

gested this in homœopathically potentized form as the remedy. A small quantity of the salt was procured, a homœopathic potency rapidly made, and administered. Improvement soon set in and recovery happily followed. The infant patient, saved by *Mercurius cyanatus*, lived to do most brilliant work with this same remedy when practising in St. Petersburg, and *Mercurius cyanatus* has taken a sure place at the head of remedies for this affection. The local symptoms are very clearly defined, and among the generals cyanosis is a leading indication. Villers had better results in the 30th than with any lower attenuation. *Mercurius cyanatus* is also a very effectual prophylaxis in diphtheria. In the sensational New York poisoning case of February, 1889, Mr. Henry C. Barnett, the victim, was treated for diphtheria by his doctors before the cause of the illness was discovered.

—*The Layman Speaks, Jan., '57.*

PRINCIPLES OF HOMŒOPATHY

DR. ARTHUR W. RECORDS, M.D., INDIANA

Homœopathic physicians, teachers and professors have written many books and articles. They gave lectures over the years on *Materia Medica*, *Homœopathic Therapeutics*, *History and Philosophy of Homœopathy*, the *Organon*, *Repertory*, *Principles of Homœopathy*, *Chronic Diseases* and many other important subjects.

One of the most recent articles written was *Principles of Homœopathy*, copyrighted in 1929 and published in 1947, by our own Garth Boericke, M.D., Professor of *Materia Medica* and *Therapeutics* at the Hahnemann Medical College Philadelphia, Pa., and Director of the Constantine Hering Laboratory. Other articles which helped in the writing of this paper were :

1. Hahnemann's *Organon*.

2. *Homœopathic Principles in Therapeutics* by Thomas H. McGavack, M.D.
3. *Organon of the Art of Healing* by C. A. Baldwin, M.D.

I believe you will agree with me that the great American public has, during the past several years, taken up the reading of more medical articles. The public also listens to radio and watches television with interest on medical subjects. Perhaps the most frequent topics are cancer, muscular dystrophy, heart disease, and diabetes.

We homœopaths have been lax in writing lay articles and those that have appeared in *Reader's Digest* and some few other magazines have been written by newspaper editors without correct information and have actually discredited rather than credited Homœopathy. It may be true that it is hard to get an article on Homœopathy published in national magazines, but we could ask that any articles printed receive the O.K. of the editorial staff of the *Journal of the American Institute of Homœopathy*.

It seems as though we have always known that frozen feet are best treated with snow or by putting them in ice water to thaw them out slowly and have found it to be the best treatment. Also burned fingers seem to respond well if held close to heat until the fire is drawn out.

Ipecac has been used as an emetic the world over and it has been proven effective in small doses for nausea and vomiting. Likewise poison ivy leaves have been used by grandmother in bread and butter sandwiches for the treatment of those with poison ivy dermatitis with success. So we have discovered the law of like cures likes or as Hahnemann would say, "Similia Similibus Curentur."

Homœopathy is the method of therapeutics founded on the fact that a drug given to a healthy person will produce definite symptoms; when similar symptoms arise in diseases that drug will act curatively if given in small doses.

We ought to understand that Homœopathy has to do only with pharmaco-therapy. Surgery, preventive medicine, immunology and diagnosis coincide with the beliefs of other physicians who hold a degree of M.D.

Our reason for existence as a separate school of medicine is only on account of our different attitude regarding the scope of usefulness of drugs in the treatment of diseases. Signs are not wanting in recent years that regular medicine is rapidly coming to the homœopathic viewpoint, but there can be no compromise until medical colleges include a homœopathic curriculum in their course of *Materia Medica*. Most of us realize that modern medical colleges teach very little regarding drugs or drug therapeutics. No doubt it is because of the belief of ordinary medical men that drugs are useful in a very narrow curative field, if any, and that there is no law for their administration and, lastly, that there is possible danger to the patient. This drug danger is not true of homœopathic drugs, as stated in the *Organon*. I quote paragraph 283, "No harm results if the remedy administered is not the correct simillimum since the patient will not be affected by a fine dose of the remedy to which he is not susceptible."

What Homœopathy had shown to be true a century ago is true today. Symptoms of disease and symptoms of drugs do not change and that is the rock on which the basis of Homœopathy rests. Critics often say that Homœopathy does not progress and fails to avail itself of the advances in the medical field and has been negligent in research work. This is a very inaccurate statement and the homœopathic attitude towards medical "progress" is simply this: "Advances," "new discoveries," are too often shown to be but the fad of the hour. This is not confined to drug therapeutics, although most frequently seen in this field. Back in 1918 aspirin was advanced as a panacea for disease only to be proven far short of such claims. We as homœopaths resent drug salesmen trying to sell us new combinations, new serums, and new "sure shots," which proves in itself the ever-changing uncertainty of the drug products offered. A remedy to be efficient must stand the test of time having a good clinical record before adoption.

