

Giovanni Giannotti M.D.

SARS

a proposition for its
treatment

Ler Editrice

The author is willing to settle any dues regarding any quotations in which sources were not traceable at the time of writing this book.

Any reproduction or imitation either of the text or of the figures is categorically prohibited.

Copyright by
Giovanni Giannotti 2003
www.docsorders.org
www.sarsremedy.org
docsorders@sarsremedy.org

Translated from Italian
by Sally Thompson Deliziosi.

The oil painting on the cover is “Presenza”
by kind permission of
Fulvia Levi Bianchi, 1996, 150 x 130,
the property of De Vorzon Gallery in Los Angeles.

This work is authenticated by
the signature of the author
Giovanni Giannotti M.D.

“Discovery is seeing what everyone sees and thinking what nobody has thought”.

Albert Szent Gyorgyi, Nobel Prize for Medicine

“Truth is destined to be moked at first, but then to be recognised”.

Albert Schweitzer

Dedicated to my wife Carmen and daughters Rebecca and Micol.

Foreword by¹

SARS: a wicked virus has infected thousands of people and devastated the economy, thus spurring on scientific research.

Bangkok, November, 2003.

A year has passed since the date when the SARS virus is said to have been born, the new virus of the third millennium able to generate an epidemic which, up until now, was unknown. As well as destroying the immune system of the first unlucky victims, it immediately generated another series of bad problems. First of all it caused the conspiracy of silence of the Chinese government which hid the epidemic, a fact which stopped the WHO from blocking it at once. The cost of this silence was 5,200 infected people in China, plus 1,700 more in Hong Kong. Then, in the first three months of 2003, thanks to air travel, contagion reached twenty other countries in every part of the world in a very short time. When the victims were already hundreds, the WHO discouraged people from travelling to the worst hit countries. On the 29th of March Dr. Carlo Urbani died of SARS in Bangkok. He was the first to discover the disease in Hanoi in Vietnam. In April 2003 true global panic broke out, above all concerning South East Asia. Tourism and business trips were interrupted and some economic magazines wrote that SARS had made more victims amongst uninfected people who had become unemployed because of the economic crisis, than amongst those who died from actual contagion. The

Dr. has directed various organisations of the World Health Organisation and of the United Nations in Africa, Latin America and Asia. He has published 17 books on the subject of sustainable development, amongst which the most recent is.....**The opinions expressed here do not necessarily represent the opinion of the United Nations or of the World Health Organisation.**

global total was about 8,000 infected people, a considerable number, but always limited if compared, for example, with the 40,000 people infected by influenza registered every year in the United States.

Therefore, as well as its RNA which was at first unknown, the new virus has brought other novelties with it and very few are good ones. Worst of all, the little good news about SARS which does actually exist, is not widely known. A group of virologists from all over the world worked day and night to define the genetic map of the virus. And they reached their aim in record time. Many research institutes are seeking an efficacious therapy but for the moment no vaccine exists. The control of public health and monitoring in the areas of risk in China, Hong Kong, Taiwan and all South East Asia has been made uniform with quality levels controlled by the WHO. Traditional medicine too, which is strongly rooted and respected in China and other parts of the Far East, has started hunting for other remedies, spurred on by the fact that, for the time being, no treatment with medicinal substances of synthesis is known. It is not surprising that also in the field of homeopathy someone is on the road towards a remedy. This book offers a new opportunity to those who know and practise homeopathy and, for those who neither know it nor practise it, to look beyond the horizons of the more common medical practices. The SARS virus and the other new infections are a strong and menacing enough enemy to justify research which even goes beyond the normal 360 degrees.

Foreword by Frederik Schroyens

Epidemics, such as SARS, are entangled in the history of homeopathy.

In the 19th century, at the beginning of homeopathy, epidemics were raging and caused multiple deaths.

Around 1831 there was a devastating cholera epidemic in Prussia.

The death rate at regular hospitals was more than 50 %. At that time homeopathic treatment was applied as well, with a death rate of less than 5 %. Both these figures were on hundreds of patients. This spectacular difference gained a lot of support for homeopathy.

The homeopathic experience in epidemics has been repeated countless times ever since, epidemic fever, scarlatina, influenza, etc. Even though homeopathy needs to "individualize" the prescription, experience has shown that a lesser degree of individualization is needed in the case of an epidemic. This makes

homeopathy particularly interesting for the treatment of epidemics, once the main remedy (or remedies) have been defined.

This is the work that Dr. Giannotti has undertaken for SARS.

A new, dangerous disease often quickly becomes the "monopoly" of super-specialisms and University Hospitals. We should not forget that, in addition, homeopathy has an offer to treat epidemics. These principles of cure have not changed, only evolved, since more than two centuries. Homeopathy does search for new remedies and approaches, but can apply the known and repeatedly verified principles to new situations, such as SARS.

