

WAR (THE) of the DOCTORS x x x x x

"ETERNAL VIGILANCE IS THE PRICE OF LIBERTY."

THE
WAR OF THE DOCTORS ✓

ON

THE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE.

ARGUMENTS AND ADDRESSES IN REMONSTRANCE THEREOF,
DELIVERED BEFORE THE MASSACHUSETTS LEGISLATIVE
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH, AT THE STATE
HOUSE, BOSTON, FEBRUARY, 1880,

BY

Alfred E. Giles, Allen Putnam, Edward Hamilton, Richard
Holmes, Loring Moody, A. S. Hayward, Joshua
Nyc, and Prof. Charles Wesley Emerson.

SECOND EDITION.

BOSTON :
COLBY & RICH,
No. 9 MONTGOMERY PLACE.
1881.



THE
MAY OF THE DOCTORS
ARGUMENT OF ALFRED E. GILES

PREFATORY.

IN the Massachusetts Legislature—Session of 1880—was presented the petition of Robert Treat Paine, jr., and others, Committee of Health Department of American Social Science Association, also of certain other citizens, for an act to “prevent all persons from practicing *any* branch of medicine in this State except such persons as have furnished to the authorities of the State sufficient evidence of good moral character and of the possession of a thorough knowledge of their duty and calling.” Remonstrances of many citizens against the petition were also presented. The petition and remonstrances were referred for investigation and report to the Committee on Public Health. That Committee gave several public hearings to parties and their counsel interested in favor of or against said petition.

ARGUMENT OF ALFRED E. GILES.

MR. GILES said that he came before the Legislative Committee on Public Health in behalf of certain remonstrants against the petition of Robert Treat Paine, jr., and others, Committee of Health Department of American Social Science Association. He desired to state some reasons in behalf of Spiritualists, clairvoyants, spiritual mediums, sensitives, healing mediums and magnetic healers, why "A proposed Act to regulate the practice of medicine in Massachusetts" should not be enacted. He believed that to the greater part of the Regular medical profession, and to many of the best citizens of the State, the names and avocations of Spiritual mediums, clairvoyants, Healing mediums and magnetic healers were known only as terms of reproach. He therefore thought it was proper he should refer to their origin in this country, and briefly to mention the therapeutic principle which guided them in their medical prescriptions and their methods in the treatment of disease, which he believed was almost unknown to the larger part of the certificated practitioners of the regular schools of medicine.

About the 1st of December, 1843, in the State of New York, a Poughkeepsie shop-boy of seventeen years of age was mesmerized. He was a kind-hearted, truthful youth, not quick-witted, in fact was considered as rather slow and dull in his mental capacity. His educational acquirements were the reading, writing and ciphering accomplishments, which he had picked up during five months' attendance at country schools. After being mesmerized, and while under its influence, he became *clairvoyant*. He could see through opaque substances, through wood partitions, and solid brick walls, and to vast distances—over hundreds of miles. These are facts, and are well authenticated, and their evidence is in the Spiritualist literature of the day.

He also discovered that while in the clairvoyant state he could see into the interior of the living human body, and behold the workings of all its organs. He there saw the causes of the sickness and disease that afflicted many people. He made known his knowledge to his friends, and suggested to them appropriate remedies, not common in the medical

schools, for their complaints. They tried those remedies, and invariably were benefited. His fame spread. He became known as the Poughkeepsie seer. For about two years following his first mesmeric experience this uneducated and undiplomated youth devoted himself almost daily, for two hours a day, to clairvoyant examinations, and to prescribing remedies, generally very simple ones, never mineral, or metallic, or violent ones, to the many patients who came to him for relief. During his clairvoyant medical period, young Davis actually CURED nearly three thousand old chronic cases of almost every imaginable disease, from internal cancer to elephantiasis, cases which had been given up as incurable by very distinguished medical gentlemen and diplomated graduates of the medical schools. About the same number of patients, though not cured, were greatly helped and made comfortable through his treatment. No patient ever died from disease while under his clairvoyant treatment. What was the principle that guided him in his administration of remedies? What was the secret of his wonderful success? He has stated it in his autobiography, for he has written it under the title of "The Magic Staff," and he himself, ANDREW JACKSON DAVIS, is known through his many published works to thousands and hundreds of thousands of intelligent people in America, Europe and Asia, and in the islands of the sea; yet the earnest and enthusiastic young Regular physician, Dr. E. A. Cushing, of the Boston City Hospital, who has been conspicuous this winter in committee rooms and lobbies of the State House for his zeal in pressing the proposed medical bill upon the attention of the legislators, told me last week, and again to-day, in the presence of this committee, and of this audience, that he had never before then heard of the name of Andrew Jackson Davis. He has also here publicly stated, in answer to my question, that the Regular Medical School "have no theory of disease, that is to say, no exclusive theory." Of course, it is probable that many of the Regular School physicians, especially those who have never heard of Andrew Jackson Davis, nor read his medical works, are unacquainted with the principles of his philosophy of Health, Disease and Healing. *Disease is discord.* Andrew Jackson Davis perceived and revealed to the world that disease originates in a want of equilibrium in the circulation of the Spiritual principle through the organism, that what the medical faculty call *diseases*, are but evidences of constitutional or spiritual disturbances—and that vital magnetism and electricity are the divine (not moral) elements of spiritual nourishment, and are the mediums through which the spirit acts upon the body; and that to restore harmony or health, the *prime-moving* principle in the body must be addressed by and through identical mediums or elements with itself.—*I. Great Harmonia*, pp. 144-213.

After an experience of two years in using his clairvoyant powers for medical examinations and remedies, young Davis removed from Poughkeepsie to the city of New York. There, while in the trance state, or what he calls the "superior condition," induced by mesmerism, he delivered one hundred and fifty-seven lectures before many witnesses, and in

a room open to all persons who might desire to hear them. These lectures have been published, and are entitled "The Principles of Nature, her Divine Revelations," and fill a large octavo volume of near eight hundred pages. The first lecture was delivered November 28th, 1845, when this unlettered youth, uncertificated and unlicensed by any board of medical registration, was scarcely nineteen years of age, and the last lecture on January 27th, 1847, not six months after he had attained to the age of twenty-one years.

This great volume treats of the Origin and Structure of the Univercœlum; of the Solar System; of the Origin and Geological History of the Earth; of the Early History of Man; of the Origin of Language; of Mythology, and Theology, and of the Spirit-World. On p. 675 is a statement and a prophecy, viz.: "It is a truth that spirits commune with one another while one is in the body and the other in the higher spheres—and this, too, when the person in the body is unconscious of the influx, and hence cannot be convinced of the fact; *and this truth will ere long present itself in the form of a living demonstration.*" The statement is, that it is a truth that the spirits of the so-called dead do commune with the spirits of persons yet clothed upon with mortal bodies; the prophecy is, that this truth will ere long present itself in the form of a living demonstration. Was this prophecy fulfilled? Let me answer:

In Hydesville, N. Y., John D. Fox, a respectable farmer, lived with his family. From about the middle of December, 1847, to the last of March, 1848, frequent knockings, rappings and noises were heard in his house. Neither he nor any of his family, though they often sought for their cause, could discover it. On the night of March 31st, 1848, his two children, Kate Fox and Margaret Fox, the one aged nine, and the other twelve years, heard the raps apparently near their bed. Kate attempted to imitate the sound by snapping her fingers. To her surprise the same number of raps responded from an invisible source. She clapped with her hands six times. Six raps followed from an invisible rapper, as if in response to her six clappings. Further experiments followed. The family repeated those experiments. Neighbors made them. Strangers hearing of the wonder also came and experimented. Some people said that spirits caused those raps; others that they were produced by the toe-joints; others that concealed machinery or legerdemain effected them. At that place, Hydesville, N. Y., and on that night, March 31st, 1848, when it appeared that the invisible source of those mystic raps was possessed of intelligence, and could hear and respond to questions proposed to it, Modern Spiritualism was born. From that time to this it has grown in wisdom and strength among those who are best acquainted with it. It has many adherents, and it has a literature. Among those who have received it, it has developed freedom of thought, and has enlarged their sphere of observation. True it is, it has modified the views and theories which they held on many subjects before they were convinced and satisfied that the life beyond, a spirit life, is intimately associated and commingled, as it were, with this external and every-day life of man in the body. To

some extent it has changed their religious or theological views and theories. Conservative clergymen and supporters of the ancient theologies mourn over the defection of Spiritualists from their churches, and from standard catechisms and articles of faith. Spiritualism has withdrawn its adherents from the medical and remedial views and practices that they once entertained, which they had acquired from the physicians of the Regular or other established schools of medicine, and substituted other, milder and less harmful medicines and agencies in their stead. Spiritualists are not apt to use medicines of a mineral or metallic base. They dislike calomel, and drastic cathartics, and heroic doses, and vaccine virus, and bullet-sized pills, and unknown prescriptions written in astrologic symbols, and in a language they cannot read.

They prefer milder remedies—simple herbs, human magnetism, homeopathic pills, and gentle application of the electric current. They seek to know the occult laws of Nature, and to apply its principles in their daily life, in their food and drink, in their avocation, their sleep and their recreations. They dislike the old school theology, but not its ministers; they love not the old school medicine, though they respect its practitioners. They want neither the Regular, nor the Homeopathic, nor the Eclectic, nor any other system of medicine, except their own. No one can tell exactly where the shoe pinches except its wearer. Many Spiritualists do not like the Regular Medical shoe, nor the Homeopathic shoe, nor the Eclectic shoe. They prefer to buy their own shoes adapted to their own feet, and their medicines and prescriptions adapted to their constitutions, where they please to buy them. Why should the Legislature enact a law to prevent them from doing so, either in respect to their shoes or their medicines or prescriptions? Least of all do Spiritualists and Liberalists ask for any system or school of medicine registered or not registered by medical certifiers, to be coerced upon themselves or upon their neighbors, by legislative enactment.

It has appeared in the discussions before the Committee that the different schools of medicine have dissimilar systems of therapeutics—*i. e.*, different means and methods of treating disease. The Allopathic physician has an allopathic system. Homeopaths use homeopathic remedies in homeopathic doses. Eclectics select means and modes of cure from all systems except from the Harmonial system taught by Andrew Jackson Davis and practiced by Spiritualists and mediums. These different systems of therapeutics differ each one from all the other systems. Therefore it is that the third section of the proposed Act does not require an examination in therapeutics of an applicant for a license, but permits every licensee to use his own system of therapeutics. But many Spiritualists, clairvoyants, magnetic physicians and healing and spiritual mediums, use a system of therapeutics peculiar to themselves. It is not allopathic, nor homeopathic, nor eclectic, in the meaning of that school. It is what I may here term the Harmonial or Spiritualistic method of treating disease. It cures or benefits its patients. They like it. The Allopaths do not know it,

and cannot comprehend it any more readily than they can understand homeopathy. Homeopaths do not know it, though they approximate to it. Eclectics do not know it. But Spiritualists know it, though some of them may not readily explain it. Mediums know of it and practice it; and students of the Harmonial Philosophy more or less understand it. Now I ask, by what principle of law, right, truth, justice, equity or mercy, are Spiritualists, clairvoyants, healing, medical, magnetic and spiritual mediums, to be prohibited in Massachusetts from practicing their own systems of therapeutics, their own means and methods of relieving themselves and others of sickness? And why should they and all the rest of the community be compelled to submit, in case of sickness, to the therapeutics of one or the other of the three incorporated medical schools? The enactment of the proposed Bill might draw students to the incorporated medical schools, fees to their professors, and additional practice to registered licensees, but, as I believe, would multiply diseases, increase mortality, and tarnish the good name of the State. There were righteous Hebrews in the time of Daniel who regarded not the decree of Nebuchadnezzar nor the statutes of King Darius, and I doubt not there are conscientious, God-loving, God-serving people, descendants of the Pilgrims, yet living in Massachusetts.

Probably not a veteran Regular practitioner, nor any recent graduate of the Harvard Medical School, or of the Homeopathic College, nor any physician who under this proposed Act would be likely to be appointed on the Board of Medical Registration, understands or appreciates the philosophy of health and disease, as presented and illustrated by Andrew Jackson Davis in his books entitled "The Physician," "The Harbinger of Health," "Diseases of the Brain and Nerves," and "Spirit Mysteries Explained"—books which are in thousands of families in this Commonwealth, and whose doctrines are the basis of the successful treatment administered by thousands of physicians, mediums and healers throughout the United States.

Spiritualists believe, and have evidence that will bear the closest scrutiny, to believe, that oftentimes the spirits of the so-called dead associate, sympathize with, and assist themselves and their fellow-men and women, yet living in bodies of flesh, when they are in trouble and sickness. I have had experience thereof in my own life-history. I have alluded to the uniform success that accompanied young Andrew Jackson Davis's prescriptions for his patients—to his theory of disease, and philosophy of healing. Whence that theory and philosophy, and whence that success? Is not the question answered, when one learns that Davis had for a friend and counsellor, *Galen*, the celebrated Greek physician of the second century of the Christian Era, whose name is honored in medical schools? That fact Davis fully and distinctly states in his Autobiography on pp. 233-243, and furthermore confirms it in his book entitled "Diseases of the Brain and Nerves," published 1871, on page 52, where he states that he has seen Galen at least once a year since 1853, and that on August 11th, 1871, Galen gave to him a brief message, which is there printed, and which all persons who desire may there read.

Other Spiritualists and mediums besides Mr. Davis declare and believe that they are assisted in their avocations by disembodied spirits. The truth of such declarations can be tested only by experience or investigation. Opposing sneers, opprobrious epithets and contemptuous expressions, though often cast upon, do not destroy the truth, but do delay the knowledge of it among men. Some of these mediums profess to have the gift of healing by the laying on of hands, and others assert their gift or power of prescribing healing remedies for the maladies of their patients. Those prescriptions, so far as I know, are usually very simple, harmless preparations; never, or scarcely ever, are they perturbing medicines. A very remarkable spirit medium, Mrs. Cora L. V. Richmond, has for the last six weeks been lecturing every Sunday in Boston. Spiritualists believe that her lectures are prompted or inspired by spirits. She sometimes prescribes medicines for friends in their sicknesses. It is said and believed that her spirit physician is the celebrated Dr. Rush, formerly of Philadelphia.

Other mediums also have, as they themselves declare and as their patients believe, spirit guides, counsellors and physicians to assist them in ministering to, and prescribing for patients, sick persons, and sorrowful applicants for strength and comfort.

Now this state of things is not pleasant to medical practitioners of the Old School, nor to some apothecaries who deal in the Old School remedies. Their prescriptions are not sought for nor their drugs bought as largely, especially by Spiritualists and reformers, as they formerly were bought; Spirit physicians do not prescribe strychnine nor arsenic nor chloral, nor even less poisonous medicines, in the heroic doses which they may have administered prior to their entering into spirit-life. In the *Banner of Light*, a Spiritualist paper published in Boston, in its issue of March 10th, 1877, is the following communication from spirit physician Dr. Shute, formerly of Hingham. It came through the medium who then occupied the platform in the *Banner of Light* Circle-Room, which, as it ever has been, is now free to all inquirers and investigators, and was addressed to the audience there present. The spirit physician, Dr. Shute, says, "Rest assure I, my friends, I never would give one particle of the medicine I gave when I was here. I ignore it completely, and think it a fallacy from beginning to end, and only fit to be put on the pages of the dark ages. Here, finding that there is such a thing as magnetism and electricity, I find that medicine need not be measured out in the largest spoons, but can be given in the most minute particles."

But it may be asked by an astonished honest person hearing now of these marvels for the first time, "Are these things really so?" "Do any regularly educated physicians believe that clairvoyants and spirit mediums can successfully prescribe for human maladies, or that the spirits of deceased physicians do actually prescribe effective remedies?"

Yes, I answer; I know of Allopathic and Homeopathic and Eclectic physicians who do so believe, and I have their letters to that effect. Some of these physicians, practicing in Massachusetts, are unwilling that their names should be

mentioned in this connection, because they say such mention might tend to break up their pleasant association and relation with their medical societies and their professional brethren. I will therefore give evidence to the same point from well-known physicians out of the State who have never bowed the knee to the Massachusetts Medical Society.

Dr. Eugene Crowell, of Brooklyn, N. Y., is widely known through his volumes entitled "*Identity of Primitive Christianity and Modern Spiritualism*," and by his pamphlet, "*Spiritualism and Insanity*," in which he completely demonstrated the error of the statements of Medical Dr. L. S. Forbes Winslow, of London, and Rev. Dr. Talmage, of Brooklyn, that Spiritualism especially tended to promote insanity. Here is Dr. Crowell's letter:

BROOKLYN, N. Y., 196 Clinton Avenue, Feb. 14th, 1880.

ALFRED E. GILES, ESQ.: *My Dear Friend*—In reply to yours of the 12th inst., I would say that I am 62 years of age; practiced medicine for twelve years in New York; was a regular allopathic physician; received the diploma of a Doctor of Medicine from the Medical Department of the University of the City of New York in March, 1842.

At one time I might have favored a proposition to restrict medical practice to the regular practitioners of certain schools, but a larger experience, and especially an acquaintance with Modern Spiritualism, have modified my previous views, and now I am decidedly in favor of medical freedom.

I have had abundant and conclusive evidence convincing me that the spirits of deceased physicians have frequently through sensitives or mediums given medical advice and prescribed effective remedies, and in a number of instances I have personally known of the prognosis given through these instrumentalities to be verified where all the symptoms pointed to different and opposite results.

Nine years since, the health of my wife failed, and I resorted to every means which suggested itself to my mind and to the minds of my medical brethren, in order to restore her to health, but without avail until, as a last resort, and as an experiment, I employed a healing medium, or magnetic doctor, and the effects of the treatment were surprising, for she soon improved; and since then, now nearly eight years, she has depended upon this treatment for the renewal of her exhausted vitality. The good effects of every treatment have been apparent to her friends and family.

I know a number of regular physicians in this vicinity who have as much faith in this mode of treatment as I have, and I know two who personally employ the magnetic healer here spoken of.

I could say much more, and relate some startling facts in corroboration of what I have here said, but I will conclude with the remark that I earnestly hope such a bill as the one now before your Legislature, will not pass that body, and the time is now not far distant when the faculty will work in perfect harmony with their unrecognized but equally useful co-laborers, the magnetic healers.

