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These changes were suppressed by Madame Hahnemann at the advice of some contemporary homeopaths, who with this single act stopped all progress in homeopathy for a long time.
The 6th edition that was published is modified and incomplete as to what Hahnemann had originally intended.
Later, when the book was finally published, it was modified to reflect the practices of the then current homeopaths and has lost the original thoughts of the great man.
What is commonly known as Classical Homeopathy today is basically an effort to keep the practice of homeopathy unchanged from the time of Hahnemann. The problem with this is that homeopathy is a science.
Thus science, as we know today embodies a process of continuous development in the course of which observational facts change with piling up of more statistics and with the betterment of the instruments and methods of observation.
Newton’s law of gravitation, ultimately yielded place to Einstein’s general theory of Relativity, which correctly predicted more precise phenomena which were unexplained by Newton’s Theory. Physical scientists neither accuse Einstein for changing Newton’s ideas, nor do they write off Newton for not being more accurate.
This specific example has been given here to emphasize the fact that it does not violate a scientific attitude if we try to better the observations and statistics of Hahnemann. Neither does such an attempt imply disrespect or denial of the contribution of Hahnemann.
In fact, Dr. Constantine Hering says [Archive f.d. hom. Heilkunde, Vol. XVI., H.3, p. 92.], “I am universally regarded as a disciple and an adherent of Hahnemann, and I am willing to declare that I belong to those who adhere to him most faithfully and pay the most enthusiastic homage to his greatness, but I affirm also that from the time of my first acquaintance with homeopathy (1821) up to the present day (1837) I have never accepted a single one of the theories in the Organon as they are given.”
The fundamental principles of any scientific inquiry are often called “working hypothesis”. Hahnemann’s “Similia Similibus Curentur” was one such hypothesis.
Thus the “Single Simple Minimum” medicine hypothesis may not be always correct although the “Similia Similibus Curentur” principle may be retained.
It is a scientific fact, that with the passage of a century after Hahnemann, the causes of the diseases have undergone mutations, the congested city civilization has given rise to more complexities and virulence to many diseases.
One should realize that no principle can be allowed to stand unless it is repeatedly tested by newer and still newer experiments. Even though millions of observers tend to bear out a principle, a single observation that contradicts it or is inconsistent with it must force its modification.
Thus Hahnemann’s dictum of “single simple and minimum” based on Hippocrates hypothesis “similia similibus curentur” is not infallible. No matter how many times it has met its tests successfully, there can be no certainty that it will not be withdrawn by the next observation.
Truly science will never stand still. It is a panorama that subtly dissolves and recreates.
First and foremost is the need for standardization and replicability. The recognition that homeopathy is as scientific and efficient as conventional medicine needs to be highlighted. It is alarming that at present homeopathy is not within the first 50 options as career choices in India and gradually it is getting further and further behind.
A recent survey in June 2004 by Dr. Sushil Vats in Delhi revealed an alarmingly grim picture of the classical homeopathic practice. Out of the total of 3500 homeopaths in the city area, only 50% are into active practice and of these 50% have another source of income and of the remaining, only 10% have income worthy to survive in metros like Delhi.
To establish a system so that is free from mysticism and more in consonance with nature is consistent with Hahnemann’s dream of the future of homeopathy.
How can such minute doses of medicine, which have no molecular trace on testing with conventional instruments, produce any effect on the human body?

Why do homeopaths use different medicines on different persons suffering from the same disease? They consider this as unscientific and say that it is only a placebo effect that makes a difference in the well being of the patient.

