

troubles of the heart. The first part is divided into Pericarditis, Endocarditis, Myocarditis, and Cardiac weakness; The second part is divided into: Tachycardias, Bradycardias, Extra-systolic Arythmia, Complete Arythmia and Palpitations. A detailed description of the remedies suitable to each case is given, always keeping in view the causes that give rise to each case.

Very often the efficacy of Homœopathic treatment of the diseases of the heart is denied. It is not because the Homœopathic remedies are really inefficacious but because in most cases the homœopathic medicines are wrongly applied which is a result of not having a clear idea of the remedies that are particularly applied in the different troubles of the heart. The author has taken up only the most important remedies and has clearly expressed their application in cases suitable to their action.

A good book on the treatment of the diseases of the heart was a long-felt want in the Homœopathic literature. This book will surely remove that want.

R. K. M.

HOMŒOPATHY

A Constructive Contribution in the Argument against Animal Experiment

DR. FERGIE WOODS

The movement against animal experimentation will make headway in proportion to the progress made by these methods of treatment that have no dependance upon such experiments.

We must not expect either the medical profession or the lay public to be finally influenced by considerations of humaneness or by merely theoretical argument, as to the

unsoundness of the vivisectional standpoint. On the other hand it is probable that very few animal experimentors or those relying on them would wish these experiments to be continued, were they firmly convinced that they were unnecessary.

For this it must be clearly shown that successful treatment of patients, both human and animal, can be given without the slightest reliance on the use of animals in experiment.

One such method of treatment is the system of medicine known as Homœopathy.

This system, which, up to a few years ago, was looked upon askance by the general medical profession, is now attracting more interest from that body, while the general public is showing an increasing demand for it. One reason for this may be the knowledge that the Royal Family of Great Britain as also the royal families of other Countries, are, and have been for some years, homœopathic patients.

The medical profession is realising, also, that much of the principle of Homœopathy is in line with modern medical ideas.

Homœopathy has taken its place, with ordinary medicine in the new National Health Scheme, and its hospital in London, which was recently granted permission to call itself the Royal London Homœopathic Hospital, has been placed in a group to itself, instead of being put in a group with other (allopathic) hospitals. Thus, its essential difference in principle and in treatment has been officially recognised.

And now, what is Homœopathy? The word itself is derived from two Greek, words, meaning "similar" and "suffering", so implying that Homœopathy is a system of treatment in which a remedy or substance is given which is capable of causing in healthy persons similar symptoms to those in the patient being treated. Here is a simple illustration.

The deadly night shade (*Belladonna*) which grows in our hedges, has red berries, which are some times eaten by children, who become ill therefrom. The symptoms generally produced by eating the berries are: high temperature with flushed face and bounding pulse, dry tongue and throat, throbbing headache, a fine rash over the body, and perhaps swellings of glands, together with dilated pupils.

Now when a patient suffering from any disease presents most of these symptoms, the remedy to help is likely to be *Belladonna*, whether the name of the disease be influenza, *Scarlatina*, or anything else.

There is expressed in the Latin motto, "*Similia Similibus Curentur*"—Let likes be treated with likes. This principle is not confined to the realm of drugs. If you have a blow on the head, you instinctively press the part hard with your hand—the effects of one kind of blow being relieved by what may be termed a modified blow from the pressure of the hand. Again, if you scald your hand or foot with boiling water, pain and other ill-effects will be quickly removed by holding the scalded part as close as possible to the fire—one kind of heat (radiant) relieving the ill-effects of another kind of heat.

The Homœopathic principle is not a new discovery. It was known to the ancients in Medicine, including Hippocrates and Paracelsus.

But no one appears to have thought of basing a definite system of treatment upon it until we come to the founder of the system as we know it to-day, Samuel Hahnemann. Much that is derogatory and quite untrue has been said about Hahnemann, but the facts show that he was an outstanding personality in Medicine.

Samuel Christian Hahnemann was born in Meissen, Saxony, in 1755, the son of a porcelain painter.

