

Nothing can be a happier news than this of unique achievement on the part of the authorities of the British Homœopathic State Faculty. This will surely give an impetus to Homœopathy to rise to her full stature in course of time. Notwithstanding some contrary opinions held by some of those connected with the British Homœopathic Association, we, still, stick to our previous idea of establishment of completely separate Homœopathic institutions as conducive to the best interests of Homœopathy both as regards its standard of teaching and spread of its practice.

B. K. S.

DISEASE

The word disease is compounded of two parts—"dis" plus "ease"—which denotes want of ease on the part of a living organism. It is a negative way of expressing a condition or a state. Positively disease indicates a suffering of the organism. Thus disease signifies an abnormal condition of the organism, just as health implies a normal condition of the same. Health and disease stand in the same relation to the organism as does quality to substance. In this connection we have to bear in mind one patent psychological fact. Our minds are compelled to divide the great whole into a number of fragments in order to study it, but in doing so we must always remember that our divisions have been made for our own convenience and are artificial rather than real. Things which are indivisible or inseparable are divided and separated by our mind. Abstractions are made out of a concrete whole and these, in their turn are mistaken for concrete entities. Thus the human mind has a faculty of creating prisons for itself and eventually fall into errors and dogmatisms. Structure and function, substance and quality and organism and its different states are inseparable as concrete wholes—whereas it is our mind which separate them and builds them into apparently independent entities. A disease is not a morbid entity if by

this commonly used expression is meant a rigid, unchanging sequence of characteristic events. Diseases are not comparable to animal or botanical species. We observe individuals suffering from pneumonia, typhoid fever, diabetes, etc. Then we construct in our mind certain universals, certain abstractions, which we call disease. Disease is a personal event. It consists of the individual himself. There are as many different diseases as patients.

But it would have been impossible to build up a science of medicine merely by compiling a great number of individual observations. The facts had to be classified and simplified with the aid of abstractions. In this way disease was born, and medical treatises have been written. A kind of science has been built up, roughly descriptive, imperfect, indefinitely perfectible and easy to communicate and teach. Hence the need of books like the "Practice of Medicine." The mental process of classification of diseases is necessary for marshalling of facts and retaining them in memory—though individualisation of diseased conditions is necessary for treatment according to the Homœopathic system of medicine.

Homœopathic conception of Disease:

Hahnemann holds that "in the healthy condition of man, the spiritual, vital force, the dynamis that animates the material body, rules with unbounded sway and retains all the parts of the organism in admirable, harmonious, vital operation as regards both sensations and functions so that our indwelling, reason-gifted mind can freely employ this living, healthy instrument for the higher purposes of our existence." Accordingly, *disease per se* is nothing more than an alteration in the state of health of a healthy individual caused by the dynamic action of external, inimical forces upon the life principle of the living organism making itself known only by *perceptible signs and symptoms*, the totality of which represents and for all practical purposes constitute the disease. It becomes, necessary, therefore, in homœopathic prescribing to carefully separate the pri-

mary functional symptoms which represent the morbid process itself from the secondary symptoms which represent the pathological endproducts of the disease. Homœopathy prescribes for the patient—selecting and being guided by symptoms which represent the morbid, vital process which preceded, accompanied and ultimated in the development of gross tissue changes. So we must bear in mind that with the morbific agents themselves homœopathy primarily has no more to do than it has with the tangible products or ultimates of diseases. And the knowledge of this fact will help us to avoid much of the needless controversies regarding the relation of pathology to therapeutics. Homœopathy takes its stand on perceptible phenomena, thus avoiding vain theories and hypothesis and minimising the chances of error and failure to their maximum.

Homœopathy holds that all functioning of the living organism depends upon a constant reciprocal action between the different constituents of the body within itself and of the organism as a whole with its environment, the external world and its constituents. Illness expresses the adaptation of the organism to a pathogenic agent or its passive destruction by this agent. Adaptation is an aspect of all physiological processes and of their physico-chemical components. It employs multiple processes to attain its end. It never localises in one region or one organ. It mobilises the whole body. So in illness the body preserves the same unity as in health. It is sick as a whole. No disturbances remains strictly confined to a single organ. Physicians of the orthodox school have been led to consider each disease as a speciality by the old anatomical conception of the human being. Homœopathy holds that only those who know man both in his parts and in his entirety, simultaneously under his anatomical, physiological and mental aspects—are capable of understanding him when he is sick. For the total disease syndrome is made up of, *first* by the reactions of the central life mechanism; *secondly*, by the

special contributions which the various systems of the body when diseased may make to these syndromes; *thirdly*, by those modifications of those contributions which the patient's characteristic personality reaction can affect; and *fourthly and lastly*, by those elements in the syndromes for which the latter is entirely responsible.

