17

Who is a Homœopathician?

A LECTURE

DELIVERED BEFORE THE

HAHNEMANNIAN INSTITUTE,

PHILADELPHIA, FEBRUARY, 17th, 1865,

BY

ADOLPH LIPPE, M. D.,

Professor of Materia Medica at the Homœopathic College of Pennsylvania.

PUBLISHED BY ORDER OF THE HAHNEMANNIAN INSTITUTE.

PHILADELPHIA:
KING & BAIRD, PRINTERS, No. 607 SANSOM STREET.
1865.

1882.
KING & BAIRD, PRINTERS, No. 607 SANSOM STREET.
PHILADELPHIA.

PUBLISHED BY ORDER OF THE HOMŒOPATHIC COLLEGE

ADOLPH LIPPE, M. D.

A BIOGRAPHY

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

Thankful for the honor conferred upon me by the invitation of the Hahnemannian Institute to deliver the annual address, I feel that I cannot better fulfil their request than by choosing for my subject the solution of the question: "Who is a Homœopathician?"

A Homœopathician is one who practices Homœopathy, while a Homœopathist believes in Homœopathy.

A person who practices Homœopathy, or believes in it, is supposed to understand Homœopathy; that is, the fundamental principles, the exposition of its laws of cure, and its comparative merits over all other methods for the treatment of diseases, based on the results of its practical application. Were this so, it would be superfluous at this present time to dwell on the solution of the question; but, as erroneous and fallacious ideas on this subject exist, the Hahnemannian Institute, as such, will no doubt join me in the assertion that at this time there is a necessity for a clear definition of Homœopathy: its principles; its past, present and its future position; and also the relation in which stand those persons who are Homœopathicians and who practice it, and those who do not practice it.

We will then, to accomplish that object, define Homœopathy and its fundamental principles. This definition can best be given by stating the historical development of the science. We must do so, because a proper comprehension of the new healing-art can only be obtained by a careful following of Hahnemann, arriving with him, step by step, at what he termed Homœopathy. Hahnemann, in calling

his new healing-art Homœopathy, gave us the formula: "Similia similibus curantur. This formula is not the law of cure, but it expresses it in its widest sense, as an accepted and acknowledged formula by all Homœopathists: all the theoretical explanations and practical rules must accord with it. We can take for example the formula adopted by our Republic. On every coin we find the mystic words: "E pluribus unum." This formula is not the Constitution and the laws under which we live; but it collectively expresses the fundamental principles of our form of Government; and no action of the people forming this compact could be termed constitutional, if not in harmony with the accepted formula. Should we compare it with the formula of other nations, living under opposite forms of government, as for instance, "Dei Gratia," we find a different but, collectively, and clearly expressed formula, with which all their laws and institutions are and must be in harmony.

We accept then, as Homœopathicians, our own formula; and will now explain the fundamental rules, principles and practice which must be in harmony with it: if contradictory, they would not belong to the system which the formula represents. Homœopathy is entirely founded on facts; and if we but carefully and consistently follow the great master, we will find how facts only led him to establish his system and its formula.

Hahnemann translated Cullen's Materia Medica from the English into the German. In the second volume of Cullen's Materia Medica, on the 91st page, treating of Peruvian bark as one of the "Tonics," is the following passage: "We proceed therefore upon the supposition that the bark possesses a tonic power, and that the action of this power in the stomach sufficiently explains its operation in preventing the recurrence of the paroxysms of intermittent fevers: for I see no reason for referring it to any mysterious and unexplained specific power which, however, some writers seem still disposed to maintain. I hold it to be established as a fact, that both astringents and bitters, in their simple and

separate states, have proved often sufficient to prevent the recurrence of the paroxysm of intermittent fever; and that they most certainly do it when combined together. . . . . And although I should admit that what is frequently alleged on this subject is a frivolous argument, as a different degree of power it does not affect the general question concerning the nature of that power." To this passage we find Hahnemann's foot-note on the 110th page of the second volume of his German translation. He says: "It is evident by what the author says, that he is sorry not to be able to demolish all the objections of the opponents. His zeal seems to be directed against those who continually speak of the specifie effect of the bark, and who themselves do not understand what they mean by it. Had he contemplated that much more bitter and astringent substances than Peruvian bark might be composed from the Extract of Quassia and Nut-gall, but yet that such a compound was not capable of curing an intermittent fever of six-months' standing; had he had any suspicion that the bark possessed a power to cause an antagonistic fever (as some other newly-discovered Cinchonas possess, very likely in a still higher degree and without the tonic power): it is certain that he would not have sustained his declaration so stubbornly.

