

V - The legacy of the past... Fourth stage¹ (1)

The 'modern' face of 'Homoeopathy'

Homoeotherapy

The name 'homoeotherapy', which has, curiously, recently disappeared from the Net, appeared in Canada about fifteen years ago and was used there to refer to the approaches coming from Kent but not using, like him, the similitude taught by Hahnemann. It was associated there with the names 'new homoeopathy' and 'parahomoeopathic therapy'².

There are three permanent features that define homoeotherapy:

Hahnemann is considered to be 'totally outmoded'!

The 'Kentian' bases³ are, to a large extent, retained but have undergone profound changes and many distortions.

It claims that it is based on 'avant-garde' scientific data.

Its different components have several common characteristics:

The concept of original sin has been replaced by that of 'spiritual cause' or 'break with natural laws';

This is what gives them a universal quality.

They have retained of Hahnemann only the use of diluted, dynamised substances.

As well as *pathogénésies*, theoretically⁴ carried out and presented according to the original mode.

Similar to Kent's principles by certain aspects,

Predominance of mental signs, numerous *pathogénésies* (in the absolute, as many as there are individuals), 'authenticating' clinical cases;

They are different from them by others:

The similitude advocated by Hahnemann and respected by Kent has been replaced by analogies of a different nature...

- botanical or animal phylogenetic classifications permit to infer characteristics and modalities consequently attributed to the medicine.

- groups of metals are used in a systematised and complex way. The characteristics of the medicine are linked to the fact that it is on the vertical or horizontal line in Mendeleev's

¹ Fifth section of a seven-part article entitled, *Entre héritage du passé et modernisme... L'homéopathie*, Geneviève Ziegel, December 2019, published on homeopsy.com

² Has the differentiation from the name homoeopathy been seen as damaging or inappropriate given that, on the decline, homoeopathy such as taught by Hahnemann and practised by non-doctors would seem to be replaced by 'more modern' homoeopathy based on scientific elements at the leading edge of progress? One can ask oneself the question...

³ Single remedy, pre-eminence of mental signs, repertorisation...

⁴ Certain of them would have been carried out in a week.

Table and chemical components - molecular structure or weight - are put opposite psychic modalities (sic!).

The pathogénésies to which they refer make one wonder in many respects.

- Their sometimes 'debatable' origins and ways of being carried out do not prevent the referencing of their modalities...

- They are often vague and confused;

- The paucity and lack of precision of the physical signs contrast with the plethora of signs connected with the psyche.

- Certain pathogenetic modalities concerning that domain often seem to have been somewhat 'slanted' in order to 'fit' analogically the characteristics of the substance tested⁵.

Observed from outside the world of homoeopathy, from the perspective of a scientist or specialist well versed in the functioning of the unconscious, what is drawn from it can only make one wonder. The theoretical flaws, contradictory elements, questionable assertions and forms of discrepancies are strikingly evident.

- Particularly concerning the psyche, the modalities seem to be often interpreted according to the practitioner.

It has been very seriously suggested to choose between the psyche seen by so-and-so or so-and-so (sic!).

Moreover, very unusual and questionable pathogénésies appear every day.

Venus light, wood from a boat lying high and dry, holy water, etc. They show both growing subjectivity and retreat into personal convictions.

Mental signs are determined from sources that are as various as debatable.

'Intuition', material from and recounts of dreams, mythology, Kabbalah, alchemy, special features linked to the substance⁶, relationship with the spiritual, 'sensation' are used to discover the subject's characterological dominant features and essential problems. Everything is used to determine the appropriate medicine. But vagueness, confusion, mistakes are legion behind the apparent coherence and rigour of the classifications and tables of all types...

The emphasis on and use of symptoms can only be questionable.

They can only call to mind what is vastly decried by many practitioners and linked to the much debated psychiatric classification, DSM.

The fact that repertorisation has supplanted more and more the use of materia medica also gives a somewhat arbitrary quality to the manner in which the medicine is chosen.

The clinical cases presented are not from the same perspective as those coming from Hahnemann:

⁵ Many examples could be given, but I shall not cite them out of respect for sometimes well-known colleagues who recounted them without, apparently, sufficient objectivity or critical judgement to be even aware of the way other people, less fascinated by the post-Kentian approach that is theirs, might see them. (Author's note)

⁶ Cf. *Rêves et cauchemars au coeur de l'homéopathie*, a case recounted in which the presence of elements calling to mind Natrum - given the withdrawal - and Bromatum - given the sexual problems - had led the therapist to prescribe Natrum bromatum, with the result - according to the therapist - that the patient got married and was cured of his homosexuality (sic!).

They are not intended to illustrate the effect of the medicine (Hahnemann) but, in a way, to authenticate the pathogenetic modalities that have been given to it.

The vagueness engendering confusion is significant...

The differences from Hahnemann are not really expressed;

Whether it is engendered by the desire of many practitioners of that approach to be considered the supporters of 'standard Homoeopathy' - which can be confirmed in a recent form of advertisement on the Net - or, on the contrary, by the wish to be differentiated from them, given the 'outmoded' aspect linked to Hahnemann, it seems to be a permanent feature.

Implicitly present and stamping their mark at different levels, certain types of theoretical data remain somewhat vague.

They were already so at the start concerning the true foundations of JT Kent's theorisation⁷ but they still seem to be so in the approaches that followed.

In fact, doing as Hahnemann⁸ did, JT Kent only referred to 'original sin'⁹ in his annexed writings. Without apparently meaning to or even being aware of it, he put in place 'unsaid things', which were later transmitted in different forms. The fact that the concept of 'primary psora' and the egotistical desire to 'control' life, which constitutes its essence, has been linked to a 'defect'¹⁰ constitutes one of its encrypted occurrences of emergence.