Most truly yours, EUGENE CROWELL.*

Now why is it proposed to restrict the practice of medicine in this Commonwealth? And why does a Committee of the Social Science Association coöperate with the diplomated doctors to that end? To the first question this answer suggests itself to my mind, viz.: There is not sufficient medical practice to comfortably support all the diplomated physicians who rely upon their profession for their support. In the opening article of the *New York Medical Tribune* for December, 1879, p. 50, the writer says: "There exists no

**Vid* letter to the same point, of Prof. Jos. R. Buchanan, M. D., page 33.

need or desire among the people for any of this extraordinary medical legislation. It would never have been asked for but for the exigencies of the men who are to receive benefit. The civil war gave employment to an army of surgeons who were returned to private life at the close, and are unable now to gain lucrative practice."

To the second question, Why does a Committee of the Social Science Association give the sanction of its name to the proposed Doctors' Bill? The reason, as it appears to me, is that the doctors having failed last year, and the year before that, when in the name of the Massachusetts Medical Society they attempted to secure a legislative act to restrict medical practice to diplomated doctors, now renew their effort under another name, through another agency, but for the same end. Many regular and diplomated doctors are members of the Social Science Association. They are the parties, as I believe, who there initiated this diplomated and certificated doctors' crusade. Warned by the experience of the last two years, they do not now appear directly as *petitioners*, but have persuaded, as I think, some of their associates who are not doctors, to give the sanction and influence of their names as petitioners. This proposed act if it had been circulated among the signers of the Social Science petition would not, as I believe, have received a thousandth part of its signatures. The signers to that petition I surmise, did not dream of the now manifest plot of the chartered Medical School doctors to monopolize to themselves the medical practice of the State. "Committee of the Social Science Association" is the figurehead, but in this matter the *doctors*, as I believe, are behind it, and engineer its movements. It is worse than Monsieur Tonson come again in a new guise. The ancient and wise Hermes counselled, "Be wary in thy speech, oh son, and not deceived in the names of things." J. R. Lowell, one of our poets, has written:

"Let us speak plain; there is more force in names
Than most men dream of; and a lie may keep
Its throne a whole age longer, if it skulk
Behind the shield of some fair seeming name."

Let me ask your attention to the petition of the Committee of the Health Department of American Social Science Association before you. Many petitioners have signed it. They have signed *that* petition. *They have not petitioned for the proposed Act now before you* to regulate the practice of medicine. That proposed Act is probably mostly the work of the *young doctors* whom you have here seen so zealously working for its support. You see in its eleventh section it declares that:

"SECT. 11. Any person who shall practice or shall in any manner publicly offer or advertise to practice medicine or dentistry within the Commonwealth, without being duly licensed or authorized thereto, as herein provided, shall be punished by fine not exceeding five hundred dollars."

Let us now examine the petition of the Social Science Association. If what it prays for be inexpedient or impracticable, you will, notwithstanding that it bears the names of many most excellent citizens, not recommend its adoption.

That petition consists of four matters or statements in its preamble, and an inference or conclusion. Its first two statements, viz: that boards of health must receive certificates of death from any physician, and that the professional actions of physicians are of extreme importance, I will not now examine. They are here of no special importance. The third statement is, that it is notorious that very many so-called physicians, who are ignorant of medicine, or unscrupulous, or both, are practicing in Massachusetts, to the great harm and loss of the sick, and to the frequent injury or ruin of young men and women." To which I answer that, whether that statement be true or not, (and I do not believe it) it is equally notorious that many citizens believe that very many diplomated physicians, especially *young* graduates of the so-called Regular Medical Schools, are especially ignorant of that branch of medicine known as Therapeutics (or the application of remedies and cure of disease) and are practicing in Massachusetts, to the great harm and loss of the sick persons who are committed to their care. A Regular doctor or a graduate of any medical school may pass examination and be certified and registered as acquainted with anatomy, physiology, pathological anatomy, pathology, chemistry, the action of poisons, surgery, midwifery, medical diagnosis and medical jurisprudence, and yet be more ignorant of therapeutics, or the application of proper remedies for the cure of disease, than many an undiplomated physician, than many a magnetic healer, than many a spiritual and healing medium, than many a nurse and many loving old mothers, sisters and women, such as may be found in every village, town and city of the Commonwealth. Yet the proposed bill to regulate medicine does not exclude these young diplomated Regulars from practice. In fact it is so drawn as to admit such ones to practice, while it carefully excludes the genuine healers whose chief qualification is their knowledge of spiritual or harmonial therapeutics. Such an enactment, I believe, would largely increase the death statistics of the State and work great sickness and woe among our citizens. Do the Regular faculty, do physicians who administer allopathic drugs and medicines, by such ministrations promote the health of our citizens? Let the elder members of the profession answer. Here is their testimony.

Dr. Jacob Bigelow, formerly President of the Massachusetts Medical Society, in his "Expositions of Rational Medicine," says: "I sincerely believe that the unbiased opinion of most medical men of sound judgment and long experience is, that the amount of death and disaster in the world would be less than it now is, if all disease were left to itself."

"The disgrace of medicine," says Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes, now Professor of Anatomy in the Medical School of Harvard University, in his "Border Lines of Knowledge," p. 70, "has been that colossal system of self-deception, in obedience to which mines have been emptied of their cankering minerals, the entrails of animals taxed for their impurities, the poison-bags of reptiles drained of their venom, and all the inconceivable abomination thus obtained thrust down the throats of human beings suffering from some fault of organization, nourishment or vital stimulation."

Sir William Hamilton, in his "Discussions on Philosophy," p. 638, remarks: "The history of medicine, on the one hand, is nothing less than a *history of variations*; and on the other, only a still more marvelous history of how every successive variation has by medical bodies been furiously denounced, and then bigotedly adopted."

Probably it has not yet passed from your recollection that Charles O'Connor, the eminent lawyer of New York, was, some four or five years ago, when very sick, given up by his attending physicians to die. They had exhausted their skill and their remedies upon him without any apparent benefit. But he was, as I have been informed, restored to health by the "laying on of hands." The *New York Times* of May 4th, 1878, thus pleasantly comments on Mr. O'Connor's recovery and continued health:

"Charles O'Connor is still a living monument of the fallibility of the opinion of doctors of medicine, and it is said that they have never quite forgiven him for thoroughly recovering two or three years ago from a complication of diseases which they solemnly declared the ablest of them agreeing on this point) must of necessity prove fatal. Respect for the medical profession should have prompted him to withdraw from the world permanently, and his stubbornness in continuing to live, in the face of the most learned diagnoses, has naturally incurred their displeasure. After he got up and out from his late illness many of the physicians comforted themselves—professionally, we mean—that he could not contradict their predictions more than a few weeks at most. And yet, now, at seventy-four, he is as healthy and vigorous as he has been for eight or ten years, and bids fair to be an octogenarian at least. Some doctors think that he is living from pure malice toward them, but he is living because he prefers to, and because he still has a good deal of unfinished work before him. When questioned, as he often is, as to the cause of his unexpected recovery, he laughingly ascribes it to his unwillingness to take the prescriptions given him by the M. D.s, and malignantly allows his questioners to draw an inference that would naturally exasperate the whole medical faculty."

At this present date (February, 1880,) Mr. O'Connor yet continues in good health, and the *New York papers* of a month ago rumored his expected marriage.

The eminent Dr. Joseph R. Buchanan, of Louisville, Ky., who some few years ago delivered a course of lectures on the Brain, before the Medical School of the Boston University, in his *Journal of Man*, Vol. I., p. 440, begins the article entitled "The Present State of Medical Science" as follows: "Of all known sciences none have been more unstable, confused and contradictory in doctrines than practical medicine. Not only is it changing from age to age, and even from year to year, but on the very same day, if we pass from nation to nation, from city to city, or from one medical school to another located in a neighboring street, we find the most contradictory doctrines taught with dogmatic confidence at the same hour, and the votaries of each expressing no little contempt for the others."

Dr. John Mason Good, author of "The Book of Nature," and an eminent English physician in the early part of the present century, wrote: "The science of medicine is a barbarous jargon, and the effects of our medicine on the human system are in the highest degree uncertain, except, indeed, that they have already destroyed more lives than war, pestilence and famine combined."

Bichat (the great French Pathologist), in his "General Anatomy," Vol. I., p. 17, remarks: "Medicine is an incoherent assemblage of incoherent ideas, and is perhaps of all the physiological sciences that which best shows the caprice of the human mind. What did I say? It is not a science for a methodical mind. It is a shapeless assemblage of inaccurate ideas, of observations often puerile, and of formulæ as fantastically conceived as they are tediously arranged."

The late Sir Henry Holland, one of the most eminent physicians in Europe, in his "Recollections of Past Life," p. 88, says: "Actual experience, with a sense of responsibility attached to it, is the sole school in which to make a good physician. One of the most learned men I ever knew in the literature of medicine, as well as in physical science, was one of the worst practitioners, borrowing his diagnosis from books, and not from that happier faculty, almost an instinct, a spiritual gift, which enables some men to interpret and act upon signs which no book can describe." The latter class of men that Sir Henry mentions are what are sometimes designated as born or natural-physicians.

There are gentlemen in Boston who remember that Charles Sumner and Professor Agassiz were advised and attended each in his last sickness by Prof. Brown Séquard and other eminent regular practitioners. The *post mortem* examinations of their bodies did not reveal the existence of diseases sufficiently dangerous of themselves to cause their deaths. All organs were normal. I verily believe that if they had been attended and treated exclusively by good magnetic healers their lives would have been prolonged, and both perhaps might now be alive in our midst.

That wise and remarkable man, Andrew Jackson Davis, beloved by all who know him, whose book entitled "The Physician" has assisted in liberating thousands and tens of thousands of men and women from allegiance to the learned doctors, in IV. Great Harmonia, p. 383, says: "It is my conviction, the result of considerable investigation, that should intelligence be transmitted and proclaimed by some undisputed authority that on the last day of December next the entire medical profession, except the departments of dentistry, surgery and obstetrics, would 'positively make its last appearance' in the world, mankind, even with their present limited knowledge of the laws of life, even with all their diseases and infirmities upon them, would straightway be immeasurably benefited." And that his opinion continued the same for nearly twenty years afterwards may fairly be inferred from a communication of his in the *Banner of Light* of January 11th, 1873, wherein he remarks: "The medical profession is based upon a huge mass of learned ignorance and assumption."

"The present system of medicine is a *burning shame* to its professors, if, indeed, a series of vague and uncertain incongruities deserve to be called by that name. How rarely do our medicines do good? How often do they make a patient *really worse*?"—*Dr. Ramage, F. R. C. S., London.*

Thomas Inman, M. D., London, author of "Ancient Faiths Embodied in Ancient Names," etc., etc.; consulting physician to the Royal Infirmary, Liverpool: Lecturer suc-

cessively on Botany, Medical Jurisprudence, Therapeutics, *Materia Medica*, and the Principles and Practice of Medicine, etc., in the Liverpool School of Medicine, etc., gives the following statement of his medical experience and observation as a Regular practitioner of the straightest sect of doctors:

"Some thirty years ago, after a period of laborious study (says the learned doctor), I became the House Surgeon of a large Infirmary. In that institution I was enabled to see the practice of seven different doctors, and to compare the results which followed from their various plans of treatment. I soon found that the number of cases was nearly equal amongst them all, and became certain that recovery was little influenced by the medicine given. The conclusion drawn was, that the physician could do harm, but that his power for good was limited. This induced me to investigate the laws of health and of disease with an especial desire to discover some sure ground on which the healing art might safely stand. The inquiry was a long one, and to myself satisfactory. The conclusions to which I came were extremely simple, amounting almost to truisms; and I was surprised that it had required long and sustained labor to find out such very homely truths as those which I seemed to have unearthed. Yet with this discovery came the assurance that, if I could induce my medical brethren to adopt my views, they would deprive themselves of the means of living.

"Men, like horses or tigers, monkeys and codfish, can do without doctors. Here and there, it is true, the art and skill of the physician or surgeon can relieve pain, avert danger from accidents, and ward off death for a time; but, in the generality of cases, doctors are powerless. It is the business of such men, however, to magnify their office to the utmost. They get their money ostensibly by curing the sick; but it is clear that the shorter the illness, the fewer will be the fees, and the more protracted the attendance the larger must be the 'honorarium.'"

Other testimonies of *old* and experienced physicians of the Regular School—not young ones just graduated, possessing sheepskin diplomas as the only evidence of their ability to cure diseases—might be cited to an indefinite extent. Let one more suffice. It shall be the testimony of Dr. Eliphalet Kimball, of New Hampshire. He was a diplomated doctor of the Regular School. In his "Thoughts on Natural Principles," published in 1867, on page 7 he remarks:

"There is a doctorcraft as well as priestcraft. . . . Physicians have slain more than war. As instruments of death, in their hands calomel, bleeding, and other medicines, have done more than powder and ball. The public would be infinitely better off without professed physicians. In weak constitutions nature can be assisted. Good nursing is necessary, and sometimes roots and herbs do good. In strong constitutions medicine is seldom needed in sickness. To a man with a good constitution, and guided by reason in his course of living, sickness would be impossible. He could defer death until the natural time. By the use of reason in food I passed unharmed through the great cholera in New York in 1832. I was nearly two months in a cholera hospital, engaged with the sick, day and night. The medical practice provided and paid for by the city was nonsense and an injury to the sick."

On page 8 of the same work Dr. Kimball continues as follows:

"Immense numbers of children in canker-rash have been killed by the 'regulars,' or scientific doctors, of whom I am one. The practice of many of them has been to give a powerful cathartic and calomel at first. The consequence is the rash cannot come out, the child sinks away and dies. In many of the country towns as many as sixty

children have died of canker-rash in one winter, and nearly all of them, undoubtedly, from medicine given them by physicians. It is shocking to think how many soldiers in the late war were killed, or their constitutions ruined by army doctors. The irrational use of medicine by physicians sweeps off the people as fast as war could. It has a serious effect upon the census. . . . Confidence in nature is the all-important principle, not only in disease, but in social welfare as affected by government. Artificial law causes the diseases of society, and has made the world a bad one."

The third statement in the preamble of the petition of the Social Science Association is, "that by the laws of this State, death caused by culpable and reckless ignorance of duty is not considered manslaughter by the courts in regard to physicians, although it is held to be manslaughter in the case of those following other callings, so that ignorant and self-styled physicians are not restrained by fear of the law from recklessly trifling with the lives of the citizens of this State."

To this statement I would answer that if the law of the State be as specified in that statement, let the law be amended, so that all physicians—the Regular as well as the irregular ones, if they perpetrate manslaughter on their patients, shall be held responsible and amenable to law. This course has been adopted in Rhode Island, and the February number, 1880, of the *New England Medical Gazette*, the monthly organ of the Homeopaths, quickly gives warning to doctors and to all its readers, by itemizing the case, on pp. 61-62, as follows :

"A young man whose fingers had been cut off by a circular saw was taken to a Rhode Island Charity Hospital, where the excessive hemorrhage was controlled by the use of a tourniquet, which, however, having been kept on seventeen hours, necessitated amputation of the arm at the shoulder. The Court at first decided that a charity institute should not be held liable for unskillful treatment, but the Supreme Court decided that Hospital Corporations should be responsible for lack of care in selecting skillful men."

If we need additional legislation in Massachusetts to restrain manslaughter or malpractice by physicians, let us have it. But the plan proposed by the Social Science Association, while tending to exclude from practice many meritorious and efficient healers of disease, whom the school physicians stigmatize as quacks and charlatans, does, as appears by its own statement, make no provision for holding to a proper responsibility such *regular certificated physicians* as may by accident, mischance, or culpable and reckless ignorance of duty, commit manslaughter on their patients. Let us have equal rights. Make both the regular and the irregular practitioner *responsible* each for his doings, and equally amenable to the law.

The conclusion and prayer of the Social Science Association petitioners is "that the General Court will by suitable legislation and *registration* prevent all persons from practicing any branch of medicine in this State, except such persons as have furnished to the authorities of the State sufficient evidence of good moral character, and of the possession of a thorough knowledge of their duty and calling." This plan thus suggested appears to me impracticable. The Bill proposes that the Governor shall appoint from the members of existing incorporated medical societies the persons who shall constitute the Board of Medical Registration. But

as I have previously stated, there are many citizens who do not want as their medical attendants the practitioners of any incorporated medical school. Moreover is the Governor (excellent man as he is) any better qualified, or are his appointees more likely, to select suitable and acceptable physicians for you and me and our families and the citizens of the State, than are you and I, and the rest of the people of lawful age and of sound and disposing mind and memory? Why should not such persons be permitted to select their own medical attendant and comforter? Let us have free physicians and patients' rights.

Furthermore, the proposed Act, in its policy, appeals to the selfishness of the members of the Board of Medical Registration, to restrict to the smallest possible quota the number of practitioners whom they may permit to practice in the State. The smaller the number of practitioners, the larger the field of practice for themselves and their associates in the medical societies, and the more abundant the harvest of their fees. Such legislation as this is retrograde, mediæval, not even up to that of the age which abolished licensed printing.

The petitioners ask that the practitioners should be of "good moral character." So do I; and not only that all practitioners, but that every man, woman and child in the State may be of "good moral character." But I do not believe that such legislation will secure either the one or the other of these desirable ends. With no intention of wounding the feelings of any one, I would ask you to call to mind a tragedy which occurred some years ago within the walls of yonder Harvard Medical School, in Grove street, Boston. There, in a regular medical school, one regular Doctor, being himself a Professor in that school, *murdered** another regular Doctor, who had been a bountiful benefactor of that school. Would any certificate or other evidence of good moral character granted by a Board of Medical Registration have prevented that catastrophe? I do not believe that it is or will be in the power of any Board of Medical Registration to distinguish and to separate the wheat from the tares among medical practitioners. I surmise that while gathering in the tares they will root up also the wheat with them.

The plan of restricting medical practice to so-called educated physicians, somewhat as now proposed in this Bill, has been tried in Europe and England. Let us briefly notice how it worked.

In the fourteenth century, the Roman Catholic church restricted the practice of medicine solely to educated practitioners. It proclaimed "that any woman who dared to heal others without having duly studied, was a witch, and should therefore die."—(*Michelet's Witches of the Middle Ages*, p. 15) But Paracelsus had no respect for the learning of the educated physicians. At Basle he threw the works of Galen and Avicenna into the fire, and in disgust at the pretensions and false knowledge of the medical faculty, said there was more knowledge in his shoe-strings than in the writings of

* In 1843, Dr. George Parkman was there murdered by Prof. J. W. Webster.

all the physicians; he averred that he knew nothing but what he had learned from witches.—(*J. Michelet's La Sorciere*, p. 5.)

