

BREYFOGLE (W^m L.)

A LECTURE
ON
HOMŒOPATHY,
BY
WM. L. BREYFOGLE, M. D.

“Read not to contradict and refute, nor to believe and take for granted,
nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider.”

LORD BACON.

LOUISVILLE, KY:

SHERRILL, WILSON & CO., PRINTERS, 292 WEST MAIN STREET.

1873.

A LECTURE

ON

HOMŒOPATHY,

BY

WM. L. BREYFOGLE, M. D.

“Read not to contradict and refute, nor to believe and take for granted,
nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider.”

LORD BACON.



LOUISVILLE, KY:

SHERBILL, WILSON & CO., PRINTERS, 292 WEST MAIN STREET.

1873.

INTRODUCTION.

"True philosophers, who are only eager for truth and knowledge, never regard themselves as already so thoroughly informed but that they welcome further information from whomsoever and whencesoever it may come; nor are they so narrow-minded as to imagine any of the arts or sciences, transmitted to us by the ancients, in such a state of forwardness or completeness, that nothing is left for the ingenuity and industry of others."

WILLIAM HARVEY.

Among the many important "topics of the day," none, having reference to this life only, can possess higher claims to calm inquiry and earnest attention than the various resources which are available to mankind, when suffering from bodily disease—a trial which few, if any, at all times escape.

In the present age of discovery and invention it would be remarkable if, while all around are sailing onward, the physician alone was becalmed; while every branch of art and science is progressively and rapidly improving, the resources of medicine remained stationary. But this has not happened, the onward wave has reached the healer's barque, and he also is afloat upon the mighty waters of natural science.

There are indeed many who would stoutly stand upon the "old paths," but in this case we have no inspired prophets and apostles, as happily we have in an affair of higher moment, upon whom to rest as upon a firm foundation. The *opinions* of mere men, however venerable by age, are but a sandy base. The people of the present age are not given to echo the sentiments of a master. Nature's laws and nature's facts alone

are able to stand the rigid scrutiny to which the sentiments of men, in physical science, are now so unreservedly exposed.

Some men's minds, under such an apparently unsettled and disorderly state of things, become sceptical and faith-less. This arises from indolence; they will not give themselves the necessary trouble to investigate, and thus they throw truth and falsehood overboard together, and vainly try to rest upon a negative.

But to the more active and industrious mind the same condition is stimulative to exertion. Truth is sought after with earnestness, and when found, is embraced with satisfaction and delight.

Among the medical inquiries of the day, Homœopathy in the judgment of many, is the most important which has yet appeared, while in the opinion of many more it is "the biggest humbug that ever was."

It is proposed to consider, in a few words, what Homœopathy is, and what it is not. It has been well said, "there are truths which some men despise, because they will not examine them, and which they will not examine because they despise them." Homœopathy is one of these. Men of large scientific attainments, and indefatigable in adding to their store of knowledge, think it foolish because they are ignorant of its truth, and this notion of its folly hinders them from becoming acquainted with the evidences in its favor.

Nevertheless, Homœopathy embraces scientific and practical truth of so much value, that were it known, it would interest alike the man of science and the man of practical utility. This truth, known only as men know other truths, imperfectly, may be mixed up with numerous errors, but it is wiser to endeavor to separate what is true from what is false than to reject both.

The jealousy of power may indeed attempt to crush the rising influence of new truth. A Galileo may by force be constrained to read a reluctant recantation, but "the earth moves notwithstanding." Such is the vitality of truth, that

when once discovered, it seems never afterward to die. If, therefore, Homœopathy be true, we may confidently expect that it will survive the opposition to which it is exposed. If it be false, let us have proof. It is not to be condemned as some people would condemn a suspected felon, without judge, jury or witness.

