

Roberts (G. B.)

POINTS OF SIMILARITY BETWEEN US AND
HOMŒOPATHIC PHYSICIANS.

THE ANNUAL ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT
OF THE
PHILADELPHIA COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY
FOR 1892.

BY
JOHN B. ROBERTS, A.M., M.D.

[Read May 24, 1893.]



REPRINTED FROM THE TRANSACTIONS
OF THE PHILADELPHIA COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY.
1893.

POINTS OF SIMILARITY BETWEEN US AND HOMŒOPATHIC PHYSICIANS.

THE ANNUAL ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT.

BY JOHN B. ROBERTS, A.M., M.D.

[Read May 24, 1893.]

In the address which I had the honor of delivering from the Presidential chair a year ago, I gave it as my opinion that this Society should be liberal enough to accept as a member any physician whose education and personal character made him a fit associate for intelligent men. I stated my belief that the test of qualification for membership should not be the college from which the applicant received his diploma; but an education enabling him to understand and appreciate the science of medicine, and an honest purpose to treat his patients by all means and methods which experience, investigation and research show to be serviceable. It seemed to me then, as it does now, that such a physician's political, religious or social beliefs and affiliations should not disqualify him; nor should his opinion that in "similars" he sometimes finds a remedy of value.

Following out this line of thought, I have undertaken an investigation to determine whether there are any points of similarity between us, who decline to receive any sectarian designation, and those who accept for themselves the name of homœopathic physician. This study has interested me very much, and it is my purpose to lay some of the results before the Society this evening.

None will deny the fact that as a class we, as well as they, are law-abiding citizens, whose culture, intelligence and wealth add to the intellectual and financial prosperity of the districts in which we live. The doctors of village, town, or city, are ever respected by the community, and their counsel is sought in many emergencies not strictly medical. This deferential courtesy is extended to all honorable and skilful physicians, without thought as to their belief in, or rejection of, the law of similars. In this amenity of civilized society, then, there exists no

difference between us and our homœopathic neighbors. Our mutual social relations also teach us that there should be none. We meet each other in drawing-room, mart, or amusement hall, to find no difference in courtesy, refinement, or large-hearted charity. How often do we meet a homœopathic friend with the heartiest of hand-shakes, because we honor him as a man and love him as a friend. The grasp returned shows that the respect and affection are fully reciprocated.

Much to be regretted is it that a marked similarity exists between the ignorant and half-educated graduate of all kinds of medical colleges. We do not hold a monopoly in the graduation of men who tell State Boards of Medical Examiners that the boiling-point of Fahrenheit is "about 300°," that the "average respirations are 70 per minute," and that the same disease is called pneumonia when it affects one lung, pleurisy when it affects the other. The ignorant and reckless doctor will always be a menace to the public health, whether he decline or accept the designation "homœopathic." The greater damage is probably done by our half-educated graduates, because the number of homœopathic medical colleges in Canada and the United States is only 26, whereas we have 220. From these colleges there graduated, in 1890, only 391 homœopathic physicians, while our colleges sent out 4237. The number of medical matriculates in the United States and Canada during the decade from 1880 to 1890 was, in our own colleges, 115,355. The number of graduates was 35,655. The number of matriculates in the homœopathic colleges during the same decade was 11,366; the number of graduates, 3883. The percentage of graduates to matriculates in our schools was 30.9; in the homœopathic schools, 34.1. These tables, taken from the statistics compiled by the Illinois State Board of Health,¹ would seem to show that the ratio between the number of students and the persons granted degrees was nearly the same in both classes of medical colleges.

