

## PHYSICIAN HEAL THYSELF\*

DR. DIWAN HARISH CHAND, New Delhi

I start the consideration of my paper by giving three quotations from different people, at different places and at different times in the history of mankind. The oldest is one from Charaka of India—the Sanskrit saying translated means: 'That which restores health is the proper remedy, he who cures the patient is the best physician.' For Greece Asclepiades (124 B.C.) said: "Cito, Tuto et jucunde", which means: 'Disease should be treated speedily, safely and agreeably.' And Hahnemann in the *Organon* emphasizes that: "The physician's high and only mission is to restore the sick to health..."

The truth has thus been perceived through the ages, but have the physicians grasped its full meaning? I have titled my paper 'Physician Heal Thyself' to try and divest the mind of the average orthodox physician who equates a palliation, a suppression, a transfer or metastasis (morbid substitution) with cure. In fact the very concept of a true cure is almost unknown in the present generation of physicians of the orthodox school and, therefore, no cure is sought. The concepts of cure, recovery, and suppression would always depend on and remain intertwined with the concepts of health and disease causation (aetiology). This has varied in every age and has determined the basis of treatment of human illness and different therapies.

In ancient times, among primitive men in different parts of the globe, all natural phenomena, including diseases, were considered to be the visitation of gods, demons, spirits. This *supernatural concept* of diseases (demonic or spiritual) still exists in primitive races in certain parts of the world, in folk or tribal medicine, but even in the modern civilised world examples of such superstitious concepts can be found at times. The treatment based on such concepts is a curious blend of superstition and empiricism. Very often it consists of methods to exorcise the devil or spirit by physical measures and by witchcraft and counter-witchcraft. The practice of medicine was the monopoly of the priest, sorcerer and witchdoctor.

Out of the more organised concepts of disease and the resulting systems of treatment the oldest is the *Atharva-Veda* from which was derived *Ayurveda* of the Hindus. It is both ancient and contemporary. Ayurveda literally means the science or knowledge of life. The age of this is quite unknown but authenticated works on it have been dated in the second millennium B.C. May I take you on a journey through the dense mist of time to half a million years ago when, as established by the archaeologists, there existed in our part of the world the Indus Valley Civilisation. I place before you

\* A paper read in the International Homoeopathic Congress, Athens, September 1969.

the philosophy of life, health and disease that this civilisation developed to the more recent period of its recorded history, which again is more than 5000 years old.

To give you just one pertinent example of the high state of development of this civilisation I may mention of the archeological finds at Harappa and Mohenjo-daro dated about 3000 B.C. In those well preserved ruins, the houses that have halls and rooms 57 feet  $\times$  17 feet, it is of medical interest that there are bath rooms with proper slope and an elaborate system of drainage not only of the houses but of the whole city (one huge drain is 6 feet high). The construction is by burnt bricks and wedge-shaped bricks are used around wells.

Records about the existence of the first hospitals in the world are dated at 321 B.C. In the early centuries of the Christian era there existed a register of births and deaths, legal enforcement of rules of hygiene (social and preventive medicine) and a notification of dangerous disease.

It is not the purpose of this paper to describe even briefly the fantastic advances that had been made by Indian medicine in that dim past: 125 surgical instruments; magnets for removing metallic foreign bodies; amazingly advanced plastic surgery; anaesthesia by use of Indian hemp (*Cannabis indica*) and wine; antiseptics; division into subjects of surgery, medicine, pathology, anatomy, obstetrics, biology, ophthalmology, hygiene, and even a little psychology; a mention of 1120 diseases and 760 vegetable drugs besides drugs of mineral origin (including metals) and others (*Charaka-Samhita* and *Susruta-Samhita*).

#### AYURVEDA VIS-A-VIS HOMOEOPATHIC CONCEPTS

We come now to the medical system of Ayurveda. I take the liberty of dealing with it in some detail and especially those aspects that show some similarity to Hahnemann's concepts and homoeopathic practice. It has as its basis a kind of *humoral theory* based on a concept of constitutions and is called the *tridosha*. This word is of Sanskrit origin signifying three (*tri*) faults (*doshas*). There are three principal elements or dhatus (supports or humors) out of a possible seven which are subject to becoming faulty in action, that is, to derangement.

