

An Open Letter to the Homeopathic Community in the Light of Recent Threats of Biological Attacks – What Can We Do to Help?

–Rudi Verspoor, Hahnemann Center for Heilkunst

“It was the best of times, it was the worst of times.” Dickens begins his epic tale of the turbulent era of the French Revolution with this profound insight into the nature of human challenge. We live in a time, almost unimagined for most of us, when allopathic medicine itself is in decline and people are voting with their feet and their wallets by the millions to seek out a better alternative. And yet we also live in a time when the rich legacy of true medical care bequeathed to us by Dr. Hahnemann again faces the threat of extinction precisely at a time when we need it more than ever. The threat, however, is not so much from external forces, but from within. It is time to re-examine the very basis of the prevailing teachings of Hahnemann’s medical system, for it is this orthodoxy that is effectively undermining the ability of homeopathy to respond.

This internal problem has been apparent to myself and a few others for a number of years and I have written extensively about it with Steven Decker in *Homeopathy Re-examined*. A more extensive analysis of the flaws inherent in what is often termed “classical homeopathy” has recently been released in electronic form – *The Dynamic Legacy – From Homeopathy to Heilkunst*.

A few have read the evidence, most have not. Some have understood its intent, the rest have rejected it. One or two have engaged in constructive debate, but a greater number have felt it necessary to impugn the motives and character of the authors rather than address the evidence presented. That is in the nature of change, however unfortunate. My initial impulse to trust to time to resolve these important issues was altered by a recent incident and I have been prompted to take more direct action to reach a wider audience on the issues raised in these works.

I am referring to a series of articles by Paul Herscu (*The Herscu Letters*), written for a select subscriber list on the issue of vaccinations and homeopathy, which was recently made available more generally (for a fee) on the grounds that the extraordinary events of our times (the threat of biological terrorism) demanded this.

The premise of these “letters” is that much of what has been written by others on this topic is wrong and confused. The goal of the papers is to end the confusion and create a scientific basis for homeopathic intervention. “I want to take the discussion out of religious belief of people and lay it at the footsteps of science.” (Letter #35, p. 1)

I, too, have been undertaking considerable research over the past few years on Hahnemann’s writings and on homeoprophylaxis in particular. I was eager to read what Paul Herscu had to say, knowing of his fine work with materia medica and his long teaching career and experience with homeopathy. I must say that, having now received them, I am sadly disappointed.

I will set aside the issue of why 100 pages of type, offered as a public service comes attached with a hefty fee (\$57 US). What concerns me more are the following statements. They take us into the heart of the darkness in homeopathic philosophy that we must finally acknowledge and confront.

“While it would be nice to believe that homeopathy can definitely protect you from epidemic diseases, I can **absolutely** say that it does not. I can state that people can be doing very well on their **constitutional remedy**, feeling very well, and yet when an epidemic comes along, they become ill. As such, I can absolutely say that homeopathic remedies **do not confer specific immunity** for specific illnesses, at least at the same high percentage as vaccines do.

Therefore, if the goal is specific immunity to a specific epidemic, then the **best** mechanism to attain that, at this time, is through a[n allopathic] **vaccine**.

It **remains** the job of a **homeopath** to help the **overall health** of the patient.” (Letter #37-38)

“When homeopathy began, [allopathic] medicine was in its infancy.”

“...medical treatments were both ineffective and in fact many times damaging.”

“In contrast to that, homeopathy treated people during epidemics and had good success.”

“[Allopathic] Medicine changed, evolved. [Allopathic] **Medical treatment improved** and became more precise.”

“What I am trying to say here is that there is **no longer a great discrepancy in results between drugs and homeopathy** during an epidemic, and in **fact where there is a drug for a severe epidemic it should be taken**. But **when no drug is available**, or is ineffective, **homeopathy** should be employed. Even if a drug is given, **homeopathic remedies** should still be given as they are **aimed at the host**, rather than the **drugs** which are **aimed at the offending organism**. In this way you **help the patient** and their **healing process**.” (Letter #37-38) [Bold emphasis added]

The central message of Herscu’s letters to his subscriber list is that homeopathy is not medicine and only useful so long as [allopathic] medicine is not yet properly developed. Here is openly stated the logical result of classical teachings. Hahnemann’s system of medicine is unmistakably reduced to a handmaiden for allopathy, useful only to support the patient where allopathic medicine has no effective treatment for the disease (which homeopathy, it seems, cannot treat anyway as it treats the patient, not the disease). Homeopathy, according to these statements, is simply a stand-in to buttress the very system of medicine condemned by Hahnemann for being unprincipled, because grounded in no principle of nature, only founded on the shifting sands of empiricism.