At an early age he showed exceptional ability and intelligence and as soon as his age permitted he went to University, where he qualified as a doctor.

He was also an expert chemist and a brilliant linguist, knowing six or eight languages fluently. It was this gift for languages that resulted in the gift of Homœopathy to mankind, as will be seen.

Soon after qualifying as a physician Hahnemann became disgusted with the methods of medical practice then in vogue, which included bloodletting, cauterisation, and the prescription of numerous substances together, many of them fantastic and superstitious. He felt that he would rather not practise medicine at all than use such methods.

But he had married and was raising a family, so had to find some other means of livelihood. He took to translating medical works, and it was while he was thus engaged in translating an English book into German, Cullen's *Materia Medica* that he came across a reference to the action of quinine which did not satisfy his scientific mind. Quinine (or Cinchona Bark) was then as now, the chief remedy for malaria. Hahnemann determined to try the effects of a dose of this drug upon himself, he being in good health and not having suffered from malaria. He took a material dose of the drug, and found that he developed symptoms similar to those of malaria.

After an interval, he repeated the dose, with the same results. He tried other drugs upon himself, and in each case developed symptoms similar to those of the disease for which the drug was usually given. Realising that he might have come upon a law of cure, Hahnemann went on to test many other drugs upon himself and a group of interested friends very carefully recording the various symptoms produced by prolonged taking of each drug, and noting those occurring in the majority of the testers as symptoms of that remedy.

This proving, as it is called, on healthy persons, is the basis of the homœopathic *materia medica*, and although Hahnemann in his day was without the delicate methods of diagnosis, blood-analysis, etc. that we use to-day, his

patience and exactness were such that the symptoms recorded are still reliable indications for the prescription of the various drugs he proved.

In recent years, the proving of drugs has been much neglected but now the Faculty of Homœopathy in Great Britain is engaged in proving some new substances and re-proving some old remedies, with the latest tests and analyses.

This insistence upon the importance of the symptoms, in the remedy and in the patient has caused Homœopathy to be criticised for treating symptoms. Homœopathy does not treat symptoms; it treats the patient through the symptoms.

The object in prescribing is to match the symptoms of the patient with the symptoms of a remedy, and it is remarkable how often the symptom-picture of a patient does coincide more or less exactly with the symptom picture of a remedy as elicited in the principle. Be it noted that when we speak of the symptom-picture of the patient, we do not refer to the symptoms of the disease from which he is suffering. These symptoms of the disease are the least valuable of all for prescribing.

Homœopathy treats the patient, not the disease, so that the symptoms that are of importance for finding the remedy are those expressing the patient's individual reaction to disease.

An illustration may help to explain. Imagine two patients in adjoining beds, both suffering from pneumonia. The symptoms of pneumonia will of course be the same in each—high temperature; head cough, with rusty sputum; pain in the side of the chest affected; rapid, difficult breathing.

But observe No. 1 patient, and note that he is lying quite still on his right side, getting irritable if disturbed, but liking his chest to be firmly pressed. He is thirsty wanting good long drinks, but not very often. It may be noticed that he gets worse towards nine o'clock at night.

Now, look at patient No. 2, and see how restless he is, tossing about and even trying to get out of bed to walk about. He is obviously anxious, and may complain that he knows he will die unless something be done for him. He also is thirsty but takes only a sip or two at a time, very frequently. He is found to be worse in every way about midnight. The first patient needs the remedy Bryonia, the second one must have Arsenicum.

And the correct homœopathic medicine prescribed on these lines will get each patient well as quickly as the sulphonamides would do it, and with no ill effects to get over afterwards. Now, when Hahnemann began to treat patients according to this method, he soon found that the remedy, given in crude form, often upset the patient considerably, even though curing him eventually.

So he began to give less and less of the drug, and found that the more attenuated the dose the better were the results. This smallness of the dose has been the cause of a great deal of misconception and ridicule.

