

THE PROBLEM OF INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING OF HOMŒOPATHY*

DR. B. K. SARKAR, M.B., D.M.S., Calcutta

Since the discovery of the Homœopathic system of treatment its best method of teaching remains a moot problem. Hahnemann, revolted, with justification, against the therapeutic part of the medical system which was current in his time. He picked up the logical fallacies, practical absurdities and uncertainties along with harmfulness, in most cases, of the orthodox medical treatment and sought to replace that therapeutic system with one that he discovered and claimed as more rational, scientific, efficacious, most harmless and based on some principles, strictly scientific. He hoped that the orthodox school would accept his discovery and incorporate it in their own system, though rejecting much which was absolutely untenable from his point of view. It must be told to the credit of the followers of the orthodox medical school at Leipzig that Hahnemann was permitted, after fulfilling certain conditions, to deliver lectures on the Homœopathic system of medicine.¹

* A paper presented before the Conference of Representatives of All State Boards and Councils of Homœopathic medicine in India, Patna, 1960.

(1) How much credit can justifiably be given to 'the followers of orthodox medical school at Leipzig' can be assessed from the following excerpts from R. Haehl's "*Life of Hahnemann*" (Vol. 1):—

"Hahnemann satisfied these conditions and on the 26th June, 1812, he delivered the required speech of qualification. The dissertation was written in Latin, as was the custom of the time, and was called 'Dissertatio historico-medica de Helleborismo veterum'.

"In this speech Hahnemann purposely limited himself to historical medical provinces, where he found ample opportunity to show to advantage his extraordinary knowledge of languages, his reading and scholarship particularly in the history of medicine....." (Ibid, P. 97).

"But he did not touch upon his own principles and theories, as exploited in the "Organon" of the previous year" (Ibid, P. 98).

... "The opponents could not find any objections to Hahnemann's

Accordingly in the winter term, 1812 Hahnemann started his lectures. Those who came to attend his lectures, consisted of medical students, doctors, representatives of professors and many other curious people. But the lectures which Hahnemann delivered, failed to win friends and followers for his theories or himself. "For whenever possible, he poured forth a flood of abuse against the older medicine and its followers." He went so far as to assert that "better have no doctor and no medicine at all than receive treatment in the manner of the old school. The result was that his audience lessened every hour and finally consisted of only a few of his students." The medical students who stuck to Hahnemann inspite of bad treatment they got from other professors, found themselves in a difficult situation as they could not decide about attending only Hahnemann's lectures and studying only

medical claims and they took up the points of view on philological details obviously in order to have something to say. And where are there philologists of the older languages, who are ever of the same opinion?"

From these we see if any credit is to be given to any thing it is to the (a) constitutional rule of the University of Leipsic and (b) tactfulness on the part Hahnemann.

The credit bestowed upon the "followers of orthodox medical school" is far more than negated when we look to their subsequent behaviour:—(*Statements of Franz Hartmann*).

"Perpetual raillery from the students, poisonous looks from most of the professors, anxious desire of every body to avoid more intimate intercourse with us as if we were injected with some pestilential eruption all this made my stay in Leipsic really painful, and consequently a visit to another university, at any rate for a short time, highly desirable" (*Ibid*, P. 100).

"This was then the little circle formed round Hahnemann which even under the best circumstances had to tolerate much mockery and irony and in malicious cases, hatred and persecution, not only during the student years but far beyond them. I can always remember very clearly how Hornburg (one of the friends—R.H.) was worried in his Final Examination by the old pates and only just managed to escape being plucked, whilst miserable thickheads, not fit to wipe Hornburg's boots, passed cum laude and are now flourishing aloft here—narrow-minded but successful physicians". (*Ibid* P. 100).

