

WELLS. (P. P.)

WHAT IS HOMŒOPATHY,
And what the Possibilities and Duties
of its Practice?

—BY—

P. P. WELLS, M. D.

—
REPUBLISHED FROM

THE NORTH AMERICAN JOURNAL OF HOMŒOPATHY,

—BY—

THE CENTRAL NEW YORK HOMŒOPATHIC MED-
ICAL SOCIETY.



—
SYRACUSE, N. Y.:
MASTERS & STONE, PRINTERS AND BOOK BINDERS.
1878.

REPORT.

Mr. President, and Members of the Central New York Homœopathic Medical Society : Your committee, to whom was referred the matter of presenting to the public the real state of Homœopathy, which its enemies suppose killed by the action of those professing to be its disciples and followers, beg leave to present the following report :

In the early days of Homœopathy, to be a follower of Hahnemann, meant sincere devotion to his principles, and all who accepted them sought everywhere and always to apply them. The result was a success in the healing art which has brought Homœopathy into popular favor throughout almost the whole civilized world. Then, to be a Homœopath meant ridicule and persecution by almost all medical men. Now, to be a Homœopath means popular favor and success. Consequently, men rush into its profession and practice for the sake of popular favor and success, rather than from conviction of its truth and devotion to its principles. They come with only a smattering knowledge of its materia medica, by their own confessions, too ignorant always to apply its law, presumably, too indolent to learn how to apply it, and of course fail of that success which has given Homœopathy its glory. To cover up their failures they resort to the old-school methods of palliation, narcotism, stimulation, etc., while they deceive the people with the *plea of liberality*, and thus put dollars in their pockets. At the same time the whole medical profession, of every form of faith, recognizes them as pretenders, being neither one thing nor the other. These men have become so numerous as to be a controlling power in some of our societies, and have committed those societies to their position, till our old-school

brethren, seeing our disgrace, have informed the people that "Homœopathy has committed suicide in the open street." But it is not true. Homœopathsists as a class have not forsaken their principles. They are only betrayed by doubtful allies in their own ranks. That the people may know that it is not true, and may have a better knowledge of what Homœopathy is, your committee recommend that this society re-publish and scatter broadcast, a paper from the last number of the *North American Journal of Homœopathy*, by P. P. Wells, M. D., of Brooklyn, entitled "What is Homœopathy, and what the possibilities and duties of its practice."

T. DWIGHT STOW,
WILLIAM A. HAWLEY, } Committee.
E. B. NASH.

At a meeting of the Central New York Homœopathic Medical Society held at Syracuse, September 19, 1878, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That this Society endorses the paper of P. P. Wells, M. D., entitled "What is Homœopathy, and what are the possibilities and duties of its practice?" published in the last number of the *North American Journal of Homœopathy* and the report of its committee recommending its republication and circulation among the people. Further, that a committee of three be appointed, of which the president, Dr. Wm. A. Hawley, shall be chairman to secure the re-printing of the same for the use of this Association, and that the cost thereof shall be met by voluntary subscriptions.

WILLIAM A. HAWLEY, } Committee on
L. B. WELLS, } Printing.
STEPHEN SEWARD.

WHAT IS HOMŒOPATHY ?

The object of this paper will be to answer these questions. The attempt can hardly be untimely, when we are told effort is being made in England, under the leading of one in high official position, to virtually abandon what this word represents, and when we have approval of this effort by some in this country, who claim to be "familiar with the Homœopathic system of medicine." It cannot be impertinent to inquire what it is these gentlemen would have us give up. It can hardly be uninteresting, if we can succeed in giving a clear and correct statement of what this is, which for more than half a century has been made an object of ridicule and misrepresentation, and faith in, and practice of which, has been deemed a sufficient reason for heaping on men, otherwise intelligent and upright, obloquy without stint. Then it cannot fail to be of interest to know definitely what this is, which, notwithstanding the combined opposition of the entire medical profession as it existed when Homœopathy was first proclaimed, and which has been continued to the present time, has yet had steady growth in the numbers of its adherents, and in the confidence given to it by men educated in the sciences which belong especially to the medical profession, and also by the general public over the civilized world, who have witnessed and experienced its benefits. That it still lives and flourishes is a fact. That it lives, is solely because the truth could not be killed by the weapons so freely and unscrupulously used against it. It is certain no lie could have withstood them. What is this which lives and flourishes to-day, after enduring for more than half a century so great opposition and abuse ?