As many medical colleges are commercial associations to manufacture doctors as rapidly and cheaply as possible, it is apparent that their output will be ignorant physicians, whose individual beliefs as to the laws or methods of therapeutics will do little to protect the public from malpractice and criminal medical ignorance. The high-grade medical colleges have recognized the fact that the cure for this public wrong is the establishment of State Boards of Medical Examiners, whose examination alone shall determine the qualifications of the applicant for license to practise. It is gratifying to know that we and the most highly educated homœopathic physicians in the various States agree on the necessity for such State laws. It is true, however, that a number of our medical schools (University of Pennsylvania, University of Michi-

¹ Medical Education, etc., Springfield, 1891, pp. 24 and 31.

gan, Harvard University, Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania, and perhaps one or two others) now require four annual courses of college lectures before the student can obtain his degree; and that only one homœopathic college (Boston University School of Medicine), so far as I know, demands this high standard. It is to be hoped that more colleges will soon follow this movement to elevate the standard of medical education.

The text-books for students recommended in official announcements afford instructive evidence of the similarity in teaching given the four or five thousand graduates coming annually from the two kinds of medical colleges. The announcement of the Hahnemann Medical College of Philadelphia, for 1891-92 shows that a great proportion of the works recommended are the same as those we advise our students to purchase. Leidy's *Anatomy*, Tyson's *Urinary Analysis*, *United States Pharmacopœia*, Mann's *Prescription-Writing*, the Stillé and Maisch *Dispensatory*, Wood's *Therapeutics*, Pepper's *System of Medicine*, Gross's *Surgery*, Agnew's *Surgery*, Playfair's *Obstetrics*, Duhring on *Diseases of the Skin*, Reese's *Medical Jurisprudence*, and Gould's *Dictionary* occupy no less conspicuous positions in the list there found than in the announcements of our own colleges.

What I have said shows clearly enough that the material out of which medical students are made, and the college training by which they are developed into medical practitioners are very similar, whether the intending doctor expects to become a physician without a sectarian title or hopes to belong to the ranks of homœopathic medicine. The students are gentle or boorish, earnest or slothful, intelligent or dull, ignorant, or wise, in about the same proportion. They study many of the same books, live in the same boarding-houses, have the same pleasures and trials, and make much the same kind of doctors. The educated, true and earnest are capable of bringing manifold blessings into the sick-room; the ignorant, false and careless do infinite harm to the public—the public which, in Pennsylvania, has no protection from such dangers, since the State has not as yet thought it worth while to weed out the grossly ignorant and incompetent by a State examination and license.

A very striking similarity between us and our homœopathic neighbors is the latitude of opinion exercised in the choice and administration of drugs. Many thoughtless persons believe that we give only large doses, the homœopaths only small ones; that we do not use powders or triturates, that they do not write prescriptions, or administer alcohol or opium. Nothing is easier than to show the fallacy of these statements.

Every member of this Society knows that any attempt to restrict one of us to the use of certain medicines or methods of treatment, or to the employment of any stated size of dose, would result in the immediate

rupture and destruction of the Society. Such interference with individual liberty would not be tolerated. Everything and anything that I believe will aid my patient I must have full liberty to use. No organization has the right to say what drug or what medicinal dose you or I shall employ in the treatment of disease. The whole field of science, medical and collateral, is utilized in our endeavor to relieve and cure disease. We are bound by no therapeutic law of "similars," or of "dissimilars;" we never have been and never can be. We follow the authority of no man, and are bound by no dogmas; but with full liberty of conscience we act as individuals responsible to no other human agent. This phase of our position is often misunderstood by the public. It was, however, clearly stated ten or a dozen years ago in the deliberately written words of the American Medical Association, which, in speaking of a similar topic, said: "Neither is there any other article or clause of the said Code of Ethics that interferes with the exercise of the most perfect liberty of individual opinion and practice."¹

The homœopathic practitioner of to-day, as a rule, feels the same liberty as we do, but believes in what he calls the "law of similars" being a good indication as to the choice of remedies.

Neither we nor they, unless it be isolated individuals, base our practice on "an exclusive dogma, to the rejection of the accumulated experience of the profession, and of the aids actually furnished by anatomy, physiology, pathology, and organic histology."

