

Physics, Hahnemann and next steps

Dr. Franziska Blauer, Switzerland

I am happy to hear from Rajesh Pradhanang that classical homoeopathy is spreading and growing in Nepal, and I would like to thank him for challenging me once more to write an article. I take it as an opportunity to reflect upon my own situation and the aim of homoeopathy in Switzerland. Whereas in Nepal a fundamental concern is to provide medical care for all people, in my country we already have extensive infrastructure. Yet, homoeopathy is not considered as a part of basic medical care, and is not reimbursed by the basic health insurance that everybody is required to have. This might be changing, but only due to growing political pressure by people convinced by homoeopathy or other popular methods with very little academic support. The challenge remains to provide information about homoeopathy. Even though in Switzerland the use of homoeopathic remedies is relatively widespread, they are often not used correctly. I would like to discuss the role homoeopathy may play in the future through the following two questions:

1. What could open the established medical system to homoeopathy?

The main claim against homoeopathy is that no model with broad acceptance can explain how it works. Let us have a closer look at the basis on which the established medicine is standing, to reach to the conclusion that what we know is not solid and does not exclude the existence of other possibilities. For that, I would like to explore the four forces of the standard model of physics, which are (i) gravitation, (ii) the electric force, (iii) the weak force and (iv) the strong force, in order to match them with the condition of life, medicine, homoeopathy, and matter. Each of these forces is dominant in a certain range of distance.

The first one, (i) gravitation, describes the movements of galaxies, stars, planets, and our own. The three dimensions are a basic condition for life to develop. If you added more dimensions in Newton's formula, the orbits of earth and all other planets would no longer be stable. It describes the way we see space in three dimensions. Whether Newton's formula for gravitation is still appropriate at very large scales and at very small scales, cannot be determined with certainty. At very large scales, Newton's constant "g" would have to take different values, or there would need to be a force in empty space to explain accelerated expansion. At very small scales the uncertainty whether Newton's formula (i) is still accurate below 0.1mm arises because actions in that realm are dominated by (ii) the electric force.

Therefore, from the point of view of Physics, space below the 0.1mm scale could have four or more dimensions. In mathematical terms, this would mean that the unique characterization of every point

would require four or more distances instead of just three. We would not realize it, because 0.1mm is the limit at which our eyes can still distinguish two points as separate. This space below the 0.1mm scale, where (ii) the electric force dominates, could in fact be very different from the space we perceive at our scale. It is the range of action between molecules and atoms, in which pharmaceutical drugs are produced and act, blood values are measured and modified, tissues analysed and formed, x-ray and magnetic resonance interact with matter. This means that factors beyond the possibilities our brain can imagine could influence the appearance of what is considered to be known. We would have to use analogies. It is evident that statistics, the favourite tool of today's science, can hardly bring to light factors which have been excluded prior to analysis, nor show their consequences. But it should not be ignored that every action is individual in space and time.

What prevented the acceptance of homoeopathic remedies for a long time is the fact that potencies stronger than C12 are diluted more than $1/10^{23}$, which means, in reference to Avogadro's law, that there is no atom left inside. Thus they are not dominated by (ii) the electric force and the effects of homoeopathy must refer to forces in a different scale of space. But this picture of smallest particles, containing a certain weight, forming solid matter, is difficult to unthink, even though what has been considered to be an element – indivisible – as was the atom, is shown to consist of leptons (e.g. electron) held together with hadrons (e.g. proton, neutron) by (iii) the weak force. It is amazing how much empty space is contained in what we once believed was solid.

There is no smallest. Hadrons again contain quarks, held together by (iv) the strong force. Every question carries several new questions within its answer, without leading to a final one. There are about 10^{22} stars we are able to see, but what we see is, according to calculations, only about 4% of the whole. We should have confidence in what we experience and observe, no matter whether an explanation has been found. The effects of homoeopathy are no less evident, they only appear in a different manner. If a homoeopathic remedy is suitable, and only then, healing will appear faster and unfold differently from the spontaneous process, both in humans and in animals. This should not be ignored. What Hahnemann discovered is worth revisiting with today's knowledge.

2. What could open homoeopathy to established medicine?

You might object here that there is no need to change. But is homoeopathy definite and immovable? Some physicians integrate it in their work. Is this enough? How can we bring up the question about living power and shift the focus away from the structure (the body) to understand its function (aim)? The body as “dead matter” has been the subject of medical research over centuries. Living power, the process of life, habits and intentions, on the other hand, are pushed into the field of psychology, where they are discussed as if any of those could exist without a body. The artificial

separation between pathogenic findings and what is happening in someone's life should be eliminated, both when opening a case through anamnesis and when treating it. These discussions should not be restricted to people who are interested in or have experience with homoeopathy.

Hahnemann proved with his method that it is possible to face and treat sickness with no more than our senses, consciousness, and the remedies he was able to produce by himself with simple tools. He founded a medicine respecting creatures, without animal testing and inhuman study settings. I wish Hahnemann's discoveries could gain the respect and weight they deserve. They are strong enough to face the dialogue with other opinions, and could be extended to a more general attitude, perception, and experience. This view of mine is no doubt far away from your reality, but I hope that it will be no less inspiring than it is for me to hear from others.

These ideas and pictures of mine are strongly formed by my surroundings, namely Pierre Strub and Kiroku Fukutome. I would also like to thank my husband Ernst Huber for his input on experimental physics and to Sophie Fukutome for help with the manuscript.