

## ALARMING TRENDS IN HOMOEOPATHY IN INDIA

DR. C. V. S. COREA, Sri Lanka

I have been much interested to read the various papers read and discussions that took place in regard to simplifying homoeopathic prescribing. To my mind the only method to make homoeopathic prescribing easy is by the difficult method of studying intensively and extensively the teachings in the 6th edition of the *Organon* and the *Chronic Diseases* of Hahnemann as well as homoeopathic philosophy and our materia medica. I dare say that some of the tips given by some of the doctors may come in useful to the young practitioner but there is absolutely no way of simplifying classical Homoeopathy which is the only Homoeopathy that is in existence. I am a little perturbed and also amused at the trends of thought of some of the modern pandits in Homoeopathy at the various seminars and meetings held on matters pertaining to Homoeopathy published in many homoeopathic journals of late. Instead of eulogising modern developments in Allopathy and wanting to incorporate some of them in Homoeopathy as the later homoeopaths in Europe and America did, which was undoubtedly instrumental in bringing about the fall of genuine Homoeopathy in those countries, the homoeopaths of India, and I would say Asia, should concentrate on Homoeopathy and Homoeopathy alone, if they want to establish it firmly in India which is the Mecca of Homoeopathy today. In this connection I was very happy to read and whole-heartedly agree with what Dr. Kanjilal had to say regarding the use of allopathic medicine during homoeopathic treatment. He has spoken my heart as my views are identical with what he has said. I was astounded to read at the end of a well-known homoeopathic journal in India the following definition of a homoeopathic physician: "A homoeopathic physician is one who adds to his knowledge of medicine a special knowledge of homoeopathic therapeutics and observes the law of similars". It is this stupid definition which was adopted by the A.I.H. which undoubtedly is responsible for the decline and fall of Homoeopathy in Europe and America. The great Kent says, "the astonishing part of the first formula is expressed in the first part; who adds to his knowledge of medicine. Of what does the knowledge consist? Is it what all tradition, counts as up-to-date use of drugs? Does it mean that the homoeopathic physician must know these so that he can have something to which to add the special knowledge of homoeopathic therapeutics in order to be a homoeopathic physician? It would be supposed that the homoeopathic physician had abandoned the first to become a physician of an advanced and scientific order. It must be acknowledged that all of this knowledge of medicine, to which he is to add his homoeopathics, is traditional ignorance and absurdities. Now to this ignorance he is to add a knowledge of homoeopathic therapeutics. Would it not be better and wiser to say that a

homoeopathic physician is one who has abandoned traditional absurdities and adopted the science and philosophy of healing according to the law of similars? Men who depend upon the diagnosis, the laboratory findings, the pathology, the bacteriology, for selection of their remedies are expected to add to such knowledge (?) a special knowledge of homoeopathic therapeutics. The astonishing part of the formula is that it frames into the definition just the part that prevents every man from becoming a homoeopathic physician. So long as he holds on to the traditional absurdities, even when called modern scientific medicine, so long he is incapable of learning the true art of healing according to the law of similars. It cannot refer to anatomy, physiology, pathology, chemistry etc., because, to these he does not add as they are part of doctor's possessions. Was not the adoption of this definition for the sole purpose of giving standing to men whose requirements were a knowledge of fads and traditional absurdities, and ignorance of Hahnemann's *Organon* and the pure *Materia Medica*. Yet the A.I.H. definition permits the fraudulent misrepresentation to pose as a genuine homoeopathic physician." I think the Homoeopathic Medical Association of India which is to be the authority on Homoeopathy should definitely adopt the following definition of a homoeopathic physician as given by 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 this is not done genuine Homoeopathy will fall into the abyss as has happened in Europe and the U.S.A. With all the so-called advances in modern Allopathy they have not discovered the law of cure which is the most important discovery and the main thing in Homoeopathy. I am amazed at the stupid statements made by some so-called pandits in Homoeopathy that "a homoeopath should first be a physician and then a homoeopath." If a homoeopath is not a physician what is he? A brick layer, an engineer or a lawyer? They fail to realise that a homoeopathic physician is the greatest physician in existence in the world. These are the saboteurs in our own ranks who damage the prestige and superiority of Homoeopathy more than what all our opponents can do. If these people are allowed to dominate and steer the destinies of Homoeopathy in India, all I can say is, God help Homoeopathy.

I cannot understand how a homoeopath who knows his Homoeopathy could want to incorporate other systems of therapy, which they believe are also curative, into the homoeopathic fold. A genuine homoeopath should know that Homoeopathy is the only really curative system of medicine in the world. Some had the audacity to criticise even Hahnemann. As the great Kent said, "Let all men learn of him until they can do as he did; for he was, and still is, the teacher above all others." He was the first advocate of Homoeopathy, and we must look to him, and all deviation from his teachings should receive another name. He so arranged the rule of practice in the *Organon* and *Chronic Diseases* that the system of homoeopathic therapeutics

(Continued on page 8)

town, San Francisco, I can report a perpetuation of the Homeopathic Foundation with its recently modernised Hahnemann Hospital. On what was formerly the Homeopathic College of the Pacific several authors and professors of homeopathy were teachers. These included Dr. Samuel Lilienthal in 1890, his son Dr. James Lilienthal in 1907, Dr. Thomas McGavack, Dr. H. R. Arndt from Southern California, Dr. James W. Ward whose book "Sensations as if" still is used. I must mention Dr. William Boericke's Manual of the Materia Medica, which is precisely a pocket manual in the true sense, and is handled by all of us homeopathic physicians daily on both sides of the Atlantic ocean building a sort of a spiritual NAHO (North Atlantic Homeopathic Organization). To mention this might be the appropriate here in Brussels, however, William Boericke's Pocket Manual use busts the frame of the North Atlantic because you can find it on the desk of our Indian confreres as well as in Buenos Aires or in Hongkong. This little book makes us real brothers in Homeopathy and I am proud to be a friend of the distinguished Boericke family.

Finally I want to mention another old timer Timothy Field Allen, Professor and author in New York who wrote a ten volume Encyclopedia of the Materia Medica which are very large books. His middle name Field points to his relative Dr. Field who invented the Lochkartensystem or punch card box with 6400 cards which could serve as precursor to computerised findings of the similimum, one tape for generalities, another tape for peculiarities.

And herewith I return to the paragraphs 153 and 154 in the light of the IBM machines for Datenverwertung.

Honored confreres:

The purpose of this paper was two fold. First, I wanted to give you a small impression of the early homeopathic activity in the United States. Secondly, I read the famous paragraphs 153 and 154 sixty-three times in our three languages, and tried to convey some of its semantics to you, thus lessening your burden to study it. If you have gained a new insight into the historical developments of the Organon, we are both the richer for this experience.

—*Journal of Am. Inst. of Homeopathy, September 1974*

### ALARMING TRENDS IN HOMOEOPATHY IN INDIA

(Continued from page 3)

may be considered complete. Homoeopathy rests not upon theory nor opinion but upon facts. Allopathy concerns us very little, its way and that of Homoeopathy have long since parted. Homoeopathy pure and simple is all that is desired in the cure of the sick, that the law is universal, and failures can only come from the ignorance of the prescriber.