

Editorial.

The desideratum "so devoutly to be wished" has come to be realised at last. It is really a pity that there was hardly ever a combination worth the name amongst the Homœopathic Practitioners in this country, though Homœopathy, as a Science and Art of Healing, has already got its entrance into every household, rich or poor, literate or illiterate. Homœopathy has not obtained the State recognition, though irresistibly proved by force of reasoning and also daily verified at the bed-side that the Law of Similars is the only curative Law under the sun. In this circumstance, there ought to be a *bonafide* governing body or a central control, in order to put a stop to the many abuses that have necessarily crept into the field, as well as to ensure an onward progress of such an important Science. Indeed such an institution should have been a thing of the past.

In 1929, we tried to assemble and form a conference amongst the Calcutta Practitioners, but we failed. Everything seems to have an opportune moment for its coming into being, and this year a few of us took into their head to unite themselves into an All Bengal Homœopathic Conference. On the 10th April last our worthy and hoary headed colleague—Dr. Sarat Chandra Ghose, M. D. (U. S. A.) issued a strong Appeal for the purpose, and thus the ball was set a-rolling. The Presidential Address is given below which will speak for itself.

Almost all the Calcutta Homœopaths and many of the Mofussil Practitioners assembled at the conference held from the 17th to 19th May last. Some important resolutions were passed which are expected to be carried into effect by and by. We wish the Conference all success. Glory to the good originators and to the worthy President. May their labours be crowned with success.

The All Bengal Homœopathic Conference.

Presidential Address.

Maharaja Bahadur, Brother Practitioners,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

Allow me at the very outset to offer you my most sincere and cordial thanks for the very high honour you have thought fit to bestow upon me by asking me to preside over the deliberation of this All Bengal Homœopathic Conference. I feel, in responding to the call made upon me by the promoters of this conference, that I am appropriating an

honour which should have fallen upon some one of the distinguished colleagues whom I see around me.

For myself, I had never dreamt of occupying this chair. Many of my colleagues are fully aware of the fact that I have tried to avoid this honour. Moreover in recent years other public duties and responsibilities have been thrust upon me and which have so increased that they now swallow up practically all my available time and energy and good deal of my leisure.

I thank you sincerely from the bottom of my heart for your selection of me. I can assure you that the best of all that is inherent in me is at the service of this Conference so long as by your good will, I occupy the Presidential seat, for in serving this Conference I know I am propagating the cause of Homœopathy.

In the name and by the authority of the Homœopathic Conference I greet you, brother practioners and citizens, constituents of this assembly! This representative assembly, inspired by one mind, is the tangible manifestation of the solidarity of Homœopathy in our country. Great is the power of assembling ourselves together; for in our confraternity the whole is as great as its parts, only when the parts come together. The living sense of comradeship, the animating effect of assembling with one accord, the mighty stimulus derived from human assemblage—these are added factors permeating the structure of our intellectual frame work and are poorly represented or represented not at all by a mere paper register of adherents. Here we strongly augment the springs of action by the contact of personalities.

Homœopathy does not now lisp its first words. It has spread into every nook and corner of our country. It is a matter of extreme mortification on our part to say that there are many intelligent and educated men in India who do not know the principles of Hahnemann's Science of Therapeutics, but in spite of their palpable ignorance they always scoff at and ridicule Homœopathy. Homœopathy has

been put to the touch-stone of experience and experiment and has ever come off with flying colours.

The subject that I have chosen for my Presidential address is "Homeopathy: Its underlying principles of cure and scientific basis" and I have made this choice with the ostensible object of vindicating the claims of Homœopathy as a rational system of medicine and of dispelling the darkness from the minds of those persons who are not conversant with its principles.

But I say in all humility that I am a poor homœopath,—no better than a pigmy follower of our immortal Master and as such the gentlemen present here cannot expect any illuminating speech from me.

Vast and varied as the wealth of Homœopathy is, I would not seek to display its splendour in all naked sublimity before this assembly; it would be absurd making any such attempt in the present discourse. However, I shall just try to give an idea of the underlying principles of Homœopathy and its scientific basis. Homœopathy is a science of which we have every reason to be proud. Whether we consider it as a philosophy, as a science, or as a life-restoring, health-imparting art, we may well be satisfied to consecrate our lives to its expansion, propagation and advancement. There is no branch of human endeavours more prolific than ours in the practical betterment of our race and civilisation and there is no department of our art, no section or degree of Homœopathy, which does not excite the sympathy and fostering care of this Conference. If any body wishes to be conversant with my religion, my instantaneous reply is, I am a Homœopath. My politics? I am a Homœopath. My fatherland? Homœopathy. With me, Homœopathy is the dominating spirit. Homœopathy is first, and second and everything else that is worth having comes after that.

When I took my first timid peeps into the beauty and grandeur of Homœopathy, I had an impression at the back

of my mind that I should soon be able to detect and make use of all the good there was in the system and that I must study and work assiduously in exclusion. But that impression was pretty soon knocked out of me. I found in the system much more than I foresaw, and I found this in addition, that if I was to make anything at all out of it, I must dedicate my life to its cause and associate myself with others who had done the same.