What is the difference between the two schools of medicine? The homœopath, due to his particular knowledge and training, is enabled to use drugs as curative agents for a host of diseases. While the opposite school, according to its know-

ledge and training, have a scant half-dozen curative drugs and the rest of its *Materia Medica* is largely palliative.

Research in medical centres is almost exclusively devoted to immunology and bacteriology in the broadest sense. Research in Homœopathy has taken the form of drug experimentation, the so-called "proving," and deductive clinical application in drug work. Neither is complete without the other.

Over one hundred years have proven the reliability of its tenets, and its principles should have made some impression on medical practice and educators.

Surely one thing that the public can thank Homœopathy for is the small dose.

Dr. Hahnemann advocated careful histories and also attention to personal hygiene, diet, fresh air, all of which medical practice adheres to today.

It is my belief that the public does not understand that a homœopathic physician takes all the courses in surgery, preventive medicine, diet and so forth that any medical student studies and also concerns himself with the homœopathic *Materia Medica* and Therapeutics which is an addition to the medical course prescribed by the standard medical schools which leads to the degree of M.D.

Homœopathy holds that first the cause must be removed if such be known, this endorsing surgery by emphasizing the fact that often a homœopathic remedy will help materially in post-operative recovery.

Chemistry, and especially colloidal chemistry, has done much to throw light on the principles of homœopathic drug action. Every homœopath knows that dried plants are frowned upon by homœopathic pharmacists who ever seek to get the whole fresh plant and use it as a basis for our tinctures.

It is generally believed that diseases run a regular course, yet homœopathic physicians by good homœopathic prescribing, have cut short many acute diseases. Medical men will say, "Oh well, he would have gotten well anyway."

So far we are unable to state just how homœopathic drugs effect a cure, but experience by our group over the years has

clinically proven without a doubt that they are effective. Perhaps science will be able to aid us and explain more fully the action of the homœopathic potencies as science has done for the picture industry. Recently it discovered that instant electronic change on the film was the thing that produced the color in the picture instead of the old impression that it was due to a chemical process. I only state this as there is a possibility that electronics may be the answer we are looking for to prove Homœopathy so that the doubting Thomases may be able to grasp the full significance of homœopathic principles.

We are taught that all diseases that we as human beings are subjected to have constant symptoms. So drugs proven by the Hahnemann method on the healthy human being present constant regular symptoms. With these two constants we are able to prescribe with accuracy and consequently obtain gratifying results when disease symptoms and drug symptoms are alike. A careful homœopathic prescription based on the totality of symptoms invariably leads to better results.

When a healthy person takes a medicine for experimental reasons certain effects are produced. Changes in body functions, secretions and sensations. These collective phenomena are spoken of as drug proving. When arranged schematically and written down, they are known as a drug pathogenesis. These pathogenetic effects evaluated, interpreted, and abbreviated form the homœopathic *Materia Medica*.

This study of pure, single drug effect is a distinctive feature and the foundation of Homœopathy. It is also an original contribution by Hahnemann to medical research for which he deserves the greatest credit.

Hahnemann pointed out that the greatest poisons have proven to be our greatest medicines since drug proving is the very basis of our research. He should be given credit for first proving all of our important drugs. However, numerous societies and individuals have reproved many of these drugs and also others.

Brief rules for drug proving are given here :

1. Use a pure preparation. Nothing else of a medical nature should be taken at the same time.
2. Keep a written record.

3. Dosage : usually appreciable doses of the tincture or low potencies are taken first, followed by a proving with the middle and higher dilutions. In this way the whole effect of the drug is exhibited, both functional and pathologic.
4. Repetition : the drug is taken at different intervals, usually every two hours, until definite symptoms develop. As soon as this takes place, these symptoms should be allowed to show themselves without further medication.

Samuel Hahnemann took his training in Leipsic until 1775, in Vienna until 1777, and graduated in medicine in Erlangen in 1779. In medical practice he soon learned to distrust medicine and thus started to compile facts regarding drug action.

He was struck with the similarity of drug action to the symptoms that they were reputed to cure. In 1790, he undertook to test the action of Peruvian bark (*Cinchona*) by deliberately taking the drug until its symptoms were produced. It produced all the symptoms of an attack of ague, not only the chill, heat, and sweating, but several of the minor symptoms usually accompanying an attack. After the attack had passed off, he waited awhile, and on repeating the dose he repeated the experience. In other words, he found that the drug which he knew to be the best agent to cure ague would produce symptoms similar to ague, an unexpected and surprising result.

Could this indicate the existence of a general law applicable to other drugs or all drugs? Here was a drug producing on the healthy symptoms similar to those which he knew it cured. Hahnemann determined to investigate further. His object was to verify this intuition by the inductive method of research and see for himself the action of drugs in health and disease.

