

WBK
H776
1857

North American Review,

✓
HOMŒOPATHY;

ITS TESTIMONY AGAINST ITSELF.

Presented by S. G. Green

Reprinted from the BOSTON MEDICAL AND SURGICAL JOURNAL,
with additions.

Surgeon-General's Office.
LIBRARY.
W 32617
Washington, D.C.

BOSTON :

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR, BY D. CLAPP,

Over 184 Washington Street.

1857.

EXTRACTS AND NOTES

WBK
H776
1857

EXTRACTS AND NOTES.

QUACKERY is an ill-sounding word, and so would be any other used to express the same idea. It relates to the making of false pretensions concerning medical affairs, whether by ignorant or educated persons. It is rendered familiar partly by the advertisements of disguised medicines, which continually appear, and sink into neglect, again to be brought forward under a new name, and perhaps altered in appearance. It is now difficult to find the person who credits what is urged in favor of any one of these nostrums; and they are used, for the most part, when a cheap and inferior article is chosen. Such directions as go with them can be afforded much cheaper than the advice of a physician.

They manage such things differently in Germany. Besides the usual extravagant pretensions, each one is there anxious to show that his own nostrum is in the height of fashion, and is used by the nobility everywhere. That course was attempted by those charlatans who got up the system of quackery called homœopathy; and when it was imported into this country, the same course being continued here, some of the American "aristocracy" were a little, a very little, imposed on. But if any wish to inquire, they can find that in whatever parts of Europe homœopathy has been known, it has always been scouted by nearly all persons of the higher ranks; and that the only evidence that it ever was fashionable, is derived from some homœopathic source. The evidence that a lawyer delights in, is that which is wrung from the witnesses of his opponent; and

we here rely chiefly on the writings of the homœopaths themselves. Their periodicals are all in reality quack advertisements, under the guise of scientific publications, as any well-informed person may ascertain by examination. Though no more credible than such advertisements in other forms, especially when they speak of their success, yet what they contain adverse to their own pretensions is not unworthy of observation. Externally they resemble other quarterlies and monthlies. They are not printed for the use of physicians, like the ordinary medical journals; but rather to influence the public. Certain extracts are read or reported to those interested, other parts are written solely to give the volume a suitable bulk, and by their mere external appearance some leading minds are brought to infer hastily that the body must needs be a reputable one which publishes such quarterlies. Whatever the stories of their success, one may as well put confidence in the puffs on the last certain cure for consumption; but they contain some things which with more prudence would have been suppressed.

Whether or not the term quackery should be applied to homœopathy, some have doubted; not so the homœopaths themselves. They, by their writings, confess it their own. They complain that for more than fifty years they have been subjected to the laws against quackery, which exist in most European nations, and are enforced more or less strictly in different places. Such complaints they make continually. These laws are made on the principle that the holding out of delusive hopes of cure, by making false and extravagant pretensions, is a crime to be punished, because the credulous are thereby swindled out of their property, and other injury is produced. By the operation of these laws, they have in most places never been able to gain a foot-hold; in other places they have been exterminated, and every where more or less disgraced.

From the *British Journal of Homœopathy*, published in London, Oct. 1853, p. 665, it appears that no homœopathist ever practised in the large republican city of Frank-

fort before 1848 ; that one who began business there, about that time, was soon expelled from the city by the magistrates, solely on account of his method of practice ; that he then took up his residence in a neighboring village, within the bounds of Hesse Cassel, and visited his patients in the city as before ; and that for these visits he was fined, and compelled to leave the neighborhood. From the silence of subsequent publications, it would seem that no homœopathist has been permitted to practise there since. These facts were published, not from a desire of making them known, but in order to represent a bad matter in a light least hurtful to themselves. Other facts are made known in the same way, yet we can in no case feel sure that the most interesting parts are reported.

In the same quarterly, for July, 1853, p. 485, it is said that homœopathy was never practised at Rome until Dr. Wahle removed there in 1843, after his residence at Leipsic had been made disagreeable by "persecution," and that for a long time he met with great difficulties in getting permission to begin business, though latterly his practice was large. It appears from the article, that the time when those difficulties were removed, and his practice became large, was at the setting up of the last Roman Republic, in 1848. At the restoration of the Pontifical government, his practice seems to have been again interfered with, for it is mentioned that he had leisure to travel into the north of Germany.

In the *North American Homœopathic Journal*, published at New York, May, 1852, p. 127, speaking of late political events, it is said that "in France, Italy and Germany, revolutions, and still more reactions, have hindered the progress of homœopathy." From this it should perhaps be inferred, that after the revolutionary movements of 1848 were subdued, the homœopathists were again subjected to the degradation from which the outbreak had relieved them, and that the laws against them were executed more rigorously than before, because some had neglected their own business to

attend to state affairs. In the *Quarterly Homœopathic Journal*, published in Boston, July, 1850, p. 300, it is said that "Dr. Wurmb, a homœopathist of Vienna, was a captain in the students' legion against the emperor, during the revolution, and took part in one of the battles; and that the reaction has nearly destroyed him." In the same *Journal* for April, 1850, p. 252, the following extract appears. "Most of the Austrian homœopathic physicians belonging to the republican party were deeply involved in the Vienna revolution, and many of them had to fly after the hopes of the friends of liberty were prostrated." The following is found, pp. 244 and 245. "Bavarian physicians are not permitted to settle any where but by permission of government. The American homœopathic practitioner has hardly any conception to what innumerable annoyances his German and European brethren are exposed. The privilege to practise in any Bavarian town is granted only to favorites, and that these are hardly ever [never?] homœopathists may easily be conceived."

