

THE
HÄHNEMANNIAN GLEANINGS

*with which is incorporated the
INDIAN HOMŒOPATHIC REPORTER.*

VOLUME IV. SEPTEMBER 1933. No. 8

An open Letter

TO

MAJOR-GENERAL SIR JOHN MEGAW, KT., I. M. S., M. B.,
B. CH., B. A. O. DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF THE
MEDICAL SERVICE IN INDIA.

*Being a reply to his recent utterance pertaining to
Homœopathy and other Systems of Treatment.*

BY SARAT CHANDRA GHOSH, M. D.

I have read a fragmentary portion of the views of Sir John Megaw about Homœopathy and other systems of treatment which he expressed in his address before the Simla Medical Association a few days ago. Sir John Megaw is an eminent personality in the Indian Medical Service and holds the highest official position amongst the I. M. S. Officers in India. And withal he was known in Calcutta to be a very conscientious man. Sir John Megaw is perfectly justified in going in raptures over the claims of the allopathic system of treatment; but he can not minimise and cry down the immutable truth of Homœopathy of which he is, I am afraid, quite ignorant. As his observations might carry convictions to the people of our country, I can not but write the following lines to disabuse them and also for Sir John Megaw's perusal. Homœopathy is, no doubt, a foreign system of treatment; but that is no

reason why it should be discarded by us and decried by Sir John Megaw.

Homœopathy was first introduced in India in 1839, and since that time it has been making slow, but onward march amongst the people of India. It has now spread into every nook and corner of our country.

Sir John has said that the allopathic system is founded on facts; but the facts should be gathered from the cures effected by the system and from the opinions expressed by the learned exponents of that school of Medicine.

Did Sir John Megaw care to read the opinions of the foremost members of his own system about the inefficacy of allopathic remedies?

He can very well read a sermon over the greatness of his system; but some of the foremost members of his professions have decried their system with all the emphasis they can command. Let me quote a few remarkable opinions of these men to prove the hollowness of his system. :—

Troudean (the great French allopath) pays no importance to internal medication, and is of opinion that out-of-door life and forced nourishment should be the essentials in practice.

The Eminent Professor Evans, Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons, London says :—“The medical practice of our day is, at the best, a most uncertain and unsatisfactory system; it has neither philosophy nor common sense to commend it to confidence.”

The eminent Allopath, Professor Gregory, of Edinburgh says :—“Ninety-nine out of a hundred medical facts are medical lies and medical doctrines are, for the most part, stark, staring nonsense”.

Dr. Benjamin Rush, M. D., Professor in the First Medical College of Philadelphia says :—“Dissection daily

convinces us of our ignorance of disease and causes us to blush at our prescriptions. We have assisted in multiplying disease ; we have done more ; we have increased their fatality”.

The wellknown Dr. Ramage of London says :—“How rarely do our medicines do good ! How often do they make our patients really worse ! I fearlessly assert that in most cases, the sufferer would be safer without a physician than with one.”

Dr. John Mason Good, M. D., F. R. S., says :—“Our medicines are in the highest degree uncertain, except indeed that they have destroyed more lives than war, pestilences and famine combined.”

Dr. Johnson, M. D., F. R. S., Editor of the Medical Chirurgical Review says :—“I declare as my conscientious conviction, founded on long experience and reflection, that if there was not a single physician nor drug on the surface of the earth, there would be less sickness and less mortality than now prevail.”

Professor C. A. Gilman, M. D., of the New York College of Physicians and Surgeons, says :—“Nine-tenth of the disease to which flesh is heir is due to abuse of allopathic medicine in infancy or childhood.”

Sir Richard Douglas Powell, Bart, M. D., K. C. V. O., F. R. S., remarks :—“In spite of all that we hear of our progress in medicine, we cannot cure a common cold.”

Sir Frederick Treves Birt, G. C. V. O., C. B., M. D., L. D., F. R. S., says :—“The time will soon come when drugs and medicines will be a thing of the past.”

Sir John Forbes, M. D., F. R. S., Physician to Her Majesty Late Queen Victoria, says :—“Some patients get well with the aid of medicine, more without it, and still more in spite of it.”