Homœopathy is simply one of nature's laws, enacted and made a part of the condition of man's existence, when he was created subject to pain and sickness. It is the law of relationship between man's pains and sicknesses, and the agents by which these were to be relieved and cured. It being one of the natural laws, it must have had the same origin as other natural laws, and its operations must be as uniform and reliable as are those of other

laws. The object of this law is, given a sick man, to enable himself or another to find with certainty that agent which will cure him. That the finding of this boon may not be left in the darkness of guessing and blundering, but be guided by the clear light of law. So, then, this which doctors have opposed, skeptics rejected, wits and fools have ridiculed, is nothing less or other than the *law of specifics*. That which Sydenham, more than a century ago, recognized as the great need of his profession, the knowledge of specifics, and its great duty, to find them out, this law stands the way to that knowledge, and the guide in the performance of this duty. There was in Sydenham's idea of specific medicine a radical defect. He contemplated specifics for classes of diseases, as for pneumonia as a class, for dysentery, rheumatism, and the like, which, in the nature of things is impossible. The law does not lead to this, but to a knowledge of the specific for each individual case of these or other classes of diseases as it is present to be cured. So, then, the practice of Homœopathy is ever and always the finding of the specific for the case now to be cured. And this finding is to be repeated in every succeeding case, individually, to the end of time, though the thousands of succeeding cases may be called by the same name. This is Homœopathy, and this its practice.

The law declares that the agent which produces in the living organism, phenomena most like those of the natural disease to be the specific curative of that disease. The finding and administering of that which is most similar, is the practicing of Homœopathy, not the giving of pellets or pills, large or small, of high or low potency, or of no potency at all. A man may be a graduate of a Homœopathic college, and put "Homœopathist" on his sign and business card, procure his medicines of Smith or Tafel, give them in high or low potency, or in the crude form, and never make a homœopathic prescription, but by accident, in his life. This is not the finding of that most similar agent which alone constitutes the prescription homœopathic. All short of this, claiming for itself to represent this law, is simply practical false pretense.

If this be a true statement of what Homœopathy is, it must be evident, that in order to practice it there must be such a knowledge of the effects of the agents employed, on the organism, as will enable the prescriber to know that which is most similar when he finds it. But this necessitates ascertaining beforehand, what are those effects of each agent to be employed in the treatment of the sick. The sum of the knowledge of these, as already ascertained by giving drug agents to persons in health, and observing and recording the results which followed, constitutes the Homœopathic *Materia Medica*. In this way, and in this only, could the requisite knowledge of them be obtained.

Then, having this knowledge, and being about to use it for the cure of the sick, in accordance with this law, it is equally evident

that but *one agent* can be given at the *same time*. We do not forget that this has recently been declared "vague, valueless and unscientific." Vague it certainly is not. Nothing can be more explicit. Unscientific it cannot be, if it be a necessity to obedience of one of nature's laws. So neither can it be valueless. Let us see how this is. The law requires that the agent be found and given which, in its effects on the organism, presents the greatest resemblance to the facts of the disease to be cured. Now, as there are no two agents in the record of the *Materia Medica* which have been found to produce identical effects on the healthy, it follows there cannot be *two* which are most like the disease in these effects. Therefore, giving two agents at the same time is giving at least one which is not *most like*, and therefore giving it is an infraction of the law, and is, therefore, unscientific. Now, in view of this law, and its administration as here presented, what is there that should call forth the opposition of the medical profession? What that should attach to its adherents opprobrium and reproach?