We are censured by our medical brethren of the old school for bringing professional discussions before the tribunal of the public, because, it is said, the public are incompetent judges of such matters. Some of our own party are disposed to join in this censure, and we are all ready to admit that, in the present condition of medicine, an appeal to the public is in itself an evil. But it must be observed that this evil did not originate with the Homœopath. Hahneman did not take this step; he published his first essay in Hufeland's Journal, a periodical strictly professional, and of the highest character and standing in the profession. The step was taken by the physicians of the old school, and at the very commencement of the discussion; for instead of meeting Hahneman on their common ground, with arguments and facts wherewith to refute his opinions, they appealed to the public authorities, and by the aid of this unprofessional force, drove him from city to city and from village to village. And, moreover, this appeal to the public by the Allopathic portion of the profession has been continued to the present hour, and is still continued. What are the resolutions so frequently passed at public meetings of medical men, and published in the newspapers, declaring that they will not recognize and cannot hold communion with Homœopathic practitioners, whom they stigmatize as quacks, knaves, and fools, but an appeal to the public to aid them in their endeavors to suppress the unwelcome novelty!

Ridicule has been called the test of truth. If this be so, Homœopathy must be true, for it has now stood exposure to every kind of banter and jest, whether witty or sarcastic, for more than half a century, and Homœopathy not only exists—

it advances on every side, and through every grade of society. Ridicule, however, when boldly looked at as an argument against the statement of *facts*, is a mean "scare-crow." That it should be brought to bear upon a subject so sacred as the sufferings of the human family, and the means of relieving them, is a great reflection upon the characters of those who thus venture to use it.

They cannot be surprised if such conduct reminds others of the proverb, "as the crackling of thorns under a pot, so is the laughter of the fool."

LECTURE ON HOMŒOPATHY.



To Samuel Hahneman, of Leipsic, a physician of high standing in the “regular” school, is due the credit of having fully discovered and developed the law of cure, *Similia, Similibus Curantur*; and to him, was then accorded the “honors” which scientific men of all professions receive, as reward for their arduous researches. He was considered by the leading members of the old school, to be the most accomplished and scientific physician of his age, and it was only when the followers of his doctrine increased in such alarming proportions that they—the self-styled regulars—finding that their own pet theories were in danger, united in one common effort to overthrow it.

The principle governing Homœopathy is, that

SIMILARS CURE SIMILARS ;

or, in other words, *a drug which produces a certain series of symptoms when taken in health, will cure similar symptoms when produced by disease.*

As an illustration, it is well known to medical men, that mercury produces affections of the throat, bones, and skin, so like the diseases of those parts arising from other causes, that they often find it impossible to distinguish the one from

the other, or to decide to which to attribute the symptoms. Let us consider two patients standing side by side, with ulcerated throats, swellings on the bones, and eruptions on the skin, in the one *caused by mercury*, in the other not, and the most experienced surgeon shall be puzzled to say which is the mercurial case and which is not.

Mercury given to these cases would aggravate the one whose symptoms were owing to mercury, while it would almost certainly cure the other.

That the law of the similars is *the law of nature*, no intelligent person can dispute; and the oldest writers mention the similarity between the effects of the drug used, and the diseases which they cured.

Among writings attributed to Hippocrates are found the following remarkable words: "By similar things disease is produced, and by similar things, administered to the sick, they are healed of their diseases. Thus the same thing which will produce a strangury, when it does not exist, will remove it when it does."

The learned Dr. Francis Adams, in his translation of the works of Hippocrates, published in 1849, by the Sydenham Society, thus comments upon this passage: "The treatment of suicidal mania appears singular—'give the patient a draught made from the root of mandrake, in a smaller dose than will induce mania.' * * * He then insists, in strong terms, that under certain circumstances, *purgatives* will *bind* the bowels, and *astringents* *loosen* them. And he further remarks that, although the general rule of treatment be '*contraria contrariis curantur*, the opposite rule also holds good in some cases, namely: '*Similia similibus curantur.*'"

In confirmation of the Homœopathic law, he further remarks "that the same substance which occasions strangury, will also sometimes cure it, and so also with cough."

And he further acutely remarks "that warm water, which when drunk, generally excites vomiting, will also sometimes put a stop to it by removing its cause."

Hahneman observes that "later physicians have also felt and expressed the truth of the homœopathic method of cure, as for instance, Boulduc Bertholon, Thoury, Von Storck, and especially Stahl; and all these during the eighteenth century. But their observations were slightly made, and produced no permanent impression, either on their own minds or on those of others."

We are then indebted to Hahneman for the full discovery and development of the law, and for forcing it with sufficient perseverance upon the attention of the world.

The physician who has investigated and embraced this *principle* feels conscious that his mind is cleared of useless and endless speculations, and filled with a truth applicable every moment and of the highest practical value.