In this context, it is interesting to quote from Gunavante² that "*.....When the cholera epidemic was raging, Hahnemann said that the remedies Veratrum, Cuprum and Camphor suited the cases. Yet he had never seen a case of cholera. He simply said that the provings had led him to these remedies, and therefore they ought to cure this sickness; they are our sheet-anchor in cholera even today.....*"

I hope that the hypothesis in this book will open the dialogue to help patients with the homeopathic "genius epidemicus" for SARS.

Dr. Frederik Schroyens
Gent, Belgium
December 9, 2003

Note- Frederik Schroyens M.D. is a homeopath and the scientific director of "Synthesis Repertorium Homeopathicum Syntheticum".

Index

² Gunavante S.: "The Genius of Homeopathic Remedies".

Foreword by doctor

Foreword by doctor Frederik Schroyens

Preface

Part one

A historical summary

The philosophic concepts which inspired Hahnemann to
formulate the postulates of classic homeopathy

Concepts and Postulate: the fundamental principle

Constitutional or Situational

Two explicative clinical cases

How to take the remedy

Part two

SARS andaccording to official medicine

Respiratory physiology

Pathologies which alter pulmonary functionality

- Restrictive diseases
- Obstructive diseases

Respiratory insufficiency

- Symptoms and signs
- Hypoxaemia
- Hypercapnia

Viral pneumonia caused by the influenza virus

The Homeopathic hypothesis

.....by various Authors

Symptoms in the Repertory

A proposition for its treatment

Conclusions

Glossary

Bibliography

PREFACE

This is a proposition about a treatment, and it is made by a doctor who, by applying a homeopathic method, is convinced that what he is about to make public is, at this moment, the only suitable, not preventive, treatment possible for SARS and he is willing to put his professional credibility at stake in the name of every man of science's right to make his experiences public.

Maybe scientists, clinicians and pharmacologists will think it is rash to publicly advance fresh solutions and they may be perplexed when reading my statements as, for the time being, mine is only a hypothesis based on a method which has not yet been officially recognised which, above all, belongs to "alternative" medicine.

The fact that I will describe a SARS patient in the most minute detail without having either seen or treated one will definitely arouse incredulity; it is normal to arouse this perplexity, but this news is part of the "aspecific" symptoms of every homeopathic remedy, the cultural experience of the homeopath.

It is sufficient to read the "proving" (experimentation) or the remedy described by the various Authors to make sure of this.

Italian clinicians, and not only they, have only had marginal news about the epidemic. In traditional medicine nobody has ever given importance to "aspecific" symptoms which generally accompany pathologies, let alone in such a serious pathology. Clinicians obviously know what to do in the case of hospitalisation but my concern is their inadequacy to manage a hypothetical epidemic. The intensive care units present in the territory would certainly not be sufficient if it took on the proportions, I will not say of the pandemic "Spanish influenza", lethargic encephalitis, which killed forty million people between 1918 and 1920, but of a common influenza epidemic.

The treatment hypothesis proposed, which could appear to be without sufficient scientific foundation, claiming to solve such a serious pathology as SARS in a simple, soft way (as happens in homeopathy), is no more than the fruit and the logical

consequence of the application of a method tested by me for the treatment of electrosensitivity. This method, known by all homeopaths, has already given me a valid result which is “highly suggestive”, to use a current formula, which classifies those therapies not yet supported by sufficient experimentation. Electrosensitivity is represented by symptoms classified by official Medicine as “non-specific”, treated so far with symptomatic drugs or by entrusting these patients to psychotherapy, which has few results according to the literature on the subject. These symptoms, on the contrary, if interpreted in a homeopathic way, have a clear causal connotation and require a specific therapeutic approach. Occupational medicine, above all in Northern Countries, which has shown itself to be the most interested in the question of electrosensitivity, has been making attempts for many years to give a scientific and experimental reason for the “electrosensitivity” phenomenon, but, unfortunately it is still groping in the dark, so much so that its doctors have had to use other approaches of “alternative” treatment, such as acupuncture and shiatsu.....in order to find adequate therapies. This to demonstrate that allopathic Medicine is the first to try out new therapeutic approaches when it does not have the solution to a problem. Why, therefore, can a homeopathic doctor not suggest a treatment hypothesis, considering the above mentioned situation?

Also in that circumstance I had the luck to come across my first extremely serious case of electrosensitivity and, right from the beginning, based on the symptoms described to me, I knew that the result would be positive. And so the “highly suggestive” homeopathic remedy for the treatment of electrosensitivity will allow me, having treated the first case, to suggest a therapeutic solution which is sure to arouse the same perplexity as a homeopathic remedy to treat SARS will create, a pathology from which there is no escape, as everyone knows.

