

Homeopathy and National-Socialism*

Lore Fortes

Abstract

It is a well known, yet still polemical issue the support homeopathy received from the Nazi regime. As a fact, National Socialism favored so-called natural therapies as a whole, as well as their integration with conventional medicine into one single approach known as *Neue Deutsche Heilkunde* (New German Medicine). The latter has come under the attention of scholars very recently, however the specific role of homeopathy has only been very sparsely address. It is difficult to trace the particular paths of homeopathy at that time, since, on the one hand, it was intertwined with the other types of alternative medicine included in the project of the New German Medicine, and on the other, it shared the agenda of conventional medicine against lay practice. This article aims at discussing expressions particular to homeopaths as appearing in journals of the National Socialist period.

Keywords

History of medicine; Germany; 20th century; National-socialism; New German Medicine; Homeopathy

A Homeopatia no Nacional-Socialismo

É bem conhecido, embora ainda questão polêmica, o apoio que a homeopatia recebeu do regime nazista. Na verdade, o Nacional-Socialismo favoreceu as terapias naturais como um todo, assim como a integração destas com a medicina convencional numa abordagem única conhecida como *Neue Deutsche Heilkunde* (Nova Medicina Alemã). Essa tem começado a receber atenção da parte dos estudiosos recentemente, no entanto, o papel específico da homeopatia tem sido estudado muito raramente. É difícil traçar o percurso da homeopatia dessa época pois, por um lado, estava intimamente ligada com as demais terapias alternativas representadas na Nova Medicina Alemã e, do outro, partilhava a posição da medicina convencional contra a prática leiga. O presente artigo discute, assim, as manifestações expressas especificamente por homeopatas em periódicos da época nazista.

Palavras-chave

História da medicina; Alemanha; Século XX; Nacional-Socialismo; Nova Medicina Alemã; Homeopatia

* This article is an updated reworking from one chapter the author's doctoral dissertation "A Institucionalização da Homeopatia no Brasil e na Alemanha: Uma Análise Sociológica dos Conflitos e Convergências entre seus Agentes" (Universidade de Brasília, 2000). (Institutionalization of Homeopathy in Brazil and Germany: A Sociological Analysis of the Conflicts and Convergences among its Agents). Field research for this project was carried out in Germany funded by DAAD/CNPq

Introduction

A well-known and still polemical issue is the support given by the Nazi regime to homeopathy.¹ The rise to power of National-Socialism (NS) in 1933 was attended with the official recognition of so-called natural therapies, including homeopathy. In 1937, the *Reichsärzterordnung* (Medical Regulation of the Reich) established a new professional statute, which redefined the medical specialties.

In this context, a new health policy was introduced, known as *Neue Deutsche Heilkunde* (New German Medicine), that aimed at synthesizing together conventional medicine, natural therapies and homeopathy.² In this context, it is very difficult to discuss separately the status of homeopathy, since NS approached all these areas of medicine in a linked manner. By the same token, it is also very difficult to inquire on the specific position of homeopathic doctors at that time.

Moreover, the role of medicine and doctors under NS was long kept under silence; first discussions appeared in the 1960s, and only in 1980 a public debate was carried out, during the *Gesundheitstag* (Health Day) in Berlin.³ Until the mid-80s, the medical subjects receiving most attention were euthanasia, racial policy – and its consequences on the emigration and persecution of doctors – and other issues related to fascism.⁴ On these subjects there is extensive literature.

Also the *Neue Deutsche Heilkunde* came under the spotlight in the 1980s, however, the particular situation of homeopathy remains sparsely approached until this day. Since most available sources on the health policy of NS link all alternative medicines together, I chose to focus my analysis on the most relevant contemporary sources, i.e. medical journals in general, as well the specifically homeopathic ones: *Hippokrates*, *Allgemeine Homöopathische Zeitung*, *Leipziger Populären Zeitschrift für Homöopathie*, *Deutsches Ärzteblatt*, *Münchener medizinische Wochenschrift*, *Natur und Gesundheit* and *Naturärztliche Rundschau*.

Analysis of literature shows an immediate and clear feature: critics met immense difficulties to separate the discourse and propaganda of NS from actual reality. For this reason, I took care not to let my research be affected by the criticism directed against NS as a whole, but to try to understand what was the positions that the homeopaths adopted at that time. Remembering that the goal is to approach a particular time in the history of homeopathy in Germany, the first question that one asks is: was homeopathy, indeed, acknowledged in its specificity, when the goal of the *Neue Deutsche Heilkunde* was to effect a synthesis between conventional medicine, homeopathy and the remainder of natural therapies? To answer to this question it must be further kept in mind that the natural therapies were practiced by lay-people and that the naturalistic movement that gave rise to this professional group in Germany was as large and significant as to threaten the structure and reliability of conventional medicine.

In this context, a second question emerges: did the German homeopathic doctors actually want the synthesis proposed by NS? As a fact, such synthesis represented a mixture between

¹ Robert Jütte, “O Papel da Homeopatia na Alemanha Nazista: Uma Avaliação Histórica”, *Revista de Homeopatia* 72, No 1/2 (2009):1-5.

² Gerhard Wagner, „Begrüßungsansprache des Reichärztesführers Dr. Wagner bei der gemeinsamen Tagung am 20. April 1936”, *Hippokrates* 7, No 14 (1936): 371-2.

³ Alfred Haug, *Die Reichsarbeitsgemeinschaft für eine Neue Deutsche Heilkunde (1935/36): Ein Beitrag zum Verhältnis von Schulmedizin, Naturheilkunde und Nationalsozialismus* (Husum: Matthiesen, 1985).

⁴ Doris Kratz & Hans-Michael Kratz, “Neue Deutsche Medizin und Neue Deutsche Heilkunde: Entscheidungsformen der Anpassung an ideologische und politische Zielsetzungen der faschistischen Diktatur von 1933 bis 1945” (doctoral thesis, Leipzig Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig, 1985), 5 ; see also Walter Wuttke-Groneberg, *Medizin im Nationalsozialismus*, 2nd ed. (Rothenburg: Schwäbische Verlagsanstalt, 1982), 5.

university-trained physicians and lay-people with no theoretical learning whatsoever but extensive practical experience in therapeutics resulting in a wide questioning of the efficacy of medicine.

The idea of a synthesis placed all these groups – conventional and homeopathic doctors and lay naturalistic practitioners – on same professional footing. Certainly, this goal was difficult to achieve, and active resistance developed among the university-trained groups – although it is very difficult to establish the actual influence of this opposition on the dissolution of the “synthesis policy”, since, as it goes without saying, in dictatorships no one can adopt an open stance against governmental decisions. It is worth to highlight that, on the other hand, this policy had important consequences for the organization of the naturalistic movement as a new professional category that, with the enactment of a specific law – the *Heilpraktikergesetz* (Law of Lay-practice) – became fully under the control of the State.

