

Box

McManus (F.R.)

AN ADDRESS

DELIVERED AT THE

SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING

OF THE

AMERICAN INSTITUTE

OF

HOMŒOPATHY,

HELD IN THE CITY OF PHILADELPHIA,

JUNE 6th, 1860.

BY F. R. McMANUS, M. D.,

OF BALTIMORE, MD.

PUBLISHED BY ORDER OF THE INSTITUTE.

Surrey
LIBRARY
29684

NEW YORK:

AMERICAN HOMŒOPATHIC REVIEW PRESS.

1860.

AN ADDRESS

DELIVERED AT THE

SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE
OF HOMŒOPATHY, HELD IN THE CITY OF PHILADELPHIA,
JUNE 6TH, 1860,

BY F. R. McMANUS, M. D.,
OF BALTIMORE, MD.

In the cause of science and of humanity, my colleagues, we meet again, and, in a feeling of deep gratitude to God, I first thank Him for the bounty He has vouchsafed to us, in permitting us to assemble, in annual session, for the seventeenth time; and, secondly, I congratulate you, individually and collectively, upon the privilege thus conferred upon us. I am happy to see among you, those who have been made familiar by our annual meetings, and me-thinks I can perceive in your countenances, animated as they are with zeal, and brightened by hope, that it is a mutual pleasure to be thus again united in the cause and for the advancement of our beloved science—Homœopathy.

The very name of Homœopathy is sufficient to arouse in our nature an enthusiasm—a love—which no other name of earth can inspire. Many of us have been, for nearly a quarter of a century, united under its banners, diffusing its health-giving comforts to the sick and the afflicted. We can recollect well the opposition and obloquy we encountered, in years gone by, from the ignorant, the interested and the malevolent;

and, we can recollect, too, how often we felt the almost utter impossibility of being able to contend against forces so superior in number, so protected by custom, and so free to resort to the lowest means of warfare; to misrepresentations the most unjust, and opposition the most unnatural and intolerant. We can recollect when our adversaries covertly conferred upon us the epithets of ignoramus, fool, knave; when our pretended friends were secretly proving themselves to be our worst and strongest enemies; and when we were expelled from medical societies, and deprived of the common courtesies to which our education and diplomas entitled us; nay, even more, of all professional and social intercourse, because we had super-added to our stock of knowledge the study and practice of Homœopathy. Have we not observed too, when our science was in its infancy, that the friend and patron of Homœopathy would go behind a door to take a powder, rather than to be seen by or receive the ridicule and sneers of the jester? Yes, all this we have witnessed; nevertheless, with an independence and a firmness almost without a parallel, we have gone forward confiding in the sublime truth of Homœopathy and in the justice of our cause, acknowledging no criterion but success, and we have lived to see that which was once a small seed acquire the growth and size of a magnificent tree, under whose protecting influence the afflicted have been comforted, the weak strengthened, and the sick cured. We have ~~have~~ lived to behold it extending over the habitable globe, from ocean to ocean, and from pole to pole, and to see its advocates and admirers increase by thousands. What a change! We may well congratulate each other that we have outlived our early trials, and that we have reached the period when many who had opposed, have united with us in the cause of truth; and, when even our greatest opponents look upon us, with an eye of jealousy and envy, rather than of pity and contempt.

As we are honored, on the occasion of our annual address, by an audience which is not exclusively a professional one, I will offer this evening, as appropriate, a few remarks upon

the principles of Homœopathy. My explanations will no doubt be tedious to those who are already acquainted with the subject, but they may not be useless or unacceptable to the many who have not had an opportunity of learning what those principles are, which have received so much ridicule and gross misrepresentation.

There is no subject of more importance to the community, in a temporal point of view, than that of the medical treatment of the sick. It is a matter in which all are interested; no age, sex or condition being exempted from the ravages of disease. The solemn fact is before us that each individual has but one natural life, which, once extinct, the whole world, with all its philosophy and power, cannot recall. What, then, can be considered of greater temporal concern than the means by which that life is to be, through the providence of God, preserved?

