

THE HAHNEMANNIAN GLEANINGS

Vol. XXXIII

JULY 1966

No. 7

EDITORIAL

THE RATIONALITY OF THE USE OF ALLOPATHIC PALLIATIVES ALONG WITH HOMŒOPATHIC REMEDIES

At the outset, it must be made clear that, this article refers to only *drug-therapeutics* in actual *diseased conditions*, rather than to the various physiological, hygienic or surgical measures necessary in the respective exigencies.

There are good many Homœopaths in our country as well as in the West, especially the latter, whose knowledge and proficiency in both Allopathic and Homœopathic systems of medicine are unquestionable, who assert that there is not only no harm in the simultaneous use of both the systems of therapeutics in the same patient, rather, that practice is more congenial to the patient and hence necessary. And on this plea they lavishly use Penicillin etc. whenever there is a diagnosis of Pneumonia, Sepsis, Venereal disease etc.; Entromycetin or allied drugs whenever there is a diagnosis of Enteric fever; various other Antibiotics in various pathological conditions; Cortisones in various arthritic, allergic and other conditions; Tranquillizers in various neurotic conditions; Laxatives in constipation; various Tonics and Synthetic Vitamins in various speculated deficiencies; and so on, along with the indicated Homœopathic remedy.

As the rationale of their practice they flourish the following arguments:—

(1) Hahnemann was thoroughly justified in castigating the crude and groundless therapeutics of his day, but had he been living to-day, his out and out scientific mind would have appreciatingly accepted and adopted all the modern developments in the field of therapeutics.

(2) Allopathic medicines acting on the physiological plane and Homœopathic medicines acting on the dynamic plane, can continue their beneficial activities in their respective planes without clashing with each other, when used simultaneously on the same patient.

In their opinion, it is nothing but ignorance or bigotry and dogmatism which stand in the way of a Homœopath in making use of the highly effective

modern drugs in his cases; thus depriving his patients of the benefits of modern therapeutics. So, they dub all Homœopaths differing from their viewpoint as sectarian and puritan who place their dogma above the sole guiding ideal of any physician—the benefit of the patient.

Let us, now, try to place the viewpoints of those Homœopaths who endeavour to follow the basic principles of Homœopathy as strictly as possible, and that not for the sake of the mere principles (which, by the way, are all inductively drawn from concrete experience and experiment for many years), but for the *real* benefit of the patients.

(1) It cannot be gainsaid that the modern therapeutics of the dominant school is far more elegant, charming, effective and rational than it was at the time of Hahnemann. But to be equitable and rational the following facts must be taken into consideration—

(i) The crudeness and ugliness of therapeutics of Hahnemann's time was due to the fact that too many drugs were used in mixtures or powders in their crude natural state in heavy doses. They were as a rule very unpleasant to take and often produced immediate and obvious undesirable, nay, sometimes, atrocious side-effects, but mostly superficial and short-lasting and hardly affecting the deeper planes of the organism. Whereas modern therapeutics seldom ever uses crude drugs, but their essential constituents, and that often prepared synthetically. So it requires lesser amount of doses, more easy (if not always pleasant) to administer. They work on far deeper plane and far more lastingly. But their deleterious side-effects, although not always immediately obvious, produce long lasting, deep disorder of the economy of the organism. These disorders are often so far-reaching, deep and subtle that, it becomes difficult to trace the source of these disorders to the actual drug, (whereas, formerly the disorders by the crude doses of Cinchona, Arsenic, Mercury etc. could be traced easily to the respective drugs and suitably antidoted).

Thus we see, the modern therapeutics is far more elegant and charming than it was at Hahnemann's time, as the electric chair is far more elegant and charming than the hanging rope and guillotine of older times.

(ii) It is true that, modern therapeutics is effective in suppressing a wider range of so-called specific diseases (to wit, Pneumonia, Typhoid, Sepsis, Gonorrhoea, Tuberculosis, etc.) and many a particular symptom (to wit, tachycardia, anxiety, convulsive fits, persistent vomiting, various spasmodic conditions, etc.) but they are at the same time productive of vast range of deep and almost irremediable iatrogenic disorders as side-effects (e.g., dermatitis, allergy, diabetes anaphylaxis, vascular collapse, hypotension, anaemia, aggranulocytosis, thrombotic tendency, osteoporosis, hepatic dysfunction, peptic ulcer, depression, ataxia, perkinsonianism, etc. etc. etc.). So, their overwhelmingly powerful effectiveness is far outflanked by the irrevokable damages they are inflicting to-day on the human race.

(iii) It is quite true that, at Hahnemann's time, therapeutics was based

mainly on the mere opinion of various authorities, whereas modern therapeutics has in all its measures some rational basis. But the shallowness of this rational basis will be obvious from the following examples—

(a) **Prescriptions based on various speculated deficiency conditions** e.g., the various specific vitamins or vitamins in general; minerals like—calcium, ferrum etc.; endocrines—pituitary (anterior or posterior), thyroid, parathyroid, adrenal (cortical or medullary), sexual hormones (male or female) and so on. It may be reminded here that, this category of the therapeutics should not logically belong to therapeutics proper, but to physiological adjustment.