"It was unfortunate that the clinical professor of the time (Professor

his theories, as was Hahnemann's desire, since he said, the older methods could offer nothing certain. But Hahnemann's reaction to the queries of his students regarding the question whether it would suffice for them to be examined on Homœopathy alone, was very elusive. Hartmann, one of the most staunch followers of Hahnemann writes in this connection; "His (Hahnemann's) manifold hedgings to avoid an answer to this question, convinced me of the falsity and impracticability of his proposal and it was never mentioned again in conversation during the whole of my student period. It almost seemed as if when the subject was brought up at any time in the circle of young men gathered around him, he studiously ignored it as though convinced of its inadvisability."² So during the period 1812—1820, Hahnemann lectured at Leipzig University, all he could do was to attract a band of devoted young men to form a group of collaborators for the proving of drugs. He alienated from himself the majority of the orthodox school, through his violent tirades against them and their system of treatment;³ but his therapeutic success increased his reputation as a physician and evoked admiration from both the professionals and the laity. That he was later⁴ convinced of the utility of undergoing a complete course in medical training before one could

Dr. Clarus at the University, Leipsic) as also the highest medical authority in Saxony, and in virtue of his position could appear at any time as Prosecutor and Judge. To him the 'carryings on' of Hahnemann and of his pupils (as he liked to call it) whom he dismissed as 'ignorant fellows', represented a real horror, and his bitterest hatred persecuted anything that was at all reminiscent of Hahnemann or his theories. He did not consider it worth while to conceal the fact. On the contrary, it fascinated him to tyrannise over students whom he did not like and to repudiate them in public under a cloak of scholarship and titular authority". (Ibid, P. 100).

(2) Please see the editorial article (J.N.K.).

(3) "His violent tirades" may be one of the cause of his alienation from the orthodox school, but the main cause seems to be the prejudice and horror of the latter against his new line which was against all their ideas, concepts and practice, and even vested interest (J.N.K.). (Please see editorial April and May).

(4) There is no proof that he was ever unaware of the necessity or utility of "a complete course in medical training", himself

become a complete Homœopathic physician, is to be inferred from his correspondence with one H. Wiesecke of Berlin, who wanted to study Homœopathy. Hahnemann replied that he must first go to a University, before he could commence the actual study of Homœopathy. This correspondence took place in November 22nd, 1831, (Vide Haehl's Life of Hahnemann, Vol. II, p: 198, Supplement 100). Thus the problem of imparting institutional training in Homœopathy was left unsolved by Hahnemann though Homœopathy as an efficacious therapeutic method rapidly gained ground even during his life-time and it had embraced the whole world within fifty years after the Master's death. As Homœopathy is rapidly gaining ground and more and more people, both the professional and the laity, are being attracted to the practice of Homœopathy, the question of the best method of teaching Homœopathy institutionally rises up again and again. The great Hering was a towering personality in U. S. A. and it was he who first established a full fledged Homœopathic College and Hospital. Homœopathy is primarily a therapeutic art or to be more precise, it is a particular method of drug-therapy. But in order to practise the therapy a physician must have knowledge of diseases, drugs and of many other ancillary subjects. A complete system of medicine comprises both the 'Science' portion and the 'Art' portion. The 'Science'-portion attempts to discover the causes of disease-conditions, classify diseases (more or less in the line of Botanical or Zoological classifications) nosologically, form concepts to denote and explain physiological and pathological phenomena and correlate them with the anatomical structures of living organisms for purposes of diagnosis and prognosis of diseases based on integration of various types of symptom-syndromes as well as study of pharmacological actions of drugs.

being a versatile scholar of prodigious degree in all the allied medical subjects including even chemistry and Botany which were not at his time taught to medical students. The real problem with him was rather *how* a complete training could be arranged for, so that his students would become complete *homœopathic* physicians. And the same problem is none the less vivid and vital today as was in his time. (J.N.K.).

The 'Art'-portion deals particularly with techniques of selection and administration of drugs to disease-conditions for the purpose of curing and preventing sickness in human beings. Thus the course of training in any medical institution of any system of treatment must cover teaching of subjects belonging to the 'Science'-portion and 'Art'-portion of medicine, if complete physicians are to be turned out from that institution. Homœopathy, being primarily therapeutic art and secondarily a school of medical thought, must be taught from that point of view in a Homœopathic medical institution, whether of a Licentiate, Degree or a Post-graduate standard.

