



ALLOPATHY

AND

HOMOEOPATHY

CONTRASTED.

BY

EDWARD J. SWEENEY.

RAVENNA, OHIO:

L. W. HALL, PRINTER.

1863.

ALLOPATHY and HOMOEOPATHY

CONTRASTED.

BY

EDWARD J. SWEENEY.

RAVENNA, OHIO:

L. W. HALL, PRINTER.

1863.

Introduction.

I feel that I ought, perhaps, to apologize for intruding upon the public the few thoughts contained in this pamphlet. My only object has been to correct error, and bring out the truth on a subject which I consider of vital importance to every one. During a period of fourteen years, I have patiently submitted to the misrepresentations of my opponents, and could still continue to do so, but that the cause of truth demands an exposition of facts in reference to this subject. And I do this the more willingly, now that it cannot be said with any show of reason, that I do it for my own interest.

I have thought it best to take this method, which is an open and fair one, of answering the many interrogatories in the minds of the people, as well as to correct the many misrepresentations made by the opponents of Homœopathy.

E. J. S.

WBK

S974a

1863

ALLOPATHY AND HOMŒOPATHY CONTRASTED.

AMONG all the things which concern our material existence, probably none more interests us than the subject of medicine.

This is emphatically true when sickness invades the family circle, and death threatens to deprive us of the society of loved ones. No matter how much in health we may affect to despise the disciple of Esculapius, when death seeks to invade our home sanctuary, we gladly implore him to stand between the grim monster and those we hold dear.

At such a time, no science, no art, seems so important to us as the healing art. And yet with all its importance, probably there is no subject of such general interest of which there is so little known by those most affected by it. Who can estimate the almost unlimited changes in the destinies of a single human being, who has been hurried away into eternity by charlatan practice, based upon a want of knowledge on the one hand, or neglect to exercise the functions of nature's laws on the other.

Well and truly has a learned professor said upon this point: "that upon the accuracy of the medical practitioner's knowledge, and the correctness of his principles, depends perhaps a father's happiness, a mother's hopes, the support of infants, the enjoyment of a wide circle, the prosperity of neighborhoods, the liberties of a people, perhaps the peace of the world; yea, happily the opportunity of repentance. He tells the profession that such men should be well aware of the nature of their office; that they should shrink from the notion that all information is exhausted; that they should doubt even their own powers; that they should weary heaven with their prayers for light and knowledge, and that not a finger ache should be cured above the line of perpetual snows, but like fine ears in the tale, they should catch the whisper of it along the earth.

Aside from the grief that wrings and wrecks the hearts of friends, aside from the lacerations in home and friendly circles, independent of national calamities that it may bring upon us, there are still higher considerations.

Death severs the bands that bind us to earth, and launches us into eternity.

It is no trifling responsibility, then, which rests upon him who undertakes to step in between the monster death and those we love and hold most dear of all that is mortal; and that man is not excusable either before God or his fellow man, who, with such responsibilities resting upon him, refuses to investigate thoroughly and honestly, the merits of the system upon which he stands, as well as those opposed to him.

Progression is ignored at the present day in nothing unless it be in the principles upon which the healing art is based; and when we talk of innovation upon the antiquated dogmas of the old school of medicine, we are at once set upon by its votaries with the cry of heresy, and are generally told that theirs is the only system that can boast of having stood the test of time—that

they can trace it back to a period anterior to the Christian Era—that it alone is sanctioned by the experience of ages.

There is, we all know, in the minds of mankind an inclination to venerate old established customs, and to be slow in parting with them. This to a certain extent is laudable, and we ought to argue well in our own minds the merits and demerits not only of that system which we propose to cast aside, but also of that which we propose to substitute in its stead.

I propose to take a brief retrospect of Allopathy, from the time of Hipocrates to the present, in order to see whether there is any reason in the claim which it sets up on the account of its long standing. It is highly probable that in the primitive ages few maladies, and those not generally of a serious nature, afflicted mankind; consequently, little skill was requisite to remove them; but as mankind multiplied, society became more dense, luxury, dissipation and vice became prevalent, diseases multiplied, and medical aid became proportionately necessary. From this necessity sprang the medical profession.

Of Hipocrates, it is said, "He is reckoned the 18th lineal descendant from Esculapius, the profession of medicine having been hereditarily followed in that family, and under whose direction the Coan School arrived at its high degree of perfection. Not content with the Empirical practice which he derived from his ancestors, he studied under Herodocius, who had invented the gymnastic medicine, as well as other philosophers.

He supposed and taught that there were four humors in the body: blood, phlegm, yellow and black bile, having different degrees of heat or coldness, moisture or dryness, and that to certain changes in the quantity or quality of these, all diseases might be referred.

His treatment consisted in a great restriction of diet; but hardly any medicines were administered except gentle emetics, and laxatives and clysters.— "He bled freely in cases of extreme pain and inflammation, and advised trephining in cases of violent headache." In the year 131 Claudius Galenius was born. It is said of him that he spent much time in traveling, that he might converse with the most intelligent physicians of the age in which he lived.