From the earliest periods of the world, diseases have been combated by a class of substances called medicines; and medicines, in the general, in certain proportions, are known to be destructive of the very life, which, in other proportions, they are used to preserve. It is an easy thing to understand, then, how an improper use of those substances would prove destructive instead of preservative, and how life could be thus destroyed by even those whose great desire would be to save it. It is to the genius of Samuel Hahnemann and his exhaustless industry, that the world is indebted for a process by which medicines, the most poisonous, have been deprived of their destructive properties, and yet retain their curative powers; and, when I say this of him, it at once erects to the perpetuation of his memory a monument, (which no other human being, who ever preceded him, had a claim to,) and which has won for him an admiration and a gratitude which will not be confined to this generation, but will be accorded to him by millions yet unborn. He has originated a system of medical practice whose beauty is to be found in its simplicity, and whose value is to be found in its safety; for simplicity and safety are its distinguishing characteristics. Had

do he a right to this? Why not? Was it not his duty to make use of the intelligence, the genius, the intuitiveness with which God had endowed him, in a superlative degree, to use those qualifications of his mind in ameliorating the condition of diseased and suffering humanity? Certainly it was; and he possessed an amount of independence and industry commensurate with his mental endowments. He was the man for the age, and he was the man, as the instrument of God, for the great work which he lived to accomplish. Was he competent for such a task? It is not my intention to attempt, in the short time of an ordinary address, to give you his biography, nor will I give to you my views of the powers of his intellect. I will state here, however, the opinions of a few of his opponents in practice, with the names and reputation of two of them, most of you are acquainted, standing, as they do, high in the scale of professional and literary fame in our own country, I allude to Professors Valentine Mott and James McNaughton. I extract them from the first number of the first volume of "The Homœopathic Examiner," published in the City of New York, January, 1840, now twenty years ago, and edited by our late beloved and distinguished colleague, A. Gerald Hull, M.D. Giving the opinions of eminent allopathists, we find the following under the head of *America*—

"Valentine Mott, justly the pride of American Surgery, imbued with the becoming liberality of an unprejudiced and noble mind, visited Hahnemann during his first sojourn in Europe. Instead of denouncing this venerable philosopher as the conceptionist of a *puerile* and useless theory, he has had the moral courage to speak of the Master Spirit of Modern Medical History in the following language:—"Hahnemann is one of the most accomplished and scientific physicians of the present age."

Professor James McNaughton, of the Western Medical College of the State of New York, and late President of the New York State Medical Society, in his "annual address" before the society, made an avowal of sentiments that were

inspired by the pure spirit of philosophy. The Professor, said, "generally speaking, physicians have at once pronounced the whole subject absurd—a delusion—or, a gross imposition upon public credulity. Now, is this the proper mode of treating it? Is it philosophical to call anything absurd, professing to be founded on observation and experiment? If it be false, it should be proved to be so, by showing that facts do not warrant the premises, or the deductions drawn from them. It is possible that the homœopathic reasoning may be erroneous; it is possible that the medicines may act as specifics, like the vaccine virus, and that the mode of action may be altogether inexplicable in the present state of our knowledge. We are, therefore, more interested in determining the correctness of the alledged facts, than in the theory offered to explain them. Many of these facts are of such a nature as admit of easy examination, and can be readily proved or refuted. Whether Homœopathy be true or not, it is entitled to have its claims fairly investigated. The object of the profession is to ascertain the truth, and if it should turn out that in any disease the homœopathic remedies are more efficacious than those known to the ordinary system, they ought, unquestionably, to be used. It will not do for the members of the profession to wrap themselves up in their dignity, and to call the new system absurd without further enquiry. The history of the profession presents many lamentable instances of the obstinacy with which errors have been clung to, and improvements resisted."

In *Germany*, Hufeland, the venerable patriarch of the Allopathic School, conceded the existence of merit to the system of Hahnemann. "Homœopathy," said he, in his Journal, "seems to me to be particularly valuable in two points of view. First, because it promises to lead the art of healing back to the only true path of quiet observation and experience; and secondly, because it furnishes simplicity in the treatment of disease."

In *France*, Professor Broussais, in his public lectures, advised that impartial trials should be made before Homœo-

pathy was judged or condemned, and concluded his address with words that are honorable to his candour and philanthropy. "Many distinguished persons," said he, "are occupied with it; we cannot reject it without a hearing; we must investigate the truth it contains."

In *Italy*, Breera, who holds a distinguished rank in the Allopathic School, has uttered opinions with fearless liberality. He thus writes in his Journal,—“Homœopathy is decried by some as useless, and by others as strange; and, though it appears to the great majority as ridiculous and extraordinary, it can, nevertheless, not be denied that it has taken its stand in the scientific world. It has its books, its journals, its chairs, its hospitals, clinical lectures, professors, and most respectable communities to hear and to appreciate; even its enemies must receive it in the history of medicine, for its present situation requires it. If Homœopathy proclaims facts and theories, which cannot be reconciled with our present knowledge, this is no sufficient cause, as yet, to despise it, and to rank it among absolute falsities. Woe to the physician who believes that he cannot learn to-morrow what he does not know to-day. Do we not hear daily complaints of the insufficiency of the healing art? And are not these physicians, who honestly suspect the solidity of their knowledge, the most learned, and, in their practice, the most successful? Let us always recollect, that the greatest discoveries have given origin to the most violent controversies. Witness the examples of Harvey, Galileo, Newton, Descartes, &c.”

