

POLYPHARMACY, PATENTS, ETC. OR SINGLE MEDICINE?

DR. B. P. SAHA, B.SC., D.M.S., Calcutta

Now-a-days there is a dangerous trend amongst a section of the so-called homoeopaths to prescribe more than one medicine in potentised form at a time to a patient. One of the busiest poly-prescribers of Calcutta has recently opined in an article in a Calcutta daily that he is getting very good results by this method. He further adds that this method is most modern and scientific than the orthodox method of prescribing single medicine to a patient. Moreover, he has indirectly showed disrespect to the followers of master Samuel Hahnemann.

There is also another dangerous trend amongst a section of the homoeo-pharmacists of introduction various patents containing mixture of various medicines which are claimed to be a specific remedy for specific diseases, e.g. fever, cough, leucorrhœa, alopecia, etc. They also claim that the users of these patents are getting very good results. They are also introducing various oils, ointments, etc. and giving a wide publicity regarding their efficacy in the treatment of many an apparently local malady.

A careful analysis of the above ideas in the light of homocopathic principles and doctrines will reveal their hidden anti-homocopathic roles. First of all, let us define a homocopathic physician. According to Dr. J. T. Kent, "The homoeopathic physician is one who prescribes the single remedy in the minimum dose in potentized form selected according to the law of similars." If we now analyse the above definition we find that (i) the poly-prescribers are not using a single medicine, (ii) they are not using the medicines in the minimum dose, (iii) they are not following the law of similars too because to follow the law of similar one is to select a single medicine whose drug picture obtained by drug proving on healthy human beings should be similar to disease picture. But the poly-prescribers are giving two, three, four or more medicines at a time on the basis of apparent symptomatology of the diseased person without having any drug picture of these combined medicines obtained by proving on healthy human beings. So according to the definition of a homoeopath they are not at all homocopaths and hence they should be debarred from using the name of Homoeopathy by suitable legislation. Secondly, in aphorism 273 of the *Organon of Medicine*, 6th edition, Dr. Hahnemann has opined: "It is absolutely not allowed in Homocopathy.....to give the patient *at one time* two different *medicinal substances*." Hence, the advocates of poly-pharmacy also do not follow the instructions of the father of Homoeopathy. Thirdly, if several medicines are used together, their cumulative effect in the organism is not yet known. Even in some cases, the drugs used in the poly-prescrip-

tion have antagonistic symptoms with one another and thus, contradict the action of one medicine with another. Fourthly, if several medicines go on acting in the system for a pretty long time the chance of developing drug diseases is more. Fifthly, the primary action of a homoeopathic medicine removes the natural disease and the body is made free from the yoke of the disease force; the medicinal disease within the body is then removed by the reaction of the vital force, i.e. by the secondary action of the vital force the patient gets cured; but when several medicines are administered simultaneously, the vital force has to behave in different ways at a time and thereby the chance of cure on the principle of the action of the vital force is remote. Sixthly, when several allopathic medicines are administered simultaneously they may act independently because there the role of the vital force is virtually of no importance and the medicines work by virtue of their physiological actions and hence to draw an analogy of the working of allopathic medicines in combination with that of homoeopathic medicines (potentised and dynamic) in combination are beside the point. Seventhly, if several medicines are used to cover the symptomatology of a patient then what is the utility of *evaluation of symptoms*? In many cases, it may so happen that dozens of homoeopathic medicines will be required to cover the symptomatology. Is it more scientific than the use of a single medicine chosen by evaluation of symptoms etc.? Eighthly, if so many medicines are administered at a time for a pretty long time proving of many of them may start in the patient and thereby the symptomatology of the patient will get complicated in such a manner that it will be utterly impossible to make a second prescription especially, in a chronic case. Out of several medicines how will a poly-prescriber select one or more medicines for the second prescription? How will he antidote any untoward symptoms brought out due to an incorrect prescription? How will he use a particular cognate or complement or change his plan of treatment according to the necessity of the condition? That means the points to be noted in case of a second prescription are totally ignored by the poly-prescribers.

There are many more points against poly-prescription but I think that it should be condemned like anything if it is claimed to be Homoeopathy. I think the poly-prescribers are indulging in an unfair and unholy practice in the name of Homoeopathy and is doing mere palliation than cures. They indulge in it to avoid the strenuous study and are not willing to give time required for a case-taking on Hahnemannian principles. If temporary results be the only guideline to claim a system as most modern and scientific without having any scientific research and investigation based on homoeopathic principles and doctrines then many proclaimers of faith cures are to be considered as most modern and scientific. The use of specifics for a disease is also another anti-homoeopathic trend and they have virtually no role to play to cure a case. How a homoeopath can depend on a cough-mixture containing, e.g. Belladonna, Ocimum, Justicia, Ipecac, Drosera, Eucalip-

tus, plus one or two other drugs to treat a case where cough is the most characteristic trouble? Will he not require Arsenic alb., Bryonia, Aralia, Cina, Kali carb., Kali bichrom. Hepar sulph., Antim tart., etc. to treat a condition where cough symptom is most predominant? Then how a cough mixture can be a *panacea* for all coughs? As a homoeopath, can we not pick up the right single medicine for a particular type of cough? This is just only one example. Unless true homoeopaths strongly oppose these unscientific trends in the name of Homoeopathy then cure and palliation will be intermingled and the concept of ideal cure will be lost for ever. Moreover, this is not Homoeopathy and no natural disease can be cured by these mixtures unless the case is treated according to Hahnemannian principles. Can alopecia be checked by pouring gallons of X, Y or Z type of hair oil on the head? Is it not a false gimmick in the name of Homoeopathy to exploit the public for monetary gains? Is not miasmatic internal treatment a dire necessity and the first and foremost one to check alopecia? Hence, true homoeopaths should join together to save Homoeopathy from this dangerous play of the pseudo homoeopaths. They will be doing more harm to Homoeopathy in future than the allopaths are doing at present.