It is surprising to find in NS a health policy aiming at a synthesis, especially by comparison to the present time, when the issue of the integration of conventional medicine and other approaches to health is once again discussed.⁵ This makes the subject of this paper particularly relevant, in order to distinguish past and current approaches to the integration of the so-called complementary and alternative medicines (CAM).

Crisis and tendencies to unification in medicine in 1933

Discussions on the existence of a crisis in medicine began by the mid-1920s and extended until 1933. Therefore, they can be included within the “pre-history” of NS, showing the beginning of tendencies that would appear later fully developed in the *Neue Deutsche Heilkunde* as the official NS policy for health. The tendency to unification in medicine was a reaction against the so-called “crisis in medicine” and the development of the lay naturalistic movement.

What were the reasons that led the times to acknowledge a “crisis in medicine”? Looking back at the social conjuncture of that time, there was an overall economic crisis affecting Germany as a whole. In the specific area of health-care, by approaching different social groups separately, as e.g. children and workers, it can be verified that health-standards were quite below desirable levels. The Prussian Minister of Welfare established in 1931 that only 10% of schoolchildren were in “good” nutritional state.⁶ Walter Wuttke-Groneberg characterizes the state of children and workers as of “hunger, wrong nutrition, cultural and mental abandonment, lack of access to medical services due to the fear of losing their jobs or due to material poverty”⁷.

On the other hand, the events of the November Revolution, cannot be neglected, as e.g. the 8-hour working day achieved in 1927. This brought further stress into the working mass due to the higher demands in performance and the consequent measures of rationalization against unemployment, leading to a significant worsening of the general health conditions.

This situation is evident in the policy adopted by the industry, as exemplified by the “*Gasolei*” – *Grosse Ausstellung für Gesundheitspflege, Soziale Fürsorge und Leibesübungen* (Grand Exposition of Health Services, Social Welfare and Physical Education). The goal of industry was to have people healthy in order to work at maximum levels of performance in a steady manner. Obviously, these

⁵ On lay medicine in the Third Reich seen as an “outsider”, see “Naturheilkunde im Dritten Reich: Aussenseiter, Schulmedizin und nationalsozialistische Machtpolitik”, *Deutsches Ärzteblatt* 92, No 3 (1995): 73.

⁶ Pohlen (1936), apud Hubert Cacik, ed., *Religions- und Geistesgeschichte der Weimarer Republik* (Düsseldorf: Palmos, 1982), 94.

⁷ Wuttke-Groneberg, 283.

economic aims of Weimar had remarkable consequences on therapeutics and the practice of conventional medicine.

The state of medicine at that time can be approached from two different perspectives. On the one hand, there was an evident worsening in the overall state of health-care, which can be verified through the increase of the mortality rate due to cardiovascular disease, cancer and diphtheria, as well as the increase of deaths associated to obstetric causes and suicide. Most contemporary doctors had no solutions against these conditions. On the other hand, although medicine witnessed impressive advancement in the early decades of the 20th century, especially in bacteriology and chemotherapy, the new discoveries did not find immediate paths of application.⁸

According to Eva-Maria Klasen, the symptoms and causes of the crisis in medicine were “the criticism against the mechanistic and materialistic view and against analytic-causal thinking, the skepticism of official medicine, relative disappointment with the slow advance of allopathic medicine, the problem of ‘quackery’ and the effects of social security”⁹.

When appraising the conjuncture of that time, it must be highlighted the role of the political and labor-movements organization, which strengthened the position of the workers and made the number of potential patients to increase, whereas medicine was poorly equipped to satisfy the demands of the population. The case of the doctor-patient relationship illustrates this point.

The promulgation of the *Krankengesetz* (Law of the Sick) in 1883 signaled the beginning of criticism against the system of social security, in particular, through the elaboration of Erwin Liek (1878-1935).¹⁰ Liek held that with the development of medicine, the doctors were gradually becoming more and more detached from their patients, and in order for this problem to be solved it was needed to revise the notion of “disease” within the framework of the “tendency to unification” in order to formulate a new model for the natural sciences.

In 1928 and 1929, Georg Honigmann (1863-1930) published an article in *Hippokrates* with the title “Tendencies to Unification in Contemporary Medicine”. His notion of “unification” was grounded on Rudolph Virchow’s ideas, who had conceived of medicine in an anthropological and humanistic framework, namely “the theory of the human being and everything human”¹¹. Honigmann further referred to the “acknowledgment of the lack of homogeneity in the global views of doctors”¹², because doctors did not approach their patients as wholes. He mentions the lay naturalistic movement but not homeopathy. From this moment on, these notions constituted the editorial policy of *Hippokrates*.

At the same time, the tendency to unification also developed a strategy to control the crisis directed against those who aimed at making profit of it, namely, the quacks. From 1933 onwards, after the promulgation of the *Krankenversicherungsgesetz* (Law of Health Insurance), conventional doctors opposed the claims of naturalistic doctors and lay practitioners to be admitted into the social security. This same protest had already been explicit in the *Doctors Meetings* of 1886 and 1887, who, on the other hand, denied both the existence of a crisis in medicine and the tendencies to unification.

⁸ Wolfgang U. Eckart, *Geschichte der Medizin* (Berlin: Springer, 1990).

⁹ Eva-Maria Klasen, “Die Diskussion über eine “Krise” der Medizin in Deutschland zwischen 1925 und 1935” (doctoral thesis, Johannes-Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, 1984), 17-60.

¹⁰ Detlef Bothe, *Neue Deutsche Heilkunde, 1933-1945* (Husum: Mathiesen, 1991).

¹¹ Georg Honigman, “Einheitsbestrebungen der Gegenwartmedizin: Zur Einführung.” *Hippokrates* 1 (1928/29): 3-15, on 15.

¹² *Ibid.*, 10.

The new policy for health: *Neue Deutsche Heilkunde*

Alfred Haug does not rate the *Neue Deutsche Heilkunde* as a central element, but as a form of community work in the *Reich*, whereupon the expression “New German Medicine” merely refers to organizational aspects. In his view, the *Neue Deutsche Heilkunde* was above all German, with the meaning that NS attributed to this term. Then, natural medicine came to be reinterpreted as a “popular community-based biological ideology” (*biologischen Volksgemeinschaftsideologie*), whereas the third element established by the new policy was “the so much hoped-for non dogmatic synthesis” (*angestrebte undogmatische Synthese*) of conventional medicine and natural therapies.¹³ These three aspects were clearly present in the formulation of the new healthy policy in an intertwined manner. Data from the 1930s show the role homeopathy played in this context.

