

any further progress of the disease is arrested quickly, and a lame baby begins to utilize its hands and legs as normally as ever in 3—7 days' time. None the less, confirmed cases of longstanding, extensive spinal lesion, given up by children's hospitals as incurable, regain the powers of their limbs, if treatment is carried on steadily for 1—3 years.

Lathyrus has found great favour with the American School of Homœopathy. Our British colleagues like Sir John Weir and Dr. T. D. Ross could not support our American colleagues. The Britishers recommend Gelsemium and Physostigma. While Gelsemium has been found to influence the course of the disease favourably in some cases, we have had upto now no experience with Physostigma. It has been kept in reserve for future trial. But however genuine the points of controversy on both sides, Lathyrus in Bœricke & Tafel's potencies has served me brilliantly on many occasions, and I have learnt to regard it as safe, constant and reliable.

THE WORLD'S PRESENT-DAY NEED OF HOMŒOPATHY

DR. ALVA BENJAMIN, M.B., Ch.M., F.F.HOM.

I recently had cause to compare the teaching and practice of medicine during my student days—1908-1913—with those of today, and I could not help being struck by the tremendous changes that have taken place during those 40-50 years.

You will notice I use the word changes and not advances, because I am not sure that one can justifiably use the latter term without considerable qualification. For instance, in my student days one often heard used the expression "Vis medicatrix naturæ"—the healing power of nature—as being the means by which patients recovered from their illnesses, helped no

doubt as we thought, by the remedies used or the operations performed. One thought more in those days of the patient as a whole : while today the patient as such is often forgotten during the intense investigations carried out in the laboratory or in the X-ray room.

Hear what Sir Henry Cohen, the Dean of the Medical School at Liverpool, has to say on this subject : "Man used to be regarded as greater than the sum of his parts ; a whole human being in health and disease and his reactions to his environment were not overlooked. But as the twentieth century advanced, the torrent of scientific discovery rushed on so impetuously that it all but engulfed the humanism of medicine. In the pursuit of knowledge, man was fragmented and his organs, tissues, cells and secretions subjected to intensive study. Unless basic medical training be directed to the study of the whole man in relation to his external and internal environments, it will be misconceived in aim, in structure and in balance."

It is indeed true that with the discovery of the sulphonamides and then of antibiotics, the fight against acute and chronic infections is waged with very much more success, than was achieved by the dominant school of medicine before their introduction. Some cases which used to be regarded as almost certainly fatal, such as tubercular meningitis, are now tackled with considerable assurance of success. And then there are the striking advances in thoracic surgery, particularly operations on the heart, which now enable surgeons to alleviate very considerably the lives of those with congenital cardiac abnormalities, or those acquired through an attack of rheumatic fever in childhood.

All honour must be given to those pioneers who have made these advances possible : and very many patients have reason to be very thankful to them and their disciples who have perfected themselves in these modern techniques. But, one must ask, have these modern miracles, as some people like to call them, been achieved under a completely cloudless sky ? A short survey of the history of medicine since the beginning of this century will unfortunately force us to say no.

As an example, let us briefly survey the changes in the

treatment of syphilis during these years. In 1905 Chaudinn discovered the organism responsible for this infection—the *Spirochæta pallida*. In 1909 Paul Ehrlich, after 605 experiments to find a drug that would be lethal to the *Spirochæta* but harmless to the tissues of the infected human being, arrived at the 606th experiment which produced Salvarsan, or "606" as it was called—an organic preparation of *Arsenic* which was thought to fulfil these requirements.

Many of my audience here today will remember with what éclat and enthusiasm this product of the inventive diligence of Ehrlich was received by the profession and hailed as the key to the terrible problem of the very wide distribution amongst the population in this and other countries of this complaint with its appalling sequelae. After 606 had been used for some time, however, it was discovered that it did not cure every case of syphilis; and what is perhaps more important, unforeseen side effects, or poisoning results, such as optic neuritis, etc., were observed in a small proportion of patients treated by this drug.