We are all members of one fraternity and this Conference has only one interest—Homœopathy. It is inspired by one enthusiasm—the enthusiasm of Homœopathy. Every sincere advocate whose principal object in life is to exemplify the Hahnemannian law, has the right to the countenance and support of this conference. The law is one and the glory of it, but we cannot all practise it exactly alike however much we may desire to do so. We can all aim at one ideal, and the higher we can pitch our aim the more likely we are to reach the climax of attainment; but we have each to find out the particular method which gives the best results to our individual limited powers. Only, it will be well if we do not take too humble a view of our powers and their limitations; and whatever we do, let us ever be eager to extend our borders. We must always be moving on: and if I can, in some measure, discharge the humble policeman's duty, of moving you all on, I shall feel that my election has not been fruitless.

ENTHUSIASM OF HOMŒOPATHY

Motion is life—Stagnation is dissolution. And no less important than motion is the direction in which the movement takes place. It matters not what our grand or shade of homœopathic practice may be, so long as we are ever moving onward, forward and upward further and further away from the region of allopathic name — fetters and negations, we are contributing to the evolution of our Science and the welfare of our race. And the force which alone

can move us on is enthusiasm—the enthusiasm of Homœopathy.

In this Conference and all cognate associations the spring of all our endeavours against human ills, the force which carries us onward towards the consummation of our art, is the enthusiasm of Homœopathy. It is this which inspired our immortal Hahnemann, when once he had grasped the idea, to undertake those stupendous labours, the magnitude of which even his disciples but imperfectly appreciate. The enthusiasm of Homœopathy has had its martyrs as well as its heroes; and who shall say that its martyrs have not suffered in a cause worthy of their sufferings? Enthusiasm knows no laws of human making—only the laws of Nature herself. The worship of Hahnemann is not the religion of this Conference, but the enthusiasm of Homœopathy is and the more perfect our consecration, the more fiery our zeal, the greater is the glory we render to the world's leader and benefactor. It is enthusiasm that heralds success, it is enthusiasm that removes obstacles, gains treasures, achieves results; and enthusiasm backed by a good cause, can and will plant Homœopathy in a small place. A profound confidence in the immutable law of similars, a burning zeal to make the right prevail, to advance the welfare of mankind, and a single eye to the interests of our science—these are the forces with which our American fellow workers have won their victories; these are the forces which have carried them and will carry us on to complete triumph.

MISSION OF HOMŒOPATHY

The mission of Homœopathy is to civilise, I might almost say to spiritualise, medicinal practice. When we think what the millions of suffering humanity are daily losing for the want of the help which Homœopathy is ready to give, all smaller questions fade into nothingness beside the one supreme question which burns in our hearts, the desire to make the truth we know prevail for the salvation of the world from

disease and suffering. This is our mission as individuals, gentlemen, and it should be the mission of this Conference too.

HAHNEMANN

Of all the medical systems which have successively made their appearance in the world, there cannot be found any which has commanded more world-wide renown and greater interest than Homœopathy. Like all discoveries, like Harvey's circulation of the blood, like Paracelsus' antimony, and like Jenner's vaccination, Hahnemann's Homœopathy was, for some time, persecuted with the most remorseless rancour by its opponents. A tempest of derision burst upon Hahnemann's head while the news of his discovery was promulgated. The superiority of his philosophy which he ever maintained with so much kingly dignity, bore the infallible stamp of the exuberant predominance of his intellectual vigour and genius. To lift up the minds of the people to a healthy atmosphere of medical science and to dispel the darkness which stretched like a network into every nook and corner of this vast universe requires, no doubt, the agency of a superhuman intellect and it was the great Hahnemann who performed that glorious task. The teaching and principles disseminated by Hahnemann have stood the probing test of the scientific world for more than a century and his law of cure stands unchanged to the present day. But science knows no barricade of race or language; the rays of its majestic sunrise are the liberty, equality and fraternity which are illuminated by knowledge.

Hahnemann was scholar whom scholars honoured and respected; a physician whom physicians feared; a philologist with whom philologists dreaded to dispute; a chemist who taught chemists; a philosopher whom adversity nor honour had power to change.

Truth triumphs alike over custom and prejudice and the doctrine of Hahnemann has, therefore, advanced with rapid strides, sweeping away the stumbling-block

of progress with superiority and stability of its laws.

It is no hyperbole or fiction to say that Homœopathy has widened its boundaries over the entire civilized world. Homœopathy has survived the deadly arrows of persecution and won the clustering laurels of triumphant worth. The attention of all the civilized world has now been directed to the sublime truth of Hahnemann's Homœopathy in its pristine purity, and the mist of misconception, wilful or otherwise, that prevailed before as to its relative position in the medical world, has been cleared by the convincing gale of its worth.

Homœopathy 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 homœopathic law is the only rational and scientific law ever evolved for the right prescribing of drugs. Thousands of active, energetic, intelligent, thoroughly educated practitioners; 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. We honour Hahnemann because his pure soul loved that which was right; because his stored mind of varied learning and questioning spirit sought the truths of nature; because he ennobled our race; because he has contributed as much as any man living or dead to the real prosperity of the world; because he left a legacy of helpfulness to every human being. Millions are paying homage to his genius at this moment and pronouncing his name with veneration. He was never found on his knees before the altar of insincerity or authority. He stood erect, sublime in immensity, by the grand tranquil column of Reason. Close to the age of 90, bowed down under the weight of years, covered by the insignia of honour, beloved of two continents with royalty to do him homage, he laid his weary head upon the

bosom of universal mother and with loving arms encircled around him sank into that slumber called Death.

