ring had supported the womb perfectly, and as the uterus was well above the pubes I withdrew the ring. I have no doubt that she will not require any further attention until full term.

J. G. Houard, M. D.

Dr. Ad. Lippe then read the following paper:

## Is Homœopathy to be Governed by Principles or Opinions?

BY ADOLPH LIPPE, M.D.

The growing differences in the views and practice of the different members of the homœopathic profession can be traced to but one cause, and that cause consists in a belief, held probably by a majority of the members of the profession, that our school, like all former medical schools, from the days of Hippocrates down to those of Hahnemann, is governed by opinions only; governed by opinions which change as the views of this or the other distinguished authority change; and it is held, therefore, that Hahnemann offered the world only *opinions*, which are liable to be rejected, altered, or modified, as men who pride themselves on being infallible authorities may be inclined. Among the various views expressed, differing entirely from the views held by the followers of Hahnemann who believe in the principles he taught and whose practice is guided by these principles, and who also believe in a further development of medical science on the basis of strict homœopathy, we find prominently the following:

1st. "Freedom of medical opinion and action" is claimed, and by inference the existence of fundamental principles governing our school is denied.

2d. It has been claimed authoritatively that the best mode of teaching homœopathy is that each professor shall teach his own opinions, and out of these it is expected that the graduate will adopt what best suits his inexperienced mind, and practice homœopathy accordingly. This also implies that our school is not based on principles, but is made up of opinions.

3d. We have learned and good men anxious to put on homœopathy the livery of the physiological school to make it look more learned, and as such an attempt is utterly in contravention of the principles belonging to and distinguishing homœopathy from all former schools, these men impliedly also hold that we have no principles, but are to be guided by opinions only.

All these are, no doubt, "*honorable men,*" but they are sadly mistaken. The object of this paper is to show how *we must necessarily be guided by principles,* and discard opinions; and as it is my misfortune to represent a numerical minority of homœopathicians, I must crave your indulgence when I ask for a hearing.

We shall, in this paper, make a beginning of illustrating our views, and take for our text the first paragraph of Hahnemann's *Organon of the Healing Art.* It reads thus: "*The physician's highest and* ONLY *calling is to restore health to the sick, which is called healing,*" and in an explanatory foot-note the author says further: "But not the habit (with which many physicians wasted their time in search of fame) of concocting so-called systems of certain empty vagaries and hypotheses concerning the inner obscure nature of the process of life, or the origin of disease; not the innumerable attempts at explaining the phenomena of disease or their proximate cause, etc., ever hidden from their scrutiny, which were clothed in unintelligible words, or as a mass of abstract phrases intended for the astonishment of the ignorant, while suffering humanity was sighing for help. We have enough of such learned absurdities, called *theoretical medicine,* having its own professorships, and it is high time for those who call themselves physicians to cease deluding poor humanity by idle words, but to begin to act, that is, to help and to heal." If, then, at the very beginning of the greatest of all medical works we find such a sentence and accept it, we accept at once the doctrines therein contained, that we are to be governed by principles and not by opinions.

We are told that it is our highest and only calling to restore health to the sick. Hahnemann does not say that it is our calling to cure diseases, but the sick, and thus he impliedly and at the very outset declares that he abandons the classification of diseases, and declines to treat diseases as such. When we are now asked to put on a scientific livery that we may look presentable when we start into professional life, it is done by mistaken men, who do not accept even the first paragraph of the *Organon.* They say to us: Had Hahnemann lived in our days of professional science he would have greatly modified his views. The truth is that he would have done nothing of the kind. Do *we* now know more of the inner obscure nature of the process of life or of the origin of disease than he did?

The innumerable attempts at explaining the phenomena of diseases or their proximate causes were just as ridiculous before Hahnemann's days as they are now. For the sake of an illustration permit me to quote from the writings of a man highly recommended to us, the learned Dr. Schüssler. He published, on the 15th of September, 1875, a paper in the *Homœopathic Klinik*, in which he makes the following statement: "On the 4th July I was called to see a five-year old baby who had diphtheria. The exudation was small, only on one tonsil, but both tonsils were swollen. In the forenoon I gave Kali chloratum 6. At 10 P.M. I was again called on account of a general aggravation of the case. The patient had several times vomited a watery fluid; the tongue was dry; the face pale-red. He had much fever; at times the arm twitched; when questioned he either did not answer at all, or as if he were in a dream. This condition induced me to give him Natrum mur. 6 and Kali chloratum in alternation. They were given alternately every hour. The following morning I received a good report. After the first dose of Natrum mur. the vomiting had ceased; the fever had first become much worse, but had abated after one or one and a half hour's duration. . . . . The brain symptoms in the above case were caused in the following manner according to *my opinion:* A number of the tissue-cells in the brain had lost their Natrum mur., and had thereby lost their ability to retain their watery contents; the ungoverned water affected the nerve-cells of the brain as a foreign body; therefore was Natr. mur. indicated as the curative salt of the brain affection." The learned Doctor gives his opinion, and under the belief that he can, without molestation, enjoy the freedom of medical opinion and action, that he can, as of olden times, explain the phenomena of disease, that as of olden times he may with impunity clothe his explanations of the origin of disease in unintelligible phrases, intended for the astonishment of the ignorant, he really gives us a caricature. His attempt to put the physiological livery on the homœopathic school, his attempt to show pretended learning, was only productive of a caricature. Had Dr. Schüssler been guided by *principles* he would not have claimed that the case was one of diphtheria; he would have accurately described the kind of effusion, stated the locality with exactness, and above all things would have seen that the brain symptoms of the child were not caused by the uproarious waters let loose in the brain, but by his excessive

