It’s an honor to affirm that the magazine Cultura Homeopática has become, at the same time, a reference and a novelty in the homeopathic field. It happened more due to the effort of the authors who – in an area of very low productivity – has concentrated their entire endeavor to present the best in research and reflection about our art, than due to the merit of all the CH team.

In this special and bilingual edition, that is annual, some of our best brains entered in our list of articles trying what all the ones who do research should look for: make phenomena talk again, unveil what is under the surface until the digging starts to show meanings, evidences, sometimes conclusions, certainly the unexpected.

The unicists are finally stepping down the pedestal to show that there is another kind of clinical “proof”. And this time without things inapplicable and showy, nor the mecanicist reduction. There are still the ones that believe in the strategy of “hiding” their brilliant cases without ask themselves to which secret posterity they will keep them in the end.

That’s why we present here this interesting case report “Treatment of chronic dishydrosis”, written by Leni Hatsue Yoshihassu. The case was elaborated by EPH’s students and teaching assistants who were inductors and witnesses of an interesting homeopathic interference in an academic environment, which has the advantage of allowing a more shared and dialogued analysis of evolution, suppression and clinical conduct.

This is also the spirit of Vanessa Guimarães’s work, who brings us her epidemiological lucidity to show that yes, a method of investigation mathematically and probabilistically measurable, and, at the same time, that respects the theoretical and practical presuppositions of homeopathic proceeding is possible. Extremely complex but also enforceable, it considers that the quantitative epidemiological chance of homeopathy is doing studies having the subject as its own control.

The work of Marcia Gutierrez et als., “Validation of techniques and methods for the impregnation of homeopathic globules”, translates the healthy awareness of validating the proceedings of homeopathic pharmacotechnique with methodic and clearing proceedings. That’s an area in which Brazilian homeopathic pharmacotechnique is, with no doubt, one of the most prolific and influent.

The editor of this magazine and Silvia W. Priven present “Some reflections about symptoms in homeopathy”, trying to evidence what can be called the atom of homeopathy: the symptom. That’s a vital subject, even being a discussion postponed by homeopathic community. Especially when this point of view doesn’t starts from something given, but understood from its roots: What does configure a symptom? How can it be divided? Which are the semiotic and therapeutic implications involved in its admission, for example, that there are constitutive symptoms and marker symptoms in the evolution of a clinical case?

We still have the erudite article "Did Hahnemann plagiarize Thomas de Aquina?", by Silvia W. Priven, who uses the historiographical technique of analysis. She approaches the polemic question about the supposed plagiarism made by Hahnemann, who would have evoked ideas and entire texts of Thomas de Aquina without mentioning him as a source. The Argentinean homeopath Masi-Elizalde was pretty convinced of this aspect and pursued anxiously an impugnment that could satisfy him intellectually. Let the readers check in which plagues his pleas circulate.

Amarilys de Toledo César et als., in “Dynamization techniques. Divergences between the proposals of Hahnemann, and today’s practices”, also evokes a fundamental pharmacotechnique question: Was there any kind of change in relation to a better comprehension of the fundaments established by Hahnemann?

The article "Ontogenesis of illness", by our gaucho colleague Renato Sampaio de Azambuja, develops reflections about Maturana’s autopoiesis, showing that the interfaces in perception of the health-disease phenomenon that touches a vitalist rationality. So points of interface to homeopathy underlies in the article, even that any linear transposition of an episteme to the other should present the traditional difficulties of linkage.

"Before stopping
at some last point that consecrates it
Every Thought sends forth
One Toss of the Dice"

“One Toss of the Dice”, by Stéphane Mallarmé
The article “Biomedical semiotics and its limits: opening up paths between the subtle and the evident”, by Amarylis Triana, follows the path of her thesis and shows that the tune and the differences between different semiotics can be a way of knowing the specificities of each rationality. And it’s in this trajectory that she detects the problems of biomedical semiotics.

We couldn’t forget to mention in this edition, with the explicit purpose of make a homage to a person who will be recognized in some point of History as the one who transmitted to us definitively an inexorable path to the elucidation of infinitesimal doses. We are talking about Jacques Benveniste, the French immunologist who, among other contributions to immunopathology and alergology, dared to look for necessary explanations - against the bet of scientificist fundamentalism - to build a more scientific rule to homeopathy. His dease occurred on October 2nd, in Paris, in 69 years old. Press announced the fact all over the world and at big Brazilian centers.

Even if basic research isn’t enough to validate alone the homeopathic proceedings, Benveniste relighted the debate that used to be warm and took it to the point of incandescence inside the hardcore of contemporary science. What drove more the attention it was the emphasis on the fact that he would have turned in to a joke among the scientists due to the methodological flows - admitted afterwards - in his famous work about “Water Memory”, published in Nature magazine in 1988. The same media also published that he would have died “convinced” of his pretense “”. What was not published is that his theories about the biological action of infinitesimal doses has been rescued in European important labs and research centers as a valuable contribution to nanotechnology and to the behavior of water.

Even if the redeem haven’t occurred the most important here is to emphasize that Benveniste enters the rol of the ones who feed knowledge with the enlightenment progress, even if the cost was his own reputation, maybe the abbreviation of his life. Canguilhen, Thomas Khun and Paul Feyrabend already mentioned that every challenge to established science generates, in the first moment, refusal and repulse. Only the future, always more indulgent and fixing, reserves a judgment less full of prejudices to the ones that dare to roll the dice of uncertainty in the addicted board of convictions.