

Characteristic Features of Homeopathy

- First and foremost, homeopathy employs **the doctrine of Similars**:

'One should apply in the disease to be healed...that remedy which is able to stimulate another artificially produced disease, as similar as possible; and the former will be healed - similia similibus -- likes with likes.' [Haebl, Vol. 1, 66]

"The primary characteristic of homeopathic medicine was the law of similia..."
[Rothstein, 165-6]

'Hahnemann called the 'law of similars' a 'law of nature' discovered 'by the observation of nature and my own experience' [Defence of the Organon, 1896, USA, 76]..' [Coulter, II, 362]

'Then came the hypothesis -- drugs cure disease by causing lesser diseases which the organism can effectively overcome -- which is to say, 'similia similibus curantur' or 'like cures like'.' [Cameron, p.29]

'... the second of homeopathy's prime principles rendered them impotent. In a nutshell, the doctrine held that drugs increase in potency with their dilution...' [Cameron, p.30]

There occurred to him an "association of ideas that led him to suppose that he could cure fever with fever, instead of by the brutal current method of the evacuation of 'pernicious juices.'" [Gumpert, 68] When he published his Essay on a New Principle in 1796, "this work was the successful attempt of a man buried alive to force his way out into the open air." [Gumpert, 86] Similars was indeed "the doctrine which was to redeem him from the medical nihilism of despair." [Gumpert, 104]

"Hahnemann considered the production of his 'mercurial fever' necessary for the cure of syphilis." [Ameke, 103]

"a kind of artificial fever must be produced by Ipecacuanha, in order to cure certain forms of intermittent fever." [Ameke, 104]

He held "the view that in insidious fevers from unknown causes in which the vital force is sluggish, a new, strengthening and efficacious fever must be excited." [Ameke, 104]

He "remarks that the mercurial disease resembled that of syphilis." [Ameke, 104]

*His whole being rebelled utterly against the use of **medical contraries**, which he felt run entirely against the efforts of Nature: "it is improper to treat constipation with purgatives, the excited circulation of hysterical, cachectic and hypochondriacal patients by venesection, acid eructations by alkalies, chronic pains by Opium, etc." [Ameke, 105]*

"By choosing a remedy for a given natural disease that is capable of producing a very similar artificial disease, we shall be able to cure the most severe diseases." [Ameke, 107]

- **It is empirical**—it originated solely in experiments and was progressively refined solely through further experiments.

'Like all other Empirics before him, therefore, Hahnemann insists that therapeutic theory arises out of therapeutic practice. Practice is always prior to theory.' [Coulter, vol. 2, 351]

'[Hahnemann]...was committed with all his mind to the observational method...he rejected in its entirety the clap-trap of medieval traditions and he made out an eloquent case for the pharmacological experimental method.' [Cameron, 32]

William Harvey [1578-1657] professed to learn *"not from books...not from the tenets of Philosophers, but from the fabric of Nature."* [Porter, 215] A good example of Paracelsus' qualification as a radical empiricist, like Bach and Hahnemann, is when he *"thought he could learn more medicine by travelling and observing than from any library,"* [French, 148] which is certainly a sentiment reminiscent of Bach's travels in the English countryside.

Knowing that *"we owe almost all our knowledge of the pure healing forces of nature to the unembellished lore of the common man,"* [Gumpert, 24] so Hahnemann *"cast tradition aside, and had recourse only to the medicines he had learned, tasted and confirmed."* [Gumpert, 67] In his construction of homeopathy, Hahnemann gives *"pure experiment, careful observation and accurate experience alone,"* [Gumpert, 144] as the sole determining factors, the sole forces that shaped his new system.

Homeopathy is a testament to Baconian induction and empiricism and is not theory-laden to anything like the same extent as the Galenic and medieval medical systems that preceded it.

"Galileo established a new criterion for truth: truth was only that what...everyone could test for himself and see to be true. The means used...was the experiment, that magnificent invention of the western world, brought to perfection by Galileo...before Galileo, theoretical definition was the prime criterion for truth...the completely new element brought in by Galileo...the leitmotiv of Galileo's work as I see it was his passionate opposition to belief based on authority.'[Einstein]..." [Pietschmann, 156-7]

"Physiology...looked only through the spectacles of hypothetical conceits, gross mechanical explanations, and pretensions to systems...little has been added...what are we to think of a science, the operations of which are founded upon perhapses and blind chance?" [Hahnemann, 1805, in Lesser Writings, 423-6]

"Samuel Hahnemann was not only a physician at war with the medical practices of his time, he was also a great experimental scientist. He observed and collected his observations until gradually a pattern showed itself...observation alone is not sufficient, it must be coupled with right relating, relating in right order until we arrive in the Goethean sense at the idea, the underlying principle or pattern of a thing - the 'urphenomenon'." [Brieger, 241]

"Science derives its knowledge of life from a consideration of the facts of observation and experience." [Close, 11] Homeopathy was indeed "the logical and legitimate offspring of the Inductive Method and Philosophy of Aristotle and Lord Bacon." [Close; 15] Being "founded and developed into a scientific system...by Hahnemann...under the principles of the Inductive method of science as developed by Lord Bacon," [Close; 16-17] and even like "chemistry or physics, homeopathy is established under the principles of the inductive method...its elements are: 1. the phenomena of disease; 2. the phenomena produced by drugs when administered to healthy persons; and 3. the general law of mutual action...Newton's Third law of Motion...the law of similars, which connects the two series of phenomena." [Close, 19]

Homeopathy involves: "1. the totality of the symptoms of the patient is the basis of medical treatment; 2. the use of single medicines...[whose] symptoms and sphere of action...have been predetermined by pure, controlled experiments upon healthy persons; 3. the principle of symptom-similarity as the guide to the choice of the remedy; 4. the minimum dose capable of producing a dynamic or functional reaction." [Close, 22] All these principles derive not from vain conceits and wordy conjecture, but solely from experiment, which is observation and experience, as defined by Bacon. In that sense, homeopathy is certainly a science in the accepted sense.

These empirical methods are those "which, in the early days of homeopathy, Hahnemann undoubtedly employed," [Cooper, Feb 1893, 66] And also that "any departure that I may be guilty of from the beaten tracks is to be judged of simply and solely by result." [Cooper, Feb 1893, 67] For it is indeed axiomatic that "all great improvements in science are made by men who throw off the trammels of previous teachings and begin by a complete and radical overhauling of the entire subject," [Cooper, 1894, 389].