This development led throughout the years to many modifications of this remedy for which one after the other less toxic effects were claimed: and even the help of the old remedy, *Mercury*, was invoked to make more certain of the cure of the unfortunate patient. Then there appeared the artificial induction of malaria, especially for neurosyphilis. The latest treatment is by penicillin, which has a very dramatic effect on this disease. It remains still to be seen if this drug will go the way of all its predecessors. As a matter of fact the experts are still arguing whether the artificial induction of malaria and/or penicillin is the better treatment for syphilis, especially in cases of involvement of the central nervous system.

This type of sinister progression has been followed right up to the present day by very many of the modern drugs, even cortisone and some of the antibiotics, etc.

Take the case of *Cortisone*. Dr. L. C. Cope, Physician at the Postgraduate Medical School of London, has said: "*Cortisone* and *Corticotrophin* do not cure, they merely suppress some manifestations of disease."

When this remedy is administered in adrenal disorders such

as Addison's Disease, one cannot raise any valid objection to its use. It is then used as a substitution treatment just as insulin in diabetes. Occasionally *Cortisone* therapy is indicated to inhibit the uncontrolled activity of an abnormal adrenal, leading to pseudo-hermaphroditism in female infants and young adults and precocious puberty in males. But when one comes to consider its use empirically for so many diseases, including rheumatoid arthritis and disseminated lupus erythematosus, one wonders whether it is justified as it cures none of these, can only palliate while being administered, and if stopped, the disease may manifest itself in a much aggravated form. In a recent investigation carried out under the auspices of the Medical Research Council of Great Britain, it was found that in early rheumatoid arthritis, *Cortisone* was not more effective than aspirin in retarding the progress of the disease.

If this unpleasant development of possible aggravation were not enough, one has to remember the long list of side effects that have been recorded, true, in only a proportion of patients so treated, e.g., water retention, glycosuria, hirsutism, acne, amenorrhœa or oligomenorrhœa, psychoses, especially in collagen diseases; the activation of latent tuberculosis, the suppression of symptoms of very severe illnesses, e.g., pneumonia, peritonitis from ruptured peptic ulcer or gangrenous appendix, etc. Even a minority possibly so adversely affected should make us ponder very seriously before employing such a double-edged weapon.

I know that quite a number of physicians of the dominant school are disturbed by this problem of side effects of many of the modern remedies; but unfortunately they do not seem to know what to do about it, where to turn for an alternative. One does not see in the medical journals enquiries for an alternative, but yet there is such an alternative right on their doorsteps, if only they would open the door of their minds to it.

On this point let me quote from an address given by Sir Heneage Ogilvie of Guy's Hospital "To Those about to enter Medicine": "I regret that the advances I see taking place around me are for the most part in directions other than that I value most, the path of human kindness and mutual under-

standing, the medicine of Hippocrates and of the New Testament. We must allow all to speak and hear all with equal courtesy, the student and the professor, the small town practitioner and the Medical Research Council expert. We must allow every method, even the unlikely one, to have a trial unless it has been shown to be dangerous."

Let me read to you now what some authorities on the continent of Europe have to say about the use of modern, and especially synthetic, drugs. No doubt quotations along similar lines could be obtained from all five continents of the world. The *Volksgesundheit* of Zurich, published January, 1956, reporting a meeting of the Therapeutic Congress of Karlsruhe on the dangers of remedies, says that :

"Professor Dr. Eichholz gave instances of poisoning through remedies, and stressed the problem as a serious one. He was of the opinion that a reform which will disregard all financial interest of industries is absolutely essential.

"Dr. Wolff, Head of the Department of the World Health Organization for maniacal poisons, pointed out the great dangers which occur through the steadily increasing use of synthetic analgesics. These preparations, with an action akin to morphia, and of which he named a few, may cause dangerous forms of mania and should therefore be more strictly examined and controlled. For Germany Dr. Wolff proposed the system which had proved useful in other countries of prescriptions for all synthetic analgesics."

