

TO EACH THE ILLNESS HE REQUIRES

DR. RONALD LIVINGSTON

Lady Eve Balfour, in her book "The Living Soil", published in 1951, describes five groups of people in different parts of the world who enjoy a perfect state of health. They are the Hunzas of India, eating a lacto-vegetarian diet; the islanders of Faroe, Iceland and Greenland, who eat a carcass diet; the people of Tristan da Cunha, living on the products of sea and soil; the North American Indian of pioneer days; and the people of certain parts of rural China, eating fruit, vegetables and sprouted grain, rice, tea, meat, birds, fish and eggs.

The common factor pertaining to them all is that they eat their food whole—the whole carcass, the whole grain or vegetable. There is much weighty evidence to support Lady Balfour's view that it is this wholeness of the diet which is responsible for making these people's constitutions so strong that they are able to resist virtually all disease.

Conversely, it is her opinion, which is shared by many able minds, that the main cause for the susceptibility of the populations of civilised countries to the diseases from which they suffer, both acute and chronic, is the notable absence of the right kind of living, in general, and whole food, in particular.

TASTY, BUT HARMFUL

Cooking, additives, correctives, preservatives, flavouring agents, fertilisers, hormones, colouring agents, "purifiers"—all may make our food more tasty, but less health-promoting, and lower our resistance to disease. Excessive consumption of alcohol, sugar and fat, help to weaken our natural defences still further.

Even water does not escape harmful interference. To the long accepted chlorination, fluoridation may well soon be added. This too, can be harmful when taken over long periods. Moreover, much of the water is tainted with traces

of industrial products known to be damaging to human tissues.

Thus our highly artificial way of life determines our illnesses to a tremendous degree. Unfortunately we can do little about all this. Not enough people are even aware of the dangers, and so there are too few actively interested in promoting a change.

Occasionally we come across an individual who, like the groups mentioned above, is so constituted that he has no illness, even throughout a very long lifetime, and despite ordinary diets. Samuel Hahnemann, that genius who founded homœopathy, probably thought himself to be such a one. This proved very useful to him—and to us—since it spared him for many years of invaluable research and healing and rendered him peculiarly suitable as a “prover” of his medicines. People like the Hunzas and Hahnemann did not need illness and, therefore, they never had to hoist the distress signals of Nature, which we call symptoms of disease.

The vast majority of the human race, however, is not in this happy position. To them illness should surely be regarded not only as a protective necessity, but actually a “blessing,” unpleasant though this may be. How could we survive without it? Just as a pain or a high temperature immediately alerts us to the fact that something is wrong, and tells us, if we will but learn, exactly what is needed to put it right, also all illness performs a similar task, though on a sometimes broader basis. And the broader the basis, the more likely are we to find the right remedy by correctly interpreting Nature’s danger signals.

DANGERS OF SUPPRESSION

Orthodox medicine is all too often tempted to relieve individual symptoms on grounds of humanity, or in acknowledging the impossibility of cure. It does not realise the grave dangers of such suppression which, as Hahnemann taught, invariably produces deeper-seated trouble and renders ultimate cure more difficult and longer of achievement. Even when only palliation is possible homœopathic treatment is preferable, in that it achieves its object without making the illness worse.

In student days one was taught never to try to reduce a temperature or suppress the pain of, say, appendicitis with morphia until radical treatment has been undertaken. These seem to be the only two injunctions that are considered relevant in this connection by the orthodox school of medicine, why?

If Nature's need is satisfied by attention to the early symptoms of disharmony, and the right medicine administered homœopathically, the illness develops no further. This reply to signals of distress removes the protective necessity for any further extension of the illness. It is also an effective and pleasant immunizing mechanism against further trouble of the same sort.

There are, of course, certain circumstances in which suppressive treatment cannot be avoided. But these are limited, and their danger is never overlooked by the homœopathic physician. Such instances may be suppression of pain temporarily, pending very urgent operation. Or they may be infections so virulent, rapid and overpowering to the individual patient, perhaps ill already from some other weakening cause, that it is the choice of the lesser of two evils. Again, the right remedy for a very urgent condition may not be clear, and no time may be available for a trial of several likely ones, or the effect of one particular group of symptoms, such as those of shock, may threaten death so greatly as to render suppressive treatment justifiable or even desirable. These are the rare exceptions.

RESISTING TEMPTATION

In these days, when patients are trained by all sorts of propaganda to expect and demand quick results it is not surprising that the temptation to palliate without treating radically is very great. It must be resisted by all those who realise how dangerous such action can be.

If, as I have suggested earlier, illness is not only a necessity, but actually a 'blessing' to mankind, one will expect patients to "catch" the illnesses to which their constitutions

have a specific susceptibility—illnesses which they need to maintain and strengthen their natural defence.

