

Ian Watson interviewed by Katherine Armitage in March 2000.

K.A.: You recently brought out a revised copy of your book, *A Guide to the Methodologies of Homoeopathy*. The first edition sold ten thousand copies - did you think it was going to be so popular?

I.W.: No I didn't, but then I didn't think it wouldn't be either, so I suppose it's a pleasant surprise, and having said that people tell me it is a good book. Also, people have told me that there isn't an equivalent book still. I think it just found a niche. It is interesting to me to that it has become required reading at quite a few places, that's nice.

It's a philosophy book in a sense isn't it?

It is, but I would like to think it is a practical philosophy book. It is a philosophy book, but it's a way of applying that philosophy in practice. It is meant to stimulate the idea that there is no limit to how many ways we can apply the principles in practice.

You have moved into other areas, different ways of looking at cases?

Very much so. To the extent that when I was revising the book recently for the new edition, it was quite a challenge for me to get myself back into the space that I was in eleven years ago when I wrote the first edition, because I realised that is not who I am any more. It is not what I do anymore, and I suppose it is like any skill - there is a time when you do it consciously and you are pretty much working it out on the job. I am less inclined to think in terms of strategy and analysis these days. I am more inclined to work with whatever presents in a very immediate way.

Do you think that you might write another book based on the work you are doing now, or are you still exploring those ideas?

I am still exploring, but then I was exploring when I wrote that book, so

I would say that is possible. One thing that I see that is a possibility, a kind of fancy I entertain, would be to write a book which is not just for homeopaths but which demonstrates how the principles of homeopathy could be seen as principles for life, principles for living. I could reach a wider audience that way. I haven't found a way yet to communicate that effectively, but maybe I will.

It sounds a bit Taoist.

Yeah..a bit Taoist! I am a bit Taoist.

That is something that is influencing your work now or has been for a long time?

Has been for a long time. Not only Taoism. I like Taoism and I always go back to it because it is a philosophy based on observation of nature, as I believe is any true healing system. To me, it has to be rooted in phenomena that naturally occur if you allow them to, but it makes homeopathy seem like the new kid on the block. I see that Taoism is a cosmology rather than a methodology. Homeopathy is more in the realm of a methodology, an application of a basic understanding of natural law, whereas Taoism is much, much broader than that. I could leave homeopathy behind, but I always go back to Taosim!

What do you think about the classical homeopaths who are interested in finding the 'core dilemma' or disturbance in the patient, what Misha Norland calls the 'Holy Grail' of Homoeopathy or what Linda Johnson calls their 'point of pain'. Do you think this is an ideal form of homeopathy to aspire to or do you think it is just another form of intent?

I suspect it is more idealistic than ideal, in the sense that it is not that attainable all of the time or even most of the time. I have heard people like Sankaran say, and even I believe Linda in her interview says, that it is something one aspires towards without ever really expecting that it is going to be obtainable even in the majority of cases. First of all, my interest has been in looking for those things that can be simply taught

to a large number of people - that which will be effective for a majority, rather than that which is specific to a few. The other answer is my interest increasingly these days is that I am looking more for the 'point of joy' than the 'point of pain'. That is a fairly recent insight I have had into the bias that homeopathy has towards suffering and towards disease, and recognising that that is only one side of the coin. My own interest as a healer, as an educator now, is to see whether we can actually go beyond that in homeopathy. Whether we can connect people directly with their point of pleasure, with their point of love.

Do you think that we will all get the results that we intend using our own individual methods?

I think only to some extent that is true. I have heard it said that we all get the homoeopath we deserve! Maybe it is true, I don't know. I think it is important for homoeopaths to recognise what is behind their practice. What I mean by that is: what do they bring of themselves? This is an area of personal self-exploration worth going into. I feel that what makes a powerful healer is someone who has a powerful healing intention in general. What I mean by in general, is that they don't claim to know necessarily what that person needs, and this is an area where I think homoeopaths get into trouble - that we think we know what kind of healing a person may need at that particular time. I know that I have done that and come unstuck many times. But I think we can have a general desire to bring about the highest outcome. In the same way that we can have a genuine desire to be of service and to give of our best. I think this certainly colours, in a positive way, the interactions we have.

