

## TOWARD A "SCIENCE OF HEALING"

HUBERT LARCHER (*France*)

Alexis Carrel, in his book *Man the Unknown*, emphasized as follows the importance of paranormal cures: "They show the reality of a certain kindredship, whose exact character is as yet unknown, between the psychological and organic processes. They prove the objective importance of spiritual activities to which health experts, doctors, educators, and sociologists have paid little attention. They open up before us a new world."

It is therefore tremendously important to record these cures. Likewise Olivier Leroy writes in *Miracles* (1951): "There is no valid reason why a treatise on cancer should not record that apparently spontaneous cures of cancers have been verified." Yet, it is a fact that no mention of these cures has been made in treatises or classical textbooks on medicine.

I attribute this conspiracy of silence to three main reasons:

1) Scientific fetishism, as Olivier Leroy calls it. He says: "The scientist who bows down before absolute scientific principles is a fetishist in his way. Some people consider that it is an urgent matter—after our civilization has been cleansed of magic fetishism—to purge it of scientific fetishism also."

2) Miraculism, which means the systematic rejection of all that might seem foreign to the perspective of a miracle. The miraculists and the scientific fetishists both insist on excluding paranormal cures from the realm of science: the miraculists because they believe that an observable fact

may have a supernatural explanation, and the scientific fetishists because they are convinced that paranormal healing is impossible.

3) A third obstacle to the recording of paranormal cures is—strange as it may seem—that there is as yet no medical frame to ensure this recording, for the amazing reason that there is no medical science devoted to healing—even normal healing! Healing is the opposite of disease. There is a science of diseases: it is called pathology. There should also be a science of the opposite—a science of getting well—and it should be studied alongside pathology in our medical schools. The study of the cure for a disease is just as legitimate as that of its history, its etiology, its pathogeny, its complications, etc.

Having listed three important obstacles to the recording of paranormal cures, let us now outline the means to overcome them.

1) The chapter headings of the usual manuals on pathology should be completed by a paragraph entitled "The Cure," which would describe the healing processes now listed under other headings such as "Pathological Anatomy," etc.

2) This addition, however, seems inadequate because it simply makes the cure a subhead under pathology, whereas what is needed is to develop a science of healing on a basis of equality with the science of disease. There should be a history of the cure, as there is a history of the illness. It would be useful to regard certain symptoms—hitherto considered as pathological—as defense reactions contributing to recovery, such as fever, perspiring, certain pleurisies, diarrheas, pains, etc. The healing process has its own clinical manifestations, its normal spontaneous aspects, its therapeutic-promoted aspects, and its paranormal aspects. We must try to ascertain in what respect a spontaneous or promoted cure is normal or paranormal; and if it is paranormal, we must specify of what the departure from the normal healing process consists.

3) But even if we embodied the science of healing in a work as complete as a treatise on pathology, with a volume on healing in general and another devoted to the cure of individual diseases, this would not suffice. We would still want the science of healing in general and of specific cures to be made an official medical doctrine, taught in medical schools on a footing of equality with pathology and in conjunction with it. This would not bog down medical instruction. It would aid it. In this way many elements of the science of healing which are now scattered throughout other branches of medical science would take their logical and natural place in their proper framework.

It is this framework which should be placed at the disposal of the systematic and scientific recording of paranormal cures. This would enable them to be clearly differentiated from normal spontaneous and promoted cures. It seems to me that the creation of this framework is our most urgent task if we want to insure the future efficacy of an International Center for the Verification of Paranormal Cures.