The *Philadelphia Journal of Homœopathy* for Feb. 1854, p. 683, says that the homœopathic practice, after a comparatively free course in Bavaria for twenty years, was interdicted in 1842 in all the public institutions of the kingdom; and that in 1848, the year of the revolution, the prohibition was removed, but was again imposed soon afterwards.

The *British Journal of Homœopathy* for April, 1855, p. 328, says that homœopathy was prohibited in Austria in 1819; and though that prohibition was said to have been removed a long time afterwards, their journals also say other things inconsistent with that assertion. The *Quarterly Homœopathic Journal* for July, 1850, p. 305, speaking of Austrian tyranny since the revolution, says: "Of the arbitrary acts of this government, the inhabitants of a free country can hardly form any conception. Thus the rescript of the government, permitting the homœopathic practice to all physicians, has never been allowed to be published." That rescript would seem to have been the product of the revolution, and to have

lost its force when the emperor recovered his power ; and it is said, on the same page, that some homœopaths, “ in order not to be discovered, pretend to prescribe allopathic medicines which their patients never take, using homœopathic medicines all the time, according to the actual directions.” Instead of appearing openly, as men of fashion like to appear, they are forced to hide their doings from the police. Still, it has repeatedly been written that homœopathy is more flourishing in Austria than on any other part of the European continent ; and since they are there reduced to such expedients, how must they manage in places where they are yet more restricted ? As fortune-tellers have managed to lurk in the shade when their arts are prohibited, so homœopathy has by some means prolonged a degraded existence without being able to convince magistrates that its pretensions are true. They may well desire the success of the liberal party, that their arts may have a free course.

The following is from the *Philadelphia Journal of Homœopathy* for June, 1854, p. 148. “ Homœopathy is not yet exempt from persecution. In Germany the flame of persecution still burns, and in liberal and free England the spirit of intolerance is actively essaying to put [keep] it without the pale of respected things.” The *British Journal of Homœopathy* for July, 1855, p. 449, complains that there was no homœopathist with the English army in the Crimea, and gives the answer of Lord Panmure to a request to put one of the hospitals under their care. As the physicians had just lost 20,000 patients, it was urged that homœopathy should have a trial. Lord Panmure’s answer shows that, much as medical aid was needed, the government could never think of applying to them, because their pretensions were false and most extravagant. He expressed himself, however, in courtly terms, as he was not desirous of losing a vote by unnecessary harshness. The request was made, not because they had the least expectation of its being granted, but solely for the purpose of advertising themselves. It is well known that there

was never a single homœopathist on the medical staff of either of the armies in the Crimea.

The *North American Homœopathic Journal* for May, 1853, p. 271, contains an extract from the *Zeitschrift für Homœopatische Klinik*, printed in Germany. It gives an account of the condition of homœopathy in 1852. It says, "The relations of the state to homœopathy, a subject which fortunately gives but little trouble in America, seem to have remained the same in Europe. The position of the old school is as hostile and uncompromising as ever, and gives promise of remaining so." That is, in its relations to the state, by which they here mean every European government, it now stands as quackery, the same as it always has stood; and it has promise of remaining so. They give up the hope of ever being viewed by magistrates in any other light. Of course, they can never be generally viewed in any other light, until they convince physicians, the old school as they say, that their pretensions are true; this they have never attempted. Their efforts are directed not to convince them, but to deceive such as may be deceived. Of their progress, this article gives important information. It laments the low and oppressed condition of homœopathy in Prussia and other northern parts of Germany. It says that in Sweden, Denmark and Russia, it is scarcely heard of; and that it flourishes in Austria, Bavaria, and other southern countries of Germany. It says that in England it flourishes more than in Germany itself; that the number of practitioners is there large, and that "above all, America seems to have given it the warmest embrace." The *British Journal of Homœopathy* for July, 1853, p. 480, speaking of a register of the names of their practitioners in Europe and America, says, "the latter especially is a most formidable list." The *Quarterly Homœopathic Magazine*, published at Cleveland, April, 1854, p. 45, says, "homœopathy has more rapidly extended itself in this country than in Europe or elsewhere." We have here important data. The United States, it would seem, contain more homœopathic practitioners than Europe, England

more than Germany, and the south of Germany more than the north. It would seem, too, that the laws against quackery are more rigorously enforced in the northern countries of Germany, than in Bavaria and Austria. It should be remembered that, in the north of Germany, the universities and public schools maintain a higher character than those of New England.

The *North American Homœopathic Journal* for Nov., 1852, p. 493, contains a list of the names of their practitioners in New York and the principal Atlantic cities. The editors show an anxiety to make the number appear as large as possible. For New York City they give 62; for the rest of the State, 242; Philadelphia, 53; Boston, 20; Providence, 9; Baltimore, 10; Washington, 2. Total, 398. This is the list so much admired by the Europeans, as larger than all Europe can show; and as in the scattered population of the South, and of the country towns of the West and the East, they fail in finding adherents sufficient for support, there is no reason to suppose that one hundred others could have been reckoned.