If the action of homœopathic medical societies, of homœopathic medical journals, and the spoken and written statements of homœopathic physicians are examined, it is evident that very many of those whom the public regards as homœopaths have comparatively little faith in the infinitesimal doses of Hahnemann, or in the infallibility or universality of his law. The gentlemen represented in or by these societies, journals and statements have, it would seem, a belief in the more or less frequent value of the "law of similars" in treating disease; but admit that cases, more or less frequently, require the doctor to use non-homœopathic methods if he is conscientiously to do the best thing possible for his patient. In the words of a resolution passed by the Homœopathic Medical Society of the County of New York, on February 8, 1878, the belief in the law of similars "does not debar us [homœopathic physicians] from recognizing and making use of the results of any experience, and we shall exercise and defend the inviolable right of every educated physician to make practical use of any established principle of medical science, or of any therapeutic facts founded on experiments and verified by experience, so far as in his individual judgment they shall tend to promote the welfare of those under his

¹ See Journal of American Medical Association, Nov. 19, 1892, p. 611.

professional care."¹ This statement corresponds with the attitude and practice of us who, as non-sectarians, believe in the science and art of medicine; and would render the subscribers to it eligible for membership in the American Medical Association, the Medical Society of the State of Pennsylvania, or the Philadelphia County Medical Society.

Dr. Joseph Kidd and Dr. W. H. Holcombe, well-known homœopathic writers, believe, with the members of the New York Homœopathic Society, that everything and every method which cures should be utilized, even by those believing in the law of similars as a valuable indication in therapeutics. Dr. Holcombe says a physician professing belief in the homœopathic law is not obliged to limit his practice strictly to the application of that law, but claims everything which cures. Dr. Kidd, who held a position in the London Homœopathic College, made a similar statement.

I think I am justified in the statement that to-day there is comparatively little belief in, or practice of, homœopathy as advocated by Hahnemann. There is no doubt that a few homœopaths, represented by Dr. Berridge, the late Dr. Lippe and Dr. Neidhard, believe, or at least did believe, in the infinitesimal doses of Hahnemann and the universality of his law of similars, the truth of which two points is, according to Neidhard,² "identical;" but I am inclined to think that the great majority of physicians considering themselves homœopaths reject the idea that diminishing the dose increases the power of any drug. Of these all, or nearly all, give only a modified assent to the law of similars; believing that it is often, perhaps very often, a good rule to follow in selecting a remedy, but that many diseased conditions are best treated by remedies not selected in a homœopathic way. Very many quotations could be made to support my position.

It seems to me that the physicians recognized by the public as homœopaths consist of two classes: First, a small number who adhere to Hahnemann's teachings, which seem to me to be not founded on good evidence, and therefore unscientific and unworthy of credence. Secondly, an increasingly large number who, while entirely rejecting the doctrine of increased power being given drugs by dilution, still have some belief in the law of similars. These last do not wholly rely upon the homœopathic law or methods in treating disease as presented to them in daily practice. It is probable that in many cases a drug originally suggested for a certain disease by a homœopathic text-book or authority is used when that condition is to be treated, without much thought being given to the law; though the drug is administered in powder or pellets, or in

¹ This quotation is extracted from a criticism of the resolution, contained in a "Declaration of Homœopathic Principles," published in *The Organon*, Liverpool, April, 1878.

² Universality of the Homœopathic Law of Cure, pp. 29-34.

a tumbler of water. If this be true, it corresponds with the practice of many of us non-sectarian physicians, who use powders, small pills and solutions advocated by well-known authors and teachers without pausing to inquire the reason for our faith in, and use of, them.