But the opponent may say, perhaps, it is not the law to which we object, but the methods of its administration recommended by its promulgator, and, notably, his dose. Here it is. Now we have come to it, and it must be confessed that the *a priori* argument here is in favor of the objector. It is no doubt true that when the dose recommended by Hahnemann is first suggested to any intelligent mind it will seem absurd in the extreme. This is quite natural; it is so at variance with all previous experience and education as to doses of medicines. Where one has been accustomed to many grains of a drug as a dose, and to receive this from prescribers in whose wisdom and knowledge he has had confidence, the idea of the very small fraction of a grain of the same drug, as recommended by Hahnemann, being more curative than those grains, will hardly be received. The case is worse still with the doctor. He has given the many grains, and thinks he knows all about it. The small fraction disgusts him. The marvel is at the outset, how any reasonable man can have greater confidence in the fraction than in the whole. And then, of all things, in this very small fraction! It is impossible there can be any result from it. So the writer of this paragraph has thought and talked. This being so, how could it come to pass that intelligent men should ever openly approve and practice this absurdity of Hahnemann's dose? How Hahnemann himself, for he was both intelligent and learned?

We reply: the dose in the case of the master was not the result of any theory imagined and elaborated in his study; it was not the child of theory at all, in any degree, in part or whole. The dose was imposed on him by the necessities of his practical experience. He began, after the discovery of the law of cure, with the same large doses he had been giving before, and he found that such

doses of medicines, which in their effects were like the facts of the disease under treatment, were followed by an increase of suffering and danger to the patient. The necessity for the small dose then came from the *patient*, not from his doctor. The dose was diminished and yet this undesirable result followed; and this was repeated till that degree of reduction was reached which made the reception of the dose of the similar medicine no longer to be followed by an increase of the patient's sufferings. When this point was gained, he found, and was astonished when he found, that the curative power of the dose so reduced was greater than that of the larger which he had been compelled to abandon. The small dose was a necessity. Its greater curative power a discovery. Both facts, and not imaginations as some have supposed.

In the case of the followers of Hahnemann who employ the smallest doses known to homœopathic practice, so far as I know, they have come to their use in spite of strong prejudices against them. They believed it was impossible these could have any influence on the organism for good or evil. It was only by actual experiment made by themselves, or by witnessing experiments of others that this judgment was corrected. They tried the small doses and found they *did* act, and with better curative results than those larger. Years of continued experience has confirmed their confidence in this fact more and more. It has not been with them more than with the master a matter of speculation. It was first a matter of inquiry prosecuted against prejudice. Then it became to them *knowledge*. And now it is submitted that these are the men who are alone witnesses as to the power of these doses. These men who have tried them and *know*. And as against those who have not tried them and do not know, their testimony must be received. Those who do not know may talk "moonshine" and "impossibility" as much as they please, and when they have done the talk will be only—moonshine. The fact of the action of these doses is one which must rest on the testimony of those who have used them in accordance with the requirements of the law of similars, and not in any degree on the speculations or skepticisms of those who have not. But it has lately been said the homœopaths in England are abandoning the small doses, and that many have done so in this country. This may be true, but it is a little difficult to understand how a man abandons that with which he had nothing to do. It is a fact that the majority of English homœopaths never accepted the small dose as taught by the master. The same is true of very many of those of our own country. They are therefore excluded as witnesses in the case. I do not know of one in either country, who, with a sufficient knowledge of the *Materia Medica* to conduct an intelligent practice, according to the law as we have presented it, having once adopted the high and highest potencies in his practice, has afterwards given them up. They have won the increasing confidence of all such, so far as I am informed.