The report continues : "Dr. K. E. Haas from the Infant Welfare Clinic of the University of Frankfurt, mentioned the damaging action of special chocolate against intestinal worms, well spoken of all newspapers, and which consists almost entirely of a very poisonous substance, phenothiazine. In the Clinic itself were ten cases of serious poisoning, which resulted in nephritis, hepatitis and blood disorders. Propaganda does not mention the devastating results of uncontrolled use of such remedies. One is forced to ask oneself again and again how much longer responsible authorities intend to watch the process of progressive poisoning of humanity without taking action. This unwholesome state of affairs has meanwhile developed to such an

extent that only an immediate and drastic action can stop a catastrophe. Prohibitions alone are useless. The State has to decide on a system of health care which renders the abuse of synthetic remedies impossible."

In a recent report emanating from the World Health Organization about the abuse of such drugs as amphetamine, benzedrine, etc., very startling figures are mentioned as to the extent of addiction amongst young people in Japan: as many as 1½ millions is the figure given. This appalling state of things surely underlines the responsibility of us physicians when prescribing these drugs of addiction.

Again, this opinion was voiced during a meeting for the inauguration of the Institute for the Examination of Remedies in Munich. It was stated at this meeting:

"There are approximately 35,000 remedies available, of which scarcely one-third ought to be prescribed. This number is due to competition between firms, and the attempt to influence doctors through a continual flow of propaganda, letters, samples, etc. Indeed most remedies are no good."

Referring to this state of affairs Professor Dr. Heubner of Berlin said "that this attempt to influence the medical profession by such selfish motives and the yielding of many doctors to such influences was, in his opinion, one of the phenomena of the tendency to moral inferiority in our times, for it displaces the feeling of responsibility." He said "that on the whole, medical therapy is directed more by chemists, pharmacists, merchants and propagandists than by members of the medical profession. Often this hypnosis and auto-suggestion are not recognized and it is therefore clear that there is renunciation of a desirable inner order in this important field of remedies. . . ."

The report continues: "The English philosopher, Francis Bacon, had already said that the multitude of remedies is the daughter of ignorance; and at all times responsible doctors have agreed with him.

"The meeting concluded with the expression of hope that the new Institute for the Examination of Remedies may help to stop superfluous medicines. . . . The wish was also expressed that the Institute may lead to the growing recognition of the

abundance of useful remedies which Nature offers without tricks of propaganda."

Now some comments from Italy. In a paper read to the Italian Society of Medicine by Professors C. Frugoni and G. Guinchi, the former being the Chief of the Faculty of Medicine in Rome, it was stated that an "artificial recovery" brought about by the action of antibiotics when used in infectious diseases took place and attention was drawn to the complex immunological situations produced by their administration. The absence of usual symptoms was emphasized as well as the appearing of new symptoms, and the modification of the actual course of the disease. The writers further elaborated for instance how the development of an acute abdominal emergency may be masked by the administration of antibiotics—the usual classical clinical signs of such a condition being absent and so the patient's life may be very seriously jeopardized.

The inhibition of the natural curing processes was suggested and that it may be brought about by the bacteriostatic effect of the antibiotic limiting the quantity of antigen that can reach the antibody-making apparatus; and the phagocytosis tends to diminish the antigenic power of the infecting organisms.

Now regarding the risks involved in administering antibiotics, I would like to remind you of the baneful effects upon the eighth nerve causing vertigo, tinnitus and incurable deafness in some patients treated with streptomycin: I have met with two cases of mental derangement caused by the use of this drug in tubercular cases. Aureomycin and oxytetracycline may cause damage to the liver. Patients frequently become sensitized to some of these antibiotics if given in small doses for trivial complaints, so that when given larger doses for a subsequent more severe illness they may become seriously ill, and even deaths have been reported as a result of this allergy. Or, may be, the micro-organisms may develop resistant strains, so that they do not respond to the antibiotics when administered in a subsequent illness. This last development raises the query whether it is in the patient's best interests when undergoing a surgical operation that what is called an "umbrella" of anti-

biotics should be "opened" over the patient before the operation is commenced.

