

## Genuine Homoeopathy

At a congress in 1998, the famous homoeopathic physician Dr Will Klunker (1923-2002) used the term "**Hahnemann's genuine homoeopathy**", by which he meant the original, unadulterated, authentic concept of homoeopathic theory and practice.

The reason for the creation of this term was the realisation that in so-called "**classical homeopathy**" a methodological concept is pursued which shows clear deviations from the original homoeopathy, as it was inaugurated by Samuel Hahnemann, and adopted by early homoeopaths like Clemens von Boenninghausen, Georg H.G. Jahr or Constantine Hering.

During the renaissance of homoeopathy in Europe in the 1950s and 1960s, it was apparently assumed without closer examination that the homoeopathy "re-imported" from the USA, especially by Pierre Schmidt (and based on James Tyler Kent's teachings), would in no way contradict that of Hahnemann. This was supported by Kent's confession (in: Lectures in homoeopathic philosophy, Memorial ed., 1919, p. 14) that his teachings were based exactly on those of Hahnemann (and Swedenborg). However, in the course of a "back-to-the-roots" development that forced a return to the writings of early homoeopaths especially in Germany from the 1980s onwards, some surprising and glaring deviations became apparent. The term "classical homoeopathy", which has been created in the meantime (in 1955), therefore does not always mean homeopathy according to Samuel Hahnemann.

**Contradictions** between the teachings of Hahnemann and Kent (as an important representative of "classical homoeopathy") exist, for example, in:

- the view of health, disease and healing (or, cure),
- the understanding of the terms "symptom" and "characteristic symptom" (ORG VI, § 153),
- the (supposed) importance of the symptoms of the mind or the personality of the patient for the choice of the remedy,
- understanding of the so-called "chronic miasmatic diseases" and the concept of homoeopathic cure of the same,
- the evaluation of so-called "clinical symptoms" within the Materia medica.

Working according to the "genuine" approach **does not mean** ignoring or suppressing advances in homoeopathic methodology or tools. However, further developments are checked for any contradictions or incompatible aspects in relation to the genuine way of working.

Working "genuinely" also **does not mean** to follow Hahnemann uncritically in all his views and instructions. Clear errors – for example in the substantiation of the miasm theory or also incorrect translations of ancient sources of the Materia medica – must be corrected and thus sometimes lead to conclusions that result in a modification of the methodology founded by Hahnemann.

Genuine homeopathy is not just another of the already numerous methods of homeopathy. Rather, it forms (or should form) the **basis** of all later directions, at least if they are claimed to base on the teachings of Samuel Hahnemann. Existing deviations are apparently not even clear to the protagonists of those modern approaches in many cases. There is a wide field of **critical and self-critical evaluation** ahead of us here and we have to find the pathways through this "homeopathic jungle".

**Note:** in the course of translating this text into English, I found that the term "genuine homeopathy" is already used in the international language area, but mostly as a synonym for "classical homeopathy" and not in the meaning Klunker intended.

### Literature:

Klunker, Will: Hahnemanns Miasmen und Organon § 3. Source: Zeitschrift für Klassische Homöopathie [ZKH] 42 (1998), 5, 179-186 (p. 180)

Meinhard, Christian: Genuine Homöopathie – was ist das? Source: Neues Archiv für Homöopathie [NAH] 1 (2006), 1, 5-13

© Stefan Reis, Dynamis-Schule fuer Homoeopathie (2012, translated in 2022)

Correspondence address: Hardenbergstrasse 2, 45472 Muelheim an der Ruhr (Germany), info@dynamis-schule.de