His leading dogmas were that the human body is composed of four elements, viz: Earth, air, fire and water; that the animal body consisted in addition to the four elements, of four humors. Accordingly in all cases the seat of the disease was in the humors, and that it resulted from a vitiated state of one more of these humors. A modern allopathic writer, in speaking of Galen, says: "He has not much increased the stock of practical information. We must therefore regret that the splendor of Galen's talents so completely dazzled his successors that, until about the middle of the 17th century his opinions bore almost undivided sway."

He assigned to all medicinal agents four qualities, which were identical with the four qualities in the human body, and that they were curative in the exact ratio in which they were found to contain one or more of the above qualities preponderating.

In 1527, Paracelsus overran for a time the European continent with his Alchemist theory, according to which, the animal body consisted essentially of mercury, sulphur and salts, and that these three elements must exist in mathematical proportions in each individual, in order to constitute health. He taught that life is the combined action of certain divinities, which reside in, and preside over the several organs. Each organ had its appropriate deity, and it was only through the harmonious action of the different deities that health could be preserved.

It is due the Galenists, to say that they combatted this theory vigorously, but this warfare only served to break down both schools sufficiently to produce a commingling of the different views.

John Baptist Van Helmont, at the close of the 16th century, next assailed the Galenist theory. He endorsed Paracelsus' theory of presiding deities. He believed these divinities possessed of the human passions individually, and that any cause which would disturb either of them would produce disease. Accordingly all medical agents must have the power of appeasing some or all of these offended deities; and this power could only be determined by chemical analysis.

Next we have the theory of Sylvius, who supposed he had succeeded in discovering that life was a sort of fermentative process, carried on by the action of an acid and an alkali. He attributed all deviations from health to a disproportion of these two agencies. The *materia medica* was accordingly arranged upon the acid and alkali principle. This theory prevailed until about the beginning of the 17th century, when Harvey discovered the circulation of the blood.

Says Dr. Hooper: "The promulgation of this important doctrine brought upon the author the most unjust opposition, some condemning it as an innovation, others pretending that it was known before; and he complained that his practice materially declined afterward." Soon after the discovery of the circulation of the blood, we have the mechanical theory, which maintained that the animal functions are wholly controlled by the laws of gravitation. Says the author above referred to, "Perhaps no hypothesis since that of Galen, was ever received with more enthusiasm, or adopted with more implicit faith. In proportion as mathematical reasoning prevailed, attention to chemistry was withdrawn, and so entirely was the learned world engaged with the fascinations of mathematics, that for nearly a century scarcely a single improvement was made in the science, and the application of chemical laws to pathology and therapeutics was altogether suspended. Now instead of acidity, alkalinity, fermentation, putrescency, &c., we find the medical authors of this period constantly referring to calculations respecting the size of the pores and vessels, the friction of bodies against each other, the impulse of the fluids, their deviations and revulsions, the momentum of the blood, its viscidty and lentor, its obstructions, resolutions, and various other hypothetical expressions, derived directly from mechanical causes, and considered as the sole agents in every corporeal action."

In 1694 we have a new theory in opposition to the mechanical theory, headed

by George Ernest Stahl. It had been observed that there is a certain power in the animal body of resisting injuries, and correcting some of its disorders.

“Stahl referred this power entirely to the soul, which, he affirmed, not only originally formed the body, but is the sole cause of all its motions, in the constant excitement of which life consists. Whence diseases were regarded as salutary efforts of the presiding soul, to avert the destruction of the body. This hypothesis, besides its visionary character, was justly deprecated as leading to an inert practice, and the neglect of the collateral branches of medical science which Stahl maintained, had little or no reference to the healing art. And in fact both he and his followers, trusting principally to the operations of nature, zealously opposed some of the most efficacious remedies, as opium, chincona, and mercury; and were extremely reserved in the employment of bleeding, vomiting, &c.

This brief review of the medical art, brings us down to the beginning of the present century, and in order to show how much this antiquated and venerated system of medicine has been improved in the last one hundred and fifty years, I will introduce the testimony of modern allopathic professors upon the practical part of medicine. And I wish in this place to remark, that I shall adduce no testimony as coming from allopathic authority, only such as is from men who have ever stood high as authority in the allopathic ranks.

Cabanus, a distinguished French physician and philosopher, in an “Essay on the Certainty of Medicine,” says: “We are continually obliged to admit exceptions to those rules which were thought adequate for our guidance. We discover nothing *fixed* and *invariable* in their application, or in the plans which they should furnish us for our conduct. With the exceptions, therefore, of some principles, which in consequence of their very general nature, are little calculated to direct us in the detail of every particular circumstance, it seems as if the theoretical knowledge of a physician was reduced *to nothing* at the bedside of the sick, and that his practical skill resides in a sort of instinctive acuteness, improved by habit and experience. If in the mathematical sciences, the slightest deviation from the accurate construction and employment of rules, leads us inevitably to the most incorrect results, shall we ever be able to avoid errors in an art, the success of which depends exclusively on the acuteness of our organs, and in which the most happy views are less the effects of reasoning than of inspiration.” John Hunter, speaking upon the same subject, says: “The difficulty is, to ascertain the connection of substance and virtue, and apply this in restraining or altering diseased action; and as that cannot be demonstrated a priori, it reduces the practice of medicine to experiment, and this not built upon well determined data.

