

## THE ALLERGIC PHENOMENON IN HOMŒOPATHY

DR. F. K. BELLOKOSSY, M.D., COLORADO

In the fourth century before our era, Hippocrates laid down his law of similars. This law consists of two parts. The first part concerns diseases only and says: "Diseases are produced by similars." The second part relates to treatment only and says: "By similars, when administered, diseases are cured in the sick."

The first half of this law, though no less important than the second half, sank into complete oblivion after Hippocrates. Through the 23 centuries following, no medical writer mentions it, evidently because no one has understood it.

The second half, the law of cure, on the contrary, has been followed and applied in the centuries following, the Roman physician, Galen, notwithstanding. The early Christian church fathers, many of whom practiced medicine, preferred it, and Paracelsus, in the 16th century, defended it ardently and was a passionate enemy of the *contraria contrariis* principle.

In the 19th century came Hahnemann and the brilliant development of modern Homœopathy.

In 1902 a momentous event occurred, unwittingly confirming the disease principle of Hippocrates. In that year the French physiologist, Charles Richet, injected the toxic substance of a jellyfish into dogs and, to his surprise, found that the same substance which proved innocuous on the first injection, proved severely toxic, even lethal, on re-injection after an interval of several days. This was a lucky hit. Seldom has a physiological experiment had more far-reaching consequences. This experiment started an entirely new field of medical research and a new branch of medical practice. To us homœopaths it is important because it explains the first half of the Hippocratic law of similars.

Richet called this phenomenon anaphylaxis; but in 1906 Baron Von Pirquet objected to this term and introduced the term allergy as allegedly more descriptive of the altered reactivity.

Neither Richet nor Pirquet, however, were aware of the fact that this phenomenon was known to Hippocrates.

In 1940, William E. Boyd, a Glasgow homœopath and electro-physicist, explained Homœopathy by his theory of wave mechanics, that is on a biophysical basis. He was not aware that in so doing he automatically explained also the phenomenon of allergy.

According to this brilliant theory used as a working hypothesis, the homœopathic cure is a matter of interference between the vibrations of the sick and the vibrations of the drug. Also the allergic disease is a matter of interference between the vibrations of the allergic individual and those of the allergen. In order to obtain the allergic response or the allergic sickness, the two interacting waves must have the same length no matter how different or similar they otherwise may be. In order to obtain the homœopathic response, that is the homœopathic cure, the two waves must be only slightly different in length but similar in all other respects.

It is obvious that waves of identical length will increase each other both in their beginning and in their continuation as well, and it is just as obvious that waves of slightly different length will increase each other in the beginning and as long as the crests of the one coincide with those of the other and the troughs of the one with those of the other, but annihilate each other as soon as the crests of the one oppose the troughs of the other. In other words, in allergy the oscillations of the two waves remain in step all the time, therefore increase each other all the time and so produce the disease. It is exactly that which Hippocrates states in the first part of his law of similars.

In Homœopathy, the two waves of slightly different length cover each other and consequently intensify each other for a short time in the beginning, but soon get out of step and annihilate each other. The disease is thus destroyed as stated by Hippocrates in the second half of his law. The close relationship of the two sciences, Homœopathy and allergy, can thus be visualized.

The theory of wave mechanics greatly facilitates our insight into these problems. It is, however, far from any full explanation of the mysteries that puzzle us in allergy as well as in Homœopathy. This theory does not explain the phenomenon of sensitiza-

tion or hypersensitiveness. Hahnemann was fully cognizant of the oversensitiveness of the sick and based the whole structure of Homœopathy on this phenomenon, but he never attempted to explain it, and probably there will never be any explanation. One hundred years after Hahnemann, and independently from him, the allergists also established the existence of this phenomenon, calling it sensitization, and built the science of allergy on it and likewise have never tried to explain it. If for the lack of this explanation Homœopathy is unscientific, then allergy is no less unscientific. Hostile critics of Homœopathy must be reminded of that. Besides, is not almost every science based on some facts that cannot be explained? Look a little into the new nuclear science.

How does this over-sensitiveness come about? Our observation is this: in allergy the two interacting waves are extremely weak, their oscillations extremely small, in fact infinitesimal. Separately they produce no perceptible effect on our bodies nor on our senses. The wave of the receiving host, though evidently a morbid wave, is so weak that it does not make the individual appear sick. Quite as weak is the wave of the allergen as it does not affect anybody else in the least, except the individual who happens to oscillate with a wave of the same length.

