

An Interview With Dr. Benjamin Goldberg

Dr. Benjamin Goldberg

Dr. Benjamin Goldberg was interviewed on July 11, 1968 at his office/home, 8,477 Foxcroft Drive, Cincinnati, Ohio. The interviewer was Mr. Martin Kaufman, graduate student and research assistant for Dr. John Duffy of Tulane University.

Dr. Goldberg was born in Philadelphia on December 11, 1896. He attended public schools in Philadelphia during the early grades, and later completed his grade and high school education in Columbus, Ohio. He enrolled in the College of Homeopathic Medicine at Ohio State University and took an M.D. degree in 1922. He is an enthusiastic supporter and practitioner of homeopathy and still maintains an active practice. Since the early 1920's Dr. Goldberg has been deeply involved in various local and state homeopathic organizations. He served as president of both the Cincinnati Homeopathic Lyceum and the Ohio State Homeopathic Medical Society, and presented many papers to these groups. Presently he edits the Ohio State Homeopathic Medical Society Newsletter. Dr. Goldberg has extended his efforts in support of homeopathy far beyond Ohio. For more than nineteen years he has served as secretary-treasurer of the Southern Homeopathic Medical Association. In

Dr. Goldberg

addition, he has held various positions of leadership while a member of the American Institute of Homeopathy, and has contributed numerous articles to the major homeopathic journals.

Insofar as the interview was concerned, Dr. Goldberg proved a willing and cooperative interviewee. He freely discussed and answered all questions. The interview was interrupted frequently since Dr. Goldberg would often turn to his files for figures and statistics on drug-provings. On one occasion the interview was delayed while the Doctor treated a patient for a bruised knee, using arnica powder and calendula ointment.

Despite Dr. Goldberg's cooperative attitude during the interview, when the transcript was submitted to him for editing, he made drastic changes. Much of the effort he put into condensing the transcript from ninety to twenty pages was valuable, for it clarified his views on the philosophy and practice of homeopathy. On the other hand, the result completely lacks spontaneity and much incidental material which might prove useful has been lost. Regrettably Dr. Goldberg's zeal for homeopathy and his wish to present it in the best possible light has greatly reduced the value of the edited transcript.

Mr. Kaufman:

Dr. Goldberg, we would like to start by you telling us something about your background.

Dr. Goldberg:

Well, I was born in Philadelphia on December 11, 1896. I went through the early grades in the Philadelphia schools and we moved to Columbus, Ohio. There I completed grade school and continued through High School, and received my degree in M.D. from the College of Homeopathic Medicine at Ohio State University in June 1922. They had two medical schools in Columbus at the O.S.U. I chose the homeopathic college because I thought it had more to offer. Along with the regular allopathic medicine I could take advantage of the teaching of homeopathic materia medicine. For I recalled as a youngster in Philadelphia, I so frequently saw that black shiny ambulance, of the Hahnemann Hospital along the streets of the city. I became curious and later found myself inquiring about homeopathy and I was told that Hahnemann¹ was a 'great man in medicine'.

Mr. Kaufman:

Were the faculty members shared by both colleges?

Dr. Goldberg:

The first two years were almost exactly the same except for the study of materia medica. The remaining subjects were exactly the same. The same anatomy, histology, physiology, embryology and so

forth. Yes, the professors were exactly the same for both schools, except as I said, the study of materia medica. The last two years were taken on the O.S.U. campus at the Homeopathic Hospital with the exception of bacteriology which was given to both colleges in the same class. The faculty at the homeopathic school was outstanding. Even to this day our former professor of pediatrics, Dr. Earl Baxter, who went over to the allopathic college when the homeopathic school was closed in 1922, has received many honors for his outstanding work in teaching in the medical school and for his great work in the Children's Hospital at Columbus, Ohio. He was one of the outstanding practitioners in children's medicine and has retired in 1968. My college was closed in 1922 soon after my graduation. It was found after many years that it was impractical to have two medical colleges in one university when the only difference was the use and teaching of the materia medica or the use of drugs in the practice of medicine.

K.- Why was the college discontinued?

G.- There were other reasons for this besides economy.

Of course there were politics, competition, jealousies and even downright hatred between the two schools.

The other school thought that we were not their equals, although we had exactly the same premedical training and met exactly the same requirements from

the American Medical Association. Of course, now that I have grown older, I can see that having two medical schools in the same university was an error. Some of the older men in my days as a student, have always maintained that homeopathy should be a post-graduate subject--something that should be undertaken after graduation from the medical school. This has always been the case in England where there has never been a Homeopathic College and yet they have some of the world's best homeopaths. To learn homeopathy the British graduate came to Chicago to study homeopathy under Dr. James Tyler Kent and Dr. Arthur H. Grimmer. Even Sir John Weir, the great London homeopath, who is physician to the ruling Royal Family of Great Britain, was a student of Drs. Kent and Grimmer in Chicago in 1908 and 1909. He has retired just a few months ago and another homeopath-- Dr. Margery Grace Blackie--has been appointed to succeed him. England today has some of the best homeopaths in the world and now it is being taught at the Faculty of Homeopathy at the London Royal Homeopathic Hospital. Scotland has also some of the finest homeopathic prescribers in the world and they also were graduates of the London Faculty. These homeopathic graduates were, as I have said before, former graduates of the regular allopathic medical colleges and later became converted to homeopathy.