This problem is becoming a very serious one indeed throughout the world. Reports of even up to 89 per cent. penicillin resistant strains of staphylococci have been received from some hospitals in this country and in Canada. It has even been suggested that this, the safest of antibiotics, may soon have to be abandoned for the treatment of staphylococcal infections. Despite the use of new antibiotics mortality in staphylococcal septicæmia has risen to 50 per cent. in some institutions. And so one could go on were there time.

But even if this proportion of side effects could be lessened, or even eliminated by an alternative treatment, surely it would be an advantage to the health of the community if such an alternative treatment available were more generally used.

In a recent paper published in the *British Medical Journal*, Professor Kekwick of London has written: "Sulphonamides and antibiotics should never be used if less noxious remedies . . . would be as effective."

One would think that, realizing the risks of much of modern therapy, teachers of medicine would enquire whether there is an alternative: and when told, yes there is, would examine it and so diminish the hazards to which so many people are so needlessly exposed today. It would seem that the medical profession, together with the community at large, has become to some extent insensitive to these tragedies, no doubt through their having been conditioned by the appalling holocaust of tragedy during two world wars, particularly the last one. I think this fact is emphasized by the complacency with which the medical profession at large accepts the electric convulsive treatment and leucotomies for certain mental cases. Surely men are not meant to be subjected to such violent treatments.

When we come to the consideration of the therapeutics of chronic complaints very little attempt is made really to cure the patient. The profession is generally satisfied merely to suppress the most prominent symptom of the illness instead of trying to re-establish harmony between the ego, soul, or call

it what you will, and the physical body which this alternative treatment is able to do in many cases. In other words, for a cure we must get back to fundamentals of ill-health : and one of these is the disharmony between the ego or soul and the physical body, whose inter-relationship is often completely ignored by most physicians.

When a patient is found to have an abnormally high blood pressure which can have, and almost certainly will have, serious effects on the vital organs, all the guns of modern medicine in the form either of the latest vasodilators, or may be surgery, are brought to bear upon him. No treatment of the man as a whole is undertaken so as to try and restore the harmony which has been interrupted in the patient's make-up. We sometimes hear in medical discussions that the pituitary gland may be regarded as the conductor of the orchestra composed of the endocrine glands : but I suggest there is a still higher entity that controls this so-called conductor.

In infectious diseases too much stress has been laid generally on the role of the micro-organism, and not nearly enough on the host of the infecting agent. Surely to regard the micro-organism as the sole cause of the complaint, and the physical pathology set up by the presence of this organism as the whole picture of the illness is over simplifying the problem. The very word "disease" suggests some association with the consciousness : therefore there must surely be a psychic element in any disorder of the human being. In other words, all illnesses have their psychosomatic aspects and we should not confine that term, psychosomatic, merely to one type of disease.

Bearing on this contention of the wholeness of man in health and disease, I would like to read to you what Samuel Hahnemann, the founder of Homœo-therapeutics, wrote 150 years ago, and Dr. Bernard Phillips, who is not a medical man but a doctor of philosophy, of the University of Delaware, U.S.A., set out a mere two years ago in a paper entitled "Philosophy and Medicine". Hahnemann, in his *Organon of the Rational Art of Healing*, wrote :

