

II - Homoeopathic doctors¹ called into question...

Called into question... Indeed !

And at different levels...

If the previous text was enlightening as regards what motivates the 'opponents' of homoeopathy, it might be interesting to analyse, with an identical position in homoeopaths, what generates an identical response...

To want to be 'recognised' in one's practice and what comes from it...

To give, in all 'naivety' and sincerity, arguments to part of 'knowledgeable people' who 'do not want to know' may not be the most appropriate way of responding to such strong and irrationally fierce opposition.

The fact that the rigidification observed in the way of thinking put in place has existed for a long time should be taken into account. Even if it means repeating things that have already been mentioned², there is an important element that should be called to memory : from the moment that the *pharmakos*-remedy bringing the power³ of the diviners of the past became the *pharmakon*-medicine and 'purity' was separated from 'impurity', the poison from the medicine, it put a new light on everything...

What was brought by the Knowledge of the Diviner and was included in the curative substance was eliminated, consequently changing it into matter emptied of all other element.⁴ What was ternary in it, bringing another domain, 'spiritual' essence, became binary and pure materiality : the *pharmakos* concretised in the Greek rite bearing the same name as a symbol of the treating substance⁵ originally stated by Diviners⁶ became the *pharmakon*, tincture, 'medicine' ; the overindulgence in alcohol - notably during the Bacchanalia - got the better of the secret and entrenched influence over people's minds... The expression of Knowledge initially seen as in harmony with the Divine, Nature - and their fundamental laws - became questionable... The rational got the upper hand... Everything remotely connected with it was systematically eradicated. The mark engraved in the depths of consciousness remains of it... And it is still present...

Through his choice to apply 'like cures like' and by calling to mind in an imaginary way for many opponents of homoeopathy alchemy and Paracelsian positions, Hahnemann could only bring back that 'memory'. He could only reawaken profound anxiety coming from far-off times... It is probably what accounts for the instinctive rejection and the refusal to listen to - or even to examine - anything that may be outside tangible criteria of thought or of evaluation... Nothing that may, consciously or unconsciously, call that time to mind is acceptable, and it has reached the point where even the obvious is denied...

¹ Or authorised treating people... (Midwives, veterinary surgeons, dental surgeons...)

² - As each article is meant to be a unit, there are inevitably repetitions !

³ Cf. the Indo-European root of the word (*far*, to transfer, to bring ; *mak*, power - Cf. *L'homéopathie face au placebo*).

⁴ Cf. *L'homéopathie face au placebo*.

⁵ But also, like the *pharmakon*, 'poisoner, magician, sorcerer' but, unlike the *pharmakon*, 'who atones for the sins of another person, villain, scoundrel' (Cf. *L'homéopathie face au placebo*).

⁶ - the remedy, which remedies -

It is a feeling similar to phobia that homoeopaths come up against...

Not aware of the causes of that instinctive rejection, the latter try their best in vain to be 'heard' by all possible means without fully realising the strength of the anxiety to which they give rise in spite of themselves or the obviously defensive positions they engender. On no account should the protective shield constituted by the scientific and materialistic approach be removed because of the risk of causing the profound fear going back to the dawn of time to resurface... Only it can explain the violence of the rejection, the fear of being 'manipulated' and of being caught again in a cycle in which the irrational and 'magic' will supplant reason and objectivity.

Tangibleness, explicableness and reproducibility are the only acceptable points of reference... They cannot or will not listen to anything that may go outside the scope of what is concrete, detectable or may call that time to mind...

But homoeopaths try their best to explain, show, prove whereas their language - and sometimes what they say - seems 'disturbing'...

And the means put at their disposal, the protocols imposed, the excuses invoked amount to deafness and blindness running counter to all objectivity or openness to a field of exploration likely to follow a different path...

One may wonder why homoeopaths are so insistent about wanting to be listened to by the world of medicine and that of research...