In *England*, Dr. J. G. Millingan, Surgeon to the British Forces, and an allopathic physician of distinction, has offered the following comments on Homœopathy in his “Curiosities of Medical Experience:”—“The mere hopes,” said he, “of being able to relieve societies from the curse of constant drugging, should lead us to hail, with gratitude, the Homœopathist’s investigations. Despite the absolute persecution that Homœopathy is at present enduring, every reflecting and unprejudiced person must feel convinced that its study and application bid fare to operate an important revolution in

medicine. The introduction of small doses, when compared with the quantities formerly used, is gradually creeping in. The history of medicine affords abundant proof of the acrimony, nay, fury, with which every new doctrine has been impugned and insulted. The same annals will also show that this spirit of intolerance has always been in the *ratio* of the truths that these doctrines tend to bring into light. From the preceding observations, no one can accuse me of having become a blind convert to Homœopathy; but, I can only hope that its present vituperators will follow my example, and examine the matter calmly and dispassionately, ere they proceed to pass a judgment that their vanity may lead them to consider a final sentence. It is possible, nay, more than probable, that physicians cannot find time to commence a new course of studies, for such this investigation must prove. If this is the case, let them frankly avow their utter ignorance of the doctrine, and not denounce, with merciless tyranny, a practice of which they do not possess the slightest knowledge."

Such were the views entertained by these eminent allopathic physicians of Hahnemann and his discoveries,—men who held the highest rank in their several countries, and who have had the independence to lay aside the characteristics of professional proscription,—bigotry and intolerance,—and have accorded to Hahnemann's genius and learning what they richly deserved.

In giving to the world his method of cure, Hahnemann called it Homœopathy, which is made of two Greek words, *homoios* and *pathos*, which signify similar disease or affection. What, then, is Homœopathy? It may be defined thus:—The system of medical practice by which diseases are cured, *with minute doses of medicines*, upon the principle, *Similia Similibus Curantur*. The precise quantity of a dose is not an essential point with Homœopaths; and, hence, you hear of high and low dilutionists; but, the essential point is the *principle of cure*, and you will understand, hereafter, the importance, nay, the absolute necessity, for the exclusive use of minute doses by those physicians who treat diseases upon

that principle. To explain, then, the law of cure—*Similia Similibus Curantur*, it means, simply, that *medicines are given in SMALL DOSES, to cure symptoms or diseases in the sick, precisely similar to the symptoms or diseases which the same medicines would produce, in LARGE DOSES, upon the healthy.*

I start, here, with the incontrovertible fact, that medicines, in large quantities, have a poisonous or destructive effect, in smaller quantities, a curative one; and this is a very important matter in the subject of my discourse. Is it true? Let us examine the assertion by referring to the action of what is considered a very simple medicine,—Epsom Salts. Give a table-spoonful of it to a man in the best health; does it not disturb the harmony of his system? Let the dose be repeated morning and evening for a week, and at the end of that time he may be really sick; and, if persisted in, instead of producing, as it at first does, a simple irritation of the mucous membrane, inflammation will ensue, and, perhaps, more fearful consequences. The drug I have selected is not a poisonous one, nor is the dose administered a very large one, nevertheless, its continuance might prove destructive; but, the destructive influence of numerous other drugs, in common use, would be far greater than that of Epsom Salts. I have stated that large doses of medicines have a poisonous or destructive effect,—small doses, a curative one. A very small dose of a medicinal substance produces an effect directly the reverse of that produced by an ordinarily large sized dose of the same medicine. A medicine, then, which will produce purgation (diarrhoea) in a large dose, will produce a reversed action in a very minute dose; and, hence, such a minute dose will cure precisely similar symptoms in a sick man. How? (Why, by substituting a condition, created by the medicine, which nature can cure, for the one existing, the result of a morbid cause, which nature could not cure, and restoration is the result.) A large dose of Colocynth will produce colic and diarrhoea; a very minute dose will relieve similar symptoms in the sick. A large dose of Opium will obtund the sensibi-

lities,—a small dose will excite them. Mercury will produce, in formidable doses, a species of ulceration; in minute doses, it will cure a similar ulceration, the result of diseased action. This is a fact, so far as regards Mercury, which is a matter of daily observation to allopathic practitioners. They call the effect *alterative*—we ask no more. If their doses are small enough to be curative and not destructive, the cure is, strictly speaking, homœopathic, that is, in accordance with the law *Similia Similibus Curantur*.