Dr. Paris, Professor of *Materia Medica* in the Royal College of Physicians, London, in a lecture on the efficacy of medicines, remarks that such fluctuations in opinions and versatility in practice should have produced, even in the most candid and learned observers, an unfavorable impression, can hardly excite our astonishment, much less our indignation; and again, that unlike the other

branches of science it is incapable of successful generalization." Dr. Rush says: "It seems to be one of the rules of faith in our art, that truth must be helped into belief by some *persuasive fiction* of the school, and as far as I know, the medical profession can scarcely produce a single volume in its practical department, from the works of Hipocrates down to the last made text-book, which by the requisitions of an exact science, will not be found to contain nearly as much fiction as truth."

Dr. Williams, Professor of the Principles and Practice of Medicine in University College, London, and author of a standard work on Pathology, says: "Compare the state of the practice of Medicine with that of Anatomy, Physiology, and Chemistry—the great fundamental or preparatory studies. How minute, how precise, how connected and definite are these? Yet how loose, indefinite, uncertain, unconnected, is the practice of our art? To the public it appears altogether vague without any acknowledged principles." In speaking of the practitioner of medicine, he says: "He either has no theory at all, and grounds his practice on experience, (in which, as we have said, he is matched by the empiric) or, if he gives a theory, it is viewed only as an opinion no better than the hypothesis of the quack, in an art so little founded on principle as medicine." Again he says: "But let us follow the student, well crammed with his nosological lists, their definitions, &c., to the bedside of the patient. Let us see how his knowledge, so meritoriously obtained, will serve him in the hour of need. In a few cases of well marked acute diseases, such as pleurisy, scarlet fever, or rheumatism, he may get on pretty well; but in the commoner description of cases, acute and chronic, in their earlier stages, in their endless variations from peculiarities of constitution or from complicating causes, he finds himself continually puzzled: the phenomena do not correspond with any of his defined diseases; they frequently change their character in a way that he cannot account for; his prognosis is falsified; his diagnosis fails; and his treatment, although not always unsuccessful, does not answer according to his expectations; some patients recovering whom he expected to die; others dying or not improving, whom he expected to recover.

Disappointed in the failure of his nosological learning, the young practitioner more and more mistrusts it, and falls into a routine of empirical practice."

Again he says: "Why should the science of medicine be in a state of powerless infancy, when its members are progressively acquiring strength and maturity? Why should the art of medicine still be groping about in blind empiricism, and an unintelligible confusion of facts, when science even now can afford it the beginning of light and order?"

Dr. Gregory, author of a work on Theory and Practice, says: "Medical doctrines are little better than stark, staring absurdities." Sir Astley Cooper, the far-famed surgeon, says: "The science of medicine is founded on conjecture and improved by murder."

Professor Kirtland, of Cleveland Medical College, in an introductory upon the "Coinciding Tendencies of Medicines," says: "From the time the student

of medicine first opens a treatise upon Theory and Practice until he receives the honors of the Institution, he is taught in most schools to consider medicines as simply antagonists of disease, and is not initiated into the important secret that medicines under certain circumstances *may themselves become the source of disease*. He enters the stage of action with the impression that he has only to administer medicines with a bold hand, and he will at once convert disease into health. Experience soon convinces him that his views are incorrect. On treating disease he finds himself surrounded with new and anomalous symptoms of which he had no previous conception, and which increase by every effort at extirpating them. Ignorant of the source of the perplexities, he becomes distrustful of the certainties of medicine and of medical science.

“If he be a man of principle, he will most likely retire from the profession in disgust, and ever after remain the most confirmed of medical skeptics.” Dr. Abercrombie tells us that “The action of medicines upon the human body is fraught with the highest degree of uncertainty.” The distinguished Boerhave says: “If we compare the good which half a dozen true disciples of Esculapius have done since their art begun with the evil which the numerous number of doctors have inflicted upon mankind, we must be satisfied that it would have been better for mankind if medical men had never existed.”

What is the substance of the testimony which we receive from the authors and teachers of Allopathy—men of high standing and rank in the profession? That the knowledge of the physician is reduced to nothing at the only time when it is required; that his practical skill must consist in a sort of instinctive acuteness improved by experience; his practical success depending not upon fixed and immutable principles, but upon the acuteness of his organs; that the practical part of medicine is incapable of generalization; that every truth in the art must be helped into belief by fiction.

That the medical student, after years of toilsome study in the kindred branches is driven, from the want of system in the practical department of medicine, to a “routine of empirical practice.”

That the “stark-staring absurdities” “are founded in conjecture and improved by murder.” This is the testimony not of the enemies of the allopathic art, but of its friends—men who have grown gray and careworn in their efforts to obviate the evils of which they complain. It is true this testimony was not designed for the ears of the suffering victims of a murderous practice; for medicine has, until within a few years, been shrouded with an impenetrable veil of mystery outside of the profession. Is it not strange that the votaries of allopathy will persist by their misrepresentations of their opponents in bringing to light their own glaring absurdities?

These are unpalatable truths, and hard to be borne by that part of the profession who rest so securely upon the antiquity of their dogmas.

