

By Dr. D.E. Mistry M.S. Consulting Surgeon & Homœopath
46 Railway Lines
Solapur Maharashtra State, India
Email - diniumistry@hotmail.com

Comments On “Trojan Horse”

Readers of H.C.C.R. would be advised carefully to go through the article entitled “Trojan Horse in Classical Homeopathy.”

Sometime back the Homœopathic fraternity was exposed to a serious controversy cum debate between two schools of Homœopathic ideologies, one led by Dr. George Vithoulkas and his followers and the other consisting of people like Dr. Rajan Sankaran, Jeremy Sherr, Jan Scholten and others. This debate generated enough heat sometime back which was published in the Links Magazine, and led to worldwide introspection amongst most of us. As per the law of all controversies this has now cooled down, except for few periodic rumblings now and then. Here is now another and far more serious issue at debate.

Dr. Paul Herscu is a renowned senior and famous practitioner whose remarks as a series of articles called “The Herscu Letters” on the issue of vaccination and Homœopathy, seems to have stirred up a veritable hornet's nests of remarks by Dr. Rudolf Verspoor who has written this article.

At the onset, I must add that his book, *Homeopathy Re-examined - Beyond the Classical Paradigm*, written in conjunction with Steven Decker, now enlarged with new research and called *The Dynamic Legacy - Hahnemann from Homeopathy to Heilkunst*, and available in electronic form world-wide may hardly have been read by people in India. The book is very difficult to read and can only be bought from abroad. The basic conflict as I understand it is the degradation of the road of Homœopathy in the modern context, which Dr. Herscu seems to imply especially when he is writing on the issue of vaccinations and the cure of diseases by Homœopathy.

As Verspoor states, “Herscu seems to have been charmed by the changed, evolved Allopathic medicine of today to such an extent that Homeopathy has been reduced to the role of a handmaiden for Allopathy.” (pg. no. 2, last para.) By the same token it would seem Homœopathy never treats the disease - only the patient, which to me is a patently erroneous interpretation.

Verspoor has very effectively challenged Herscu's statements not only in this article, but more so through the medium of his book. To my knowledge so far not a single Indian Homœopath who has effectively gone through Verspoor's book has either commented on, refuted or challenged whatever has been mentioned in the book. Perhaps even the western veteran Homœopaths have preferred to maintain a stoical silence on what he has written. As Verspoor himself states on page 7 of his article, “No new evidence has been presented to date to contradict what has been published.”

To my mind the basic issue seems to be amongst those who have read and followed Hahnemann's 5th edition of his *Organon* and those who are following the 6th edition. Kent himself was not aware of 6th edition and he passed away three years before the 6th edition came out around 1919. Who knows what would have been the fate and practice of Homœopathy today had Kent seen and read the 6th edition during his lifetime?

There have been many who have stated both privately and publicly that Kent's Homœopathy deviated from what Hahnemann wrote and practiced especially in the later part of his life.

All these points are clearly brought out in Verspoor's book, especially how Hahnemann actually practiced and not what he has alleged to have practiced.

Dr. Rima Handley's book, *In Search of the Later Hahnemann*, gives more insights into what Hahnemann did with his medicines in the later part of his life.

The concept of the two various aspects of the living principle called the Sustentive and Generative Powers, the concept of the real meaning of primary and secondary action of the remedy prescribing, **which type of prescribing Hahnemann himself did at one time did this type of prescribing**, but had to withdraw the same due to political reasons and not because of any inherent errors of his principles - all this and more has been effectively revealed in Verspoor's book.

Even when Hahnemann withdrew as mentioned above for political reasons the above dual remedy method, Boenninghausen continued to practice this along with Aegidi who first evolved this method and gave over 240 examples to Hahnemann of this method. However, this is not my main contention and what Hahnemann did or did not do is left to the individual reader to find out for himself after reading Verspoor's and Handley's books. Certainly Kent and those who followed him kept the torch alive for many years, and in no small measure even today there are hundreds who are following that way, but to state as Herscu has stated that Homœopathy cannot deal with epidemic diseases, now that modern medicine (Allopathic) has become refined and progressed and can be the first line in treating such epidemics - is to negate and overlook the 250 years of experience of treatment of such conditions right from Hahnemann's time.

Pray did not Hahnemann himself treat the cholera epidemic even before he had seen a single case? The records of Homœopathic prophylaxis is there for all to see in various journals and books of earlier years. So should we now take a back seat and say, "Allopathy is the best and Homœopathy can come in after Allopathy has given the first choice to treat"? What else but this can be the interpretation of what Dr. Herscu is stating?