Sir Oliver Wendell Holmes says :—“If the whole

materia medica could be sunk to the bottom of the sea, it would be all the better for mankind and all the worse for fishes,"

Let us now see what the distinguished allopath Professor H. C. Wood has written in his wellknown Treatise on Therapeutics, "Experience is said to be the mother of wisdom. Verily she has been in medicine rather a blind leader of the blind and the history of Medical Progress is the history of a man groping in the darkness, finding seeming gems of truth, one after another, only in a few minutes to cast each back into a heap of forgotten baubles that in their day had also been mistaken for verities. Looking at the revolution of the past, listening to the therapeutic babel of the present, it is a wonder that men should take refuge in nihilism, and like lotus eaters dream that all alike is folly, that rest and quiet and calm are the only human fruitions."

Hear what Sir Osler, M. D., D. Sc., L. L. D., F. R. S., F. R. C. P. the Regius Professor of Medicine in the University of Oxford, has acknowledged: "It is not as if our homœopathic brethren are asleep; far from it, they are awake to the importance of the scientific study of disease. It is distressing, that so many goodmen live isolated in a measure, from the great body of the profession. The original grievous mistake was ours—to quarrel with our brothers over infinitesimals was a most unwise and stupid thing to do."

Sir Osler totally gives up drugs and looks upon them as worthless and in the majority of cases injurious."

Hippocrates wrote that some diseases can be treated by similars Theophrastus said diseases are best cured by similars. Galen said that health is maintained by supplying similar with similar.

What do Osler, Tyson and Anders teach? They

confirmed what the eminent Dr. F. Goodhart said in his annual address before the British Medical Association in 1901. He says :—"Why do we give drugs? Often not because the disease demands them, but because the patient is not happy until he gets them; too often he is not happy then. They are sometimes given to hide our ignorance, I fear, or to make time while we watch and wait. The drugs were rushed for more than they were worth and they are now buried by later booms, such as animal extracts and anti-toxin and many of these will be buried too,"

In speaking before the Faculty of Medicine in Paris, Sir Dyce Duckworth, M. D., L. L. D., F. R. C. P., of London said :—"We are, I much fear, suffering in these days from a widely spread spirit of incredulity, timidity and hopelessness in the whole realm of therapeutics. We spend much time in cultivating elaborate diagnosis and this is quite right, but we grievously neglect our main business as healers and mitigators of disease. In short, are we not, as physicians, slowly drifting into the position of abstract scientist and gradually losing our proper relation to the sick as skilful medical artist. To speak the truth, we have no materia medica worth the name."

Conservative and observent physicians of the dominant school of Medicine have now come to recognise the malevolent results of their drugs. Naturally, they have lost confidence in them and a large number have practically abandoned therapeutics. The times and the seasons have undergone a sad transformation. Now the profession, the same predominant profession, in spite of renewals in lock, stock and barrel, has come to give up practically all internal medicaments. The pendulum has swung to the other side of the arc. But if Duckworth's warning is heeded, if this scientifically acute but

practically obtuse profession will but take its eye from the microscope and raise its head from the research table, it will perceive that the shrub of homœopathic therapeutics so thrifty a century ago, has now developed into a giant oak. Within its sheltering shade is room enough for all the tribe of men who hanker after the balm of healing.

The above are a few of the opinions held by some of the most eminent allopaths and prove to a conclusion that scepticism universally reigns in the domain of Allopathy; but in the field of Homeopathy there is a perfect certainty of the law of therapeutics.

Clinical therapeutics, says, Leyden is today not based on a single definite method of cure. We take the good, that is, that which does the patient good, wherever we can find it as soon as exact investigation has determined its value. This catholic statement carries with it such far-reaching consequence that one might well wish it were both original and true. But, as in all phases of history, so in the present phase of medical history, events and thoughts repeat themselves. Centuries ago, Celsus said exactly the same thing that Leyden says today. Many others have said the same thing in the interval of eighteen hundred years between Celsus and Leyden, and the straight and beneficent path mapped out in Leyden's dictum has not yet been followed to the end, even by the best intentioned of men. The teachings of the dominant school of medicine are pregnant with unacknowledged Homeopathy. One need only examine the well known text books of Ringer, Phillips, Shoemaker, Hare and the current medical reports, to be satisfied on this point. Why should a principle of therapeutics or a method of cure not be openly acknowledged when it is found to be true and practical? Are we obliged to teach that which

we do not practise and practise that which we do not believe? It is time that the medical profession should grasp the duties of the present, the duty to our patients, the duty to ourselves, the duty to the noble art of medicine we profess to practise; and follow Leyden's dictum unconcernedly to take the good wherever we can find it, when exact investigation has determined its value. Either Homeopathy is true and therefore should be practised by all who recognise it as true; or Homeopathy is false, and therefore be proved to be false. In science, concessions can be made only in unessentials. Science is not politics. Politics lives on concessions, for its principle is expediency. The principle of science is truth, and truth can make no concessions to error. In the holiest temple of humanity, in the temple of Medical art, there should be no place for the ignorant, the pretender, the politician. There should be only men of science, courting truth without fear of the consequences to which their conclusions may lead them.

