

A REVIEW OF "HOMŒO INJECTION AND SPECIFIC TREATMENT"

BY DR. S. SEAL PRESIDENT, INDIAN HOMŒOPATHIC RESEARCH ASSOCN.

DR. B. B. CHATTERJEE, D.M.S. (Hons.), Calcutta

In going minutely through the above book, one is forced to the conclusion that failure to grasp the fundamentals of Hahnemannian principles as laid down in the Organon of Medicine has been responsible for the many goings-astray of the author.

To begin with, the preface mentions the sole mission of a physician to be to "cure" a patient, while the language of the Organon is that the sole mission of a physician is to restore the sick to health, to cure, as it is termed. It is significant that Hahnemann made a distinction, at the very outset, between "restoration to health" and "cure"; otherwise, the phrase "as it is termed" would not have been necessary at all. While a "cure" is possible in cases of artificial diseased conditions (e.g., indisposition, accidents, etc.) by the removal of the exciting factor or by surgical aid, etc., no cure can be effected by any extraneous method in case of natural diseases (which, in fact, are the concerns of Homœopathy) except by restoration of the Vital Principle by means of the similimum. It is clear that failure to grasp this important, though subtle, difference has been responsible for the author's seeking to make "improvements" on the Father of Homœopathy.

The author has unwarrantedly stated in the same preface that "diseases like Kala-azar, Malaria, Phthisis, etc. are not satisfactorily controlled by the orthodox Homœopath..." The fact is otherwise and there are lots of evidence to prove that *any* disease is curable by Homœopathy in the most satisfactory manner if only the Vital Force of the patient has not already been sapped by heterogeneous treatment. But it must be noted that Homœopathy does not treat any disease *by name* and it is concerned only with the characteristic symptoms of a disease, because names auto-

matically lead to generalisation whereas a Homœopath's function is to individualise.

The author has quoted Garth Boericke to champion his novel theory thus: "the practice of Homœopathy is in conflict with nothing in the great field of Modern Medicine." This statement is hardly acceptable to any Homœopath when he reads Aphorism 54 and foot-note 1 to Aphorism 109 of the Organon. Indeed Homœopathy *is* in conflict with practically everything in the field of Modern Medicine. Thus:

- (1) Its conception of "disease" and "cure" is totally different;
- (2) Its mode of application of medicine is diametrically opposite;
- (3) It does not aim at curing by killing bacteria;
- (4) Its doses are the minutest and always potentised;
- (5) Its diet and regimen follows a close individualistic method in that it will sanction different diet and regimen to different patients suffering from one and the same named disease if their personal likes and dislikes are different;
- (6) Even its conception of "medicine" is different in that it recognises even "moral remedy", a concept which is never found in the Orthodox Medicine and one that has only been borrowed by some psychiatrists.

The author wants us to believe that "If Hahnemann . . . were now alive . . . he would adopt this most scientific method of hypodermic medication . . ." Let us see.

Section 16 of the Organon categorically states that disease (that is, the morbid derangement of the Vital Force) *cannot* be removed in any other way than by the spirit-like (dynamic, virtual) alternative powers of the medicines acting upon the spirit-like Vital Force which perceives them "through the medium of the sentient faculty of the *nerves*. Nowhere has it even been suggested (as wrongly claimed by the author at page 22 of his book) that a drug (potentised after the manner laid down in the Organon) acts upon the diseased part of the organism "through the blood".

Then again, as the author has himself admitted, at least some pain and suffering is caused by any injection. Who would call it

a mild cure when it is seen in all pure Homœopathic practice that salutary effects *are* obtained by the employment of the potentised similimum by mouth, through olfaction and massaging? Would Hahnemann, of all persons on earth, support such an action when he was advocating against *any* violent method in treatment? Alas, Hahnemann!

The author would be well advised to go through the Commentary on Organon by Dr. B. K. Sarkar, M.B., D.M.S., to satisfy himself that Homœopathy *is* a scientific method of treatment (if not the only). The reviewer would like to assert that it is only the so-called "perfect" knowledge of "disease" that stands in the way of a correct homœopathic prescription. Thus, none but the Orthodox Homœopath (whom the author and his associates despise) can even think of *Ignatia* in boils, *Coffea* in high fever, and so on; and yet I have myself *seen* such results!

At page 9 of his book the author has stated that the analysis of Homœo drugs (action of?) stands more or less on hypothesis; although he admits that the same is based upon good reasoning from the point of view of practical experiment and experience. The interpretation which he has sought to give of Section 28 of the Organon is, to my mind, utterly motivated and ill-conceived. It should be noted that not only in regard to the action of the similimum but also in regard to the causation and pathology of diseases, Hahnemann did not want to give any explanation simply because the explanations (however "scientific") would not satisfy the sole requirement of either the physician or the patient. A reading of the Introduction to the Organon would convince anybody that Hahnemann exposed the futility of such "explanations".

The author, at page 10 of his book, laments that because of our "blind faith or dogmatic views" the original Homœopathic principles remained static. His lamentation cannot, unfortunately, be shared by the sincere Homœopaths when they find that there have been *sufficient* improvements in the approach to this noble therapeutics by such men as Boenninghausen, Farrington, Kent, etc. None can admit that dynamis means abandonment of a theory by somebody who could not, for some reason or other, properly discern the subject. As admitted tacitly by the author, failures are due to the "imperfect" knowledge. But should that induce us

to abandon altogether the science or should we not strive harder still to comprehend the subject? After all, some amount of "blind faith" is essential for any experiment, at least in the initial stage. Because, if one does not believe at all in something, he will never experiment with it to taste the pudding. And then he will declare the grapes sour!

