PRICE SIXPENCE.

POPULAR

HOMŒOPATHIC TRACTS.

No. 1. Allopathy, a Random Mode of Practice.
,, 2. Homœopathy; What it is Not.
,, 3. Homœopathy; What it Is.
,, 4. Results Compared.
,, 5. Medical Faith.
,, 6. The Inappreciable Dose.
,, 7. The Dangers of the Drug Shop.
,, 8. The Reception of Homœopathy.
,, 9. Obstacles to the Progress of Homœopathy.
,, 10. The Progress of Homœopathy.
,, 11. Allopathic Evidence in favour of Homœopathy
,, 12. Medical Absurdities.

MANCHESTER:

HENRY TURNER,

41, PICCADILLY & 13, MARKET STREET.

POPULAR HOMŒOPATHIC TRACTS.

No. I.

Allopathy, a Random Mode of Practice.

"There is," writes Christopher North, "it must be confessed, something exceedingly perplexing in the Medical Profession. We are subject to a vast variety of diseases; and physicians in order to cure them study the art or science of Medicine. By dint of extraordinary natural sagacity, great practice and experience, a physician becomes so wise in the knowledge of all diseases, and antidotes to death, that he acquires the character of a life-preserver. You see him driving about with supplies of health in his carriage, just like a cart-wagon with its Peeble's ale. He dies; and in some half dozen years or so, a physician whom he had long kept down, lifts up his now undepressed head, and gets into prodigious practice. He adopts a system diametrically opposite to that of his predecessor. That which the one said would kill, the other says will cure. Now, the question to be answered is, which of these two men is the murderer? If it indeed be within the power of medical treatment to put a patient to death, a hot close room, with a huge fire and nailed windows, and a cool airy room, with no fire at all, and windows frequently open, cannot be equally good for a child, with its face one blotch of small pox. So on with all other complaints under the sun, moon and stars. Fathers and mothers fall down on their knees before physicians, blessing them, for having, under God, rescued a beloved child from the tomb; while had they known the truth, as it is expounded by a future Hippocrates, they would have screamed him off the premises as an assassin."—*Professor Wilson's Essays, vol.* 1.

The above is a fair specimen of the estimate in which men of education have been accustomed to hold the medical art, an estimate too, founded upon observation at once extensive and accurate. From the earliest ages a series of absurd dogmas have held sway in medical matters—only to be speedily dethroned by a new series equally absurd, which in their turn after a brief reign, are consigned to the oblivion they deserve. The only basis of faith and practice

*NOTE.—At this early stage it may be adviseable to explain the literal meaning of the words Homœopathy and Allopathy, of which hereafter we shall make frequent use. The former is compounded of two Greek words signifying *similar affection*, or *similar suffering*, and has been adopted as indicating the great principle on which the new system of medicine is based—that "like cures like." While Allopathy signifies *another* or *dissimilar* affection, and is employed to designate the ordinary method of Medical treatment.

is the opinion of the most popular Solon of the day, whose views are duly contradicted by the Solon who succeeds. The practice of medicine has hitherto had no claim to rank among the sciences, being devoid of every general principle which might entitle it to such an honour.

'Tis true, diseases have been classified according to their various types, and many earnest men have bestowed their deepest thought and exercised a most patient research in investigating the mode of cure. Thus many important isolated facts have been ascertained, but in the absence of any general principle these, pearls it may be, are comparatively valueless. But not only does this state of *bewilderment* exist, the most contradictory statements and modes of treatment are maintained in connexion with every disease under the sun. It may hereafter afford us matter for curious research to record theories and modes of treatment long since exploded, but our present object is to show that at this day in what is called "orthodox" or "legitimate" practice, the greatest diversity of opinion and contradictory style of treatment exists even in the most common and longest known diseases. Neither have we to seek for this contrariety of opinion and practice, among the humbler practitioners of the art; the most famous physicians and professors are as wide as the poles asunder in the views which they entertain and in the instructions which they communicate. Verily in them we find the "blind leaders of the blind." "In the University," writes Dr. Cockburn, Licentiate of the College of Surgeons, Edinburgh,* "a learned professor was lecturing on the subject of *Pericarditis*—inflammation of the investing membrane of the heart. He spoke of the general practice of giving mercury in large doses, so as to bring the system under its action as speedily as possible; combining the mercury with small doses of opium. 'This practice,' he says, 'I believe is erroneous; for I have observed the progress of the disease unchecked, even during profuse salivation. The most efficient remedy,—in fact our sheet anchor in this disease, is tartar emetic. You will have noticed the large doses I have given of this remedy, and yet the patient seems *not to suffer from it*.' Four nights after, another professor in the same hall happened to lecture on the same subject, and expressed himself to this effect: 'It is a remarkable thing that there should be any difference in regard to the treatment to be pursued in such a case as this. I believe it is the Italian and French Schools which advocate so very strongly the employment of tartar emetic; but I would strongly urge you to put no confidence in this remedy; for, if you do so, you will lean on a broken reed;

Medical Reform.

our sheet anchor in this disease is mercury.' These," continues Dr. Cockburn, "are specimens of the instruction that young men receive at our universities, as well as specimens of the practice they are to follow."

Nor are the effects produced by the medicines ascertained with greater precision or certainty, and the highest authorities yet dispute as to the effects of the most common drugs which they so unmercifully employ. "Dr. Neligan, a standard authority," I quote again from Dr. Cockburn, "says, in regard to squills, that in consequence of its stimulating effects, it is inadmissible where there is any tendency to inflammation. Dr. Christison, on the other hand, a no less accredited authority, says, that 'it never stimulates the circulation, neither is there any sound reason for avoiding it in acute affections of the chest, on account of its supposed stimulant operation.' We leave the reader to judge which of the two gentlemen is right." "Dr. Pereira, in his Elements of Materia Medica, says, 'Dr. Murray and Dr. Thomson believe that opium is a stimulant, Dr. Cullen regards it as a sedative; Dr. Mayer thinks it is both stimulant and sedative; Orfila thinks it is neither the one nor the other." "The whole domain of medical science (?) abounds with similar contradictions, which if only half known would astound men by their enormity, and startle them from their fancied faith in the Allopathic practice of Medicine."—*Medical Reform, p.* 55.

The Lancet, the accredited organ of the Allopathic portion of the "faculty," while in regard to Homœopathy it has indulged in the vilest abuse, has in some of its calmer moments been induced to make humiliating confessions of the truth of the above assertions. "If," says this authority, "the practice of medicine is to be redeemed from the reproach of uncertainty, which is at present attached to it, —if as a *science* medicine is to rank with other departments of natural knowledge,—it must be by having all its various branches advanced without exception."—vol. i., page 125, 1844. And again, "If the natural philosopher or scientific chemist turn from his own science to therapeutics, he would be led either to abandon his confidence in the uniformity and stability of the laws of nature, or to infer that the spirit of modern science has not yet animated the practical physician."—vol. i., page 454, 1854.

Dr. Ransford writing in 1851, on this point, adduces an important testimony. He says, "We cannot quote a higher authority on this subject than the present Professor of Materia Medica in the University of Edinburgh, Dr. Christison, who, on the 1st of August last, thus addressed

the newly-capped doctors of medicine: "Of all the medical sciences it (therapeutics, or the cure of diseases,) is the most unsettled and unsatisfactory in its present state, and the least advanced in its progress. We are little in advance of our predecessors thirty years ago." The learned gentleman might with about as much truth have said *three centuries ago*.

Dr. Forbes, one of the most eminent physicians in London, makes the following confession:—"Things have arrived at such a pitch that they cannot be worse; they must either mend or end."

The same gentleman in the British and Foreign Medical Review, of which he was principal proprietor and editor, with moderation and calmness discussed the present state of the medical art, and arrived at the following conclusions: —"First, that in a large proportion of the cases treated by Allopathic physicians, the disease is cured by nature and not by them. Secondly, that in a lesser, but still not a small proportion, the disease is cured by nature *in spite of them;* in other words their interference opposing instead of assisting the cure. Thirdly, that consequently, in a considerable proportion of diseases it would fare as well, if not better, with patients in the actual condition of the medical art as more generally practiced, *if all remedies, at least all active remedies, were abandoned.*"

It will be here observed that the authorities we have quoted are all of the Allopathic school, and therefore their testimony in such a case must be held as above suspicion. Similar evidences, and from like sources, might be indefinitely accumulated, but we believe what we have given will satisfy every reader that it is not without good reason that we have taken as a title to this Tract, that Allopathy is a random mode of practice. In the succeeding Tracts we shall introduce to the reader a system based upon a uniform physical law, affording a sure and certain guide in the treatment of all diseases.

Already Published.

No. 2. Homœopathy; What it is NOT.
3. Homœopathy; What it IS.
4. Comparative Results.
5. Medical Faith.
6. The Small Dose of Homœopathy.

MANCHESTER:—H. TURNER, 41, Piccadilly.
And Sold by all Homœopathic Chemists.

POPULAR HOMŒOPATHIC TRACTS.

No. 2.

Homœopathy; What it IS NOT.

"It is the noblest act of human reason,
To free itself from slavish prepossession."
BUTTLER.

In accordance with the sentiment expressed in this couplet, we shall now endeavour to repel some of the false accusations which are industriously disseminated as to the nature of Homœopathy; and by showing what Homœopathy is NOT, we hope to succeed in divesting the minds of our readers of "slavish prepossession." It is scarcely possible to take up any of the periodicals of the Allopathic school, without meeting with gross misrepresentations which it would be only an affected charity to suppose were not intentional,—misrepresentations which have been conclusively refuted, and this within the knowledge of the parties who persist in repeating their slanderous accusations. Not only does this dishonesty continue to be practiced in journals of all grades and claiming all degrees of respectability, but the most offensive epithets are constantly applied to the practitioners of Homœopathy, and even to their patients. The most conclusive *arguments* which it has been our lot to see adduced, are such vulgar epithets as Quacks, Knaves, Scoundrels, Humbugs, and names with which we would not disfigure our humble pages. While parties against whom they have been chiefly directed can well afford to despise such weapons, we deem it necessary for the sake of truth, briefly to consider such of the accusations alluded to as appear deserving of attention. It has been fashionable of late to settle the whole question by describing Homœopathy as *humbug*. This seems certainly an easy method, and in the mouths of interested parties is capable of explanation,—but it is simply a piece of impertinence for any one who has not practically and faithfully examined the claims which Homœopathy puts forward, to pass such a contemptuous opinion on what has received the implicit

credence of multitudes of the most highly educated members of society, and is adopted and practised by many of the most learned physicians in all parts of the world.

To such parties our advice is henceforward to show as much sense and modesty as to refrain from passing an opinion upon that of which they are ignorant.

Again, Homœopathy is not *quackery*, in any sense in which Allopathy may not with greater justice be so characterized. It is practised by men not less duly qualified by education than Allopathists are. Both have undergone the same course of study. Both have attended the same classes in the various universities, and both hold diplomas from the same colleges, and if they follow a different course of treatment, it is just what we have shown in the former Tract as prevailing universally among Allopathists. The distinction lies in this, that while Homœopathists act altogether differently from the Allopathists, they agree in their practice one with another, but Allopathists, while differing essentially from Homœopathists, differ not less widely among themselves. Therefore if a mere difference in the style of treatment constitutes quackery, each Allopathist must condemn every one of his brethren as a quack.

We frankly admit that as there are quacks licensed and unlicensed, in every profession, so there may be quacks in Homœopathy, as there unquestionably are in Allopathy, with this difference however, that the chances against the prevalence of such are vastly in favour of Homœopathy, which affords, as we shall hereafter show, a uniform rule of practice. Whereas the very diversities and uncertainties of Allopathy have been the fruitful parent of quackery. Neither has Homœopathy any of the secrets of quackery. It has nothing to conceal; but on the contrary has made known its principles, its practice, its medicines, and challenges the investigation of medical men, and of all interested in the matter. Perhaps its simplicity may be an objection. If it is so among the faculty—we can understand the reason why; but to laymen like ourselves who are deeply interested in the preservation of this our mortal tabernacle, this ground of objection will cease to be formidable, and indeed become a recommendation. Homœopathy then we hold has not a single characteristic in common with quackery.

