

Homœopathy : An Explanation of its Principles.*

By Sir JOHN WEIR, K. C. V. O., M.B.,

*Physician-in-Ordinary to H.R.H. The Prince of Wales :
Senior Physician to London Homœopathic Hospital.*

My first duty is to thank the President and Council of the Royal Society of Medicine for their unprecedented courtesy in offering hospitality and thus affording an opportunity of presenting to the profession some knowledge of homœopathy. They are thus falling into line with the idea expressed in the *British Medical Journal* of July 9, 1932, in the "History of the Association," where it is stated :—

"Before the passing of the Medical Act a Committee on Quackery was appointed, which, in 1851, presented a report condemning the practice of homœopathy. In more recent years a wider view has been taken, and it has been realized 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 opinions on therapeutics."

I was reminded recently that when a man is legally qualified it is not only his privilege but his duty to practise in any way which he genuinely thinks will be for the benefit of his patients.

This meeting is really the outcome of the expressed desire of several physicians to know more of the principles of homœopathy than will be possible in a short paper on "The History of British Homœopathy" at the British Medical Association on the 29th inst.

*A lecture given at the Royal Society of Medicine, July 26, 1932.

One feels keenly the honour, but also the responsibility of having to present the subject of homœopathy before such an audience as faces me to-day. And I am minded (because of the widely-prevalent mistaken ideas as to what homœopathy really is) to simply state facts, *ab initio*.

I am delighted to tell you a little about homœopathy, because it helps me to do some things that I should have believed impossible ; and my ambition is to so interest you, that you may go away and try it.

It is only the few who are intrigued by cleverly worded arguments ; what the many want is *more power* ; and it is to such that my appeal is addressed to-day. Arguments leave most of us cold. You cannot learn homœopathy from arguments as to its possibility. The appeal of homœopathy has always been to experience. Do the works if you would know the truth.

Homœopathy could never have been discovered *a priori*. It is a science, since it is entirely based on experiment. Who was the great chemist who said the only possible way to know how a lump of sugar would behave, when put into a cup of tea, was to try ? Or, as Hunter said to Jenner, "Don't think : try." It is only our experience of homœopathy that has made us homœopaths. We have all been sceptics ; but facts have been too strong for us.

It may seem strange to you, but the century-old message of homœopathy has distinct appeal to the men of modern science. Homœopathy has reversed the old saying, "The science of to-day is the nonsense of to-morrow" ; for here, the nonsense of one hundred years is proving to be the science of to-day. And, as I said, my ambition in coming here is to help my professional brethren to an appreciation of what appears to me to be vital knowledge in regard to curative drug-action—as conducive to a more definite and wider range of usefulness and power.

It is a poor creature who, having found something good, tries to keep it to himself.

For, after all, it is *power* we need. Knowledge of disease—knowledge of drug-action—what are they?—Nothing!—lacking the essential knowledge, how to apply the one for the relief of the other. There must be the co-ordinating principle—*law*—if power is to result: i.e., the power to deal curatively, with assurance and fore-knowledge, with the sick individual. And, after all, this is our very *raison d'être*, as doctors.

Now, it is legitimate, natural and praiseworthy, to question and to strive for something better than that which contents other men. Progress would cease if we were merely to accept that which comes to us by tradition or authority—satisfied with what satisfied our predecessors. And does it not seem the height of absurdity to hark back to medical ideas of a hundred years ago for light on our problems of to-day? Changes are so rapid in our profession that it has been said, "If a doctor who dies to-day could come back in fifty years from now, and attempt to take up his profession, he would have to graduate all over again."

And yet there was one great physician of the past who, were he to come back to earth to-day, could take up his work as he left it. He would find new and exciting developments—possibilities—confirmations; but the essentials would be absolutely the same, because based on *law*. Moreover, he would find hundreds—no, thousands of doctors in all countries of the world, doing precisely what he did; treating their patients as he treated his, and experiencing, thereby, his astonishing results.

How can this be?

GENIUS.

Because, in the world's history, there appears from time to time *genius*, which, instead of moving placidly

with the times, leaps far ahead of them. "That man" we say—but we are only able to say it after his death!—"that man was born a hundred years before his time" . . . for it is from posterity alone that such men receive tardy vindication.

One such genius was *Samuel Hahnemann*. Law was revealed to him in one bright flash of intuition and realization—the Law of Drug-action; and to the elucidation and elaboration of that law he devoted his long life. Poverty—bitter enmity—banishment—scorn—were his sorry portion, but nothing moved him. His steadfast appeal was to *experience* and to *posterity*.

SIMILIA SIMILIBUS CURENTUR.

In these days I think we all allow that the medicine of Hahnemann's day (he was born in 1755) was crude and cruel; worse than that, it was harmful and futile. The establishment of issues—with venesections—salivations to a terrific extent, coupled with purgings and depletions, were wrecking the health, or costing the lives alike of the monarch on his throne, or the humble toiler for bread. So hopelessly wrong did all these things appear to Hahnemann (and here time has justified him) that he threw up a flourishing practice, and plunged himself and his family into dire poverty, that he might not, as he says, "any longer incur the risk of doing injury"; and he "engaged exclusively in chemistry and in literary occupations, supporting his family by his pen, and by his translations from many languages."

Then one of his children fell ill, and the sight of her suffering sent the born physician back to his life-work, determined to investigate the whole question of medicine in all languages. He set his soul to discover—as he put it—"if God had not given some certain law whereby the diseases of mankind could be cured."

And while he was diligently seeking the light—suddenly it flamed before his eyes. He was translating Cullen's "Materia Medica"; and in one of his characteristic annotations he criticized Cullen's opinions in regard to the action of Peruvian bark, and the idea came to him to test the effect of the drug, as to its sick-making properties on himself; when—lo and behold!—they took the form of ague. There could be no doubt about it: quinine both caused and cured ague. Hahnemann has denounced the abuse of quinine, but it was quinine that revealed to him homœopathy. Observations (accidental) on the prophylactic and curative properties of belladonna in scarlet fever, were also suggestive; for are not their symptoms identical? How did other drugs act? He set to work to discover.