The *Quarterly Homœopathic Journal* for April, 1850, p. 285, quoting the *British Journal of Homœopathy* for the January preceding, gives a list of the British practitioners. The number is 48 in London, 51 in the rest of England, 10 in Scotland, and 7 in Ireland. Total, 116. This is the number that made the German editor to wonder at their prosperity in England, where quackery is nearly as free as in this country. Hence they seem to make out that there is but an insignificant number among the 70,000,000 who speak the German language; and no credible evidence is found that it ever was larger. That these numbers are not rated too low, there is other evidence; for instance, the smallness of the number of members collected at their meetings. At *The Annual Homœopathic Congress of the British Dominions*, instituted in 1850, all their practitioners are urged to attend; notices of the times and places of meeting are widely advertised; notes of the proceedings are published; and from the noise raised, as well as from the magniloquence

of the title, the body may perhaps be supposed a formidable one, at least for its numbers. In 1852 thirty-four members were present; and they were congratulated by the president, in his opening speech, that so many had assembled. The number in 1853 is stated less definitely, but it appears to have been thirty-five. In 1854 there were eighteen precisely, and twenty-nine in 1856. Other kinds of quackery might there muster, each kind in larger numbers. *The Central Homœopathic Union of Germany* is a similar body, conducted in a similar manner for all Germans, whether Swiss, Austrians, Prussians or others. In 1854, the annual meeting was held at Weimar, in a densely populous region traversed by railroads. The number present was published, for it seems to have been unusually large. It was twenty-seven, of whom three were styled apothecaries, and one a veterinary surgeon. The preceding year, twenty-four attended at Magdeburgh; the meeting was first appointed at Hesse Cassel, but the homœopaths were prohibited by the sovereign of that country from assembling within his dominions. This prohibition seems to have been decreed not on account of their quackery alone, for they write that the sovereign was, or affected to be, suspicious that the real object of the meeting was to organize a conspiracy against the government. Hence it would seem that in Germany they are reputed to belong, not to the court party, the fashionable one, but to the radicals. See *Brit. Jour. Hom.*, Oct. 1852, p. 668; Oct. 1853, pp. 661 and 671; Oct. 1854, pp. 674 and 683; and July, 1856, p. 502.

The same Journal for October, 1856, p. 663, contains a notice of the *German Homœopathic Directory*, published the May preceding. It is described as giving a list of the homœopathic practitioners among the Germans, and "the Austrian non-Teutonic population," such as Sclavonians, Croats, Hungarians, Transylvanians, Bohemians, Venetians and other Italians. In these countries there are above 100,000 who practise in accordance with the established science; and this directory says there are 439 homœopaths. It does

not, however, give the proportion of apothecaries and veterinary surgeons reckoned among them ; nor does it say how many are superannuated, or infirm and unfit for business, nor how many are dead, but still counted among the living. Four hundred and thirty-nine, according to their showing, are scattered among 75,000,000 people, about one to 200,000 ; and thus they show how very popular and fashionable the thing has at length become.

But undoubtedly they represent the number as larger than it really is. They are always boasting and endeavoring to make their numbers appear as large as possible. This directory is described as giving information on various other matters in relation to homœopathy ; and it was evidently published as an advertisement to magnify the importance of the system. The number of practitioners, which to us appears so insignificant, must to any German appear larger than he could see reason to expect, judging from all that he can see of the system in his own neighborhood. To us it betrays their weakness, but with regard to him it must have been designed to give the appearance of strength. The directory is described as "in no case giving the particular address of the practitioner," but in general only his sur-name, together with the name of the town where he lives. Had full particulars been given, they would have been thereby betrayed to the police ; and if fictitious names of men or towns have by any accident been introduced, such facts will not there be readily detected. In short, this directory is good evidence that their number is contemptibly small ; but it is not evidence that the number is one half so large as it pretends.

The fact that homœopathy was not adopted by all physicians many years since, is ample proof of its falseness. The homœopathsists for once speak correctly of regular physicians, when they say that "every new article, or modification of means already known, is seized upon by them with avidity, and practically adopted." See *Philadelphia Journal of Homœopathy* for Feb. 1855, p. 688. Every real improvement has always

been almost universally adopted by the physicians of all civilized countries as soon as made known. It is for the interest of every one to do so, and it can be done quietly and privately by each one in his own practice; for which reasons no medical sect ever did or ever can exist, yet many counterfeits there have been, each trusted by few and soon ceasing to be current among that few. No one but an impostor ever tried to get up a medical sect. Medical science, like astronomy, is essentially the same in all civilized countries; but counterfeits have a thousand various shapes. Regular medical practice is in each case to choose from all the remedies which the world affords, such as are best adapted for that case; but quackery makes any pretensions that will any where pass current for a time, and misrepresents the medical profession in every possible way. Within sixty years, hundreds of improvements have been discovered and quietly adopted; and the public receive the benefit without having been urged to contribute to the selfish interests of a sect. When attempts are made to organize a medical sect, the private interest of the movers is the real object, whatever the pretence may be. None ever succeeded in enlisting any considerable numbers, and none ever will.