That the physician remaining in the old school is bewildered with opposing theories, and oppressed with an accumulation of heterogeneous and unarranged materials, is known and acknowledged; that the Homœopathic physician is freed from these burdens is obvious; that this is a great advantage must be above suspicion.

The theoretical method has always been extensively practiced. Diseases were, in the days of Hippocrates, cold, moist or dry. Remedies, of course, the same—a hot remedy to a cold disease, a moist to a dry, and vice versa. Hence the favorite maxim of Galen, "diseases are to be treated by contraries."

Later we had excessive and diminished irritability to be treated respectively with calmers and stimulants. (Brown.) Spasms of the extreme vessels, to be cured by the so-called anti-spasmodic. (Cullen.) All diseases attributed to local inflammation—the universal remedy, local depletion. (Broussais.) Such, and numberless other hypotheses have been imagined by ingenious men in their closets; have been eloquently propounded in their lecture rooms; have been greedily embraced by numerous classes of admiring followers; and have each in succession been supplanted by the next invention and sunk into contempt and oblivion.

Sensible of the futility and uselessness of hypotheses at the bedside of their patients, some have sought to be guided by experience only; though, in spite of this conviction and intention, they have continued to speculate upon the nature and causes of disease. These constitute the eminent physicians and surgeons of the present day. They reject all idea of a general principle for their guidance in the administration of remedies—they even deny its possibility.

Now, the Homœopathic physician claims, that Homœopathy is a general fact—a *principle*—a law of nature. *He first discovers the true properties of drugs by experiments on the healthy organism, and the symptoms thus produced, are the true guides to the administration of the remedy.*

These symptoms, or provings, when verified by experience, are arranged under their respective heads, and thus constitute the “Materia Medica.”

Medicine in the general, is poison to the healthy frame of man, and a remedy to that frame when sick; this is admitted by all, and this is Homœopathy in the general; why then not have Homœopathy in detail? Why not first ascertain what

symptoms each poison produces, when taken in health? and why not give it as a remedy for similar symptoms in natural diseases? Medical men have been experimenting in the treatment of disease for centuries, why not try *this* experiment? Our opponents admit, in general, what they ridicule and oppose when carried out in particulars. Allow me to say here, however, that Homœopathy *relates only to the administration of remedies*, and detracts nothing from the value of the collateral branches of the science of medicine. It leaves Anatomy, Physiology, Chemistry, &c., unaffected.

The Homœopathic physician ought to be accomplished in these, and other departments of knowledge, as his fellow practitioner of the old school; and he is more likely than the other to turn all such knowledge to the beneficial account of his patient.

Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes, in an address on the Currents and Counter-currents in Medical Science, delivered before the Massachusetts Medical Society, refers to the past condition of the Medical profession—the abuses it has clung to, and the absurdities it has fostered; and, considering the injury it has done in the past, and the little good it accomplishes in the present, he said, “Throw out opium * * * throw out a few specifics, which our art did not discover, * * * throw out wine, which is a food, and the vapors which produce the miracle of anæsthesia, and I firmly believe that the whole *materia medica as now used* (the italics are his) could be sunk to the bottom of the sea, it would be all the better for mankind; and all the worse for the fishes.”

Dr. Benjamin Rush, of Philadelphia, a distinguished physician, said: “upon these points, and bearing in mind that we have now in medicine the recorded practice of more than two

thousand years, let the reader refer to the proceedings of the medical profession during the prevalence of the so called "Asiatic Cholera," and he will find their history everywhere exhibiting an extraordinary picture of prefatory panic, vulgar wonder, doubt, ignorance, obtrusive vanity, plans of profit and popularity, fatal blunders, distracting contradictions, and egregious empiricisms.

ALL SUCCESS IN MEDICAL TREATMENT IS COMPARATIVE.

In London about fifteen hundred persons die every week ; for the most part these have died under Allopathic treatment. Now, if any mode of medical relief can be devised which shall diminish, however slightly, this rate of mortality, it deserves to be substituted for the older methods. The amount of general sickness greatly exceeds the amount of mortality ; whatever treatment diminishes, however little, the number of deaths, will diminish very much the quantity of sickness.

