

FROM ALLERGY TO HOMŒOPATHY

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

The law of similars as laid down by Hippocrates comprises two parts and each part is expressed by one short sentence. The first part relates to pathogenesis of disease, the second part to therapeutics. One is the law of disease, the other the law of cure. The Latins translated it in the witty language of oracles which was a detriment as it made its understanding more difficult. Moreover, they translated only the second half, the law of cure, and left the first half, the law of disease, unmentioned. So it came that the early Christian church fathers, who practiced Homœopathy, knowing only the clipped Latin version, had no knowledge of the law of disease. It is possible that Paracelsus and Hahnemann, by reading Latin books, were misled into by-passing the law of disease. And that must be the reason why we find no mention of it in Linn Boyd's book, *The Simile in Medicine*.

In the first half of the law Hippocrates said: "Diseases are produced by similars". This is the law of disease. Today we could call it the law of allergy. The other half of the law reads: "And by similars, when administered to the sick, diseases are cured". This is the law of cure, the law of Homœopathy. It makes Homœopathy look like allergy in reverse, but we shall see shortly that we could consider it as a branch of allergy.

In a paper read three years ago I drew attention to this subject, but it aroused no curiosity. It is important, however, because in our practice we are unconsciously applying the total law. To be sure, we prescribe the remedy in the hope that it will work according to the law of cure. But what happens? It all too often works according to the law of disease. Instead of working as a curative homœopathic antigen, it works as a morbid allergen. That is why our pioneers discovered antidotes to many remedies in case these should act contrary to the law of cure. They realized the importance of recognizing the allergic effect of a remedy when they happened to meet it.

Another reason why we should understand the total law of

similars is the possible future recognition of Homœopathy by the orthodox school. The orthodox man, though he may not understand all the whys and wherefores of allergy, nevertheless believes in its reality. If we prove to him that Homœopathy is founded on the same biological principles as allergy, which will be explained later, we shall have less difficulty in obtaining his much overdue acceptance.

It is therefore imperative that we stop by-passing the first part of the Hippocratic law of similars, but analyze it and study its implications in order to gain a clear mental picture showing how concisely it expresses the biological basis of allergy.

Advocates of the microbial as well as of the toxic theories of disease causation may be puzzled at this law, but we shall soon see that it embodies both their theories. To formulate in three words a law including two so divergent positions is indeed an intellectual achievement.

The fact that it remained unnoticed by Hahnemann must have had two causes, one that he was too busily occupied with the study of the therapeutic law, the other that the time was not yet ripe for this discovery. Allergy was actually discovered 100 years after Hahnemann when cases of allergies in the civilized populations became so flagrant that the stage for this discovery was set.

The assertion that the disease is caused by similars may sound strange to the orthodox man, but not so to us. In our work we see examples of such disease causation quite often and we know how to interpret them. If a remedy is insufficiently similar, it will produce a disease aggravation, intensifying the existing symptoms and causing new ones. Another form of allergic disease we see if we repeat the curative remedy too early. If a remedy is given in the sensitization period, it causes an allergic aggravation and not a homœopathic reaction.

Much more frequent cases of allergy are caused by orthodox drugs. Patients come to us and say: "Doctor, I can't take Aspirin, sleeping pills make me swell up, penicillin almost killed me", etc.

This phenomenon was first experimentally elucidated by the French physiologist, Charles Richet. He called it anaphylaxis. He

injected the toxic substance of a jelly fish into dogs and to his surprise he found that the same substance which had proved innocuous on the first injection, proved severely toxic, even lethal, on reinjection after an interval of several days. This made it possible to better understand why guinea pigs inoculated with a mixture of diphtheria toxin and anti-toxin for the purpose of standardization of the antitoxin very often died following repeated injection. It also threw more light on the clinical observations with horse serum where at times patients experienced sudden alarming symptoms.

In 1902 Richet then proposed the following two postulates:

1. A foreign substance which on first injection may be relatively harmless, may on re-injection become severely toxic, even fatal, when given in the same, or even smaller dosage.
2. An interval of several days must elapse between the first and the second injections.

These two postulates must be adhered to in every therapeutic activity, allopathic as well as homœopathic. Long before Richet homœopaths had found that these postulates must be observed to the full when using homœopathic high potencies.

The incubation period is about ten days, then the specific sensitization begins and usually lasts four months, but with some drugs much longer, and may be transferred in utero from mother to offspring. A great variety of antigens may be responsible. These may be of animal, vegetable, bacterial and mineral origin.