Logically, we would reason that the addition of these two infinitesimal, imperceptible waves, would give a resultant wave which would be just as infinitesimal and imperceptible. But here our reasoning, no matter how logical, does not hold true. The resultant wave is many million times more powerful than either of the component waves. For its performance it usurps the largest part of the life force of the body, sometime even all of it, and makes the individual very sick or even kills him.

This totally unexplainable, unlimited response is another mystery of nature and is at the root of every allergic reaction. It is an undeniable fact, and we are not unscientific if we cannot explain it. It entails and requires an enormous expenditure of the life force, always to the detriment of the vegetative functions which are drawn upon.

In order to make this process more easily understood, I shall put it this way: the individual encumbered by some allergies may enjoy perfect physical efficiency, but he is not perfectly healthy

nevertheless. On the contrary, he is permanently impregnated by some toxic vibration, however slight, and is potentially sick. If to this vibration of his another similar vibration but of the same wave length in the form of a similar toxin is added, and if at the same time enough life force is available in the system, then this unlimited response is suddenly awakened and a real, perceptible, incapacitating disease ensues; in other words disease is produced by similars just as Hippocrates asserts. Recognition is growing recently among the allopaths that, excepting massive poisonings, all acute diseases and many chronic ones are caused by this allergic interaction of toxins. This is logical, as only this unlimited response can work such sudden havoc as we see in acute diseases.

In order to show that this interaction of toxic effects is dynamic and not chemical, we can exemplify by the *Rhus* allergy. A person not allergic to *Rhus* can crush its leaves between the fingers, can even eat it, and nothing will happen. A person sensitive to it need not touch it, need not even get close to it, but breaks out in a grave dermatitis even at a distance of 1,000 feet. It is evident that at such a distance no material amount of the plant can hover in the atmosphere. The affecting force is its radiation or energy, comparable to the high potencies of Homœopathy. Allergens of all other plants, as well as those of animal and mineral origin, act in these infinitesimal doses.

In Homœopathy, we take advantage of this same mysterious phenomenon of unlimited response when we prescribe our simillimum, only the final effect is different. The effect is different, not because of any difference in the power of the response, but because of the difference in the interaction of the waves. It was said before that, as long as the two waves oscillate in step and crests cover crests and troughs cover troughs, we obtain the initial allergic effect. As soon as the crests start to oppose the troughs, the waves destroy each other and we obtain the homœopathic cure.

We have every reason to believe that the same amount of vital energy is used for their mutual destruction as for their initial allergic reaction. Both times this energy is usurped from the vegetative functions of the body. It is now obvious that in homœopathic treatment the best procedure is the one which makes the

medicinal wave just as strong as necessary to annihilate the disease wave and not stronger. Even without the help of Boyd's theory, Hahnemann's insight into these processes was so deep that he laid great stress on the proper dosage and constantly admonished us to use small doses so as not to deflect too much vital energy from the vital organs and so cause a weakening reaction.

His usual dose was one pellet of the vehicle containing the potentized remedy and not bigger than a poppy seed. To his weak patients he gave still smaller doses by dissolving one pellet in a half pint of water and administering one teaspoonful of it, or only a fraction of a teaspoonful. He also let his patients inhale the radiations emanating from one pellet of the remedy.

I have tried out this method of smaller-than-a-poppy-seed dose, that is one pellet dissolved in a half pint of water and only one teaspoonful of this administered and the inhalation method. I have found them not only just as effective as larger doses, but more satisfactory because of the avoidance of the subsequent strain and harm to the life force. I have found that opening a remedy bottle and inhaling the radiations of the remedy with deep inhalation, is much too powerful a dose in sensitive patients, and Hahnemann's one pellet inhalation is far superior. In prolonged treatments of chronic patients this soon becomes apparent to the watchful prescriber.

I admit that this is fantastic. The question is not how fantastic it is, but how true it is. It is true, and Hahnemann was right. Homœopathy being a form of allergy, and everything about allergy being fantastic, it is natural and obvious that Homœopathy must be fantastic. Isn't it fantastic to break out with *Rhus* dermatitis and high fever at a distance of 1,000 feet from the plant? Isn't it fantastic to see an asthmatic break out with an attack if he steps into a house where a cat happens to live. Many thousands of similar fantastic allergic phenomena are seen by doctors every day and all this is taken for granted. No one sees anything extraordinary in them, just phenomena of nature!