The lack of objectivity and questioning of the way of positioning oneself within the therapeutic relationship poses problems.

The lack of neutrality, the fact of not taking into account the power of the unconscious injunction obviously present at the heart of the relationship are problematic insofar as the placebo effect - which is nevertheless omnipresent - does not seem to be envisaged or even openly mentioned.

The step backwards, with its magi, diviners, their hypnotic influence and the misadventures linked to a form of 'magic thought' is obvious.

The fashion effect, the therapist's aura and beliefs obviously play a role in feeding confusion, psychic 'control', in a way, and lack of objectivity towards what is happening.

Surprisingly, no criticism is expressed...

Even when one refers to a form of 'modernity' to give substance to one's assertions. The use of psychoanalytic data to permit the classification of medicines¹¹ and contribute towards the interpretation of the pathogenetic data without any point of reference from pathophysiology likely to back up its reality is an illustration of this.

⁷ Pre-eminence of the mental state, the origin of all disorders, unicity of the medicine, etc.

⁸ - who always separated his beliefs from his experiments, but referred to them in certain annexed writings about the relationship with the patient -

⁹ - which nevertheless underlay his focusing on the 'mental state' and his conception of vital energy -

¹⁰ - to be eliminated, of course, by the appropriate medicine.

¹¹ Even though Jung always used the words 'depth psychology' and not 'psychoanalysis'.

The drawing of a parallel between a medicine and a stage of psychic development proposed in various ways and at different times¹² can only have a subjective and uncertain aspect : no reference of any other nature can confirm its correctness.

The 'distortions' mentioned are most blatant.

The frequency of occurrence of the drawing of a parallel between - even mental - illnesses and homoeopathic medicines is an example of this.

It runs counter to the Hahnemannian approach as well as to the Kentian approach.

Without any qualification to the statement, Scorpio was declared 'the medicine for ADHD', Chloral, 'the medicine for autism', Ignatia, that for 'manic depressive psychosis', etc.

There is reference to Traditions to justify certain points of view and give them an aspect of truth but they are confirmed in an erroneous way.

Obviously ill digested, certain scientific points of view are not recounted as they were stated but interpreted in a personal and inappropriate way.

The backing up of points of view with the symbolic plane mentioned by Professors Madeleine Bastide and Agnès Lagache in their publications concerning the levels of information possibly active in homoeopathy is an obvious example of this. Moreover, it is not within the scope of the Hahnemannian similitude.

The step backwards claims to have the most modern arguments.

Use of intuition to discover the medicine (S. Fayeton, J. Scholten, etc.); sometimes even 'thinking about it might replace its taking'... but use of data from quantum physics... this is a strong return to the time before Hahnemann and the arguments marred by alchemy but with a supposedly 'modern' explanation¹³...

There is no more room for questioning but for quiet assertions...

They gradually develop in people's minds and even infiltrate the practice and way of thinking of many homoeopaths, whether they are unicists or pluralists. Little or ill informed, the latter turn to a type of prescription that is more psychosomatic than somatopsychic. Broad analogies and repertorisation instead of materia medica gain ground; new *pathogénésies* carried out from disparate strains are consulted¹⁴...

It is all the more difficult to stand back as the tendency towards attractive simplification is fashionable

- The classifications and models proposed to help towards diagnosis lead to think that the data from repertories can lead to it.

- The encouragement to medicate oneself for economic reasons, the possibility that indications may be given by practitioners who are not authorised to prescribe homoeopathy, the popularisation of handbooks for family homoeopathy in which everything is often

¹² Paschero, Scholten.

¹³ Even though, as regards quantum physics, it would still be in its infancy.

¹⁴ And their use is not without risks even if they may not be perceptible or linked to the true cause. Cf. publications concerning dilutions, homeopsy.com, October and November 2019.

recommended in 9 CH - and many of the medicines are stated not according to the symptoms but to a certain disorder labelled - contribute to a form of drift.

It affects homoeopathy according to Hahnemann as well as that advocated by Kent.

Oversimplification and the loss of all objectivity given the great amount of information spread show these are times when the diffusion and sharing of knowledge are made easier.

The access to the Net encourages it but does not permit it to be always done in an appropriate way or, above all else, at the level where the message is delivered...

If confusion and vagueness contribute to fascination and illusion, they can also engender distancing and rejection.

The number of medical prescribers can only be affected by this.

The 'step backwards' initiated therefore becomes problematic...

There are serious clinicians who even base their prescriptions on 'signatures'. The use of classifications of all types to determine the signs affecting the psyche of the human being or the specific behaviour of an animal - or a group of animals - gives a 'different' face to homoeopathy.

That 'step backwards' insidiously affects the way the Hahnemannian approach is gradually apprehended.

Everything is muddled up... but bears the same name and is presented without distinction under the same banner of 'homoeopathy'.

When anthroposophic doctors, who also use dynamised diluted products, describe themselves as anthroposophic doctors and not homoeopathic doctors, the supporters of that unusual evolution of the Kentian postulates - homoeo-therapists - do not do so.

What 'homoeotherapy' carries can be accepted neither by pluralistic homoeopaths nor by the unicist ones who claim to be faithful to the 5th version of *The Organon*.

And, given the uncertain bases put forward and often used inappropriately, it can be accepted neither by scientists nor by those who have the least knowledge of the functioning of the unconscious whereas the psyche is here at the heart of research.¹⁵

To be continued...

Doctor Geneviève Ziegel

¹⁵ Translated by Pascale Tempka