

This letter to the editor appeared in 'Simillimum' (Spring 2002, Vol..XV No.1, 9-14), the Journal of the Homeopathic Academy of Naturopathic Physicians (www.healthy.net/library/journals/simillimum) edited by Barbara Osawa and Peter Wright. It is presented here with kind permission.

It is indicated to the importance of a solid education in homoeopathy, there are a lot of deficiencies in today's education.

A prescription based on conjecture and theory is - even if it heals - not homeopathy, this is question of definition, if it is a duck, call it a duck.

Today's homoeopaths want to invent the wheel once more, there is a lot of self-prmotion in it, it is better to hold to the Organon of Hahnemann.

Givon Zirkind

Reinventing the wheel

Dear editor,

Concerning the point and counterpoint between Dr. Mathieu and Dr. Wright: Dr. Wright has stated most of the sentiments necessary to respond to Dr. Mathieu's letter, as well as clearly and diplomatically articulating the issues.

I would like to add the following. Consider the various schools and programs that teach Homeopathy, Bastyr University included. If you look at their catalogs, you will notice that students take only a few courses in Homeopathy, herbology, acupuncture, etc., at Bastyr and other ND programs. It is a smattering of each subject, more like an exploratory program than a study of each method. There are other schools which have much more intensive training exclusively in Homeopathy.

The same issue applies to the NCH's program, which is limited to MDs or licensed medical professionals. If I understand the NCH's literature, the program is 160 hours, which is the equivalent of six months of college courses, two courses at a time. This is also too limited. And, as many licensed medical professionals practicing Homeopathy have pointed out, their medical training does very little for their ability to practice Homeopathy. It's a misconception to think that just because someone is a doctor, therefore she or he can easily practice Homeopathy.

This is because Homeopathy is not a specialty! Homeopathy is its own medical art. Homeopathy has its own philosophy of health and disease, which is at odds with conventional medicine.

The following analogy holds true for acupuncture as well as Homeopathy. A few courses will not cut it. Several years of study in the discipline alone are necessary, followed by several years of practice. To be good at Homeopathy as well as acupuncture requires about 10 years of study, supervised clinical practice, and clinical practice. There are programs that require entire semesters just studying remedies, an entire year studying homeopathic philosophy, and entire semesters just studying case-taking techniques, extracting themes, and rubrics. Two semesters will not cut it. There has to be required readings. In addition, it takes time to read through and digest the *Organon*, *Chronic Diseases*, *Kent's Lectures on Homeopathic Philosophy*, and other works.

For example, a colleague of mine, a massage therapist, attended a five-week seminar in India with experienced homeopaths. She saw these homeopaths treat serious diseases which she thought had to go to an emergency room and ICU wards. Certainly, in the States, those cases would have gone to an emergency room. Yet, these homeopaths gave a remedy and said,

“Come back next week to follow up.” And these patients did very well! This massage therapist made a decision at that time that Homeopathy is so vast and broad that a five-week course is not going to do. She realized that it would require years of study, to which she did not want to commit at the time.

The lack of necessary training comes through in the quality of care, and is also seen in the presentation of cases. Many of the cases that I have read, in many publications, seem to present guessing games, uncertainty, low doses, and uncalled-for repetition of doses. These are not the principles in the *Organon*. And the principles of the *Organon*, matching symptoms to symptoms, are the basis of Homeopathy!

To clarify, cases often do not clearly present even a misguided argument for a remedy by matching verifiable symptoms in the patient with symptoms in a remedy. There is a mixture of dream therapy, dream imagery, archetypes, possibly plausible psychoanalysis of the patient, extrapolated imagery, but not cold hard facts. There can be hard facts to psychoanalysis: repetition of words can be one indicator, a pattern of behavior with repetitive incidents is a very important indicator, as well as dreams, if recurrent and clearly indicating an emotion. When a physical symptom is aggravated by an emotion, that is definitely a significant emotional symptom!

And what about the physicals? Even though the mentals are very important, the physicals are not to be forgotten! I do not get that from many cases that I read or see presented, but rather a wishy-washy, airy-fairy, newage, “Maybe this is the patient’s makeup.”

