

**RADIO BROADCAST—FORUM DISCUSSION
ON HOMŒOPATHY**

**BROADCAST BY RADIO CEYLON
ON SEPT. 7TH, 1960.**

Transcript from a Tape Recording

(Reproduced with kind permission of Radio Ceylon)

PARTICIPANTS IN THE FORUM DISCUSSION

1. Mr. Livy R. Wijemanne, Additional Director, Commercial Service of Radio Ceylon—Chairman. (Abbreviated in the text as L.R.W.).
2. Dr. Diwan Harish Chand, M.B., B.S.; L.R.C.P. (Edin.); D.T.M. & H. (L'Pool); M.F. Hom. (Lond.). Postgrad. U.S.A. & Switzerland.
Member, State Board of Homœopathic Medicine, Delhi. (Abbreviated in the text as D.H.C.).
3. A very prominent Allopath of Ceylon.
4. A very prominent Veterinarian who is also well versed in Homœopathy.
5. A highly qualified chemist, who is the head of an important educational institution in Ceylon and is interested in Homœopathy.

(The last three prefer to remain anonymous)

L.R.W.—Good Evening, every body. I am very privileged to be in the Chair at this most interesting discussion that we are going to have on a subject about which I think a lot of people here in Ceylon do not know very much. I am very happy that we have been able to get on this Panel tonight a very distinguished set of people, one of whom is a visitor to the Island, a Dr. Diwan Harish Chand, who is qualified in both schools of medicine, that is Allopathic, by Allopathic I mean the orthodox school, which we are used to have in Ceylon, and the Homœo-

pathic school. Dr. Harish Chand qualified at the Punjab University and went on to Edinburgh and Liverpool and came back after getting his qualifications as the London Homœopathic Hospital and postgraduate training in U.S.A. and Switzerland. Now along with him round the table are a very prominent member of the Allopathic school practising in Colombo, a very well-known Veterinary Surgeon, who is well-versed in both the Allopathic and the Homœopathic schools of medicine, really I should say schools of thought also, and a qualified Chemist, who is the head of an important educational institution in Colombo. Now this almost sounds like a commercial quiz but I can assure you that there will be no quiz at all although you might start guessing as to who the personalities on this Panel are. In the meantime, I am going to ask Dr. Harish Chand to give us very briefly his ideas on Homœopathy. What is Homœopathy and what is the Homœopathic approach to disease?

D.H.C.—I could start by saying that the word Homœopathy has been derived from two Greek words meaning similar suffering. The word was coined by Hahnemann to express the law of similars in therapeutics—*Similia Similibus Curentur* in Latin, which translated into English means "let likes be treated by likes." This law means that when a drug given to a healthy person produces a certain set of symptoms, when similar symptoms arise in disease that drug will act curatively. This is the central principle of Homœopathy. To explain it in modern terminology, I would like you to liken it to the field of allergy. Therein you find, and for that matter in the entire field of vaccine therapy you find, that the same substance or a similar substance that causes a particular illness is also used curatively to desensitize the person as it is said, or in vaccine therapy to immunize the person against that same disease. Herein we come very close to what the orthodox or the Allopathic system thinks. Now another point of similarity in this same field of allergy is that when you are using a like remedy, by experience it has been found that you have to use the small dose. For instance such allergy may be to a certain type of protein, egg, fish, shellfish or pollen from certain flowers. Since the person is already highly sensitive or allergic to it if he was given that in a massive dose

he will feel very much worse. As already said they have found by experience that the dose has to be reduced. So where the medicine is used on Homœopathic principle or something similar to Homœopathy, therein the second principle of small dose has also to be applied. Thirdly, one of the tenets of the Homœopathic school is a strict individualization. Every patient is to be considered in his entirety, in his mind-body complex and patients suffering from the same disease may need different remedies. Now herein you find that in the field of allergy also it is not possible that the same desensitizing agent may be applicable to different patients of the same disease. Take for instance, patients of allergic asthma. One of them is sensitive to a certain type of protein, say shellfish, another one is sensitive to another type of fish, a third one is sensitive to hay pollen, a fourth one to house dust or emanations or dandruff of animals. Thus you have got different people suffering clinically from the same disease—allergic asthma, but their disease manifestations are brought on by different causative factor i.e. the allergen is different in each different case. When you want to cure them or desensitise them, which is quite distinct from the suppressive therapy by use of antihistaminics, then you use the same substance to which that particular patient is sensitive. If a patient is sensitive to dandruff of cat or dog, you cannot use extract from the pollen of flowers in order to cure that particular patient. Because of such similarity I have always maintained that the field of Allergy and Vaccine therapy is a meeting ground between the people of the Homœopathic school and the people of the Allopathic school. In both these you have got the principle of using the same substance which can cause the disease, you have also got the use of the small dose and you also have individualisation. So these are some of the principles of the Homœopathic school.

