

## SOMETHING LEFT UNSAID

DR. RAM RATNA SINHA, B.A., SARAN

Prince Jaysingh was to attend Delhi for an interview with Emperor Aurangzeb. The anxious advisers were instructing the Prince how to reply to the questions of the Emperor. At the end of the tutoring, the intelligent Prince queried, "what to do if altogether a new question is asked by the Emperor". The bewildered advisers had to admit that he would have to rely on his own wit.

Those trying to be guided by the experience of other doctors, however prominent, will find themselves in similar circumstances not infrequently.

Hence it is imperative to remember that "Law directs and experience confirms". Here experience means ones own experience and not of others.

It is the experience of Dr. Kanjilal and his friends that Malandrinum is not a prophylactic against Chicken-Pox. It was the experience of Dr. C. S. Kali that made him write "Malandrinum is a phrophylaxis against Chicken-Pox". The contradiction lies in the fact that both the experiences were obtained in different period of times and in different types of cases. It is purely a question of being indicated for the particular type or not (Dr. J. C. Bag (1) HG/360/63).

There are weak constitutions with inherited chronic miasms to work inwardly without showing outward symptoms. Such cases are very misleading and often prove very difficult to manage. The application of an appropriate homœopathic remedy will always bring about an aggravation. In such cases so much havoc is done in "incubation period" as will be done in normal cases while full invasion is on, and the treatment has to be adjusted accordingly. The patient is being cured (if curable) at the very stage when the medicine is given (inside

*(Continued on page 566)*

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

(1)

I really became much glad in seeing the comments of Dr. R. R. Sinha, B.A., appearing on the pages 231 and 232 of May, 1963 issue of the "Hahnemannian Gleanings" on my letter to the Editor published in October, 1962 issue.

I am very much obliged for the kind prescription of the writer to me though according to him the prescription of the writer seems to be totally uncalled for, vide his remarks to Mr. Deshpande in the section (B) of his letter to the Editor on page 232 of May, 1963 issue.

Is it not a fact Sir, that Platinum Patients 'Who over-estimate themselves' and 'are proud and self conceited with contempt for others do not hesitate to give examples like' 'peeling of an onion scale by scale' and do not go deep into the matter to know the actual realities? I do not think that one will be able to get the butter from the curd without churning it rightly. Simply the idea of containing butter in the curd won't suffice our requirements. I am also surprised how Dr. Sinha could know that the onion contains nothing but scales without peeling it off any day? Are all the outer-most and the inner-most scales of an onion of same quality? Perhaps Dr. Sinha counts all the grades of symptoms in his patients under one broad head as per his 'Scales of an onion'! I do not understand Sir, when the question was simply a 'why of why' how you were tempted to remark on the question raised, as to be a 'fundamental one' and wanted to have the matter 'discussed publicly', vide your letter, Reference JK-CCH dated 8-3-62 to my address at Titilagarh.

However, to accept Psora 'Without the bacteria of scabies' (is it "Bacteria"?) is not on mere blind perception. There is every ground to accept the itch (not the scabies exactly) to have been caused without Bacteria, as the course of the disease runs

from the centre to the circumference, and the itch is the reflection of the itching in the mental plane (Manasik Stara) over the body of the Organism.

"Hence this state, the state of the human mind and the state of the human body is a state of susceptibility to disease from willing evils from thinking that which is false and making life one continuous heredity of false things, so this form of disease Psora is but an outward manifestation of that which is prior in man" is amply sufficient in support of my statement.

Again, 'It was (Psora) not due to the actions of the body as we find Syphilis and Sycosis to be'. What does it state? Does it not indicate any difference about the origin of Psora *vs.* Syphilis and Sycosis?

I therefore do not understand how the Psoric principle is interpreted for Sycosis and Syphilis all along from beginning to and in every topic and hence to what extent I am wrong in expressing my doubts in my other letters to you?