Both Bach and Hahnemann were "exponents of the empirical...therapeutic method...in which symptoms and signs of the curative effort of the dynamis...must be interpreted as positive or beneficial phenomena." [van Haselen, 123] They both therefore stand in the grand Hippocratic medical tradition. Medical empiricists like Paracelsus, Hahnemann and Bach were "rejecting sterile rationalism," [McLean, 27] in favour of personal experiment. Paracelsus was referred to as "the Luther of medicine," [McLean, 78] primarily because he represented a troublemaking tendency, "an anti-authoritarian stance and insisted...on the importance of inner revelation or 'lumen naturae'..." [McLean, 78] This knowledge-creating power he respected far more, as a fertile and reliable beacon of hope and revelation, than the thunderous hair-splitting rationalism of philosophers and textbooks. He also held that the true knowledge of medicine "was not to be acquired from authority, but existed in the natural objects themselves." [French, 149]

- **It individualises;** this means a focus **not** upon "the common symptoms [communia]..." [Coulter, II, 249] those common to many people [the communia]—as in allopathic medicine—but a focus upon "the symptoms peculiar to the individual," [Coulter, II, 250] case [the propria symptoms]. The latter are much "more reliable criteria...for distinguishing one patient from another," [Coulter, II, 250] and in most cases "the patient's habits and mode of life were the most important of the propria." [Coulter, II, 250] In ancient medicine "they separated the propria from communia with the aim of coming as close as possible to the idiosyncrasy of the patient." [Coulter, 250] It is "that which distinguishes him from all similar patients," [Coulter, II, 251] and which distinguishes this "patient from all others of his class. Each sick person is unique in his sickness, and the sickness is unknowable in its essence." [Coulter, II, 251] By relying on "propria over communia they incorporated into their method precisely the characteristics which distinguish the individual patient from all others like him."

[Coulter, II, 498] It also means that pooled averages and mass data are not applicable. Nor, therefore, are mass applied therapeutic measures like vaccinations and antibiotics. It also follows that clinical trials of the allopathic type are inapplicable to homeopathy.

All homeopaths become cognisant of "*the large amount of individualisation demanded by Hahnemann.*" [Haehl, vol. 1, 92]

Osler when he said that "*it is much more important to know what sort of patient has a disease than what sort of disease a patient has,*" [V Maizes and O Caspi, The principles and challenges of integrative medicine, West J Med Sept 1999 171: 148-149
<http://www.ewjm.com/content/vol171/issue3/>

In medicine based upon similars [homeopathy] greatest stress is placed upon what is different between cases and what is unique to each case [called *symptom propria*], while in medicine based in opposites [allopathy] the main emphasis is upon finding what is common [*symptom communia*] to all cases of a similar type. This difference is both real and fundamental.

"[The Organon] gives clear expression of Hahnemann's originality, but is also the product of a mind steeped in the ideas of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment, and informed by the liberal humanitarianism of Jean-Jacques Rousseau..." [Handley, 1990, 3]

Sydenham became convinced that "*diseases were specific entities,*" [Porter, 1998, 230]; he cited "*mistletoe growing on trees, he emphasised how disease was independent of the sufferer,*" [Porter, 1998, 230]

For Paracelsus, "*each individuum was wholly peculiar and...[for him] there were as many diseases as patients.*" [McLean, 170] Bach and Hahnemann would agree.

- **It is holistic** in the true meaning of the word; it does not subscribe to a medical philosophy that seeks to carve the body up into pieces and treat them in isolation from the whole psycho-physical continuum; or to separate mind and emotions from body; it seeks to treat the whole. It is holistic as opposed to being reductionistic or mechanistic.

"...the splendid juggling of so-called theoretical medicine, in which a priori conceptions and speculative subtleties raised a number of proud schools...the art of medicine was merely a pseudo-scientific fabrication, remodelled from time to time to meet the prevailing fashion." [Preface to the 2nd Organon, xv]

Thomas Linacre [~1460-1524, physician to Henry VIII and founder of the Royal College of Physicians] "*declared that physicians assess not only the cause of the illness, but all aspects of the patient,*" [Porter, 1998, 172]

As with Hegel's philosophy, the "*central thought is, then, that only the whole is real; the partial fact is only an abstraction, which needs to be brought into*

connection with the whole in order to gain validity. 'The bud disappears in the bursting forth of the blossom, and it may be said that the one is contradicted by the other; by the fruit, again, the blossom is declared to be a false existence in the plant, and the fruit is judged to be its truth in the place of the flower...' [Rogers; 409]

- **It uses single drugs**, although these can be used in combination and they can be used in swift succession, as needs be.

"Hahnemann was, in all essentials, a flawless experimenter." [Introduction to the 2nd Organon, xxiv]

"The era of scientific medical experimentation begins with Hahnemann and nobody else. Scientific to the core, Hahnemann experimented scientifically for scientific observation..." [ibid., xxvii]

'A single simple remedy is always calculated to produce the most beneficial effects without any additional means...it is never requisite to mix two of them together.' [Hahnemann, 1805, 469]

'An equally important reason for prescribing only the single remedy was that all the provings were of single substances - not of mixtures.' [Coulter, Vol. 2, 391]

'...we must only give one single simple substance at a time.' [Hahnemann, 1805, 469]

'Hahnemann insisted that only one remedy be given at a time and continually belaboured his allopathic colleagues for their multi-ingredient prescriptions...' [Coulter, Vol. 2, 390]

'Then let us...agree to give but one single, simple remedy at a time, for every single disease...' [Hahnemann, 1797, 320]

- **An Interest in Poisons**...the great clue to the provings flowed partly from observing similars and partly through Hahnemann's study of poisons, which was crucial in his search.

In turn, the law of similars springs first from Hahnemann's studies of poisonings and second from his proving experiments. Another stream of ideas flowed from his deep interest in poisons, which reveal the effects of drugs upon the healthy. For example, his publications: On Arsenical Poisoning, 1786; The Complete Mode of Preparing The Soluble Mercury, 1790; On The Best Method of Preventing Salivation and The Destructive Effects of Mercury, 1791; What Are Poisons? What are Medicines?, 1806. There seems little doubt that these studies formed an important prelude to his provings, which are afterall merely mild forms of self-poisoning for experimental purposes.