It is a prevalent but mistaken idea that Homœopathy is simply another word for anything very small. There are many who imagine this from the tenor of remarks made about it, and really know no better. There are others however who knowing better, sedulously propagate the error. To take a single example.—An Allopathic periodical

entitled the *Medical Circular*, (30th July, 1856,) accidently fell into our hands the other day, in which some of the secrets of the profession are let out, in answer to correspondents. In this paper we find the following reply, referring to some of the examinations to be undergone preparatory to graduating.—"The Hall requires a certain amount of Latin—the College none, and a very Homœopathic quantity of English."

This may pass for being clever, as it is no doubt intended to do, but it is certainly very disingenuous. Homœopathy in itself has nothing to do with smallness. It is true, its adherents usually administer medicines in much smaller doses than the Allopathists do, and frequently in extremely small doses, both the principle on which Homœopathy is based is entirely independent of the question of doses, a fact with which the writer above quoted must have been perfectly conversant.

It is one of the advances made in Medical Reform, which has fortunately found its way to some extent into Allopathic practice, to reduce the murderous doses hitherto generally in use. This is one of the secondary effects of the introduction of Homœopathy, but one which must in no wise be confounded with Homœopathy itself.

Homœopathy is therefore not synonymous with smallness. Neither is it a system of doing nothing. No person who has seen the system in practice will be found to maintain such an opinion. It is despicable for men who know better or who might know better if they would, to retail what is notoriously false. We have had frequent occasion, when discussing the question with medical men, to hear this statement maintained in place of better argument, but never have we received other answer than a negative to our enquiry as to whether they had tried it. "Every physician," writes Dr. Joslyn, "who has fairly, fully, and practically examined Homœopathy, has adopted it."

We do not appeal to opinions, but to facts,—the result of the treatment, and for this purpose we shall quote an illustration which may serve to disprove the allegation, and while the whole practice of Homœopathy might be adduced as evidence, we shall content ourselves with one from Dr. Marsden, who has adopted the system which we advocate, after an extensive and patient investigation in the course of his own practice. After recording the cases of several children whom he had treated Homœopathically, he naively adds, "One of two things must be concluded from these premises, either there is something *most excellent* in Homœopathy, or there is something *most excellent in No*

Physic. But the majority of these children had been trying *No Physic* for some days before presenting themselves for advice. Some had had bowel complaint for a week, which stopped in twelve hours; some had not slept, had been peevish and burning hot for days, and began to recover immediately, I may say, after taking three or four of these Lilliputian pills, these infinitesimal, incomprehensible globules. What conclusion then could I come to? Why, that it really appeared to be undeniable that the system was true; but that it was so contrary to all my preceding modes of thought and action, that every caution must be had in investigating the matter, and that I must see results a hundred times repeated, and that in dangerous diseases, before I could venture to give it a practical belief. An old man of sixty presented himself, worn and wan with a diarrhæa, which was 'wearing him out,' he said, and had been treated for *six weeks in vain*, with astringents and opiates, and lime water and Mead's Mixture, &c. He took one drop of China.3* The next morning he came again to say he had been quite relieved. He took one drop more of the China, and went on his way, wondering at me for curing him, while I was wondering at him for getting well." Will those who imagine Homœopathy a system of doing nothing, adopt Dr. Marsden's method of arriving at the truth? If so, we predict it will be with the same result.

Strange as it may appear, the same parties who cry down Homœopathy as a system of *doing nothing*, also as occasion serves, raise the alarming cry of *Poison!* It is a system of poisoning. Our space forbids us to continue the subject, but we may very safely leave the one objection to answer the other.

*The figures occurring after the name of medicines in this and subsequent instances, indicate the dilution.

Already Published.

No. 1. Allopathy, a random mode of Practice.
2. Homœopathy; What it is.
4. Comparative Results.
5. Medical Faith.
6. The Inappreciable Dose.

MANCHESTER:—HENRY TURNER, 41, Piccadilly,
And Sold by all Homœopathic Chemists.

POPULAR HOMŒOPATHIC TRACTS.

No. 3.

Homœopathy. What it IS.

Having in the immediately preceding number, endeavoured to remove some erroneous impressions as to the nature of Homœopathy, by showing what it is *not*, we shall now briefly consider the converse of the question.

In Germany, above seventy years ago, a chemist and physician, even then not unknown to fame, impelled by a stern principle of rectitude, abandoned the practice of his profession, on the ground of its being devoid of every satisfactory rule by which to regulate the treatment of disease. His mind was deeply impressed with the conviction that injury, and not unfrequently fatal consequences, must be the result of such a system, and he shrunk from so great a responsibility as was involved in his continuing to exercise such an unsatisfactory profession. His love of truth overcame his love of wealth, and he devoted himself to literature and chemical studies. While engaged in translating into German the *Materia Medica* of Dr. Cullen, which had then risen into high repute even on the Continent, the attention of Hahnemann was arrested by the various and apparently anomalous effects produced by the continued use of Peruvian Bark, and especially by the statement that it produced symptoms resembling those of ague, for which disease it was the acknowledged remedy. To test the correctness of his author, he, while in perfect health, took repeated doses of this drug, and soon found himself labouring under an artificial disease,—a kind of intermittent fever,—closely resembling Ague. Having ascertained this property in Quinine, he immediately extended his researches into the effect of other substances in the Materia Medica, the specific action of which had long been ascertained, and after years of laborious investigation, he was enabled to announce to the world, that even for the treatment of disease a law existed as uniform in its operations as that by which the planets are regulated in their courses. This law he expressed in the phrase *Similia similibus curantur*,—like things are cured by like things, or more fully "that diseases are effectually cured by such medicines as have the power of producing on healthy subjects symptoms resembling those which characterize the disease itself." This and this alone constitutes the great fact of Homœopathy,—a fact

which the experience of the last seventy years has steadily tended to establish,—which has stood the test of most rigid investigation, and when fairly tried the result has uniformly been an adoption of the system. This discovery has been ridiculed,—those who place confidence in it and regulate their practice by it,—have been grossly abused by that portion of the faculty which arrogates to themselves the claim to be called the "regular practitioners,"—but it has never been disproved, nor one solitary fact produced calculated to do so.

The Law was discovered from an induction of *facts*. It is not a *theory*, nor does it depend on the authority of any man. It is a question of practical experiment, which, if capable of refutation, may be disproved by any person of ordinary intelligence and honesty. On this single fact rests the whole superstructure of Homœopathy, and on *its* stability the system must stand or fall. The result, however, of the experiments of Hahnemann and his friends in ascertaining the effects of the medicines both on persons in health and in the curing of disease, has only been more firmly established by every subsequent enquirer, and may now with all safety be classed in the list of ascertained truths.

"An opinion," says Dr. Joslyn, "prevails to some extent in the community, that Homœopathy has been examined by many Allopathic physicians and found by them to be untrue in principle and inefficacious in practice. Those who state that they have made an examination with such results, have no adequate conception of what is implied in their statement. It is implied, that they have repeatedly taken and administered a variety of our potentized medicines, in small doses, and always without any effect, either in producing or removing symptoms; secondly that they have taken doses, in number and magnitude sufficient to produce numerous symptoms, and that these symptoms differed entirely from those recorded by Hahnemann and his disciples; thirdly, that many drugs, each of which was known by them to be capable of producing many symptoms, have been separately given by these physicians to many patients, each of whose cases was specially characterized by many symptoms producible by the drug administered, and yet this drug given in sufficiently small doses and at sufficient intervals, neither cured nor benefitted the patient. I deny that any such trials have ever been made with such results. Not one of the three classes of experiments as above indicated, has ever been made by any man who is still a professed Allopathic physician."

Homœopathy is then a system of medical treatment, based upon an established *physical law*, and now for the first time has the physician obtained a uniform guide in the difficulties of his profession. It is of importance to observe that with Homœopathists the effects of the various medicines are ascertained, not on a diseased and disorganised constitution, but on the healthy frame. These effects carefully investigated and recorded enable the physician when he has made himself acquainted with the disease and its symptoms, with certainty to select a remedy. It will still be required of the physician to make a careful diagnosis and for this purpose properly educated and qualified men will always be required, though we opine that with the introduction of an enlightened system of therapeutics their work will be both less, and less difficult.

The claim which the principle of Homœopathy—*Similia similibus curanter*—has to be considered as a physical law has been disputed by some on the ground that the *theory* of its operation cannot as yet be explained. It might be sufficient answer to say that it is with results and not with theories that we have to do. And the fact of the *results* being uniform, is sufficient reason why we should regulate our treatment by the *rule*. But can the objectors give any explanation better, or even so good, of their mode of practice? The theory of the action of medicines must be admitted to be "like many other points in 'corn, cash, and Catholics,' a *questio vexata*." The objection in short meets us at every step of progress in the domains of physical science. Let us examine, however, what is implied by the expression—a *law* of nature or *physical* law. The term *law* in its ordinary acceptation implies a *rule* by which certain proceedings are to be regulated—the results arising from the pre-existence of the law. In physical science however, the term must be understood in a very different light; all that is implied in this case being—that certain results or effects uniformly flow from certain causes. It is not in virtue of a *law* that gunpowder is bound to explode when brought into contact with a spark of fire; but by experience we find that when a spark is so brought into contact with gunpowder, an explosion is the uniform result. Again with regard to the *law* of gravitation, on which no doubt we could all discourse most learnedly, what have we got more than a name? It is not in consequence of the pre-existence of a law that a stone falls to the ground when unsupported, but we find that this is the result which uniformly takes place in the circumstances supposed. How or why this result takes place we know no more at this day than was

known centuries before the birth of Newton. In like manner it has been established that in certain morbid condition of the animal system the administration of properly selected medicinal substances calculated to produce similar conditions of the body, are physically adapted and do uniformly counteract, within certain limits, the effects of the disease. This is all that is meant by the law of *Similia similibus curantur*, but fortunately it is all that is *essential* to be known in the matter. How the administration of those medicinal substances should be uniformly followed by such results we only know in the same manner that we know that a stone unsupported will uniformly fall to the ground—both facts claiming our belief on the same evidence —namely experience. Such questions however present an interesting field for further investigation, and the advancement of science may yet throw much light upon them all.

Those philosophers who oppose Homœopathy on the grounds we have been discussing, must cease to urge their objection till they can explain how the herb yields seed after his kind,—how the seed yields herb after his kind,—or how each blade of grass responds to the animating breath of spring. Of them we enquire in the words of the poet:

> "Why does one climate and one soil endue
> The blushing poppy with a crimson hue,
> Yet leave the lilly pale, and tinge the violet blue?
> Whence has the tree, (resolve me,) or the flower,
> A various instinct, or a different power?
> Why should one earth, one clime, one stream, one breath,
> Raise this to strength, and sicken that to death?"

POPULAR HOMŒOPATHIC TRACTS.—No. 4.

Treatment of Disease.—Comparative Results.

A few years ago, some daring spirits having proposed to cross the Atlantic in vessels propelled by steam, a learned and popular philosopher satisfactorily demonstrated the impossibility of accomplishing such a feat. Within a very brief period however he was glad to avail himself of that very mode of transit, even though it did confound his philosophic reasoning. This is not the only instance in which theoretical conclusions have disappeared before the march of experience.

Much time and eloquence have been expended to no purpose about matters which only required to be brought to the test of practical experiment. While however experience sweeps before it false conclusions, it is on that account the more valuable as confirming and demonstrating such as are true.