We have said Homœopathy is one of Nature's laws. In this assertion we intend an uncompromising antagonism to the recent legislation, which reduces it to a mere "rule of practice." We distinguish between *law* and a mere *rule* thus: *natural law* is *universal in its authority, extent and application*. It admits no suspension or substitute. This law, then, in its extent, is equal to the whole domain of disease, as met in the human organism. Being a law of nature, there must be, and is, in it, provision for the wants and cure of all curable maladies, from whatever source or however called.* Like other natural laws it must be equal to all the demands of the facts which called for its existence. Like the laws of gravitation and light, it must be equal at all times to the attainment of the ends for which it was created, and like these it neither needs nor admits assistance from other rules or associate laws for the most perfect attainment of these ends. Like other natural laws, then, this is exclusive in its nature.†

It is another important element in the nature of law, that it is wholly mandatory. It commands. It neither solicits nor permits.

A rule is *partial in extent, authority and application*. In practical duty a rule may be set aside in favor of another rule, or the circumstances of a case may warrant its entire disregard, however

* It has been objected to practice founded exclusively on this law, that it is narrow in its philosophical basis; that it is confined to a single groove, or "dogma," and, more than all, that it deprives the practitioner of a valuable liberty to do whatever he pleases for the benefit of his patient, *i. e.*, to give him the advantage of whatever he thinks will do him good. The true statement of the scope of the law is a sufficient answer to these and all similar objections which have been raised against it. Of that which is in its nature as broad as the domain of the disease, and contains in its record the sum of all that is positively known of the action of curative drug agents on the organism, can hardly be limited in its basis, and if a "groove" in any sense, is certainly not a narrow one. As to the liberty contended for, a practice strictly in accord with this law, will leave few occasions for its exercise.

† The exclusiveness here asserted is as to *other natural laws* for the control of practical therapeutics, and also as to means which do not come within the domain of this law, that is, which have not been proved, and their action on the organism ascertained. It is exclusive as to other laws for the reason that no other is known which fulfills the requirements of a natural law. Homœopathy is not exclusive as to "medical science" in general, or as to any branch of it. Neither is there, nor can there be, any possible antagonism between them. "Homœopathy, the Science of Therapeutics," is in itself, in perfect harmony with every branch of medical science, and with all other natural sciences, and the more perfect these are, the more welcome to its fellowship, and to become aids in its administration. A late attempt of a professed believer in Homœopathy to represent this exclusiveness as antagonistic in any degree to its sister medical sciences, is wholly gratuitous and difficult to excuse. Neither has any branch of science, medical or other, any antagonism to this natural law, the controller of the science of therapeutics.

valuable it may have been in other cases. Or it may be only partially applied in any case, without dereliction of duty. Law demands obedience now and always. It neither provides for nor tolerates any neglect or infraction of its provisions or commands. Law is expressed by—*thou shalt*—or *thou shalt not*. Rule is limited to—*it may be well to do, or not to do, this or that*, and this because of supposed analogy of the case in hand to other previous cases, in which the applied rule had been beneficial or otherwise. Law demands *exact* compliance with its requirements, admits no deviation in favor of ignorance, indolence, prejudice or personal preference—yielding to either of these, and the law violated, the fruits of practical obedience (practical successes), are of course, wanting.

Another element in the nature of natural law is *permanency*. It does not exist to-day and cease to-morrow. It neither changes nor becomes obsolete. That which was law in the relationship of curative agencies and diseases in the beginning of the nineteenth century, is law now, and will continue to be to the end of time.* This law can no more change than can the law of right and wrong, or that of gravitation. Is there, then, to be no progressive improvement in practical medicine? It may well be hoped there is to be much. But this is certainly not to be sought nor gained outside of law, nor by its transgression. Not certainly by amendments or supplements to natural law, emanating from human imagination, however bright and active, or from whatever of *ex cathedra* utterances of human ambitions or imperitineses. If this be a law of nature governing practical medicine, then improvement in this most important of practical sciences is only to be realized by a more perfect understanding of the law, a more strict compliance with its requirements, and a more perfect knowledge of the agencies which it employs in giving health to the sick and relief from pain. Improvement in therapeutics was sought outside of law for three thousand years. The result was certainly not such as to warrant a longer search in that direction. It follows, then, that to seek it by practically repealing the law, is worse than folly and madness combined. To reduce the law to the low level of a rule, as to its control of practical thought and duty, is a crime for which our language fails to give a designation sufficiently condemnatory. It is a self murder of science, so far as the body so resolving may be regarded as repre-