Homœopathy and vaccination were proposed to the world about the same time. It was at first supposed by Jenner, that vaccination might be performed with the matter of several distinct diseases to which the cow is subject; and those who were inoculated with the wrong matter received no benefit, and were prostrated by the small-pox when exposed to its power. Accordingly, many with sufficient reason were opposed to vaccination; but when Jenner, in 1798, published a pamphlet correcting his mistakes, and giving a fair description of the disease to which alone we should resort for matter, it was almost immediately received by all physicians every where. It then made more progress in six months than homœopathy has in sixty years.

Homœopathy, though a system of quackery, is not a system of medical practice. Were it entirely correct,

it would be but a small part of such a system. It comprises only two points; the one that like cures like, and the other the extravagant assertions concerning infinitesimals. The former, if true, would serve only as a guide in selecting medicines with which to make experiments on diseased persons. Why the medicine to be experimented with is the one selected, is a matter of little importance, but the experiments themselves are of much importance. It is by such experiments that all are guided in giving medicines, whether physicians or empirics. They are guided each one by his own experiments or experience, or by the reported experience of others, each one acting according to his knowledge of the nature of things, and the ignorant influenced by prejudice. Several truths connected with this point have long been known; "the hair of the dog that bit" was heard of, long before the name of Hahnemann; and it does not appear that any homœopathist has ever made a single discovery on this point or on any other medical subject.

If what is alleged concerning infinitesimals were true, it would have been by far the greatest improvement ever made in medicine; and it would have been easier for any to adopt it than to continue to practise in any other way. All physicians would have preferred the infinitesimals, because cheaper, more convenient, and more agreeable, both to themselves and others. Neither tyrants nor laws could have prevented their use, because so easily used secretly; and no country has laws against improvements in medicine. Though the only part of the system ever regarded as of much account by any, it is repudiated by the most notorious of its supporters.

"The whole question of doses is left open to the discretion of the physician, who may be as strictly a homœopathist as Hahnemann himself, though he should give his medicines in the ordinary form, simply if he select them according to their homœopathic fitness."— See *Brit. Jour. Hom.*, Oct., 1851, p. 623. "We acknowledge every practitioner a homœopath who holds fast to the fundamental principle of homœopathy, no

matter what his views are in relation to doses, &c."— See *Quarterly Hom. Jour.*, July, 1850, p. 471. The same Journal for January, 1849, p. 125, quoting a German publication on this system, says that in croup, tartar emetic should be given at the rate of "one grain of the first trituration every half hour." They sometimes dilute their medicines by mixing, in the first place, one grain with nine grains of some inert substance, and sometimes one grain with ninety-nine grains. So the above dose may signify either one tenth or one hundredth of a grain. For several centuries physicians have considered the smaller as sufficient for mild cases of croup, and the larger as abundant for almost any possible case, when tartar emetic is the proper medicine. The same Journal for April, 1850, p. 241, contains a lecture of a professor in the homœopathic college in Philadelphia. He recommends the same preparation of this medicine in croup. He says that such is the practice of a homœopathist in Germany. The preparation being the same, a dose larger than the above may be given, and the spectators have no means of detecting it. The legislature might doubtless, by a moderate effort, be induced to nullify the charter of that college, on the ground that they were deluded by false pretences to grant it.

The *British Journal of Homœopathy* for July, 1855, p. 527, quotes a German homœopathic work, which recommends tartar emetic for rheumatism. The quantity recommended is "two grains of the second decimal trituration [one fiftieth of a grain of the medicine], every three, four or six hours;" and in some cases one fortieth of a grain. For several centuries physicians have used the same and even smaller doses of this medicine in rheumatism and other diseases.

The *Philadelphia Journal of Homœopathy* for December, 1852, p. 413, re-publishes an article by a surgeon of an English homœopathic hospital, so called. He read it at the meeting of the Annual Homœopathic Congress of the British Dominions, which approved of the sentiments expressed. He advocates large doses. He says, "in acute diseases we find a healthy system struggling to

free itself; in this struggle it is our duty to give assistance. This, assuredly, can alone be done by the lower [the more concentrated] attenuations; for if not, why in cholera give a concentrated solution of camphor? Dare you, when the system is prostrated, trust to the high attenuations; would you not place more reliance on the lower, or at times on the mother tincture?" [the strongest tincture that can be made.] He gives his treatment of a case of scarlet fever as follows: "I had been giving arsenic of the third and sixth dilutions, but finding that I made no progress, I resolved to give it much lower, and the first centesimal dilution was prescribed. The next day, fearing an aggravation [the poisonous effects of arsenic], I stopped the medicine, but soon ordered it to be continued." The precise quantity of arsenic given is not here mentioned; but the preparation used is described to be as concentrated as any physician can ever wish to give, and the quantity actually given could not have been detected without the most exact chemical analysis. He says, too, that in urgent cases, medicines should be repeated every five minutes.

