

*Boardman*

# THE HAHNEMANNIAN GLEANINGS

*with which is incorporated*

THE INDIAN HOMŒOPATHIC REPORTER

---

---

Vol. XX

SEPTEMBER, 1953

No. 9

---

---

## EDITORIAL

### GENERAL ELECTION OF THE HOMŒOPATHIC STATE FACULTY, WEST BENGAL

The General election of the Homœopathic State Faculty, West Bengal was over and the results were published by the first week of June 1953. The Council is constituted of 29 members of which twenty seats were contested by the candidates which are as follows: 7 Seats from Calcutta Electorate, 8 Seats from the Burdwan Division Electorate and 5 Seats from the Presidency Division Electorate. The candidates were set up by two rival parties viz. The Bengal Homœopathic Institute and The West Bengal Registered Practitioners' Association. We are glad to note that the former party won 17 seats and lost only 3 seats to the opposing party (1 Seat in Calcutta and 2 Seats in Presidency Division). The candidates set up by the B.H.I. for the Burdwan Division were returned en bloc. As usual the rival groups framed charges and counter-charges against each other and presented their claims to the homœopathic profession for securing votes. Apparently the bulk of the profession voted for the candidates set up by the B.H.I. and they were returned by an overwhelming majority. Leaving out of consideration many canards pre-

ached by the losing party during their propaganda work we will take up only one point which involves a principle and not personalities.

During the vote-canvassing period before election-date controversies arose regarding the definition, nature and outlook of a genuine, true or a Hahnemannian Homœopath. The logic was that Homœopathy's future is always safe in the hands of a genuine or Hahnemannian Homœopath. The defeated party insinuated that a "converted Homœopath" (meaning thereby one who is practising Homœopathy after qualifying himself in the 'so-called' allopathic system of medicine) is incapable of developing the outlook of a genuine Homœopath and he, being given power, authority and opportunity will take the earliest opportunity to 'allopathise' Homœopathy and ruin its inherent potentiality as an efficacious therapeutic system, superior, in many respects, to the dominant system of medicine. This idea might have worked in the minds of some Homœopathic practitioners who were induced to cast votes for the party which lost miserably in the recent election.

Now, this controversy regarding homœopaths of different shades is as old as Hahnemann himself. It was Hahnemann who, denounced some of his followers as half-homœopaths or mongrel homœopaths and served to create a fission amongst the Homœopathic profession. In order to clarify the situation we have to study the past history of Homœopathy. The controversy became acute round about 1832-33 when attempts were made to start a Homœopathic hospital at Leipsig under the leadership of Dr. Muller. On certain informations received by Hahnemann to the effect that Dr. Muller and his followers were in the habit of taking recourse to the then current auxilliary methods at times along with the homœopathic treatment of their patients Hahnemann burst into a fury and published an open letter in a Leipsic daily paper under the caption "A word to the Half-homœopathists of Leipsic" wherein he denounced those Allopathic converts to Homœopathy as "reprobate

bastard Homœopathists who practiced "Blood-letting, the application of leeches and spanish flies, emetics, purgatives, various sorts of warm baths etc." along with the use of Homœopathic remedies in the treatment of patients. This vitriolic outburst fell like a bomb in the minds of his followers and paved the way for dissention amongst them, the legacy of which is still continuing upon us. Then followed controversies upon controversies. The whole homœopathic profession divided itself in two groups: one group following Hahnemann in letter and spirit; while the other group, though admitting the validity of the Homœopathic Therapeutic Law, discovered by Hahnemann, refused to surrender all their convictions and experience gathered during their allopathic practice. If Hahnemann took his stand on his experience they also appealed to their own. We find the dispute was not relating to the application of the Law of Similars in treating patients but as regards the scope and justification of the use of other auxilliary methods in the management of cases. Hahnemann, on his side, attributed the tendency of the 'converts' to take recourse to other methods to their inability to grasp the fundamental tenets of the Homœopathic Philosophy and their lust for sordid gain by duping their patients with apparent ameliorations of painful symptoms. But here Hahnemann did injustice to them. Their first consideration was the good of the patient and they also wanted to stick to their honest convictions. But the spirit of intolerance grew upon Hahnemann as he grew older. The treatment of his colleagues changed a modest, conciliating diffident Hahnemann to a bitter, sarcastic, intolerant and dogmatic Hahnemann, so much so that he wrote, on one occasion "he who does not walk on exactly the same line with me, who diverges, if it be but the breadth of a straw, to the right or to the left, is an apostate and a traitor, and with him I will have nothing to do." Things came to such a pass that Dr. Muller's party met Hahnemann at his Cœthen residence and an agreement was drawn up and signed by him and them referring to

what Hahnemann considered as main pillars of Homœopathy. Considering its historical importance the actual agreement is quoted here :