He pursued, with the aid of a few friendly physicians, records of the past for evidences of the treatment of diseases with similar remedies for the next six years before he ventured to publish anything regarding these experiments. Accurate records and painstaking observations free from dogmatic assertions were filed and led him to the conclusion that there was a law of drug action which he expressed in Latin "Similia Similibus Curentur."

This was the first great step towards modernism in medical thought and practice.

Hahnemann, by introducing into medicine the method of experimentation on healthy human beings to ascertain drug action, founded the science of Pharmacology.

The introduction of this method of scientific drug experimentation is another of Hahnemann's great contributions to medical science. Harvey, three centuries ago, declared that "Wise men must learn anatomy not from the decrees of philosophers but from the fabric of Nature herself."

Hahnemann led his contemporaries to the study of remedial agents, to the questioning of nature, to experiment and observation. His later followers simplified such work in the laboratory which has become the most influential factor in modern education. The legitimate results of this method of drug study gives us the science of drug pathogenesis, the symptomatology of drug effects on the comparatively healthy, pharmacological studies and experiments on animals.

The science of drug pathogenesis is its application to the cure of diseases according to the law of Similars, by which all these observed effects may and can be utilized. This application is an art, the Art of Homœopathy. It is not a science but a method of drug usage only, a specialized department of pharmaco-therapeutics. An art, like all other arts, is a thing of growth, of development, perfected by increase of the knowledge and science upon which it is founded. Hence the importance of our study and the continued development of this science of drug effects on the healthy. Every disease is expressed by symptoms, so when a outstanding group of symptoms are regularly found in a sick individual we speak of them as a disease. It must be emphasized that homœopaths treat symptoms with a curative end in view. Homœopaths claim this right by using the symptoms of a case and applying the principles of Similia.

The cause is always removed or treated if possible. Failing this, the only dependable alternative is a homœopathic prescription. This is accomplished by the dynamic use of total drug influence or, putting it in another manner, by making use of

potentization and using the totality of symptoms as a guide for administration.

In proving drugs, records are made in case of direct provings on healthy human beings, but poisoning cases never yield profitable symptomatology on account of the violent invasion by foreign destructive agents. However, if small doses are given, we obtain finer and more characteristic symptoms and a clearer picture of drug effects. Fortunately the bulk of the homœopathic Materia Medica is made up from this source. The symptoms obtained from toxicological observation and from provings are called pathogenic symptoms and the full record in the order of their development is called the drug pathogenesis.

There are two classes of symptoms in drug proving, basic and determinative. Basic or absolute symptoms are those that appear in every proving. They have little value in homœopathic prescribing : malaise, headache, weakness, eruptions, fever, and pain. Determinative symptoms are individual or personal ones if found in drug. These symptoms whether encountered in disease or a drug proving are alike and usually consist of :

1. Modalities
2. Mental symptoms
3. Qualified basic or absolute symptoms
4. Strange, rare, or particular symptoms as mentioned by Hahnemann.

With the above information we are ready to check our first patient, inquiring into his symptoms with the following rule :

1. Locality or seat of action
2. Sensation or kind of action
3. Modalities

After the case taking we now must evaluate the symptoms. Mental symptoms, if well marked, are of the highest grade of importance in homœopathic prescribing and take precedence over the others.

General modalities are second in importance, e.g., just how this particular individual reacts to seasons, heat, cold, time of day, etc. Cravings and aversions also help. Other determinative symptoms are the strange, rare and particular ones about which Hahnemann has spoken.

Clinical symptoms are those which do not appear in the proving, yet have been moderately relieved by the same drug given for another purpose. It is to be assumed that had the proving been extensive enough such symptoms would have been produced.

Bryonia is a good example. It is helpful in pleurisy and pleurisy pains, but these were not marked in the provings. Again we must take into consideration for good homœopathic prescribing the totality of both the basic and determinative symptoms. Much emphasis has been put on prescribing the single remedy in the minimal dose to accomplish the desired effect.

Case taking is most important. It should include physical examination. Avoid leading questions, accept no diagnostic symptoms of the patient, notice any alternations of symptom groups, such as bronchial symptoms, skin manifestations, gastric and rheumatic complaints as well as seasonal and periodical variations. Ask about diet and former medications.

After all the symptoms have been taken, separate them into basic and determinative classes in order to make the selection of the indicated remedy for a cure of the patient.

Much has been left unsaid regarding the use of repertories, dosage, and the homœopathic methods of preparing medicines. Yet perhaps this paper will create a genuine interest in Homœopathy so that the reader will want to continue his study of the Principles of Homœopathy.

—*Journl. of the Am. Inst. of Homœopathy, Sept. '56.*
