

25-3-2026

## Homoeopathy during one hundred years of LMHI (1925–2025) – Part 2: Historical perspectives\* (Continued from Part 1, published in the last issue)<sup>1</sup>

Josef M. Schmidt

*Institute of Ethics, History and Theory of Medicine, Ludwig Maximilians Universität, München, Germany, j.m.schmidt@lmu.de*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://www.ijrh.org/journal>



Part of the [Homeopathy Commons](#)

---

### How to cite this article

Schmidt JM. Homoeopathy during one hundred years of LMHI (1925–2025) – Part 2: Historical perspectives. *Indian J Res Homoeopathy*. 2026;20(1):107–13.

This Perspective is brought to you for free and open access by Indian Journal of Research in Homoeopathy. It has been accepted for inclusion in Indian Journal of Research in Homoeopathy by an authorized editor of Indian Journal of Research in Homoeopathy. For more information, please contact [ijrhonline@gmail.com](mailto:ijrhonline@gmail.com).



---

## Homoeopathy during one hundred years of LMHI (1925–2025) – Part 2: Historical perspectives\* (Continued from Part 1, published in the last issue)<sup>1</sup>

### Abstract

Taking Hahnemann in his entirety, as a paradigmatic example of a true homoeopath, as a sound basis for a proper understanding of Homoeopathy, the "scientific-critical" school of homoeopaths seems to miss one constitutive part of Homoeopathy: its spiritual embedment into a greater frame of thinking and feeling. In fact, the greatest successes of Homoeopathy, in terms of popularisation, institutionalisation and implementation into social and cultural practice, were achieved in countries and periods open towards spiritual dimensions. This was the case in North America at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, when James Tyler Kent propagated a Hahnemannian Homoeopathy inspired by Emanuel Swedenborg, and in India and Latin America in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, where Kentianism fell on fertile ground, later being elaborated into different innovative schools. In Europe and North America, the New Age Movement in the 1970s brought a temporary opening for spiritual and esoteric ideas – to be followed by a drawback into the "critical-scientific" approach, in the wake of evidence-based medicine in the 1990s. The founding of the LMHI 100 years ago by Pierre Schmidt and others proved to be crucial for the spreading and advancement of genuine Homoeopathy according to Hahnemann.

### Acknowledgments and Source of Funding

NA



## PERSPECTIVE

# Homoeopathy during one hundred years of LMHI (1925–2025) – Part 2: Historical perspectives<sup>☆</sup>

(Continued from Part 1, published in the last issue)<sup>1</sup>

**Josef M. Schmidt**

Institute of Ethics, History and Theory of Medicine, Ludwig Maximilians Universität, München, Germany

## ABSTRACT

Taking Hahnemann in his entirety, as a paradigmatic example of a true homoeopath, as a sound basis for a proper understanding of Homoeopathy, the “scientific-critical” school of homoeopaths seems to miss one constitutive part of Homoeopathy: its spiritual embedment into a greater frame of thinking and feeling.

In fact, the greatest successes of Homoeopathy, in terms of popularisation, institutionalisation and implementation into social and cultural practice, were achieved in countries and periods open towards spiritual dimensions.

This was the case in North America at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, when James Tyler Kent propagated a Hahnemannian Homoeopathy inspired by Emanuel Swedenborg, and in India and Latin America in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, where Kentianism fell on fertile ground, later being elaborated into different innovative schools.

In Europe and North America, the New Age Movement in the 1970s brought a temporary opening for spiritual and esoteric ideas – to be followed by a drawback into the “critical-scientific” approach, in the wake of evidence-based medicine in the 1990s.

The founding of the LMHI 100 years ago by Pierre Schmidt and others proved to be crucial for the spreading and advancement of genuine Homoeopathy according to Hahnemann.