The goal of the *Neue Deutsche Heilkunde* was to put on the same footing conventional medicine and the popular folk practices. As emblems, it chose Hippocrates, the classic locus, but more particularly Paracelsus (1493-1541), who was presented as the historical symbol of the new health policy. At that time, Paracelsus’ works were available in old German, therefore, they were translated into modern German in order to align them better with the interests of NS. It is worth to remember that already Paracelsus himself had made a point of writing in the vernacular to reach a wider public. It is significant that Paracelsus had also taken a public stance against the Jews,¹⁴ questioning their knowledge as grounded not on experience and truth, but “on chance and lies”¹⁵. On the other hand, also anti-Paracelsians, such as Erasmus of Rotterdam (1469-1536) had been anti-Semitic,¹⁶ but this was neglected by the NS.

Paracelsus had further promoted the idea that the Germans ought to prepare their own medicines rather than buying them abroad, since it would be less expensive. Moreover, since each human being, as a bodily microcosm, has connections to the region where he or she lives, each particular geographical area required a pharmacy of its own – an international pharmacy was for him something fully unconceivable. Since his ideas tended to give to Germany a preferential place, it was easy to adapt them to the ideology of NS. An example is given in the lecture by Reiter at the *Reichsgesundheitsamt* (Health Institute of the Reich), entitled “The National-Socialist Revolution of Medicine in the Health Policy”:

“Also here Paracelsus indicates the instrument seen by the people in the doctor, who is not separated from the region of origin, nature and race, so that its uses and mores can be experienced and exert influence, but only when remaining in intimate relationship. This doctor connected to his region can be somewhat different for his German patients when compared to the medical trader internationally engendered, created and trained! [...] The German doctor of the future needs to be National-Socialist from the very beginning, because he perceives the meaning of the essence of being a doctor, he needs to be National-Socialist, because in his work to live, the health of the people and popular education are intrinsically interconnected. He must be the connecting link between generations, thus, the doctor of the youth might become the trustworthy doctor of the family. By creating a sufficient number of doctors with a true National-Socialist attitude and entrusting our German youths to

¹³ Haug, 51.

¹⁴ Paracelsus, *Sieben Defensionen* (Köln, 1564, reprint Leipzig: University of Leipzig, 1928). In this book, Paracelsus writes openly against the Jews.

¹⁵ Ibid., XII: 157: “[...] allein auf geratwol und auf em trug gericht”.

¹⁶ Erasmus wrote: “The Jews establish themselves in the smallest villages and when they lend five Gulden they take six times deposit and take interests out of interest and from them even more interests, so that the pauper loses everything that he had”, apud Th. Fritsch, *Handbuch der Judenfrage* (Leipzig: Hamer, 1933), 401.

them, then we will shape the German doctor able to accompany the youth in his way to marriage, who will become again the advisor of the home and the family, and who can also be considered the best advisor on health for the new generation! In this way it can develop a new family-doctor, fatherland-doctor, and the German doctor of the people!”¹⁷

This text shows clearly the ideology behind the *Neue Deutsch Heilkunde*: the doctor had to be first a National-Socialist, then, he ought to take into account the relationships between generations, to become from a doctor to the young a reliable family doctor, to finally turn into “the doctor of the fatherland, the German doctor of the people”. Conversely, trust of families in doctors was a goal NS sought to attain and it could only be effected through the *Hausarzt* (family doctor). This particular aim was very well received by conventional doctors, who suffered from the lack of trust of patients due to the crisis in conventional medicine. Under the new policy, the doctor ought to become an educator, and the distance between him and the patient would decrease when he would become a family doctor. For these reasons, the conventional physicians were ready to assume their new function as health advisors for the new National-Socialist era.

In Reiter’s view, the doctor was connected with the ideas of home, family, generations, fatherland and people (*Volk*). The interconnection between the first three of these ideas can also be found in homeopathy, since Hahnemann had already stated that the homeopath ought to be a family doctor and as its advisor, it was also established the link with the idea of generations. So that, it can be concluded that ideologically, homeopathy agreed with the goals of NS. However, the notions of fatherland and *Volk* – an essential element at the basis of NS theory, lack completely in Hahnemann’s homeopathic theory.

As a reformulation of health policy, the *Neue Deutsche Heilkunde* was not inherently linked to the racist campaign launched against Jews, gypsies, and other groups. However, the latter was the framework within which the former evolved, leading to deeper persecutions and lack of solidarity.¹⁸ In this context, Rudolf Tischner felt compelled, in an article published in *Leipziger Populäre Zeitschrift für Homöopathie* (LPZ) in 1933, to describe Hahnemann’s genealogical tree in full detail to prove he had not been Jewish. On the other hand, it seems that one of Hahnemann’s sons-in-law, Christian Friedrich Süss was indeed a Jew, although he married Hahnemann’s daughter Amalie in a Protestant church.¹⁹ Five years later, Tischner published another paper in the same journal, entitled “Hahnemann as a German”, where besides repeating the earlier arguments, he added a physical description of Hahnemann to prove his “German traits”:

“His head undoubtedly exhibits Nordic traits, and his blue eyes are often mentioned in attempts at description, as well as in oil paintings. It is virtually superfluous to state that his thin, slightly curved nose bears no similarity to a Jewish nose. As for height, he was small and thin, his hands were thin, almost feminine. Since there is no portrait from his early years, there is nothing definite on the color of his hair, however, there is a painting that represents him at 55 or 60 years old, where the pale hair seems to correspond to a blond person.”²⁰

¹⁷ H. Reiter, “Nationalsozialistische Revolution in Medizin und Gesundheitspolitik”, *Deutsches Ärzteblatt* 63 (1933): 316-9.

¹⁸ Robert Jütte, ed. *Geschichte der deutschen Ärzteschaft: organisierte Berufs- und Gesundheitspolitik im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Köln: Deutscher Ärzte Verlag, 1997); Fridolf Kudlien, *Ärzte im Nationalsozialismus* (Köln: Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 1985).

¹⁹ Rudolf Tischner, *Geschichte der Homöopathie* (Leipzig: Willmar Schwabe, 1932-39).

²⁰ *Ibid.*, II: 62-5.

Tischner does not comment on Hahnemann's political views, only that he had been influenced by Rousseau and that he "gave great value to bourgeois freedom"²¹. On the other hand, Tischner stresses Hahnemann's translations into German, eventually having to research German terms for unknown words. Shortly, Tischner tried to present Hahnemann as a non Jewish German, since in spite of the favorable context supplied by the *Neue Deutsche Heilkunde*, homeopathy was still under attack.

