

# A Fifteen Year Study on Homeopathic Nosode Immunizations

by

Richard Hiltner, MD, DHT

## *Abstract*

---

*The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate that there is significant data on the use of homeopathic nosode [potentized disease product] immunizations to indicate their validity as well as to stimulate more formal and extensive research. 184 children were chosen from ages 2months to 12 years old. They were given potentized Polio, the trivalent Diphtheria, Pertussis and Tetanus [DPT] and Measles, Mumps and Rubella [MMR] over a 15-year period.*

*Even though this study showed flaws, there was no evidence of the diseases in children given nosode immunizations and only one episode of a minor skin eruption.*

*If one adds this information of 184 children to the much better study both in organization and in quantity by Isaac Golden on 1305 children over 13 years, one has almost 1,500 children given homeopathic nosode immunization with excellent results. This data indicates to me the obvious conclusion that the homeopathic world needs to take a serious look at a really well developed research protocol done by specialists in statistics and research.*

---

The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate that there is significant data on the use of homeopathic nosode [potentized disease product] immunizations to indicate their validity as well as to stimulate more formal and extensive research. Since there is little information on the long term results on giving nosode immunizations, as a General Practitioner, I proceeded to devise a very informal study over the last 15 years on primarily the potentized forms of Polio, the trivalent Diphtheria, Pertussis and Tetanus [DPT] and Measles, Mumps and Rubella [MMR]. 184 children were chosen from ages 2months to 12 years old. Approximately 40% of the children had some conventional immunization.

Since this data was obtained in a very informal way, namely as part of a daily private general practice, there was little rigid hard data or statistical calculation.

The patients parents were all given a handout informing them of some concerns about the safety of conventional immunizations and also a compilation done by [Francisco Eizayaga, MD](#) on global research and more technical information on homeopathic nosode immunizations.

It was clearly explained to the parents that the nosode immunizations were not the same as conventional immunizations. A potency of 200 C was chosen; since this is well beyond Avogadro's Number [ $10^{23}$ ] or beyond any original molecules of the substance being left in the medicine. In other words, none of the substance of the original nosode remained in the solution, but apparently some "energy" or memory remains in a different form. It was felt that this would be safe and hopefully effective.

When I first started using these nosodes, I followed Dr Eizayaga's regimen of giving the 200 C daily for three days every year. This was discontinued about 9 years ago. At which time it was decided to follow the more routine schedule for conventional immunizations. Please see chart on [\*Homeopathic Nosode Immunization Schedule\*](#).

If one looks at the [\*15Year Study on Homeopathic Nosode Immunizations\*](#), one is able to observe that 58 children started in the first 5-year period. 61 more the next 5 years; and, lastly, 65 the last 5 years. These children did not all start on day one of each 5-year period, but were given the nosode at various times, depending on when they decided to make an appointment, what other conventional vaccinations they had previously, and on the age in which I started seeing them.

There is a much better study on nosode vaccinations done by [\*Issac Golden\*](#), a homeopathic practitioner from Australia, wrote an excellent book, [\*Vaccination? A Review of Risks and Alternatives\*](#). He gave a homeopathic immunization program from the recommended Australian regimen: Diphtheria, Pertussis, Tetanus, Poliomyelitis, Measles, Mumps, Rubella and Hemophilus Influenza. The Kit he used covered all of these, except Rubella, and he collected data since 1988 in a series of 8 research surveys filled out by the parents. There is total of [\*1,305\*](#) children involved. On the average about 20-30% had already some conventional immunizations. To date the average efficacy of homeopathic prophylactics ranged from 89-98%. The 89% success [or 11% failure] referred to children definitely exposed to the disease. The incidence of mild side effects [sometimes beneficial, *i.e.* temporary healing response from inherited or acquired damage {father had Diphtheria}] was 10%; as opposed to 63% with conventional vaccinations.

## Questions about Conventional Vaccinations

Without going into much detail, let me say that for each immunization, Isaac Golden gives a more or less [usually more] good arguments questioning the actual effectiveness. One of the most often used arguments was that there was already a decrease in the incidence of the disease. Or in other words, the cycle of the illness was already becoming less. Yes, cycles are more important than one might imagine. After all nature manifests cycles at every turn.

Harris Coulter, PhD wrote in his book *Vaccination, Social Violence & Criminality* supports “A Summary of Some of the Long Term Side Effects of Vaccinations” listed by Issac Golden.

- 1] Severe Neurological damages.
- 2] Brain Damage.
- 3] Allergy and hypersensitivity.
- 4] General damage to the immune system.
- 5] Slow viruses.
- 6] Genetic abnormalities – Jumping Gene phenomenon.
- 7] Viral transference.
- 8] Trigger mechanism for immune system diseases.
- 9] Dynamic [miasmatic] damage.

In 2000 the United States House of Representatives had a committee hearing on the incidences of Autism associated with the Measles [especially], Mumps and Rubella immunization. In 1986 the U S government established an agency to compensate parents of vaccine-related illnesses of children. Up until 1988 \$ 108 million were paid. It is estimated that billions have been paid since then.