We claim for Homœopathy, that it is a mode of treatment, capable of being universally adopted, and should it be found on *trial, only to equal* in efficiency former methods, for the reason given under the last head, if for no other, it is much to be preferred. Should a trial prove it to possess superior efficacy, how greatly is that preference enhanced.

These comparative results are easily obtained either by hospital reports, or in private practice.

Having endeavored to show what Homœopathy is, we now desire to show *what it is not*.

FIRST. HOMŒOPATHY IS NOT A NOVELTY.

This is proven by referring to ancient writings on medical subjects, and the steady progress it has made in the last century.

SECOND. HOMŒOPATHY IS NOT QUACKERY.

The essence of quackery is secrecy. The individual practicing it pretends to the possession of some valuable remedy—a nostrum—which he sells for his own private gain, but which he will not disclose for the public good. Homœopathy has no secrets—no nostrum; *it courts inquiry*; it entreats medical men to investigate it. This is not quackery.

THIRD. HOMŒOPATHY IS NOT GLOBULISM.

Globules are a particular mode of preparing medicinal doses, invented by Hahneman and recommended by him; but Homœopathy is in no way dependent upon their reception for its successful practice. The association is accidental, and is simply a matter of convenience; *a vehicle to convey medicines into the system.*

FOURTH. HOMŒOPATHY IS NOT AN UNCERTAINTY.

It is surprising how the opponents of Homœopathy, and even some of its friends, bewilder both themselves and others, when they endeavor to explain what Homœopathy is. The impression is thus produced that the new doctrine is nothing more than a wild theory; very vague, and very worthless. The most common mistake is thus stated: “A medicine or poison which will produce a disease, will cure it.” “The hair of the dog cures the bite.” “If I am fatigued with a long walk, I must take a short one!” This is the *same* curing the same, not *like curing like*. *Similis is not idem.*

FIFTH. HOMŒOPATHY IS NOT AN INFINITESIMAL DOSE.

This is another popular mistake, diligently though perhaps ignorantly, fostered by the opponents of Homœopathy. Like

curing like—*similia similibus curantur*—says *nothing about the dose*. All that is essential to the carrying out of this principle—all that the general fact or law of nature requires for its fulfillment is announced by Hippocrates; “give the poison in a *smaller dose* as a remedy in the natural disease, than would be sufficient to produce similar symptoms in a healthy person.” A smaller dose—how much smaller is a matter of experience. If twenty grains of ipecacuanha will make a healthy person sick, the twentieth part of a grain may be required to cure a similar sickness, that has been produced from natural causes.

It should not be forgotten that Homœopathy, as a principle, was discovered by experiments made with ordinary doses, and a man may be a true Homœopathist though he never prescribe any other.

It has been sometimes said that the infinitesimal size of the Homœopathic dose carried with it so much of absurdity that any one believing in it must be either a fool or a knave.

Pause ere you act upon such an assertion, or suffer your mind to be prejudiced thereby. *The size of the dose has nothing whatever to do with Homœopathy*. The proper dose is to be found only by experiments; and every Homœopathist has a perfect liberty and right to make these experiments, and use doses of any size which he chooses. But so many times have these experiments been repeated, that it has come to be an accepted fact that they cure best in such quantities as shall not produce any toxic or poisonous effects, or aggravation of the symptoms already existing.

If the millionth part of a grain will cure better than a hundred grains, is not the physician bound to use the smaller dose?

In order to demonstrate that the *minutest quantity is not inert*, let me refer the reader to the recent experiments and demonstrations of M. Davaine, before the French Academy, on the subject of Septicæmia.

From these experiments, which have since been verified, it is seen that the *ten trillionth part of a drop*, actually destroyed life when injected into the veins of a guinea pig. Now, a tank to hold ten trillion drops must have, according to Simpson, an area of 2500 *square miles*, and a uniform depth of 300 *feet*.

With this testimony, who can longer dispute the power of infinitesimals? And the demonstration of its power to *kill*, if it does not show its curative power, at least relieves from the opprobrium of inertness.

Homœopathy is founded on a certain fixed principle or law. The precise explanation of the manner in which its remedies act, whether by the so-called Substitutive Method of Trousseau or that of Electric Affinity is unimportant, and all theories in regard to the origin and nature of disease are foreign to it, and belong only to individual opinion.

