Homoeopathy

b k sinha

Homeopathy, the author contends, goes well with the holistic health movement and holds the promise of making necessary medicines available to all.

HOMOEOPATHY is today's medicine because it offers a way out from the situation the people in need of medicine face: One of these problems is the cost. Treatment has become terribly costly, forcing an overwhelming majority of people to suffer helplessly or succumb to diseases. Homoeopathic treatment is much cheaper. The manufacture of these drugs does not involve the kind of technology which would lead to monopoly and consequently to cost escalation. Besides, the action of homoeopathic drugs does not depend on the quantity of drugs administered but on potency and higher the potency, the less there is of the medicinal matter in it. And one of its basic principles is to keep the dose of the medicine to the minimum.

Homoeopaths prescribe drugs on totality of symptoms. This saves the ordeal of going through surgical operations in most cases. Its principles for treating a group of symptoms have been tried and tested in the last 175 years and its structure is such that new information can continually be incorporated into the existing body of knowledge. And the logic behind these principles is such that it avoids logical contradictions of other systems of treatment by elevating the concepts of health, disease and cure to a level where these contradictions do not operate.

In all societies and in all ages, human beings face concrete problems and is oppressed by them. Consequently, they endeavour to solve them and to understand them. The understanding of the problem is crucially dependant on the tools that they possess including the power of abstraction. Both these tools and power of abstraction crucially depend on the state of development of the society. Within this limitation; there is yet another limitation: that of the class nature of the problems and following from it the class nature of the solution advanced. If the problem of study stems from the class needs of the ruling class and the solution to it does not question the beliefs and ideas justifying the existence and the privileges of the ruling class, the individual studying these problems and advancing solutions get support, recognition and glory from the ruling class. If these bases are questioned, such individuals incur the wrath of the ruling classes and are dealt with accordingly. If the questions studied and the answers advanced are such as do not interest the ruling classes, howsoever beneficial they may be to the advancement of the society as a whole, those are simply ignored till a class comes to recognise their usefulness, either as the ruling class of the day or as a class in struggle against the ruling class for supremacy and power. It goes without saying that societies whose ruling class in certain periods of time either suppresses such studies and solutions of the problems or ignores them is condemned to stagnate and degenerate. Historically, we see two types of development that take place in societies condemned in this way, depending upon the level of development of the society in question. If because of the development, such a class has emerged in the society which could withstand persecution, the task of developing society drives many individuals to take up such study notwithstanding the persecutions. The ruling class is then replaced by another ruling class which enables the society to develop further. If, again because of the level of development of the society, such a class has not emerged which could withstand persecution, it leads to various kinds of distortions in the existing body of knowledge of the society and to an ever increasing difficulty in procuring the means of life from surroundings, to maintain its existence and that of the ruling class. If the natural surrounding of such a society is bountiful, it manages to keep itself alive despite its stagnation and consequent distortions in its consciousness; if not, such societies must perish leaving the marks of their existence on history.

An individual's response to the problems faced has elements of both universality and particularity. Universality, because the basic problem sought to be solved and the tools of enquiry at a specific stage of development are universal. Particularly, because the answers to these problems are in terms of what is available either from nature or from what is inherited from previous generations. Hence the element of particularity is to a minimum level in primitive societies. It is for this reason that different societies existing at different points of time and space and drawing the necessary means of life in a similar method and ways tend to enquire into the problems they face in similar ways and arrive at similar answers. At a certain point of time and space, if there is a change in a society's methods and ways of procuring the necessary means of life, its ideas about the problem it faces, its tools of enquiry and the answers it advances for its solution too change, in the main. But societies where this change has not taken place continue to live in the old ways with their old ideas.

Health and freedom from illness is one of the most basic human needs. Primitive response to this need is universally magical. It could not but be so. For it was a long time before human societies could even pose the problem properly and did not possess even the elementary tools to enquire into the problem. Later, as experience accumulated abstractions of experience as beliefs and theories were put forward. Hence we see the sprouting of different systems of treatment in different societies. Some of these systems have survived to this day although they could not remain unaffected by the development of science and logic either in their own society or in other societies they came in contact with.

