

THE HAHNEMANNIAN GLEANINGS

Vol XXVI

MARCH 1959

No. 3

MEDICAL POLITICS

DR. S. M. BHATTACHERJEE, M.A., P.R.S.M., BERHAMPORE

From ancient times Medicine had been recognized as a branch of Science, concerned with the twin problems of human health and disease. In later years Medicine was dragged into the field of Law, as organized society wanted its inclusion into legal affairs in the shape of Medical Jurisprudence. With the socialization of a country's material resources, the idea of socialized medicine crept in, in more recent years. In its train, naturally, came the concepts of trade-gilds or trade-unionism in medicine. So, we find different groups with different therapies practically brush aside the common welfare of man and fight for their own group-interest. Medicine, now, is more a politics than a therapy, a conclusion which a commoner can not avoid, from the reports of speeches delivered in Medical Conferences, such as the one e.g., the 35th All-India Medical Conference, recently held in Cuttack in December, 1958. A portion of the report, published in the press, testifies to it. There the President Dr. C. O. Karunakaran, M.B.B.S., D.T.M., D.P.H. etc. is reported to have said :

"Homœopathy stands on a totally different footing. History and tradition do not place any obligation on us to show special consideration to it. Dr. Hahnemann started it, 163 years ago, as a crusade against the abuse of Arsenic, Mercury and other poisonous drugs, the unstandardised use of which, prevalent then, did more harm than good.

But with the progress of scientific medicine, during the last 50 years, homœopathy has completely lost

ground in the land of its birth. An intelligent and scientifically minded people like the Germans would not have given up what one of their great men had taught, if it had any survival value. It is not recognized or patronized as an independent system of medicine in other civilized countries also.

Homœopathy has no case for being accorded in India a treatment different from what it gets in other civilized countries—that a basic qualification in modern medicine was essential for the practice of homœopathy, also if the practice was to be recognized. A different policy will lead the country to an extremely complicated position from which it might not be able to extricate itself easily.”

—*Hindusthan Standard, December 27th, 1958.*

Perhaps, it seems irrelevant to the medical leaders, to talk of improving their standards, removing their drawbacks, rectifying their mistakes and filling their deficiencies; but, probably, they think that their conference will be a failure, if they do not criticize and slander other systems of medicine, which, for the simple reason of subscribing to the common good of mankind, could not but infuriate them. They cannot omit to treat the therapies and therapists other than their own as their enemies, since they seem to encroach upon their monopolies and curb their birth rights. The slanders and calumnies that emerge from them seem to add salt to the salads of their hatred and spice their orations. But, it would be more rational, if merit is given to speak for itself. The good old adage is, “The taste of the pudding is in the eating.”

Dr. Karunakaran is extremely ill-informed regarding the facts about Homœopathy. Homœopathy has not altogether lost ground in Germany, the land of its birth. Robert Bosch Hospital in Stuttgart, and the conversions of great physicians and scientists like Otto Leser, August Bier etc. to homœopathy, even in recent years, testify to it. The ‘intelligence’ and ‘scientifically mindedness’ of the Germans can form no logical argument for the scientificity and verity or otherwise of homœopathy. The same ‘intelligent’ and ‘scientifically minded’ Germans had the ‘intelligence’ enough to drive Hahnemann,—on whom

Dr. Karunakaran condescends, though flimsily, to bestow some real praises, out of Germany some 130 years ago, when his outstanding achievements were mostly needed for the redemption of medicine from gross ignorance, and recovery of mankind from intolerable sufferings. It is true that Homœopathy was born in Germany, but in fact it flourished in exile, in France, Austria, and later in America and Great Britain. It was Hahnemann's disciples like Jahr, Gross, Stapf etc., that somehow managed to carry the torch of Homœopathy in Germany in his absence. Yet Homœopathy survived and spread throughout the length and breadth of the world. The survival value of something depends not upon someone's ability to understand it, but upon the truth inherent in the thing itself.