THE HOMŒOPATHY : THE SCIENCE OF THERAPEUTICS

From time immemorial, medicines have been employed for the eradication or mitigation of diseases. In the infancy of allopathic therapeutics, it was recommended to use the medicines for us, because they have been foolishly and empirically administered with beneficial results. As time rolled on, medicines grew up into a system with a collection of drugs for the cure of some diseases ; and this sort of crude therapeutics descended to us from era to era with purely chaotic improvements. No logical and scientific explanation of the administration of remedies was given, no discovery of any law was made to fathom the remedial virtues of drugs and no fixed rule was adduced for their employment in the eradication of morbid manifestations.

Homœopathy was born at a time of utmost stagnation in medical learning when the Science of Therapeutics was pregnant with chaos and confusion, was groping in the dark and haphazard and not much above that employed by the savage. Venesection was the sovereign remedy in every malady ; polypharmacy had reached the climax, each massive dose containing almost everything known to be good for anything ; mercurial treatment was so universally and continuously adopted that toothless victims on that account were met at every corner ; blistering and the red-hot iron skinned their victims in order to counter-irritate them ; all these and other like measures, I repeat, produced needless purgatorial sufferings, that the historian may be able to outline, but never to depict in terms of actual experience.

Hahnemann's message at such a dark time was, indeed, a "gospel of good tidings", destined to transform the world of therapeutics. It was revolutionary and reconstructive and mark the beginning of a new era in medicine. It was

the "new birth" since improvement in all things pertaining to therapeutics began to date from that time. He will always be revered by posterity, as the emancipator, the Messiah of Medicine, the creator of the Science of Therapeutics.

Henceforth "men began to open their eyes and see", the medical mind "seemed to gather new energies at the sight of the vast field that opened before it and transformation was progressive. Why Hahnemann's amendment was not immediately adopted, by an unanimous vote; why his innovation was not greeted as the harbinger of the medical millennium and the gentle, more attractive and more efficacious ministrations were not embraced by all, at sight, was matter indeed, for astonishment, but was not exceptional. There have been other instances of great truth held in abeyance, notably Christianity, but there has been no depreciation of it on that account. Reformation moves with slow steps. All evolution is measured by the micrometer, progress being so little at a time as to be almost inappreciable.

What a remarkable state of affairs it was that eventuated after Hahnemann's discovery; what a wonderful series of events to occur in quick succession, after therapeutic immobility had persisted for thousands of years and just when knowledge concerning Homœopathy was in progress.

It was discovered by Hahnemann that certain products, such as the discharges from diseased tissues, the viruses and morbid sera possessed medicinal power and acted in harmony with the Homœopathic law. These "nosodes" as they were called, were employed as remedies with wonderful success and were subjected to more than usual ridicule and depreciation. It is now a matter of great pride and joy on our part to find that this also was an extension of knowledge as has been demonstrated by twentieth century developments. Great ingenuity of explanation has failed to convince the candid mind that this is not Homœopathy, and in spite of all such arguments the Homœopathic principle is again

triumphant. This has been freely acknowledged by Von Behring, Pasteur, Wright and others, masters of the serum therapy, who in the spirit of true scientists, were concerned only to find out the truth. The vaccines, the anti-toxins, serum therapy, and the salts of radium, as well as other drugs in general use—all these change the opsonic index, stimulate phagocytosis, generate immunity and prove curatively effective in accordance with the law of similars.

That this is distinctively homœopathic has been proved experimentally by Dr. Wheeler of London with Phosphorus; Watters of Boston, with the salts of Pottassium; Frey of John Hopkins, with Rhustox; Burnett of Ann Arber with Echinacea; Bailey of Chicago with radio-active substances, as well as all of our clinicians for ever a century in bedside practice. Homœopathy claims to be "the Science of Therapeutics". This claim involves the bold assumption that prior to the establishment of Homœopathy on a rigid scientific foundation, therapeutics as a science had no existence. I may be pardoned, if I say, that apart from conscious or unconscious Homœopathy, therapeutics as a science has no existence today.

DEFINITION OF SCIENCE

How then are we to define science? It is rationalised knowledge of verified facts concerned mainly with the laws regulating occurrences. In the broadest application and acceptation of the term, it is the bringing of the multitudinous phenomena of Nature to order and system, by discovering the hidden conditions of existence—its one and sole interest to find out the "what" and the "how" of things. The differentiating characteristic of science from our point of view is its method of graduated verification, not the employment of induction in place of deduction.

As G. H. Lewes says:—The true antithesis is not between induction and deduction, but between verified and unverified cases of induction and deduction.

Hahnemann took recourse to an entirely true method for arriving at the facts of nature. He purposely selected that form of logic called the deductive process for its special class of work. Upto Hahnemann's time the method has not been seen to be the only true and trustworthy instrument for understanding Nature's meaning in matters pertaining to medicine. All kinds of substitutes had been formulated and employed for getting at these mysterious and secret agencies of Nature about the cure of malady. Hahnemann's genius perceived that the whole must be stripped off of complications, which are food to the quibbler.