Nor is this phenomenon of unlimited response something unusual and confined only to sick individuals. In nature for the infinitesimal to meet the infinite is not the exception, but the rule. Nature offers us countless examples of infinite sensitiveness

just as fantastic as those of Homœopathy and allergy, not only in sick but in healthy creatures as well. For more information on this subject you need only to read the wonderful book of George Lakhovsky entitled *The Secret of Life*.

Two examples from this book.

How does a carrier pigeon know how to find its dove-cote after having flown a few hundred miles?

Then, how do migrating birds, which fly in a straight line day and night across the seas towards a definite destination that they cannot see because of the curvature of the earth's surface, know their direction and destination? They emigrate to feed on insects that they can no longer find in our latitude at the approach of the winter. The explanation is that the insects emit special radiations on which the cells of the birds are tuned in and which give the sense of direction to the birds often at a distance of several thousand miles. Truly, the sensitiveness of these birds defies all imagination as the waves of the insects cannot be larger than those of the highest homœopathic potencies.

Lakhovsky convinces us that this broadcasting and receiving radiant energy in infinitesimal doses is an integral part of animal and insect life. Also the microbes radiate and receive energy. It is not by the production of chemical poisons that the microbes harm us but by their radiation. The new science of radiobiology is studying these problems at present and let us hope that the time is not far off when it will investigate Hahnemann's discoveries and confirm their validity.

While in allergy we have two component infinitesimal waves, which by their interaction give a powerful resultant wave, in Homœopathy the patient's wave is not infinitesimal since it is perceptible and the patient feels his sickness. The medicinal wave, however, must be kept as infinitesimal as possible so that the resultant wave may not get too violent and become uncontrollable. The resultant wave is always infinitely stronger than the disease wave which is always limited, so there is no fear that the disease wave will not be destroyed as soon as the crests begin to oppose the troughs. No matter how infinitesimal the medicinal wave is, and no matter how strong the disease wave, the resultant wave is always so enormous, we may say almost infinitely strong, that

it always destroys the limited disease wave provided there is enough vital force left in the system that is drawn upon for the purpose of this performance.

It is plain that in order to cure grave, acute and deep-seated chronic diseases, powerful and very specific forces must be mobilized in the body. No other force except the unlimited response can be strong enough and specific enough for this purpose. Homœopathy is the science which has discovered and now possesses forces with which to awaken the specific powers strong enough to cure these diseases. Allopathy does not possess any such strong nor specific forces, is therefore incapable of curing any serious disease.

In order to be just, we must say that Homœopathy is not the only science that studies the means and ways with which to arouse the unlimited response. The Chinese Acupuncture, the American Zone Therapy of Dr. Fitzgerald, and the German Neural Therapy of Ferdinand Huneke apply this principle in their practice, though in another way. By stimulation of exactly determined locations of the body they arouse the life force to immediate powerful therapeutic action. Huneke is well aware of the forms of this action, but is more struck by its speed than by its power, and for that reason calls it "Sekundenphänomen." He and other Germans have made great efforts to explain this Sekundenphänomen with the assumption of a thrust into the vegetativum of the system, then with different electrophysiological theories and with quantum jumps of the nuclear physics. All these explanations are anything but satisfactory.

In comparison to this, it is astounding how closely Hahnemann appraised the power of the homœopathic remedy. In paragraph 279 of the *Organon* he says:

The dose of the homœopathically selected and highly potentized remedy for the beginning of treatment of an important, especially chronic disease, can never be prepared so small that it shall not be stronger than the natural disease and shall not be able to overpower it, at least in part and extinguish it from the sensation of the principle of life and thus make a beginning of a cure.

This statement of Hahnemann is printed in the *Organon* in extended type showing the great importance Hahnemann attached to it. The English translator of the *Organon* left this paragraph in

cursive type, thus proving that he did not grasp its enormous significance. In the new French translation of the *Organon* by Dr. Pierre Schmidt, our eminent guest, this passage is not only printed in enlarged type but its contents are still more emphasized by a number of clever synonyms not found in the original.

This is proof enough that Hahnemann attributed tremendous importance not only to the potentization, but also to the smallness of the vehicle carrying the potency. So when he speaks of the smallness of the dose, he always means the smallness of the vehicle, be it sugar, water or inhalation which last he called olfaction.