The *British Journal of Homœopathy* for October, 1854, p. 675, approves of giving "the first trituration of mercury," a preparation sufficiently concentrated to cause salivation speedily. The same Journal for July, 1855, p. 441, tells of a coroner's inquest where death was supposed to have been caused by twenty grains of ergot, which a homœopathist confessed that he had given. The editor argues that the dose was a proper one, not only in that case, but in all similar diseases. The number for April, 1854, p. 333, contains an article by Hahnemann, in which he says that some of his followers "interlard their homœopathic treatment with sundry devices borrowed from the old school." And on p. 349 it is said that Hahnemann himself, on several occasions, gave to a patient, who was under his care during the greater part of 1838 and 1839, one of the most nauseous medicines kept by apothecaries; and each time gave half an ounce or more.

The same Journal for October, 1852, p. 676, gives the

following extract from Hahnemann. "In cases of sudden disease threatening speedy death, no medicine can be admitted which promises help only after the lapse of some time, by its secondary or homœopathic action; but, according to common sense, antipathic medicines only can be given, which, in large and frequently augmented doses, change the morbid state into the desired opposite." That is, in severe fevers, croup, dysentery, colic, cholera and a host of diseases where the physician is most needed, homœopathy is altogether inadmissible. Through several pages onward, this Journal advocates the use of bleeding, and of the common doses of emetics, purgatives, diuretics and all other ordinary remedies, in many cases. It gives, p. 686, a speech delivered before the Annual Homœopathic Congress by the chairman of the meeting, which is stated to have been received with approbation and without a shadow of dissent. He spoke as follows:—"To the homœopathic law certain cases are not applicable at all, they are beyond the pale of it. When such is the case, it ought to be at once fixed and determined that we are not only at liberty but absolutely bound to palliate the sufferings of such patients. Homœopathy is a system that is applicable only to curable diseases. After we have got beyond the homœopathic law, when new deposits and new conditions of organs have been formed [that is, when diseases become organic], homœopathy can have no place. We must, in such circumstances, have recourse to the palliatives usually resorted to [that is, the ordinary doses of the ordinary medicines]. This is a principle admitted by all homœopaths and by all men of common sense. Such is my opinion, such is my practice, and I am glad to see that it is not confined to myself." Thus the highest homœopathic authority declares that in a multitude of diseases homœopathy should be avoided; and they pay a rich compliment to the common sense of all who believe otherwise.

The same journal for July, 1855, p. 464, reviews a publication of a French homœopathist on cholera. He is there described to have been an advocate for the ex-

clusive use of the most highly diluted medicines ; and his good sense is commended for advising, in the above disease, the exclusive use of the most concentrated medicines that can be made. He advises the mother tincture of veratrum, from one to six drops, to be given at the same time with from one to several drops of the first dilution of arsenic, both to be repeated every half hour, and three-fourths of a grain of opium every six hours, these to be used together with other medicines in like quantities.

The same journal for January, 1855, p. 156, gives the testimony of Dr. Willard Parker, of New York City, at the coroner's inquest on the body of Miss Agnes Lottimer, as follows : " Years ago I went thoroughly into the study and practice of homœopathy. I found the high dilutions invariably inefficient. With the low dilutions of aconite, arsenic, nux vomica, corrosive sublimate and belladonna, I got good effects. These are remedies we use with great caution, and make them our dernier resort." This journal, while it gives a part of the testimony of Dr. Gray, a homœopathist of New York City, in the same case, suppresses an important part. It may be found, however, in the *Philadelphia Journal of Homœopathy* for Dec. 1854. He said that, according to his experience, the high dilutions were inefficient, and that he was accustomed to give such quantities as he believed his patients needed, often the most concentrated preparations that can be made. *The British Journal of Homœopathy* for April, 1855, p. 351, contains a letter from a homœopathist of Brooklyn, N. Y., written to the editors expressly for the purpose of saying that he agreed in this matter with Dr. Gray. He mentions particularly one case which he was then treating with mother tinctures. The patients of both these men are probably still pleased with the idea that their relief comes from the infinitesimals alone.

The same journal for April, 1854, pp. 351 and 352, contains the following extracts from an editorial article on the operation of remedies. " The dose should be as a rule from the third attenuation upwards, and only ex-

ceptionally grains and drops, and preparations scarcely removed from the crude substance, and in fine the dose is an open question. This is, as far as we know, a fair statement of the average opinion of homœopathists all over the globe." "We feel inclined to believe that those practitioners, who are unwilling to discuss the matter openly, use non-homœopathic means much more frequently than those who speak out." And not improbably they all use such means more than they are willing openly to discuss. The editors undoubtedly have good reasons for their opinion.

The same journal for July, 1856, p. 365, says, "We should bear in mind that every homœopathic physician occasionally practises allopathy." On page 502 it gives the proceedings of the Annual Homœopathic Congress. That year several of the members spoke as follows:— One member said "he had had much experience in the intermittent fevers of the tropics, and held it as a fact that infinitesimal doses were often useless in such cases, but that five, six, or ten grains of quinine were often necessary." He said, too, that he had prescribed several six-grain doses of that medicine for one of the members present. That member confirmed the statement, and said his life would have been the forfeit if he depended on infinitesimals; and another member who saw the case expressed the same opinion. Another said that in many cases one grain of opium should be given and soon repeated. Another said he had been in the habit of giving as much medicine as he believed his patients needed; and that he had lately given two grains of gallic acid, and saved the life of a person in a case where any small dose would have been useless. Another said that such treatment, though beneficial, was not homœopathic.