The Sanskrit names of the three principal elements are *vata*, *pitta*, and *kapha* (which are literally translated as air, fire, and water respectively, but in fact it has only a subtle symbolic meaning and is not used in the material sense). In their proper intermingling and proportions are to be found the requisites for the maintenance of equilibrium or the true normal condition. They are like the light, heat, and moisture necessary for the growth of plant and all other organic life.

Hahnemann postulated the existence of a vital force. In aphorism 9 he writes, "In the healthy condition of man, the spiritual vital force (autocracy), the dynamis that animates the material body (organism), 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." The material body has been expressed as an 'instrument' and the immaterial 'mind' as its user. Kent has expressed it as the man (meaning the spirit-like vital force) that lives in the house (the material body).

I place before you some similar thoughts in the philosophy of Ayurveda. There is mention of something like 'vital force' as the element primarily responsible for corporeal existence, and of several 'vital airs' (in Sanskrit *vata*, meaning air) and of five 'life-winds' (*prana*, *apana*, *samana*, *vyana*, and *udana*).

The three main elements each have five sub-divisions. The three main principles with their fifteen sub-forces (mind you the idea is more of force, of dynamis, of energy, and not matter) constitute the 'genii' at work in the constant repair and preservation of the animal structure, and modern authors liken them to the agents of the inner electrical architect (vital force) within the electro-dynamic field called physical life. Air, fire, and water are considered as symbolic of nervous, blood, and mucus systems.

The element of air (symbolic of nervous system) is considered most vital. It is life itself. By strengthening the nervous system you protect the soul and this is the prime concern of the doctor. For due to the soul alone the life giving fluids circulate throughout inner and outer man, and, while the body is thus dependent on the presence of the soul, the converse is not the case and soul is in no sense dependent upon the gross, changing bodies (based on the belief in transmigration of soul and rebirth).

According to the ayurvedic concept disease is based on an individual's response in relation to environments, manifested by changes in the three basic states. Such changes are considered the essential predisposing factors which determine disease, inasmuch as in the normal condition all other aetiological factors remain ineffective. Whereas if these are deranged in the course of time, infection follows which seems to be an attempt on the part of nature to eliminate the changes.

It rings a great similarity to Kent writing that, "Bacteria are the results of disease... that they come after, that they are scavengers accompanying the disease..." Infection, is believed to be the incidental or the subsidiary cause of disease. Charaka says, "Fever cannot occur unless there is accumulation of '*mala*' (waste matter) or '*dosha*' in the body."

It is also held that bacteria cannot grow in a tissue in which the three elements are in perfect accord. Some kind of elemental disorder in the tissue must precede before bacteria can establish their foothold in it. Mostly, it is due to our errors of omission that conditions are rendered favourable to the growth of bacteria. Hence such measures are necessary as can set the internal

system aright in order to make the body unsuitable for the growth of bacteria.

The ayurvedic therapy, therefore, is essentially a *constitutional therapy* as it basically treats to bring about this equilibrium (*dhatu samya kriya*) and only subsequently removes the disease, i.e. manifest disease or end results. The emphasis is more on eliminative methods than on palliative remedies.

The more deeply I dive into the philosophy of Homoeopathy to try and screen its ocean-bed for clearer conceptions of vital force, dynamis, mind and physical matter, the more I am brought face to face with some conceptions of religious and medical philosophy of the *Vedas*. Connection of medicine with the supernatural and with theology, including a belief in the trans-migration of soul and disease and suffering due to actions in previous existence, has always retained a firm hold.

It is difficult to separate *Ayurveda* from Hindu philosophy which in ancient times was always taught to all medical students.

In the *Upanishads*, which are commentaries on the *Vedas*, there is the unitary plan of the universe. The universe is one vast pulsating life (again the idea is of force, of energy, of dynamis and not matter). The manifestation of that life is not all alike or in one grade. It sleeps in the metal. It is awake in the plants. It moves and knows in the animals. It knows, and knows that it knows, in man. Increasing complexity of biological organisation runs through *physical evolution*. It culminates in man. Beyond man is the *metaphysical*—the spirit. Therefore, at one end is pure matter (*anaatman*) in which the spirit (*aatman*) is dormant. At the other end is pure spirit in which the matter is dormant. In between beings are composed of both, and as we ascend the scale the spirit becomes progressively richer and matter poorer.