*Agreement of the 11th of August 1833.*

The main pillars of Homœopathy are :

1. Strict and unqualified adherence to the principle of similia similibus and consequently
2. Avoidance of all antipathic methods of treatment, wherever it is possible to attain the objective by homœopathic remedies ; and therefore the greatest possible
3. Avoidance of all positive remedies and those weakening by their after-effect ; consequently, the avoidance of all bleeding, of all evacuation upwards or downwards, of all remedies causing pain, inflammation and blisters, of burning, of punctures, etc.
4. Avoidance of all remedies selected and destined only to stimulate, whose after-effects is weakening in every case.

Whoever has acknowledged as his own these tenets, which are the main pillars of Homœopathy, let him sign his name below.

S. H.

(vide pp. 200 Hael's Biography of Hahnemann, vol. I)

Thus we find that the bone of contention was with regard to the use of auxilliary methods other than the remedial homœopathic treatment of patients. It is also to be noted that Hahnemann's dogmatism faded to some extent as he grew in years and experience.

He wrote in a letter dated the 19th February 1833 'For forty years I have not drawn one single drop of blood, opened one seton, used pain-producing processes or applied vesicatories. I have never employed acupuncture or cautery, weakened patients with hot-baths abstracted from them their vital humours by sudorifics or scoured them out with emetics and laxatives. . . . I have never mutilated patients with allopathic processes because they wished it

and would have paid me well for such offences against my better convictions, which unfortunately several psuedo-homœopaths, well-known to me, have not been ashamed of doing etc. etc.”.

In 1843 we find him writing in a foot-note to sec 67 in the sixth edition of Organon: only in the most urgent cases, where danger to life and imminent death allow no time for the action of a homœopathic remedy—not hours, sometimes not even quarter-hours, and scarcely minutes—in sudden accidents occurring to previously healthy individuals—for example, in asphyxia and suspended animation from lightning, from suffocation, freezing, drawing, etc.—is it admissible and judicious, at all events as a preliminary measure, to stimulate the irritability and sensibility (the physical life) with a palliative etc. . . . To this category belongs various antidotes to sudden poisonings: alkalis for mineral acids, hepar sulphuris for metallic poisons, coffee and camphor (and ipecacuanha) for poisoning by opium etc :—

Further in so-called surgical diseases methods besides remedial treatment have to be taken recourse to. Thus the whole controversy revolves round the sphere and scope of Homœopathy. Were Hahnemann alive today he might have more clearly delimited the scope and sphere of Homœopathy while adhering to the fundamental homœopathic philosophical tenets regarding disease, health and cure. We find then that this controversy rests on shifting grounds ‘*pari passu*’ with the increase in our knowledge of the science of man.

Now that homœopathy has endured for a century and a half and spread all over the world we should concentrate our energies in grasping and presenting before the scientific world the basic Homœopathic conceptions. The more we realise it the less we will feel the need of using other methods in actual practice though their will always remain a scope for other considerations. We need not wrangle over it and call each other names. It is a trite to say

that Homœopathy will unfold its curative potentialities in as much it is rightly interpreted and practised. It is a good augury that the homœopathic profession was not hoodwinked and voted for the party which consists of eminent homœopaths who have established their reputation by curing cases.

B. K. S.

#### ERRATA

We apologise to the readers of this journal for an act of commission and omission in the publication of the list of elected members of the Homœopathic State Faculty, W. Bengal in the last July issue. The printer's devil seems to be at work in omitting the names of (4) Dr. S. Bagchi, H.M.B.; and (5) Dr. N. C. Chakravarty, D.M.S. from the list of members from the Burdwan Constituency and duplicating the names of two members from the Calcutta Constituency in their stead in the list of the former constituency.

B. K. S. EDITOR: H. G.

---

### SOME CASES OF "LYCOPODIUM"

DR. T. K. GOKHALE, M.B.B.S., POONA.

Case No. 1. Mr. S. M. aged 53 was suffering from High Blood Pressure. But his chief complaint was blocking of the nose especially at night and inability to sleep on account of that. This had shattered his nerves so much that he was almost on the point of becoming a mental case. He had become irritable, he did not find peace in any place he would move from one place to another was afraid that he will soon die if things continue like this. His son one day requested him to go for a good picture. He went there but did not like the crowd, and came away before the picture started. He like open air. Was not very chilly. Did not like much covering. He liked to sleep with the window open and liked to be under the fan. His appetite had diminished, a little food would make him feel as if he has taken