The same journal for July, 1853, p. 486, gives the proceedings of a body called the *British Homœopathic Society*. A paper written to recommend the use of tinctures and other medicines of the most concentrated kinds was read by one of the members. He argued that we are not at present justified in trusting to the

high dilutions. In the discussion that followed, Mr. Kidd said "he had tried all dilutions, from the first to the eight hundredth." "The general result of the higher seemed absolutely nil." "He could adduce many cases of cure quickly brought about by the first decennial dilution, when the same medicine had been used in vain in high dilutions." "He preferred the first, second and third dilutions." "In a very large class of chronic diseases he found high dilutions useless for curative action; still he used them in some cases, especially in those of the delicate functions or fine tissues," [that is, in those of the fancy and of the imagination.] "Many acute diseases yielded before any dilution, [that is, spontaneously,] whilst others were not perfectly curable except by the lowest." "Many organic diseases yielded to mother tinctures and first dilutions." The members appeared to agree essentially with Mr. Kidd, several expressing similar sentiments, and none opposing. They appeared from their expressions to have the understanding among themselves, that they were in the habit of using the infinitesimals only to operate on the imagination, and the ordinary doses to operate on the body. The low decennial dilutions, the first and second, are quite as concentrated as physicians have usually given the more active medicines; and the third dilution of the most active kinds is more irritating than the preparations generally used.

The same journal for Oct. 1856, p. 693, republishes an article which recommends, in certain cases of hemorrhage, from half a drachm to one drachm of the tincture of cinnamon to be taken at once.

The publications quoted in this pamphlet are all strenuous advocates for the use of infinitesimals. They were sold, at the "depot for homœopathic books and medicines," by Otis Clapp, in School Street; and those now published are still retailed by him. The homœopaths have so often been detected in acting contrary to their pretensions, as to feel the need of a subterfuge of some kind. Whenever detected, the answer is always ready, that the case is one of those where the usual doses are

required; and hence such statements have often appeared, for more than thirty years, inconsistently mixed up on the same pages with assertions that infinitesimals are in all cases amply sufficient. So the leading men write; and the same men write other books, which the rank and file are anxious to circulate. These are designed to lead the public to trust in all cases in the infinitesimals, the things which they themselves seem, from their known practice, to use only to suit the fancy, and consider fit for no other purpose. Where brown-bread pills are required, there infinitesimals may succeed equally well; and no imaginary experiments afford proof of greater efficiency. Hurtful and even destructive doses of many of the most active drugs may easily be concealed in homœopathic disguises; among such are arsenic, a powerful tonic, and white lead, a soothing sedative. The latter, applied to several kinds of ulcers, quickly checks the fiery redness and blunts the pain and soreness; given internally its effects are similar. It soothes the irritation caused by a cold, and mitigates the pain and uneasiness of a variety of diseases. In quantities much larger than usual, it gives no immediate trouble. Used with arsenic, the one gives vigor, and the other ease. They may be continued several years with good acceptance; but at length a collapse ensues, either of the whole person or of some part. Other drugs may be used in the same secret way with effects no less pleasing and equally hurtful. Whenever effects follow the use of homœopathic medicines, which should not be attributed to the efforts of nature alone, considerable doses are then employed. The system is not one which uses next to no medicine, but it is a system that is forced to depend on large doses of the most active or poisonous drugs; for the milder medicines, on account of their bulk and other properties, cannot be enveloped in the homœopathic disguises in suitable quantities. They can seldom use the best remedies, for they are obliged to use such as may be most easily disguised.

Children that have received the globules for every

slight complaint, often show traces of poison imbibed. In some the injury is less obvious than in others; but a certain unhealthy complexion, a peculiar feebleness, or other symptoms, too often indicate the operation of no trifling quantities. The last named journal for April, 1855, p. 334, gives an account of a coroner's inquest on a child, which died with the usual symptoms of excessive mercurial salivation. It says that the attending homœopathist acknowledged that he had given mercury, and that it was testified that some of the globules left by him having been analyzed, they were found to contain the corrosive sublimate of mercury in doses which any physician would regard as large. It also says that the homœopathist left three powders, which were taken at the onset of the disease. That these contained each five or ten grains or more of calomel, there is reason to believe, from the soreness of the mouth and other symptoms described to have speedily appeared.

In April, 1855, an address and poem on homœopathy were delivered before a Boston audience in the Tremont Temple, and were published in a pamphlet entitled *The Homœopathic Law*. The address is filled with most extravagant statements, only few of which will be here noticed. The lecturer boasts of strange success in the management of cholera. He says that the proportion of deaths under homœopathic treatment is scarcely one-sixth as many as under other treatment. He says that, since the cholera first appeared in Europe, only from five to ten per cent have died under their treatment, and from forty to sixty per cent under other treatment. For more than twenty years, their publications have everywhere made the same boast; and to confirm it, they parade long tables of dry statistics, alleged to have been made up in different countries by the homœopathists. These tables pretend that several hundred cases of cholera have come under their care, and that from ninety to ninety-five per cent were cured. Were these tables correct, or were their success but half what is pretended, treatment capable of producing such results would have long since been adopted by all persons.