Besides, the human endeavour to fulfill health needs and discover cures for illness directs enquiries into various aspects of the problem including the human body, cause of disease, effects of drugs, hygiene, etc. The answers to all these questions must be limited by the tools available and must at the same time reflect current beliefs including taboos. Besides, the less developed the tools, the greater the grip of beliefs and taboos. On the other hand, the greater the stakes behind these beliefs and taboos, the greater the force with which they are defended. Hence any of the systems of treatment needs to be evaluated for its objectivity, not on the basis of its own 'theories' and beliefs, not on particulars, but on the basis

of science, on the basis of what is abstracted from the particulars, the universal.

If we look into the systems of treatment practised in ancient civilisations like the one in India (Ayurveda), China and Greece we find that each identifies the cause of disease differently. While Ayurveda identifies *vayu, pitta,* and *kapha* as three doshas, a disordered state of which afflicts the body with diseases of various kinds, the Chinese system identifies the balance two opposing principles—the *yang* and the *ying*—and an imbalance, therefore, meant diseases. Similarly the Greeks believed that when the four humours—blood, phlegm, yellow bile and black bile—were in balance, there was a state of health; when not, diseases resulted. Rome, after conquering Greece, based its system on Greek system but Roman physicians developed the system immensely.

Even a cursory glance at their history reveals that the inner vitality of these systems which propelled them to acquire new experience and propound theories is subsequently plagued. The loss of vitality of these systems reflects the loss of vitality of the civilisation and societies which gave rise to these systems. A period of stagnation followed. The reason is simple: the then ruling class in all these societies had become parasitical in course of time and therefore its relation with scientific enquiry had became antagonistic. Consequently, scientific enquiry was discouraged and scientists were persecuted. This is brilliantly underlined by D. P. Chattopadhyaya in his works (Chattopadhyaya, 1976, 1977).

European historiography describes the period 600–1400 A.D. as the Dark Ages of medicine. Dissection of the human body was prohibited. "The history of Europe in those days is the history of typhus and plague, of rats, lice and men... The lack of scientific knowledge promoted superstition in medicine. Saints were invoked for the curing of disease—St. Clare for sore eyes, St. Sebastian for plague, St. Appolonia for toothache, etc (Nelson, 1927).

Science having been tabooed elsewhere, Arabia came forward to take science and medicine to new heights. They preserved Greco-Roman wisdom, further developed it and enriched it with new drugs. Their contribution in the field of pharmacology is great. The system of medicine they gave rise to is known popularly as Unani system. But later, their civilisation and along with it their medicine fell into a period of stagnation much as in other societies and for mostly the same reasons.

Thanks to the maturing of merchant and manufacturing capital in some societies, not only the persecution of scientists came to an end but they began to receive state encouragement. Individuals came forward in many fields of activities including science, logic, medicine and so on, who could be compared with Columbus in their fields. Beginning with Fractorius and Paracelsus, a galaxy of physicians shed new light on various aspects of the human body and diseases. Newton and Bacon widened the horizon of human thought to an unprecedented level. Further development of knowledge came to depend crucially on the development of a logic and based on it the classification of the existing knowledge. In the field of zoology, it was taken up by Cuvier and in the field of pathology by his contemporary, Hahnemann, the founder of homoeopathic system of treatment. But Hahnemann did much more than attempt to classify diseases—he developed a logic which put forward different concepts in relation to diseases, cause of the diseases, medicines and the way medicines act and advanced several hypotheses which were later substantiated by different branches of science.

In Hahnemann's days therapeutic practice was appaling. Stuart Close says:

> Ideas which now seem absurd were then matters of the most serious moment, and in their practical working out often became tragical. Blood letting, the outgrowth of one of these false theories affords a good example. The celebrated Bouvard, physician to Louis XIII, ordered his royal patient forty seven bleedings, two hundred and fifteen empties or purgatives and three hundred and twelve clysters during the period of one year ... the death of our own George Washington was undoubtedly caused by the repeated blood-letting to which he was subjected. He was almost completely exsanguinated (Close, 1979, pp 28-29).