**Keywords:** History of Homoeopathy, Homoeopathic philosophy, LMHI (Liga medicorum homoeopathica internationalis), Kentianism

## Introduction

The leading question in the history of Homoeopathy during one hundred years of LMHI (1925–2025) will be: What kind of Homoeopathy (just physically or physically *and* spiritually orientated) developed and prevailed, where and why?

The thesis is that, in order to comprehend, support, defend and spread Homoeopathy as a concept of healing, one needs to consider both of its dimensions: the physical and spiritual ones. This implies, of course, that a true homoeopath must oneself comprise these two dimensions, i.e. be a physical and spiritual human being. Otherwise, one may not be able to grasp Homoeopathy in its entirety, but only a fraction of it, a part, a trunk, a caricature.

The sub-thesis is that whatever historical appearance Homoeopathy may be given by its adherents, may to a great part be determined by the *Zeitgeist*, i.e. the genius of the time.

It may be suggested that the way Homoeopathy was conceived by homoeopaths down the ages, depended, on the one hand, on their own mindset (whether material *and* spiritual – or physical only), and, on the other hand, how homoeopaths reacted to political, economic, and cultural framework conditions, how they complied, opposed or ignored them.

The *Shiboloth*, i.e. the feature of distinction between the two factions, may be their basic belief or

**How to cite this article:** Schmidt JM. Homoeopathy during one hundred years of LMHI (1925–2025) – Part 2: Historical perspectives. *Indian J Res Homoeopathy*. 2026;20(1):107–13.

<sup>☆</sup>This article is a revised version of a paper presented at the 78th LMHI World Congress, in Utrecht, The Netherlands, on May 15, 2025.

Received 14 October 2025; Accepted 16 February 2026.

E-mail address: [j.m.schmidt@lmu.de](mailto:j.m.schmidt@lmu.de) (J. M. Schmidt).

<https://doi.org/10.53945/2320-7094.2746>

2320-7094/© 2026 Published by Central Council for Research in Homoeopathy (CCRH). This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 Licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>).

attitude: am I really a holistic person, i.e. am I living in a material *and* spiritual world, or just in a physical world where God is supposed not to interfere?

Contrary to Hahnemann or Kent, for whom the spiritual world was at least as much a reality as the physical one, for scientific-critical homoeopaths only the material world had been considered to be real. Accordingly, for the latter Homoeopathy and its laws were not a divine revelation (as for Hahnemann and Kent), but just a couple of hypotheses that may be verified or falsified by means of scientific tools and methods.

## History of Homoeopathy since 1925

With this in mind, let us now look at the course of Homoeopathy through the last 100 years, since LMHI was founded in 1925.

Starting with *Germany*, in the 1930s, within the materialistic environment of medical science, Homoeopathy existed almost only in the form of scientific-critical homoeopaths, like Hans Wapler (1866–1951), etc., who applied low potencies (up to 6x) according to proved indications and as a supplement to regular treatment. After the LHI congress was held in Berlin in 1937, under the patronage of representatives of the national-socialistic government, the German medical leaders started a project to unite all known methods of medicine, be it conventional or traditional, under the label of New German Medicine (Neue Deutsche Heilkunde) and to test their efficacy. The background and aim were to select from the entire pool of healing methods those that would prove most suitable and effective for utilisation in the looming war.

With unprecedented financial and institutional means and support, homoeopaths were now, 1937–1939, compelled to demonstrate what up until then they used to be claiming. They were free to design and implement the studies they would suggest and prioritise. What may sound paradisiacal to materially-minded people, in fact had this constraint and drawback: Homoeopathy should be buckled on a torture rack and squeezed out with statistical tools, or, in philosophical terms, Homoeopathy was just treated as a physical object of investigation and nothing more. In other words, its other, its spiritual side, was not considered and addressed at all, and in fact, was not contained in the minds of the scientific-critical homoeopaths either. Reified as a set of hypotheses that may be tested in controlled drug provings or clinical trials, eventually, no significant results were accomplished (Fritz Donner-Report). Philosophically speaking, the negative outcome may have suggested that Homoeopathy is indeed not a form of medicine,

functioning according to material standards needed in industrial mass production and warfare.