Where is the scientific proof that these medicines work? In conventional scientific scrutiny, the current path followed is – first in the laboratory *in vitro* studies, next in the laboratory on *in vivo* animal studies and finally on human subjects. While homeopaths claim that the medicines are clinically proven, there is not enough proof available in scientific circles to justify the claim.
In conventional scientific scrutiny, the current path followed is – first in the laboratory *in vitro* studies, next in the laboratory on *in vivo* animal studies and finally on human subjects.
The scientist at MDACC experimented in their laboratory on different cancer cell lines and it is observed that 6c, 30c and even 200c dilutions kills cancer cells in laboratory slide. Which proves that the minute doses, which has no molecular trace, has definite effect.
The Banerji Protocols, giving fixed medicine protocols to patients suffering from the same disease, in a definite and fixed potency, in preset dosage patterns have demonstrated that these medicines work.
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The Banerji Protocols: Why use them??

These protocols are easy to learn since the focus is on the diagnostic approach thus the case-taking time is shortened.

The fixed nature of prescription, for specific diseases along with specific potencies standardizes medicine selection. In our protocol like conventional medicine.
We have specific medicines with fixed dilution for every disease based on our experience of over 50 years of observations, which is very effective. There is enough data to vindicate our claims. Quick case taking and prescription in a few minutes.
Our approach is more Diagnostic than Individualistic i.e. more objective than subjective. That is why it is easy to disseminate to medical students and the general public. In a short time more patients can be treated. Consequently, it makes the medicines affordable to the weaker sections of society making it.
“The People’s Medicine”. In case of Science it is a rule that results should be repeated with almost same result: i.e. replicability, and The Banerji Protocols fulfill this. Any doctor can treat their patients armed with a ready reckoner which The Banerji Protocols can provide.
Results of Treatment of 21888 Malignant Tumour Cases (1990 – 2007)

- 32% Completely regressed
- 24% Improved and static
- 21% Discontinued
- 23% Aggravated/Expired
Results of treatment of 1132 cases of Lung Cancer, Brain Tumours and Oesophageal Cancers (Aug 2006 – Aug 2007)
More than 60 countries all over the World using “The Banerji Protocols” through e-mail

- **Major users**
- **Minor users**
A Presentation of Cases
Intracranial Space Occupying Lesions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>PT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of illness</td>
<td>16 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of first visit</td>
<td>24.08.2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief complaints</td>
<td>Gradual weakness of the right side of the body and limbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past history, if any</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
M.R.I of Brain dated 10.11.2003
Casenote 1

Treatment given

1. Ruta graveolens 6c, 2 doses daily
2. Calcarea Phosphorica 3x, 2 doses daily

Now the patient is leading a trouble free normal daily life but he still continuing his medication in reduced doses.
C.T. Scan of Brain dated 11.08.2005
CASE NO. 1

C.T.Scan of Brain dated 28.08.2007
CASE NO. 1

M.R.I. of Brain dated 10.11.2003

CT Scan of Brain dated 11.08.2005

CT Scan of Brain dated 28.08.2007
PROBABLE COMBINED EFFECT OF THE *RUTA GRAVEOLENS* (FLAVONE) AND CALCIUM PHOSPHATE ON NEOPLASTIC BRAIN TUMORS

- Flavone
- Calmodulin
- Calcium
- Phosphatase
- Phospholipase
- DNA
- Tumor Necrosis Factor
- Gamma Interferon
- Interferon-γ
- CD4 + T Cell
- Spontaneous Regression
- Prolonged Arrest
- AP-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TNF</th>
<th>Tumor Necrosis Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IFN-γ</td>
<td>Gamma Interferon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>Spontaneous Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Prolonged Arrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP-1</td>
<td>A protein complex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bronchogenic Carcinoma
**CASE NO. 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>MKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>47 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of illness</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of first visit</td>
<td>30.11.1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief complaints</td>
<td>Chest pain with cough, Loss of weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past history, if any</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Condition at the time of treatment</td>
<td>Patient presented with restricted respiratory movement in the left side and few localized crepitations in the upper part of left chest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chest X-ray dated 18.11.1994
CT Scan of Chest dated 19.11.1994