Acting on this conviction, we propose in the present number to give additional proof of the correctness of our previous conclusions as to the superiority of Homœopathy, by examining its results in actual practice. From the fact that Homœopathists are in possession of a sure and definite guide in the selection of medicines suitable to be administered in the various diseases, one would, as a natural consequence, infer that a greater degree of success would attend their mode of treatment. We now propose to examine whether this inference is sustained by facts, and in order to do so we shall institute a comparison between the results of Allopathic and Homœopathic treatment; thereafter comparing both with the negative treatment of no medicine at all.

From a comparison of the reports of various Hospitals, one uniform general result is obtained,—that the mortality under Allopathic treatment is nearly *three times* as great as under the Homœopathic system.

In proof of this we shall avail ourselves of certain statistics drawn up by Dr. Routh, himself hostile to Homœopathy. The following is the result obtained by comparing the reports of the Hospitals in London, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Liverpool, Vienna, Leipsic, Linz, &c., with reference to ALL DISEASES.

	Nos. treated.	Died.	Mortality per cent.
Allopathic Hospitals.....	119,630	11,791	10-5
Homœopathic	32,655	 1,365	 4-4

Here then, according to Dr. Routh's own showing, the mortality in the Allopathic, is 2½ times greater than in the

Homœopathic, Hospitals. To prevent the possibility of any false impression being entertained as regards the nature of the diseases treated, we shall select some of the most dangerous and fatal kinds. It is not unusual to suppose that Homœopathy is only suitable for imaginary or at least only slight ailments, but not to be depended on in a deadly struggle with acute disease; whereas it is in such a case that its superiority is most distinctly manifested. We shall first take some statistics of a disease before whose mysterious march thousands were in a few hours hurried to the tomb, and in whose presence the strongest nerves were shaken and the stoutest heart quailed; we mean CHOLERA.

In 21 Hospitals in France and Italy where the Allopathic treatment was adopted, the deaths, taking the average of all the Hospitals, were 63 in every hundred cases.

On the other hand, in 10 Hospitals in France, Italy and Germany, where the Homœopathic system was adopted,—the deaths, taking the average as before, were only 11 per cent., or nearly 6 times less.

In the city of Vienna alone when cholera raged there in 1836, each of the Hospitals had a cholera ward set apart and the following are the published returns. It is worthy of remark also that the Homœopathic hospital like the rest, was under the inspection of two *Allopathic* physicians, appointed by the Government.

In the Allopathic Hospitals 66 died in every hundred.
„ Homœopathic „ 33 „ „
or just one-half,—"Two-thirds *recovered* in the one, and two-thirds *died* in the other."

In Liverpool, in 1849, the Hospital returns showed the following results respectively:

Under Allopathic treatment, mortality 46 per cent.
„ Homœopathic „ „ 25 „

In Edinburgh, in the same year, the comparison is still more favourable for Homœopathy, the mortality under Allopathic treatment being 66 per cent., and under Homœopathy only 25 per cent.

In Newcastle, in 1853, the mortality under the Homœopathic treatment was only 20 per cent., or one-fifth of those attacked by the disease. The returns under Allopathic treatment are imperfect, but the mortality is believed on satisfactory evidence to have been not under 50 per cent., or one half of all who were attacked.

And, finally, with regard to this disease. When it was prevalent in London in 1854, statistics were carefully collected, and were finally presented to both Houses of Parliament. The following are the returns.

Mortality under Allopathic treatment, 45 per cent.
" " Homœopathic " 17 "
Collapse cases, Allopathic " 69 "
" " Homœopathic " 30 "

DYSENTERY.

Allopathic treatment, mortality, 22 per cent.
Homœopathic " " 3 "

PERITONITIS, (Inflammation of the investing membrane of the bowels.)

Allopathic treatment, mortality, ... 13 per cent.
Homœopathic " " ..... 4 "
Edinburgh Infirmary, (same disease) ..... 28 nearly

PLEURISY (inflammation of the investing membrane of the Lungs.)

Allopathic treatment, mortality nearly 13 per cent.
Homœopathic " " only 1¼ "

PNEUMONIA (inflammation of the lungs.)

Allopathic Hospitals, mortality..... 23 per cent.
Homœopathic " ..... 5 "
Edinburgh Infirmary (same disease) 36 "
Glasgow " " " 27 "

"These diseases," says Dr. Marsden, "are the very touchstone of medical skill,the test of medical power." Compare then the results of the treatment by bleeding, blistering, leeching, administering tartar emetic, &c., with the administration of minute doses of aconite, aud other medicines which are proved to be Homœopathic to the disease.

The latter cures from 3 to 10 times as many as recover under Allopathic treatment. "Look on this picture and on this,"—and decide into whose hands you will confide your case when prostrated by fell disease.

Having shown the superiority of Homœopathy over Allopathy, we now proceed to compare both with that mode of treatment which dispenses with the use of medicines altogether, and for this purpose we shall simply make two quotations amply illustrating the point.

"Dr. Dietl, the Allopathic physician of the Wieden Hospital, in Vienna, anxious to test the efficacy of dietetic regimen in pneumonia, instituted a series of experiments. In the course of three years that gentleman treated 380 cases of pneumonia. 85 of these cases were treated by repeated bleedings, of this number 17 died, or 20 per cent.; the remaining 68 recovered. 106 were treated with tartar emetic; the mortality was now 20.7 per cent., 22 dying and 84 only recovering. The remaining 189 were treated by simple dietetic means; the deaths amounted to 14, or 7.4 per cent., 175 recovering."—*Dr. Routh's Fallacies*, p. 55.

Allopathic treatment (Dr. Dietl,) mortality	20	per cent.
Do-nothing „ „ „	7.4	„
Homœopathie „ (Vienna Hospital)	5	„

The above comparison speaks favourably for doing-nothing —but says very little for Allopathy,—while at the same time it clearly establishes the superiority of Homœopathy to either. "When fever and dysentery," writes Dr. Sharp, "were desolating many parts of Ireland in 1847, one of the places which suffered most was Bantry, near Skibbereen, in the county of Cork. During ten weeks 192 cases were treated Homœopathically by Mr. Kidd, at their own homes, amid all the wretchedness of famine; the mortality from fever was less than two per cent., and from dysentery fourteen per cent. During the same period many were treated on the old method in the Bantry Union Hospital, with the advantages of proper ventilation, attendance, nourishment, &c., and from the report of Dr. Abraham Tuckey, the physician, the mortality from fever was more than 13 per cent., and from dysentery 36 per cent. At the same time another Fever Hospital was opened for similar cases occurring among the emigrants from Ireland to this country, in which the medical man tells us he abstained from all interference, and remained passively watching the cases, ordering free ventilation, cleanliness, and confinement to bed; water, or milk and water being given as drinks. He congratulates himself upon the success attendant upon thus allowing the cases to take their natural course undisturbed by medicine; the deaths from fever in this hospital were 10 per cent. We have here, therefore, an opportunity of comparing together the results of the three methods;—the ordinary system of medicine, no medicine at all, and the Homœopathic medicine. The deaths from fever are thus reported:

Under ordinary medicine, above.....	13	per cent.
Under no medicine at all	10	„
Under Homœopathic medicine less than	2	„

A sufficient proof that that is doing something and gaining by it; while by the same comparison, giving large doses of medicines is doing something indeed, but losing by it."—*Dr. Sharp's Tracts on Homœopathy.*

Already Published.

No. 1. Allopathy, a random mode of Practice.
2. Homœopathy; What it is NOT.
3. Homœopathy; What it IS.
5. Medical Faith.
6. The Inappreciable Dose.

MANCHESTER:—H. TURNER, 41, Piccadilly,
And Sold by all Homœopathic Chemists.

POPULAR HOMŒOPATHIC TRACTS.—No. 5.

MEDICAL FAITH.

"Men," says Dr. Simpson, "labouring under diseases even the most acute, and consequently much more so under slighter ailments, do not as a general rule die, even when left without any medical treatment whatever. There is an internal energy in the system, recognised as the *vis medicatrix Naturæ*, (the curative power of Nature,) which constantly works to the effecting of a cure; and often it does so with so much success that the less positive interference from without the better. Such being the case, it is evident that where a medical attendant merely rubs some part of the body, administers a visionary or otherwise innocuous medicine, or acts in any other way indifferently to the actual disease, that disease may be all the time abating of itself, not in any way affected by the treatment, to which accordingly the cure can only be attributed under a mistake. In the second place, there are cases in which the medicine or treatment may be said to have really effected a cure, more or less thorough and permanent, but in a wholly indirect manner. Its effect in these cases is owing to the intervention of a mental affection on the part of the patient. The maladies to which this principle applies are chiefly of a nervous character. The treatment is an application to the nervous system, which may be called the main-spring of the human constitution; it is so far then an intelligible process. At one time we see a Valentine Greatrakes giving out that he can cure all diseases by stroking the affected part with his hand; at another we have a Prince Hohenloe undertaking to heal the whole of a certain class of ailments in a distant province by his prayers, on the sole condition that the patients have faith in him, and pray to the same purpose at the same time. Or, perhaps there is a belief, connected with the religious creed of the individual, that if he pilgrimise to a certain Saint's well, or tomb, or shrine, and there go through certain ceremonies, his malady will leave him. Or it may simply be, that some mystical-looking system of therapeutics, like Homœopathy, has acquired a hold upon the faith of the patient. In all cases the

patients are taught to expect something wonderful. A real effect is consequently wrought in them; and under the powerful impulse given for the moment to the nervous system, the bed-rid finds he can rise, the paralytic throws away his crutches, the deaf hears, and even tumours and ulcers subside and are dried up."—*Chambers' Journal, June* 23rd, 1855.

Such then is the most satisfactory explanation which Allopathists can give, and such the miserable shifts to which they are reduced in order to account for the astonishing success of Homœopathy. At an earlier period its success was simply denied, but that being now no longer possible, recourse is had to such clumsy and unmanly explanations as are contained in the above quotation. In answer to the first mode of escaping from the difficulty, the *vis medicatrix Naturæ*, we would simply refer to the statistics in the immediately preceding tract, and the quotations with which it closes as to the respective merits of Allopathic treatment,—no medical treatment at all, and Homœopathy.

In the article from which the above is an extract, the writer with a becoming grace classes Homœopathy in a list of popular delusions, of which the medical profession has from time immemorial afforded an abundant supply. We are far from denying that the imagination has a very powerful influence for good or for evil upon the corporeal organisation, and are therefore prepared to admit that many diseases are induced by a morbid condition of the mind. It is not unnatural then that many such diseases and it may be others "of a nervous character," should yield to a renewed elasticity and buoyancy of mind. But while we readily admit all this, we are puzzled to see either how it accounts for the superior success of Homœopathy, or what bearing it has upon the question at all, and yet it is reiterated and retailed with singular complacency as a most happy discovery. If it is to account for cures at all, it certainly should have the greatest amount of success in Allopathy. A "doughty keeper from the grave," reputed to be "exceeding wise," with watch in hand telling life's beat, should have much the same effect on the mind of the trusting patient, to whatever school of medicine he belongs; whilst his sage prescription, with its multiplicity of ingredients, supplied in quantity and quality adapted to make a very decided impression on the senses, when balanced against the unlikely and apparently inadequate doses of the Homœopathist should act with an amazing preponderance in favour of the Allopath.

Instead of Homœopathy being aided by the imagination,

the contrary is the case, the conviction of its truth being forced upon those who adopt it *in spite of* their faith and imagination, both of which are prepossessed against the success of the cure. The very improbability of a dose so small, and so unlike what we have been accustomed to, acts so far as the imagination has any influence upon the cure, unfavourably instead of the reverse. This we believe is invariably the case with those who are induced for the first time to submit themselves to that mode of treatment, and never did this fact receive a more decided illustration than in the individual case of him who now records it. We have thus pretty strong *primæ facie* evidence that the curative power of imagination cannot account for the success of Homœopathy, even in the case of those who may "be of imagination all compact." The absurdity of the assertion however, is at once established by the cures effected among infants and even among domestic animals.