Herscu’s statements may shock some, but they are only the logical outcome of the prevailing homeopathic teachings. But wasn’t the resurrection of homeopathy in the 1970’s in North America and, by implication around the world, supposed to avoid the fate that befell homeopathy earlier in the last century? The revived homeopathy, called “classical,” was intended to be pure and unsullied by any allopathic taints, able to

withstand any corrupt influences from without. Now it's practitioners are ceding the field of disease to allopathic medicine. What has gone wrong?

The design of classical homeopathy was flawed from the start. The clay used to mold the bricks for the foundation of the citadel of orthodoxy was full of sand. The bricks are now finally crumbling.

In Dr. Herscu's "Letters" we find this fatal blend of claiming to be "classical," yet asserting that homeopathy has no role in the curing of disease. The one comes from the prevailing dogma of what Hahnemann is supposed to have taught, and the other comes from Dr. Herscu's clinical experience. And what is the foundation of this clinical experience? The tenets of classical homeopathy!

Dr. Herscu claims to be seeking only the truth and wanting to set aside all dogma and belief (yet, his *Letters* are strangely full of statements starting with "I believe."). He has, in effect issued a challenge for someone to present a better model than his that he will accept if it explains more, predicts more and works better in practice. (Letter #36, p. 14)

Well, I wish to take up that challenge. I trust that I can take Dr. Herscu at his word and direct his attention to the medical legacy left to us by Dr. Hahnemann himself. It is already there for the taking and forms the solid foundation for a true system of Western medicine. That should be the end of the matter and we, including Dr. Herscu, could get on with the business of curing disease as Dr. Hahnemann intended.

And yet Dr. Herscu claims indirectly, through his reference to "classical homeopathy" to be already following Hahnemann's legacy. So, my task is a more formidable one as it involves a very laborious deconstruction, one by one, of the abstract tenets of classical homeopathy, subjecting them to critical analysis using the actual writings of Dr. Hahnemann. A century and a half of mis-translations, misunderstandings and deceptions in homeopathic philosophy and history leaves many layers of confusion and distortion that need to be carefully stripped away, layer by layer, to reveal the true image underneath.

As A.N. Whitehead wrote in *Science and the Modern World*, "if science is not to degenerate into a medley of *ad hoc* hypotheses, it must become philosophical and enter upon a thorough criticism of its own foundations."

Fortunately, much of the research and analysis has already been done and is available in electronic form. This will allow me to state the case here in its basic terms, trusting Dr. Herscu and any other reader of good faith to examine the evidence in more detail on our website.

A small footnote: Normally, access to the research library of over 1000 pages would cost \$100 US for 5 years. However, in the same spirit of public service as motivated Dr. Herscu to make his private "Letters" available, and in the light of the serious situation that we face, both for homeopathy and for the freedom of individual liberty, the authors have made access to the research library available to anyone for free for

until 15 December. All that has to be done is to e-mail info@heilkunst.com and you will be sent a password to access the electronic library.

Now, let us turn to the task at hand. It is not Dr. Herscu who is being critiqued here, but rather the inimical entity or Kurwesen called “classical homeopathy.”

The Issue in Contention

So-called “classical homeopathy,” is guilty of misrepresentation and, as a result, of damaging the reputation and power of the system of medicine founded by Dr. Samuel Hahnemann. Further, it has harmed the ability of homeopathy to take its rightful role in the cure of disease and the healing of the sick.

“Classical homeopathy,” in its well-intentioned efforts to resurrect homeopathy from a half century of decline, is guilty of having vacated any claim to cure disease, the critical core of any system of medicine, which Hahnemann identifies in the very first three aphorisms of the *Organon*.

As a pale substitute “classical homeopathy” offers the illogical and abstract notion that the patient and the disease are the same, which obscures this critical distinction, even to the extent that some versions of the *Organon* in English have actually substituted the word “patient” for the word “disease” in the original, a error of commission rather than simply of omission. This then leads to the false claim that homeopathy “treats the patient, not the disease,” and only supports the patient’s natural healing, completely at variance with what Hahnemann actually taught.