Cullen continues, on page 92: "And whilst it is allowed to be a very safe and powerful remedy, the only questions which remain respecting it are: In what circumstances may it be most properly employed? Hahnemann solves this question. He knew that Cinchona had cured *some* cases of intermittent fever, but not other cases; and the great question with him was, how could it be ascertained what cases of intermittent fever were curable by Cinchona? or, in other words, what were the unfailing indications of the remedy? Would not the healthy organism when subjected to the effects of this drug give an answer? Carefully preparing, then, an alcoholic tincture of Cinchona officinalis, Hahnemann took it himself, and experienced symptoms *resembling* those of intermittent fever; they ceased

after the lapse of a few days, and returned as soon as he took more of the Tincture of Cinchona. The pure and unadulterated power which the drug had on the organism was now ascertained, and his wonderful spirit of honest research and noble self-sacrifice rewarded. This first fact was also the first step towards the development of the great truth. Even at this very opening of the science, we perceive misstatements and consequently subsequent wrong conclusions. It has been stated that Hahnemann took Peruvian bark until it produced an attack of intermittent fever: had that been the case, his formula, "Similia similibus curantur," would be at fault. Symptoms *similar* to intermittent fever, but *not the* intermittent fever, were produced by taking the Tincture of Peruvian bark. Hahnemann never averred that drugs produced an intermittent fever on him or any one else; but he asserted that changed conditions in the healthy organism caused by drugs did *resemble, were similar* to natural diseases. After carefully ascertaining and recording the symptoms Peruvian bark had produced upon him while in a state of health, he compared them with *similar* symptoms at times developing themselves during an attack of intermittent fever; he discovered a strange similarity between the symptoms produced and those cured. If Peruvian bark created certain alterations in the healthy organism, and cured them also when the result of intermittent fever, why should not other drugs have the same power? This question would naturally present itself to the mind of a man so happily endowed with an indefatigable spirit of devoted energy. The fallacy of the then established Materia Medica became apparent. Should the formula Hahnemann had thought of prove to be correct, many more and extended experiments had yet to be made. A new Materia Medica was to be constructed; and Hahnemann, his disciples and pupils, proceeded over twenty years later in the creation of this new Materia Medica by experimenting upon themselves. From some drugs involuntary provings had already been made, and their results were collected; among which

are well recorded cases of poisonings. Other drugs, known or supposed to have medical properties, were subjected in their crude state to provings, which were unavailing—no answer following, and no alterations in the sensations being experienced: this was truly a new fact and a new difficulty. Charcoal, when taken in substance, produced no symptoms: it was supposed it had some medical qualities—and how were they to be ascertained under this difficulty? Hahnemann advised his pupils, who had assisted him faithfully for fifteen years, to triturate charcoal with an inert substance (sugar of milk) to the proportion of 1 to 99; continuing this trituration for one hour; then to take one grain of this preparation, and after triturating it with 99 grains of sugar of milk for another hour, take of this second trituration another grain, to be agains triturated with 99 grain of sugar of milk for one hour; this third trituration to be taken when in a state of health to see the effects by it produced. This experiment developed a positive *fact:* the proving of the third trituration of Carbo vegetabilis, causing changes in the healthy organism which the crude substance had not accomplished. The newly observed fact had to be accounted for, there was some power developed by trituration which had before remained slumbering in the crude substance. This fact gave rise to the so-called potentization theory. Had Hahnemann constructed his Materia Medica by experimenting with "full doses," as has been erroneously stated, that theory would have never come to light. He says in his Organon, in the 269th paragraph: "The Homœopathic healing-art develops for its purpose the dynamic medicinal virtues of the crude substances, peculiar, and, to a degree, previously unheard of, and by a process hitherto untried: by this process *all* become intensively effective and curative, even those which in their crude state "did not betray the least medicinal power upon the human organism." Continuing their provings on themselves and others, the master and his disciples laid the foundation of our Materia Medica, the pride of Homœopathy. Acquainted with the facts of

the medicinal powers of drugs, they proceeded to apply these facts to the cure of diseases; and they found that all diseases were cured by such substances as were capable of creating an alteration in the organism similar to the natural disease.

The provings on the healthy had demonstrated both by experiment and experience that Peruvian bark caused sensations in the organism similar to intermittent fever, and that it cured the same symptoms when they occurred in intermittent fever; that Copper produced symptoms similar to a form of epilepsy and cured the disease if similar symptoms appeared; that Belladona produced symptoms similar to scarlet fever, and if similar symptoms appeared it cured that disease, etc. From these accumulated facts and the verification of their application in the cure of diseases arose at first the *Organon,* and later the *Chronic Diseases,* explanatory of the new discoveries in the healing art.