The problem is still more grave when Dr. Herscu deals with the topic of vaccinations, for as stated on page 9 Herscu states that Allopathic vaccinations should be resorted to because they work and Homœopathic efforts at prevention do not. To my mind this is the most dangerous, illogical unfounded almost insane contention and I cannot understand how this can go unchallenged. Has Dr. Herscu read at all the various disasters and side-effects of modern vaccination therapy? Is he aware of even the 3 to 4% of Sudden Infant Death Syndrome (SIDS), autism, dyslexias, epilepsies, mental retardation, hyperactive syndrome, not to mention various allergies and proneness to various infective processes brought about by this obnoxious practice of injections, inoculations and vaccinations to babies at birth? Is he aware of what is given in the books of Coulter or of other well-researched books, particularly the one by **Neal Z. Miller**?

In my own little field of 40 years of practice I have never given, advised or advocated any vaccination to any child whose mothers I have treated and the same children born of them after birth for over 10 years. I'm sorry to say that none of this has been effectively taught to the Homœopathic students of Homœopathic colleges which I have been connected with, especially in Maharashtra, run like chickens to get themselves vaccinated recently for Hepatitis. If anything it reflects effectively on the teaching capacities of their Homœopathic teachers, a matter of shame indeed.

But what can one do if the teachers are not committed and the Homœopathic students fed on Allopathic milk from their birth? More shocking to me in the past was the realization that even young and senior Homœopaths have vaccinated their children. How can one do so when are all taught both as Allopaths & Homœopaths that the immune system is not developed at all at birth and it takes many months to do so?

After all, have western mothers & perhaps their modern Indian counterparts forgotten the role of antibodies conveyed to children through breast milk?

The Japanese have been wiser. They inoculate their children after 2 years and all the Japanese statistical records as compared to American statistics show a remarkable decrease in harmful side effects in their children. Measles and other diseases which come by the natural route give a very different immunity and raise the level of vitality above that which is produced by the poke of an injection needle and the entry of the foreign protein directly into the blood stream of the child. Such a procedure may supposedly prevent a potential measles from nature to come to that child but this is so because the vaccine has given the child an artificial measles disease to an immune system and this is not the same as what comes through the natural course. More on this I need not add.

Perhaps we in India are more insulated Homœopathically than what is abroad. Thus this controversy may seem to be beyond our present situation. But no, if we sink, we all sink together and if we rise, we all rise together.

Allopathy, call it by whatever name, modern medicine, is essentially suppressive and destructive. It is also aggressive, totally against the principles of nature, lopsided if not one sided in its views, has no essential principles of healing or cure, no principles which can essentially deal with health, because that is not in their thinking at all. We in India, whether it is lay people who are practicing Homœopathy and very often effectively at that, or lay persons coming to us as patients or all those who consider ourselves as Homœopaths and more so as healers, we all must sit up & ponder & meditate & ultimately question ourselves as to whether by what we are doing will raise the status of Homœopathy, not as a handmaiden, not even as a complementary therapeutic procedure, or alternative procedure, but in times to come as the main procedure, the dominant therapeutic practice at least in India; if not so it will lead to the death knell of Homœopathy for all of us.

Initially I had planned to pen only a few editorial remarks for Verspoor's article. Then I felt it could not be so, my Homœopathic spirit rebelled and I was carried away to write an article in itself my readers should forgive me for this and I would love to have the views, opinions, remarks & comments of my senior and veteran Homœopaths and also my young readers.

Dr. Verspoor's reply to Dr. Mistry's Comments:

Dear Dr Meher,

Thank you for your recent communication concerning my article, "Allopathic Trojan Horse in Classical Homeopathy," and your request to publish it in your journal along with the editorial comments by Dr. Mistry.

I would be pleased to see this article published in your journal and the issue raised therein receive more exposure within the homeopathic community, particularly in India, as it is an important one for the future of homeopathy, as Dr. Mistry himself points out in his excellent editorial, and a large part of this future will be decided by Indian practitioners given the importance of Dr. Hahnemann's system of medicine in your country.

I find myself, not surprisingly, in agreement with the main points that Dr. Mistry makes about Dr. Herscu's views and very much appreciate his support for the comments that I myself have made in defense of Dr. Hahnemann's system of medicine as it relates in particular to the issue of prophylaxis.

I would at this point simply underline, however, that the central point of my article - namely, that classical

homeopathy, because of its misguided emphasis on the treatment of the patient to the exclusion, indeed ignorance and denial of the matter of disease diagnosis, which is critical to Hahnemann's system - is not really made clear in the editorial comment. It is this tendency within so-called "Classical Homeopathy," a dogma that dominates the journals and schools and associations in North America and Europe, and thereby heavily influences homeopaths world-wide, that is so worrisome to me as it effectively vacates the field of disease, that which Dr. Hahnemann worked so hard to conquer from the Old School and put on a firm footing of principle, to allopathic medicine, without one single shot being fired in defense of what Dr. Hahnemann wrote, taught and practiced.

This amounts to a sort of "rot within" that threatens to reduce homeopathy and Hahnemann's complete medicine system (which is detailed in past books written by myself and Steven Decker, and most recently in *The Dynamic Legacy*) at best, as I have put it, to a handmaiden of allopathic medicine.