Homeopathy and natural therapies within the context of "popular community-based biological ideology"

In November 23 1930, the homeopathic physician Hans Wapler wrote about the "framing of homeopathy within a global medicine"²². In this article, he mentions Karl Kötschau (1892-1982) - who in 1935 was given a chair at Jena - and his "biological medicine".²³ The *Reichärzeführer* (Chief of the Reich's Physicians) Gerhard Wagner (1888-1939) commented on this chair of biological medicine as well as on homeopathy in a speech on the *Neue Deutsch Heilkunde*: "There is currently at the University of Jena a special chair for Biological Medicine, led by the Director of the Reich's Task Group for a New German Medicine, including the teaching of natural therapies, homeopathy and allied therapies [...]"²⁴

Kötschau wrote in the homeopathic *Leipziger Populäre Zeitschrift für Homöopathie*:

"The Director of the Medical Board of the Reich created a biological medical organization. It comprises all the doctors devoted to natural approaches to healing (natural therapies, homeopathy, etc.) [...] Just as a doctor can succeed without biological thinking, also the biological doctor can do without the exact natural sciences [...] What we need is the construction and the community solidification of a medicine historically efficient in order to also be accepted by the older medicine, biological enough as to integrate popular medicine (natural therapies, homeopathy, etc.), encompassing enough as not to give up the discoveries of modern medicine. For this construction we need the collaboration of all understanding doctors."²⁵

This formulation of the new "biological medicine" contained the notions of "global medicine" and/or "popular medicine" – as Kötschau called them. One year later, however, the notion of "synthesis" replaced both. The attempt at making a synthesis between conventional medicine and the vitalistic conceptions of the natural therapies and homeopathy was actualized through the use of the notion of "holism", of which Kötschau was one of the major proponents. As a fact, the term "holism" was minted by South African general and politician Jan C. Smuts (1870-1950) and introduced in Germany by biologist Adolf Meyer. According to Kudlien, Kötschau used the term "holism" even in political discussions within the Nazi party (NSDAP), within the context of the control of the spiritual education and the worldview of the Party. For these reasons, the homeopathic doctors and pharmacists had to reinterpret homeopathy to insert it in the framework of natural medicine. For instance, this is how pharmacist Niedermayer attempted to define homeopathy:

²¹ Ibid., I: 44.

²² Hans Wapler, "Die Eingliederung der Homöopathie in die Gesamtmedizin", *Allgemeine homöopathische Zeitung* 1 (1931): 1-24; Wapler had already written on homeopathy and conventional medicine in 1926, see Hans Dreyer, "Arbeiten von Dr. med. Hans Wapler, Leipzig, aus den Jahren 1895-1935", *Allgemeine homöopathische Zeitung* 184, No 6 (1936): 355-9.

²³ Haug, 85-99.

²⁴ Gerhard Wagner, "Zur Wiesbadener Tagung 1936", *Hippokrates* 7 (1936) 9: 233-234, on 419.

²⁵ Karl Kötschau, "Was ist biologische Medizin?", *Leipziger Populäre Zeitschrift für Homöopathie* 66 (1935): 41.

“Homeopathic treatment or the treatment with stimulating medicines is biological medicine. G. Müller also defines homeopathy as a biological medicine, and tries to demonstrate ‘how a hereditary and ill physical constitution of a person in the age of growing can manifest and gradually distinguish more and more noticeably, so that some hereditarily biologically determined lines become visible, so that the relations between the diseases of relatives – parents and grand-parents - can be identified. In organic terms, each and every person is originated from his or her consanguine environment: if considered in a musical manner, his or her life presents a melody in a good or a bad sense, where the fundamental chord is determined from the very beginning by familiar heredity of numberless origins – a fact that must be observed, without attempting to disclose the enigma of life.”²⁶

In the face of the indiscriminate mixture of approaches in Kötschau’s “biological medicine”, some homeopaths feared that homeopathy would lose its specificity. However, Kötschau explained that it was false to “place homeopathy and the remainder of natural therapies in one same pot, annihilating its specificity”, conversely, to him it was a duty to “orientate the focus to the whole, instead of placing on the foreground that which separates the different systems one from another, rather [it ought to be placed] on the interconnection between them.”²⁷ In this way, the doctor would widen his horizon as much as possible in order not to blind himself to other therapeutic methods, as such knowledge could prove decisive to save the life of an ill person.

The synthesis of conventional medicine, homeopathy and other natural therapies

As a fact, the idea of a global medicine was not new. It had already appeared in the Renaissance and again during the Romantic period before it was surprisingly taken up by NS. Furthermore, the efforts to develop such “global medicine” were not restricted to natural therapies, but they were grounded on the notion of the unity of human existence with its corresponding worldview.²⁸

According to Bernhard Aschner, this synthesis in medicine was adjusted to a tendency to globality, universalism and totality, involving also other spiritual levels. In this regard, Friedrich Schelling was the most common quoted source, particularly “The whole is larger than the sum of its parts [...]”. “Truth is in the whole”, says Aschner, taking up Schelling words.²⁹ Grounded on this worldview, the control NS sought to establish on everything and everybody was masked. This goal was also masked behind the discourse claiming to seek better professional training of doctors.

The aims of NS became explicit in a speech by Gerhard Wagner, a doctor who between 1933 and 1939 was the Director of the *German National-Socialist Medical League*, the NSDAP Counselor for all Issues related to the People’s Health and who held different positions in the circle

²⁶ G. Müller “Die Homöopathie, eine biologische Heilweise”, *Leipziger Populäre Zeitschrift für Homöopathie* 67, No 8:146-8; “Die Bedeutung der Homöopathie für die Volksgesundheit”, *Leipziger Populäre Zeitschrift für Homöopathie* 67, No 11 (1936): 209-10.

²⁷ Karl Kötschau, *Zum Aufbau der biologischen Medizin* (Stuttgart: Hippokrates, 1935), on 373.

²⁸ Wolfgang Jacob, *Medizinische Anthropologie im 19. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart: Ferdinand Enke, 1967).