Up to this present time it is believed to be correct, that in order to become a true physician it is necessary, first to possess a comprehensive knowledge of what is to be cured; secondly, a knowledge of the most efficient curative agents; thirdly, a knowledge of their application. Hahnemann, in his Organon gives the most explicit and comprehensive advice to physicians in order that they may examine and ascertain all that is essentially necessary to learn from the patient, that a cure may be the result. To ascertain the symptoms and individualities of the patient: the strictest discernment of the case is the first and indispensable duty of a physician; for the object of healing is not the disease in the abstract, but the patient. The scientific and educated physician must exercise circumspection, common sense and great attention, studying, profoundly examining, and patiently individualizing the picture of the disease. The objective local symptoms give him, collectively, the picture of the disease, the subjective, peculiar, unusual or additional complaints give him the characteristic individuality, and

the analogy and great similarity of the subjective symptoms guide him in the choice of the truly curative medicine for the patient. After having obtained a full knowledge of what is to be cured he must next possess a knowledge of the medicines through which to cure, and the curative powers of the medicines which must be applied. The only mode by which we are, have been or ever will be enabled to ascertain what curative powers that or the other medicine may possess, is to find, through the experiment, what power it possesses to cause distinct alterations in the sensation of the human organism. Under the power of medicines causing diseased disturbances in the healthy organism, or under medical symptoms, it is not understood that the organism remains passive and suffering. The symptoms are not attributes of the medicine but of the organism; showing through them their activity, proving that their influence on the organism are a joint production of the medicinal power and the activity of the organism. The *peculiarity* of the symptoms depend alone on the affecting medicine. It is certain that each medicine, be it mineral, animal substance or a plant, possess different powers peculiar to it in causing a diseased condition; and therefore a different combination and succession of phenomenas, conditions and sensations in the organism will be the result. Their external differences, their chemical and physical distinctions already point them out as substances differing from each other. Each plant differs from all other plants in external appearance, in peculiar growth, in taste, smell and color; each metal and salt differ in physical and chemical properties from all other metals and salts, and in like manner each of them possess a different power to produce a diseased altered condition of the organism, and the same power to change this diseased condition into health; each and every one differing one from the other. Former efforts to ascertain the effects of medicines had been made by the aid of chemistry, and were found to be exceedingly deficient; it was also known that the similarity

of the effects of plants belonging to the same natural order gave only very vague indications, and that further, the sensitive properties of medicinal substances (smell, taste, color and shape) only evinced general indications; that the experiments made on animals by injecting medicinal substances into their veins, or by administering to them the medicines in the ordinary manner was a very crude one, and that the relation of the animal to man was so vastly different, that no conclusions could be drawn to define the very delicate and varying action of medicines by such gross proceedings; therefore the only positive manner to ascertain the effects of medicines was by trying them on the human organism. That necessity had been known at all times, but the only and extremely improper manner in which it had been done was by trying the medicines on the sick. This trial on the sick might be made in a twofold manner: either a single medicine to be tried in all diseases, and on all patients, or all the medicines to be tried in a certain form of disease in order to ascertain which medicine would cure the disease with most certainty. That nothing could be thus learned by this mixture of medicines is more than self-evident. There is but one manner possible by which to ascertain in what peculiar manner each medicine affects and changes the mental and bodily condition of man; and that is only by the careful, pure experiment on the healthy individual. How these experiments should be made, Hahnemann teaches us in his organon.

Having obtained the necessary knowledge of what is to be cured and a knowledge of the positive effects of medicines, the question remains to be answered: by what fundamental principles does the phycian apply the medicine known to affect the condition of the healthy organism in order to cure the sick? Homœopathy is based on the principle of similarity, and it is so expressed in the formula, as the fundamental principle to be applied in the treatment and cure of the sick, a fundamental principle from which arises and on which depends other principles; as for

instance the principle of simplicity, to administer only one single medicine at one time; *not* a mixture of medicine, not medicines in alternation at short intervals, nor a variety of medicines at the same time: furthermore to administer the medicine in so small a dose as will cure the patient without causing unnecessary suffering which could only disturb the healing process—the dose to cure the sick must be smaller than the dose which will cause in the observer while in a state of health, a perceptible change of his sensation; a medicinal disease.

