

THE HAHNEMANNIAN GLEANINGS

Vol. LI

MAY 1984

No. 5

EDITORIAL

HAS HOMŌEOPATHY PROGRESSED AFTER HAHNEMANN ?

This question is often asked by many. Probably it is asked only to compare Homoeopathy with the all out advances of the modern medicine. (Hahnemann established Homoeopathy and named the then medical practice Allopathy to differentiate between the two. In fact, the dominant medical practice of today is not Allopathy but rather modern scientific medicine which many still call Allopathy).

Let us see how much advances the modern medicine has made. Truly speaking it has made very little therapeutic progress. All that is seen is the advancement in technology of diagnostics introduced by non-medical scientists. Modern medical science has assimilated these advances to help it diagnose the condition. The entire approach is to determine the cause and direct the medication for its removal and or elimination. In spite of all these advances how much cure can it demonstrate? Except in a few infectious diseases, it has very little to offer curatively, e.g. in diabetes mellitus, hypertension, asthma, epilepsy, nervous diseases, etc.; the list will be endless.

The medical therapeutics of modern medicine is directly linked with the advances in organic chemistry. This fact was even visualised by Hahnemann in his times. Being a reputed chemist of his times, he had also sounded a note of warning that indiscriminate use of organic compounds on the human economy would ultimately damage the fibre of mankind. The curative value of the drugs of the past has changed through its bitter and dangerous side-effects seen years later. Many have to be discarded and new ones have to be taken in with caution. No doubt that the pharmaceutical industry has organised itself into a very effective research sponsoring organisation in organic chemistry, solely depending upon the results obtained on animal experimentation. We see its results fail in large number when they are applied to man. The wonder drugs of yesterday fall in disrepute when something new is brought out.

Homoeopathy has fixed principles on which its therapeutic activity rests. It has embraced the natural law of similia or similars. Man is an important and an essential link in the development of homoeopathic thera-

peutics. After Hahnemann, the entire methodology of drug proving has undergone a change. It has assimilated the advances taken place in various techniques of understanding man, i.e. biochemistry, immunology (susceptibility) etc. In the earlier provings only subjective symptoms and poisoning effects were recorded, but the recent provings indicate, qualitative, quantitative constituents of the drug and the changes taking place in man along with the appearing of symptoms. The final product of the drug is also standardised; the more recent move is standardisation of the case-taking method particularly, in collecting the relevant data in respect of man. It is proposed to use this data in finally preparing the required statistics. In Hahnemann's time there were only 92 drugs to combat the ailments. Today we have more than 1500 drugs in our armamentarium. Recently more than 200 drugs have been added, the materia medica of which is available. Potentisation, which was all these days a stumbling block for the recognition of its scientificity, is gradually getting recognised with the recent advancements in molecular chemistry.

Homocopathy works on the concept of dynamis keeping the man in the centre, unlike modern medicine which keeps the pathogenic organism in the centre. What progress now is needed in Homocopathy is *modus operandi* of the therapeutic agent. It is a work of fundamental nature and would need a very large and well established laboratory with people with a will to work. Desires for quick results and fame have caused the proliferation of frauds in the scientific community. No one, therefore, enters the field of fundamental research where scope for quick results is very poor.

The valued readers and professional brethren are invited to contribute their views on the subject.

The views and opinions expressed by the authors of articles published in this journal are not necessarily those of the editor and publishers.