Nature of Scientific Enquiry

Science studies nature in general and within this universality, the different aspects of nature, the particularities. All scientific enquiry reflects nature more deeply, truly and completely. But what exists in nature is matter in motion. Hence what science studies is different forms of matter in motion, scientific judgements and concepts relate to it and therefore are needed to be placed at different levels.

To illustrate the point: The simplest form of motion is change of place—mechanical motion. But there is no such thing as motion of a single body although motion towards a centre common to many bodies can be treated as such. But as soon as a single body moves in a direction other than towards the centre, the laws of falling to which it was subject, undergo modifications:-

a. As laws of trajectories and lead to reciprocal motion of several bodies, planetary motion, equilibrium in motion itself. But the real result of this kind of motion is ultimately the contact of moving bodies—they fall into one another.

b. As laws of bodies in contact—ordinary mechanics, livers, inclined plane, etc. But the effect of the contact is not exhausted by these. Contact is manifested directly in two forms: friction and impact. Both have the property that at certain degree of intensity and under certain conditions, they produce new effects like heat, sound, electricity... no longer mechanical effects.

c. As science of these forms of motion—physics. It establishes the fact that under certain conditions, they pass into one another and at certain degree of intensity which varies according to the different bodies set in motion produce effects which transcend physics, changing the internal structure of the bodies—chemical effects.

d. As science of chemical nature and internal structure of bodies. Its task becomes to prepare these substances artificially and it subsequently prepares the ground for dialectical transition to the organic sciences... (Marx and Engels, 1953, pp 342-43).

We thus see that all these branches of science study the particularity of contradiction and are differentiated on this very basis. These contradictions are rooted in the objective world and are independent of human will. And human thinking is a subjective reflection of the objective world. But human thought may or may not reflect the objective world correctly. The contradiction between a correct and an incorrect reflection of the same thing in nature gives rise to another type of contradiction—logical contradiction. Appearance of a logical contradiction in human thinking means that the thought is not correct and development of thinking depends

upon its solution. But for this, it must be separated from dialectical contradictions—the contradictions existing independently in nature. But given the nature of human knowledge and the way it has advanced, logical contradictions too are mistakenly treated as dialectical contradictions and pose difficulties for separating the two. Besides, it can be separated only on the basis of practice. But the word practice has to be understood clearly—it is different from what can be termed as 'naive practicality'. For practice to be correct, it has to be guided by theory and the latter must correspond to the level at which the contradiction operates.

Consider an example. Euclidean geometry grew out of practical activities spanning centuries. Its axioms and theorems are still found correct and serve our needs. It served Newton's needs as well when he was formulating his laws of gravitation. Newton's laws of gravitation are one of the greatest triumphs of science. But he could only describe gravitation, he could not explain it; limited as he was by the level of science of his day. Explaining it would require on the one hand, such fundamental advances as the development of the concept of fields, the creation of electrodynamics and the theory of relativity. It would also require, on the other hand, a deeper approach to natural science, its methods and problems. But when one begins to explain gravitation, one simultaneously begins to see the contradiction inherent in both Euclidean geometry and Newtonian mechanics. This of course, does not mean that Euclidean geometry or Newtonian mechanics are wrong; they are very much correct within their own limits. The confusion arises only when their limits are violated.

Hahnemann's Contributions

Hahnemann lived in an age in which he could ask questions and provide answers only in the hypothetical form; he could not back up his hypothesis with exact experiments, nor could he express himself in the exact language and terms of science. The problem was compounded for him as he enquired into complex subjects like health, disease, cure, action of drugs, etc. He could bank only on his power of observation and abstraction and could draw but little from his predecessors. The competence with which he founded his therapy is amazing. And in so doing, he gave a new interpretation of these concepts, applied some of the known principles in a different way and developed his system of cure.