Let us turn for a few moments to their works on practice, and see if their so-called system has been underrated by the authorities previously referred to.

Take, for instance, Prof. Watson's work on Theory and Practice, a work to be found in the hands of every allopathic physician amongst us. Let us see what rules he gives as a guide in the administration of their most potent and generally used remedies. I will select his treatment of inflammation, because,

to use the Professor's own words, "A great majority of all the diseases to which the human frame is liable begin with inflammation, or end in inflammation, or are accompanied by inflammation during some part of their course, or resemble inflammation in their symptoms. In short, a very large share of the premature extinction of life in general, is more or less attributable to inflammation." Has not suffering humanity a right to expect of this ancient, arrogant and self-assuming school, something definite, some rule approximating at least to certainty in that form of disease which, according to the Professor, enters in some form into almost all diseases to which the human family is liable. Blood-lettings, Mercury, Digitalis and Opium, are laid down as the most reliable remedies in inflammation.

Watson says: "The *great* remedy in acute and dangerous inflammation is blood-letting. Now although blood-letting is the summum remedium for inflammation at its commencement, there is a point beyond which it not only does no good, but is positively injurious. And this point is not always easy to hit. On one side is the danger that the inflammatory action may continue to extend: on the other, the danger that the strength of the system may be so reduced as to prove unequal to the process of restoration; for, to remove the interstitial extravasations, and to repair the damage that has accrued, a certain degree of vital power is necessary, and a sufficient quantity of healthy blood."

"Bleeding," says the same author, "will cure inflammation, but it will not always cure the effects of inflammation; nay, it may render them lingering in their departure, or even determine their fatality." Again: "Its power is great for evil as well as good; and in rash or inexperienced hands it too often becomes an instrument of fatal mischief." "Next to blood-letting as a remedy, and of vastly superior value upon the whole, to purgation, in serious inflammation of various kinds, is mercury." "It is important to know that different persons admit of, or resist the specific agency of mercury in very different degrees; so that in some patients it becomes *unmanageable* and *hazardous*; while in others it is inert and useless. It is most grievously disappointing to watch a patient laboring under inflammation which is likely to spoil some important organ, and to find, after bleeding has been pushed as far as we dare push it, that no impression is made upon the gums by the freest use of mercury. Such cases are not uncommon, and unfortunately they are most apt to occur when the controlling agency of mercury is most urgently required. On the other hand, there are other persons in whom very small doses of mercury act as a violent poison; a single dose producing the severest salivation, and bringing the patient's existence into jeopardy."

He then relates the case of a lady who took only two grains of calomel, which produced furious salivation in a few hours; and she died, at the end of two years, worn out by the effects of the mercury, and having lost portions of the jaw-bone by necrosis." Still another case, "a man, so susceptible to the influence of mercury, that when his wife had rubbed a very small portion of white precipitate ointment upon her neck for some cutaneous affection, after sleeping with her his gums were tender for three or four days, and slight salivation then took place. This did not happen once only, but three several times. On one occasion this same man took two blue pills, as preliminary to a common purge-

and was salivated *profusely* for six weeks." Of course you would expect the Doctor would tell his class, while recommending such a potent two-edged remedy, one which enters into almost every prescription of any importance in the practice of the allopathist; of some rule by which to discriminate between where it will be life, and where it will be death. But he is very far from doing so. He says: "Cases similar to these occur now and then to most medical men: we cannot tell beforehand in whom such effects are to be looked for." "So distressing," he says, "sometimes, are these effects of mercury upon the mouth, that I may pause a moment to tell you what I know about the means of relieving them. You will constantly be called upon to do something for the relief of this disease (for so we must call it) which you yourselves, or some of your brethren, have with the best intentions inflicted. I have tried all sorts of expedients, and I have asked a great many of my friends what is the best plan to adopt in such cases; but I never could get much satisfactory information from them. All admitted that they knew of no certain remedy. *Neither do I.*" Comment on this is unnecessary.

"Digitalis is another powerful medicine, from which, as a remedy for active inflammation, much was at one time hoped; but this hope has been in a great measure disappointed. It is not a manageable remedy in such cases. If you give moderate doses of Digitalis, its peculiar effect upon the pulse comes on at very uncertain periods, and may be postponed until it is too late to be of any service. If, on the other hand, you give it in such quantities as to speedily affect the heart's action (which is what we want in acute and serious inflammation), then you are *never secure* against what may be called its poisonous effects; deadly faintness, frightful syncope, and *even death itself*."

Most practitioners can tell of cases in which patients, who were taking full doses of Digitalis, have suddenly expired; and when the remedy has appeared to have more to do with the fatal event than the disease." Of the utility of Opium as a remedy in inflammation, he says: "Certainly Opium, like most of our powerful remedies, may do much good, as it may do much *harm*, in different inflammatory diseases. I believe that by a free use of Opium I saved the life of a relative of my own, an old lady, who was in danger of being worn out by the cough and bronchial irritation which attended the influenza. On the other hand, I have certainly known more than one person laboring under extensive and severe bronchitis so effectually quieted by a dose of the same medicine that they never woke again." In view of the foregoing facts, is it marvellous that Bichat, speaking of the old-school *Materia Medica*, says: "It is an incoherent assemblage of incoherent opinions. It is not a science for a medical mind. It is a shapeless mass of inaccurate ideas, of observations which are often puerile, of deceptive remedies and formulas, as fantastically conceived as they are tediously arranged."—That Hoffman should say: "There are few remedies the effects of which are well known. The greater number disappoint the expectations of practitioners." That Broussais should say: "When I would seek a guide among authors most illustrious, to whom therapeutics expresses herself most obliged, I find nothing but confusion."