In his treatise on *Materia Medica*, Professor Eberle, who is good allopathic authority, giving the various actions of this medicine, says, “Mercury may prove remediate, first, by producing a new and peculiar excitement in the system, and thereby overcoming the morbid excitement. It is in this way, probably, that Mercury removes disease when *exhibited in such doses as to produce no sensible evacuations or affections of the system.*” “In diarrhœa,” he says, “Calomel, judiciously managed, is a remedy of great efficacy. In *minute doses*, (mark this,) it allays morbid intestinal irritation, more readily than any remedy we possess.”

It is known to every one that, in large doses, Calomel is purgative, that is, it produces diarrhœa; and here we have the testimony of a distinguished professor of the allopathic school to the fact that, in *minute* doses, it allays a similar condition in the sick, the result of “morbid intestinal irritation, more readily than any other remedy.” No one, who is acquainted with the reputation of Prof. Eberle, as an author on *Materia Medica* and Therapeutics, will question the value of his testimony; and I can offer to you nothing which more strongly corroborates the truth of the homœopathic law of cure than this. It may be said that Prof. Eberle never administered doses as minute as homœopathy prescribes them; this may be true; nevertheless, that does not militate against the law. Homœopathy proclaims that this law holds good, in regard to every other medicinal substance with which we are acquainted, as well as with Mercury, and this is not based upon hypothesis but upon actual experiment and actual

fact. You will have perceived that Homœopathists do not give medicines to produce effects similar to those produced by the large doses of the allopathic school. It would be a great absurdity to suppose that we attempt to produce such mechanical effects upon the human system with minute doses, for, to produce mechanical effects, we should give mechanical doses, and, in a ratio proportionate to the size of such doses, would be the mechanical effects produced. It may be asked, Do homœopathic physicians ever administer medicines in mechanical proportions? Certainly they do. We never attempt to eject the contents of the stomach, to dislodge a poison, with attenuated doses. In cases of this kind, we resort to the ordinary and proper emetics. We also use, when necessary, chemical antidotes to poisons; and, where surgical appliances are necessary, we resort to surgical art. These, however, have nothing to do with our ordinary practice in the treatment of ordinary diseases.

I have explained to you the "law of cure," and I hope satisfactorily; and the subject now to be considered is,—How can minute or infinitesimal doses cure the sick? How can they effect the organism? (It must be remembered that our doses are given to act upon *diseased* tissues or organs alone; and, in order that they should produce an effect at all, *there must be a susceptibility to their influence caused by disease, otherwise they produce no effect.*) If a child, in health, would take a dozen doses of a homœopathic medicine, which are intended to relieve an adult of pleurisy, a dozen such doses, or half that number, might cure the adult of pleurisy; whereas, they would produce no effect upon the child, for the simple reason, that there is no pleurisy in the child, and consequently no susceptibility to the action of the medicine. If a physician will insert a small quantity of Vaccine virus into the arm of an adult, sixty years old, who has not had the small-pox and has never been vaccinated, and, at the same time, insert the same quantity of the virus from the same crust into the arm of a child three months old, who has been vaccinated, he will produce, in the adult, the vaccine disease,

while his vaccination will produce no effect upon the child ; because, in the latter, there is no susceptibility. The secret of the power of homœopathic medicine is to be found, alone, in its applicability to the disease for which it is administered, not in its poisonous character or in its mechanical proportions, for it has neither. Medicines are deprived of both of these qualities or properties, when prepared for homœopathic use, as I shall hereafter explain to you ; and you will understand how every substance, thus prepared, retains its *internal* or *specific* influence, when it will be made apparent to you that Arsenic is not more poisonous than common Salt. This I claim to be one of the distinguishing beauties of our system of medicine.

An incident comes to my recollection which occurred in Baltimore, about twenty-two years ago, the period at which I commenced the practice of Homœopathy. An allopathic physician, a neighbor of mine, who then numbered some three-score years, and who had acquired, deservedly, a large share of professional reputation, found, at one of his visits to a patient, several doses of homœopathic medicine ; and, to convince the inmates of the house of the inertness of the medicine, he very deliberately took the several doses, much to the alarm of those present. The good old doctor was, of course, ignorant of the fact that our medicines required the susceptibility hertofore explained ; without it, they would produce no action whatever.