*It does not, therefore, follow that remedies which cured diseases, called by a given name, a century or half a century ago, will for that reason cure them now. The elements of the disease may have changed in this time to an extent that the former similarity, by virtue of which they were cured no longer exists. Still the law remains unchanged, and now, by reason of this change in disease, calls for the discovery of other more similar remedies for its cure. This is illustrated by the history of the relations of Belladonna to Scarlet Fever.

senting the science of therapeutics, and out and out murder of human beings, so far as this resolving may have control over the practice of others, who may by it be tempted to give up law for rule. Of this hereafter.

If proofs be demanded of the justice of the claim which we set up for the law of similars, that it is one of nature's laws, they are many, convincing and sufficient. They abound in the continuous history of its practice by those who have strictly followed its instructions, and complied with its requirements, during more than half a century. It can hardly be necessary to give, to a candid mind, more than a few of the many facts of which these proofs consist, and this rather as evincive of the nature of these facts, than as an assumed sufficiency of these few alone to sustain the claim. To go farther would exceed the limits of the plan in view in the preparation of this paper.

The first fact, and one which goes far in the proof we are attempting, is, that in the prevalence of the fatal typhus which followed the disasters of Napoleon's Russian campaign, in 1812, and was so general throughout Europe, Hahnemann was able, from a knowledge of the facts of the epidemic, to name, in his study, the curatives of the disease according to this law, with a certainty which was confirmed by their successful use in the treatment of this historical fever.* It was this success which first gave to homœopathy its European reputation. The cases treated by those remedies, as directed by Hahnemann, recovered with marvelous uniformity, and in a very short time, and this to such an extent as to force the recognition of a relationship of law between the remedies and the disease, on all intelligent minds who witnessed the facts. They saw and acknowledged that this uniformity of result could not be accident.

The second historical fact which I shall notice, is still more remarkable. On the approach of the first epidemic of Asiatic Cholera, to Northern and Western Europe, in 1829, while it was yet far off, and Hahnemann had never seen a case of it, he was able to name the remedies, which, in its presence, would be found both curative and prophylactic, and this from the descriptions of those who had been observers of the dread malady.† Experience with these remedies in the presence of the disease, abundantly confirmed the accuracy of his predictions, and this to an extent that all subsequent opportunities for observing and treating cholera, have given us no improvement in the course recommended, under these unfavorable circumstances, by this truly great philosopher and observer. Even in subsequent epidemics this course has given successful results, which, in comparison with any and all other methods of treatment, go far, very far,

* *Allgemeine Anzeig. der Deutschen*, No. 6, 1814.

† *Dudgeon's Lectures*, p. 29.

towards demonstrating the principle on which this selection of remedies was made to be a natural law, and not in any part a mere hypothesis or accident. The mortality of this plague has been reduced, on the average, by this course of treatment, about fifty per cent. In many localities the reduction has been much greater. And even this result, remarkable as it is, was surpassed by the success which followed the use of the recommended prophylactics. The protection was so great as to completely demonstrate the existence of law in the preservation realized, and in the process by which the prophylactics were discovered. In some epidemics, and in some localities the protection has been uniform and complete. In others, where attacks followed the use of the prophylactics, they were uniformly of a mild character. Can this have been accident? And now wherein was the man, or the law which he thus proclaimed and demonstrated, proper objects of ridicule or reproach? It is not necessary to this argument to repeat in detail the comparative statistics of mortality by cholera, in its successive epidemics, which so triumphantly prove the superiority of the homœopathic treatment over all other methods, and so assuredly affirm Homœopathy to be one of Nature's laws. These have been often published, and now it can only be needful to allude to them to bring them fresh to every memory.