(It has been observed in confirmation of Hahnemann's findings in regard to cinchona, that workers in quinine factories suffer with a cinchona poisoning resembling ague.)

His eyes opened by that initial experiment with cinchona, Hahnemann began to realize (and all his subsequent experiments—conducted during some fifty years—confirmed this) that *"It is only by their power to make sick that drugs can cure sickness; and that a medicine can only cure such morbid conditions as it can produce, when tested on healthy persons."*

Hahnemann had one of the attributes of genius, "an infinite capacity for taking pains"; but he had more than this. He was pre-eminent in intuition—in deduction—in industry—in research—in absolute self-devotion to truth and to humanity. He was not only great as a scholar, linguist, chemist, sanitarian, physician, but he takes special rank as one of those to whom law reveals itself. For as Newton discovered the law of gravitation, so Hahnemann discovered the law of similars—dimly

guessed at, but never realized—never understood, never demonstrated before his day.

Hahnemann found the enunciation of the law in the "remarkable words *Similia similibus curentur*" (let likes be treated by likes) "in one of the books attributed to Hippocrates", and he also found its foreshadowings in solitary remarks (which he quotes) in works by half a dozen authors (viz., Boulduc, Detharding, Bertholon, Thiury, Von Stoerk and Stahl). "But," as he says, "no one had taught this manner of cure ; no one had put it into practice."

THE PROVINGS.

PROVINGS ONLY ON THE HEALTHY.

The tendency of medicine has always been to experiment on the sick. Hahnemann experimented only on the healthy, in order to have an exact materia medica, ready and proved, for administration in sickness. He soon gathered round him an enthusiastic band of disciples (some fifty of them were medical men) and he and they "proved" (i.e., tested), drug after drug, with all possible precautions to eliminate error ; and these original provings, carefully and faithfully recorded, form the nucleus of the homoeopathic materia medica. They are embodied in his wonderful work—his "Materia Medica Pura"—which is as alive and up to date to-day as on the day when it was published, and in his subsequent work, "Chronic Diseases." These two, with his "Organon on the Art of Healing," are the best known among his numerous works, and embody the essentials of his teaching.

The purely scientific bent of Hahnemann's mind, and the reason why his medical works have survived those of his contemporaries, to be as illuminating and useful to-day as on the day when they were penned, is seen by the following :—

"A true *materia medica*," he says, "will consist of the genuine, pure and undeceptive effects of simple drugs"; and again, "Every such *materia medica* should exclude every supposition—every mere assertion and fiction—and its entire contents should be the language of nature, uttered in response to careful and faithful enquiry."

Many remedies, since Hahnemann's day, have been added to our armoury against disease; but all subsequent work has been done on his lines. It has never been found necessary to eliminate or to alter. Recorded in the simple language of nature, free from theory, safe from the transient language of succeeding generations, they stand for all time, complete and true; while science, in discovering new truths, has never been able to touch Hahnemann's premises—except to confirm—since they are based on *law*.

It is interesting that in Austria, many years ago, when doubt was thrown on some of the original provings, they started to reprove certainty of the drugs. But, finding their results identical with those of Hahnemann, they concluded to accept the rest.

For the more exact purposes of homœopathy, experiments in drug action on animals are useless, as Hahnemann pointed out; and that for two reasons. The proverb, "One man's meat is another man's poison," applies with tenfold force when it comes to animals. Substances poisonous to man are innocuous to many animals, "Aliments and poisons are convertible, according to the specific nature of different animals, so that aliments become poisons, and poisons alimentary."

Opium, with us a medicine, is to some Eastern nations an alimentary substance.

Hedgehogs feed on cantharides and take no hurt.

Rabbits eat belladonna with impunity.

Morphia makes dogs drowsy and vomit, but excites cats.

Styrian mountaineers take doses of arsenic sufficient to kill ordinary persons ; and horses are given large doses of arsenic to improve their wind and to make their coats glossy.

Rats are immune to diphtheria.

Cats are said to be immune to tubercle, whereas guinea-pigs and monkeys are highly susceptible to that infection.

By experiments on animals it may be found that certain drugs affect certain tissues—of certain animals. That is all.

But more than this, homœopathic provings have to be very fine, very delicate and very definite ; and the subjective and mental symptoms (all-important for our purpose) can only be obtained from humans.

It is only men and women who, in provings, could have given us the mental symptoms, which have led to so many brilliant cures—such as the depression to the verge of suicide of aurum ; the insane jealousy of lachesis ; the terror of insanity of mancinella ; the frantic irritability and intolerance of pain of chamomilla ; the suspicion and restlessness of arsenicum ; the terrors of anticipation of argentum nitricum ; the fear of death of aconite and arsenic ; the sensation of tallness and superiority of platina ; the sensation of unreality of medorrhinum ; the sensation of two wills of anacardium ; the indifference to loved ones of phosphorus and sepia—all straight cuts to the curative remedy, and they can only be got by provings on human beings. Even provings on the sick are not accepted, since sickness modifies the response of the organism to drugs, and from the sick no true drug-picture can be obtained. Remedies also need to be proved on women as well as on men, in order to get their whole range

of usefulness. The provings of *lilium tigrinum*, for instance, entailed intense sufferings on the heroic women who undertook them ; but they have given us a most useful remedy for the peculiar suffering of women, in uterine displacements, after miscarriages, &c.