They devoured the homeopathic teachings with so much zest and enthusiasm that it is almost unbelievable. In fact some of England's greatest physicians soon became the leaders in the homeopathic profession. Some of these men were: Dr. John H. Clarke, Dr. Skinner, also Drs. Hughes, Cooper, Shepard, Bach and many, many others. France, Italy, Germany and the Scandinavian countries have also many homeopathic practitioners. Switzerland has Dr. Pierre Schmidt of Geneva who has often in the past been in consultation in the many severe illnesses of the former Pius. Dr. Schmidt is also a convert to homeopathy. Homeopathy has been the school of choice of the British ruling family since early in 1930 when the Prince of Wales (now the Duke of Windsor) called in a homeopath for the severe illness of his father, King George V.

K.- Why did you specifically enroll in the homeopathic division?

G.- I felt, after investigating and studying the differences between the two schools, that I could get everything that the old school had to offer and besides also get the knowledge of the homeopathic system. I visited the clinics at the homeopathic hospital and saw for myself what they had to offer and saw for myself the cures that they could get

with the homeopathic remedy. I can even now remember a clinic patient who came into the homeopathic clinic one day suffering from a severe case of asthma. Dr. Hinsdale our professor of materia medica and therapeutics examined him, and it seemed so simple to me that when he gave the patient a remedy on some little white tablets and told him this will help him and to come back in two weeks. I made it a point to watch for this same patient and when he returned in two weeks he said that he was much better and was able to return to work.

K.- In a letter you wrote to Dr. Duffy² you said and this is a quote--"I have always felt that homeopathy has so much to offer to this sick world." What did you think that homeopathy had to offer?

G.- Well, homeopathy has much to offer. For instance, we have a new remedy that has brought so much relief to sufferers of asthma and emphysema. This remedy was sent to me by Dr. William Gutman of New York City. I have used it and it has given me so much satisfaction and the patients so much relief that it is almost unbelievable. This remedy is Sulphurous acid, or H_2SO_3 . Not Sulphuric acid which is H_2SO_4 . The former remedy has been used by many physicians all over the world and they obtained similar results. Other benefits from homeopathy are that it takes the patient's history, his background, family inheritances,

his ill effects from previous chronic and acute ailments--all these things are taken into consideration before he is treated. His mental and physical conditions, his suppressive former treatments, the ill-effects from former medical treatments--all these are taken into consideration in his treatment. Many times a patient is treated because he inherited some familial disease--not necessarily venereal, but some other taint which has been passed down through former generations. Remember that Oliver Wendell Holmes, himself a physician, said very appropriately that "Man is an omnibus in which ride all his ancestors." This is so true. The allopathic physician can do nothing for these inherited ailments, except possibly in syphilis. And even in this condition the therapy is of doubtful benefit. The homeopath can do much more with his various remedies. Many of these stigmatic diseases can be cured. Dr. William Griggs³ has cured many, many cases of inherited mental and mongoloid diseases in children and has brought many of these children back into a very useful life. The homeopath does not palliate, he does not suppress, he does not cure one disease and give the patient another in exchange. There are no known side effects from homeopathic therapy. There is never any harm done. The patient is treated and most often relieved and remains cured. The homeopath prevents a great

deal of unnecessary surgery because he has the remedies for these conditions. The influenza epidemic of 1918 is a very good example. The death rate from this dread disease was about 1/10 of that from the dominant school. The death rate from pneumonia is almost nil in comparison. The complications from injuries are so few under homeopathic therapy that it is almost difficult to believe. Our remedies are a balm for the aged, the tired, the sick and the broken-down constitutions ravaged by disease and neglect. Our remedies give them relief and contentment. It is a well known fact that in this country percentage wise we have more older homeopathic physicians and patients than those under regular medical therapy. We have many more homeopathic physicians who are still practicing their form of therapy today than the old school. The old school physician can only palliate, he seldom cures. Heart disease is very respondent to our form of treatment. They live longer, are very comfortable, and are symptom-free for a much longer time. The homeopath never confuses symptoms with disease. We cure the patient as an individual; each case is different. We may have three different cases of pneumonia in three different patients. Each patient manifests his disease in many different symptom pictures. In other words each one feels different, is sick differently and reacts differently.

Because his symptoms are different his remedies are very apt to be different. We do not treat diseases. We treat patients who are sick and because each patient is sick in so many different ways, we therefore alter the remedy to his CONDITION and not to his DISEASE. This sounds strange but it is one of the tenets of our school and has stood the test of time for over 150 years. Another example, take a patient with asthma. One will tell us that he gets worse at 3 A.M., another that he gets worse at midnight. One is chilly, one is warm. One sweats with chills; another sweats but is warm. You probably have had these experiences yourself. By treating so specifically you can see that we get closer to the patient with his ailments. This is known as the 'totality of the symptoms' and is a basic rule in homeopathy. Another rule or rather law is the 'single remedy.' Hahnemann cautioned that to obtain the best results the single remedy must be given so as not to confuse the case. Each remedy has its own specific symptoms and these symptoms are taken into consideration when prescribing. Just as an example, I treated a little dog several years ago who was under the care of a very fine veterinarian and was in the hospital for about a week with a staphylococic skin infection. The little animal was very sick and the vet told the family that he did all he could, and to take the dog home, as this condition would last from several weeks

to several months. The family called me for help. I gave the dog some of our medicine internally and also locally. They called the next day and told me that within several hours the dog began to eat, felt better and was sleeping in the mother's bed as was his custom. This condition cleared up very quickly but it returned in about three weeks. Another prescription and the whole thing cleared up entirely and the animal was himself again. Now after three years there was no recurrence. We do not look for a diagnosis. It is not necessary! We go by the patient's symptoms--the remedy goes to work with the diagnosis known, unknown or undetermined. Putting a label on a sick man in most cases does not always help cure him. Of course, we try to know what the patient is suffering from as a matter of information. Another example. The antibiotics will cure bacterial disease but they will not cure diseases caused by viruses. The only remedy that the allopath has for viral disease are aspirin in one form or another, for pain and fever. But they cannot touch the disease itself. The homeopath can, with his remedies, reach such a patient through his symptoms and relieve or cure the patient much more easily and successfully, even because of the fact that viruses are not responsive to the ordinary form of treatment.

