

HOW TO REVERSE THE DOWNFALL OF HOMOEOPATHY IN THE U.S.A.

After its meteoric rise in the last century Homoeopathy has declined in the U.S.A. until today it has reached the lowest point in its history. What can be done to reverse this trend?

Scattered throughout the world there is a great reservoir of human potential willing and able to work for this goal: there are uncounted human beings everywhere who could use a variety of talents or the advantages of fortune and opportunity to serve Homoeopathy. They feel strongly that this system is right and that it is based on truth; they deplore the present trend of official medicine and see more or less clearly its dangers, and their future development; they would very much like to do something constructive.

But somehow there seems little they can do. Overtaken by the speed and intensity with which official medicine has imposed its outlook on the world and controlled the socio-legal organization of medicine at all levels, they remain impotent and nearly mute.

How can these people work together and really advance the fortunes of Homoeopathy in the complexity of the modern world?

First of all, it is necessary to understand fairly clearly why Homoeopathy has declined.

(1) The fundamental tenets on which this system is based belong directly or by implication to a holistic, vitalistic, spiritual view of life and man. But we are living at a time in history when exactly the opposite philosophy very strongly prevails in collective consciousness—materialism. It expresses itself outwardly in all human affairs: government, civic institutions, law, morality, conduct, science, and all the disciplines through which man tries to understand the world, including medicine. That is why orthodox medical thought today consistently expresses a material, mechanistic outlook, in keeping with all other branches of science and technology.

(2) The huge drug industries of the developed countries are among the most powerful corporations in the world. In a number of ways they control public medical opinion and shape official medical policy in all its branches: research, education, social organization, government legislation. Allopathy and the drug industries are inextricably bound up together, two distinct but complementary aspects of technological medicine. If Homoeopathy became widely established the drug industries would largely go out of business, and their losses would even affect the economy. So medical organizations, hospitals, medical schools, and government legislation—all acting in perfect solidarity with the drug manufacturers and expressing the same interests—have through the years pursued a concerted and discreet policy against

Homoeopathy. The detailed history of these attacks and take-overs makes very interesting reading, but lies beyond the scope of this study.

(3) Homoeopathic physicians consequently became an unpopular minority in the medical world, the object of official sanctions and public ridicule. Because homoeopathic schools and teaching hospitals were taken over by Allopathy one by one, it became more and more difficult to find competent instruction. If one could find a suitable homoeopathic school, one could only attend it after graduating from an allopathic medical school where one would have been steadily conditioned against Homoeopathy for several years. A student who does somehow manage to persevere and complete his specialization in Homoeopathy finally starts practising at a material disadvantage, for to practise Homoeotherapy properly a doctor must spend much more time with each patient than he would practising Allopathy, and can see fewer patients during a day's consultation. The allopath prescribes for a particular complaint, the diagnosis and can do so quickly by consulting the prescription manuals—rather like sales brochures—put out by the drug companies, whereas the homoeopath prescribes for the patient instead and can only do so after a painstaking examination of all his signs and symptoms. Homoeopathy offers the medical student less opportunity, security, and public esteem than Allopathy and the prospect of less material reward as well. It is therefore no wonder that very few new doctors are joining the ranks of Homoeopathy in the United States, and that the average age of homoeopathic physicians is around retirement.

(4) Homoeopathy is largely formulated in nineteenth-century concepts that are incomplete and outmoded today, and in a style that easily discourages bright and inquiring minds in modern medicine.

(5) By barring Homoeopathy from the mainstream of medical activity, medical associations and other instruments of official medicine have made it the companion of all the underground charlatans who are likewise excluded. What they practise may not be Homoeopathy at all, but they proudly proclaim that it is, and publicly champion the cause of Homoeopathy. The public and medical associations take them at their word, and judge Homoeopathy by their results. In the choice between such friends and opponents, the competent homoeopath remains silent. Can one blame him? In the face of hostility and incomprehension from the outside, and the absence of new recruits to the cause within, it is surprising that there still are so many good homoeopaths practising. Naturally they try to attract as little attention as possible and go about their business quietly: as long as they are quiet they are tolerated by the medical associations. This conspiracy of silence has harmed Homoeopathy more than its assailants. Homoeopathic textbooks, journals, and publications are today almost exclusively circulated in the closed milieu of homoeopathic physicians and their associations.

So what can be done?

(1) It would seem nearly impossible to stem this tide by attacking the problem superficially. What is needed is an entirely new emergence of Homoeopathy in the world, a new medicine, the support and coordinated labors of the finest men and women working in Homoeopathy, one unified, clearly understood homoeopathic doctrine, and one united corps of physicians throughout the world.

(a) It will be necessary to reformulate, revise, and complete the statement of homoeopathic doctrine for the present and the future, to review all material from the past so as to retain and restate all that is valid, sometimes with suitable commentary.

(b) An indispensable part of this operation is to recruit the finest potential among young doctors and medical students, and form specialised international schools of Homoeopathy where they will be prepared to meet the highest demands of their calling.

(c) Then it will be necessary to bring about new medical organizations and legislation everywhere, and so align and harmonize them that practitioners, teachers, students, and information can be freely exchanged from one country to another.

(d) While Homoeopathy has been declining, Allopathy too is in crisis throughout the world. Because of the fluidity, disorder, and constant change in the general picture of modern medicine it will be much easier to present and establish something new if it is true and properly formulated.

(2) The correct understanding of medicine presupposes the correct understanding of man. Before one can speak of restoring him to health one must know the entity one has to treat. So medicine is inextricably bound up with the psychology and philosophy of life. It was so in the past and must be so today. In all the great civilizations of the past the priest was also the doctor: he was concerned with the well-being of man, and man was an indivisible whole so that it never occurred to anybody to separate the health of his body from the health of his mind and soul. Not only in matters of health, but in everything else, there was no division between the sacred and the profane. All man's activities and his relationship with society and with nature were an integral part of the absolute order which rules the seasons and the heavens. But as time went by heaven and earth were set apart: life was divided into the secular and the sacred. Theologians and scientists went their various ways. Both religion and science suffered by being reduced to separate activities. Religion decayed and had less and less to do with life—superstition flourished, and tyrants of the churches arose: science prospered, but since it also had less and less to do with the whole of life, great knowledge was indiscriminately wielded by men who had more intellect than wisdom, more power than morality. We can observe everywhere the results of this dichotomy. It has brought so much alienation into the world that we

now need psychologists to patch things up. But for all its claims modern psychology in its multiple branches is a poor substitute for that contact which men once had with the divine.

Any new medicine which comes into the world must go hand in hand with a new teaching, a new understanding by which man can live and die. Whether we see it socially, politically, medically, or ecologically, there is today a crisis in human consciousness. Modern man has no real faith, no anchor from which to put the multiple actions of his life into orderly perspective. Today he needs his own immediate contact with that which is divine: the time for priests, intermediaries, and ceremonies is past. Medicine, art, justice, science, and social order must naturally flow from the correct understanding of man and his relationship to the universe.

(3) Certain things can be done immediately, steps towards the long-range goal. The greatest and most urgent need is to establish centers where the finest homoeopaths practising today will offer thorough post-graduate training to young physicians and medical students. The king-pin in any renaissance of Homoeopathy is the preservation and correct transmission of pure homoeopathic doctrine. If it is lost there will be darkness indeed, but whilst it remains and can be spread, everything is possible.

—Editorial in *Homeotherapy*, February 1975