The *British Journal of Homœopathy* for July, 1855, p. 457, expends some half dozen pages in making complaints that their cholera statistics are not considered credible. Their story is briefly as follows. During the prevalence of cholera in London, in 1854, the government sent to all the legally qualified medical men, whose names appeared in the directory, blank schedules to be filled up with the particulars concerning the cases of cholera under their care. [It seems that in London, as well as elsewhere, some few of the legally qualified medical men, in order to obtain business, make homœopathic or other quackish pretensions.] Accordingly some of the schedules fell into the hands of homœopaths. The board of health, in making the report to be presented to parliament, took no notice of their returns. A member of parliament in his seat inquired the reason, and was answered, that "to use their returns would give an unjustifiable sanction to an empirical practice, opposed alike to the maintenance of truth and the progress of medical science." This journal complains that their returns were said to be incorrect in reporting as cholera cases that were not cholera, and in making false reports concerning the kinds and quantities of medicine used. Though held up before the parliament as false pretenders, they made no attempt to defend themselves then, at the proper time and place, as they might have done, if they had had any defence to offer. The parliament called for all papers concerning the affair, and thus gave an opportunity to send in any documents which they had or could make; but though no insult more cutting could be given, or given more publicly, they bore it quietly. The editor merely says, p. 463, "The matter will not be suffered to rest as it is. Steps will, we believe, be shortly taken to obtain a just recognition of the success of the homœopathic system during the late epidemic of cholera." With these words the matter seems to have ended, for no steps appear to have been taken since that time, for the simple reason that none could avail. Being guilty of the fraud imputed to them, to avoid an examination may well have been the best policy.

The following statement is found in the Tremont Temple address, p. 32. "Several European governments, conservative as they are, in compliance with public demand, have not only removed all restrictions relating to homœopathy, but have given grants of public money for its support." What governments are referred to, the lecturer does not mention; no other homœopathic publications appear to have made the same boast, as they would eagerly have done, were there ground for it, and they would have repeatedly given the particulars concerning an affair so important; according to their own showing, their numbers are everywhere so small that the public could nowhere have made such a demand; and from the general scope of their writings, as well as from other authority, the assertion seems to be a mere fabrication. The restrictions referred to seem never to have been removed in any nation, except for a short time during the revolutionary outbreak of 1848.

The lecturer says that "about twenty-four professors of medicine, in European universities, have openly adopted, teach and defend homœopathy by government sanction and support." By such fabrications the legislature of Michigan must have been deceived, when in 1854 they passed an act requiring the regents of the university of that State to appoint a professor of homœopathy. As the legislature had transcended its power, the regents refused to make the appointment, alleging that there was no such professor in any European university. The *British Journal of Homœopathy* for July, 1855, p. 511, speaking of that fact, says that "the regents are not correct, for there is one such professor in Europe at the university of Munich in Bavaria." One professor of homœopathy is multiplied, by the voyage across the Atlantic, into twenty-four, for the entertainment of the audience. In German universities there are several classes of professors. One class receives a salary from the civil government, generally not sufficient for their wants; and they depend in part on fees from the students. Another class, called professors extraordinary, are, like the former, appointed by the govern-

ment; but as they receive no salary, each one depends altogether on the fees obtained by his own exertions. Another class, called private instructors, is neither appointed nor salaried. Almost any one that chooses, hires a room in some private house, and very independently gives instruction, on whatever subject he prefers, to all he may please to admit, having the use of the library on easy terms. One may freely teach homœopathy, or pretend to teach it, though not permitted to practise it. It is not mentioned to which class the Bavarian professor belongs, though doubtless it would have been, had he belonged to either of the two higher.

This lecturer also says that "Many of the European sovereigns and courts have their medical counsellors from the homœopathic ranks." The same has been often repeated; and the degree of success that has attended homœopathy in this country, has resulted chiefly from their groundless assertions that it is every where trusted by the most fashionable. The *Philadelphia Journal of Homœopathy* for May, 1855, p. 116, has a list of sixteen persons styled court physicians. A court physician is always a man of high repute, appointed to attend the sovereign of some nation, and considered an officer of his court. Fourteen of the above number are represented to be in Germany, the country where homœopathy is scarcely known, except from its prohibition by the tyrannical governments so much complained of. When they undertake to prohibit a thing, they usually drive it into concealment at least. Were homœopathy the fashion in fourteen different courts, and consequently in the same nations, the number of German practitioners should be many times larger than it really is. The *North American Homœopathic Journal* for May, 1852, p. 127, lamenting their slow progress in Germany, says that "tyrants, influenced by their court physicians, will not foster homœopathy," speaking as though among all the principalities of that country there was not a single court physician to favor them. Of the above list, six are represented as being merely attendants of some inferior person attached to some court, a position wide-

ly different from that of the chief medical officer. A considerable proportion of the list are dead men, though reckoned among the living. Obituary notices of three, Altmuller, Hartung and Marenzeller, may be seen in the *British Journal of Homœopathy* for January, and for April, 1854, pp. 168 and 320. It is not there said that either was ever a court physician, though a few instances are eagerly mentioned where they were called to visit one of the ordinary nobility.