Beyond that, I think we have to recognise that healing is not within our hands, just as life and death is not within our hands. The moment that we start to think it is - that's what I see causes problems, and that is when the fears come in. If we think that we are responsible for whether someone not only gets well or doesn't, but if we think that we are personally responsible for whether they live or die, then we don't sleep so well at night. Then we feel we have to be insured in case something 'bad' happens that we hadn't intended. Then we need to protect ourselves against possible horrible outcomes. At that moment I feel we cease to be good healers. We have ceased to be active healers, because we are now operating from a place of fear. We are allowing

our own fears to get in the way of being of true service. So for me it is important that we operate from a place of trust, that is more important than what we intend, that we trust that ultimately life heals itself and that we are all on a self-healing journey, and also we trust that death is part of life.

We see a very small snapshot of a person's life and sometimes we draw a big conclusion on the basis of that. I feel that we have to learn increasingly to be humble enough to say, well, actually we don't know the truth of this. The fact that the person went to hospital doesn't necessarily mean what we think it means. Maybe they needed to take some time out in hospital!

That goes back to what you were saying about process, knowing where you are with the person you are working with.

Yes, and knowing the limits and boundaries of what you can do at any time. Of course, you don't know what they are until you reach them, it's paradoxical. If you find yourself in a situation that brings up a lot of fear then it is showing you, in some ways, the area for your own healing, it's like your own growth potential is being revealed in that interaction. That is one of the beauties of working with other people, that we get to self-heal at the same time!

Do you see homeopathy then as being a holistic form of medicine which it is traditionally thought of?

No I don't. I believe that it aspires to be, but I don't believe that it is in its present form. Because a system of healing has to embrace all of life to be holistic, and it needs to include things like an awareness of what kind of diet is healthy, what kind of lifestyle is healthy, and although Hahnemann alluded to these things in the *Organon*, very few practitioners I know embrace that within their practice to what I would see as its fullest potential. We should have appropriate exercise programmes, and perhaps spiritual disciplines sometimes when it is needed, counselling may be needed. I am not saying that the homeopath needs to *provide* all these things, but we should have a broad enough vision to recognise that they are a part of healing too. I think sometimes I, as a homeopath, have fallen into being more of a pill-pusher.

One of the things that worries me about the Holy Grail approach to homeopathy is that sometimes it gives too much emphasis to finding the remedy, as if finding the remedy is everything. I actually believe it is one small piece of a big jigsaw that is that person's life. There is also the interaction that happens between the practitioner and patient, there is also the life that the person leads when they are not in that one hour consultation once a month or whenever it is. To me, a holistic therapy has to embrace all of those things.

Perhaps the homeopath is a pointer to other things?

Hopefully. I think for a lot of people homeopathy is a doorway and it's a doorway into the world of energy and energy healing, and it can be a doorway into the world of increased self-responsibility for your own health and that of your family. So I think that homeopathy is tremendously needed right now. Because people reach the limits of what allopathic medicine can do, they need a doorway, they need to be able to go somewhere else. Sometimes we go into the room called 'homeopathy' and we think that is it. For me that hasn't been it. It has been a stepping stone to other things, and I recognise it as that for people that I have worked with as patients. It has been true of them too. Homeopathy was something that they needed for a while to get them to a certain point, then they needed to be able to let go of that also. I think that is part of the development of homeopathy as a healing art, to recognise its part in the larger scheme of healing. I think sometimes homeopaths are a bit too attached to the idea that homeopathy has a monopoly on healing, which I simply don't believe. There are so many diverse ways of healing and I don't see the evidence that homeopathy does it all the time for everyone.

Do you think that the Lakeland college is like a stepping stone for people to go in their own direction?

