

The two hundred years war on homeopathy and the ongoing offensive against it

Dumitru DOBRESCU, M.D.

*Pharmacology and Homeopathy Professor
PhD in medical sciences, Homeopathic physician, licensed in Pharmacy
Corresponding member of the Romanian Academy
Titulary member of the Romanian Academy of Health Sciences
Correspondence email: dumitru_dobrescu@hotmail.com*

About war

War has been defined as "armed struggle between two or more states or groups." In a figurative sense, it means misunderstanding, strife, hatred, enmity. (Breban, Mic dictionar al limbii romane, 1997).

War is always between two opposite parties. These may be states, but on a smaller scale they can also be institutions, social or professional groups and even individuals.

The causes triggering wars are in many cases economic and the source of conflict is the desire of domination, the enslavement, especially when ideological or diplomatic means fail to achieve the same goal.

Several types of war have been described. Virtually, all fall into two

main categories depending on the purpose. True war that does not annex, for defense or liberation. Unjust war, that does annex, establishes subjugation, constrain development.

A war is usually opened by the dominant part, which is the agressor and has a better economic foundation, which allows it to waste the wealth of the nation. This is understandable, since any war implies some costs, which often have important values. Most often, a war is started by a single man or a small group around him, dominated by warrior spirit and which hold certain positions that allow them to take important decisions for the community. They are voluntarily followed by a restrained number of

war profiteers. They all attract or compel large groups of people to follow them, who usually bear the sacrifices, hardships and consequences of war.

Usually wars end with winners and losers. But often, the losers' consolation is the idea that they "lost a battle but not war" and think of revenge.

The results of war are viewed differently by winners and losers. The correct assessment should be done from the point of view of people who don't want war, they have no implication or blame for the suffering and consequences of war. From this perspective, the results are always negative, especially innocent victims and hatred among men.

The duration of wars had different lengths, from a few months to many years. The record seems to have been the "335 years war" between the Netherlands and the Isles of Scilly.

A vast amount of writing on wars was done because, according to statistics, in the past 3,500 years, the Earth experienced only 230 years of peace. These data seem to refer to armed warfare. Wars, figuratively, have been and will be virtually permanent, all over the world, which is a less flattering touch to the character of men. In this grim context, any initiative in favor of diminishing the warrior spirit becomes light and hope for the better. This is exactly what I try to do with this article.

The war between allopathy and homeopathy

The subject of my article is the war between those who have started and

maintain it, the war between allopathy and homeopathy. It meets all the features presented earlier, which is why I described it as such in the introduction.

This war began over 200 years ago, immediately after the discovery of homeopathy by the German medic Hahnemann. Medicine from the late 18th - early 19th century was in a prescientific phase. Therapy mostly used herbs and some natural substances. These were described as "medicinal substances" ("*Materia medica*") and were taught to students along with the clinical education. There is no notion of drug nor the science of the drug, pharmacology.

The potential and proven efficacy of homeopathic medicines, far superior to "medicinal substances" at the end of the 18th century, initially made homeopathy to have amazing success, surprising for that era. As expected, these success immediately generated intense opposition from allopathic medics, scared by the success of homeopathy. It was the beginning of the war. With the passing years, along with the developments of the allopathic pharmaceutical industry, the initiative and maintaining the war were taken by this industry.

Meanwhile, allopathy has evolved dramatically, reaching the outstanding performances of today. In parallel, the negative aspects also widened, some major, like the frequency and severity of adverse effects and increasing costs. However, allopathy sees only its positive side and avoids or omits to expose the negative spot. Instead, homeopathy stagnated in the early stages, keeping however the obvious advantages of remarkable effective-

ness, lack of side effects, low costs, particularly positive aspects, which are not emphasized as much as they deserve. To justify itself to the people, allopathy pleads the alleged lack of effectiveness of homeopathic drugs but also allopathic concern for the good of the people. This is only a pretext. The efficacy of homeopathic medicines has been profusely demonstrated by numerous scientific research papers, unknown to allopathy or intentionally ignored.