That Rostan should say: "Let no one say, that medicine has freed herself from the darkness of the middle ages. Let one but glance at the formularies,

and he will rise with indignation against the prevailing practices." That Dr. Good says: "The effects of medicine upon the system is in the highest degree uncertain." That Dr. Adams says: "We cannot think of the various theories of medicine since the days of John Hunter, without the most painful distrust in all modes of treatment." That Dr. Simon should say: "This fannago of traditions—the misnamed science of *materia medica*—has remained so contented and so stationary, that at the present moment, in the middle of the nineteenth century, we do not possess a complete medical knowledge of a single article of the *pharmacopia*."

Dr. Nunnally, speaking of the allopathic treatment of Erysipelas, says: "The practice pursued by different persons is of the most dissimilar and contradictory nature. While one party relies upon blood-letting freely and repeatedly performed, as the surest and only method of cure; another, and perhaps larger party—certainly as respectable, so far as authority goes—wisely repudiates the abstraction of blood, and depends upon tonics and cordials for the removal of the complaint. Indeed, so confidently are the most opposite remedies enforced, and so contradictory are the results said to follow the application of the same means in the hands of different persons, equally worthy of credit, that the impugner of medical skill may fairly point with confidence to this part of our field, and demand if such contradictions are worthy of the name of a science, or of trust."

What, I ask, is there in such a system, to entitle it to the consideration of intelligent human beings? When the standard writers and lecturers in allopathy admit, either directly or indirectly, that theirs is a system of guess-work, improved by murder; is it not time that its blinded and selfish admirers ceased their ridicule and misrepresentations of Homœopathy, which although but little more than half a century old, has found a foothold in every part of the civilized world, and numbers its votaries in all ranks of life, from the peasant to the potentates of the world. That system, which based upon an immutable and unchanging law in nature, presents to the medical practitioner a correct guide, and a sure and certain method in the practical department of medicine. It has already outlived the predictions of its allopathic despisers, and has at this day a large and increasing literature. It has a number of colleges, and over three thousand practitioners in the United States, while among the numerous Homœopathic physicians on the European continent there are upwards of thirty Professors in European Universities; more than fifty medical and court counsellors, and thirty court physicians. It has numbered in the old world among its advocates such men as Fleishman, of Vienna, Marenzellar, for years the Surgeon-General of the Austrian army, Professor Buchner, of Munich, Professor D'Amador, of Montpellier, Professor Tessier, physician to a ward in one of the grandest hospitals in Paris, Dr. Henderson, Professor of Pathology in the University of Edinburgh, Dr. Horner, of Hull, late President of the British Medical Association. We might continue to multiply this list indefinitely, but it is needless. There are among the prominent laymen, who have borne witness to its efficacy, such men as Guizot, Emperor Nicholas, of Russia, Washington Irving, Wm. C. Bryant, &c.

Homœopathy is based upon the law "*similia similibus curanter*," in other

words, a disease is cured by a medicinal agent which is capable of producing a similar affection in the healthy organism; or in the words of another writer, "Every drug is a poison which exerts a specific morbid impression upon the healthy organism and tissues of the human body. This impression is revealed by certain functional or organic disturbances called symptoms, or signs of disease; and the said drug will cure, by a natural law, similar morbid effects which have resulted from other causes." But says one, I thought Homœopathy consisted in "little pills" and "diet." Very likely you thought so, and the chances are that you received that idea from an allopathic physician. But such is not the truth. The physician who prescribes a grain of Ipecac in a case of nausea and vomiting attended with the expulsion of a great deal of tenacious mucus from the stomach, is practicing Homœopathy as much as if he gave the millionth of a grain. So he who prescribes a fluid ounce of castor oil in a mucous diarrhea, or in gastroenteritis, is practicing upon the same principle. This law is universal in its application to the treatment of all diseases of a dynamic origin, or in other words, of all diseases not of a chemical or mechanical nature. As an example of treatment upon chemical principles, we may instance a case of poisoning, in which the Homœopathic physician would prescribe an antidote; and in the case of a person who had filled his stomach with cherry pits, or any other indigestible substance, which was producing mechanical disturbance, he would prescribe an emetic. Ah, says one, my doctor (Allopathic) says if your patient had taken a poisonous dose of Arsenic, you would prescribe more Arsenic to cure him. Well, if your Dr. is a man of ordinary intelligence, and makes such an assertion as that, you would only be using necessary precaution in locking up your valuables, when he is about your house. With these limitations, then, the law *similia similibus curanter*, is a general law of cure. Diseases of a dynamic origin, as well as the dynamic complications in chemical and mechanical diseases, are always cured, if cured at all, upon this law. A patient is none the less cured Homœopathically because an allopathic physician by chance cures him upon that principle.