Besides the fact that they want to be considered to have the status of full doctors - which is legitimate since they have had their basic training with that in homoeopathy in addition - and obey a charter subjecting them to the same rules and constraints, there is another element that plays a role... It motivates them in a natural way...

They follow the example of their master...

One should keep in mind that - even though all those who regard him as a 'charlatan' or 'illusionist' seem to forget it - Hahnemann was a researcher and experimenter trained in chemistry...

He was rigorous and always prone to question many of his points of view : not to mix medicines to get objective and clear observation of the effects of any substance, to state, after day-to-day clinical tests, that, with chronic illnesses, it is often necessary to alternate the medicines, not to persist in wanting to treat psychiatric⁷ - and not psychic - problems are obvious examples of this - one should not forget that he was undoubtedly influenced by Lavoisier, with whom he mixed⁸...

⁷ This is a **fundamental point of change**. Generated somewhat quickly (about 10 years) in comparison with the changes occurring at the same time as the appearance of Kent's theorisations, not well known even in the circles advocating the taking of one medicine, the latter, which put the mental state at the centre of all research, appeared in a form modified by the new theorisations. But as their most usual supporters do not have any training in psychiatry - or, if they do, most of them have no training in personal psychoanalysis (it is a matter of times) -, they cannot see what is obvious for the older generation (mine and that of Dr Jacqueline Barbancey, which initiated the use of homoeopathy in psychiatry). Consequently, the prevailing training in CBT and, as regards the diagnosis - which is consequently much less qualified -, what comes from the 'recorded' use, in a way, of the DSM cannot permit to assess the differences brought to the approach to the disorder and to the therapeutic way of dealing with it, whether it is homoeopathic or allopathic.

⁸ Le point 8 10 2017.fr

Besides, like all experimenting scientists, it must be stressed that he never mixed what concerned his experiments with any metaphysical approach⁹. Unlike what happened as soon as Kentian points of view appeared, he was always very clear on the subject.¹⁰

It is therefore natural that the homoeopaths who follow all his principles should also want to continue in that way, if only in the way of carrying out *pathogénésies* and of widening their scope... Except that...

Times have changed ; as the methods of investigation become more and more specialised, the fragmentation of knowledge runs counter to what previously happened, all the more so as certain elements coming from the Kentian theorisation are still vague for many people...

In fact, if the skills in all fields of the doctor still retain the mark of what used to be in the past¹¹, in reality, the problem is far more complex. Paradoxically, the advancements in technology, expertise and even in languages make communication outside the circle of competence from which one comes difficult :

- How can one make people understand that, for a 'scientist', statistical results are not proofs, that the close similitude used by Hahnemann - and current in the scientific world - has nothing to do with the broadened one used by certain trends that have recently appeared in the world of homoeopathy ?

- How can one call to memory that reference *pathogénésies* must be carried out with the same rigour as those carried out according to Hahnemann's method ?

In this respect, many of those put online and from various sources that are more or less doubtful or biased according to the theorisation underlying them are not at all 'acceptable' because they have completely moved away from the Hahnemannian - and even Kentian¹² - model.

⁹ His conception of life force, such as it was expressed in the 6th version of *The Organon*, was unambiguous on that point.

¹⁰ - this had been quite obvious for all homoeopaths before various trends of different types coming from that theorisation - and without anyone being really able to explain why - gradually put the mental state and repertorisation at the centre of the practice of homoeopathy, hence the more and more marked confusion of the younger generation and the perplexity of the older, supporting or not the single medicine - officially prescribed in France from the rule stated in the 5th version of *The Organon*.

¹¹ It took, it must be called to mind, real opposition from psychotherapists about ten years ago for the title not to be systematically given to doctors if they had not followed a specialised course of study... It must also be noted how hard many politicians have tried, until recently, to eradicate psychiatrists, considering that GPs were quite able to replace them... and also that psychiatrists, in the original definition of their profession, may be authorised, if necessary, to carry out tests usually reserved for GPs...