During the reign of Henry VIII. Parliament undertook by statute to limit the practice of the healing art in England to "those persons that be profound, sad and discreet, groundly leaved and deeply studied in phisic," and practitioners were "to be licensed by the Bishop of London or the Dean of St. Paul's." But in 1543 the previous act was modified so as to permit "divers honest persons, as well men as women, whom God hath endowed with the knowledge of the nature, kind and operation of certain herbs, roots and waters," to prescribe for and treat certain dangerous afflictions there mentioned.—(*Knight's History of England*, Vol. II., p. 498.)

Yet notwithstanding these experiences of the past, many medical practitioners, many diplomated and certificated graduates of the schools, are now ready and eager to proclaim the superiority of their own practice to that of other physicians, and to exalt and to fight for the morality and science of their favorite schools.

The quarrels, jealousies, personal enmities and feuds of different schools of medicine are notorious. What land or State of the Union has not been filled with the tumult of their brawls. The fight between the Allopathists and Homeopathists in Massachusetts—between heroic doses and infinitesimal pellets—was bitter. As is well known, three years or more ago, Allopathists, after a protracted struggle, succeeded in expelling certain Homeopathists from the Massachusetts Medical Society. Then the Homeopathists held a great Fair in Boston, raised money, started their own medical society, obtained a charter from the State, and now Allopathists, Homeopathists and Eclectics for the time being ignore their ancient feuds, and join hand to hand to crush out all healing mediums, spirit mediums, clairvoyants, and all other competitors. Occasionally has it happened in other times and places (for history repeats itself,) that rival powers have for the moment become complaisant to each other, if by so doing they could rid themselves of other obnoxious parties. In Luke xxiii: 12, one may read that on a certain day, when a much-maligned but faultless man was before the magistrates, fiercely accused of much evil doing, on the same day Herod and Pilate were made friends together, for before they were at enmity between themselves.

In this present application to the Legislature for special legislation in behalf of diplomated doctors, of incorporated medical schools, efforts are made to vilify and scandalize their opponents. The petition of the Social Science Association would excite your fears of "ignorant, self-styled physicians." I surmise there are more of such physicians among the young graduates of the Regular schools, especially in therapeutics, than in any other class of the community. *The New England Medical Gazette*, the monthly organ of the Homeopathic school, in its February number, 1880, p. 36, says that "the proposed Medical Bill will be opposed only by unprincipled charlatans or their agents or dupes." It is an old adage: Give a dog an ill name and he'll soon be hanged. Give a man an ill name and his work is done. Such argu-

ments we hope will not weigh with the legislators of Massachusetts. Regular medical practitioners are apt to stigmatize other physicians as quacks, charlatans and humbugs, yet they will appropriate (though sometimes not till after the common people are thoroughly acquainted with them) the remedies and discoveries of the men they affect to despise.

Says Dr. Adam Smith: "After denouncing Paracelsus as a *quack* the Regular medical profession stole his 'quack-silver' (mercury); after calling Jenner an *impostor* it adopted his discovery of vaccination; after dubbing Harvey a *humbug* it was forced to swallow his theory of the circulation of the blood."

"Remember," said Dr. Rush, addressing medical students, "how many of our most useful remedies have been discovered by quacks. Do not be afraid, therefore, of conversing with them and of profiting by their ignorance and temerity. Medicine has its Pharisees as well as religion, but the spirit of this sect is as unfriendly to the advancement of medicine as it is to Christian charity. In the pursuit of medical knowledge let me advise you to converse with nurses and old women. They will often suggest facts in the history and cure of diseases which have escaped the most sagacious observers of nature. By so doing you may discover laws of the animal economy which have no place in our system of nosology, or in our theories of physic."—*Dr. Daniel H. Tuke's "Influence of Mind on the Body," p. 9.*

In the history of science it has often been the fortune of the ignorant and the lowly to hit by chance on some great fact for which the wisdom of the ages has sought in vain. Especially has this been the case in *Therapeutics*. Truly says Dr. Stille (*Therapeutics, Vol. I., p. 31*), "Nearly every medicine has become a *popular* remedy before being adopted or even tried by physicians, 'that by far the greater number of medicines were first employed in countries which were and are now in a state of scientific ignorance,' and Pereira declares that *nux vomica* is one of the few remedies the discovery of which is not the effect of chance."—*Beard and Rockwell on Medical and Surgical Electricity, p. 110.*

"It is idle to hope for a time when a medical prescription should be a simple resultant of human qualities"; "the number of those in the profession is rather increasing than diminishing with the advance of science, yet *therapeutics* is mainly a matter of empiricism."—*p. 125.*

Dr. D. H. Tuke in his "*Influence of the Mind upon the Body*," p. 343, quotes Burton's pithy observation that an empiric or a silly chirurgian doth more strange cures than a rational physician. Nymannas gives the reason because the patient puts his confidence in him, which Avicenna prefers before art, precepts, and all remedies whatever. "Tis opinion alone, says Cardan, that makes or mars physicians, and he doth the best cures, according to Hippocrates, in whom most trust. "Perhaps the great fault of physicians in this most literal and material age is to undervalue the erroneous curative influence of the mind over special forms of disease."—*Dr. Edward T. Blake in Dublin University Magazine for October, 1877, on the Medical Basis of Charms.*

"With the exception of a very few, and those comparatively insignificant diseases, the medical art does not possess the power of curing disease in a direct and positive manner. In the very few diseases in which it may be said to do so, speaking generally, it not seldom fails to do so in individual instances, so that *such cases require to be transferred to other categories of therapeutic action.*"—*Of Nature and Art in the Cure of Disease, by Sir John Forbes, p. 256.*

In 1842, at a discussion at the Medical and Chirurgical Society, on an operation performed *without pain* under the influence of Mesmerism, a distinguished member of the profession, the late Dr. Copland, asserted that the fact was unworthy of the Society's consideration, *because pain is a wise provision of nature, and patients are all the better for it, and recover more quickly.*—*Dr. D. H. Tuke's Influence of the Mind Upon the Body, p. 49.*

"The editor of *Chelius* wrote against ether, 'I have a considerable doubt of the propriety of putting the patient into so unnatural a condition as results from inhaling ether, which seems scarcely different from severe intoxication, a state in which no surgeon would be desirous of having a patient who was about to be submitted to a serious operation.'"—*p. 49.*

For more than thirty years last past, healing mediums and magnetic healers have exercised their vocation in laying their hands upon their patients, and by this simple process have been wonderfully successful in relieving them of their ills and maladies and restoring them to health. It came into vogue in this country about the time that Mesmerism attracted the attention of many thoughtful and progressive minds. In 1847, James Victor Wilson, a special friend, and attendant at the lectures of Andrew Jackson Davis, wrote and published a small practical treatise on "Magnetism and Clairvoyance," with instructions on the method of procedure. The Regular Medical School, with few exceptions, either ignored the subject or, as we have seen Dr. Copland did, opposed it. But irregular physicians and practitioners, and especially Spiritualists, examined the matter, and experimented in it. Their patients liked it. It gradually grew in favor. Good results—wonderful, marvelous, instantaneous cures—often followed its application. Who has not heard of John R. Newton, the celebrated healer? I have seen crowds of the lame, the halt, the deaf, the blind, come to him to be cured of their infirmities. He treated them one by one—a few passes over them, or the pressure of his hands upon them, a few kind words, a blessing or a prayer—and again I have seen his patients walk away cured or much relieved of their lameness or other weaknesses, leaving their crutches, their canes, their spectacles and ear-trumpets behind them. Often did such treatment do good; seldom or never did it harm any person. Spiritualists liked it; other people liked it. It has become popular. Now the old-school physicians, the Regulars, are looking into it. Of the various applications which magnetic healers and healing mediums make with their hands in rubbing, kneading, stroking, tapping and slapping the bodies of their patients, and which they include under the name of magnetic or mesmeric treat-

ment, the Regulars have learned something, and now designate such treatment as *massage*. Dr. Adams, President of the Board of Health, or of the Board of Medical Examination, in New Hampshire, in his testimony before you said: "Every physician knows *massage*; rubbing is all there is in it." I hope you and he will pardon me if I do not agree with him in either of his statements, and permit me to comment on them.

A valuable article entitled "The History of *Massage*," by Dr. Douglass Graham, of Boston, was published in the *Medical Record* last August. The writer states "that in 1876 there were many physicians in Germany" (which with Austria is probably the headquarters of regular medical skill) "who had never heard of *massage*, and that it was then an every-day question as to what it meant." Dr. S. Weir Mitchell, in his treatise on "Fat and Blood, and How to Make Them," published in 1879, devotes Chapter V. to *Massage*, and says it "is little understood in America," that he "first saw it used by a *charlatan*," and that "the results obtained were so remarkable that he began soon after to learn what he could of its employment," and that he "soon found he had an agent little understood and of singular utility."

Prof. Von Morengell of Bonn, speaking of *massage*, says, (as quoted by Dr. Graham in his tract, "*Massage*," p. 27.) "Its value must be recognized, but it is not adapted for every-day use by every physician; nor will it be much used in hospitals for lack of time. . . . Specialists, therefore, will probably get the most satisfactory results from it."

But Dr. Adams further says that "Rubbing is all there is in it." I believe that something more than mere rubbing is in it. Dr. Graham, p. 29, says, "Some people have a natural tact with a peculiar quality of strength and structure of hands which render them vastly superior as manipulators." Hippocrates says (as quoted in James Victor Wilson's treatise, p. 11.) that *the heat* which oozes out of the hand on being applied to the sick is highly salutary, and that it has often appeared to him while he has thus been soothing his patients as if there were a singular property in his hands to pull out and drain away from the affected parts aches and divers impurities by laying his hand upon the place and extending his fingers toward it. "It is known," he says, "that health may be implanted in the sick by certain gestures and by contact." Real benefit was often derived from the use of Perkins's metallic tractors by persons upon whose bodies they were applied at the beginning of the present century. It was supposed that galvanism, excited by or imparted from the metallic tractors, produced the benefit; but when salutary results followed the manipulation of two pieces of wood painted to resemble the metal tractors, then the Regulars supposed that the patient's *faith* wrought his cure. For myself, I think that it has been and often is something more than mere rubbing, or the patient's faith, or expectant attention, that substitutes health for sickness, and strength for debility, both in cases of patients operated on by healing mediums, or by metallic or wooden tractors. Otherwise, why have the tractors lost their efficacy, and why are the rubbings of certain hireling hospital manipulators of but little

effect? These and other considerations not appropriate now to be dwelt upon, have constrained me to believe that spiritual agencies and angel operators at some times more than at other times, with some patients more than with others, cooperate with certain mediums and healers more than with other operators, in relieving patients of their sicknesses and maladies. At some times, healer and patient have, as I believe, entertained angels unawares.

Another point in connection with Dr. Adams's testimony before the Committee now occurs to me. You doubtless remember the means that he said he employed to prevent irregular physicians or what he called quacks from practicing in Manchester, N. H., where he resides and practices. When an itinerant healer there arrived and put out his sign or circular, Dr. Adams said that he informed the city marshal thereof, who in his turn sent an official notice to the new-come doctor warning him of the law, and hinting at prospective prosecution, etc. Such a notice is sufficient, said Dr. Adams, his face mantling with smiles at his shrewdness and success; the quack soon folds his tent and silently steals away and probably returns to Boston. I am free to say that I did not appreciate Dr. Adams's services in thus excluding healers and itinerant physicians from Manchester as highly as the doctor seemed to value them. I thought of the chronic sick people there living, who but for the New Hampshire restrictive law would probably have been healed or greatly benefited, but their health continued broken and miserable. Why? Because they knew not and were not permitted to know of the time of their visitation by messengers of health, some of whom doubtless wander about destitute and afflicted, like the healers mentioned in the Bible, of whom the world was not worthy.

Section 3 of the proposed bill provides that applicants for a license to practice medicine, shall be examined on such subjects as the board of medical registration shall require, "not including therapeutics." But *therapeutics* is the only department of medicine in which magnetizers, healing and medical mediums practice. It is the only department wherein the Bill requires no examination of its licentiates. It is the only department wherein Allopaths, Homeopaths and Eclectics do not agree, and about which they quarrel with one another and with everybody else. It is in *therapeutics* that many Spiritualists, reformers and other people, will trust healers, but will not trust regulars. Now please remember that according to the philosophy of Andrew Jackson Davis *disease is discord*: it is a disturbance, or an inharmonious circulation of the spiritual principle through the organism. Magnetizers, healing and medical mediums in their treatment of, and prescriptions to patients, seek to lull the discord—to harmonize the circulation of the spiritual principle, to bring peace to the troubled body and soul. Hence their healing practices may properly be called Spiritual or Harmonizing therapeutics, and their system may be termed the Harmonial system. The proposed Bill leaves to, and permits Allopaths to practice Allopathic therapeutics, Homeopaths to practice Homeopathic therapeutics, Eclectics to practice Eclectic therapeutics. Why, then, in a Com-

monwealth which undertakes to secure equal rights and liberties to its citizens, should not magnetizers, healing and medical mediums be permitted to practice their Spiritual and Harmonial therapeutics? especially upon patients who believe in and prefer that practice and go to them for it? But two or three points were urged in behalf of the petitioners which it may be well here briefly to notice.

1. Dr. Cornell said in effect, "let healers, clairvoyants and others, who object to the Bill, form a society of their own, and become incorporated as we Eclectics did." To this I answer that the Constitution of the State declares that the end of government is to furnish to the *individuals* of the body politic "the power of enjoying in safety and tranquility their natural rights." It treats its citizens as *individuals*. It does not require that they should first become corporations, or members of an incorporated society, before they may enjoy in safety and tranquility their natural rights.—(*Preamble of the Constitution.*)

2. A physician, in the truest, broadest sense of that term, belongs to, and practices in no exclusive school of medicine. He may have been trained as an Allopath, or as an Homeopath, or as a Botanic practitioner; but as he grows in wisdom and knowledge, he perceives evils and deficiencies in each system, and excellencies inside and outside of other systems. Hence a progressive physician necessarily outgrows the limitations of sectarian medical societies and systems, and learns to recognize and apply in practice other curative agencies. Allopaths may call themselves *regular*, but so long as they adhere exclusively to Allopathic remedies and modes of treatment (call themselves by what name they may) they are simply sectarists in medicine—or incomplete physicians. Were a member of the Massachusetts Medical Society to say, as its President recently did in your hearing, that he would not consult with a Homeopathic physician, even if the patient was dying, I should infer that such an one was a sectarist in the healing art, a fractional physician, and not a physician in its truest and broadest sense. I should infer that he had hardened his better nature, and dwarfed his manhood to the rules of his society, and that the Massachusetts Medical Society had outlived its usefulness. The Pharisees had no dealings with the Samaritans, but Jesus, the noblest of all the Hebrews, was not bound by their limitations; he ate and drank with publicans and sinners. "I am a man," said Terrence, "and nothing that pertains to man is alien to me." Which were the truest men, which the great physicians, which more likely to be public benefactors—ancient democrats who set at naught, or modern doctors, stunted by the restrictions of sectarian medical schools, and plotting for protective legislation for themselves?

3. The counsel for the Society of Specialists mentioned it as an existing evil that strangers needing a physician cannot learn from their signs and titles whether they are regular doctors or quacks. This difficulty arises from the medical faculty attempting to include in their professional titles more than they are honestly entitled to. M. D. is an abbreviation of Doctor of Medicine. Many systems or schools of

medicine exist. There are doctors or persons learned in the Allopathic system of medicine but not learned in the Homeopathic system. There are doctors or persons learned in the Homeopathic but not learned in the Allopathic system of medicine, and there are doctors or persons learned in the Eclectic or Botanic system but not learned in the Allopathic or Homeopathic system. Now let these diverse practitioners specialize, and by their titles indicate their special systems of practice. Let the Allopath name or indicate his vocation, not as Doctor of Medicine in its widest signification, which he is not, for he is not learned in all systems of medicine, certainly not in the Harmonial system—but is learned in one department of it, viz., Allopathy; let him therefore style himself and be called Allopath, and put, if he wish it, A. M. D. after his name. So let the Homeopathic practitioner call himself and be called Homeopath, and append, if he desire it, H. M. D. to his name; and let the Eclectic designate his calling as Eclectic Doctor of Medicine, and ornament his name with E. M. D. This plan is one of specialization (and the scientific practice of the age more and more tends to specialties), and is one which if the *Society of Specialists* adopted, would tend to diminish the evil complained of by their counsel, and obviate the need of any additional legislation in the matter.

4. One of the learned counsel in advocating the Bill stated that its enactment would not exclude magnetizers from practicing their vocation. Now if magnetizers did no more than manipulate their patients the statement would be true. But there are magnetizers and clairvoyants, and healing, and medical, and spirit mediums who prescribe and sometimes prepare medicines, usually very simple ones, for their patients. Such prescribing of medicine is within the purview of the Act, and Section 11 provides that any person who shall practice medicine within the Commonwealth without being duly licensed or authorized thereto, shall be punished by a fine. Consequently the proposed Bill prohibits from practice in the State all unlicensed prescribing magnetizers, clairvoyant healing mediums, and spirit mediums.

I would here present some arguments (cogent ones they are,) of eminent physicians in favor of Universal Medical Freedom for all practitioners—diplomated or undiplomated—of this school or that school, or of no school of medicine. Dr. James John Garth Wilkinson, of London, in his pamphlets entitled "A Free State and Free Medicine," and "Medical Freedom," published in 1870, and Dr. Joseph R. Buchanan, now Professor of Physiology, Anthropology and Physiological Institutes of Medicine in the Eclectic Medical College of the City of New York, in his "Earnest Appeal for Medical Freedom," published in Boston in 1877, advocate that beneficent and liberal plan of medical practice. Even the *New England Medical Gazette*, which now favors the present proposed Medical Bill, and says "it will be opposed only by unprincipled charlatans, or their agents or dupes," in its April issue, 1877, p. 178, declared then that such a law could bring nothing but pollution to medicine. But let me quote its exact words: "A bill is pending in Tennessee 'to

protect citizens from empiricism.' But there, as in Michigan, where a trial of 'State Medicine' has been made, and elsewhere, the opinion prevails that the law can bring nothing but pollution to medicine, and that if the profession cannot stand on its own merits, it cannot be propped up by the law. This is the principle homeopaths have always acted on, and the most sensible men among regulars recognize its merits, and understand the folly of attempting the practice of exclusion." But now this same Homeopathic *New England Medical Gazette* advocates a restrictive medical law, and in its last May number says Massachusetts, and every State in the Union, needs it. It gives reasons. Its last is probably its strongest argument, viz., that such a law is an imperative necessity "for the protection of the medical profession." When the editor was an outsider, and felt the cut of the Allopathic lash, he denounced the whip; now he would like to hold that same whip, and lash all other physicians outside the incorporated schools. Whether he be at the butt end or the tail end of a whip, strangely alters the critic's opinion of its efficacy.

