

A Case for Medical Homeopathy

Dear AIH Members and Colleagues,

Over the past ten or so years, there have been considerable efforts within the general homeopathic community to come to common ground regarding the freedom for all well-trained homeopaths to practice. To that end, the Homeopathic Action Alliance was formed to serve as a forum for various organizations within the United States to communicate the current issues and future directions for their organizations. Both lay (or more currently named “professional” homeopaths) and licensed providers get together on a quarterly basis to update one another.

Having attended a number of these meetings, several points have become clear to me:

1. The various groups representing different homeopathic interests absolutely benefit by joining together as one voice.
2. These various groups have different and sometimes conflicting interests.

Joining our voices to form a politically active unit is a powerful vehicle to influence public policy and ensure the availability and quality assurance of homeopathic medicines for the future. The Homeopathic Pharmacopeia Convention of the U.S. (HPCUS) is currently leading an effort to communicate the homeopathic community’s opinion on upcoming National Healthcare Legislative changes that could potentially impact our practice. This effort has the support of most, if not all other homeopathic organizations, including the AIH. The coordination of all of these groups to provide a clear and consistent message to the legislators lends weight and credibility to the effort. And I send out a heart-felt ‘kudos’ to the board of the HPCUS.

Unfortunately, not all efforts from the various homeopathic organizations are conducted with the large view in mind. A significant divide between licensed and unlicensed homeopaths continues. In my observation, a primary interest of some of unlicensed groups is to define “Homeopathy” as not being “Medicine.” I have often heard the description that in their practice of homeopathy, they do not treat “Disease,” but more

generally help patients to reach their maximum level of health using homeopathic remedies. While this definition of homeopathy is consistent with Hahnemann’s first paragraph of the *Organon*: “The physician’s high and *only* mission is to restore the sick to health, to cure, as it is termed,” that definition is not supported by Hahnemann’s second paragraph: “The highest ideal of cure is rapid, gentle and permanent restoration of the health, or removal and annihilation of the disease in its whole extent, in the shortest, most reliable, and most harmless way, on easily comprehensible principles.”

In my humble opinion, efforts to define Homeopathy as *not medicine*, are based on the concerns of unlicensed practitioners providing medically related advice in states that have existing medical practice acts, but no health freedom legislation. Health freedom legislation currently exists in six states (CA, ID, MN, OK, LA, RI) and similar bills have been introduced in at least six other states. A recent law in California (SB-577, passed in 2002) is a good example. This legislation applies to anyone without a medical license “who practices or attempts to practice, or who advertises or holds himself or herself out as practicing, any system or mode of treating the sick or afflicted in this state, or who diagnoses, treats, operates for, or prescribes for any ailment, blemish, deformity, disease, disfigurement, disorder, injury, or other physical or mental condition of any person...” *The law requires two primary compliance points (presented here in simplistic form):*

1. Disclosure of training and qualifications to clients in a written form.
2. Refraining from representing oneself as a doctor or engaging in potentially dangerous practices that only licensed healthcare providers are allowed to do.

Unlicensed practitioners in California who comply with the law will not be prosecuted for the practice of medicine without a license. Practitioners who do not comply are subject to prosecution by action of the State Medical Board or under Consumer Protection laws. While all health freedom laws will vary to some extent, the California law represents the essence of this type

of legislation. More information is available at www.californiahealthfreedom.com.

While this type of legislation solves much of the issue for unlicensed homeopaths, most states have no such protection, leaving these practitioners at risk for prosecution. I am sympathetic to the needs of these groups, and certainly health freedom legislation is a solution that is available to solve these needs.

However, I cannot support efforts to re-define Homeopathy as *not medicine*. In my office, I treat patients with diseases and disorders. Hahnemann refers to *disease* over five hundred times and *medicine* over two hundred times through the *Organon*. In my practice, I do heed the knowledge of the *Organon* and certainly focus all care on the individual. I prescribe to raise my patients' overall level of health, but I never lose sight of the pathology and the speed at which a healthy patient can move to a disastrous state provided sufficient environmental stress. Medical training gives me a deeper perspective on the totality of health for any given patient, which aids my ability to restore the sick to health.

Regarding this matter in total, ***I believe the AIH has two specific charges:***

1. Define *Medical Homeopathy* as uniquely practiced by Physicians, Dentists, and Allied Healthcare Providers.
2. Ensure that this definition is clearly communicated to those within the homeopathic community and the public at large.

I have taken the liberty here to use the phrase Medical Homeopathy because it helps solve some of the blurring that is occurring within homeopathy in general, and because the terminology can be easily defined

for and recognized by the public. Medical Homeopathy represents the ability to accurately take a history, examine, test, diagnose, and treat patients with wide ranges of physical, mental and emotional imbalances.

I believe the AIH has no interest in hindering the ability of any well-trained homeopath to utilize the skills of this art, but we have a clear interest in communicating to the public the unique training and expertise of our members, compared to other practitioners.

I would like to see several efforts completed in this matter. First, several AIH Board members are currently working on a White Paper which will clearly define Medical Homeopathy. Once completed, the draft will be circulated for a brief comment period. After including the relevant commentaries, a completed document will be published in journals important within the homeopathic community and on the AIH website for public access. Second, I believe the AIH has the responsibility to lead American Homeopathy. We have tremendous depth of experience among us. We see thousands upon thousands of patients. Many of us are expert in either research or in proving, and yet our voice is so weak, so restrained. When groups like the HPCUS step up to take on the role of being the liaison to the U.S. Congress, I am very proud to be a member of such an organization and very happy to know that someone has my back. I am hoping that if a disaster like the Swine Flu really does manifest as a pandemic, AIH members will stand up and rally to find the solution; and then, together, promote that approach with a unified voice of certainty and experience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Todd A. Hoover, MD, DHt, CCH
President, AIH 