"It may be granted that every disease must depend upon an alteration in the inner working of the human organism. This

disease can only be mentally conceived through its outward signs and all that these signs reveal ; in no way whatever can the disease itself be recognized. The invisible disease producing alterations in the inner man, together with the visible alteration in health, makes up that which is called disease : both together actually constitute the disease." In another part of the same work he wrote : "The unprejudiced observer, knowing the worthlessness of abstract observation which cannot be confirmed by experience, is unable, however acute he may be, to take note of anything in any single case of disease except the changes in the condition of the body and soul, which are perceptible by the senses, the so-called disease phenomena, symptoms, in fact ; in other words, he can note only such fallings away from a former state of health as are recognizable by the patient himself, the friends in attendance and the physician. All these perceptible signs make up together the picture of the disease. As then in disease there is nothing to pay hold of except these phenomena, the disease can only be related to the required remedy through the symptoms by means of which, in fact, it both makes known the need of the patient for help, and points to the kind of help that is required. Thus, this symptom complex, this outward reflection which is a representation of the inward being of the illness, is the only means whereby it is possible to discover a remedy for it, the only means which can indicate the most appropriate agent of cure."

Here Hahnemann suggests the basis of homœopathic therapeutics, namely "Similia similibus curentur" : "Likes may be cured by Likes." In order to bring out this similarity of symptoms, it is necessary to give drugs to human volunteers to see what symptoms they produce in a healthy human being. It is interesting to note that in 1949, Dr. R. B. Hunter, Professor of Materia Medica in the University of St. Andrews, Scotland, stated : "Drug proving under known conditions on healthy human volunteers is undoubtedly one of the important functions of my Department." He suggested that unless this were done any drug that had been tested only on animals had been insufficiently proved.

Bernard Phillips, in his paper "Philosophy and Medicine",

puts in a nutshell what I think. He deplors the divorce between philosophy and medicine, how the former has developed unto a purely intellectual discipline, and has ceased to be a guide to living; and how the latter has, in spite of its much boosted advances in recent years, degenerated very largely into a technological exercise and has to a great extent forgotten the whole man; by that is meant not only the physical aspect, but also the psyche of the individual. After enlarging on these statements, he puts before his readers some suggestions towards an integral philosophy of medicine, which for him must include five chief postulates:

"An adequate system of medicine will not merely be a science of medicine, it will be a wisdom of life. It will base itself on man in his organic wholeness and thus its theory as well as its therapy will reflect an adequately comprehensive view of human life, and not merely the partial viewpoint of this or that speciality. Its concern will be with persons and not simply with diseases."

How very obvious to those who not only look, but see: and how very true that is.

The second postulate reads:

"As man is a creature of many aspects and levels, diagnoses should reflect and therapies minister to the various levels of his being."

How truly does this statement reflect the homœopathic physician's approach to his patients.

Now postulate three:

"An adequate system of medicine will be one which tries to cooperate with Nature, not one which tries to outsmart Nature. It will recognize with proper humility that it is the *Vis Medicatrix Naturae*, which is the healing agent, and that the doctor is Nature's assistant, and not her master."

Could not this statement be interpreted as a condemnation of the violence of much of modern therapeutics?

Postulate four:

"An integral medicine will recognize that it is as much

an art as a science, and that healing is a relationship between two living personalities."

This applies, of course, to treatment carried out by a physician belonging to any school of medicine.

Finally, five :

"An adequate system of Medicine will be more concerned with agents than with patients. In other words, the sick individual has to take an active part in his treatment, not merely be the passive recipient of this or that treatment. In fact, each individual has a power within himself to help in his own cure."

It has always been my practice for many years to stress this point personally with my patients. I think that any fair-minded, clear-thinking and unprejudiced person must admit the truth of Phillips's thesis. Most of my audience will agree with me, I am sure, that the official medical schools in their teachings fall far short of such a broad-minded attitude to the science and art of therapeutics. Too much stress is too often laid on the work of the pathologist, the radiologist, the surgeon and ancillary branches of medicine.