Not long ago we happened to see an infant nine months old, and unweaned, which for ten weeks had vomited every article of food or medicine within a few minutes after swallowing it, and this in spite of, or shall we not rather say in consequence of, constant medical treatment. With six globules of Ipecacuanha dissolved in a wine-glassful of water the vomiting was permanently cured, and for the first time during ten weeks mother and child experienced the bliss of a night's unbroken repose. Lest this should appear somewhat irregular on the part of a lay disciple, we shall quote an equally satisfactory illustration on the authority of a physician.

"I treated," says Dr. Marsden, "during the period named, (three months,) between 70 and 80 children, *under ten years of age, and therefore* not very likely to be under the influence of imagination. With the exception of three cases of internal inflammations, which were, *horresco referens*, treated after the usual method, these young patients, affected with infantile, eruptive, and intermittent fevers, derangements of the digestive organs, confined bowels, relaxed bowels, illness from teething and other ailments incidental to childhood, all recovered as far as I had the opportunity to observe. One little girl had been under a surgeon's care for five weeks for intermittent fever; under the use of aconite she got well in three days. Another little creature, three years old, was reduced to skin and bones, was wasting away from a disease called atrophy; the food she took was not digested, the old looking, wizened face, dull eyes and yellow complexion made me painfully feel how little the ordinary mode of treatment could hope to relieve her. She had been

long taking medicines in vain, so I ventured to try Homœopathy, which my books assured me, would be successful. She took arsenic, the millionth or billionth part of a grain every four hours; that was followed by nux and sulphur. She soon rallied, and was completely restored to health in a few weeks."—*Marsden's Notes*, p.p. 14 & 15.

The same author (page 22,) says, "I was taken to see one of those large London dairies, in which were, I believe, a couple of hundred cows, which had been treated Homœopathically during an epidemic influenza that had been very fatal among cattle. I spoke to the head of the establishment, a regular pound, shilling and pence man, as little likely as one of his own cows, to diverge from the path of interest for the sake of philosophical research; he assured me he had lost fewer cows by one half than any of his neighbours, and that the expense of the treatment had been about one-third less than theirs had been."

There are now many Homœopathic Veterinary Surgeons, and the superiority of the system is not less manifested in the success which atends their practice than we have shown it to be in the treatment of the human family. With such facts before him, will any candid individual persist in attributing the cures of Homœopathy to the influence of imagination?

Already Publtshed.

No. 1. Allopathy, a random mode of Practice.
2. Homœopathy; What it is NOT.
3. Homœopathy; What it IS.
4. Treatment of Disease,—Comparative Results.
6. The Inappreciable Dose.

MANCHESTER:—H. TURNER, 41, Piccadilly,

And Sold by all Homœopathic Chemists.

POPULAR HOMŒOPATHIC TRACTS.—No. 6.

The Small, or Inappreciable Dose of Homœopathy.

The mind of man is lost in the amplitudes of Omnipotence when investigating the minutest atom, not less than when contemplating the ponderous globes which wheel their stated courses in illimitable space. Yet how almost universal is it to consider that to be impossible which our finite capacities are unable to comprehend. To this perverse conceit of the human mind, doubtless, must be attributed the fact, that the smallness of the dose usually administered by Homœopathists has proved to many a stumbling-block in the way of its adoption. Let it be here again however remarked that the question of the size of the dose is only an adjunct to Homœopathy, and is entirely distinct from the great principle which forms the basis of the science, as already explained. When Hahnemann first put his discovery into practice, he employed doses of the usual size. Experience and further investigation however, taught him that smaller doses were not only sufficient, but when frequently administered, more efficacious than large ones,—a satisfactory reason for adopting the former. This reason was further greatly strengthened by taking into consideration the injurious effects produced by the large doses usually given. The minuteness in the subdivision of the medicines used by Homœopathists, and the process of trituration through which they pass, undoubtedly develop a power which is not manifest in the drug in its crude state. How this is done—whether by an increase of its material surface or otherwise it is neither our purpose nor intention to discuss. We shall avoid theorising and content ourselves by stating the fact,—and reiterating that in practical experience small doses are found to be more efficacious than large ones. The statistics already presented have proved that the medicines used by Homœopathists are more successful than those employed by Allopathists. The principal cause of this superiority has been shown to consist in the selection of the medicine and in the administration of that which is Homœopathic to the disease. So far then as the comparison of Allopathic and Homœopathic treatment is concerned, while it decides the superiority of the latter system, *with all its adjuncts*, it cannot decide the question of the size of the dose. This must be established in Homœopathic practice itself, and the experience there has been, that in small doses frequently repeated the medicine

is more efficacious. The precise potency in which the medicines should be administered remains and will probably continue to remain an open question to be decided by the exigencies of each case.

While Homœopathists invariably administer medicines in doses exceedingly minute as compared with Allopathists, they yet employ them in gradations from the globules in the higher dilutions to the powerful tincture.

But to return to the main question; when we consider the marvellously minute and delicately constructed organization of our mysterious frame, why should it appear so wonderful, that it should be influenced by minute quantities of medicinal substances?

As the river with its tributary streams, meandering through the vale, spreads fertility and life on every side, so the life-giving stream ceaselessly flowing through our bodies, carries with it throughout all the system health or disease. This blood consists of minute globules floating in a colourless fluid, and on the right condition and quantity of these depend our health and life. In what precise manner these globules perform their functions is yet hidden among the things unknown, but it is generally admitted that they are the grand laboratories and sources of supply to all the parts of the body. Of these little vescicles it would require 5,000 side by side to extend one inch in length, and no less than 125 billions (125,000,000,000) to form one cubic inch. Again, "The body is protected externally and internally, as in the throat, by a skin or cuticle full of blood and life; this cuticle is composed of cells, which contain smaller cells, infinitesimal among the infinitely small: these measure, according to the celebrated anatomist Henle, about $\frac{1}{5700}$ part of an inch in diameter; and yet contain other cells, called nucleoli, which are only $\frac{1}{57000}$ part of an inch in diameter; they are so beautifully arranged in order that they form what is termed a tesselated or pavement web, to which the gossamer web that we see hanging from flower to flower on a summer's early morning, is coarse and unworthy to be compared. There are several varieties of cells, that form this cuticle,—one variety is composed of cells shaped like a pyramid $\frac{1}{1200}$ part of an inch long; these have attached to the extreme end of them fine ciliæ or hairs, about $\frac{1}{50000}$ part of an inch long; and these hair-like bodies, found in every part of the tubes of the lungs, for instance, are in continuous motion during life, waving backwards and forwards, and propelling onwards the fluids and minute particles in contact with them."—*Dr. Marsden*, p. 79.

Another beautiful instance is found in the composition

of a muscle. This consists of a bundle of small fibres each composed of cells and possessing the power of contraction. These fibres so composed, vary in diameter from the twenty thousandth to the fifty-thousandth part of an inch, and these again are penetrated by innumerable blood vessels and nerves. An amazing illustration of the infinitesimal is also to be found in that class of invisible creatures which exist in such profusion and of such dimensions that a million of them would not amount to the bulk of a grain of sand. Yet these animalcules are endowed with life and an activity which throws our sluggish efforts into the shade. These seem endowed with all the organs requisite for their existence in a no less perfect degree than man himself.

"The shapely limb and lubricated joint
Within the small dimensions of a point."

How inconceivably minute and exquisitively fine must be such an organism. If the globules of the life-giving fluid, whatever it may be called which flows in their tiny veins, bear the same proportion to their bulk that the globules composing the blood of a human being do to his body, one such globule would compose the one thousand quintillion of a cubic inch,—or it would require one hundred quartillions to equal the bulk of a grain of sand.

Seeing then that in the constitution of man as well as in the lower animals, the Omnipotent Creator has employed the most delicate and minute organizations, even defying the research of the most powerful microscope, why should it be held so very improbable that medicines triturated to extreme minuteness should exert an influence on such organs. May we not infer rather that this influence will be much less destructive than the large doses of crude medicines in ordinary use. Nay! may we not with reason conclude that those extremely attenuated medicines are much better adapted for permeating a system, the organization of which is so infinitesimally minute.

Nor is the inanimate world less fertile in illustrations of amazing minuteness of division, and of the no less wonderful effects of those infinitesimals. "From this power over matter," says a writer in the *Edinburgh Review*, "with which existing progress has invested man, how wonderfully interesting are the results and substances which he can produce at will. One of these substances takes fire and glows brilliantly when simply exposed to the air, another starts into flame when it is touched with water or with ice, a third shines in the air with a paler and more lambent but almost perpetual light, and the smell of the fourth is too nauseous to be endured. One gas when diffused through the air *in*

absolutely inappreciable proportion affects those who inhale it with violent catarrh, another when inhaled exhilerates with a happy but fleeting intoxication,—a third, if breathed but once, suddenly arrests the current of life. A single drop of one fluid, if swallowed will produce instant death, of another will set in motion the whole contents of the alimentary canal,—while the vapour of a third will produce speedy insensibility. In organic compounds containing many molecules united together, it is most surprising that the addition of a single molecule more should often entirely alter their properties and relations to life. Benzoyl, for example, contains 21 atoms,—14 of carbon, 5 of hydrogen and 2 of oxygen,—and yet the addition of 1 of hydrogen to these 21, forms the high-flavoured and poisonous oil of bitter almonds, or 1 of oxygen added in its stead forms the well-known benzoic acid to which our pastilles owe so much of their agreeable odour." Sir Humphrey Davy discovered that six square feet of copper—as for instance, the sheathing of ships, are rendered electro negative (that is the polarities of all the innumerable particles which make up that extent of surface are reversed) by a *zinc nail* driven through the space and are thereby protected from the corrosive tendencies of the sea. The deadly poison known as prussic acid, half a drop of which will produce instantaneous death, is innocuous till it enters the mouth. It does not exist ready formed in the bitter almond, but is a product of the chemical combination of the Amygdaline—its chief ingredient—with the saliva of the mouth. In fine, who can weigh, or by his purest tests discover the poisonous ingredient which by infection or contagion carries disease and death? And who may deny that even an *inappreciable* dose of medicine adapted to the disease should effect a cure. If such there are, we would only invite them to "test and see."

POPULAR HOMŒOPATHIC TRACTS.

No. 7.

The Appreciable Dose, or Dangers of the Drug Shop.

"He that sinneth before his Maker, let him fall into the hand of the Physician."—ECCLESIASTICUS, 38 CHAPTER, 15 VERSE.

"I know very well," says a veteran in the medical profession, "that perhaps more than seven tenths of mankind die, not from disease, but from the unsuitableness and excess of medicine." "So far as my experience of medical matters goes," says another, "few people are permitted to die of disease, the orthodox fashion is to die of the doctors." Such is the declared opinion of the very men into whose hands through necessity or prejudice, we have been in the habit of committing ourselves and families when afflicted by disease. It is difficult to persuade ourselves, that a profession embracing so many thousands of practitioners should be under the necessity of making such humiliating confessions; and that we continue to avail ourselves of such advisers, can only be explained upon the ground that a drowning man will grasp for help even at a floating straw.

While the whole style of Allopathic treatment, with its bleeding, blistering, &c., is undoubtedly responsible for such results, our object at present is to call attention to the injurious effects of large doses of compounded drugs. Those who are inclined to ridicule the small doses, have as we shall shew, more reason to tremble at the large ones. Every medicinal substance administered is *intended* to produce some effect upon the body, and a *composition* of such substances is intended to effect a variety of results on the system. But it is a notorious fact, that substances the most incongruous and unsuitable to one another are frequently jumbled together in one mixture, in which, by chemical affinity, a totally different compound is not unfrequently produced, possessing not one of the original properties of its component parts. Much more may such effects be produced, as undoubtedly they are, when the whole composition is introduced into the stomach, where, as in a chemical retort, at a high degree of temperature, wonderful changes are produced. As was shewn in our last number, a substance not possessing any poisonous properties undergoes such a change when brought into contact simply with the saliva of the mouth, as to prove instantaneously fatal,—what unknown effects and changes then may not be produced in the stomach by these com-

pound doses. These results are produced even in cases where there exists a rational precision in the mind of the physician as to the object he has in view in administering them,—but how rarely is this the case?—Dr. Paris, President of the Royal College of Physicians, in London, says that, "the file *of every apothecary would furnish a volume of instances*, where the ingredients of the prescription *are fighting together in the dark*." The same gentleman tells us of a practitioner who had informed him, that he always increased the number of ingredients in his prescriptions in proportion to the difficulty which he experienced in understanding the nature of the disease, on the following highly rational ground;—"If," says he, "I fire a great profusion of shot, it is very extraordinary if some do not hit the mark,"—we humbly opine, that many a murderer, less blood-stained than he, has been hanged!