²⁹ Bernhard Aschner, *Lehrbuch der Konstitutionstherapie: Technik der Allgemeinbehandlungsmethoden* (Stuttgart: Hippokrates Verlag Marquardt, 1928), 54.

of Rudolf Hess, the vice-*Führer*.³⁰ In October 1933, as Director of the *Reich's* Medical Board, Wagner addressed all German doctors involved in biological medicine in the *Deutsches Ärzteblatt*:

“I want to reunite here all doctors! I don't want to found any new association or society that makes doctors disassociate from their associations or leagues, but I want to see them all together with their associations and leagues reunited in one large and wide associative chain congregating all the biological doctors from all orientations. Only after this synthesis [is achieved that] it will be possible for all therapeutic approaches to have the proof or recognizance that they deserve, so that they can offer training and improvement to doctors for the sake of the patients needing our help [...] For this reason, I exhort all those aligned with this orientation to come to me seeking a closer union [...]”³¹

As a reaction against the crisis in trust within the doctor-patient relationship, it was defined the National-Socialist goal of promoting the connection of people with nature in order to strengthen trust in conventional medicine. Here it is needed to mention the words of Julius Streicher (1884-1946) on the administration of health-care in NS. To remind, Streicher was an anti-Semitic agitator, editor of the journal *Der Stürmer*. He became known for his health policy, and in 1933 he launched a journal named *Deutsche Volksgesundheit aus Blut und Boden* (Health for the German People out of Blood and Soil); he was also the founder and sponsor of the *Verein Deutsche Volksheilkunde* (Association of German Medicine for the People) and the *Paracelsus-Institut*. He thus, wrote: “The Jew led us so away from nature that today it is hard for us to recognize what is good and right [...] Back to nature! Then we will be again with God, and God will be able to help us. Basically, we no longer understand the Simple and the Great.” It is evident from here that the Jews were blamed for everything, in this case, for the detachment of Germans from nature.

The notion of synthesis, dictatorially instituted through the policy of the *Neue Deutsche Heilkunde*, had to be “voluntarily” accepted by all doctors, homeopaths and lay naturalistic practitioners. In this way, it was hoped that past conflict would be left behind and from that moment on there would be no more controversy among all these professional categories. The arguments by Kröner, published in *Zeitschrift für Spagyrik* explain how the connection between these categories ought to be established in order to overcome earlier divergences between conventional medicine and lay naturalistic practice:

“When the doctor and the lay practitioner as health teachers for the people intertwine their knowledge, the former in a more academic-scientific manner and the latter in a more intuitive and nature-related manner [...] then the separation between doctors and naturalists will vanish, the path for the German doctor of the people will be free and in this way, the unified German medicine of the people will be founded on the teachings of Paracelsus”.³²

To summarize, through the discussion of the new notion of “biological medicine” within the perspective of the *Neue Deutsche Heilkunde*, the concepts of conventional medicine and natural therapies were reformulated and placed in direct connection with the notion of “popular health”.

³⁰ The Group of the Vice-Führer, taken from the journal *Völk Beobachter, Naturärztliche Rundschau* 6 (1934): 120-4, apud Haug, 161.

³¹ Gerhard Wagner, “Anruf an alle Ärzte”, also published in *Hippokrates* 1933:309; see a new edition in *Allgemeine Homöopathische Zeitung* 181 (1993):235-7.

³² Karl Wachtelborn, *Künder der Volksheilkunde: Paracelsus der deutsche Arzt* (Nuremberg: Deutsche Volksgesundheit, 1936), 23.

In this context, “science” was frequently invoked, and all the different approaches pretended to be recognized as “scientific”. This trend can already be seen in homeopathy since Hahnemann’s times, but in the National-Socialist era it became so exacerbated that arguments to prove that homeopathy was “truly scientific” were sought for even in ancient poetry.³³

Despite the efforts by homeopaths to become aligned with the goals of NS, Eberhard Wolff, in his appraisal of the action of the association of homeopaths of Heidenheim/Brenz, concludes that the loyalty of these doctors to homeopathy superseded the interests of the party: “In case of doubt, the members ought to remain loyal to homeopathy above and beyond the loyalty to their political convictions”³⁴. He further explains that the platform of the homeopaths was founded on medical, economic and cultural interests and that within the association; the loyalty of homeopaths to their colleagues must have been, indeed, so remarkably strong that in the public sessions, the vice-president would plead to the members to remain silent regarding some items in the agenda. It must be stressed, however, that Wolff identified this pattern of behavior in one single homeopathic association, and for this reason, any generalization of this attitude as a movement of resistance of homeopathy against NS is untenable.

In 1936, the notion of “biological medicine” was discussed by homeopath E. Bastanier in two lectures on homeopathy given at the University of Berlin, which were complemented by an article published in *Hippokrates* entitled “The Foundations of the Healing Art: Matters of the Times and Controversies”³⁵. Bastanier subjects the notions of “homeopathy” and “allopathy” since Hahnemann’s times to analysis and concludes that the former had been used for a long time with negative and pejorative connotations, eventually as an insult. The time had come, according to him, for “homeopathy to become a qualitatively high part of medical science and practice”³⁶. He immediately addresses the rejection by conventional doctors to the tendency to unification: “As long as official medicine refuses integral parts of the healing art, it will only be able to sustain a pretension to be considered the scientific medicine par excellence [...] because the foundations of homeopathy and the natural therapies are also scientific [...] Intolerance regarding all other tendencies in other areas is a proof of its allopathic linkage”³⁷.

Despite the apparent support of homeopathy by the State, still in 1936 some articles maintained the earlier attitude of conventional medicine, as e.g. the one by P. Martell published in *Zeitschrift für Ärztliche Fortbildung*, entitled “Medicine and Superstition”, where he sustained that the principle of similarity could lead to “odd and superstitious healing measures”³⁸. Such articles show that not all conventional doctors agreed with the new health policy enacted by NS.

Doris and Hans-Michael Kratz,³⁹ a couple of doctors from the former Eastern Germany, sustain that only a small fraction of National-Socialist doctors wished an integration leading to a global medicine, including the doctors affiliated to the NSDAP. However, this assertion is not grounded on any verifiable data.

³³ Stens, “Was ist die Homöopathie”, *Leipziger Populäre Zeitschrift für Homöopathie*, 66, No 4 (1935): 16.

³⁴ Eberhard Wolff, *Gesundheitsverein und die Medikalisierungprozess: Der Homöopathische Verein Heidenheim/ Brenz zwischen 1886 und 1945* (Tübingen: Tübingen Vereinigung für Volkskunde e.V., 1989), on 204.

³⁵ E. Bastanier, “Zur Frage der Bezeichnung Schulmedizin”, *Hippokrates* 7, No 17 (1936): 397-9.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 398.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸ P. Martell, “Medizin und Aberglaube”, *Zeitschrift für Ärztliche Fortbildung* 15 (1936): 445-7, on 445.

³⁹ Kratz & Kratz.

