

The following are excerpts from the book of Walter Buschauer "The authentic interpretation of homoeopathy as completion of Hippocratic Medicine, Karl F. Haug Verlag, 1985". They are presented here with kind permission of the author.

The following summary of "Homoeopathy as completion of Hippocratic Medicine", a basic lecture on the authentic interpretation of homoeopathy with respect to the theory of science underlying every drug therapy, held by D. Walter Buschauer during the "Medizinische Woche Baden-Baden 1984" and the "Declaration of Bern" from 13. 11. 1983 are excerpts from the book of Walter Buschauer "The authentic interpretation of homoeopathy as completion of Hippocratic Medicine, Karl F. Haug Verlag, 1985". In the "Declaration of Bern" Walter Buschauer (1972 – 1987 president of the Swiss association of homoeopathic physicians) had called for a fundamental discussion concerning the interpretation of the teachings of Hahnemann in autumn 1983.

Walter Buschauer

Homoeopathy as completion of Hippocratic Medicine

Summary

I wanted to show, that Hahnemann – in his concern about the safety of drugs – was the first in Germany to abandon all dogmas, systems, cosmologies etc., theoretically as well as practically, and that it was he who called back to mind the teachings of Hippocrates, the ancient school of empiricism, i. e. observation and experience as the only reliable basis for scientific drug therapy. This was the result of the knowledge that a "rational drug therapy" cannot be achieved as long as "the nature of the principle of life, which is a secret (Cabanis)", has not been explained rationally. Today scientific does not mean dogmatic, aprioristic, ontological thinking but rather, as expressed by Jaspers and then adopted by Stiegele – "the methodical process which leads step by step (inductive – empirical) to decision on the grounds of experience" – (F. Gross "continuous proving of remedies" is analogical to this).

This established fact led to the claim I raised last year in the "Schweizer Ärztezeitung": to create a "centre for homoeopathic literature", the entirety of which is dependent on the contribution of all homoeopathic physicians world- wide.

I wanted to show that the experimental way of pharmacology is only able to verify effects but not effectiveness (Fülgraff); that criticism of the experimental method of modern medicine seems justified. As Mohl writes in the "Deutsches Ärzteblatt", the hereupon technicalization of medicine combined with its exorbitantly rising costs has led to exaggerated diagnostics more so than to therapeutic consequences which make sense. Due to the development of technology more and more methods of treatment were introduced which did not provide adequate reliability when treating chronic diseases. This development has led to the trend that more and more "self-confident laymen" seek help from naturopaths, "psychologists" and other non- physicians.

I aimed to show that Hahnemannian methodology is preferable not only with regard to the costs but also with respect to ethical-human aspects; it is a crucial step towards a "completion of Hippocratic medicine".

DECLARATION OF BERN

Fall meeting of the Swiss society of homoeopathic physicians on 13.01.1983 in Bern

Scientific discussion re: The interpretation of homoeopathy

Dr. W. Buschauer, Lengnau: Introduction to the topic

The second scientific part of today's meeting will be addressed especially to those colleagues who are trying – like me – to establish homoeopathy in universities. I will explain the thesis I mentioned in my Vienna lecture to them:

He who gives lectures on homoeopathy in a clinic auditorium, who is attempting to establish homoeopathy in universities, must expound that