In 1906 Pirquet objected to the term anaphylaxis and introduced the term allergy as more descriptive of the altered response or altered re-activity of cases showing no antibodies, called non-reagenic. The term allergy was immediately accepted by all writers on allergy and the term anaphylaxis was retained for cases with antigen-antibody reactions.

Persons who have never been drugged and much less purposely sensitized do not develop allergic diseases. They are immune to them. If, however, they have been exposed to some toxic substance, even mild, for prolonged periods of their foetal or extra-uterine life, they do develop a temporary or permanent allergic diathesis or sensitization to this toxic substance. Such people give the appearance of perfect health as long as they do

not come in contact with the substance to which they are sensitized or with a chemically similar substance. If in such sickness they subsequently avoid the substance, they recover soon. This is the way the Hippocratic law of disease is to be understood.

As a boy I was taken in the summer to a farm where I would play with farm boys in freshly mowed and dried hay. There I could see the difference between a city and a farm boy. Farm boys never developed hay fever, city boys always did. The rural populations of Europe at that time were rarely allergic to anything, while allergy was found in large cities and then especially among the wealthier classes.

Outside the drug and other chemical allergens, troubling the life of civilized peoples at present, there is another class which is produced by the excess of cooking. Ever since the invention and manufacture of the convenient kitchen stoves foods have been over-cooked. Natural foods are charged with electro-magnetic energies which come from the sun and which are destroyed by too much cooking. Energies carried by these foods, and so essential in nutrition, are thus lacking and such foods become mere chemicals. We call them devitalized; they fall in the class of any other chemical apt to sensitize the organism to itself and to all chemically similar substances. The two most abused and most allergenic food articles have been well-cooked meat and white industrial sugar. They vitiate the metabolism and irritate the sympathetic nervous system, thus sensitizing the individual: meat to its own proteins and to groups of similar proteins, bacterial, viral, dust and pollen and animal emanations; sugar to itself and to chemically related substances, such as honey, alcohol, vinegar and starches. These are only two examples among hundreds. The violence of the disease so produced depends on the degree of similarity and intensity of the preceding sensitization. The delicate cells of the child and especially of the foetus are far more easily sensitized than those of the adult. May older patients are much less often allergic than the younger, because years ago the older were raised on more natural wholesome foods, while the younger are victimse of the growing industrialization of the country and are being raised on dainties and canned foods.

At this juncture I wish to interpolate a short account of an

observation never reported before but which I have made many times. I would give placebos to a patient to be taken every other or third day and he would come back and say that on those days that he took my remedy he would feel badly, but would feel quite well on days he would not take it. For years I thought that it was a queer auto-suggestion, but one day I happened to treat a young lady who told me that every time she would take my remedies it would almost immediately cause sneezing and itching of the nose. This solved the problem unequivocally. The smallness of the dose could not have been an objection to my conclusion. The patient was allergic to sugar and received no more milk sugar placebos. I now often give such cases a dose of *Saccharum officinale* CM and a bottle of distilled water as placebo.

White sugar was first introduced into the human diet about the time Homœopathy was born. Its consumption took the start in families of rich merchants, industrialists and aristocrats in large cities of civilized countries and 100 years later it was already in general use. Sugar and other allergies then cropped up in prosperous families. Thus it was no coincidence that allergies were first thoroughly studied and the term allergy invented in the Austrian capital of Vienna, famous for its pastry, 50 years ago by an aristocrat, Clemens Baron von Pirquet, who was professor of Pediatrics and chief of the large pediatric University Clinic where he had a thousand and one opportunities to see such cases. It was *de bon ton* then to shower pregnant and nursing women with cakes and Swiss chocolate candies and feed children only highly sweetened foods. Consequences of such practices could not be averted and it was unavoidable that some one should discover the food allergies.

Allergy, unlike Homœopathy, found recognition with mercurial speed. With all his research Pirquet was unusually lucky. No one objected, no one criticised. Fifty years before the same city was not so generous to Semmelweiss. The valuable research of this man on puerperal sepsis was so violently attacked that the grief over it beclouded his mind. And Sigmund Freud, who lived in the same city at the same time, was met with derision and ostracised by the Vienna society. Nothing of the kind happened to Pirquet. Though scientific superiority had nothing to do with

his luck, still it was no coincidence. Some imponderable forces were at work. He belonged to the nobility of Vienna and was the son-in-law of another aristocrat, Baron von Eiselsberg, who was aulic councillor, eminent professor of surgery and chief of the first surgical university clinic. You know how the public bows to everything aristocratic, the medical public not excluded. Even if he had been wrong, no other professor of the medical faculty would have challenged him. Also his many collaborators and assistants in his large hospital were only too eager to applaud everything he said, and in addition to all that he was a finely-educated kindly gentleman. He was equally beloved by his colleagues, his students and his patients, and unable to make enemies.*

