

THE RELATION OF THE SCIENCE OF HOMŒOPATHY WITH THE SCIENCE OF MEDICINE IN GENERAL

• DR. J. N. KANJILAL, M.B., CALCUTTA

(Continued from page 324)

CONDITION OF THERAPEUTICS IN THE TWO SCHOOLS: CONDITION IN THE OLD SCHOOL (ALLOPATHIC):

Here, Therapeutics, i.e. the plan of treatment of a diseased condition is founded upon no basic Law of Nature but on various assumed theories as to the nature of the disease. These theories often conflict with, or even subvert each other, (e.g. the disease is due to some Vitamin deficiency or Vitamin deficiency is due to the disease, and so on).

These theories again are based upon, either.

(a) Interpretation of some Pathological data—e.g., deficiency of insulin due to structural (degenerative or inflammatory), or functional (idiopathic) deficiency of Isles of the Langerhans of the Pancreas as the cause of Diabetes Mellitus; and they plan their treatment with the purpose of making good that deficiency by adequate supply of Insulin by injection etc., together with a diet restricted (according to some with liberal) supply of carbohydrates, minimum fat etc. But after all, this is simply application of methods of Hygiene in the field of Therapeutics. The real disorder the deficiency of the Islets of Langerhans can never be remedied by this method, nor can the proper utilization of carbohydrate by the organism be permanently restored. Or

(b) Some speculation as regards the essential nature of the disease (which as already noted is an absurd attempt); e.g. Essential nature of Rickets is taken as deficiency in Calcium Phosphate, which again is due to deficiency of Vitamin D and the Enzyme Phosphatase. This theory can not explain why in the same family, in the same environment and taking the same diet,

some children develop rickets and some not. In the plan of treatment they adopt the same hygienic methods, viz.—making good the deficiency by liberal supply of Calcium Phosphate and Vitamin D, without any regard for the capacity of the child for assimilation and utilization of these elements, and often possibly overloading an already weak metabolic capacity; the essential cause of these deficiencies ever remaining unknown as still remains the essential nature of healthy functioning of different cells in the body or in other words the life itself.

They generalize too much their subjects of study, viz., the patients, depending upon only a few phenomena, ignoring others. In spite of the reality that no two cases of any type of disease, e.g. Malaria—are exactly similar, they generalize all cases under one category—Malaria, depending upon only one phenomenon, viz. existence of Plasmodium Malariae in the R.B.C., admitting of only slight variation depending upon the type of the infecting Plasmodium, ignoring totally the constitutional temperamental and other peculiarities of individual cases—as “irrelevant” and “of no moment.” But the fact is, there is nothing in Nature as “irrelevant” or “accidental”. Every minute detail of Nature is connected with each other.

If any other feature of the case in hand (like anæmia or dropsy or skin eruption etc.) forcibly demands serious attention, they label them separately as complications, distinct from the main disease, basing them again in their turn, only on some pathological feature e.g. in case of anæmia on the number of the Red cells or the quantity of hæmoglobin per cell and so on.

Thus in planning the treatment of any particular patient instead of making one comprehensive theory comprising all the factors and phenomena of the case, they have to form series of theories depending on the different Pathological aspects of the case and base their treatment on those theories, as if repairing a *machine* instead of treating a diseased *man*. They treat the different aspects of the disease instead of treating the patient as a whole.

The worst fallacy with them is that they ignore the fact that the Pathological data on which they base their theory as the cause of respective disease, are themselves effect of disease,

i.e. disorderly function and structure of the organism or the Life itself.

I do not mean to say that these theories are of no value to a medical scientist. These theories, like scaffolding in a masonry work, or supporting strings in diving, are of immense value in the study of Pathology, as temporary aids in understanding the deeper significance of the phenomena and grouping them into different categories and arranging them into a definite order. In this way they may give indirect aid to the science of therapeutics (as theories of the nature of light give indirect aid in interpreting the Laws of Optics), but they can never form the basis of a true Science of Therapeutic.

THEIR ATTITUDE TOWARDS DRUGS

Thus far about their attitude towards the *Subject* of treatment viz. the patient. Now let us examine what is their attitude with respect to the *means* of treatment, viz. drugs.

Which property of any substance we are concerned with, as Theraputists? It is that property which almost every substance has, to produce changes in the function and structure of living organism and especially on human being, because our subject mostly is human being.

What is the condition of their research on drugs? They investigate the Physical and Chemical properties of drugs, their effect on bacterial culture, their effect on function and structure of organs of animals in the Pharmacological Laboratory and so on—but *never any experiment to find out their effects on healthy human being* (except keeping some records of findings of cases of poisoning, and that again, for any purpose other than obtaining any therapeutic data).

What do they do with the data thus derived? They use them on the body machine of the patients according to their views as to the type of disorder in the different parts of the machine: e.g.:—

1. Physical properties—

Protective coating to ulcers inside or outside—Kaolin,

Calamina, Bismuth etc.

Absorbants—Carbon, Kaolin etc.

