

THE HAHNEMANNIAN GLEANINGS

Vol. XXXIII

JUNE 1966

No. 6

EDITORIAL

BE AWARE OF THE SO-CALLED MODERNIZERS OF HOMŒOPATHY

We have discussed on many occasions what are the real problems in Homœopathy still remaining unsolved, what are the obstacles in the path of progress of Homœopathy, what are the real dangers for the very existence of Homœopathy as an integral system of medicine, still we are being forced to write on the same subject only to counteract the Goeblian policy of the self-styled "Progressive Homœopaths". These "modernizers" of Homœopathy have taken into their head that a falsehood repeatedly uttered may turn into a truth. And so they are maintaining a continuous propaganda, through various platforms and magazines, against Hahnemannian Homœopathy, making all sorts of distortion of Hahnemannian principles to suit their purpose, as well as bantering those principles which they cannot mould up to their satisfaction. In this matter, they of course, lavishly invoke the solemn name of Hahnemann, by ventilating what would have been said and done by Hahnemann in support of them, had he been living today. The "modernizers of Homœopathy" in our country frequently use, as an additional weapon, quotations from their authorities in western countries, perhaps with the idea that anything coming from the West will sell in India without any question; as if Homœopathy is based on anybody's opinion and policy, and not on sound and irrefutable principles tested on myriads of occasions for more than a century and a half. We could have given deaf ears to these patterings, had they come from the simple pharmacists and pure businessmen. But unfortunately, these forceful propaganda showers come from people who attire themselves with gorgeous garb of Homœopathy, posing themselves not only as outstanding homœopathic physicians, but also as homœopathic teachers and leaders. Many of them possess their own magazines. But if we trace the source of the real colour of these propagandists we can easily see that they are either owners of medicinal business or have some close link with it. Their sole aim is easy money, rather than any good of Homœopathy and for that matter any

good of ailing humanity. But far more unfortunate fact is that, these propagandists, up till now get sufficiently honourable seats in Homœopathic Societies, and enough space in magazines owned by the various Homœopathic Associations, nay even tacit support from various Homœopathic leaders. This might be due to complacency or callousness on the part of the Homœopathic leaders to the real danger to the very existence of Homœopathy, or even, in some cases at least, to their own urge for surrendering to easy paths for earning money rather than taking to the hard path of developing Homœopathy in the interest of ailing people. We solemnly call upon these homœopathic leaders to wake up to the real danger to homœopathy, especially in India, where Homœopathy has today enough scope of real progress and development.

Some innocent homœopaths incriminate the homœopathic pharmacists and manufacturers as the real danger to Homœopathy. But, we must make a clean distinction between those businessmen, simply engaged in manufacture and supply of homœopathic medicine and posing themselves as such and those businessmen who hide their business outlook under the garb of a homœopathic physician, homœopathic leader and teacher. We had plenty of talk and correspondence with true homœopathic businessmen—from Boericke & Tafel to many leading homœopathic pharmacists of India. All of them unequivocally said that, they have little concern with the principles of Homœopathy, their sole concern is to earn profit by selling goods to homœopathic physicians and their patients. And that they will surely stop manufacturing and advertising the goods which we call unhomœopathic or pseudo-homœopathic, as soon as the demand for such goods will cease to come from the homœopathic physicians. Can we have anything to say against this frank statement? So we have no alternative other than to find out the real sources who are maintaining and feeding the market for these pseudo-homœopathic products. It is those businessmen and their interested and opportunist associates who pose themselves as "modernizers of Homœopathy".

In order to make our point clear we give here a latest sample of the method of propaganda of these "modernizers", from the monthly journal "*Homœopathy*"—a magazine with the ostensible purpose of propagation of homœopathic science, edited, printed, published and owned by Dr. V. R. Murty—the Proprietor *cum* Director of "Indian Institute of Homœopaths" (which hold occasional "personal classes" and issues a diploma of M.I.H., and also hold various forms of meetings and celebrations including personal Jubilees in which important personalities of the Government and public are invited as distinguished guests), and of a pharmacy named BAHOLA that manufactures various sorts of patents and specifics, under various catchy names but with gaudy homœopathic labels. In the Editorial article of the April 1966 issue of the blessed magazine HOMŒOPATHY we find the following passages:—

"In the text books of Homœopathy we read that chronic diseases can be cured only in two, three or more years. In Hahnemann's time patients were willing to undergo treatment for years in order to escape the outrageous tortures inflicted by orthodox medicines. People are no longer willing to undergo such leisurely, protracted treatments. (1)

