



Editorial

This year we celebrate the 250th anniversary of the birth of Samuel Hahnemann, a man who has blessed the world with the light of homeopathy. He developed the practice and philosophy of homeopathy in one lifetime to a near-complete system of healing: an unequalled feat accomplished with so much power and conviction that, now more than 200 years later, it never fails to keep impressing us.

In this summer issue of LINKS there are two articles that shed light on the shadow of Hahnemann and, due to his indissoluble connection with his discovery, the shadow of homeopathy. Where other scientists like Freud, born much later than Hahnemann, have had their work long questioned and challenged, homeopaths until today are hesitant to engage in this Oedipus-like conflict with their founding father. This is partly due to the completeness of the heritage that Hahnemann left us, but also to a prohibition on following his motto 'Sapere ode' if that implies violating his 'mach es genau nach'.

The schism this conflict causes has cast its shadow on the homeopathic community in the past decades, resulting in discussions and polemics that are more emotional than scientific in nature, and regretfully often more damaging than constructive. The polarisation owing to the split in our community has strengthened the outgrowth of both uncritical developments and unshakable steadfastness. Taking a little distance one can easily see how the qualities behind these two attitudes need and complement each other.

I hope therefore that the articles by Jane Cicchetti and Helmut Ossege signify that the time has come to meet our common shadow and to refrain from fruitless projections. Perhaps the Melanie Grimes article on night-watching is a synchronicity underlining our awakening, and the article by Jenni Tree on intelligent Barytas one to signify a more mature and intelligent way in administering the legacy that has been put in our trust.

How would homeopathy have looked if Hahnemann had lived another hundred years? I have no idea, but considering his tireless drive to improve and perfect there can be no doubt that he would have continued optimizing homeopathy, as he did, into old age, in his sixth and last version of the Organon. What if he had died ten years earlier? Would we today have been able to read the article by Ubiratan Adler et al on LM potencies? Would we have accepted the idea of LM potencies coming from anybody other than Hahnemann?

I hope the celebration of the 250th anniversary of the birth of Samuel Hahnemann will coincide with the birth of more consciousness and understanding in our community. Once the shadow is perceived and acknowledged the anima and animus can together procreate a new era of balanced growth and development. We owe that to Hahnemann, we owe that to our patients and we owe that to ourselves.

Harry van der Zee, MD, editor