Again it mentions that from this very *aatman*, which is identical with *Brahman* (Godhead or Supreme Being), the ether was produced, from the ether air, from air fire, from fire water, from water earth. These elements combine in different proportions to produce all bodies, and also minds.

Such is the philosophic or religious thought which is expressed in the ageless *Vedas* written more than 5000 years ago. In the twentieth century Sir Jagdish Chandra Bose, the brilliant investigator, who has revolutionised our thinking on plant life writes: "Do not the two sets of records of the living and non-living tell us of some property of matter common and persistent? Do they not show us that the same kind of molecular upset on stimulation occurs on both the inorganic and the living—that the physiological is closely connected with the physical—that there is no abrupt break, but a uniform march of law? The dust particle and the earth, the plant and the animal, are all sensitive. Thus, with an enlarged cosmic sense, we may regard the million orbs that thread their path through space, as

something akin to organism, having a definite history of their past and an evolutionary progress for their future."

And again: "In pursuing investigations on the border region of physics and physiology, I was amazed to find boundary lines vanishing and points of contact emerge between the realms of the living and the non-living. Metals are found to respond to stimuli; they are subject to fatigue, stimulated by certain drugs, and 'killed' by poisons."

In the make up of the body *prithvi* (literally earth and signifying the physical) contributes to the grosser part of the body while the finer parts are respectively the mind (*manas*), the vital air or breath of life (*prana*) and the procreative life element (*janana*).

Ayurveda recognises that the mind is very powerful both in the causation and cure of disease. Emotions like hurry, anger, greed, and pride are also treated as diseases (*raagaadi rogas*) or potent sources of disease. These affect the health, happiness, and longevity of the individual.

In fact the grading starts from the organs (physical body) at the lowest rung of the ladder and ascends through mind (*manas*), intellect, cosmic intelligence (*mahat*), unmanifested causal state of universe (*avyukta*) and finally the infinite being.

Kent writes, "The organs are not the man. The man is prior to the organs. From first to last is the order of sickness as well as the order of cure. From man to his organs and not from organs to the man." "What is there of this man that can be called the internal man? What is there that can be removed so that the whole that is physical may be left behind?" When a man dies, "That which is carried away is primary and that which is left behind is ultimate." These show a close similarity in thought to the writings in the *Vedas* given above.

Besides in the *Bhagvadgita* (meaning Songs of God), which is the Bible of the Hindus, it is written, "Bodies are said to die but that which possesses the body is eternal. It cannot be limited, or destroyed."

And again: "When the Lord puts on a body, or casts it from him, he enters or departs, taking the mind and senses five away with him, as the wind steals perfume out of the flowers."

As regards *therapy* both the *contraria* principle (*vipareetha chikitsa*) and the *similia* principle (*vipareetharta chikitsa*) are mentioned in Ayurveda.

In a Sanskrit poem called *Sringara Tilak* written by Kalidas about fifty seven years before the Christian era the following line occurs which shows that the fact involving the principle of Homocopathy had, even at that early period of time, passed into a proverb. Translated it reads, "It has been heard of old time in the world that poison is the remedy for poison."

For treatment based on *contraria* (e.g. astringent in diarrhoea) it is mentioned that medicine is given as a specific in the particular disease in a routine manner irrespective of the nature of deranged doshas (humors)

showing clearly that the contraria is not essentially a constitutional treatment.

The treatment by similia has been elaborated by numerous examples as regards medicines (emetic in vomiting, castor oil in diarrhoea); external applications (hot fomentations and warm poultice-*upanaaha sweda*) in inflammatory processes of the *pitta* (fire type); hygienic conduct (threatening a patient suffering from insanity of *vata* type with the help of disguised robbers, police, etc.) . . . Fear, which is one of the causes of promoting insanity, increases *vata* but here it (fear) helps the patient (as an ameliorative measure); and diet (certain laxative diets in diarrhoea and diets that promote certain humors in the body in diseases ascribed to the same humors).

