

This editorial first appeared in 'American Journal of Homeopathic Medicine' (Vol.95, no.2, Summer 2002,p.58-59) the journal of the American Institute of Homeopathy, Alexandria, VA, USA, (www.homeopathyusa.org/journal) edited by George Guess. It is presented here with kind permission.

In his editorial preface George Guess (editor of the AJHM) compares the articles of Dr. R. Morrison – representing the pragmatic application of effective remedies – and Dr. A. Saine – advocating Hahnemann's pure homeopathy as a consequent discipline.

The comment of the colleague Dr. Moskowitz is introduced as a mediator trying to reconcile the conflicting ideas by gentle objectivity based on his seasoned experience.

George Guess expresses his hope, that this debate and its further cultivation might contribute essentially to the growth and development of the science homeopathy. Additionally he remarks upon the issue of falsification of cases.

George Guess

Editorial Preface

We present this, the second, issue of the AJHM with simultaneous excitement and trepidation. Highlighting this issue is the controversy within our homeopathic ranks — nothing new, sad to say — that has erupted in reaction to the writings and teaching (and some will say misperceptions) of a group of relatively new homeopathic mentors, including Rajan Sankaran, Jan Scholten, Massimo Mangialavori, Nancy Herrick, etc. This controversy first took shape within the pages of the NCH publication, "Homeopathy Today," with a series of editorials and articles critical of some of the ideas attributed to the above homeopaths. Subsequently the "accused" homeopaths and some of their supporters defended their position in a letter, signed by the so-called "Group of 21," which was also published in "Homeopathy Today." Andre Saine responded with a lengthy article ("Homeopathy vs. Speculative Medicine." Simillimum. Vol. XIV, Issue 3. Fall 2001.p. 34) in the "Simillimum," the journal of the HANP, and a briefer article in "Homeopathy Today." Now the issue comes to the pages of our journal; with, first, a letter to the editor Dr. Roger Morrison sent to "Homeopathy Today," which we are reprinting; second, a lengthy article by Dr. Andre Saine in response to Dr. Morrison's letter (an abbreviated version of this article appears in the Spring 2002 issue of Simillimum); third, a final response by Dr. Morrison to Saine's current article; and finally, an article by Dr. Richard Moskowitz which was written not so much as a response to any specific argument put forth by Dr. Saine and others, as his general perspective on the conflict and the divisive issues in question.

While feeling loathe to fan the flames of this controversy publicly, we feel that this controversy is too important to ignore. We seek to provide a forum wherein both sides can express their concerns in a professional manner, one without rancor. Debate is critical to the growth of a science, even one as steeped in tradition as homeopathy. We hope to cultivate and refine this debate, hoping in the process to further the development of our beloved discipline.

It is readily apparent that all of the above contributors, regardless of their perspective, have the best interests of homeopathy and their patients at heart. Dr. Morrison, with his usual efficiency and organizational skills, displays a very pragmatic commitment to the pursuit of the most effective means of curing with homeopathy, conscientiously sifting information gleaned from a number of teachers, seeking the most useful. Dr. Saine's erudition, passion and commitment to pure Hahnemannian homeopathy fairly leap from these pages. His

devotion to the science of homeopathy and his concern for seeing our highly effective and consistent discipline diluted and perverted are equally apparent. Finally, Dr. Moskowitz contributes to this conflict an admirable tolerance and openness, balanced with a gentle objectivity — all products of seasoned wisdom.

We humans have always had a tendency to become overly and too quickly enamored with “new ideas.” In the process we forsake disciplined thought and rational scepticism, which are healthy and grounding. Such infatuation can easily lead us astray. We have, as a species, always had a superior ability to deceive ourselves. It was this realization that led to the scientific method. Has the profession’s recent infatuation with new ideas gone too far? Do we risk undermining homeopathy?

At the same time one has to recognize that there are those among us who adhere too rigidly to the earlier dictates of Hahnemann and discard all innovation in homeopathy if it is not given the *Organon*’s seal of approval. Such rigidity fails to give due credit to the progress achieved over the years in homeopathic, much less scientific thought. Quantum theory, chaos theory, systems theory, a new appreciation for the role our consciousness plays in our perception of reality (e.g., its role in affecting experimental results, etc.) and other developments, if they were incorporated into our science, could conceivably alter the way we conduct provings, formulate ideas of *materia medica*, administer remedies, etc.

Admittedly, if we opt to incorporate a few or many of the newer ideas into homeopathy, we should aim to build upon the rock solid foundation of Hahnemannian homeopathy, retaining the many truths we find there and not forsaking scientific rigor and sobriety for a new theory still in its infancy. We would do well to recall that Hahnemann, always a tireless experimenter, advanced new models of treatment only after lengthy periods of incubation, defined by much clinical experimentation.

So, how do we proceed? It’s a question each of us must ask ourselves. Do we adhere solely to the dictates of Hahnemann, believing in the science as he advanced it adequate to the health care challenges of today? Do we cast aside much of the wisdom of the past and embrace one new concept after another, holding in abeyance our critical faculties? Or perhaps we will opt to meld the two, planting our feet firmly in the science and art as we were given it, yet seeking to advance it by conscientiously developing and applying new ideas which enhance our understanding and application of *materia medica*, medicinal provings, treatment methodologies, etc.?

I would submit that many of us have confronted difficult cases when all of our best efforts to treat them according to the tenets of Hahnemannian homeopathy failed. At such times, many of us are tempted to employ other strategies of case analysis to find the *simillimum*, at times meeting with resounding success. Such cases are usually the exception to our daily practice, and they could be considered exceptions to the practice of “pure” homeopathy. That’s the question before us, as I see it and as Dr. Saine very pointedly puts to us — do we consider such strategies exceptions and outside the purview of pure homeopathy, or do we consider them an extension of homeopathy, an incremental advancement, if you will? And if we consider such cases exceptions to Hahnemannian homeopathy, what does that imply about the completeness of our science? We anticipate having the ability with this remarkable healing tool to cure or palliate the patients and diseases presented to us. When we fail, if the reader thinks at all as I have done, we tend to blame ourselves for being inadequate to the task. But what if we aren’t, what if we actually practiced in the highest manner possible and still met with failure? What might that say about the completeness of our science?

Can we say that homeopathy as Hahnemann invented it and a few of his successors enhanced it should stand unaltered? Our dictum then, obviously, would be to work harder and harder at perfecting the old, improving our application of it — as Andre Saine suggests. If we, though,

were to decide, despite our best efforts to master the old, that the art and science of homeopathy needed to be developed further, what innovations would be acceptable? Reliable? Effective? This is our dilemma. And it is in the hope of solving this puzzle that we open our pages to your thoughts on the matter, always with the ultimate goal in mind of promoting our great medical art and science.

And one last matter — the issue of falsification. Dr. Saine's allegations on the matter of practitioners/teachers falsifying cases to bolster their arguments is very troubling and one which, frankly, we would rather avoid. Such allegations, without confirmatory evidence, stretch the bounds of professionalism. Dr. Saine's general concerns about falsification of any kind and by anyone are valid, however, and thus we allow them to stand. The reader will note that Dr. Morrison, although no impugnation of his character is evident in this journal, voluntarily supplied to the editor his handwritten case notes and videotapes of interviews for the two cases he presents in this issue. In future, Dr. Saine's point having been made, this journal, while under my editorship, will not publish any other such allegations absent specific and documented proof of complicity.

George Guess, MD, DHt

Editor, AJHM