After the war, in the 1960s and 1970s, an existential challenge for Homoeopathy arose from the economic and political threat of the new drug legislation intended by the European Economic Community (EWG). With diplomatic skill and also luck, the scientific-critical German homoeopaths succeeded in protecting homoeopathic remedies from vanishing from the market, by insisting on their otherness. Finally, while regular drugs, in order to be admitted, from 1976 onwards had to demonstrate their efficacy by means of clinical trials, homoeopathic non-prescription drugs had only to be registered, if sold without claims of their effectiveness for certain medical indications. However, as a compromise, in the new German Homoeopathic Pharmacopoeia homoeopathic remedies were no longer defined according to the homoeopathic principle (*similia similibus*), but merely according to the process of their production. Needless to say, on neither side were the spiritual dimensions of Homoeopathy a topic during this struggle.<sup>2</sup>

Meanwhile, through the teaching activities of Pierre Schmidt and LHI congresses in Geneva (1931), Lucerne (1939, 2006), Lausanne (1951) and Montreux (1960), in *Switzerland*, a new confident and dynamic way of advocating and practising Homoeopathy was formed. Inspired by the original writings of Hahnemann and Kent and under a less restrictive mindset than in Germany, Swiss physicians like Adolf Voegeli (1898–1993), Rudolf Flury-Lemberg (1903–1977) and Jost Künzli von Fimmelsberg (1915–1992) in the 1960s and 1970s also started to give lectures in Germany, introducing individualising, constitutional high potency prescribing, including repertorisation. This uncommon and fresh approach, according to Kent and Hahnemann, has since been called “classical Homoeopathy”.<sup>3</sup> It opened up and legitimised, as it were, the horizon of a new understanding of Homoeopathy, more authentic, including its spiritual dimensions. Thus, a new generation of homoeopaths were educated by reading Kent’s “Lectures on homoeopathic philosophy”.<sup>4</sup>

Other countries and continents, like *India*, were open to Kentianism almost from the beginning of their history of Homoeopathy. To acknowledge spirituality as a reality has never been a problem in India, where the materialistic medicine of its British colonial rulers was widely rejected, and by the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Indian doctors were already studying at American homoeopathic colleges. In addition, LMHI congresses helped to connect Indian homoeopaths with colleagues from all over the world. Five congresses actually took place

in India: in New Delhi (1967, 1977, 1994, 2011) and Kolkata (1989).

As such, in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Indian homoeopaths achieved an enormous spreading and popularising of Homoeopathy, in terms of numbers of homoeopathic physicians, colleges, hospitals, pharmacies, journals, societies, etc., and even succeeded in being included in the health care system of the state. In India, up to recent times, nobody has really missed a distinctively scientific-critical school of homoeopaths.

In *Latin America*, Homoeopathy also developed and thrived almost independently from materialistic concerns about infinitesimal dilutions of remedies or the like. Rather, it was the spiritual aspect of Homoeopathy that appealed to the mentality of the inhabitants. Obviously, living Catholicism may provide a more receptive disposition for spirituality than inveterated scepticism of predominantly atheistic countries. Inspired not by scientific-critical homoeopaths, but by Kentianism, e.g. in Mexico, Argentina and Brazil, internationally renowned innovative schools of Homoeopathy were founded and institutionalisation and professionalisation advanced. In Brazil, Homoeopathy meanwhile is part of the national health care system.<sup>5</sup>

In Argentina five LMHI congresses took place: in Buenos Aires (1971, 1984, 2004, 2016) and Cordoba (1992); four in Mexico: in Mexico City (1929), Acapulco (1980), Oaxaca (1995) and Puebla (2007); four in Brazil: in Rio de Janeiro (1954, 1986, 2015) and Salvador da Bahia (1999); one in Ecuador: in Quito (2013); and one in Columbia: in Bogotá (2023).