However, all this does not mean that ayurvedic practice is the same as Homoeopathy. It only shows that some aspects of it had been perceived even in that very distant past. But the world had to wait for a very long time for the pharmacodynamic experiments—the provings of Hahnemann, to be able to apply these principle widely and with greater certainty.

There is reference to individualisation thus: "The individual patient suffering from his particular disease of the body is to be treated as a sacred entity by himself."

The small dose has also been mentioned. Examples are given to illustrate that the more rarefied an element is, the more powerful is its kinetic action and the more gross an element is the less powerful its action.

An authenticated and fully recorded example of medication by olfaction appears in the seventh or sixth century B.C. in the treatment of Lord Budha (623-588 B.C.) by the very famous physician, Jeevaka. It is described thus: Jeevaka was in a fix to find out what should be the proper purgative for a holy person like the Budha for whom a strong purgative was not considered by him to be quite becoming. He then hit upon the lotuses (considered holy) as the best remedy for the purpose and got three handfuls of three lotuses which he imbued with various drugs. The lotuses thus treated were then given to the patient to be smelt by him. Each handful thus smelt produced ten motions.

Again a case is described of a lady suffering from some very chronic disease of the brain cured by him by administering the medicine prepared in fat through the nose.

In fact, medication through the nose was well recognised so as to merit a separate name—*naasyam*. Hahnemann has recommended this in his later writings.

The concept of an *ideal cure* finds its parallel in the *Charaka Samhita*, thus: "That method of treatment which annihilates an existing disease syndrome but gives rise to another new set of symptoms is not the method of an ideal cure; whereas that method which removes a symptom-complex without exciting any other in its stead, is the ideal one."

Perhaps it is because of such a background that India offers a suitable soil for absorption of homoeopathic ideas.

#### MEDICINE IN THE WEST

Two other civilisations grew in ancient times—the Mesopotamian, between the rivers Tigris and the Euphrates, and the Egyptian, along the Nile Valley. The practice of medicine there was associated with medico-religious practices. Further west the great land of Greece developed a high form of civilisation whose philosophy and advances in many branches of science have influenced, through the ages, and are still influencing, human thought. The earliest therapy was in the temples erected to Asklepios, as the Egyptians erected to Imhotep, where patients looked for and supposedly found relief in their sleep.

Here the scientific appraisal of diseases began with Hippocrates (460-361 B.C.) called the Father of Medicine. I cannot express his greatness better than in the words of the Roman poet philosopher, Lucretius: "When human life lay grovelling in all men's sight, crushed to the earth under the dead weight of superstition, whose grim features loomed menacingly upon mortals from the four quarters of the sky, a man of Greece was first to raise mortal eyes in defiance, first to stand erect and brave the challenge, fables of the gods did not crush him, nor lightning flash and the growing menace of the sky."

His *humoral concept*, as embodied in the treatise on 'Air, waters and places', was studied in medical schools for nearly 20 centuries. He emphasised the role of external environment on the characteristics of man in health and disease. It was with his great wisdom that he considered disease to be a deviation from the normal state and not an entity. Like ayurvedic physicians he was acquainted with the law of similars (*similia*) as also with the law of dissimilars (*contraria*).

"The diseases of sick people are cured through a method of treatment which opposes it. This holds true for every disease. . . . A different way (for therapy) is thus: The disease is produced by influences which act similar to the effects of the remedy and the disease condition is removed through remedies which produce similar symptoms to the disease."

In the same strain he writes, "In certain cases a feverish state can be cured by influences identical with those that had provoked it; other cases on the contrary will be cured by remedies absolutely opposed to the casual agents."

The *similia* has been amplified as, "By similar things disease is produced and by similar things, administered to the sick, they are healed of their diseases. Thus the same thing which will produce strangury, when it does not exist, will remove it when it does; in the same way, a cough can be provoked and cured by the same medicine." In treatment of suicidal mania he writes, "Give the patient a draught made from the root of mandrake

in a smaller dose than will induce mania." Thus he also perceived that in the application of similia a smaller dose is required.