I admit that I did cure some clinical cases of electrosensitivity before publishing a book indicating the “highly suggestive” homeopathic remedy for its treatment, whereas this did not happen for SARS.

After the success of this homeopathic treatment, it seemed right and my duty to make another intuition about SARS public. By applying the same “modus operandi” I felt it my duty to make at least a hypothesis of treatment with a homeopathic remedy, which could be an answer to the concern I have as a parent for my children’s health. Now I am satisfied. Personally, if my dear ones should unfortunately contract SARS I would not hesitate to administer them, taking complete responsibility as a father and a doctor. I am sincerely convinced of what I am saying, even though I must suggest it formally in a prudent way. If anybody takes my research into consideration, testing the remedy on these patients, without excluding conventional therapies if necessary, we will be able to make, if we have the time, all the necessary epidemiological studies which medical science requires.

Having made these necessary preliminary remarks, I have to thank Doctor, first, for his presentation to my book; then because, thanks to his book, I managed to have the necessary intuition in order to identify the so-called “highly suggestive” remedy for treating SARS. In his book, “.....” (19), you can find all the most up-to-date references to the diffusion of this epidemic.

My particular thanks go to doctor Frederik Schroyens, the editor of “Synthesis Repertorium Homeopathicum Syntheticum”, for his presentation, and for having created a repertory which enables homeopathic doctors to have at their disposal an indispensable instrument for seeking the “Simillimum”, thus giving me the opportunity of discovering this specific remedy for the treatment of SARS.

I have been in contact with health operators in Canton, Hong Kong, Singapore and Toronto in order to get a homeopathic reconfirmation of the “aspecific” symptoms which are part of the proving of and, therefore, referable in a homeopathic way to SARS but, given the seasonal nature of the virulence of this corona-virus responsible for the pathology, I cannot put off the publishing of this book.

I am proud that an Italian was the first to treat the symptoms caused almost certainly by electromagnetic waves, whose father was Alessandro Volta, and has succeeded in the same year in finding a “highly suggestive” homeopathic remedy for treating SARS whose viral typification was made by the Italian colleague Carlo Urbani who died of this lethal infection.

Just as it had happened with the highly suggestive homeopathic remedy for treating electrosensitivity which provokes in the proving a guide symptom, referred to me by a patient, as a symptom which was strange, rare and peculiar. In this way I was able to deduce the above mentioned remedy which has enabled me to treat electrosensitive patients. My experience with SARS happened in exactly the same way.

I have always thought that a highly suggestive homeopathic remedy for treating SARS could exist; it is, in fact, an interstitial pneumonia. Pneumonia, in expert hands, and this I have observed with my own eyes, is treated with homeopathic remedies which give rapid resolution. I was busy preparing my book about electrosensitivity and, as at that moment there were not any active infection centres, I gave precedence to another more hidden pathology, but which is certainly to be treated immediately, and I would have liked to have revealed its highly suggestive treatment solution. Already in the month of August 2003 when I read “.....”, my attention was caught by a symptom described as “.....” which, in an influenza syndrome, thus it appears at the beginning, seemed to me to be indicative of only a few remedies of the homeopathic Materia Medica.

The clinical picture is that of a drowning person. The difference is that suffocation takes place very slowly: it is a very slow agony!

At this point allopathic medicine, for the seriousness of the respiratory clinical picture, is unable to recover the patient and this is the reason why we must adopt a different treatment which is alternative and innovative and stops the patient from reaching

this irreversible stage; a treatment, even if hypothetical, which can treat SARS patients right at “its onset”.

Therefore, it is not prevention but a “highly suggestive” hypothesis of real treatment. The oxygen administered when these patients are hospitalised in many cases is sufficient at the beginning to control the slight respiratory insufficiency; when, however, the respiratory function worsens with the appearance of, the precarious pulmonary compliance creates the presupposition that this pneumonia may cause death in a high percentage of patients. In many cases of recovery, however, pulmonary fibrosis is formed; therefore, there is not a “restitutio ad integrum” of the pulmonary parenchyma causing, after some time, respiratory trouble. The allopathic drugs also, proposed as therapy, are not specific; antiviral drugs do little or nothing against viral infections, and often have such a high intrinsic toxicity that it is better not to use them. For a vaccine, years are necessary, and so it is not a preventive aid to be considered today: unfortunately it is not next autumn’s weapon! Therefore, research into the “simillimum” homeopathic remedy, “highly suggestive” for the treatment of SARS, has been made necessary for various reasons. First of all, for the incapacity to treat those who could succumb to this pathology for lack of hospitalisation, considering the latitude at which the worst infection centres appear. Then, for the rapid diffusion it could already have this autumn because of the strong infectiveness of this corona virus already demonstrated which, as well as being transmitted through drops of saliva spread by coughing, seems to be transmitted also through the faeces. Moreover, for the existence of all those who have chronic illnesses concerning the lungs, heart, kidneys and liver and, finally, those who have alterations in the immune system and are easy prey to any infection.