K.- You said that homeopathy has remedies to cure heart

disease, tuberculosis. Can you be specific about these?

G.- Yes. Let us take heart disease. We treat a man's heart disease because of the symptoms that he manifests. He shows great agony and a great fear of death; he fears that he will die any minute. His fears overshadow every other symptom. Aconite will very likely be the remedy, because in the pathogenesis of this drug, fear of death is outstanding. A child once sick with the croup in his agony only complained that he could not breathe and said, "I am going to die, do something, I am going to die." This same symptom, fear of death, in these two widely divergent diseases called for the same remedy. And Aconite will cure both diseases. Another case of heart disease clutches his chest to relieve him from a pain in his chest from a coronary attack. He is suffering from a maddening pain. His heart feels like it is clasped in a vise and is squeezed. Cactus may be the remedy because Cactus grandiflora has this symptom in its symptomatology. Given this remedy he will most likely be relieved in a few minutes and soon fall asleep. Other cases of heart disease may have swollen ankles, have dyspnea (shortness of breath) and edema (swelling) of the ankles. His remedy may be one of several other remedies which have their effect on the heart muscle.

Instead of giving Digitalis which is the most common remedy of the old school, the homeopath will most likely give Crataegus or Strophanthus or Convallaria, for these remedies have in their symptomatology these very symptoms. Some complain more at 3 P.M. and no other symptom. Their remedy may be Kali Carbonicum which has the symptom just as the patient's complaint. Oh no, it is not just that simple. One must take other symptoms into consideration. Some may complain of symptoms which are worse from 4 P.M. to 8 P.M. Their remedy may be Lycopodium clavatum. Because this remedy has this very symptom. Arsenicum album has an aggravation at midnight. The patient is restless and worse at midnight. He has fears but they are not quite as severe as those mentioned under Aconite. In gallbladder, another quite common remedy may be Chelidonium which has the symptom of pain under the right shoulder blade. He belches, full of gas with a tenderness over the gallbladder region. This condition will respond to Chelidonium. We also take into consideration the AGGRAVATIONS or AMELIORATIONS--whether the patients are made better or worse under certain CONDITIONS. This will also help to differentiate the remedy. Some patients are strangely relieved or ameliorated by wet weather. Causticum is the remedy. Why? Because in the pathogenesis of this drug there is a peculiar condition that this remedy will relieve conditions

relieved by wet or dampness. Don't ask me why! It is just so. It is a fact. Fat foods sometimes bother most patients. Some are not affected. It is in the make-up of the patient and also found in the remedy. Here I also cannot explain why. But it is fact.

K.- What do you consider to be the most important tenets of homeopathy?

G.- There are several. The most important is the SINGLE REMEDY. This means that after the patient's symptoms are studied the selected remedy should be given singly, without combining it with any other remedy. This is a fundamental doctrine. Disease is manifested by symptoms. Every remedy has certain symptoms. The purpose is to find the remedy or drug that has the symptoms which corresponds to the symptoms manifested by the patient. No combinations are tolerated. That was Hahnemann's teaching. It is difficult but upon study it can be done. Another is that the study of drugs is very important and they are studied or "proved" upon the healthy. The symptoms are carefully noted. No animal expiration is permitted, because so many drugs have different effects on people as compared with the effects on animals. For instance dogs can take so much more morphine than can the human being. This is also true between animals. Some animals can take more morphine than others.

So you see that the comparison between human and

animal experimentation can be widely different. All homeopathic remedies are tested or proven on the human being to get the true effect of the drugs. Hahnemann went through scores of provings on himself. The individual must be healthy. The symptoms are carefully written down and a careful record kept. Another tenet is the Law of: "Similia Similibus Curantur"--this means that likes are cured by like. This means that a disease showing certain symptoms is cured or relieved by a remedy having the symptoms similar to those shown by the patient. This remedy is given and the chances are that that patient will be relieved. An example: Belladonna taken by provers will show fever, rash like scarlet fever, sore throat, red tongue and many other symptoms. A case of scarlet fever shows very much the same group of symptoms--almost exactly. The remedy is therefore--Belladonna. Of course all scarlet fever cases are not the same, they vary somewhat as do many other diseases. The thing to do, therefore, is to find another remedy which has these different symptoms. This different remedy is therefore the patient's remedy. Another tenet is the "Totality of the Symptoms" which means that the symptoms of the patient manifested must compare with all the symptoms of the drug. You can see how difficult this can become. These symptoms, too, must be the total of those which are subjective and objective. And then again, some symptoms are more

important than others. These must be properly evaluated and the TOTALITY is thereby found. Then again, mental symptoms take precedence over others. Another is the MINIMUM DOSE. This means that to cure, the dose of the remedy must be MINIMAL or the smallest dose. Sometimes these small doses are very, very small--frequently a millionth of a grain. This seems impossible, but Hahnemann had all this worked out after many years of experimentation. The allergist today gives these very small doses to desensitize his patients. By the way, the allergist and the homeopathist are very closely related. Vaccine therapy is also based on this principle. Another one of the tenets is the matter of AGGRAVATION and AMELIORATION which means what makes the patient better or worse? Some remedies, in fact most, have this characteristic. We therefore fit the drugs aggravations or ameliorations against the patient's AGGRAVATIONS or AMELIORATIONS in finding the true remedy.

