants and, through them, for the human race as a whole.

To **Jan Scholten** : tackled through Mendeleev's Table, metals are brought to a similitude to certain mentalities. They are accompanied by a most unusual and personal explanation in comparison with a most elementary scientific and psychopathological approach<sup>19</sup> : Mendeleev's classification, which is based on the physico-chemical properties of the elements, is turned into a medical classification.

By using very rough elements coming from alchemy or old points of view, and through most simple analogic comparisons, each category of metals is linked to a type of problem<sup>20</sup>.

Iron would therefore play a role in routine work, Silver in creativity at work, Gold as regards power and responsibilities... Their prescription in tiny doses would permit to correct the disorders playing a role in any pathology linked to a problem in this field...

**Rajan Sankaran** tries to find the 'sensation' which changes the view of the world and expresses the subject's mentality : the essential characteristics of a medicine coming from the animal, plant, or mineral kingdom are mirrored by the signs presented by the subject.

Defined from alchemy, the phylogenetic classification<sup>21</sup> of plants, or that of metals, they sometimes characterise not only a plant, a mineral, or a vegetable but a whole family<sup>22</sup>...

To **Massimo Mangialavori**, the medicine also shows the subject's adaptation to their environment... 'Pathogénésies' should be re-examined according to that assertion.

### ***Similitude versus Hahnemann-Kent is treated roughly***

Though claimed even if the symbolic level does not **in whatever way** belong to the levels of similitude described by Professors M. Bastide and A. Lagache<sup>23</sup>, the application of the Hahnemannian similitude is left behind if not considered outdated...

---

<sup>19</sup> If this is not meant to be a criticism, this is meant to be a necessary observation to be highlighted, otherwise many 'opponents' or practitioners who are remotely aware of the confusion will do so one day and quite rightly.

<sup>20</sup> Which, outside a conception stemming from alchemistic points of view and going by a very broad and uncertain analogy, cannot make any sense in comparison with a dynamic conception of the subject and even less in comparison with their psychological characteristics. If it is conceivable that gold may harden tissues and produces sclerotic phenomena and therefore the thirst for domination, can one, for all that, come to the conclusion that will permit to prescribe Aurum from this notion ? And as for silver, which certainly encourages activity, can one therefore conclude that all 'people creative at work' should be given silver salt even if one can notice the obsessional aspect of Argentum Nitricum subjects ? If what is put forward here can find an echo in the symbolic level, it is the systematisation and classifying aspect which pose problems. **Everything happens as if, whereas one tries to be as close to the subject as possible, one tries to be as close to the medicine as possible.**

<sup>21</sup> Published recently, it was quickly used in his work to corroborate the scientific aspect of what he announced even though the explanations provided and the analogic comparisons coming from the past can on no account give his theorisation this aspect or justify their alleged 'modernism'. (Cf. the article by R.P. Halm, *Le Cymothoa et l'homéopathie moderne*, Cahiers de biothérapie, mars 2017).

<sup>22</sup> Can one say that the boletus will have the same 'pathogénésie' as the Satan's bolete, or that Zea Mais and Zea Italica, usually well distinguished from one another in their 'pathogénésies', will have exactly the same effects ?

<sup>23</sup> Whose hypotheses have not been invalidated so far.

This is therefore a form of paradox : whereas a form of 'modernism' is announced, this is not only the field of an analogy like that used in many types of traditional medicine but also in the Paracelsian and alchemistic one, abandoned by Hahnemann.

### ***'Homoeopathy espouses the laws of life'...***

'This is the reason why it cannot die but can only reappear in a form or another', Professor Madeleine Bastide said quite rightly.

### ***Some rules must be respected***

Obedying immutable constraints, the similitude advocated by Hahnemann shows the logic of them :

'Like the wolf which mimes its death to tell its opponent not to kill it, by its diluted and dynamised form, the homoeopathic medicine corresponding to the disorder to be treated tells the subject, in a mirrored way, not to see the information given as with a meaning linked to toxicity but, conversely, in its treating meaning' : this is one of the key elements of the work on the signifiers of the body initiated by Agnès Lagache<sup>24</sup> and Madeleine Bastide.

In order to do so, the organism must be informed in an appropriate way and at as many levels as possible about where the similitude may manifest itself...

The latter must be as strong as possible ;

The symbolic level is not part of it ;

Broad analogies are not in current use in it : on no account are they comparable to the Hahnemannian similitude.