It has as one of its aims the idea that if we allow the space and give the support and encouragement, then people will find their own way. To me one of the cornerstones of homeopathy is individualisation. I feel, in some ways, that it is even more important than the law of similars. I see that a lot of times in homeopathy we adhere to individualisation in

our case work but we don't look at that possibility in terms of our education. We tend to train people in very much standardised ways. I feel everybody has some inherent gift and that the task, as educators or as a college, is not to just impart a specific body of knowledge, which is then passed on from one generation to the next. The task is to make the knowledge available and at the same time facilitate the internal development of the practitioner, such that they get in touch with what I would call their own 'inner healer', then they can tap the knowledge in their own way. The aim is to be non-dogmatic and to allow people the freedom to practice in the way that actually suits them, that fits them.

I know from my own experience that I learned from some great teachers, but after a while I realised some of the things that I learned were like a badly fitting jacket, they did not actually fit me, they fitted the person who taught me. Then I had to cast that off and find a way that suited me. Some people say, well, that is a necessary part of the process of becoming a practitioner, but I question that. Maybe it wasn't necessary to take it all on in the first place. I am not convinced that the way I was trained and my trainers were trained is therefore the best way.

You have different opinions from Hahnemann on certain points of homeopathic philosophy, which parts of the philosophy do you question?

First of all there is very little in Hahnemann I disagree with, very little, hardly any in fact. I'll give an analogy. I have studied a lot of the new physics, this interests me greatly, quantum mechanics, relativity theory. What the physicists came to recognise from the 1920s and 30s was not that Newton was wrong, but that Newton's world view was limited and that what he did within that worldview was fantastic, but it was still a limited worldview that only allowed for certain possibilities and did not hold true in every circumstance. I suppose that is how I feel about Hahnemann's teaching now. What he did, within the times that he was born and grew up and lived and practiced was fantastic, and was limited. I aim to extend, I suppose, without throwing out any of what Hahnemann said, I believe we can build on it and we can extend it into areas where he couldn't have taken it, simply because he is not around now, he was around then.

I feel, as consciousness evolves, homeopathy needs to evolve also, so to give some examples, concrete examples: Hahnemann, it seems to me, emphasised the side of homeopathy that involves gathering data, clinical observation, making careful notes of symptomatology, matching that to a remedy picture. Now we know that works, just as we know what Newton described in terms of the movement of the planets works but, nonetheless, I feel there are other ways of working which we have developed through, for example, areas like psychology, from the contributions of Jung and Freud and people like this. We recognise the value of the interaction now between practitioner and patient in ways that Hahnemann, I don't think, could have known about. I look to emphasise this as well without detracting from what Hahnemann said. This to me is an area we could be emphasising more now, and a lot of homeopaths are.

Similarly, he emphasises the removal of suffering which, yes, it is a fantastic thing, there is plenty of suffering in the world, but I also see that if you stop at the removal of suffering in some ways it leaves a void, and I feel there is also an opportunity for helping people to develop their potential. That is an area that I found, using only with the tools of homeopathy, I lacked the ability to work in. He also advocated similars. This might be a controversial example, but he seemed to have the idea that he had found 'the' law of healing, but according to Taoism every coin has two sides. So if there is a law of healing that is based on similars there must also be a law of healing based on opposites. Hahnemann chose to look at the paths which he called antipathic medicine and allopathic medicine, which he said were detrimental, but there are other systems based on opposites which are very gentle and work very well, like flower essences for example. I do not feel it is any discredit to Hahnemann if we take what he gave us and try and extend it.

What do you think about getting the balance between the intuitive and academic in homeopathic education? Homeopaths, especially ones who had a very academic training, it seems, want other people to have to go through what they went through.

Yes, I think to some extent that is true. Although it is interesting how many people in homeopathic education now actually had trainings which were probably apprentice style, for want of a better term. Many

people who are in the key positions did not actually go through that kind of training. I certainly wonder about it. I know from my own experience that for me the most potent healers I have met have not been academics, so I start from that point. What makes someone a good healer? What makes someone an effective healer is actually being true to who they are. They are centred in who they are and in what they do. I have met some very interesting healers working in diverse ways and, whether or not they use a therapy like homeopathy, to me the ones who were the most potent, were the ones who had a clear sense of self, first of all. They had a sense of who they were, they had a love for humanity, they were open-hearted, they had a desire to be of service, they had a compassionate heart and a loving presence, a healing presence, which was something they had cultivated through their own life experience, not usually through an academic training.