In order to cure the sick the physician chooses among the known and proved medicines the one, which not only corresponds with the principal symptoms of the disease, but which corresponds especially with the most prominent unusual characteristic symptoms of the patient. He will pay especial attention to the mental condition and the character of the patient, the medicine must correspond in its characteristic effects with the characteristic symptoms of the patient. The scientific physician knows well, that it is wrong to try to effect by a multiplicity of means what can be accomplished by a single process; he, therefore, does not find it necessary to administer more than one single medicine at a time. In cases in which it seemed as if one medicine best corresponded with one part of the symptoms, and another medicine with another part of the symptoms, some physicians have tried to give the two medicines in alternation. It is positively certain that two medicines so administered cannot each develop its own characteristic actions, but that they must interfere one with the other: the one counteracting the other or partly destroying its effects; or that a medicinal action is produced which could not be foreseen and, therefore, could not be desirable. Two medicines given in alternation cannot be expected to develop their specific peculiar effects each separately for his corresponding part of the disease; both collectively for the patient's cure and by analogy, two medicines when administered to a healthy person cannot produce collectively

a disturbance in the sensations of the prover, and, besides that, develop each for itself separately its own peculiar characteristic sphere of action.

After having stated in a concise manner the fundamental principles of Homœopathy, and having explained the formula expressing them, we will glance for a moment at the past and present state of Homœopathy and draw our conclusions from these observations as to its future. Hahnemann met at the outset with an opposition more bitter, relentless and undeserved than any one who had ever promulgated a new truth. The powerful and influential part of the profession who directed and controlled the first opposition were guided by prejudice and interest. They resorted to ridicule and tried to ignore it altogether, instead of examining the claims of Homœopathy by the experiment as they were asked to do, they resorted to old superannuated laws, and denied the physicians the right to administer their own medicines; if that law was transgressed they caused fines to be enacted and the medicines confiscated. But Homœopathy nevertheless, grew in strength, its principles were true, and therefore, its vitality was indestructible. Its literature increased; Hahnemann, by the aid of some true and devoted friends, was enabled to give the world a materia medica pura. Journals were published advocating the new principles and proving their correctness by well authenticated cases, giving also the proof by which they could claim these cases for it. Soon Homœopathy spread over other nations, finding meanwhile a home in this country, where the opposition to its progress could not be checked by the aid of oppressive laws. On the contrary, charters were obtained whenever they were asked for. Colleges and hospitals were opened, the benignant laws of a free country sheltered the young giant who gladly took refuge under the wings of the eagle.

But let us pause here and take cognizance of what took place in the interior development of the young science. The adherents were increasing in and out of the profession;

the marvellous cures made by Hahnemann and his disciples had shed a lustre over the growing heresy; ardent friends and grateful patients urged the progress of what they had learned to be a great truth and a great blessing. But the enemy is never quiet, and soon a doubt was expressed by some, we will suppose charitably, well-meaning friends, whether the progress of Homœopathy could not be better served, if some of Hahnemann's dogmas were allowed to be dropped, if, in short, we would strive to make a compromise with Allœopathy. It was suggested "that we might, with propriety, admit the use of caustic or irritant eye-washes to inflamed eyes; of nitrate of silver to sore throats, the introduction of medicated bougies, or stimulant injections, as in hydrocele, ascites, etc., and the application of blisters, caustics, iodine, etc., to ulcers, erysipelatous and other cutaneous affections; for, after all, nothing else would be done than what we contend for, that a similar artificial disease was induced in the diseased tissues." It was charged "that Hahnemann had thoroughly imposed the despotism of a master over his disciples; that the profession must get rid of that despotism, and that Hahnemann must fall back to a subordinate place; that Homœopathy reformed, emancipated, and *rationalized* would be established on a stronger and more scientific basis," and as a final result to this speculation it was claimed "that whilst Homœopathists were no longer Hahnemannians, the Old School would approach to Homœopathy with rapid strides." Above all things Homœopathy had to get rid of the small doses. The apparent inadequacy of the means to effect the end in view, was considered the great stumbling-block in the way of the new school. While it was admitted that "the dose, like the law itself, was not a matter to be settled by theory and speculation, but a mere matter of fact and experiment;" it was falsely stated "that the principle had no reference to the dose:" "that he who gave an ounce of Epsom Salt prescribed homœopathically just as truly as though he gave the same substance in the hundredth million part of a grain."

It was further truly stated "that Hahnemann and his disciples began by giving large doses, but produced such aggravations that they were obliged to diminish them greatly;" but the assertion "that it was believed by most Homœopathists that the attenuation process was pushed to an unnecessary and absurd degree," is utterly unfounded in fact.