As we said, the experiments of Homœopathy have always been on healthy human beings. They have always been voluntary experiments. And they have never proved detrimental to health (whatever the immediate sufferings may have been), but on the contrary they tend, as Hahnemann pointed out, to raise the resistance of the prover. And Hahnemann should know, who, having spent the greater part of his life in proving drugs, lived on, in full possession of health and senses, till only one year short of ninety.

To CURE . . .

•The outcome of his experiments is this . . . "*To cure mildly, rapidly and permanently choose for every case of disease a medicine which can itself produce a similar affection.*"

•Homœopathy is no invention : no theory. It has been hammered out of hard facts. It is simply a scientific way of discovering what drugs can do in the way of perverting the health, mental and physical, of healthy human beings, and then applying them for the relief of just such conditions in the sick.

"Homœopathy appeals," said Hahnemann, "solely to the verdict of experience. . . . Repeat the experiment, carefully and accurately, and you will find the doctrine confirmed at every step. . . . *Homœopathy insists on being judged by results.*"

DOCTRINES OF HAHNEMANN. .

But it was not enough for Hahnemann to have merely discovered *power* ; he devoted a long life to its investigation,

and to showing under what conditions it best works. And he has bequeathed to us, not only the law, *Similia similibus curentur*, but also what he calls his "Doctrines," which not to obey is to render much of our work inferior, if not futile.

May I here point out that these Doctrines of Hahnemann apply equally to such homœopathic measures as vaccines; and that, had Hahnemann's Laws been known and observed in regard to vaccine, X-ray and radium therapies, better and more reliable results might, from the first, have been obtained; since those who use them have had perforce, to approximate to the methods of Hahnemann.

For Hahnemann teaches, not only

The like remedy, but also
 The single drug,
 The small dose,
 The infrequent dose,
 Non-interference with vital reaction,
 Initial aggravation, and
 Potentization.

VITAL FORCE.

I think we all recognize, in these days, what Hahnemann insisted on, that cure comes by the reaction of what he calls vital force against disease. We know a little more about the complicated mechanism of such reaction; but it is no longer absurd to teach, as he taught, that vital reactions are evoked by disease, and that such reactions are curative; and that the utmost we can do, *curatively*, is to stimulate such reaction.

He says that thousands of substances, subversive to health, simulate disease conditions, and can be employed to evoke enhanced curative reaction, where such is the case.

For instance . . . , who will diagnose belladonna

poisoning from scarlet fever? They have often been mistaken; or diagnose between dysentery and poisoning by corrosive sublimate? Or between ptomaine and arsenical poisonings? Hahnemann contends and demonstrates that substances which simulate natural diseases can be used, in fine dosage, for their cure. And the most striking homœopathic curative results can be seen when using arsenic (in infinite subdivision) for ptomaine poisoning, merc. cor. (corrosive sublimate) for dysentery, or belladonna for scarlet fever. Any one who desires to put homœopathy to the test, cannot do better than start with one of these.

Homœopathy never contemplates curing disease by drugs in massive and repeated doses. Its object is to *stimulate the patient to cure himself*. Therefore it is never a question of quantity, where the vital stimulus is employed, but always of precise selection and quality, in the drug employed for the purpose.

SINGLE DRUG.

As to the *single drug* . . . that goes without saying! For what can be learnt, in provings, or in practice, from mixed prescriptions? If work is to be exact and scientific, drugs, as Hahnemann contended, must be proved separately, and can only then be used with foreknowledge and confidence, for the cure of sicknesses of like symptoms.

THE SMALL DOSE.

And then the *small dose*—that ancient bugbear—as Hahnemann foresaw, even for his own followers; and for others a subject for endless witticisms. No need to apologize for the small dose now! Radium, vitamins, ferments, ions, colloids, even mineral waters have done that, and have demonstrated, to some extent, the immense

potentiality of the infinitely little. Even chemistry teaches that chemical affinity comes into play only on surfaces, which are enormously increased when mass is reduced to impalpable powder. A lump of antimony plunged in chlorine gas shows nothing spectacular; but powder the antimony and throw it into chlorine and the violence of the reaction will be almost explosive.

By minutest subdivision, energy is liberated from inert mass, bulk, weight; from things palpable and manifest to our grosser senses. We are at last beginning to realize to potentialities of the intangible and the imponderable. But the most sensitive thing in the world is the diseased cell or tissue for the remedy of like symptoms, in infinitesimal subdivision. And it is with this that we have to deal.

Science is bearing Hahnemann out in this, and his small doses present no difficulty to modern biology.

Recent research on enzyme action, and the standardization of such agents as thyroxin and pituitrin has emphasized the action of minute quantities of all kinds of agents, from minerals to complex organic substances.

Romeis states that thyroxin influences growth and development of tadpoles in dilutions of 1 in 5,000,000,000 [1].

Jakoby shows that potassium cyanide activates the ferment urease in a dilution 1 in 1,000,000 [2].

Reid Hunt has demonstrated that acetyl chloride in the strength of a milligram in half-a-million gallons of blood causes a distinct fall in the blood-pressure [3].

Macht has shown that the uterus of a virgin guinea-pig responds to such a dilute concentration of histamine as could not be demonstrated by the most refined micro-chemical methods [4].

Cobra venom has been shown to hæmolyse red-blood corpuscles in a dilution of 1 in 10,000,000 [5].

The addition of 4 parts in 10,000 of copper doubles the rate of toxin production from a culture of diphtheria bacilli. (Locke and Main [6]).

These are merely random selections exemplifying the action of micro-doses in living cells, bacterial, amphibian, and mammalian.

But why this ultra-refinement in the dosage of homœopathic remedies? Why, when all medicine is concerned with the maximum dose, should homœopathy teach the minimal dose? And indeed such minimal doses as we shall speak of later, when we come to describe potentization.

