

Patogenesis reliability

Dumitru DOBRESU, M.D.

Romanian Academy of Health Sciences,
I. C. Bratianu Blvd. nr.1, Sector 3, Bucharest, Romania
Correspondence email: dumitru_dobresu@hotmail.com

Abstract

The proving reliability term expresses the degree of confidence in their content, as an expression of the percentage carrying scientific, objective value. Because most provings were performed without respecting the criteria found in scientific papers of this kind, the reliability of most provings found in materia medica is below 20%.

The author is discussing the discordance of these low levels of proving reliability and the much higher success rates of homeopathic therapeutics.

Keywords: homeopathy, pathogenesis, reliability

Rezumat

Termenul de fiabilitate a patogeneziilor exprima gradul de incredere in continutul lor, expresia procentului de informatii cu valoare stiintifica, obiectiva. Intrucat cea mai mare parte din patogeneziile au fost facute fara a respecta criteriile unor lucrari stiintifice de acest gen, fiabilitatea majoritatii patogeneziilor din cartile de materia medica se situeaza sub 20%.

Autorul comenteaza discordanta dintre aceste valori scazute ale fiabilitatii patogeneziilor si proportiile mult mai mari ale succesului teraputic homeopat.

Cuvinte cheie: homeopatie, patogenezie, fiabilitate

Introduction

Certainly, **the foundation of homeopathy is the homeopathic drug, the relationship between its toxicological and therapeutic properties.** Knowledge of these relationships in a form as accurately as possible, is essential to practice homeopathy. This knowledge is provided by substances' provings¹.

These provings are the result of the accumulation of numerous data obtained in various possible ways, over a period of many years, in the **analytical stage** of homeopathy^{1(Chapter 7.3)}.

Therefore, unfortunately but inevitably, as rendered by most

Homeopathic Materia Medica books, **provings contain a lot of data that have been introduced without the necessary scientific justification.**

This fact, long recognized by many skilled homeopaths, has determined the questioning of provings reliability problem.

The reliability, a term frequently used in technical language, expresses better functioning ability of a component or device. By extension, the word means **the degree of confidence that we can provide to a certain thing or person. Reliable, is therefore a thing or a person that can be trusted.**

From these definitions it is understood that the homeopathic

provings reliability problem is fully justified.

In this article, the author will comment on the issue mentioned above, calling the data from a reference work in the field, "*Contribution à l'étude des fiabilité des pathogenesies*" by Jouanny J. (1983)². The book includes a "*Critical study of the Encyclopedia of Pure Materia Medica* by Allen T.F."

As early as the *Introduction*, Jouanny highlights that **"provings are indications that, in daily clinical practice, reveal as accurate, but some as less accurate.** This results in the **current use of about 60 drugs and exceptionally of about another 200, from a total of around 2000 strains theoretically available.**"

We present only a few of the data mentioned in the work cited.

For **Arsenicum album** there were 390 authors that have reported studies on this remedy. Allen gathers 3590 symptoms. Of these, Allen *et al.* retained only 698 (19.44%) as trustworthy.

Arsenicum acts on all organs and functions. Action is often local, with particular characteristics: special aspect of the skin (pallor mortis), intense dyspnea with little expectoration, general weakness, extreme agitation, delirium. Among the features, these are mentioned: intense burning, described as "fire" or "going through hot coals", frequent nocturnal worsening in the first part of the night, extreme thirst. Improving with heat is marked experimentally, but not with the consistency that would have been expected.

Indications are more numerous and the choice of the remedy is easy.

For **Belladonna**, 285 authors have reported observations, starting with a single case to several hundred, for collective accidental poisoning. Allen cites **2681 symptoms, but only 512**

(19.10%) are considered valid by frequency or therapeutic checked. The following are mentioned: the sudden appearance of symptoms, making Belladonna a remedy for acute and subacute conditions - mucosal dryness, local or general spastic phenomena, local or general congestion, but predominantly cephalic. The latter causes dizziness, headache, delirium, seizures, sensory hyperesthesia, agitation or prostration. It is noted that neurological or behavioral phenomena have generally been improperly labeled "mental symptoms".

Sweating does not seem characteristic, at least experimentally.

White Bryonia

Jouanny mentions 46 references. Nine come from Hahnemann, without indications on the experimental dosage.

Allen cites **1925 symptoms, of which, only 345 (17.92%) are reliable.** Among them: dryness of mucous membranes, particularly vivid thirst, serous irritation, worsening of symptoms by moving frequently. Right side laterality, classically admitted, is not obvious.

Lycopodium.

Fortyfive references are cited. Allen gathered **3114 symptoms, of which only 443 (14.22%) are reliable.** The general manifestations are in the digestive sphere, nasal and pharynx, urinary tract (less frequent). Left side laterality is noticed, especially in abdominal signs, lack of food desires and aversions classically described, rare experimental behavior signs, lack of aggravation between 16-20 hours.

Pulsatilla.

24 experiments, **1322 symptoms of which 588 (44.48%) are reliable. These include mucous membranes,** especially the digestive ones, respiratory ones, genital ones and the nervous system. Not included: food desires and aversions

classically quoted, kindness, softness, gentleness, resignation, improving through solace, fear of men. Are present: great irritability, high anxiety, moody behavior, grumpiness, bad mood, sometimes depressing mood.

Natrum muriaticum

Fiftyseven experiments, **2901 symptoms of which 300 reliable (10.34%)**: extreme thirst, alternating hunger and loss of appetite, desire for bread, fish (at evening time), appetite for sweets, the desire for cold things, aversion to meat, beer, wine and tobacco. Cachexia with fatigue, depressive tendency with no tendency to work, sadness, hypotrophy, abundant clear mucous discharge.