As Dr. Wilkinson's pamphlets in favor of "A Free State and Free Medicine" are scarce and but little known in this country, and his arguments are good, I shall quote quite freely from them. Dr. Buchanan's pamphlet was published and can easily be obtained in Boston, therefore from it I shall give no extracts. Dr. Wilkinson has been and is widely and favorably known in Great Britain and the United States, especially by Homeopaths and Swedenborgians, for his many valuable publications and because of his high character as a physician and a philanthropist. He writes, "I plead in the name and interest of the community alone." "The medical profession has crept into the Government and is inciting it to breaches of the most sacred freedom," pp. 2, 3. "It undertakes to immure the people of these Islands" (i. e., England and Ireland) "in its own narrow materialism," p. 21. Says Dr. Wilkinson, "the arrogance of chartered medicine has been displayed on various subjects ever since I entered the profession. When Mesmerism came up, and nobody knew anything about it, and a few wished to learn by experiment, chartered medicine appeared upon every mesmeric scene and attempted by violence to foreclose the experiment. It swooped down upon the people who were investigating; it knew that the whole exhibition was humbug and imposture, and it comforted itself with an enormity of conceited ignorance such as no one can command or contain unless he has a permanent conceit pipe running into him directly from a chartered college. And yet, reader, the subject was new; these little men knew nothing about it, but they hated it; and they hated it because it enlarged the domain of physiology and psychology beyond their possession; and their possession was narrow, their heart was narrow and their mind was narrow, and their spirit was, not because their calling was no creation of God, but a manufacture of their State colleges," p. 22. "Why do candid physicians every now and then astonish casual hearers by a hint of the very small progress which therapeutics have made since the day of Galen? Why

does poor little Medicine, stunted and wizened, cast so wistful an eye at the strong limbs and bouncing proportions of cousin Chemistry? Simply because the unhappy child has been brought up on little but *maintenance of truth*, while her relative, lucky in not being committed to the care of colleges, has been brought up on *progress of science*. Go for progress, and let truth maintain herself," p. 23.

Dr. Wilkinson says that "for thirty years he has been convinced of the inestimable benefits to be derived from medical freedom; that the results of all legislation toward freedom have deepened his conviction. Many years ago he translated Swedenborg's "Animal Kingdom," a work in which a free layman demonstrated by light and life that the psychology and physiology of the body of man are opened by God to free thought where they are closed against professional thought," p. 29.

"Not a college, sect or diploma will perish when physic is free from State patronage and protection;" that is to say, unless public bodies, (*i. e.*, State colleges and chartered medical societies) "choose to disband themselves. The only power they will lose, will be the power of harming other bodies or other people not of their way of thinking. They will gain the power of emulating the good works and open-mindedness of all the useful people whom they have called quacks, and impostors, and unqualified practitioners, who have been the moving wheels of practice in all ages of the world," p. 33.

To the question whether he would commit the lives of the community to the possible intervention of uneducated men, Dr. Wilkinson answers, p. 34, "The education of the schools cannot fit men for curing the diseases of their fellows! it is only one way of launching them toward professional, but not necessarily healing life. A man of no Latin, no anatomy, no physiology, is every now and then a good physician, though he sits on the lowest forms of society. He is educated for that use, though he cannot write his own name. By freedom bring him into *rapport* with the light of learning if you can, but at all events kill not the divine power which is in him of doing good because he is not educated up to your bench."

"The State, it is true, can exact from every one that he or she shall pass through a curriculum of preparatory studies and hospital attendance to fit him to enter upon practice. But of the studies, many may be useless except as accomplishments. From the studies many useful ones may be left out owing to the bigotry of the elders. The *diploma may be sought as the shield of protection to the doctor, rather than as the shield of health to the patient*. Numerous men naturally qualified for medicine, born doctors maybe, are shut out from their life-work by the expense which confines the practice of physic to the abler, *i. e.*, the wealthier 'classes.' State licentiates leaning upon their diplomas are apt, from the very necessity of their practice, to be mastered by a conceit in which natural skill must languish. To be built up against freedom, to be privileged, is to be built up against nature. . . . The root and basis of medicine is the love of healing in the universal heart and mind," pp. 35-36.

"An impression has been sedulously cultivated that Anatomy and Physiology, Pathology, and various other branches of science are the healing virtues in the world, and that they and the written practice of medicine constitute positive faculties in man; whereas they are mere books, or at best outlying experiences. Not one of them has any direct relation, any rule of thumb, to a single case that will hereafter occur. In every instance they require to pass through a living medical perception to be of any use. That perception and all that belongs to it is a spiritual thing, and must only be fed, but not substituted or overlaid by knowledge. It is an appetite for doing good and working cures, and experience and knowledge must feed it; and this must take place upon true social conditions; that is to say, all the men who belong naturally to the calling must be encouraged by the absence of State interference to take their places at the Board of Healing," p. 37.

"Emancipate medicine from State trammels, and poor men's medical colleges would arise, and compete not ignobly with other colleges. The poor could then be attended by educated men of their own sort at small expense, and the masses generally would be raised by having their own unscorned natural professions, and a new class of bluff, honest common sense, and artisan ways of natural life would be added to these noble arts. The medical instinct and inspiration of humanity shall stand upon their feet in the masses," p. 42.

"The protection of medicine by the State is artificiality and injustice. Remove it, and with it you begin to remove the baneful belief—now all but universal—that medical men can be created by culture; that real culture can come from without, and that nature and gifts of the men are of second rate importance," p. 43.

"I owe it," says Dr. Wilkinson, at the close of his *Free State and Free Medicine*, "to all my medical brothers and sisters, to say, that though I have spoken hardly of their corporations, I desire to speak and think reverently and lovingly of themselves; for I am one of them, on board of their own boat. I am an old medical practitioner, forty years at the work. And especially do I desire to see us all more free and open in our hearts and minds, less fearful and less unbelieving; looking less to the past than to God and the future, and praying for his inspiration while we scan all nature and art and books for this instruction. And I have learnt that the way to advance to all this, is by going out of State swaddling clothes, and under heaven winning for ourselves freedom of medicine in the greater freedom of our country," p. 30.

Some eight or ten years passed after the publication of Dr. Wilkinson's pamphlet on *Medical Freedom*. The Regular Allopathic Schools and Faculty continued to hold by legal enactments the almost entire monopoly of medical practice in Great Britain. Again did Dr. Wilkinson protest against its injustice, wrong, and oppression. From his "HUMAN SCIENCE AND DIVINE REVELATION," recently published, I make the following extracts:

"Look at the medical 'Regulars,' grasping at place and power that the dogmas of the most uncertain of arts and sciences may be

secured and attested, not by nature but by Parliament." . . . "See the empire of violent drugs, of quinine and calomel and chemicals, still holding much of its own sway. Mark the new extension of the opiate delusion, the chloroform and chlorals which are committed as a habit, and a destroying habit it is, to the rich. Look at the vast hospitals which are medical and surgical thrones, where patients die at a rate unknown to private practice. Observe corporate medical secrecy and its technical pharmacopœias which warns the public from learning the mystery of its own diseases," p. 37.

He exhorts the people "to shake the aristocracy of medicine, submit it to a vigilant popular tribunal, and shift and subordinate the medical mind and conscience as a centre in the country," p. 45. He insists that the "lust of drugging is the demon of medicine," p. 46, and that such a healing art is a bad healer; that it tortures and shortens, and does not bless nor lengthen human life, and leaves out the marrow of cure; p. 49. He says that "Hospitals are artificial infestations and pollutions of the peace of the general health," p. 51.

"The centralization and papacy of medicine has advanced into the State, and a virtual infallibility has been claimed for its orthodoxies, which are carried forth" in England "with terrible compulsory legislation. The evil power that has been cast down from the clerical plane has fallen upon the lower level of the doctors, and the earth is troubled with their use of it," p. 430.

"Commit every calling to its own maintenance and responsibility; do not privilege it and pay it, in no way direct or indirect, for orthodoxy or belief in articles, and let every man practice without interference of law, leaving his competency to be decided only by his employers, and any harm he does to be answered before the ordinary tribunals," p. 430.

In the Preamble of the Constitution of the United States it appears that the people of the United States ordained and established that Constitution (among other objects) to secure the blessings of *liberty* to themselves and to their posterity. Certainly does not that declaration include that you, I, and all the people of the United States have *liberty* to employ such physicians as we may respectively wish to employ?

The Constitution of Massachusetts declares that the end and purpose of government is to secure to individuals who compose the body politic—"the power of enjoying in safety and tranquility their natural rights and the blessings of life." Imagine, if you can, a Liberal, a Spiritualist, or any other citizen who instinctively shuns the practice of a diplomated registered doctor of any of the three medical schools, as confined at his home by illness. He sends out for his healing magnetizers to relieve him in his sickness. None come. They have been debarred from practice by this Act. The good wife of the sick man then brings in a young Regular doctor to *conjecture* on her husband's malady. The sick man instinctively shrivels up in horror as he sees the young Regular son of Esculapius enter his apartment. The invalid (perhaps he was at one time a member of the Legislature) has heard of Regulars. In the discussions there, or elsewhere, he has heard or read that Regulars are the men who mix drugs of which they know little, to pour into a body of which they know less, to cure a disease of which they know nothing, that under pretence of helping the public health and good morals they plotted to monopolize the medical practice of the State to themselves and their associates. As the young doctor approaches his bedside the sick patient, nervous and indignant at a Government doctor be-

ing, as it were, forced upon him, sees expectant fees in that doctor's eyes, purgation in his pills, venesection in his lancet, vivisection in his scalpel, variola in his quill points, inflammation in his plasters, poisons in his medicines, confusion in his prescription, death in his treatment, an expensive undertaker, and a funeral at his own door. "Throw physic to the dogs," says he, "I'll none of it." How, under such circumstances, can the sick man enjoy, in the safety and tranquility assured by the Constitution of his State, his natural right of selecting his own friend and doctor, to comfort, support, strengthen, and, if possible, relieve him of his illness?

Let me delay a moment to explain one ground of the aversion of this supposed invalid to the Regulars. He has heard, as I've said, that they are the men "who mix drugs of which they know nothing"; (have not my citations of the testimonies of many eminent physicians tended to prove that part of the statement?) "to pour into a body of which they know less,"—*they know less* because they know not of, and do not minister with their medicines to, the *spiritual* principle in man. It is the *spirit* that pervades the body, it is the *spirit* that quickeneth. (John vi: 63.) When the spirit is well, the body is well; when the spirit is sick, the body is sick. The flesh profiteth nothing. Regulars minister to the body, magnetizers and spirit mediums to the spirit.

The best government, as I fully believe, is where there is the least possible government consistent with the safety of the body politic, and the protection of human natural rights. It is the special duty and function of good government to protect those rights from invasion either by individuals or by corporations. Liberty—freedom from interference or oppression by State, church or society—is a great blessing. Jefferson said, "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." The beloved and martyred Abraham Lincoln advocated a government of the people, by the people, for the people, that liberty perish not from the earth; but this proposed doctors' bill provides "a government of the people, *by the doctors, for the doctors,* and restricts liberty. Lincoln's conception was for freedom and liberty. The doctors' plan is for domination, tyranny and fees. Herbert Spencer declares that medical popery, which the doctors think is so defensible, is parallel to religious popery, which all Protestants think is so indefensible. Prof. Francis W. Newman has also truly declared "to enact a medical code, or command a medical process, is usurpation—not legitimate legislation, even viewed from the scientific side," "and certainly," as Prof. Dr. A. Wilder, of New York, remarks, "when viewed from the standing-point of common right, or the principle of Republican government, it has no warrant or justification whatever."

Good advice was it that Gamaliel gave to the priests and Sadducees of his day, who were indignant that the apostles by their hands wrought signs and wonders, and healed the sick folks. Said Gamaliel, "Refrain from these men, and let them alone, for if this work be of men it will come to naught, but if it be of God ye cannot overthrow it."—(*Acts* v: 38.)

Let me hope that the wise spirit of toleration and brotherhood which prompted this advice of the Hebrew counsellor and doctor of the law, will have weight with the legislators of Massachusetts, and will operate to prevent the enactment of an act which, like the Witch Statutes of two centuries ago, will bring certain disgrace on the name of Massachusetts, will withdraw health-giving energies, spiritual and angelic therapeutics from its citizens, and is sure to inflict oppression and persecution upon the useful and humble healers known as clairvoyants, spiritual mediums, healing mediums and magnetizers.

Mr. Chairman, in behalf of and for the protection of the many remonstrants whom I represent, against unjust, unequal and privileged class-legislation, I submit as an amendment to the Bill before you, and to any Bill which may be proposed to restrict, to regulate, or otherwise to interfere with the free practice of medicine in this Commonwealth, the following provisos, the same to be added to and made a part of this and any other Medical Bill that may be proposed, namely:

"Provided that the provisions of this Act shall not apply to spiritual mediums, to clairvoyants, to healing mediums, nor to magnetic healers.

And further provided that every citizen of this State above the age of twenty-one years, and of sound and disposing mind and memory, may employ for himself and in his family the medical aid and services of any person he may wish to employ, anything in this Act to the contrary notwithstanding."

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee, thanking you for your kind attention, I now close my argument in defence of healing and medical mediums, and for universal freedom in the practice of the healing art, with the following eloquent and convincing letter to the same points which I recently received from Dr. Buchanan, Professor of Physiology, Anthropology and Physiological Institutes of Medicine in the Eclectic Medical College of the City of New York:

NEW YORK, Feb. 19th, 1880.

ALFRED E. GILES, Esq., *Hyde Park, Mass.*:

DEAR SIR—I earnestly hope the friends of medical freedom will not only defeat the attempt to legislate against the rights of the people, but will stamp this movement with such reprobation as will forever prevent its repetition.

It is as fundamentally wrong in principle to attempt in any manner, by force of law, to restrict popular freedom of choice in medicine, as it would be to restrict the freedom of choice in religion. Medical freedom and religious freedom stand on the very same ground, and the Medical College has no higher right than the Theological Seminary to determine who shall save body or soul. It is shocking to think that descendants of those who left the Old World to escape from religious bondage should engage in the establishment of a system of medical bondage, which has been far more cruel and oppressive than that of the hierarchy. There is no physical suffering imposed by the priesthood of an established church: but the physical suffering and misery imposed by a medical oligarchy have left a terrible record throughout Christendom, to which it would require a volume to do justice.

The practice of treating disease by bloodshed has been kept up throughout Christendom ever since the days of Galen, and is not yet entirely abandoned, although it was demonstrated over forty years ago in the most incontestable manner that every act of bleeding was

an assault upon human life, which impaired vitality and accelerated death.

Upheld by law, medical schools have prolonged this outrage upon Nature, and endeavored to crush all who would introduce more rational systems. Bleeding was but one of the cruel acts of violence against the laws of Nature, which have aggravated the mortality of disease in many cases and prevented the remedial power of Nature from effecting a cure.

Until a very recent period, every consumptive was peremptorily handed over to death, unless saved by escape from the control of Allopathic physicians, and to assert the curability of consumption was to bring down scornful denunciation upon the daring medical heretic. With the same blind adherence to authority and tradition, cholera was treated with a mortality varying from twenty-five to sixty per cent., by the leaders of the medical profession—while it has been amply shown by American physicians who have thrown off the shackles of authority, that ninety-five per cent. can be cured by rational treatment, and that any mortality exceeding ten per cent. is a proof of ignorance and malpractice.

The curability of cancer has also been denied even more positively than the curability of consumption, and while its cure has been carried on by American physicians who exercise the professional freedom of eclecticism, these improvements have been opposed and concealed from the rising generation of physicians by medical colleges, with the disastrous result of causing a mortality of half a million, four fifths of which would have been prevented by rational treatment.

Can it be possible that such a system of medical malpractice, dogmatism and cruelty can receive any assistance from a republican legislature in perpetuating these enormities and crushing every effort of philanthropy to save the victims of false doctrine and unfeeling practice from their prolonged sufferings?

Can it be possible that any legislative body will endeavor to make benevolence a crime and to uphold the power of an avaricious monopoly against the influence of modern enlightenment and scientific reform?

Such legislation, conferring exclusive privileges upon the pupils of medical colleges, even if those colleges represented an enlightened system of medicine, would be an invasion of one of the dearest and most inalienable rights of humanity—the right of doing our duty, the right of obeying God, the right of helping the unfortunate. If we have the right to help the suffering with bread and milk, we have no less clear a right to give help by healing herbs, by baths, by bandages, by mineral waters, by electricity, and by the life of our own bodies given through the hand, as it was given by the early Christians.

The healing of the sick by the magnetism of the human body and soul is not only a right but a duty—a duty from which no true Christian can be free. To interfere with this right is to violate religious liberty, to put a penalty upon duty, and place the legislation of man in opposition to the laws of God. We are exhorted in the Scriptures to cultivate and use these gifts of God, the healing power and the power of prophecy, and in the performance of this duty we may defy any law of human enactment, for he who makes or enforces such a law is the *criminal*, not he who obeys the law of God in giving relief to the suffering. No medical school or medical clique gave to the Christians of the Pentecostal churches the power or the permission to heal the sick, nor would their authority have been regarded for a moment by those faithful disciples and followers of Christ.

There are errors and quakeries under all systems that exist, for human beings are always imperfect in their administration of principles, but the errors and quakeries of dogmatic medicine are so enormous in amount that one of the highest authorities in the medical profession of England, Dr. Forbes, confessed that the Allopathic system, which he had practiced, was of very little practical value, and there are many physicians beside Dr. Jennings, of Connecticut,

who have, after ten or twenty years' experience in the old school profession, lost their faith, and almost or quite abandoned their use of drugs, not because medicines are useless, but because a false system of practice made them dangerous and destructive.