Many homœopathic physicians have their libraries well stocked with journals and text-books edited and written by non-sectarian physicians, who, of course, repudiate Hahnemann's teachings. Various remedies are advocated in these works for the diseases which doctors are called upon to treat. It seems to me probable that homœopaths consult these books in their libraries and select from the drugs therein recommended such as seem to them to be instances conforming to the law of similars. My opinion is confirmed by a recent review in a homœopathic journal,¹ of a book written by a non-sectarian physician. It says of the book: "The doses are generally larger than would be called for, but the suggestive character of the prescriptions will often give excellent hints to meet individual cases." This is very far from being the practice of homœopathy as Hahnemann taught it; but it is not unlike scientific medicine, which aims to select such remedies as will correct those morbid disturbances and changes in the organs and tissues which are the essence of the disease. In a similar manner many of the text-books used in homœopathic medical colleges are written by those who deny the truth of homœopathy.

Dr. James B. Bell, President of the International Hahnemannian Association, in his address last June, said:² "Our society numbers in active living members about 150, and it would be a generous estimate, I think, to double that number, as representing in the whole world all those who may be called true Hahnemannians or who are becoming such. If we have patients going to other cities, especially in the West and South, how rarely can we recommend a physician to them, and if the patients are going to Europe or England, we know of but five or six men in the great cities to whom we can safely intrust them."

Such a statement, coming from an evidently reliable homœopathic source, convinces me that the great majority of homœopathic physicians are very like ourselves in their means and methods of treating disease.

We believe, with Rokitsansky, that the basis of medical treatment is a knowledge of the morbid disturbances and changes in the tissues and organs. The real homœopathy, if I read Hahnemann and his followers aright, pays no attention to the microscopic and chemical changes in tissues and organs, but believes in selecting a remedy which by "provings" causes symptoms similar to, but not identical with, "the totality of the symptoms seen in the patient."

¹ N. Y. Medical Times, January, 1892, p. 309.

² The Homœopathic Physician, Philadelphia, August, 1892.

The great body, then, of homœopathic practitioners, if Dr. Bell is correct, use any drug, administered in any way that seems to them likely to be beneficial. They are, however, called homœopaths, because they have a belief in the partial value of a law of similars, and because non-sectarian physicians usually decline medical association with them. All of these physicians ought to be accepted by us as eligible for professional association and consultation, since they are willing to use any and all methods, and are bound by no exclusive dogma or law. Their preference for remedies selected according to what they consider a good rule in many cases does not impeach their general intelligence or their value to the community any more than the differing opinions of many in our own ranks on other medical topics.

That the tendency of homœopaths is to drop Hahnemann's views and come nearer and nearer to scientific medicine, is well shown in a recent work of Professor Theodor Bakody, a homœopathist of Buda-Pesth.¹ He says: "The dilution of medicine should not be carried to a point beyond scientific recognition;" and "I do not consider the biological medical therapeutics of Hahnemann a universal one, inasmuch as it covers only that department of practical activity where medicinal therapeutic causal cures can be effected." These views were expressed by him in 1873, and were still his views when the volume was written. A further quotation will show how near he is coming to our views in medicine. "In making drug-provings we should not be satisfied with the manifestations of mere subjective or general functional symptoms, but in accordance with the scientific knowledge of our day also include in the field of our observations the finer pathological, physiological, anatomical, and chemical manifestations."

This method of finding out the action of drugs is indeed scientific, and different from the method of Hahnemann, his immediate followers and present imitators. Compare, for example, Hahnemann's *Materia Medica Pura*, translated by R. E. Dudgeon, M.D., with annotations by Richard Hughes, L.R.C.P.E., Liverpool, 1880.

An indirect evidence of this decadence of belief in Hahnemann's homœopathy is the effort of many homœopaths to explain away the inconsistency of their practice with homœopathic doctrines. Dr. Charles S. Mack, of Ann Arbor, affords curious corroboration on this point.² He says that the homœopathic law of similars is "the law and the only possible law of cure," but that there are various principles "upon which useful, though not curative, treatment may be based." He says that iron, lime, demulcent drinks, stimulants, and germ-destroying agents

¹ Scientific Medicine in its Relation to Homœopathy. Translated by R. F. Bauer, M.D., 1891, pp. 36, 37.