Medical men before and after Hahnemann's advent in the world, seem to have been obsessed with one master idea that Medicine can only be raised to a scientific level (on a par with other branches of science) if only its 'Art'-portion is based or dependent on its 'Science'-portion. But Hahnemann has revolutionised that idea. To him Medicine is primarily an art, but like other arts and crafts, has benefitted greatly from the help derived from the different branches of science *e.g.* Physiology, Biochemistry, Pathology, Chemistry and Physics; just as the science of Chemistry helps the art of agriculture or the science of Astronomy helps the art of navigation. In their attempt to turn Medicine into an applied science, the orthodox medical school has laid undue emphasis on the auxiliary science and has reduced the art of medicine to a subordinate position. But according to Hahnemann or rather to any rational thinker, Medicine is a department of Biology and no vital phenomenon can be adequately explained only by the underlying chemico-physical processes. In a living organism there is always something beyond purely chemical and physical formulations. That is the mysterious Life-principle which baffles all analysis. The so-called modern scientific medicine speaks of Medicine as applied Anatomy and Physiology, which, in their turn, are based on concepts of chemistry and physics or at best bio-physics and hence inadequate for the concepts of science of medicine. That is why Homœopathy can be defined as a "science of vital dynamics" though it has yet not succeeded to form concepts relevant from that point of view. Through the clinical mode of

approach to the study of diseases and drug-actions on the living organism and the discovery of a therapeutic law, Homœopathy has made medicine assume its true place in being an 'art'—the art of healing, having a life of its own considerably independent of the nourishment its associated science bring. That Homœopathy has raised medicine to a level of independent art is evidenced by the spectacular therapeutic successes of lay homœopaths (*i.e.* not institutionally trained), in all places, since the discovery of this system of medicine. Proper appreciation of the fact that the auxiliary science-subjects need not be considered as 'basic' science—they should rather be considered as 'indispensable preliminaries' to the study of Medicine proper. Properly speaking the subject matter of Medicine is concerned with life, health and disease in man. And these sub-sciences are not capable of constructing concepts sufficiently adequate for the explanation and understanding of vital phenomena which comprise the science of medicine. Now, we think, it is clear where Homœopathy stands in the field of Medicine, in general. Homœopathy, in short, is but an individualistic method of drug-treatment according to a law of therapeutics, arrived at inductively, definitely based on a distinctive biological outlook, philosophically sound and open to experimental proof.

As regards Homœopathic training in institutions there are the following arrangements in the world, viz.:—

(1) Homœopathic training on a post-graduate level—as existing in U. K. and the European Continent. ♦

(2) Medical Institutions where both the orthodox and the Homœopathic systems are taught or mainly allopathic institutions where Homœopathy is taught on the basis of an elective course *i.e.* any student who wants to study Homœopathy, may attend certain courses of lectures on Homœopathy delivered in the same institution—as existing at present in U. S. A.

(3) Completely separate institutions for Homœopathy—as existing in our country.

(4) Completely separate Homœopathic institutions with a graded course of licentiate, graduate and post-graduate standards—a scheme envisaged and sponsored by us.

Let us discuss the merits and demerits of each type of institutions.

Re. 1. Homœopathy is not a subject for post-graduate study for graduates in medicine. The course in any given subject implies a more intensive study of the said subject in continuation and in furtherance of the course of study which a candidate has already gone to obtain his degree. The introduction of the teaching of Homœopathy only at a so-called post-graduate level is impracticable psychologically, physiologically and economically. This arrangement will surely lead to rapid strangling of the Homœopathic profession and eventual extinction of its practice in the country (if the law of the state is strictly enforced) due to shortage of human materials. No profession can thrive on chance converts recruited from the members of the orthodox school of Medicine.