I do not decry a rational, practical, liberal system of medicine that follows nature; on the contrary I have that faith which is never found in the Allopathic ranks, that it can alleviate or cure all human diseases. But I deny the right of any legislative body to deprive freemen of their choice in medical treatment. And I affirm that if any system is to be restrained by law it should be the system which has heretofore consigned to death all cancerous and consumptive patients, nearly one-half of the cholera patients, and about one-fourth of the sufferers from pneumonia. Under Allopathic management forty years ago a drug store in active business was more destructive to the health and life of the neighborhood than a grog-shop sending out its rum, whiskey and brandy. And I am sure that if a legislative committee were to inquire into the mortality of the drug business under Allopathic control at present, it would be proved that Allopathic drugs have been as destructive as alcohol, and as urgently need legislative supervision, if the legislature is to think for the people.

In opposition to this destructive system, modern intelligence has developed methods that are absolutely safe and harmless. Legislative power has been often used or invoked against Homeopathy, which its fiercest enemies must acknowledge is absolutely harmless and safe. Equally safe has been the electrical treatment of disease and the hydropathic system, while the methods of animal magnetism, including clairvoyance and spirit-guidance, which were the methods of the primitive Christians, are not only absolutely safe but are purely and entirely beneficent, for they are simply the giving of life from the well to the sick, and as incapable of doing harm as a gift of water to the man dying with thirst. In every city of our country we can find those who have been healed by these natural methods, after the faculty had failed—the natural methods that were in vogue before the dawn of scientific medicine, and which still produce results that are far beyond the power of the schools.

A committee that would fairly investigate this subject would find thousands of cases in which clairvoyance had corrected the blundering diagnoses of college graduates, and in which magnetic treatment had healed the quacked, worn-out and abandoned patients of Allopathy.

Clairvoyants and magnetic practitioners are often assisted in their practice by the spirits of departed friends—departed physicians, who in spirit-life discover the follies of their earthly systems of practice, and not only use medicine more wisely, but, having a deeper insight, become infallible in diagnosis.

I do not speak of these things as a one-sided partisan, for I do not belong to the clairvoyant ranks, and I have been a member of the medical profession for forty-five years, and was one of the founders of the most successful medical college ever established in Cincinnati, in which I labored for ten years, during the latter half of which time I was its public representative as the Dean of the Faculty. I am still a medical professor in New York; but I have never indulged in the bigotry of the profession, or discouraged those who, being happily endowed, are able to cure by the methods of nature without the aid of science.

I have known the success of clairvoyants in diagnosis and prescription for many years, and I have seen successful practice in my own family by deceased physicians giving their directions through spirit mediums in private life. In the midst of my medical labors at Cincinnati, a servant girl in my family being disabled by a swelled and diseased ankle, was sent several times to the best hospital within reach, for surgical treatment, without any material improvement, when my wife consulted, through a mediumistic lady living near, the spirit of a deceased physician, her brother-in-law, and received di-

rections different from anything known in medical authors, which made a very speedy and thorough cure.

In another case, during my absence from home, the same spirit-physician, when consulted, corrected an erroneous diagnosis in the case of one of my sons, and prevented him from taking unnecessary and improper medicine presented by a respectable young physician.

Such cases are abundant all over our country, and so far as my observation goes, I have never known an erroneous prescription or one of dangerous character given from the spirit-world, through those who have the refined interior powers that reach the minds of the departed.

The accessibility to these spirit-influences and spirit-communications is a part of man's religious nature, by which he becomes accessible to the influences of the Holy Spirit and to the Divine Influx, which ennobles humanity and renders the soul and body of the good man a temple for the Lord.

To war against these benevolent ministrations from Heaven is an act of impiety, which may be natural in a dogmatic infidel to whom all but matter is nonentity or superstition; but to cultivate all the refined and beautiful elements of the soul by which God and the angels are brought into humanity is a duty of the highest obligation, and no man or woman who prays in sincerity for the influence of the Holy Spirit will reject the influence and help of the "*ministering spirits*" of whom the Scriptures speak.

But whether the legislator believes or disbelieves in God and his angels, he has no right to raise a sacrilegious hand against the performance of those sacred duties which religion imposes on the good, and which the angels assist by their inspiring presence. In all that I have said I am sure I have your concurrence, as well as that of the most enlightened thousands of Europe and America.

In haste, yours cordially, JOS. RODES BUCHANAN.

ADDRESS BY ALLEN PUTNAM.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee:

I believe, and freely avow it, that Mr. Palne, the head petitioner, and a large majority of his associates, are high-minded and philanthropic, seeking to advance the public welfare, and not that of any profession or class. Our educated and diplomated physicians are as much aloof from undue selfishness and are as public spirited as any other class. I am here to meet honorable, philanthropic men on their own plane, and discuss this question of great public importance.

The late Prof. Louis Agassiz, as you well know, held a very exalted position among scientists, and Dr. Brown Séquard, I think, is classed by public estimate among our globe's most eminent medical scientists and practitioners. I intend to argue against your granting the prayer of the petitioners, as embodied in the bill before you, mainly from data furnished by the two eminent men I have named.

On the 1st of May, 1873, Prof. Agassiz lectured in Boston upon "The Methods of Creation," and soon after published the lecture in the *New York Tribune*. A few years since I copied from that lecture, when preparing a pamphlet entitled, "Agassiz and Spiritualism," involving the investigation (of Spiritualism) by Harvard professors in 1857. From that pamphlet, page 61, I will now quote. Agassiz says: "Dr. Brown Séquard, in a recent lecture in Boston, laid before his audience a *new philosophy of mental powers*. Through physiological experiments and study of pathological cases he has come to the conclusion that there are *two sets* of mental powers in the human organism; essentially different from each other: the one our ordinary conscious intelligence; the other a *superior* power which controls our *better* nature; solves, sometimes suddenly and unexpectedly, our problems and perplexities; suggests the right thing at the right time, *acting through us without conscious action of our own*, though susceptible of training and elevation—or perhaps I should rather say our organism may be trained to be a more plastic *instrument* through which this power acts *in us*." Thus has said Séquard, as quoted by Agassiz, who goes on and adds: "I do not see why this view should not be accepted. By experiments Dr. Brown Séquard has satisfied himself that the subtle mechanism of the human frame—about which we know so little in its connection with mental processes—is *sometimes acted upon by a power outside of us, as familiar with that organism as we are ignorant of it*." Thus teach Séquard and Agassiz—good scientific authority—yes, the *best*.

Science, then, through the lips and pens of her most gigantic masters, tells us that there are two sets of mental powers in the human organism; that one set, the *superior* set, is sometimes *acted upon by a power outside of us as familiar* (mark the expression)—*as familiar with that organism as we are ignorant of it*. An intelligent power that *must* be, and not an owner of the body through which it acts. Therefore nature, or God in nature, has provided an instrumentality

through which intelligences not robed in flesh can speak to and act upon us through mortal lips and organs.

Séquard's "New Philosophy" has strong claims for cognition by the scientific, especially by medical scientists. That philosophy may lead them to acquaintance with, to training and use of mental faculties wherethrough they may get higher medical knowledge, power and aid than their own "ordinary conscious intelligence," their more external mental faculties, can possibly obtain. Very obviously too it will lead them into the domain where Spiritualism's countless springs are sending forth their healing waters in unprecedented abundance. Well for them, and for diseased mortals, if they become medical students there.

Agassiz said: "We know *so little* of the human organism in its connection with mental processes." That statement implies that he, Séquard, and of course our schooled and experienced medical practitioners, know *next to nothing at all* about it. But eyes exist which can look the human system through from centre to surface, and powers who can report to us the results of clear visual inspection.

About three years ago the spirit of my classmate and chum in college—and my friend to this day, though his body has been entombed for years—Dr. Augustus A. Gould, long a highly respected, successful and scientific medical practitioner in this city, volunteered to tell me, through borrowed lips, that my wife's mental ailment resulted from ossification of the spinal marrow, which was not curable in her case, and threatened to bring on such violent insanity as would demand her commitment to some asylum; he however saw ground for hope, if I would care for and treat her as he should from time to time advise, that she might be saved from such incarceration.

During nearly two years, and until death of body released her spirit, I followed his advice and escaped necessity to place her in a hospital. My conviction is firm that his advice—very singular in some of its requirements—was wiser and more helpful than embodied man's medical science could have given.

The bill before you, if enacted, will make the estimable lady through whom I received the advice a legal culprit, if I avail myself of her form for obtaining similar help in future. I say her *form*, for she is unconscious of what comes through her from outside powers, so that you may as rationally and much more humanely fine my pen for recording this account, than to fine *her* because of what flows through her at such times.

Can you wonder, gentlemen, that I make an earnest appeal to you to give these petitioners leave to withdraw, so far as they ask you for power to fine Dr. Gould's sensitive, living instrument, in a case where he must be the only possible culprit! Lawyers, drafting the bill, would have shunned that absurdity had their clients posted them adequately to the fair demands of the case.

Do you wonder that I protest against putting any legal obstacle in the way of anybody's getting help from outside powers whose familiarity with the interior of the human system while alive is as great as every physician's ignorance of it must be who is not clairvoyant? Will you abridge access to the higher available knowledge, and restrict us as far as you can to relative ignorance? At this dawning of a new and brighter era in medical science and practice, whose coming is, and has been through thirty years, harbingered to the *people* by the unprecedented multitude of human forms taken hold of and used by invisible doctors, and more recently harbingered to scientists by Séquard's discovery—at this auspicious hour will you attempt to legislate us back into days of darkness and arbitrary rule? "Sumptuary laws," says Webster, the lexicographer, "are abridgments of liberty and of very difficult execution. They can be justified only on the ground of *extreme necessity*."

Why have our doctors been so long neglectful of Séquard's discovery? I think it is in harmony with the usual methods of the power which governs our world and its inhabitants that they have left it unused hitherto.

Can you teach the theologian theology? the scientist science? the

lawyer law? or the physician physic? Rarely—very rarely. Anything not generally known in their brotherhoods pertaining to their specialities is not worth hunting for—so their conduct usually says. Whatever lays outside of their mill-horse rounds rarely wins their careful inspection; more lowly persons, generally, in the methods of Providence, are made the first recipients and appreciators of great revolutionizing and uplifting truths and facts. It was the common people, and not the learned, who of old, in Jerusalem, *gladly* heard the boy of twelve years who sat in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them and asking them questions, and creating astonishment by his understanding and answers.

Christianity had to gain its first firm foothold amid the lowly: fishermen, publicans, sinners, harlots, were among those to whom it was first presented. Such ones were less creed-bound than the more cultured; less hampered by position; less covetous of respectability; more free to let intuition, or the superior set of mental powers, take rule within, and consequently better conditioned to sense and grasp the sublimity, potency and intrinsic worth of what came forth from the lips of the unlearned carpenter's son. Nearly every Christian sect and broad philanthropic scheme has taken root first among the lowly. My own memory can take me back to days when Methodism, Universalism, Abolitionism, Homeopathy, all now in good repute, were more or less under the ban of the most cultured classes. Today Spiritualism, mediums, magnetic healers, Spiritualists *en masse*, are under similar ban; were it not so I should distrust its supervision by supernal wisdom and benevolence, which generally have subjected the world's most extensive and helpful reformers to toil, buffets, reproach, obloquy and vilification.

The demands of trained scientists are that all spirit phenomena shall be amenable to none other than such laws and methods of testing as they are familiar with, forgetting or ignoring the fact that spiritual things are spiritually discerned, and manifested through the application of other forces than such as mere mortals have knowledge of. Their external science—or the restrictions which that puts upon them, keeps their superior set of mental powers inactive where use of them is essential to fair and accurate discernment. Not to such would supernal wisdom put infant Spiritualism out to nurse—they would soon crush all life out of it. Common people—wiser and kinder nurses—were selected to tend the young giant till he should need no protectors; could go forth in his own strength and compel acknowledgment of his claims to be an immigrant from supernal realms.

I do not claim to be a scientist, but I stand on what a most eminent scientist has scientifically discovered, when I ask in solemn earnestness, and from the depths of my religious and humane nature, whether man in becoming reverence toward the great Author of Nature and Father of all men, can legislate to impede in slightest measure resort to natural channels in some human frames wherethrough ailing mortals can get aid from outside intelligent powers as familiar with the interior of the living human form as mortals must necessarily be ignorant of it?

Why not as well restrict us to the employment of licensed graduates from specific theological schools for curing the soul, as to do what is sought for in the bill? Dear as the freedom is to choose my spiritual doctor, freedom to select who shall care for my body and mind is not less prized. You leave me free to select a doctor for my horse or dog, and would abridge the vastly dearer freedom to choose one for myself and family. In this age and land of growing freedom, under the government of the people, by the people, for the people, it is out of time and place.

It is ungenerous, unwise, to abridge by law freedom to employ whomsoever each one prefers to administer to self or family in times of sickness, when faith and confidence in and sympathy with the physician are among the most helpful of all remedial forces! Give me the humblest shoeblack, if I know him to be intuitive, sympathetic, cheering, and a battery from which may issue healthful ema-

nations, either willed or spontaneously—yes, give me such in my hour of sickness, rather than your most scientific physician, if much lacking in those properties.

God's original part in making a good physician is far greater than all which man can add thereto in any medical school; by no schooling process can medical professors inject brains, or tact, or common-sense, or intuitive faculties, or sympathetic temperament, or good moral instincts, or health-engendering magnetisms into their students; and if any graduate be licensed to practice who is much lacking in such properties, however great his scholastic attainments, he never can become the one-half of a genuinely good physician.

Born doctors, *born* half-doctors, are vastly better than many whom nature's journeymen finish off in medical schools. Therefore let the God-made ones—all of them—have a fair free field in which to benefit mankind, through doing, without hindrance or fear of law, what they were originally organized and compounded to perform beneficently.

Gentlemen of the Committee, do not the facts and considerations presented permit me to say, beware, lest by passing the restrictive bill before us, thereby suppressing some evil, you shut out also the very highest agencies active in our midst for outworking the very end which both the petitioners and myself are seeking, viz., *the public good?*

ARGUMENT OF EDWARD HAMILTON, ESQ.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: As a remonstrant against the passage of the extraordinary legislation proposed in this bill, I wish to say a few words to you as a citizen of Massachusetts. Since 1630 my ancestors have lived on the soil which is now our proud Commonwealth. I cannot find that they ever even went out of this State to marry, so that I believe I have a right to claim to be a Massachusetts man; and, as both my grandfathers were eminent physicians, and several of my nearest relatives were of that profession, most of them members of the Massachusetts Medical Society, and as I was brought up in the drug business myself, I think I have a right to speak on this question. Now, sir, I am one of those who believe in the doctrine of the fathers—in the doctrine of personal liberty. I do not think you legislators sit here to take away the liberty of the citizen, but to protect your own and the liberties of those you represent. These sinuous encroachments on individual rights in our day are sapping the very foundation of our political structure. This is not Massachusetts doctrine. [Applause.] It is the doctrine of the Spanish inquisition; and I sometimes think there are men in Massachusetts, yes, and women, too, who would, if they could, restore that dark and bloody code, so they could sit in judgment. [Applause.] This bill calls the examiners a "board of commissioners;" a commission; and provides that it is to sit in judgment on the moral character of citizens of this Commonwealth. It is an inquisition differing from the Spanish only in degree. Moral character! Who are these men who set themselves up as standards of morals? Do they drink rum, smoke or chew tobacco, slander their neighbors, and thank God that they are not as other men? [Applause and laughter.] Is the Executive Council, the Senate or the House to be the standard of morals? Or, if either, are Stickney, Chase, Pond, the Rev. Winslow and the Rev. Sereno Howe to compose the commission? [Applause.] What is the standard of morals to be adopted? Must they be Christians, and must it be the Christian standard? If so, what becomes of the Jew, the Free Thinker, and people who are followers of other codes of morals than the Christian code? [Applause.] Gentlemen, you are not here to establish Boards on moral character; that is out of your province. I understand it is proposed to allow none to cure people except those who have a thorough knowledge of their business and calling. I am glad of it; it is a good thing.

But this bill fixes a standard—true, rather a mixed standard—providing that the Board shall be composed of members from the Massachusetts Medical, Homeopathic Medical, and the Eclectic Medical Societies. I believe they are not now allowed to join each other's societies, as they do not recognize each other as physicians of "good, moral character" [applause]—at least, not good enough, as physicians, to belong to one society; but as a Board, under this bill, they are compounded, mixed; and not only appear as a Board with a "thorough knowledge of their business and calling," but of such good moral character that they, as a Board, are the standards of virtue. [Laughter and applause.] Who, in the medical profession, claim they can cure all classes of diseases, and can impart to others the knowledge how to do it? This is just the question, exactly, which

has for ages agitated civilization when discussing the subject. I have yet to learn that any one of the various schools of medicine claim they can cure all disease. Citizens not graduates of colleges cannot practice medicine. Why apply this rule only to those who cure disease? Why allow men who are not graduates of colleges to take part in any public affairs? [Applause.] Benjamin Franklin was not a graduate of a college, or Fulton, or Oliver Evans, or Good-year, or Bell, or Edison. [Applause.] Nor were Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, Andrew Johnson, Henry Wilson or Nathaniel P. Banks, and hundreds of others of our ablest and best minds. [Applause.] A college never produced a Shakspeare. From the bigotry displayed in this bill, one would think we had returned to the days when witchcraft was a capital offence here. [Applause.] I know, of my own personal knowledge, that the "regulars" cannot cure all classes of ailments, for twice in my life I have been

GIVEN UP AND PRONOUNCED INCURABLE

by them after consultations, and afterwards cured by persons not members of the societies, and who, under this bill, would not be allowed to practice in this State. [Prolonged applause.] One of the remonstrants to this bill is a gentleman long a resident of this city, who spent hundreds of dollars in seeking a cure of scrofula by members of the different schools. He had three scrofula sores on his neck—ulcers—seven or eight years ago. I went with him to a lady in this city, who cured him in three weeks [applause], and he, to this day, has never had a return of the malady. Shall Massachusetts people be deprived of these outside sources of salvation? [Applause.] Now, sir, I would like to quote what Daniel Webster told an eminent physician: "Why, doctor, there is no such thing as science in your profession or mine." Why, sir, a few centuries ago, and a very few, homeopaths would have been hanged, and eclectics burnt at the stake. [Applause.] Even in the days of Shakspeare, and Bacon, and Queen Elizabeth, in that enlightened age, the fact of the circulation of the blood was not known, and powdered pearls and other gems among the wealthy, and toads' eyes, serpents' teeth, and similar talismans among the poor, were prescribed as medicines and used to cure diseases. The old motto used to be, "Fear-God and keep the bowels open." [Uproarious laughter.]