Further, to my statement "Potentised nosodes bear the same morbid power as the bacteria bear in it" Dr. Sinha has commented to be 'totally an incorrect statement'. Let me again repeat Dr. Kent's opinion on this, 'Substance in simple form is just as positively substance as matter in concrete form'. 'Matter is subject to reduction'. 'All operation that is possible is due to the simple substance'. 'The thing that does not start from it's beginning with a purpose is not a thing or to put it another way what makes any thing a thing is because of it's purpose or ultimate which is use and there is never created a thing without purpose'. What I understand a matter when potentised is reduced to the state of simple substance. So it is not understood as per the remarks of Dr. Sinha, whether the theory of simple substance is incorrect or the potentised medicines are devoid of simple substance? If either of the two is correct does it not counterstate the theory of simple substance of the immortal soul of Dr. Kent?

Besides, my idea of the question was not about the action of the drugs on a diseased organism. It was the question of the symptoms depicted by the organism when a certain drug, Bacteria or say a foreign body acts over a healthy living body.

Lastly Dr. Sinha has questioned me 'Is the questioner convinced?' I, with due regard to him, agree in the fact that Sycosis and Syphilis are two miasms originated after the suppression of the diseases Gonorrhoea and Syphilis without any reasonings to their origin as individual diseases.

In fact I am afraid of the fact that according to the views of Dr. Sinha a day will come when all such individual diseases of different nomenclature will turn each in to a miasm of its own, as every such disease is a kind like Gonorrhoea and Syphilis caused by the vitiation of the mental faculty.

Really I am in a dilemma when such contradictory views and ideas are grouped in to my mind. So this novice will be obliged in getting a clear idea of the fact from your end.

K. K. KAR  
6-6-63.

(2)

Will you please permit me to say a few words in reference to Dr. R. R. Sinha's letter (Hahnemannian Gleanginge, May 1963, pp. 231-33)?

I refrained from answering the questions posed by Shree K. K. Kar in his letter (H.G., Oct., 1962, pp. 477-78) partly because they were of the nature of eternal riddles, answers to which are only plausible explanations and may or may not satisfy the interrogator; and partly because they had been, in a way, already answered by me when I had said in my letter (H.G., July, 1962, p. 333) . . . . " Its origin, whether of Syphilitic or Sycotic nature, will have to be traced to the vitiation . . . ." Dr. Sinha says nothing new when he says ". . . . their origin . . . . in the 'Vital Dynamic Plane'. . . ."

The roll of bacteria also had been discussed by me in the same letter towards the end. Incidentally, Dr. Sinha makes mutually contradictory statements when he says on the one hand that ". . . . Bacteria . . . . are . . . . companions or products of disease" (which means where there are bacteria there is or was the disease) and on the other ". . . . there have been

found in the organisms of people dying in accidents, germs of different diseases though they never suffered from those diseases before the accident”.

(2) My criticism of Dr. Sukerkar's article came forth to prevent erroneous matter from passing for facts in writings of a scientific nature. True, attempts of the sort made by Dr. Sukerkar are being made to make the understanding and memorising of our vast Materia Medica relatively less difficult. But, however well-intentioned the attempts, statements made loosely and without a fair element of correctness in them have not failed to pollute the clear stream of scientific thought. It is essential that scientific matter is thoroughly reliable and completely in accordance with facts. No consideration such as novelty of approach or need for simplicity and easy understandability should be allowed to get the better of reliability and truth. A degree of watchfulness, therefore, I suppose, is not “uncalled for”.

20.5.63.

G. M. DESHPANDE

(3)

This letter of mine may be taken as a continuation to my letter dated 6.6.63, a reply to Dr. R. R. Sinha's comments in the “Hahnemannian Gleanings” vide Page 231 of May 1963, and I expect while dealing with the topic your attention will never miss these facts.

