

"THE HAHNEMANNIAN PROVING MUST BE USED AS A BASIS IN MODERN THERA- PEUTICS OF THE TRADITIONAL SCHOOL"

DR. HILARIO LUNA CASTRO, M.D.

"In order to know the curative effects of drugs, one has to prove them upon the healthy man : that is what the founder of Homœopathy called pure proving."—Dr. Higinio G. Perez, founder of the "Escuela Libre de Homœopatía de Mexico", *General pathology*, page 239, Mexico, 1914.

DR. SAMUEL CHRISTIAN FREDERICK HAHNEMANN (1755-1843), the renowned founder of the therapeutic axiom "Similia Similibus Curentur", categorically stated : "Medicament is every substance which has the property of making the healthy man sick and curing the sick one. Medicament is distinguished from morbid causes, because these make sick but do not restore health."

To the sage of Meissen corresponds the glory of raising pharmacodynamics to the category of science, for having introduced the knowledge of drugs action upon the healthy man through the rigorously experimental method of induction.

If this were not sufficient, Hahnemann, in his *Materia Medica Pura*, the solid and immovable basis of Hahnemannian Therapeutics, added to the anatomophysiological experimental results upon man, the symptomatic manifestations of the animic order, were what constitute a truly unexpected source of psychopharmacologic knowledge for the physicians of his epoch and a theme of new orientation for the so-called psychosomatic therapeutics of the present time.

Besides having founded his therapeutics and *Materia Medica* upon the basis of proving in the above mentioned form, Hahnemann, with an unusual clinical criterion rejected polypharmacy, magistral prescriptions and the massive doses of opium, mercury, arsenic, etc., used in his epoch, requesting at the same time not to employ the drugs "*ab usu in morbis*" and only to apply them through pure proving.

Empiricism disappeared with Hahnemannian proving, and as glimpsed by Mattioli, Stoerck, von Haller, Vicat, etc., new horizons were opened for therapeutics with precise indications and with always flattering results, as has been corroborated during the existence of the Hahnemannian therapeutics for over a century and a half.

Hahnemann published in 1796, in Hufeland's Journal, an article entitled "An Essay upon a New Principle for Discovering the Curative Power of Drugs", in which he pointed out the rules for carrying out the proving medicaments upon the healthy man, continuing his labours in this new way of investigation, in collaboration with his pupils and friends, publishing in his book entitled *Fragmenta de Viribus Medicamentorum Positivis* the results of the proving of twenty-seven medicaments, the basis of his *Materia Medica Pura*, which verification he called pathogenesis.

Hahnemann, after a severe criticism about the form of imparting the knowledge of *Materia Medica* and therapeutics of his time, affirmed: "We have no other recourse left us than that of proving the remedies upon a healthy man, if it is necessary on our own bodies. The necessity of this method has been felt at all times but in spite of that has been nearly always followed in the wrong way, because the medicaments have only been employed empirically and "*ab usu in morbis*", giving place to the complete ignorance of their pharmacodynamic action and leading us to their erroneous use in therapeutics."

In all and every one of the pathogenesies, conscientiously obtained by the very founder of Homœopathy, and his collaborators Jorg, Hartlaub, Trinks, Hempel, Roth, Stapf, etc., the anatomo-functional and animic symptoms were taken into account under a true hierarchization, establishing by this fact the exceptional, proper, and genuine psychopharmacodynamics of the Hahnemannian school.

Hahnemann, in his monumental work entitled *An Exposition of the Homœopathic Medical Doctrine or Organon of the Art of Healing*, in paragraph 105, lays down: "The second point of the business of a true physician relates to acquiring a knowledge of the instruments intended for the cure of the natural

diseases, investigating the pathogenetic power of medicines, etc., etc.", and in paragraph 108, among other things textually he affirms : "There is, therefore no other possible way in which the peculiar effects of medicines on the health of individuals can be accurately ascertained there is no sure, no more natural way of accomplishing this object, than to administer the several medicines experimentally, in moderate doses, to healthy persons, in order to ascertain what changes, symptoms and signs of their influence each individually produces on the health of the body and of the mind. . . ."