After Hippocrates was a period of speculation in medicine and the growing desire to systematise what one knew or thought one knew. Numerous schools were created as the 'Dogmatics', the 'Empirics', the 'Herophyles', the 'Erasistrates', the 'Methodists', and the 'Pneumatists', and these were engaged in the bitterest contest. Systematisation, the true soul of these diverse tendencies, finally celebrated its greatest triumph with the theories of Galen which in time acquired the status of dogma.

Galen (130-200 A.D.), in spite of his many and great achievements, seems to have put the clock back as far as therapeutics is concerned during the very long period of nearly 15 centuries that his theories were in dominance. These could be termed the dark ages of medicine. Some of the rational conceptions of Hippocrates were abandoned for the speculative theories of the four elements—water, earth, air, and fire which share in all creation; four cardinal properties of matter—hot, cold, moist, and dry; and four basic humors—mucus, blood, yellow and black bile. His theories are nothing but distorted versions of the *tridosha* theory of Ayurveda and lose much of their merit. He also propounded fallacious theories regarding pulse and urine. In therapy he was the great apostle of the first of the Hippocratic rules *contraria contrariis curentur*, and his therapeutic system was one of palliation, not of cure. He makes no mention of the second rule, *i.e.* of similia, though undoubtedly cognizant of its presence in the writings of Hippocrates. He will be remembered for his schematism and also for his extremely complex prescriptions which are almost synonymous with his name and termed 'Galenicals'. His theories did not receive any serious challenge to give way to more realistic concepts till the 16th, 17th, and even 18th centuries. Harvey (1578 to 1657) overthrew Galen's physiologic ideas on the tidal ebb and flow of blood.

Chronologically the first challenger to Galenic concepts of disease and methods of treatment was Paracelsus (1493-1541), the Luther of medicine, a man who was destined to break the bonds of tradition which enslaved medicine and breathe into the medical atmosphere a spirit of independent thought and enquiry. He gave by his revolutionary independence an impetus to medical thought which amounted to a renaissance.

(To be continued)



## PHYSICIAN HEAL THYSELF

DR. DIWAN HARISH CHAND, New Delhi

(Continued from page 374)

Paracelsus not only refutes Galen's fundamental principle '*contraris curentur*' but emphasises—"when similar is put to similar, and used and applied with intelligence, the nature is served well." From this viewpoint his assertion is quite unequivocal that a cure is effected by the means which caused the illness "as arsenic cureth arsenic, anthrax cureth anthrax, as poison cureth poison, thus similar anatomy cureth a similar one". Paracelsus protested vehemently against the misleading nomenclature of diseases.

He laid down not only the homoeopathic law of healing *similia similibus curentur* but also three other principles which are peculiar to Homoeopathy—individualization of patient, diagnosis in terms of like remedy, and minimum dose. He lacked only the 'provings' of medicines to enable him to apply the law of healing to the sick persons.

He also had some perception of the vital force as evidenced from his expression of *principium vitae*.

There is some mysticism in his writings that remind one of ayurvedic teachings. He states that, "The origin of diseases is in man and not outside of man; but outside influences act upon the inside and cause diseases to grow. Man is himself a cosmos. A physician who knows nothing about Cosmology will know little about disease. He should know what exists in heaven and upon the earth, what lives in the four elements and how they act upon man; in short, he should know what man is, his origin and his constitution; he should know the whole man and not merely his external body...."

It is, therefore, not surprising that Hahnemann's critics accused him of stealing Paracelsus' ideas, but then Hahnemann has already acknowledged that many before him had perceived this principle.

Disease came to be considered by Sydenham (1624-1689) as a *definite clinical entity grafted on the host*—something of which the host was to be purged. There was thus a shift in the emphasis from intrinsic factors as the cause of disease. This was the era of heroic treatments—purging, vomiting, blood-letting, leeching, and massive drugging (polypharmacy) to get rid of the poison.

The dissection of dead bodies led to the discovery of organic or *pathological changes* in tissues and organs, which were held to be the cause of disease in the Morgagnian era (1682-1771). The restricted view was held that it is a *local disorder*.

Hahnemann's (1755-1843) concept that tissue changes (pathology) are the effects of disease and not the cause and disease is a constitutional

disorder and not merely local, although having local or peripheral manifestations, has not been generally accepted by the orthodox dominant school. This we consider in more detail later.

