

tled blueness, general coldness, coupled with screaming between the spasms in an unconscious state which reminded me of the case of Dr. A. H. Croucher, cited by Dr. J. H. Clark in his *Dictionary of Materia Medica*, Part 1. *Hydrocyanic acid* was visibly indicated and administered in three doses of the 200th every 4 hours. It controlled the case in thirty-six hours, when the extremities became warm, blueness disappeared, crying abated, the patient gained consciousness and could drink a small quantity of milk. A dose of the same potency of the same remedy was administered on the fifth day of treatment, after which the patient was completely free from all symptoms. The convalescence was rapid.

The citation of only four cases need not disappoint us, as the insignificant four goes to make up its giant multiple 4,000,000, and that it will definitely do, if the fraternity of homœopaths all the world over combine to report their cured cases of such fell diseases to an international organization.

—*Journal of the A.I.H.*, August, 1954

HOMŒOPATHY AT THE CROSS-ROAD

DR. J. GHOSH, M.A. (CAL.), Ph.D. (EDIN.), F.N.I., CALCUTTA

Apart from the theoretical, experimental and philosophical foundations of homœopathy, the actual results, obtained from the treatment of patients, afford sufficient proof of the therapeutic value of homœopathic medicines. In many types of diseases of women and children in a large variety of chronic and constitutional diseases, homœopathic treatment has been found to be superior to allopathic treatment, and in some cases where allopathic treatment has definitely failed, homœopathic treatment has been found to be successful.

The value of homœopathic treatment has also been recognised by the Indian Medical Council, who have re-

commended homœopathy as a course of postgraduate study for those who have already finished the ordinary medical degree course. While thus giving formal recognition to homœopathy, the Council has however suggested a step which will have the effect of restricting and ultimately abolishing the study of homœopathy in this country. It is said that some western countries have adopted the same principle. But it is highly unreasonable that we should ape other countries in all matters, irrespective of the actual conditions prevailing in our country.

No one would deny the value of modern allopathic system of medicine. But even then, as the most eminent physicians and surgeons themselves would confess, a perfect system which would cure every illness of every individual, has not yet been developed. There are many diseases and many derangements of the human body, which cannot be tackled by allopathic treatment. Is it reasonable, then, to shut out by law, the possibility of cure by other methods of treatment based on a systematic logical foundation? Can any particular system guarantee cure for all possible diseases under all possible conditions?

Even if we assume—though no one, not even the allopaths themselves would assume—that the modern allopathic system can cure every patient, is it possible at present to provide for adequate allopathic treatment for every citizen of India? Only the other day I was called by a patient who has spent about three hundred rupees on X-ray photographs alone, besides other heavy items of expenditure. What are we going to do in the case of millions of Indian citizens for whom adequate allopathic treatment is altogether out of reach? I met a patient about a month ago, for whom a course of treatment had been prescribed, which would cost an amount, which he would not be able to procure even if he sold all his earthly belongings. So long as we are unable to provide for adequate allopathic treatment for every individual at a cost consistent with his income, it is certainly highly unreasonable

to deprive the millions of people of a far cheaper course of treatment, which has been proved to be an efficient, and in many cases a superior, system of treatment.

Apart from the fact that the provision of a post-graduate course in homœopathy in place of an independent self-sufficient course, will inevitably discourage the study and practice of homœopathy and thus gradually abolish it altogether, there is another very serious objection to the provision of homœopathy as merely a post-graduate course. A post-graduate course in any subject means an extension of a corresponding under-graduate course. But there is nothing in common between allopathy and homœopathy except the basic subject of anatomy, physiology and certain other auxiliary subjects. And of these subjects, too, a homœopath does not require the same kind of intensive training as an allopath, just as an ordinary allopathic physician does not require the same amount of detailed knowledge of anatomy as a specialist in surgery may do. The theoretical and philosophical foundation of homœopathy is so fundamentally different that it is impossible for any person to be an allopath and a homœopath at the same time, without being traitor to one. An allopath may, in very rare cases, completely convert himself into a homœopath, but he cannot be both simultaneously. A 'Sakto' may convert himself into a 'Vaishnava', but he cannot be both at the same time. A man cannot have sincere convictions about two fundamentally different and in some respects diametrically opposite tenets. Half faith is worse than no faith. A man who has been trained systematically for years in a particular scientific school of thought cannot give up and unlearn his deeprooted convictions and it is also not desirable both from the ethical and practical points of view. A serious conflict of principles and practice is inevitable and the possibility of mixing up the two systems in a haphazard manner cannot be altogether ruled out.

It will also mean an extraordinary taxation on the time and energy of a student, who wants to be a homœopath, to

undergo a full M.B. course and then unlearn most of what he has so assiduously learnt, in order to undergo a further course of three years in homœopathy. Even then, as I have already said, it may be psychologically impossible to get over his hard-earned convictions. The net result of the provision of a merely post-graduate course will be that very few M.B.'s will consider it worth while, or find it practicable to take up this doubly expensive course and the number of homœopaths will soon be reduced to a mere handful, if not to zero.

At present we have no provision for imparting medical education to a sufficiently large number of students. Only a small fraction of the candidates for admission to medical colleges can be admitted and the number of M.B.'s is far too short of our actual requirements. So, to expect voluntary diversion of some of these few medical students to homœopathy and thus to provide for homœopathic treatment of the people, is really tantamount to bidding good-bye to homœopathy. And to prescribe allopathic treatment as the only method of treatment would be just like compelling every citizen to buy a motor car, or in the alternative, do without any conveyance of any kind.

Though I have laid some stress on the economic aspect of the problem, it is not merely an economic question. There is no justification for abolishing a system of medicine, which has been found beyond any doubt to be efficient as well as economic, and in a wide range of human maladies, distinctly superior to other systems. It is also a noteworthy fact that there is a large number of highly educated men, rich and poor, scientists, and even allopathic doctors, who have been benefited by homœopathic treatment after they have exhausted all the weapons in the armoury of other systems.

It is not reasonable to reject homœopathy simply on the ground that it is not modern. There are many fundamental laws of nature whose discovery is not modern. It is also not reasonable to assume once for all that what-

ever is modern is good for health. Motor cycles are more modern than hackney-carriages, but they are certainly not more beneficial for health. It is doubtful whether the modern electric lights, as we usually use them, are really better for the eye than other older forms of lamps. Moreover, what is modern today will not remain modern tomorrow. The human body and its normal physiological processes and biological functions are not changing from day to day. The fact that we are having new and newer method of cure at very frequent intervals proves that we are yet very far from a really sound principle consistent with the mechanism of human body. Under the circumstances, it will be highly injudicious to reject a principle of cure, which is based on a sound logical basis and which has been verified by innumerable patients for about a century and a half.

HOMŒOPATHY

DR. A. K. NANDI, B.Sc., F.I.C.S., C.S.G.M., BOMBAY

Normally natural immunity is developed as a person is repeatedly exposed to a small number of pathogenic organisms. These organisms may not be sufficient to cause actual disease, but can *stimulate* production of antibodies. This argument is an established *scientific* one, and is agreed upon by the members of the dominant school of medicine. If that is so, then there is no reason why they should not accept the dictum of *Similia Similibus Curantur* as it is one and the same thing as the above, only expressed in a different way.

When a person is suffering from any illness, that means to say that the said person has not got enough of the antibodies in his system to overcome the external invading disease, and as such he falls a victim to the said disease. Now by some means or the other if it is possible to *stimulate* the production of the antibodies in the