1. **Homeopathy** means the **doctrine of Hahnemann**. He must explain that his healing method – as a competent interpretation of his medical way of thinking and care demonstrates, in contrast to the teachings of some of his epigones – is based upon
2. an **inductive-empirical**, i. e. a **scientific way of thinking** from today's point of view that cannot be accepted by the faculty. What is more, as *Hahnemann* consistently includes the subject in treatment, this has a trend-setting character for the official school, and is therefore of highest actuality. He (who..., see above) must reconstruct *Hahnemann's* train of thought, which he himself repeated over a period of decades and according to which – as long as life itself has not been explained – the imbalance of the principle of life, i. e. the “inner cause” for the symptoms representing the only visible part of the disease also cannot be explained. He must
3. as an **academic** physician - like *Hahnemann* – distance himself from
 - all kinds of naturopaths, because: how can a non-physician recognize the disease (*Hahnemann*)? He must also remain at distance
 - to all expounders of ontological, speculative systems and their followers (the so-called “schools” which *Hahnemann* called “medical sects”, “of which one was even more fanciful than the other”) as well as to futile aphorisms; because contradictory to him, they base their practice work on a speculatively deduced “inner cause” of the disease, deriving their treatment herewith. (Like Kent describes “aberrant thinking and will”, so his followers expound a “constitution” or “predisposition” which is regarded as primarily given). He must distance himself
 - from “fantastic speculation (signature)” (*Hahnemann*), from belief and murmur instead of scientific thinking. This is applicable to the “Organon” as the “bible of the homeopaths”, as well as to “Stuttgart” as “Mecca of homoeopathy” (*Leeser*); he must not only distance himself
 - from old astrology (*Hahnemann*), but also
 - from more recent natural philosophy (“from the so-called philosophers, followers of Kant, who are responsible for the warped and disorganized minds of many young physicians”) (*Hahnemann*); and furthermore
 - from dark mysticism not comprehensible in itself, which – as *Hahnemann* expresses it – aimed to throw a light on that which clear-cut chemistry and physics were not able to. He must – like *Hahnemann* – following his (*Hahnemann's*) “reshaping of pharmacology”, think scientifically by modern day standards. Today scientific does not mean dogmatic, aprioristic, ontological thinking but rather, as expressed by *Jaspers*

and later adopted by *Stiegele* – “the methodical process which leads step by step (inductive – empirical) to decision on the grounds of experience”.

The discussion of principle with respect to *Hahnemann's* scientific healing method which I aimed at here did not take place in Vienna (1983); there an uncritical audience applauded in a like manner to even highly controversial interpretations of the doctrine of *Hahnemann*.

During the “Dozenten-Seminar”(lecturers'seminar) held in 1983 by the “DZVhÄ” (Central Association of German Homeopathic Physicians) in Karlsruhe, people were asked to find “paradigmas” in order to explain (a priori) the action of homeopathic remedies. The “theory of information” was discussed and it was hoped that homoeopathy would receive recognition by the faculty by means of a third “revolution” of general science which - as could be heard - postulates a totally new definition of science.

This all only makes us miss the mark. As we declare ourselves to be disciples of *Hahnemann*, we should no longer be “under the delusion, that the essence of medicine consists in the fact that everything is explainable” (*Hahnemann*), but rather – along with him - solely rely upon experience; like him – and *Virchow* - we should attach little importance to a “scientific explanation”; the dynamic action of a remedy on the whole living organism cannot be explained as long as its active force has not been explained first. The writing of hypotheses which has spread enormously – according to *Hahnemann* – since the invention of the printing press, will never open the road to university. However, it could be opened to us if we strictly complied with the scientific findings especially of the older *Hahnemann*. In any case, even though the younger *Hahnemann* might have believed in the rule of similarity as a natural law, in later years he saw the limited possibility to verify it, as thousands of patients with chronic diseases remained incurable.

Whosoever now – in spite of *Hahnemann's* contrary experience which he wanted to rely upon solely his whole life long – continues to assume that the rule of similarity is a law exempt from experience, ends up where *Swedenborg* or the Saints did, who – as *Frings* knows to report – “non contrariis, sed similia simillimum usu curare solent” (used to heal not by use of contrary but of similar (remedies)). He is a credulous yet uncritical “homeotherapist”. Whereas he who relies up *Hahnemann's* experience and recognizes that the rule of similarity requires a restriction, one which *Hahnemann* did try to provide with his doctrine of “psora”, according to the level of knowledge in those days, is a critical scientific homoeopath.

I herewith open the discussion on *Hahnemann's* scientific healing method, called **homeopathy**, with respect to its **representation at university**. I invite you to disprove the interpretation – based on a source study of *Hennes* – that I just presented here and/or to make use of the opportunity offered to us and – faced with the current worldwide misinterpretation of his teachings - agree with the obliging statements of points 1 - 3 as

DECLARATION OF BERN.

“The more the bastard teachers increase in number and the louder they raise their voices to let their wisdom shine in a matter based on pure experience, in which they themselves have not gained mature experience, the more urgent, as is my belief, the duty of us born and raised followers of science not to remain idle, but rather to raise our warning, advising and teaching voices without fear” (*von Bönninghausen*).