Recently it has been discovered that the civet, a rodent similar to the beaver, seems to be responsible for transmitting the infection to human beings.

The virus has a cyclic nature connected with the seasons: autumn is one of these and it is already here unfortunately. In

these November days I am finishing this book and I foresee at least another month before I can make public what I am about to expound.

Another characteristic of viruses: they change. Today's allopathic therapy may be different from the one to be adopted tomorrow. This does not happen with homeopathic remedies as the prescription is made for symptoms discovered in the patient, not for characteristics of the virus.

This book is not intended to be a treatise of homeopathy, even less to encourage the reader to cure himself, but I would like to be the spokesman, in this specific area, of this “soft” method of treatment, following some well codified rules.

By means of this book, the result of my knowledge and intuitions, you have the opportunity of discovering another therapeutic reality.

“Free will” gives mankind the possibility of choice.

Self-suggestion or a rapid, soft and resolute remedy?

Not wishing to enter into the subject of physics for objective difficulties and because of the vastness of this subject, I will limit myself to giving only brief indications, giving more ample space to the clinical argumentation of my province.

Pharmacologists and chemists object to us homeopaths that, as there is no quantifiable substance, which is measurable with apparatus, in our homeopathic preparations, our therapies do not have a scientific basis. Homeopathic medicines are obtained by starting from the Basic Tinctures formed by distilled water and alcohol in which the active principle that one wishes to prepare has been dissolved.

The molecules of water (H₂O) each contain two atoms of hydrogen (H⁺) and one of oxygen (O⁻); the three atoms are attracted among themselves by forces of an electric type known as “hydrogen bridge”. The molecules of water are not all in the same state: some are in a *disorderly liquid* phase, whilst others are structured in “clusters”, agglomerates of molecules of precarious stability, united amongst themselves by crystalline-liquid hydro-magnetic “bonds” which are similar to the structure of liquid crystals, which have the characteristic of receiving and memorising information. Electronics have exploited this suggestion given us by mother nature and have used it in the construction of “displays”.

By means of the concepts of Physics described above, the information contained in a homeopathic medicine transmits to our organism that specific vibrational information which it received from the Basic Tincture (solvent), the liquid in which the pharmacological substance to be prepared (solute) was dissolved. This is the phenomenon of “resonance” by which the clusters of water enter into resonance, that is, with the vibrations of the Basic Tincture, conserving in this way the information.

In Physics, resonance is the following phenomenon: an oscillating circuit, composed of a reel of electric wire and a

condenser, having the characteristic of constantly vibrating at a specific frequency. This is the physical principle of radio-television functioning and of trans-receiving with electromagnetic waves; by calibrating two oscillating circuits with the same frequency, both will vibrate simultaneously supporting, each one of them, the oscillation of the other: this is called “mutual inductance”.

The principle in Physics is similar to the tuning fork, which puts a crystal or another tuning fork which vibrates at the same frequency into resonance.

In the case of mutual inductance the resonance is induced by electromagnetic waves. In the tuning fork, on the contrary, it is supported by sonorous waves. (18)

For Physics this is the reasoning which can explain the mechanism by which homeopathic remedies act.

Clinically one has a rapid, soft healing which is even more sensational in acute pathologies. Fever is an easily measurable clinical manifestation which is not open to question; if the remedy is correct it will disappear in a few hours; this is not autosuggestion, and it certainly is not magic. The subtle energy, present in the remedy, cures by the physical principle of mutual inductance, and the patient is cured. If he is not cured, not homeopathy but a bad prescription is to blame.

These affirmations will baffle many clinicians, but only because they do not know, or do not agree with, the postulates of homeopathy.

We homeopaths have only chosen to administer medicines without intrinsic toxicity to our patients. The therapeutic approach, not the clinical one, changes: it is sufficient to think of allergic patients, pregnant patients and all those patients who cannot tolerate allopathic medicines because they have problems of accumulation or bad elimination. It is enough to think also of all those patients who are not cured by traditional medicine, such as the so-called “*electrosensitive*” patients; allopathic medicine is not a science without the possibility of error and, for

this reason, it must accept the hypothesis of new ways toward a cure.

Also in this case, as for “electrosensitive” people, we absolutely must offer SARS patients a chance to be cured too!

I have always claimed that it is necessary to find the synergism between the various known fields of medicine and not increase the contrasts between them by defending oneself behind rigid mental attitudes!

Up until today traditional medicine and homeopathy have followed parallel routes without having any dialogue with each other: this serious pathology may help to find a meeting point, marking the first important step which will exalt the treatment method of doctors of the third millennium.

