



An Open Invitation

In 2007 LINKS had its 20th anniversary and we organized a conference in Heidelberg to celebrate this. When meeting colleagues I'm still regularly reminded of that amazing meeting, and expressions like 'the best conference I've ever attended' sum up the general impression it left behind in the memory of many.

And I agree. It was a wonderful meeting where we celebrated homeopathy, its latest advances and above all shared a deep feeling of genuine friendship and community. The atmosphere was fantastic and the presentations were of high quality.

One thing I had hoped the conference would bring and was even designed to generate was debate. Rajan Sankaran, Massimo Mangialavori and Jan Scholten have each made immense contributions to the development of homeopathy, preparing it as it were for the new millennium. As key speakers they had the platform to evaluate what they had developed, and to project into the future where their ongoing quest might lead them. The other speakers were all excellent homeopaths in their own right and in their practice had also integrated the work of one, two or all of the key speakers.

The scientific debate we intended to let take place largely didn't happen. Apparently the time was not ripe for it and we as a community not ready for it. Completely new developments within any science will logically have to mature, and in that process ideas become further refined, tuned and improved. Innovative thinkers like Jan, Rajan, Massimo and many others not only deserve to be heard but also need their ideas to be tested in debate with colleagues. They deserve more feedback than our applause; they deserve to hear our experience in testing out their hypotheses, especially where our cases do not seem to fit these. Each science advances most from seriously studying those observations (in homeopathy those cases) that do not fit the current general understanding of an adhered theory.

The major goal of the study of debate as a method or art is to develop one's ability to play from either position with equal ease. This, I'm afraid is not the level at which we generally dare to investigate the theory and practice of homeopathy. Can you imagine how our art and science would blossom if we could do this, attack our own beliefs, defend someone else's point of view? What freedom such an openness of mind would render, with what strength the resulting openness of heart would empower us!

A journal is less equipped for debate, which needs an arena with live audience, and serves better as a platform for discussion. But also an open discussion of the fascinating developments in homeopathy is not really taking place, as fixed positions pro or con any idea, whether old or new, do not really stimulate our science to progress, but rather hamper it.

This editorial is intended as an invitation to bring more open discussion to the pages of LINKS. An open invitation for an open discussion with an open mind and an open heart. I'm inviting you to share the observations you make in your practice using any method of case taking, case analysis and case treatment currently available to us. Where do you feel any of these could be improved? E.g. how do you feel a sensation of a specific plant family would be better described, or which miasm would better fit a species of it; how do you feel the muriaticums, the actinides or a stage or series of the periodic table might be better described; what more precisely is the survival mechanism of a specific animal and how does that translate to humans; where do you feel the current beliefs considering posology need to be adjusted; how can layers in a case or levels of health be better understood or translated into more effective treatment; etcetera.

I'm inviting you to keep your contribution to this open discussion restricted to 300 words, and to refrain from closed opinions and instead come with open suggestions based on your observations. You may include in your writing an open question or suggestion. In case this concerns anyone in particular we will pass this on and ask for a response. Let's create a regular column in which we together improve our theory and practice. We could call this rubric LINK & LEARN. Suggestions for another name are welcome.

I truly hope to hear from you,

Harry van der Zee