Now I come to Homœopathy, an alternative system of therapeutics which does so very closely conform to these postulates. For the homœopathic physician does not seek specifics for named diseases, nor does he try to suppress individual symptoms with his drugs. Indeed, he maintains there are no diseases in the abstract, there are only sick persons. The homœopathist, when seeking for a remedy to help his patients, does not stop short when he has diagnosed the physical disease as does usually his more orthodox colleague. The homœopathist goes on to diagnose the patient as an individual, by recording his reactions to his environment in all its aspects, especially if those reactions have been altered by his illness. This is quite a different approach to the problem of therapeutics from that of the dominant school; this latter treats the symptoms of the patient by the use of contrary drugs, whereas the homœopathist treats the patient through the totality of his symptoms by drugs which produce similar symptoms in healthy people. The homœopathic remedy has no side effects and acts as a stimulus

to the patient's resistance to any infecting organism ; or helps to restore the harmony which has been interrupted between the ego and the physical body in complaints which are not due to any such infection.

The essence of Homœopathy is the matching of the drug proving with the patient's symptoms, and is not, as some people think, the minuteness of the dose usually employed. This minute dose, which may indeed contain no trace of the remedy which can be detected by ordinary analytical means in a laboratory can be shown by special electrical instruments to have a potency energy. This absence of material drug, but presence of potency energy, is one of the principal stumbling blocks to the acceptance of Homœo-therapeutics by the dominant school. They do not believe that such doses can possibly have any influence on the sick person. To overcome this difficulty the late Dr. W. E. Boyd of Glasgow, by means of a series of experiments in his specially equipped laboratory carried out throughout many years, has proved that potencies of the nature of the 30c can influence biochemical reactions and biological phenomena. His experiments have been subjected to statistical investigation and have satisfied a number of scientists in Glasgow who were more or less associated with him in his work, or were asked by him for an opinion on his results. We are expecting that some other investigator will before long carry out some further experiments to confirm this work of Dr. Boyd's. When this is done it is hoped that the medical teaching authorities will then be encouraged to investigate our clinical results. I maintain, however, that even before this laboratory confirmation has been achieved, these teaching authorities should investigate our method of therapy, as has been suggested in my quotation from Sir Heneage Ogilvie's statement : "that even the unlikely therapy should be given a trial unless it has been shown to be dangerous".

Sir William Osler, who was the Dean of the Medical School of the Johns Hopkins University, also Emeritus Professor at Oxford, and well considered one of the world's greatest medical teachers and authorities, has put this on record : "It is not as if our homœopathic brethren are asleep ; far from it, they are awake to the importance of the scientific study of disease.

It is distressing that so many good men live isolated in a measure from the great body of the profession. The grievous mistake was ours : to quarrel with our brothers over infinitesimals was a most unwise and stupid thing to do."

It is very interesting to note here that fairly recently in this country a case was won on appeal in the Law Courts, in which a firm was prosecuted for manufacturing and selling some veterinary homœopathic powders, which it was alleged were falsely described as medicine. This accusation was based on the fact that the Public Analyst had been unable to detect by the ordinary methods of analysis the presence of any medication. The appeal was based on the presence of potency energy which was demonstrated on the Emanometer of Dr. Boyd. A homœopathic physician gave evidence at the appeal that these powders, which were of 9c potency, could effect the claims made for them by the manufacturing firm. The Chairman of the Appeal Bench, in giving the verdict of the Court, described the case as a very interesting one. The result shows, in my opinion, that if our claims are considered with an open mind by individuals used to sifting evidence, the reasonableness and truth of these claims must be admitted.

Earlier on in this Address I have mentioned what might be regarded as a negative reason for the wider use of homœotherapeutics in both acute and chronic illness, i.e. the absence of side effects from our remedies. I would now like to point out very briefly some of the positive advantages that would accrue throughout the world if Homœopathy were more widely practised.

Much time and money is being spent on trying to find a cure for the common cold, so far without success. I venture to suggest that no such single cure can possibly be found as individual colds differ in the degree and quality of the coryza and lachrymation produced by the cold. Homœopaths, by individualizing in the treatment of their patients' colds according to these differences, have for very many years been able to abort a great proportion of such cases in a few hours.

In the treatment of all acute infective conditions the homœopathic physician chooses the remedy known to produce symp-

toms in a healthy person similar to those of his patient. The physician is thus able to cure his patient safely, quickly and comfortably. In the great majority of such cases there is no need to use antibiotics or sulphonamides.