¹² Certain of them, often carried out by non-doctors, show, it must be said, obvious lack of coherence, with the predominant and most subjective looking for mental signs, 'jumble' of physical signs stated in no particular order without any pathophysiologic points of reference... They run counter to that sort of backbone constituted by the diathesis to which the medicine belongs - and what it permits to perceive as regards the progressive nature, the pathological risks and the points of fragility. Many masters of homoeopathy - Roland Zissu, Michel Guermonprez, etc. - always stressed this, each in their way...

- How can one make people understand that all references to the scientific world must be backed up by acceptable arguments and that, very often, the training in medicine alone does not permit to see their essential requirements in an appropriate way ?

The rapid advancements in technology and knowledge are, in this respect, all the more formidable that the younger generation of doctors has been made more aware of any gap in that field : what they are taught now centres more on examinations and their results than on clinical observation.

To remain faithful to Hahnemann's principles may be a way of avoiding many disadvantages.

One may even say that, if one wants to maintain the fragile dialogue with current authorities, this is absolutely essential...

Except if it fits perfectly into the context proposed, no argument of an experimental nature will find favour with 'knowledgeable people'...

It is important to keep this in mind and not to delude oneself... What is at stake is much too important, it goes far beyond the economic excuse or the usual one of the 'proofs' put forward.

One thing is certain and obvious, even though it is well-known that, in essence, it cannot, in homoeopathy, be carried out under the conditions proposed, 'double-blind testing' has become an essential point of reference to such an extent that it represents the only valid element for the authorities. This is an important point, which many homoeopaths disregard or even often forget. The work carried out as closely as possible to what is imposed by that experimental approach has not even been judged at its real value. It could never be published and has always been received with contradictory elements... Too few cases, questionable elements, etc.¹³

Besides, one knows that, at present, apart from some brave stands, few researchers run the risk, especially in France, of expressing the slightest interest in homoeopathy.

Moreover, except if it is carried out within the referenced and approved scope of academic research, no other type of experiment is likely to be respected or even taken into account. In this respect, statistical results can only - this has already been mentioned - be questioned as proofs...

Besides, what might widen the scope of research is neither known nor pursued¹⁴...

The drawing of a parallel between antidepressants, mood stabilisers, magnesium salts and homoeopathic types with the highlighting of synergy, the possibility of determining 'responding types' to a certain molecule, the anticipation of the appropriate dose have been the subject of theses within the context of the Faculty of Pharmacy, Montpellier thanks to Professor Madeleine Bastide (†).

¹³ 'Give a dog a bad name and hang him', as it is well-known !

¹⁴ Quite interesting as therapeutic support as well as to understand certain reactions linked to quick or unusually important iatrogenic effects (Cf., on the site, different articles mentioning the problem posed by Roaccutane® or by the more or less quick and paradoxical effects of certain molecules designed to fight Alzheimer's disease), unfortunately it has not had any more developments or consequences... In that domain, everything is now at a standstill.

There remain the obvious effects on plants and some mentioned by veterinary medicine to try to put forward a line of argument likely to be examined... This is a possibility, which is nevertheless not certain. The fanatical and simplistic clinging to 'double-blind testing' will undoubtedly be a considerable obstacle... It can only be made bigger by the lack of means put at disposal and it will always be possible to find one more argument to use...

It seems that there is little chance that the way of looking at that point will change. If they are logical in principle, the fallacious economic arguments put forward can only strengthen a position which, if it does not sign the death warrant for homoeopathy in its present aspect, will undoubtedly make it take a big step backwards... Until... Or unless...

A potential no ?...

Opposed to the fact that its point of view - and its money - will not be taken into account and, above all else, that other people choose in its place, public opinion may cause a stir and change in the response to an issue put forward regularly... This might - but this is not certain - lead to reconsider everything. This is not an element to be ignored...