In 1975 I personally had the unfortunate experience of seeing first-hand the effects of a DPT immunization given by another physician to a few months old child. The child developed mental retardation and chronic seizure disorder. This continued to be the case at least until 1987 when I lost track of the patient. Since that time I have not given any conventional immunizations, only nosodes [homeopathic].

**Master Homeopaths Who Support Prophylaxis With Homeopathy  
[Homeoprophylaxis—HP].**

Issac Golden list a number of references supporting homeopathic prevention [homeoprophylaxis]:

In 1801 **Samuel Hahnemann** describes in his Lesser Writings the use of Belladonna to prevent Scarlet Fever.

In 1900 **Dr. J T Kent**, Lectures on Homoeopathic Philosophy, “We must look to homoeopathy for our protection as well as for our cure. Now you will find that for prophylaxis there is required a less degree of similitude than is necessary for curing. A remedy will not have to be so similar to prevent disease as to cure it, and these remedies in daily use will enable you to prevent a large number of people from becoming sick.”

In 1907 **Dr. C W Eaton** read a paper before the American Institute of Homeopathy on *Variolinum* 30 [a Nosode prepared from a smallpox vesicle]

Persons given Variolinum 30	2806
Definite exposures after taking Variolinum 30	547
Smallpox cases after taking Variolinum 30	14
Efficacy	97.5%

**Dr. Dorothy Shephard** states in Homoeopathy in Epidemic Diseases, “Nosodes or disease products of the actual disease are often most active preventatives.” [1967].

**Dr. P Sankaran** in Prophylactics in Homoeopathy in 1972 reviews the sources of 92 practitioners and hundreds of examples of homeopathic prevention. In 1978 in his *Some Notes on the Nosodes*, “**Wheeler** recommends that in epidemics, the corresponding nosode in the 30<sup>th</sup> potency will protect for at least a fortnight. Others like **Grimmer** recommend one dose in high potency, once a year.”

In 1991 **Dr. B Sethi**, *Homoeopathic Prophylactic Remedies*, states that in regard to *Diphtherinum*, **Allen** “had used it for 25 years as a prophylactic and has never known a second case of diphtheria to occur in a family after it has been administered.”

Many more quotes could be given, but that seems sufficient enough.

### Questions and Problems Concerning the 15 Year Study

One of the most obvious problems foreseen was that there was no discrimination between those who had one or more conventional immunizations and those who had none. Also other immunizations were given to a much less frequent amount, including Hemophilus Influenza [Hib], Hepatitis B. There was no double-blind data.

The study did not require a set time of reporting. The only mandatory requirement was that the parents inform me if any negative symptoms occurred.

One of the legitimate questions brought up by some is that these 7 primary illnesses have shown a decrease, which is thought to be by conventional immunizations. Since there has already been a decrease, can one say that over the last 15 years the nosodes really kept these children from acquiring these diseases? This is a very good question. I certainly cannot say for sure that the nosodes or the conventional approach prevented these illnesses. I would again refer above to the various analyses done on exposure to various diseases vaccinated against by Isaac Golden and even better would be to read the details in his book.

One of the main concerns was whether the nosode immunizations would interfere with constitutional prescribing. The answer to this question is not totally clear in my mind. As a general rule, it did not seem to interfere. However, on some patients with more serious systems, I was more reluctant to give the nosodes. Obviously, not every child seen was cured of every chronic illness, but overall my results seem to be good when the simillimum seem very clear. Also as a regular rule no nosode was given for at two weeks after any acute illness; be it from the constitutional or otherwise.

The question of suppression must be raised. Since nosodes/isodes do not consider the “whole” symptom picture or the constitution directly, the possibility of suppression cannot be totally ruled out. One could, of course, say the same for a homeopathic medicine that is prescribed considering the whole picture and previous provings. One could still make a mistake and suppress the illness. Again I tried to always be aware of the constitution, miasmatic picture and whatever remedy appears to be the simillimum. Suppression does not seem to be the case for the most part. However, I cannot categorically say that no case was suppressed.

This question brings about another: namely, would conventional immunizations do more harm than the nosode? There is little doubt in my mind that a conventional immunization is much more likely to cause interference with constitutional prescribing than a nosode.

There are certainly practitioners who state that no immunizations, conventional or nosode, should ever be given. I must say that I have had difficulty making such an absolute statement.

I must continue to quote from Issac Golden’s book on vaccinations because it rings of truth as well as from my own experience. It is necessary to consider some of his responses to homeopathic colleagues who prefer to be purists and give no nosode to prevent illness.

1]”Some homeopaths argue [correctly] that we do not fully know the dynamic [miasmatic] long term consequences of potentized prophylactics. They conclude that it is desirable to allow a child to contract a disease and treat the disease according to the Law of Similars.