The reason is plain. Medicine hitherto has been mainly concerned, if one may so put it, with doing violence to the organism. It has been directed to cause sweating, vomiting, purging, or sometimes to paralyse the action of the bowels. It has been used to deaden pain, to induce a drugged sleep, to modify the action of the heart, to depress fever, to excite appetite. In all these cases the dose must be material. We are doing something subversive to the patient or to his parts. Therefore the dose must be a poisonous but not a lethal one. It is for this reason that the dosage of official medicine is apt to be the largest one dare give to ensure the desired effect.

But when a remedy is used, in exactly the opposite manner—croton oil for diarrhœa—apomorphine to control vomiting—opium for the coma of cerebral hæmorrhage—lead for constipation—rattle-snake poison to control bleeding—and so on, it is only common sense to give it in the smallest dose that will evoke the desired reaction. Anything more than this will *pro tem.* increase suffering—even where the ultimate result is good. And this is why, in the first instance, experience compelled Hahnemann to reduce his doses.

Observe! Homœopathy never wants to do anything to a patient: only to stimulate his own reactive powers, and so cause him to cure himself. For Hahnemann, disease was merely the rebellion of vital force against noxious agents, inimical to life: and he taught that cure can only come from the *stimulated* reaction of vital force against disease.

Again, Hahnemann tells us that the smallest possible dose of a homœopathic medicine will operate chiefly upon the diseased parts of the body, which have become extremely susceptible of a stimulus so similar "to their own disease."

This increased sensitiveness of diseased parts is stressed by Bier also, who talks of the "extraordinarily sensitive disease threshold" [7], and who quotes Hufeland, "There is a reagent which is more delicate than the most delicate chemical reagent, and that is the reagent within the living organism."

As a crude instance of this increased sensitiveness in disease, Bier states that "it requires 250,000 times as much formic acid to produce symptoms in the healthy than in the gouty."

Hahnemann, when applying to hypersensitive diseased tissues the one stimulus to which they were most sensitive, viz., the drug of like symptoms—that is to say, the drug that was proved to irritate those particular tissues, was forced, again and again, to reduce his doses.

It is by provings that we discover, in each case, exactly what organs or tissues are affected by different poisons; and when we apply these, as stimulants, to parts (not only specially sensitive to those particular drugs, but also rendered hypersensitive by disease) the necessity for reducing the dose is manifest.

THE INFREQUENT DOSE.

Hahnemann speaks of *the dose*, whose repetition, depending on many factors, is never a matter of routine, or of the proclivities of the prescriber, but always depends on the reactions of the individual patient.

In acute sickness, without structural changes (I will give you cases) the effect of the first dose may be dramatic, and establish such instant and complete reaction that no second is needed.

Or, in (say) pneumonia, after a marked improvement all round, the disease may, a few hours later, again get the upper hand; and experience shows that the remedy generally needs to be repeated in from four to six hours for a couple of days, till the temperature not only comes but remains down.

In deadly and most rapid diseases, such as cholera, Hahnemann tells us that the repetition of camphor must be in three to five minutes till reaction is established, or with cuprum or veratrum every hour or half-hour. . . .

He says that remedies which act for a considerable time, have the duration of their action diminished in proportion as the disease is acute.

In chronic diseases the call to repeat varies with every case. The symptoms demanded a remedy, and the return of symptoms, modified, will demand its repetition.

But there are other factors that come in. Some remedies are deep and long acting; some superficial and short-acting. Some patients respond actively; others are sluggish and slow in their response. The question of the potency also comes in, since reaction varies with different potencies, and lengthens out with the higher potencies.

Therefore experience and observation alone can decide as to repetition; which depends on the *individual reaction of the patient to the individual medicine*.

This allowing the remedy to act was one of the great obstacles, as Hahnemann foresaw, to the acceptance of his work. His rule is, that the dose of the carefully selected homœopathic remedy should act till it has accomplished its effect.

"Perceptible, continuous improvement, whether in acute or chronic disease, so long as it lasts, counter-indicates the repetition of any medicine whatsoever." He says that every new dose of medicine would disturb the process of recovery.

And is not this reasonable? Medicines do not cure: they merely stimulate curative reaction in the patient; and so long as this is in full swing it is foolish to interrupt. The call for repetition is the renewed call of symptoms.

Hahnemann says, and we have proved it: "The surest way to hasten the cure is to let the medicine act so long as improvement continues. . . . He, who observes this rule with the greatest care, will be the most successful homœopathic practitioner," . . . and one may add vaccine-practitioner—as has been found.

One of Hahnemann's greatest followers has told us that "More cases are spoilt by the too-hasty repetition of the remedy than from any other cause."

But Hahnemann foresaw the long years in which even his own followers, convinced of the law of similars, would yet doubt his teachings in its regard, and would do inferior work, because of the two great stumbling-blocks to its acceptance—the *small dose*, and the *infrequent dose*. He says: "My doctrines in regard to the magnitude and the repetition of the dose will be doubted for years. . . . I do not comprehend it—but facts speak for themselves. The truth of the proposition is demonstrated by experience—in which I have more faith than in my intelligence.

... If physicians do not carefully practise what I teach, let them not expect to be successful in their treatment."

And here let me say, that it is the experience of all of us, whose practice is guided by the homœopathic law, that the closer we stick to the doctrines of Hahnemann, the better our results.

INITIAL AGGRAVATION.

And then Hahnemann's *initial aggravation*—transient and little noticed in acute sickness, but often very definite in chronic disease; where it may occur during the first eight to ten days. It was the initial aggravation that caused Hahnemann, as we said, to reduce his doses; and which led presently to the establishment of the fact, that when remedies are reduced again and again by repeated subdivision into the region of infinitesimals, there is no loss, but an augmentation of energy. . . . And therefore, as time went on, and observation was added to observation, "dilutions" became for him "potencies": and the 30th dilution ("one in a decillion") was more correctly named the 30th power, or potency.