In the treatment of First Aid cases in Britain, and no doubt in other countries, there is first hand evidence of the value of Homœopathy, not only in the home and the street but in the factories. In the factories the great diminution of absenteeism through accidents both minor and major is very striking when the factory medical officer has instituted homœopathic treatment in the First Aid posts. This fact should surely be of great interest to factory owners throughout the world. Here are three short extracts from three factory reports :

(1) From the Works' Medical Officer of a large Engineering Works in the West of England :

"Our Works' Manager (one of the firm's directors) has authorized me to say that he is quite convinced that Homœopathy has been of great service in the Works, especially in cases that have been given up as incurable by their outside doctors ; and to add that the Board of Directors has on more than one occasion congratulated the Works' Medical Officer on his results, and particularly on the low sepsis rate in the factory."

(2) From an electrical firm in Surrey :

"*First Aid.* (a) Wounds heal more quickly with little shock or pain ; (b) More than a first dressing is rarely needed ; (c) Great saving in time lost from work.

"*Welfare.* To raise resistance to colds, coughs and influenza a regular weekly dose of a properly balanced number of constitutional remedies was taken between September and May, resulting in a 25 per cent. immunity, the remainder suffering such mild disabilities that they were able to carry on working."

(3) From a jam factory near London :

"We have now had First Aid Homœopathy in use in our Works for the past four years and the loss of time from accidents is now practically nil. We have had during these four years the usual number of scalds, wasp and bee

stings, cuts, etc., but by treating the injuries in the proper way with Homœopathy no time has been lost from work. No blisters with the following troubles from scalds, no swelling from the stings and no delay in the healing of cuts. We have also been able to help with the common everyday ailments, such as acute colds, etc., and have reduced the time away due to sickness."

In the treatment of chronic cases, the homœopathic physician, by studying his patient as a whole, not only physically but mentally and morally, is often able to remove the cause of the patient's symptoms for which he has consulted his doctor. Undoubtedly this is a better method than merely suppressing the most prominent symptom of the patient, which is so often done nowadays.

Another noteworthy fact is that some homœopathic physicians claim with justice that none of their patients who have consulted them for rheumatic pains have ever developed into frank rheumatoid cripples. This is achieved by getting down to fundamentals and not merely dosing the patient with the latest analgesics.

Fissura in ano is often amenable to homœopathic therapy : and, believe it or not, even some tumours which the great majority of doctors would say only surgery could remove, can at times be cured with Homœopathy. I remember very well the case of a woman who had had some tumours removed from one of her breasts by a competent surgeon at one of the teaching hospitals here in London. A few months after the operation, not only did further tumours appear in that breast, but some appeared in the other as well. Further surgery was the only method of treatment offered to her at that hospital. The patient, however, declined this offer and decided to try homœopathic treatment, with the result that a permanent cure was effected. Fortunately the pathological report on the tumours originally removed at operation was obtained from the hospital. The pathological report was fibro-cystic adenomata. I think you will all agree that it is very interesting that such a condition was amenable to medical treatment.

I hope I have now given you sufficient reasons for demand-

ing, in the interests of the health of the community, that in medical schools throughout the world there should be removed all present obstacles to the inclusion in the medical curriculum of homœopathic therapeutics— at any rate in the first instance as a postgraduate study.

I have shown you that all is not well with the current official teaching and practice of medicine, and that homœotherapeutics is a method of treatment well worth much more serious consideration than has hitherto been given to it.

The present position of Homœopathy in this and no doubt in many other countries is a paradoxical one. Certain authorities in the land recognize the practice of Homœopathy while others refuse to do so, not because they have investigated it and found it wanting, but purely through prejudice. They will not take the word of those physicians who have practised Homœopathy or of those members of the public who have enjoyed the benefits of its administration, sometimes after all else has failed, that the claims made for it by responsible physicians are fully justified.

