

The author sent this letter in summer 2002 to the editors of 'Simillimum', where it could not be published at this time. The publication here is with kind permission of the author.

In this letter to the editor K. S. Srinivasan holds a speech for the defence of "genuine homeopathy" and emphasizes the fixed basic principles of homoeopathy. Till now Simillimum published in this sense, but now it was going to lose its character by opening itself to all trends of modern homoeopathy. "Quality can be maintained only by being fastidious and not being liberal."

K.S. Srinivasan

Letter to the editor of Simillimum

Dear Editor,

I write this letter in the light of not less than 40 years of homœopathic practice. I am mentioning this only to stress that what I write is based on so many years of practice.

I have been a regular reader of the Simillimum all these years (from 1990). (I might have missed an issue here and there.) I am happy to see the Simillimum becoming better and better (and that's why I have been subscribing to the journal year after year although the subscription cost is, to us here at least, expensive) – and the reason for its quality is the genuine Homœopathy mostly that is presented in it.

Many colleagues have attempted to justify synthetic prescriptions, prescription based on signatures, etc. (Sim., XV, 2/2002). If you synthesize two remedies because the 'case' does not fit well into either one of them but has the components of two remedies, what would you do if a remedy has the components of three remedies or four? Would you prepare a synthesis of all these three or four? Merely because a prescription succeeds can that be the justification? Did Hahnemann, or for that matter, the 'new trend' teachers, say that you have to 'somehow' cure? Is there not a prescribed basis? Homœopathy is 'similar suffering' - the similarity between what is observed actually occurring in a healthy person to whom a specific substance is given for the specific purpose of ascertaining such and not 'similar look' or any other similarity, and certainly the 'creation' of an artificial similarity by synthesizing two or more substances and 'attributing' certain imaginary qualities for such a 'creature' was never in the mind of the founder. Are we trying to be 'one up' over HAHNEMANN?

That there are many plant remedies in use with incomplete provings is no argument to add to that stock of incomplete works. Attempts should be to 'prove' them properly.

A journal that would gladly print ideas opposed to the express purpose for which it was founded, just to survive, loses its character. You can't compromise basic principles just to survive. One writer has said that the true simillimum (why qualify a 'simillimum' as true/untrue?) may not be repertorizable; o.k. Repertorization is not a sine-qua-non for a homœopathic prescription. Repertory is only an aid, if you want such an aid; it is not a condition. Many times we do not need the repertory.

The argument that the synthetic remedies are essential to cure that are otherwise incurable (by that homœopath) is also no argument for speculative prescriptions. The old homœopathic journals are full of difficult cases cured by well proven remedies and according to the basic homœopathic laws. Once Hering, Lippe and another well-known homœopath (Wesselhoeft, I think) were talking and Wesselhoeft narrated a case and told Hering 'I could not have cured but for your Apis'; Lippe is reported to have said 'No, you still could have cured if you give first - ... remedy followed by ... remedy'. Lippe knew his Materia Medica so well. As early

as 1883 H.N.Guernsey has said: "By those of us who practise the true Scientific art of healing, the blind are made to see, the insane to become rational again. We dissipate tumours of all kinds, open occluded passages and remove all morbid and material growths and accretions that result from disordered vital force. It remains for us to remove the bounds of incurable diseases and to declare the possibilities to all. Because we are following on in that true stream of science which flows from the infinite to the finite". (Transactions of the International Hahnemannian Association 1883-p.280)

Can we with our thousands of remedies now boast of doing better than what genuine masters like GUERNSEY with the comparatively smaller number of remedies at their disposal did? It is our everyday experience that the symptoms recorded 200 years ago and which Hahnemann used as early as 1801-02 are as much 'guiding' symptoms as they were. What is required in every homœopathy practitioner, be he an octogenerian, is that he/she keeps on honing the art of case taking and repeated daily study of the Materia Medica – the source books, particularly. Where is the question of 'trend' in Homœopathy, a medical Science and Art at the same time? Trends indicate fashion, a short-lived one, soon to be replaced by another 'trend', or 'vogue'. Neil TESSLER speaks of 'progressive trends' and the current editors of the Simillimum acting against 'progress of Homœopathy'. Is the Simillimum an 'in-house' magazine or a journal of homœopathic therapeutics for Homœopathy practitioners. When we say Homœopathy we mean the Homœopathy taught by Samuel Hahnemann in his Organon, Chronic Diseases and many essays of his in the 'Lesser Writings'. Exposition of these are available aplenty in the writings of von Boenninghausen and Hering.

The case reports one reads in the old journals – the 'Recorder' the "Int. Hahnemannian Transactions" etc. are much more impressive and useful than those appearing in the modern journals.

Quality can be maintained only by being fastidious and not being liberal. If quality is the aim then there can be no compromises whatever. Keeping everyone happy is not possible without sacrificing quality. There has been mongrel Homœopathy always but Simillimum must maintain its 'class', at risk of being 'unpopular'. Allowing space for everything 'trendy' will be letting in the Trojan horse. Genuine Homœopathy will then be hijacked by the 'trendy' and will it not then be a betrayal?

I hope and pray for wiser counsels to prevail upon the Board.

I mean no ill-will for those who have introduced 'new trends' or have contributed to the 'progress' of Homœopathy; I have respect for them and everyone on both sides of the camp. If what I have written appears harsh somewhere I hereby express my willingness to be forgiven. It is all because of Love for Homœopathy. Let HAHNEMANN's bones rest in peace.

Yours sincerely,

K.S.SRINIVASAN