We see this happening all the time, particularly is it noticeable in children those with hereditary tuberculous taints or tendencies contracting measles or whooping cough and being rendered the stronger thereby; those with hereditary syphilitic taints or tendencies getting scarlet fever to scaffold their weak points. These taints may have derived from transmissions through many generations. •

ALL DISEASE "ALLERGIC"

A short acute illness immunizes against recurrence for a varying length of time, the needed stimulus to anti-body formation having been, as it were, attracted to the patient who needed it to strengthen an inherent weakness. It is, therefore unwise to suppress these natural manifestations of Nature's protective handiwork. It is quite another thing, however, to help Nature by matching her distress signals with those artificially producible by the most similar medicine.

We hear a great deal about allergy these days, the term being restricted in the man to unusually delicate and excessive tissue reactions to unknown or only suspected agents, to which the body has somehow become sensitised. For example, conditions such as eczema, urticaria, hay fever, asthma, rheumatoid arthritis, penicillin sensitivity and many industrial hazards.

In the widest sense of the word all disease is surely allergic in character, if the above ideas have any validity? The child with scarlet fever has its very own individual sensitivity or allergic response to the streptococcus *at the time of its illness*. But the streptococcus lives happily and harmlessly on the child whose specific sensitivity is, say, to the influenza virus.

Neither will get the other's illness at the same time, owing to the refractory effect produced during illness giving varying degrees of immunity. But each may change his sensitivity from time to time, and in differing circumstances, being "triggered off" to *his* illness by one or more of many possible pre-

precipitating causes, frequently wrongly judged to be the "real" cause.

The child who is "allergic" to tuberculosis, though he may never have had the disease—and may be fortunate enough never to contract it clinically because not enough precipitating causes come his way—will, nevertheless, and mercifully, be highly susceptible or "allergic" to BACILLINUM.

This, given in the right potency, will cure the susceptibility because it has satisfied it. The body then has no further need to attract, or "catch" tuberculosis in an effort to fortify itself against an individual and particular weakness.

Fortunately for the chronic patient, suppression of symptoms—so often practised of necessity from the orthodox point of view, in lieu of inactivity or a true knowledge of the right approach to the problem—does not result in immediate disaster or dramatically adverse effect. Quite the contrary, the immediate or latest complaint is apparently overcome, to the satisfaction of doctor and patient alike, while the illness itself goes deeper.

NATURE ADAPTS HERSELF

New or different symptoms are then used by Nature as distress signals, though not generally recognised as such, or even as belonging to the same basic picture. The agony is prolonged but in a different form, always designed to indicate distress, but also to compensate for damage done. In other words, Nature adapts herself to the circumstances, the most vulnerable parts of the body always being defended most stoutly, and a sort of symbiosis occurs between body and damaging circumstances—an adaptive response on the part of all contributing factors.

Just as the sense of smell, for instance, can be easily tired by constant stimulation of the same sort, a kind of refractory period being produced during which response becomes more and more feeble, so, in chronic illness: Nature's efforts to throw off the burdens of disease become less and less effective as the patient learns to live with his disability. In such

circumstances we see daily how a new, vital stimulus produced in the system by the homœopathically selected method and the right remedy re-awakens the body's inert responses in a truly amazing way—as though, indeed, latent energy, previously blocked, were suddenly liberated and used in the right instead of the wrong, or suppressed way.

Theories are fascinating and dangerous toys. They should serve as "ladders, not cages." Practice is what counts, and any theory which might plausibly explain all the phenomena observed is good enough as a working hypothesis. It is for this reason that I have suggested a possible explanation.

FASCINATING AND CHALLENGING

In chronic disease, as one picture melts into another as the result of time or, more often, injudicious symptomatic treatment, it becomes more and more difficult to sort out the original disease picture, altered and overlaid as it is. This makes the task of the homœopathic physician more difficult and more fascinating and challenging. Layer after layer of superimposed illness has to be penetrated by the appropriate remedies before the basis of the chronic illness is uncovered—often laid down many years previously, or even several generations back.

One can never go too far back in the history of a patient or his family to reveal and cure the original dyscrasias, or taints, upon which all his subsequent troubles are built. How can we attempt to explain how all this works? We live on a razor edge, but we are not rigid, we oscillate within narrow limits between health and disease. Any movement in one direction is counteracted by a contrary movement in the opposite direction.

A wonderfully simple but effective compensatory mechanism, elastic and self limiting, is found throughout the body, mind and spirit of all Nature. This applies to every part of us, and to the other animals, plants, and micro-organisms, whether hostile or friendly to man, seeming to "know" what is required of it for the best ultimate advantage, and working

in harmony with all other parts, individual yet inextricably interrelated and interdependent.

