

THEORIES IN HOMŒOPATHY

Reflections on the point of view of a homœopathic doctor

DR. DAVID CASTRO, Rio de Janeiro

Translated from L'Homœopathie Française—February, 1960

A few days ago a physician asked me two direct questions:

1. Do you consider homœopathy to be the only true form of therapeutics?

2. Have you ever, during the course of your clinical activities, had occasion to use an allopathic drug?

Before answering his questions I did some quick thinking, promising meanwhile that I would supply him with a detailed explanation. This is given below, and I am further availing myself of the opportunity to answer those who, though they may not actually have asked these same questions, yet have them always on their lips.

"All roads lead to Rome," as the old proverb says. Good sense however adds: "But one of them may be better, quicker or shorter."

A sincere homœopath will reason similarly on the subject of therapy. All therapeutic methods may lead to cure, but for him, the homœopath, the best and the most efficient is homœopathic therapy.

Such reasoning is logical and comprehensive. The doctor's first duty is to heal. And if a doctor chooses homœopathic therapy, it is because he considers it most strongly indicated for the easy accomplishment of this duty. The same holds good for the partisans of all other therapeutic methods, unless they are non-scientific.

Taking a neutral point of view (which I must admit is for me only theoretically possible) I concede to the partisans of so-called allopathic therapeutics the right of considering that their methods are the best, the most strongly indicated and the most efficient. This is as logical from the medical point of view as it is human from the individual point of view.

Eclectic Point of View

There is however another aspect of this question in which homœopathy differs from other therapies; it is from the point of view of eclecticism. In allopathy this term has really no meaning. It cannot be said to constitute a therapeutic theory, in the same way as homœopathy does.

Allopathy is a collection of therapeutic theories, rather than a concrete general theory of therapeutics. This is not to say that it is not scientific. Its experimental bases are indeed strictly scientific. But its concepts are broad, diffuse, and subject to the constant inclusion and exclusion of drugs and methods.

And amidst these multiple concepts and methods, a doctor is free to accept all, or just some of them; to recognise this and to reject that; to admit the efficacy of such and such a drug or method against illness, and to admit no other.

An allopathic doctor can even advise homœopathy, and many of them do so. Yes, they can deliberately recommend the use of homœopathic remedies; and this is without taking into account a number of drugs used in allopathic medicine, whose action is clearly homœopathic.

Established Theory

In homœopathy, the position is different. Homœopathy is a definite, established theory. Its laws are held to be proved, and "Similia Similibus Curentur" (sic) means that the method of cure based on the law of similars is considered to be true, best and more right.

The theory of homœopathic therapeutics contains many other more or less important concepts which the homœopath owes it to himself to follow. Here is no prejudice or unhealthy orthodoxy. It is the very nature itself of the method or of the theory.

When a homœopath refrains from prescribing arsenic or mercury for a syphilitic, it is not because he is against arsenic or mercury or because he doubts their action upon the treponema. Rather it is because in his therapy, based as it is upon pathology, the concept of the microbe is not so important as are the subjective and objective effects of that microbe and its toxins upon the patient—the symptom picture. Obviously the homœopath is going

to seek for the remedy indicated by this picture, in a word, for the "similimum".

Our purpose here is not to argue as to which is the best form of therapy, or whether or not syphilis is cured by arsenobenzols. Certainly they must cure it, or they would not have been in use for such a long time.

But the homœopath, by virtue of his very name, uses his own method, and only his own method, because for him it is the best and the most strongly indicated.

Thus eclecticism is not recognised by homœopathy. Either one uses homœopathic methods according to the laws of homœopathy, and one is a homœopath; or one uses different methods according to no particular laws, and one is not a homœopath.

Varying Reactions

Allopaths, or doctors who are not homœopaths, are in the main anti-homœopaths. But their reactions vary. Some know nothing about homœopathy, have never heard of it and will not discuss it. Others simply despise it. Others again ridicule, without understanding it. Some tolerate it. A very few understand, without using, it. Lastly, some fight it furiously.

All of these attitudes depend upon very personal, subjective or objective factors. Not one of them is essential or fundamental. Whether or not they are adopted has no effect on true therapeutic methods. The explanation of this lies in the fact that non-homœopathic therapeutics are the official ones, that is to say, those taught in recognised medical schools all over the world, and practised by the great majority of doctors.

The position of homœopaths with regard to allopathy is very different. In the first place this position is universal, general, common to all homœopaths because it is a part of their doctrine. Further, it is based upon a constant comparative analysis. Finally, it relates to a doctrinal necessity of the theory.

For a homœopath, non-homœopathic theories and methods are serious and profoundly scientific questions. They are questions like: What is the therapeutic position of surgery? Are mental symptoms influential in the choice of a remedy? Is diagnosis the fundamental element in the choice of a remedy? Is the action (of

a remedy, Tr.) on the human organism more, or less, important than its action on the microbial agent? Is the question of the elimination of the remedy given proper consideration in non-homœopathic therapeutics? Will not a tendency to specialisation lead to a loss of the notion of the organic wholeness, of the One?

Need of Understanding

These are only some of the questions discussed by the homœopath, and he can obviously only do so in the light of other theories. Moreover, given his social position, the homœopath needs to be widely understood in a way that would be quite useless to classical medicine. To spread this understanding, the critical method is the best, if not the only, way.

So have thought all the masters of homœopathy since Hahnemann. So have done, in Brazil, Mure, Souza Martins Soares de Meireles, Murinho, Licinio Cardoso, Nilo Cairo, Alberto Seabra, Galhardo, etc. There is nothing sectarian about this, unless it is respect upon a scientific and impersonal basis. It is not a matter of denying other therapies, but of showing the advantages which homœopathy can offer in obtaining cure, according to the true homœopaths.

"All roads lead to Rome." But homœopaths consider that theirs is the best, the fastest, and the most efficacious, and feel themselves under the obligation to demonstrate the reasons for their conviction, not only in showing which is their "road", but also in analysing that of the others which they think is less efficacious or contra-indicated.

Finally, the question of whether I employ non-homœopathic remedies in my clinical practice. The answer is, No. I have never used non-homœopathic remedies in my clinical practice.

But,—this must be amplified—this is not through systematic opposition, but because never in my professional life have I encountered the need to do so, either from scepticism or from insufficiency of means in the homœopathic *Materia Medica*.

Thus it has been until today, and thus I think it will continue to be, because I consider homœopathy to be a sufficient medical

(Continued on page 131)

has been monopolised, so to say, by big cartel Organisations, large-scale manufacturers, who manipulate and regulate all researches, pharmaceutical, and other activities in medicines to suit their own vested interests. WHO and Health Directorates of Governments are nothing but a mouthpiece of these gigantic users. To do big business and push on their products is their only aim. They have no real interest in the welfare of humanity. The cruel apothecaries of Hahnemann's times have appeared in this garb today. Beware of these monstrous havocs that are being wrought over man through their nefarious activities. Practice of Medicine today is only an organised demonstration of millions of patent drugs mostly synthetic, that are responsible for the increase of so many types and names of diseases. More than 50 per cent of present-day diseases is due to the ill-effects of modern drugs used for prevention and treatment of diseases.

Purity of Homœopathic medicines, steadfastness to Hahnemannian principles and unity of genuine homœopaths are the only answers to this present-day barbarism in medicine.

THEORIES IN HOMŒOPATHY

(Continued from page 121)

theory and practice. I do not however guarantee that I will never do so, since after all the cure of the patient is the essential object of the doctor's mission, as Hahnemann said in the first paragraph of the Organon.

—*Homœopathy, June 1960*