CASE NO. 2
CASE NO. 2

Picture of Histopathology
Treatment given

1. Kali Carbonicum 200c, 2 drops thrice in a week
2. Ferrum Phosphoricum 3X, 2 tablets twice daily

Patient is now asymptomatic and living his normal life without any medication.
CASE NO. 2

Chest X-ray dated 31.01.95
Chest X-ray dated 05.07.95
Chest X-ray dated 09.01.1996
Case No. 1  MKS (Carcinoma of Unknown Primary. Possible Lung CA)

47 y.o. man who presented to PBHRF on 11/30/94 with a 3 month history of present illness. Chief complaints were: Chest pain with cough. Weight loss.

• Diagnostic Evaluation:
  – Chest X-ray (11/18/94) - Left upper mediastinum mass
  – CT scan of Chest (11/19/94) - 8 x 6.4 cm mass in upper mediastinum on left. Consolidation of adjacent left upper lobe.
  – CT guided fine needle aspirate (11/24/94) - Cytology showed “Malignant tumor.”

• TNM Staging- American Joint Committee on Cancer Staging System:
  – Lung Cancer Staging (T2, N1, M0) – Stage II
  – If unknown primary then it is stage IV.

• Treatment:
  – Homeopathic medical treatment began 11/30/94. No other therapy.
Case No. 1 MKS (Carcinoma of Unknown Primary. Possible Lung CA)  
[cont.]  
Follow-up:

Symptoms resolved.

Chest X-ray (1/31/95) - “...considerable shrinkage in the mediastinal mass...”

Chest X-ray (7/5/95) - “Gradual and excellent regression of the mediastinal mass since original X-ray of November ‘94.”

Chest X-ray (1/9/96) - “...small residual opacity still present.”

Chest X-ray (9/23/96) - “There has been complete resolution in the mediastinal tumor since last X-ray which was taken on (Jan. 9, 1996).”

Chest X-ray (1/7/99) - “There has been no recurrence of mediastinal mass since last X-ray. Lung fields are now clear.”

OCCAM Assessment: Documentation adequate for review by pathology, radiology and CAPCAM.

CAPCAM Comments: Complete Documentation
CASE NO. 2

All plates together
Esophageal Carcinoma
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Name</strong></th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>75 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration of illness</strong></td>
<td>2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of first visit</strong></td>
<td>16.12.1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chief complaints</strong></td>
<td>Difficulty in swallowing food, heartburn and belching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Past history, if any</strong></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clinical Condition at time of treatment</strong></td>
<td>Dysphagia, heartburn and belching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CASE NO. 3

X-ray
Barium Swallow
17.10.1996
CASE NO. 3

Picture of histopathology
Treatment given

1. Condurango 30c, 2 drops twice daily.

Patient is now asymptomatic and living his normal life without any medication for last 10 years.
X-ray
Barium Swallow
12.07.1997
Pictures of *Marsdenia condurango*.
Probable Anti-Carcinogenic Mechanisms Of Condurango.

Condurango

- Anti-promoting mechanisms
  - Free radical scavenging
  - ↓ lipid peroxidation
  - ↓ Superoxide formation

- Apoptosis
  - Prevents development of cancer
  - Cancer regression
Osteogenic Sarcoma.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Name</strong></th>
<th>MLM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration of illness</strong></td>
<td>5-6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of first visit</strong></td>
<td>18.07.2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chief complaints</strong></td>
<td>Swelling left knee, difficulty in knee flexion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Past history, if any</strong></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CASE NO. 4

X-Ray dated 05.06.2003
CASE NO. 4

Picture of Histopathology
Treatment given

1. Symphytum Off 200c, 2 doses daily
2. Calcarea Phos 3X, 2 tablets twice daily
3. Carcinosin 30c, a dose every alternate day.

Patient is now asymptomatic and living his normal life without any medication for last 3½ years
CASE NO. 4

X-Ray dated 14.08.2004
CASE NO. 4

All Plates together
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