The famous French physiologist of the nineteenth century, Claude Bernard, threw a great deal of light on the remarkable constancy maintained in the body by Nature. He pointed out that the cells of the mammalian body could only function normally when they were surrounded by fluids of an exact and constant composition, and that all the vital functions were designed to maintain this "*milieu interieur*" exactly constant. (Clarke's "Applied Pharmacology", 8th Edition.)

UNEXPLAINED MYSTERY

Water balance, salt balance, acid-base balance and calcium-phosphorus ratio are a very few examples of such delicate, constantly oscillating adjustment to constantly fluctuating environmental changes in tissues, cells and body fluids. Relatively tiny variations in terms of chemical, physical and electrical balance are wonderfully counteracted by their own mechanism acting as a trigger, and can be observed and predicted. Their mechanism can be understood as logically necessary, indeed essential, to the continuation of healthy life, but no one knows how they came about. Each apparent revelation of a hitherto unexplained mystery in Nature simply takes us one step further back and discloses another mystery.

All great thinkers and workers have always known this. They have been characterised by their humility in the light of these great wonders. Only we moderns are arrogant in our conceit of our scientific discoveries—our pride in our achievements being our greatest enemy, effectively blinkering us to so much of the truth.

We should realise that lack of scientific explanations of a fact need not prevent us from using its proven effectiveness. So it is with homœopathy. We do not fully understand how it acts, but we do know how effectively it can be used in careful and experienced hands.

Modern investigations are daily revealing the wonderful intricacies of tissues and fluids, which are found to be com-

plicated and manifold in constitution, though so simple in conception and totality.

The late Dr. E. J. Cohen, one of the foremost investigators in the field of human blood fractionation, in a book published in the United States in 1943, reported that he and his colleague J. J. Edsall had separated nearly 40 *different* identifiable *fractions* from human blood, in addition to red and white cells and platelets, all maintained in equilibrium by subtle processes of Nature of which the average man or woman has never heard. The fact that we have not heard of such wonders does not invalidate them. All that really matters is that Nature's mechanism works, and this applies to homœopathy *par excellence*.

UNCHANGING NATURAL LAWS

It can be observed working according to definite and unchanging natural laws just as certainly as the constant balance of tissue fluids was observed by Claude Bernard, and recognised and explained by him as a law of Nature; just as certainly as the immutable laws of the Universe discovered and explained by Albert Einstein (Dr. Einstein and the Universe—Lincoln Barnett), who was, incidentally, no stranger to the knowledge of the power of the infinitely small, no less than the infinitely large; just as certainly as Samuel Hahnemann discovered and explained the immutable laws of Nature regarding the cure of disease 150 years ago.

Observation of the effects of homœopathic remedies when appropriate in selection and potency lead to the deduction that they are as assisting Nature in the essential balancing process when the permissible margins of constancy are approached. They act as the self-adjusting mechanism which we see constantly at work in maintaining the "*milieu interieur*", now commonly termed homœostasis.

Many people nowadays think that the process is catalytic in nature; most of them think that it is of electronic character; all are certain that the unit common to all phenomena

(Contd. on Page 41)

Relativity, is needed to do full justice to Homœopathy; pigmy brains won't do.

Homœopathy is a system based on the science of correspondences, which is a *unerring* as the laws of *Astronomy and Physics*." Truly, no man of sense will stand a challenge to this faultless and momentous experience of Dr. Skinner, the winner of the Simpson gold medal, who has surpassed the true necessity of introduction in the field of medicine. The Allopath in him covered the first 27 years of his medical career and the Homœopath in him luckily could cover the same span of 27 years, before making this weighty declaration. Now, at the ripe old age of 78, when an experience is valued as more than right, he, Dr. Skinner, could only present his unique experience to the self-chosen eyeless world.

(Adapted with many important changes from the book, *An Exposition of the Homœopathic Law of Cure* by Dr. D. N. Ray).

TO EACH THE ILLNESS HE REQUIRES

(Contd. from Page 31)

of existence is a unit of energy. No one knows where that comes from. It is unknowable.

There is no new discovery made in medicine which does not seem to bear out the truth and worth of the homœopathic principle and supports the view that it is, as Hahnemann taught, an immutable law of nature. All Nature's laws are immutable and all will, one day, undoubtedly be universally recognised and exploited for good.

Meanwhile, those blessed with the knowledge of homœopathy's immense power to heal and soothe will practise it and trust to its beneficial influence when the not so obvious "blessing" of illness, apparently inseparable from our modern society, seemingly calls for its individual artificial counterpart.

—Homœopathy, April '58.