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

tests before admitting the validity of any knowledge and maintains that even so it is only a matter of probability in many cases. The same cannot be said of homoeopathy, judging from the available literature on it and the claims made by its practitioners and sympathisers in India. It, like politics and religion, tends to claim that its knowledge is certain and irrefutably true, yet, as Bertrand Russel has said in History of Western Philosophy, "all definite knowledge belongs to science." This conflict can be resolved by only one method, namely, that of most stringent controlled scientific experimentation on approved modern lines. The present authoritarian trend of homocopathy is more likely to destroy than to foster the source from which it claims to emanate. It is not yet fitted to be labelled as a scientific system of medicine and to deserve state recognition except as a form of therapy with a very restricted scope of utility.

In judging homoeopathy one should apply to it the criteria one applies to all growing and developing things and ask what was its past, what is its present and what will be its future. As it stands it is irrational to expect it to produce discoveries comparable with the development of vaccine prophylactics, sulpha drugs and antibiotics. "Science is called the science just because it does not recognise fetishes, just because it does not fear to raise its hand against obsolete and antiquated and because it lends an attractive ear to the voice of experience, of practice."—(Stalin).

The honourable path for a homoeopath seeking recognition is the arduous one—to qualify first in order to gain recognition and obtain the privileges of a qualified doctor, and then turn to his particular love, i.e., homoeopathy, as he has done in Germany, U.K. and U.S.A. for generations past. Homoeopaths who undertake the full care of patients must first obtain a medical qualification recognised by the Medical Council of India or the Provincial Medical Councils. Doctors who practise homoeopathy should be given every chance of proving the value of their methods. Where

Homoeopathy seems to fail is in its wholesale claim to know all and cure all.

Those are in the wrong who label homosopathy as refined quackery; that is an unworthy insult. The homosopath's premises may be false but they are sincere men who feel that they have a mission to perform.

Much of the homoeopath's popularity with the public in India is due to his claim to cure all diseases; to palatibility, smallness of dose, and cheapness of his medicines and simplicity of his methods of examination of his patients, and not because of their scientific value. Human mind is proverbially known to be credulous. The public is ever craving for the miraculous or the unorthodox in medicine. It is unable to differentiate between the claims of the numerous 'pathies' and ready to thrust the mantle of honour on a similar resounding name.

There is a limited field for homoeopathy but it needs to be winnowed in the testing ground of modern scientific institutions. Medically qualified homoeopaths should be given an opportunity to work and prove their case in scientific institutions. They will find it an exhilarating, if somewhat trying, process, grinding their wits on the whetstone of others. Time will soon tell what ideas are "fit to be written but on air or the stream that swiftly flows." If homoeopathy, or in fact any pathy, is recognised as a separate scientific medicine, which it is not, other cults will soon be clamouring at the gates of the state.

Note-The Italics are ours.

N.B.—Though the above article is over a year and a half its rejoinder is published so late, we owe an explanation to our readers. The rejoinder was sent to the Editor of that journal for publication. Ordinary courtesy demands that any reply to any editorial remarks should first be published in the same journal. But the learned editor put it off for a considerable time and in answer to our several reminders put forward one excuse after another to justify their decision of not publishing the same in their journal. We got tired of the whole affair and decided to publish the whole thing here. Better late, than never! We hope this will help to remove many misunderstandings and misconceptions regarding the just claim of Homocopathy for State Recognition and the unscientific attitude of the orthodox school of medicine.—Ed, H, G.