Sir John Megaw says that his system is based on facts. But if his system be dissected it will be conclusively proved to be based upon the contrary of what he has uttered.

The proof of the pudding lies in the eating and the correctness of this old adage can be found in Homeopathy.

Homeopathy has faced bitter opposition, has withstood the most rigid investigation and to-day everything produced and used by any School of Medicine bears ample testimony to the fact that the homeopathic law is the only rational and scientific law ever evolved for the right prescribing of drugs. Thousands of active, energetic, intelligent, thoroughly qualified and distinguished medical practitioners and hundreds of thousands of patients and practical beneficiaries stand and give testimony to its wonderful clinical

efficacy, for in all diseases there can be found a similimum, for every ailment a homeopathic remedy.

In all epidemics of malignant diseases, Homeopathy has been found always in the vanguard of progress and has always come out victorious with flying colours. In Cholera, Small-pox, Plague, Influenza, Pneumonia, Typhoid fever and other diseases Homeopathy has been far more successful than Allopathy.

Individual and hospital statistics have conclusively proved the authenticity of the above assertion. For the edification of Sir John Megaw I say that in the year 1708, the great allopath Albert Haller was born. Haller was the first to suggest that if we wish to make ourselves conversant with the action of drugs, those drugs must be tested on the healthy human body. But who followed his admonition? Hahnemann, the father of Homeopathy, made the tests. But Haller is considered one of the great fathers of dominant Medicine and until now Hahnemann's name has been a forbidden one outside the ranks of his followers.

Is it scientific to make suggestions and unscientific to carry them out? The scientific method of treatment is described by the eminent Dr. Horatio C. Wood (Hare, System of Practical Therapeutics, 1901, volume 1, page 21) "as being based upon a knowledge of what it is necessary to do in disease, an acquaintance with the power of the forces at hand; and an application, by the ordinary process of reasoning of such forces to the needs of the occasion."

Dr. F. C. Shattuck, M. D. of the Harvard University (New England Medical Gazette, April, 1906, page 171) states the leading therapeutic principles as follows:—

"First, Do no harm; second, try to see as clearly as possible just why give a drug, your purpose in giving it, whether as a specific, curative, palliative or as a placebo;

Third, as far as you can, give a drug uncombined. Fourth, in using an efficient drug be as sure as you can of a good preparation and then give it until something happens—either the desired effect or evidence appears that the limit of toleration has been reached.”

If the above are the true statements of the scientific method of treatment and it can not be denied that they are accepted as such by the great mass of the dominant profession—then Homeopathy is unquestionably the scientific method of treatment, for Homeopathic medication is founded “upon a knowledge of what it is necessary to do in disease, an acquaintance with the power of the forces at hand and an application, by the ordinary process of reasoning, of such forces to the needs of the occasion.”

Homeopathy has been the result of scientific process of observation, generalization, experimentation. Experiment, observation, verification are the three mighty pedestals on which any induction is elevated. These identical pedestals are the *terrafirma* of Hahnemann's Homeopathy.

It will be no news to Sir John Megaw to hear that homeopathy has made and is making an astonishing progress in all foreign countries.

In England homeopathy is making forward march.

The British Homeopathic Society and London Homeopathic Hospital are well known medical organisations of England. The members of these associations have been recruited from eminent allopaths of that country.

At present a Homeopath has been knighted and has been appointed as the Ordinary Physician to H. R. Highness the Prince of Wales.

He is no other than Sir John Weir, K. C. V. O.

It is a noteworthy fact that very recently there has sprung a great desire on the part of the “dominant school

of medicine" to be conversant with the principles of Homeopathy. This has not been forced by any medicant act or policy on our part. There are two prominent factors which have brought about this change on their mentality.

First, the slow and persistent dissatisfaction on the part of the allopaths with the very uncertain and unsatisfactory condition of their present-day therapeutics and secondly, the expansion of Homeopathy all over the world and its official recognition in some of the principal countries and its ready appreciation in the highest quarters of the world.

Sir John Megaw was certainly cognisant of the fact that the great centenary meeting of their all powerful British Medical Association was held in London in July, 1932.

