

THE HAHNEMANNIAN GLEANINGS

Vol. XX

OCTOBER, 1953

No. 10

THROUGH THE MAGIC DOOR

DR. S. M. BHATTACHERJEE, M.A., P.R.S.M. (HOMŒO.),

MURSIDABAD

The present is a complicated step towards the prospective future, rich in the colourful potentialities, hopes and aspirations that the four-dimensional human existence can create and recreate. But the past is no less conjuring. The spirits that had been and that could not be seen through the magic door of memory breathe a twilight perspective of immense susceptibilities. So, the spirits from the date of Dr. Samuel Hahnemann down until our own had been for a positive development of the scientific art of Homœopathy. The present also would yield a fruitful harvest for the future. Still, a sense of gloom, a note of discontent benumb us. Hahnemann, wouldst thou wert amongst us!

There are among us the Hahnemannians, the Kentians, the followers of Boenninghausen and so forth. But the living import of the science, the art and the philosophy that was the body and soul of the by-gone masters, is no longer with us. What we have mostly is the mere prosaic regurgitation and effervescence of the past. We do not eagerly graze on the green but merely chew the cud. But what was with Hahnemann? Every "to-day" was a new step further to him from every "yesterday." Imagine

the tremendous changes in the texts of the six editions of the *Organon*. The divine law of similars remained, of course, unaltered, but the working postulates varied considerably. You can not identify Samuel Hahnemann of about 1810, scribbling his first medical philosophy, with the Master Hahnemann of 1841, emending the fifth edition of the *Organon* for his latest and best, the sixth.

Fortunately for mankind a luminous sun is on the horizon, and we are out to welcome a new dawn. It is an age of newer and newer discoveries in all the branches of science. Physics, chemistry, and biochemistry present us with a new thing, a new meaning every day-break. The marble structure of mathematics is also yielding new knowledge: old postulates are either replaced or made to bear new meanings. What a wonder! Two and two do not always make four! Length, breadth and thickness have added to them a fourth dimension of "time." Ours is a changing, flowing world of ideas. In this age of newness and proneness, if Homœopathy has to retain its social values, it must be re-fitted in the proper perspective. If it is to survive it must stand face to face, eye to eye with the latest developments of modern science. Probably the law of similars is a divine law, as inimitably eternal as the law of gravitation, or the laws of the tides. Yet, its soundness has to stand any new test, and hold its own in bold contrast to the fallacies of any human theory.

There are signs of newer developments in Homœopathy, too. The efficacy of Homœopathy is going to be proved by other methods than the old one of clinical success. Dr. Boyd and his group's discoveries of low frequency waves in human body, the diastase capability of homœopathic potencies, the electromagnetic and emanometer grouping of drugs; Dr. Patterson's valuable researches on the bowel flora; and the theory of polarity and vibratory rates in drugs and disease; all these indicate a new stir, a new life, a new alertness and a new approach

to the good old law of similars. We are much ahead of our times, we have gained much by analysis. But what is yet to come is a new synthesis, a new harmony within the fold of Homœopathy.

There are three unexplored corners in the mighty Gothic structure of Homœopathy. First, the proving of new drugs and re-proving of old ones in different environments, ages and nationalities at the same time. Secondly, the relation of the potency to the individual. Thirdly, the relation of Homœopathy to biochemistry and bacteriology. Concerning the last two, opinions are poles apart from each other, and whereas a collective approach is essential in these two, we have handled them only singly and disconnectedly.

Frankly speaking, excepting the nosodes, we seldom travel outside of Hahnemann's polychrest group in clinical applications. But Mother Earth has not been depleted in her treasure of drugs all these years. Have we extended our search for them? Have we tried to harness more of Nature's wealth for the aid of ailing humanity? And the fragmentary re-provings undertaken recently by certain institutions are far below the mark. Renovate Homœopathy or it is a dead science not many years hence. Air liners and other revolutionized means of communication are at our command, and we can prove or re-prove drugs jointly all the world over, to ascertain their true pathogeneses irrespective of age, environment, climate and nationality.

The revolutionizing biological, biochemical and other discoveries of the present day may open up new avenues to the approach of the homœopathic doctrine and art. The recent researches in hormones, enzymes, nuclear physics and atomic energies may serve to furnish fruitful clues to the power of homœopathic potencies, until recently the stumbling block to the average educated mind. And the more qualified scientists enter the homœopathic fold, the

more honourable and useful for us. We can not wait until the outside scientists would furnish postulates for us to utilise for our own peculiar needs, and meekly follow their lead. We are confident, if Einstein or other scientists remained in the homœopathic fold or acted in keen collaboration with the homœopathic doctrine, the atom bomb or the hydrogen bomb would have been many years older than at present. Really, the discovery of the power of homœopathic potencies may serve to enlighten the world in a new physics, new biochemistry and new biology.

"High or low" is the other question of prime importance in the use of potencies. The enigma of the potencies, high or low, must be solved by our collective efforts and in a scientific manner. Dr. Kent's theory of conformity between the planes of vital affection and the penetrativeness of potency is purely conceptual and we have to invent other tangible measures of test if we can.