With such a system as this, we need not be surprised when we are informed, that the larger proportions of diseases are medicinal—the effects of drugs. And alas! such has been our treatment from the cradle to the grave.—The seeds of a life of disease and premature death are implanted in the tender frames of infants, saturated as they are with calomel and other mercurial preparations. The rage for multiplicity in former times knew no bounds, and as many as four hundred ingredients were required to constitute a perfect dose, and fifty articles in one prescription was to the men of that day neither unusual nor considered absurd. This excess of absurdity has been very materially reduced in our day, yet many prescriptions, even now, glory in enumerating above a decade of ingredients. The tendency however, is decidedly in favor of diminishing this complexity, a circumstance which, while we hail it with unmingled satisfaction, we claim as an improvement, forced upon the "regular" phalanx by the introduction of Homœopathy. Dr. Forbes, when speaking of the mixing of medicines, says, "Our system is here greatly and radically wrong. Our official formulæ are already most absurdly and mischievously complex, and our fashion is to double and redouble the existing complexities. This system is a most serious impediment in the way of ascertaining the precise and peculiar powers of the individual drugs, and thus interferes in the most important manner with the progress of therapeuties. Nothing has a greater tendency to dissociate practical medicine from science, and to stamp it as a trade, than this system of pharmaceutical artifice." Dr. Paris, while he maintains a decided hostility to Homœopathy, admits, that by this system of admixture,

"the mildest remedy may be converted into an instrument of torture, and even of death." And again, "let not the young practitioner, however,"—and he might with great propriety have included the old—"be so deceived; he should remember, that unless he be well acquainted with the mutual actions which bodies exert upon each other, and upon the living system, (which no one, as yet, is acquainted with,) it may be laid down as an axiom; that, *in proportion as he complicates a medicine, he does but multiply the chances of its failure.*"—Dr. Paris, as quoted by Dr. Sharp, *Tract* xi. p. 8.

The *quantity* usually administered is also a fruitful source of disease and death, and this even when the medicines are not at all, or only slightly compounded—mercury has slain its thousands. Dr. Stokes, of Dublin, declares, "that he had *never* heard of persons who had taken much colchicum living to a great age." Dr. Wood, of Edinburgh, who has signalized himself by writing an octavo against Homœopathy, says, with regard to opium, "some of the most melancholy cases of *tic-doloreux*, which I have witnessed, have been where opium has been given to mitigate the pain; *time after time the dose has increased*, until, to the original morbid state, inducing the neuralgia,—*has been superadded the marasmus of slow opium poisoning.*" "A vast proportion of the most common and stubborn diseases," writes, Dr. Cockburn, "are, to a great extent, manufactured by medical men. Thus an individual accidentally becomes confined in the bowels, (perhaps, by the way, a very salutary accident,) and he gets physic from the doctor. The primary action of the physic in opening the bowels is soon followed by renewed constipation, more stubborn than before, and for this, more physic must be taken. In this way, the indications of nature are frustrated, and the constipation becomes confirmed—chronic; or as the unfortunate patient is made to believe, constitutional. But the evil does not always stop here. The physic has an injurious effect on the rest of the system;—upon the stomach, in producing a great variety of painful and uncomfortable symptoms, generally classed under the head of dyspepsia, or indigestion. For these again, bark, or some other so-called *tonic* must be given. The little relief afforded by these is of short duration, and besides a return of the former complaint, we frequently find, so-called nervous and conjestive head-ache, produced from the abuse of these fine tonics. Not only is this true, in regard to strong drugs, such as mercury, arsenic, bark, &c.; but it is equally true as regards the most simple and innocent medicines. Magnesia for

example, an article frequently recommended by doctors, and extensively used among children, produces most dangerous after effects. On this point, we shall quote the opinion of an influential Allopathic journalist:—'That which is called the most innocent medicine may be the source of the utmost harm. Thus, magnesia has been productive of fatal consequences. Masses unchanged have been found after death, closely collected together, or patches of the powder adhering with the utmost pertinacity to the intestines. Some very curious instances of this kind are upon record, and some of the cases have been from the apparently suspicious circumstances made subjects of investigation; for even deaths have been attributed to arsenic, when *post-mortem* examinations have shewn, that *magnesia* taken medicinally, not arsenic given as poison, was the destroying power."

Another prolific source of death, springs incidentally we admit, from the administration of large doses, and of which every reader will have too many instances in his recollection to require one here,—we refer to the frequent cases of accidental poisoning, arising from the wrong medicine being given,—as laudanum instead of tincture of rhubarb, &c. With such doses of dangerous medicines, a mistake is fatal, and from its speedy action tells its tale. How many are as surely poisoned, in whose cases, a sufficient interval of time elapses to avoid a coroner's inquest.

If such are the consequences of administering excessive doses of a single medicine,—what havoc is not produced by a combination of the two evils, excessive quantity, with absurd complexity.

Dr. Paris, already quoted, declares, that "simplicity should be regarded by the physician as the greatest desideratum." This is just what Homœopathists have done—they avoid complexity, and give their medicines singly, allowing each a sufficient time to produce its effects. When it is requisite, as not unfrequently happens, to administer more medicines than one, they are not jumbled together "to fight in the dark," but are given alternately, at sufficient intervals. This method must recommend itself to the judgment, as the only one founded on common sense, and capable of ascertaining, with any degree of certainty, the effects of the individual medicines; and were Dr. Paris, conscienteously, to carry his own declared opinion into practice, he would at once adopt the Homœopathic system, in the administration of a single medicine at a time.

Manchester:—H. TURNER, 41, Piccadilly,
And Sold by all Homœopathic Chemists.

POPULAR HOMŒOPATHIC TRACTS.

No. 8.

The Reception of Homœopathy.

No discovery of ancient or modern times has encountered more violent opposition than the subject of these tracts. Announcing, as it does, a uniform law of cure, which had hitherto been the great desideratum of the medical profession, and propounding a safe and sure method of treatment in place of the haphazard system of the old school, we might naturally have expected, that on its first announcement, the whole profession would have, with eager research, examined the merits of the new discovery. The profession of the physician is, from its very nature, one of great difficulty, and any discovery tending to obviate much of that difficulty ought certainly to have received their earnest study and attention. Instead of this, however, its founder, and all his followers, professional and lay, have been loaded with abuse—we need scarcely add, almost solely by medical men. Their ostensible objections to Homœopathy have been briefly considered in previous numbers, but these objections by no means account for the virulent character of the opposition. Pre-conceived notions, confirmed habits, education, and last, not least, a conviction that the craft by which they have their wealth is in no small danger—such are the obstacles to a fair investigation of the merits of Homœopathy. In its reception, however, this discovery is by no means singular. Let astronomy, geology, and above all medicine bear witness to the fiery persecution with which every new discovery has been hailed, if it in any way ran counter to the pre-conceived opinions of the dogmatizing representatives of the respective sciences. Familiar to all is the case of Galileo, whose heretical discovery of the rotation of the earth on its own axis, brought down upon him the anethemas of all the theologians and men of science of the day. The worthy philosopher was forced under Papal authority, and the pleasing prospect of the inquisition, to recant what they were pleased to call his errors. Nor was his daring heresy less obnoxious to Protestant than to Papal theologians. Turretin, whose works are used as text books, even in the present day, in theological seminaries, no doubt satisfactorily to himself and others, proved the *impossibility* of Galileo's proposition, for the following reasons which appear to us of the present day abundantly silly and trifling. First, because the Scriptures affirm that the sun rises and sets; secondly,

because the sun is declared to have stood still; thirdly, because the earth is said to be fixed immoveably; and fourthly, because birds which fly off from the earth, even for the space of an hour at a time, could never come back to their nests, for the earth would have revolved in that time 450 miles away from them. By arguments singularly akin to these has Homœopathy been also proved to be *impossible.*

The cases of Harvey and Jenner, in the medical profession, are so well known, that we shall only refer to them. The former, when he announced his famous discovery of the circulation of the blood, was loaded with the grossest abuse by his brethren, who adhered pertinaceously to their ignorant hypotheses and childish absurdities, leaving it to posterity to do justice at once to the philosophic discoverer and to his abusers. Jenner, who conferred lasting benefits on the human family, by his discovery of vaccination, incurred no less than Harvey, the paltry persecution of the profession, one of whom considered that the heretic was worthy of being hanged, and kindly volunteered to give his vote in that direction. Such is precisely the reception which Homœopathy has encountered. The following extracts will best illustrate the spirit in which it has been received by the profession:—We could multiply such so as to fill volumes, but must content ourselves with a very few, bearing first on Hahnemann himself, then as directed against his followers in the medical profession, and lastly, upon laymen, the patients of Homœopathic physicians.

"He (Hahnemann) discovered in 1790 the new system, which he afterwards designated Homœopathy, and a noteable discovery it was for him and his disciples, enabling them to carry on a system of cheating, with homicide, in defiance of the laws, and without fear of God or man. It was not however a new discovery, but a verification of a long established truth, that there is no absurdity or wickedness too great or extravagant for the credulous multitude to adopt; no form of iniquitious quackery, which, if plausibly and boldly put forward, will not secure its devotees and patrons. * * * That a man so acting (practising Homœopathy) is guilty of manslaughter, culpable homicide, and even murder, we have no doubt; and that certain folk who ride in their coaches and live in fine houses on the wages of their iniquity in this way, should be expiating their crimes in Australia, we have also no doubt; but circumstances alter cases, and criminals, patronised by silly lords and conceited ladies, are not to be treated like vulgar felons."—*Dublin Medical Press, July* 12, 1843.

Now this from the men who practise what one of themselves, Sir Astley Cooper, has declared to be "founded on conjecture, and improved by murder!" While it may be safely said, scarcely two Allopathists will be found to agree as to any style of treatment, they are wonderfully unanimous in their condemnation of the men who have adopted Homœopathy; and while the Scotch Colleges are silent as to their own innumerable diversities, they have endeavoured to refuse diplomas to students who have Homœopathic tendences.

The Royal College of Physicians, of London, has also resolved to refuse their license to any one who has adopted the new system. It must be remembered also, that those licensing bodies have no thirty-nine articles, no rule of faith or practice, their diplomas only testifying to the fact, that the bearer has attended certain classes, and successfully undergone certain examinations required upon the subjects taught in those classes; and in order to meet the cases of those who have abandoned Allopathy, and now practise Homœopathy, a code of resolutions have emanated from a conclave of the fraternity, whereby the bann of excommunication has been hurled upon the devoted heads of those, who, on due examination, have dared to differ from their brethren.