Allopathic works abound from the time of Hipocrates until the present, with illustrations of this law. The English sweating sickness, which in its commencement carried off ninety-nine out of a hundred, was only subdued by sudorifics. Vomiting has often been cured by emetics, diarrhea by cathartics, delirium tremens, by alcoholic stimulation, &c.

And as I have already introduced allopathic testimony to prove that allopathy has no guide in the administration of remedies; I mean any rule which is recognized as a law, but that each practitioner is left to cut and carve according as his judgment, or want of judgment dictates; I propose to introduce the same testimony to prove the proposition that disease is cured upon the Homœopathic law although they deny that law being universal in its application.

Professor Watson, speaking of the treatment of tetanus, or, as it is sometimes called, lockjaw, says: "Strychnia has been suggested for severe tetanus; not in infinitesimal doses, as Hahneman would, I suppose, prescribe it, but in sufficient quantities to produce a sensible effect. The principle upon which this is recommended is the same with that on which nitrate of silver ointment is applied to the inflamed conjunctiva in purulent ophthalmia.

We know that strychnia acts upon the spinal cord, affecting apparently those parts and those functions of the cord which are affected in tetanus: and in so fatal a malady, it would be justifiable, I conceive, to give the strychnia in the hopes that it might occasion a morbid action which would supersede the morbid action of the disease, and yet be less perilous and more manageable than it." Says the Professor, "This, were it successful, would be a cure according to the Hahnemanic doctrine—*Similia similibus curanter*—a doctrine much older than Hahneman." Dr. Symonds, in an article on Tetanus, says: "Upon this ground we are disposed to suggest a trial of strychnia in tetanus; not that we have become followers of Hahneman, but that it is a *simple, undeniable fact*, that disorders are occasionally removed by remedies which have the power of producing similar affections."

Prof. Wood, author of an allopathic treatise on Practice, says: "It is a general, though, by no means, a universal law, that two powerful diseases, or forms of abnormal action, cannot exist in the whole system or any part of it at the same time. If, therefore, we can produce a new disease, or new mode of abnormal action in the exact position of one which may be existing or expected, we may possibly supersede the latter; and, if the new disorder subsides spontaneously, without injury, we cure our patient." But let us hear the doctor still farther. He says: "The susceptibilities are often different in health and disease, so that the same medicine may produce opposite effects in these two states. The Cayenne pepper, which produces in the healthy fauces redness and burning pain, acts as a sedative in the sore throat of scarlet fever. A mere difference in the mode in which a medicine is employed, may cause it to be either stimulant or sedative. A concentrated solution of Acetate of lead applied to the denuded skin, or to a mucous membrane, acts as an irritant; while the same solution, very much diluted, will operate as a sedative through the peculiar power of the medicine."

Very true, Dr. Wood, this is good Homœopathic doctrine, and for believing and practicing which, Homœopathic physicians are treated as medical heretics.

If the Doctor would push his investigations still further, he would find this principle true throughout the whole materia medica. He would find that large doses of Belladonna produce congestion of the brain, and that Bell., diluted, will relieve that condition when induced by other causes; that colocynth in large doses will purge and gripe, and that given in diminished doses it will relieve those symptoms.

Had Hahneman contented himself with the occasional glimpses of truth that obtruded itself upon him, he would never have laid the foundation for that noble superstructure which is destined to gladden the hearts of the whole human family, by doing away with the whole system of guess work in medicine which is constantly carrying its victims to an untimely grave. While engaged in the translation of Cullen's *Materia Medica*, he was attracted by the eulogy pronounced by the author upon Peruvian bark in the treatment of intermittents. He at once resolved to test the effects of this medicine upon himself while in perfect health. The result was the development in his own system of the same abnormal manifestations for which the Bark was so highly

recommended as a specific. To his philosophic mind here was a ray of light piercing the Egyptian darkness which enshrouded medicine.

He continued his experimenting with dosings upon himself and such of his friends as could be induced to join him. After six years thus spent, in the year 1796 he published his views in Huefeland's Journal, under the title, "Concerning a new principle for discovering the curative virtues of medicines." He still pursued his investigations until the year 1805, when he published a work in two volumes, containing the results of his experiments with twenty-seven medicines on himself, his family, and disciples.

In 1810 he published his work, "Medicine founded on Experience." This brought upon him the usual abuse from the profession whenever a new truth is brought to bear against the long-cherished dogmas of the school; the same persecution that deprived Harvey of a lucrative practice when he promulgated his discovery of the circulation of the blood.

There were, however, amid all this opposition, some of the leading physicians of Continental Europe, who assembled around Hahneman, and who aided him by experiments on their own persons. With the information thus obtained, in 1811 Hahneman published the first edition of his *Materia Medica pura*, which was not completed, however, until the year after. He was at this time engaged in the practical exemplification of his theory by effecting many extraordinary cures.