Take remedies, said he, administer them in health—the pure, uncomplicated state—observe what they produce, and you possess a certain guide to their powers when one is sick. Now, some investigators employ untried remedies to individuals who are sick, and draw their conclusions from the medley which results. Others observe what happens with and what happens without the administering of a certain medicine in a certain kind of case, and then from their opinions as to its worth. Hahnemann simplified the problem, eliminated the cross-currents of disease, and noted down the pure and uncomplicated symptoms resulting from drug-giving in a healthy person. Here, said he, is the clear and faithful account of the powers of the remedy. And this is the pure Homeopathic plan or trying or proving remedy. In this fashion matters proceeded, till in the Victorian era there appeared two mighty logicians, John Stuart Mill and Alexander Bain. Both were impressed with the sterility of non-homœopathic methods and analysed with critical eyes the causes of the apparent impediment in progress. Bain criticised the apparent inability of medicine to go beyond empiricism—that is, a medicine is good for an ailment with no satisfactory explanation of the reason. If you do not do better than this, in substance, he said, your progress cannot but be very circumscribed.

Mill's intelligence and perception went further. He

discussed the cause of the tardy progress in medicine and dived deep into the available methods of discovery. One common method he dismisses at once as giving "no conclusions of value". Another specified method, he says, "is in these complicated cases out of the question." And both he dismisses as "from the very nature of the case inefficient and illusory".

Mill, however, proceeded still further. The proper method, said he, is the deductive method. "If we try experiments on a person in health, to ascertain the laws of the action of a drug, and then reason therefrom how it will act in a particular disease, this may be a really effective method—and this is deduction."

Could any words more fitly set forth the process of Hahnemann devised and formulated by him before logic had warranted the plan? Mill, after taking a full view of the region recounts the obstacles in investigation, discards certain favourite methods as irrational, specifies and enumerates one method as strikingly, or as he names it, "naturally fitting". And this, gentlemen, is exactly and precisely the method chosen and formulated by Hahnemann for ascertaining the hidden properties of drugs.

The Homœopathic Science of Therapeutics is, therefore, an experimental science; and as observation and experiment are the twin methods of induction, we claim for "Similia" that is an inductive generalization of derivative, not empirical, value.

Gentlemen, you have all heard of the name of Lord Francis Bacon. Bacon believed that it was possible to formulate "an accurate and complete register of all specific medicines". But the sublimest thing for which Bacon is rightly famous is the stress he laid upon the method of induction and the motive he gave individuals for the application of this system of reasoning to the occurrences of life generally, which was, "to provide man with what he requires while he continues to be man". As Lord Macaulay

has written of the inductive philosophy,—“it began in observation and ended in art.” It is therefore true that all the arts and even all the known sciences of this age, owe their definite existence and perceptible progress to Francis Bacon. In short, Bacon taught us to observe facts as they exist and then to make a careful and critical examination of the reason for their existence and for the phenomena which are seen in relation to these facts. By classification of the facts and a systematic arrangement of the things relating to them, principles and laws could be brought to light.

As Dr. Rutherford Russel writes in his History and Heroes of Medicine : - “that Hahnemann achieved what he did is owing to the general advancement of the method of philosophy first proclaimed and explicitly expounded by Lord Bacon”.

Experiment—Observation—Verification—These are the three mighty pedestals on which any induction is elevated. These identical pedestals are the *terrafirma* of Hahnemann's Homœopathy.

DEFINITION AND PRINCIPLES OF HOMCEOPATHY.

Now what is Homœopathy? Homœopathy is a method of selection and employment of remedies for the cure of disease and the alleviations of its sufferings, which method rests upon a rule or law which is invariable and unchangeable. After laborious experiments Hahnemann formulated the following propositions :—

- (1) That the scientific mode of ascertaining drug action upon the human economy is by experimenting them upon a healthy individual.
- (2) That the healing properties of a drug correspond to its disease-producing properties upon the healthy human organism.
- (3) That as a necessary consequence of the above two propositions the drug must be administered in such

a dose that will not produce too great an aggravation of the existing or natural disease.

From the first two propositions Hahnemann formulated the law of "*Similia Similibus Curentur*" or let likes be treated by likes, which is the homœopathic rule of drug therapeutics.

Homœopathy is, therefore, a therapeutic law whose expression is found in "*Similia Similibus Curentur*."

It is based upon the following fundamental principles :—

- (1) That drug action is ascertained solely by proving upon healthy human individuals.
- (2) That the curative virtues of a remedy correspond to its disease-producing properties.
- (3) That only one remedy should be administered at a time.

The scientific method of treatment is described by the eminent Dr. Horetio 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." If this is a true statement of the scientific method of treatment,—and it cannot be denied that it is accepted as such by the great mass of the profession—then homœopathy is without a doubt a scientific method of treatment, for homœopathic medication is 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." Homœopathy is the result of scientific process of observation, generalization, experimentation.