² Philosophy in Homœopathy, Chicago, 1890.

may be useful though not homœopathically indicated, and may lead to the recovery of the patient. This, however, he regards as not a cure but a recovery. It is difficult for me to see the difference as far as the patient is concerned, even though Dr. Mack says (p. 75) that he finds "no impropriety in limiting the meaning which *cure* shall have while considering the claim of *similia*." In other words, he justifies his belief in the homœopathic law of *similia* as the *only curative* treatment of disease, by excluding all cases of patients who recover under non-homœopathic methods of treatment. The latter *recover* but are not *cured*. When asked if he would use a chemical antidote to a chemical poison, which was found to be the cause of the acute disease from which the patient was suffering, he replies that he would use such an antidote, but that "even successful treatment with that antidote would not be curative" (p. 123). His faith in the homœopathic law is thus seen to be founded on a hair-splitting of words; and he further says (p. 135), "to-day homœopathists are, more than formerly, availing themselves of various practices which are distinctly not homœopathy."

Recent publications in the homœopathic journals indicate the same half-hearted belief in the "law of similars," and the almost total rejection of the doctrine of infinitesimal doses.

Dr. D. A. Gorton, a homœopath not unknown to homœopathists, deprecates¹ the use of the words "System of Medicine" as applied to homœopathy. He says it is only a system of therapeutics, and states that he is constrained to regard the law of similars as but a fragment in the grand art of curing disease. He thinks that Hahnemann was wrong in regarding homœopathy as destined to supplant all other methods of treatment. He quotes from Hahnemann's *Organon* to show that a true homœopath must never give a laxative, prescribe a warm bath, nor subdue pain with opium; and indicates his belief that few homœopathic physicians are, therefore, true homœopathists in Hahnemann's sense. He expresses doubt whether, out of the eighty or more homœopathic physicians in Brooklyn, twenty could be found capable of rendering in a chronic disease or in an obscure acute disease, a sound prescription according to the law of similars (p. 61). He adds (p. 65) that he has known many professedly strict homœopathic physicians to break up ague paroxysms with massive doses of quinine, use caustics in ulcers, and prescribe emetics, cathartics, and sudorifics.

I am quite sure that my hearers will agree with me that we are very like homœopaths in the treatment of disease, if these homœopathic writers give a truthful account of the methods employed by themselves and their colleagues. These statements, moreover, are substantiated by other writers, who speak in a similar strain.

¹ The Drift of Medical Philosophy, revised edition, 1875, pp. 56 and 70.

A well-known journal,¹ edited by believers in homœopathy, in a recent editorial made the following statement: "It is apparent to even the casual observer, that scientific study is rapidly bringing all schools more in harmony with each other, and while it eliminates more and more the theoretical and conjectural, is building up a scientific therapeutics based upon the unanswerable logic of facts, the general outline of which will be acceptable to all."

The same journal suggests (p. 51) that if the societies composed of non-sectarian physicians revise their by-laws so that physicians now called homœopaths may be eligible for membership, the next move should be for the homœopathic medical societies to drop the sectarian name. Could anything show better than this suggestion the slight hold homœopathy has upon many of the supposed followers of Samuel Hahnemann?

The *Northwestern Journal of Homœopathy* says: "The practitioners of homœopathy forty years ago who are now living can scarcely recognize the merchantable article called homœopathy at the present day,"² and asserts that the doctors who "really practise homœopathy are very few compared with the proportions who did so forty years ago."

The *Homœopathic News* for March, 1892, says editorially: "We venture to assert that had not our school drifted away from the practice of forty years ago, it would have been dead and buried long since." Continuing, this recognized journal of homœopathy says:

"We have drifted away from the practice of giving a pellet of the two-hundredth or higher, and waiting thirty or sixty days for its curative effects; from the prescribing of a high dilution by smelling the dry pellets, those same pellets 'grafted' by shaking a thousand pure pellets with one medicated by the ten-thousandth.