When saying this, it is absolutely not my intention to irritate allopathic clinicians and those who are doing their utmost to treat such a serious pathology, but to stimulate their curiosity, offering them my willingness to collaborate in order to reach a great therapeutic result, seeking that synergism which can exalt the curative capacity of medicine in general, demonstrating, once and for all, that only one medicine exists with the same will: “*to cure our patients*”.

No doctor can allow himself to exclude prejudicially any known therapeutic instrument, thus depriving his patient of the most suitable therapy in order to cure him.

I will transmit to the medical Institutions in charge this new approach to treatment, even though it is “highly suggestive” so that it may be made public as soon as possible and receive the clinical confirmation that it deserves.

I trust in the good sense of these Institutions which are the custodians of our health, even though this hypothesis of therapy may not seem very orthodox. At the same time, I am sure that I have offered my homeopath colleagues a suggestion for the

possible treatment of this pathology and of the others listed in the chapter “a proposition for its treatment”.

Finally, my deepest recognition goes to the father of homeopathy, Samuel Hahnemann, who made all this possible. My greatest dream is that he will finally receive well deserved recognition for his intuitions by official medical science. Just as acupuncture has been recognised by official medical science, the same should take place for homeopathy. This, at least, is my deepest wish.

In order to understand the therapy proposed, some brief historical information is necessary, followed by a brief description of the “modus operandi” of classical homeopathy.

The Author

PART ONE

A Historical summary

Samuel Hahnemann (Meissen, Germany 1755 – Paris 1843).

Before becoming the father of homeopathy, as he is universally recognised, Hahnemann practised as a physician having gained a degree in Vienna in medicine.

He soon discovered how inadequate western medicine is and his disagreement grew stronger after having read the medical studies of a Scottish colleague, William Cullen. The latter came into the limelight after he had discovered the therapeutic remedy in cinchona bark for treating the gastric disturbances caused by malaria.

Hahnemann wished to try it out personally: he took strong doses of quinine, a cinchona bark extract, and he had the same symptoms as those of the disease. In fact, every day at the same time, he had attacks of fever. At the same time he noticed that, by taking moderate doses of quinine, the fever would disappear. He intuited the great hidden principle: substances exist in nature which can produce symptoms on the one hand, but on the other they can treat those very same symptoms. Homeopathy was born from an act of intuition.

The actual formulation of the fundamental laws of homeopathy goes back to 1796 when Hahnemann published an essay entitled: “A new principle for ascertaining the curative properties of drugs”.

The key-ideas were the following: every potent medicinal substance produces a certain disease in the human body. In nature, if we look carefully, we can observe that diseases never happen by chance. In fact, the disease always appears, to a certain extent, in order to re-establish a new balance, once the old one has been disturbed. It may even happen that nature generates in an organism a certain pathology which enters into conflict with a pre-existent pathology, treating it and curing it.

This operative model is adopted by homeopathy: it causes with its specific remedies “artificial” diseases which turn out to be therapeutic regarding the ailments from which the patient suffers.

Hahnemann, who published his *Organon der rationellen Heilkunde* in 1810 (homeopathy’s basic textbook), has the merit of having introduced the “LM potency” of the homeopathic substance.

Allopathic doctors challenged him for this reason and in 1821 he was forced to abandon Leipzig where he had lived, practised medicine and taught in the University.

But this did not stop his experimentation: in fact, still in 1821 and in the sixth and last volume of the above mentioned treatise, the beneficial effects of no more than sixty-four homeopathic remedies were demonstrated!

The homeopathic doctrine had already been intuited and practised by ancient peoples. For example, a singular episode is quoted in the Old Testament: the Jews who had been bitten by poisonous snakes in the desert were treated by Moses, ordered by God, when He prescribed them to stare at a copper snake. The homeopathic intuition noticeable in this episode is evident.

However, the true development of homeopathy took place in the nineteenth century with Hahnemann and his disciples. Already in the first decades of the century they verified experimentally a bond between the morbid homeopathic substances, those capable of causing diseases, and those same substances which were utilised as therapeutic remedies for the same pathologies.

The philosophic concepts which inspired Hahnemann to formulate the postulates of classic homeopathy

The substantial difference between allopathic medicine and homeopathy consists in the way in which the states of health and of illness are conceived. In allopathic medicine disease is an enemy to fight against, a state regarding only one organ, or the single organs, affected by the pathology. According to homeopathy, on the contrary, the organism is a whole governed by the Vital Principle², which keeps the Vital Force in balance. This, by means of the VIS MEDICATRIX NATURAE and by means of the principle of NATURA MORBORUM MEDICATRIX, keeps the organism in good health and cures it when it is ill. The action of a homeopathic remedy is to re-balance the Vital Principle, so that the latter may carry out its task.

From this different way of seeing things a different approach to reaching a cure is derived.