Here in Great Britain we know that the demand of the public for homœopathic treatment far outweighs the supply of doctors with a working knowledge of its principles and practice. No doubt the same is true in other parts of the world.

In some countries there is governmental recognition, but the professional medical teaching authorities refuse such acknowledgment. In other countries there is by law imposed such a restriction on the manufacture and sale of potencies that the practice of Homœopathy is very much hampered—to the detriment of the health of the people. How can this unhappy state of affairs be rectified ?

In truly democratic countries where Parliament and government are responsible to the will of the people and can be changed if necessary, by that "vox populi", it is not an impossibility, although it may not be an easy task.

In order to suggest a practical campaign it must be constantly borne in mind that it is the prejudice of the teaching authorities, and not their considered judgment based on knowledge of Homœopathy, that prompts their refusal when asked

by certain lay governing bodies should this acknowledgment be granted? This fact should therefore be quite unmistakably brought to the notice of these enquiring bodies.

I submit that any such authority wishing for a considered judgment on the subject should seek the opinion of a specially appointed body—mainly lay in composition—to investigate the claims of Homœopathy to such recognition. This body should be composed very largely of judicial individuals accustomed to assessing the value of evidence put before them and should also include homœopathic physicians as well as other doctors. In Great Britain I would suggest a Royal Commission should be so appointed. In other countries an equivalent body according to their custom. But it may be that the Minister of Health, who is the one individual in any democratic country primarily responsible for the health of the community, has the desire to advise the medical teaching authorities that all the obstacles to the full recognition of Homœotherapeutics must be removed. If, however, such a member of the Government does not have the inclination to take this necessary step in the interests of the health of the people, then the latter must take strong and effective action on their own behalf. In this way they can demonstrate to the Government the urgent need for action in this regard.

I know this suggestion may shock some of my professional colleagues as they have said to me what business is it of the public to “interfere” in the education of the doctors. To them I reply: “It is not an interference, but a justifiable attempt to make available to us all a safer and more pleasant way of being treated for our ailments, acute or chronic. In fact, it is an attempt to secure that fundamental human right of being treated in the safest way possible, rather than being subjected to unnecessary hazards when we are ill. I am fortified in this opinion by the fact that some years ago in a report of the Goodenough Commission on Medical Education in this country it is expressly stated “the public should take a lively and intelligent interest in the education of their doctors”.

Now in order to get such a Royal or other Commission appointed it will be necessary to stimulate and organize public

opinion to demand this necessary development of medical education by such means as articles in the press, both professional and lay, public meetings, writing to and lobbying members of Parliament, and even if necessary, petitions to the supreme head of the country, whether that person be a President or a Sovereign.

In conclusion, I should like to quote from a report on "Training the Doctor" by the Medical Curriculum Committee of the British Association :

"It is a matter for regret and concern that the rapid advances in medical knowledge and the development of the resources of medical science during the last fifty years have not resulted in a proportionate improvement in the general efficiency of medical practice."

It goes on to state : "The Committee believes that the cause of the failure to produce more good doctors lies much deeper than faulty education. It is to be found in the very conception of medicine and medical training on which in the past the curriculum has been based."

It proposed a drastic overhaul involving a different approach. It advocated a return to the Hippocratic approach, wherein was studied the whole man, his appearance, his habits, his work, his illness, and all that comprised his environment.

Then, in conclusion, the report continues : "With our wider knowledge of scientific medicine we have tended to lose sight of general principles in a wealth of detail : the individual patient is subordinated to an interest in the disease with which we label him. One of the most serious defects in present-day medical training is the failure to regard the patient as a whole. The student cannot be properly trained in this conception by the present method of dividing medicine into a number of distinct compartments taught separately."

Remember these words are not mine, but are contained in a report of a Committee of the British Medical Association. No homœopathic physician could state the case for Homœopathy more conclusively.

—*The British Homœopathic Journal, July-Oct., '56*