dosing. And whenever the attempt has been made (and for all times whenever it is made) to explain the origin of disease, or, to use a modern phrase, to describe the condition of sick physiology, the same caricature has been (and forever will be) produced. If we take into consideration that a perfect knowledge of anatomy (that branch of the collateral medical sciences which is much more easily demonstrable to the senses than is physiology), when we consider that even a perfect knowledge of anatomy cannot guide with certainty the surgeon who deals with diseased or disturbed anatomy, that the surgeon must "individualize," as he finds in every individual a deviating anatomy, as he knows that while general anatomy is at his service, for practical purposes it is not an infallible guide, and if the anatomy varies in different persons, varies so much, although so easily demonstrated and so well known, how much more do physiological actions vary in different individuals; and if the various functions are similarly performed by various individuals, their performance still differs in different persons even when health exists, and it becomes obvious that the attempt at an explanation of the appearance of sick organs, or the cause of the disturbances called disease, a description of sick physiology, is fruitless. Basing therapeutics on such mere guesswork is what the allopathic school does and has always done. It is just this guesswork, these learned absurdities, this theoretical medicine, which Hahnemann rejected. When he says that it is our calling to restore health to the sick, he impliedly not only rejects the treatment of classified diseases, or the treatment of imaginary causes of diseases, but he also clearly demands that we individualize and treat what we can discern by our senses as constituting the deviations from health in the sick. And here at the very outset we see men belonging to our school differing widely.

What constitutes disease? *What* have we to restore to health, and what are the causes of diseases, are the questions? And long before we come to settle our therapeutics, long before the question of the dose or any other question can come up, it behooves us to adopt, accept, or reject a principle demonstrating the cause of disease.

Hippocrates, who was the first medical author who attempted to join error and truth together, who told such great truths as they had come to him from Alexandria and the old Egyptians, felt himself apparently compelled to intermix all these

old truths with the error of materialism. Among the many great truths, he says, "The origin of diseases is supernatural and divine." Truth and error, as taught by Hippocrates, could not coexist, and error took the lead; and error, based on materialism, has governed the various medical schools ever since. But Hahnemann claimed and pointed to a principle, which he says is that it is our first and only duty to heal the *sick*. But what did he say of the origin of diseases? He shows us that they have a dynamic origin; that they originate in a disturbance of that spirit-like force which animates the material body. Meanwhile the material causes of diseases remain to be unsuccessfully investigated by the materialistic common school of medicine. Homœopathy lays it down as an axiom and as a principle that diseases have a dynamic origin. The various other medical schools called allopathic, have always taught that diseases have material causes, and on these causes a variety of opinions were held by different authorities. These opinions as to the cause and nature of diseases sprang from a great variety of minds, and the theoretical products of their fancies were called "*systems*," each contradicting the others as well as itself. None, however, were in harmony with nature and experience; they were theoretical fabrications, utterly useless in practice at the bedside. And now while Hahnemann, from the very outset, lays down the principle, that we have to treat the sick, that disease manifests itself in each individual differently, that as a logical sequence we have to find out how the sick individual is affected as an individual, that we cannot seek to find a form of disease, give it a name, or else find, if not the name of a disease, at least the causes of a sick physiology, that diseases have a dynamic origin; and while we find that for 2500 years medical men have gone into materialism more and more deeply, and abandoned whatever great truths were taught by Hippocrates, there now rises before us one of the important sights in progressive medicine. We find that for three consecutive years one of the learned professors of the University of Pennsylvania has boldly taught that physicians must not treat diseases but individuals, and in the public clinics of that University the aim of the examining physician is to find out the *characteristic symptoms of the sick*, irrespective of the name the disease might have. They individualize, and have thus accepted the very first fundamental principle of the school established by Hahnemann, and called by him Homœopathy; and

having accepted this, they are bound logically to gradually advance and accept one after another of those principles which grow out of it.

