

The Reasons of Homeopathy

We are very close to the Brazilian Congress of Homeopathy (which, by the way, deserves our support and prestige) and I think that we will be able to do a provisory evaluation of our status till here there.

As is known, the specter of marginality always escorted homeopathy. The homeopaths were always underestimated and incorporated this underesteem.

But who would say that homeopathy could achieve an undeniable institutional progress? Areas such as veterinary and odontology expanded their actuation perspectives. In pharmacy and medicine, this consolidation is even more evident. All this accomplishments were important and decisive. But they are not enough. It's not sufficient to wait for a permanent progress, trusting in a trajectory that is on course but that is not continuous. In a movement that follows the inertia of its unusual success.

The truth is that even if homeopathy advanced institutionally it didn't manage to keep up to its potential yet. If homeopathy is now more accepted, it is something still very far away from being known as an actual option by the public. Homeopathy was not turned into a cultural fact, such as biomedicine or *lato sensu* sciences. Scientific media behavior denotes this. And so its relative low impact in society.

We are in the eve of new challenges. From now on our performance will be still more vital to evaluate the place we want to reach. Homeopaths that aspired a more dignified status for its art for so long witness nowadays the inscription of homeopathy in the scheme. It's not a regional phenomenon. It's happening all over the world.

We've got two immediate obstacles: The internal sectarianism and the resistance. Homeopathy has got hidden enemies, artificially created for them to impose their agenda full of resentful jargon against all the things that are supposedly a threat. But homeopathy has also acute critics - internal and external - whose lucidity and earnest deserve highlight and respect, for them not to be confounded with gratuitous attackers.

What these critics affirm is that the speech analysis of great part of homeopathy movement denotes sectarianism and the wish of hegemony. It seems to be some kind of motivation that looks for something like a homeopathic supremacy. And these critics have their reason. It seems to exist a kind of chronic intolerance in the homeopathic speech, a resistance to self-criticism that sacrifices the interlocution for the hermetism, the fusion of horizons for one-sidedness, the epistemological advance for opportunist scientificism.

The other great criticism, also relevant, is the permanent incapacity of self-comprehension of our polysemies. There are plenty of homeopathic terms that can signify lots of concepts, several possibilities of interference and investigation in schools that, in general, don't dialogue amongst themselves. And per-

haps that's exactly where the problem is. In the non-dialogue. We could even assume the companionship of several schools to, in the end, admit that there are lots of homeopathies. What can we do? After all, our field is under construction. By this point of view, it even put us in a poetical license status, so we can do as much linguistic experiences as we think are necessary until we fit in a pattern that can define an agenda of researches and a shared glossary.

But maybe these polysemies represent exactly the perspective that the unrepeatable individualities demand different focuses. That the people (patients) go towards to people (therapists) and not necessarily lines or schools. That a certain medical ability created in a therapeutical encounter will not repeat necessarily in another. That the incredible variety of therapies - and the freedom and generosity that it denotes - is foreseen in hahnemanniana theory when it evokes, with its traditional radicality, the principle of individualization, so well represented by Kant's quote that each man has his peculiar way of being healthy?

After all, which are the reasons of homeopathy?

We are in the edge of a construction which fundamental step is to present an interesting therapy, unique in comprehension and exceptionally accessible as instrument. Homeopathy will surely go forward. So, we prefer that this progress is slow and consistent as an alternative to the improvised speed.

The Subject Medicine (theme of Brazilian Congress) it's not a reverie without airfield anymore. And it's not only a homeopathy aspiration. In fact, it's far from being an ephemeral vogue.

A Subject Medicine, leaded or developed by homeopaths, finally will put in the right place again who always should have been there, namely, everyone who needs it. And by growing up we can even export it to other disciplines.

Homeopathy's institutional challenge (the other theme of the Congress) refers to the scientific maturity we ought to present from now on. Our philosophical and political aspirations can be in our favor now, but only we can do something more creative to conquer hearts and souls, and transform homeopathy into a cultural fact. It demands a collective endeavor. Requires maximum participation. The institutions - as we all know - are difficult experiences. In general, they remind us of the difficulties that involve mutual growth. General agreements are more efficient for democratizing experiences than voting, since consensus does not produce losers. Every participant is successful a priori, because the results are not impinged but written by multiple voices.

Homeopathy is a cause. But homeopathy's reason - is always good to say - is not in itself. It's in the subjects. And it is in their name that we should listen and make us heard. So we can have another reason.