From that day until this, a period of about fifty years, his theory has steadily gained ground in spite of the most untiring opposition, and the vilest misrepresentations from members of the allopathic school. In competent hands, Homœopathy has proved itself efficacious in the treatment of consumption of the lungs, cancerous affections, dropsy, local as well as general; in dyspepsia, neuralgia, convulsions, St. Vitus dance, lockjaw, spinal and hip disease, diseases of the heart, paraplegia, rheumatism, scrofulous diseases, and the almost endless varieties of skin diseases.

In acute diseases it is no less certain and more striking in its manifestations. Inflammation of the brain, the spinal marrow, the eye, the ear, the tongue, the throat, the lungs, the heart, the stomach, the liver, the bowels, the spleen, the kidneys; together with inflammatory fevers, intermittents, typhus, yellow fever, small pox, scarlet fever and measles, influenza and whooping cough, dysentery and diarrhea, have all yielded to remedies applied upon the Homœopathic law. Then in the treatment of that dreadful scourge of the human family, Asiatic Cholera, the mortality of which under Allopathic treatment amounts to about 75 per cent., is diminished under Homœopathic treatment to 15 per cent. Take again that dread malady of warm climates, yellow fever. Here again Homœopathy has proved itself far superior to the allopathic school. So much superior did it prove itself when the frightful pestilence swept over the valley of the Mississippi in the year 1853, that the trustees of the Mississippi State Hospital, located at Natchez, appointed Homœopathic physicians and surgeons to that Institution, to take the place of the most distinguished allopathic physicians which they had hitherto been able to obtain.

This was an old established hospital, and had been under the exclusive control of the allopathic school ever since its foundation. The trustees declared that

in making the change they were actuated solely by the superior success of the Homœopathic treatment in yellow fever.

But in the treatment of diseases generally, what are the practical results of Homœopathy compared with Allopathy? As an answer to this interrogatory I propose to give a few out of many hospital reports, showing as they do in all cases where Homœopathy has had a fair trial its superiority in arresting disease.

EUROPEAN ALLOPATHIC HOSPITALS.

PLACE AND NAME OF HOSPITAL.	PER CENT. OF MORTALITY.
Belrio, Charite, 1838-9	10 to 11
Breslau, Qu Allerheilgen, 1838.....	17 " 18
Leipzig, Jakob's Hospital, 1839.....	11 " 12
Stuttgart, Catherinen, 1830-38	3 " 4
Strasburg, Forget's Clinique, 1835-38.....	15 " 16
Hamburg, Krankenhaus 5th Report.....	6 " 7
Munich, General Hospital, 1832.....	7 " 8
Milan, Great Hospital, 1814.....	15 " 16
Palermo, " " 1823.....	12 " 13
Brussels, St. Peter's Hospital, 1823.....	11 " 12
St. Petersburg, Civil " 1837.....	20 " 21
" " Seidlitz Clinique, 1840.....	13 " 14
Vienna, General Hospital, 1834.....	13 " 14
Brothers of Charity, 1838.....	9 " 10
Elizabetherrinnen, 1838.....	8 " 9
London, St. George's, 1850-55.....	18 " 19
Lyons, Hotel Dieu, 1837.....	13 " 14
Paris, " " 1835.....	9 " 10
" St. Marguerite, 1851-2,.....	11 " 12
" Vel de Grace, Imser Broussais, 1819.....	7 " 8
Average.....	11 " 12

European Homœopathic Hospitals.

PLACE AND NAME OF HOSPITAL.	CASES TREATED.	DEATHS.	PER CENT.
Sisters of Charity, at Vienna, 1834 to 1856.....	17,313	1,087	6 2-10
" " " " Linz, 1842 to 1854.....	9,129	501	5 5-10
Hospital at Gyongyos, Hungary, 1855.....	1,538	143	9 3-10
" " Guns, in " 1841.....	395	82	
" " Kreimser, 1845 to 1848.....	1,520	94	6 1-10
Leopoldstadt Hospital at Vienna, 1850.....	3,789	211	5 5-10
Hospital at Nechanits, 1846-48.....	394	102	5 10
" " Nislini, Novogorod, 1855.....	249	124	8-10
" " Leipzig, Prussia.....	4,596	188	4 1-10
Infantry Hospital, St. Petersburg.....	397	16	4
Marenzeller's Experiments at the Military Hospital at Tulzyn.....	147	64	4 1-10
London Homœopathic Hospital, 1850-56.....	1,172	554	7-10
Horatii's Experiments at Naples, 1829.....	68	23	
Sum total.....	40,911	2,342	5 7-10

In the London Homœopathic Hospital there were, during the years 1850 to 1856, 1,062 cases, 48 deaths. Per cent., $4\frac{1}{2}$.

In St. George's (Allopathic) Hospital, London, there were, during the years 1854 and 1855, 5,413 cases, 1,018 deaths. Per cent., 18.

In the Hospital of St. Marguerite, in Paris, there were two wards under Homœopathic treatment by Dr. Tessier, side by side with two other wards under Allopathic treatment. Their reports show :

Under Homœopathic Treatment.

1849,.....	1292 cases,.....	126 deaths,.....	9 75-100 per cent.
1850,.....	1677 "	138 "	8 22-106 " "
1851,.....	1694 "	135 "	7 96-100 " "

Under Allopathic Treatment.