So whilst I can see that homeopathy requires that we take on board a certain body of knowledge, I feel that if the cost of that is that we don't also develop as human beings and as healers in a deeper sense, then I feel that the cost is too high, that something is also lost. I see the evidence of this in the fact that a lot of people do a very thorough training and yet, at the end of four or five years hard study, they are still left with the feeling of not-quite-readiness. That says to me that the training is unbalanced. It is not that the academic should not be there, but it needs to be balanced with something else, with internal work as well.

Just a couple of weeks ago I had the experience of a student who I didn't know from another college talking to me. She was in her third year I think, and she thought her college was great and the tutors were great, but she expressed how difficult homeopathy was. I said 'really, what's so difficult about it?' She said that even the tutors who were good at it, who were teaching it, told you that the four years training will get you to a point where you are ready to start, but really it takes at least 30 years to be any good at it! I kind of raised my eyebrows at this and said 'do you believe that is true?' She said 'well, I don't have anything else to go on, so I suppose I have to believe it, if that is what my teachers are telling me.' This I think is a popular idea in homeopathy. It has become associated with a long and arduous struggle, with extended periods of poverty and deprivation, loss of your friends, and so on and so on! The fact that it has become that way doesn't necessarily mean it has to be that way.

I think that if I could make a comparison with what happened in the

psychotherapy world when NLP came along, it wasn't unusual for someone to go into therapy for five years, or analysis for ten years, that became the norm, so everybody says that is how it has to be. Then when people developed NLP techniques, they realised that what some people were spending three years to do, they could do in five minutes, effectively. So I say if that is possible in one area, then it is possible in another, so I question that. To me, something that takes as long as thirty years to get any good at - basically, if we adhere to that idea, we have built in our own obsolescence. Homeopathy as a system of healing is probably not going to offer much to the majority of the world's population on that basis. I feel it needs to be much more accessible than that, and it could be much easier.

You place quite a lot of emphasis on the internal work. How do you think that is best acquired or learned?

Again, I don't know. It is work in progress, so I really wouldn't claim to have found anything like the best way. I feel like we are fumbling beginners at that. It is kind of a novel idea within homeopathic education but, I suppose, I am becoming aware that what needs to be built into any training is a recognition of the need for development of self-awareness on the part of the students. It needs to be gentle, and it needs to be supportive. I feel in many ways it mirrors what a good healer will do in practice, which is to do with creating a safe environment; creating a supportive relationship with the patient they are working with; encouraging increased self-responsibility and self-reflection; being as non-judgmental as possible; not imposing any particular agenda. These are things we have to do with our patients and I feel that as educators these are the things that we should be modelling to our students.

Another of the problems I see with the academic approach is that it emphasises the content over the process. I feel that needs to be balanced. Healing essentially is a process, and I think there is no amount of 'content' that can necessarily get you to a place where you become a process facilitator. You become effective as a facilitator through going through your own process, and then sharing that process with other people. So this is an area where I would like to see more of a balance. If we take out some of the content, make it less

rigorous academically but the students' process, their self-discovery journey is given more emphasis and more space - if you do that, it seems to speed things up.

That makes sense. In a time when things are being seen to be speeding up generally, when we are told that 24 hours in the day now is equivalent to 16.

We are on internet time now, everything is 7 times faster or something!

Going on from there to your idea of intuition and that it is a fast way of accessing information which years of book study may not match up to?

They may or may not get you to that place. I agree, and again I would like to see a balance, because I don't think we need to throw out the analytical side of homeopathy. But it concerns me when I see and hear well-respected homeopaths saying, and I think I could quote Peter Chappell from a recent article - although I have plenty of respect for the work Peter is doing - he says he can't see how any homeopath can function effectively in the future who doesn't use a computer. He is not alone in that opinion, but that concerns me because to me that is like saying that no-one is going to be able to communicate in the future who doesn't have internet access. That is not true. It is a tool only, and if we mistake the tool for the process of healing then I think that is a misperception.