Notwithstanding these new orientations in pharmacodynamics and therapeutics contributed by the founder of Homœopathy, since 1805, the traditional school does not give even at the present time all the interest that it deserves to the study of the action of the medicament upon the healthy man, because the great majority of drugs are prescribed by the knowledge had of them in laboratory and through the study of their action upon animals, which constitutes a fallacious guide to their use upon the sick man.

In the traditional school, Claude Bernard, called the father of modern scientific medicine, introduced his experimental works from 1847 to 1850, that is to say, forty-two years after the provings realized by the founder of Homœopathy, and in his work *Introduction to Experimental Medicine* (1865), page 159, emphatically asserts : "We give great importance to the experimentation upon animals and we add that under the theoretic point of view, experimentation upon every species of animals are indispensable to medicine."

The same line of behaviour is followed by the traditional school since that time, as Gaddum, professor of Pharmacology in Edinburgh University, Scotland, in his work *Pharmacology* published by Oxford University Press of London, 4th English edition, 1953, 1st Spanish edition, 1955, page 469, says among other things : "one should not give a new drug to man, before one is sure that it has been administered to different species of animals. Mice because they are cheap are used when it is necessary to employ great numbers of them. Rats, rabbits,

guinea pigs and cats are also used. Monkeys, genealogically similar to man, are used to prove the action of drugs."

Anthropoids, which in the biologist scale are nearest to man, differ from the latter who possess organization, a way of life and fundamentally a psychical manner and articulate language, and if that were not enough, there exist irrefutable proofs that that which constitutes a food for certain animals is a poison for man and vice versa, so that different results of immunity, tolerance or receptivity to pathogenic agents can be verified between man and animals.

Cyanhydric or prussic acid is a most active poison to man whom it kills instantaneously, on the other hand the hedgehog and porcupine are affected only to a slight degree.

Some herbivorous animals, especially sheep, goats and rabbits can ingest leaves of Belladonna without danger; according to Fleishmann it depends upon the fact that the blood and liver, particularly of rabbits, have the property of rendering inactive and even destroying the toxic action of this plant. Horses and bovidae are more sensitive. On the other hand, a middle size dog supports a larger dose than a horse, and a cat dies very rapidly with really small quantities. Ten centigrams of atropine obtained from Belladonna leaves are mortal to man.

Goats eat *Rhus toxicodendron* without any consequences and upon man it produces gastro-intestinal phenomena and diverse dermatitis of changeable localization.

Hyoscyamus roots can be eaten without danger by the hog. Dogs eat leaves and seeds of *Aconitum* without showing any manifestations of intolerance.

The rat, toad and water salamander are absolutely refractory to *Digitalis* action and in this way we found numerous examples that it would be prolix to enumerate.

Regarding pathogenic agents, opotherapeutic drugs, vitamins, physical and ambietal means, etc., among man and animals there are absolutely different results of intolerance, receptivity and anaphylaxis.

The Koch bacillus has a pathogenetic action on man and bovine cattle. Goats, guinea pigs and rabbits do not acquire tuberculosis spontaneously and they are only tuberculous through

repeated inoculations and the ass is completely refractory to this infection.

The Eberth bacillus is highly pathogenic to man; upon the chimpanzee and macaque it is only possible to reproduce alterations resembling typhoid fever by the ingestion of concentrated cultures. On the other hand the female goat is extremely sensitive to the Eberth bacillus and to the *Brucella melitensis* that is the cause of Malta fever in man, and is found in the organism of the male goat without producing abnormal symptoms.

Atlassoff, produced typhoid phenomena in a rabbit, introducing typhus bacillus directly into the intestine, a completely different procedure from natural infection.

The ram, guinea pig, mouse, young cat, gray adult rat, old rat, young pigeon and hog, are very sensitive to carbuncle infection. The hen is refractory and only by subjecting the hen to low temperatures (Pasteur's cooled hen) does it get the infection. Batrachia and argeline ram are quite refractory to carbuncle. Crocodiles offer absolute immunity to tetanus toxin.

