

Translation: Judith Widderich

In his concluding remarks, the author refers to the fact that the editorial of Julian Winston was the result of conversations that took place with him during a ten-day visit of J. Winston. Reference is also paid to important elements of homeopathy and to the fact that the term "homeopathy" is restricted to Hahnemann's genuine homeopathy.

Klaus-Henning Gypser

Concluding remarks

Dear colleagues Habich, Kösters and Rohwer,

Thank you very much for your friendly words and especially for the enclosed documents dated August 20. It was only last weekend that I was able to study the documents that you must have had a hard time gathering and preparing in such an impeccable manner.

Going back to their beginnings, we find Julian Winston's contribution, which was the result of inspiring discussions held during his ten-day stay here in Gleebs and unintentionally stirred up feelings to such an extent that a group of colleagues drew up a statement from which all else proceeded. In this sense, being tied to the beginning of events so to speak, following brief thoughts can perhaps find their end.

When we talk about homeopathy, then only genuine homeopathy of its founder can be meant. It is his appreciable knowledge that builds the foundation in the manner of *conditio sine qua non*. By abandoning it, you may by all means have success in treatment, yet this does no longer have anything in common with homeopathy.

Just what does this foundation consist of, or historically speaking, what prompted Hahnemann to search for new methods of treatment? In his works, he plainly expresses his despair concerning the state of methods of treatment of his time, especially with respect to their *therapeutic unreliability*. Therefore, he looked to put an end to this and to establish a therapeutic approach to the extent that - in the indicated and curable case in question - the cure is *certain in advance* (a priori), namely in the sense of scientific, if not factual reliability. How could he attain this goal? He could only do so by way of securing *reliable* information about the healing capacity of drugs and by making himself independent of speculations in contemporary medicine. It was in this difficult situation that he discovered the drug proving of a healthy person.

With his next step, he discovered the application of drugs according to the law of similars as being the only lasting form of treatment, after having excluded palliative treatment based on the *contraria contrariis* rule of application. What followed thereafter was just consequential and natural: The inquiry of symptoms beyond the main symptom, which remained unacknowledged in medical history, was an important medical achievement of Hahnemann as well as drug prescription in the proper dosage and the elimination of obstructions to cure. Thus, he could write in § 3 of the *Organon* that according to law, a cure *must* be effected upon compliance with conditions. What about so-called modern approaches appearing arbitrarily and using the name of homeopathy? Some have already caused the line between healthy and ill to become blurred, when traits of character are mistaken for mental symptoms (compare *Organon* § 210 to § 212). Still other approaches make use of patients' favourite colours or their handwriting in order to find the simile. Or one claims to study *Materia medica* on patients - which does misrepresent homeopathy, because it is just this path taken by the old school, namely of gaining knowledge about the healing capabilities of drugs on the sick,

afterwards so to speak, that Hahnemann sought to leave, as he considered it to be unreliable. Or one proceeds in doing so-called drug provings according to a fictitious method, without administering a single remedy, and then allocating the dream symptoms of the following night to such a remedy. Arbitrary set-ups like that of an essence or a central disturbance are still quite harmless by contrast.

The characteristic symptoms of a remedy are what distinguishes it from others. Without them, the remedy itself ceases to exist. In a similar sense, homeopathy ceases to exist when its fundamental principles - mentioned here incompletely - are given up. These fundamental principles are not bound to the opinion of some authority that proclaims them, but rather can be reconstructed by contemplative thinking and by strictly placing one's view on the subject at hand. All that is required are Hahnemann's pertinent works and enough openmindedness. The person referred to must possess this innate quality, because he cannot acquire it elsewhere. Therefore, he who postulates freedom and at the same time abandons fundamental principles, be it those of homeopathy or another faculty, has to accept the objection that he is mistaking freedom for his own lack of discipline.

In closing, what remains to be desired, is that all enormous efforts, made with respect to this debate, may bear fruit and, that the great works of Hahnemann and his disciples may be met with deeper respect as sometimes seems the case, because in your drug provings, you and your families have, amongst others, endured, that which nowadays is applied with the intention to cure, in an all too matter-of-course manner. Thus, what holds true in our times of intellectual dictatorship regarding scientific thinking in medicine, which strives to dismiss homeopathy as a people-friendly method of treatment, is the necessity to stick together as colleagues and to jointly take on the sizeable tasks that lie before us.

Sincere regards

K.-H. Gypser