In accordance with this law, medicines must be given for precisely such symptoms as they are capable of producing. Thus in disease of the head, a medicine is required which effects the head, not the stomach; if the stomach is disordered, one acting on that organ rather than on the skin. And the medicine must act, not in a general manner upon that organ, but upon that particular portion of it which is diseased. It is useless to administer a medicine which effects only the mucous membrane of the stomach, when either the muscular coat, or the nervous filaments of that organ are the seat of the disease.

So far we have a *theory* merely, but fortunately one that can easily be put to a test. Let me ask the five thousand Homœopathic practitioners in the United States, if they have not frequently seen a decided and marked curative effect from a minute dose of Aconite in fever, Ipecacuanha in vomiting, Mercury in diarrhœa, Coffee in sleeplessness, Belladonna and Glonoine in headache, Hepar sulphuris in croup, Arnica in injuries and Chamomilla in many diseases of infancy.

I know well their answer will be “most assuredly we have,” and proof of this character might be obtained in thousands upon thousands of cases. Even the most bitter opponents of Homœopathy are finding this out slowly, and are giving medicine homœopathically—but “on *physiological* principles.”

They have lately learned that minute doses of ipecacuanha will cure nausea and vomiting, while they have given large doses of that drug for a century; first increasing vomiting and thereby curing it—on the Homœopathic principle to be sure; but so “ignorantly and wickedly” applied, that great mischief is often done thereby. But some wise observer among them has discovered that very minute doses of ipecacuanha will cure nausea and vomiting in a more prompt and satisfactory manner. This astonishing discovery is explained, they think, by the bold statement that ipecacuanha *is a tonic!* How cunningly they avoid the Homœopathic law—“*Similia Similibus Curantur.*”

There are many other instances of the same nature, which might be stated, showing how the “old school physicians” have for years blundered along the road towards Homœopathy, but if told of it, the learned reply is, “Homœopathy is a humbug” and that is the end of it.

SIXTH. HOMŒOPATHY IS NOT A HUMBUG.

Were the matter a piece of deceit, it is not likely to have had the steady success which its opponents are constrained to acknowledge attends its practice.

A short time, at any rate, would expose its fallacy. An ingenious and plausible advocate might make an hypothesis popular, but he could never obtain extensive belief in the statement of a supposed fact which every day's observation proved to be untrue.

The old system has had possession of the Commonwealth for two centuries.

Our system has been known here not quite forty years. Making fair allowance for time, we have as many families entrusted to our care as they have. And our patients are not the careless, the ignorant, the needy, who must take what they can get, or the reckless, carried away by every new whim. No; we count among our patients the rich, who have tried every clime for health, every city for medical skill, every theory for efficient help; we have the foremost men at the bar, in the pulpit, on the exchange. In intelligence, social position, and world-wide culture, the men and women who trust their lives to our system, may be fairly measured with any who consult theirs.

Have we failed to help these friends? Have we been found wanting in severe disease? Forty years is sufficient for trial. The evidence that they have found us efficient helpers is that they continue to trust us. Who then can pronounce a "humbug" what two generations of the best educated men in this country and in Europe continue to trust; which the foremost governments in Europe recognize; which has its hospitals,

both city and national, all over the world; and who dares to compare its success in curing disease with the best of them? If world-wide recognition, unequalled success in curing disease, and the confidence of the most enlightened classes here and in Europe do not lift a system into sufficient character to prevent the term "humbug" being applied, then please describe to us what can?

Homœopathy has been recognized as medicine by the highest public authorities.

There are *incorporated* Homœopathic Medical State Societies in the following States: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan; also in the following, the State Societies are probably incorporated: Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, California, Kansas. Our own State has also "wheeled into line" and organized during the present year a State Society. Besides these nineteen State Societies there are more than sixty local or county societies in active operation, many of which are incorporated.

HOMŒOPATHIC MEDICAL COLLEGES.

There exists also the following incorporated Homœopathic Medical Colleges: Pennsylvania, 1; New York, 2; Ohio, 2; Illinois, 1; Missouri, 2; Michigan, 1. In addition, the Michigan Legislature has passed a law ordering the appointment of two Professors of Homœopathy in the *Michigan University at Ann Harbor*. The Boston University has just established its Medical Department under Homœopathic auspices.