B. K. S.

APPOINTMENT OF A HONORARY HOMŒOPATHIC
PHYSICIAN TO THE PRESIDENT OF INDIA

We are glad to learn that Dr. K. G. Saxena, B.M.B.S. (Cal.) the General Secretary, All-India Institute of Homœopathy, has been appointed as Honorary Homœopathic Physician to Dr. Rajendra Prasad the President of India. Our sincere congratulations go to Dr. Saxena who is noted for his indomitable zeal for the cause of Homœopathy. Though this appointment does not imply as yet the state recognition of Homœopathy it is certainly the thin end of the wedge driven home slowly but surely.

B. K. S.

EDITORIAL ARTICLE OF THE JOURNAL OF THE
INDIAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, JULY, 1949
HOMŒOPATHY

The Homœopathic Enquiry Committee appointed by the Government of India has finished its labours the result of which is awaited. Science has never claimed to know everything nor the scientific system of medicine can cure all diseases. On the other hand *homœopathy, or at least the more vocal and predominant section of it, like religion and politics has made that claim.* The history of scientific medicine has been more largely the story of the rejection of claims which have failed to stand the test of experimental demonstration. It has demanded the most stringest

THE HAHNEMANNIAN GLEANINGS

with which is incorporated

THE INDIAN HOMŒOPATHIC REPORTER.

Vol. XVIII

APRIL, 1951

No. 4

EDITORIAL

DISEASE (*Continued*)

In our previous issue of this journal, the essential nature of diseases was discussed. An attempt was also made for explaining the Homœopathic point of view regarding diseases. According to Hahnemann, disease is primarily a morbid dynamical disturbance of the vital principle or power which animates the organism, caused by the influence of some morbid agent external to the organism and manifesting itself by perceptible sensorial, functional and organic symptoms. Here Hahnemann went deeper into the problem of disease, and made some subtle distinctions between disease 'per se' and disease, as popularly understood by his 'allopathic' contemporaries. Not only did he make this assertion that health and disease are mental abstractions and not concrete realities but also he explained, in unmistakable terms, that disease is not a morbid entity, "if by this commonly used expression was meant a rigid, unchanging sequence of characteristic events and comparable to animals of botanical species. Disease, according to Hahnemann is essentially a morbid process due to disorderly action of the vital force. It is purely a dynamical disturbance of the vital powers and functions which may or may not ultimate in gross tissue changes. The tissue changes are no essential part of the disease but only the products

of the disease, which, as such, are not the object of treatment by homœopathic medication. It becomes necessary, therefore, in Homœopathic prescribing to carefully separate the primary functional symptoms which represent the morbid process itself, from the secondary symptoms which represent the pathological end-products of the disease. It is, therefore evident that with the morbid agents themselves Homœopathy primarily has no more to do than it has with the tangible products or ultimates of disease. This morbid vital process is by itself invisible and imperceptible. It makes itself known only by perceptible signs and symptoms, the totality of which represents and for all practical purposes constitute disease. That is why Homœopathy prescribes for the patient, selecting and being guided by the symptoms which represent the morbid vital process which preceded, accompanied and ultimated in the development of gross tissue changes e.g. tumours etc. Theoretically disease comprises both the elements e.g. imperceptible inner element, *viz.* the deranged vital force, and the perceptible outward element *viz.* the totality of symptoms which according to Hahnemann, is the outwardly reflected picture of the inner change. This dual aspect constitutes the whole of disease. They are really inseparable, though for the convenience of understanding our mind separates what is really inseparable. Thus Hahnemann writes in sections 5 and 6 of his *Organon*, first edition:

Sec. 5: It may be granted that every disease must depend upon an alteration in the interior of the human organism; this disease can be conceived mentally only through its outward signs and all that these signs reveal; in no way can the disease itself be recognised.

Sec. 6: The invisible disease producing alteration in the interior and the visible alterations in the exterior (the sum of the symptoms) together make what one calls the disease, both are the disease itself.