The Homeopaths of England were permitted and got an opportunity of presenting the *raison d'être* and *modus operandi* of Homeopathy before that distinguished assemblage of physicians of the dominant school of medicine under the auspices of that school itself.

Dr. George Burford, M. B ; M. C. himself a great Homœopath, saw Dr Cawadias, Secretary of the History of the Medicine Section and requested him to set apart a day or two for Homeopathy.

The matter was put before the Council of the British Medical Association and the reply was that there was no objection whatever, and that the nature of the papers was left entirely to the officers of the sections.

Dr. Burford saw many prominent members of the Association, including the President of the British Medical Association Congress, Lord Dawson and, wherever he went his proposal met with a ready and sympathetic response and kindly interest. I may write with Dr.

Burford's own words that he "had been knocking at an open door".

After necessary confabulations and deliberations, the members of the Royal Society of Medicine were pleased to lend the largest room for the proposed meeting on July 26, 1932 at which the eminent allopath Sir William Wilcox, of St. Mary's Hospital presided at the "express desire of Lord Dawson".

Sir John Weir, K. C. V. O. in collaboration with Dr. Frank Bodman read the paper entitled "Homœopathy—an Explanation of Its Principles" there where all the stalwarts of the British Medical Association and British Homœopathic Society were present to hear that paper.

A notice of the paper was subsequently published in the British Medical Journal in common with other Congress papers. It would thus be evident to everybody that a definite object had been gained, as the subject of Homeopathy was discussed for the first time in the head quarters of the Royal Society of Medicine. On the following Friday, July 29, 1932 at the British Medical Association Centenary Meeting, another paper was read and the meeting was very largely attended.

Sir William Wilcox opened the discussion which was published in the British Medical Journal of August 20, 1932. Sir W. Wilcox "reminded the section, that there was complete freedom of action in therapeutics. Much of the advance in medicine during the past century could be reconciled with Homeopathic principles, but it was still incumbent upon Homeopaths to prove the validity of their formulæ in relation to serious diseases. Could they, he asked, cure syphilis with secondary lesions by means of Homeopathic drugs and doses? That was a crucial test".

At the banquet in the evening, Sir George Wyatt Truscott who has been known to be a loyal friend and

supporter of Homeopathy presided. Dr. Hamill, of St. Bartholomew's Hospital, an eminent allopath, replying for the guests said: "Why should there be barriers between the Homeopaths and others? They had the same end in view, were trained in the same schools and passed the same examinations. Why should there be a distinction? Let them pool their knowledge and work together in harmony."

The good Chairman stated that he was very pleased "to have lived to see such a day."

He said: "It was very pleasing to an old Homeopath of over forty years to learn that more cordial relations now existed between different schools of thought in medicine. This greater liberality of mind was a very gratifying feature of the present Congress. For the first time in the history of medicine in this Country a welcome had been extended to the exponents of Homeopathy, and papers had been read not only before the British Medical Association, but also by the courtesy of the President and Council, at the Royal Society of Medicine. These papers should do much to dispel the misunderstandings of a century and the ignorance that still exists as to the actual teachings and methods of Homeopathy."

At a Hunterian Society Meeting, where the subject of gout was being discussed, Sir John Weir was present. As soon as the allopaths had finished their respective says, Sir John Weir was asked by the President to express his views from the Homeopathic stand point.

These are facts, established, convincing, conclusive facts which will go a long way to prove that Homeopathy is also based upon hard and solid facts.

Another healthy sign of the recognition of Homeopathic principles can be found in the editorial remarks published in the British Medical Journal of July 9, 1932.

which is considered by all of us to be a conservative Journal.

It is written : "Before the passing of the Medical act, a Committee on quackery was appointed, which in 1851 presented a report condemning the practice of Homeopathy. In more recent years a wider view has been taken and it has been realised that in medicine there is no orthodox doctrine, but that when once a man has obtained a registrable qualification in the usual way, he is entitled to hold his own opinion on therapeutics".

The catholicity of views expressed in the above editorial comments will show the present outlook of Homeopathy in England.

In the United States of America, the President of the American Republic has appointed a Homeopath Dr. Boon to be his ordinary Family Physician.

Homeopathy as a scientific and rational art of healing, has been openly acknowledged in England, America, Germany, France, Brazil, Russia, Italy, Switzerland, Mexico and Spain.