"Day after day, he tested medicines on himself and others. He collected histories of cases of poisoning. His purpose was to establish a physiological doctrine of medical remedies, free from all suppositions, and based solely on experiments." [Gumpert, 92]

He pondered the relationship between disease and drug; whether single or mixed drugs were best; whether contraries or similars; the question of dosage or posology; were all drugs innately also poisons? what is health and sickness? Questions of this type were central parts of his mental world during his phase of making translations [1784-1806]. Heuristically, he found that yes indeed, all drugs are 'poisons' that can more or less derange health and induce artificial illness states. The provings were partly inspired by accounts of accidental poisonings—thereby opening up an entirely new pathway to therapeutic knowledge.

This meant that many previously "*highly poisonous substances*," [Ameke, 131] could now be safely brought into use as harmless healing agents. They could indeed be "*converted into...powerful remedial agents in the hands of a skilful physician*." [Ameke, 131] Hahnemann felt that "*medicines become poisons simply by imperfect use; in themselves no medicines are poisonous*." [Haehl, I, 75] "*He zealously occupied himself...with the collection of cases of poisoning*." [Ameke, 101] His view was that "*those substances which we term medicines are unnatural irritants...[that] disturb the health of our body...and excite disagreeable sensations*." [Ameke, 101]

"Within the infant rind of this small flower Poison hath residence and medicine power." [Shakespeare]

"Day after day, he tested medicines on himself and others. He collected histories of cases of poisoning. His purpose was to establish a physiological doctrine of medical remedies, free from all suppositions, and based solely on experiments." [Gumpert, 92]

'Hahnemann very carefully argues the question of the new law; he adduces many results of poisonings by drugs, gives his experiences in the uses of medicines...and records the symptoms that certain medicines produced on himself and others.' [Bradford, 58]

- **It uses provings** of single drugs to determine their precise sphere of action; these provings have been conducted upon healthy human volunteers, and do not employ animal experiments, for example: "*his great endeavour was to found a physiological materia medica*." [Ameke, 101]

'...Hahnemann neatly and conscientiously assembled and numbered his observations of the symptoms excited in himself and his children by the most varied of medicines.' [Gumpert, 114]

Meticulous collection of the fine detailed effects of a drug upon human health leads to the provings being converted into drug pictures of symptoms many pages in length. Such mild poisoning experiments are the source of all homeopathic drugs in clinical use. The corpus of drug information has also been expanded with clinical notes derived from their use.

“The true healing art is in its nature a pure science of experience, and can and must rest upon clear facts and on the sensible phenomena pertaining to their sphere of action.” and that it ‘...dares not take a single step out of the sphere of pure, well-observed experience and experiment, if it would avoid becoming a nullity, a farce.’ [Preface to 2nd Organon, xiv]

‘There followed a period of twenty years during which Hahnemann worked prodigiously to accumulate data in support of his ‘law of similar’ as it came to be called. An immense Materia Medica was compiled, and he conducted continuous experiments on himself, his friends and those of his colleagues who were curious and willing.’ [Cameron, 29]

- **It uses tiny quantities** of drugs [minimum dose]—the smallest doses required to induce a therapeutic response. The basis of these small doses was empirical, that is to say, they were arrived at through experience and trial and error; the doses were arrived at by Hahnemann in an attempt both to progressively reduce the toxic action of the drugs, but also to retain the therapeutic action; the result was smaller and smaller doses.

“no poison, however strong or powerful, the billionth or decillionth of which would in the least degree affect a man or harm a fly,” [Simpson, 11]

‘[In his ‘Essay On a New Principle’ of 1796] Hahnemann does not yet talk about diminishing the dose, but insists on the necessity of administering but one medicine at a time...in all these discoveries Hahnemann was guided by experience, to which he trusted solely...’ [Dudgeon, 1853, 49-50]

- The **small drugs** homeopathy employs **are produced in a unique** way by shaking and diluting in a serial manner in dilute ethanol; the chemical and physical basis of this method—in terms of modern scientific conception—remains a mystery, but was also arrived at empirically, by trial and error. This potentiation method somehow imprints the essence, or energy pattern, of the plant, mineral or animal drug upon the dilution medium, which can then be transferred to lactose pills.

‘We cannot fail to be struck by the sudden transition from the massive doses he prescribed in 1798 to the unheard-of minuteness of his doses only one year later, and we can but guess the causes for this abrupt transition.’ [Dudgeon, 1853, 395-6]

“Hahnemann’s idea at first was simply to reduce the “strength” or material mass of his drug, but his passion for accuracy led him to adopt a scale, that he might always be sure of the degree of reduction and establish a standard for comparison.” [Close, 1924, 216]

‘[The] principle of the infinitesimal dose [is]...an outrage to human reason.’ [Forbes, 17 and Nicholls, 121]

“...the doctrines of potentiation and the infinitesimal dose has always been the central point of attack upon homeopathy by its enemies.” [Close, 215]

'In the United States, regular physicians...found Hahnemann's theories absurd and incredible. Reasoning that no one in his right mind could believe such arrant nonsense, they concluded that homeopaths must be either knaves or fools.' [Blake, 86]

"His discovery of the principle of potentisation came about gradually as he experimented in the reduction of his doses, in order to arrive at a point where severe aggravations would not occur. Gradually, by experience, he learned that the latent powers of drugs were released or developed by trituration, dilution and succussion." [Close, 190]

- **Homeopathy does not use broad disease labels**, but treats each individual as a unique case of sickness. It regards that there are as many diseases as there are patients. It therefore resists any temptation to clump together cases of a similar type or give them a name or treat them with the same drug, such as has become the standard practice in allopathic medicine.

One ineradicable problem with **all taxonomic schemes** is that to some degree it is “*a system of idealised entities...fictions compounded out of observed uniformities...concepts and categories...conditioned by human aims.*” [Berlin, 301] Because all such systems are “*a set of formulas, of imaginary entities and mathematical relationships,*” [Berlin, 302] so to the same degree it is always in part a false and abstract system imposed upon raw reality itself, an “*artificial construction of our intellect,*” [Berlin, 302] that is not so much found but made. In reality, “*nature is not a perfect machine, nor an exquisite organism, nor a rational system,*” [Berlin, 302] it is rather “*a savage jungle: science is the art of dealing with it as best we can.*” [Berlin, 302]

By overlooking “*that the disease classification is man-made...they assume...that disease entities somehow have an independent existence,*” [Wulff et al, 82] which of course they do not. They are human constructs with no more reality than pipe dreams. The “*disease classification is still largely a mixture of disease entities defined in anatomical, physiological and microbiological terms,*” [Wulff et al, 77] which is indeed “*a man-made classification of individual patients.*” [Wulff et al, 77] True and natural disease “*classifications are not arbitrary but must be moulded on reality as it is.*” [Wulff et al, 88] Thus far, these do not exist.