Physiologists have a chemical explanation for these allergy cases in which antibodies are formed in the presence of an antigen. This explanation deserves a comparison. One fly is harmless to an elephant, but when two flies alight on the back of an elephant, then, with their united forces, they can kill him. And that should explain the anaphylactic shock. Nor has anyone ever expressed his doubt in such an explanation. For cases without antibody formation no explanation has been tried yet.

Allergy, as well as Homœopathy, can be explained on a bio-physical basis by the theory of wave mechanics which has been done by the late William E. Boyd, a Glasgow electronic physicist and homœopath. Boyd started from the view that all matter radiates energy which is vibratory in character and electro-magnetic. In living subjects this energy varies with the changes in health of the individual. The homœopathic cure is a matter of interference between the vibrations of the sick person and the vibrations of the potentized drug. This theory can be applied also to allergic disease. Here the wave length of the disease must be the

*This is authentic because he was my teacher and examiner in pediatrics. I still remember how nice he was to me when on the day of my pediatric examination I appeared too late for it. My watch had stopped that morning. When on the way to the clinic I discovered that I was late, I ran and arrived for the examination all out of breath. Students and patients were lined up on the platform, Pirquet examining, and the seats of the amphitheatre filled with listeners when I shot into that crowd, frightened and expecting a rap on the knuckles. But the professor only gave a smile and forthwith proceeded to examine me. In a minute my worry was gone.

same as that of the antigen, while in Homœopathy the two waves have slightly different lengths. It is obvious that two similar waves with identical lengths, if inter-acting, will increase each other all the time as the crests of the one will coincide in phase with the crests of the other and so will the troughs. The two oscillations will remain in step permanently, increase each other and so produce the disease, as stated by Hippocrates in the first part of his law of similars. If, on the other hand, the two similar waves differ in their wave length even slightly, they will cover each other exactly only for a short time and intensify each other, but soon they will be out of phase and their crests will oppose their troughs, so that they will annihilate each other and thus, after an initial aggravation, a disease is destroyed, as stated by Hippocrates in the second half of his law of similars which is Homœopathy. The close relationship between allergy and Homœopathy can thus be visualized.

No doubt, Boyd's theory is beautiful, satisfying and better than anything physiologists have ever offered us in this matter. Boyd's aim was only to explain the biological basis of Homœopathy and he did not know that with it he explained also allergy.

In order to make this theory more complete, we must become cognizant of a phenomenon which is the most essential part of Homœopathy as well as allergy and which seems to be ignored by everybody as no one has ever talked about as far as I know. But we must talk about it, not only because it is the most mysterious phenomenon of medical science, if not of nature, but because it links allergy and Homœopathy more tightly together than anything else. The problem is this: I ask you have much pollen, how much horse dander, how much bacterial toxin or poison ivy emanation is necessary to produce a violent attack of hayfever, asthma, dermatitis or infectious fever? The individual is stuffed full of toxins anyway, what difference should it make if an infinitesimal amount of a similar toxin is added to his toxins by a pollen touching his nasal mucous membrane or a little dust falling on his skin or some faint odor inhaled by his lung. Our reason tells us that there could be no difference whatsoever. However, reasoning alone is insufficient and misleading. We must look and see and observe. If we do that, we discover something seemingly con-

trary to our reasoning. If we use both reason and vision, we become amazed at our discoveries. We then understand the fatal case caused from an infinitesimal quantity of a non-toxic substance. We believe it and do not shout "fraud, rubbish, impossible!" If people would reason and observe, they would believe in homœopathic miracles, but so often they only reason and do not observe. So they miss noticing the most wonderful, the most valuable and most mysterious phenomenon ever bestowed on humanity. To better understand this phenomenon we must translate it into terms of wave mechanics. If we do that, we shall see that the oscillations of two similar waves do not simply add their amplitudes to, or subtract from, each other but either multiply or divide each other, so that the resultant is not a simple sum total or difference of the two waves, but an enormous, often unlimited multiplication or just as enormous division and even total destruction of one wave by the other. If mere addition or mere subtraction of the waves were at work here, the change would be so slight that it would be negligible and no anaphylactic shock nor homœopathic cure could ever result. Why the interaction of the two waves produces such a disproportionate effect, we shall never know; it is one of the many of nature's mysteries. It is operative in both allergy and Homœopathy, for good in one, for bad in the other. It seems to have no limits in its intensity as it can destroy the healthiest man with one stroke or restore health from the gravest disease with one dose of the remedy. It confirms Hahnemann who was the first to tell us that one dose of the properly chosen homœopathic remedy suffices to effect the whole cure of an acute disease.