With the advent of the microscope was ushered in the era of *cellular pathology* (Virchow, 1821-1902); it was held that structural changes in the cells of tissues and organs were the cause of disease. The concept of disease as a local disorder still prevailed.

Robert Koch (1843-1910) established the *microbes* as a cause of disease and thus emphasis was once again shifted from the host to the environment, from intrinsic to extrinsic factors. The treatment, therefore, was aimed at the annihilation of the germs at all costs, the *therapia magna sterilisans* of Ehrlich. The importance of the natural resistance or susceptibility of the host to adverse environmental stimuli was consequently ignored. There was excessive preoccupation with germs (external factors as causator of disease). This caused a lot of suffering and brought about the lop-sided development of medicine, pushing the individual into the background; and this, despite the classical experiment of Pattenkoffer (1818-1901), and the internal milieu of Claude Bernard expressed as, "All the vital mechanisms, however, varied they may be, have only one object, that of preserving constant the conditions of life in the internal environment." Pattenkoffer swallowed a test-tube full of live cholera germs, enough to kill a regiment of soldiers, with impunity. Further, the ultra-microscopic viruses were also implicated in the diseases. Thus, there has been adequate control of acute infectious diseases and adoption of rapid preventive measures for public health. But the indiscriminate use of chemotherapeutic agents and antibiotics has resulted in a host of iatrogenic diseases, in the phenomena of drug-sensitization, including fatal anaphylactic shock, drug-resistance, bacterial mutation, and disturbance in the natural immunity mechanism of the body, which renders the patient susceptible to relapses or a state of chronic ill health. The decline in infectious diseases has resulted in the rise in functional disorders, new growth and degenerative disorders. Surely it would not be sane to put such metastasis or mutations of disease or temporary suppressions as cures.

Such then, has been the evolution of concepts of disease causation to the present times along material lines of thinking—physical and physiological, also designated, "the mechanistic viewpoint" or "the broken machinery concept". The lines of treatment adopted have corresponded to such concepts.

Therefore, in present day orthodox medical practice science is dominating over art and the humanistic value of caring for the sick is lost. Over-specialisation has fostered the competent but impersonal physician interested in part rather than the whole. His main defect is to confuse the fraction with the integer, part truth with the whole truth. This is in sharp contrast with the homoeopath's holistic, individualistic view. And other reasons for the seeming aloofness of the physician can be attributed to the fact there is

a tendency for the physician to depend more and more on laboratory investigations rather than on his clinical impressions because he is more concerned with the type of bacteria than the way the individual has been affected. In the aim of his treatment he has become more obsessed with bacteriological recovery than with a clinical cure. But as long as disease is equated with material causes like bacteria so long will the concept of true cure elude the physician.

As Dr. Jacob Chandy admits, "The advances in the treatment of diseases have not kept pace with the physician's ability to make correct scientific diagnoses and hence the power to cure is much less than his ability to understand the disease process." This reminds me of what Dr. Tyler has said. She writes that "...diagnosis without the remedy is poor consolation for the patient." But then there also are those mentioned by Dr. Hubbard, "who would rather have a diagnosis and die than be cured of they don't know what."

In spite of all the great advances in science, mostly physical sciences, for systems of treatment based on philosophically untenable conceptions, the words of Voltaire still hold true—"Doctors pour drugs of which they know little, to cure diseases of which they know less, into human beings of whom they know nothing."

The exception to this is provided by Hahnemann's system of Homeopathy. Hahnemann conceived of disease, in its deeper implication and wider perspective, as a biological phenomenon of 'altered life' (*biological concept*).

This *metaphysical view* of disease processes was held by Paracelsus (1493-1541), when he said: "Medicine is not only a science, it is also an art: it deals with the very processes of life, which must be understood before they may be guided." As mentioned earlier Hahnemann postulated that the 'vital force' keeps the human organism in healthy harmonious functioning at all levels of the total human entity, i.e. the physical, the intellectual or thought structure; the emotional or feeling nature, and the spiritual. In disease, this vital force gets deranged or vitiated by some morbid agent inimical to life, resulting in disharmony at all levels.