One would be humorist scathingly said that a dose of homœopathic medicine was equivalent to putting a drop of the tincture in the river Thames at Kew Bridge, and taking a bottleful out at London Bridge. This gibe entirely misses the crucial point of the drug attenuation.

Hahnemann's method, and that employed ever since is to dilute repeatedly in conjunction with vigorous shaking (succussion, as it is termed). It is not certainly known just what the succussion does, but broadly speaking we may suppose that it breaks up the molecules of the substance in finer and finer particles, which can enter more easily into the body cells.

Two scales are employed in this potentisation, as it is called—the decimal, diluting one in ten each time, and the centesimal, diluting one in a hundred. This is the procedure. When one starts with a substance easily soluble, such as a plant tincture, one part of it is mixed with nine parts by volume of distilled water or alcohol, and this vigorously

shaken several times. The result is called the 1x (one in ten). One part of this is again mixed with nine parts of diluent, shaken, and called 2x. After the first few times, the process is usually carried on in the centesimal scale, for greater rapidity, a 2x being equivalent to 1 (or the first centesimal potency) in the latter scale.

Hahnemann made another valuable discovery. He found that insoluble substances such as the metals, could be rendered soluble after a certain amount of "trituration"—rubbing in a pestle and mortar with an inert substance, such as milk-sugar. One part of the insoluble body (for example, iron filings) is rubbed for several hours with nine parts by volume of milk-sugar, until the whole is uniform in colour. This is the 1x trituration.

One part of this again triturated with nine parts of milk-sugar, and when homogeneous is called the 2x.

After the 6x trituration has been reached, it is found that the resultant can be dissolved in water, and further potentising can be carried on in the liquid state.

Water is used in preference to alcohol, as being so much more economical, but distilled water must be used, as ordinary tap water contains various salts, *e.g.*, of lime, magnesium, etc., which would undergo potentisation with the original remedy, and so confuse the result.

It is easy to ridicule this potentising as moonshine and the results in patients as due to faith-curing. A little honest trial of the potencies will dispel such an idea.

The action of the higher potencies, indeed, is so pronounced, that, in cases of chronic disease with much tissue-change they have to be used very carefully, to avoid excessive reaction.

Hahnemann established two facts which have been abundantly confirmed since his day. First, that there is probably no substance at all in the world that is not capable of developing curative powers when potentised.

Second, that there is no limit (yet reached) beyond which attenuation will remove the specific action of any remedy.

It has already been told how the homœopathic remedy is found by matching the symptoms of the patient with those of a remedy, and that the important symptoms in the patient are those expressing his individual reactions and not the common symptoms of the disease.

Now, in the individual symptoms of the patient, some kinds are more valuable than others in prescribing.

The most important symptoms are the mentals, which show more clearly than any other kind the patients individuality, upon which we seek to prescribe. The patient's loves and hates, strange ideas, attitude towards life or towards other persons, etc., etc.—if any of these have recently changed, they form the most useful basis for prescription.

Then there are the "strange rare and peculiar" symptoms, as they are called symptoms unusual, either in themselves or in the particular patient. Following these are the "generals," symptoms expressing the patient's reaction as a whole to the various influences, e.g., weather, to which he is subjected.

Then can be taken into account any symptoms affecting particular portions or functions of the body.

Lastly are the symptoms of the disease, the "common" symptoms, which are not used at all for prescribing, unless the more individual symptoms are lacking.

It will be realised that Homœopathy treats with the single remedy, and does not mix drugs in a prescription. Polypharmacy, or the prescribing of more than one remedy at a time is unscientific when you are treating the *patient*, as Homœopathy does.

Only one remedy can be indicated at any given time for the individual as a whole. Besides this, remedies must act upon each other, and may even sometimes antidote each other.

Another thing that will be realised is that Homœopathy does not give the patient as much medicine as he can stand which appears to be the principle in ordinary Medicine.

It aims at giving the least amount of medicine that will have the desired effect.

It is a policy of persuasion not of force, of working with nature, not fighting against her.