By the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, in the wake of annual Liga congresses, many other European countries that had originally been dominated by scientific-critical schools were also introduced to Kentianism and classical Homoeopathy, which then began to spread increasingly. So, by and by, all members of the LMHI had a chance to get to know the entire spectrum of Homoeopathy, not only its regional forms.

Most Liga congresses, nine so far, have taken place in Germany: in Stuttgart (1928, 1955), Berlin (1937, 2005), Bad Godesberg (1962), Hannover (1966), Hamburg (1979), Cologne (1991) and Leipzig (2017). Eight congresses took place in France: in Paris (1926, 1932, 1968, 2014), Monte Carlo/Nice (1938), Bordeaux (1957), Vichy (1970) and Lyon (1985); six in the Netherlands: in Arnhem (1934), The Hague (1952), Amsterdam (1961, 1998), Rotterdam (1975) and Utrecht (2025); five in Italy: in Rome (1930, 1981), Florence (1959), Capri (1996) and Sorrento (2019); five in Austria: in Salzburg (1958), Vienna (1973, 1983, 1993) and Graz (2003); four in Spain: in Madrid (1933), Barcelona (1963, 1990) and Seville

(2024); three in Belgium: in Brussels (1953, 1972) and Ostende (2008); three in Greece: in Athens (1969, 1976, 1988); two in Hungary: in Budapest (1935, 2000); one in Romania: in Sibiu (2001); one in Poland: in Warsaw (2009); and one in Turkey: in Istanbul (2022).

Also in Asia, LMHI congresses took place: one in Russia, in Moscow (2002); one in Japan, in Nara (2012). And also in Africa: one in South Africa, in Cape Town (2018).

Great Britain may be considered to be an exception to this development, as here, due to good trading and travel connections to the USA, Kentianism had already arrived by the turn of the century and superceded the old guard of scientific-critical homoeopaths such as Richard Hughes (1836–1902), who had dominated British Homoeopathy throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Five Liga congresses took place in the United Kingdom: in London (1927, 1950, 1956, 1965) and Brighton (1982).

In the *United States of America*, the development of Homoeopathy progressed very differently compared to the rest of the world. It was introduced in the 1820s and 1830s by European homoeopaths, e.g. Constantine Hering (1800–1880), who was a true Hahnemannian. Due to steady European immigration in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, North American Homoeopathy may originally have been similar in theory and practice to the scientific-critical homoeopaths, i.e. prescribing low potencies according to proved indications. However, after Swedenborg's writings were translated and distributed in America in the 1850s, a religiously inspired spiritual trend emerged in Homoeopathy, culminating in Kent's philosophy.

Nonetheless, until the 20<sup>th</sup> century, besides Kent's colleges in Philadelphia and Chicago, also scientific-critical schools and research institutes of Homoeopathy existed in the United States, e.g. in San Francisco, to where the German physician Otto Guttentag (1900–1992) had emigrated, or in New York, led by Lynn J. Boyd (1895–1981). Anyway, the decline of medical Homoeopathy in the United States, due to unaccomplishable political and economic pressure on homoeopathic institutions after the Flexner Report of 1910, affected both schools, whether they could demonstrate scientific studies or not.<sup>6</sup> In a way, after its decline, the remains of North American Homoeopathy may have profited from its continuous connection with LMHI congresses, four of which actually took place in the USA: in Washington, DC (1974), Washington, DC & San Francisco (1987), Seattle (1997) and Redondo Beach (2010).

## The new age movement

In the 1970s, as a counterculture to an increasingly rational, commercial and bourgeois mentality in Western industrialised countries, the so-called New Age Movement rose up, with a strong orientation towards spirituality, esotericism and holism. The corresponding shift of the *Zeitgeist*, involving complaisant media coverage of alternative therapies, also had a significant impact on the development of Homoeopathy. In line with a general optimism of progress and with modern values of creativity, individuality and personal growth, spiritual and even esoteric concepts became more easily acceptable, within Homoeopathy as well as in society at large. Even though not all concepts now emerging on an extended homoeopathic market were purely spiritual, their widespread and international reception owed a lot to this new openness for innovation and plurality in medicine.