What we face is the failure of some 200 years of homeopathic interpretation of Hahnemann’s teachings to grasp the core truth about disease based on his central insight into the dual nature of the Life Force, and the canonization of this failure in “classical homeopathy,” presenting this, almost religiously, as the true essence of Hahnemann’s teachings. That the prevailing teachings are based on almost 200 years of tradition, so-called classic secondary texts, is no argument in defense. Almost 200 years of error is still almost 200 years of error. Hahnemann had to challenge more than 2000 years of medical tradition.

Hahnemann engaged the Old School of medicine on the very high ground of his insight into the dynamic and dual nature of life and disease. “Classical homeopathy” has effectively vacated these ramparts for the swampy ground of wholeness (the patient, not the cure). Hahnemann’s radical medical reform has been forced to give up more and more ground, now effectively reduced to the handmaiden of allopathic medicine, that very same system of medicine that Hahnemann roundly condemned as flawed in principle. While Dr. Herscu’s statements may be challenged by some, it is important to realize that they represent the logical outcome of the inherently flawed logic of “classical” tenets.

“Classical homeopathy’s” claim to represent the pure version of the teachings of the founder of homeopathy is demonstrably false by the very testimony, still living, of that founder. Despite that, “classical homeopathy’s” particular tenets have become the current

orthodoxy and have taken over most of the schools, journals and professional associations around the world. To the extent that homeopathy is now being judged by practitioners and by outsiders to be ineffective in curing disease, in contravention of history and true experience, then the fault must be laid at the doorstep of this flawed teaching.

The Tenets of Classical Homeopathy

“Classical homeopathy” holds, as does Dr. Hershcu it appears, the following claims to be true of the writings of Dr. Hahnemann and his medical system:

- The only acceptable basis for prescribing a remedy is on the basis of the symptoms of the patient.
- Homeopathy treats the patient, not the disease.
- Homeopathy works by stimulating and supporting the body’s innate healing power or immune system, called the vital force.
- There can be only one remedy at a time.
- The only principle for prescribing in Hahnemann’s system is the law of similars.
- The only acceptable basis for Materia Medica and prescribing is that derived from provings.

What Hahnemann Said

Let us examine what Dr. Hahnemann actually had to say on the matter: I will here state only the essence of the case. I will have to leave it to the good faith of the reader to obtain the extensive corroborating evidence in the detailed research material made available separately.

- The true physician must treat for each case of disease in the patient.
- There can be more than one disease in a person at one time, so the disease and patient are not synonymous.
- There are two types of diseases:
 1. Diseases of a constant Wesen (essence) that appear each and every time the same and have a constant remedy (each and every time the same as well). This remedy is largely determinable through the cause or clinical evidence, an approach Hahnemann termed “true causal prescribing” and the preferred approach.
 2. Diseases of a variable Wesen, which are different in nature each time and cannot be treated causally (issuing as they do from a constant Potence, or

primary disease). The curative remedy must be found by taking the totality of characteristic symptoms of the disease (not of the patient) and matching it to the disease image found in the *Materia Medica* derived from provings or clinical evidence.

- There is no vital force. Hahnemann was no vitalist (Herscu – “Homeopathy fits within the vitalistic tradition.” – Letter #34, p. 13) He revealed instead that the Living Principle/Power or *Dynamis* of the human being (erroneously translated as “vital force”) had two aspects that were distinct, but functionally linked (dynamic in nature):
 1. The sustentive power of the Living Principle or “*Lebens-Erhaltungskraft*,” which maintained the organism admirably in health, but became a liability in disease. Erroneously translated as “vital force”.
 2. The generative power or “*Erzeugungskraft*” of the Life Principle, which is responsible for the generation of life, such as cell division. Again, erroneously translated as “vital force” removing all trace of this important distinction, important, because the understanding of disease and true cure hinges on it.
- Disease is not simply an imbalance in the Living Power or on a continuum with health caused by interaction with a stressor. This is a key issue.

(Herscu – “However, because the stress is too great or because the person’s susceptibilities are such that they feel this stress and are not able to *strain* easily to overcome/grow from it, the person must *strain* more vigorously to overcome the stress. **This vigorous straining is what we call disease...***If this is so, the job of the physician is to help the individual grow well, and to make sure that the stresses the person experiences are not so strong that they wreak havoc with the person.*” Letter #33, p. 8-9 – Contrast this with what Hahnemann states in Aphorism #1-3 of the *Organon*.)