K.- Some early homeopaths publicly argued that the law of similars was the only law of cure. Do you think that this is correct?

G.- If we mention law we must admit that the homeopath is the only one who follows the law. The allopath has no law. His method is simply one of fighting diseases crudely. He palliates or suppresses. For pain, he gives a preparation which will relieve pain. For diarrhea he gives an opiate which stops peristalsis

and therefore stops the diarrhea. He has no remedy for a cure. His method is simply treatment by opposites. That is what the word allopathy means. The nearest approach that the allopath comes to homeopathy is by the use of vaccines, and in this instance he has invaded the field of homeopathy. Allergy is another instance. The allergist and the homeopath are really first cousins when it comes to therapy, altho' very few allergists know much about homeopathy. I said that vaccine therapy is the nearest thing to homeopathy, but it is really ISOPATHY-- meaning the SAME therapy. They give the patient the same remedy that causes disease, whereas the homeopath gives the SIMILAR remedy. They are, of course, closely related and many look upon the two as very much alike.

K.- Do you think there is a law of dosage?

G.- Dosage is secondary in importance. The first and most important thing to consider is the proper remedy. There have been in the past many spirited arguments on dosage. This thing has almost split our school apart. I believe the most important of all is the proper remedy. After this is found the dosage does not matter too much. It is a personal preference. The proper remedy will work in ANY dosage, although sometimes one dose is found to be better than another dose. But it really is secondary.

The question of dosage is less of a concern today than in former years. In modern science--physiology and in bacteriology--it has become an accepted fact, and working with our potencies today is a common thing.

K.- Would you describe your practice?

G.- My practice is what you may call a general practice. I practice the old family-style way of the old family physician of former years. I have practiced for 46 years and I intend to continue. I enjoy it. It is very gratifying to see people get well under these homeopathic remedies. I get my patients off these harsh drugs and they just bloom out and get well and stay well. My patients are never sleepy, groggy or unduly pepped up or exhilarated by stimulants and depressants. Homeopathy does not need an excuse for its existence. It has proven itself all over the world, in many epidemics of typhoid, influenza, pneumonia, smallpox, yellow fever, the plagues and so forth. I give a minimum of antibiotics when I do not have time to get the proper remedy or when in a hurry. And I feel guilty when I do this. The homeopath does not need these harmful drugs except in the most dire circumstances. Now, let me explain that the homeopath will not cure everyone who comes to him with the homeopathic remedy. We cannot cure everybody. We lose our share of patients, but believe me, they are far less than of the dominant school.

If we do not cure them, at least we do not harm them! I am dedicated to the fact that homeopathy is safe, sane, harmless, and our patients live longer. Just look through the A.M.A. list of obituaries and when you come to the name of a physician who lived past 90 years the chances are that he was a homeopath. Many of our homeopathic practitioners today in active practice are well into the seventies or eighties. There is a doctor in Dallas who is going to be 100 years in July 1969. He still practices homeopathy, but he will not take on any new patients, because he says he is getting a little too old. He only quit seeing patients during the night hours only recently. Dr. William Griggs is 96 years old, he still sees a few patients. His memory is phenomenal. His only marked defect is a bad case of cataract. He comes to our national meetings and it is a pleasure to hear him recite case reports of patients whom he treated 50 or 60 years ago. This is no exception. The old school physicians live a shorter life and they are usually racked with degenerative disease. In my class of 1922 all our graduates were still alive in 1962-- after 40 years. The other college in O.S.U. lost 33% of their members in the same period. This is no coincidence. It is true.

K.- Do you use homeopathy completely in your practice?

G.- No, I would say that I use it about 80%.

K.- In what conditions do you prescribe allopathically?

G.- Well, in some cases when the patient does not respond too well with our remedy, in cancer cases and in some cases of diabetes. We have some very wonderful homeopathic remedies that will turn the tide in cancer. But they will not touch them all. Our remedies will make the patient comfortable, lessen the pain and they will certainly live longer.

K.- What homeopathic remedies relieve cancer?

G.- I am not so sure about our remedies in lung cancer, but in cancer of the stomach, liver, and uterus, our remedies do almost the impossible. Really, some of the results are outstanding. There was a Doctor Grimmer, (Arthur H.) of Chicago, whose results were absolutely phenomenal. He treated patients from all over the country. They would come to Chicago, when no hope was given them by their own doctor. They would improve. Many would get well and Dr. Grimmer's results were outstanding. But he was not the only one. The same results were duplicated all over the world by men like Dr. William B. Griggs of Philadelphia, Dr. Roger A. Schmidt of San Francisco; by Dr. Spalding of Boston, now dead; by Dr. Elizabeth W. Hubbard of New York City who passed away two years ago. As to my own experience, I have had many cases of inoperable cancer and many others who refused operation, and with the proper remedy have kept them alive for quite some time, with freedom from pain and from narcotics. Some have lived for years. Others began to have a