But not only are the Homœopathic physicians obnoxious to these intolerant spirits, the patients of Homœopathists have in an almost equal degree shared in the abuse. This has been directed chiefly against the higher and better educated classes, among whom the new doctrines have spread with amazing rapidity. The *Dublin Medical Press*, from which we have already quoted, referring to this subject (September 10th, 1845), says, "they are all equally ignorant, all equally uneducated. The rustic can dig and plough, can sow and reap. The lord knows a little Greek and some Latin, and the lady can speak French, perhaps Italian, but the one party is just as incapable of reasoning as the other, as unable to distinguish truth from falsehood. Nay, we will go farther, and state what we believe every man of experience will admit—that of the two, the lower order of society exhibits more of common sense, shrewdness, and observation, in matters medical, than the higher." As already indicated, we believe the virulence of the opposition clearly arises from the very important consideration that the craft is in danger. One after another, their patients, and these too, of the better paying class, are abandoning the old drug swallowing system. The poor, unread, and unacquainted with anything better, still adhere to the

falling cause, while the worthy doctors compliment the lower orders of society for exhibiting more of common sense, shrewdness, and observation, in matters medical, than the higher; they know well that the former class *don't pay so well*, and hence the abuse of the higher classes, who can read and judge for themselves in matters medical. Rising to the climax of their wrath, the *Lancet* has, so late as February 2nd, 1856, thundered forth the following anathema:—"When William III. was induced, on one single occasion, to lay his hand on a poor wretch, wishing to be cured of the king's evil, by the royal touch, he said, 'God give you better health and more sense.' We must confess that our wishes for the patients of the Homœopathic physicians are not so seemingly merciful, and that we are prone to utter such imprecations on them as would make the shade of Ernulphus walk disturbed. May your vigour of mind and body fail, your bones decay, your limbs be eaten by disease, your joints stiffen, and be everlastingly immoveable." Away with such abuse; shame on such ungentlemanly conduct; Homœopathy fights with no such weapons; its claim is, that it has established a definite and uniform law of cure, acting on which, the educated physician can cure three patients for every one that comes through the Allopathic hands; that it is a safe, sure, and inexpensive mode of cure, as compared with the other. It has no secrets, its medicines are all proclaimed with the effects they produce, both on health and disease. It courts inquiry. Its mode of treatment, as well as the results, are published to the world; and in answer to all this tornado of abuse, it says, *try it*, prove the statements we have made, which any honest man amongst you can do, and if false, expose them. Such is the answer which Homœopathy returns, to the abuse of which, a small sample is given above, and we leave the question with the public.

Will Shortly be Published.

No. 9. Obstacles to the Progress of Homœopathy.

Already Published.

No. 1. Allopathy, a random mode of Practice.
2. Homæopathy; What it is NOT.
3. Homœopathy. What it IS.
4. Comparative Results.
5. Medical Faith.
6. The Inappreciable Dose.
7. The Appreciable Dose, or Dangers of the Drug Shop.

MANCHESTER:—H. TURNER, 41, Piccadilly,
And Sold by all Homœopathic Chemists.

POPULAR HOMŒOPATHIC TRACTS.

No. 9.

Obstacles to the Progress of Homœopathy.

When Bacon introduced the inductive method of reasoning, he supplied the means of rescuing the sciences from the regions of conjecture and absurdity, and of establishing them on a solid and immoveable basis. Alchemy, enshrouded in darkness, and eagerly pursuing the phantom of the philosopher's stone, which, with its magic touch, was to transmute all things to gold, when shorn of its absurdities, by being brought to the test of rigid investigation, has emerged at length into the noble science of chemistry. In like manner the foolish pretensions of the astrologers have vanished before the method of inductive reasoning, and the sublime science of astronomy has risen in its stead. Unfortunately for medicine, it still, as a whole, occupies the lower position, so that, instead of ranking as a science, it must be classed among those subjects which are termed empirical, that is, which merely rest on *opinions*, and not on *ascertained and established facts*. Hahnemann was the first who can be said to have applied to medicine the method of induction, that is, ascertaining indisputable facts, and thence deducing the consequences, which, as a necessary result, must follow. While this is the only safe and satisfactory method, it is one which requires no small amount of labour and patient research, and this of itself, to the majority of men, is an obstacle in the way of progressive acquirements. Especially is this true of medical men, in whose case many other reasons weigh in addition to that unwillingness to undertake laborious investigations, which is common to humanity. Their whole education and professional studies pre-dispose them against entering on a new field of research, on a subject on which they imagine that they have already acquired the collective wisdom of generations. Their pride naturally rises against the admission that their previous acquirements were erroneous, their mode of treatment fallacious and unsafe, and that their whole practice abounds in absurdities and inconsistencies. Especially must these considerations stand in the way of aged men, whose case is well expressed by one of themselves, when he says, "the trouble is immense, and I have grown idle." Again, the consideration arising from the present sacrifice of income, is one which few men can

afford to overlook; and a change of system, on the part of a medical man, almost of necessity, implies a very considerable breaking up of his former connections, and it will, of course, require some time to form new ones.

The extremely uncharitable resolutions of those who arrogate to themselves the sole claim, to be considered the "faculty," have greatly tended to intimidate those who might have wished to satisfy their own minds by investigation; their doing so, should it become known, being tantamount to an exclusion from the profession altogether. Notwithstanding this, it is a notorious fact, which, in our own experience, we can confirm to some extent, at least, that there are numbers of Allopathic physicians practising Homœopathy *sub rosa*. No doubt when they have sufficiently tested its efficiency, these will be found, as has always been the case hitherto, openly to declare themselves. The resolutions of several of the colleges to refuse their diplomas to students who are known to have Homœopathic tendencies, is another means for forcibly repressing the study of the science. Were the professors who form the licensing body in those colleges, to examine the question themselves, and if able to do so without being convinced of its truth, let them place before their students the results of the experiments which they had made, and which had proved satisfactory to their own mind. By this course they would more properly discharge the duties of their office, than by refusing diplomas to young men who may be desirous of trying the efficacy of the new system. Be it here observed, as before shown, that there exists no uniformity in the Allopathic practice—that it is nothing but a mass of absurd contradictions and diversities—yet all these differences in opinion and practice are allowed without challenge. The Homœopathic system is the *one forbidden* method, and those who condemn it boast that they have never examined whether it is true or false, even while they cannot deny its success in effecting cures.

Another obstacle in the way of the progress of Homœopathy, is found in the utter exclusion from the ordinary *Medical Reviews* and periodicals of all articles on the subject, except such as virulently abuse it. From this circumstance the great majority of the profession are prevented from acquiring any knowledge of the question, beyond those false and calumnious representations of it, of which a few specimens were given in our last tract. Common honour and honesty would dictate that the same channel which is opened to abuse the system, should also be opened for its defence, or at least for a refutation of the false and calmu-

nious statements. This, however, not being the case, a fair discussion of the merits of the system is prevented, and the majority of the profession consider it necessary to ridicule and contemn that which is so treated by the magnates who edit the reviews. Keeping the practitioners in the dark, of course, prevents to a great extent the knowledge of the question among the mass of the population, who rarely hear of it at all, or only hear it scoffed at, unless there be some one either lay or professional, who can display its merits in practice, or testify to its efficiency in his own person or experience. The fallacy carefully disseminated that Homœopathy is synonymous with small doses, is also a barrier in the way; the very unlikelihood of doses, so small, having any effect, being a stumbling block in the way of those who have not fully examined the system. The want of medical practitioners in the meantime is also a great difficulty and obstacle in the way of Homœopathy. Those who would prefer to employ Homœopathic physicians must incur great expense in calling them to their aid from a great distance, and in cases of sudden emergency, even this is impossible. They are, therefore left, either to act for themselves without medical aid, or to avail themselves of the only aid at hand, Allopathic though it be. They are tempted to resort to the latter course from the difficulty which they experience in satisfactorily ascertaining the nature of the disease, and as it is expressed in order to save reflections, though we consider that any intelligent person, with a good medical guide book, and a case of medicines, would be much more likely to be successful than any Allopathic physician, for this simple reason, that the former is in the right course, while we believe that the other is decidedly in the wrong.

Be it understood, that it is only in cases where a physician is not at hand, or where the ailment is only slight, that we would recommend unprofessional persons to practice Homœopathy. The difficulties in ascertaining the nature of disease are as great to a Homœopathic as to an Allopathic physician, and a knowledge of the anatomy of the human frame, coupled with experience, are requisite, in order to successful treatment. There is the further important matter of the selection of the proper medicine in which the experience of a thoughtful and observant physician is invaluable.

The want of success on the part of those over zealous amateur practitioners is itself a barrier in the way of Homœopathy. Their ignorance of many of the first essentials as regards the nature of the disease, the physical

condition of the organs affected, and especially the causes which have produced, or are calculated to produce such a morbid condition, render it impossible to be at all successful. They may observe certain symptoms, and to the best of their ability select a remedy, but from ignorance of many most important matters may not select that one which is Homœopathic to the case, and in consequence may be completely disappointed as to the expected results. As too often happens, this disappointment, instead of being placed to the credit of ignorance on the part of such dabblers, is charged to Homœopathy itself; and as we have, more than once, had occasion to hear Homœopathy set down as useless, or as a humbug, because in the hands of such unskilful practitioners it had not worked miracles. Thus, in regard to Homœopathy, the words of the poet are more than ordinarily true; "A little knowledge is a dangerous thing." We would much rather see such indiscreet friends continue to avail themselves of any treatment, except the Homœopathic, until they can obtain the aid of a Homœopathic physician, or until they have more perfectly informed themselves upon the subject, a course to which we very cordially invite them. To prevent the possibility of his motives being misconstrued, the writer may again take the liberty of indicating that he is only a lay disciple of Homœopathy himself, and that he only here records his own personal conviction and experience. To refer only to one other obstacle: we all know how delicate and difficult it is to discard the "family physicians," many of whom have for years been but too frequent visitors in our households, and in many cases both deserve, and have secured our affection and respect.

Such are a few of the difficulties in the way of the progress of Homœopathy, but they are chiefly difficulties common to every new discovery, and time will speedily remove them all. Time is speedily removing them, and the wonderful rapidity of the progress of Homœopathy is at once encouraging to its friends, and alarming to those interested in opposing it. In our next tract we shall give some details of the present state of Homœopathy at home and abroad.

MANCHESTER:—H. TURNER, 41, Piccadilly,
And Sold by all Homœopathic Chemists.

POPULAR HOMŒOPATHIC TRACTS.

No. 10.

The Progress of Homœopathy.

"Quem metuunt, odêre: quem quisque odit, periisse expetit."—*Ennius.*

What people *fear*, they *hate;* what any one hates, he anxiously desires to see destroyed.—*Freely translated.*

On its first introduction into this country Homœopathy was met by such a storm of opposition as few modern discoveries have encountered. The most violent abuse and persecution were directed against all who joined its ranks, and in short it was attempted to be put down by "force of arms." Associations were formed in order to bring the combined energies of the "faculty" to bear in an unbroken phalanx on the small troop of invaders, and to crush them at a blow. They were branded as quacks, and so far as that was possible, expelled from the ranks of the profession. Their names were struck out of the Medical Calendar and Directory by the suffrages of the "regulars," couched in many cases in language all but diabolical. In spite of all this "energetic treatment" on the part of the Allopaths, the new-born heresy, as they called it, grew and prospered. Suddenly they seem to have gathered some experience from history, and to have become alive to the fact, that such persecution was a ready means of forcing the cause into fame, for no doubt, in this case, as in others, on-lookers were led to inquire into those new doctrines which were every where spoken against. Having made this discovery, "the faculty" seem to have bethought them to make no mention of the name of Homœopathy where it could be avoided, and where it could not be avoided, to speak of it with scorn and contempt, and with a supercilious curl of the lip, as if it were a subject unworthy of their notice. The old spirit, sorely pent up, and unwillingly confined, does occasionally even yet spurt out, and in the *Lancet* and such like periodicals, the abusive language appears, of which the *unhallowed benediction* of the patients of Homœopathists, quoted in a previous tract (No. 8), may be taken as a specimen. With such exceptional ebullitions, however different tactics are at present generally adopted, and making less noise about Homœopathy themselves, they pretend that it is on the decline. Whether their own quiet demeanour in regard to Homœopathy really has the effect

of making them believe that it is not increasing, or whether they only pretend to believe so, is all the same to us, certain it is that they are very sedulous in disseminating the mistake that "Homœopathy is every where going down." Perhaps they really do make themselves believe that such is the case, their earnest "wish being father to their thought." For the sake of those gentlemen (should it by any chance fall into their hands), but more especially for the public in general, into whose hands it may probably fall, we purpose, in this tract, to supply such information as shall prove a totally different state of things. The adherents of Homœopathy among physicians embraces many thousands of the most highly educated men in the profession; and over Europe and America its adherents among the laity are numbered by millions, embracing all ranks of society.