It was Hahnemann who gave the name allopathy to the system which was practised in his time. In his time, quite like the present, treatment generally proceeded on the principle that a disease or a symptom of disease is cured by using a medicine that opposes the symptom, either by direct suppression or by inducing a reaction leading to its suppression. Even the descriptive terms for drugs with prefix "anti" indicate the principle on which they are prescribed. He opposed this principle and called his system homoeopathy. The basic principle of homoeopathy is stated in a phrase: "Similia similibus curentur" or "Like shall be treated by like".

Hahnemann was not the first to propound this idea. It had been expressed by thinkers and scientists from ancient times. He acknowledged his debt to Hippocrates, in whose writing the principle of "like cures like" appears. In ancient Indian philosophy we find a similar reasoning advanced by Uddalak Aruni in Chandogya Upanishad, "The essential nature of the cause is to be inferred by the essential nature of the effect" (Chattopadhyaya, 1976, p 477). But this principle in itself could not have taken Hahnemann beyond Hippocrates. As it constituted a part of the complex whole he was reasoning, it propelled him to go further and devise suitable means for its application.

Allopathy and other systems of medicine believe that the cause of the disease must be diagnosed before to determine proper treatment. But knowledge of the cause of the disease depends on the level of theory and the available tools of investigation. A further deepening of knowledge must therefore invalidate old therapeutic practice which is only logical and sound. But the cause of the disease is too complex. Disease, like health, is influenced by a number of factors in complex combinations. This constitutes a logical contradiction and leads to unsound therapeutic practice. James Krauss says:

> It is impossible to know all the antecedents causative of disease consequents. ... How then shall we remove or palliate these effects by medical substances? Here, Hahnemann steps in to say, 'remove the effects and you remove the disease'. We must apply medicinal substances on the basis of knowledge of their actual effects which we have ascertained and know. Disease effects are removed by the application of medicines having corresponding medicinal effects. Scientific comparison of disease effects and medicinal effects for application leads to the diagnostic inferences of scientific medicine, makes scientific medicine possible (Krauss, 1979, p 9).

Besides, Hahnemann had observed the opposite action of large and small doses of medicine. Ipecac in large doses caused nausea and vomiting and in small doses, under certain condition, cured it. This held good for a number of drugs then in use. This observation led him on the one hand to anticipate what was later discovered and formulated by the Arndt-Schulz law, an allopathic rule formulated towards the end of the nineteenth century. On the other hand it led him to propound the theory of potentisation or dynamisation.

Potentisation is a process of dilution and vigorous succession at each stage of dilution. If the original medicinal substance is soluble in ethyl alcohol, the starting point is a concentrated solution called mother tincture (O). If it is not, then it is triturated with 99 parts (in centisimal and decimal scales of dilution respectively) of milk sugar. After this initial trituration, one part of this is again triturated with 99 or 9 parts of milk sugar depending upon the scale. After third trituration, he observed, the medicinal substance becomes soluble in alcohol. [Triturations therefore anticipate the development of colloid chemistry.] It is then treated like soluble substances and further diluted to reach higher potencies.

Dalton's atomic theory and Avagadro's hypothesis were known in Hahnemann's days. The atom was not considered to be divisible by the former and according to the latter, one gram molecular weight of any compound or element contained approximately 6×10^{23} molecules. Therefore, if one gram molecular weight of any substance, say for example 48.46 gram of sodium chloride (natrum muriaticum) is dissolved in 99 parts of water then the solution will contain 6×10^{23} molecules. If one part of this solution is diluted in 99 parts of water then the solution would contain 6×10^{21} molecules assuming that the solution is thoroughly mixed. Second dilution will leave 6×10^{19} molecules. If we go on then a stage will be reached when the number of molecules present in the solution will be 6×10^{1}. At this point if we take a hundredth part of the solution then the number of molecules will be 6×10^{-1} or 0.6. It means that beyond 12th.

centesimal or 24th decimal potentisation, not even a single molecule of the original substance is there in the medicine. But the more commonly used medicines are 30th and beyond.