- **It stimulates the innate vital powers** to initiate or enhance self-healing activity; it is vitality-enhancing; this is true of all natural medicine and is a unifying aspect of the entire field of natural therapies. This approach stimulates self-healing and induces health autonomy, rather than the obvious medical dependency that results from using chemical drugs and surgery, which do not cure but merely palliate, control and manages symptoms.

Ancient physicians generally always took the view of medicine as one of “*supporting the patient and trusting the healing power of nature,*” [Porter, 260]

“*[a] life-force dominated all corporeal processes...a health-defending property,*” [Porter, 208]

'...any improvement in the patient could be attributed only to the natural healing powers of the body and to the power of suggestion.' [Gevitz, 1637]

Daniel Sennert [1572-1637] *"accepted many Paracelsan notions, blending them with humouralism...[he] adopted a position between the Galenic notion of dis-ease [humoral dis-equilibrium] and the Paracelsan ontological concept of disease as a real, local entity, sickness was the result of an accident affecting the soul or vital powers of the body, impairing its normal organising power,"* [Porter, 1998, 207]

'Hahnemann starts...with the conception of Life as a real or substantial entitative power or principle...the Dynamis and the Life Force. This is Hahnemann's greatest discovery, and the absolute bedrock of his system.' [Close, 30-31]

'Hahnemann starts...with the conception of Life as a real or substantial entitative power or principle...the Dynamis and the Life Force. This is Hahnemann's greatest discovery, and the absolute bedrock of his system.' [Close, 30-31]

Even Sir John Forbes [1787-1861], consulting physician to Queen Victoria, 1841-61, *"accepted the homeopathic cures as the result of the Vis medicatrix naturae...the less the physician does, the better chance the patient has of recovering."* [Rothstein; 243] Such innate self-healing powers, *"the self-rectifying powers of the vis medicatrix;"*[Simpson, 82] the *"natural sanative powers of the constitution,"*[Simpson, 81] *"the curative powers of nature,"*[Simpson, 88] and *"the vital dynamism,"*[Simpson, 23] are valid forces at work in every one of us and the enhancement of those powers is the primary task of all natural healing.

It truly is the *'innate healing power'*. We should always *"remember that it is our duty to help nature as far as possible do her job."* [Bodman, 1971, 225] Medicine involves an attempt *"to restore health...an attempt to restore balance,"* [Wheeler; 1] for true *"health is simply the balanced life."* [11; 4] Sir John Weir [1879-1970] said in an *"address: homeopathy...is no religion, no sect, no fad, no humbug...remedies do not act directly on disease; they merely stimulate the vital reactions of the patient, and this causes him to cure himself."* [Weir; 200-201] Regarding the remedy, we need to remember, *"that the reaction it sets up in the organism is a reaction which goes on working to the ultimate dispersion of the infirmity,"* [Cooper, Jan 1893; 14].

Reliance upon the *"natural healing power leads to interpretation of symptoms as signs of the body's struggle against disease."* [Coulter, II, 456] and thus symptoms are seen *"as beneficial—being the signs of the struggle of the vital force against disease."* [Coulter, II, 487]

For example, when John Foley says, *"only that nerve energy that runs through you and controls every function and autonomic process of your being every second of your life is capable of healing you. No drugs of doctors can do that. We can only facilitate it,"* [Foley] then he clearly echoes the vitalist views of homeopathy and acupuncture. When he further contends that *"drugs, if anything, interfere with that innate ability to heal from within,"* [Foley] and that mere *"covering up symptoms with pharmaceuticals has done little,"* [Foley] then he inclines towards the claim of homeopaths that drugs do not cure.

He also condemns any medical system that searches out and respects only *"the mechanical origin of diseases...[and] which derives diseases from the original form of the parts."* [Ameke, 95] However, Hahnemann—like Bach, Paracelsus and Bailey—regarded sickness as due to *"a morbid derangement of the internal dynamis,"* [Hahnemann, 1810, Aph. 12] and an affection of the *"morbidly deranged spirit-like dynamis."* [Hahnemann, 1810, Aph.15]

He regarded *"symptoms...[as] the expression of the vital force untuned."* [Handley, 66] He also states that *"diseases obviously are not and cannot be mechanical or chemical changes in the material substance of the body...but are an exclusively dynamic, spirit-like untunement of life."* [Hahnemann, 1810, Aph.31]

Hahnemann's expresses his own sentiments in the *Organon* [Aphorisms 11 [9, 10], 15 and 16]: *"let it be granted now...that no disease...is caused by any material substance, but that every one is only and always a peculiar, virtual, dynamic derangement of the health."* [Hahnemann, *Organon*, Aphorisms 11 [9, 10], 15 and 16] Such is certainly a view of disease as a *"dynamic derangement of the life force,"* [Close, 37-8, 74] As Hahnemann states, *"fright, fear, horror, anger, vexation, a chill, &c., are impressions that do not present themselves in a concrete form, that cannot be subjected to physical. Investigation,"* [Hahnemann, 1809] but he regards them all as reliable triggers of sickness.

like Hahnemann, he believed that *"health comes when we regain harmony between our physical and spiritual selves."* [van Haselen, 122]

Like Hahnemann, he also believed in the innate *"self-healing energy in the patient,"* [van Haselen, 123] what he called the *"self-regulating vital force, the vis medicatrix naturae."* [van Haselen, 123]

both *"contain a non-material healing energy."* [van Haselen, 123] They are also prescribed *"based on presenting symptomatic layer,"* [van Haselen, 123] and they both aim to mobilise the *"self-healing vital force,"* [van Haselen, 123] which they both recognise as the source of all natural healing. Sir John Weir [1879-1970] said in an address that homeopathic *"remedies do not act directly on disease; they merely stimulate the vital reactions of the patient, and this causes him to cure himself."* [Weir, 200-201] Both systems *"use single remedies,"* [van Haselen, 123]

they lead to *"stimulation of a person's self-healing strengths."* [Franz, 32] He also thinks that *"homeopathic remedies and Bach essences act as a catalyst,"* [Franz, 32] to stimulate innate self-healing processes.