### ***The moving away from Hahnemann's teachings***

This is not what is applied in the new post-Kentian approaches.

Under their similar appearances, they are very different as regards both the theoretical field and the practice, with :

- Even greater centring on the subject's psyche without necessarily knowing its modes of functioning : listening is important but the aura of the therapist, who will find 'the medicine that ...' **at last** and the necessity of detecting signs coming from repertorisation to define it can only have an impact.

Despite the highly advocated neutrality, neither the 'placebo effect' inherent in any therapeutic relationship nor the subjective quality present on both sides nor the unconscious phenomena seem to be taken into account. They are mentioned neither in their influence on the consultation nor in the realisation of the 'pathogénésies'.

In this respect<sup>25</sup>, many of them use, concerning the psyches, somewhat simple<sup>26</sup> - if not 'simplistic'<sup>27</sup> - phrases : if, *in fine*, they bear no relation at all to any concrete reality, they no

---

<sup>24</sup> Who also worked on the media of treatment used by the Australian Aborigines : insofar as the patient had in themselves the frame of reference which permitted them to integrate their treating message, they enjoyed their treating power as soon as they were confronted with them visually.

<sup>25</sup> No judgement is intended at all here but this is the view of a psychiatry practitioner.

<sup>26</sup> Scorpio, which 'hides under a stone' and is particularly poisonous, can therefore be a medicine for an isolated and vindictive subject !

doubt have an influence if only on the sometimes euphoric conviction with which they are recounted or stated.

But, it must be said, this can be somewhat problematic in many respects in comparison with the serious quality of homoeopathy as a whole.

- The increased and **often prevailing** use of repertories constitutes one of the particular aspects of those practices : Hahnemann and Boenninghausen used them only supplementarily.

The daily increase in the number of 'pathogénésies'<sup>28</sup> forces one to use them permanently, with all the risks linked to unenlightened repertorisation, that is :

- The convenient use, which makes things easier but is devoid of any real reference to the data of materia medica ;
- Possible 'induction' of the responses ;
- The use of more or less reliable data, **'psyche' being chosen according to the method and the master**<sup>29</sup> !

The taking into account of the data used can be compared to that which is based on the classification of psychiatric illnesses<sup>30</sup> and is decried more and more today.

- The increase in the number of 'pathogénésies' which are more or less reliable but are used, given that they are published on the Net.
- Scientific explanations which are more or less problematic because they are somewhat risky in comparison with intellectual rigour : quantum physics, erroneous interpretation of the work of M. Bastide and A. Lagache, inappropriate use of the data of certain classifications ;
- The lack of if not, from some of them, the 'closing' to any questioning : 'This is the "new type of homoeopathy", Hahnemann is outdated ! '...
- The reintroduction of the 'magic' element... and, in some ways, of the impact of the 'diviner' or 'magus' who, in former times - or in the traditional types of medicine<sup>31</sup> - , delivered the treating message<sup>32</sup>.

---

<sup>27</sup> Without any pejorative note or value judgement intended, this is the word which, unless one adopts the language used in the past and in the traditional types of medicine in the truest sense of the word, might be used by anyone who has the smallest notion of the functioning of the psyche.

<sup>28</sup> Some of which - and this was said without any embarrassment - were done within a week...

<sup>29</sup> Which, surprisingly, does not seem to pose any problem even for experienced homoeopaths but which, even if certain elements - shared by different 'pathogénésies' - may reappear, is a real problem if only as regards the credibility which may be attached to homoeopathy in comparison with that lack of rigour : the elements recounted are not stated in the same way, totally different points are stressed according to the authors. (See, on that subject, the enlightening observation in this respect concerning Lac Caprinum in *Rêves et cauchemars au coeur de l'homéopathie*).

<sup>30</sup> DSM

<sup>31</sup> - and today, in some respects, in the conventional type of medicine.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. the book *L'homéopathie face au placebo*.

## ***The past beneath an appearance of modernism***

Problematic theories beneath modern appearances, they show the blatant lack of knowledge about the theories on which they claim to rely.

Unless they are compared to a different view from the Hahnemannian approach - which some of them claim - and have a different name from that of 'Homoeopathy', they may constitute a serious problem for the credibility of the latter.

Whereas interesting prospects appear in many fields, they act as a brake on the relationships with the medical world as a whole.

