

Towards a new horizon

Re: BBC Horizon programme

I am sure that many of you saw the BBC2 *Horizon* programme concerning homeopathy that was screened on 26 November 2002 (28 November in Scotland), or at least have followed the discussions on the BBC website (www.bbc.co.uk/science/horizon). Obviously, many of you must have been disappointed by the rather negative outcome of the properly conducted experiments. However, I for one was *not* – and let me tell you why.

In the first place, a homeopathic remedy does not generally have the same biological properties as the drug from which it is derived. We all know that when we give *Belladonna* (according to proper indications) to a red-faced febrile patient, pallor is produced rather than plethora. So why should we expect potentised histamine to act like histamine itself? Of course, we should not – except in *rare* instances. These relatively scarce events are certainly seen in experimental or sporadic provings. They are by no means routine, and depend, in part, upon the sensitivity of the subject. What Benveniste and Ennis appear to have demonstrated is thus an inconstant phenomenon, and one which is not readily replicated. Had it been otherwise, my faith in my own theories of homeopathy would have been shaken rather than stirred. So, congratulations *Horizon* on the demonstration of one important homeopathic principle, albeit unwittingly!

In the second place, we cannot ignore the influence of the observer in homeopathic trials. It has been said – and I was initially reluctant to accept the fact – that the more stringent the test conditions, the more likely a null result. That is to say, the more you deny observers knowledge of what is being tested, the greater the probability of a negative outcome. This observer effect is not so much apparent in the routine pharmaceutical production of remedies (if at all), but in their action upon the living organism – be it plant, animal or cell. It would seem that for a remedy to exert an effect on an organism, there must be also injected some form of subconscious or conscious thought – which we may term ‘positive intention’. *This is quite independent of any psychological placebo effect.* Intention acts as a catalyst to a cascade of events triggered by a homeopathic remedy.

Though the remedy is something physical, in that it is a specially contoured ‘piece’ of electromagnetism, its interaction with the general electromagnetic field of an organism (or group of cells *in vitro*) appears to require intervention of the human psyche. *In this respect, a potentised remedy is quite different from a material drug, which does not require such a catalyst for its action.*

From what I have said, neither is it too difficult to see that there is also a thing called ‘negative intention’. This may be imposed upon any experimental investigation by the experimenters themselves, or by persons remote from the experiment but who know that it is taking place. Physical presence is not a prerequisite for either positive or negative influences upon scientific trials. Thereafter, it is the summation of all the positive and negative intentions of the persons concerned with the experiment which will partially determine the result. Intention, however, must be focused or tuned. Some are better at doing this than others. A powerful ‘negative intender’, such as The Great Randi, can work all sorts of devilish mischief with the subtle process of remedial effect. Great ‘positive intenders’, like Reilly perhaps, can perform opposite ‘miracles’. Some, like Benveniste, Ennis, or their assistants, may induce (albeit subconsciously) the electromagnetic field of cellular preparations to reverse the *Gestalt* of the remedy, so that it produces effects similar to those of the drug of origin; and the same may happen with people directing or carrying out experimental provings of substances in potency. Many require a more precise definition of the material to be tested before they can exert either catalysis or inhibition of biological effect, and the more stringent the trial, the less is their influence.

Of course, all this sounds quite mystical. However, it has strong support in the tenets of quantum mechanics, where it is believed that the outcome of a quantum experiment is partially determined by the observer. Even beyond this, the idea that the structure of the universe depends upon the intercommunication of every particle and object suggests that such conscious or subconscious influences of mind over matter are a stark reality – and certainly so in such subtle and delicate matters as the homeopathic

effect. The basis for this most strange process is discussed in some detail in Chapter 3 of the ARH Monograph, *A New Physics of Homeopathy*.

**Dr Colin Lessell MB BS BDS MRCS LRCP
FBHomDA DDFHom**

A New Physics of Homeopathy by Colin Lessell can be ordered from the ARH office (08700 736339, or info@a-r-h.org) or from the ARH website (www.a-r-h.org), price £9.99 (£8.99 for ARH members) plus postage and packing. Copies will also be on sale at our New Year Seminar in London on 25 January.

ARH Board meeting

A full Board meeting of the Alliance of Registered Homeopaths took place on 11 November 2002. As a number of issues regarding future ARH policy required in-depth discussion, it was agreed to devote considerable time to these areas at our next meetings, in January and February.

Continuing Professional Development (CPD), and its role in a future combined/single register, were considered. The ARH Board accepts the desirability of encouraging its members to engage in ongoing CPD in order to support, strengthen and enhance the future development of the profession. However, in order for CPD to be both meaningful and of value, the Board believes it should be approached in a flexible manner and be largely voluntary. The Board would like to explore a variety of possible approaches to CPD, and include consultation with ARH members in deciding the best way forward.

The Board considered how ARH administration might be improved, and it was agreed to provide more telephone cover during office hours. Also, credit card facilities would be implemented as soon as possible.

The work of the newly formed Education Working Group was briefly discussed, with the Board endorsing the group's initiative to try to develop an ARH mentoring network, to support both graduates and established practitioners alike.

Other issues, such as deciding on our corporate ID and whether we should accept applications for ARH membership from practitioners living overseas, were postponed for consideration at our next full Board meeting, which will be held on 27 January 2003.

Karin Mont MARH