There can be no question that in order to use a remedy effectively we must know what it can accomplish. Just as we make palpation, inspection, percussion, auscultation of the body to find out and weigh symptoms of disease, disease

effects, just so it is an imperative duty and necessity on our part to make palpation, inspection, percussion, auscultation of the body to find out and to weigh, by the symptoms that drugs produce, drug effects. We cannot tell what there is in a drug from its physical qualities (Galen), from its resemblances to certain parts of the body (Paraselsus), from its sensory attributes, or even its chemical constitution. The only way we can learn what there is in a drug is by studying its effect on the organism. For generation, drugs were administered to the sick and effects on the sick were considered to be drug effects, and relying on that basis drugs were continued to be used on the sick.

In the year 1708 the great Albert Haller was born. Haller was the first to suggest that if we wish to make ourselves conversant with the action of drugs, these drugs must be tested on the healthy human body.

Hahnemann made the tests. But Haller is considered one of the great fathers of dominant medicine and until now, Hahnemann has been a forbidden name outside the ranks of his followers. Is it scientific to make suggestions and unscientific to carry them out? It is scientific to give urotropin in bacteriuria; an excellent treatment, by the way. Why is it not equally scientific to give Apis Mellifica in a albuminuria with scanty urine, pallor, dropsy, restlessness, and lack of thirst? Is it because the former treatment is allopathic (antipathic) and the latter is homœopathic? Why is it scientific to give Opium for sleeplessness and not scientific to give Opium for sleeplessness with emotional exhilaration, delirium, fright or terror, dark red face, contracted pupil, stertorous breathing and almost tetanic rigidity? Is it because in the former treatment we practise one-symptom homœopathy, and in the latter treatment we practise homœopathy covering a totality of symptoms? Why is it scientific to combine many drugs, in order to remove as many symptoms and not scientific to prescribe just one drug which is known to produce many symptoms and to disperse as many? Is it

because the former is traditional polypharmacy and the latter is homœopathic monopharmacy ?

Dr. F. C. Shattuck of 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 you 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.

In 1797 Hahnemann (Lesser writings, translated by Dr. Dudgeon, page 273), wrote : —

"Dare I confess that for years I have never prescribed anything but a single remedy at once, and have never repeated the dose until the the action of the former had ceased—a Venesection alone, a purgative alone and always a simple, never a compound remedy, and never a second until I had got a clear notion of the operation of the first ? Dare I confess, that in this manner I have been successful and given satisfaction to my patients and seen things which otherwise I never would have seen ?" Evidently, it was not scientific for Hahnemann to have been one hundred and fifteen years in advance of his time.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ALLOPATHY AND HOMŒOPATHY

Now I shall proceed to dwell upon the difference of the methods of the two schools of medicine. It is chiefly to be found in the manner of prescribing and employing remedies.

The first and most natural objection put forward by one who is not acquainted with Homœopathy is the smallness of its dose. The allopathic physician employes his remedies for their physiological effect which means that the remedy must cause a marked effect, discernible to the senses, upon

the organ or tissue upon which it is expected to act, and as a rule, the effect of the drug must be the opposite of the condition existing in the body or the disease. In order to obtain this effect the dose must be a massive one; thus if he prescribes for costiveness he administers a drug that will cause diarrhoea, and thus force an action of the bowel, ignoring or not observing that costiveness is not the disease but merely the effect of the disease. Therefore, when the effect of the cathartic passes off, the constiveness remains because the drug produced an artificial disease only and the cause producing the constipation was not touched.

The homœopathic physician instead of prescribing a remedy that causes a condition dissimilar to the natural disease, employs one that produces a condition similar to the natural disease; that when he prescribes for constipation he chooses a drug that will bring constipation if given in the same dose as the allopathic physician gives, or the physiological dose. It is clear, therefore, that the dose prescribed according to the homœopathic method must necessarily be small to prevent an aggravation of the natural disease from the drug effect.

Now let us see, why does medicine employed according to the Hahnemannian law cure better than that employed according to the allopathic method?

It should first be noted that all or almost all medicines act like poisons to the human economy whether in health or sickness, and are powerful alike for evil and for good. When, therefore, a medicine is introduced in the system in a massive dose it acts as a marked irritant which is manifested by the symptoms it produces. These symptoms are known to be the primary action of the drug. The secondary action, consists in the effort of the organism to make up for the violence done to it by the primary action. Thus the effect of castor oil when employed is to produce an active diarrhoea, which is caused by the irritation it produces upon the nerve centres guiding the secretions of the intestinal glands and the

muscular fibres of the walls of the intestines. This represents the primary action of the castor oil and is the effect of the organism to rid itself of the drug.

As soon as the effects of the drug have passed off or the diarrhoea has disappeared, we get an aggravation of the constipation ; this is owing to the effect of nature to compensate for the violence done to the organism by the primary action of the drug and constitutes the reaction of the organism.

When the medicine is employed in accordance with the homœopathic law, the irritation is produced along lines similar to the natural malady, and the dose being only sufficient to produce an impression, the reaction of the organism effectually ride itself of the drug disease and with it the natural disease.

Allopathic doses over-stimulate and extinguish the reactive powers of the organism which is already exhausted by disease. Homœopathic doses are just enough to produce an impression and so stimulate without weakening. So much for the small dose.

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.