use *"natural healing substances."* [Richardson, 174] Paracelsus believed that *"attenuation would release from the crude matter the inner 'arcanum,' the essential curative virtue,"* [Richardson, 174] They further held that *"the overall archeus or vital force and the archeus of each organ could be healed by a corresponding archeus of a medicinally prepared plant or mineral."* [Richardson, 174]

that the vital force becomes *"more challenged during times of stress and adversity,"* [Richardson II, 27]

Homeopathy treats *"the person and not the disease."* [Shaw, 6] Through treating mentals or *"mood can, in many cases, make the disease redundant."* [Shaw, 7] It is thought that *"through their subtle vibrational energy the remedies work,"* [Shaw, 7] for *"no physical part of the plant remains in the remedy,"* [Shaw, 10] the remedies *"contain the energy or imprint of the plants from which they were made."* [Shaw, 10] The resulting liquid he then decided was *"impregnated with the power of the plant, and was very potent."* [Weeks, 51] True remedies would be those that have *"the power to elevate our vibrations...cleanse mind and body, and heal."* [Weeks, 54]

- **Homeopathy is safe and gentle**—it contains no toxic residues and can induce no unpleasant or harmful side-effects.

"no poison, however strong or powerful, the billionth or decillionth of which would in the least degree affect a man or harm a fly," [Simpson, 11]

- It implicitly and actively **encourages medical or health autonomy** rather than medical dependency. This stands in stark contrast to allopathy where palliation, control and management of conditions like arthritis, asthma, diabetes and headache form the best clinical outcome; true cure is manifestly unattainable via chemical drugs and surgery.

"movement towards CAM...is motivated primarily by the ensconced attitude of the medical system, which is too rigid and technical and has reduced the patient's autonomy to a therapeutic choice of drugs or surgery. Modern medicine is also too physician-centered, in that the doctor, not the patient, defines the nature and boundary of the patient's problems," [Diamond, 11]

Kent's insistence that cure should: *"leave the patient in freedom always."*
[Kent, 1900; 160-1]

- **It is cheap and inexpensive**, because no complex laboratory or expensive equipment is required to make its simple natural remedies. Self-treatment and self-preparation thus become vivid realities. By handing health power back to the patient, it therefore correspondingly erodes the power of doctors and drug companies to determine one's health and vitality.
- It has been **used most consistently**, even since its origin, **by royalty, the rich and by aristocrats**.

"Queen Mary and King George VI were firm followers of homeopathy, the King even calling one of his horses Hypericum which won the 1000 Guineas race [in 1946]." [Inglis, 1964, 81-2]

"[Hahnemann]...eventually settled in Paris and lived long enough to see widespread support for his doctrines, which struck a chord amongst patients suspicious of drugging practices. He won over a large and often fashionable clientele and captured a significant fraction of the medical profession across Europe and America..." [Porter, 1998, 391]

"Homeopathy rapidly became extremely popular among the wealthy in many communities throughout the country..." [Rothstein, 234]

"The practice Samuel and Melanie Hahnemann established in the heart of Paris soon became fashionable. The wealthy people of the city and, indeed, of Europe generally, were more than ready to try a new medicine...they were predominantly members of the French and British upper and professional classes: nobles, clergy, military officers, doctors...the British were among the earliest visitors: Lord

Elgin...Lady Kinnaird represented Scottish aristocracy...Dr Quin...Baron Rothschild...Viscount Beugnot...Countess Musard...Lord Capel...Lady Belfast and Lady Drummond, the Duchess of Melford... [Handley, 1997, 20-22]

"...homeopathy...retained an elite clientele, including members of the royal family." [Sharma, 1992, 185]

"...homeopathy still had much support from people in high places in the mid-nineteenth century..." [Sharma, 1992, 183]

"[Hahnemann eventually settled in Paris...he won over a large and often fashionable clientele and captured a significant fraction of the medical profession across Europe and America..." [Porter, 1998, 391]

'Homeopathy was especially successful among the more wealthy and educated classes in the United States, in contrast to other irregular systems...' [Blake, 85]

'Homeopathy...appealed primarily to those urban middle and upper class persons who were seeking an alternative to regular medicine...homeopathy was extremely fashionable among the European nobility and upper classes, whose tastes were often copied by affluent Americans.' [Rothstein, 160]

'Homeopathy rapidly became extremely popular among the wealthy in many communities throughout the country...' [Rothstein, 234]

'...with his connections, he was quickly established among the well-known and wealthy. Quin counted the Dukes of Edinburgh and Beaufort among his patients, and became physician to the household of the Duchess of Cambridge.' [Leary et al, 1998, 253]

'The principal supporters of the [homeopathic] hospital, until Quin's death in 1878, were members of the aristocracy.' [Leary, et al, 1998, 254]

'His Lordship, who was 96 on his last birthday wrote with his own hand, under date March 12, 1914 : "I wish all success to Homoeopathy, to which I attach my physical well-being in a great measure. When I was 90 I was asked to what I attributed my well-being at that late period of life. My answer was "To parentage and moderation." I should have added "AND HOMOEOPATHY." with which I have been treated since I was 20." [Wemyss]

'In the USA homeopathy was an early challenge to regular medicine since it appealed to a more affluent clientele with well-trained doctors, who offered, in addition, a less heroic type of therapy...the body of homeopathic doctors was a relatively small sect, concentrated geographically in the North-East and in the large cities...[upon] a clientele from a high and correspondingly influential class.' [Dinges, 186]

- **It has since the beginning scored its biggest hits against the major infectious scourges** like Cholera, Typhus, Yellow fever and Scarlet fever, but is increasingly effective today against all chronic diseases like asthma, skin problems, emotional disorders.