LMHI congresses continued to serve as a forum for the exchange of ideas and experience, and in the following decades, the systems of Vithoulkas, Ortega, Paschero, Masi-Elizalde, Sankaran, Scholten and many others became known within all countries of the homoeopathic community. Backed by the general public's enthusiasm, in fact, more and more homoeopaths embraced spiritual concepts of Homoeopathy, while the scientific-critical faction seemed to be outdated and lacking in influence.<sup>7</sup>

## Globalisation and evidence-based medicine

In the 1990s, however, with the emerging paradigm of so-called globalisation, America's Big Money realised the enormous economic growth rates of the alternative health market (up to 20% per year), and the USA attempted to become the world's leader and profiteer of this sector. So, the term CAM was coined to label a new field of business, encompassing some 200 different methods of healing, including Homoeopathy. In order to select those therapies that might best be exploitable in mass production and consumption, the National Center for Complementary and Alternative Medicine (NCCAM) was founded in 1991 as a United States government agency and was endowed with an annual budget of some 100 million dollars, cumulating in 2.5 billion dollars in 2009.

During this period, in England, David Sackett came up with the concept of evidence-based medicine (EbM), at his Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine, founded in 1994 at the University of Oxford.<sup>8</sup> The idea was, to establish a neutral arbitrator to pragmatically and objectively measure and compare the

efficacy of all existing therapies, according to industrial standards, on the basis of randomised controlled trials (RCTs). To be sure, the spiritual background or basis of the different concepts would not be considered and was ignored.<sup>9</sup>

The reaction of homoeopaths to this new agenda, imposed by the big players of the new political-economic-scientific complex, to test the old and new claims of Homoeopathy in double blind studies with pre-defined outcome measures, was increasing uncertainty, on the one hand, and compliance to fulfil these requirements, on the other. Ensnared by new technical possibilities, such as computer-repertorisation, data-collection and -processing, meta-analyses, etc., a new generation of scientific-critical homoeopaths today seems to be ready to try to accomplish what in the long history of Homoeopathy has never succeeded: to prove Homoeopathy in a way that materially-minded, spiritually ungifted and economy-based researchers may also be able and willing to accept.

However, as a corollary of this narrowing of the mind, the essence of Homoeopathy, being therapeutics well based on material empiricism, however, on a spiritual basis, is dramatically in danger of being overlooked or even lost.<sup>10</sup>

## Conclusion

At this point, the reflection turns back to its outset. Homoeopathy, founded as it has been, as an art of healing based on both material *and* spiritual constituents, was from the beginning torn by its recipients between exaggerations of just one half of them.

Taking Hahnemann as the paradigm and example of true Homoeopathy, its 200-year history may be interpreted as recurring aberrations from the golden mean, i.e. as a continuous battle between exponents of a more materialistic, so-called scientific-critical view, on the one hand, and a more faithful and spiritual, so-called Hahnemannian succession, on the other.

Considering the socio-economic context, the scientific-critical school of Homoeopathy may well have been the maximum of what, in a science- and economy-driven landscape, was possible to ward off fatal regulations by the state, and avoid its final decline. However, in its heyday, Homoeopathy's thriving could only be brought about on the basis of an acknowledgement of its spiritual dimensions, when it could be practised and taught free of political paternalism, public materialism and economic pressure.

The LMHI has accompanied these developments for the past 100 years. It had been founded to spread true Homoeopathy and to connect homoeopaths of

different provenance and demeanour from all over the world. One of its noblest tasks, therefore, may be the bridging and mediation of this perennial tension between the true and eternal essence of Homoeopathy, on the one hand, and its different forms of appearance and their relativity and dependence on the *Zeitgeist*, on the other.