* Initial aggravation is succeeded by a period of amelioration, Sir Almroth Wright has called it a "Positive phase," which, Hahnemann says, must not be interfered with. Vital reaction has been brought into play, and must be permitted to work itself out.

VACCINES—HOMŒOPATHIC.

Such initial aggravations are only seen in homœopathy and where homœopathic remedies, such as vaccines, are employed. Here they are often very definite, and have led, as in Hahnemann's case, to the reduction, again and again, of the dose.

And that vaccines and disease products used for the

cure of disease are homœopathic, is pretty widely recognized.

Dr. Cabot, a 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 homœopathic principles in our school. . . . The poison of tuberculosis, which can produce some of the symptoms of tuberculosis, is here applied for the cure of tuberculosis, through the production of immunity or resisting power in the tissues. Surely this is a case of *Similia similibus curentur*, as homœopathic writers have pointed out. The use of bacterial vaccines recently produced by Sir Almroth Wright is distinctly homœopathic."

Von Behring, the discoverer of diphtheria antitoxin, said: "By what technical term could we more appropriately speak of this influence excited by a similar virus than by Hahnemann's word, 'Homœopathy.'" And of tuberculin he said that its therapeutic usefulness "must be traced in origin to a principle which cannot be better characterized than by Hahnemann's word, 'Homœopathic.'" And again, in regard to immunity in sheep, vaccinated against anthrax, he said, "By what technical term could we more appropriately speak of this influence, of a virus similar in character to the fatal anthrax, than by Hahnemann's word, 'Homœopathy.'"

It may be interesting here to state that, according to the directions of Constantine Hering (one of Hahnemann's great followers), in 1830, anthracinum was prepared from the spleen of animals affected with anthrax; and that, in 1836, the homœopath, Weber, published in Leipsic a treatise on "Cattle Plague treated with anthracinum, also of men similarly affected," in which he claims to have cured every case.

In regard to the use of disease products for the cure of disease, homœopathy has been using them since the days of Hahnemann : but administered orally—in potency—and after provings have been made ;—just like any other homœopathic medicines.

As pointed out by Dr. McGavack ("Homœopathic Principles in Therapeutics"), in addition to vaccines, official medicine is now experimenting with another group of pathogenic agents, homœopathically applied, for the cure of asthma, hay fever and other diseases of foreign protein origin. The proper pollen is selected, in each case, by individualization.

But homœopathy has been treating diseases of sensitization for over a century with success ; individualizing always, but after the homœopathic methods of drug-selection.

"Every set of cutaneous sensitization tests contains common oats (*Avena sativa*), yellow dock (*Rumex crispus*), plantain (*Plantago major*), elder (*Sambucus nigra*), spikenard (*Aralia racemosa*), &c." But all these, in provings, produce either hay fever, or asthma, or both, and are therefore capable of curing these diseases . . . and that "long before the laboratory was capable of demonstrating their power, as antigens."

These, and many others, are to be found in Clarke's "Dictionary of (homœopathic) Materia Medica," published in 1900-1902).

- Avena* Suffocative attacks at night.
- Rumex* Nose, sudden, sharp tingling sensation, followed by violent and rapid sneezing. Violent sneezing with watery coryza.
- Plantago* Frequent sneezing, with sudden attacks of profuse, watery, bland coryza.
- Sambucus* Wheezing. Obstructed respiration when

lying down. Spasmodic paroxysms of suffocation at night, with great agitation. Great difficulty of breathing.

Aralia Wheezing : sense of impending suffocation. Immediately on lying down, an attack of asthma.

But it is not enough to know that a remedy can cause asthma or hay-fever. The homœopath must know more, in order to differentiate between such remedies. He must know which to choose.

Rumex is peculiar in being worse by breathing cold air. In chest troubles, wants to cover up the mouth.

Sambucus has a bluish, bloated face ; a great tendency to fright—great agitation during the attack—great pressure and constriction of chest . . . and so on.

And there are many others, even more valuable, but each only valuable in its place.

In coryza, with *Allium cepa* (the onion), the discharge from the eyes is bland, and from the nose excoriating.

With arsenicum also, the discharges from the nose are hot and excoriating.

But with euphrasia, the other way about, the eye discharge is acrid, and the nasal discharge is bland.

But homœopathy goes much further, and has a far wider field than vaccines, which apply to only a limited number of diseases ; whereas, substances producing like effects to disease can be used in the same way, or be substituted for vaccines, with great simplification of preparation, elimination of risk, and precision in dosage.

NATURAL DISEASES AND DRUG DISEASES.

Hahnemann shows that diseases of like symptoms annihilate, or as we may say, *antidote*, one another ; and he instances, *inter alia*, cow-pox and smallpox.

In the same way (he contends) an artificial or drug-disease will antidote a natural disease of like symptoms.

Only that the artificial or drug-disease is vastly superior, as a curative agent, to any natural disease ; since natural diseases are uncertain in action and leave many persons unaffected ; whereas, medicinal agents (take arsenic, for instance) "act at all times, and under all circumstances, on all living beings, and have this great advantage, that they can be diluted, divided, potentized to the verge of infinity, at the will of the physician, till the result of treatment is seen only as a gentle, imperceptible but rapid transition from suffering to health."

This uncertainty in the employment of natural diseases for the cure of disease is exemplified in the use of malaria for the cure of general paralysis of the insane. A plaintive tale in this record was voiced recently by Menninger and Fellows in the *Journal of the Kansas Medical Society*.

It is a tale of difficulty and uncertainty ; of the damage to certain organs—liver and spleen ; of the risk of spreading malaria by patients under treatment ; and of enhanced mortality.

POTENTIZATION.

The extreme subdivision of homœopathic remedies has been keenly criticized for 100 years. But, as Hahnemann taught the potentizing of medicines, the thing is perfectly simple and accurate.