Only sixty years have passed since the theory which we advocate *(similia similibus curantur)* was first published to the world. At once did the apothecaries and physicians discern that this new system was destined to effect a wonderful revolution in existing dogmas, and above all, that by its progress, their craft must be not a little endangered. They therefore early commenced their persecuting career, and succeeded in driving Hahnemann from place to place, till, in 1810, he found a temporary refuge, and crowds of patients in Leipsic. By a vigorous combination of his enemies, however, he was expelled from that town, but finding protection in a neighbouring principality, he was destined to see a demonstration of the adage, "Great is the force of truth, and it will prevail." After an uninterrupted and almost unprecedented career, he died at Paris, in 1843, full of years, seeing all his efforts crowned with success, his name known and honoured over the civilized world, and his discovery spreading, and every day gaining new adherents.

A few years before the death of Hahnemann, his doctrines had spread into Great Britain, where they were attended by the usual success.

By the last returns within our reach the fully qualified and authorised physicians practising in England alone exceed 200, and in the United Kingdom, from 240 to 250. In London alone there are not fewer than 71 practising physicians, embracing in that number some of the most eminent medical men in the metropolis—eminent even in the Allopathic ranks before they were acquainted with that better system, to which they have added the weight of their education and position. In the City of Manchester there

are now sixteen practising physicians, and few towns of any consequence in England have not one or more Homœopathic physicians. In Edinburgh there are seven physicians, including in that number one of the medical professors in the University (Dr. Henderson). In Ireland, also, it is making progress; and though, as yet, there are not many physicians there, it reckons among its lay adherents, perhaps the most profound reasoner and eminent logician of the age, Dr. Whatley, Archbishop of Dublin, a man who is not likely to adopt any theory without well weighing the evidence on which it rests. While the number of physicians is thus already very considerable, and increasing in a very rapid ratio, in spite of all the obstacles which, as already shown, have been thrown in the way by the Colleges, &c., the number of adherents among the people is in far greater proportion, and includes some of the highest nobles and most eminent scholars in the land. As an illustration of this statement, we shall here give the names of the patrons and office-bearers of the London Homœopathic Hospital, founded in 1849.

Patroness, Her Royal Highness the Duchess of Cambridge; Vice-Patron, His Grace the Duke of Beaufort; President, The Right Honourable the Earl of Wilton; Vice-Presidents, His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin; Right Hon. the Earl of Albermarle; Right Hon. the Earl of Essex; Right Hon. the Viscount Sidney; The Viscount Maldon; Lord Francis Gordon; Captain, Lord C. Paget, R.N., M.P.; Captain, Lord A. Paget, M.P.; Colonel, Lord G. Paget, M.P.; Right Hon. Lord Robt. Grosvenor; Right Hon. the Lord Gray; Sir Charles Askam, Bart.; Charles Powell Leslie, Esq., M.P.; Colonel Wyndham; F. Foster Quin, Esq., M.D.; Marmaduke B. Sampson, Esq.

In the United Kingdom there are now several Homœopathic Hospitals where patients are received into the house, and treated there, and above 70 Dispensaries where patients have an opportunity of consulting Homœopathic physicians. Many, or most of these latter institutions, also, combine a system of visiting at their own houses patients unable to attend at the Dispensary. There are also nine associations formed for the purpose of promoting the cause, publishing treatises on the subject, protecting its adherents from any attempts to crush them by any medical bill of pains and penalties, such as have already been attempted to be smuggled through the houses of parliament, and to watch over the interests of the science generally.

It is also worthy of notice, that in addition to a large number of private individuals treating their horses and

cattle Homœopathically, there are at least seven licensed veterinary surgeons practising on that system. So much, then, for our own country; and looking at the facts above detailed, we cannot but feel astonished at the rapid progress it has made in so short a period. Surely this does not look like going down.

It is impossible for us to give anything like the exact number of physicians practising Homœopathy on the continent. But in every country of Europe, and from Saint Petersburgh to Lisbon, the cause is rapidly advancing. There are between 400 and 500 in France alone, and over central Europe they are even more numerous in proportion. There are at least 15 Homœopathic Hospitals, one of them receiving an average of nearly 1,000 patients per annum. The number of Dispensaries is very great, and these, with the Hospitals, are conferring the benefits of an enlightened system of medicine on hundreds of thousands.

In America, also, the cause has made immense progress. There are not fewer than 3,000 Homœopathic physicians in the United States alone, and this number is rapidly augmenting. There are two Homœopathic Colleges, with a full staff of professors, established by legislative enactment; and a third, if not already opened, will immediately be so. In order to show the success attending these Colleges, we may mention that the College in Pennsylvania, opened in 1848, was attended in its first session by 16 students, and in the session of 1854, the number was 93. There are also several Hospitals, and a great number of Dispensaries.

There are above 40 professors in Universities who have adopted Homœopathy. Two of these are in Scotland. There are also reckoned above 20 court physicians, and 35 court and medical councillors, who have embraced the new doctrines.

Does this look like Homœopathy going down?

POPULAR HOMŒOPATHIC TRACTS.

No. 11.

Allopathic Evidence in favour of Homœopathy.

The reception which Homœopathy has experienced at the hands of the adherents of the old school has been already freely adverted to in previous numbers of this series. We have seen that the violent, and not unfrequently, vulgar abuse, with which it has been bespattered, has not been effectual in checking the progress of the science, either amongst the profession, or the public. We have seen, also, that there is not an authenticated case where a medical man has given Homœopathy a fair trial, without adopting it. The abuse then comes from men who have no right to express an opinion, who are not in a position to do so, from this single consideration, that they have not examined the merits of the question,

As might have been expected in this numerous list of practitioners, there are found some men of sufficient liberality of mind to look upon the new opinions, and the promoters thereof, in the spirit which usually animates the breasts of our countrymen, and forms a grand element in our national freedom, that every man must be held innocent till he is proved to be guilty. As may naturally be supposed, such liberality of sentiment will be found in men of the first rank in their profession, and not in the promiscuous crowd of mediocre practitioners. We have already referred (Tract No. 1) to the fearless declarations of Dr. Forbes, physician in ordinary to the Queen's household, as to the powerlessness of all Allopathic treatment. The following presents his opinions as to the claims of Homœopathy.

"As an established form of practical medicine, as a great fact in the history of our art, we must *nolentes volentes*, consider Homœopathy. Not only do we see all our ordinary curable diseases cured in a fair proportion under the Homœopathic method of treatment, but even all the severer and more dangerous diseases which most physicians, of whatever school, have been acustomed to consider as not only needing the interposition of art to assist nature in bringing them to a favourable and speedy termination, but demanding the employment of prompt and strong measures to prevent a fatal issue in a considerable proportion of cases."

The following extracts—we wish that space permitted us to enlarge the quotations,—are from the pen of the late Dr. Andrew Combe, and contrasts nobly with the paltry spirit and abusive language of meaner men.

"Let us scout quacks and pretenders as we may, Homœopathy

presents too strong a *primâ facie* case to warrant our dismissing it with mere ridicule and contempt. * * * View the question as we may, *one of three things must be:* either Homœopathy is true, or it is false, or it is a mixture of truth and error. Let us suppose the worst, and hold it to be false in its foundation, and false in its superstructure; what harm can result from putting it to the test, and ascertaining the fact demonstrably. None whatever; but on the contrary, much good. We shall at least have gained the power of giving a direct and authoritative negative to its allegations, which we shall then prove to be fallacious, and which have been suffered to reign and diffuse themselves for thirty years, from the absence of direct counter-evidence by which to rebut them. * * * If we adopt the supposition that Homœopathy embodies an admixture of truth and error, the inducement to institute a rigid and careful inquiry into its claims becomes still more imperative, that we may obtain possession of the one and carefully avoid the other. * * This can be done only by careful investigation; and that such investigation would be amply rewarded may fairly be presumed from the good already effected by Homœopathy in demonstrating the evils attendant on that over-active medication, which characterizes so much, especially of English practice.

"The remaining, although unlikely, supposition, namely, that Homœopathy shall prove essentially true in its fundamental principle, and, consequently fraught with benefits to science and humanity, as its advocates affirm it to be, need not detain us more than a moment. If true, how much more shall we then have reason to rejoice that we did not look upon its claims with prejudiced eyes, or reject and condemn it unheard and unexamined! Had Harvey's detractors examined his facts first, and then given their verdict, how different would the results have been to themselves, to him, and to mankind! And yet, in our own day, the profession acted towards Jenner, and also towards Gall, as if Harvey's name and memory had been blotted from the page of history. * * * Ridicule and declamation may be rightly employed to explode errors *after they shall have been proved to be so,* but they are most unfit instruments for the primary investigation of truth, and as such, ought to be banished for ever from scientific discussion, and a candid spirit of philosophical inquiry be substituted in their room. I have had no personal experience of Homœopathy, and am consequently as little inclined to admit as to reject its claims."—*British and Foreign Medical Review,* April, 1846.

We find the world-wide renowned surgeon, the late Mr. Liston, expressing himself in a similar strain of calm and honest inquiry. He had been induced by Dr. Quin to adopt the Homœopathic medicines in the treatment of erysipelas, and with very marked success. In alluding to this, in his addresses to his students, he was unavoidably led to refer to the new theory of medicine. The following is a very short extract from his remarks:—

"You know that this medicine is recommended by the Homœopathists in this affection, because it produces on the skin a fiery eruption or efflorescence, accompanied by inflammatory fever. * * * I believe in the Homœopathic doctrines to a certain extent, but I cannot, as yet, from inexperience on the subject, go the length its advocates would wish, in as far as regards the very minute doses of some of their medicines. The medicines, in the above cases, were certainly given in mnch smaller doses than have hitherto ever been prescribed. The beneficial effects, as you witnessed, are unquestion-

able. I have, however, seen similar good effects of the Belladonna, prepared according to the Homœopathic pharmacopœia, in a case of very severe erysipelas of the head and face, under the care of my friend, Dr. Quin. The inflammatory symptoms and local signs disappeared with very great rapidity. Without adopting the theory of this medical sect, you ought not to reject its doctrines without due examination and inquiry."

When cholera last raged in London a Medical Board was appointed to obtain statistics as to the different modes of treatment, and Allopathic inspectors were appointed to visit the various hospitals. In a former tract (No. 4) we referred to the circumstance that the returns from the Homœopathic Hospitals, presenting as they did such a contrast to the others, were rejected by the Medical Board altogether. Dr. M'Loughlin, however, one of the inspectors, recorded his views in a remarkable letter, of which, space only permits us to quote the concluding paragraph.

"In conclusion, I must repeat to you, what I have already told you, and what I have told every one with whom I have conversed, that although an Allopath by principle, education, and practice, yet were it the will of Providence to afflict me with cholera, and to deprive me of the power of prescribing for myself, I would rather be in the hands of a Homœopathic than an Allopathic adviser."

Such are a few examples of voluntary testimony in favour of the science, and of the manner in which it ought to be received; but, perhaps, the tacit testimony of the general body of practitioners is even stronger evidence in favour of the superiority of the system. Contemporaneously with the rise and spread of Homœopathic opinions, and, in consequence thereof, a complete revolution has been gradually achieved even in Allopathic practice. Witness the almost total abandonment of the bleeding system so lately resorted to on nearly every occasion. Professor Bennett, of Edinburgh, now condemns the system out and out, and Dr. John Reid, in his work on the Nervous System, gives it as his opinion, that "less slaughter has been effected by the sword than by the lancet, that minute instrument of mighty mischief."