The third fact which we shall present differs from the two preceding in that it pertains to diseases in general, while they each have to do with only one individual form of epidemic. Kurtz, medical and civil counsellor to the Duke of Anhalt Dessau, gathered the results of Allopathic treatment of diseases, for ten consecutive years, in hospitals in England, Scotland, France, Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, Germany, Sweden, Bohemia, Bavaria, Austria, Hungary, Silesia, Russia and Italy, and found the published reports of these hospitals disclosed a mortality of between ten and eleven per cent. of all cases treated. During the same years there were hospitals where diseases were treated exclusively by the Homœopathic method, in Germany, Austria, Bavaria, Silesia and Hungary, in the same cities where the Allopathic hospitals were located, whose reports made a part of the materials from which the above average mortality was ascertained. These Homœopathic institutions had to do with the same epidemic influences as their old school neighbors, and in the general, with the same class of population and diseases. The reports of these institutions disclose a mortality of between four and five per cent. of all diseases therein treated during these same ten years,† the difference being something more than 50 per cent. in favor of Homœopathic treatment. Can so great a difference

† *British Journal of Homœopathy* Vol., I, No. 7.

have been an accident? Does it not rather affirm the treatment to have been an offspring of law?

In private practice the facility for obtaining correct and reliable information is less than that afforded by hospital records. Private practitioners are not accustomed, as a rule, to keep a written record of all cases they treat, for a series of years, yet in one instance at least this has been done through a long life.* This honored physician practiced Allopathy thirty-three years, treated in this time 75,360 patients, with a loss of 6.7 per cent. He practiced Homœopathy seventeen years, treated 27,078 patients, with a loss of one in 105½, or less than one per cent. The loss of three other homœopathic physicians in the same city, at the same time, was nearly the same as Mühlenbein's. The general Allopathic practice in Brunswick for the years 1835, 36 and 37, resulted in a loss of nine and a half per cent., or something more than eight times as great as that of Homœopathic practice in the same years, in the same city. A difference altogether too great to be accounted for by any plea of accident. It sustains with emphasis the claim we urge for Homœopathy, that it is indeed one of nature's laws. We have no doubt there are in this and other countries practitioners of this method whose record, if it could be had, would show an equally favorable result.†

But it may be asked, are there not other natural laws of healing than that of similars, by which we may be guided to the selection of specific curatives in treating the sick? I cannot say there are none. I can truly say I know no other. Does the inquirer? If there be another or others, which can show me a better practical record than that which has come to us from a strict obedience to the law of similars, I should like to know it or them. I am ready to abandon this law any day when I can be shown a better with a better record. In the absence of any knowledge of any other law, I am bound to obedience to that which I do know, and especially when I remember its hospital

* Mühlenbein. Physician and Privy Councillor to the Duke of Brunswick.

† Dr. George August Heinrich Mühlenbein died on the 8th or January, 1845, at the age of 81 years in Schöningen, in the duchy of Brunswick. It will enhance our estimate of the remarkable record of the first seventeen years of his Homœopathic practice, if we remember the poverty of the resources of the Homœopathic physician, of that time, as compared with ours of the present. There were then no more than sixty or seventy remedies satisfactorily proved, on which he could draw for his cures. We have added to these some six or seven hundred, more or less successfully proved, which are now available to us in our daily practice. It would be truly grateful to us if we could believe our practical record to have been an improvement on Mühlenbein's in the ratio of our greater number of proved remedies to which we have access.

record shows a possible saving of 52 lives of every 100 lost in allopathic practice, and in private practice a possible reduction of loss to less than one per cent.

We do not forget that the resolution by which the New York State Homœopathic Medical society perpetrated its suicide, appeals to "*experience*" in its plea for the right to disregard this law, and to substitute for it whatever of means may be imagined to be sustained by this well-sounding word. We accept this appeal. We give the above records of hospital and private experience, under the guidance of this law, and challenge a better from whatever other guidance, or from the use of whatever other means not sanctioned by the requirements of this law. Till a better law with a better record is shown, the advocate for abandoning this, occupies no enviable ground.