For Hahnemann's favourite "30th" or "decillionth" potency, only thirty small vials are needed, and a few drachms of alcohol or water. One drop of the strong tincture is put in a small bottle with ninety-nine drops of alcohol, and this, vigorously succussed, is the first centesimal potency. Subsequent potencies are prepared in the same way—always one drop of the preceding potency in ninety-nine drops of the attenuating medium, to from the

next. And it will be easily seen that, so long as matter is divisible, each succeeding vial will contain a saturated solution of the drug, in finer and finer subdivision; always activated, and not diluted and rendered less potent. Boyd, of Glasgow, has recently proved that every single succussion, up to forty, alters the potency; then it remains constant, till further potentized by taking one drop into a fresh ninety-nine drops of alcohol.

But homoeopathy makes use of many *insoluble* substances; and it uses them *pure*, and in tincture form . . . how can this be?

And here we have another of the discoveries of Hahnemann. With insoluble substances, gold, silica, carbon, lycopodium, his first potencies are made by trituration (one part of the substance in ninety-nine parts of sugar of milk, triturated in an agate mortar for a couple of hours). One part of this first centesimal trituration is again ground up with ninety-nine parts of sugar of milk for the same period, to make a second centesimal potency, and a third is made in the same way. That gives the substance as one in a million. And he shows that after these three triturations all substances become soluble in alcohol or water, and potencies can now be run up in the usual way.

The profession now has colloidal silica, &c., but silica, gold, vegetable charcoal, silver and a host of insoluble substances were bequeathed to us, proved as to their exact role in combating sickness, by Hahnemann, over one hundred years ago.

Many, in the past, have called this diluting, and the resulting tinctures, "dilution." So did Hahnemann, till experience taught him that subdivision (and he never reached its limits) meant more completely-liberated energy, when he substituted for "dilutions" the truer term, *potencies*. And here, again, he appealed to facts

and to experience, and has taught us to do the same; insisting that, so long as a remedy, so treated, can evoke some evidence of aggravation, we have curative power. And our personal experience of some twenty years is, that it is from the highest potencies (provided that the remedy is correct) that we get the most alarming aggravations; so much so that we dare not employ them in advanced disease, with much destruction of tissue. For instance, in advanced phthisis, a very high potency of phosphorus, in establishing too severe a reaction, may determine a fatal hæmorrhage.

Hahnemann (from years of experience) claims further that, by potentization, not only do insoluble substances become soluble, but that their medicinal virtues can thereby be fully and even infinitely developed; besides which, their chemical properties are so altered that they are no longer subject to chemical laws. They have passed, for instance, beyond the laws of neutralization. . . . (Hahnemann was one of the foremost chemists of his day.)

OPPOSITE EFFECTS OF LARGE AND SMALL DOSES.

While I have been trying to put facts before you, in all simplicity, a number of confirmatory instances must have occurred to you.

For instance, the opposite effects of large and small doses . . . and here the Arndt-Schulz law comes to the support of Hahnemann. For, where large doses of a poisonous substance prove lethal, and smaller doses inhibit, minimal doses of the same poison actually stimulate the vital activities of the same cells.

As Bier says, "The same remedy may stimulate a function, when given in small doses, but destroy it if larger doses are administered."

And he says, "According to Schulz, the great bulk of remedies do not act by neutralizing, dissolving, disinfecting, &c. (i.e., in a metabolic manner) but by irritating certain organs. The latter are thereby stimulated to an activity which promotes the healing process. Since the slightest irritation often produces great reaction, Schulz elucidates the action of the minimal dose; and again, since the symptoms of disease often are merely an expression of the healing reaction of the body, he explains the homœopathic cure by symptom-similarity (the law of similars). Accordingly the remedy merely augments the natural healing process." But, of course, this is all Hahnemann!

The recent Medical Research Council Report on Radium refers to "the general principle that has been established with so many drugs, that large doses and very small doses act in opposite ways" [8].

Taylor has shown that irradiated ergosterol, in small and medium doses, favours the deposition of calcium from blood to bone; but large doses have a reverse effect, and cause calcium to be absorbed from bone into the bloodstream [9].

Duke, in a research on blood-platelets, found that large doses of benzol reduced the platelet count to a point where the bleeding time was prolonged, while small doses of benzol brought about an increase in the platelet count [10]. This also held good for a complex substance, such as diphtheria toxin—a large dose caused an immediate fall in the number of platelets, while sublethal doses stimulated their production [11].

It is seen that the same drug may stimulate or depress, given appropriate conditions.

But more crude instances of homœopathy, and the opposite effects of large and small doses, are familiar to

all. You use ipecacuanha to check vomiting; pot. iod. (which Norman Walker tells us produces skin affections diagnosed as gummata) for gumma; salicylic acid for Meniere's disease, &c.

And Dr. Dyce Brown, some years ago, published a very long list of drugs, used by the official school, homœopathically and with success. He quotes striking testimonies from prominent physicians and teachers as to their efficacy in conditions caused by them. Among them we find the following:—

"Belladonna.—Its power to produce convulsions is well known, while Trousseau and Pidoux speak in very high praise of its value in epilepsy, in eclampsia of infants, and of puerperal women. They say that 'belladonna administered in small doses sometimes produces unhoped for results.'

"On the brain, the action of belladonna is well known causing mania, hallucinations, delirium and general mental excitement. On this Trousseau and Pidoux remark—and this quotation is very important from our standpoint: 'Analogy, that guide also sure in therapeutics, ought to lead us to use belladonna in the treatment of mania, inasmuch as belladonna taken in large doses produces a temporary mania; for experience has proved that a multitude of diseases are cured by therapeutic agents which seem to act in the same manner as the disease to which we oppose this remedy.' This is a beautiful testimony to the law of similars.