And that was about all there was to the practice of medicine in those days. Then came blood-letting; and how the old ancestors of ours poured out bowls full of blood as a sacrifice to the theories alone recognized in those days. [Great laughter and applause.] Then came the calomel period, which originated the practice of dentistry, and the effects of which treatment follow many of our generation. I think the present may be denominated the "morphine period" in the old school practice. [Laughter and applause.] Why, sir, if we could only find these in strata, as we do the old red sandstone, you would discover each period as distinctly marked with some new theory, some abandonment of preconceived notions, as is the track of time in the sandstones. [Applause.] How did the old school change their practice without either experimenting themselves or adopting the experiments proven to be of value by positive evidence through the practice of people not belonging to their especial church and gospel of practice? [Applause.] You may as well set up an exclusive church as an exclusive set of theories as to the practice of the healing art.

But, gentlemen, there is another phase to this question. What right has this or any legislature to say whom I shall or shall not employ as a physician? [Applause.] What right have you to say the person I employ shall be a man of "good moral character?" Permit me to refer these petitioners to the sixth section of the bill of rights: "No man, nor corporation, or association of men, have any other title to obtain advantages, or particular and exclusive privileges, distinct from those of the community, than what arises from the consideration of services rendered to the public; and this title, being in nature neither hereditary nor transmissible to children or descendants

or relations by blood, the idea of a man being born a magistrate, law-giver, 'doctor' or judge is absurd and unnatural." Sam Adams meant, when he drew this clause, that "every tub must stand on its own bottom." The men of his day

BELIEVED IN DEEDS, NOT IN DIPLOMAS

[applause]; and so it is provided that no medical or other "association of men" shall have any exclusive privileges over each and every citizen to do anything the constitution gives him power to do, or to do all those things he has reserved the right as a freeman to do. [Applause.] Article 4 says: "The people of this Commonwealth have the sole and exclusive right of governing themselves." But this bill proposes to come into my family and govern our medical affairs, and pour down our throats certain powdered pearls or toads' eyes, because some medical society or association of men say that none but their exclusive association or practice shall be allowed either to kill or cure us. [Laughter and applause.] And this is called liberty, freedom, in Massachusetts, by some people. [Applause.] But if you should pass this bill, do you stop this evil? There are medical diplomas and associations other than those named in the long list before you—legal bodies chartered under the laws of other States; and persons, citizens of other States, belonging to them, in spite of your law, would have a right, under the constitution of the United States, to practice medicine in Massachusetts, for that constitution says [article 4, section 2]: "Citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States." Therefore people now practicing here, citizens of Massachusetts now, would only have to become citizens of another State to continue practice here, in spite of the extraordinary provisions of this act, even were its propositions constitutional. I trust the petitioners will withdraw this application, or, if not, that your honorable committee will give them leave to do it in your report upon this petition. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF CAPT. RICHARD HOLMES.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee: I am not a physician or the son of a physician, neither am I a practitioner at the bar, and in the few crude ideas that I may advance upon the merits of the Bill now before you I am confident I shall be exempt from the charge of being peculiarly interested therein; for I do not stand here as the paid advocate of any society or organization, or in the promotion of the peculiar sentiments of any sect or creed—neither in the personal interest of any M. D. or “Quack”—but I should be recreant to the promptings of my own heart if, as a citizen of Boston, born and reared on the soil of Massachusetts, I did not, in sympathy with thousands of your constituents, enter my protest with theirs against your recommending to the Legislature for adoption any measure tending to curtail the rights and privileges we have inherited, viz: the God-given principles of life, liberty and the pursuit of health and happiness, and of adopting any measures for preserving the lives of our dear ones that seemeth to us good.

Mr. Chairman, I am a believer in the liberty of thought, of speech and of action, to the fullest extent, in politics, in religion, ay, in the practice and use of medicine also, and it matters not to me whether in your political proclivities you are Republican or Democratic, in your religious belief Protestant, Catholic, or neither, I would accord to you the freest, uninterrupted enjoyment of your opinion and belief, simply claiming for myself the right to exercise the same privilege.

Gentlemen, in evidence before you last evening it was admitted by one of the oldest and most eminent physicians in Boston, that he had received more information from an old nurse than he ever obtained from any other party in his life. Well, I make no doubt that was true, for of the wise old nurses there are many, God bless them! and while I concede to the Allopath the undisputed right to quaff his pleasant draughts of jalap and calomel, and to the Homeopath the same right to partake of his miniature doses of aconite and belladonna, God forbid that the State of Massachusetts should, by legislation, deprive me of the privilege of administering to my dear ones, when ill, the simple remedies prescribed by the wise, experienced, judicious, dear old nurse.

You have been told that the old physicians were fast passing away; well, this is but the fulfillment of the laws of God and of nature. Massachusetts might perhaps by legislation hasten, but she can in no way retard the progress of their journey; it is an old and true saying, Mr. Chairman, that no man lives so great that the position he occupies cannot be filled when vacated by him, and I am confident there are those within the sound of my voice who will in their hearts reply “Amen” as I from my heart say, “Would to God some of them had passed on sooner,” for “incompetent and omnipotent in their own opinion” might with propriety be inscribed upon many of their tombstones!

Do the mechanical or mercantile interests of the State require at your hands legislation of this character? For instance, the old carriage builders of Boston are fast passing from the stage of action, and from fear that some bungler will construct a carriage that will endanger your and my life or limb, providing we attempt to ride in it, are we to ask the Legislature to prevent any party from manufacturing a carriage who has not a diploma or license from these

pioneers of the trade? Why, gentlemen, is the telephone a myth, or the magnetic telegraph a humbug, because the inventors experimented with the electric spark without a license from Benjamin Franklin?

Mr. Chairman, your fertile brain may work out an important invention, an improved water-wheel if you please, and the government protects your valuable invention by issuing to you letters patent under which you can obtain remuneration for the many laborious hours of active, useful brain-work, but do you come to the Legislature of Massachusetts and ask them to enact a measure compelling the people to use your invention whether they will or no, or in other words say to them they shall use no other? Not at all. Do these petitioners claim any new inventions? Have they any improved methods of eradicating disease? Have they any new ideas for the preservation of health worthy of merit? If so let them apply to the general government for protection by letters patent, in place of asking you to build around them a barrier to protect them from innovations that are making rapid inroads upon a heretofore lucrative profession. It has been suggested to you that there should be a clause inserted in the bill graduating the price for medical services, viz: A high price for those in affluent circumstances, a medium price for the middling classes, and a mere pittance for attending the poor. So amend and pass this bill, and God save the poor when sick, say I. It has been stated that we were in danger of being confined in insane asylums by the certificates of designing parties, not M. D.s; is the influence of "Quacks" so potent, then, that the M. D.s in charge of these asylums receive parties not proper subjects whether they will or no?

It is a noticeable fact that the advocates of this Bill are, with but two exceptions, doctors. I expected they would be aided by more of the clergy, and perhaps a train of undertakers, and in my imagination I pictured the advocates of the measure in the near future mourning over an occupation gone.

It has been claimed that there have been many cases of malpractice among the poor by incompetent parties, yet they have signally failed to substantiate one single case where this malpractice was from others than regular M. D.s, and we all know that the majority of the extreme poor when sick are attended by dispensary doctors, who are graduates of the M. D.s' cherished institutions. The certificates of children's deaths read last evening for the purpose of showing how illiterate were the parties who issued them, were a source of merriment to some, but it awakened in my memory vivid recollections of the past, and brought up before me the death of my first-born son, and I could have added one more certificate as follows: "Boy, aged ten months and fifteen days; cause of death, poison; administrator of the poison, Walter Channing, M. D." The old man has gone to his long home; peace be to his ashes; these reminiscences are unpleasant to contemplate, but the facts are so palpable that never can I efface them from my memory.

The President of the Medical College told you last evening that he would not employ a man who said he could cure diseases; that the Almighty God cured diseases, and to this my heart responded Amen; but, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, Almighty God needs no earthly guardians, and it would be sacrilege for the Legislature of Massachusetts to attempt to dictate to him in what manner and through what instruments he shall exercise his miraculous powers!

These petitioners have come here with no systematized plan, no union of action, no fellowship between the several schools, and it is in evidence that those of the same school do not agree in the treatment of the same disease under similar circumstances, and when doctors disagree, Mr. Chairman, legislation will not harmonize them. It is within the memory of every one present that but a few years since the Allopaths made a fearful onslaught upon the Homeopaths, but falling in exterminating them, they have now in this matter taken them to their bosoms, and the Allopathic lion and the Homeopathic lamb have lain down together, and the little Eclectic child is lead-

ing them, and they come to you not only for protection for the strip-ling and the innocent lamb, but for the would-be-devouring lion. Much has been said with regard to the importance of the members of the medical profession bearing a high moral character. With this sentiment I fully agree, and in response would say, Let those who are without guile cast the first stone.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, we have no record confirmatory of the fact that the Good Samaritan had either a diploma or a license, and God forbid that you should recommend the enactment of any measure that will prevent me or my brother from binding up the wounds or administering to the wants of our suffering fellow-men. Report this Bill on no hearsay evidence, but if you deem it necessary, examine the past record of those whose individual interests are by it affected, and by their works judge ye them !

ADDRESS BY LORING MOODY.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee: As the Bill "to regulate the practice of medicine" in this Commonwealth is one deeply affecting the right of every citizen to elect his own assistant in time of need, and being one of the remonstrants, I ask your attention to some of the objections to the proposed measure.

Having heard the Bill read, and listened carefully to the arguments in its favor, I yet fail to see on what ground such a law as that proposed is called for. Have we not already laws enough on the subject? or has any new exigency arisen which demands new safeguards for the public? Or, rather, is it not felt necessary to guard a limited number of professional practitioners from the competition of non-professional ones? Some speaker has said: "This Bill is *not* in the interest of the established societies, as 'quacks' bring grists to the mills of respectable physicians." The truth lies more largely the other way—the respectable physicians bring grists to the mills of the quacks; for if respectable physicians really understood the causes of diseases and their true remedies there would be no "quacks."

The Committee of the Social Science Association speak of "medical science," and of "persons duly qualified to practice medicine." "Medical science" does not deal with dead corpses—the number of bones in the hand, the size of the liver, the location of the spleen, the distribution of arteries, &c.—these belong to the province of a real science; but if there be such a science it deals with living beings. It must deal properly with the *vital force* with which living entities are endowed; and this force is an essence of which our medical science knows absolutely nothing, beyond its phenomena or the forms of its manifestations, as it not only eludes scalpel and forceps, but the most rigid examinations and analyses of microscope, crucible and retort. And yet all diseases result from disturbance of the normal relation of this subtle, unknown essence—life—with the organic forms through which it manifests itself; and the sole aim of medical science is, or should be, to remove the disturbing cause and to restore the normal balance.

And right here, at the very point, pith and marrow of the subject which this Bill proposes to regulate, "medical science" is all at sea, and always has been, without fixed chart, compass, or any safe anchorage ground; and often wrecks its subjects on the rocks of death, in its ignorance of the true and safe currents of health and life.

"Medical Science," so called, has attempted to arrange the abnormal states of the human mind and body into classes, orders, genera, and species—as naturalists have plants and animals—as if they were living, organized beings, with well-defined forms, shapes, and clearly marked, distinctive characteristics; while really they are only different conditions of the mental and physical structure and relations, resulting from an infinite variety of causes, a few of which, with their modes of action, are known, while the great majority are still unknown.

A condensed presentation of the different classes, &c., of these diseases, as arranged by different learned doctors, will help to illustrate the conflicting opinions of different medical authorities, and the great need of further knowledge on this subject: Cullen gives 8 classes, with 149 genera; Sauvages, 10 classes, 615 genera; Linnæus, 11 classes, 326 genera; Vogel, 11 classes, 560 genera; Sagar, 13 classes,

351 genera; Macbride, 4 classes, 180 genera. Here is the difference between 4 and 13 in the number of classes, and the difference between 149 and 560 in the number of genera, while Dr. Good makes 6 classes, with subdivisions into orders, genera and species, altogether too complicated for a brief statement. The present condition of medical practice, with its allopathic, hydropathic, homeopathic, eclectic, hygienic, botanic, Thompsonian, and I know not how many other modes of treatment, with thousands of patent medicines, new and old, with numerous other remedies, constantly in use, shows the utter lack of ascertained knowledge on this subject; wherein everybody, even our most learned professors, are only groping and feeling their way in the dark.

If the practice of medicine rested upon such established and well-known principles as justly to entitle it to be called a *science*, these divisions and controversies could not arise. For real science is never divided against itself, and never quarrels about anything. See how kindly and sympathetically men work in geology, botany, zoology, chemistry, mechanics, physics. And even in astronomy, when it became known that the sun was the center of the system, controversies came to an end; and in law, how little there is comparatively of conflict. It is only when people enter the regions of the unknown, when they get into the dark and lose their way, that they begin to dispute and wrangle, and divide into conflicting and dogmatic sects, and enact laws to fine and imprison dissenters, and coerce conformity. And here, surely, we are groping blindly in the dark. Therefore while I am glad that this device for "regulating the practice of medicine" did not *originate* with either of the medical societies, I am equally sorry that they should lend their sanction to it.

It was quite lately that the largest of these societies brought several of their most sincere and conscientious members to trial, judgment, condemnation and expulsion, for practicing according to the formularies of another; and now, as Pilate and Herod were made friends when there was a just man to crucify, so all three of these societies unite for the purpose of driving from the State, or fining and imprisoning all who shall dare to practice the healing art without first having obtained their sanction and approval.

I am grieved that the Social Science Association should have initiated this movement, or given it any countenance whatever. Science is always out on voyages of exploration and discovery; it throws its doors and windows wide open to all light and knowledge; and it reaches no conclusions on any subject until it can learn no more, and even then holds all of its opinions or conclusions subject to revision. But here the *American Social Science Association* proposes to put up legal bars, and to padlock them with the penalties of fine and imprisonment against all who shall search after and apply their knowledge for healing the sick outside of certain especially prescribed limits.

I certainly had been led to hope for better things from this Association. I had believed its conduct would have been guided by a broad, comprehensive spirit of inquiry and research on all subjects, instead of this narrow foreclosure on the important and warmly contested question of medical treatment. But it has given us all notice that when we are sick we shall not pay any one to come and lay healing hands upon us who has not first been approved by these medical societies.

It seems to me I have right of unlimited choice in the premises, and to elect such as may best serve my needs, as freely as I do my shoemaker, blacksmith or tailor, and to be my own judge as to whether I am benefited, without the meddlesome intervention of either medical society or license commissioner.

The phrase—"persons duly qualified to practice medicine"—has been frequently used. From our ignorance of the causes of diseases, and their true remedies, if there are such, there are *no* persons duly qualified to practice medicine, upon any foundation of positive knowledge, hardly more than a blind man is duly qualified to judge of the nature and properties of light; and so, if a "quack" is defined as an

empiric—one who *pretends* to knowledge—who, on this subject, has right to claim exemption from the title?

Only a few years ago the "regulars" of the Massachusetts Medical Society hurled the epithet at all practitioners of whatever class, or degree of knowledge, or measure of success, outside of their special school; and to-day, while they are willing to coöperate with the Eclectic and Homeopathic schools, for the purpose of imposing a restrictive law upon others, they refuse to consult or hold any medical communion or fellowship with them, and still regard and treat all others as "quacks."

"Is," asked our excellent brother, the bishop, in his plea, "the medical profession to hold its own as a learned profession?" And he spoke of the need of legislation. If that profession is founded on the rocks of truth, it will need no legal bolstering; if not, all the statutes of all the legislatures in the country, with Congress thrown in, cannot help it to "hold its own" against the progress of discoveries in biology and its relations which are being made.

Within my memory the "regular Old School" physicians would allow their patients only the least possible quantity of water during the most burning fever; with this disease a man in my neighborhood was very sick, and continually calling for water, of which his physician would allow him but a few drops at long intervals. A neighbor came to watch with him, and requested him to keep still until all others were asleep, which he did, when his friendly watcher went to a spring near by, from which he brought a pailful of water, of which he let the sick man drink as he desired. Before morning he fell into a quiet sleep, with a profuse perspiration, and when his physician called the next day he found his patient suddenly on the high road to recovery.

The man who administered the water was "a quack," and the other was "duly qualified to practice medicine." So the Hydropathic "quacks" had to come and tell scientific doctors that there is nothing else in the world so good to put out a fire as water. And the Homeopathic "quack" had to come and tell them that the practice of medicine had a more intimate relation to the vital principle than they had thought of—that there is a living force in these human bodies which cannot be tinkered up with so much bismuth, antimony, calomel, and the like, as you may mend an old teapot with pewter. Then the Eclectic "quack" had to tell them that there were more things in heaven and earth than were, or could be, dreamed of in their philosophy, or in any narrow school of medical guess-work, which would not even guess outside of certain pent-up limits—that the wisest way is to seek after and apply truth in this, as in all other relations.

Indeed there is no end to the obligations the world is under to "quacks": Galileo, Columbus, Luther, Fox, Fulton, and men of their kind, despising the narrow limits, prescriptions and conventionalisms of their times, and under loads of ridicule, contempt, obloquy and reproach, heaped upon them by ignorance, bigotry and intolerance, have been the explorers, discoverers, inventors and reformers of the past; and those whom the regulars in medicine have scoffed at as "quacks" have ever been, and will continue to be, the leaders of the race out of the quagmires and miasms of ignorance and folly up to the sound ground of knowledge, wisdom and health.

Is not this proposed movement reactionary, and bordering close on despotism? The movers have gone outside the State, even to Canada and Texas, in search of precedents, and have imported an expert from New Hampshire—which Daniel Webster said "is a good State to emigrate from"—to enlighten us on the subject. But what have Texas, Canada, or even New Hampshire, to tell us that we did not know as well, if not better, than they did before? The gentleman from New Hampshire tells us the restrictive law works well in his State. *Works well for whom?* Why, for the *regularly regulated doctors*, of course; for when one who refuses to be regulated comes, and puts out his sign, they have only to serve him with notice to quit, on pain of fine and imprisonment, and he decamps at once. "Works

well," of course it does! it leaves the field clear to the duly qualified "quacks"—all marked and branded by the statute—who remain.

The same gentleman tells us they would not be troubled so much with "quacks" but for Boston. Well, Boston has troubled New Hampshire people with other things besides its "quacks." It has been largely responsible for building up its manufacturing towns, railroads, and of developing its material resources; and it has got a little common-sense to spare in regard to the true conditions of acquiring knowledge—to wit: to leave all questions open to free examination, experiment and trial; and especially such mooted ones as the causes and cure of disease. And so a few Boston "quacks" might help deliver New Hampshire from a part, at least, of its ignorance. I know this might be distasteful to those who work the State like a machine—by statute.