Disease is in reality an impregnation or impingement of that power (degeneration) through the generative side. All diseases entail imbalances of the Life Force, but not all imbalances are diseases. The process of disease is a dynamic one and has two distinct but not separate stages:

1. The impingement of the generative power or “initial action” (“*Erst-wirkung*” – erroneously translated in most versions as “primary action”). This action is short and produces few if any symptoms, but alters the state of the patient from one of health to disease. Each disease produces a unique state in the patient.
2. The ‘counter-action’ (“*Gegenwirkung*” or “*Nachwirkung*” – erroneously translated as “secondary action”). This action includes the efforts of the sustentive power of the patient to restore balance in the face of disease. However, its efforts cannot succeed (only medicine has the power to destroy the state of disease) and the symptoms that are produced in its strivings now

become part of the disease proper, such that it is almost impossible to tell them apart, and to the patient they feel the same.

- In the remedial process, we also have two actions:
 1. The curative remedy annihilates the disease (the initial action) and the patient's generative power is freed from this burden and the patient returned to a state of health. This is the cure.
 2. It now remains to the sustentive power to react to the remedy (artificial disease) and the removal of the disease by once again seeking to restore balance (counter action), but this time successfully as the disease has been removed.
- Thus, the remedy works by destroying the disease engendered in the generative aspect of the Living Power (cure) and the remedial process is completed by the sustentive aspect of that same Living Power, now operating in the restored state of health to repair the damage left behind (imbalance in the condition of health).
- Hahnemann, for the greater part of his period of practice, prescribed multiple doses and multiple remedies, either a second dose or a second remedy within the full action of the first (simultaneity of action). For a significant period (1833-1836) he also prescribed two remedies to be ingested at the same time (simultaneity of ingestion), each, as he stated, "from a different side," but returned to the simultaneity of ingestion approach because of political difficulties within homeopathy and outside from certain allopathic figures who sought to use this as evidence that Hahnemann had dropped his condemnation of polypharmacy. This dual remedy prescribing (based on the recognition that there were two types of disease, or two sides to Disease (conceptually speaking), was fully consistent with the principles of his system right from the very beginning. The historical evidence for this has been suppressed and hidden, but now the story can be more fully told based on the available evidence that has been laboriously pieced together from various sources. The use of more than one remedy at a time is not polypharmacy so long as there is more than one disease at one time in the patient. The single remedy injunction is "one remedy per disease." The reference to one remedy per patient is where the action of a given remedy is unknown and the use of more than one remedy per patient would prevent knowing what that remedy can do.
- Hahnemann also applied the principle of the law of opposites in his medical system, Heilkunst, of which homeopathy was a part: in regimen (diet and lifestyle), where the issue is one of deficiency or excess (give the opposite to create balance in the sustentive power), in the limited use of antipathic methods in true life and death situations (act on the irritant principle to revive the patient, giving way then immediately to medicines on the basis of the law of similars), and in the diseases of the soul and spirit that are relatively recent and have not deranged the somatic realm too much.

The statements above may seem surprising to many and difficult to accept, but if you will take the time to examine the evidence you will see that they are grounded in the writings of Hahnemann and fully documented in our published research. By the evidence of Hahnemann's own words, "classical homeopathy" is a misrepresentation of his medical system. To date it has been an unintentional deception, but the plea of ignorance can no longer be accepted in the face of the evidence.

Footnote: Of course, the authors of the research stand ready to engage any well-intentioned person who wishes to constructively discuss the findings and the evidence. Where it can be shown to be flawed, they are ready to alter the analysis. To date, no new evidence has been presented to contradict what has been published. The public can only benefit from revealing the truth of Hahnemann's complete medical system, an inestimable gift to suffering humanity.

How is the classical establishment able to ignore the very reality revealed by a close and detailed analysis of the record?

The problem lies with the inability of past interpreters of Hahnemann's writings to "see" the fundamental polarity that he gave us in the Life Force or Dynamis (misnamed the "vital force"). There is no abstract "vital force", but rather a Dynamis that has two aspects. One is the sustentive power, which simply maintains health, and the other is the generative power that has the capacity to alter our actual state. Disease, for Hahnemann, is a change in state caused by the impingement of our human generative power by a disease entity. It is not simply an imbalance in the state of health, but a new state of mind. It is the disease that must be treated, not the patient. Classical homeopathy has no true concept of disease, only one that is reduced to the patient. The ultimate reduction is that homeopathy is seen as simply supporting the natural healing power (treating the person) and as not being effective in curing disease.