Much impressive epidemiological data can be adduced from many times and places regarding the superiority of homeopathic treatment in Influenza, Cholera, Typhus and Scarlet Fever, etc. Here is a representative sample of such data:

"During the great cholera epidemics in England in 1830 and 1854, Naples in 1854-5, Vienna in 1836, and New York in the 1850s, the average mortality rate of those treated regular old school medicine was 60-70%. In the hands of homeopathy, the death rate across Europe was 9%, and in New York 4-5%." [Diamond, 18]

"In 1854 there was a severe outbreak of Cholera in London...figures revealed that where the death rate in other hospitals was 51.8%, in the London Homeopathic Hospital the rate was only 16.4% in all the true Cholera cases." [Blackie, 11]

"When [Cholera] struck Edinburgh in 1848, the homeopathic dispensary...achieved a mortality rate of 24%; the Board of Health's figures...had a mortality of 68%...at Liverpool in 1849...a death rate of 26% [pertained for homeopathy, as] against a general rate...of 46%." [Nicholls, 146]

"In 1851, a physician from Cincinnati admitted to the Convention of the AMA that all his colleagues agreed with him - Camphor had been one of their most valuable remedies in the Cholera epidemics of 1848 and 1849," [Griggs, 229] Needless to say, Camphor was first recommended for Cholera by Hahnemann entirely on its ability when ingested in crude dose to induce similar symptoms in the healthy.

With regard to Yellow Fever in the American South, in 1879-80, then *"homeopaths employed a number of remedies...Aconite, Belladonna, Arsenicum album, Carbo vegetabilis, Phosphorus, and the snake poisons, Lachesis [Bushmaster] and Crotalus [Rattlesnake]...employed in dilution up to the 30th decimal. Most interesting, however, were the homeopathic statistics. In New Orleans, homeopathic physicians had treated 1945 cases with a loss of 110 - a mortality of 5.6%. In the rest of the South they had treated 1969 cases with a loss of 151 - for a mortality of 7.7%...the overall death rate of reported cases was at least 16%."* [Coulter, III, 302]

In Germany, *"homeopaths were highly successful in treating the typhoid fever that Napoleon's tattered remnant of an army brought back with them [in 1812] from Moscow."* [12; 179] Homeopathic treatment *"of cholera proved remarkably successful. Of the 1655 cholera patients treated in Raab [Hungary], for example, only six of the 154 patients treated homeopathically, died [3.9%], whilst of the remainder, 821 [almost 50%] treated conventionally, died."* [Cook, 157]

Dr. MacLoughlin, "one of the medical inspectors appointed by the General Board of Health, visited the [Cholera] wards, examined the cases under treatment, and watched their progress. His statement, addressed to Mr. Hugh Cameron [1810-1897], a member of the medical staff, was as follows: "You are aware that I went to your hospital prepossessed against the homeopathic system, that you had in me in your camp an enemy rather than a friend... although an allopath by principle, education and practice, yet were it the will of Providence to afflict me with Cholera, and deprive me of the power of prescribing for myself, I would rather be in the hands of a homeopathic than an allopathic adviser." [Sixty-five Years Work]

- **A great diaspora of homeopathy** occurred swiftly throughout the 19th century extending itself throughout Europe, Russia, India and the Americas.

'By 1826 homeopathy had taken root in France, Italy, England and the Scandinavian countries....the doctrine arrived in New York in 1825...' [Cameron, 30]

'The first doctor who brought homeopathy [to India] was Dr. [Martin] Honigburger, who first came to the Punjab...in 1829...' [Kishore, 76]

'Dr. Hering immigrated to America in 1833 and later became known as the father of American homeopathy...Dr. Gram's student, John F Gray, opened his own practice in 1828.' [Karst, 5]

'Homeopathy spread first in Germany, then France, and England. Its greatest popularity, however, was in America...' [Flinn, 427]

'Nowhere did [homeopathy] flourish as luxuriantly as in the United States. Perhaps the climate of democracy was more favorable...' [Cameron, 30]

'...by the early 1840s American homeopathic practitioners were gaining considerable influence and prestige.' [Warner, 1977, 299]

'Cells of homeopaths were formed in nearly every community large enough to have a medical society. In the period 1880-1900 they were at the height of their influence. Hardly any city numbering over 50,000 souls was without a homeopathic hospital and many smaller communities could claim them. In 1890 there were 93 regular schools, 14 homeopathic and 8 eclectic. In 1900, there were 121 regular schools, 22 homeopathic and 10 eclectic.' [Cameron, 31]

'...homeopathy appeared to find its Eldorado in Pennsylvania.' [Cameron, 31]

'Homeopathy enjoyed wide popularity after 1841. This was due in part to many botanic practitioners (Thomsonians) joining their ranks. Also, many orthodox physicians gradually embraced homeopathy.' [Siddall, 121]

'There was an estimated one homeopath for ten allopaths in the United States. In the state of Ohio in 1893 there were 1,000 homeopaths and 4036 allopaths. Included in the homeopath count were nine women...' [Siddall, 121]

- **Hahnemann was a well-educated ordinary doctor** before he discovered homeopathy

'Samuel Hahnemann was a well-educated individual. He studied in Vienna, acquired a medical degree at Erlangen, and served for a period as translator in Leipzig. Cullen's Materia Medica was the accepted authority at the time. Hahnemann in translating it into German became disillusioned and dissatisfied with current medical practice. He... began experiments, later called 'provings', on himself and other healthy individuals.' [Flinn, 425-7]

Before his death in 1843, Hahnemann was known throughout the world, and homeopathy had become one of the fastest-growing movements in medical history.' [Karst, 5]

By contrast, allopathic medical methods mostly seem to have *"reduced the patient's autonomy to a therapeutic choice of drugs or surgery,"* [Diamond, 11] which stands as a chilling indictment of its claim to cure disease

- **Homeopathy acknowledges and includes the mental and psychic state of patient**

Homeopathy recognises that sickness can be triggered by failure and loss and a sense of overwhelm. For example, when he says *"some violent exertion of the body or mind, but particularly some shock to the health caused by some severe external injury, or a very sad event that bowed down the soul, repeated fright, great grief, sorrow and continuous vexation,"* [Hahnemann, 1828, 3] can induce a collapse of good health. He says that is especially those who *"have been exposed to many mental exertions and thousand fold vexations of spirit,"* [Hahnemann, 1828, 44] where sickness will crop out.

However, *"as soon as these persons advance in age, even moderate causes (a slight vexation, or a cold, or an error in diet,"* [Hahnemann, 1828, 48] or are visited by some upset *"caused by mental disturbance (grief, fright, vexation), a chill, over-exertion of the mind or body immediately after eating,"* [Hahnemann, 1810, intro] *"a vexation (sometimes even a bewitchment), etc,"* [Hahnemann, 1810, aph.206] then sickness of some form is almost bound to follow in its wake.