"Poly-pharmacy and the administration of Homœopathic medicines by parenteral route are in vogue all over the world by *progressive homœopathic physicians* (Italics—ours) to-day and they find that they are very effective and give better results quickly. (2)

"Mr. Ellis Barker further writes 'The argument for poly-pharmacy is simply this. Hahnemann did not realise that apparently single drugs, such as Thuja, Pulsatilla, China etc. consisted of a large number of chemicals wonderfully blended by nature. Some herbal medicines are composed of 10 or 20 different chemicals. This was a fact Hahnemann was unaware of (3). But when a physician now believes that poly-pharmacy should not be practised as that would not be following faithfully the principles laid down by Hahnemann in the eighteenth century, which Hahnemann would undoubtedly throw overboard were he alive to-day, we can imagine him exclaiming with hot indignation. "What gentlemen—you have made no changes in the progressive science of Homœopathy? It is shameful. It is disgraceful (4). It is an outrage to my most progressive science.'

"Samuel Hahnemann lived at a time when medicine was backward indeed. He possessed no clinical thermometer, no stethoscopes, no apparatus for measuring blood-pressure and no hypodermic syringe. Hence Hahnemann advocated *rubbing* in of the medicine in a healthy part of the body over the skin (5). Those who decry the parenteral route for administering homœopathic medicines are the real unfaithful disciples of Hahnemann and they have made Homœopathy of the sixth edition of the organon a rigid religion. Science and especially the science of healing must progress or it will decline (6). The men who dominate and advise the Governments to-day, in our country are real enemies of Homœopathy and if this state of affairs continues Homœopathy is bound to lose ground in this country also as in some others.

"These so-called puritans are ruining the most wonderful science and art of healing by their stubborn opposition to all progress (7)."

On this sample of Editorial article we have the following comments to make on the points marked in the text:—

(1) If people suffering from Chronic diseases were unwilling to undergo protracted treatment, then Homœopaths like ourselves whose almost exclusive practice is with Chronic cases would have starved to death. The real fact is just the reverse. Plenty of cases disillusioned by years of treatment of all other systems of medicine, including, in many cases, those of the so-called progressive Homœopaths—i.e., mixopathists, homœopathic injectionists and poly-pharmacists, stick to our treatment for years on, and furthermore,

most of them remain life-long devotees not only to their homœopathic physicians but to true Homœopathy itself.

(2) Poly-pharmacy and parenteral homœopathy may be in vogue all over the world—because there is no dearth of ease-loving dullards any where in the world who may prefer easier path of earning money rather than to take up the hard path of true Homœopathy for the real cure of ailing people. Anything cannot be acceptable to sane persons, simply on the ground of its being in vogue all over the world, for example, sophisticated lie is in vogue all over the world today, but that cannot be accepted by any sound person.

That these methods are more effective and give better, quicker and permanent result, have got to be proved on the basis of authentic statistics in institutions like Homœopathic hospitals. At least this much can be asserted at this stage that, theoretically and logically these methods bear no consistency with the basic law and principles of Homœopathy; this we have discussed on plenty of occasions before. We have also shown in our previous writings that however much the followers of these methods may vaunt themselves as progressive homœopaths, they are, in reality, debasing and vulgarising the foundations of Homœopathy.

(3) We are astonished that, such an outrageously silly statement can be reproduced by anybody as an authority. What more absurd imagination or delusion can there be than to think that Hahnemann who was one of the highest rank chemists of his day, many of whose formulation and discoveries in the science of Chemistry are still remaining un baffled, was unaware of the composite character of organic compounds, when the chemical nature of organic substances derived from the vegetable and animal kingdom had already been established by Lavoisier (1743-94), organic substance—urea—had been synthetically prepared by Wohler in 1828 although the different alkaloids, glucosoides etc. were, of course, isolated later on.

But, anybody with an iota of knowledge in Homœopathy knows that the use of any drug in Homœopathy, does not depend upon its chemical composition, but upon the totality of the symptoms produced by it as an integral substance on healthy provers. In this matter we do not care whether an individual drug is a simple compound like Morphine, Codeine, Quinine, Cinchonine or Calcareo Carb., Natrum Mur.; or composite compounds like Opium, China, Thuja, Pulsatilla etc.; or nay further multiple compounds like Chininum Ars., Natrum Ars., Calcareo Ars., Aurum Muriaticum Natronatum—only provided we know the pathogenetic properties of the particular drug as a whole. It is difficult to believe that our *Homœopathy's* western authority Mr. Ellis Barker is innocent of this simple fact. Then are we to believe that Mr. Barker has made this statement only to hoodwink the naive homœopathic public?