The other day in Germany, through the exertions of illustrious Professor Bier a Chair of Homeopathy and a Poly-clinic have been established in the Medical Faculty of Berlin. Professor Bier's conversion to Homeopathy is to be considered a great event in the life of Homeopathy in Germany.

It is an acknowledged fact that biological works and scientific investigations in various countries from various sources have confirmed the truth formulated by Hahnemann.

Dr. Cabot, the eminent University teacher in New England, said in 1906, "The use of tuberculin is a form of vaccination which illustrates better than any example

known to me the approval of Homeopathic principles in our school.

The use of bacterial vaccines recently produced by Sir A. Wright is distinctly Homeopathic".

Von Behring, the discoverer of diphtheria anti-toxin, said "By what technical term could we more appropriately speak of this influence excited by a similar virus than by Hahnemann's word, 'Homeopathy'." The well-known Arndt-schulz law has proved the correctness of Hahnemann's Homeopathy.

The recent researches of Taylor, Sir J. C. Bose, Duke, Bier and Karl Kohschau and the recent Medical Research Council Report on Radium come to the rescue of Homeopathy and refer "to the general principle that has been established with so many drugs, that large doses and very small doses act in opposite ways".

The erudite Robert Boyle made a discovery of great importance to mankind, a discovery which, in the present day specially, has been a blessing. This was, that a diseased organism is more sensitive to influences than is a normal organism. Hahnemann took hint from this observation and the principal cause which led Hahnemann to adopt such smaller doses of remedies than those so long administered, was the observation that the susceptibility of the organs and tissues of the body was greatly enhanced for their specific stimuli by disease. The eye in health can bear the brightest light, but when it is diseased the smallest flood of light produces excruciating pain. The ear in health can tolerate the roar of a hundred cannon or the most loud-sounding peals of thunder, but in a state of inflammation it suffers with the greatest torture from the slightest sound. Every organ of the body is painfully affected by its specific stimuli, which in normal health, produce only pleasurable

sensations. It is, therefore, clear that the various tissues of human body, when not in health react with strong force to doses of their specific stimuli, greatly smaller than those they can tolerate without pain in health.

Professor Rudolf Arndt has found that weak stimuli bring forth vital action, medium stimuli augment it, strong stimuli impede vital energy and the most powerful neutralize and do away with it.

Professor Schulz agrees with Arndt and writes with emphasis that where massive doses cripple and kill, infinitesimal doses excite, that is, not the diseased condition but the reaction of the healthy tissues against it and that disease is cured by the stimulation of the healthy parts of the organism to throw off the diseased.

The laborious experiment conducted by Professor Sir Jagadis Bose, KT; C. S. I; C. I. E; M. A.; D. SC; F. R. S. in his *Animal and Plant Response*, are of extreme interest, as illustrating that, with plants also, the answer to electrical and drug stimuli varies with the condition of the plant stimulated, and with the amount of the dose. A poison that turns out to be deadly in bulk, will act as a stimulus to growth and resistance if exhibited in sufficiently minute doses.

He stated that "the effect of a drug was modified by the constitution of the plants. As a concrete example, he cited the different re-actions given by three batches of seedlings, similar at the start.

"These were kept for sometime under three distinct conditions, and afterwards subjected to the action of a given dose of dilute poison.

The first batch succumbed to the poison immediately. The second batch struggled for a time against it; then recovered and exhibited a moderate rate of growth afterwards. The third batch was actually stimulated by the

poison and demonstrated this by invigorated growth. "The physiological effect of a drug on the plant was further shown to be modified by the dose of application. Thus, a poisonous agent, which caused depression or death was shown to act as a *strong stimulant when administered in a minute quantities.*"

The cause is found in the discovery of an important factor viz, the dose of application ; not, hitherto taken into account. Thus I find that while a particular intensity of electric current accelerated growth, any excess above a critical point retarded it.

The same is true of chemical stimulants. A striking practical result was obtained with certain poisons, which in normal doses killed the plant but in quantities sufficiently minute acted as an extra-ordinary efficient stimulant, the treated plants growing far more vigorously.

"We see how a fresh line of research has opened up for pharmacology and medicine." (Vide Royal Society of Medicine, March 21, 1920).

These are oft-repeated and transparent truths which can be verified by any member of the dominant school of Medicine if he has a mind to do so.

Sir John Megaw ought to know that many distinguished allopaths like his own distinguished self of his own country, were converted to Homeopathy.

