

IS IT CORRECT FOR A HOMŒOPATH TO
SAY THAT "HAHNEMANN WAS THE
FATHER OF BACTERIOLOGY"

BHAGWAN DAS,

Lucknow.

The above remark, within the inverted commas, as it stands, seems to imply that Hahnemann (who is universally regarded as the Father of Homœopathy) also believed in what Pasteur (who is universally regarded as the Father of Bacteriology) believed and preached about four decades after the death of Hahnemann viz. that the bacteria are the cause of disease and in accordance with the Old School dictum "Tolle causam" ("Remove the cause") the bacteria in the diseased organism should be removed by killing them directly and chemically with bacteriacidal medicines, in order to cure the diseased person. As it obviously seemed ridiculous even to Dr. B. K. Sarkar to argue with success that the Pasteurian theory of disease, as stated above, is the same as taught in Hahnemann's Organon, he has stated, in reply to Dr. Dirghangi's criticism, that the Homœopath's should accept as correct the Pasteurian theory regarding only the "causation" of disease but they should reject as false the Pasteurian theory regarding the "cure" of disease. I think, the two parts of the Pasteurian theory are inter-dependent, the second part being based on the first part thereof and the first part having no therapeutic purpose if the second part be rejected. Why does Dr. B. K. Sarkar think it necessary to accept the first part only and to reject the second part of the above-stated Pasteurian theory of disease? Of what use the acceptance of the first part will be to the Homœopaths in finding out the curative medicine? Even supposing that the first part may be accepted as correct, as desired by Dr. B. K. Sarkar, it will absolutely be of no

use to the Homœopaths in selecting the curative medicines because the Homœopaths are required by their Therapeutic Law of Cure (*Similia Similibus Curantur*) to find a simillimum not of the CAUSE but of the EFFECTS, *i.e.*, of the outwardly reflected image of the inner disease, *per se*, whose real prime cause nobody can fully and correctly understand vide footnote to paragraph one of the Homœopathic Organon. But, Dr. B. K. Sarkar seems to argue that if the Homœopaths will accept the Pasteurian theory regarding the bacterial cause of disease then they will be able "to kill the bacteria when they are outside the body". Firstly, I think, this killing of the bacteria, when they are outside the body, is only a wild-goose chase. The Allopaths have already tried their best in killing such bacteria during the last seven decades and what has been the result? I think the present position is not much better than what it was when a renowned Master of Homœopathy, Dr. P. P. Wells, M.D., wrote as follows in his "Introduction" to Dr. B. F. Joslin's Booklet on the Homœopathic treatment of Epidemic Cholera:—

"The discovery of microbes has not been of the least benefit to doctor or patient. Are these men (the Allopaths), therefore either wiser or more humbled by their failure? Apparently they are neither. They are now, as in 1831, the same conceited, blinded, proud, confident rejectors of *Law*, of which they have no need, What are disinfectants? And who has ever seen a well-marked disinfection of any morbid cause from the use of any so-called germicide? And what has been the result of it all? The progress of cholera has not, so far as we know, been arrested by all this buzz and bustle in any one instance, and where present, the number of attacks have neither been diminished nor their fatal character in the least abated. If these organisms were, as claimed, the cause of the disease, there has been abundant opportunity to show it. And yet it has not been shown. If living organisms were the cause, these, it would seem, might be destroyed.

And yet cholera has not been stamped out. Microbes may safely be dismissed from our thoughts in our clinical dealings with Cholera and also from our study of its etiology". Secondly, even admitting that the external killing of the bacteria will prevent the outbreak of disease, why this killing cannot be done by one who does not believe in the false Pasteurian theory? Even a non-Pasteurian can perform the task of killing the external bacteria just as well as a Pasteurian can if at all it is possible to kill all the bacteria of the Universe. Thus, neither for selecting the curative homœopathic medicine nor even for killing the external bacteria, belief in the false Pasteurian theory of the *causation* of disease seems necessary. Hahnemann, who held just the opposite views regarding the *causation* and the *cure of disease* as compared with those of Pasteur was also the pioneer teacher of the hygienic measures to be taken in connection with Cholera and other infectious diseases. It is regarding his useful hygienic teaching that we can justly and proudly say that Hahnemann was its Father. But, it would, I think, be a lie against and an insult to our Great Master Hahnemann if any Homœopath declares that "Hahnemann was the Father of Bacteriology, the implication of which remark has been stated above. The fact is that Hahnemann was just the opposite of what the above remark implies. If Hahnemann may be called the *Christ* of the true system of Medicine, then Pasteur, I think, may justly be called its "*Anti-Christ*".

