

This article first appeared in 'Homeopathy Today' (April/May 2002, p.31), the newsletter of the National Center for Homeopathy, Alexandria, VA, USA, (www.homeopathic.org) edited by Julian Winston. It is presented here with kind permission.

In his short answer to A.Saine's article "Drawing a Line in the Sand" R.Morrison rejects especially A.Saine's critic of Sankaran's concepts and explains his wish to finalize this debate and coming back to a peaceful community.

Dr. Morrison has been given the final word in this debate in Homeopathy Today. He has been asked to limit his reply to one-half page. [Editor's note]

Roger Morrison

Reach for the olive branch

In this small space allowed for my final reply, I will not be able to answer all the interesting arguments raised by Dr. Saine and will focus on a few clarifications.

Regarding the remedy Hura: Dr. Saine quotes from Sankaran's description of how he formulated his ideas from a search of the repertory. He uses this to "prove" that the ideas are mere speculation. Dr. Saine failed to read far enough in the chapter to reach this passage: "Ever since I wrote this description of Hura in my book *The Spirit of Homoeopathy*, I have had cases that confirm this feeling of Hura." In fact, Sankaran's observations have led to cures in over a dozen cases reported in homeopathic journals on 4 continents - most of these patients were in a miserable state; several were suicidal. All conformed exactly to Sankaran's observation. Thus, what began as hypothesis was reported only after multiple cured cases - that is, pure observation. Shall we ask these patients to antidote with coffee until we can find a more "approved" method of finding their remedy?

Careful experimentation is the life of any science - thus I cannot understand the sleight-of-hand attempt by Dr. Saine to diminish his many years experimentation with homeopathically potentized sarcodes in his practice. Perhaps he believes that by dismissing his own experiments as "non-homeopathic", he is free to condemn other's experiments. But if his practice is truly a mixture of homeopathy and something non-homeopathic, perhaps Dr. Saine should re-read Hahnemann's letter to the "Half-homeopaths of Leipzig" which he hurled like a weapon against others in our community. Putting sophistry aside, I believe many homeopaths would be very interested to hear Dr. Saine's results. This is how growth occurs!

Regarding cases cited in my previous letter (Thea and Sanguinaria). Most likely it slipped Dr. Saine's mind that I proposed jointly to he and Mr. Winston that these cases be published for all to see in this issue of Homeopathy Today. Mr. Winston declined (I think wisely) saying that the mission of Homeopathy Today does not include such detailed and advanced case analysis and doctrinal discussion.* In this I heartily concur. In my view this newsletter should inform the public and celebrate the miracle of homeopathy and the joy it brings to so many lives. There has been too much negativity in these exchanges and I fear I am not guiltless on that score.

I also fear the rhetoric of this debate can only do harm to our cause. I know well that Drs. Saine, Olsen and Sheppard, and Mr. Winston have all done wonderful work for homeopathy. For this I honor them. I hope we can now reach for the olive branch (which gives me a great idea for a new proving!) and get back to the real work of helping patients.

** The video-taped Thea case was publicly presented at the IFH case conference and the Sanguinaria case is scheduled to be published in our professional journal (Journal of the American Institute of Homeopathy).*