In order to properly comprehend why it is that physicians of one school use very minute doses, and those of the other, large ones, it is necessary to understand that there is a difference, in the two schools, in regard to the pathology of diseases, as well as the manner in which they are to be treated. The allopathic physician cures diseases, in the general, by reaching them through the healthy organism and mechanically, hence he must use remedies in mechanical quantities ; whereas, the Homœopathist treats the disease portion alone, and reaches that through the medium of the nerves. Let me illustrate. Suppose the disease to be a violent head-ache, the

allopathic physician would prescribe a cathartic as a principal remedy, and thus relieve the head, by creating a diseased condition, temporarily, in the bowels, acting either as a counter-irritant, or, by its depletory influence, or both; and as he acts upon the disease through the healthy portion of the body, his remedies must be necessarily larger. If the disease be pleurisy, and he should consider bleeding necessary, by far the largest quantity of the blood abstracted comes from the sound or healthy parts of the body, and he is creating a disease of debility, if I may use the expression, in the whole of the healthy organism, while he is relieving the small portion which is diseased; and, thus, his bleeding must be, necessarily large. A man has no more blood in his body at nine o'clock at night, when he is attacked with pleurisy or pneumonia, than he had at nine in the morning, when he was in health. The allopathic physician, regarding his disease as an undue fulness in the blood-vessels, and, that the fulness must be emptied by mechanical means, adopts a practice which is rational with his theory. Our views, however, are different. We attribute all diseases, save, alone, those which result from mechanical injuries or from chemical poisons, to an altered condition of that portion of the nervous system which regulates and controls the action of the diseased organ or organs in health. We consider the nervous system to be the supreme regulator of the animal economy—organic and functional; and disease to be a disturbance or altered action, primarily, in that system. In accordance with this theory, and to be rational with it, we reach the diseased organ through that channel, and, for head-ache, we alter the condition of the nerves regulating that part which allowed it or caused it to ache; and in pleurisy, we alter the condition of the nerves of the pleura which allowed its blood-vessels to become congested and inflammation to ensue; and so we treat the catalogue of diseased organs. This will explain to you how the Homœopathist relieves with small doses, and why he uses them in preference to larger ones. You have heard that his remedies act upon and through the medium of the nerves,

and I will try to give you an idea of the great increase of sensibility an organ has when diseased, in comparison with what it has in health.

In health, the ear can bear the thundering noise of the cannon's roar with impunity; in disease, the buzzing of a fly would be insufferable. In health, the stomach receives ordinary food with comfort; in disease, a tea-spoonful of water, nay, the sight or smell of food may disturb it. In health, the eye can bear the light of mid-day without inconvenience; in disease, the smallest amount of light would be intolerable. And so it is with the other organs of the body in a diseased state. In fact, we cannot estimate, by any possibility, the amount of the increased sensibility in diseased organs, nor can we estimate the smallness of the dose of medicine, if applicable to the disease, which would cure it.

I have endeavored to explain to you how minute doses of medicines cure diseases, and I propose the question—How small may doses be made, or, how much may medicines be attenuated and retain the power to affect the nervous system? I will reply, by saying, (astounding and absurd as the assertion may appear), that the mathematical ingenuity of the world, perhaps, cannot compute it, and I will prove the truth of the assertion by the statement of a few plain facts.

By way of illustration, let us consider that the essential medicinal power of Camphor resides in its odor. You are all acquainted with the odor of this medicinal substance. Let us imagine how many persons could smell of a single grain of Camphor, and that, too, without any appreciable diminution of its weight. The numbers could not be counted; each individual of millions, although blind-folded, would tell it was the odor of Camphor. Let this experiment be tried with Musk, or any similar odoriferous substance, it would be the same; and I think I have already shown that it would puzzle the ingenuity of the mathematical world to compute the smallness of the quantity of odor emitted from one grain of Camphor or Musk, which could convey to millions the difference in the odor of each. This experiment applies to

the nerves of smell. Let us consider the effect upon the nerves of hearing, which would be produced in a densely populated city, by the tolling of a bell, the great attenuation of sound by which countless thousands would be apprised of the hour of the day, whether one, two or three o'clock. To compute the attenuation of sound caused by the vibration which the bell would produce upon the air, would be impossible. I might give many examples of a similar kind, but think it unnecessary, as I must have satisfied you of the truth of my proposition. You will recollect, however, that although I have selected the nerves of smell and of hearing to elucidate my subject, the remaining portion is as sensitive as these, and as susceptible of impressions, each portion having its peculiar office to perform. You cannot recognize with the nerves of smell, the sound of a bell, or, with these of the ear, the odor of a rose. So much for the attenuation of substances, and for the impressibility of the nervous system.

Until within the last few years, the great object of the medical profession was to ascertain how large a dose, of the several medicines could be administered, without proving destructive, and the practitioner who was the most heroic, bore the palm. This is not so much the case now, for, in view of the fact that patients *get well* under the care of Homœopathists, and that they cure *with nothing*, the more sensible members of the profession, instead of drugging as they used to do, recommend, particularly in chronic diseases, exercise in the open air, a visit to the country, a change of climate, strict *hygienic* observances, but *no medicine*. This much has Homœopathy done, in the way of reform, among those who ridicule it.