Anyway, only a small number of doctors wrote critically against the official policy. As an example, it can be mentioned Chief Doctor Hermann Berger of Fürstenberg,⁴⁰ who ponders on the difficulties to understand the *Neue Deutsch Heilkunde* and to integrate the people within the perspectives established by it. He describes the position of doctors in NS with the following words: “We, the doctors of the Third Reich, have long been recognized as the ‘German protectors of health’ (although this name has not been solemnly conferred) [...] What does the political configuration of the German medical corpus have to do with the *Neue Deutsche Heilkunde*?”⁴¹

Berger mentions a letter written by a colleague, who “wasn’t unknown in Berlin”, and for this reason he could only quote indirectly. According to the latter, “the joint work of all the cultural nations is indispensable”, a *Neue Deutsche Heilkunde* is a utopia, completes Berger.⁴²

The immediate predecessor of the *Neue Deutsche Heilkunde* was the *Deutscher Verband der Ärzte für physikalische-diätetische Behandlung* (The German Assembly of Doctors for Physical-Dietetic Treatment), which met in November 24-25, 1934 at the Rudolf Hess hospital, reuniting doctors and naturalistic lay practitioners.⁴³ This hospital had been founded in June 5 1934 in Dresden as an “institution for medical research in natural therapy”⁴⁴. The hospital had a special Section for Natural Therapies under the direction of Alfred Brauchle, and a Medical Clinic, directed by Louis Radcliffe Grote.⁴⁵ The collaboration of Brauchle and Grote was highly relevant for the synthesis between conventional medicine and natural therapies, diagnosis was performed according to the latest technology, whereas treatment was carried out on naturalistic principles.⁴⁶ This probably was the best example of joint work between both approaches to medicine, and it was only possible because it was supported by the State.

From May 12 to 16, 1935, an exposition was held entitled *Volksheilkunde aus Blut und Boden* (Popular Medicine out of Blood and Soil) and in May 25-26, in Nuremberg, there was the *Proclamation* by the *Task Group of the Reich for a New German Medicine*, led by Streicher and organized together with the first massive *Reichstagung der deutschen Volksheilbewegung* (Meeting of the Popular German Therapeutic Movement) with the participation of 1,200 naturalistic lay practitioners.⁴⁷ In May 25, Wagner (1888-1939) gave a speech before an audience that included Kötschau and Oskar Vath.

Some organizations joined the *Task Group of the Reich*, including the *Deutsche Allgemeine Ärztliche Gesellschaft für Psychotherapie* (German Medical Society for Psychotherapy), *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Bäder- und Klimakunde* (German Society for Baths and Climate Therapy), *Deutscher Zentralverein homöopathischer Ärzte* (Central Association of Homeopathic Doctors), *Kneippärzte-Bund* (League of Kneipp Doctors), *Reichsverband der Naturärzte* (Association of Naturalistic Doctors of the Reich), *Reichsverband Deutscher Privatkrankeanstalten* (Association of the German Private Hospitals of the Reich), *Vereinigung Anthroposophischer Ärzte* (Association of Anthroposophic Doctors).⁴⁸ This

⁴⁰ Hermann Berger, “Auslegung des Begriffs ‘Neue Deutsche Heilkunde’”, *Zeitschrift für Ärztliche Fortbildung* 33 (1936): 531-5; this article was written after the medical congress at Wiesbaden, which is discussed below.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 534.

⁴² *Ibid.*

⁴³ Haug.

⁴⁴ *Deutsches Ärzteblatt* 64 (1934): 605-8; see also the chapter “Rudolf-Hess-Krankenhaus in Dresden”, in Fridolf Kudlien, *Ärzte im Nationalsozialismus* (Köln: Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 1985), 136-45.

⁴⁵ Horst Neumann, *Das Verhältnis der Homöopathie zur naturwissenschaftlichen Medizin in den letzten hundert Jahren im Spiegel der medizinischen Fachpresse* (Berlin: Ernst-Reuter-Gesellschaft, 1966).

⁴⁶ Louis R. Grote & Alfred Brauchle, *Gespräche über Schulmedizin und Naturheilkunde*, 2nd ed. (Leipzig: Philipp Reclam Jun. Verlag, 1935).

⁴⁷ Wagner, “Aufruf Dr. Wagners, des Reichsführers der ärztlichen Spitzenverbände an alle Ärzte Deutschlands, die sich mit biologischen Heilverfahren befassen, und unsere Antwort”, *Allgemeine Homöopathische Zeitung* 181 (1933): 235-37.

⁴⁸ *Deutsches Ärzteblatt* 66 (1966): 366-7.

illustrated the goal to synthesize all different approaches in order to comply with the new health policy.

Enactment of such policy required to increase the number of doctors as well as to create university chairs.⁴⁹ The adhesion of associations was to be only collective, i.e. without individual adherence by doctors. This rule sought to contribute to the mutual understanding and the development of each of the participating specialties. Beginning January 1936, a series of meetings (*Gau*, an administrative unit of the NSDAP) took place.⁵⁰ At the first one, carried out in Nuremberg, among the participants was the Rector of the University of Erlangen, as well as the Dean of the Faculty of Medicine and all the medical professors. In his speech, Wagner criticized conventional medicine and elaborated on the new goals of NS:

“The cause of the lack of development until now is based on the manner how professional training evolved, as practiced even today in the universities. Students did not become doctors but were educated to become doctors, natural scientists and technicians. The representatives of science and of medical teaching preferred to deny everything beforehand, [everything] that had not grown in their soil instead of examining all the results attained by other therapeutic methods, testing them with good will and consciously. The training of our young doctors will have to receive a new orientation and a new German medicine ought to be built.”⁵¹

Kötschau, the Director of the *Reich's* Task Group, stated in his lecture that the time when doctors were divided between two sides had to be overcome. Biological medicine was successful, since official medicine had reached the boundaries of its wisdom.⁵²

Between 18 and 20 April 1936, it was held in Wiesbaden the first *Reich Meeting of the Reich's Task Group for a New German Medicine*, which at the same time was the 48th Congress of the *German Society of Internal Medicine (Kongress der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Innere Medizin)* – not widely announced in *Zeitschrift für Ärztliche Fortbildung*, which seems to indicate the lack of interest of the conventional physicians. On the other hand, the journal *Deutsches Ärzteblatt* reported that more than 2,000 doctors were present,⁵³ although Hermann Berger questions that number.⁵⁴ Independently of the actual number, this Congress represented the peak of the influence of the *Reich's Task Group for a New German Medicine*; the central characters at that time included Gerhard Wagner, Kötschau, Hermann Griesbeck, Alfred Schwenkenbecher and Berger who, indeed, took pains to implant the synthesis between conventional medicine and natural therapies.