It is not forgotten that a claim has been set up for *contrarai contrariis* as one of nature's laws of healing. A moment's reflection suffices to show the claim to be absurd and false. What is the contrary of typhoid fever, pneumonia, pleurisy, peritonitis, rheumatism, neuralgia, whooping cough and a multitude of other maladies which afflict our race? There is none. Then this claim fails in one of the essentials of natural law—*universality of application*.

But liberty is claimed to do for his patient whatever in the judgment of the physician will do him good. We go as far as the farthest in our advocacy of the largest liberty to do what is right. There is, or ought to be, no liberty to the physician to do wrong. If there be a law of nature which is an adequate guide to the doing of that which is right, he has no liberty to set this aside, and proceed without law, or other guidance than his own impressions, in favor of this or that. But "experience and observation"—these must be sufficient guides—sometimes. Must they? Whose "experience and observation?" What is the "experience and observation" which claims the right to set aside a natural law, and decide issues which properly belong to it alone? Whose is this "experience and observation" for which this authority is claimed, and on what foundation does this asserted superiority rest? Was not the appeal to the "experience and observation" of 3,000 years, when men attempted the defence of blood-letting in the treatment of inflammatory diseases? And have not the "experience and observation" of Dietl proved that of every twenty-two deaths from pneumonia so treated, fourteen were killed by this treatment. Has the appellant a longer experience or one more confidently trusted than was this of blood-letting? If he forsakes law for the guidance of any so-called experience, let him remember this history of blood-letting, and look well to the foundation of any which tempts him to this course, which, however plausible, may end in a crime as great as

that detected and exposed by the experiments of Dietl.* We have accepted the appeal to "experience and observation," and confidently rest in the assurance that the records of both hospital and private practice sustain before it the superior results of practice founded on law. Allopathic practice has for its foundation this "experience and observation," or it has none. We have shown its short-comings in comparison with a practice guided and controlled by law.

But shall I not be at liberty to do any thing for my patient which will cure him best? Certainly. And it is because true experience and observation have proved that diseases are best and most certainly cured by a strict conformity to the requirements of this law, that we insist earnestly on its authority, and on the duty of all to whom a knowledge of it has come to give their patients the benefits which authentic records prove to be most certainly realized by strict obedience to its requirements. It is because diseases are more safely and surely cured by homœopathic methods and means that we protest against its law being supplanted by any rule less authoritative, and its means by any less potent for cure.

We protest against endeavors to discredit this law by its professed friends, either by adverse legislation or neglect of its authority in their practice, and we claim that our protest is fully sustained by the records of practice which it has wholly guided and controlled.

We protest against the claim set up for liberality by those who proclaim their readiness to substitute for this law, in their practice, other means and methods which the records prove to be less efficacious in curing the sick than those sanctioned by this law, affirming that by this substitution they deprive their patients of fifty-two per cent. of their chance of recovery, as proved by the record.

Finally, we protest in the name of this law, against the pretense to the community of its practice, by physicians who habitually disregard it and all its methods and requirements, and resort to means wholly outside its domain, thus depriving their

* Of all practical fallacies, this which sounds so plausible, and even reasonable, is one of the greatest. Take the history of medical theories in all the past centuries, all or nearly all of which are now abandoned as absurd, but few of which survived the lives of their promulgators, and yet each of these, for the support of his theory and the recommended practice founded on it, appealed to experience. When theories were opposites, the appeal was still to experience. When *Bouillard* would have pneumonia treated by repeated bleedings ("*Saignez, coup sur coup*"), he appealed to experience as sustaining this course, which *Dietl* has since demonstrated to have killed about 70 per cent. of those who died under its administration. And so the appeal has ever been to experience, and experience has ever, or too often, been a cheat.

patients of the benefits which the record proves them to be entitled to, and which a truly homœopathic practice assures to them, and demand in the name of humanity that such physicians cease their deceiving, and no longer use the name they dishonor by this course, and that they stand and be recognized by that which truly characterizes them—*Eclectics*.