I would like to see homeopathy available to anyone who wants to learn it whether or not they are computer literate or even want to be. We should be able to teach it in ways that simple people can pick up and understand. They learn it today and they use it tomorrow. That to me is the potential that homeopathy has, that it could really reach the grassroots of humanity en masse, not just a few well-off people working in offices with electricity supplies.

How do you see that happening, how could that be organised, to bring it to so many people?

Ironically enough, Peter is someone who is doing good work in that

area. He is taking homeopathy through his projects to places like Venezuela and Eastern Europe and so on, and I support what he is doing. I feel that first of all we have to let go of the idea that it is an expert-dependent system of healing. I think there is still an idea, that is widely believed within the homeopathic profession, that we somehow need to hold on to the knowledge and that people will harm themselves or each other using the tools of homeopathy, and I really don't believe that is true. There is a long tradition in homeopathy of home prescribing, many people have kits that they use in their homes with very scanty indications. That is how I started. My experience was that it wasn't damaging, it wasn't harmful, on the contrary it was helpful. That is the area I would like to promote.

I remember Robin Murphy saying that the highest form of homeopathy is first-aid. It took me a long time to understand that, and now I understand it I see the wisdom in that. It is not only the highest because it is the easiest to learn and reproduce, it is also the most prophylactic. How many times do we hear of a chronic ailment that dates back to a first-aid acute situation. If only those people had known about *Ignatia* in their home, they would never have had to consult that professional later.

I would like to see *Arnica* on ambulances. Local to me we have mountain rescue teams, one or two of which are using remedies now, and they all should be using remedies. Homeopathy is economical enough that we could do this. The potencies we have already are so cheap to reproduce, we could even teach people how to reproduce it themselves, but I think the desire to hold on to it and to be experts is a tempting thing. I think we need to be willing to give it away more, otherwise it works against our bigger aims. Our bigger aim is for homeopathy to be accessible to everyone, yet we are setting it up in such a way that this is going to become impossible, because we make it computer-dependent, and we make it long and arduous and difficult.

You were interested in healing from a young age, what circumstances brought that out in you, what early formative experiences led you to this work?

I suppose a combination of my own life traumas as a teenage adolescent which led me on a path trying to find some deeper meaning to my life, and a simple interest in that area. It is very hard for me to say where that came from because I didn't grow up in a family of healers or doctors particularly. I had a grandmother who had an

interest in things herbal and so on, but from age 15/16 onwards I was reading books on alternative healing. I had a set of Bach Flower remedies when I was 16 and I was exploring herbal remedies before I got into homeopathy. The interest was there and I suppose I gave myself the freedom to follow it. I was pretty bored with what was happening at school and so I spent my time reading the things that interested me. My parents gave me something special - what they gave me was the freedom to do that. They didn't push me down a career path or something that didn't really fit me, and for that I am really grateful. I was left to find my own way and I am very happy with that.

You are a very reassuring and encouraging teacher, and your students gain a great confidence to practice - is this an important part of the training at The Lakeland College?

I suppose the Lakeland college does reflect that to a large extent, but like any other place some students are more confident than others, just as some people are more confident than others. There is a certain level of confidence that we get from knowledge and skills and this is the level that is available from any homeopathic training. You learn how to take a case, how to analyse, how to find a remedy. There is a level of confidence that comes just through familiarity of doing that enough times, but I feel that it only takes you so far. When you are challenged with difficult life situations, potentially death situations as well, that doesn't always carry you through. Sometimes you open the book and what you want to find isn't there, that wonderful keynote symptom - its not there! These things can shatter confidence quite quickly, that gap between how you thought it was going to be and how you found it. So I have learned there is a deeper kind of self-confidence that comes from another place.