Hahnemann pursued his onward course, and by an increased knowledge of the effects of medicines on the human organism he was enabled to prove his doctrine with accumulating evidences; through experimental science he gradually decreased the dose, and gave the world his experience, in his great work entitled the "*Chronic Diseases.*" Hahnemann's followers and his most faithful disciples resolved to determine, by experiment, at what degree of potentization the curative power of the medicines ceased to show itself. However while they thought that the whole scale from the crude natural substance up to the highest infinitesimals should be open to the choice and the practice of all candid and rational men, they also wished to discover and determine where the highest appreciable infinitesimals were to be found. Joehnichen, imbued with zeal and a strong will, made the first extensive experiment; he was ridiculed and insulted by some physicians calling themselves Homœopathicians, while others with more liberality, honesty of purpose, and ability of application, tried his preparations called high potencies, and found them more efficient for the cure of diseases then they had found all other preparations they had used before. These facts were published and laid before the profession. The point at which the curative power of medicines ceased was *not* found; on the contrary, it appeared evident that the latent curative power of medicine continued to be further developed by potentization, from the fact that diseases which had not yielded to the formerly known potencies had actually been conquered by the so-called high potencies. The physicians who tried these high potencies in the cure of

diseases, affirmed and reported their efficacy and their individual experiments. Another class of physicians, also claiming to be Homœopathicians, were anxious for compromises, and expressed "their preference to our medicines in very small, but still appreciable quantities—quantities which would have no influence whatever in health, or on any part of the system, except upon the diseased point." Had those physicians been inspired with the desire to define clearly their position, instead of uttering vague and unmeaning phrases, as habitually done by the Allœopathists, they would have tried to obtain the knowledge of what appreciable quantities of medicines could have no influence whatever in health. The experiment was made and the report published. The Vienna Proving Society, composed of men of great learning and honesty of purpose, again proved Natrum muriaticum, a substance possessing no medicinal and curative powers in its crude state. Contrary to their expectation, contrary to preconceived but erroneous ideas these men in their report confessed that they were sorry to be compelled to admit, that the higher, the thirtieth potency of Natrum muriaticum, had developed more and decidedly characteristic symptoms on the healthy organism than the lower potencies. Either willfully closing their eyes to these and other facts, or what would be almost worse, ignorant of them, and quite satisfied with the utterance of a plausible absurdity, they calmly folded their arms and continued their efforts at compromise with the Old School; adding nothing to our Materia Medica, and the further development of it, but assailing the multiplicity of symptoms, vainly hoping to find specific medicines for specific diseases, and entirely losing sight of our great formula, they became eclectics to all intents and purposes.

The question of doses being then discussed by them, one assertion after the other was brought forward to sustain their assumed position. Clinical observations were asserted to have established the superior curative effects of the lower and larger doses over the higher one, these assertions were

ot accompanied by definite and precise statements or statistical tables; while the results of experiment made by various potencies in the treatment of pneumonia during a long period of years, and reported by Dr. Eidherr at Vienna, showed clearly and conclusively that, as in proportion the potencies employed were higher, the time of curing the disease was shortened. These statements were ignored as not available to the purpose of carrying on an argument by other means than by bold assertions, they were ignored in the same manner in which the Old School has or pretends to ignore all our statistical statements, however well they may be sustained; bold assertions being preferred to patient inquiry. The question of doses was from time to time discussed in the journals, but did not lead to any solution of the question. Later provings were commenced with the higher and highest potencies, but no potency as yet has been found so small as not to effect and have influence on the healthy organism, more than this, these provings not only confirmed the former observations obtained by comparatively larger doses, but they developed more characteristical symptoms of the medicine. All communications to that effect were laid aside, treated with distrust and satire, the publications refused under the ridiculous plea of the fear to offend some one; it must certainly have been an undisguised expression of fear which prevented otherwise enlightened men to give countenance even to further experiments with the higher and highest potencies, in order that the important question might be solved: "at what point of potentization the medicines no longer developed an influence on the human organism?" The question is as yet open, and has not yet been answered, and the discussion on the question of doses having led to no satisfactory solution, the evidence being strongly against the empty unsupported assertions, further questions were asked, viz.: "What is Homœopathy?" and, "Who is a Homœopathician?" This question was asked by men who contended that Hahnemannism had ceased to exist, and

reformed Homœopathy had taken its place; in their opinion it made no difference whether one believed in the theory of potentization or not, if he only seemingly pretended to advocate the formula; that in fact we could easily induce the Old School to adopt our system if we would only rid it of the objectionable dogmas—that is, if we would drop small doses, pick up again the lancet, clutch the caustic, admit purgatives, venerate pathology, and abandon our Materia Medica, in fine, capitulate to the enemy. When these men are reminded of the fact that neither Homœopathy nor the Materia Medica could exist without the potentization theory, that the otherwise inert substances were proved, and could only be proved after they had been potentized; they could scarcely pretend ignorance on that point, resort to assertions and unmeaning phrases, and avoid arguments on facts of which they must either be ignorant, or try to pervert. They are anxious to compromise with the Old School, no matter at what price.