L.R.W.—Doctor, would you agree with what Dr. Harish Chand has said?

Allopath—Before I commit myself to an answer to that question I would like to ask a question to Dr. Harish Chand myself. Do you claim that Homœopathy has an answer to all diseases? Or do you restrict yourself to certain groups of diseases, such

as allergy or diseases against which a certain individual could be immunized or his defensive mechanism can be built up?

D.H.C.—No, I will say to all diseases. Barring surgical conditions and barring accidents, otherwise all diseases.

Chemist—All curative diseases.

D.H.C.—Yes, all curative diseases, of course. There is the old Japanese saying that medicine can only help a man not destined to die. Well after all no pathy has found an answer to death. Homœopathy can treat all ordinary diseases, yes, certainly.

Allopath—Up to a point Allopathy has been indulging in this form of treatment, where we have been immunizing people against certain specific diseases we have achieved the same amount of results. But there is a large reservoir of diseases and this reservoir is getting bigger and bigger as new diseases and new organisms which cause diseases are being discovered. We find that a large number of diseases are coming into popularity, into vicious popularity I will put it, because new organisms are finding new diseases. Is Homœopathy keeping pace with the progress of diseases?

D.H.C.—Doctor, your question interests me intensely. Homœopathy has no new diseases and a Homœopath is not caught napping. He has an answer to every disease because his science has been made fool-proof by the recording of symptoms in the ordinary man's language and not in diagnostic terms.

L.R.W.—In other words you do not treat the disease as such, you treat the personality.

D.H.C.—Yes. Well, there is a subtle difference. As it is put, "you treat the patient and not treat the disease". What it really means is that you treat the individual, the way he is affected by that particular disease rather than the disease name. For instance, for the same disease diagnosis or pathological diagnosis, there may be a number of remedies each varying in their individual symptomatology to a slight extent.

Chemist—For instance, take the case of diabetes, it is due to mal-function of a particular organ. Now would there be a remedy or a course of treatment according to Homœopathy.

D.H.C.—There would be a course of treatment but diabetes

will not need one particular remedy. You can't say that this is "the remedy" for diabetes i.e. for all patients of diabetes. You can say that this is the remedy for Mr. so & so, for that particular individual. It is the way that particular person is made. Homœopathy is the one system of treatment that takes cognizance of a man's mind and of his physical ailments i.e. a Homœopath considers the psychosomatic aspects of every patient. A Homœopath thinks that all medicine is psychosomatic. We feel that mind and body are interwoven into one unit and so while treating, we take into consideration all his symptoms and all his traits in the physical, mental, moral and spiritual aspects.

L.R.W.—So your answer to the Allopath's question is that Homœopathy is modern and up-to-date for all time.

D.H.C.—Yes, it is like this. Taking recent examples, we have had epidemics of two new diseases in India. One was Asiatic flu. It was found that the virus had changed. By the time new vaccine was being prepared the epidemic had already vanished. What advantage did that vaccine serve? But an influenza according to symptoms, whether it was the big influenza pandemicus of 1919 or the present one, showed no difference and therefore the Homœopathic remedies which worked then will also work now. This is because we have got remedies written for different set of symptoms and not so much for the disease diagnosis of influenza or for a particular type of virus influenza. The virus has now changed and they are going to change. They are low forms of life and they have many generations in a day and big macroscopic colonies of even such tiny microscopic things can show up in the course of hours on culture media. So, therefore, for them mutation is easy. If human beings have during the course of many generations altered slightly in the process of evolution, how greatly modified can be these little things, which are unicellular or some of them are not even that. They will go on modifying and if an antibiotic is used for a particular set of organisms these organisms mutate and the new generations or strains are resistant to that antibiotic and so becomes valueless. Well, in Homœopathy it is not so because those symptoms of the patient, which are the