The allopathic method of treating disease consists in treating individual symptoms as they come on in the course of a disease. Thus in the course of a remittent fever it is often necessary on the part of an allopath to employ a remedy to arrest the delirium, another drug to remove constipation, still another drug to act upon the wind which has accumulated in the stomach. These three conditions may be present at the same time and the allopathic physician prescribes three or four or more different drugs simultaneously.

This method is irrational because the physician is not conversant with the manner in which the different drugs react upon each other when taken into the body and is not, therefore, in a position to differentiate what symptoms are the effects of the natural disease and what the result of the drugs.

The homœopathic physician, in prescribing, takes into consideration the whole aspect of the case including the individual idiosyncracies of the patient and the disease and chooses one medicine, whose action upon the healthy organism closely tally with the disease picture. This is scientific because his knowledge of drug action is absolute, inasmuch as it is demonstrated by experiment upon the healthy body.

OPINIONS OF SOME EMINENT ALLOPATHS REGARDING THEIR DRUGS.

The Art of Healing must not be taught first. The Science must be taught first and the Art next—the law first and experience following. Unless and until the science of cure is known, the art will remain defective. But what are the opinions of its most eminent followers ?

A few quotations from their sayings and writings will throw much light on the subject :—

Traudeau (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.

Dr. Kellogg authoritatively declares to the whole world that the vegetable diet is the one and sole means of cure for suffering individuals.

The eminent Professor Evans, Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of 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 diseases ; we have done more ; we have increased their fatality."

The well-known 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 :—"Inspite 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. 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 inspite 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 well-known 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 revolutions of the past, listening to the therapeutic babel of the present, is it 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 Univesity of Oxford, has acknowledged :—"It is not as if our homœopathic brèthren 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 infinitesimal was a most unwise and stupid thing to go.”

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 observant physicians of the old school have come to recognise the malevolent results of drugs. Naturally, they have lost confidence in them and a large number have practically abandoned therapeutics. The times

and the seasons have changed. Now the profession, the same dominant profession, in spite of renewals in lock, stock and barrel, has come to give up practically all internal medications. 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 see 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 homœopathy there is a perfect certainty of the law of therapeutics. For a given chain of symptoms, no matter where the homœopath got his education or where he practises, be it in Calcutta or America, the dominion of our beloved King-Emperor or of Canada. "From Greenland's icy mountains or from India's coral strand", the medicine prescribed will be found to be the one and the same.

As there is no established law and no unanimity of principles concerning the employment of remedy, every allopath considers himself to be a power unto himself in the selection of his drugs. The eventual consequence is that for a certain ailment or a set of symptoms, there may be a many different prescriptions as there are physicians in the orthodox school.

COMPARATIVE STATISTICS OF BOTH THE SCHOOLS OF MEDICINE

The cities of New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Brooklyn, Denver, Providence, Rochester, Chicago, Ditroit and Michigan abound with up-to-date homœopathic hospitals. During a recent year the allopaths in these cities had a death rate in measles of 3 per cent ; the homœopaths lost

0·8 per cent. The mortality rate in scarlet fever was 9·24 for the orthodox school ; 5·66 per cent for the homœopathic schools.

Dr. Edwards, Professor in North Western Medical College, in his book on practice, gives the allopathic mortality in Pneumonia in private practice as 10 to 38 per cent ; in hospital 33 to 50 per cent ; in asylums as from 50 to 100 per cent. Dr. Dewey, Editor of the Medical Century and Professor of Michigan University is authority for the statement that the homœopathic mortality, taking all these classes together, is less than 6 per cent.

Diphtheria is, no doubt, a dreadful disease. The allopaths are very unsuccessful in the treatment of this malady. The advent of anti-toxin was found by them to be the miracle of the age.

A short review of successful treatment, past and present, among foreign homœopaths cannot but be of interest.

Dr. Fisher treated 22 cases of malignant form and did not lose a single case.

Dr. Lippe, one of our most eminent authorities, says that almost all cases of Diphtheria that were placed under his treatment, yielded to homœopathic remedies.

Among American Annals there is a record of 74 cases of malignant form treated with appropriate homœopathic remedies ; only two deaths.

Dr. Peterman, in Medical Century, September, 1912, says :—I have not lost a Diphtheria case in 42 years ; never used anti-toxin or a prophylactic.

Dr. Kroner, of Germany, cites 69 cases of Diphtheria, 61 of which he treated homœopathically, losing two, the other 8 were treated with anti-toxin and homœopathy, and 3 died.

Dr. Von Villers treated 100 cases losing none. The late Dr. H. C. Allen used Diphtherinum 200 for 25 years as a preventive of Diphtheria and found it to be universally successful as a prophylactic.

Appendicitis is, no doubt, a dangerous malady. It was the unanimous decision of the last Surgical Congress assembled in Berlin that Appendicitis is entirely a surgical disease and there is thorough impotence of the orthodox school in the internal treatment of this fell malady.

Let us see what our own school has got for its treatment. The Eighth Homœopathic International Congress was held in London in 1911. Dr. T. Mende of Zurich read there a paper on the homœopathic treatment of Appendicitis which proves that it is amenable to homœopathic remedies. Of his more than 200 cases of Appendicitis, he handed over to the Surgeon only 14 patients, and of these only three died.