External elements sometimes play a role in tipping the scales in an unexpected way¹⁵. As long as it follows Hahnemann's laws and continues to be practised by doctors or authorised treating people, the crisis raging in the world of homoeopathy might mark a fresh start for it in France... Who knows ?...

A salutary revival ?

Beyond all the obstacles put to make its presence disappear completely, can the fact of combining high technology with individualised listening to arrive at a personalised treatment constitute, thanks to its intervention, the challenge of the present stage ? This is, in spite of appearances, a possibility.

One should not forget that homoeopathy goes in the same direction as Life and the latter has its laws and principles which make things move in the necessary direction¹⁶ even if, at first, it seems to be difficult to foresee in its long-term effects.

Despite the decline in credibility initiated by the form of 'downgrading' inherent in the fact that medicines will no longer be listed in the official pharmacopoeia, the possible reappearance of strains and dilutions left out for economic reasons and because of certain constraints imposed by the obtention of the product licence in France can only have beneficial effects... It would permit greater precision in the treatment, better individualisation and therefore more convincing results...

And one should keep in mind that homoeopathic medicines have their properties. Those who use them know this but homoeopathy should remain in its appropriate place,

¹⁵ The last article taken from the book mentioned in the first part of this work is, in this respect, as unexpected in its appearance at the required moment as propaedeutic in its content...

¹⁶ Luckily (!!) discovered by René Philippe Halm as he carried out research into the subject, the little-known but award-winning book by the chemist, historian of chemistry and philosopher of science Hélène Metzger (1889-1944-died in the Nazi concentration camps), *La méthode philosophique et l'histoire des sciences*, Fayard backed up certain elements concerning the potentiality of being listened to by the 'decision-making' authorities. By permitting for the first time to define the boundaries of analogy within the context of scientific research, Hélène Metzger showed that, even if it could facilitate certain intuitions, the latter was inadequate to permit to constitute any element of 'proof'. We come back to those authorities of authorities in place on the subject of 'double-blind tests' (Cf. *Rêves et cauchemars au coeur de l'homéopathie*).

prescribed by authorised treating people and not limited to *bobologie*¹⁷ or to a type of medicine practised through self-medication and not always appropriate or harmless.

A necessary clarification...

Highlighting and taking into account the unpredictable impact of Kent's theories and of the modifications gradually made to the Hahnemannian basis to have reached the stage where one considers that this is the 'modern' face of homoeopathy¹⁸ can only - and this is also a positive impact of the present crisis - facilitate the distinction between homoeotherapy¹⁹ and Hahnemannian homoeopathy.

The constant confusion increased by the propagation - very often, by non-doctors - in American countries or others is most problematic... Many doctors - homoeopaths or not - and people in favour of homoeopathy eventually feel lost and, unfortunately, often turn away from it.

The present times will undoubtedly permit to be clearer about that additional difficulty which will, eventually, have effects.

The battle is not lost yet...

But it is necessary to grasp all the facets of the issue and to take into account the unknown factors likely to play a role in modifying what is apparently unavoidable and undoubtedly marks a new evolutionary stage...²⁰

To be continued...

Doctor Geneviève Ziegel

PS : We have had to put certain fundamental explanatory elements in footnotes so as to avoid weighing down the already dense main text. We apologise for this. (Author's note)

¹⁷ From *bobo*, which is in French a child's onomatopoeia for 'physical pain'. (Translator's note)

¹⁸ - even though it is a step backwards to the model before Hahnemann and to the Paracelsian points of view.

¹⁹ It is important to stress again that anthroposophic doctors, if they are linked to homoeopaths given their use of dynamised diluted products, do not claim to be homoeopaths, and what applies to them can also apply to the trends claiming to adhere to Kent's Unicism (and not to that based on the 5th version of *The Organon*) and to its various manifestations present in varied forms in different countries.

²⁰ Translated by Pascale Tempka