These and similar statements have been used as the basis for most devastating criticism applicable to Hahne-

mann's simile as well as for the construction of two divergent schools of thought within Homœopathy viz. the pathological school and the purely symptomatic school. The divergence of the above two schools of thought is based on the difference in the interpretation of the two terms—inner and outward or exterior. The traditional interpretation given and reads as follows: by internal alterations Hahnemann means the anatomico-pathological alterations inside the body which are to be contrasted with the external manifestations, the symptoms. The anatomico-pathological changes inside the body are unknowable, therefore the simile has no need of pathology. Therefore Homœopathy remains with the symptoms expressed by the patient and has no need of science. Some Hahnemannian Homœopathic physicians following Kent have pursued methods which justify this interpretation, other have been surprised that Hahnemann should have made this statement.

But the above interpretation is not the only analysis of possibilities; in fact, its acceptance leads to contradictions within the Hahnemannian doctrine itself. Another solution is given by Tischner: "On the one side Hahnemann knew the external manifestations to which belong the externally visible symptoms and also the corporally conceivable internal alterations of a pathologico-anatomic type, and on the other hand, the alterations of the vital force which he conceived as internal (immaterial) alterations." The 'external,' 'outwardly reflected,' etc., mean the body, the material, the mechanical; internal means the immaterial, the psychic, the living, the vital. The organ is "external," "outer; life, living, the inscrutable is the "inner", internal world.

Thus interpreted Hahnemann would have included all discoverable phenomena as indications for treatment and not merely the symptoms. To use modern example, the blood-pressure, urine analysis basal metabolic rate would all become elements of the totality of the symptoms. There is much to justify this interpretation because Hahnemann

actually speaks of visible alterations of the internal parts in contrast to the inward being of man. Moreover he states that everything which can be seen, felt or heard form indications for the selection of the remedy. Thus, according to this school, anatomico-pathologic factors are as important as functional symptoms in the application of the simile.

Now the problem of evaluating the place of pathological knowledge in relation to the knowledge of disease to cure it, is too deep to be discussed here. It requires a separate discussion which will be undertaken in some future editorial articles. Suffice it to mention here that structures and functions are the dual aspects of the same indivisible organism. One cannot understand the living being by studying a dead body. In reality, an organ separated from its nutritive medium no longer exists. We must not separate cells from medium and function from structure, as anatomy and Physiology as distinctive science, have done. Of course, we can supply our explanation why Hahnemann did not include such objective findings which constitute the science of pathology, in his growing *Materia Medica*, and why did he put over-emphasis upon the purely symptomatic and subjective phase. During Hahnemann's time Physiology was more a speculative science, the study of pathology was in a most elementary stage, histo-pathology was almost unknown and the modern diagnostic methods of examination whether physical, chemical, physiological or biochemical were then in the most rudimentary stage of development. As Hahnemann wanted to build a therapeutic system based on observations and experiments according to the methods of inductive logic nothing remained for him except the employment of symptoms which could be directly obtained and which did not admit of preconceived notions and hypothesis. The study of subjective symptoms is based on immediate and direct knowledge whereas the study of anatomico-pathological changes is based on indirect and inferential knowledge. The study of pathology supplies one with the knowledge of structures of organs and

tissues, derived from microscopical sections of dead tissues, more or less modified by fixatives and dyes; and this knowledge is brought to bear on diseased but living person by mental process of inference and analogy. There is always room for uncertainty and probability in such procedure which Hahnemann wanted to obviate. That is why he built *Materia Medica* solely on observed facts and styled it as *Materia Medica Pura*.

The scientific study of diseases must comprise classification and nomenclature of diseases. What was the attitude of Hahnemann with regard to those points, will be discussed in a succeeding essay.

B. K. S.

THE BOWEL NOSODES

By JOHN PATERSON, M.B., CH.B., D.P.H. (CAMB.), F.F.HOM.

INTRODUCTION

The name of one of your illustrious countrymen, Louis Pasteur, will forever be remembered as the founder of the science of bacteriology. It was he who first isolated and identified a specific germ and related it to a definite clinical entity (disease). Following upon his discoveries, medical science concentrated on the laboratory technique for the isolation and identification of a specific germ for each known disease, and the Koch postulates were accepted as the standard for declaring any germ capable of pathogenesis—of having power to cause disease. The motto of the medical profession is still *Tolle Causam*, find the cause, and to-day there are many who consider that germs are the only cause of disease and are working to discover the specific germ or virus for well-known clinical entities.