There are many reasons for the opinion that there never was a homœopathic court physician, and never will be. It was once said that Hahnemann was physician to the duke of Cœthen; but the Tremont Temple address, in its eulogy on him, page 15, merely says that he lived for a time in that duke's dominions. It says that instead of holding such an office, the government, where he first made known his pretensions, was induced by his opponents to treat him as a criminal; and that "other governments were appealed to for the enactment of such laws as those gentlemen saw would most effectually arrest the spread of Homœopathia, and, if possible, crush it in its infancy. Thus Hahnemann was persecuted, and driven from city to city; and at one time was unable to venture beyond his own threshold." Those laws were not directed against curing by the smallest possible quantities of medicine, but they were directed against those manœuvres which are known by no other name than quackery. It appears from the above, that Hahnemann's conduct was such that the magistrates were led to judge him guilty of violating them. Had he actually discovered what he pretends, he might have secured for himself a very different reception.

It has been said that the physician of the Emperor Nicholas was a homœopathist; but that is denied by the *British Journal of Homœopathy* for January and for April, 1855, pp. 170 and 349. It is there said that the physician referred to uses the ordinary quantities of medicine, and is no homœopathist, but that his opinions coincide with theirs in some respects. As authority for this last assertion, the editors refer to the *Journal*

de la Société Gallicane, a French homœopathic periodical. Until better evidence appears, it will scarcely be credited that the emperor's physician was infatuated with homœopathy, or any other irrational notions. In Naples an editor published a puff on homœopathy, in which he stated that the king favored the system. For that statement he was arrested; and as he refused to make known his authority, [which was perhaps about equal to that for some other puffs,] he was put into prison among criminals, by one of whom he was nearly assassinated. See *Brit. Jour. Hom.* Jan. 1854, p. 170. The statement that the king could believe a story like homœopathy seems to have been regarded as a libel.

The last named journal for July, 1853, p. 493, contains an article insinuating, but not asserting, that the present emperor of Austria received homœopathic treatment for an injury of the head sustained from the hands of an assassin. The editor admits that the rumor is somewhat improbable, and the evidence of it not satisfactory, and that whether true or not it is hardly possible to ascertain on account of the difficulty of penetrating the walls of the palace. The story is, that the emperor dismissed his own physicians after some ineffectual treatment, and placed himself under the care of a homœopathist ninety years old, elsewhere said by them to have been for a long time nearly incapable of business, and that "by the use of arnica he was speedily freed from blood effused on the brain, and by the order to abstain for some time from riding, he is forever secured against any new effusion of blood, and restored to complete and permanent health." The *Philadelphia Journal of Homœopathy* for February, 1855, p. 702, asserts roundly that "The emperor of Austria recently has been cured of a cerebral affection which allopathy had fruitlessly endeavored to relieve." It is in this country reported as an absolute fact, on no other authority than that it was told an indefinite number of times as an uncertain rumor.

But men of eminence have in some instances resorted to them, in times of doubt and terror, and so they have

to dealers in false pretensions of other kinds. The *British Journal of Homœopathy* for October, 1853, page 670, publishes a certificate from the Marshall de St. Arnaud, declaring that he had just been completely cured, by homœopathy, of a disease that for fifteen years had seriously troubled him at times. The disease referred to must have been the derangement of the heart, which soon afterwards proved fatal to him, at the close of the battle of Alma. The same page contains his answer to a request that he would use his influence to relieve the homœopaths from the laws against quackery, that burden them in France; but though he was then minister of war to Louis Napoleon, and possessed of power to make them secure in the exercise of any just rights that belong to them, he with some ambiguous, courtly expressions of regard, declined to take the first step in the matter.

A French homœopathic periodical, *L'Art Medicale*, for May, 1856, contains an article of ten or twelve pages written to urge their practitioners to drop the title *homœopathic*. Some frivolous reasons for that course are given at large; but what seems the real reason is only hinted at. It is that the title being any thing but an honorable one, they are ashamed of it. The *British Journal of Homœopathy* for Oct. 1856, republishes the entire article with marks of approbation; and hence it would appear that the same sentiments prevail in England. To relinquish that title, involves the relinquishing of all their peculiar pretensions.

Some of the American literati have given rather amusing proofs of confidence in the infinitesimals. There is a sort of natural philosophy, admired by many, called transcendentalism, whether correct or otherwise it is not to the purpose here to inquire; but the chief of the works on homœopathy are written in the style of transcendentalism, and contain many of its peculiar expressions and modes of thought. Yet it is not transcendentalism, but an imitation of it merely; so, of course, the German metaphysicians consider it, or they would not have despised it, as they all do except some few of

very peculiar acuteness of penetration. Had they received it, their influence is such that it would also have been received by all who speak their language, and the practice of it would never have been forbidden by the German princes. It is not only counterfeit science, and counterfeit fashion, but counterfeit transcendentalism. The American votaries of this philosophy have, some of them, been prone to take the counterfeit for genuine: and it is not rationally to be expected that such as have resided not many weeks in the neighborhood of German libraries, and are but moderately well versed in the things of Germany, can have developed those powers of detecting German counterfeits, which the natives of the land themselves possess.