Whilst an allopathic doctor fights the symptoms by opposing them with antagonist substances, in compliance with the principle “**Contraria contrariis curantur**”, a homeopathic doctor will treat his patient by availing himself of the law of similitude, “**Similia similibus curentur**”, by which the symptoms which the medicine is able to cause in a healthy person must correspond to the patient’s symptoms of suffering.

³ **The concept of the Vital Principle, which cannot be demonstrated for the time being by our means of scientific research, can, however, provide an explanation for the whole epistemological and clinical meaning of homeopathic practice.**

In other words, a homeopathic medicine intends to treat an ill person by administering substances to the organism which, during experimentation or proving, provoked similar symptoms to those present in the patient who asks us to be cured.

A homeopath wishes to bring back to health in a soft, rapid and lasting way; he considers the body and psyche to be an inseparable whole.

This refers us back to concepts which are not strictly medical, but also philosophical, such as those characteristic of the classic Aristotelian-Thomistic conception (a speculative tradition, which is also naturalistic and philosophic, which began in the fourth century BC with Aristotle and reached its climax in the thirteenth century AD with St. Thomas Aquinas).

According to this vision, not only human nature, but also that of every living species, is created from the union of two fundamental elements: matter (in Greek “ile”) and form (“morfe”, corresponding to “psyche”, which in Greek means soul).

In this union there is the form which determines the identity and the organisation of matter, as well as its purpose and the evolutionary phases for reaching it.

In the Middle Ages they said Vegetative Soul, Sensitive or Animal Soul, Intellectual or Rational Soul, in order to indicate the principles which inspire our growth in a physical, emotional and mental sense.

The thought of Hippocrates from Cos (460 – 335 BC) was not very different as, for him, man’s health or illness are the result of harmony or disharmony inside the organism, connected with the balance of the 4 humours it contains (BLOOD, PHLEGM, YELLOW BILE, BLACK BILE), whose different proportion also determines the person’s temperament (the humoral theory).

According to Hippocrates’ doctrine, the humours depend on the balance-unbalance (in a dynamic sense) and equalisation

(adaptation) of man to his climatic, hydrologic, geographic and political-social environment.

This theory, the humoral doctrine, exercised an unaltered influence over medical pathology up to the second half of the 1800s. The conditioning and influence of the humoral doctrine will be maintained right up to the end of the nineteenth century, that is, until Virchow and his “cellular pathology”.

It was with Descartes, in the seventeenth century, that a different perspective was adopted regarding the relationship between body and soul which, from that moment onwards, were considered as two distinct, separate entities. The soul issued orders to the body (inert matter) by means of the pineal gland.

Modern science and medicine have followed this formulation denying Nature (the *Fysis* of the ancient Greeks) any intrinsic, autonomous principle of vitality and dynamism which was not ascribable to an “objective” measurement, according to the parameters of experimental science.

The human body, in particular, has been reduced to the role of an object to be studied for laboratory tests.

A mechanistic, positivistic conception has prevailed, according to which every vital process is the necessary result of factors which are measurable and objective, defined according to the categories and language (as well as the measuring instruments) of Experimental Science of a Galilean, Cartesian, Illuministic and positivist type.

Therapy becomes the precise application, “following the manual”, of standardised, uniform procedures, taking little account of the variables connected with subjective cases.

From here onwards the patient is no longer a “whole” but he is forced to go and consult numerous specialists each of whom treats the symptoms of the “part” of his competence, without paying too much attention to the patient’s personal history.

Hahnemann reverses this vision by recognising once again that the organism has its own capacity of self-curing, placing the complexity of the organism at the centre of the doctor’s

attention and renewing the therapeutic concept as stated by him in “Organon”, where we can read:

§10:

It is wrong to consider the physical organism as capable, alone, of feeling, acting and self-preserving itself. If this happens, it depends only on the Vital Force which exists and operates inside it. (2)

§16:

Health and illness do not depend essentially on external forces but on the dynamic interaction between these external forces and the Vital Force, a spiritual, dynamic principle in whose hands we can find the health and harmony of a person.

Homeopathic medicines really do treat deeply, because they help the Vital Principle to fully recover its power. This is possible when the description of the patient’s symptoms made by a homeopathic doctor enables him to “centre” the most suitable remedy and bring the disturbed Vital Force back into balance. (2)

This careful collecting of the symptomatologic, psycho-physical train which accompanies every illness makes it possible, by means of the “simillimum” remedy, to prescribe the remedy which covers the symptoms observed in the patient and referred by him, thus treating the patient. The causality is kept in mind but, however, it is the symptoms which guide the medical prescription.

Concepts and postulates: the fundamental principle

From these genial intuitions Hahnemann arrived at the formulation of the first concept already mentioned “*Similia Similibus Curentur*”, which means: a similar thing treats similar things.