If we wish to draw conclusions from the past and present state of Homœopathy and to the future, we cannot do better than to find a parallel case in the past. The historical time in which we now live offers an opportunity for comparison. The past, present, and future state of our great Republic may be regarded as closely resembling it in its developments and progress; also in its present state of purification and its prospective glorious future. And so, also, passes before us the same different stages of Homœopathy, that were, are, and will be. The Republic as well as our formula were newly established principles, but yet were not new,—the mode of applying them was new. The Republic and Homœopathy would have met with no serious impediment, if all who professed either the Republic or Homœopathy had been true to their inherent principles. The deviation of these inherent fundamental principles and the unhappy belief that compromises could give stability where positive opposition to vital principles prevailed, pre-

vented either from becoming permanently and peaceably established. One compromise necessarily encourages the demand for another; the party granting a compromise always gives evidence of weakness; either the position which was first assumed was in itself fundamentally wrong or from other causes untenable; in either case it betrays weakness of the assumed position. In a few words I will explain the position of the Republic in parallel with Homœopathy.

The first historical document of the Republic is the Declaration of Independence, and in it we find this sentence, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by the Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among them are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." In the second historical document, the Constitution of the United States, we find in the 5th article of the amendments among other things, "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law." Had we consistently adhered to this Declaration and the Constitution, had we rejected all offers of compromise, had we insisted upon it that according to the principles so laid down we knew, could know nothing of slavery or distinction of races or color, and that liberty the endowment of the Creator could only be forfeited by process of law; the great struggle would not have come after many fruitless compromises to settle these first fundamental principles. This painful war the offspring of an unfortunate rebellion would not have brought sorrow and grief to our firesides; the great Republic would not have been shaken to its very foundation, and our common enemies the crowned despots of downtrodden Europe would not have been flattered by the vain hope of destroying our great Republic; they could not for a moment have indulged in the hope,—a fallacious one I trust,—that our institutions which daily and hourly they fear, might vanish from the earth; but overcome by the moral influence of this government, they would have been

compelled to slacken the reins of their own despotism. As the history of our country plainly shows the bond of the Union which hold together the free States who see no right established by the Constitution to sanction slavery, and the slave States who claimed to possess a legal hereditary property in their slaves, inherited and legalized under the monarchy, and therefore claiming the right to ignore some of the fundamental principles of the established government; this bond has been kept from dissolution but by successive compromises. This compromising policy could only for a time avert the final catastrophe; it had to come, compromises were only palliatives, and who among us does not look back on the past, regretting the unhappy, necessarily unsuccessful policy, the result of a want of moral courage to uphold and permanently establish all the principles without any exception, on which rest, and which are contained in the Constitution of the United States? Further compromises were rejected and rebellion broke out; war is now upon us, but the Institution which the enemies of the Republic hoped to preserve and perpetuate is no more, the first principles of the Republic are all without exception established, and the rebellion is almost crushed. We have learned to know ourselves, and the great resources of the country developed under the free institutions; we look forward to a great future, to a permanent establishment of the Republic, to great results from moral influence over our common enemies!

We will now return to the starting point Homœopathy, with its fundamental principles and its own formula, not created, promulgated and established in a moment, but developed principle after principle, and Hahnemann the father of the school avoiding the publicity of progressive development until he could show by experiment the correctness of his proposition. The principles of Homœopathy diametrically opposed to the practice of the Allœopathic school form a unit as compact, indivisible and logical as does that unsurpassed historical document the Constitution

of the United States. Every physician adopting Homœopathy is understood to accept all and every one of the principles, just as every citizen of our Republlc is bound to accept and support the Constitution of the United States. As there were found men forgetful of their obligation, like the good citizens who violated some of the inherent principles of that Constitution, and adhered to and wished to establish permanently in the Republic, slavery, the offspring and inheritance of the Old School Monarchy; who, while they deny and ignore an essential principle of the Constitution boldly demand from the consistent adherents of the Republic to compromise with them; so are now found among the Homœopathicians, men who boldly negative some essential fundamental principles of that system. We find it boldly asserted "that Hahnemann is falling back to a subordinate place; and Homœopathy reformed, emancipated and rationalized is becoming established on a stronger and more scientific basis than ever." Under "Homœopathy reformed" is meant the small doses, the potentization theory and in fact most of the master's practical rules are rejected. It is further stated that "if Hahnemannism were Homœopathy, the system would long ago have been demolished." These assertions are nothing but preposterous phrases. How and by whom was Homœopathy established? How could there be a Homœopathy that was not Hahnemannism; and any and every kindred system of medicine not based on the practical rules of Hahnemann assuredly can have no claim to Homœopathy. Halfway acceptances are an impossibility, nay, a logical absurdity, and while we abstain from charging persons so forgetful of first principles with a complete ignorance of what they utter, we are inclined to put the most charitable construction on their erroneous course; undoubtingly they desire a compromise, they think to bring themselves with but a shadow of Homœopathy into the good graces of the Old School, and thus induce *them* also to adopt such a caricature of this system of medicine under an assumed name. These assertions and subsequent offers

for compromise are publicly made and supported by the so-called Homœopathic journals. Homœopathy like the Constitution must be accepted entirely or rejected. And why should we think of compromises when the past and present history show us too plainly where compromises lead to?