The findings of bacteriology have been a stumbling block to the Kentian homœopaths in the same manner as the homœopathic potency is to the Allopath. The works of Allen, Gregg, Kent and their followers and co-workers abound in such maxims "Bacteria are the result, not the cause of disease." Dr. Kent has devoted a considerable portion of a chapter of his *Homœopathic Philosophy* to this end. He was a great commentator, a grand propagandist of the principles enunciated by Hahnemann. His assiduous work on the *Repertory*, his unique sifting of the chaff from the wheat of the *Materia Medica*, his wonderful delineation of drug pictures, and above all his metaphysical approach to the science and art of Homœopathy, have made a large number of disciples among homœopaths all over the world, including the present writer himself. This Kentian approach is not an isolated development in the stream of Homœopathy. It is a correlated wave in the current of homœopathic thought since the eighties of the last century. But the Father of Homœopathy, Dr. Samuel Hahnemann,

conceived of disease as the derangement of the living organism, produced by a "dynamic morbid agent inimical to life," (*Organon*, sixth, Section 11). It is a spirit-like dynamic derangement of the vital principle, "caused by the *external inimical forces* that disturb the harmonious play of life," (*Organon*, sixth, Sec. 16). To Hahnemann the material as well as the spirit-like dynamic character of disease were equally prominent. What Hahnemann knew is that syphilis and gonorrhoea are contracted by no other means than contact; that measles, small-pox are propagated through "nearness," and cholera is definitely propagated by the "excessively minute living creatures" carried with infested water. Many other instances of Hahnemann's bacteriological conception of disease may be cited. (Vide Psora—the real crux in Homœopathy, *Recorder*, June 1949). Actually, Hahnemann was the pioneer bacteriologist much in advance of Pasteur. It is only his generalisations that are being worked out in minutest details by the bacteriologist, after a lapse of about a century. What Hahnemann knew is, of course, that the bacterium can not infect living organism unconditionally. It affects persons in whom a proneness, a susceptibility, is already present and the vital resistances is lowered; and being invisible to the naked eye, it is spirit-like in form. It is also dynamic in character as the symptoms are nothing but the action-cum-reaction of the bacterium upon the living organism and of the vital principle against it. Therefore, to Hahnemann the bacterium, the vital principle and the dynamic, as opposed to the static, derangements were equally formidable truths. He saw them all and ignored none. But unfortunately for us all, Dr. Kent and his co-workers laid special stress on the susceptibility, proneness and vital principle, or in other words on the soil alone, ignoring the bacterium, the seed, outright. To them the living organism was diseased first of all by psora, syphilis, scycosis, or other things, and next, the bacterium came as the scavenger to clean the system of

morbid tissues and poisonous toxins. But are not psora, syphilis and scyosis produced by bacterial contents? Why has a specific morbid matter a specific bacterium, specific in size, shape, behavior and mode of life? Why is not the bacterium of a tuberculous sputum the same as that of gonorrhœal pus? Why is it seen that the more numerous the bacteria in a subject, the more violently is he diseased? Hahnemann was a true scientist, and he saw all round the ball; Kent was a metaphysist and he saw one side of it to deduce generalisations therefrom.

The deductions of Kent have gone further, and some followers have advanced so far as to pronounce all diseases as the children of the mind. Their argument is that, as disease is due to susceptibility, susceptibility due to psora, and as latent psora affects the mind and morbidly deranges it, so all diseases—itch, syphilis, gonorrhœa, cholera and small-pox—are born of the mind of the patient himself. Therefore, behave properly, lead a moral, spiritual life and be free from disease. But morality and spirituality are relative terms; their connotations vary with varying environments and nationality. Are not the saints also affected with disease, and do they not die of it? If disease is born of mind and not of external agents, Hahnemann's conception of the infective character of miasms becomes null and void.

You may call it idle to discuss the problem of the causative factor of disease. We are aware that, save and except the "exciting" "fundamental" and "maintaining" causes in acute and chronic cases, (*Organon*, 6th Sec. 5), we need not consider any other causative factor before the preparation of the anamnesis. In fact, the totality of symptoms is our sole guide. But research is the only approved sacrifice at the altar of Truth. Dissuade the world from all thinking and research, and the whole civilised society becomes a zoological garden in a decade. If Hahnemann refrained from theorizing, the *Organon* and the *Chronic Diseases*—the highest monuments to medical philosophy

the world ever saw—would never have seen the light. The bacterium may not be our target in the clinic, but it is a deadly enemy in society. Hahnemann says: "He (Physician) is likewise a preserver of health, if he knows the things that derange health and cause disease." (*Organon*, Sec. 4). The physician is to advise people in matters of hygienic means to prevent disease, in the same manner as he is to select his remedy on the totality of symptoms, in order to induce the vital principle to arouse its defense mechanism, to produce antibodies, and effect or enhance automatic eliminations and thus achieve a cure.

This metaphysical approach of Dr. Kent and others is responsible for overlooking many salient points of Homœopathy. The most prominent of them is the question of dose. Hahnemann strictly differentiated dose from potency, quantity from quality, and clearly enjoined the administration of one or two globules of the size of the poppy seed as the adult dose. But the metaphysician says: "(Let) large and small, as to the dose, be dismissed from the thoughts of the prescriber. . . . Large and small can hardly be predicated of that which is wholly dynamic," (Wells, *Intermittent Fevers*, page 92, Ind. ed.), as if the dynamis had no mathematics because there is not the matter, as you can not count it. Why, our present mathematics may fail, a new mathematics may be invented to cope with the problem, and measure the infinitely divided atoms or ions. Dynamic or static, every thing has its own volume, pressure and velocity, hence its penetrating or shock-giving power. From the merest atom to the mightiest star, every thing has in it a magnetism, an electricity or radio-activity which is now or will be in future measureable by a new standard of mathematics. Does not the shock-giving power of a spiritlike dynamic electric current vary with the increase or decrease voltage, ohms and watts? Is not an electric current within our measureable capacity?

—*The Homœopathic Recorder*, May, 1953