(4) In our opinion, if Hahnemann would have come to life again, he would have exclaimed with indignation "What disgraceful, that the homœo-

pathic society of the twentieth century has allowed the parasites to grow so lavishly and hinder the growth of Homœopathy in European countries and stifle it out from its most glorious citadel the U.S.A., all in the name of progress, the parasites against whom I myself as well my disciples like Boenninghausen etc. had relentlessly fought throughout our lives ! ! !”

We should keep in mind that parasites (e.g., plant parasites) generally grow with beautiful colours; and if we allow our eyes to be charmed by the parasitic growths in the homœopathic society—either imported from foreign countries or grown indigenously—a day is sure to come when Homœopathy in India also will be stifled out like what has happened in the U.S.A.

(5) Indeed medicine was far more backward in Hahnemann's time than as it is to-day; but not so backward as the Editor of the *Homœopathy* wants us to believe. The reality is that, mercurial Thermometer invented by the German Physicist Fahrenheit (1686-1736) and Stethoscope by the French physician Laennec (1781-1826) was definitely used by Hahnemann, but not so much for therapeutic diagnosis as for pathological diagnosis. Hypodermic syringe might not have been invented within the life-time of Hahnemann, but even if it would have been invented he would not require it for administering his dynamised medicines, as it is not required to-day by any true homœopathic physician.

(6) No Hahnemannian homœopath consider the sixth edition, and for the matter of that, any edition of the *Organon* as rigid religion, or as the last limit of the progress of Homœopathy. As a matter of fact the sixth and last edition of the *Organon* has left many problems unsolved and open to research to wit, the problem of deciding the dose and potency in particular cases, the problem of the real nature of homœopathic remedy, the *modus operandi* of the action of homœopathic remedy, the problem of how best to select the similimum from the huge forest of the *Materia Medica*, the problem of homœoprophylaxis, the problem of further developing and sharpening the pathogenetic properties of drugs, the problem of proving more drugs indigenous in our tropical countries, and so on. Anybody wanting real progress of Homœopathy must bother about these problems and strive by all means to solve these problems. And the real homœopaths are struggling their hardest to open up resources for research on those problems.

(7) The reality is diagonally opposite. It is the ease-loving, avaricious, opportunist pseudo-homœopaths who are running to ruin the most wonderful art of healing—the real Homœopathy, by trying to deprive it of its real intrinsic merits and by refraining from the hard path of true progress, while at the same time beguiling the people by vulgar methods in the name of modernization and progress.

We are quite aware that this negative path of continued polemical struggle with the conscious vulgarizers of Homœopathy will not serve much concretely the basic purpose of strengthening and advancing Homœopathy. We

(Continued on page 249)

DISCUSSION

Dr. James Stephenson (New York City): Like Dr. Reed, I often rack my brains for the cause of my own personal failures, and one day when I was doing that I realized that, like most homœopathic physicians, I have had a number of animals in my practice. As I thought about it, I realized I had never had a failure with any of the animals which have been brought to me. These were not mild cases, because usually by the time someone brings a pet to you, he has made the rounds of every veterinarian in town. These were things like skin cancers and terminal diseases of one variety or another, and usually it has just been a matter of my giving the dog or cat one remedy, and that has done the trick.

So I tried to think of the significance of that in terms of my own practice, and from then on I tried to repertorize my cases in a non-verbal manner, and tried to have the remedy in my mind before I started taking the chronic case, which sounds a little peculiar. But, after all, a dog or cat isn't verbal! I think sometimes we confuse ourselves by the very complexity of humans once they start talking about their troubles. In my own experience I have found if I observe the patient in the office, the way he sits, and the way he walks, whether he talks a lot or doesn't talk a lot, the way he carries his hands—just the little casual things—and then if I just wait a second, a large percentage of the time a remedy will come into my head which I will note on the side of the page. Then, after the complete repertorization, over and over I find that remedy which was my first impression is the one which is the most effective in actual therapy.

—*Jourl. of the Am. Inst. of Homœopathy, July-Aug., '61*

EDITORIAL

(Continued from page 245)

know that, the only positive path for the purpose is to educate the homœopathic masses in real essence of Homœopathy, by correct teaching and concrete examples. Still we are forced, from time to time, to get involved in these empty polemics, only because our silence and indifference may provide the vulgarizers of Homœopathy an open field to hoax the naive public. We would earnestly request our readers to peruse again the article "*The main source of danger to Homœopathy in the present age*", reprinted in the December 1965 issue of the *Hahnemannian Gleanings* (Vol. XXXII/12/567) to get an all round view of the problem.

J. N. Kanjilal