"We have drifted away from a belief in provings made by taking a single dose of the one-thousandth, thirtieth, or third even, and then recording all the symptoms felt by the prover—natural symptoms, colds, diarrhœa, etc., for the next sixty days!

"We have drifted away from the carrying a pocket repertory to the bedside of the patient, and recording the symptoms in columns, and a weary search in said repertory until a mechanical similimum was found.

"We have drifted away from the days when our pseudo-surgery was a disgraceful farce, when we expected silica to open a felon, or hepar sulphur to lance an abscess.

"We have drifted away from the narration of miraculous cures with the highest attenuations, which were not cures at all, but a spontaneous finale of a self-limited disease.

¹ New York Medical Times, May, 1892, p. 48.

² Reprinted in New York Medical Times, May, 1892, p. 55.

"We have drifted from the days when our practitioners would sit by the bedside of a woman dying of uterine hemorrhage, hunting in a repertory for the 'indicated remedy,' while the vital fluid was ebbing away, without recourse to the tampon or ergot."

Dr. Conrad Wesselhoef, in a paper read before the Southern Homœopathic Medical Association,¹ admits that homœopaths, in order to join the ranks of a united medical profession, may "have to recede somewhat from the too premature axiom of the universality and infallibility of our law of similars." He apparently signifies his assent to this necessity.

In an article on "Defects and Limitations of the Materia Medica Homœopathica," a writer, who is a homœopathist, discusses² the difficulty of selecting the proper remedy, because of the possibility of the patient not detailing symptoms accurately, and of the inaccuracy of some of the drug effects attributed to remedies. He makes this pertinent statement:

"It is not too much to say that clinical experience does not verify the half of the symptoms to be found in Allen's mammoth collation of materia medica, and, like the man who never speaks but half the truth, one is left to wonder which half of the recorded symptoms is true and which is false. Many of the prominent drugs in the materia medica were proved, as our correspondent says, in the thirtieth potency—that is to say, in the decillionth dilution. What manner of man must he be who can believe that there is an atom of a drug in a drop of that dilution, or the least degree of drug-force!"

The unreliability of homœopathic "provings" and of the derived "pathogenesis" of drugs is here admitted even by a believer in the law of similars. The *Hahnemannian Monthly*, whose homœopathic orthodoxy will, I presume, not be impeached, publishes an article³ by Dr. J. P. Dake, in which the author says: "But the reliability of pathogenesis has not suffered alone from such causes. Some drug-provers have undertaken to note symptoms produced by doses in which there was no probability, hardly a possibility, of the least drug influences; and some have passed by a great number of articles, having promise of medicinal power and usefulness, to prove some that are eminently disgusting as well as useless."

Even Charles Neidhard has written: "For some peculiar diseases the homœopathic law requires us to give large doses."⁴

This rather lengthy series of quotations from homœopathic writers has been made to establish my point that we and most of them are for

¹ New York Medical Times, January, 1892, p. 313.

² New York Medical Times, November, 1891, p. 225.

³ "Reliability in Materia Medica," read before the Southern Homœopathic Medical Association, January, 1892, p. 2.

⁴ Universality of the Homœopathic Law of Cure, second edition, p. 30.

all practical purposes similar and at one. They, as well as we, are free to choose whatsoever is thought to be the proper remedy for a diseased condition, and to give it in whatsoever dose is considered curative. Speculation as to the manner of action of a remedy or the best method of selecting it is only interesting from a philosophical point of view. Difference of opinion in such matters makes us no less like them than it makes me different from such members of this Society as believe pulmonary consumption to be of nervous origin, or from those who consider aseptic trephining a dangerous operation.