That in the said volume of the “Hahnemannian Gleanings” Dr. Sinha with an indication to me stated “He should not assured that Bacteria are not responsible for any disease. They are, at best, companions or byproducts of disease” and cites no authentic explanation for that. I do not think that in the contrast of the prevailing system of medicine and our system such dogmatism on our views without a deep study of the science will in anyway help in the victory of our science. We must not be so very superfluous in our views and decisions.

By tressing over the comment he again stated that “For further conviction he may refer to the fact that there have been a number of naturalists who have swallowed full dose of

disease culture with immunity". To this perhaps Dr. Sinha forgets to consider that some poisonous drugs or substances which are well tolerated generally by majority in certain doses become lethal to some. There are number of instances in the provings of drugs that while some are very susceptible to the actions of a drug in a certain dose, some do not respond even in the least, though they were quite susceptible to other drugs or to some other form of the dose of the same drug.

Further he has stated in contradiction to my opinion "Potentised nosodes bear the same morbidic power as the bacteria bear in it," (Explanation in regard to this statement has already been given in my letter to the Editor, dated 6.6.63) that "It is one of the Homœopathic theories that potentised nosodes drugs act in just the opposite way to that of their crude drugs of origin. This has not been reasonably explained to the point of scientific standard."

Here in this context it is seen that Dr. Sinha has just tried to put a theory of his own in the name of Homœopathy and at such going to misguide the students which contradicts the basic principles of the science of "Similia Similibus Curentur."

Let me quote some more illustrations in support of my opinion.

That Dr. Kent says while dealing with "Thuja" in Page 947 of his lectures on Materia Medica "we see in the proving of a drug what we see in disease."

A similar statement is also given by Dr. Carrol Dunham on the topic of selection of medicine that "a remedy must be selected for it in accordance with the similarity which the symptoms produced by the remedy in the healthy subject bear to the symptoms of the sick person for whom it is selected" vide Page 225 of his Materia Medica."

Dr. Kent also in his lectures of Homœopathic Philosophy" on Page 25 gives the same views in a different language that "As we perceive the nature of sickness in a drug image so must we perceive the nature of the sickness in a human being to be healed."

Dr. Dunham in his "Science of Therapeutics" on Page 84 remarks in support of the fact that "They are to be applied

by giving to a sick person, such a drug as would produce in the healthy subject symptoms similar to those of the sick person."

Dr. Kent again in his "Lesser Writings" on Page 167 gives stress "we are sure a drug will cure in the sick, such symptoms as it has produced up on the healthy."

So it is not understood how a theory of opposite prevail in the science of Similia Similibus Curentur! ! ! However I shall be very thankful to Dr. Sinha if he takes pains enough to enlighten me the authority from which source he has obtained this novel theory "It is one of the Homœopathic theories that potentised drugs act in just the opposite way to that of their crude drugs." Is Dr. Sinha bold enough to say that if a drug in its cruder form is prescribed on symptom similarity will not cure the patient?

Thanking you in anticipation.

5.10.63.

K. K. KAR

#### SOMETHING LEFT UNSAID

*(Continued from page 560)*

out), though apparently it may look otherwise (HG/361/63). The fatal case of the child reported by Dr. J. N. Kanjilal (HG/March/63) appears to be one of such cases. However, the following comment appears to be called for in this case.

(1) While giving Malandrinum as prophylaxis, symptom similarity to the prevalent cases should have been given weight.

(2) The potency (2c) was too low to give good results.

(3) The repetition should always have been in higher potency to prevent undesirable revolt from the vital force.

(4) In prophylaxis, we are at best, taking a "blind" aim. We should take correct aim as indicated by the symptoms without delay when they are out.

In the list of some Small-pox prophylaxis-remedies, the Indian drug Solanum Xanthocarpus (Kantakari) deserves a place. It will be most useful when the prevalent types have sore throat symptoms in prominence resembling this remedy accompanied with scanty urine and Asthamatic breathing.