Supposing that Homœopathy has been banished from Germany, does it follow that it has no survival value? If so, the Jews, who had been driven from Germany, by Hitler, would have no survival value, the refugees from Pakistan would never have any claim upon rehabilitation. Between driving and evaluating there may not be any efficient cause. One drives out a person, whom others tend to reward. The crucifixion of Jesus gives the same story.

Homœopathy is a minority in medicine. But to it has never been meted out the same deal that a political minority deserves and receives. A majority has never been as unrealistic and as autocratic as the majority in medicine. The majority, here, with its deep-rooted arrogance, intransigent behaviour, and blindfolded reverence and adherence to its own dogmas, is not inclined to investigate the minority points of view. They claim that their dogmas are all that can be found in heaven and earth.

It is true that Homœopathy was born in the Crusade that Hahnemann started against the unstandardized, unrestrained use of arsenic, mercury and other poisonous drugs. It was more than a century and a half ago. But the said crusade has its revival value today. The unrestrained and injudicious use of synthetics, antibiotics and tranquilizers have almost the same effect as the said poisonous drugs. They have their side-effects, they disturb the vital equilibrium, benumb the defence-mecha-

nism, change the blood-chemistry, and along with killing the guest,—the bacteria, tend to have a killing effect on the host,—the noble human organism. In this crusade atleast, if not anywhere else, Homœopathy has its survival value.

But the said crusade is not the whole story about Homœopathy. It had been only the beginning. From there, it developed into a complex plot and unfolded itself into a science, an art and a philosophy. It has a theory, a theory that materialized into and is verifiable by practice. The practice leads to the tangible and positive amelioration of human sufferings, leaving nothing as sequel. The combined approach of Science and Art in Homœopathy, having its basis upon pure, unsophisticated experience and reasoning, is strictly realistic, and views at a distance a goal,—a destination that is rapidly nearing. The pure experience, unsophisticated reasoning, and conceptions of the destination produce generalisations, that are logical deductions, and are integrated with Principles and a Philosophy of Life. So, we find in Homœopathy an integration of Science, Art and Philosophy, a unification of matter, energy and spirit, the sum-total of living existence, of the created universe. Homœopathy is not the crusade only. It is a distinct Science—Art—and Philosophy, deserving and demanding a distinct treatment.

Homœopathy does not claim any practice without a thorough grounding in the basic medical subjects. Homœopathy is opposed to quackery. Even a casual study of the curriculum as recommended by the Homœopathic Committees, founded by the Government of India, will convince anyone of our contentions. But be it known that we want a separate status for Homœopathy, separate institutions, separate colleges and hospitals, bred and reared in a strictly Homœopathic atmosphere, run by Homœopathic teachers professing and practising Homœopathy only. It is not because we are narrow-minded bigots, not because we have separatist mentalities, that we have been urging thus, but because we have earned a lesson at a tremendous cost,—a lesson from the fate of American Homœopathy, that every one in the Homœopathic world will gainfully, but most painfully, keep by heart. The tactics, that our brothers of the majority group have been utilising here,

had been the same adopted by the dominant school in America. Our brothers in America were beguiled ; they handed over their institutions, and integrated them with the Allopathic ones. Consequently, the Homœopathic atmosphere was gone, the Homœopathic teachers were gradually squeezed out, the curriculum altered, changed, and the treatment given only in Allopathy. Ours had been the greatest blunder in America, which had once practically been the Father of World Homœopathy, and we are in no mood to have the same story repeated in India.

REMARKS ON SOME INFECTIOUS DISEASES AND THEIR NOSODES

MORBILLINUM

DR. Q. MURIEL ADAMS

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

The subject this evening is the nosode *Morbillinum*. As there is only time for a short paper, I have confined my remarks to the problem of how the nosode should be used, the method employed in research and the preliminary findings.

Nosodes are disease products prepared after the homœopathic method, administered in potency and given in infrequent doses by mouth.

There are those that think the conception and use of nosodes only date back to the time of Dr. Margaret Tyler. It is true that both by her work in the outpatient department of this Hospital, and as editor of the monthly magazine *Homœopathy*, she gave great prominence to the use of these nosodes, but she herself was the first to acknowledge that they were Hahnemann's own contribution to the successful treatment of