body's reaction to disease, remain the same. In influenza the state of fever, aching in body, catarrhal signs, thirst etc. in all its details are what we need. The common man's language of his symptoms is the same as it was 30 years ago. So this epidemic of Asiatic Flu offered no difficulties to the Homœopaths. Another new disease which cropped up recently in India was the Mystery disease. It was considered to be a form of encephalitis and inostly affected children. For this particular disease the Allopathic profession, inspite of all their advances, which are considerable, felt quite at sea. Because, firstly, the cause could not be discovered as it was something quite new and secondly, the virus was not affected by all the known antibiotics. It was something absolutely new and the attack was very violent and very quick. Within hours, before the patient could be got to the hospital, the child was no more. The Homœopaths treated this disease very successfully, most of the cases with a drug called Belladonna because the symptoms were—violent onset, red flushed face, throbbing carotids, dilated pupils and delirium corresponding to the Belladonna type. So whether it was 1850 or it is in 1960 it all means the same. Therefore, for us it is not a new disease because the language of nature has not changed, it is only our diagnostic terms which may go on changing.

Allopath—Don't you concede this point that although they may be the same organisms but as time goes on they change their virulence and different set of symptoms and clinical pictures are brought into play.

D.H.C.—I quite agree. When the clinical symptoms change we have another remedy corresponding to that state, regardless of the causative germ. It is because we are acting primarily on the soil, on the body and not on the seed. We try to make that soil, the body, capable of tackling the organism e.g. whether it be para-typhoid, or paratyphoid B or C or typhoid itself, the clinical symptoms are very similar and the same remedies will tackle all of them equally well.

Allopath—Take some of the acute infections, some of the diseases which untreated will kill a patient in 24 to 36 hours or so or in 3-4 days. Now are you suggesting that in your

science you can build up the reserves or immunise a patient so fast and quickly as to produce the same results as the allopathic medicine has which aims at killing the causative organisms? Take, for instance, Pneumonia or virus infections or any of these acute infective fevers for which there are specific remedies. Do you claim to have the answer to those diseases?

Chemist—May I also ask one question in here. We have said that the germs or bugs are being killed. How is it that they are capable of producing other generations of organisms that are resistant to that particular agent that we are employing now?

Allopath—That is a peculiar feature of these organisms that they keep on mutating.

Chemist—That means they can't be killed, they are still alive.

Allopath—At any rate the immediate results are these that we are able to achieve concrete positive results with facts and figures to show that this particular remedy or drug is more effective than the one we used a few years before. Can you, for instance, give us statistical data to show that under Homœopathic treatment results from Pneumonia or typhoid or paratyphoid or acute infective hepatitis beat the Allopathic or even approximate to those figures? Can you give us the figures?

Chemist—The only kind of figures that I can think of are for of that famous epidemic of cholera that did take place during the time of Hahnemann himself and was sweeping through Europe. Of course, I must admit that they did not have the armamentarium that the modern allopath has. Nevertheless, the approach to the thing is the point. Hahnemann prescribed on the symptoms that were given to him and the remedies were found to be very effective.

Allopath—But Allopathy 50 years ago was more or less practising Homœopathy in the broad sense of the term. We did not have so many specific remedies. But in the last 10 years, the advances in Allopathic field are so considerable that we have specific remedies and we are able to achieve much better results than the figures that we had been able to achieve 15 years ago. Now can you alongside give us the figures to

show that with our method of approach we claim just as good results. So far no published figures have appeared anywhere.

L.R.W.—I can't understand how a Homœopath can give figures of that nature. They do not treat the disease as such. According to Dr. Harish Chand a Homœopath does not treat the name of disease, he treats the person.

Allopath—The science of Homœopathy and Allopathy are concerned with the prevention and cure of diseases, of human ailments. We are only concerned with that. No matter what the abstract approach of Homœopathy is, from the practical point of view how many patients suffering from Pneumonia or Syphilis or Gonorrhœa or Tuberculosis are curable under the Allopathic treatment and what is the percentage of cures in a similar group of diseases under Homœopathic treatment?

