

WHY NATURE IMMUTABLY DEMANDS THE SINGLE MEDICINAL AGENT AND THE INFINITESIMAL DOSE

ALFRED PULFORD, M.D., M.R.S., F.A.C.T.S.

Homœopathy correctly explained: Homœopathy is the *only* system of medicinal healing scientifically based on an immutable—Natural Law. That—Law—immutably demands that the medicinal agent to be administered to aid in the cure of any disease *must* be capable of producing, in its proving on the normal healthy human body, symptoms *accurately similar* to those symptoms appearing in the disease that that particular agent is to aid in the curing. There is a special reason for immutable demand which you will learn as you read on. That immutable demand has had over 150 years of verification by some of the most learned and brilliant minds in medicine.

The only strictly scientific system of medicinal healing is one that rigidly follows—Natural Law, and *that* Homœopathy strictly does. Constant verifications prove that, and the only proof we have that anything is stable is by constant verification. Following that—Law—the death-rate under Homœopathy is the *very* lowest on record. Then, you ask, “why is it not more popular?” Simply because it does not lend itself to commercialism; money is the present medical goal! It does not have to make false statements to cover up its shortcomings, if any. It produces no narcotic addicts; it produces no “wonder or miracle drugs” that are lauded to the sky today and quietly tossed in the ashcan tomorrow. Homœopathy is not afraid of competition and that is what hurts the modern doctor. All the money spent to bury it; all the articles in the press trying to ridicule it and all the attempts of the modern doctors to poison the nurses against it in our hospitals have not been able to make the least dent on the foundation on which Homœopathy is so firmly

founded. Homœopathy is *not* new, founded on—Natural Law—it has *always* existed, only our discovery of it is new. We may attempt to bury it, but we cannot possibly destroy it!

Before we can fully understand the real reason for that immutable demand of nature, and the use of *the highly attenuated single* remedy in the cure of disease one *must* have a clearer concept of disease than at present exists, also of its true nature, its basic cause, of just what does the *real* curing of the disease, of just what is the remedy's *real* role in the cure, as well as the victim's gross pathology's relation to his disease. One must have a clearer concept of the construction of the human body than the crude concept that now appears to be prevalent. That clearer concept thoroughly understood will expose the lack of knowledge of dynamic principles, or the lacking of the illumination of the homœopathic theory. Did the medical scientists thoroughly understand that they could not possibly condone, broadcast, write and sponsor the detrimental acts and beliefs they do at this late day.

It is but natural, after being ingrained with so many years of medical darkness, that any new medical light, no matter how important or valuable that light may be, should blind even the so-called intellectual, to say nothing of the medical profession. As one allopathic doctor wrote: "I thought perhaps the more highly learned would use more judgment about medical matters, but I find they follow the reigning fads in medicine as religiously as their more ignorant brothers." All that has been brought about by the false installation into the developing brain that it is the *drug* that cures the disease, therefore the more drug the better, a belief directly opposed to the true facts. That is a sad state that will not be readily erased.

The change from the crude senseless drugging to the finer and more intelligent aspects of the case as exposed by Homœopathy gives the ingrained belief to the unthinking being that Homœopathy is all "moonshine," therefore

they can see no reason to change, all of which shows the real weakness in our present system of school training. That weakness is due to the lack of training the student how to think for himself; the student therefore follows the reigning fads and lets the other person do his thinking for him. It seems that the more magnificent our institutes of learning have become the more inferior the product they turn out.

It is not to the credit of the Modern Medical profession that it has allowed itself to wander around in the same identical circle for the past 2500 years, and that with so little advancement. Some of the medical compounds that are prevalent at this late day would make even the ancient doctors blush with shame! The modern doctor knows apparently nothing about disease the reason he takes its end products or gross pathology into the laboratory to study them in order to find a "specific" for the name he arbitrarily attaches to his crude findings. He reminds one of the tailor who spent his whole life and fortune attempting to devise a single pattern from which he could cut a single suit of clothes that without alteration would fit every white man by the name of John regardless of his stature. The tailor you call a fool, but the man who attempts the same with disease you call a "scientist." Imagine! Even the college bred cannot see through that!

Now let us look at the finer aspects of the human body aside from those revealed to us through anatomy, physiology, histology, etc., and study them. I admit that I repeat occasionally, but only either for emphasis or as constant reminders lest you forget. Our bodies are endowed with central control organization whose duty it is to collect and distribute to *all* parts of the body that life giving and health sustaining principle—Vital Force—without which the body would be dead and our remedial agents useless. From this central control organization ramify lines of communication to *all* parts of the body in order to keep the parts in perfect health and repair and thus render the body immune to *all* disease.