For this purpose, deeply feeling the subject, have I drawn this parallel, yet wishing to add one more weighty reason against these humiliating proceedings, and that is, that the Old School has long since made, and continues still to make, compromises and concessions. They have decreased their doses in the most exemplary manner; they have even formed societies to ascertain the true effects of drugs by experimenting on themselves in imitation of Hahnemann and his followers; the lancet is now almost entirely unused; they denounce, almost as energetically as we do, the use of quinine, opium, and calomel; Dr. Holmes, the great humorist, and opponent of Homœopathy, himself an Allœopathic professor, declares "that if all the medicines in the world, except wine and opium, were thrown into the sea, it would be better for men and only worse for the fishes." The very fact that the Old School has made these concessions shows its weakness, and that what it held to be the true and best mode of practice fifty or twenty-five years ago is now no longer to be relied on. How then can any reasonable person doubt that ere long this tottering structure will fall to the ground overcome by progressive Homœopathy. Is it necessary that Allœopathy should acknowledge Homœopathy? Certainly not. Wherefore did Allœopathy make concessions? Was it not from necessity, by force of circumstances and by the very will of the people to whom they vainly thought that they could dictate in medical matters? The same cause will eventually compel them to capitulate. Did not Hahnemann at first address himself to the profession and to the most learned and influential among them? Did he not find the Faculty in the same mood as Columbus did the very learned professors at Salamanca? Hahnemann and the Homœo-

pathicians have received and receive the same treatment from the Faculty, but they addressed and continue to address themselves to the people. They never will offer a compromise; adhering strictly to the fundamental principles, and aiming at their development, they meet their opponents; and the final results of their respective practices are the only evidences brought before the people, who in the course of time will necessarily find it to their advantage to adopt the system which cures in the mildest, quickest, safest, and most permanent manner. The Homœopathicians neither offer nor allow any of their number to sanction a compromise, obeying the principles as they accepted them under the formula, and trusting the great unerring principles which enabled Hahnemann almost single-handed to establish a new practice; in short, to use the words of Croserio, to "cure where the rest of us could do nothing." The new system, attacked by envious men who could, but would not learn, even to the present day, by experience, established through the greatest and unparalleled success and favorable results, in individual cases and during the great devastating epidemic, the cholera, and thus not only by assertions or dogmas of Hahnemann. The denials of the Old School will amount to nothing against the success of the Homœopathician who is true to the cause. The community at large will be undeceived, and, sitting as judges, will give their decision to the deserving. The so-called regular physicians pretend to say that as they individually are getting along very comfortably, it would not be profitable to alienate their brother doctors; and besides they assert that Professor Andral, Professor Simpson, and Dr. Holmes, having examined the question fairly, had decided point-blank against it, and consequently that it should be now laid on the shelf. The small doses come in also for the main share of ridicule and incredulity, because they are an essential part of Homœopathy; without them we could not have found the characteristic symptoms of medicines recorded in the Materia Medica; without them a number of most

indispensable and most valuable medicines would never have been proved; we would have neither Silicea, nor Carbo vegetabilis, Lycopodium, Lachesis, or Natrum muriaticum, by means of which powerful acting remedies, made so by potentization, we have cured and continue to cure patients and diseases formerly considered beyond the reach of medical aid. The simple trial of them in disease is all that is asked. No a priori argument can convince any one, or can be advanced as proofs of their truth: it is a question only to be determined by experiment. Again, we hear that it is all "imagination;" and yet infants and horses are cured by it better than the most nervous or imaginative young or old lady. Then it is said to be the diet; and yet it is well known that we always permit a more liberal diet than the Old School physicians. Some attribute the cures to nature; but is it not wonderful that nature should always practice in partnership with us and not with the Old School? Instead of the experiment by which alone they should and could test the correctness of the fundamental principles of the New School, they resort to shallow, absurd, and ridiculous objections. The denial of facts, which can be appreciated by the community at large, will not help to retard Homœopathy; and we can complacently look at the violent efforts made by the opponents of Homœopathy to slay the giant whom they so often have pronounced dead, and who nevertheless is steadily growing, not on supposed tonics in any form, not by iron pills, magnetic chains, nor deceptions or false presentations; but by facts, accumulating facts alone; and when *these facts* come to the knowledge of every one, what then will be the future of Homœopathy? As we are placing *facts* before the world at large, the conviction that a free people can govern itself, that in the republic the greatest happiness for the greatest number can be obtained, provided as members of that republic we are true to the fundamental principles; so, as Homœopathicians, we are now placing before the world at large facts—facts which show that under the Homœopathic treatment of dis-

eases the duration of them has been considerably shortened, and that the mortality in diseases has and will greatly decrease, provided that Homœopathy is practiced according to the original fundamental principles.