Chemist—Now the point is this. The advantages of the Allopathic school against the accepted Homœopathic way of treating is that there are several more hospitals wherein we have got a chance of working in and getting better results than the Homœopaths can because they are a very small group. They have not been given the recognition that they deserve from accepted points of view. So for statistical figures we have got groups to treat on.

Allopath—But as against that even in Western medicine, there are so many practitioners—private practitioners, general practitioners, who have no access to public institutions or hospitals. But they keep their own figures and records and if they are interested in a particular disease or if they have discovered a particular line of treatment which they have found advantageous they are able to publish figures and we can accept them purely on statistical data.

D.H.C.—My friend has just said that "with recent advances we have gone much further and our armamentarium is very much more and the results are much better". I take my hat off to those people who have done so much to advance it or reduce human ailment. But the point is that whenever controlled studies have been made with Homœopathy, it is not that how it works, how quickly the body immunises itself, how quickly it is going to mobilise its resources and fight with the bacteria,

whether the disease be of a fulminating nature that kills a man quickly or of a slow nature or lingering type, all the same the results show that it can act very quickly. So much so that in the very acute illnesses Hahnemann has said that you sit by the bed-side of the patient. If within half an hour or an hour he is no better, your medicine has not been correctly selected. I thank you for giving this reference of Cholera. That is just what I meant by saying that Homœopathy does not know any new diseases. For any new disease it has got its answer because it is not bothered with the diagnostic label, with the germ, with the seed, it is bothered only with the soil.

Allopath—I have no quarrel with the basis of your science from the scientific point of view. I accept all that you say, that your approach to the cure of disease is different from ours. What I am concerned with is this. In so far as your method of treatment is completely different from ours, if you make a claim as to its superiority or even approximating efficiency with the other one, the only basis on which I can accept the validity of your argument is on a basis of statistical proof that these are the figures we obtain as against yours. Until the time such results are produced, with due deference to the system in respect of which I have no argument whatsoever, I am rather indifferent about it.

Veterinarian—Can't we agree that all our statistics are a form of lies?

Chemist—As a Chemist I would not agree to that.

Allopath—No person who has any pretensions to be a Scientist of any form will dare publish any figures which will not stand the test.

Chemist—The only thing is that there are so many hospitals e.g. in Mexico I think Homœopathy is fairly well established. In India there are a number of hospitals which are fairly well established. Surely there must be statistics available in those places. The only thing that we can't have is the kind of statistics that the doctor is speaking about, namely controls—one set to be treated with one system of medicine and the other set to be treated with the other system of medicine. With human beings you just can't do that.

Veterinarian—May I ask one question? There was a point raised by Mr. Wijemanne here to the effect that Homœopathy deals with the individual and not the named disease. Now if a person is coming on to a Pneumonia and shows symptoms which may not end in Pneumonia, might clear up on its own but is treated in the Homœopathic way. Can we safely say that it is a statistical cure as case No. 1 against Pneumonia?

Allopath—We assume that the person who is carrying out these investigations with the intention of producing as proof in support of a certain case, he will be sure of every step that he takes. If he produces phoney results then they are not worth the paper on which they are written.

L.R.W.—I think the Homœopathic school suffers from a disability here, for instance, in Ceylon it has not been recognised, no opportunities have been given to its practitioners to maintain statistics of this nature. In India, I do not know what the position is probably it is much better. They have hospitals, recognised hospitals there, where they can keep those statistics.

Allopath—My own feeling is that Homœopathy has steered clearly away from acute infective diseases.

D.H.C., Veterinarian and Chemist—No, no, on the contrary.

L.R.W.—I think the others will disagree with that.

Chemist—I know of several cases which had gone so far as to. . . .

Allopath—You mean chronic cases for example.

D.H.C.—I am not talking of those but of very very acute conditions. I have a large practice myself and in my practice I have both acute and chronic cases. I never have any occasion to use allopathic medicines. There is nothing to stop me from using it.

L.R.W.—Yes, you are qualified in both systems.