If an ill person has the same symptoms both physical and/or mental which the remedy developed in the proving in healthy subjects, he will be treated by this remedy and will be cured autonomously.

What is a proving?

Proving or experimentation is carried out by administering a homeopathic remedy under the tongue in dry form every day for a certain period of time to healthy individuals in double blind, thus creating an artificial pathology which reverts at the moment in which we interrupt the administering of the medicament. The homeopath's task is to supervise the patients, requesting them to take note of any symptoms both **physical and mental** they may notice, indicating the time and modality of their appearance.

The basic idea of homeopathy is exactly this: the medicinal substance treats in the ill person the same symptoms it provoked in the healthy person.

Hahnemann tried it out personally by examining mercury which, during that time, was used in massive, intoxicating doses in the treatment of syphilis. And so he tried **diluting** the mercury,

distributing the particles, strongly diluted in an aqueous solution, with strong shaking called **succussion**.

By diluting the substance and then shaking it Hahnemann discovered that its therapeutic efficacy was enhanced. Shaking and dilution were defined by him as **homeopathic dynamization**.

Moreover, he made a further fundamental discovery: not only did the homeopathic substance cause pathologies of a physical type, but also symptoms of psychic and mental disturbances.

Through the law of homeopathy he soon discovered that all these symptoms, be they physical or mental, which had been induced by homeopathic substances in healthy people, were cured by the same substances in ill people. "*Similia similibus curentur*".

In a daily clinical situation, in fact, the patient notices both physical and mental symptoms, sometimes with one prevailing over the other. Nowadays one of the most common mental "generational" symptoms is anxiety, manifesting itself in the form of sleeplessness, claustrophobia, panic attacks

Constitutional or situational

There are **constitutional** and **situational** remedies.

Constitutional remedies are, shall we say, our guide remedies which can hardly be changed; they will help us during our life to solve most of our illnesses, unless particular causes or symptoms require another remedy : a situational one.

We prescribe a **situational remedy** in acute situations in which the constitutional remedy does not cover the patient's symptoms. For example, in forms of influenza where the epidemic gene is so strong that most of the population have the same symptoms; in this case, as in electromagnetic intoxication, the constitutional remedy is no good, so we will use the situational remedy which totally covers the symptoms the patient's organism is manifesting at that moment; this is the case in SARS.

Other examples are traumas, mourning, lovesickness, to name just a few, if the symptoms are not covered by the constitutional remedy.

Another typical phenomenon **in acute pathologies** is **the annulling of the patient's chronic symptoms**; at this moment the organism is busy fighting an acute disease and, as if by magic, the symptoms of our chronic ailments disappear only to reappear punctually as soon as our organism has been cured of the acute pathology. The organism had to establish a new balance to face the acute event and it cannot simultaneously fight chronic and acute pathologies! There is a precise logic in this.

Try and think about it!

How is the right remedy found?

The symptoms induced by experimented remedies are collected in the Materia Medica written by various Authors; the common symptoms of about 3,000 known remedies are collected in sections, and then in rubrics, each of which deals with a specific symptom, and in this way they can be easily consulted in the repertories.

By comparing the various rubrics we can find the remedy which appears in most or those with the strangest, rarest and most peculiar symptoms which, in this case, unmistakably indicate a unique remedy (this happened with “.....”).

I have always spoken about a remedy in the singular because it is only a single remedy wisely administered following the rules laid down 200 years ago by Hahnemann, written in the Organon, which still today in the 21st century allows us to treat our patients.

Nothing has changed: one remedy only must be administered, only the first time in a dry form and subsequently in an aqueous solution, shaking it so that every time the remedy changes its potency, if only a little.

These simple but efficacious rules are often not followed causing the therapy to fail. It is sufficient to read the ABC on which homeopathy is founded: the sixth edition of the ORGANON.

This is not my own personal opinion but that of many illustrious homeopaths who apply the rules of classical homeopathy.

Illness is a state of biological-emotional adaptation to that which surrounds us and involves the person totally. The morbid localisation is a sign of the illness, but it is not the actual illness. IN ORDER TO STAY IN BALANCE OUR ORGANISM PRODUCES SYMPTOMS.

The proliferation of germs is not the cause of an illness, but the result; germs, in fact, teem all over an organism without causing illness. Homeopathy acts on the ground, that is, it helps a person's innate defence potential, it does not eliminate the guest (the infecting agent). Every day one can notice the phenomenon of the morbid substitution between completely different manifestations like eczema and asthma.

The following example will help to understand this deepening of the illness: a child suffering from eczema was treated with a cortisone ointment.

