

does not exist in India, the result of which is that when a Homœopath surrenders his patient to the surgeon he does it with some misgivings for the well-being of the patient, because he feels that he would not be able to give the patient any post-operative treatment which would lead to speedy and complete recovery.

It is therefore high time that patients and surgeons think twice before undertaking a risk the consequences of which they are not in a position to foreshadow. It may take a little more time to get well but a little faith and patience can save endless suffering.

I earnestly appeal to all my professional brothers, whether Allopaths, Homœopaths, Ayurvaidyas or Hakims to shed their prejudices and bias and cooperate with each other in their great national effort to eradicate disease and to alleviate the sufferings of their country men.

MY STUDY OF HOMŒOPATHY

SRI B. CHATTERJEE, M.B.H.,

Serampore.

Organon defines Homœopathy as the restoration of health in the sick by the reaction of the vital force against the rightly chosen remedy. It is significant that no use is made of such expressions as "disease", "medicine", etc. In fact, homœopathy is not symptomatology in the general sense of the term at least. Again, "restoration of health" being its sole object, homœopathy cannot be expected to do anything unless the "vital force" is sufficiently strong to react against the rightly chosen remedy.

To illustrate the first point, that is, homœopathy is not symptomatology. A patient comes with a boil which, on pathological and symptomatological examination, is found to be full of pus, very painful, with sticking pain and relief

by the application of heat. Suppose, however, that the patient is found to be jesting and joking while the examination is being conducted. The ordinary prescription of Hepar will fail to *cure* the boil while a dose of Ignatia would be found to relieve the patient of his *suffering with the boil* in an astonishing way. While, therefore, symptomatology aims at removing the boil, the only function of homœopathy is to cure the *sufferings* of a patient with that eruption.

Removal of symptom (pathological, of course) is not, again, homœopathy. Symptoms may only appear in a patient whose vital force is deranged and so it is the only duty of the homœopath to revitalise the patient, which can only be done by selecting a natural (or miasmatic) *remedy*. This is clear from S. 76 of the Organon where it is said that "Only for *natural* diseases has . . . homœopathy the means of affording relief . . ."

In the above context it would be clear that each and everything cannot be "remedies". Any drug or medicine, having only the capacity to remove one or more symptoms without at the same time restoring health to the suffering individual is definitely not a "remedy". We know that Digitalis, Belladonna, Nux Vomica, Hyoscyamus, Aurum and a host of other medicines are used by the other schools of medicine alike. These do not become remedies by the mere fact of their being phialed in little containers! They become remedies only to the degree 'of their ability' in bringing about an unhealthy *state* in a healthy individual; that is to say, they become homœopathic only where they have been sufficiently proved to bring about a definite *state of ill-health* in the sound individual. Suppose a medicine in the proving brings out several eruptions in a healthy individual without effecting any change whatsoever in his state of health. Would it be homœopathic to apply this medicine to a patient with eruptions of a like nature? The obvious answer will be "No." Because

nothing is sought to be done by this medicine to restore health to the patient.

Take the symptom "Nausea at the smell of food". Every homœopath knows that Colchicum, Arsenic, Sepia and some more medicines have this symptom, Colchicum being known to have it as a "Characteristic" symptom. Now, Colchicum *may* only 'palliate' the symptom unless the patient has a gouty state. Arsenic will only cure the acute suffering when the state of prostration, restlessness, etc., is present and Sepia when there is the state of hungry feeling, indifference, etc. To prescribe for the symptom will at best suppress it and then the medicine acts only allopathically and cannot be termed a "remedy".

Let us now consider the scope of homœopathy. As already pointed out, only for natural diseases has homœopathy the means of affording relief. Accidents, indisposition and drug diseases, however serious they may be, do not, therefore, come under the scope of treatment by homœopathic remedies, unless, of course, it be that the results of such accidents, etc. persist in a patient due to the existence of a natural disease, that is a miasm. The "states of ill-health", according to the Master, which 'persons bring upon themselves' and which are, therefore, indisposition (and not disease), disappear under an improved mode of living unless there be any natural disease lurking in the constitution of the individual. The same observation applies to accidents which ordinarily yield to bandaging, stitching, etc.

Besides the miasms, there remains the drug diseases, brought about by anti-homœopathic medicines or drugs. It should be carefully observed in this connection that unless a medicine is prescribed in *full* conformity with the laws of homœopathy, it always acts as a drug and anti-homœopathically. In this context I feel tempted to quote Dr. Kent who says:

"If you practise medicine in a neighbourhood where there is a very poor homœopath you will find that he is

giving some preparation of Mercury for almost all of the colds or sore throats. This establishes upon all of these patients an over-susceptibility to the weather changes. . . . But the more they take of these red powders the more frequently they have sore throats and colds It is astonishing what a great number of men, women and children are bowed down by the miasm that Mercury produces, and yet those prescribers go on giving this form of Mercury and say it is practicing Homœopathy." (Vide page 600-601 of Kent's *Materia Medica*).