Bach clearly *"recognised that mental and emotional symptoms were the most important ones."* [Franz, 29] *he developed a new method for capturing the ethereal plant quality in remedies—comparable to the 'arcanum' of Paracelsus."* [Franz, 30]

Like Bach and Hahnemann, van Helmont *"also hinted at the power of the mind in the causation of disease...[especially that] fear or loss of honour could start an illness."* [Richardson, 175] He saw disease as often being caused by *"an intruding archæus...[leading to] an unbalanced organism...led by the imagination."* [Richardson, 175] Again we see the connection between the ideas of Hahnemann, Paracelsus, van Helmont and Bach. Certainly, *"Hahnemann reflects van Helmont's*

notion that the image of disease is originated in the mental/spiritual realm, in the imagination, which is located in the archeus." [Richardson, 175]

Hahnemann also "*believed that consciously held erroneous thoughts or beliefs could spark disease,*" [Richardson, 175] a position which comes quite close to the ideas of Bach, and "*is in tune with Paracelsus' and van Helmont's concept of the archeus.*" [Richardson, 176] According to them all "*the dynamis of the corresponding natural life form, medicinally activated by potentisation...restores the individual human dynamis to health...[and represents] the highest immaterial or spiritual extraction of medicines.*" [Richardson, 176] Kent's view that potentised remedies contain "*purely energetic medicinal powers imprinted on the water/alcohol medium during preparation,*" [Richardson, 176] is entirely consistent with the views of Hahnemann and Bach, and they would probably all further agree with him that such remedies resonate "*profoundly with the soul, mind and will.*" [Richardson, 176]

- **Homeopathy adopts an allopathic critique**

Like Paracelsus before him, Hahnemann was "*driven to innovation by dissatisfaction with the limitations of conventional medicine.*" [van Haselen, 121-2]

The process is therefore akin to "*Paracelsus and van Helmont building their systems impertinently amid the ruins of the Galenic.*" [French, 211]

"based more upon quality and not a quantity," [Barnard, 301]

What he also called "*speculative refinements, arbitrary axioms...dogmatic assumptions...[and the] magnificent conjuring games of so-called theoretical medicine.*" [Ameke, 134] Instead, he reserved his greatest respect for "*a science of pure experience...knowledge of the disease to be treated and the actions of drugs.*" [Ameke, 134] These, he insists can only be deduced "*from pure experience and observation,*" [Ameke, 134]

Sources

Wilhelm Ameke, History of Homoeopathy: Its Origins, its Conflicts, with a note on University Medicine, (translated by A. Drysdale, edited by R E Dudgeon), London: E Gould & Sons, 1885

Julian Barnard, Bach Flower Remedies, Form and Function, Hereford: Flower Remedy Programme, 2002

Isaiah Berlin, Georges Sorel, in Against the Current: Essays in the History of Ideas, London: Pimlico, 1997

Margery G Blackie MD, The Patient Not the Cure, London: McDonald & Janes, 1976

John B Blake, Homeopathy in American History, Trans. Stud. Coll. Phys., Philadelphia, Series 5, vol. 3, 1981, 83-92

Frank Bodman, Sir John Weir Obituary, Brit. Homeo. Jnl 60.1, 1971, 224-228

Jean Bonnard, Robert Thomas Cooper and Arborivital Medicine, Student Homeopath 21, London, 10 Sept 1994, 22-24

Bradford, Thomas L, 1895, The Life and Letters of Hahnemann, Jain

A Bullock & S Trombley [Eds.], The New Fontana Dictionary of Modern Thought, third edition, London: Harper Collins, 1999

Cameron, Charles S, 1959, Homeopathy in Retrospect, Trans. Stud. Coll. Phys. Philadelp., 27, 1959, 28-33

Johanna Brieger, Methodological Obstacles In Homeopathic Research, BHJ 50, 1961, 239-45

Stuart Close, The genius of Homeopathy: Lectures and Essays on Homeopathic Philosophy, Philadelphia: Boericke & Tafel, 1924

Trevor M Cook, Samuel Hahnemann, the Founder of Homeopathy, Wellingborough: Thorsons, 1981

Robert T Cooper, Calcarea carbonica – a Warning, Homeopathic World, 2 Jan 1893, 11-15

R T Cooper, One Dose - One Value, Homeopathic World, Feb 1 1893, 64-68

R T Cooper, Some Results of Single Doses, Homeopathic World, Sept 1 1894, 389-393

Harris L Coulter, Divided Legacy, A History of the Schism in Medical Thought, Washington: Wehawken Books, 1973, volume 1

W John Diamond, The Clinical Practice of Complementary, Alternative and Western Medicine, Washington: CRC Press, 2001

Martin Dinges, The Role of Medical Societies in the Professionalisation of Homeopathic Physicians in Germany and the USA in Juette, Risse & Woodward, 1998

Robert E Dudgeon, 1853, Lectures on the Theory and Practice of Homeopathy, London, 1853, Jain reprint, India

Albert Einstein, Preface to Galileo's Dialogue of the Two Principal World Systems, German edition, 1952

Flinn, Lewis B, 1976, Homeopathic Influences in the Delaware Community A Retrospective Reassessment, Del. Med. Jnl., 48:7, July 1976, pp.418-428

John S Foley, Drugs never cured a thing, BMJ e-letter, 14 June 2003
<http://bmj.com/cgi/eletters/326/7388/518/c#33299>

Sir John Forbes, Homeopathy, Allopathy and Young Physic, London, 1846, Forbes was physician to Queen Victoria, 1840-61

Angelika Franz, Bach-Blüten und Homöopathie, Allgemeine Homöopathische Zeitung, 240-1, 1995, 28-34 [with English translation]

Roger French, Medicine Before Science: the Business of Medicine from the Middle Ages to the Enlightenment, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003

Norman Gevitz, (Ed), Other Healers, Unorthodox Medicine in America, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1990

Norman Gevitz, Sectarian Medicine, Jnl Amer. Med. Assoc., 257, 1987, pp.1636-40

Barbara Griggs, Green Pharmacy A History of Herbal Medicine, London: Jill Norman & Hobhouse, 1981

Martin Gumpert, Hahnemann - The Adventurous Career of a Medical Rebel, New York: L B Fischer Publ. Corp., translated from the German by Claud W Sykes, 1945