That’s not Homeopathy. Even if it works, it isn’t Homeopathy.

This is not to say that other healing modalities do not work or should not be used. I am a big fan of, “If it works, use it!” But “it” may not be Homeopathy. And, if it’s a duck, call it a duck!

This is true inside as well as outside the profession. By what right do acupuncturists have the right to administer (to prescribe, in plain English) homeopathic remedies, while professional homeopaths cannot? Can professional homeopaths just go around sticking needles into people, or applying pressure to “points” on the body? After all, I can buy a book on acupuncture, and have a meridian chart on my wall, or a doll on my desk.

The mark of the classical homeopath has always been considering all the symptoms, giving high potencies (C, M, and LM, the infinitesimal dose), single doses, and no theories. If someone says she or he is a classical homeopath, then they should practice what they preach and truth in advertising. A homeopath should follow the guidebook of Homeopathy, the *Organon*. Also, a classical homeopath will use high doses and single doses, because they work. Classical homeopaths should know that high potencies work, because they should have done some provings on themselves, as Hahnemann recommends in the *Organon*. (See the article about *Aloe* in the last issue.) Hering gave a dose of *Aloe* because the patient experienced the same symptoms that Hering had, when he proved it. As Hahnemann clearly states in the *Organon*, doses should be repeated only when symptoms return, if the original prescription was effective, **and there was some kind of contradicting cause.**

Hahnemann observed the phenomenon, like cures like, for decades and transcribed his observations. He explains it in detail. It behooves anyone who calls himself a homeopath to follow Hahnemann’s teachings. Even though Hahnemann didn’t have a patent, he developed the process. If people want to credit themselves with someone else’s work, they should follow the original process.

When people talk to me about MD homeopaths, I always want to ask, what does your MD homeopath do for bronchitis, or anthrax? Does he take penicillin and Cipro, or *Phosphorus*

30C and *Anthracinum* 200C? Does he vaccinate his children, or use homeopathic remedies? Does he feel he can cure an ovarian tumor with a homeopathic remedy, or must he operate? Is he the kind of homeopath that knows by laboratory experiment that Homeopathy works, i.e. proving a remedy on himself? Does he give entire tubes of remedies for asthma, or the single dose?

Provings do not have to necessarily be done for new remedies only. Student homeopaths should do provings of polycrests and other remedies to feel what the symptoms are like and how remedies work. Is there any better way to know what a remedy does than proving the remedy? Reading is good, but a proving will make it stick in the mind! The provings don't hurt. They simply strengthen the constitution. Does Hahnemann not say all this in the *Organon*? Yet, how many student homeopaths have themselves done provings of regularly prescribed remedies?

The true art of Homeopathy is matching the symptoms of the patient to the remedy and posology. Posology was something that Hahnemann did not complete in his lifetime. If we want to constructively use our creativity and add refinements, we can further polish the study of the phenomenon of "like cures like." We can prove more remedies. We can better define the symptoms of remedies, especially polycrests. That is what Sankaran has done in his works. We can, and have, developed better guidelines for posology. Obviously, there were some areas of Homeopathy left open, particularly posology. This is clear, because the *Organon* went through six editions. But most of the ground work has been done and shouldn't be tampered with, certainly not for the sake of self-promotion. In my opinion, self-promotion is the cause of most of the theorists with new improved "wheels."

Sadly, modern Homeopathy or homeopaths can be bashed quite justifiably by doctors and quackbusters for the very same reasons that people get into Homeopathy and bash doctors! Egotism and greed have no place in the medical profession. The practice of medicine is no place to "milk" people for money. No one has the right to think that they can definitely cure anything. Certainly, no one has the right to think that they can cure everything! And no one should present themselves or Homeopathy as the panacea.

Some modern homeopaths present the university syndrome—"If you don't publish every year, you're dead." (You won't be reappointed to your position, etc.) There seems to be some kind of need to improve the wheel, to demonstrate who is better, and to massage egos. To be better, homeopaths must increase their success rate. Knowing materia medica and perfecting adherence to the *Organon's* principles will both help increase a homeopath's success rate.