Considering, with much solicitude, that medicines were destructive, and having discovered that they cured the sick by virtue of the power which they possessed of making the well sick, Hahnemann adopted a plan by which he deprived them of their destructive character, and ascertained, to his satisfaction, how small he could make the doses without depriving them of their curative power. His paramount object

was to cure the sick with as little medicine as possible ; and, having ascertained that grain doses produced an effect, he determined to ascertain the power of sub-divisions of a grain. To effect this, he made his first attenuation thus :—The medicine being a solid substance, he triturated one grain, with ninety-nine grains of sugar of milk, for one hour. By this process, each particle of the grain was intimately incorporated with ninety-nine grains of an inert substance, and that which had before the *size of a grain*, had then the extent of a *hundred grains* ; and although each grain of this attenuation had only the one hundredth part of the original grain, he found it to possess a curative power. The second attenuation he made by taking a grain of the first and subjecting it to the same process ; he found, also, a curative power in a grain of the second attenuation ; and so he continued, in preparing succeeding attenuations, until he reached the thirtieth. In a grain of this attenuation he found a decidedly curative power ; so much so, that he recommended the thirtieth attenuation or potency as more speedy and more decided in curing acute and chronic diseases than the lower attenuations. His maxim was—“*Ich rede aus erfahrung*”—“I speak from experience ;” and he gave to the world nothing as facts, but that which was established and sustained by experiments, nothing was based upon hypothesis. That you may form some idea of the effrontery with which Hahnemann has been misrepresented, I will give here some extracts from a volume, published in this city, by Lindsay and Blackiston, the title of which is—“*Homœopathy ; Its tenets and tendencies, theoretical, theological and therapeutical*, by JAMES Y. SIMPSON, M. D., Fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, Professor of Midwifery in the University of Edinburgh, Physician to the Queen of Scotland, &c. &c. &c.” First American from the third Edinburgh edition. If titles are a guarantee of professional acumen and fame, you will conclude that Professor Simpson has a large claim to such distinction, for he is certainly rich in titles.

In endeavoring to give light to the world in regard to the

homœopathic attenuations, Professor Simpson says, (see pages 62 and 63 of his work,) "The thirtieth dilution, which Hahnemann declares as infallibly the most appropriate dose, *as well for chronic as for acute diseases*, consists of a decillionth of a grain or a decillionth of a drop of a drug, whatever drug that may be which is employed. The human intellect, however, can scarcely appreciate this quantity when expressed either in language or figures. And to obtain some slight idea of the infinitesimal exiguity of dose which is thus contained in the thirtieth dilution, let us take one or two illustrations to help the mind to some distant conception of the medicinal dose thus recommended to be used by him."

"I have already stated," says Professor Simpson (page 24), "that the earth is computed to contain, at the present time, some 900,000,000 human beings, and that if all these 900,000,000 had been called into existence when Adam was created, some 6,000 years ago, and had lived up to the present time, and each of these 900,000,000 individuals had, when first called into existence, begun to swallow, and continued to swallow up to the present hour, without rest or cessation, night and day, a decillionth dose of a grain, such as Hahnemann recommends to be used, these 900,000,000 beings would not yet, during these past 6000 years, have finished one single grain of the medicine. Nay, if each of these 900,000,000 men, now 6000 years old, had swallowed during every moment of their past existence, not a single globule, but *one million* of globules of Hahnemann's thirtieth dilution, they would not yet have finished a single grain, and would not finish it working constantly every second at the same rate for millions of centuries yet to come.

At page 66, of Professor Simpson's book, we find the following:—"Soon after the promulgation of Hahnemann's doctrines, it was suggested that, if the decillionth part of a grain have any efficacy, an ounce of medicine (Epsom Salts) thrown into the Lake of Geneva, would be sufficient to physic all the Calvinists of Switzerland. But more careful systematic calculations," says Professor S., "have shown that this

is stopping infinitely short of the truth, and that the thirtieth homœopathic dilution is, in such a parallel, enormously understated instead of over-stated. In fact, the tenth solution alone would, as Mr. Cap has shown, require for its proper solution a body of water five hundred times greater than the bulk of the Lake of Geneva, or a sea somewhat larger than the Gulf of Venice. To make the eleventh solution, a quantity of water greater than the Mediterranean Sea or the German Ocean would be necessary. The twelfth solution could scarcely be accomplished in a sea extending over the whole surface of the earth, and five hundred fathoms in depth. And if the whole Solar System were buried in an ocean extending in depth from the Sun to Neptune, *it would not form a sufficient fluid medium for adequately dissolving to the thirtieth dilution, a common dose of any of the common medicines of the Homœopaths.*"