A typical example of the author's confusion appears at page 13 of his book where he states: "Matter is energy and energy is matter", while the fact is that matter may be *transformed into* energy and *vice versa*. The same confusion has been made at page 19 of the book where it has been said that medicines become more active and powerful in higher "dilutions", when the fact is that potentization by the peculiar method advanced by Hahnemann makes medicines more active and powerful.

In pages 34-49 the author has argued for "combination method". In doing so he has said that Hahnemann at one time himself owned and approved it. Let us see.

Assuming that "The Manual of Homœopathic Theory and Practice" by Dr. A. Lutze did exist (although it is queer that such a valuable treatise should have been allowed to go out of print), let us see if it was possible for Hahnemann to say all that is attributed to him in the author's book.

The alleged letter of Hahnemann to Aegidi dated 15.5.1833 clearly shows the type of combination that Hahnemann advocated for. The type is when two separate *drugs* are mixed together in their *crude state* and then *potentised and proved* as identical units.

Let us now take up the Organon to see how Hahnemann *considered and rejected* the poly-pharmacy. Sections 272 and footnote thereto, 273, 274 give *in extenso* Hahnemann's views as to why poly-pharmacy must not be resorted to. Section 147, which has to be read with Section 153, shows that the homœopathic remedy is the one which contains the *greatest* similarity to the totality of the symptoms of a given disease. Grammatically, only one remedy can bear such *greatest* similarity. Section 169 gives the reason for using only one medicine at a time. It would appear that Hahnemann at least re-considered the point and preferred *not* to support Aegidi. It should be noted that while the author mentions that "It is . . . very rare that one single drug covers

exactly all the tableau of the symptoms . . .” Organon categorically states that the cases in which the true homœopathic medicine cannot be employed at the first opportunity are of *very rare* occurrence. Not only Hahnemann was deadly against using medicines in combinations, but also from Section 197 we find that he deprecated the use of even remedies externally along with internal medication in cases of topical affections not caused by external injury or proportionate violence. A reading at pages 31 and 32 of the Introduction to Organon will reveal the reasons for avoiding poly-pharmacy. Moreover, when one considers “disease” as an “altered state of the being” (which is no doubt the case), it would be appreciated why an individual can exhibit *only one morbid state* at a time, although there may be several symptoms (subjective and objective) through which such a state is manifested. And, as there can be only one state in a diseased individual, only one medicine can be homœopathic so long as that state remains unchanged. The conception of single remedy proceeds directly from Section 9 of the Organon. As the Vital Force is only *one* unit, one cannot oppose it by more than one agent (either homœopathically or allopathically or enantopathically) with any amount of certainty. On all these showings, therefore, it would appear that the author’s explanation for his not finding the alleged “commitments” of Hahnemann in the 5th Edition of the Organon is untenable. Indeed, the manner in which the author thinks that medicines are “generally selected” is responsible for the peculiar mode of treatment he has advocated in his book.

Apart from the reasons already stated against administration of medicines by injections, the following simple reasons would be sufficient to establish that the so-called “injectules” are *in no way* homœopathic:

- (a) The heat that is required to seal the ampules is sufficient to destroy the medicinal properties of any drug prepared in the Homœopathic way;
- (b) So far as is known, Madaus and Schwabe, the two foreign firms dealing in injectules, admit that saline is used to dissolve the medicines sold in ampoules. This, by itself, would be unscientific as homœopathic medicines are to be

(Continued on page 48)

BOOK REVIEWS

1. **The Clinical Relationship of Homœopathic Remedies**—Compiled by Dr. P. Sankaran, L.I.M., F.C.F.H., D.F.HOM. (Lond.), 3rd Edition. Published by The Homœopathic Medical Publishers, 13A, Station Road, Santa Cruz (West), Bombay-54. Board bound. Pages 38, Price—Rs. 2.50.

2. **Prophylactics in Homœopathy**—Compiled by Dr. P. Sankaran, L.I.M., F.C.F.H., D.F.HOM (Lond.), 2nd Edition. Published by the Homœopathic Medical Publishers of same address. Pages 10, Price—60 P.

These two booklets require no introduction, they are already popular among the homœopathic public. We are very glad that these two highly valuable booklets required a fresh edition so quickly. Both these booklets bear the talent of the Author, and we are sure, they will be highly useful to students and practitioners alike.

J. K.

REVIEW OF HOMŒO INJECTION

(Continued from page 45)

prepared without *any* admixture of other medicinal substance.

While this reviewer concedes that we need (and indeed we have!) specifics, he cannot recognise anything as specific until it is specifically (i.e., homœopathically) related to the totality of a diseased condition. Section 147 of the Organon says exactly the same thing. To talk of "specifics" which are manufactured by interested parties and which bear only some relation (mostly antagonistic) to the name of a disease is to disown the very fundamentals of Homœopathy. Moreover, the crude form of the so-called "specifics" is by itself dangerous when it actually *is* specific (that is, homœopathic) to a case. As is known to every genuine Homœopath, the theory of potentization closely clings round this consideration as we find in Sections 275 and 276, which, though superficially referring to dose, also refer to potentization.