As this gentleman from New Hampshire took evident delight in exposing the ignorance of the number of bones in the hand, etc., of a Boston "quack," brought up for examination; and as this Bill deals especially with the treatment of diseases, let us in turn examine the examiner on that subject:

QUES.—What is the specific cause of any specific type of fever?

ANS.—I do n't know.

Q.—If fever is caused by malaria, what is the specific character of that malaria?

A.—I do n't know.

Q.—What proportion of malarious matter must there be relatively to the oxygen, nitrogen and carbonic acid of the atmosphere, in order to induce typhus?

A.—I do n't know.

Q.—What proportion in order to induce typhoid?

A.—I do n't know.

Q.—Why will one person be attacked by fever in the same atmospheric conditions, and another escape?

A.—I do n't know.

Q.—Why is one person susceptible to fever in a given condition of the atmosphere, while another is not?

A.—I do n't know.

Q.—Can you tell in advance what state of the atmosphere will cause fever in any particular state of the system?

A.—I cannot.

Q.—Can you tell in advance what condition of the body will induce fever?

A.—I cannot.

Q.—Can you cure fever as certainly as you can stop a toothache by pulling it out?

A.—I cannot.

Q.—Can you ever be certain that you can cure fever, diphtheria, small-pox, or any other disease?

A.—I cannot.

Q.—What is the cause of measles?

A.—I do n't know.

Q.—Two persons are exposed to measles at the same time and under the same conditions—or to the small-pox. Why may the disease attack one, and the other escape?

A.—I do n't know.

Q.—Do you know of anything that will cure measles or small-pox? that is, that will stop their progress in any given stage of the disease, and restore the patient to health?

A.—I do not.

Q.—What causes mumps?

A.—I do n't know.

Q.—Why do mumps sometimes affect only one of the parotid glands at a time?

A.—I do n't know?

Q.—Why do mumps destroy the virile power of their subject?

A.—I do n't know.

Q.—Do you know of anything that will cure mumps—stop their progress at once?

A.—I do not.

And so we might pursue the inquiry in regard to other diseases with the same results. And yet, doubtless this gentleman is a highly educated physician and knows as much as any of them. And when questioned all must admit that their modes of treatment—excepting in cases of surgery—are almost, if not wholly, empirical. They must feel their way along in the dark, experiment and guess; and on account of the influence of “quackery” many of them have ceased to be tied down to their old formularies.

And *here*, upon this groundwork of ignorance, contradiction and absurdity, the Social Science Association proposes to establish a law to regulate the practice of medicine! The first and highest duty of the physician is, to teach people how not to be sick, so as not to make a trade of their calamities. And the duty of all is, first, to learn more, so as to know a little what we are about. It was in the depths of religious blindness and ignorance that laws were framed to coerce conformity and punish dissent. The demand of strict justice is that we hands off, and let all modes of treatment stand by their merits, or fall by the want of them. It is only ignorance that runs to the law for protection. *Science* does not need, nor does it ask any legal protection against ignorance, any further than to keep ~~the~~ *dig-* oted and violent hands off.

ADDRESS OF A. S. HAYWARD.

To the Committee on Public Health Mass. Legislature:

The petition of the remonstrants against the enactment of a law to regulate the practice of medicine is signed by more than three thousand citizens of the State of Massachusetts, and this number might have been increased tenfold had sufficient time been had for obtaining them; but these were obtained within ten days, and sufficiently show that the people do not desire to have their liberties restricted by any such law as is proposed. The persons who have signed this petition largely represent a class who recognize the power of certain subtle invisible forces in Nature, and believe they can be made available in the eradication of disease from the human system, and they claim an inalienable right to the use and exercise of those powers. I oppose the Bill from principle, and for the following reasons:

1st. The people do not ask nor require medical guardianship, and especially by guardians who want to hold a power over the people to compel them to employ them when sick.

2d. There are several hundred clairvoyant and magnetic physicians in the State in successful practice, and the people employ them when sickness afflicts them; and some of the most intelligent families of the State are among their patients.

3d. The combined movement to-day appears like an attempt to interdict and destroy the practice of these persons, unless they are willing to continue it *without fee*, and use no sign, neither advertise to cure the sick, as doctor or physician.

4th. The M. D.s do not seem willing that success in curing shall be recognized as a *standard* for the people to judge from. Dr. Lyman stated before your committee that the Almighty made the cures, and not the doctors, and that he learned from a nurse one of the most valuable things in the medical practice he ever knew. He afterwards said that a cancer never was cured. Of course it will be inferred from this last statement that Dr. Lyman considers the Almighty to be limited in his power to heal. I have just received a report from a Cancer Hospital in London, England, which I will place before your committee, that you may judge whether the statement of Dr. Lyman as to the incurability of a cancer is true or false.

Doubtless there are many persons healing the sick by and through a *force or power* that they have no knowledge concerning, and cannot comprehend in full, any more than they can the design and ultimate of human life. Cures are said to have been made in Bible times, by persons who had no medical diplomas, and I have no reason to doubt the statement, as we are daily witnessing in this age seemingly miraculous cures, in cases that have baffled the skill of our most highly educated M. D.s.

In all the States where a regulation law has been enacted the people want it repealed, and yet the favored M. D.s claim that the law works well. Which report shall we believe? In Illinois they admit that magnetic treatment (manipulating) is legitimate, but if I go into that State to practice I must pay a license of \$1,200 yearly, be forced to leave the State, or contest the constitutionality of the law. Two years ago I visited Nashua, N. H., and had eight patients, and if any person had felt so disposed they could have caused my arrest, and fined me \$500 for each patient, the informer getting \$2000 for the mean act.

Gentlemen of the Committee, is it any wonder that the people cry

out, Give us liberty ! in regard to employing the mode of treatment and the person using it? It matters not whether the person we employ is educated or uneducated, provided he possesses that natural ability and healing power such as we read of in the Bible, but which when applied in our day and generation elicits the cry God does not work in that way to-day—while the facts prove that he does in almost every household. The laws already upon our statute books (if enforced) will punish abortionists, etc., whether in or out of the pale of the regular practice, also the same in malpractice; and as far as "swindling" is concerned, all persons engaged in the medical profession are subject to the general law. The present movement seems like a step toward uniting Church and State, and when we see able talent engaged in advocating the restrictive law, calling to their assistance the aid of Bishops, and other religious teachers, it is time for the people to be aroused. How would it look for M. D.s to offer their services to the clergy to regulate the religious teachings of the day? It is not strange, therefore, that men and women voluntarily come forward to unmask the schemes and expose the plans and purposes of a class of men who, for their own personal pecuniary interests, seek, under the pretence of protecting the people, to bind them with the fetters of a proscriptive law.

TESTIMONY OF JOSHUA NYE.*

To the Chairman of Committee on Public Health, State of Massachusetts:

All my life, till within eleven years, I have been a rigid, radical disciple of the "old school" of medical practice. During the summer of 1869 I had a very violent attack of sciatic rheumatism, while on a visit to West Point, New York. The surgeon of the post was called at once, and he and his assistant visited me several times a day for about a week, without affording me any relief except while under the influence of epidermic injections. Finally the surgeon advised me to make an effort to get home to Maine, giving it as his opinion that I would not recover for a year, at least. After suffering untold misery, I succeeded in reaching my home in about three weeks from the commencement of my sickness.

I was upon my back for thirteen weeks longer, under the care of eminent allopathic physicians, without obtaining any permanent relief. I then decided to go to Boston for medical treatment. I saw in the morning papers the card of a well-known Boston "magnetic physician," and by the very earnest persuasions of my wife, consented to call him, and see what he could do. By the application of his hands he took away all pain, and effected a permanent cure. I remained perfectly free from all pain till July 4th, 1879, when, being exposed, I took a violent cold, when the same kind of pain came on again in another part of my body. For nine days and nights I endured agony not to be described, attended by a first class physician of the homeopathic school. I obtained no permanent relief. I then sent a telegram to the same magnetic physician in Boston, asking him to visit me. He did so, and relieved me of all pain, and I have been free from it to the present time. I could give you many other cases of cures in Maine, as remarkable as my own, effected by this same physician and others of his school. Now I trust you will do nothing to drive such healers from practice, but let the people have the privilege of selecting their own physicians, and not give a monopoly to any one or more classes of men. I feel that I, in common with all citizens of the United States, have a personal interest in this matter, and that "*Good old Massachusetts*" will be the last State to deprive the people of their Constitutional rights.

In closing this brief statement I will relate another instance of cure: Ten years since my wife discovered a scirrhous tumor in her left breast—at any rate, several physicians in this State pronounced it to be such. Wishing to make sure of the case, I went with her to Boston and consulted with two physicians of the "Old School" who are as well known and stand as high as any physicians in this country. Without any hesitation both of them pronounced it *scirrhous tumor*, and advised that the left breast should be amputated within ten days. On her return to the hotel she was advised to consult a magnetic physician before submitting to the knife. She did so, and in less than three months he completely removed the tumor by manipulation and medicine given internally. She has been perfectly free from all signs of tumor since. At the end of the three months I called with her to see one of the doctors who advised the amputation. He made an examination, and said he "would not advise *amputation now*."

* At the time these cures were effected an account of the two cases, from the pen of Hon. Neal Dow, was printed in the *Congregationalist*, under the caption of "What is It? Can the Doctors Tell?"

PLEA OF PROF. CHARLES WESLEY EMERSON.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: I wish before speaking on this proposed Bill, to define my individual position by saying, first, I do not practice medicine, neither do I wish to, nor have I any personal friend practicing or wishing to practice, whom this Bill would in the least affect. I am not here in the interests of any person or class. Many of the members of the State Homeopathic Society, as well as very many members of the Eclectic State Medical Society, together with some of the members of the Massachusetts State Medical Society, have petitioned you not to recommend legislation on this subject. But I do not represent any of these societies, nor do I represent the Spiritualists who oppose this Bill. I am not a Spiritualist, and have no belief in it whatever. I object to this Bill because it is opposed to the well-being of the people of this Commonwealth, *by impeding progress in the art of curing disease.*

The President of the Massachusetts State Medical Society stated to this Committee that the most useful information he had ever received was given him by a nurse. We have only begun to learn the practice of medicine. Scarcely any branch of it can be called exact science. There are some things to be learned yet, even in anatomy; and much in physiology. Progress in these two departments we must necessarily look to the learned for, but it does not follow that these learned scientists will be graduates of any medical college. The facts go to show that a large number of the discoveries in these sciences have come from men who are not M. D.s. Some of the names that stand the highest on this continent, and on the other, as discoverers and authors, whose books are looked upon as the best authorities contributing to the knowledge of anatomy and physiology, have never graduated from any medical college. Yet this Bill, if passed, will prevent such men not only from practicing medicine, but even debar them the privilege of an examination. It might seem to those who have only superficially examined this Bill that it is at least an intended stimulant to education. But it is not even this; for it will not permit a man to practice on the ground that he can pass a creditable examination on all the branches supposed to be requisite to a thorough medical education, for it will not even examine the candidate unless, in addition to his knowledge and fitness, he also presents the board of censors a diploma from some approved medical college. Disguise it as they may, the regular M. D.s of Massachusetts are simply asking for a monopoly, by the guarantee of a legislative enactment.

Progress in anatomy and physiology, as we have stated, comes in the nature of things from the learned, but the progress in therapeutics (the meaning of which Webster defines "that part of medicine which respects the discovery and application of remedies for diseases") has, and still continues to, come from the unlearned. The *materia medica* is almost entirely made from the discoveries of the unschooled. An entire change in the treatment of diseases has taken place in all schools during the last fifty years. Prior to that time the human system was literally loaded with mineral poison by the doctors, they vainly hoping that disease was not merely lack of health, but an entity, that could be killed by pouring deadly mineral poison into the body of the patient on the one hand, and on the other drawing away all the good blood in the arteries. Samuel Thomson was the first successful innovator upon this horrid system of prac-

tice; and he was an uneducated farmer, who could barely write his name. The ignorance in the learned profession was so great at that time concerning the remedial properties to be found in the vegetable kingdom, from which Thomson drew all his medicines, that upon Thomson's losing a patient he was arrested for willful murder; and at his trial the poison of which the patient was said to have died was brought forward by a regular M. D. of this same school in whose interest they would have you pass this Bill. Upon examination it was discovered to be the harmless root of marsh-rosemary, used in making common candy at the present time. The cures this man wrought wherever he went seemed, in contrast with the success of the regular practitioner, to be little less than miraculous. The news of his wonderful cures spread abroad, not by his advertising them, but it was told from man to man. The people rejoiced in the new light, the physicians tried to suppress him, but the people would have him. At last the doctors said, if the people will be doctored by this quackery; viz., roots and herbs, we cannot lose our practice; and hence we are compelled to sit at the feet of this ignorant old "quack," and learn what he gives, and how he performs these wonderful cures. And so Thomson's remedies are now used by every medical school, though they still decry his name. And these compounds of Thomson's, and his many discoveries, to the number of more than one hundred, are sold by all druggists in America and Europe. His system now is a part of the recognized system, even among the members of the Massachusetts State Medical Society.

The Water Cure system has a similar history. So of all the different elements that now compose the regular practice. Every one was fought in its turn by the regular schoolmen; but the people were benefited, and therefore, notwithstanding it has ever been made scandalous to employ a person outside the regular practice, yet "all that a man hath will he give for his life." So these systems the regular schools were compelled to adopt, or else be left among the fossils of the past.

I brought before you a member of the family of the far-famed "natural bone-setters." For two hundred and fifty years their system, called the "rotary" system, was fought back by the colleges of medicine, and kept out of the regular practice until the people were determined to have this graceful and easy method of bone-setting; and then the regulars were forced to adopt it; and again the schoolmen were compelled to move forward a step. Now they say, "Do not let any more men practice outside the regular system, for we are tired of moving on. We wish to draw our robes about us and rest. We might have been resting these hundreds of years had it not been for the 'quack' compelling us to learn first this improvement in medicine and then that, or else lose our practice and stand one side and see the money all go into the pockets of the man who cures, he having plenty and to spare, while we starve on our 'sheepskin.'"

It seems, at first thought, very strange that these marvelous improvements in treating disease, and even in bone-setting, should come from persons who have not read, and can give no scientific name to the diseases they cure, or even tell the anatomical names of the bones they set; yet these are the facts, and not even the promoters of this Bill will dare attempt a denial of them. But this seeming eccentricity of nature is not alone confined to discoveries in the healing art, but is true of nearly all the improvements. Common people give us our improvements, and the schoolmen spend their time in giving Greek and Latin names to these improvements, and building metaphysical theories concerning them. George Stevenson, the inventor of the locomotive, could scarcely read—he was a poor, ignorant collier. He knew nothing of the laws of mechanics, never heard of a school of Technology. Yet nobody thought the less of his invention because he could not pass an examination concerning the very principles of mechanics which he had been applying. Even Morse, the inventor of the electric telegraph, was not a scientist, and could not have passed a creditable examination before any college board of examiners; yet we do not think the less of these

wires which, like so many nerves, bring into harmony all the families of man.

Again, disguise it as the friends of this proposed Bill may, *the measure is a proposal for class-legislation!* The immortal Lincoln said, "This is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people." This Bill proposes to govern the people for the doctors, and by the doctors. It is even worse than that: it proposes to put this monopoly, not into the hands of all the educated, graduated physicians, but into the hands of those who happen at this time to be members of the different State Medical Societies.

At this point I wish to refer to the physician brought here, by the petitioners of this Bill, from New Hampshire, who was used for the purpose of making you believe that Massachusetts is full of "quacks." He read you quite a lengthy letter from a physician residing in Concord. The whole letter, if seen in the light of unvarnished facts, will show your honorable body *who* started this movement to legislate in favor of certain physicians, as some States have essayed to do, and which other States, when importuned, refuse to do, among the latter Wisconsin being entitled to honorable mention—a State which, while this hearing has been going forward, has nobly refused to legislate in favor of a class of men who are unable to convince the people that they are of sufficient value to the community to entitle them to patronage. The points in this letter, sent by one physician from New Hampshire and read to you by another, were to the effect that an attempt had been made to repeal the law in New Hampshire by some of its citizens, or, rather, by Massachusetts "quacks," together with a few persons in New Hampshire who had sent in dead men's names on the petition for a repeal! Notice the charge, gentlemen, which a physician in Concord makes against the inhabitants of his own State without any warrant or proof. What will the citizens of New Hampshire say when they hear what a physician in their capital has charged them with? This unfounded statement shows the true spirit of those who are interested in the making and perpetuity of such sumptuary laws. This writer would leave an entirely different impression from what is correct on your minds, in saying that a man from Lebanon tried to get this law repealed, and during the last session was seen hanging around the State House, "button-holing" the members; and that certain lawyers, who were members of the Legislature, were supposed to hold retainers' fees in their pockets. He went on to insinuate that money had been raised by Massachusetts "quacks" to do all these things, saying that somebody had said, in the steam-cars, to somebody else, that he would give one thousand dollars to get the law repealed. He further stated that the agitation against their New Hampshire law had been started by one Hayden in Massachusetts, etc., etc.

Now while all this is not precisely legitimate to the subject under discussion here, yet on the ground that the petitioners have seen fit to present this testimony for want of better, I shall attempt to show, by a true recital of this whole affair, what the real animus of these law-movers is. This physician from New Hampshire said at the time the repeal was attempted in that State, that talent was imported from abroad, insinuating that this wonderful thousand dollars given by somebody, nobody knows who, in addition to its buying up members of the New Hampshire Legislature, also sent this "talent" to advocate the repeal. The facts about this whole matter, gentlemen, are as follows: The law above mentioned had been in force in New Hampshire for about two years, when a member of the Legislature from Lebanon, who was not a doctor of the "quack" order, or any other, but a most estimable merchant, a noble, high-minded and genuine lover of humanity, discovering certain great wrongs that had been permitted under this doctors' monopoly, presented a Bill for a repeal of said law, and being an old and true friend of mine, and knowing that I saw the inhumanity of this law in the light in which he saw it, wrote me, asking if I would come to Concord and assist him in presenting the petition for a repeal; telling me there was no money to be paid, but if I would come and *give* my services in the

name of humanity, to *come*. He did not know when the hearing would take place. Days went by and weeks; we could not understand the reason for the delay; at last a day was appointed, and we went, and found the city literally filled with doctors from all parts of the country. They had, on the day appointed for the hearing, a meeting of all the Societies in the State; then it dawned upon us why the delay for the hearing had been so long. These doctors appointed their speakers, and such a flocking of doctors to the State House could only be accounted for on the ground that their craft was in danger. There were lawyers on the Committee before which the hearing came, and these lawyers reported in favor of a repeal, after hearing the argument on both sides. The writer of the letter I have just referred to as being sent by one physician and read before you by another, was one of the speakers appearing *in favor* of the New Hampshire law. One of the doctors came forward at that time, and declared that a "quack" in Massachusetts said he would give one hundred thousand dollars to repeal the law; they have now modified the report to *one* thousand; at this ratio of reduction by next year it will be ten cents.