The simplest way I can relate it is to say that it comes from being yourself. There is a time when you can take on other peoples ways of doing things, and there is also a time when you need to let go of that. Your deeper confidence comes from your willingness to let go of what you learned and just be yourself. It goes back to individualisation. If I am encouraging, what I hope to encourage is not that people become clones of what I do, it is that they become more of who they are. Then they do what they would do naturally. I am not invested in what they might be. Occasionally it appears to people that I am doing things that

might be risky or strange or esoteric, but I am just doing what comes naturally. If you follow your interest then you have the enthusiasm for the subject, you will always be willing to learn, it is not an effort. You will also have the passion to share it with other people and encourage them.

You have brought many ideas across into homeopathy from other traditions such as traditional Chinese medicine, yoga, astrology, and the Yacqui Indian tradition. Does this make your practice and teaching of homeopathy more colourful, does it keep you inspired?

Yes. It is certainly more interesting to me than anatomy, physiology and pathology! Again, I suppose what intrigues me is how much energy people put into studying things that fundamentally don't interest them, and I wonder why they do that. That doesn't make much sense to me, and not only does it make it more colourful it makes it more *real* for me, because homeopathy as a system of energy healing, I feel, needs to root itself in an understanding of energy. Which means an understanding of the basis of all of life. So the places where I look to understand homeopathy are the traditions that have developed an understanding of all of life. To me, homeopathic philosophy really starts with understanding things like the energetic basis of matter, the inter-connectedness of all things, the sacredness and divinity of all things, the fact that nothing is apart in nature, that everything is part of a greater whole. This, to me, is real philosophy. It is a philosophy that is shared by every ancient and mystical tradition on the planet, and I feel that in order to root homeopathy in something really solid we have to dig much deeper than what we traditionally call 'homeopathic philosophy'.

You like collecting maps of consciousness, are there any you are working on at the moment?

Well, no! I am going over familiar ground. There is nothing particularly new I am studying. I am still studying what the ancient Chinese wrote about healing, I am still looking at traditions like Taoism, in particular. I also like the Zen tradition. I think Zen has a lot in common with homeopathy. I like the minimalism of Zen, how it has the ability to

condense a lot into very little.

Can you give some examples?

One of the things I like in the Zen philosophy is the idea that everything is okay as it is. Everything remains okay as long as we don't add anything to that okayness. What I have noticed is that at homeopathy school we learn lots of things, but we also *add* lots of things. To me, the power of homeopathic philosophy is that it is very simple. We add things that then make it complex, and one of the things I learnt from the Zen tradition is that they teach very little, what they do is take away. You get rapped on the knuckles every time you have *added* something that should not be there. Which means that the training is a training of letting go. It is a training of getting rid of the excess baggage so that you are free, free to be awake to the moment and to spontaneously respond to whatever presents itself. For some of the Zen masters this was a matter of life or death - the Samurai, they based their whole life on that. For us it is a little bit more mundane but the principle is the same. If we want to be free as practitioners, then we have to be free of the limited ideas that come from the past that we now impose on the present.

Do you think in that case the setting of the classroom is not necessarily appropriate, perhaps a walk around the park would be better?

Yes, very much so, and similarly the setting of a consulting room is also something of a false construct, and to me it always feels like a compromise going into a classroom setting. Often it does not feel like the place that is an ideal environment for learning.

You do a lot of travelling and teaching. Do you see these as opportunities for a different kind of healing to running a private practice?

Yes, and a lot of the healing I do these days is healing homeopaths. I

have the privilege of being often invited to work with a group of homeopaths, maybe for a day or maybe for a weekend - something like that. In that space I feel that the work I am doing is not that different from the work I would do in a consultation. I go into a situation, I meet a new group or sometimes it is a group I have met before - in which case it is a follow up - and I assess where the group is at that time, and I respond accordingly. I don't tend to go with a set agenda as to what I am going to teach, so I am very much responding to whatever comes up. My hope is that we can explore, go into something together that results in an expansion, an increased sense of awareness and potentially some healing.