Although Wiesbaden gave rise to several interpretations on what the “New German Medicine” actually was, the common goal to effect a synthesis remained common to all. Wagner alluded to the need to end with freedom in healing: “Unlimited freedom in healing must receive soon its end and so it will be. This is also the will of the naturalistic practitioners themselves, i.e. the *Heilpraktikern*”⁵⁵.

⁴⁹ Haug; *Deutsches Ärzteblatt* 65 (1935): 538.

⁵⁰ Haug, 53.

⁵¹ Wapler tells about Wagner's speech in *Allgemeine homöopathische Zeitung* 183, No 3 (1935): 179.

⁵² Rudolf Finke, “Dritte Reichstagung des Reichsverbandes der Naturärzte e.V. vom 17. Bis 19. Januar 1936 in Berlin“, *Deutsches Ärzteblatt* 66 (1936): 94; Hans Wapler, “Erfreuliche Klärung als Ergebnis der Nürnberger Tagung der Naturheilverbände“, *Allgemeine homöopathische Zeitung* 183, No 3 (1935): 177-82.

⁵³ Haug, 59.

⁵⁴ Herman Berger, “Auslegung des Begriffs 'Neue Deutsche Heilkunde'“, *Zeitschrift für Ärztliche Fortbildung* 33 (1936): 531-35, on 532.

⁵⁵ K. W. Thiele, “1. Reichstagung der Reichsarbeitsgemeinschaft für eine Neue Deutsche Heilkunde und 48. Kongress der Deutschen Gesellschaft für innere Medizin“, *Leipziger Populäre Zeitschrift für Homöopathie* 67, No 6 (1936):116-7.

It is remarkable that already by this time, the lay naturalistic practitioners were called by the NS “*Heilpraktikern*” when the law creating this new professional category was only promulgated three years later, in 1939. As a fact, Wagner’s goal was to suppress freedom in healing, inhibit the growth of naturalistic practice and at the same time, to promote the training in medicine. However, he did not aim at making natural medicine a “small [kind of] medicine”,⁵⁶ but to set limits to the sphere of action of naturalistic lay practitioners.

The journal *Hippokrates*, founded in 1929, was acknowledged only in April 9 1936, this is, almost eleven months after the *Proclamation of the Task Group* in Nuremberg, as the official organ of this *Task Group*. Still that same year, it was carried out in Dresden the *94th Assembly of Naturalistic German Researchers and Physicians*, where the aim of synthesis was still alive, but no signs of the presence of homeopathy can be detected.⁵⁷

The dissolution of the *New German Medicine*

The *Reich’s Task Group for a New German Medicine* failed in terms of organization and showed in practice that it was unable to enact the policy established for health in January 2 1937. Wagner, the Director of the *Medical Body of the Third Reich*, chose to dissolve the *Task Group*.⁵⁸ However, this did not stop completely the hope to establish the *New German Medicine*, since according to Wagner, its goals were immutable.

Indeed, from 1937 onwards the notion of “synthesis” began to be formulated differently – although “the foundations, the firm ground and the certain acknowledgment by official medicine, which was frequently abused and many times defamed”⁵⁹ were kept. The goals conserved were the training of all the German doctors – especially of the younger generation – and the founding of training institutions, as e.g., the *Hospital Rudolf-Hess*.⁶⁰

The *XII International Congress* and *98th General Assembly of the Central Association of German Homeopathic Doctors* were held in Berlin from 8 to 15 August 1937, with the support of the State, as it is shown by the speech of the sponsor, Rudolf Hess, the Reich’s Minister:

“It is for the sake of the people that it must be integrated what seems to bring benefit to it [...] Homeopathy is a therapy close to nature. As a function of necessary availability it is always possible to intertwine opposites, which shows a parallel with National-Socialism, that in its intertwining of socialism and nationalism has attained the utmost political success of the State. Allopathy and homeopathy have nowadays in their joint work a great task to fill in many fields that have not yet been researched in medicine”.⁶¹

The president of the *German Association of Homeopathic Physicians*, Hans Rabe (1900-1939) alluded in his speech to the official support to homeopathy, “With the entrance of Rudolf Hess, the

⁵⁶ Anonymous, “Reichsärztführer auf dem diesjährigen Schleswig-Holsteinischen Ärztetag”, *Arzteblatt für Hamburg und Schleswig* (1937): 353-63.

⁵⁷ Volker Schalwig, “Paracelsus’ Bedeutung in der Medizin des Nationalsozialismus“ (doctoral dissertation, Kiel, 1974).

⁵⁸ “Reichsärztführer Dr. Wagner”, in *Neue Wege der Heilkunde*, ed. Kurt Klare (Stuttgart/Leipzig: Hippokrates, 1937), 8-12; this was Wagner’s speech on the dissolution of the New German Medicine.

⁵⁹ Klare, 9.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶¹ “XII Internationaler Homöopatischer Kongress und 98. Hauptversammlung des Deutschen Zentralvereins homöopatischer Ärzte in Berlin”, *Leipziger Populäre Zeitschrift für Homöopathie* 68, No 10 (1937): 192.

fight for homeopathy attained a more objective stage⁶². However, these public expressions seemed to ignore that the *New German Medicine* was already in process of dissolution, being rather manifestations of wishful thinking.

Nevertheless, the goal of achieving a synthesis was still alive. For instance, from 1937 on it was allowed for all general practitioners and hospitals doctors to place a sign with the word “homeopathy” in their private offices – although such designation was only officially acknowledged in 1956 by the *Ärztelkammer* (Medical Council).

During NS, homeopathy was not merely supported by the new health policy, but it received such powerful endorsement by the State, that in practice there was no hindrance whatsoever for doctors to obtain authorization to practice homeopathy. By the same token, attacks by conventional doctors diminished dramatically during this period.⁶³ Another factor easing the relationship between homeopaths and conventional doctors was the contemporary onset of the debate leading to the regulation of the profession of *Heilpraktiker*, with the consequent need to demarcate professional spheres of action.

In 1936, the President of the *Reichsgesundheitsamtes* (Office of Health of the Reich) launched an appeal to all doctors in Germany to be present at a scientific examination of homeopathy, which was well received by the *German Association of German Physicians* since it opened the door for places in clinics for doctors trained in homeopathy.⁶⁴

The process of dissolution of the *New German Medicine*, meanwhile, was accelerated by the death of Wagner in March 25 1939. His successor was Leonardo Conti (1900-1945), who took up the position of *Stadtmedizinrat* (City Medical Advisor) of Berlin. Conti had previously been the director of the *Berlin Gau of the German Association of Doctors of the National Socialism (Gau Berlin des NSD-Ärztelbundes)*, and immediately decreed the disaffiliation of the Jewish doctors. Since Conti had developed his career in the medical bureaucracy, he was a promoter of conventional medicine.⁶⁵ Therefore, although in 1940 he defined the notion of “popular health” as encompassing “at the same time physical and psychical-mental process. Biological observation does not admit the opposition between body and spirit, but it can also conceive of a healthy life as an indivisible whole”⁶⁶, it must be remembered that by this time the global view on the organism had already been assimilated by NS as compelling in the field of health.