This uniformitarianism ("vital force" totality of symptoms) of classical homeopathy results in the degeneration of the power of homeopathy through the device of "constitutional" prescribing, which is ineffective at curing most, if not all, disease in the patient. The constitutional remedy, if a true one, can only restore an imbalance in the state of health (constitution), not remove a disease. If it is a so-called "constitutional remedy," that is, based on an actual disease symptom picture, then it can only remove that particular disease, and not the many others the patient is suffering from, albeit often without symptoms (latent).

Dr. Herscu claims to base his assessment in favor of allopathic medicine on the poor ability of homeopathy to treat disease, on his stated experience, using essentially constitutional and acute prescribing. We can refute the same on the basis of our own experience in addressing all the diseases in the patient.

Herscu's own prescribing is very much linked to the use of the "constitutional remedy." Hahnemann never prescribed for the constitution for the simple reason that he equated the constitution with the state of health, not a state of disease. If we carefully examine the whole issue of constitution we see that the true constitutional remedy simply helps to

balance the state of health. It cannot cure any disease. Thus, if one is limited to the use of the constitutional remedy, then, of course, this will not be very effective at protecting one against a strong epidemic. A specific remedy for that disease is needed.

However, the problem is also in the lack of recognition by “classical homeopathy” of the reality of disease. Dr. Herscu appears, in the absence of any understanding of disease in homeopathic terms (if we treat the patient, what does this matter? seems to be the general classical view), to accept the allopathic “diagnosis” of disease, the very false disease naming that Hahnemann condemned!

So, Dr. Herscu’s conclusion regarding the handmaiden role of homeopathy to allopathy today (now that it, the “real” medicine, has finally grown up and can take over), is based on a deep misunderstanding of Hahnemann’s actual system and principles. Dr. Hahnemann clearly warned his detractors not to judge of the efficacy of his medical system unless they applied it as it was intended to be applied.

And in comparing effects, Dr. Herscu ignores the intense effort Hahnemann went through to reveal the flaw in the prevailing system of medicine that was only interested in effects, not in principle (hence he called it allopathy - no principle to treat the suffering) and to distance himself from it because it operated mainly to suppress. Today the (unconscious) anti-pathic measures of allopathic medicine reveal that same basis of suppression, not cure. The “impressive” effects Dr. Herscu sees in the more modern version of allopathy is only a more impressive suppression. Quelle change!

Vaccinations

Finally, we must deal with the issue of vaccinations. Dr. Herscu states that allopathic vaccinations should be resorted to because they work and homeopathic efforts at prevention do not, this despite the full acknowledgement of the severe dangers of such vaccinations to certain children and the longer-term, chronic damage in terms of the undermining of the overall state of health.

First, as Dr. Herscu himself acknowledges, the record is clear: Hahnemann advocated the use of homeopathic remedies as a prophylactic measure in the case of epidemics and the historical evidence is almost overwhelming that it worked very well, even by modern standards. The protection was not 100%, but then neither is the protection offered by allopathic vaccination even today.

We agree that allopathic vaccinations “work,” not because the evidence of their clinical trials is at all convincing (the problems in the adequate testing of vaccines has been subject to much critical review, even from allopathic medical observers), but because it is an application of the law of similars. However, as Hahnemann pointed out, the reason that medicine before his time neglected the law of similars was because it could kill and maim people in crude doses. This is what happens in the conventional vaccinations, mainly through the weakening of the general immune system, but also because of the shock created by the method of delivery (actual viral material injected into the bloodstream), which is highly unnatural. It is these shocks that must then be treated for,

although Dr. Herscu is correct to point out that just treatment for the shock alone is often not enough (the acute disease triggered by the shock, plus any underlying chronic miasms must also be addressed in a systematic manner, one that Hahnemann himself outlined).

The more refined the dose, the less the danger of harm, until it becomes nonexistent. This was the impetus to Hahnemann's increasing potentisation of dose. Also, the delivery of the vaccine orally more closely approximates the natural method of contact.

The clinical evidence is clear that homeoprophylaxis works. While one recent study with rats suggests that this may not be the case, it is too early to draw any conclusions from this, a caution that has often been issued in allopathic medicine from hard experience. Randomized, double-blind clinical trials are notoriously difficult to design and run with any level of accuracy. Recently, an epidemiologist at McGill University in Montreal reported that a close examination of the top clinical trials published in the last 15 years in North America revealed that some 90% were seriously or significantly flawed. Vaccine research is no different and even worse as there is no control group to which the vaccine efficacy can properly be compared.

We must, however, thank Dr. Herscu for having examined the issue of allopathic vaccines and homeopathic ones in some detail in order to better understand the basis on which they operate. There is much to be pondered over here. Dr. Herscu points out that to the extent that the vaccine is given prior to any exposure to or attack by the infectious disease agent it is not acting on the basis of the law of similars, but is a proving.