D.H.C.—By hippocratic oath I am supposed to do the best for my patients but the occasion just has not arisen. I know I can tackle all of them by Homœopathic medicines and better. As a matter of fact it is supposed, rather it can be shown, that when acute diseases are treated with Homœopathic remedies you are not only clearing the toxic part of the illness, like drop-

ping down the temperature etc., you are even clearing out the entire pathology much earlier than when you give antibiotics say in Pneumonia, for example. This has been shown by taking a series of X-ray pictures. If you give penicillin or the appropriate anti-biotic, you find that although the temperature drops but the inside resolution is not hastened to the same extent as it would be with the Homœopathic medicines. As far as the statistics are concerned, the point is that Allopathy has improved a lot but Homœopathy had the same results 100 years ago. Whatever the statistics then were they are still as good, they will be even better.

L.W.R.—Is it correct to say that Homœopathic remedies restore the balance within a person.

D.H.C.—Oh, yes. Certainly. Even some Allopathic medicines act through the body e.g., Sulpha drugs. They were initially introduced as if they were going to get hold of the bacteria and just kill them inside the body. But it actually does not happen like that because if you put it in vitro, in a test tube, it does not happen. You have to have the serum also. That means that the serum is doing something in this complex picture in order to enable it to kill the bacteria. The human body does come in.

Chemist—The body is not like a chemical factory or a test tube. It just does not do that alone i.e. the killing of bacteria alone is not sufficient to cure the disease. Am I right?

Allopath—This is true. Even there are several drugs in our own pharmacopœia, as Dr. Chand has mentioned just now, which do not aim at directly destroying the causative micro-organisms. We create certain environments hostile to the multiplication of the particular organism and the individual shakes them off. So we really practise Homœopathy on a much more scientific basis.

Chemist—I don't know. For instance, if you are using the direct products of disease and pushing them, pumping them, into the body, I would hardly call that scientific approach to disease. Whereas the Homœopathic method of doing it would be to extract it, take dilutions of it where finally there will be nothing material of the original substance left and then use that for the purpose. I would hardly call your method scientific.

very large strides in the last 15 years. Until then we were depending quite a lot on the indirect approach to the cure of diseases, which Homœopathy is based upon.

D.H.C.—Well, at that time nobody admitted it.

Allopath—But we claim this position now that in so far as advances are concerned, whereas Allopathy has progressed considerably on a scientific basis, but in Homœopathy you have more or less remained static.

Chemist—I contest that, doctor, because every new chemical that is discovered would be a part of the Homœopathic armamentarium.

D.H.C.—In other words, the Allopathy of today says that the Allopathy of yesterday was nonsense and the Allopathy of today is a science. Well, I say Homœopathy does not change. The science of yesterday remains the science of today. Not that the science of today, makes it the nonsense of yesterday.

Allopath—No, we mustn't use the word nonsense because I don't think it is a very scientific term to use but what we maintain is this that whereas in Western medicine years ago there were certain dark obscure pockets, which remained obscure for a long time and research and progress and investigations have gone on and on and every new discovery has been a positive advance over what we were practicing previously.

Chemist—Doctor, I am rather doubtful of the question of this progress, of the term progress, for the simple reason that when Cortisone was first discovered it was hailed as the last word in the treatment of arthritis and so on.

D.H.C.—Medicine discoveries in Allopathy are like fashions.

Chemist—Now it was only the other day that I read a pamphlet by the British Medical Association which warned people against the frequent use of Cortisone.

Allopath—Well, every drug has got to be used with discretion.

Chemist—Quite so, with a lot of discretion. Therefore all this progress that we talk of is not quite so in reality.

L.R.W.—Well, I am afraid we have to call off discussion

at this stage. We have gone on to the very last second almost. I am very grateful to Dr. Harish Chand for coming along this evening and also to the three distinguished Ceylonese on the panel who have kept alive this discussion on a most interesting subject Homœopathy. I think we are agreed that there is a lot of good in both sciences. Don't you agree, doctor.

Allopath—Oh, yes, quite.

L.R.W.—Both sciences can treat all diseases. We have been told that this evening and I am sure with the recognition of Homœopathy shortly in Ceylon, we will be able to produce the statistics which the Allopathic doctors need to prove the efficacy of this, what is new to Ceylon, this new system of medicine—Homœopathy. Well, thank you very much and good night.