We have shown how Homœopathy was developed, what belongs to it essentially, and what therefore, belongs also indispensably to the Homœopathician. As all things have some characteristics by which we can know and discern them from all other things we will endeavor to point out clearly, distinctly, and strongly, the characteristerics of the Homœopathician and the non-Homœopathician, to which latter class belong of course all those who are not of the first-mentioned class, no matter by what name they call themselves.

A Homœopathician speaks with the highest veneration of Hahnemann, of his writings, acquirements, genius and honest uprightness; of his superior gift of observation and success in applying his new method of cure with far better results than his pupils through his most intimate knowledge of the Materia Medica which he created. The older the student, and the more he admires the genius of the master, for he knows him better and trusts him more the longer he associates himself with his writings, gradually becoming identified and enabled to follow him by experiment.

The non-Homœopathist speaks disdainfully of Hahnemann; he calls him a man of straw, a visionary; declares him unreliable in his observations, his Materia Medica a mass of chaff, perfectly useless unless well sifted; his system he terms unscientific and ridiculous, in need of being modified, remodeled, or exploded. The less he knows of it the more fault he finds with it.

The Homœopathician treats the patient.

The non-Homœopathist treats diseases by their names.

The Homœopathician makes Pathology and all other collateral branches of the science of medicine subservient to the law of cure.

The non-Homœopathist makes the law of cure subservi-

ent to Pathology, and vainly looks for specifics in specific diseases; as for instance: China for intermittent fever, Crotalus for yellow fever, Iodide of mercury for diphtheria, etc.

The Homœopathician administers one dose of medicine at a time, and never repeats that medicine or gives another until this one dose has exhausted its effects; because he knows well the effects of his medicines.

The non-Homœopathist administers a mixture of medicines or alternates them; he never allows one dose of medicine to exhaust or even develop its effects, for he knows nothing accurately about the effects of any of his medicines.

The Homœopathician is liberal, and contends that the whole scale from the crude natural substances up to the higher and highest infinitesimals should be open to the choice and the practice of every sensible and candid person.

The non-Homœopathist is illiberal, and contends for appreciable quantities, sneering at the attenuating process and declaring it simply an absurdity.

The Homœopathician generally administers small doses, believing in potentization; he knows by the experiments that Hahnemann's discovery of the development of medicinal and curative powers by potentization is true, and he decreases his dose in the same proportion as he increases his knowledge of the Materia Medica.

The non-Homœopathist ridicules the pellet; he defiantly demands palpable doses, if unsuccessful, he never admits his ignorance of medicines but requires still larger doses; he does not see medicinal aggravations from his over-doses, but talks learnedly of the changed pathological conditions; in his hands the searing-iron, the caustic, the fly-blister, the scissors and the knife become blessings of no small virtue and of much more importance than the cultivation of the knowledge of the Materia Medica, which he despises through his dread of labor; he does not consult it, for he could not understand it, he boldly asserts that sleeplessness

is cured by opium in large doses, and in this manner he betrays complete ignorance of physiology.

The Homœopathician when he relates successful cures, enumerates at first *all* the symptoms discovered in the patient, and at once it is apparent that he has well examined the case; he next gives the remedy, and states what characteristic symptoms demanded the choice of this remedy in preference to all others; the communication, so made, carries with it the assurance of truth and is instructive.

The non-Homœopathist claims to have found the specific medicine or medicines for the specific disease or pathological conditions; he gives no reason but makes mere assertions and no instruction is gained by them; the credulous and ignorant only will follow his example—to fail!

The Homœopathician is consistent and true to himself and to the fundamental principles he has accepted in the formula, and as a foregoing conclusion he cures.

The non-Homœopathist is inconsistent, true to no principles; having none, he contends for empiricism, and his occasional cures are accidental occurrences.

The Homœopathician represents the true democratic principle in the healing art, he courts inquiry and lays facts before the people by which they may judge of the validity of his claims to superiority.

The non-Homœopathist is tyrannical, denies the people the right of inquiry, lays no facts before them and dictates to them what they should believe.

The Homœopathicians accept the formula as Hahnemann gave it; their motto is:

In certis unitas, indubiis libertas, in omnibus charitas.