1849,.....	1087 cases,.....	169 deaths,.....	14 71-100 per cent.
1850,.....	1195 "	107 "	8 99-100 " "
1851,.....	1442 "	135 "	9 36-100 " "

Average of Three Years' Treatment.

Allopathically,.....	3,724 cases,.....	411 deaths.....	11 3-100 per cent.
Homœopathically,....	4,655 "	399 "	8 55-100 " "

STATISTICS OF TYPHUS FEVER IN THE VIENNA GENERAL HOSPITAL.

ALLOPATHIC.

1850,.....	872 cases,.....	144 deaths,.....	16 5-10 per cent.
1852,.....	491 "	133 "	27 " "
1853,.....	1119 "	259 "	23 1-10 " "

HOMŒOPATHIC.

1850,.....	81 cases,.....	9 deaths,.....	11 1-10 per cent.
1851,.....	80 "	10 "	12 5-10 " "
1852,.....	121 "	11 "	9 " "

MORTALITY IN NEW YORK ORPHAN ASYLUM.

ALLOPATHIC.

One in 41,.....or, 2 2-5 per cent.

HOMŒOPATHIC.

One in 146,.....or, 68-100 of 1 per cent.

Ratio of mortality under Allopathic treatment, compared with Homœopathic, to be more than 3 to 1.

At the Nursery at Randall's Island, under Allopathic treatment, the mortality is 1 in 17.

The Home for the Friendless, under Homœopathic treatment, 1 in 40.

Or a mortality of 5 8-10 per cent., Allopathically.

" " " " 2 5-10 " " Homœopathically.

With these figures before them, any one can see that if Homœopathic treatment is no treatment, Allopathic treatment is by far *worse* than no treatment. But says an objector, I don't believe in Homœopathy because I cannot see how

your medicines operate upon the system. I see no sensible effects from the medicines, even in cases which recover. If this objection is a valid one, it operates equally against the whole Alterative treatment of Allopathy, and excludes their so-called specifics from the *materia medica*. Let us hear Dr. Wood upon this point. Speaking of the medical properties of Peruvian Bark, he says: "The power, by which, when administered in the intervals between the paroxysms of intermittent disorders, it interrupts the progress of the disease, is something more than what is usually understood by its Tonic [sensible] property; for no other substance belonging to the class, however powerful or permanent may be the excitement which it produces, exercises a control at all comparable to that of the medicine under consideration. As in these complaints it is probable that, in the intervals, a train of morbid action is going on out of our sight, within the recesses of the nervous system; so it is also probable that bark produces, in the same system, an action equally mysterious, which *supersedes* that of the malady, and thus accomplishes the restoration of the patient."

Prof. Bache, speaking of the medical properties of Mercury, says: "Of the *modus operandi* of Mercury we *know nothing*, except that it *probably* acts through the medium of the circulation, and that it possesses a peculiar alterative power over the vital functions, which enables it in many cases to subvert diseased action by *substituting* its own in their stead. This alterative power is sometimes exerted without being attended with any other vital phenomena than the removal of disease."

Oh well, says one, Homœopathy is contrary to common sense, therefore I don't believe in it. To such an one I would say, do not be too hasty in your inferences. You may with propriety, perhaps, say that such facts are new to you; but is it reasonable in you therefore to say that it cannot be true? Are there not many marvelous facts which are none the less facts? If a marvelous truth bears the scrutiny of a truthful and careful investigation, ought we not to admit its truth? It is nothing new for men to cry out, upon the promulgation of a new truth, "Humbug, it is contrary to common sense." This is the cry that the ignorant and prejudiced always raise?

When Gallileo invented the Telescope, he discovered the satellites of Jupiter. According to the account given by Professor Baden Powell, "Many positively denied the possibilities of such discoveries; others hesitated; all were struck with astonishment.

"The principal professor of philosophy at Padua (in which University Galileo was also a professor) pertinaciously refused to look through the telescope."

A German, named Horcky, one of those wonderfully wise men who suppose they are hard to dupe, suggested that the telescope, though accurate for terrestrial objects, was not true for the sky!

The usefulness of the Homœopathic law is admitted by the opponents of the system. If it be admitted that there is such a law of cure, is it not folly to deny its universal application? Is not one universal law of cure one of the principles of universal order? "If drugs were intended as the natural neutralizers of diseases, I do not see how, with a belief in a Providence, whether the Providence of a God or the Providence of Nature, whose surprising and

all-governing care extends to the minutest details of the Great Whole, the idea of a specific adaptation of drugs to diseases can be avoided. And if drugs are specifically curative under his infinite Providence, it can be shown that they cure Homœopathically." But say our opponents, if all you claim for Homœopathy be true, why any necessity for people dying by disease, and prematurely.

The answer may be found in the fact that while we claim that Providence has provided the way and the means, we do not claim that man has yet arrived at perfection in judgment and information. It does not follow as a logical deduction, however, that because we are not perfect in judgment we should still cling to a system of medicine which is admitted by its best informed votaries to be imperfect. Surely in a matter of so much importance we should search for all the light which Nature offers us, and until medical men are willing to do this, independent of bigotry and prejudice, humanity must suffer untold misery and premature death.

