

This article first appeared in in the Magazin of the Contemporary College of Homeopathy, Exeter/England, June 2000

It is presented here with kind permission.

In this article Michael Bridger describes that meditational provings has nothing to do with homeopathy.

Michael Bridger

Meditational Provings

A lot of people ask me what I think about the above subject so I thought I'd put a summary in writing.

Even in a Hahnemannian proving we have to worry about subjectivity getting in the way of objectivity, the story goes that Platinum was proved on a chick he fancied at the time. As he was about eighty, I think we can see that we are looking at the attitude of a girl to an old man more than any kind of objective scientific proving. We know we have to be cautious. The meditational provings, on the other hand, appear to abandon any concern about this objective/subjective issue, as if it doesn't matter. Everything that happens is o.k.

As a homeopath, my main concern is the individual I am treating. The patient has to be the centre of everything we do. Homeopathy is essentially therapeutic. This has its limitations. We treat individuals and their symptoms but sometimes it is true to say that their symptoms may actually be less individual and more a manifestation of human, spiritual or planetary sickness. While homeopathy makes in-roads into such problems it cannot cure those kind of fundamental problems. I think some people get frustrated by the limitations of homeopathy and become more interested in esoteric speculations and spiritual dogma. There is nothing new in this. Rudolph Steiner used homeopathy as a platform for his spiritual ideas and turned it into something completely different.

The problem occurs when we delude ourselves into thinking that we are expanding or clarifying homeopathic philosophy when what is really happening is that homeopathy is transforming into some sort of vague 'new age' monster, which is so heavenly it is of no earthly use whatsoever. Ironically, often the results appear more related to allopathic thinking than homeopathic thought.

Some of the meditational provings appear to come from spiritual sources or even spiritual guides. There ought to be serious debate about this because it is I would have thought highly contentious. However I see people using these remedies and it worries me particularly when it is the students that I teach. How do we know that such a proving comes from a spiritual guide and not the imaginings or even the messianic delusions of the self proclaimed 'channeler.' Ultimately we can't know. At least we should be careful before these so-called provings enter our materia medicas. If it turns out that we as a profession have consorted with the ideas of lunatics then not only do we undo the brilliant achievements we have made in keeping our therapy alive we will consign homeopathy at best to a place alongside laughter therapy.

From the evidence of the meditational provings I have read there is little evidence that they're useful for homeopathic prescribing. They lack the true specifics and individualising symptoms we need as practitioners. They are vague, generalised and spiritually judgemental. They strike me as being about as individualistic as the Daily Mirror horoscope. They are riddled with assumptions about what people need, whether they do or not, and this is allopathic. The wonder of homeopathy is that there is no judgement. What is needed in terms

of the remedy is defined solely by the patient and not the spiritual ideas of the practitioner. This for me is sacrosanct. It is the rock upon which homeopathy is built.

As a profession we are cautious of being self-critical but if we don't discuss and argue we will suppress. If we don't speak our minds about these trends in homeopathy we may witness the demise of our credibility and we'll deserve it.

Are we heading for a schism between the orthodox homeopaths and the meditators? My gut feeling is 'No', but I might be wrong. I just don't think that meditational provings, at least the ones I have seen, are based even loosely on the kind of language that we as homeopaths can use in practice. They don't represent anything strong enough to constitute a schism.

Meditational provings in my book are simply not homeopathy. Ironically, I suspect that they have little to do with meditation either! The whole essence of meditation as I understand it is to contemplate 'nothingness' and to remove 'intention'. This contradicts the notion of intending to find the nature or the symptoms of a substance. What do you folks think?