Vitamins—There is hardly yet any direct method by which it is easy to identify which particular vitamin is deficient and to what extent. It is on secondary evidences that deficiency of particular vitamins is surmised. So, particular vitamins are usually prescribed on a surmised basis; and what is more commonly done, especially when a specific deficiency cannot be definitely ascertained, all the vitamins are mixed together and supplied in the form of the various multivitamin preparations. But, it should be remembered that, excessive intake of any vitamin may disturb the whole economy.

Then there is the further problem—whether the surmised deficiency is due to defective assimilation or to inadequate supply. In most cases the deficiency is due to defective assimilation. In such cases any additional supply of the vitamin in question is like loading a person with quintals, who cannot carry even a kilogram. Still, that is what is usually done.

If the deficiency is due to inadequate supply or excessive drainage or waste, then of course there is some rationality in compensating the inadequacy. But, in this case one well-known biological fact should be remembered. Biological system prefers natural products and that again of particular types, suiting the taste and dietetic habits, and often refuses to accept and assimilate the artificial products, for example—vegetarians draw their protein requirements from milk or vegetable sources like pulses etc., non-vegetarians from fish, meat, egg etc. and both of them dislike and are often upset by artificial or bottled proteins. Thus, our economy may accept and selectively assimilate vitamins from natural foods, but fails to assimilate and often get upset by the various synthetic products. Still, that is the usual form in which vitamins are supplied in modern therapeutics.

With respect to the minerals, the direct evidence of their deficiency may, of course, be ascertained and even quantitatively estimated by means of the modern laboratory methods. But in their compensatory administration, all the problems discussed in the case of vitamins remain. Moreover the supply of any particular mineral may at best temporarily fulfil the deficiency, but can never remove the cause of their deficiency, which is often due to diseased state of the vital economy. Furthermore the prolonged use of any particular mineral is quite likely to upset the whole economy by its pharmacodynamic effects.

With respect to endocrinal deficiencies the same problems prevail. The cause of the deficiency of any particular endocrine secretion cannot be removed by the borrowed supply from the modern pharmacists. And moreover, the whole endocrinal system is so delicately balanced that, any inappropriate attempt at temporary adjustment by borrowed supply may deeply and sometimes permanently upset the whole economy.

(b) **Prescriptions based on the various specific germs**—It is true that, the modern therapeutics is now able to kill a wider range of germs against which it was, even upto a few decades ago, quite helpless. But it is often found that the annihilation of the incriminated germ far from curing the patients throws him into prolonged suffering due to the various unavoidable side-effects of the germ-killers, as well as to the disturbance of the essential balance in the germ community of the organism. Moreover, it very often so happens that, a particular germ-killer which enters the field of modern therapeutics with great uproar due to its outstanding credit in killing a specific germ, soon becomes hopelessly impotent with respect to the same germ. Thus we find in the field of modern therapeutics an everchanging scene of one glorious hero being soon completely discredited or even disgraced by a subsequent hero. This is due to the fact that, germs have an inconvenient nature of soon becoming resistant against their enemies and of frequently changing their habit and even morphology according to the requirements of their environment.

After all, it must be remembered that, germs are only one of the causative factors of the various specific diseases, the other and far more important factor is the relative susceptibility of the soil—the vital resistance of the organism. The most potent germ-killers may be temporarily efficient enough to remove the germ factor, but they have no power to increase the body resistance, rather, most often they jeopardize it by their various side effects.

(2) Let us now come to the second argument of the eclectic Homœopaths. It is quite true that the potentized medicines act on and through the dynamic plane and the crude medicines act on and through the physiological plane. But there is no Chinese wall between these two planes, as will be obvious from the following considerations—

(i) The dynamic pathogenetic properties of any drug may often remain dormant in its crude state, but it is never absent. And the dynamic activities of a potentized drug has not only its reflections but actual effects on the physiological plane. Thus we see, in proving of drugs in crude physiological doses many subjective and even some mental symptoms produced in the dynamic plane, and also in the proving with high potencies production of many symptoms in the physiological plane.

(ii) The plea for the use of the various allopathic drugs along with homœopathic potentized remedies, is mainly to remove or suspend or suppress some unpleasant or troublesome symptom or a germ. But we should remember that, in homœopathic therapeutics the symptoms are the sole guides

not only in selecting the remedy but also in following the course of the progress or retrogression of the case in hand. They are guiding lights in our path of treatment, from the very beginning to the end. If some of these lights are removed by force, we fall in darkness and there arise various confusions in deciding our path.

(iii) These potent drugs not only remove the symptoms or the offending agents, but, as already mentioned, produce various side-effects, disturbing the totality of the natural symptoms and often deranging the whole biological economy of the case. And in such a situation it becomes extremely difficult to assess, which of the symptoms are really due to actual disease and which due to the drugs taken; and thus selection of the similimum becomes awfully difficult, nay, sometimes, impossible. As a matter of fact the onrush of modern therapeutics has thrown Homœopathy in great difficulties mainly on this score.

Thus it is clear that, the scientific minded, humanitarian Hahnemann, had he come to life again, would have become terrified and infuriated at the modern developments of the Orthodox therapeutics, far from applauding and accepting them.

J. N. Kanjilal