But Dr. B. K. Sarkar may not agree with the above view and may, perhaps, argue that Pasteur was a great Scientist and Hahnemann was not a great Scientist. Therefore, Pasteur's theory of disease is correct and that of Hahnemann is incorrect. My rejoinder to such an argument would be that a much greater Scientist than Pasteur, who was really the original discoverer of many things for which Pasteur unjustly took the credit himself, taught just the opposite of what Pasteur taught. His name was

Bèchamp and that great French Scientist (Bèchamp), four decades after the death of Hahnemann, preached the same Hahnemannian truth regarding the *causation* etc., of disease but, as was naturally to be expected, Bèchamp did it in a more up to date scientific phraseology etc., of his time. Instead of the Hahnemannian term "Life-force", Bèchamp used the more scientific term "Mycrozymas" but, Bèchamp's conclusions are in harmony with those of Hahnemann. Bèchamp disproved the false theory of Pasteur that bacteria are the *cause* of disease. Bèchamp demonstrated (as all the true Homœopaths believe) that the bacteria are the *result* and not the *cause* of disease. Full reasons in support of Bèchamp's view are given in the wonderful book named "Bèchamp or Pasteur?" by E. Douglas Hume, price 15 shillings, published by The C. W. Daniel Company Ltd., Ashingdon, Rochford, Essex. For want of space, I will reproduce the medical opinion of one good authority only among many others viz. of the Director of the Pasteur Institute of the Loire-Inferieure. He wrote that the book "Bèchamp or Pasteur?" has not only resurrected Bèchamp in the fullness of his work, but in accomplishing this object this book has also erected a monument of Truth". A perusal of the said book will also show that nobody has, so far, refuted with success the view of Bèchamp. If Dr. B. K. Sarkar can do so now, then, I think, that should mean the glorious triumph of Dr. B. K. Sarkar as well as of his original medical parents—"Allopathy" even though that would mean the defeat and perhaps also the falsehood of his newly adopted medical parents—"Homœopathy". But, why should we worry when we have firm faith in the Vedic Truth viz.. "Truth, not Falsehood, triumphs" ("Satyam jayte nà-anritam".)

2. Now, let us examine Dr. B. K. Sarkar's main arguments, point by point:—

(i) Dr. B. K. Sarkar says that "Hahnemann meant by Miasm what we mean by *Microbes*. Had it been so, then, Hahnemann could, would and should have used the

term "pathogenic micro-organisms" which term, as admitted by Dr. B. K. Sarkar, was well-known to Hahnemann. For Hahnemann and all his true followers the term *Miasm*, as used by him in his *Organon*, is that most mysterious Simple Substance which cannot be seen even by the most powerful human microscope and which cannot be weighed in any human scales. Dr. Sarat Chandra Ghose M.D., (Chicago, U.S.A.) when answering the unanswerable question "What is *Miasm*?" said on page 138 of his booklet on Cholera that "it consists of *something*, prodigious effects of which are marked and yet it is so small in mass that no scientific instruments are sensible enough to detect its unwelcome approach or injurious contact". Dr. B. K. Sarkar quotes a fragmentary portion of para 2 of page 9 of Hahnemann's "Chronic Diseases" 2nd. Edition (1835) and by putting a wrong meaning into that quotation he wants to prove the fantastic and false Pasteurian theory of disease from Hahnemann's teachings on the subject. The fuller quotation runs thus: "All chronic diseases of mankind They must therefore all have for their origin and foundation constant chronic miasms, whereby their parasitical existence in the human organism is enabled to continually rise and grow". The word "whereby" appearing in the said quotation refers to the words "chronic miasms". Hence, the word "their" which immediately follows the word "whereby" cannot, according to the rules of the English Grammar, refer to "chronic miasms". The word "their", like the word "they" refers to the words "chronic diseases", and this grammatical interpretation of the said quotation alone seems to fit in with the fundamental teaching of Hahnemann, as per his Book of "Chronic Diseases" viz. that *Psora* miasm is the root cause of all diseases and nothing which is at conflict with the fundamental teachings of the *Organon* should be accepted as correct by any true follower of Homœopathy. This is the generally accepted principle of interpretation of all books dealing with fundamentals. In

connection with the above interpretation it may be pointed out that the word "parasite" does not mean "bacteria" only. It also means "anybody or anything solely depending upon another body or thing" e.g. the beggars of India are called the "parasites" of the public. Why, then should Dr. B. K. Sarkar reverse the rules of the English Grammar in order to push the false Pasteurian theory which, as stated above, has been disproved to the hilt by the great French Scientist. Bèchamp.