It will be observed, therefore, that drug diseases are caused not only by the allopathic medicines but also by the so-called homœopathic medicines used anti-homœopathically. For this class of disease the Master asserts that *there cannot be any treatment* except that the drug-ging may be sought to be counteracted only by setting the vital force of the patient in order and allowing it to fight out the drug effects, if, of course, he has vitality enough left in him.

Again, in the note to S. 67 of the *Organon* we see that *the most urgent cases*, where danger to life and imminent death is present, *allow no time for the action of a homœopathic remedy* and palliation is advised in such cases. When the non-miasmatic and so-called "acute" homœopathic medicines are used in such cases, they become only palliatives and not "remedies". Such palliation could also be attained by electric shock, etc. But here also palliation may only be successfully thought of in healthy individuals who have undergone some accidents, etc., and the sudden serious manifestation of sufferings in an unhealthy individual (that is, one suffering from a natural disease) cannot be mitigated to any appreciable degree, at least with remedies. In this connection attention is invited to Dr. Kent's following remarks:

"The time for the administration of this dose is at the close of the paroxysm That is true of every paroxysmal disease You cannot mitigate them very

much during the attack; indeed, if the medicine is given then it very often increases the difficulty" (*Vide* page 484 of Kent's *Materia Medica*).

Again, according to S. 72 of the *Organon*, "acute disease" is only "the rapid morbid processes of the *abnormally deranged* vital force, which have a tendency to finish its course more or less quickly but always in a moderate time." In S. 73 we find: ". . . . when left to itself" the acute disease "terminates itself in a moderate period of time in death or recovery, in reality, however, they are generally only a transient explosion of latest psora." Two very important suggestions of Dr. Kent are well worth mentioning here:

(1) "All recurrent troubles, those that come periodically, or after eating certain articles, or from exposure, or with a periodicity that belongs to time—all these states are chronic; they are not acute troubles" (*Vide* page 593 of *Materia Medica*).

(2) "When diarrhoea occurs in a vigorous constitution, and there is nothing but the diarrhoea, then it is necessary to know all the finer details," (*Vide* page 572, *Materia Medica*).

Obviously, a case of indisposition is spoken of in the second. But, according to S. 8 of the *Organon* "a disease of any *importance* does not consist of a single symptom" and, therefore, such cases do not come within the scope of homœopathy. (*Vide* note to S. 8, First Edition).

Again, prescribing on partial symptoms so changes the character of the real sickness that no one, according to Dr. Kent, can find a cure. We know that in the acute manifestation of Chronic disease we always get only a partial view of a case and unless the situation is *very grave* it should always be allowed to pass over without any prescription. When it is really threatening, of course a *palliative* (be it a so-called homœopathic medicine, an allopathic injection or anything!) should be resorted to;

but the moment reaction follows, the patient should be set on his constitutional remedy. Unless this be done, the patient may even die in 24 hours. (Vide page 943 of Kent's *Materia Medica*).

From all the above it occurs to me that the sole duty of the homœopath should be first to ascertain whether the patient has a disease, or is only indisposed or has an accident or is suffering from some drug effects. When it is an accident, he should resort to bandaging, etc., and of course stimulation by any process best known to him. When it is a case of indisposition, he will set the patient on an improved mode of living, such as forbidding a meal or a bath, prescribing a fomentation, etc., etc. When it is a simple case of drugging, he will resort to such measures best known to him to counteract the effects of the drug; but when the drugging has produced a miasm in the patient, he should not hold out any promise of a cure to the patient but may only put the patient on a miasmatic remedy. It is only where a natural disease is to be treated that he will select a homœopathic remedy and then and then only he will not himself be guilty of drugging, etc. To this end, therefore, he will devote more attention to the Constitutional Remedies.

DEFICIENCY OF VITAMINS AND MINERALS

R. S. RASTOGI, B.A., M.D.H.

Health cannot be maintained without the intake of a suitable well-balanced diet capable of supplying the different and varying needs of the body and thus maintaining the Vital Force at the highest level of perfection. While the Proteins are indispensable for carrying on the regeneration, repair and replacement of tissues to meet the constant wear and tear going on in the human machine, and the Carbohydrates and Fats are essential for providing