Natrum sulfuricum

Six experimental sources, **905 symptoms, of which 26 reliable (2.87%)**: digestive, respiratory, joints. No events at skin level. There is no mention of aggravation by the cathedral environment (stained glass light, music) or by moisture.

Argentum nitricum

Sixtysix sources, **831 symptoms of which 146 reliable (17.57%)**. A single mental sign present "*feeling of bodily and mentally affection - does nothing, too afraid to fail.*" Precise symptoms of irritation of the mucous membranes in the digestive and urinary thorny sensation. Desire for sweets was reported by a single experiment.

Aurum metallicum

Seventeen sources (of which 12 from Hahnemann) **594 symptoms, of which 94 reliable (15.82%)**: depression. There are no short-bone suppuration symptoms, pain in the lower abdomen.

During the past 30 years since the author began to read more and more books of homeopathy, he often had the intuition that **the plethora of data contained in provings, more or less unorganized, contains a certain**

amount of information of approximate value, some even worthless. But he never imagined that the situation is so serious. The explanation for the existence of such enormities can be only one: **data regarding the medication were gathered without respecting the rules of the drug field. This would not have been possible, unless: the people that contributed writing provings were persons who haven't known the means of scientific rigor, nor logical thinking.**

Provings reliability data provided by the work of Jouanny and Allen, analyzed in this chapter, obviously can be extended to all homeopathic remedies. Of the nine remedies processed, with the exception of Pulsatilla (44.48%), others have a reliability ranging between 2.87% (Natrum sulfuricum) and 19.44 (Arsenicum).

The conclusion is clear. **According to this data, homeopathic health ranges from 2.87 to 19.40%. These values seem amazing, incredible. It means that only this percentage of provings have objective, scientific value, and the rest of the data are pure fantasy provings without any scientific value. Does it also mean that all homeopathy is built on fantasies and therefore has no value?**

As a homeopathic medical practitioner, **with more than 20,000 consultations, having good and very good results for most of my patients, I can not accept this conclusion.** The great majority of practicing homeopaths have probably the same opinion. The question that needs to be answered is **which is the explanation of this major differences between data regarding provings' reliability and the success of the homeopathic practice?**

Perhaps there is **more than one answer.** The most credible is, in the author's opinion, the next one. The major deficiencies regarding the reliability of provings were spontaneously entirely

and compensated by the attitude of homeopathic practitioners.

Most homeopaths prescribe without prior research of the directories, for each consulted patient. Any homeopathic practitioner, as well as an allopathic one, knows more or less, a limited number of remedies and provings. The experience of each one of them, translates into the increasing knowledge of smaller and smaller number of remedies that they prescribe. **Through this continuous selection, contains many homeopaths reach to achieve, without realizing, that parts of provings provings and reliable.** The real successes of homeopathy, which allowed it to survive for over 200 years, is due to these selections. In this context, the worthless fantasies reported mentioned earlier, translated into **unreliable provings, are rare or do not occur in homeopathic prescriptions.** One might say that, in time, **there was a natural, spontaneous, unintended selection of provings. When remedies are prescribed using unreliable provings, they are responsible for some of the failures of homeopathy.** In other words, whenever a homeopathic remedy is prescribed according to guidelines in provings and the desired effect is not attained, it should be appropriate to question the reliability of that particular pathogenesis.

Finally, the author expresses his belief that this chapter, regarding the reliability of homeopathic provings, offers tangible, undeniable data, which is a convincing plea for ideas repeatedly commented in the author's previous works, regrading the positive, but also negative aspects of homeopathy, mentioning among others, the reporting provings with no indication on the administered dose or the duration of treatment. The conclusion can be only one: **the positive aspects must be**

retained and the negative ones should be abandoned. This can be done in one way: by recognizing homeopathy as part of homeopathic pharmacology, this representing the only way to become a medical science. **Specifically, it comes down to purification, by removing unreliable ballast, which is higher in percentage than reliable data. This can not be done, except by passing through the relentless and purifying fire of drug modern medical science, pharmacology.**

On a personal level, the author didn't limit himself to the findings and comments. In his book "Homeopathic Pharmacology Volume II. Respiratory System", the author proceeded to selecting remedies contained in the repertoires of Kent and Burgetzianu and managed to retain only 72 remedies for the respiratory system. Of these, 50 for the disorder of the nose, 58 for cough. Of the 148 remedies cited in the Burgetzianu repertoire for morning worsening cough, 10 remedies were selected (6.75%).

Therefore, regrading the existing provings, the author believe that in the future everything has to be reviewed from the standpoint of modern pharmacological research.

Unfortunately, after the appearance of the incontestable works by Allen and Jouanny, homeopathy books continued to appear all over the world, all of these books retaining the unreliable parts reported by the two authors.

The purpose of cultivating a scientific attitude, the only correct comment homeopathic proving the modern in a separate article in this issue.

For the sole purpose of cultivating the scientific attitude, the only correct one, the modern homeopathic proving shall be discussed in a separate article, published in the same issue of the current journal.

References

1. Dobrescu D., *Farmacologie homeopata (ecologica)*. Volume I, 3rd edition, Editura Universitara, Bucuresti, 2011, ISBN 978-606-591-111-6.
2. Jouanny J., *Contribution a l'etude de la fiabilite des pathogenesies*. Tome I. Éditions Gerbert, 1983.