INCORPORATED HOMŒOPATHIC HOSPITALS.

The following Homœopathic hospitals have been chartered by State legislatures and have been established: Massachusetts, 1; New York, 7; Pennsylvania, 2; Ohio, 2; Illinois, 3; Missouri, 1. Besides these there are upwards of twenty other hospitals or asylums under homœopathic care in the United States, in which homœopathy is permitted or required by law.

INCORPORATED HOMŒOPATHIC DISPENSARIES.

There are twenty of these of considerable size, in active operation, and a large number of smaller ones which do not assume a corporate organization.

In *one* of the Homœopathic dispensaries in New York city 41,714 patients were treated last year, (1872.) 7,384 visits were made, and 84,648 prescriptions were given, making it one of the largest, if not the largest, dispensary in the country.

THE EXTENT OF THE PRACTICE OF HOMŒOPATHY.

In 1825 Dr. Gram introduced Homœopathy into America. He met with so much opposition and ridicule that in 1840, or fifteen years after its introduction there were scarcely one hundred physicians believing in it in the United States.

In 1846 a medical school was established in Philadelphia for the teaching of its principles, since that time its growth has been rapid, and as you have seen, it has become a power in the land.

Already more than five thousand physicians, including many from the old school of practice, have adopted its principles, and practice in accordance therewith.

LITERATURE OF HOMŒOPATHY.

There are of Homœopathic journals published and well-supported in the United States alone, three quarterlies, seven monthlies, and one bi-monthly. Not less than one thousand volumes have been published relating to Homœopathic medicine; and more have been issued during the past year than ever before in the same time.

ACTION OF THE GOVERNMENT REGARDING HOMŒOPATHY.

I might call to mind the dismissal by our national government of Dr. Van Aernam, a commissioner of pensions, for the sole reason that he removed subordinates on account of Homœopathic belief; and also the subsequent *reinstatement*, by the government, of the men removed by him.

So also, within the past year the State government of Massachusetts, has had under commission, as militia surgeon and assistant surgeons, three men who were well known to be Homœopathists.

The time therefore is past when men are to be ostracized for adopting the Homœopathic belief and practice of medicine.

CONDITION OF HOMŒOPATHY IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

In Europe, where, thirty years ago, we were told that it was *dying out*, Homœopathy was never so extensively practiced as now. More than thirty hospitals and asylums have adopted this practice. There are upwards of two hundred practitioners of it in Paris alone. It is taught in several universities by a distinct chair. In Saxony, for several years, every pharmacy has been compelled to maintain a separate Homœopathic department. In the German army are many Homœopathists.

Among them the philosophic Grauvogel, noted for his work on the science of Homœopathy, occupies a high position.

In Leipsic, where Hahneman first announced his valuable discovery, and from which place he was afterwards driven by the bitter persecutions of his medical enemies, stands on the public highway a monument with life size statue of this great genius, erected at the public expense. In every court in Europe Homœopathy has been introduced, and is used by a fair proportion of the nobility and gentry, as well as by men of letters, and families of the largest influence and intelligence.

In England alone there are forty-four public, and seventy-one private dispensaries, and nine Homœopathic societies.

In Brazil and some portions of South America, it has already become the prevailing or "orthodox" practice.

It has been favorably introduced among the nations of China and Hindostan, and a handsome monthly Homœopathic journal is issued in Calcutta.

In Australia a Homœopathic hospital has just been established, and in New Zealand a Homœopathic medical journal is published. Whether unprejudiced people will see it or not, the *world does more*.

THE ADVANTAGES HOMŒOPATHY PRESENTS TO THE PATIENT ARE .

The banishment of nauseous drugs and painful and debilitating applications.

It is gentle and agreeable in its effects.

It economises the vital powers, and the convalescence is much shorter.

The deliverance from medicinal diseases, and other destructive consequences of former methods of treatment.

How often do we hear the remark: "I cannot take such strong medicines;" "it *makes* me sick to take it?" How often do we see the patient ejecting every thing, like medicine, from his stomach, gather his enfeebled energies, raise his emaciated form and greet with a ghastly smile his physician who, having failed to reach the disease in the usual manner, comes armed with an assortment of blisters and a huge syringe, determined to reach the disease and "assist nature" either by fair means or foul?