Richard Haehl, Samuel Hahnemann His Life and Works, 2 volumes, 1922, India: Jain

Samuel Hahnemann, The Medicine of Experience, in Lesser Writings, 1805

Samuel Hahnemann, 1805, Aesculapius in the Balance, 1805, in Lesser Writings, p.421-2 [Hahnemann's Lesser Writings, 1851, Edited by R E Dudgeon, London, Jain reprint]

Samuel Hahnemann, On the Value of the Speculative Systems of Medicine, 1808, in Lesser Writings, pp.489-90

Samuel Hahnemann, Observations On The Three Current Methods Of Treatment, *From Hufeland's Journal of Practical Medicine, vol. xi, pt. 4. 1809*

Samuel Hahnemann, Organon of Medicine, 1810, translated and edited by W G Boericke & R E Dudgeon, Philadelphia: Boericke & Tafel, 1922

Samuel Hahnemann, Are the Obstacles to Certainty and Simplicity in Practical Medicine Insurmountable?, 1797, in Lesser Writings, 320

Samuel Hahnemann, The Chronic Diseases-their Peculiar Nature and their Homeopathic Cure. "Die chronischen Krankheit..." Die chronischen Krankheiten ihre eigenthümliche Natur und homöopathische Heilung; Dresden, Leipzig: Arnold, 1828

Rima Handley, A Homeopathic Love Story, USA: North Atlantic Books, 1990

Rima Handley, In Search of the Later Hahnemann, Beaconsfield: Beaconsfield Books, 1997

Harrison, J F C, 1988, Early Victorian Britain 1832-51, Fontana, London

Brian Inglis, Fringe Medicine, London: Faber, 1964

Robert Juette, Gunter Risse and John Woodward (Eds.), 1998, Culture, Knowledge and Healing: Historical Perspectives on Homeopathy in Europe and North America, Sheffield Univ. Press, UK

Frederick Karst, Homeopathy In Illinois, Caduceus, 4:2, 1988, pp.1-33

James T Kent, Lectures on Homeopathic Philosophy, N Atlantic Books, 1900, 1980 edition

James T Kent, New remedies, clinical cases, lesser writings, aphorisms and precepts, Chicago: Ehrhart & Karl, 1926

Jugal Kishore, About Entry of Homeopathy Into India, Bull. Ind. Hist. Med., vol. 3 (2), April 1973, pp.76-78

B Leary, M Lorentzon & A Bosanquet, It Wont Do Any Harm: Practice & People At The London Homeopathic Hospital, 1889-1923 In Juette, Risse & Woodward, 1998

London Homeopathic Hospital, 1914, Sixty-five Years Work, A History of The London Homeopathic Hospital, London

Ian McLean, Logic Signs and Nature in the Renaissance: the Case of Learned Medicine, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002

Ursula Miley, and John V Pickstone, Medical Botany Around 1850: American Medicine in Industrial Britain, in Cooter, 1988, pp.139-153

Phillip A Nicholls, Homeopathy and the Medical Profession, London: Croom Helm, 1988

John V Pickstone, Establishment And Dissent In Nineteenth Century Medicine, Studies In Church History 19, 1982, pp.165-189

Herbert Pietschmann, Medicine - A Discipline Between Art & Science, BHJ 72.3, July 1983, pp.155-61

Roy Porter, Disease, Medicine and Society in England 1550-1860, London: Macmillan, 1986

Roy Porter, The Greatest Benefit to Mankind A Medical History of Humanity, New York: Norton, 1998

John Reid's Course on Practical Alchemy - I. Chapter 2. The Three Essentials
<http://www.levity.com/alchemy/reid1-2.html> [accessed 6-3-2004]

Cornelia Richardson-Boedler, Doctrine of Signatures: a Historical, Philosophical and Scientific View [I], BHJ 88, 1999, 172-177

Cornelia Richardson-Boedler, Doctrine of Signatures: a Historical, Philosophical and Scientific View [II], BHJ 89, 2000, 26-28

Arthur K Rogers, *A Student's History of Philosophy*, New York: Macmillan, 1960

William G Rothstein, American Physicians in the 19th Century From Sects to Science, Baltimore: John Hopkins Univ. Press, 1972

William Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*, act 2, scene 3

Ursula Sharma, Complementary medicine today: practitioners and patients, London; New York: Routledge, 1995.

Non Shaw, Bach Flower Remedies a Step-by-Step Guide, Shaftsbury: Element Books, 1998

A Clair Siddall, History of Homeopathic Medicine at Oberlin, Ohio, 1833-1933, Ohio State Med. Jnl, 74, pt. 2, 1978, pp.121-124

Sir James Young Simpson, Homeopathy: its Tenets and Tendencies, Theoretical, Theological, and Therapeutical, 3rd ed., Edinburgh: Sutherland and Knox; London: Simpkin, Marshall, 1853

Sixty-five Years Work: a History of the London Homeopathic Hospital, 1914; a limited circulation document published by the Hospital

M Tyler & C E Wheeler, Appreciations of Dr Clarke, April 1932, BHJ 21, London

R A van Haselen, The Relationship Between homeopathy and the Dr Bach System of Flower Remedies: a Critical Appraisal, BHJ 88, 1999, 121-127

John Harley Warner, The Nature-Trusting Heresy, Perspectives on American History, 11, 1977, 291-324

John Harley Warner, The Therapeutic Perspective Medical Practice, Knowledge and Identity in America 1820-1885,, Harvard Univ. Press, USA, 1986

Ian Watson, Book Review: Cancer and Cancer Symptoms: Chiefly Arborivital Treatment by R. T. Cooper, and The Therapeutics of Cancer: Transactions of the 9th Quinquennial International Homeopathic Congress, 1927 by J. H. Clarke et al. published in Homeopathy Today, May 1991, USA, 11-12

Nora Weeks, The Medical Discoveries of Edward Bach, Physician, Ashington: C W Daniel Co, 1940

Sir John Weir, The Hahnemann Convalescent Home, Bournemouth, BHJ 20, 1931, 200-201

The Right Hon. The Earl of Wemyss and March, President of the London Homoeopathic Hospital. quoted in History of The Homeopathic Hospital, 1914

Dr Charles Wheeler Obituary, Brit. Homeo. Jnl 37.1, April 1947, 1-11

E Whitmont, The use of Dreams in Homeopathic Prescribing and Proving, The Homeopath, UK, 1996; 62: 588-9

H. Wulff, A. Pedersen, R. Rosenberg, Philosophy of Medicine, an Introduction, London: Blackwell Scientific Publications, 1986