This mysterious phenomenon, we could call it the phenomenon of the unlimited response, is a function of similarity in both allergy and Homœopathy. It works in serum disease, in shock, from bacterial and other toxins and is not a function of potentization. The potentization, however, does make the vibrations and the response more violent. This phenomenon is also operative in the ancient Chinese Acupuncture, in the Neural Therapy as practiced by the brothers Huneke, two German physicians, and in some forms of mental therapy.

Arthur Coca's pulse test is the most reliable and most practi-

cal method of diagnosing food allergies. Skin tests are of some value only for the diagnosis of hayfever, asthma and infantile eczema. These methods enable us to find the allergenic substance of the patient so that we can advise him to avoid it, which is in perfect accord with the teaching of Hahnemann who was scrupulous in the matter of avoiding all that is in any way injurious to the patient. Our medicinal treatment, however, cannot and must not depend solely on this knowledge of the patient's allergens. We must not treat with extracts of pollens, fungi, food and other allergens, as these are only occasional, provocative and contributing causes of the disease and are not the whole disease. We must treat the totality of the condition, the allergic diathesis as characterized by all its symptoms. The idea of repeated injecting of small quantities of allergen extracts is no doubt borrowed from Homœopathy, but its orthodox application is thoroughly un-homœopathic and as such can only suppress some symptoms. The vital functions of the system as a whole are only harmed by it, and the homœopathic treatment, if it should be resorted to later, is then made more difficult. In all the allopathic armamentarium there is only one drug worth mentioning. It is Epinephrine. It is of temporary usefulness in allergic shock in cases where we cannot decide quickly on the proper homœopathic remedy. The homœopathic remedies for this shock are *Veratrum album*, *Carbo vegetabilis* and *Camphora*. The homœopathic remedies for sub-acute allergic conditions are *Nux vomica* and *Veratrum viride*. In chronic cases of allergic diathesis and psoric remedy may be indicated. It is disheartening to find not a word of advice in the allopathic books on how to prevent the development of this diathesis. In this respect Hahnemann in his fifty years of research achieved infinitely more than all the thousands of orthodox allergists together in as many years. Nevertheless we must admit that the allopathic effort has not been quite in vain. It has solved some problems of diagnosis and hygiene which we should adopt. The two sciences should be merged into one as they complement each other, just as Hippocrates combines them in his immortal law of similars. The term Homœopathy would then express better what is meant under the term "allergy," that is allergy should be called

(Continued on page 332)

Khagra, Murshidabad) or the Genl. Secretary, W.B.S.H.F. (87, Dharamtala Street, Calcutta-13) and to send all their help and suggestions regarding the Conference to either of them.

(b) To send erudite articles (in Bengali or English) to the Chief Editor of the Souvenir of the 4th W.B.S.H.P. Conference—Dr. B. K. Sarkar, 86, Beltola Road, Calcutta-26, or to the Genl. Secretary, W.B.S.H. Federation, 87, Dharamtala Street, Calcutta-13.

3. Study classes and Refresher Courses for preparing the candidates for Registration under the Council of Homœopathic Medicine, West Bengal, are being organised and conducted by various Associations, in the different regions of West Bengal, affiliated to the West Bengal State Homœopathic Federation.

4. In a Symposium, organised by the W.B.S.H. Federation on 9-5-64 at D. N. De Homœo. Med. College, Calcutta, the suggestions of the W.B.S.H.F. regarding a uniform curriculum and syllabus for homœopathic education in India was finalised. The suggestions have been published in the form of a booklet, which can be obtained on remitting Rs. 1.20 (including Postage) to the Genl. Secretary, W.B.S.H. Federation, 87, Dharamtala Street, Calcutta-13.

FROM ALLERGY TO HOMŒOPATHY

(Continued from page 312)

Homœopathy, and the term Homœotherapeutics would be more descriptive of what we call Homœopathy today. The combined science would then best be called Homiatriy and we would be called Homiaters or Homiättrists.

—*The Homœopathic Recorder, July-Sept., '59*