If, in other countries, the practitioners who are not doctors release themselves from all dialogue with the scientific world or if some doctors refer to it more or less unduly to back up what they say, it seems necessary not to forget three of the most important elements :

- The similitude used is on no account that of Hahnemann or Kent.
- This is a backward step towards a way of thinking decried by the founder of homoeopathy.
- The impact of unconscious phenomena is not even envisaged : the data linked to them is not even mentioned in their possible role and influence on the results stated<sup>33</sup>.

It is important, in this respect, to say that, if Hahnemann tried to tackle the type of pathology which constitutes the day-to-day practice of a psychiatrist, he did not persist in it<sup>34</sup> and the use of homoeopathy in this field is quite new.

Unfortunately, it has been for several years hindered by the confusion engendered not only by the appearance of the new theorisations but also by the way in which mental disorders are tackled again : the effects of a classifying type of medicine looking for medical protocols, standardised treatments and the undeniable decline - in favour of CBT or 'short-term' types of therapy - of the purely psychoanalytic methods based on the looking for the unconscious motives are undeniable. They bring about a backward step, notably in drug prescription, which is now often as massive as if not, sometimes, worse than - because it is not appropriate and obviously not backed up by a diagnosis in due form - around 1965<sup>35</sup>...

## ***A backward step beneath 'at the leading edge of progress' appearances***

Everything happens as if, even though a modern way of thinking seems to be adopted and its tools used either in homoeopathy or in allopathy, a return to the past was occurring : in both cases, the subject is, in spite of appearances, erased by a form of interpretation of their pathology :

- such problem, such homoeopathic medicine ;
- such disorder, such neuronal or metabolic dysfunction, such molecule ;
- such family of plants or metals, such type of psyche ;
- such medicine, such disorder ;
- such neuronal and metabolic disorder, such pathology, therefore such medicine.

---

<sup>33</sup> Even though, by simply mentioning the placebo effect or the role of the actors in the experiment, the most 'hard-line' 'scientists' make reference to it in a more or less marked way.

<sup>34</sup> Besides he did not use the word 'psyche' of the subject but the psychic signs which the latter might show. The word 'psyche' seems to have appeared concurrently with the Kentian points of view.

<sup>35</sup> This is the fact that appears today and to which I can testify. (Author's note)

### ***Certain risks...***

If the results of those new approaches of homoeopathy are left to the judgement of those who apply them - or benefit from them - and if they constitute ways of treating also using diluted, dynamised medicines given at infinitesimal doses, perhaps they should be clearly and officially totally distinguished from Hahnemann's approach.

It would quite obviously be more appropriate to call them differently rather than consider them to be a 'revolutionary' advance and at the leading edge of progress of the latter.

The apparent 'psychiatrising' of 'modern' homoeopathy is on no account, it is important to say, an evolution but a backward step in many respects.

It can lead the latter to its death if not to a massive simplification of its indications. It would run counter to any prospect of change, even though the scope of investigations suggested is huge and shows the richness of the Hahnemannian approach<sup>36</sup>.

The rigour of the master of homoeopathy, which was that of a chemist and of a clinician, and M. Bastide<sup>37</sup> and A. Lagache's way of looking at his observations lead one to be more vigilant with regard to the drifts linked to pseudoscience.

Its remaining within the scope of medicine, to which the Hahnemannian discipline has many things to contribute in many fields, is at that price.

It is necessary to make more effort towards appropriate clinical research with suitable protocols and to have the possibility of assessing in a precise and indisputable way the results obtained.

As with a conventional medicine, objective elements leaving no doubt about the action of the medicine are essential - even if, as with the latter, the effect of the relationship and that of various elements making psychosomatic phenomena play a role can never be left out... This is all the more important when one bases one's judgement on signs coming from the psyche and it is even more so when, in order to tackle problems concerning this field, one uses non-objective signs taken from analogic comparisons.

At the risk of saying the same thing twice, this was worth not only backing up, revealing but also explaining and stating clearly.<sup>38</sup>

Doctor Geneviève Ziegel

---

<sup>36</sup> The practice of psychiatry shows a little more every day the importance of it in comparison with the diagnostic and therapeutic possibilities.

<sup>37</sup> The G.I.R.I. (Groupe International de Recherche sur l'Infinitésimal), of which M. Bastide, with Doctor René Philippe Halm, was one of the founder members, pursues its work on high dilutions...

<sup>38</sup> Translated by Pascale Tempka