In India the late illustrious savant Dr. Mahendra Lal Sircar, M. D ; D. L ; C. I. E. was the second M. D. of the Calcutta University. Within a very short time he occupied a unique position as a great allopath. He was the most shining star in the horizon of our Indian allopathic physicians.

It will not be uninteresting as an episode in the history of Homeopathy in India to relate how Dr. Sircar's conversion to Homeopathy was brought about. Dr. Sircar

was equally with his other Colleagues a confirmed hater and denouncer of Homeopathy and perhaps the most bigoted of them all. Through the indomitable exertion and dogged perseverance of the late Babu Rajendra Dutt, a millionaire of Calcutta, Dr. Sircar's eyes were opened to the excellence of Homœopathic remedies. I refrain from dwelling upon the full history of his conversion. His calling took him to the bed-side of the sick and he unfortunately saw many youths and maidens plucked off in the flower of their age and the healthy and vigorous dying in a few hours. These patients were sanguine of eventual convalescence, but to the extreme mortification and chagrin of Dr. Sircar the orthodox remedies could do nothing to nip the malady in the bud and the patients breathed their last sigh.

Strange to relate that the cases declared to be hopeless by Dr. Sircar were eventually cured with despised Homeopathic remedies by Rajendra Babu. This fact staggered Dr. Sircar and the result of those cures was something bordering on the marvellous if not miraculous.

In the course of a year he was fully convinced of the truth of Homeopathy and to further resist, denounce and oppose it would, it appeared to him, be a crime.

Through the exertions of the late Dr. Goodeve Chakrabarti, I. M. S. a branch of the British Medical Association was opened in Calcutta in 1863. Dr. Sircar was appointed its secretary and three years later one of its Vice-Presidents. At a special meeting of this association it was decided that Dr. Sircar would speak something against Homeopathy. Dr. Sircar read a paper on the Supposed Uncertainty in Medical Science and on the Relationship between Diseases and their Remedial Agents at the 4th Annual meeting of the Association in February, 1867. Everybody thought that Dr. Sircar would pass

scathing remarks against Homeopathy. But the men present were struck with wonder when they heard Dr. Sircar's views. The man who came prepared to curse, began to pray.

As soon as his paper was read, a scene was created which was dramatic in the extreme and the temper of the meeting underwent a sudden change for the worse.

And subsequently Dr. Sircar avowed his faith in Homeopathy and his conversion by a bold and open declaration. In fact, Dr. Sircar's sudden conversion and steadfast allegiance to Homeopathy should be reckoned to be a glorious event of Homeopathy in India, and the expansion of Homeopathy in our country may be counted from that date.

As long as Dr. Sircar lived, moved and had his being in Calcutta, Homeopathy reached the highest pinnacle of prosperity and perfection. Dr. Sircar made a valiant endeavour to bridge the gulf between Homeopathy and orthodox medicine. His Allopathic Colleagues became his formidable opponents, but at last some of them were bludgeoned into his way of thinking. They caught the contagion from Dr. Sircar, followed his example blindly and sacredly and began to practise Homeopathy openly with an amount of zeal and earnestness worthy of ardent followers.

But unfortunately what is the present position of Homeopathy in India? It is true that Homeopathy is spreading its wings over the whole of this vast continent but it is equally true it has not been officially recognised by the Government of India. The position of Homeopathy in India, the positive discouragement it receives from the Government, the sneers and contempt which are being regularly showered upon its head by the duly constituted

body of regulars are things to which we can shut our eyes.

But in spite of this palpable disadvantage, Homeopathy has steered clear of the rock of public opposition in India. Homeopathy has been the saviour of numerous precious lives from the jaws of death where Allopathy has been found to be quite impotent to effect any cure, alleviation or palliation.*

I wish I could prolong this discussion to my heart's content, but space stands in the way. With these few words I bring this editorial comment to the notice of Major-General Sir John Megaw.

Incalculable good will accrue to the humanity from a proper and friendly understanding between Allopathy and Homeopathy.

In fact the present day findings in the researches of Modern Medicine and its tendency appear to be more and more towards the principles of Homeopathy. If we have a sincere desire to keep this torch of principle ablaze in the gloom of therapeutic scepticism of the last generation, it should be our constant endeavour to become worthy disciples of Hahnemann in our knowledge of medical science in general and Homeopathic principles in particular.

Major-General Sir John Megaw is a liberal-minded Allopath who is imbued with the principles of true science. He is universally known to be above party politics and as such I appeal to him not to look askance but to do something for the good of Homeopathy in India.