In some sixty passages of his *Organon* he speaks of this smallness but no one seems to have been impressed. It is pitiful to look back and to observe how shamefully he was misunderstood. He was misunderstood on potentization, on the repetition of the dose and most of all on the size of the dose.

As to the size of the dose, it seems that in 160 years no one has followed him. Kent who studied Hahnemann's *Organon* more thoroughly than anybody else, and who often speaks with emphasis of the dreadful power of high potencies when improperly applied, nowhere mentions the smaller-than-poppy-seed dose. It looks as if he, too, had suffered from fear that the public would misunderstand him.

Not having found anywhere in the homœopathic literature the confirmation of the smallness of the dose of the *Organon*, I have been under the impression for many years that it does not make much difference whether one or ten or a hundred pellets are administered in one dose, just as it does not make any difference whether we use one or ten or more matches to light a fire. Dr. Boyd's theory of wave mechanics made me study the matter more deeply and gradually led me to a better understanding of the *Organon*.

It would be good for the reputation and success of Homœopathy, if those who use large bottles filled with big tablets and administer them in frequent repetition would start to study the *Organon*. Also, we have had enough of the unhomœopathic combination remedies and we should instruct the lay public using



self-medication that in the long run only harm ensues out of such Homœopathy.

On the title page of his *Organon* we read Hahnemann's motto: "Aude sapere," which means have courage to tell what you know. In the face of a continuous avalanche of unjust accusations, ridicule and insults, it was courage that he needed most. It is a wonder that, under the impact of so much humiliation, he could have strength to continue his work for suffering humanity. Studying Homœopathy in conjunction with allergy, you will come to the conclusion that Hahnemann was right in everything he advised us and that all the reproaches thrown at him were based on ignorance, presumption and lack of investigation.

#### DISCUSSION

ROGER A. SCHMIDT, M.D.: Dr. Bellokossy never fails to bring us provocative, forceful, honest papers with plenty to dig into and to think about. Attacking a subject as basic and thorny as allergy and Homœopathy is indeed a challenge and he has opened its study very well.

He chooses the linear mechanical approach for his demonstration which is the easiest one to understand. This appealing and simple explanation does not explain, however, all the intricacies of a problem that goes deeply into animated life. Aside from the mechanical approach there are others, such as the chemical, the electronical, the physiological and others, all very complicated and none giving us all the answers of the phenomena of sensitivity, allergy and immunity which are the main features of health and disease.

Modern medical physiology teaches that allergy and immunity are indelibly related, for allergic reactions occur only when a person is mildly immunized against an antigen. Yet, when the individual is strongly immunized against the antigen, allergic reactions do not occur. Thus, in the early stages of acquired immunity during babyhood, the baby is likely to become temporarily allergic to many substances, including egg albumin and many meat extracts; but as more immunity develops the allergy disappears.

When an immune reaction between an antigen and an antibody takes place in the blood stream, essentially no allergic response occurs; however, if it occurs in the tissue spaces, a severe reaction is likely to occur and the reason why is unknown. This has led to complicated theories based on the Arthus phenomenon—the release of histamine and H substance by the tissue cells. The atopic allergies result from another mechanism with hereditary factors involved, for example, atopic dermatitis, hay fever and asthma on which antihistamine drugs have but little effect but which respond

readily to the indicated homœopathic remedy. It is an accepted fact that the allergic process is a generalized phenomenon among human beings rather than occurring in some individuals only.

Certain assertions of Dr. Bellokossy's paper are not readily convincing. For example, the *Rhus* allergy which is supposed to produce a severe dermatitis at a distance of a thousand feet. This very subject was recently discussed at a Staff Meeting of the University of California Medical School by various specialists. It was the consensus of opinion that no such thing occurs. The Army Medical Corps has done years of extensive research on the *Rhus* allergy with rigid scientific controls and concluded that there must be a contact, direct or indirect, with the alkaloid before the allergic response takes place.

I do not dare to venture into the mysteries of animal instinct and its relation with the allergic phenomenon.

The emphasis on the minimal dose is well taken and should prompt us to penetrate this arcanum and find out by direct clinical observation.

Dr Bellokossy is to be congratulated for his presentation of a very difficult and obscure subject.

—*Journl. of Am. Inst. of Homœopathy, Nov.-Dec., '59*