sense of well being and lived in peace and contentment. Now, these results in the therapy of cancer were not only in this country but in other countries, especially in Great Britain, France, Germany, and Switzerland. For instance, Dr. LeHunt Cooper of London a good many years ago reported many cures--yes cures--from cancer. Others in Great Britain whose results were outstanding were Drs. John H. Clarke, Wheeler, Hughes, Edward Bach, John Paterson of Glasgow, Scotland. On the continent, Pierre Schmidt of Geneva, Switzerland cured many. In fact he was a frequent consultant in the many illnesses of Pope Pius, although cancer was not involved in this instance. I am just mentioning the calibre of the men who treated cases homeopathically. In Germany, Dr. Emil Schlegel, now dead, was a master for prescribing the homeopathic remedy in cancer. Others were Dr. A. Nebel of Lauzanne, Switzerland; Dr. Fortier-Bernoville in France; Dr. James W. Ward of San Francisco; Dr. Benthack from Nebraska had many, many patients from all over the U. S. The numbers were so many that it would just waste time to mention them all. I am convinced that these men were honest, scientific and dedicated men. Dr. Garth Boericke of Philadelphia and his brother Charles of Berkeley, California, along with Dr. Schofield of Hahnemann Hospital, reported many cases cured of carcinoma of

the rectum with such a simple remedy as Arsenicum iodide. All these men were very careful prescribers and observers. Their approach to these patients were beyond doubt one of dedication and of honesty. While many years ago it was almost a cardinal sin to mention 'cure' in a cancer case, these men stuck their necks out and claimed cures. Now it is an accepted fact as the American Cancer Society in their literature so frequently mentions that cancer CAN BE CURED. So you can see that in this instance, also, the homeopath was first. He took much criticism and was reproached for saying that cancer could be cured! You asked for remedies. I shall mention only a few. Of course, the remedy is found by using the symptoms that the patient manifests, as mentioned a few pages back. The remedies usually are: Arsenicum album, Argentum nitricum, the cadmium salts, Causticum, Conium or the poison Hemlock, kreosote, Lycopodium, Thuja, phosphorus, the Kali salts, fluoric acid, tellurium--only to mention a few. We have also remedies for the terrible pain of cancer whereby the patients may be kept comfortable and at ease without the indiscriminate use of the narcotic drugs--a boon and a consolation to the suffering. We have also remedies for the aged and ailing at the end of life's journey when racked with suffering and anguish with a broken-down constitution and little resistance. We can make the patient's

last few days worthwhile. Even the most desperate cases can be restored to some degree with ease and safety.

K.- Now this is just an impression that both Dr. Duffy and I have received after speaking with Dr. Sutherland, Dr. Griggs and Dr. Stephenson,⁴ and in the case of yourself; that regardless of what you dispense, regardless of what drug, or what treatment you give, you will be successful because you exude confidence.

G.- That is mostly true. Some of this confidence is due to experience. The physicians you mentioned were men of great experience. But confidence in itself is not sufficient. We do depend so much on confidence to cure our patients. For instance, the treatment of an infant or an animal such as a dog. In these cases confidence has no meaning. The patient is influenced by confidence. There is no room for psychology here as the infant or the dog have not been influenced by the physician's confidence. He used his talent to produce a cure.

K.- Dr. Goldberg, during the nineteenth century homeopathy, I think, was primarily successful because it arrived during the time of what is called "heroic medicine," where the traditional therapy included massive doses of drugs, calomel, opium, which led to excess, and regardless of whether the homeopath found the correct remedy or not, by giving such minute doses, or doses of high potency, he had to be more successful than the

physicians who were over dosing.

G.- Yes, that is very true. There were extremes. In Hahnemann's time, as you say, they gave so many drugs, some very powerful and destructive to the human body. Some of their prescriptions contained as many as twenty-five ingredients, sometimes many more. Toad's skin, snake eyes, and toad's ears were used. Most of these ingredients were empirical, without any scientific basis for use. Another extreme was the heroic use of mercury in most patients along with opium and alcohol. Mercurialization became a real danger, and this along with large doses of opium and alcohol the problem became almost overwhelming. Dr. John Brown, a famous physician in England drugged his patients to death. He himself became an alcoholic. He also died an alcoholic. Then there came a time-- a sort of a rebellion to all this. When I was a student in the twenties Dr. William Osler an Englishman and Professor of Medicine at Johns Hopkins Medical School said that there is only a small need for medicines in the treatment of disease. He listed morphine, Salvarsan, laxatives, pain medicine for the lesser types of pain, digitalis for the heart. Almost a period of therapeutic nihilism. This period lasted until the early forties when penicillin and other drugs showed up. Soon the synthetic vitamins, tranquilizers, the benzedrines made their appearance.

We are now again in a period of polypharmacy where people are again being overdrugged. This is a very sad situation as this overdrugging is taking place on top of a deluge of additives which are being used in our foods and the pollutants in the air, and the chemical fertilizers which are being used in our soil. It is not a very good situation to be in. It is just about time for another Hahnemann to come on the scene. I am not saying that these drugs did not serve a purpose. Some were actually life-savers. Penicillin has saved thousands of lives but it has also done irreparable damage. Some of the other drugs such as Prontisil which was the forerunner of the sulfa compounds has served a good purpose. About the only discovery in medicine that I can think of which has not been abused has been insulin. It has saved millions of lives and the damage done has been practically nil. Hahnemann shall also be remembered for his advanced type of treatment of the insane. He always urged that we consider the mentally ill as SICK people, whose treatment should be changed toward a better understanding of this type of sick person. This has come about, but so many, many years too late!

