

for the suppressions produced by these drugs. The so-called allergic reactions to these antibiotics are extremely often cured by *Sulphur*. And although many of these pseudo-homœopathists claim that, as physicians, they are entitled to use any or all of the modern drugs, yet this writer has never yet had to have recourse to them, on account of the failure of the homœopathic remedy. Especially does this sort of practice indicate ignorance and failure on the part of the physician to comprehend and use Homœopathy, and the more so, when we have such well-proven and well-tried old friends as this one at our command. Moreover, some authorities have already advanced the opinion that it may well be the *Sulphur* element in these antibiotic drugs that is responsible for the favorable results claimed in certain cases.

With painstaking and diligent labor Hahnemann gave us the only method by which homœopathic practice can be successful. And those of us who have followed him thus far have not found any of the new discoveries to even approximate his scientific exactness or therapeutic acumen. But to know this, one has to know HOMŒOPATHY. How many do?

—*The Homœopathic Recorder, June, 1953*

FOUR IDEAS FOR MODERN MEDICINE

DR. A. C. GORDON ROSS, M.B., CH.B., ST.AND., F.F.HOM.

An idea should be understood as a mental image. This is the proper meaning of the word as defined by Dr. Johnson in his Dictionary. Let us examine in turn, four such mental images which are in danger of being lost to the Profession to-day.

The first is the importance of thinking of the patient as a person: the second is to think of disease as disharmony or 'dis-ease,' meaning a state of chaos in the person, and not a label attached to symptoms, signs and clinical findings.

The third is to think of drugs as restorers of harmony and not as lethal weapons. The fourth mental image is to realise that the body can maintain its own defence against both lethal weapons in the shape of drugs and infection also.

If we accept the mental image of the patient as a person, we think of him as an individual, and all individuals are different, with personalities, palates, prejudices and peculiarities: therefore the doctor best qualified to treat the patient, is the doctor who knows most about that person. He will know something about his family, his environment, his difficulties and the special set of circumstances in which that person is placed. Such knowledge is not usually available to a Consultant or a Specialist, who may know nothing of the individual he is supposed to be treating, although he may know everything about his special branch of medicine.

The second idea—the mental image of regarding disease as disharmony means that we must accept the fact that it is not the actual bacteria which cause illness but the weight of attack which makes the patient sick. In other words, the actual organisms may live in a state of symbiosis in the body and it is only when the balance is disturbed that one crop of bacteria multiply at the expense of another and endanger the patient's life. It is when the good doctor encounters this state of affairs that he will use the modern lethal weapons of science. Those of us who believe that the balance of nature has been disturbed by the effectiveness of Penicillin, anti-biotics and Sulpho Drugs have expected a great increase in the 'so-called' virus diseases and there is no doubt that polio, shingles, mumps and measles, winter colds and influenza are on the increase. This last winter some of us have encountered a peculiarly virulent type of virus pneumonia where a multiplicity of organisms have been isolated, or occasionally, none at all.

The third mental image to consider is the habit of regarding drugs as harmony restorers and not as lethal

weapons with which to kill bacteria. This idea is unacceptable to many, but it follows logically on our first two mental images. One advantage which should appeal to those using the idea of drugs as harmony restorers is the fact that in practice not so much drugging is required to restore harmony—indeed occasionally no drugs are required at all, merely the voice of authority to impart order or confidence: like a policeman's voice in a rowdy dance-hall.

Lastly, physiologists regard the brain as the part we think with in the body. The late Ambrose Bierce in his *Devil's Dictionary* defined the brain as 'the apparatus with which we think'. This is a subtle definition because Bierce knew that the body thinks also with the blood, the glands, the skin, the hair and even the stomach.

If we accept our first three mental images we can accept the fourth postulate which is that bacteria breed their own immunity and that if they are killed off too efficiently, their bodies, lying in the so-called reticulo-endothelial system may register their protest by clogging the mesh-work of cells in the lymphatic system, where their nuclei may yet prove to be the origin of the mysterious so-called virus diseases responsible for Hodgkin's Disease, influenza and the common cold.

We feel that this is what Mr. McDonagh meant when in a letter published in the *Sunday Observer* on 19th April, he stated that if virologists would only study the phenomenon of coagulation objectively, the problem of influenza would no longer be perplexing.

It may be a long time, however, before this rational view is acceptable as it would mean recasting medical philosophy to include the ideas outlined above. Any trained observer who has taken the trouble to read the above brief outline of four ideas for modern medicine will be struck perhaps by two things, namely, that Homœopathy has not been mentioned once and yet those ideas, or mental images, must have been foreseen by Hahnemann when he wrote his *Organon*.

I think this is how Homœopathy should be taught to doctors trained up in their most impressionable years by the orthodox school. Present the philosophy of Homœopathy to them with imagination, and let them discover the logic and sweet reasonableness of it for themselves. As they become interested, then is the time to stress the practicability, efficiency and convenience of homœopathic prescribing.

If the homœopathic teacher can help them to get the above four mental images clear in their minds, then is the time to explain that Hahnemann merely developed a theory of medicine first advanced by Hippocrates in 400 B.C. and that orthodox medicine took the wrong turning some 500 years later when it elected to follow Galen and his doctrine of fighting disease by antidotes. It is no doubt comforting to the Homœopath to regard Galen as the father of the flood of medicaments which daily go down the throats and the sinks of the Great British Public, but it is unwise to tell the young enquirer after truth, that his teachers in the orthodox school have been wrong since 150 A.D.!—Leave that to his imagination and concentrate on making the tyro think out the philosophy of disease for himself.

—*Homœopathy, June, 1953*

HOMŒOPATHY AND THE LITTLE ONES

DR. R. S. RASTOGI, B.A., M.D.H., DEHRA DUN

The call of civilisation demands a minimising of pain and suffering incidental to human illness and making its treatment short, safe, sure, painless, and simple to understand and apply. This is all the more imperative in the case of the helpless little ones who cannot even properly express their suffering or choose the avenue of treatment and have to be entirely at the mercy of parents and physi-