Resolution of the eczema at skin level occurred (however, we homeopaths call it suppression), but after a short time the child got asthmatic bronchitis. Official medical science cannot connect the two things, it is not able to understand the causal connection, as it is not part of its postulates! By administering the constitutional remedy, the asthmatic bronchitis disappeared and the eczema came back which clearly indicates that the remedy prescribed is correct. Therefore, I have to continue administering the same homeopathic remedy until the eczema is cured and only then will the patient be completely cured. Of course, having used the constitutional remedy which acts at three hundred and sixty degrees, if he suffers from other chronic pathologies such as rhinitis, constipation, sleeplessness, anxiety, etc. by following a well codified treatment course, the above mentioned symptoms will be cured. From this you can see that if the constitutional remedy is correct, one will obtain the psycho-physical cure of the symptoms described by the patient according to Hering's law or rule, that is:

From the inside towards the outside (from the most inner organs to the most exterior ones, see the example eczema-asthmatic bronchitis);

**From the top towards the bottom;
from the most recent to the oldest.**

The **remedy treats** the patient, the “vis medicatrix naturae” or **vital energy**, our intrinsic capacity to heal, **cures us**.

To suppress the symptoms with a pluralist or complex homeopathy or with chemical products does not produce a cure but a deepening of the patient’s suffering; there is the risk the illness will be manifested in another much more serious pathology in another organ or apparatus.

Therefore, a case history should be diligently and patiently compiled including the patient’s whole affective, family biography, his childhood vicissitudes, his relationships, bringing to light any emotional or moral traumas which could have badly upset his balance; only in this way will it be possible to connect the symptoms with their deep cause. As I have already said, our organism, in order to keep its balance, produces symptoms which can even last for years!

Two explicative clinical cases

My clinical cases could fill a book but this, however, is not a suitable context for them.

In this sense I remember a patient who, following the death of his son, had developed a widespread psoriasis. Having tried an allopathic therapy in which a cortisone ointment was used to treat the skin symptom, unfortunately with no result, he came to my attention.

From his detailed case history the characteristics of his “causticum” constitutional remedy emerged; mourning for his son had caused the psoriasis, this being the causal link; the remedy prescribed brought him back to a normal emotional life and thus, having eliminated the reason for the symptom, the psoriasis gradually disappeared and the patient was totally cured.

Another clinical case occurs to me of a girl who, at the age of 18, lost her fiancé.

When she came to me she was 38 and she told me that she had been visiting the cemetery every day since her fiancé died. She told me that her emotional life was finished as it was closed in this great sorrow. I administered her constitutional remedy “natrum muriaticum” and, as if by magic, after a few weeks her life changed.

These two clinical cases demonstrate what the “simillimum” is able to achieve. Whenever a homeopathic “miracle” takes place I still feel a strong emotion and this, apart from giving me great

joy, fills me with enthusiasm and shows me the course I must keep following.

How to take the remedy

I have always specified “homeopathic remedy” because **only one remedy** must be administered, because this is the only way I can assess how the treatment is going, based on the symptoms described by the patient: have you ever tried to drive a car with two steering-wheels?

And, should one get a result by administering two remedies at the same time, which is the one that functions?

The remedy should be administered **only once in dry form under the tongue** for the various potencies thus avoiding a proving.

It should then be taken in hydro-alcoholic solution or in water which has previously undergone succussion.

To the question “when should I take the remedy?” I reply by asking: “When do you fill up your car? The patient replies: “when it is about to run out or has already run out of fuel”.

Usually a few daily administrations are sufficient to treat chronic pathologies; otherwise, in the case of fever or other acute pathologies, the remedy should be administered more often; in the case of fever, every ten minutes or quarter of an hour and, only when the fever goes down, the doses can be reduced.

These very clear, simple rules of Hahnemann’s are often disobeyed creating much confusion on the part of some homeopaths who go on changing the remedy thus worsening the pathologies in a homeopathic way.

The conviction that homeopathic remedies do no harm because they lack intrinsic chemical toxicity is just as false. Have you

ever tried putting diesel into a petrol run car? Never do it! If we give the wrong type of energy (what we administer with our homeopathic medicines is, in fact, subtle energy), we can even make our patient worsen!

The homeopathic remedy, dissolved in distilled water and alcohol which constitute the Basic Tincture, is soaked into micro spheres of lactose or saccharose (support).

In the case of serious allergies to these supports and to alcohol, by increasing the potency by one unit the alcohol and the support can be eliminated from the solvent, thus leaving only the distilled water and the active principle dissolved in it.

About the Author

Having gained a degree in Medicine and Surgery at the Università degli Studi in Milan, Giovanni Giannotti presently operates a medical practice as a Dentist and Homeopath.

Having received degree at the C.D.O. in Milan with a thesis entitled “Panic attacks and Homeopathy”, he is now a member of the “Federazione Italiana Associazione e Medici Omeopati” (FIAMO) and of the international equivalent (LIGA).

His next book will soon be published. It is entitled “Electrosensitivity: its treatment”, Ler Editrice, a pathology defined by the author as belonging to the third millennium.