Hahnemann was aware of this paradox. He advanced the reasoning that the process of dilution and succession released a "spirit like power". Stuart Close adds, ". . : homoeopathic potentiation (potentisation) is nothing more or less than a physical process at which the dynamic energy, latent in crude substances, is liberated, developed and modified for use as medicines" (Close, 1979, p 219).

Hahnemann by arguing that removal of symptoms itself meant cure from the disease and by treating the question of health, disease, and power of medicine to cure at a dynamic plane, elevates them to a plane where the contradiction inherent in other systems of treatment does not operate. This in itself is a great advance in science and the applied science of medicine.

Homoeopathy and Its Detractors

Homoeopaths and homoeopathic treatment are more widespread than is normally estimated. England is an important centre for homoeopathic teaching and practice and homoeopathic doctors are part of the National Health Service. According to an official estimate in 1972, there were more than 72,000 registered homoeopaths in India. Other commonwealth countries like Australia, New Zealand and Canada have quite a significant number of homoeopaths. It is also taught and practised in the USA, France, Germany, Switzerland and Holland. This in itself should be sufficient to silence those who ridicule the homoeopathic system of treatment by saying that there is no medicinal substance in the drugs.

They can convince themselves by the reasoning advanced by Bernard and Stephenson. In an article written in 1967 they proposed that through the process of dilution and succession, the active substance acts as a template, communicating a field to the solvent through the formation of polymer chains (gaint molecular aggregates) in the solvent. The three dimensional structure of such polymers would be specific to each individual solute. Once the structural informational content of the solute has been transmitted to the solvent through the formation of the polymer chains, the solute need no longer be present for the solvent to communicate that information to the human organism (Bernard and Stephenson, 1967, pp 277-86).

Mathew Hubbard pointed out in an article in 1977 that when Avagadro formulated his law, matter was not believed to be visible beyond the level of the atom. Now, of course, we have identified subatomic particles, and one contemporary model defines atoms as ordered waves of energy. Thus when we study the phenomena associated with apparently material substances, we are no longer restricted to the realm of matter; matter and energy are interchangeable and are constantly being transformed from one form to the other (according to the first law of thermodynamics, as electrons jump from one orbit to another around the nucleus of the atom, radiation is released, which can be measured on a spectroscope). Each chemical element has its own spectroscopic "fingerprint", which is produced by this characteristic pattern of radiation. He proposed that the energy released from such molecules of matter must permeate an entire solution; thus, even if there is not a single atom of the original substance present in a highly diluted solution, the energy associated with this subatomic activity should be present in the solvent (Hubbard, 1977, pp 433-36).

The above two tentative approaches to the explanation of the activity of high potencies have some implications that can be tested in the laboratory. In a series experiments in the 1950s, A Gay and J Boiron demonstrated measurable differences between the capacitances (dielectric constants) of distilled water and of sodium chloride dissolved in distilled water and carried through stages of dilution upto 10^{-605}. Also, in 1931, Paterson and Boyd showed that the Schick test, conventionally used to determine the presence or absence of immunity to diphtheria, can be altered through the administration of high potencies of either alum precipitated toxoid—used by the allopaths in material doses to induce immunity—or of Diphtherinum, a nosode prepared from a diphtheritic membrane. There are many more studies of experiments to prove the effect of high potency drugs. Weiner and Goss cite a few examples in their book (Weiner and Goss, 1982, pp 129-30).

Another group of detractors allege that since homoeopathy is solely concerned with symptoms, it ignores even such cause(s) of the disease that modern science so powerfully establishes, like bacteria. Some go further and argue that even after the symptoms are removed as a result of homoeopathic treatment, the cause remains and therefore the symptoms again reappear. Yet another criticisms is that since it treats individual patients and prescribes different drugs to different persons suffering from similar symptoms; it is not suitable in epidemic conditions. A surprising thing about such criticism is that they are levelled not by uninformed persons but by highly informed ones, by 'experts'.