However, since this dialectic between the spiritual world of eternal truths, on the one hand, and the material world of physical and statistical findings, on the other, may never be solved for good, we, followers and sceptics alike, will all have to learn to endure this and allow Homoeopathy to retain a kind of everlasting mystery.

To be sure, not everyone will agree with this attitude or like this perspective. However, Hahnemann himself did not recognise everybody to be a true Hahnemannian homoeopath, either.

For the time being, we may be well advised to endorse the motto of the founders of the Homoeopathic Medical College of Pennsylvania in 1848: “*In dubiis libertas, in certis unitas, in omnibus caritas*”.<sup>11</sup> The translation of this timeless maxime may read like this: “In doubtful matters freedom, in certain matters unity, in all matters charity (or brotherly love).”

## Conflict of interest

None.

## References

- Schmidt JM. Homoeopathy during one hundred years of LMHI (1925–2025) - Part 1: Philosophical perspectives. *Indian J Res Homoeopathy*. 2025; 19(4):461–7.
- Eschenbruch N. Precarious efficacy: homeopathic remedies, drug efficacy and the politics of regulation in 1970s Germany. In: Balz V, Schwerin A, Stoff H, Wahrig B, eds. *Precarious Matters. The History of Dangerous and Endangered Substances in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Centuries*. Berlin: Max Planck Institute for the History of Science; 2008, pp. 51–60. Available from: <https://www.mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de/preprint/precarious-matters-prekare-stoffe-history-dangerous-and-endangered-substances-19th-and-20th-centuries>.
- Schmidt JM. *Taschenatlas Homöopathie in Wort und Bild. Grundlagen, Methodik und Geschichte*. Heidelberg: Haug; 2001, p. 191. Available from: <https://epub.ub.uni-muenchen.de/17928/>.
- Kent JT. *Lectures on Homoeopathic Philosophy* [Lancaster 1900]. New Delhi: B Jain Publishers; 1985.
- Dinges M, ed. *Patients in the History of Homoeopathy*. (Network Series.) Sheffield: European Association for the History of Medicine and Health Publications; 2002.
- Schmidt JM. Merging with the University of California: History of the Homeopathic College and Hahnemann Hospital in San Francisco. In: *Medizin, Gesellschaft und Geschichte (MedGG)*. 2009;27:173–204.
- Schmidt JM. *Taschenatlas Homöopathie in Wort und Bild. Grundlagen, Methodik und Geschichte*. Heidelberg: Haug; 2001, pp. 86–95. Available from: <https://epub.ub.uni-muenchen.de/17928/>.
- Sackett DL, Rosenberg WMC, Gray JAM, *et al*. Evidence based medicine: what it is and what it isn't. *BMJ*. 1996;312:71.
- Schmidt JM. Homeopathy in need of a philosophical and political reframing. 77th World Homeopathic Congress, Sevilla, Spain, 2–5 October 2024. In: *Book of Abstracts*. Sevilla: Liga Medicorum Homoeopathica Internationalis; 2024, p. 264.
- Schmidt JM. A new paradigmatic framework for integrative medicine, and its implications for medicine and politics. *Advances in Integrative Medicine*. 2025;12(3):100526. online: [doi.org/10.1016/j.aimed.2025.100526](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aimed.2025.100526).
- King WH. *History of Homoeopathy and its Institutions in America*. New York, Chicago: Lewis Publishing Company; 1905, vol. II, p. 54.

**Note:** Part 1 of this series is published in this journal in the issue preceding this one.

## L'homéopathie durant un siècle de LMHI (1925-2025) – Partie 2 : Perspectives historiques.

Prenant Hahnemann dans son ensemble, comme exemple paradigmatique d'homéopathe authentique, comme base solide pour une bonne compréhension de l'homéopathie, l'école « scientifique-critique » des homéopathes semble négliger un élément constitutif de l'homéopathie : son ancrage spirituel dans un cadre de pensée et de sensibilité plus vaste. En réalité, les plus grands succès de l'homéopathie, en termes de popularisation, d'institutionnalisation et d'intégration dans les pratiques sociales et culturelles, ont été obtenus dans des pays et à des époques réceptives aux dimensions spirituelles.