Another point of similarity between the members of the Philadelphia County Medical Society and the homœopathic practitioners of this city and State is, that much attention is given by both to hygienic and dietetic measures in the management and treatment of the sick. The value of a faithful study of these departments of medical science is admitted by all intelligent practitioners. Again, all of us believe that much priceless information has been gained by investigations into the effects of drugs upon the healthy human organism. That the results of such study can be utilized in the treatment of disease is averred by writers such as Wood, Bartholow, and Hare in our ranks, and by the homœopathic authorities, Dake, Farrington, and Hughes.

When our patients are suffering from symptoms which cannot be removed by any known means, or from diseases which experience has shown to be at present incurable, we and they resort to palliative measures. Remedies which lessen suffering and prolong life, even if they have not the least curative effect on the symptoms or disease, are often administered by you and me and our homœopathic neighbor. Opium, one of the most conspicuous of these drugs, is alike used by us all; and by the way, serves well to illustrate the fact that even homœopaths do not rigidly adhere to their supposed custom of administering remedies singly. It, as we all know, is a combination of many valuable remedies.

A glance at the catalogues of Boericke & Tafel, known the country over as manufacturers of homœopathic remedies, will prove to you that my statements are well founded. In them are seen price-lists of triturates of opium (1x, 2x, 3x, and 6x); sepia (2x, 3x, and 6x), mercurius vivus, silicea, morphia, graphites, and china, as well as of iodoform, podophyllin, rheum, and other names more familiar to our ears. It is more than probable that these chemists supply physicians of all kinds with these triturates, as well as with their one-drop tablets (made from mother tincture) of bryonia alba, aconite, senna, and squill.

When Charles J. Hemple wrote, in 1874,¹ that constipation was to be treated by rhubarb and Seidlitz powder and advocated the use of mor-

¹ The Science of Homœopathy, pp. 32, 33.

phine in colic, he certainly was not dissimilar from us in this respect, nor we from him. Yet he was a pronounced homœopathist.

I have already indicated by quotations from homœopathic sources that few homœopathic practitioners now believe in the augmentation of the medicinal power of a drug by diminishing the quantity administered. Hahnemann's assertion of the increasing potency of these infinitesimal doses seems to have lost its supporters among homœopathic practitioners. It is needless to say that in this disbelief we are like them.

The study which resulted in the production of this address has brought me to the same conclusion as that indicated by Dr. Henry O. Marcy, the recent President of the American Medical Association. He says¹ that "homœopathy was born, in a measure, as a protest to indiscriminate heroic dosing with powerful drugs," and that its popular success was partly due to "an unreasoning prejudice in the minds of a narrow conservative leadership" which characterized our predecessors. He intimates that we and the average homœopathic physician are so nearly alike, except in name, that the great body politic of our profession should institute measures to make it easy for such men properly educated to enlist in the grand army of workers devoted to unbiased investigation and the practice of scientific medicine.

Dr. Henry I. Bowditch, our distinguished associate, put it even more strongly when he wrote,² not many years since, that homœopathy and eclecticism were the legitimate offspring of the absurdities of the medical profession at the time of their advent.

A short time ago a paper on revision of the By-laws of the American Medical Association was read before the Chicago Medical Society by Dr. J. C. Culbertson, the well-known editor of the *Journal* of the Association. The action of the Society in approving the sentiment of the paper indicates that its members share the views of President Marcy and Dr. Culbertson; for the first important clause of the proposed revised By-laws provides that the members of the American Medical Association "shall be physicians in good standing in the medical profession, who are graduates of reputable medical colleges, and who in every respect conduct themselves as educated physicians and as gentlemen."

If these opinions of such recognized authorities are correct, and I do not doubt it, it is good evidence that, in the course of five or six decades, mutual observation and gradual deviation from our respective original standards have brought us and the homœopaths so near together that the similarities quite outnumber the dissimilarities.

¹ President's Address, *Journal of American Medical Association*, June 11, 1892, p. 725.

² *The Past, Present, and Future Treatment of Homœopathy, Eclecticism, and Kindred Delusions.* Boston, 1887.