However, as Hahnemann points out in recommending provings to his followers, a proving amounts to a challenge to our system that results in a strengthening of the state of health, unless the dose and method of delivery of the vaccine are such as to cause injury in and of themselves. The vaccine alerts the organism to a potential threat and creates a sort of resistance that wasn't there before. If we have been once defrauded, we are more careful and can avoid being taken advantage of the next time.

To the extent that the person has already been exposed to or is fighting off a particular infectious disease agent, but has not really produced any or many symptoms of the struggle, the homeopathic vaccine, acting at the dynamic level, acts to counter any efforts of that agent to impinge on the generative power. There is a fine line between a proving effect and a curative effect, or between prevention and cure, as the moment of the actual impregnation of the generative power of the human Wesen by the disease entity (Hahnemann's terms) is difficult, if not impossible to determine. But the result to the patient is more or less the same – he does not become sick.

Having said all this, we agree that the final choice should be left to the patient or the parent. Neither form of vaccination (prevention) can offer 100% success as many other factors play into one's immunity. It is the patient's or parents who suffer the consequences, whatever they may be, not the authorities or the practitioner.

What Can We Do To Protect Ourselves?

Dr. Herscu opened the door to a better model.

“I am also happy to say that I would be glad to change, modify, discard, or add anything to the model...It has to be a better model that would explain even more of what we observe, predict more of what may happen at any situation, and aid us in our treatment protocol.”
(Letter #36, p. 14)

That model is the complete medical system bequeathed to us by Hahnemann himself. It is not to be found in the pale and confused version proffered by “classical homeopaths.” The real version, called Heilkunst (*Organon der Heilkunst*), involves a complete range of treatment from diet to spiritual diseases, based on a comprehensive identification of imbalances and diseases and methodical treatment of these imbalances and diseases according to clear principles and respect for natural law. This system is taught at the *Hahnemann Center for Heilkunst* (www.homeopathy.com) in-class or by distance learning. I welcome any student or practitioner to take on the challenge of learning Hahnemann’s complete medical system and testing it in practice.

Hahnemann gave us a true system of Western medicine. There is no justification for the surrender of these truths and the inestimable benefit thereof for mankind, needed now more than ever. We must take on the challenge of re-examining the prevailing orthodoxy of “classical homeopathy” in the full light of Hahnemann’s dynamic legacy.

In terms of dealing with the current threats and potential exposure, we offer the following guidelines for practitioners and student alike. This advice is based on a dual approach: generally strengthening the Life Force on the one hand, then protecting against any infectious disease agent on the other.

- Use of the true constitutional remedy if known.
- Taking of the specific remedy for the constant Wesen (tonic) disease of fear (*Papaver somniferum*), plus its most immediate variable pathic offspring (*Aconitum napellus*) to prevent or remove these diseases that so much debilitate our resistance (as Hahnemann taught in his *Chronic Diseases*). If there is a sense of loss (freedom, security, etc.) or actual loss (death or injury of a loved one), then *Natrum muriaticum* and its most immediate pathic offspring (*Ignatia amara*).
- Use of any other specific pathic remedy (based on the acute symptoms of the case) as needed that has emerged in a given person as a result of emotional shock.

These measures are generally sufficient where there is no imminent threat of exposure to an infectious disease agent, such as anthrax or smallpox. Also, the more that a person has been previously treated to remove various diseases identified (this requires a full understanding of what Hahnemann meant by disease), the stronger will be his or her resistance to any disease agent, and the lower the degree of susceptibility.

- Where there is an imminent or potential threat of exposure to a specific disease Potence, the specific remedy for that disease should be taken. This is usually the nosode or isode.

Dosage

Hahnemann made clear that dose could only be properly determined in the context of the living case (see the chapter on Dose and Potency in Volume I of Dynamic Legacy), but in these critical circumstances some general guidelines can be given.

- The more intense the disease agent or disease expression, the more often the remedy needs to be taken and the higher the potency.
- The pellet is the weakest dose, the liquid dose (pellet dissolved in a little water) the stronger.
- A 30C or 200C is best to start with in actual or imminent danger of contact. One dose of 30C every days, then generally once every week; one dose of 200C every week are good basic dosage guidelines.
- For more general prophylaxis, use one dose of 30C for three days, or one dose of 200C and wait.

Rudi Verspoor, FHCH, RHom.