K.- During the nineteenth century homeopaths, especially those who were converts to homeopathy from the orthodox profession, were ostracized by the state, local, and the American Medical Association. What has been your relation with the A.M.A.? Are you a member of the

A.M.A?

G.- No, I am not a member of the A.M.A. But I presented two papers before the Cincinnati Academy of Medicine in the mid-twenties. I reported epidemics of scarlet fever and diphtheria in an orphan institution. They asked me to give my findings. However, I belong to all the homeopathic medical societies.

K.- Do you have hospital appointments?

G.- Yes, I am on the staff of one hospital.

K.- Do they know that you are a homeopath?

G.- Oh, yes, in fact this hospital was at one time an exclusively homeopathic hospital. Since the homeopaths have died out there are only about three remaining on the staff.

K.- Do the remainder of the physicians on this hospital staff know anything about homeopathy?

G.- Not really. They have a distorted knowledge about it, but the fact is that they really know nothing about it. We have a few of the staff, especially the allergists, who know something about homeopathy because they see how it works in allergy. Homeopathy and allergy are really first cousins. The principles are very much the same. The best way to reach the men in the orthodox medicine would be by teaching him the principles of our school. Of course, we could not reach them all, but we could reach about 10 to 15%. There is a postgraduate school held in August

in Pennsylvania for about two weeks and they always have about four to six allopaths who are eager to learn about homeopathy. And they learn to practice it well, and come to homeopathic conventions.

K.- You said that you graduated from Ohio State in 1922?

G.- Yes, in June, 1922. There were seven students in our class. The other medical college graduated thirty three.

K.- Did this indicate that homeopathy ceased to become attractive to the students? And if so, why?

G.- There were several reasons. They, of course, knew nothing about it to begin with. What little they knew was, like the older orthodox physicians, distorted. They could not see the small dose, the similar remedy, the principles of the thing. Before one can embrace homeopathy, he should know what it is, what it is not, what it can do, and what it cannot do. As I said before, the allergist is very friendly toward our school as the principles of allergy are essentially the principles of homeopathy. He is a great believer in the small dose and the similar drug. He is open-minded about the underlying tenets of our school.

K.- I wonder if you could tell us how you first became involved in organizational work.

G.- My first experience was in connection with the local homeopathic society--the Cincinnati Homeopathic Lyceum. We would meet once a month except for the

summer months. I became more and more interested in this subject of remedy selection and practice. We had some very fine physicians and prescribers. Being a novice they were all eager to help me in many ways. I guess that they soon saw that my interest was growing and theirs did too. I soon became closely associated with several of these fine men, relieved them on their vacations, and did some night work for them. My interest increased. In two years I relieved one Dr. Charles Eha for an entire summer when he went to Vienna, Austria. This was in 1924. He and two others were instrumental in getting me to come to Cincinnati to open an office. Before that I was a resident of Columbus, Ohio. Our friendship grew and our professional contacts grew with it. Soon I was secretary of the local society. Then president after about six years of practice. They saw to it that I presented papers to the local as well as the Southern Homeopathic Medical Association. In 1949 I became secretary-treasurer of the latter society. Then I was elected as Trustee of the American Institute of Homeopathy for three years. I am still secretary-treasurer of the Southern. Then came requests for papers from other homeopathic organizations. Then Bureau Chairmanship. Eleven years ago I was elected Editor of the Ohio State Homeopathic Medical Society's Newsletter. I have held this post all these years,

except for two years when I asked to be relieved so I could get a little breather. Some of the contents of the Ohio Newsletter are reprinted in other medical journals especially in England, West Pakistan and in India. You asked me about the books available on homeopathic remedies. I shall name a few. The simpler and most readable ones are these: Pierce's Plain Talks on Materia Medica, Nash's Leaders in Homeopathic Therapeutics, Boger's Synoptic Key. Then the more advanced books that go into greater detail and are more difficult to master would be: Boericke's Materia Medica with Repertory, Dewey's Practical Homeopathic Therapeutics, Cowperthwaite's A Textbook on Materia Medica and Therapeutics, E. A. Farrington's Clinical Materia Medica, Margaret Tyler's Homeopathic Drug Pictures, Hering's ten volumes on Guiding Symptoms--a monumental work of over 5,000 pages; Gentry's Concordance Repertory; Another splendid volume is John H. Clarke's three-volume Dictionary of Materia Medica, Hahnemann's masterful, Materia Medica; also, Hahnemann's Chronic Diseases. Some of the finest homeopathic literature is found in the Transactions of the International Hahnemannian Association and in the bound volumes of the American Institute of Homeopathy. Many, many more can be mentioned. Among the biographic books: The Life of Hahnemann by Haehl in German; Bradford's Life of Hahnemann; Martin Gumpert's Life of Hahnemann