Some of the feedback I get suggests that happens. People write to me or ring me up occasionally and say, you know there is something you said on that day, that we did two years ago, and since then I haven't worried about that in my practice. That is healing as far as I can see, some healing happened in that moment. The person was able to let go of a fear that had limited them. So that is one of the ways I am doing healing in disguise, I like to think in terms of the ripples that come from that. If I have enabled one practitioner to be a little more effective and a little less anxious, less limited in what they allow themselves to do with their patients, I have no idea how busy their practice is, but think how many people that has reached potentially. So I have learned not to worry about the numbers side. Again, as long as I do what I feel is right for me then healing results will come from that.

You produce many tapes for homeopathic students and homeopaths. Can you talk a little bit about these?

Yes. I suppose the tapes are simply a way of putting out some of the things that I am exploring to a wider number of people that I would not otherwise reach. What is nice about the tapes is that it allows me to move on fast without feeling I have to keep on saying the same thing over and over again.

You have developed a number of diagnostic tools for homeopaths, which of these do you most like working with?

Self-awareness. I feel it is the key to case taking and working with patients. What I mean by that is simply noticing what happens in my own energy body, and where it happens, when I am interacting with someone else, and becoming conscious of that to the point where it becomes useful information. I feel that on one level it is the simplest thing I have learned, but there is also no end to the depth of it. There are levels of subtlety in that, and I feel that everybody has that inherently - the capacity for increased sensitivity and self-awareness which enables us to go deeper with our clients.

Something that you have said is that you are just teaching people what they already know.

Sometimes just to uncover - that is, to let go of the things you have learned and to uncover what was naturally there - is often all that is needed. I have seen so many people come into homoeopathy and they have a natural flair for it and a natural sense of what was going on, and after three years of training they have lost that and they don't trust it anymore. That distresses me greatly and so my goal then is not to teach that person anything new, but just to encourage them to a place where they are willing to let go of those things that they have taken on so that they can restore what was already there, and they can trust it again.

In a seminar you gave entitled *The Inner Game of Homoeopathy* you talk about ideas popping into your mind and about knowing something bodily just at the point when you need it in a consultation.

Yes, and I think that is a product of simply being in tune with the moment. If you are in tune with the moment, what you need will come to you. I choose to believe that. I can't prove it to anyone other than to say try it for yourself, just try it and trust. I feel that if you trust what comes, a cycle develops - the more you trust it the more it comes. The problem I see is that a lot of people have the gut feeling and then they override it, often because they feel they have to justify it to somebody. To me the only justification is, does it help you in your work with your clients? If it does, then it doesn't matter if you can explain it to me or not.

I think that you have said that you do not need to work out how you are going to get somewhere - you should just trust.

Yes. I learned a lot from studying R.D. Laing's work, the scottish psychiatrist. He had the therapeutic idea that if someone has been in prison for twenty years and the door happens to be open, it is not necessarily that effective to spend a lot of time working out how they got in there. I see a lot of that in homeopathic case taking, a lot of time spent dwelling on how you got to this point in your life - as opposed to - you are here now, where would you like to go? That is the difference between the point of pain and the point of joy. So where do you want to put that emphasis? I would rather say, where do you want to go from today? All things are possible, and what is done is done, but you are here now. Where shall we go together today? And it may not take that long.

How do your spiritual ideas fit in with your practice of homoeopathy?

I suppose I am working on it. I am healing the split in my own life such that I don't believe that there is any separation between what I believe to be true about the nature of life and the universe and how that reflects in my work as a healer - to me it is the same. Ultimately, all healing is spiritual healing because nothing is not spiritual. I agree with, I think it was Wayne Dyer who said, that we are spiritual beings having a human experience.

So in a sense spirit-centred work is the focus more than person-centred work?

Rather than ego-centred, yes. If we focus on the ego then we focus again on the pain and we focus on the suffering and we focus on what is wrong - the problems. If we focus on the spirit, then we focus on what is okay, so we can move towards that place within us that already knows that we are healed. That we are healed already.

This interview first appeared in The Homeopath, Journal of The Society of Homeopaths