It is important to emphasize that the 200 years war between allopathy and homeopathy is not, in fact, between the two therapeutic methods. It is a war triggered by certain groups of people who have defined economic interests, namely, the heads of these groups that are acting on behalf of allopathy. There is not, in any case, a war of many people. Those who maintain the war do not hesitate to draw in even more people, physicians and outsiders from the medical field with their own interests, who are the executing soldiers, lacking minimum knowledge about homeopathy.

The important fact is that this war is unjust, unidirectional, of a minority of allopathy camp against homeopathy, as therapeutic method. It is a tool used primarily against homeopathy but more importantly, against the people, of humanity, which will make them oversee half of the therapeutic potential provided to the people by nature.

In the conditions of modern society, the allopathy-homeopathy war unfolds under particular aspects. Mass media gets involved. In Romania, without any shame, the *Capital* magazine, which has a well-defined publishing profile,

published a defamatory article on the efficacy of homeopathic medicinal products, which is outside the concerns of the magazine. In addition, the article is signed by a person without specialized training. The same magazine refused to publish an article of mine, containing scientific and objective data, with interest to any citizen, although I am the most authoritative in the field. Moreover, people outside the medical field, organize street demonstrations against the "effectiveness" of homeopathic medicines. Against an elementary logical thinking, some of the protestors swallow a bottle of homeopathic granules to demonstrate the lack of "effectiveness". They do not realize that this gesture only proves the lack of "acute toxicity", which is a great advantage for homeopathic medicine. To be convinced that the homeopathic medicine has an "action", it should be taken, not in a bottle, but 5-10 granules, five times a day, for at least five consecutive days and monitored about two weeks. They will be convinced of the existence of a chronic toxicity, a phenomenon that is the basis of homeopathy.

It is amazing how the leaders against homeopathy lack fairness, but can not accept that homeopathy, without answering their blows, without ever attacking, continued to slowly gain the trust of those who resorted to it. Despite permanent attacks it received, the truth about homeopathy was understood by many physicians and patients. In Germany there are 6,700 homeopathic physicians. Twentyfive percent of physicians in all specialties use homeopathic treatments. In the UK, the British Homeopathic

Association exists since 1902. Four homeopathic hospitals are in use (one is the Royal Homeopathic Hospital in London, founded in 1848) and a Faculty of Homeopathy. For decades, the British royal house uses homeopathic medicines and has hired a homeopathic physician of the royal court. Fortytwo percent of doctors send patients to homeopathic ones. In France, 80% of the population used homeopathic treatment at least once in their life.

Given the evolution of the relationship between allopathy and homeopathy, for any lucid mind, it is clear that if the perpetrators will continue to maintain the same position, this war will never end. There will be no winners and losers, because allopathy and homeopathy are expressions of the laws of nature, which are immutable and perennial. But there will be huge costs incurred by the offenders, in order to maintain the war, in fact payed by innocent people who pay greatly for allopathic medicines. And there will be many victims - those who believe the aberrations told by the supporters of war and refuse to treat diseases with particularly effective homeopathic medicines.

The truth about homeopathy

Discovering homeopathy was an manifestation that could not be conceived other than within the limits of the medical knowledge of the time. Hahnemann himself considered it as a "therapeutic method", a concept which, unfortunately, is maintained until today. Because of this view, now obsolete, homeopathy was not accepted as a medical discipline but

considered as an "*alternative medicine*". This is one dntre biggest mistakes in the history of medicine.

In fact, Hahnemann discovered a second type of drug, the homeopathic one. This one, along with allopathic medicine, known and accepted by all, are the only ones that may exist, according to the laws of nature.

As a professor of pharmacology, as far as I know, the only one in the world who knows and practices homeopathy (I gave over 20,000 homeopathy consultations), I decided to analyze homeopathy from the positions of pharmacology. I found out that homeopathy exists as a medical practice because the homeopathic medicines exist. It is a perfect resemblance between allopathy and homeopathy, both of them existing only because the corresponding drug exists.

I demonstrated the truth about the two types of medicines in my book "*General Homeopathic Pharmacology*", published in 2007, the first book in the world on the subject. A complement of this proof was the essay "*The medicine in the twenty-first century*", which includes a description of allopathy and homeopathy evolution over the past 200 years, an essay published in "*Memomed 2011*". In this work I put forward ideas and facts of impeccable logic, impossible to dispute.