That is why the number of qualified Homœopaths is dwindling fast in U. K. and the European Continent. Not merely quality but also quantity is required to make the influence of the Homœopathic profession felt in the state and the society.

Re. 2. Institutions imparting mixed training in Homœopathy and (so-called) Allopathy:

Many of us seem to labour under a misconception as regards the subject matter of medicine and its objects. Properly speaking the subject-matter of Medicine is concerned with study of life, health and disease that constitute the individuality of a system of medicine. The auxiliary subjects are independent sciences—they are no monopoly of any particular medical system. These studies supply us with a multitude of scientific facts; but each system of medicine has its own interpretations and its own way of utilising and applying the principles evolved out of these facts for the purpose of healing the sick. Hence it is clear that the mode of pedagogy in a homœopathic institution regarding medicine proper, as well as auxiliary subjects, must be different from that in an institution of the allopathic system of medicine. Hence mixed training leads to ideological conflicts and will not be conducive to develop amongst the students a real Homœopathic orientation towards matters medical. Further the show and numerous parapher-

nalía in connection with Allopathic medical teaching will attract immature medical students to the detriment of the cause of homœopathy.

Re. 3. Completely separate medical institutions for teaching Homœopathy.

This demand for a separate homœopathic medical institution does not imply denial of limitation in the scope and sphere of Homœopathy. This demand arises out of a desire to afford an all-out opportunity to Homœopathy to evolve according to its genius. It is to be borne in mind that though Homœopathy started as a specialised system of drug-therapy, it has developed into a distinctive school of medical thought as the viewpoints of homœopathic philosophy, homœopathic materia medica etc. are so fundamentally different from that of the parallel subjects in the so-called allopathic system of medicine. So we insist on completely separate institutions where the students, from the beginning, will move, live and have their being in the atmosphere of the homœopathic philosophy.

Re. 4. Graded Course in Homœopathic teaching:

Considering the vastness of our country, poor economic condition of the general mass, dearth of qualified physicians, wide gulf in the standard of living in the cities and villages, there should be graded medical service for the whole country, to render medical help to all strata of society, both in towns and villages. From the academic point of view, this graded course is also desirable as intensive teaching in Homœopathic philosophy and Hom. materia medica with minimum working knowledge of the auxiliary sciences can be imparted in the basic (licentiate) standard of teaching. A student should be thoroughly orientated with the Homœopathic outlook regarding matters medical, in the beginning. An integration of Homœopathic and the modern medicine can be effectively accomplished in the next higher grade i.e. graduate course. Those who are desirous of acquiring maximum amount of knowledge in matters medical with Homœopathy as a specialty and believe in the American definition of a Homœopathic physician (i.e. a Homœopathic physician is one who adds to his

(Contd. on Page 236)

character until it became mostly serous, and the sloughing went on gradually. At no time was the pain as intense as it is sometimes in gangrene. There was some "proud flesh" in all the openings and these gradually yielded to *Arsenicum album*.

The most remarkable thing to me in the result was the minimum loss of tissue, far less than the most conservative surgeon would have removed. There is also a minimal scar.

While this man is not cured of his diabetes, he has been saved for a while at least from the terrors of gangrene and his general condition improved by his more strict adherence to diet. Here again, the physician was more amazed than the patient.

If we were as careful with our money as Divine Providence is with our tissues, Ike would not have to be battling the budget.

—*The homœopathic Recorder, Jan.-Mar., '58.*

THE PROBLEM OF INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING

(Cont. From Page 213)

knowledge of medicine a special knowledge of homœopathic therapeutics and observes the Law of Similia. All that pertains to the great field of medical learning in his by tradition, by inheritance, by right) may go up for a post-graduate course study to secure degrees like M.D., M.S. and M.O. in Homœopathy.

In this system of graded-course-training we might solve the problem of how best to turn out complete Homœ. physician who will be able to hold their own in every field of medicine.