is a very fine, easily-read volume and a very popular work. Then the various repertories which may be called 'a dictionary in reverse'--you look under the symptom to find the remedy. There are about fifty or sixty of these repertories in circulation. These authors in many instances spent almost one-half a lifetime to get one of these repertories together. It was in most cases a most tedious job. Then, to complicate things even more, there are repertories on cough, dysentery and diarrhea, female disease, nerve disease, and running the gamut of every other disease, tearing the symptoms apart, and then piecing them together again to find the proper remedy. Do you remember me telling you that homeopathy is VERY difficult? It is as difficult as it is fascinating. To the homeopath nothing is too difficult. He could easily give morphine or an aspirin compound to alleviate a pain. But no, he would rather pour over books and find the underlying cause of that pain, and cure the condition as it exists in the patient! He has made a contribution to medical science which shall leave its mark. Without homeopathy there would be no allergists; no psychiatry; no geriatrics. This medical science has produced so much to alleviate suffering humanity from its terrible diseases and made man a much healthier being. Hahnemann was one of the greatest men in the history of mankind. He

made so many sacrifices to help his fellow human being; he was maligned, persecuted, driven out of Germany, but he withstood suffering, stood alone. Homeopathy has frequently been called a cult. So has osteopathy been called a cult. Now let us see why they are so wrong.

HOMEOPATHY A CULT?⁵

Homeopathy has sometimes been called a CULT! Now let us see and examine the names of the men who practiced this CULT! Some of the most famous names in medicine were won over to homeopathy after they found out, as Hahnemann did, that the practice of medicine of their day left much to be desired. One of the first CULTISTS was Constantine Hering--A German, who was given the task to "expose and eradicate" homeopathy in Germany in Hahnemann's time. Hering was a very thorough and very studious man and after a very exhaustive study of this new method of treatment he became very much interested in homeopathy. He made a study of Hahnemann's ORGANON and soon after he became the victim of an infected hand following a postmortem. He was informed by the best surgeons in Germany that the hand would have to be amputated. Upon the advice of a friend who practiced homeopathy he was persuaded to take "ridiculously small" doses of Arsenicum album: for the gangrenous member. The effect was so magical that Hering RESOLVED TO DEDICATE HIS LIFE to the great cause of homeopathy. In writing

to a friend Hering said: "WHEN, AFTER TAKING A FEW DOSES OF THE REMEDY ON THE TONGUE, A SENSE OF RELIEF FROM THE HORRIBLE AFFECTION BEGAN TO PERVADE MY BODY, THE LAST OBSTRUCTION THAT MADE ME BLIND TO THE RISING SUM OF THE NEW HEALING ART, VANISHED BEFORE MY EYES. I STILL HAVE MY HAND; IT IS THE SAME WITH WHICH I WRITE THIS, AND MORE THAN ALL, I HAVE DEVOTED MY ENTIRE HAND, BODY AND SOUL TO THE CAUSE WHICH HOMEOPATHY GAVE TO SUFFERING HUMANITY." Dr. Hering later came to America and founded the Allentown Academy which later became the Hahnemann Homeopathic Medical College in Philadelphia. Cult? Madame Curie's father-in-law was a homeopath and introduced it into England. Dr. John Weir came to Chicago to study homeopathy. In a letter to this writer dated October 1963 he wrote me-- "I go back with pleasure and gratitude to my time with Dr. Kent and Dr. Grimmer in Chicago in 1908 and 1909." Other renowned physicians in England who embraced this new healing art were Dr. John H. Clarke who was the author of the monumental work on homeopathic materia medica which is famous all over the world; Dr. Richard Hughes, Dr. Skinner, Dr. LeHunt Cooper, Dr. Wheeler, Dr. Edward Bach, noted for his work on herbal remedies and the famous Bach Bowel Nosodes. Famous patients who employed homeopathic physicians, and their names were legion, were Napoleon Bonaparte, Disraeli, the Prime Minister to Queen Victoria;

Bismarck, the Iron Chancellor of Germany, Pope Pius, and so many others that space will not permit. In America when the homeopathic colleges could be counted by the score and where it flourished so successfully at the turn of the century the patrons of homeopathy would literally fill pages. President Harding's father was a homeopath (homeopathic physician) in Marion, Ohio. Soon after his election to the presidency Harding appointed Dr. Sawyer as his personal physician (a homeopath). Presidents Coolidge and Hoover also employed homeopathic physicians. Dr. John D. Rockefeller, the elder, Henry Ford, Charles Kettering, the great genius in automotive engineering, who was the great benefactor of the Homeopathic Medical College at the Ohio State University in Columbus, Ohio. It was my great privilege as a senior student and as an intern at Columbus Homeopathic College to escort Mr. Kettering very frequently on Saturday afternoons throughout the Hospital. Mr. Kettering in the early 1920's gave the Homeopathic Hospital at Columbus 1000 shares of General Motors stock valued at \$350.00 a share (total value \$350,000) for research and built increased facilities at the hospital. When the College closed in August 1922 this money was returned to Mr. Kettering. The President of Brazil employed Dr. Amaro Azavedo, a homeopath, as his personal physician. Henry Clay,

the great statesman of the last century employed a homeopath. Senator Royal S. Copeland of New York was a homeopath. Dr. Pierre Schmidt of Geneva and his illustrious brother of San Francisco are both homeopaths. So the list goes on, almost endlessly! Dr. James Ward of San Francisco was the physician of the Matson family--of the Matson Steamship Lines. Dr. Grimmer made the remark that he once made a trip of 2000 miles to see a moribund child with pneumonia and simply placed a powder of Tuberculinum on the child's tongue. The patient had the best talent in attendance and was given up as 'hopeless'. After Dr. Grimmer's prescription the child made a complete recovery! Is more proof necessary? P.S. Sir John Weir was also physician to Her Majesty the Queen of Norway, since 1928. Madame Sarah Bernhart--the great tragedienne employed a homeopath as her physician. Perhaps Dr. Richard C. Cabot of Harvard Medical School was much more tolerant of homeopathy than we realized when he said: "HOW FORTUNATE WERE THEY WHO FELL INTO HAHNEMANN'S HANDS, AND SO ESCAPED BEING BLED, PURGED, PUKED, SWEATED AND SALIVATED." Or when Sir William Osler who was regarded as the dean of orthodox medicine in the first quarter of this century when he said: "IT IS NOT AS IF OUR HOMEOPATHIC BRETHREN WERE ASLEEP: FAR FROM IT. THEY ARE WIDE AWAKE TO THE SCIENTIFIC STUDY OF DISEASE. IT IS DISTRESSING