Demulcents—Oils, Gums, Liquorice etc.

Irritants and counter irritants—Mustard, Cantheris etc.

2. Chemical properties—

Acids—for neutralising Alkalies

Alkalies—for neutralising Acids.

3. Physiological properties—

Cathertics, Diaphoretics, Diuretics, Incitors or Inhibitors of nervous system (central, sympathetic or parasympathetic), Ruborificents and so on.

What is the principle adopted in application of these data? No fixed principle. Application depends upon their individual choice in any particular case or part of a case. Totally different principles may be followed simultaneously for different part, or aspects of the same case (as for example Aspirin for depressing the nerves and caffeine for stimulating the heart may be used in combination as caffiaspirin for the same patient).

Among the different principles they generally adopt, the following deserve mention as examples:—

(1) Physiological or Hygienic—by counter-acting or removing the obvious or palpable defects or causes.

(2) Antipathic—trying to stop diarrhoea by astringents, slowing a rapid heart with Digitalis or Stropanthus, and so on.

(3) Stimulating nature in the process of elimination of poison or diversions of the seat of trouble i.e. relieving one type of symptoms by producing another—diuresis, diaphoresis, catheteris, etc.

(4) On no Principles. but "hit and trial", and statistical result of the efficacy of any particular drug they happen to choose by chance, for any particular group of diseased conditions. The obvious fallacy of applications of statistical methods in such affairs, makes their Therapeutics stand on very shaky ground. Results of say, 5,000 cases may show the efficacy of a particular drug to be 60% but a further study of say 2,000 more cases may reduce the successful result from 60% to 30% or even less; and the drug in question, thus discredited has to give place to another chance drug or at least to share its monopoly field with others (e.g. Quinine yielding its monopoly to Atabrin, then Palludrin and so on).

Such is the condition of Therapeutics in the Old School.

Does it conform with any of the attributes of a true science? Viz. (1) Does it provide for limitless progress without detriment to its integrity as a whole? Although there is enough movement in their therapeutic field, but very little progress in more than last two thousand and five hundred years, because each such movement tends more or less to prejudice or even subvert the previous stand; so that they have to move round practically the same circle. Only in recent years the circle might be said to have extended a bit. Upto about three decades ago, of the myriads of diseases, they could claim to have at their disposal so called specifics for only 4/5 diseases (viz., Malaria, Kala-Azar, Syphilis, Amæbiasis). In last three decades, they have secured acquirements of some specifics for 15/20 more diseases in the various forms of Sulpha drugs and Antibiotics. But how far these specifics are true cures for respective patients is a separate question. As already noted treatment with Vitamins, Endocrines etc. do not fall within the domain of true therapeutics (or what they call Chemotherapeutics), they really fall within the domain of Physiology or Hygiene. (2) By application of their agents to the case in hand, can they predict results with certainty? No they can not. Because there is no dependable law binding and linking their agents (phenomenon of the drugs) to the subjects (phenomena of the patients). (3) For the same reason they cannot find out any reason for their failure in individual cases. And so they have to grope and trot about in their daily work, inspite of the specifics in their hands.

The main cause of such a chaotic state of affairs in the Old School Therapeutics, lie in the fact of their vain attempt to base their work on the Rational Method; instead of striving for constructing an empirical science by noticing the pathognomic phenomena of patients and pathogenetic phenomena of drugs, and discovering a constant relation between the two, thus formulating a natural law of therapeutics. Not that the existence of such a relation never attracted their attention in their long march of two and a half thousand years, but they ever failed to appreciate this relation as the sole Law of Nature. This Law was ultimately re-discovered and finally established by the honest, unpreju-

diced, keen seer and inductive minded philosopher—Samuel Hahnemann, in the last decade of the 18th Century. It was Hahnemann who founded the basis of a real science of Therapeutics for the first time in the long annals of the Medical Science. And it is a great pity that even after the discovery of a true science of Therapeutics, with a constant unchangeable Therapeutic Law, the truth of which has been incontrovertibly proved in limitless number of cases during last 150 years,—the Old School scientists are not being able to cast aside their prejudices and illusive attraction for a Rational Therapeutics, which as already discussed, is an absurd idea; and are failing to appreciate this new science as a Natural science, this law as the Law of Nature; and rather maintaining a blindly hostile attitude towards both, all along throughout the last long one hundred and fifty years.

Although such deplorable is the plight of the Old School Medicine with respect to Therapeutics, but does it mean that its march during the two and half millennium has been all in vain, achieving nothing? Far from that. In every field of the vast science of Medicine (except of course therapeutics), it has at its credit immense achievements. Their contributions to the store of knowledge in these branches (viz. Biology, Anatomy, Physiology, Pathology, Hygiene, Surgery, Midwifery etc.) are increasing by leaps and bounds even today. On the other hand the New School (the Homœopathic School), though sharing the exploits in these fields commonly with them, has all along got very little opportunity to contribute substantially, in its hard strugglesome life of over one and a half century.