Where the mother who does not shrink with all the maternal instinct from giving her delicate offspring such nauseous doses—first persuading, then threatening and finally holding the little sufferer's *nose*, thus compelling it to swallow the dose?

With Homœopathic remedies this is avoided. Its medicines only act upon the diseased organ. If the head be sick, it does not add to this sickness a complaint in the intestines, which strong purgatives must do; if the lungs be inflamed it does not also bring on an inflammation of the skin, which a blister does.

The beneficial consequences of this method is conspicuous in the speedy return of the patient to his accustomed health and

occupation. When the acute disease is removed, which is often in an unusually short space of time, the patient is *well*; he has no medicinal disease, no tedious convalescence, requires no wine or bark.

Our remedies are not designed to tear down or to destroy tissue, but to build up and replace that already destroyed. It is this fact that enables a healthy individual to take an ordinary dose of Homœopathic medicine “without its making him sick.”

We frequently hear it said, “if your medicines act on disease, why is it that they can be taken in large doses by children without making them sick?” With the same propriety might you ask why a man, who in health can eat his daily rations of pork and beans, can not do so when sick; or, why the eye, which in health bears the strongest glare of light from the noon-day sun, when inflamed, suffers the most excruciating pain from the slightest ray of light from a candle, even through several folds of linen.

The Homœopathic physician gives but *one medicine at a time*. A small dose is generally administered, and time allowed for its effects to be produced before either another dose is given, or another medicine is tried. We do not think it necessary to produce such violent effects from medicine, what we desire is the *specific action* of the drug, the effect which is really of value in the treatment of disease. This is best obtained by a very small dose.

All drugs being poisons, not only is “more in vain” but more is positively injurious “when less will serve.”

The Allopathic physician prescribes his remedies in *combination*, and it is impossible to diminish the dose, without diminishing very materially its effect.

An injury to the patient is also by no means an unfrequent evil from the prevailing practice of mixing drugs together, and thus complicating, often beyond their control, their operation on the living body—sometimes until it lives no longer.

“The mildest remedy,” says Dr. Paris, “may thus (by injudicious combination) be converted into *an instrument of torture, and even of death.*”

He also says: “I was once told by a practitioner that the quantity, or rather the complexity of the medicine which he gave his patients, for there never was any deficiency in the former, was always increased in a ratio with the obscurity of their cases: ‘if,’ said he, ‘I fire a great profusion of shot, it is very extraordinary if some do not hit the mark.’”

A patient in the hands of such a practitioner has not a much better chance than a Chinese mandarin, who when attacked with any disorders, calls in twelve or more physicians, and swallows in one mixture all the potions which each separately prescribes!

It is not unusual now, when a patient has been cured under Homœopathic treatment, for physicians to attempt to turn the force of such evidence in favor of Homœopathy by remarking that “*the patient has got well by leaving off medicine!*” But what a satire upon themselves is such an admission as this! Are they really conscious then that the medicines they are so eager to prescribe from day to day, and for the continuance of which they contend so earnestly—are they conscious that these medicines *prevent* the recovery of their patients? Are they content that the matter should be thus viewed by the public? That the effect of taking their prescriptions is to lengthen out disease—to prolong the patients sufferings?

Are they so driven into a corner by the evidence in favor of Homœopathy, that they have no better weapon to defend themselves than such an argument as this?

IT IS AN ASSERTION MADE IN IGNORANCE.

What do those who make it know of the matter? Nothing. Where are their experimental investigations? Nowhere. What time and pain have they bestowed upon the inquiry? None at all. They do not even profess to have studied the subject; they would not condescend to study it; "they have too much sense." Would you have them study "quackery," and listen to "humbug?"

Alas! we are all far too ignorant of the operation of natural causes, and the production of natural effects, to be justified in using such language as this.

IT IS AN ASSERTION MADE IN INDOLENCE.

I say this because of the facility with which the matter may be tested, and ignorance respecting it removed.

Every medical man engaged in actual practice has opportunities of putting the principle and the dose of Homœopathy upon trial every day. Let any practitioner resolve to look at the question with his own eyes, and he can immediately do so. Let him begin with those drugs with whose poisonous action he is already well acquainted, and in fairness, till he has more skill, give them in the lower dilutions, (the first and second) and afterwards, when he has become more familiar with their use, in the higher or infinitesimal ones.

