

FIRST PRINCIPLES IN HOMOEOPATHY

By J. R. SANDY

Some weeks ago I was reading an appreciation of Hahnemann published over 60 years ago. In the course of it severe criticism was levelled against those homoeopaths who dared to exceed Hahnemann's highest potency—the 30th centesimal—and against many other innovations too. In December's issue of "Heal Thyself" a correspondent queries the usefulness of *Lac caninum*, etc., not because he has found it useless, but because he does not believe in it; while Ellis Barker, in the same issue, finds it necessary to justify his own practice of departing from the single remedy method.

Now I am getting more than a little tired of these time wasting discussions. Let us get down to fundamentals, and see the futility of criticizing each other's ways. Homoeopathy is based on the one law and two basic principles. The rest is up to us. The law we all know. *Similia Similibus Curentur*. The principles we hear often enough, but are too apt to misapply them.

First is the Principle of Clinical Test, and Secondly (arising out of the first and proved by it) the Principle, that it is necessary to treat the patient as an individual, and as a whole, not the disease. Now it is this first principle of Homoeopathy that I wish to discuss. It has two major points of application. Followers of the homoeopathic method must be prepared to try anything which appeals to them as being worth trying, even though it may seem ridiculous viewed in the

cold light of reason: And they must be equally willing to accept any hypothesis as being true, when it has been proved by the acid test of clinical experience; or to reject even their most cherished notion which does not stand up to such a test. Now where do the critics stand? Ellis Barker has shown clinical evidence that, for him, his method works. Clinical evidence is available in plenty for the use of many drugs which superficially appear to have no clinical value whatever.

As to the high potencies, no experienced practitioner would deny their value, and few would care to be without them.

The trouble with this Homœopathy of ours is that it is unlike anything that has gone before. It is far too vast for any human mind to comprehend and the more the individual student goes in for it (for the most advanced homœopath is still a student) the more he realizes his abysmal ignorance. We all have an enormous amount to learn, and even the veriest beginner has his contribution to teach. And since Homœopathy is an individual science, each practitioner must use highly individual methods—keeping the law and the principles. Homœopathy is a vast armoury against the enemy—disease—and each of us must select the weapons best suited to our hands, discarding those we do not find suitable, using those with which we feel we can become most skilled. I have tried using several drugs as Ellis Barker does, but I find this weapon clumsy in my hands. Equally, I would be embarrassed at having to prescribe a single

dose in high potency at very rare intervals. Amongst homoeopathic practitioners, the greatest common factor, apart from their adherence to the law, is the wide difference between each of their methods. A diversity of method, but one Law. And while each of us has a perfect right to criticize provided that we can bring clinical evidence to give point to our criticism, we ought to leave criticism without such evidence to the allopaths. For better or worse there is no rule of thumb in Homoeopathy, standardization either of treatment or method is outside our sphere. Each of us must use his own initiative, develop his own technique and, provided that his experience shows a validity of that technique, there is no ground for complaint against it. Let me give two examples from my own experience in which I have had to depart from strictly orthodox treatment. A woman who came to me some months ago asked for treatment for her son who had been living for some time in muddy ditches in Holland with the B.L.A. He had come out in a large number of boils and was spending a considerable amount of time in the "sick-bay". I had never seen the youth; there was no photograph available and his mother was not an expert at description. Seeing that his normal health was good I ignored the usual treatment for boils and excrescences and gave *Opium* 6 because of the patient's environment. *Opium*, we are told, is of immense value in the Fen districts where farmers easily become depressed in mind and where the slightest scratch is liable to develop into a festering sore. Sometime

later I met the mother who told me that the boy had just come home and wanted to thank me because, he said, that the boils disappeared miraculously and he had never felt so well in his life.

I had been treating a young married woman for nearly twelve months. She suffered from asthma, considerable nervous disorder and menstrual trouble. She was painfully thin and had bronchitis every winter which sometimes kept her in bed for weeks. She was unhappily married, but was unable to get away from her surrounding. I tried the usual remedies, which appeared to be strongly indicated, but although she received some benefit from them, it was clear that I was getting nowhere near the root of the trouble. She was quite satisfied, but I was not. At last I pushed my books on one side and sat down to think, and I remembered that she was living in a very clayey district where buttercups abounded. Now I believe, in good company, I am told that God provides us with what we most need in the greatest profusion on our own doorstep; and although there were no signs of herpes and the pains in the chest could not be described as true intercostal neuralgia I prescribed *Ranunculus bulbosus* 2x. When I saw her a month later I hardly recognized her. She had put on several pounds in weight and filled out tremendously and looked attractive and happy, and admitted to feeling better than she had ever done before. This, of course, was not a cure, but at last the foundation stone was laid.

—Heal Thyself, March, 1946.