

## HAHNEMANN—THE UNCOMPROMISING HOMŒOPATH

DR. B. B. CHATTERJEE, D.M.S. (Hons.), Calcutta

I quote a few passages from the "Introductory lecture" delivered by Dr. Dudgeon at Hahnemann Hospital, London during the sessions 1852-53 as also from *The Organon of Medicine* (fifth edition) to show how uncompromising the Master was in his attitude towards allopathic system of medicine. I hope these quotations will serve as an eye-opener to the not very few Homœopaths who now and then seek to strike the most unhealthy compromise between Homœopathy and Allopathy and thus prejudice the very cause of Homœopathy.

"His intolerance for those who differed from him latterly attained to such a height, that he used to say, "He who does not walk on exactly the same line with me, who diverges, if it be but the breadth of straw, to the right or to the left, is an apostate and a traitor, and with him I will have nothing to do."

"Dr. Gross, who was one of his most industrious disciples, and enjoyed his most perfect intimacy, having lost a child, wrote in the sorrow of a bereaved parent to Hahnemann, and said that his loss had taught him that homœopathy did not suffice in every case; this gave great offence to Hahnemann, who never forgave Gross for this remark, and never afterwards restored him to his favour".

"Another quality of Hahnemann's mind conscientiousness is strikingly displayed in his abandoning the lucrative practice of medicine when his faith was shaken in it. . . ."

"... had Hahnemann been more a man of the world, and had he taken into his confidence some of those of his followers who were distinguished for their independence of thought and proficiency in the medical sciences, Homœopathy would . . . not have presented such a harsh contrast, and stood in such violent antagonism to the old system of medicine; and the improvements and discoveries in physiology, pathology, and

chemistry would have probably been made use of by Hahnemann. . . . .”

Of course Dudgeon has sought (in vain, should I say) to justify this antagonistic attitude of Hahnemann in the following words—“To facilitate our inquiries as to what parts of the system promulgated by Hahnemann belong to the domain of the unerring laws of nature, what derive a colouring and a bias from the individuality of the author, I think it is of great importance to endeavour to form a just estimate of his character and mental organization, and as I believe the circumstances of his life have exercised a considerable influence on his doctrines and precepts . . . .” It is very unfortunate that Dr. Dudgeon has only persecution which, in his opinion, made Hahnemann intolerant of contradiction, etc. But, an unprejudiced reading of *The Organon* would make any one understand that Hahnemann never propounded a theory unsupported by reasons and experiments. It is no doubt true that it is sometimes very difficult to follow everything Hahnemann said. But unless any of his doctrines can be falsified by *actual* demonstration, it would be unscientific, to say the least, to say that such and such of the doctrines propagated by Hahnemann are unsound or the like. On the other hand, Kent, one of the ablest exponents of Homœopathy, gives us to understand that although in the beginning of his career he could not see eye to eye with Hahnemann in many respects, in latter period, with experience, he was forced to acknowledge the absolute reasonableness of each and every of the doctrines enunciated by Hahnemann. After all, it is very difficult to conclude from an unbiased and *experimental* reading of *The Organon* that Hahnemann’s bias against allopathy was due to the persecutions that he had to undergo.

And now I pass on to quote a few passages from the *Organon*. In the foot-note to Section 67 we read: “Only in the most urgent cases, where danger to life and imminent death allow no time for the action of a homœopathic remedy . . . in sudden accidents occurring to *previously healthy individuals* . . . is it admissible and judicious, at all events as a *preliminary measure*, to stimulate the irritability and sensibility (the physical life) with a palliative, . . . When this stimulation is effected,

the play of vital organs again goes on in its former healthy manner, *for there is here no disease to be removed*, . . . . And yet the new sect that mixes the two systems appeals (though in vain) to this observation, in order that they may have an excuse for encountering everywhere such exceptions to the general rule in diseases, and to justify their convenient employment of allopathic palliatives, and of other injurious allopathic trash besides, solely for the sake of sparing themselves the trouble of seeking for the suitable homœopathic remedy for each case of disease—I might almost say for the sake of sparing themselves the trouble of being homœopathic physicians, and yet wishing to appear as such”.

In the foot-note to Section 109 Hahnemann says: “It is impossible that there can be another true, best method of dynamic diseases (i.e., all diseases not strictly surgical) besides homœopathy, just as it is impossible to draw more than one straight line betwixt two given points. He who imagines that there are other modes of curing diseases besides it could not have appreciated homœopathy fundamentally nor practised it with sufficient care, nor could he ever have seen or read cases of properly performed homœopathic cures; nor, on the other hand, could he have discerned the baselessness of all allopathic modes of treating diseases and their bad or even dreadful effects, if, with such lax indifference, he places the only true healing art on an equality with those hurtful methods of treatment, or alleges the latter to be auxiliaries to homœopathy which it could not do without!”

The foot-note to Section 149 is particularly interesting. Here we read: “. . . . How could this laborious, caredemanding task, . . . please the gentlemen of the new mongrel sect who assume the honourable name of homœopathists, and even seem to employ medicines in form and appearance homœopathic, but determined upon by them anyhow, and who, when the unsuitable remedy does not immediately give relief, in place of laying the blame on their unpardonable ignorance and laxity in performing the most important and serious of all human affairs, ascribe it to homœopathy, which they accuse of great imperfection (if the truth be told, its imperfection consists in

this, that the most suitable homœopathic remedy for each morbid condition does not spontaneously fly into their mouths like roasted pigeons, without any trouble on their own part). . . ."

---

**A LEGACY OF HAHNEMANN—THE KEY  
TO SYNTHESIS**

*(Contd. from Page 168)*

or tubercular diathesis is produced, Sycosis makes the condition malignant and more painful.

**Slow but Steady Progress of Synthesis :**

If the votaries of other systems or therapy do not refuse to benefit by these new discoveries, which are almost like revelations, Synthesis of Medical Systems will, in practice, commence and proceed apace.

---