Ce fut le cas en Amérique du Nord à la fin du XIXe siècle, lorsque James Tyler Kent diffusa une homéopathie hahnemannienne inspirée par Emanuel Swedenborg, et en Inde et en Amérique latine au XXe siècle, où le kentianisme trouva un terrain fertile, donnant naissance par la suite à différentes écoles novatrices.

En Europe et en Amérique du Nord, le mouvement New Age des années 1970 offrit une ouverture temporaire aux idées spirituelles et ésotériques, suivie d'un repli vers une approche « critique et scientifique », dans le sillage de la médecine fondée sur les preuves dans les années 1990.

La fondation de la LMHI il y a 100 ans par Pierre Schmidt et d'autres s'avéra cruciale pour la diffusion et le développement de l'homéopathie authentique selon Hahnemann.

## Homöopathie im hundertjährigen Bestehen der LMHI (1925–2025) – Teil 2: Historische Perspektiven.

Nimmt man Hahnemann als paradigmatisches Beispiel eines wahren Homöopathen als Grundlage für ein umfassendes Verständnis der Homöopathie, so scheint die „wissenschaftlich-kritische“ Schule der Homöopathie einen wesentlichen Bestandteil der Homöopathie zu übersehen: ihre spirituelle Einbettung in einen größeren Denk- und Gefühlsrahmen.

Tatsächlich wurden die größten Erfolge der Homöopathie hinsichtlich ihrer Popularisierung, Institutionalisierung und Integration in die soziale und kulturelle Praxis in Ländern und Epochen erzielt, die spirituell aufgeschlossen waren.

Dies war in Nordamerika Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts der Fall, als James Tyler Kent eine von Emanuel Swedenborg inspirierte Hahnemannsche Homöopathie verbreitete, und in Indien und Lateinamerika im 20. Jahrhundert, wo der Kentianismus auf fruchtbaren Boden fiel und später in verschiedene innovative Schulen ausgebaut wurde.

In Europa und Nordamerika brachte die New-Age-Bewegung der 1970er-Jahre eine vorübergehende Öffnung für spirituelle und esoterische Ideen mit sich – gefolgt von einer Rückbesinnung auf den kritisch-wissenschaftlichen Ansatz im Zuge der evidenzbasierten Medizin in den 1990er-Jahren.

Die Gründung der LMHI vor 100 Jahren durch Pierre Schmidt und andere erwies sich als entscheidend für die Verbreitung und Weiterentwicklung der authentischen Homöopathie nach Hahnemann.

## LMHI के सौ वर्षों के दौरान होम्योपैथी (1925-2025) - भाग 2: ऐतिहासिक परिप्रेक्ष्य।

एक वास्तविक होम्योपैथ के आदर्श उदाहरण के रूप में हैनिमैन को समग्र रूप से लेते हुए, होम्योपैथी की उचित समझ के लिए एक ठोस आधार मानते हुए, "वैज्ञानिक-आलोचनात्मक" स्कूल होम्योपैथी के एक मूलभूत भाग को समझने में विफल प्रतीत होता है: अर्थात् इसकी अध्यात्मिक निहिता, जो विचार और अनुभूति के एक व्यापक परिप्रेक्ष्य में अंतर्निहित है।