THAT SO MANY GOOD MEN LIVE ISOLATED, IN A MEASURE,
FROM THE GREAT BODY OF THE PROFESSION. THE ORIGINAL
GRIEVOUS MISTAKE WAS OURS: TO QUARREL WITH OUR
BROTHERS OVER INFINITESIMALS WAS AN UNWISE AND
FOOLISH THING TO DO."

End

Footnotes

1. Samuel Christian Hahnemann, founder of homeopathy.
2. Dr. John Duffy, Professor of the History of
Medicine, Tulane University.
3. William B. Griggs, M.D., Jenkintown, Pa.
4. Allen Sutherland, M.D., Brattleboro, Vt.;
James Stephenson, M.D., New York City.
5. Ohio State Homeopathic Medical Society
Newsletter, April 1969.

INDEX

- Allentown Academy, 30
- American Cancer Society, 20
- American Institute of Homeopathy, 26
- American Medical Association, 3,
23-24, 17
- Asthma, 5, 8
- Bach, Dr. Edward, 4, 19, 30
- Baxter, Dr. Earl, 2
- Benthack, Dr., 19
- Benzedrines, 22
- Blackie, Dr. Margery Grace, 3
- Boericke, Dr. Charles, 19
- Boericke, Dr. Garth, 19
- Brown, Dr. John, 22
- Cabot, Dr. Richard C., 32
- Cancer, 18-20
- Chicago, Illinois, 3, 30
- Children's Hospital, Columbus, Ohio, 2
- Cincinnati Academy of Medicine, 24
- Cincinnati Homeopathic Lyceum, 25
- Clarke, Dr. John H., 4, 30
- College of Homeopathic Medicine, 1
- Columbus, Ohio, 1
- Columbus Homeopathic College, 31
- Cooper, Dr. Le Hunt, 4, 19, 30

- Diabetes, 18
- Duffy, Dr. John, 5, 21
- Eha, Dr. Charles, 26
- Emphysema, 5
- England, 3-4, 27-30
- Fortier-Bernoville, Dr., 19
- France, 4, 19
- Geneva, Switzerland, 4
- Germany, 4, 19
- Great Britain, 19
- Griggs, Dr. William B., 6, 17-18, 21
- Grimmer, Dr. Arthur H., 3, 18, 30, 32
- Gutman, Dr. William, 5
- Hahnemann, Dr. Samuel C., 1, 8, 12,
14, 22-23, 28-29, 32
- Hahnemann Homeopathic Medical
College, 30
- Hahnemann Hospital, 1, 19
- Harvard Medical School, 32
- Heart Disease, 7, 9-10
- Hering, Dr. Constantine, 29-30
- "Heroic Medicine", 21-22
- Hinsdale, Dr., 5
- Holmes, Oliver Wendell, 6
- Homeopathic Hospital, Ohio
State University, 2
- Homeopathic Medical College, 31

Homeopathy, books on, 27-28;
Cancer remedies, 19-20; drugs,
5, 10-11, 13, 20; famous
patients of, 3-4, 19, 30-31;
potency of drugs, 21

Hubbard, Dr. Elizabeth Wright, 18

Hughes, Dr. Richard, 4, 19, 30

India, 27

Influenza, 1918 epidemic of, 7, 16

Insulin, 23

Italy, 4

Johns Hopkins Medical School, 22

Kent, Dr. James Tyler, 3, 30

London Faculty of Homeopathy, 3

London Royal Homeopathic
Hospital, 3

Nebel, Dr. A., 19

Ohio State Homeopathic Medical
Society Newsletter, 26-27

Ohio State University, Columbus,
Ohio, 1, 2, 17, 25, 31

Organon, 29

Osler, Sir William, 22, 32

Paterson, Dr. John, 19

Pennsylvania, 25

Penicillin, 22-23

Philadelphia, Pa., 1

Plague, 16
Pneumonia, 7, 16
Prontisil, 23

Sawyer, Dr., 31
Scandinavia, 4
Scarlet fever, 13
Schlegel, Dr. Emil, 19
Schmidt, Dr. Pierre, 4, 19, 32
Schmidt, Dr. Roger A., 18
Schofield, Dr., 19
Scotland, 3
Skinner, Dr., 4, 30
Smallpox, 16
Southern Homeopathic Medical
Association, 26
Spalding, Dr. Ray W., 18
Stephenson, Dr. James H., 21
Sutherland, Dr. Allan D., 21
Switzerland, 19
Syphilis, 6

Tuberculosis, 10
Typhoid, 16

Vaccine therapy, 15
Viruses, 9

Ward, Dr. James W., 19, 32

Weir, Sir John, 3, 30

West Pakistan, 27

Wheeler, Dr., 19

Yellow fever, 16