

THE HAHNEMANNIAN GLEANINGS

Vol. XXXIII

APRIL 1966

No. 4

EDITORIAL

WHY HAHNEMANNIAN HOMŒOPATHY MUST BE SAVED

Some learned physicians claim, "Our *only* mission is to *cure* the sick. We are at liberty to take recourse to any method for fulfilling our mission, why should we bother for any particular principle or method?"

Some others again assert, "Because we have adopted the Homœopathic line for fulfilling our mission, we must follow the Homœopathic principle in curing the sick. But Homœopathic principle simply means removal of any trouble by the use of a drug capable of producing similar trouble e.g., alleviation of constipation with ineffectual urge by means of Nux Vom., removal of throbbing pain with Belladonna, Intermittent fever with China and so on. Why must we bother for so many principles or any particular method?"

But this sort of attitude towards Homœopathy leads one to various blind alleys viz.,

(1) Each of the troubles is covered by a number of drugs. The particular symptom *per se* gives little hint as to whether the trouble will be relieved specifically by the particular medicine. These physicians try to overcome this impasse by increasing the dose of the medicine selected or even by taking recourse to the method of injection, but very often in vain.

(2) Patients usually come not only with one trouble, but with a number of troubles. The drug covering one trouble may not cover other troubles. These physicians try to overcome this difficulty by mixing various drugs covering the different troubles in one prescription or by administering the several drugs in alternation, thus creating a hotchpotch of the case.

Hahnemann faced all these difficulties immediately after his discovery of the Law of Similia. And by dint of his extraordinary power of observation and insight, gradually evolved the following principles on the basis of meticulous experience and experiments and inductions therefrom:—

(1) The separate symptoms are nothing but the different manifestations of the whole disease affecting a particular individual,

(2) Removal of any one or more of the symptoms has nothing to do with cure. Rather removal of isolated symptoms (palliation or suppression) disturbs the real picture of the disease and thus hampers the process of cure.

(3) For true cure, that is, permanent annihilation of the whole disease, all the manifestations, that is, the totality of symptoms representing the disease with its background must be removed.

(4) For removal of the totality of symptoms a remedy must be found out, in any particular phase of the disease, which covers the maximum number of symptoms, especially including those symptoms which characterise the individual patient suffering from the disease, as distinguished from other patients suffering from the same form of disease. That is, the remedy must be similarmost to the suffering individual at the particular phase, with his background and environment. This is the principle of *individualization* of the disease and the remedy.

(5) This similarmost remedy cannot naturally and logically be more than one. This is the principle of *single remedy*, for any phase of the whole diseased condition.

(6) In actual application of the Law of Similia, one is forced by necessity to reduce the dose of the remedy; as more the dose the greater is the likelihood of aggravation of the disease. Forced by this necessity, Hahnemann had to reduce the dose gradually and gradually, eventually coming to such a quantity of the dose, where material existence of the drug could not be traced by any means. Ultimately he was led to the conclusion that the dose of the remedy can never be too small to produce any action, and the greater the symptom-similarity the lesser the dose necessary. This is the principle or *minimum* dose.

(7) In the process of minimising the dose by means of dilution and attenuation with an inert substance (Water, Spirit or Sugar of Milk) with rhythmic succussion or trituration, Hahnemann hit upon his *Dynamic Theory*. He noticed the wonderful fact that by the process of dilution and attenuation, the real medicinal potency of the drug (as apart from its physiological and other crude effects) instead of getting diminished is gradually more and more enhanced. Thus he came to the conclusion that, the real pathogenetic and therapeutic property of a drug is not due to its chemical and physical qualities, but due to its dynamic properties, and it acts not on a crude plane through the crude channels like blood and other body-fluids but on dynamic plane through the nerves. Thus *injections and other crude methods are inconsistent with and alien to Homœopathic principles*.

Hahnemann in his opus magnum—the *Organon*—expounded, in thorough detail, not only these interconnected principles, but also the practical methods of their application. Any physician desiring to fulfil his mission of life—cure of the sick—by Homœopathic method, without thoroughly grasping

the tenets of the Organon and scrupulously putting them into practice will simply tinker with Homœopathic remedies, which, it must be remembered, are not always simple sweet powders or globules, but often on being misapplied, act as most virulent dynamic poisons endangering the life of the patient or thoroughly spoiling the case and barring all possibility of real cure.

