

tion, and the results of such investigation will enrich the health of mankind. The possibilities of homœopathy are infinite. The better knowledge we have of our art, the better use we can make of it. In the words of Dr. Kent "while homœopathy itself is a perfect science its truth is only partially known. The truth itself relates to the divine, the knowledge relates to man."

THE PRESENT-DAY NEED FOR HOMŒOPATHY

DR. ALVA BENJAMIN, M.B., CH.M., F.F.HOM.

When studying the history of medicine one is impressed by the fact that through the ages the trends of treatment have shown a striking parallelism with the spirit of the times in which patients were treated; and the same is to be seen even today.

In ancient times medicine was very much bound up with mythology and superstition. Through the ages it went through an evolution, just as other human activities have done. When we come to mediæval times, we find men fired with the spirit of exploration and experiment, no longer content to have their thoughts and actions based merely on the authority of their ancestors. It was during these years that medicine began to develop a scientific foundation. It was then that Europe discovered America, printing was introduced from China, and William Harvey demonstrated beyond doubt the circulation of the blood. This experiment of his was, perhaps, the beginning of the mechanical interpretation of vital phenomena and the first step taken away from the wider philosophical outlook on medical treatment. It has since then become more and more scientific, based on work in laboratories of many kinds, until at the present day it has almost lost sight of the individual as such, and treats the human body much as a mechanic would handle a broken-down motor car.

This or that organ is tinkered with ; this or that microbe immobilized. In other words, modern orthodox medicine has become more or less a mere technology, has lost all semblance of an art and has no philosophy as its basis. It reflects the violence of the age in which we live by the constant use of all these modern drugs, which, useful as they are, and in many cases a great advance on former allopathic remedies, are, nevertheless, potent for evil to a greater or lesser extent by reason of their so-called "side effects". The patient has often to recover, not only from his original illness, but also from the effects of his treatment.

In my opinion, the fact that, in many cases of infective illness, the temperature is brought down to very quickly, is not in itself sufficient grounds for maintaining that antibiotic treatment is undoubtedly the method of choice for such conditions. One must always bear in mind the "side effects" of so many of these remedies. It is the state of the patient when the infection has been completely got rid of that should be the yardstick by which the treatment should be judged. I think it is true to say that the convalescence of a patient treated homœopathically is usually much more rapid. The patient treated homœopathically is certainly in a better condition than one treated antibioticly, for the former has recovered through the raising of his resistance to the infecting organism and is therefore less liable to a recurrence. He also has no "side effects" from which to recover.

Many modern physicians do not seem to be aware of the fact that there are no such things as diseases in the abstract, there are only sick people. It is the patient as a whole who must always be healed. Not only must the physical body of the patient be regarded, but also his mental, emotional and spiritual maladjustment must be taken into account when treating him. In other words, every medical problem is a psychosomatic problem, not just merely one here and there. One may retort that surely

psychotherapy, in all its variations, takes care of these aspects of the whole man. It, on the other hand, often overlooks the physical aspects of the case: and, in so far as it does that, cannot be regarded as an all-embracing, comprehensive system of medicine.

So that a system of medicine may fulfil this qualification, it must be based on a philosophy of life which appreciates and, takes notice in its therapy, of both the physical and immaterial aspects of the sick individual. It must realize that man is a creature of many aspects and levels, so any prescription for healing him must be capable of affecting these different facets of his being.

Such a system must also have regard to the *vis medicatrix naturae*, and anything it does for the patient should act in conformity with this and not antagonize it. We should never forget that the practice of medicine is an art with a basis of science and philosophy, that the mind can influence the body, and therefore the patient must realize that he himself must take an active part in his treatment, and not be merely a passive recipient of it, such as is so often the case in modern orthodox practice.

It seems to me that homœopathic therapeutics, followed according to the teaching of Samuel Hahnemann, pre-eminently fulfil the above requirements of a comprehensive all-embracing system of medicine.

How different is its approach to the sick person in its regard to the whole individual as opposed to so much of modern medicine, which concerns itself with the infecting organism alone, or with the suppression of the most prominent symptom of which the patient complains. The importance which the homœopathic physician, in his history taking when seeking the simillimum, attaches to the patient's mental and emotional reactions to his environment, emphasizes this difference of approach. Indeed, at times the homœopathic prescription is made from these reactions alone, quite irrespective of the physical conditions of which the patient complains.

The homœopathic physician should, in addition to trying to adjust the patient to his environment through the indicated remedy, not neglect the importance of modifying, if necessary, the environment to the patient's needs. That is to say, he must see that the patient lives under the best hygienic and social conditions possible and is properly nourished by taking a well-balanced, vital diet. To sum up, the physician's duty is to produce as far as possible a harmonious relationship between the patient and his environment, so that he is placed most advantageously for a complete restoration to health through the action of the simillimum. When doing this he must see he does not use any agents likely to injure the patient, and therefore put an obstacle to his safe, pleasant and rapid recovery.

Can this last condition be said to be fulfilled in ordinary modern medicine? I hardly think so.

When one realizes how many of these modern drugs produce undesired side effects, as they are called, in an appreciable minority of patients, and the modern physical treatments of mental illness produce in a not insignificant proportion of cases either physical or mental and emotional traumata, one cannot help asking, are these heroic measures justified, except in exceptional cases, when there is a safer, effective and more humane treatment available by the use of the simillimum.

I therefore suggest to this Congress that in order to liberate the great bulk of the people from the unnecessary hazards of modern allopathic treatment, we homœopathic physicians should lose no opportunity to bring these facts to the notice of the people and their governments. We can demonstrate to them how much more humane and ethical is the homœopathic system of medicine, which has now proved its efficacy throughout nearly two centuries.

As, unfortunately, there is still so much prejudice against us in the hierarchy of the profession—and prejudiced people are not open to argument—our efforts in future should be directed to informing the public of the

benefits of which they are being deprived by this prejudiced opposition. We should tell the people that they have it in their hands to alter this unsatisfactory state of things by demanding from their governments a full recognition of our system of treatment, so that it will be taught in our medical schools, preferably, I think, as a postgraduate study.

In my opinion, this approach through the laity is absolutely necessary. No medical authority has the right to deprive the community of one of its fundamental human rights, to be able to get in time of illness the kind of treatment in which it has learned to have confidence.

—*The British Homoeo. Journal, July-Oct. 1954*

PREVENTION OF FOOD AND OTHER ALLERGIES BY SPECIFIC POTENCIES

N. J. P.

We are all familiar with the child who doesn't like milk, and with the adult who dares not eat crab—two common examples of sensitivity to foodstuffs. The child will probably grow out of it—a long and tiresome process. The adult will probably sooner or later be faced with a situation in which he has to risk eating the offending food—for example, at a dinner, when it would be awkward to refuse it. Then, unless he already has some antidote to the "food poisoning" which may follow, he is likely to have an uncomfortable time.

Orthodox medical treatment is satisfactory up to a point. The new antihistamine drugs neutralise the histamine which the body produces in its reaction to the foodstuff or other substance. But antihistaminics sometimes have side effects, and these side effects can be inconvenient or even disagreeable.