Comparison of aluminum toxicology and homeopathic Alumina: a mixed methods study

Christine Wittenburg¹*, Jean E. Duckworth¹

¹University of Central Lancashire, United Kingdom
* Corresponding author email cwittenburg@hotmail.com

Abstract

Toxicology forms part of homeopathy. The founder of homeopathy, Samuel Hahnemann, incorporated many toxicological symptoms in his Materia Medica. These symptoms are part of the information homeopathic practitioners relay on to choose the appropriate medication for their patients. This medication is administered in form of ultra-high dilutions. Hahnemann also developed Materia Medica on the base of provings done with high diluted substances only – simply because these substances did not have a known toxicology at his time. Alumina is one of these substances. Today we possess a reliable toxicology of aluminum and its compounds. The objective of this study was to determine the grade of concordance between homeopathic (highly diluted) Alumina and aluminum toxicology. A striking concordance will add to evidence of homeopathically potentized substances.

The present was a literature-based investigation conducted from a phenomenologist stance. The design is a novel one. Symptoms of aluminum intoxication were obtained from case reports published in scholarly journals. 70 original research articles containing case-reports of 5 aluminum-induced diseases served for the extraction of over 300 symptoms. These symptoms were compared to Hahnemann’s Alumina proving symptoms.

A review of modern investigations of the toxic effects of aluminum showed that the conventional medical paradigm and basic science are just starting to explore the huge number of noxious effects the metal has on human, animal and plant health. Qualitative explorations of the relevant homeopathic literature (toxicology in homeopathy and Alumina in randomized controlled trials) resulted in the finding that toxicology plays a minor role in modern homeopathy and that Alumina has been poorly investigated.

The result of the quantitative part of this study – the comparison of proving and toxicology obtained from clinical cases – shows an uneven picture. It leads to only partly significant concordances between symptoms from both sources which are strong in core areas of Alumina’s remedy action while the overall comparison shows a coincidence of 50.76% (39.76% for symptoms probably produced by UHDs).

This study has to be seen as a pilot for a literature-based proof of the evidence of homeopathic potencies. There remains much to be done, especially in the realm of homeopathic proving and its design. Hahnemann’s procedure – to rely on sensible provers – should be reconsidered. The reproving of Alumina should be envisaged.
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