Is Homeopathy being promoted? Or, is some new *wunderheilungshaft* being promoted to either enrich a practice or inflate an ego?

I understand everyone needs to make a living and has to promote his or her practice and skills to do so. Does this mean promoting unique innovations? Or promoting a competent homeopath who adheres to the guidelines of the *Organon*?

There are many good lectures being given and books being put out by dedicated homeopaths expounding on homeopathic philosophy, clinical experiences with remedies and provings of new remedies. Unfortunately, some works are tainted with arrogance, which casts doubt upon their dedication.

Our goal is to heal the sick

Dr. Wright's explanation about Hahnemann's deductive logical approach to medicine is 100% on target. In fact, Hahnemann was even more scientific than even modern medicine. Hahnemann's work, the *Organon*, is timeless. Hahnemann dealt only with what he saw in the clinic and could repeat. He spent years doing research; he denied theories, most

dramatically the doctrine of signatures. His work is logical, well-laid-out, and systematic. His approach is obviously scientific. In my opinion, Hahnemann was following Bacon to the tee.

Do we know how Homeopathy works? In the sense that we cannot give a chemical equation or explanation, we cannot explain Homeopathy. But we can explain the existence of a natural phenomenon, like cures **like**, and rules and guidelines for applying that phenomenon to healing. It is not conjecture. It can be repeated under laboratory circumstances.

Hahnemann advances this approach by stating that the phenomenon is “energetic.” In my opinion, Hahnemann did not mean bioelectric, as George Vithoulkas likes to explain Homeopathy. Rather, “energetic” means exactly what Hahnemann says. There is some kind of cause and effect between the remedy and the human body which we cannot explain. However, the relationship exists, just like magnetism which was one of the first phenomena of fields and energy to be studied, followed by electricity and then atomics. Magnetism was also the analogy that Hahnemann used in the *Organon*, to describe how homeopathic remedies work. The basic definition of a field and energy is that a force which cannot be seen is generated by something, and will cause work, as defined by physics, i.e. moving some other object over a distance, to take place.

You cannot improve upon the wheel. A circle is a circle. There is nothing you can do to improve upon its beauty, simplicity or natural laws. Just as Euclid’s work cannot be improved, so too Hahnemann’s work cannot be improved upon. Hahnemann discovered a natural law. Can you improve upon a sunset? You can paint it, but can you improve it? There will always be 360 degrees in a circle, any circle that circumscribes a triangle will have 360 degrees, and the angles of the triangle will always have 360 degrees. Because it appears that homeopaths are trying to improve upon a natural law, I get the impression that self-promotion is a very important point that has to be considered even more. A material dose of humility would do the profession good, especially with these improvements on the circle.

The only things we can “improve” upon, or alter, are the theories, the assumptions, the postulates. How many lines parallel to a line pass through a point not on the line? One, none, many? How many postulates are in the *Organon*? Very, very few, almost none.

Another area that is open to homeopaths today is scholarly work on the history of Homeopathy. This work, including articles published in *Simillimum*, that discusses the history of Hahnemann’s research, the differences between the editions of the *Organon*, and the subtleties and various meanings that different translations impart, is all very necessary for the understanding of homeopathic principles and good Homeopathy. These articles are very enlightening and broaden the understanding of the *Organon* as well as the teachings of many other homeopaths. Studying the work, including case histories, of successful homeopaths sheds a lot of light upon how to practice successfully. There are also other areas that need to be studied and put into perspective.

In sum, it would behoove the profession to do what Hahnemann said in the *Organon*, paragraph 1 and its footnotes. Work with what is real, rather than produce theories using fancy words that nobody understands; come to the realization that the body is too complex for us to understand. Therefore, we should use an immutable natural law to cure the sick. Unfortunately, the profession, with the bioelectric theories, the Zwitteronic complex substance theories, and other theories is doing exactly what Hahnemann disagreed with. Research is nice, but when it comes to curing the sick, stick to the facts and use what works: like cures like, and other principles listed in the *Organon*.

Sincerely,

Givon Zirkind