(ii) At the end of his reply, Dr. B. K. Sarkar says that "Dr. Dirghangi still sticks to the theory of spontaneous generation of living beings—from inanimate matter. Here, he follows Dr. Kent but this theory has long been exploded. It is only life that begets life". As far as I know, neither Dr. Kent nor Dr. Dirghangi have stated anywhere that living beings grow out of the *dead inanimate matter*. On the other hand, they have (as far as I understand their writings etc.) loudly proclaimed and preached the same eternal Truth which was first proclaimed and preached by the divinely-inspired *Rishis* of the *Vedas* viz. that "Brahm" (i.e. The Only True Life) pervades the whole universe. The great Indian Scientist (Sir J. C. Bose) also preached the same old eternal Truth of the *Vedic Rishis* when he demonstrated that "plants" have also got life. The great French Scientist (Bèchamp) also preached the same old eternal Truth when he demonstrated that "chalk" has also got life. Certainly, "life begets life". But, does Dr. B. K. Sarkar think that when a healthy person becomes sick and bacteria grow out of his sick-life-principle, then the sick-life-principle should be regarded as "dead inanimate matter". If not, then, what is the hitch in admitting that the living but diseased beings (bacteria) grow out of the living but diseased organism of the sick person? Healthy life begets healthy life and diseased life begets diseased life. What is wrong in that process? If there were no sick persons in the world, could any Bacteriologist get the pathogenic bacteria for his culture preparation etc.?

If the answer is in the negative (as it should be) then what is the hitch in accepting the Hahnemannian or the Bèchampian discovery that bacteria are the "result" and not the "cause" of disease? As regards Dr. B. K. Sarkar's remark that the theory of "spontaneous generation has since been exploded, I would invite his attention to pages 75-77 of the above mentioned book "Bèchamp or Pasteur?" which will show that the explosion by Pasteur of the theory of "spontaneous generation" has not been accepted as a proved fact.

3. Before concluding may I humbly suggest to Dr. B. K. Sarkar to peruse carefully, with an unprejudiced mind, Dr. Royal E. H. Hayes M.D.'s article headed "The Germ Theory" which was published on pages 343 to 348 of the *Homœopathic Recorder* of May 1947 of the International Hahnemannian Association, the opening sentence of which is reproduced below:—

"The germ theory of disease is the greatest travesty on "Science" that was even stumbled over during this semi-civilized age; the most ghastly medical farce in which the human mass ever played its part; the biggest hoax the medical profession ever took in after but little hesitation and no mastication". I presume that Dr. B. K. Sarkar must have cured several cases of cholera and other "bacterial" (?) diseases with the highly potentized Homœopathic medicines, *which do not act chemically*. How, then, our non-chemically acting potentized medicines can kill directly and chemically his pet living creatures—the bacteria? The only reasonable answer appears to be that the bacteria are the "result" of the disease, i.e., "of the deranged life principle" according to the Homœopathic Organon and according to the same Organon our non-chemically but dynamically-acting potentized medicines set right "the deranged dynamic life principle" and when this is done then the "bacteria", which are only the parasites of that "deranged life-principle", automatically die as if of starvation. It is for this reason that the Bacterio-

logists have to give the "disease-food" to their bacteria so that they may be able to live during the process of their culture preparation. Is not all this a sufficient proof of the fact that the bacteria are not the "cause" but the "result" of disease?

In the end, may I cheer up my learned and respected friend—Dr. B. K. Sarkar—by giving him the good news (if he is unaware of it) that many Allopaths also are now giving up the idea that germs are the "cause" of disease. For instance, the world-renowned Allopathic Doctor August Bier of Berlin stated that "Bacteria are of secondary importance in infection; a healthy individual does not become infected." Now, when our Allopathic brethren are moving *forward* from darkness to light, it is a matter of deep regret that a Homœopath of renown should move *backward* from the Homœopathic light to the Allopathic darkness.

May God lead our erring friends and brethren from *Darkness to Light!*

HOMŒOPATHY AND SURGERY

DR. B. R. CHUGHA,

Chairman, Homœopathic Registration Tribunal, Bombay

Surgery has come to have a glamour of its own in the scientific world of today and obviously every new entrant in the medical profession wishes to share that glamour and incidentally earn more also. So he starts dabbling in surgery without any proper training as an apprentice to a senior surgeon. He begins to advise an operation for any ailment for which a surgical operation is possible with the result that the infant surgeon and the ignorant patient both come to grief. Although in the primitive past