Now compare these plain statements with the insinuations of this New Hampshire doctor's letter.

The same kind of spirit has been shown here to some extent. Only yesterday a statement was made here that of some fifty or more names for the remonstrants purporting to come from Salem, only three could be found in the Salem directory. As you yourselves will see by due investigation, these names did not purport to be from Salem. No place is affixed to these names. A forced construction was placed on the fact that the gentleman who placed these names on the table wrote something like this on the paper connected with their names: "Mr. So-and-So, from Salem, sends in so many names," the explanation of which is this: the gentleman who collected the names has an office in Salem, whence he sent this list; but he has business in other towns taking him daily from Salem, and he collected other names in the localities visited, presenting them all, at last, as the names of citizens of Massachusetts, without giving the place of residence, thinking it unnecessary to mention the towns visited, since this matter is not a town but a State affair. This simply shows to what extremes persons engaged in the engineering of this hoped for monopoly will go.

The object of the petitioners for the passage of this proposed Bill is to make the number of physicians in the State small, and thereby constitute the greatest money monopoly ever heard of in this country, or any other. Then every member of the profession in this State will have security of practice, whether he helps or hinders the sick, and they will not only have plenty to do, but can charge whatever price they please for their services, and there is no appeal; for there is no other doctor permitted to practice, without pains and penalties.

The real purpose and intent of the Bill is hidden under two very popular disguises. First, *that of a higher standard of education*, and secondly, *the extermination of "quackery."* We will notice these points in their respective order:

First, Is this Bill in the interests of higher education? We have already shown that it will hinder progress in medical knowledge. Let us see what the Bill actually does by its licenses and prohibitions. In the very start it gives all the members of the various State societies a license to practice without an examination. And yet many of the members of these various State societies, it is well known, have never received a diploma from any medical college, and many others who have a diploma in said societies took it from some one of the very colleges this Board of Examiners will condemn.

Much has been said condemnatory of the ignorance of many doctors who are *outside* the pale of these State societies. I will offset that by stating something concerning the ignorance of those *inside* the pale: A druggist asked a gentleman the other day what he would make of the following: "Ag Mont." The gentleman, although a learned physician, did not know, neither did the druggist. Another

member of the Massachusetts State Medical Society was asked to state what a common dose of morphine is. He replied from one to five grains. In one of your highly approved medical colleges of this State the old Caloric theory of heat was taught five years ago, and is to-day for aught I know. I should hope that learned (?) professor would not be on the Board of Examiners provided in this bill; for in that case no true and accepted scientist could get a license, simply because he would answer correctly, and the Professor would not know it.

Much has been said about the manifest ignorance of "quacks" who sign certificates of death. Did they give us anything that could excel the following from a regular M. D.? "Not certain of the cause of death. Don't know whether it was scarlet fever or from eating too much Bellona sausage."

They tell you this bill is for the purpose of weeding out pretenders; but they do not tell us how it is to work this most desirable change. They raise a great cry about "quacks." A "quack" simply means one who pretends to do something he cannot do. That there are such pretenders in the medical profession, and in every other profession, nobody thinks of denying; and far be it from me, or any opposer of this Bill, to defend such. The people all have a common interest in rooting out all such, and many persons have signed the petition for the passage of this Bill because it was represented to them that this would exterminate that obnoxious race; but has any one shown us how this Bill, if passed, has any power to sift them out? It has no such power, but, on the contrary, it protects them. It is a wall of fire around all the "quacks" who are inside the medical societies, and where is the man who possesses the audacity to say there are no "quacks" inside those societies? Yet this Bill will compel the people to employ them, because no choice is left them; for the number from which to choose, should such a Bill as this pass, would be kept exceedingly small. Note another means which this Bill provides for keeping the number small:

By the terms of this Bill no one is eligible to an examination merely because he is sufficiently learned, or has graduated, unless he shall have graduated from a college which they approve. Thus their power is wholly arbitrary. They can cut down the number of candidates, at any time, by disapproving the colleges from which they graduated, though every such college holds a charter from the State in which it exists. Again, another means is provided for lessening the number of physicians, in the clause about "a good moral character." The Bill provides that any person having a good moral character shall be licensed, if such person has practiced within the State ten consecutive years, yet, although this looks very fair on the face of it, by looking a little deeper we shall see that no criterion of morals is established, but the matter is left wholly to this Board of Examiners. How easy and how consistent it is with the entire spirit of this Bill to say, "If you have practiced ten years without being a member of our Society or having studied medicine in the regular way, you are a 'quack,' and you have been humbugging the people ten years, and no license shall be granted to a man who is immoral enough to humbug the people for that period." For if this Bill means anything it means to teach that all persons who have not been through a medical college are humbugs unless they belong to one of the State medical societies. Thus all such can be cut off.

They tell you of criminal practices among "quacks" that this Bill will put a stop to. Gentlemen, I hold in my hand the names of four physicians now residing in this city, who are members of the old Massachusetts State Medical Society, in good and regular standing, who have been before the court for the crime of producing abortion, and also the name of one who is now serving his time in the State Prison for arson; so that it seems that the Massachusetts State Medical Society is not in a condition to "cast the first stone"; but still it asks that you throw around them, by special legislation, the arm of the law, lest people shall employ better men outside the regular societies.

Again, this Bill takes away, without compensation, an honorable

and successful business from a large number of persons, which is most unjust and cruel. And what does this law propose to call a crime? Simply this: the restoring to life and health a human being. This Bill does not ask the question, "Does this man cure the sick?" No; if he cures him twice, it makes him pay one thousand dollars; if he cures a patient three times, it imprisons him. Surely such a law is nothing better than barbarous.

Again, I object to the Bill because it practically puts into the hands of one medical society arbitrary power; and that society so hostile to the other societies that, according to the testimony of the president of that society, they will not counsel with a Homeopath or an Eclectic, though the patient calling for counsel is dying and this counsel will save his life. This rests not alone upon the testimony of this president; it is one of the rules of the by-laws of said society. This Bill would force the two small State societies into the very jaws of this inhuman lion; although one quarter part of the members of one of these societies have sent in their written or verbal remonstrance; and a large and influential part of this other society also join in the remonstrance, led by no less a member than its worthy secretary, Dr. Morse, of Salem, a man of high social standing and extensive practice. Other eminent Homeopathic physicians of this city, members of the State society, and Professors in the Medical College, sent up their names, but you have not had time to hear them.

Again, I object to this Bill because it proposes to legislate away the sacred rights and dearest privileges of the people. What is so sacred to a man as his own life? Yet this Bill proposes he shall not be allowed to choose the means of his own recovery if he is ill.

Let us notice the ground upon which the petitioners ask for the passage of such a bill:

1st, They claim that the medical profession needs protection from the competition of "quacks," and to this end they brought a Bishop from, I do not know where, neither do I know what he was Bishop of—I only know the lawyer for the petitioners was very careful to make you understand he *was* a Bishop. This Bishop said the medical profession was a very honorable one and needed protection; he said also that the clergy needed protection just the same as the doctors, because there were so many "quack" preachers. Now what is the burden of this argument? If it means anything it means, "We hope you will pass a bill to protect the doctors this year, and then a bill next year cutting off all ministers from preaching who are not in this" (or in some other bishop's) "diocese." I admire the candor of that Bishop, and I feel greatly obliged to him for helping our side so much. If we had said there is no difference between the doctors asking for a bill to protect them, and that of ministers asking one to protect the clergy, the advocates of this Bill would have said there *was* a difference; but now that it comes from one of their own choosing—one they had brought here *because* he was a Bishop, thinking thereby, as they have in several other instances, to overawe us—it strikes them dumb that this good, simple-hearted Bishop, should, all unintentionally, "let the cat out of the bag," by saying, in substance: "Please pass this Bill for the doctors, and then pass one for us ministers, so that we can get larger salaries, for we need more money as much as the doctors do."

They have brought you the names of other prominent clergymen. What we would like to know is, whether these clergymen who sent in their names for this petition know what they are doing, and are, hence, using this as an entering wedge to bring back the oppression of the ages gone by, or whether they do not see the bearing of this Bill. I am happy to say I incline to the latter opinion; for I know a number who signed this petition who are now sorry, saying they would never have signed it had they known its full meaning. All they meant by signing it was to get rid of pretenders, but they now see the Bill is not calculated in the least to do that, but is simply asking for the most crushing monopoly that ever bore down upon the common people. All this cry for the medical societies, all this telling how the poor members of the medical societies have flat pocket-

books because the people will persist in employing other physicians, is contemptible. Poor, poor regulars! how hungry they go because the people are not compelled to take their calomel, and prefer the harmless root-and-herb doctor! Why, all this lamentation in behalf of the doctors, because they may not compel the people to employ them, makes me think of the little boy whose mother was showing him a picture of Daniel in the lions' den; the little fellow began to cry bitterly, when the mother said: "You pity poor Daniel, don't you, because the lions are going to eat him up?" His reply, amid his sobs, was, "I was not thinking anything about Daniel. I was thinking about that poor little lion in the corner, who won't get any, 'cause the old lions will eat him all up first."

In all this cry for a Bill to protect the members of the old medical societies, not a word is said for the common people, whom Daniel represents in the lions' den. This Bill takes away all possible competition, which is the only safeguard of the people.

No price for medical advice or treatment is mentioned in this Bill. All is left to the nine despots of the proposed Board of Examiners, clothed with absolute power, and these despots are the interested party. They may say, if the price is too high, people need not employ the doctor. But what kind of an apology is that? People cannot help being sick, and they cannot lie and die, as these monopolists very well know; hence those members of the medical societies, who have no practice now, and who, for want of natural fitness, ought never to have any, the people will be compelled to employ. Why, gentlemen, when I think of the inhumanity of this Bill, and, practically, those who advocate it, I am dumb with horror. The grocers might as well band themselves together and ask for legal monopoly. The friends of this Bill tell you there is an immense amount of malpractice among the outside doctors, yet they have failed to point out a single case. Go look at the law reports, and you will find scarcely a case of malpractice outside the members of these societies, while the reports of those inside are innumerable. They talk to us as though we had no law now to regulate the practice of medicine, when the truth is we have laws that cover every imaginable case of wrong doing, in this matter, that law can cover.

We have already, for instance, a law that if a man advertises himself as M. D., when he has not that title, he can at once be arrested for obtaining money under false pretences, and the penalty is State Prison. Again, we have the strictest laws concerning malpractice, making bad or injurious medical practice also a State Prison offence. Now I ask in all candor what more we need? No further legislation is possible without abridging the rights of the people by taking from them power to choose for one's self what physician he shall have.

Please notice this is a contest not between "quacks" on the one hand and educated, honest physicians on the other, but, simply, may the people elect the person they wish to treat them when sick, or may they not?

No testimony whatever has been brought, during this protracted hearing, against the practice of those who work outside the regular schools. Mark one thing in all the testimony presented: not a physician among the "irregulars" has testified; they have all modestly stayed in the background, while their works have praised them. The witnesses are persons in every walk of life except the doctors. Every one who has testified has stated that he was first given up to die by the regular physicians before he employed one of the outside physicians. The Regulars have no reason to complain, for all these persons gave them the first chance, and in many instances were doctored by them until they had no money left to pay the outside doctor who finally cured them. Does not this crowd of witnesses show plainly that if you will legislate some way, it certainly should not be against those who have wrought the cures?

The President of the old Massachusetts State Medical Society declared to you that cancer could not be cured. Thus, through the mouth of their chief, the regular physicians declare they cannot cure

cancer; yet I have brought witness after witness to testify that they have been cured of cancer by these irregular physicians, whom this Bill would cut off from practice. One might say these were another kind of tumor, and not cancer; but we have been careful to guard that point by proving, in every case, that the regular physicians pronounced it a cancer, and incurable. The President, above referred to, said it was a blood disease, and hence incurable. The cases we have presented here have been well ever since the cancers were taken out, and they were taken out years ago. They testified that the doctors, who cured the cancers, gave them medicine for the blood at the same time. Thus we have proved that these cancer-curers take the cancer out without the use of the knife, and that their knowledge of blood-remedies enables them to eliminate all tendency to cancer from the blood. Can the people afford to be deprived of doctors who are known to cure cancers in innumerable cases, and be compelled to content themselves with a class of physicians who come in here and testify to you that they cannot cure a cancer? Cancer is a disease more dreaded than any other, and yet a very common disease. Think of the despair of the poor patient, when he is told by one of the doctors whom this Bill would protect and give the monopoly to, "You have a cancer, and I am powerless to help you. You must be eaten up slowly by this most loathsome disease while yet alive." Imagine this Bill taking effect as a law, and though the dying patient begs of the old cancer-curer for help, he dare not, for the prison walls loom up before his sight.

Who has favored this Bill beside the lawyers, who were hired to do so, and a few physicians? Did the honored President of the Boston University? To be sure he was brought before you to advocate that side. Did he do so? No! He warned you against putting so much power into the hands of one class. Not once did he favor this Bill by a single expression. His arguments were all on the other side; telling you of the tyranny concerning this medical matter in the despotic States of Europe. Did he ask you to follow the example of those old oppressive governments! No! Did the President of the Young Men's Christian Union favor this Bill? He did not say one word about the Bill.

The advocates of this Bill tell you the people need the guardianship of the Medical Society, because the people do not know what they want. This has ever been the voice of despotism. I will not go over the testimony in detail; I will content myself by mentioning a single case, which you recognize to be a fair representative of the testimony which has come before you, throughout this entire hearing:

Mr. Nye of Augusta, Me., sent to this honorable Committee a letter, asking you not to recommend any legislation in favor of any such law as this Bill proposes, in which he gives a statement of his own case and others. Permit me to tell you who this man is. He is Superintendent of an Orthodox Sunday school. He has been Treasurer of the Maine Central Railroad for seventeen years, and for many years State Commissioner of Insurance; also Centennial Commissioner from Maine; a man of the highest standing. This gentleman testifies that he was taken ill while on a visit to West Point, some ten years since, with sciatica. The eminent surgeon of the place attended him, but gave him no relief; finally told him he could not hope to be better for one year, at least. He then came home and employed the most eminent of the Maine doctors, but with no success. Finally, a magnetic healer, (a resident of Boston,) cured him with one treatment. Mr. Nye also speaks of the case of his wife, who had a cancer. The best doctors of Boston, the most eminent in the regular faculty, were consulted. Finally they decided that within ten days the knife would be her only chance of prolonging life. A clairvoyant said, "Do not use the knife." A magnetic healer was then employed, and the wife was cured. This was ten years ago, and the wife has been well up to date. These, gentlemen, are not isolated cases, but of every-day and hour occurrence, in every part of the State.

Gentlemen, although I do not, like my brother Giles here, believe

spirits of the departed produce these cures, yet we all must believe that some great physiological law is here involved, the discovery of which is of the highest value to mankind; and I ask you, in the name of God and humanity, not to recommend a bill that shall cut off these benefactors from practicing within this Commonwealth.

You must have noticed the great crowd that has attended this hearing from the first. You also have not failed to notice, by their demonstrations, that they are utterly opposed to this Bill, and most of them eager to testify what great good has been done them by the persons whom this Bill will cut off. A mother became so anxious that, although the time was filled, yet she cried out to you from the depths of her grief and fear, in the name of God, not to pass this Bill, for her life and that of her friends had been saved by these persons of natural medical genius.

I but voice the prayer of the vast majority of the citizens of this Commonwealth when I pray you not to deprive us of the help of those persons who have again and again proved themselves possessed of the natural and improved gifts which make them *the* physicians! Will you take away the persons who have been our family physicians for years, in whom we have the utmost confidence, who have saved us and our little ones when all scholastic skill gave us up to die, and in their places compel us to take the young man just passed from the hand of this board of censors, with no other claim upon our confidence than the fact that he has a good memory or is the son of a rich father who would have him a professional man, because it gives him higher caste in society, when, according to the laws of his organization, he should have been a coal heaver, or at best a shoemaker?

The subject before us is of the gravest character. It is a matter of individual choice in a case of life and death. In the simplest words possible, we pray you not to take away from us, the common people, the one we choose to stand by us in the hour of our sorest need. Do not take away from us—who believe that Dr. Morse, of Salem, who was for years a professor in the medical department of the Boston University, spoke the truth when he said that some men were born physicians, and such were always successful practitioners, even if uneducated, while he knew many who, though having graduated from the oldest medical college in Massachusetts, were never known to help a patient—the power to choose these natural physicians, to whose wonderful cures so many testify.

The natural physicians will not go to your approved medical college; they have methods of study peculiar to themselves. Think of the "Sweet family of natural bone-setters" being compelled to go through a medical college in their time, when in after years every medical college was obliged to learn of them, or the college go unpatronized. They say: "These men may go to college if they have this natural genius." That is easily enough said, but will they tell me when in the history of the world David would wear Saul's armor when he went out to fight the giant? They will simply give up practice if you pass this law, and we shall be deprived of their most valuable services. I do not plead for them. *They do not need us; WE NEED THEM!* The man of genius always stands on the dignity of his God-given powers, and says to the world, what Edmund Burke said when he was finally shut out of Parliament: "Gentlemen, I can afford to get along without you, if you can without me." It is the fifth-rate men who go down on their knees, crawling in the dust to get place and power, as is amply illustrated in the little fifth-rate doctors who ask for this monopoly for their benefit. Not one of the doctors the Old School calls "quacks" has appeared here asking you not to pass this Bill. They can afford to stand back, as they have stood. But we, who wish their help, cannot afford to stand back and see our rights taken from us, not only the right to liberty and the pursuit of happiness, but the right to life; unless we can live in spite of all the poison that the old Allopath would pour down our throats, and charge us what he pleases for.

The people do not want this Bill, therefore I pray you will not recommend it!