This is due to the stepmotherly and sometimes even hostile attitude of the States and the moneyed people towards it, perhaps from fear of damage to their vested interests in the business aspect of the Old School Science, as well as from various prejudices.

THE CONDITION OF THERAPEUTICS IN HOMŒOPATHY:

DOES IT FULFILL THE CONDITIONS OF A TRUE SCIENCE?

1. In its structure it consists of a Law—“*Similia Similibus Curantur*”, expressing the general and constant relation between

two completely independent series of phenomena, each, of which can be pursued *ad infinitum* as an independent branch of Natural science under the heads of Pathology (investigation of the totality of signs and symptoms of patients), and Pathogenesis (investigation of phenomena elicited by drug proving). Each branch again for its progress must collaborate with various other subsidiary sciences, such as—Anatomy, Physiology, Biology, Psychology, Sociology, Chemistry, Physics and so on. Thus link is established not only between the two aspect (the subject and the means) of therapeutics by a basic immutable Law, but also between Therapeutics on the one hand and the whole Nature on the other, leaving or bypassing nothing for chance or accident, and with possibility or infinite progress.

And again because this fundamental Law of Homœopathic Therapeutics—“*Similia Similibus Curantur*” is based upon no speculation or hypothesis as to the essential nature of either variety of phenomena, but on critical observation of actual facts and concrete experiments, and then application of the process of induction on those objective data,—it can not be reputed by counter speculations or contrary hypotheses.

And further, “this Law may not be fully complete today, may not be all embracing at the present state of our knowledge, but it atleast forms a solid stepping-stone to still wider generalization, which shall one day embrace both it and something besides and which shall one day make clear many dark spots in our field of therapeutics which we can now see deemly and where we often fail to apply the law adequately. But should this occur as the like has occurred in other natural sciences, there will be, there can be, no revolutionary action in it. It may be that, the edifice, as we now occupy it, is still unfinished,—but assuredly, as the tower is to the spire, as the buttress to the pinnacle, so will this generalization be to that which may be constructed upon it,—a basis,—an indisputable first step in the construction of the Science”. (Dunham—“The science of Therapeutics”—P 28).

Thus, the first condition of any Natural Science, *Scope for infinite progress without subverting the previous achievements*—is fulfilled by the Homœopathic Science of Therapeutics.

2. The second condition of any Natural Science, *its Capacity for Provision, that is correctly anticipating a set of phenomena, corresponding to a given set of phenomena*—is fully satisfied by the Science of Homœopathic Therapeutics as all the aspects of this science are based on solid foundation of observed facts and not on speculations. Thus given a set of phenomena—viz., the totality of symptoms of the patient, the infallible Law of Homœopathy shall at once point to the corresponding remedy if the pathogenetic phenomena of the drug has already been found out and included in the *Materia Medica*. And as this indication does not depend upon the hypothetical explanation or name of the disease, but on observed facts, it can be relied upon with complete confidence,—even if the remedy has never been known to have cured such a case of disease. Conversely, when the pathogenetic properties of a given drug have been investigated and its therapeutic phenomena well ascertained, the Physician is in a position to pronounce with certainty what forms of disease it will cure, even though no such disease has ever been witnessed or treated by himself or by any body else. Many instances of such events are known to any Homœopathist of a little experience, (e.g. Epidemic Dropsy of the last thirties, Epidemic Jhinjhinia of the post war period, or for the matter of that any epidemic,—old or new,—coming in a new form,—when the task of the Homœopathists becomes finding out a *Genus Epidemicus*), still I cannot refrain from referring to the historical example of the Great Hahnemann's pointing out the remedies for an epidemic of Asiatic Cholera, when it first invaded Europe in the thirties of the last century, when Hahnemann or any other Physician of Europe had no previous experience about the disease. And his prediction of the remedies was proved to be fully correct by the brilliant results of their application in actual cases,—in the back ground of utter dismay of the Physicians of the Old School, who based their therapeutics on Pathological speculations alone. Is not this capacity of provision assured by the Homœopathic Science a boon to the human race?

3. Still, there may be failures in the practical application of the science,—as occurs in any other Natural Science. But these failures do not disprove the terms of the science,—they only

signify incomplete study of the phenomena (of the patient or of the drugs), or misapplication of Law,—and give the scientists further impetus to deepen and extend his pursuit of knowledge.

And this is the third condition of any Natural Science. And it is by this impetus that every branch of Natural Science is daily progressing in its minutest detail, through daily research. The problems of research in Homœopathy will be discussed in a separate article.

Thus we see that all the conditions of a true Natural Science is fulfilled by the science of Homœopathy; and that Homœopathy is distinct from and opposed to the Old School mainly on the question of Therapeutics, i.e., approach towards a case of true disease, which is an internal derangement of the organism, or in other words disordered Life, and towards the means of remedying the same.*

** In preparing this article I consulted various books on science of which Dunham's "Science of Therapeutics" deserves especial mention.*

*—The Homœopathic Bulletin, March,
May, Oct.-Nov., '60.*