In Pneumonia, homœopathic remedies are far more efficacious than allopathic ones. I also sent a paper on Pneumonia to the last homœopathic congress stated above which was read and discussed there. I treated 16 very bad and typical cases of Pneumonia in 1910; but all the patients were convalescent within a week.

It is a patent fact that homœopathy has been uniformly successful in the treatment of Cholera and Plague as well. In the last century it had won its spurs at a time of public crisis, the first Cholera epidemic—by opening the door of the London Homœopathic Hospital to the free admission of Cholera cases and carrying out homœopathic treatment so successfully as to obtain special Parliamentary attention to its high standard of success. I treated 62 cases of Typhoid fever last year and I am glad to say that all of them recovered.

Not only is the mortality very much reduced by the administration of homœopathic remedies, but also the average duration of the malady is lessened. This fact is given by some statistics completed by the British Government, whereby it was proved that the homœopathic hospital at Melbourne, Australia treated 80 cases of Typhoid fever with only one death. It is, therefore, a patent fact that the rate of mortality amongst homœopathic practitioners is far less

than the rate of mortality in the dominant school and the duration of the malady much shorter. It can be asserted without any fear of contradiction that the superiority of our medicines has been demonstrated in every climate and in every season.

There must be a law or fixed principles of cure. No "guess-work, empiricism, or round about methods, or a cut-and-dried use" of drugs can bring about a real cure. The fact of one remedy acting on a certain principle and another on a different principle, and so on, is simply ridiculous and is not sanctioned by the immutable law of nature. Homœopathy has only one law of cure and brings about "the speedy, gentle and permanent restitution of health or alleviation or obliteration of disease in its entire extent, in the shortest, most reliable and safest manner, according to clearly intelligible reasons."

SCIENTIFIC DEVELOPMENTS IN SUPPORT OF HOMŒOPATHY.

Is the infinitesimal dose, administered for the purpose of a cure, too small for our senses? Outside of the realm of matter, have we not the realm of forces? Albert Robin, of the Faculty of Medicine, Paris, himself a great allopath and experimenter whose scientific attainments have led him to pronounce that medicines act through dynamism and not through their mass. He has discovered that "almost infinitesimal quantities are endowed with very great activity."

The powers dormant in the crude drug are roused into activity with the division of matter through trituration and succussion. To-day we are all becoming cognisant of the fact that matter is but the depository of forces; that matter goes, but forces remain. Yet we hear a voice from over the ocean, the eminent Professor Huchard of Paris, as he says in his writing entitled "The Therapeutics of Yesterday and of To-morrow": "Medicine must remain a school of tolerance and especially one of modesty, for reasons alas! too wel

known ; it must not in the face of adverse theories, assume either a haughty or a proud attitude, for no one person, or one school, should believe himself or itself the depository of Truth. From whatever source truth may arise, and however difficult it may be for us to grasp, we must accept it. Medicines act not only chemically, but also and especially, produce physical effects, simply by their presence. For bringing about these physical effects, we must use weak doses, infinitesimals, so reduced that they may correspond to a beginning of atomic dissociation. I am convinced that the law of similars as taught by Hahnemann, is the law of cure." We have admired bacteriotherapy, serotherapy and the study of immunities ; we have studied thoroughly the properties of serum and those of blood corpuscles. But the whole edifice of our studies will crumble like a castle in the air, if we do not start with that obligatory principle, which now no longer astonishes any one: the use of morbid and not of antidotal agents, for obtaining healing products.

God has created every animate or inanimate thing with an occult power in a dormant state. Man possesses animal magnetism, but it lies in a dormant state in every body and requires development in order to be effective. It should be developed, otherwise no body can exercise it. This occult power is present in inanimate things also in a state of latency. Electricity is developed by friction. If a piece of steel is forcibly and rapidly rubbed by a downward stroke against a hard stone, sparks of fire fly off and kindle the tinder they fall on. When sparks are thus struck with great force and caught on a sheet of white paper, then we can see with our eyes, or with the help of a lens that small pellets of steel are lying there, which have been disjoined in a state of fusion from the surface of the steel by the strong friction blow with the flint. The ordinary individual does not believe that the steel which is drawn thoughtlessly from his pocket to light his tinder, is pregnant with an unfailing stock of caloric in a latent state, and that this caloric is developed

only by friction. But the fact proves otherwise. The effect of friction is so far reaching, that not only are internal physical properties, such as caloric, odour, &c., are roused into activity, but also the spirit-like remedial powers of natural substance are thereby greatly intensified. Remedial agents are not dead masses in the general sense of the term; on the contrary, their correct essential nature is solely dynamically spiritual—is only force which may be intensified in potency almost to an incredible degree, by that very marvellous way of trituration and succussion according to the Hahnemannian method.

Von Behring whose discovery of anti-toxin has done so much to relieve the scourge Diphtheria, says 'You may call me a homœopath, if you will, but I say to you the efficiency of anti-toxin increases with the attenuation.'