This argument is appealing in theory, and can be sustained where both parents and practitioners wish to follow this approach. However, there are complications in practice:

[a] Some diseases can be tragically severe in tiny infants, even with reasonable treatment. *Eg. Pertussis ...*”

“Without doubting the effectiveness of homeopathic treatment, such treatment presumes that an accurate prescriber is locally available, and somewhat ignores the suffering for both child and parents while treatment occurs.

[b] Many parents are not impressed with the argument that a child should be allowed to contract every disease and, if no alternative method of protection is offered, they will resort to conventional vaccination.

...”The author would strongly argue that if parents prefer to vaccinate their children rather than provide no specific protection, we as practitioners are professionally obliged to offer them the use of the homeopathic alternative...”

“Some homeopaths might argue that protection can be stimulated by using constitutional remedies. Even though this method undoubtedly works, there are many examples of individuals with a high vital force contracting specific infectious diseases. Disease-specific prophylaxis is more effective in stimulating disease-specific immunity.”

“The ‘purists’ have not proven that homeoprophylaxis [HP] causes dynamic damage, just as the ‘pragmatists’ cannot prove it doesn’t. To ignore the value of HP, however, places those patients who would otherwise vaccinate conventionally at a disadvantage. And to be openly antagonistic towards colleagues who are doing no more than following in the footsteps of the Master prescribers is as foolish as it is divisive.”

There are a number of practitioners that feel giving the nosode of an immunization after a conventional immunization can be beneficial to antidote the negative effects of the conventional.

In the “real world” many parents find it very difficult to do “all” or “nothing.” There is generally so much pressure put on the parents, or even one parent on the other, to do conventional immunizations. The schools as a general rule go out of their way to make it seem that the child **must** receive conventional immunizations in order to be allowed in school. As a matter of fact in most states, including California, the law allows three exceptions to obtaining immunizations: for medical, religious and philosophical reasons.



## In Summary

This small study certainly has many flaws as enumerated above and probably more not seen. On the positive side the following information has been obtained: No one of the 184 children had any of the illnesses for which they received nosodes. There were no side effects or allergic reactions. To my knowledge the only negative report was that of a rash on the upper extremities which later appeared to be a milk allergy.

If one adds this information of 184 children to the much better study both in organization and in quantity by Isaac Golden on 1305 children, one has almost 1,500 children given homeopathic nosode immunization with excellent results. This data indicates to me the obvious conclusion that the homeopathic world needs to take a serious look at a really well developed research protocol done by specialists in statistics and research. The National Institute of Health in the United States, especially in its Complementary and Alternative Medicine division, seems to be a very good choice to consider.

As an addendum, it is well to deliberate on this. In light of the events of September 11<sup>th</sup> 2001, it is appropriate to speak more emphatically of the obvious possible aid homeopathic nosode immunizations could afford in bio-warfare associated with terrorism. According to the Center for Disease Control [CDC] in the United States, there are five likely candidates to be used [also included the nosode or a remedy of common use following]: 1] Anthrax [Anthraxinum], 2] Smallpox [Variolinum], 3] Botulism [Botulinum], 4] Rattlesnake venom [Crotalus Horridus] and the Plaque [Operculina].

If there were an exposure or epidemic, a suggested procedure for prescribing would be a 200 C or 30C [X] daily for a week, and then weekly for a month. This is, of course, open for debate, but should be looked at seriously.

I hope this paper has helped to clarify your ideas on immunizations. It truly is one of the most important and fiery debated subjects of our time. Let's trust that the total truth reveals itself clearly in the near future.

---



<b>15 Year Study on Homeopathic Nosode Immunizations</b>			
<b>Study Periods</b>	<b>1986-1996</b>	<b>1991-1996</b>	<b>1996-2001</b>
<b>Total of 184 Children</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>DPT 200C POLIO 200C MMR 200C</b>	<b>ALL</b>	<b>ALL</b>	<b>ALL</b>
<b>Estimated % already having some conventional Immunizations</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>40%</b>

% Exposure to any of the above Diseases	Unknown	Unknown, But there were reported some cases of Pertussis in Ventura, County	Unknown But there were reported some cases of Pertussis in Ventura, County
% having any negative effects from homeopathic nosode immunizations	1% a mild skin eruption	None reported	None reported
% having negative effects from conventional immunizations	Estimated the 50-70% mainly fever, pain, rashes, URI	Estimated the 50-70% mainly fever, pain, rashes, URI	Estimated the 50-70% mainly fever, pain, rashes, URI
% having the disease after homeopathic Immunization	0%	0%	0%
% having the disease after conventional immunization	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

## Homeopathic Nosode Immunization Schedule

AGE	NOSODE IMMUNIZATION
2 MONTHS	DPT 200 C # 1 POLIO 200 C # 1
4 MONTHS	DPT 200 C # 2 POLIO 200 C # 2
6 MONTHS	DPT 200 C # 3
12 MONTHS	MMR 200 C # 1
18 MONTHS	POLIO 200 C # 3 DPT # 4
5 YEARS	DPT 200 C # 5 POLIO 200 C # 4
12 YEARS	MMR 200 C #2