Those physicians who want to fulfil the mission of their life—cure of the sick by taking recourse to any method they like, must clearly understand what is *disease* and what is *cure*. They must not confuse various troublesome symptoms with the diseases themselves and must try to understand the difference between a real disease (a dynamic disorder) on the one hand, and the various physiological indispositions and mechanical disorders on the other hand; which latter must be dealt with by suitable physiological and mechanical means. When they will understand what a real disease is, they will find that, for its real cure there will remain no option other than to take recourse to pure Homœopathy, strictly following the tenets of the Organon. This path is of course rather a bit hard. It may be difficult for some of them to stick to this tiresome path; so they may have to take recourse to various easier methods for getting rid of the trouble at least for the time being, consoling themselves that they are doing everything only to give relief to the patient, the mission of real cure of course going to the skies. Worse still, the more cunning among them, in order to cover their own deficiency would go to interpret the tenets of the Organon in their own opportunist way, or even to improve upon Hahnemann to make it more flawless, scientific and modern, without taking the trouble of disproving any of them, or at least showing out the flaws in them. With respect to this latter sect we have got nothing to say except echoing the words of Dr. Meyer, who in his narration of Dr. Boenninghausen, tells us "He (Dr. Boenninghausen—Ed.) considered the doctrine of Hahnemann, as a precious inalienable jewel, which must be carefully cherished and guarded from every impure admixture. Evermore glorious, so he wrote in one of his letters, will Homœopathy unfold its banner, ever more brightly will it beam in the firmament of science; evermore full of creative virtues she will show her wonderful powers, if she is not decked with any false finery nor disfigured with borrowed attire or ornaments. Homœopathy is natural growth and independent in its nature and every alien admixture is but to her detriment. The germ of its development lies in her own nature, and it therefore, only needs an intelligent gardener, who will give it the necessary and correct culture and also faithful watchmen, who will relentlessly destroy every parasitic plant that would approach it." (T. L. Bradford's *Pioneer of Homœopathy*, p. 175).

This statement of Dr. Meyer demands especial attention to-day, in view of the fact that, the Homœopathic world, in the present age, has become infested with various form of highly influential parasitic growths, which are

(Continued on page 179)

those whose horizons reach far beyond these boundaries. Though science has liberated man from many prejudices and one-sided viewpoints, it has imprisoned us afresh in the new superstition of matter and the merely measurable and sense-perceptible being the fundamental and basic reality of Nature. To the modern scientific idea on which is based the modern scientific medicine, physics is the basic science to which all other sciences must be reduced; whereas according to the Homœopathic viewpoint, medicine should be studied as a branch of Biology with its subdivisions of psychology and which must become basic and physics and chemistry and the rest derived therefrom. Thus the acceptance of Homœopathy depends on new ideas to grasp the new realms of subtle facts and new ideas mean new thinking and new methodologies of investigation.

3. FUTURE TREND IN MEDICINE

There is no doubt that the mechanical age is passing. It is becoming widely recognised in medicine that there is a grave danger in specialisation and reliance on highly technical laboratory tests. They may aid in the diagnosis of the physical changes in separate organs of body, but it is being realised more and more that a sick organ is a very different thing from a sick man. He cannot be put into a test tube and analysed. The holistic view is bound to dominate matters medical, in near future; and as such Homœopathy has a bright future.

EDITORIAL

(Continued from page 147)

fast gaining so much strength as to completely stifle out real Homœopathy. It is not for the sake of Hahnemann, nor for the sake of his devoted disciples like Boenninghausen and others, but for the sake of the ailing humanity, with their fast increasing complicated diseases, that Hahnemannian Homœopathy must be saved from the encroachment of those parasitic infiltrations in any form. Let us all swear, every year, on Hahnemann Birth Day in the name of ailing humanity, that **we will be faithful and effective watchmen of Hahnemannian Homœopathy.**

J. N. Kanjilal