At page 73, Professor Simpson says:—"The waters of the collected oceans of the earth are computed to cover an area of about 147,800,000 square miles, and supposing their mean depth to be two miles, their cubic contents would be nearly 300,000,000 cubic miles. But an ocean many, many, many million of times larger, would, as stated in the text, be required to dissolve one single grain down to the thirtieth dilution." "*These computations,*" says Professor S., "*have been kindly revised for me, and authenticated by several of our most distinguished mathematicians.*"

These extracts will give you some idea of the mode by which allopathic physicians form their opinions in regard to what they call the absurdities of Homœopathy. Professor Simpson's work had reached the third edition in Edinburgh six years ago. It is considered by Allopathists a fair and masterly exponent of "Homœopathy,—its tenets and its tendencies." Those of his own medical faith, who have read it, profess to believe every word and assertion in it, and they are thus enlightened in regard to Hahnemann and his system of practice. Nay, more, they place this work in the hands of the non-professional readers to enlighten them also; this is certainly a verification of "the blind leading the blind."

I venture the assertion that there is not a school-boy, of ten years of age, in the City of Philadelphia, who understands the rule of multiplication, who will not tell you that Professor Simpson's calculations, *practically speaking*, are absurd and ridiculous. You have heard that Hahnemann prepared his first attenuation with one grain of medicine to ninety-nine of sugar of milk; his second, with *one grain from the first* and ninety-nine more of the sugar of milk; and the successive attenuations were all prepared in the same manner. If a fluid medicine was to be attenuated, alcohol was used as a menstruum instead of sugar of milk, and succussion or shaking instead of the process of trituration. Well, how much sugar of milk will it take to make his thirtieth attenuation? If each one requires ninety-nine grains, how much will thirty require? Thirty times ninety-nine of course. Thirty times ninety-nine grains will make two thousand nine hundred and seventy grains, and this whole amount is ninety grains more than six ounces, apothecaries weight, very little more than half a pound; and Hahnemann has not only made the thirtieth attenuation out of this, but, in making it, he has made ninety-nine grains of each and every attenuation from the first to the thirtieth. If alcohol was used instead of sugar of milk, it would take between six and seven ounces to make the thirtieth dilution. If, then, 2970 persons would each take, at a dose, one grain of each attenuation thus made, they would consume not only the thirtieth attenuation but the ninety-nine grains of each and every one of the several attenuations, from the first to the thirtieth, in one instant.

I consider Professor Simpson's whole book a tissue of systematic misrepresentations. He has exhibited Hahnemann as carrying out the attenuation of *each and every grain of every attenuation*, instead of stating fairly and honestly, that Hahnemann took *one grain only, not every grain*, of one attenuation, to make, with ninety-nine grains of the menstruum, the next attenuation. In the broadest charity, I really do not know where to look for his apology. In attempting to expose Hahnemann and Homœopathy, he has only succeeded in con-

victing himself either of malice or ignorance. In contemplating the attenuating process of Hahnemann, it may appear strange to the casual observer that a medicinal power could, by any possibility, be preserved. According to the principles of the Atomic theory, matter cannot be annihilated. The *intrinsic principle* of a diamond is to be found in a particle the size of the head of a pin, as well as in a mass the size of a house. Ten millions of grains of Opium contain its active (dynamic) principle—Narcotine; but the ten millionth part of that quantity, one grain, also contains that active (dynamic) principle, and so does the ten millionth atom of that one grain contain it. The *intrinsic principle* of a medicinal substance resides in its atomic constituents or particles; and, by overcoming the attraction of aggregation or cohesion in these ultimate atoms, this active (dynamic) principle is developed. The aptness and power of Hahnemann's process of attenuation is now made apparent.

In a matter so important as the administration of medicines to the sick, and in view of the responsible office of the physician, it is absolutely necessary that he shall be certain that his remedies, whatever they profess to be, shall possess the power to control and cure diseases, regardless of speculative philosophy. Can the Homœopathist have such a certainty in regard to his remedies? Certainly he can, by administering them to the sick. Here he can have the testimony of his eyes that they are effective and reliable. He prescribes for all kinds of fevers, for croup, for pleurisy, for pneumonia, &c., and he surely would be the first to detect the want of efficiency in the medicines he administered. It would not require the opposition of his adversaries to change his practice; if his patients continued to suffer or would die, he would die with them, professionally, and his own interests, if he could disregard the sacred appeals of humanity, would compel him to change. Tell his adversaries, however, of the diseases he has cured, and the universal reply is—"they would have recovered if nothing had been given." Well, be it so. If the diseases required nothing, and he gave nothing, who can

question the utility of his course? While he can have the happy consolation to know that he did not afflict his patients by the administration of crude and disgusting drugs.