What exactly this vital force or life principle is has been the speculation of men of science from time immemorial. In the *Vedas* it is *praana* (breath of life, vital air); Descartes regarded the 'deity' as the essential property of physical being. Leibnitz used the term 'force'; Shopenhauer (like Hahnemann) used the term 'vital force', and Sir William Crookes used the 'etherical vibrations of electrical energy'. It baffles modern science and medicine, as it defies physico-chemical analysis, and is difficult to conceive of by materialistic minds.

An Indian Philosopher and Nobel Prize winner, Rabindranath Tagore writes, "In life a multiple of cells have been brought together through a marvellous quality of complex self-adjusting inter-relationship maintaining

a perfect co-ordination of functions. This is the creative principle of unity which baffles all analysis."

This '*dynamic or vital concept*' lays down that disease is primarily a disturbance of the vital force circulating in the human economy, resulting in the disorganisation of sensations and functions, and manifesting on the external plane as signs and symptoms. Disturbed inner vitality, then, is the philosophical root or basis of all human illness, whatever the extraneous factors responsible. "It is the morbidly affected vital force alone that produces diseases" (*Organon*, aphorism 12). Disease, thus, is essentially intrinsic and not extrinsic; its spread is centrifugal from within outwards, from the centre towards the periphery.

Health is a state of dynamic stable equilibrium of the human organism within itself and all its constituents and between man and his environment of which he is an integral part.

Disease is a state of dynamic unstable equilibrium, imbalance, disharmony, both within man and between man and his environment. It means 'disease', 'ill-at-ease'. As disease is essentially dynamic, and as the vital force is invisible and intangible, disease too is invisible and intangible; it is unknown and unknowable, save through its effects, which are signs and symptoms, as experienced by the patient, observed by the attendants, and elicited by the physician through clinical examination with or without accessory aids to diagnosis—the laboratory, x-ray, etc. Symptoms, therefore, form the sole perceptible evidence of disease, which lies deeper than its peripheral expression. Symptoms are the 'language of nature' which the physician has to learn to decipher. Their classification, correct interpretation, and evaluation are of paramount importance in remedy-selection and subsequent management.

Disease is the result of failure of adaptation of an abnormally susceptible human organism to adverse environmental stimuli, external and internal physical and emotional. As the vital force pervades the whole being of man, its derangement affects man as a whole, at all levels. It is not the part, organ, or tissue only, that is diseased; it is man as a unit who is sick. Disease affects both the soma and the psyche. Our study, therefore, should be man, the subject of accidents or disease, and not only diseases. "The individual not the disease, is the entity", said the celebrated Sir William Osler. Dr. Alexis Carrel, in 'Man, The Unknown' strikes a similar note: "A disease is not an entity. Disease is a personal event. It consists of the individual himself. There are as many different diseases as patients. Immense regions of our inner world are still unknown. The science of man is the most difficult of all sciences, and medicine will have great contributions to make thereto, if, as doctors, we take off our blinkers, and study 'man' and not merely his disease."

Man, for us, is a composite being, a multidimensional entity, a synthetic unit of life, consciousness and intelligence. "Mind is the key to the man",

said Hahnemann. Kent writes, "Man consists in what he thinks and what he loves and there is nothing else in man." Whether we realise it or not, we are externalised thought, and thought-habits are the surest guides to the indicated remedy.

There is a centrifugal flow of disease from within outwards, first affecting the inner man (mind, emotions, intellect), as denoted by change in his mental disposition, thought structure, and feeling nature. These may be termed the 'symptoms of the individual' on the inner dynamic plane of the human economy. The inner man is always the first to be sick before the disease filters into the plane of the physical body. The next group of symptoms to emerge on the surface are disturbances in the functions of the physical body (altered physiology). These are chiefly felt subjectively by the patient. Then follow organic or structural changes in tissues and organs, i.e. pathological formations (altered anatomy). These are mainly elicited by the clinician. The last to be affected are the vital organs, such as brain, heart, kidney, liver, lung, etc.

The classical example of such orderly progression of symptoms is peptic ulcer. There are at first the symptoms of the change in the patient's mental nature, followed by symptoms of excess acidity in the stomach, followed later by the formation of an ulcer in the stomach. These are the stages in the evolution of the full-blown disease-picture.