The two types of medicines are instances, concrete but different states of the concept of drug, which is one. They are complementary they complete eachother, not exclude one another. They are two halves of a whole, subject to the universal law of duality found in many phenomena and

realities of the material and spiritual world.

I have demonstrated that homeopathy is *homeopathic pharmacology*, the science of the homeopathic drug and therefore it is *ecological pharmacology*, a concept launched by the author in 1998. Like there is only one concept of drug, there is only one science of the drug, pharmacology, but with two branches, allopathic and homeopathic.

The similarities between allopathy and homeopathy are obvious. From a scientific standpoint allopathy is the science of the allopathic drug, and homeopathy is the science of the homeopathic one. In terms of medical practice, allopathy is a therapeutic method with allopathic drugs, thus allopathic pharmacotherapy. Homeopathy is homeopathic pharmacotherapy. From a conceptual standpoint allopathy and homeopathy are well defined medical doctrines.

As in any other science field, the effectiveness and value of the homeopathic drug can only be determined by those who have trained well enough and have specialized knowledge and practical experience in the field. An unimportant fact is that, of the hundreds of thousands of homeopathic physicians worldwide who practiced homeopathy, there was no one that abandoned it due to lack of efficacy.

To persuade you even more about the correctness of the statements above, I mention that both internationally and in every country, there are organs and official bodies that regulate all aspects of medicines. World Health Organization (WHO) is a specialized body of the United Nations (UN).

WHO makes no distinction between allopathic and homeopathic medicines. It even supports promoting the homeopathic one, considering the benefits they offer. For 25 years I was a WHO drugs expert. In the European Union (EU) the European Medicines Agency (EMA) aims at the harmonization of legislation concerning quality, efficiency and safety of medicines. All rules and guidelines developed, make no distinction between allopathic and homeopathic medicines. In every country and in Romania, there is a National Medicines Agency. I personally created the agency in our country. Our legislation in the field of medicines is in full compliance with the EU.

Although official bodies responsible for public health, considering the scientifically proven reality, equate the two types of medicines, the faculties of medicine do not accept homeopathy and do not teach it to students. This discrimination makes most of the patients to be treated only with half the therapeutic potential offered by nature. Taking into account the actual value and the particularities of each of the two types of drugs, it would be logic that both should be taught at the faculties of medicine, both allopathic and homeopathic pharmacology. Like this, any doctor will be able to prescribe both types of medicines, depending on the particularities of each treated case, both in ambulatory and in hospital. I firmly believe this is the major goal of medicine in the beginning years of the 21st century.

Invitation to a rational behavior

This paper addresses people of goodwill, doctors and lay people. It's also a warning and an invitation, as it is about health issues that interest each individual and society as a whole, everyone should take notice of the alluring call against their own health and life.

Let's recall that, given the damage of war to mankind, society responded by establishing "laws and customs of war", rules of international law to be respected by the belligerent parties in the relationship between them. The purpose, avoidance of using the means that would cause great suffering and also protecting the population against the consequences of combat operations. Violations of these laws are considered international crimes. The consequences of the war we are dealing with could fit into this category.

I allow myself to believe that over 60 years of my life dedicated to the allopathic and homeopathic medicines, the accumulated theoretical and practical medical knowledge (5 original allopathic drugs, including

Distonocalm, Calmogen, 20 original homeopathic medicines, 33 books on allopathic medicines, five books on homeopathic medicines, world's first homeopathic pharmacology, published in English and French) and services to the people through these contributions, entitles me to assume my role as mediator and to propose not an amnesty but an unconditional peace, total and definitive for the 200 years war between allopathy and homeopathy. Moreover, moving from rivalry and unnecessary and harmful fighting, to close collaboration, a secure guarantee of outstanding achievement for human health. For the sake of my argument, I emphasize that allopathy and homeopathy have the same common goal, the health and life of people, their most valuable assets, of inestimable value, to which all people have an equal right, without any discrimination. Drugs are not consumer goods that are bought as one wishes or as one can. Therefore, there should be no rivalry, nor competition in the distribution of medicines to the population. Only cooperation can solve the particularly difficult problems of preserving health.