Moreover, Conti explicitly says in his speech that “in NS, no one has anymore the right to represent the working mass and its health as a personal and private matter, that can be disposed of at will”⁶⁷. Therefore, each German youth with ability and skills to heal ought to learn medicine, “without taking into account the social class and the financial state of his parents” as neither the level of previous school education.⁶⁸ Nevertheless, during the stage under Conti’s leadership, the tasks established by the new health policy together with the notions grounding it fell gradually into oblivion due to the lack of actual application.⁶⁹

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Robert Jütte, *Wege der alternativen Medizin: Ein Lesebuch* (München: Beck, 1996).

⁶⁴ *Münchener medizinische Wochenschrift* 85 (1938): 1131-3, apud Horst Neumann, *Das Verhältnis der Homöopathie zur naturwissenschaftlichen Medizin in den letzten hundert Jahren im Spiegel der medizinischen Fachpresse* (Berlin: Ernst Reuter-Gesellschaft, 1966), 77.

⁶⁵ Haug.

⁶⁶ Leonardo Conti, „Volksundheit als Kriegswaffe“, *Deutsches Ärzteblatt* 70 (1940): 292.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Leonardo Conti, “Zur Heilpraktikerfrage: Eine Stellungnahme auf der ersten Reichstagung der deutschen Heilpraktikerschaft”, *Ziel und Weg* 11 (1939): 336-7, on 337.

⁶⁹ Detlef Bothe, *Neue Deutsche Heilkunde: 1933-1945* (Husum: Mathiesen, 1991).

During the time of the war, the connection between conventional medicine and natural therapies became impossible due to the shift in economic and political goals that led to a consequent change in the policy for health. After 1940, the idea of a synthesis between conventional medicine, homeopathy and natural therapies had completely vanished. The medical journals, such as *Deutsches Ärzteblatt* and *Münchener medizinische Zeitschrift* only dealt with topics of conventional medicine and its success. Since the role of naturalistic doctors had decreased in significance, those who had previously attained a high level of acknowledgement as, e.g. Brauchle and Grote⁷⁰ continued to push for the synthesis between conventional and natural medicine,⁷¹ as also did the homeopaths.⁷² For this reason, notions used in Wagner's times came back to the stage, as it is shown by the articles of Arthur Zschau.⁷³ Noticeably, still in 1954 there was an article by Kötschau published in *Hippokrates* discussing the problematic nature of the mutual relation between conventional medicine and homeopathy.

Concluding remarks: the professional profile of doctors during NS

As Alfred Stehr stated, the doctor of the NS ought to be “a doctor, a priest and a statesman”⁷⁴. After 1938, it was merely spoken of “doctors” and no longer of “biological doctors”. How was it defined the professional pattern of doctors in NS? According to Werner Bockhacker, “the German doctor was the sanitary leader of the German people” and had become a political persona. He ought to be a friend, give advice to patients, in order to act as a “family doctor, in the widest sense of the term”⁷⁵.

According to Kurt Blome,⁷⁶ the doctor who would not express a strong personality and traits of leadership would never be able to secure the complete trust of his patients. Borst observed that in order to attain the ideal profile of the efficient doctor and make it true, teaching and continual improvement were essential parts of the overall program.⁷⁷

However, manifestations sometimes were contradictory. Whereas Berger was critical of the *New German Medicine* of the NS,⁷⁸ sanitary promoter Streck would list as duties of the physician to be above all a firm national-socialist, then a politician, a soldier of the *Führer*, and only lastly a doctor.⁷⁹

One of the goals of the health policy of NS was to awaken the trust of patients in their doctors, however, a study carried out shortly before the end of the war shows that it was not achieved. In this regard, it is noteworthy that the highest index of trust in doctors was attained by the homeopaths.⁸⁰ It goes without saying, that at that time, this result was presented as a success of NS. However, it must be noticed that homeopathy had in this sense complied with Wagner's aims,

⁷⁰ Both worked together since the thirties; see Louis R Grote & Alfred Brauchle, *Gespräche über Schulmedizin und Naturheilkunde*, 2nd ed. (Leipzig: Philipp Reclam Jun. Verlag, 1935).

⁷¹ Alfred Brauchle, “Gemeinschaftsstationen zwischen Schulmedizin und Naturheilkunde an den Universitäten”, *Hippokrates* 25 (1954): 1-11.

⁷² Bernhard Heimbrecht, “Wege zur Verständigung zwischen Allopathie und Homöopathie”, *Hippokrates* 12 (1941): 814-8.

⁷³ Arthur F. Zschau, “Zusammenarbeit von Schulmedizin und Naturheilkunde: Reichstreffen der deutschen Volksgesundheitsbewegung in Stuttgart”, *Leipziger Populäre Zeitschrift für Homöopathie* 70, No 8 (1939): 161-2.

⁷⁴ Alfred Stehr, *Arzt, Priesterarzt und Staatsmann* (München: Verlag der Ärztlichen Rundschau Otto Gmelin, 1933), on 5.

⁷⁵ Werner Bockhacker, “Der Deutsche Arzt als Gesundheitsführer”, *Deutsches Ärzteblatt* 68, No 7 (1938): 115-6.

⁷⁶ Kurt Blome, “Arztum in Kultur und Wissenschaft”, *Deutsches Ärzteblatt* 68, No 8 (1938): 137.

⁷⁷ Borst, “Das Idealbild des Arztes”, *Deutsches Ärzteblatt* 68 (1938): 346-52.

⁷⁸ H. Berger, “Alte und neue Lehrmedizin”, *Hippokrates* 7 (1936), 198-201.

⁷⁹ Streck published this list in 1935 in the journal *Ziel und Weg*.

⁸⁰ Jütte, *Wege der alternativen Medizin*, 54.

when he had defined the German doctor as “a doctor for the people, in the sense of the ancient family doctor”⁸¹.

Lore Fortes

Sociology of health; alternative and complementary medicine; institutional evaluation.

Department of Social Sciences, Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte (UFRN), Brazil.

e-mail: loref45@hotmail.com

⁸¹ Deutsches Ärzteblatt 66 (1936): 947.