Such criticisms spring from a profound ignorance of Hahnemann's teachings and subsequent developments in other fields of knowledge and science. In section 31 of *Organon*, Hahnemann says: "The inimical forces, partly psychial, partly physical to which our terrestrial existence is exposed, which are termed morbific noxious agents, do not possess the power of morbidly deranging the health of man unconditionally, but we are made ill by them only when our organism is sufficiently deposed and susceptible to the attack of the morbific cause. . .".

We thus see that Hahnemann not only identifies "morbific noxious agents" but also explains the reason because of which not every one succumbs to bacteria though all may be equally exposed to them. It would be interesting to note that he recognised the presence of bacteria and attributed to these animal forms, too minute for the eyes to see, many forms of epidemic and acute illnesses. He announced his deductions in 1818, more than 60 years before Koch isolated the tubercle bacillus (Roberts, 1979, pp 180-81).

Stuart Close says:

> The real cause (of the disease) is the whole of these antecedents, and we have no right, philosophically speaking, to give the name of the cause to one of them, exclusively of the others.

Also,

> Brilliant and successful as have been the attainments of bacteriologists in creating a new science of sanitary engineering, they have failed and must continue to fail, to establish bacteriology as the basis of a therapeutics.

Further,

> In cholera, for example, admitting the existence and presence of the bacilli as one causative factor, we still have to reckon with sanitary, atmospheric and telluric conditions; with economic and

social conditions and habits of life, with means and modes of transportation and intercommunication between individuals and communities; with individual physical, mental and emotional states, etc., all of which are essential factors, in some combination, in determining and modifying the susceptibility of individuals to the bacilli; for without some combination of these factors, the bacilli is impotent and the disease would never occur (Close, 1979, pp 268-69).

We thus see that homoeopathy is closer to the modern concept of health care and preventive medicine than other systems of treatment including allopathy.

Homoeopathic treatment has been successful in epidemics even during the lifetime of Hahnemann. Weiner and Goss give a detailed report of a survey conducted in England to determine the effectiveness of a homoeopathic nosode, Influenzinum. This holds good for the diseases caused by the virus also. Weiner and Goss add a speculative note:

> There is a widespread concern about the dangers of the research in bacteriological warfare; scientists and the lay people alike portray the possible disastrous consequences of the escape of virulent organisms that have been specifically bred to resist chemotherapy. Mysterious illnesses, such as 'legionnaire's disease' have also aroused public interest. The allopathic response to legionnaire's disease was to search for an etiologic agent in order to determine the proper medicine to eradicate the hypothesised 'bacteria' responsible. In theory, homoeopathic treatment could yield impressive result in such instances for two reasons: (1) both situations have the characteristics of epidemics, hence a single remedy or a group of remedies could be determined for each particular epidemic as the proper treatment in the majority of cases; and (2) since homoeopathy selects the remedy on the basis of symptom alone, identification of the organism involved would not be necessary, nor it would be necessary to develop a chemotherapeutic agent that had the specific effect of eradicating that organism.

Underlying the specific precepts of homoeopathy there is a vitalistic principle that is clearly spelt out in *Organon* (sections 9 to 14). Section 15 visualises the "affection of the morbidly deranged spirit-like dynamis (vital force)" and "the totality of the outwardly cognizable symptoms produced by it in the organism and representing the existing malady, constitute a whole." This vitalistic principle at the heart of the homoeopathic doctrine and dialectical method of its application distinguishes it from allopathy and other systems of treatment.