In this regard, your readers should be aware that the book, *Homeopathy Re-examined*, to which Dr. Mistry refers, has been substantially revised and new research material added, particularly on the issue of the dual remedies affair. This revision is only available in electronic format because of its size, but can now easily and readily be made available to any homeopath and student of homeopathy world-wide. It constitutes, in its new, expanded form, more a library of 'research related to Dr. Hahnemann's complete medical system based on his writings, which is searchable and allows for a more dynamic means of studying Dr. Hahnemann's legacy to mankind.

It is my hope that this new research will help others to see the tremendous benefits of Dr. Hahnemann's legacy and to have it take its rightful place in the evolution of medicine, that of the true system of Western Medicine. It is in this regard that the dogma surrounding Dr. Hahnemann's teachings in the form of so-called "classical homeopathy" is so dangerous.

Dr. Mistry's Reply To Dr. Verspoor's Remark:

Dear Dr. Verspoor,

It was so kind of you to have communicated. to Dr. Meher, your impressions about my editorial remarks concerning your article, "Allopathic Trojan Horse in Classical Homeopathy." It is correct, as you have stated, I have not made very clear in my remarks, **the** contentions that there is a great measure of denial on the aspect of disease diagnosis by many Homeopaths, both here and abroad, during their treatment of the patient - the tendency being to lay emphasis on the treatment of the patient and giving secondary or poor importance to the disease diagnosis and its treatment. Perhaps this has been the result of the overwhelming influence of the Kentian System all over the world and more so perhaps because what Hahnemann himself wrote was interpreted in a manner suitable to the temperament and spirit of the translator and perhaps of that movement in Homeopathy at that time from the exclusive involvement of disease diagnosis as was prevalent then, and even now, and the trend towards treatment of the patient took precedence over the treatment of the disease.

As I feel from my experience of life and various therapies that there are always swings in aspects of treatment, which raises the fundamental questions for most of us. Do we treat only the disease as is exclusively the role of Allopathy at present and even in Hahnemann's days the same, or do we treat exclusively the patient - making disease treatment very secondarily, or do most of us consciously or unconsciously treat both without clearly understanding which is more important in that individual patient at that moment of time and space? Coupled with this is the matter of potency problem in which also one finds extremely wide practices from mother tinctures to the highest potencies.

As a surgeon I have been very practical and in my own field of practice with the patients that come to me I give more importance to disease diagnosis and the treatment of disease, especially in cases of cancers and AIDS and other diseases of advanced pathology and then took towards, “what is in the patient” on the mind and emotional level, on the causative level, and on the heredity and immune level which created the disease. Of course, as you know, in life it is never only white or only black, but this too along with all shades of grey in between. There is a natural human tendency to be caught in words and then get fixated within the bounds of well-meant but often limiting symbols like classical Homœopathy, Revolutionary Homœopathy, Kentian Homœopathy or Hahnemannian Homœopathy.

Perhaps each one of us as practitioners is drawn by our own temperament to practice one or the other system and perhaps unconsciously berate the practitioners of other systems. I have friends, senior practitioners who practice high potencies and Kentian methods and scorn on those like Richard Hughes or the late Pritam Singh of England or methods taught by Dr. Robin Murphy of USA; are even unwilling to either try or accept at least in thinking that others can also get good results. I have long asked myself the fundamental question that aside from intrinsic merit of a remedy, of whatever pathy it may be, what really does happen which **sets the needle in** which a patient towards cure or improvement in his condition? Is it the overwhelming power and personality, knowledge and education, and the system that the doctor practices or that receptivity and the faith of the patient, or a subtle force, intelligent and unknown to most of us, lets call it the force of healing, which flows from the doctor to the patient, or is it just the Tight time and the fight circumstance and other influences, Karmic or otherwise, which bring the patient and the doctor in a relationship which as its net result, invokes the “healer” within the patient, to start the movement towards recovery?

Perhaps, there is wide truth in the parable of the Six Blind men and the elephant touching various parts of elephant and giving their various interpretations of what this animal could be. For a brief period of time the grace of a spiritual master gives them a vision and they see the truth of the whole animal and what **they thought of animal** which was a part of the whole truth.

Perhaps, in a similar way, unless we evolve to a wider vision, a cosmic vision, we as individuals and as doctors will not know the full process and the forces behind the laws of healing and cure.

In your letter you have remarked that your book *Homeopathy Re-examined* has been revised and now in an expanded form made available in an electronic format. I wish it is on a book form because I have a one eye vision since many years and I do not sit at a computer any longer because of that. Maybe I can ask Dr. Meher if it is OK with you to download the book which you have now brought out so that I can read it at leisure.

Sorry once again for the length of the letter to you which is personal and my deep regards to you and your colleague Steven Decker and to your families. You are always free to put my remarks in your journal whenever you feel like. And certainly you can correct whatever mistakes that may be in letters to which I have requested Dr. Meher who stays far away from me to email you.

Thanking you with kind regards,

Dr. Mistry