"*Rhus toxicodendron*.—Trousseau and Pidoux, Pereira and Sanders, of Edinburgh, testify to its power to produce in a skin eruption exactly like erysipelas, with vesiclées here and there, on the hands, arms, face, &c.; while the first-named authors say: 'This curious action of rhus on the economy has led the homœopaths to employ this

substance in diseases of the skin; but already, before them, Dufresnoy of Valenciennes had published a paper in which he highly praised the virtue of this plant against skin diseases, and later, against paralysis. From that time we have found from time to time essays on this subject in the different periodicals, and many reliable physicians have confirmed Dufresnoy's experiences.

"*Stramonium*.—Trousseau and Pidoux then quote M. Moreau, of Tours, who says, 'It is especially useful in cases of monomania with hallucinations,' founding this statement, say Trousseau and Pidoux, 'on the fact that stramonium causes hallucinations; and that mania ought to be cured by stramonium in the same way as the majority of irritating agents are employed topically to cure irritations.' If this is not homœopathy, I would ask, what is?"

But one might multiply indefinitely examples, simple and complex, to show the opposite effects of large and small doses of substances medicinal or poisonous.

INDIVIDUALIZATION.

Homœopathy takes into account the individual, with his personal reactions to environment, physical, mental and moral; his deviations from the normal, and especially from his own normal, due to sickness. With Hahnemann, when it comes to prescribing, "we know no diseases, only sick persons," whose sickness has to be matched in *materia medica*.

And this is only common sense, since no illness, if we take the trouble to inquire, affects all persons alike.

In rheumatism one person, like *bryonia* in its provings, has pain on the slightest movement; another, like *rhus*, needs to be constantly on the move, to make the pain endurable. One, like *rhus*, is always worse for wet and

cold; the other, like bryonia, is more affected by dry weather. One rheumatic patient may have pains intolerable in the warmth of the bed; another, only tolerable when warm. It is the identical symptom-complex of drug and patient that ensures a successful prescription.

Even in pneumonia, for abortive and curative work, the individual patient has to be considered in prescribing. A number of drugs have caused and cured pneumonia—phosphorus, bryonia, nitric acid, &c. But, which are we to use? Since one will not do for the other.

The bryonia patient wants to be let alone—is very irritable; is worse for any movement. Has a white tongue—is dry and thirsty. Cough is dry and painful. There is apt to be pleurisy of the affected part, relieved by pressure, worse by movement—even respiration—therefore he lies on the affected side.

The phosphorus pneumonia especially attacks the right base. The patient is unable to lie on the left side. He is very thirsty; wants company—sympathy; there is bright blood in the sputum, or possibly the prune-juice expectoration.

The mercurius picture, in pneumonia, is very different and distinctive. Here you have profuse offensive sweat, offensive mouth, filthy, tooth-notched tongue, with much saliva of horrible taste. Here mercurius will quickly cure.

And yet, though homœopathy knows no specifics for diseases, there are certain substances which, in poisonous doses and in provings, reproduce so nearly described disease conditions as to be practically specific for most cases of those diseases.

Crotalus horridus (rattle-snake poison) which produces bleedings from every organ and orifice of the body—even

the pores of the skin, and which affects gravely liver and kidneys, &c., is our great remedy for blackwater fever.

Latrodectus mactans, a spider poison, whose bite occasions symptoms not to be distinguished from those of angina pectoris, proves astonishingly curative, in infrequent doses, for that condition. We have recently seen several such cases.

Corrosive sublimate poisoning, as said, simulates dysentery, and in infinitesimal doses cures rapidly most cases of dysentery.

Plomaine poisoning, which simulates arsenical poisoning in its agony of vomiting and purging, its deadly anxiety and restlessness and collapse, is promptly cured by arsenicum, in potency.

Belladonna simulates scarlet fever, and belladonna given for scarlet fever ensures a minimal mortality and freedom from sequelæ.

Camphor, whose symptoms resemble those of the early stage of cholera, has proved astonishingly and rapidly curative in that disease, while in the later stages—with severe cramps, cuprum—or in collapse with severe vomiting, purging and profuse cold sweat, veratrum, have demonstrated to the world, in the epidemics of 1830-1 and 1854, the dramatic curative powers of remedies homœopathically indicated.

Dr. MacLoughlin, Inspector to the Board of Health, wrote in 1854, to one of the doctors at our Hospital, which had been cleared for cholera patients, "You are aware that I went to your hospital prepossessed against the homœopathic system: that you had in me, in your camp, an enemy rather than a friend. . . . That there may be no misapprehension about the cases I saw at your hospital, I will add, that all I saw were true cases of cholera, in the various stages of the disease; and that I

saw several cases which did well under your treatment which I have no hesitation in saying would have sunk under any other. In conclusion I must repeat to you what I have already told you, and what I have told everyone with whom I have conversed, that though an allopath by principle, education and practice, yet was it the will of Providence to afflict me with cholera, and deprive me of the power of prescribing for myself, I would rather be in the hands of a homœopathic than an allopathic adviser. You are at full liberty to make what use you please of this letter." It found its way finally into the Parliamentary Blue Book.

In those cholera days of terror, homœopathy practically reversed the mortality. For where, under the treatment of the day, two-thirds of the patients died, under homœopathic treatment two-thirds recovered. While, in many places, homœopathic results were almost incredibly dramatic, so much so that in Austria they caused the laws against homœopathy to be repealed.

All these are the more coarse instances of homœopathy, easy for anyone who wishes to make the attempt.

For the comparison of the finer symptoms, and for more difficult cases, special symptom-registers—or repertories—have been compiled, and from these, with a little practice, it is possible to work out the equation between the symptom-complex in drug and disease.

PRACTICAL RESULTS.