The rat is insensible to diphtheric toxin.

Man is deeply affected by streptococcus, on the other hand, the white rat and the dog have a natural immunity to this pathogenic agent.

The hedgehog is unsusceptible to ophidians' poison.

Polyneuritis in doves subjected to a diet lacking in vitamin B₁, provokes the death of this animal four days after the first symptoms (Peters and Reader), and man has manifestations of a deficit of a different character that is able to produce other kinds of troubles that exceptionally end in death.

Health in man which is a state of equilibrium, harmony and psychophysical well-being does not admit of excess or defect, should be for the Hahnemannian School, the point of departure and term of comparison in order to know the morbid phenomena that constitute the sick man's pathology and the symptomatic phenomenology of the pathogenesies that form the Homœopathic Materia Medica, for establishing in this way the relation of analogy between disease and remedy that leads to the simillimum for its use in therapeutics.

For that reason, given the peculiar and unmistakable psycho-physical characteristics of man, it is impossible that he will display the same reactions and responses in the same manner to the influence of the pathogenic causes and pharmacodynamic proofs as these of the other animals of Creation, and it is to the founder of the homœopathic medical science, Dr. Samuel Christian Frederick Hahnemann, whom we have to comprehend and extol, because due to all the aspects of his exceptional culture and indisputable intellect, he knew how to fix the authentic and true form of carrying out the provings upon the healthy man and not on other animals, in order to always obtain the same psychic and somatic symptoms and therefore to be able to prescribe the remedies on the sick man according to his axiom "Similia Similibus Curentur".

CONCLUSIONS

1st. The eminent founder of Homœopathy, Dr. Samuel Christian Frederick Hahnemann, father of psychopharmacology, taught us how to know the healthy and sick man under his double psychosomatic aspect, unknown in his time, more than a century and a half ago.

2nd. The experimentation upon animals, initiated by Magendie (1783-1815) took great impulse with Bernard, Richet, Roux, Ludwig, Müller, etc., continuing to the present day as one of the fundamental basis in the therapeutics of the traditional school.

3rd. The Hahnemannian School accepts experimentations of this kind only as a verification of laboratory and refuses it in the therapeutics of man, because it has in mind the biological axiom of John Paul Tessier (1811-1862), distinguished French physician of the traditional school, eminent pupil of Dupuytren and Trousseau, Director of "Medical Art" published in Paris, and converted to Homœopathy, who categorically demonstrated: "Every animal becomes sick according to his species and in each species the individual suffers according to his own nature" and

4th. The world at present day needs the homœopathic medical science, in order that modern and future therapeutics take to the solid and immovable pure proving upon the healthy man,

due to the privileged brain of the great sage of Meissen, Dr. Samuel Christian Frederick Hahnemann, in order that the physician, with a perfect knowledge of all drugs can administer them in a correct way and lead suffering mankind to the recovery of health.

—*The British Homœopathic Journal, July-Oct., '56*

EXCERPTS FROM INTERNAL HEALING ART IN SURGICAL DISEASES*

DR. EMIL SCHLEGEL, M.D., GERMANY

Berta G., 4 months old, suffered from a *naevus* 3 x 4 cm., had been treated by galvano-cautery and lunar caustic, which was followed by fast spreading, and surgery had been advised. *Sulphur* 30c was given internally every week, and *Ferrum phos.* daily. After three weeks, improvement was reported : less red. *Sepia* 30c was now given. Naevus showed white lines of thin scar tissue, and patient was generally improved. One dose of *Lycopodium* 30c was given, followed by *Abrotanum* 3c. Four weeks later : patient does not tolerate touching of the diseased area. *Calcarea carb.* 30c was given, and a small *urano-thor* application made. A month later : red coloring is less, and swelling of the previously puffed and convex naevus is also less. *Calcarea fluorica* 30c finished the treatment. Patient has improved generally, and, only when crying, very slight redness showed the spot.

Albert K., 15 months, had fungus haematodes on both ears surrounding the auricle, especially the posterior aspect, which

* Translated by the late S. W. Staads, M.D.