Those lines are all composed of material basic cells, and through drug proving we learn these things: each line is composed of its own individual class of these basic cells, all ultra-microscopic and material, and second that no drug, in its proving, will attack a line not composed of its own class of cells. That is the reason that a drug, say Belladonna, never varies in its drug pathogenesis, thereby furnishing us an unerring guide to the selection of that remedial agent to aid in the cure of the disease. Since all those lines are composed of material, ultra-microscopic cells, and since the cells required to repair those lines when broken *must* also be material and ultra-microscopic one can readily see the reason for Nature demanding the single highly attenuated remedy as only that can supply the necessary cells to aid in restoring the flow of the real curative agent—the Vital Force. The more highly attenuated the remedial agent the more sure we are of a prompt and radical cure. That then is proof positive that remedies attenuated above even the 200x contain material cells of the original agent or they would otherwise be useless and no cure could possibly take place from their use. Nature is still infallible hence the reason for this paper.

DISEASE: What is and why why disease? The medical profession's conception of disease is a very erroneous one. Modern Medicine accepts disease as a separate entity, a something entirely apart from the body that entertains it. On the contrary disease proper is an invisible, intangible state; a state felt but *never* seen whose sole presence is expressed in *symptoms* only, only its gross pathology or end products are seeable and feelable. Thus the intelligent mind will note the fallacy of attempting to take those end products into the laboratory in order to attempt to study disease and try to find a "cure" for the name he arbitrarily gives to his crude findings.

On the other hand the homœopath proves his remedial agents on the normally healthy individual, notes the symptoms they produce, registers those symptoms and when he

finds a disease whose symptoms accurately correspond to those of his proven remedy he has a *perfect* guide to the selection of that remedy for that particular disease. So we note that appropriations of money for the study of disease in the laboratory and ignoring the patient is money and time wasted.

CAUSE of disease, what is its basic cause? Since health depends entirely on *all* the lines of communication being in full repair and a free flow of—Vital Force—to *all* parts of the body, disease must then depend entirely on a lack of that vital feature to the part affected, due to either an interruption of that flow or a complete stoppage due to a break in the line of communication. Therefore there can be but one real basic cause of *all* disease, and that one basic cause—Shock. Yes, but you counter with: "There are numerous causes of disease." I readily admit there are numerous activating and contributing causes, but if they cannot or do not produce shock there will be no disease. You will recall the Russian scientists discovered that anaesthetized patients were immune to poisoning with crude cyanide of potash and to prussic acid. Why? Because they could not produce shock in order to break the lines of communication. Just as long as a free flow of—Vital Force—can be kept up there will be *no* disease.

CURE of disease: What really does the *real* curing of disease? Drugs? Emphatically—No! What then does the real curing? Simply—Vital Force! Crude drugs simply break down the natural body defenses and invite disease. Then just what is the drug's real role in the cure of disease? Why employ them? Drugs have a *vital* role in the cure of disease. The real role of the drug is to supply basic cells, to repair broken lines of communication. The moment the line is repaired the sooner the cure is complete. The more highly the remedial agent is attenuated the more rapidly can the cells be taken up by the assimilative powers and placed and the more rapid the cure.

As a splendid illustration of the fact that it is not the drug that cures disease, just take gangrene of the toes as an example. If the flow of—Vital Force—can not reach those toes all the drugs and high attenuations in Christendom will not cure those toes, they will die and drop off. Therefore from the above you will learn just why Nature immutably demands the single highly attenuated medicinal agent, and why Homœopathy strictly complying with that immutable demand is the ONLY system of medicinal healing existant today! Now if Homœopathy is to be saved from burial again all homœopaths in all countries will HAVE to pool their interest and support a drug proving institute.

—*Health through Homœopathy, Sept.-Oct., 1949.*

PHILOSOPHY VERSUS EMPIRICISM

A. H. GRIMMER, M.D.

Philosophy as defined by Webster's Dictionary has several definitions. First: "The knowledge of phenomena as explained by, and resolved into, causes and reasons, powers and laws." Second: "A systematic body of general conceptions or principles ordinarily with implication of their practical application as, a philosophy of life." Third: "Practical wisdom, calmness of temper and judgment, equanimity." Fourth: "A treatise on philosophy."

Empiricism, defined by the same author, has first: "Method or practice of an empiric, especially in medicine, hence quackery." Second: "The philosophical theory which attributes the origin of all our knowledge to experience."

From the above expressed dicta we can see that those who work along with philosophic principles and laws are