I do not say that diseases have not been, and are not now cured by allopathic treatment, according to the reversed principle—*Contraria Contrariis Curantur*. I would as soon say that travellers have not been conveyed from Philadelphia to Baltimore in the old-fashioned four horse mail coaches; but, I do assert, that the distance is now passed over more comfortably, and in one fourth of the time, by the aid of steam. And what was the objection to the use of steam, when first proposed for purposes of locomotion and of navigation? Its *simplicity*. It was nothing but water, whose power was developed by the introduction of caloric. We have ~~have~~ lived to see and to enjoy its superiority as a motive power. What was the objection to the magnetic telegraph? Its *simplicity*. Many, who now hear me, recollect the time when Professor Morse applied to the Congress of the United States for an appropriation of \$30,000, to test the experiment of a line from Washington City to Baltimore; and, when that appropriation was granted, how almost every one felt and expressed dissatisfaction at the proceeding, calling the whole experiment a “humbug.” That was the common phrase. We have lived to see the utility of that discovery demonstrated, and to avail ourselves of its advantages. What was the objection to the discovery of the immortal Jenner, who first proposed the system of vaccination as a preventive of that most dreadful of all diseases—the small pox, the virus for which was obtained from so humble a source as the cow? Its *simplicity*. And, what has been the objection to the discovery of the immortal Hahnemann in giving to the world a mild and safe antidote to disease? Its *simplicity*. And is it possible that the *simplicity* of a proposed improvement should oppose its investigation or adoption? It is even so; and so it has been from the time of the Saviour of the world upon the earth, and, perhaps, for ages before His coming. The simplicity and humility of His birth—His life—His whole earthly career—were the greatest objections to His power.

But, Homœopathists are charged with deluding the public. How? Was there ever anything seen in the practice which was calculated to delude? On the contrary, there is no other method of medical practice which is not better calculated to impose upon human credulity than Homœopathy. In all other modes of practice the patient can taste, feel or see that the physician is operating upon him, even before he feels a curative effect; and, if he should be no better or really worse from the action of the remedies used, he has testimony that *something* has been done for him. This is not the case in homœopathic treatment; for, such is its simplicity, that it has, really, more the appearance of doing nothing, and the first tangible evidence the patient has that the physician is doing *anything*, is a relief from pain, or some other indication of a cure. At the commencement of my investigation of Homœopathy, I was forcibly struck with this fact, and I asked myself the question—If Hahnemann had a desire to impose upon the credulity of the world, why would he have proposed such a course of treatment? He certainly disregarded all the common devices of the Charlatan, and adopted a plan the least of all calculated to deceive, which the ingenuity of man could ever have invented.

When I had been engaged in its investigation but a short time, one of my medical friends, who felt much solicitude for my welfare, asked of me, "What will the profession think of you?" There is the great question, and, unfortunately, it is the governing principle with the weak-minded. The fear of obloquy has been the cause of having prevented many an honest physician from looking into this discovery. But, what is the moral character of the man who stops to ask this question? Is he to be trusted with so responsible an office as that of physician? I would say he was better suited for that of a grave-digger!

In conclusion, I would offer a few words to my colleagues of the American Institute of Homœopathy. On the 10th day of April, 1844, sixteen years ago, our Institute was organized in the City of New York, by a meeting of twenty-

five physicians. I had the privilege and the pleasure to be one of that number, and I have attended at every annual meeting since that time. I have seen its members increasing in number at every session, until now when it amounts to upwards of five hundred, giving to us an average increase of thirty a year, and I can truly assert that it is now one of the largest medical associations in the world. In and out of our Institute, we number, in the United States, alone, more than two thousand working homœopathic physicians. Sixty years ago, our distinguished leader wore the honors of his discovery alone, but he has handed down to us the rich inheritance which the splendour of his genius and his indafatiguable industry had achieved. Convinced, as he was, of the truth of his discovery, and of its value to mankind, he allowed no human obstacle to retard his progress, and, in the last days of his useful life, he was animated and sustained by the reflection that he would leave to posterity and to suffering humanity the greatest benefaction which history would ever record. *We* have been permitted to see the truth and beauty of his discovery, and to be among those chosen ones by whom it is to be perpetuated. *Our* privilege is as great as our calling is responsible; and, we cannot be true to that privilege and to that responsibility without perpetual vigilance, close study and untiring industry. With a faithful adherence to these, we shall prove worthy of our position in society, and of the great trust confided, by Providence, to our care. Let us, then, discharge our obligations with fidelity, regardless of our oppositions and of our trials. Let us move on in the path of duty as a band of brothers, to honor and defend our sacred cause; and let us always remember and cherish the sublime maxim—"In truth, unity; in doubt, liberty; in all things, charity."