Such indolence as leads a man to pronounce an off-hand sentence of condemnation against any statement largely affecting the interest of the human family, because it is novel

and startling, admits of no apology, when it is within his power to put the statement to a practical test. "We are to strive," says William Harvey, "after *personal* experience, not to rely on the experience of others, without which indeed no one can properly become a student of any branch of natural science."

IT IS AN ASSERTION MADE IN FOLLY.

A wise man said, "He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is folly and shame unto him."

When a medical man tells his patient that Homœopathy is "lumbbug," let it be said to him: "As you express yourself so decidedly, of course, you have studied the subject experimentally; may I ask you how many months you have spent in the practical investigation?"

A child in such a situation would have red cheeks; whether an adult would feel ashamed or not, I cannot tell; I think he would look somewhat awkward and foolish.

When a non-professional person gives utterance to similar language, let him be told that it is unwise to condemn without knowledge; that when he comes to suffer from disease and to experience the happy results of the new treatment in his own person, his opinion will be altered.

IT IS AN ASSERTION MADE IN ENMITY,

The question is not viewed simply with reference to its truth or falsehood.

It is an "obnoxious" subject, looked upon with repugnance and contempt.

There exists, instead of a desire to investigate it, a desire to banish it, to crush it, to do *anything* to get rid of it.

And yet it is the medicine of mercy; it proposes to eman-

cipate the suffering invalid from every disagreeable, harsh, and cruel proceeding to which he has been long exposed; it professes to be able to cure more quickly, safely, and pleasantly, "*Cito Tuto et Jucunde*," than is possible by any other means; it promises to the physician himself the satisfaction of a scientific method in place of vague experiments.

But it is an "obnoxious system; false and bad," and as such it is hated and opposed, and that to such a degree as to prevent the majority of medical men from testing it experimentally, even with a view of proving the errors which they so vehemently assert it to contain.

And what shall be allowed to be the weight of an assertion made so ignorantly, so indolently, so foolishly, and with such hostile feeling?

Is it of force to dissipate the convictions produced in the mind by an honest trial of the new method, and a careful observation of the actual results? Can they be relinquished at such a bidding? That would indeed be opposed to reason and "contrary to common sense."

Did I not speak truly when I said: "This assertion is groundless, devoid of proof, and worthless?" Entertaining enough in the mouth of a child, but unbecoming in persons who have attained "years of discretion."

ON THE CONTRARY,

Homœopathy is true, and I now include in that word the principle, the moderately small dose, and also the infinitesimal dose.

Such is a brief exposition of the leading features of Homœopathy. They would admit of being much more copiously

enlarged upon, but the aim has been to make a few points so clear that it may not be doubtful what we are contending for. We should be glad to be fairly met with facts and arguments, but in the place of these we have ridicule and abuse. But certainly the evidence in favor of Homœopathy deserves something more than ridicule. Those who reject it, or who cast it out of the way, as unworthy of inquiry, must do so on their own responsibility.

THE END.

COMPARATIVE MORTALITY

—IN—

New York, Boston and Philadelphia.

ALLOPATHIC.

CITY.	YEAR.	No. OF Physicians	No. OF DEATHS	RATIO.
New York.....	1870	944	14.869	15.75
“	1871	984	15.526	15.78
Boston.....	1870	218	3.872	17.76
“	1871	233	3.369	14.46
“	1872	233	4.575	19.63
Philadelphia.....	1872	655	12.468	19.03
TOTAL.		3.267	54.679	16.73

HOMŒOPATHIC.

CITY.	YEAR.	No. of Physicians	No. OF DEATHS,	RATIO.
New York.....	1870	143	1287	9.00
“	1871	156	1243	7.97
Boston.....	1870	40	402	10.05
“	1871	44	363	8.25
“	1872	54	446	8.26
Philadelphia.....	1872	168	2162	12.87
TOTAL.		605	5.903	9.75

Where Homœopathy loses ten patients, Allopathy loses seventeen.

These are statistics of private practice, compiled from official records, and clearly show why THE HOMŒOPATHIC MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE Co., of 231 Broadway, New York, can afford to insure Homœopaths at less than the usual rates.

Write to the Company for further information, which will be furnished free of cost.