In conclusion let me say that the foregoing may sound to you plausible—or the reverse. But, as practical medical men, your feeling must be, "Does it work?"

In order to show you that it does work, I will take a few of the simplest cases, exemplifying homœopathy in some of its phases.

I am not going to weary you with details, but merely relate salient points.

An officer invalided home with trench fever. He had been ill for a year.

Now Hahnemann lays it down that the mental, the peculiar and the characteristic symptoms of the patient himself, apart from his malady, are to be especially considered in regard to the choice of the remedy.

This man had frightful irritability of temper.

His fever started always at 9 a.m.

He had the usual pain, restlessness and jerking of extremities; these worse at night.

One remedy only, chamomilla, has just this symptom-complex; and a single dose of chamomilla, in high potency, quickly cured him and sent him back to the line.

Here you notice:—

The like remedy.

The single drug.

The infrequent dose.

The small dose.

Non-interference with vital reaction.

Potentization.

A mother of small children, with acute food-poisoning had been vomiting and purging all night, and was supported down to our Out-patient Department by her husband, at 2.30 p.m., cold, collapsed, anxious—almost "done."

Her symptoms were typically those of arsenic, and arsenicum, in high potency, sent her home, a couple of hours later, warm, and smiling, and again, well.

You see here the rapid homoeopathic action in very acute sickness. The more acute the sickness, the quicker and the more complete the curative reaction.

I was asked one night, at midnight, to see a man who had had champagne and oysters for dinner and who was doubled up with colicky abdominal pain. There were beads of sweat on his forehead. His only relief was by pressing his hands deeply into his abdomen. He could only answer in a whisper. He felt so ill that he thought there was no chance of work next day. Giving him a dose of colocynth, in potency, I timed him, and in three minutes he gave a sigh, and stretched out his legs and said, "I'm better." And he went to business next day. Here the remedy had to be colocynth not arsenicum; because colocynth is the only remedy with abdominal pains relieved by doubling up and pressure.

At 10.30 p.m. one night, I was called to a man suffering from urticaria—anaphylactic—after anti-tetanus serum. He was almost beside himself with fear and anxiety; very restless, couldn't keep still; certain he was going to die. Thirsty, felt hot, great fear of being alone. Very apprehensive. Everything had to be done at once. Rheumatic pains intolerable; said they were driving him crazy.

Hahnemann says: "Whenever aconite is chosen homœopathically, you must observe the moral symptoms, and be careful that it closely resembles them; the anguish of mind and body, the restlessness; the disquiet not to be allayed."

Here aconite, in the 30th potency gave almost instant relief, and in fifteen minutes the patient was quite himself again. This was one of the most dramatic things I have ever seen.

I was once urgently called to see a patient acutely ill with rheumatic fever, who was the despair of all who came in contact with him. Nurse after nurse had had to go, and the doctor in attendance was at his wit's end. A dose of

chamomilla brought almost instant peace; the temperature promptly dropped, and the patient got well.

One might multiply such cases indefinitely; and remember they are common, not to any one prescriber, but to homœopathy.

In these days of advancing science, when the foolishness of homœopathy is proving wisdom, and the amazing prescience of Hahnemann is obtaining every day new confirmation, what is there to prevent the most sceptical from, at least, experimenting with the power that has come to us?

Those who test homœopathy and make the experiment, do not escape. Over and over again doctors have studied homœopathy, or have been commissioned to look into it, in order to expose it—only to become its most enthusiastic adherents and exponents.

I suppose not one of us has approached homœopathy otherwise than with doubt and mistrust; but facts have been too strong for scepticism.

Sir Thomas Horder, the other day, spoke of "the present pause in therapeutic advance. He felt it would be broken by brilliant advance—in the near future. . . . The things essential to advance were toil, some humility and imagination. From what part of the scientific horizon the light would come, it was not possible to say; the sky must be scanned in every quarter. Perhaps some promising direction had been overlooked . . . would the lamp again be lighted by that strange and inexplicable flash of genius, the genius that scouted all science, because it was itself the mother of science. . . ."

May I suggest that the genius may be Hahnemann; and this the promising direction that has been inexplicably overlooked? Hahnemann antedated science; and

his prophetic eye discerned "the dawn that was to brighten into the most brilliant day of medical art."

It was 107 years ago that Hahnemann wrote: "I rejoice at the benefit homœopathy has already conferred on humanity, and look forward with intense pleasure to the not distant time when, though I shall no longer be here below, a future generation of mankind will do justice to this gift of a gracious God, and will thankfully avail themselves of the blessed means He has provided for the alleviation of their bodily and mental sufferings."

REFERENCES.

- [1] ROMBS. *Biol. Zeitschr.*, 1923, cxxiv, p. 141.
- [2] JAKOBY. *Ibid.*, 1927, p. 181.
- [3] REID HUNT. *Science*, 1930, lxxii, p. 526.
- [4] MACHÉ. *Amer. Journ. Opth.*, August, 1931, p. 729.
- [5] COCA. *Journ. Infect. Dis.*, 1915, p. 357.
- [6] LOCKE and MAIN. *Ibid.*, 1931, p. 419.
- [7] BIER. "Attitude to Homœopathy."
- [8] Medical Research Council. Special Report, Series No. 150. "Medical Use of Radium," 1931.
- [9] HARRIS and INNES. *Bio. Chem. Journ.*, 1931, vol. lxx, p. 367.
- [10] DUKR. *Journ. Amer. Med. Assoc.*, 1915, p. 1600.
- [11] *Idem.* *Arch. Int. Med.*, 1913, vol. xi, p. 100.

—*The British Homœopathic Journal.*

Editorial Notes and Comments.

End of the year. The present January issue of the Hahnemannian Gleanings will complete the third year of its existence. Its subscribers and readers have now been able to form a correct estimate of its worth and usefulness in the field of homœopathy. In these