Hahnemann believed that diseases entered the body in the form of miasms— subtle, imperceptible substances as "imperceptible as the vital force itself". He divided all diseases into two broad categories: (1) Acute disease or actue miasm: These are rapid in development and have a definite course consisting of three phases: (a) a prodromal period of onset; (b) a period of progress and (c) a period of decline. The vital force is generally able of curing itself in such cases provided the attack on the organism is not so violent as to cause death. (2) Chronic diseases or chronic miasm: There is again a prodromal period and a period of progress of the disease but there is no period of decline. The vital force is not able of curing itself. Under certain circumstances the chronic disease may quieten down and may become virtually devoid of symptoms, but each time it is aroused by adverse conditions and becomes worse than it was during the previous exacerbation.

Chronic miasms are further classified into three categories: psora, syphillis and sycosis to facilitate better choice of remedies.

What would tomorrow's system of treatment and health care be like? It can never allow humans to suffer for the profit of doctors or drug manufacturers; nor it can allow us to live passively unmindful of the questions that shape our existence and unstirred by the need to better our social life. It will have to identify the social, economic and political aspects of the whole termed as health problem; propose concrete ways of solving them and mobilise people to solve these problems. Hence those who are oppressed in such a system of treatment and health care will have to struggle for developing tomorrow's system of treatment and health care. And in this struggle, homoeopathy can became a tool, as it frees us from our dependence on those who are the targets of this struggle.

But before homoeopathy becomes a tool in this great struggle, it must rid itself of all that is unscientific in it, and must not shy away doing so. The most important among them is its secretarianism that the believers and practitioners of homoeopathy so strongly display. One of the reasons for its secretarianism is due to attacks on it and its inability to meet these attacks on the grounds of science. This has been so right from the days of Hahnemann. So vicious has been this attack that even a man of his nature had to limit himself to: "The physician's high and only mission is to restore the sick to health, to cure, as it is termed" (Hahnemann, 1977, p 92). He also added a footnote to it saying, "his mission is not, however, to construct so called systems by interweaving empty speculations and hypotheses concerning the internal essential nature of the vital processes and the mode in which diseases originate in the invisible interior of the organism (whereon so many physicians have hitherto ambitiously wasted their talents and their time)..." But now the times have changed, homoeopathy can meet this attack fully. Besides, history has put a different task before society, especially in poor and exploited countries. If more and more persons are embracing homoeopathy and are even struggling for its transformation, then it only underlines the historical task. And given the social need and the historical task, necessary forces will come forward to help in this great transformation.

References

Bernard, G.P. and Stephenson, J.H, "Microdose Paradox, A New Biophysical Concept", *Journal of the American Institute of Homoeopathy*, September-October 1967, pp 277-86.

Chattopadhyaya, Debiprasad, *What Is Living and What Is Dead in Indian Philosophy*, Delhi, 1976.

Chattopadhyaya, Debiprasad, *Science and Society in Ancient India*, Research India Publications, Calcutta, 1977.

Close, Stuart, *The Genius of Homoeopathy*, B. Jain Publishers, New Delhi, First Indian Edition, 1979.

Hahnemann Samuel, *Organon of Medicine*; 6th Edition, B. Jain Publishers, New Delhi, 1977.

Hubbard, Mathew, "A 20th Century Critique of Avagadro's Law and Its Implications", *Journal of the American Institute of Homoeopathy*, September 1977.

Krauss, James, "Introduction to Dr. Boericke's Translation of the Sixth Edition of Hahnemann's Organon", *Organon of Medicine* by Samuel Hahnemann, B. Jain Publishers, Reprint, 1979.

Nelson, Sir Arthur, *Health Problems in Organised Society*, P.S. King and Sons Ltd, London, 1927, quoted by Park, J.E, *Textbook of Preventive and Social Medicine*, Banarsidas Bahnot, Jabalpur, Third Edition, 1977.

Marx, Karl and Engels, Friedrich, *Selected Correspondence*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1953.

Roberts, Herbert A, *The Principle and Art of Cure by Homoeopathy*, B. Jain Publishers, New Delhi, Reprint, 1979.

Weiner, Michael and Goss, Kathlean, *The Complete Book of Homoeopathy*, Bantam Books, USA, 1982.

B K Sinha
Homeopathic Clinic
Tiwasa, Dist Amravati 444 903