Where do we, as a school, stand? There are before us evidences, not to be denied, that there exists vast differences of opinion on this subject. It is claimed that we must have freedom of medical opinion and action, and that we may go along gloriously without principles. We heartily join in a declaration that we must enjoy freedom, such freedom as every man enjoys "to shear a wolf." Under this erroneous conception of liberty, some honorable men declare that we must graft whatever appears to be scientific in the physiological school upon our own school, and that it behooves us to know *what* we cure and *how* it is done; and in their zeal they endeavor to explain in their own way how cures made under the homœopathic law were brought about, how sick physiology was set aright; and some go still further and exhibit the lancet and boast of their bloodletting, recommend palliatives, and advocate the use of anodynes, condemning in strong terms such homœopathicians as do not do so, charging them with neglect of duty. Shall we abandon our first principle when our former opponents advocate its acceptance? Shall we, for the sake of a mistaken opinion as to freedom of action, continue to multiply our differences, allow our opponents to "steal our thunder," and we become, to all intent and purpose, eclectic? It has been frequently and erroneously stated that the homœopathists disagree principally on the question of the dose, but this is a false issue. We have disagreed from the outset on the propriety of being governed by principles, or the expediency of being governed by opinions. Is it possible to come to certainty in medicine when we are governed by opinions only? I have shown by illustration what foolish opinions have been offered the profession by a man who is highly recommended to us as a model healer. Let us for a moment recall Dr. Schüssler. He gives it as his opinion that "*a number of the tissue-cells in the brain lost their Natr. mur., and had thereby lost their ability to retain their watery contents, the ungoverned water affected the nerve-cells of the brain as a foreign body, therefore was Natr. mur. indicated as the curvative salt of the brain affection.*" Dr. Schüssler makes a bold assertion, but *how* did he ascertain that a number of the tissue-cells in the brain lost their Natr. mur., or did he only guess at it? And if, admitting for argument's sake, he had become pos-

sessed of this knowledge, and if these tissue-cells had thereby lost their ability to retain their watery contents, and the ungoverned water affected the nerve-cells of the brain, *how* did the sixth potency of Natr. mur. go to work and persuade this ungoverned water to return to its place of duty? Was it likely that this ungoverned water would be governed, and report itself for duty again, and when off duty, having left the tissue-cells in the brain for a frolic among the nerve-cells (no doubt in search of salt, which is the symbol of wisdom), did these unsalted waters not change their character, and if not, then, why not? It would appear that the Doctor simply sent the salt to the brain to call the waters back and the Kali chloratum to the diphtheritic deposit; but how did he know that each trituration went just to the place he sent it to? Here were the results of being guided by opinions.

Should any homœopathist draw the deduction from this illustration of applying progressive scientific discoveries to homœopathy that we should reject *all* scientific discoveries, that deduction would be false? Hahnemann did not reject the light to be obtained from a knowledge of the collateral sciences. On the second page of his preface to the *Organon*, he says: "*Without ignoring the merits of many physicians, in relation to the collateral sciences pertaining to medicine, such as the advancement of physics and chemistry, natural history in its different branches, and of man particularly, anthropology, physiology, anatomy, etc., I shall now only consider the practical part of medicine, that of curing.*" If we are guided by opinions only, then the last opinion of the last authority uttered by a fallible mortal will be our guide; we thereby become only imitators, and do not make use of that precious liberty to think and work out problems guided by principles. We should make all opinions, all real or imaginary discoveries in physiology especially, subservient to our principles; we should never lose sight of our principles, and whatever opinions are advanced not in harmony with these we should surely reject.

Let us now look at the practical part of the question. Do the advocates of a consistent and persistent adherence to the principles governing our school, of adherence to the principle that it is our highest and only calling to restore health to the sick, accomplish this task better than men who accept the honorable name of our school, but who attempt to treat diseases and not the sick? Do not the men who once accepted the principle and accepted it understandingly, stand by it,

practice accordingly, and to the best of their ability endeavor to develop the school based on its principles? And do not men who accepted no principles, but are claiming the freedom to be governed by opinions, very gradually fall back into the materialism of a decaying school of medicine? Do we not see them pick up one after another of the exploded opinions offered by various allopathic authorities, even after that school, or the thinking part of them, have abandoned them?

Is it not obvious that one or the other party must be right and the other wrong? Or is there one among us who has found a remedy by which we can cement truth to error? Twenty-five hundred years ago the great Hippocrates tried it, and error once admitted ruled for two and a half centuries. The greater Hahnemann was permitted to give to the world fundamental principles to govern men in their efforts to restore health to the sick, *which is called healing.* It is obvious that those who attempt to heal must be governed either by principles or by opinions; and as it is the avowed object of all our associations "*to promote medical science,*" and we have chosen to represent ourselves to the world as an association of homœopathists, we as such should, not only as individuals and as mere parts of such associations, but collectively as an association of homœopathists, clearly and unmistakably utter our confession, and above all at the very beginning of such confession or declaration of faith say whether we as a body are governed by principles or by opinions.

The reading of Dr. Lippe's paper was followed by the annexed

DISCUSSION.

Dr. Jeanes said he agreed with the writer of the paper in regard to the action of homœopathic remedies. We are certain that our medicines do cure the sick, and that the reason for it is because they cure the symptoms which are similar. We may go a step further, and say that experience goes to show that the remedy which causes symptoms in the healthy, and then cures them in the sick, must act upon the same part. I agree with the declaration of Hippocrates, that diseases are of divine origin. In speculating, it is important not to get beyond your depth, and we must keep this always in view. Symptoms of disease are all produced by nature in