In discussing the new tubercular agent upon which he was at work he voiced these remarkable words:—'What else causes immunity in sheep vaccinated against anthrax than the influence previously exerted by the virus, similar in character to that of the fatal anthrax virus? And by what technical term could we more appropriately speak of this influence, exerted by a similar virus than by Hahnemann's world. 'Homœopathy'? Homœopathy was passing through an experimental stage in Hahnemann's time; it demonstrated its worth by the clinical test during the next period; by the present day methods it has been scientifically proven, both as to the theory of Similars and small dose. Sir A. E. Wright's opsonic work, for example, is but a confirmation or rediscovery of Homœopathy? The result of his research are known to every professional listener. Working for instance, with the germs, of pus production, he, too, observed the law of similarity. Taking minute quantities of the toxins of the disease producing germ, toxins capable of producing symptoms similar to those produced by the germ, he was able to cure the lesions caused thereby. Not only did Wright thus re-discover the law of similars, but also, strange as it may

seem, he hit upon the century old conclusion as regards the size of the dose.

Wright says :—'I am achieving result along homœopathic lines.'

Professor Max V. Verworn has dealt with the physiology of the cells and the results of his laborious investigation are that stimuli of a similar kind acting on the cell augment its response while stimuli of an opposite kind lower it. If we put it in less scientific language it means that the virus of disease acting on a cell aggravates its sensitiveness to the operation of a medicinal influence of a similar sort. If the medicinal influence be opposite in nature to the disease stimulus, the resistance given by the vitality the defensive powers, of the cell are depressed.

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, K.T., 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 extraordinary 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).

The sub-division of matter leads to dynamism pure and simple; it disengages or liberates forces which in mass the matter holds in trust. The infinitesimal dose—so long the butt-end of censure and ridicule is there any one now too mean to do it reverence? Doses in millionths and billionths of a grain are found by non-homeopathic physicians, to produce aggravations. "After giving the millionth of a milligram of tuberculin, says Tradeau and this is assented to by Von Pirquet, Wright and others. Let the action of the remedy come to an undisputed conclusion; so long as

improvement progressively advances let there be no repetition of the dose."

This is a very old homœopathic advice. So it is that science brings into camp every day a new fact or an old one verified which is confirmatory of the law discovered by Hahnemann.

It appears that one problem of medicine is very nearly settled : "the necessity of small dose." The small dose has come to stay. The argument has been made repeatedly that if patients can get well with small doses of drugs, patients can get well also without drugs. A whole school of therapeutic nihilism has risen, disappeared and risen again upon this argument. The small dose has become justified through pathology, through physics, through chemistry, and through biology. Today we know definitely that the body is made up of millions and millions of cells of the smallest dimensions, ultra-microscopic bodies. In diseases, it is these minute cells and not Alpine structures, that are affected. We are also cognisant of the fact that nature works only with the smallest mathematical magnitudes. Drugs penetrate the body not in mass, but through molecular, atomic, ionic dissociation. I have now proved conclusively that it is a display of the homœopathic idea, fulfilling itself in many ways. This idea, not consciously recognised by these original thinkers, at least not utilised as centre and basis of their work, yet runs as an informing spirit through the conclusions they have each worked out. The physiologists have condemned the plan of the employment of opposites as paralysing the protective mechanism of the cell. Therapeutists have been unable to elaborate any law that approaches the law of similars in generality. It is this law that sweeps the field, that represents explicitly or implicitly the co-ordinate findings of science. Where is the academic warrant for wholesale and repeated bleedings in inflammation? Disappeared for ever. What swept them away? Homœopathy. Where is the wholesale mercurialisation, that slew and aimed in the guise

of a remedial procedure until the remedy was as bad as the disease? Taken off the statute book of remedial measure, also for ever. What brought about the conviction that it might safely be dispensed with? Homœopathy, first and cheapest. Whence came the impetus for dissemination, nay, whence came the ideas, themselves—of the treatment of the patient rather than of his latest disease merely, the discovery of the potency of the small dose, the frequent implied utility of the similar law, bodied forth in the administration of Ipecac for sickness and Cantharis for Nephritis and a host of other instances. Whence came, I say, alike the ideas and the consciousness of their fertility? From the same fountain—the applied science of homœopathy. The end of logic is proof; and we have now examined, with the eyes of the logician, the scientific basis of homœopathy.

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 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 homœopathy. 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 practice; and follow Leyden's dictum unconcernedly to take the good wherever we can find it, when exact investigation has determined its value. Either Homœopathy is true and therefore should be practised by all who recognise it as true; or Homœopathy is false, and therefore should be proved to be false. In science, concessions can be made only in unessentials. Science is not politics that 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.

(to be continued).

The R. C. NAG

REGULAR HOMŒOPATHIC COLLEGE.

166, Bow Bazar Street, Calcutta.

(*The best Hahnemannian Homœopathic College in India.*)

New Session from 1st June.

MORNING CLASS :—Vernacular—7 to 9 A. M.

DAY CLASS :—English & Vernacular combined—3 to 6 P.M.

EVENING CLASS :—English—6 to 9 P. M.

For years together this College has been maintaining its reputation in teaching Homœopathic Philosophy, Chronic Disease, Organon, Materia Medica, etc., together with Clinical Medicine and for this purpose our students rank high in attainments and teaching ability.

Prospectus on request.

Dr. K. K. Roy, M. D.
(Calif. U. S. A.) *Principal.*

Dr. G. Dirganghi,
Secretary.