As pathology advances, the constitutional symptoms progressively regress. The scope of homoeopathic application gets more limited in proportion to the pathological progression, till the point of irreversibility is reached. Then the case becomes incurable, and Homoeopathy has no scope for cure; yet it can palliate in the most gentle manner, so as to enable the patient to slide painlessly and peacefully towards the final dissolution, without in any way affecting the disease-process which goes on relentlessly.

Cases which are in the earliest beginnings of disease and before pathology supervenes are ideal for homoeopathic application and cure. With the advent of organic changes, cure will depend on the site and nature of pathology as well as the degree of constitutional symptoms present in the case-record.

*Cure for a homoeopath*, who rests his philosophy on this more or less metaphysical vital or dynamic (biological) concept, means restoration of the abnormal susceptibility of the patient which has been altered in disease; restoration of harmony, balance, equilibrium, within man and between man and his environment. It means reversal of symptoms to the 'no-symptom' state. Roberts has put it as, "the complete eradication of diseased states and consequently the complete eradication of symptoms, and a return to a condition of normal, vigorous health." It is brought about by the stimulation of the vital reaction of the human body by the similar remedy, which is aimed at the host, the soil (the patient) and not at the environment, the germs. The difference between this viewpoint and that of the orthodox school has been

summed up as: The orthodox school attempts to treat 'the disease that the patient has', whereas the homoeopathic school attempts to treat 'the patient that has the disease'.

All measures that suppress or depress the normal reaction of the individual simultaneously diminish the natural resistance, and render him vulnerable to further attacks. Such is the case with modern drugs—antibiotics, corticosteroids, hypnotics, tranquilisers, analgesics, etc.

I have tried to survey the long history of medicine and its evolution from the earliest mish-mash of magic empiricism down to the so-believed 'highly scientific' practice of modern times with an increasingly myopic concept now narrowed down to molecular biology. But in this survey and in the list of famous men who made mighty contributions in their own way and founded different schools of thought we may vainly search for one who may have established a system of curative pharmacotherapeutics. As we have seen the principle of similia had been perceived by different people through the ages but it remained for the great experimenter Hahnemann to do the pharmacodynamic experiments on healthy human beings, the 'provings' as they are termed; and thus he firmly established the therapeutic law of similars and made its application to disease states possible. He may, therefore, rightly be called the *Father of Curative Pharmacotherapeutics*.

#### REFERENCES

- Hahnemann, S.: *Organon of Medicine*, Translation by Dudgeon; Commentary by Dr. B. K. Sarkar.
- Haehl, Richard: *Samuel Hahnemann, His Life and Works*.
- Boyd, Linn J.: *Simile in Medicine*.
- Kent, J. T.: *Lectures on Homoeopathic Philosophy*.
- Roberts, H. A.: *The Principles and Art of Cure by Homoeopathy*.
- Close, Stuart: *The Genius of Homoeopathy*.
- A Text-book of Ayurveda (Ayurveda Siksha)*, Vol. I, Sec. I, Historical Background, Edited by Dr. A. Lakshmi Pathi.
- Charaka Samhita*, Edited by Gulabkunverba, Jamnagar: Ayurvedic Society.
- Bhagavadgita*, Translated by Swami Prabhavananda and Christopher Isherwood, London: Phoenix House.
- Bender: *Great Moments in Medicine*, Parke-Davis.
- Bose, Sir J. C.: *Plant Autographs and Their Revelations*.
- Carrel, Alex: *Man, The Unknown*.
- Sarkar, B. K.: *Essays on Homoeopathy*.
- Transactions of International Homoeopathic Congress: New Delhi, 1967*, Edited by Dr. Diwan Harish Chand.
- Chandy, Jacob: 'Physician & The Society', *Sardar Patel Memorial Lectures*, New Delhi, Dec. 1967.
- Health & Therapy*, A Theosophical Study.
- Laws of Healing*, A Theosophical Study.
- Schulz, Hugo: 'Similia Similibus Curentur', *The British Homoeopathic Journal* (1935).
- Schmidt, Pierre: 'Cure & Recovery', *The British Homoeopathic Journal* (1937).
- 'Homoeopathic Trends in Modern Medical Thought', *Journal of The American Institute of Homocopathy*.