We must believe as Samuel Hahnemann believed, that, strictly speaking the medicine itself does not cure it helps the *Vis medicatrix Naturae* in its efforts to restore the balance of health. It is not only with human patients that Homœopathy is successful. Animals respond to it in very striking manner.

We have found that when one's dog or cat is off colour from any cause, one dose of the right remedy will usually restore the normal health by next day. And in really serious complaints, such as distemper and pneumonia, one expects to find a definite improvement in a very few hours. Animals of course, cannot tell you their symptoms, but their behaviour can often, more especially in those in close contact with man, such as the dog, give the mental symptoms which are so valuable in pinning down the remedy.

One reason why homœopathic patients are usually in a better permanent state of health than those otherwise treated is that owing to Homœopathy's method of treating the patient as a whole and not merely his disease, the patient gets over each acute illness without the lingering bad effects so often left when one of the specifics in vogue has (perhaps even dramatically) abolished the symptoms of the complaint. It is probable that many of the diseases occurring in patients are due to wrong or incomplete treatment of previous illnesses. The question is often asked, "Can Homœopathy cure any so called incurable disease?"

One has to be careful in using the word "cure." If one takes care to mean, not only the bringing of the patient back to his normal health, but also the elimination of all disease tendencies so that he is never ill again, that kind

of cure is obviously as rare as the proverbial angel's visit.

Homœopathic treatment, however, besides curing or ameliorating any given disease can undoubtedly raise the patient's resistance and vitality, so that relapses into ill health are less and less frequent.

Apart from this, there is no doubt that Homœopathy has cured cases of supposedly incurable disease, and, short of actual cure, can always be expected in even the most serious cases of disease, to check its progress and relieve pain.

Such animal products as sera have no place in true homœopathic practice. The Homœopathic remedies give better and safer results whether in prevention or in cure.

A province in which Homœopathy is of especial and demonstrable value is that of occupational emergencies, such as accidents in factories.

Several big industrial firms in Great Britain treat all such injuries in their employees homœopathically, and find that the average time lost on account of accidents at work is much less than in the case of firms using the ordinary methods of treatment.

Another sphere in which Homœopathy can serve the state is in the treatment of backward (even mentally defective) children, who can often be improved beyond all expectations.

Homœopathic treatment is economical in more than one way. Besides the fact of the actual medicines being so much cheaper, much valuable time is saved to the patient and to the nation by a quicker return to work than is possible under ordinary treatment.

In addition to the above advantages the medicine is harmless, even if more than necessary be taken, and it is pleasant to take (an important point with children and animals).

It may be asked why, if Homœopathy has all the above mentioned advantages it has not made more headway and become more fairly established as part of modern medicine.

The reasons are various. There is, of course the well-known conservatism and scepticism of the medical profession, regarding with suspicion anything that is not orthodox. There is the stumbling block of the minute dose, although this ought not to stand in the way of acceptance of the homœopathic principle, in view of the infinitesimal amount of, say, radium or X-ray in the dose given in the ordinary way by allopathic doctors.

There is also the feeling that much of homœopathic practice is in the hands of medically unqualified persons, such as parents and teachers, combined with the feeling that Homœopathy may be all right for children and superficial ailments, but is of no use in serious disorders. This, of course, is not true, as we have shown, Homœopathy being capable of tackling the most serious (and oft called incurable) diseases.

However, all said and done, Homœopathy is an essentially scientific system founded upon a definite law, and therefore must survive and flourish where unscientific systems, based on no law but everchanging in methods of treatment, must ultimately vanish.

As Homœopathy becomes more generally accepted, it will be more widely realised that its methods of research also are scientific, and that the *only* way in which to find the properties of any drug or other substances is to test it upon healthy human beings, volunteering for the purpose.

So then, this wasteful and illogical animal experimentation will come to an end, there being no longer any excuse for thinking it necessary.

—*Health Through Homœopathy, Jan. & Feby., 1950.*
