

WHAT DOES HOMEOPATHY STAND FOR?

By C. M. BOGER, M.D., Parkersburg, W. Va.

Putting aside for the moment the factors which led up to the discovery and evolution of Homeopathy as one of the first fruits of the spirit of modern investigation, we may well ask ourselves what it stands for today. While the teachings of Hahnemann were pretty fairly followed until the close of the last century, the same period also saw the rise of the cellular pathology of Virchow, which, ranking as a collateral science at first, was soon reinforced by bacteriology, whereupon it quickly became the cornerstone of regular medicine, which has since leaned more or less toward the rationalistic form of materialism. So strong an impress upon medicine in general did not fail to make itself felt in homeopathic circles also, where its influence, especially among those who held but loosely to the law of similars became preponderant, and a majority of its followers was easily swept from its moorings by a conception of sickness which embodied the idea of concrete disease as the result of material disease producing entities. In time, these protagonists came to be accepted as good, and at the same time liberal and modernised Homoeopaths; but it proved a false step which inevitably led to a polluted and utterly unscientific form of practice, closely approaching the polypharmacy of the old school. These men over-looked the vital fact that Hahnemann was not ignorant of germ borne diseases, as such, and that dynamized remedies are all sufficient for their cure, thus showing beyond any reasonable doubt, that disease is indeed much more than the effect of germs, plus their dejecta, in a favourable breeding ground.

All human judgement acknowledges its fallibility by bowing to eternal law, and because Homeopathy has misread the lessons of pathology and helped to seek for "the secret of the universal life in carnal houses—dismembering rottenness itself and prying open the jaws of death to view the awful emptiness therein. Learning only enough to appeal you"; because she has done all this, can she not retrace her steps and shake off the malign part of this incubus? Can she not again sit at the feet of Hahnemann and learn the lessons anew which he so hardly wrested from nature's grip; learn that the law of similia is the masterkey of the universe, that it is related to and interwoven with every natural science, and that above all it is a constituent part of the still greater law of divine love.

Our present state remains one of "Wang, the Miller," who dreamed of a great treasure buried under one of the large foundation stones of his mill. To get these riches he dugged down to the stone, but as he started to raise it the whole mill tumbled about his ears, and buried him in the common ruin. The pathological short cut has only been a mirage, leaving most of its devotees in a barren desert of guesswork.

Similia similibus curantur is the crystallised expression of what we now all know to be a fact in the very nature of things, and if we wish to extend the working sphere of this natural law it is our moral duty as well as privilege to note all the apparently germane things that happen in our lives; for out of such fragmentary evidences come the highest values. What to us may seem merely trivial or incidental often holds within itself the solution of the most knotty problem; therefore what we are heedless of will often yield the greatest good if we will but observe, observe and observe again until we come at last to understand. This is the true course for every man who wishes to learn how to cure, to heal and to increase happiness.

We must learn very thoroughly what Hahnemann taught, and the rest will come to us easily enough. We must also cease to run so hard after all the fads in medicine, and devote more time and energy to learning about the law and its workings. If all the energy that has been expended in research work in other fields had been given to materia medica analysis and synthesis we would seldom need to be, as we now often are, ashamed of the prescription work of our graduates. No one is so deluded as to believe that the well-oiled allopathic institutions of today are in-capable in their own line, and need our puny assistance. Had we not better stick to our own work and develop it instead of leaving the heaviness of the

burden to a few workers who hardly ever get even homeopathic recognition? Has genuine Homeopathy, then, no questions purely its own that it must needs be so busy with other people's affairs? Is the potency enigma, aside from the field of pure mathematics, solved as yet? Has any one shown us the nature of the differential character of the reactions developed by potencies made by hand and raised by different ratios or denominators, not to speak of why such is the case? A patient who had improved while taking various potencies of the same drug made on the decimal or centesimal scale, begins to lag, and we change to another, a millennium scale or even a fluxion preparation, and the cure takes on a new impetus at once. Have our investigators (?) who are so fond of allopathic pastures solved this riddle? The efficiency of hand-made potencies, according to my own experiments, is distinctly increased by using the thumb in place of a cork and refilling the same vial each time the potency is raised instead of using a new one at each step. Magnetic influence is almost certainly a factor here.

We may speculate and perhaps reason out why such things ought to be so and so, but this does not advance us very fast, nor does it tend to open up those new vistas which are the invariable accompaniment of pure investigation. Perhaps frequent homeopathic prescribing tends to make blind imitators of us; it sometimes looks like it. If this be true, it also deters original investigation because it in a manner appeals to our imagination, fascinates, satisfies and enslaves us, by its successes and constant picture building—pictures which portray for us the tragedies of life and death. But in extenuation we must remember that it also brings renewed hope, the thing that we so desperately need, in the hour of trial. If then the gladsome victory of making a cure is born in the vision of the prescriber, how well should he know his work, and how little will all else become in his sight. We can not help but think that the hope and cheer which go with real curing are just as strong as they ever were, and our young men are just as anxious to learn how to do these things as they were of old, but the teachers of the truth are few, while smatters and imitators of allopathy fill the world with loud and discordant cries.

The seeker after homeopathic truths needs the guidance of some one who has himself been over this very difficult ground. Even the learned man will do well to begin by first reading Clark's "Homeopathy; All about It," along with Burnett's "Fifty Reasons for Being a Homeopath," as both of these books open up the subject in a very agreeable way; then should follow Hahnemann's "Organon," along with Kent's "Philosophy" as a commentary, but if the transition step seems too abrupt Nash's "Leaders" will entertain as well as instruct by the very helpful sidelights which they throw on the main thesis. Next comes Farrington's incomparable materia medica, which also by means of its many comparisons really introduces us to the study of the repertory. The next step is taken by learning the use of the synoptic key, wherein repertory analysis is combined with an illuminative synopsis of each remedy, whereby the prescriber may correct his bearings, either before or after consulting the detailed materia medica text in Hahnemann's "Materia Medica Pura or the Chronic Diseases." The aim of the above outline for study is to make the practical application of a working knowledge of the materia medica keep pace with a proper understanding of the principles and philosophy of Homeopathy in general.

Hurry characterises the modern world, hence the practice of pure Homeopathy which demands time, patience and careful consideration, is not an easy thing for the man who fails to get it thoroughly drilled into him through all the four years of his college life. As true as all this is, it is indeed strange that our colleges can't or won't see that our very existence depends upon real homeopathic work. All other methods are subterfuges and evasions that will in the end discredit their advocates and bedim the law. The doers of these things often talk loudly in praise of what Hahnemann did, but in private practice resort to the most absurd, not to say, unscrupulous things to obtain successes which are presumed to be homeopathic, but are in reality the very basest of quackeries. The end of such things is, however, not far off, and the public will learn to repudiate such men with all their debasing arts. Order will surely come out of this chaos and be visible to all eyes that can see, for the disorder characteristic of the prevailing modes of treatment is in itself their greatest condemnation, and convicts its advocates out of their own mouths. In the face of all this

regular medicine is too prejudiced to look into the only science of therapeutics that exemplifies natural law, but prefers to pursue its own devious ways, stumbling over a curative fact here, or making a crude homeopathic application there, all to no conclusive purpose because it can not or will not see that stabilising or curative action must always in its finality be similar action.

We are brothers in a great and true cause, the highest of earthly Slings; nothing should divide us, but we can and must press forward with an increasing and holy zeal to cure, to heal, and to teach others how to do the same thing in order that man may be lifted up from the blighting power of ignorance, from pain and from shame.