वास्तव में, होम्योपैथी की सबसे बड़ी सफलताएँ, लोकप्रियता, संस्थागतकरण और सामाजिक तथा सांस्कृतिक व्यवहार में कार्यान्वयन के संदर्भ में, उन देशों और अवधियों में प्राप्त हुईं, जो आध्यात्मिक आयामों के प्रति अधिक खुले थे। 19वीं शताब्दी के अंत में उत्तरी अमेरिका में भी यही स्थिति थी, जब जेम्स टायलर केंट ने इमैनुएल स्वीडनबर्ग से प्रेरित हैनिमैनियन होम्योपैथी का प्रचार किया तथा 20वीं शताब्दी में भारत और लैटिन अमेरिका में भी यही स्थिति रही, जहाँ केंटियनवाद को व्यापक समर्थन मिला और बाद में यह विभिन्न नवोन्मेषी स्कूलों में विकसित हुआ।

1970 के दशक में यूरोप और उत्तरी अमेरिका में न्यू एज मूवमेंट ने आध्यात्मिक और गूढ़ विचारों के लिए एक अस्थायी द्वार खोला, लेकिन 1990 के दशक में साक्ष्य-आधारित चिकित्सा के उदय के बाद, यह आंदोलन "आलोचनात्मक-वैज्ञानिक" दृष्टिकोण की ओर मुड़ गया।

100 वर्ष पूर्व पियरे शिम्ट और अन्य लोगों द्वारा एलएमएचआई की स्थापना, हैनिमैन के अनुसार वास्तविक होम्योपैथी के प्रसार और विकास के लिए महत्वपूर्ण साबित हुई।

### **Homeopatía durante cien años de LMHI (1925-2025) - Parte 2: Perspectivas históricas.**

Tomando a Hahnemann en su totalidad, como ejemplo paradigmático de un verdadero homeópata, como base sólida para una comprensión adecuada de la homeopatía, la escuela "científico-crítica" de homeopatía parece pasar por alto una parte constitutiva de la homeopatía: su integración espiritual en un marco más amplio de pensamiento y sentimiento.

De hecho, los mayores éxitos de la homeopatía, en términos de popularización, institucionalización e integración en la práctica social y cultural, se lograron en países y épocas abiertos a las dimensiones espirituales.

Este fue el caso en Norteamérica a finales del siglo XIX, cuando James Tyler Kent propagó una homeopatía hahnemanniana inspirada en Emanuel Swedenborg, y en India y Latinoamérica en el siglo XX, donde el kentianismo encontró terreno fértil, desarrollándose posteriormente en diferentes escuelas innovadoras.

En Europa y Norteamérica, el movimiento New Age en la década de 1970 propició una apertura temporal a las ideas espirituales y esotéricas, seguida de un retroceso hacia el enfoque "crítico-científico", en consonancia con la medicina basada en la evidencia en la década de 1990.

La fundación de la LMHI hace 100 años por Pierre Schmidt y otros resultó crucial para la difusión y el avance de la auténtica homeopatía según Hahnemann.

### **LMHI百年順勢療法（1925-2025）——第二部分：歷史視角**

以哈內曼為真正順勢療法的典範，並以此作為正確理解順勢療法的堅實基礎，順勢療法的「科學批判」學派似乎忽略了順勢療法的一個構成要素：它與更廣闊的思維和情感框架之間的精神聯繫和情感框架之間的精神聯繫。

事實上，順勢療法在普及、制度化以及融入社會文化實踐方面取得的最大成功，都發生在那些對精神層面持開放態度的國家和地區。

19世紀末的北美是如此，當時詹姆斯·泰勒·肯特（James Tyler Kent）推廣了受伊曼紐爾·斯威登堡（Emanuel Swedenborg）啟發的哈內曼式順勢療法；20世紀的印度和拉丁美洲也是如此，肯特主義在那裡找到了沃土主義，並發展出各種創新流派。

1970年代的歐洲和北美新時代運動曾經為精神和神秘主義思想打開了一扇門，但隨後在1990年代實證醫學興起後，這種思想又回歸了「批判性科學」方法。

100年前，皮埃爾·施密特（Pierre Schmidt）等人創立的LMHI（倫敦順勢療法研究所）對於傳播和發展真正的哈內曼式順勢療法至關重要。