

COMMENT ON THE QUESTION OF THE ORIGIN OF SYCOSIS AND THE ROLL OF BACTERIA ON IT

Vide—pp. 242, 333, 477 of Vol. XXIX (1962) and pp. 231, 561 of Vol. XXX (1963).

The question raised by Sri K. K. Kar (H. G. XXIX/5/242-43) concerns a fundamental issue. This issue has kept the world of Philosophy divided into so many camps. And this division has not spared the Homœopathic world too. The basic question centres on *the relation between matter and energy*. On the one side of the controversy we find the absolute Idealists—the Substantialists, Entelechyists, Teleologists etc.; on the other side stand the absolute Materialists—mainly the mechanists. There are various grades of intermediaries between these two main camps, with the role of compromisers or synthetisers of the two main idealogies. Thorough expositions of, and detailed reply to the questions raised by Sri Kar is beyond the scope of this short commentary in a magazine, that will require a full treatise, for which I do not feel sufficiently competent, nor have I the time at my disposal just at present. So I shall here only hint at certain basic points and refer to the Authorities, by consulting which the questioner as well as the participants in the controversy, and also our readers in general may try for themselves to find the answer for themselves, on this very vitally important question, without the solution of which it is very difficult for Homœopathy to make any advancement.

The Homœopathic school is divided between the Idealist camp headed by the talented teacher J. T. Kent on the one side, and Materialist camp led by Richard Hughes and many others on the other side. In between these two main camps—as far as my knowledge goes—lies Stuart Close, who has attempted to make a synthesis of those two aspects of the Homœopathic Philosophy. I like to draw the attention of our dear readers to the following chapters of *The Genus of Homœopathy* by Stuart Close, M.D., (Indian Edition, Pub-

lished by Haren Brothers, 34, Strand Road, Calcutta-1)—Chap. VI—*Life, Health and Disease*, esp. pp. 67-72 (Partially excepted in the articles entitled "*The Basic Medical Science*" H. G. September 1963, pp. 401-3); Chap. VIII—*General Pathology of Homœopathy*—esp. pp. 92-99. Perusal of these pages will surely explain most of the points raised in the controversy.

At the very outset certain facts about our great Master Hahnemann should be clearly kept in view, which are as follows:—

(1) He was neither an absolute idealist nor a mechanical materialist. Our Master had prodigious talent and intuition of a great philosopher, as well as astounding power of observation of a great scientist, combined in his character. He was a flawless logician too, so he could draw unassailable conclusions from his observation and intuition. That is why he, although belonging to an age of scientific backwardness, anticipated many things which are being rediscovered today with the technological development of the day. He not only clearly expounded—and that without any technical or ideological aid or support—the various facts and formulations of medical science of date, but also in the field of natural science, the unity of matter and energy—even in its minutest form (the energy particles of Protons, Electrons etc.) was clearly anticipated by Hahnemann—as depicted in many of his formulations especially in the Aphorism 15 of the *Organon*, where he says—
". . . . The Organism is indeed the material instrument of life, but it is not conceivable without the animation imparted to it by the instinctively perceiving and regulating dynamis, just as the vital force is not conceivable without the Organism, consequently the *two together constitutes a unity* (Italics J. K.) although in thought our mind separate this unity into two distinct conceptions for the sake of easy comprehension".

(2) In all the writings of Hahnemann, especially in his *Opus Magnum*—the *Organon*, we can hardly find any trace of speculation. All his formulations are based on observed or authentic facts and phenomena and logical conclusions drawn from them by the process of induction, instead on conceiving *a priori* principles and then drawing deductions from them.

With this understanding of Hahnemann, let us see what he actually meant by certain terms which are too often variously interpreted by various authors according to their respective bent of mind:—

(1) Chronic Miasms—"They (all chronic diseases—Psora, Sycosis, Syphilis—J. K.) must therefore all have for their origin and foundation constant chronic miasms, whereby their *parasitical existence* in the human organism is enabled to continually *rise and grow*" (Chronic Diseases—Indian Edition, Vol. I, P. 24, Para 3, last 3 lines). Now, parasitical existence, rising (i.e. birth) and growth are possible only for animated beings—call it mite, fungus, bacteria spirella virus—as the case may be.

(2) Psora is not a diathesis, nor itself a miasm, but a disease due to a specific miasm. Psora is not the mother of venereal diseases (Syphilis and Sycosis)—but of thousands of acute and non-venereal chronic diseases—"Psora is the most ancient, most universal and most destructive and yet most misapprehended chronic disease . . . has become the mother of all the thousands of incredibly various (acute and) chronic (non-venereal diseases . . ." (*Ibid* P. 24, last but one Para).

(3) The miasms (animated beings) are not themselves diseases, they are the proximate cause of diseases; neither are itch, chancre and figwart—themselves diseases they are the primary manifestations respectively of Psora, Syphilis and Sycosis—which according to Hahnemann are the three basic chronic diseases, *i.e.*, three basic types of disordered *states* of health. All these must be read in context with the Aphorisms 6, 7, 11, 12 and 13 of the Organon.

We hope a careful perusal of these few reference will settle the problem and do away with the various misinterpretations. We deliberately kept the controversy open for more than one year and a half, with the expectation that some new light be thrown by some talented scientists. But we are disappointed to find that all of the few controversialists are moving within the same fixed circle of Idealism. So let us all fall back upon the original writings of the Master for getting more light.

J. N. KANJILAL