The great improvement, so universally in progress, of diminishing the quantity of medicine administered, is now too marked to escape the attention of any one. It is a blessed improvement which every one hails with unmingled satisfaction. Improvement is also taking place in the complexity of the dose, all which improvements are the direct result of the progress of Homœopathic opinions. Did space permit we could show the effect of Homœopathic views creeping into the Allopathic treatment of almost every separate disease. This silent revolution, this tacit homage to the merits of Homœopathy is highly valuable and encouraging. There is another class of evidences which every day seem to increase, we mean the direct, though unacknowledged adoption of Homœopathic remedies by the Allopathic practitioners. It would be tedious to record all these, but ever and anon, we hear of one medicine and another being discovered to be efficacious in particular diseases. These *discoveries* are announced with a flourish of trumpets, as new, while they have for half a century been regularly employed by Homœopathists in those diseases. It would be more creditable were the source of the discovery honestly admitted and acknowledged. Among those adoptions we may mention the use of aconite, nux vomica, carbo-vegetabilis, belladonna, and others, in the

diseases for which Homœopathists have long employed them. Perhaps no medicine has been more generally adopted in this manner than the last named, belladonna. We have already referred to its use in erysipelas. It is also the specific in scarlet fever, the characteristic symptoms of which disease closely resembles the effects of an excessive dose of belladonna. It may here also be mentioned, that there is a well established conviction, that the medicine is largely efficacious as a preventative of that disease, and that where the disease is not altogether prevented, its severity is mitigated. The following advertisement, extracted from a provincial paper, will afford an illustration of Allopathic thefts.

"BELLADONNA.--The above medicine, so successfully used in Germany and France, for the prevention of scarlet fever, may be obtained in the form of mixture, with full and specific instructions for use, from J. M. ——, pharmaceutical chemist, 46, H. —— S., —— G.——

N.B.—Dr. Neligan, of Dublin, says, 'amongst the most recent investigations on this subject, may be cited those of M. Lecomte, of Paris, in which 2,227 children and adults have been preserved from scarletina by its use; those at Langendorf, in Prussia, where, in the Orphan Hospital, out of 160 inmates, to whom the drug was administered immediately on the breaking out of an epidemic, but two contracted the disease; and those of Dr. Newbigging, in Watson's Institution, in Edinburgh, where, out of 69 children exposed to the contagion, but three took the disease.'—October 16, 1856."

Dr. Neligan's *Materia Medica* is one of the standard authorities, if not the first, in Allopathic schools of the present day. We are glad to see progress being made in the right direction; but any thinking reader of the above advertisement must be struck with the absurdity, that while belladonna is the *acknowledged source of the cure*, yet true to their Allopathic instincts they must confound it in a *mixture*, the other ingredients of which are not even pretended to have any share in the cure, and most probably tend to destroy the only ingredient that has.

In conclusion, we cannot refrain from making a quotation from the *Eclectic Review*, (December, 1855). "If Homœopathy be what it is sometimes called, a humbug, why may not the humbug be made known to the world? and if it be what it professes to be, the only safe and rational system for the treatment of disease, why should not the public generally be made acquainted with its blessings? The contest has long been going on between Homœopathic and Allopathic doctors, and why may it not now be brought to a termination? Why not have an opportunity afforded to detect its fallacy, or establish its truth? Let a ward, in some of our Hospitals, be thrown open to Homœopathic physicians, and let them stand or fall by the result. If they cure their patients in shorter time and with less suffering than do the Allopathic theirs, let Homœopathy be freed from further censure. If they fail to cure them, let Homœopathy be consigned to the destruction, which failure is sure to involve. This is a fair way of settling the difference; and if the Allopathic physicians be sincere in their belief that Homœopathy is a humbug, they have nothing to fear from the trial, and therefore we should imagine they would hail the opportunity of raising their profession on the ruins of what they have so long despised."

This is just such a test as Homœopathists crave. *They* fear not the result. Nay, by such an experiment, fairly and equitably carried out, they would rejoice to stand or fall.

MANCHESTER:—H. TURNER. 41, Piccadilly,
And Sold by all Homœopathic Chemists.

POPULAR HOMŒOPATHIC TRACTS.

No. 12.

Medical Absurdities.

In an early number we affirmed, that the healing art had, from time immemorial, been a system of absurd dogmas, holding sway for a short period, to be succeeded by others almost equally absurd. In the present number we purpose very shortly to illustrate the truth of that averment.

Among the most ancient theories of medicine was that of the early Egyptians, who maintained that the human body was divided into 36 portions, each under the special protection of a particular demon or spirit, whose aid it was the part of the physician to invoke. It was not till the time of Hippocrates, who has been styled the father of medicine, that a definite practice of any kind was adopted, and undoubtedly we must give him credit for a very decided advancement in the art. While much that he proposed and practised is scarcely, if at all, improved upon at the present day, much also has been long since exploded. His medical creed was expressed in the following laconic formula:—"When medicine fails, use the knife, if the knife fails, use fire." Each of these three agents has had its period of special popularity, and none more—nor for a longer period than the last, viz., fire, the dying embers of which, even at the present day, are ever and anon fanned into activity for the torture of some unfortunate victim. Little more than a century has closed upon the barbarous practice which makes the flesh shudder to contemplate, of pouring *boiling oil* into gunshot wounds, when the lingering spark of life in the soldier, lying wounded on the battle field, was ruthlessly expelled, by pouring boiling oil into his wounds. In like manner, boiling pitch, and other similar substances, were freely applied by those plutonic scourges, who, to use their own language, "gloried in the Divine virtues of fire." Nor has the knife been less active in its sphere, from the days of Hippocrates, to the present time. That worthy father of medicine resorted to the operation called the "trepan," as a cure for head-ache. By the help of his saw, he opened the skull to let out the head-ache. Surely he was a believer in demoniacal possession. One of his successors, Praxagoras, of Cos, scrupled not to make incisions into the bowels in order to remove any obstructions which refused to yield to simple aperients. And Herophilus did not hesitate to open a way to the liver, and apply a blister

to its naked surface, when it had dared to depart from a healthy condition. The absurdity of these operations is calculated to excite a smile even in spite of the cruelty involved in them; but while we smile at these, are we in a much better condition now? Substitute the lancet for the knife or saw, and we will find that scarcely less atrocity exists, and is openly perpetrated at the present day, against the *blood*, which is the *life* of man, than existed in the atrocious performances of those ancient sons of Æsculapius. In our last, we referred to a growing opposition, even among Allopaths, to the destructive habit of blood letting, and quoted the opinion of one well able to give it, that more had been slain by the lancet than by the sword. Still the practice is by no means exploded, nor is it likely to be so for some time to come, though it is difficult to see on what ground it is defended. Those who really have any reason for what they do, have been led to argue for its use in cases of inflammation, on the following grounds, which at first sight carry with them a show of reason. They affirm that the first step towards inflammation is a state of congestion of the blood in the organ or region affected—that unless this surcharge of blood be removed, it, or rather its serum exudes, and becomes deposited on the tissue of the organ—and then, what is ordinarily called inflammation—ensues, and that the purpose of bleeding is to withdraw this surcharge of blood, thus giving relief to the congested vessels, and preventing the other consequences. Now, as already stated, this carries with it a show of reason, but, on examination, the reasoning will be found fallacious for the following considerations:—That the abstraction of blood affects the whole quantity in the body, and not any particular locality, an almost immediate equalization taking place throughout the whole system. From this circumstance, it follows, that any moderate quantity abstracted would not materially affect any particular part, even though the arteries were to retain their undiminished size; but this is not the case, and herein lies the fatal objection to their plausible reasoning. The arteries are composed of various coatings, which, for our purpose, need not be specified beyond two, a longitudinal muscular coating,—that is, muscles running the length way of the blood-vessel, and a circular muscular coating—that is, a series of muscles which act in compressing the vessel. Now, the moment any quantity of blood is abstracted, by the action of these latter muscles, the vessel instantly adapts itself to the diminished quantity; so that, unless the victim be bled almost to death, the vessels will always be as *full*, though not so large as

they were before the blood was abstracted. Let us not however suppose that any considerable number of the profession adopt even such a plausible theory as the above. We all know that, popularly, the reason for abstracting the blood is, the allegation that the blood is bad, and ought to be removed. The question immediately stares us in the face, how can the removal of a portion of *bad* blood out of the system ever make what remains *good?* It will certainly diminish the quantity, but not improve the quality. Nor is this merely a popular theory as may be established by the following case, for which we can personally vouch, and which occurred only last year, (1855), within the circle of our own acquaintance, and almost within the shadow of perhaps the most renowned medical school in the three kingdoms, but where unfortunately there exists no coroner's inquest. The victim was a man in middle life, in the middle ranks in society, and his disease was inflammation of the lungs. The operator was a duly qualified practitioner of what is called orthodox medicine. He abstracted plateful after plateful of what he called bad blood, and at length, to his great satisfaction, obtained a cupful of what he was pleased to call *good* blood, but unfortunately for the poor patient, it was the last blood in his body, and he died in his —— hands. We leave our readers to fill up the blank with any word they think proper.

In connection with this subject it may not be uninteresting to present to the reader a specimen of the kind of *definite* guides which Allopathic authors give to their followers in adopting this fatal mode of treatment.

Delirium Tremens.—" In young and vigorous subjects, and when there exists evidence of local determination, a single moderate bleeding from the arm, or the application of leeches to the temples, or behind the ears, *may prove useful;* but the bleeding should never be large, *and very seldom will it be proper to repeat it,* while generally speaking, it should be rejected as a practice *which has too often done mischief, and has not unfrequently destroyed the patient.*"—*Cyclopædia of Practical Medicine.*

Dropsy.—The cure may be begun by blood letting in certain conditions; but in others it cannot be employed without danger. It gives relief in difficult breathing, *but after it is practised, the symptoms are aggravated and rendered more obstinate.* It is not to be concealed that some persons have been cured by repeated blood letting or spontaneous hœmorrages, *but it is at the same time known that such a remedy importunely employed has in many instances hastened on the fatal event.*"—*Leutaud.*

The amazing complexity of medicines also is one of the most extraordinary instances of absurdity which ever entered into the practice of any art. In ancient times it was by no means uncommon to employ as many as 200 or 300 ingredients in the composition of a medicine, and even so late as about 70 years ago, two of the most popular medicines, known as Venice Treacle and Mithridate, contained 65 and 50 ingredients respectively. This enormous complexity was much modified by the influence of Sydenham, one of the most eminent physicians which our country has produced in its darker days, and the 200 or 300 ingredients were reduced to from 20 to 60. In our own day they are still further reduced to 6 or 8. Dr. Paris declares that simplicity in composition cannot be too much attended to, and abuses Homœopathists for acting on the only sensible plan of giving a single medicine at a time. But not only was complexity not the only fault of the medicines before Sydenham's days; every known unmentionable substance, the excrements of every attainable animal, including the human family, were employed in their abominable pharmacopœia. The following decoction may be taken as a specimen, and not to shock common decency, one *comparatively unobjectionable* is selected :—

Take of the milldew from human skulls, a sufficiency of worms, &c., and thereof make a *delectable broth* for the dainty appetite of some unfortunate invalid. The world would not believe the monstrous atrocities which have been perpetrated upon them by doctors. Did space permit, we might in the same manner trace a tissue of absurdities in the progress of every branch of medical treatment. There are few diseases which have experienced greater revolutions in treatment than the class of fevers. The ancient practice is well illustrated in the case of the Emperor Maximillian, of Austria (father of Maria Theresa), who, on the most approved practice of the day, was treated for scarlet fever, by being encased or swaddled in 30 yards of broad cloth (scarlet, we believe). It is in the memory of all who have attained the age of 20 years, that fevers in general were treated about that time very differently from what they are now. When the raging fire of fever was parching the languishing patient, there was no lack of drugs, but not a drop of pure liquid was allowed, not a drop of water to cool the parched tongue, nor a breath of fresh air to exhilerate the languid frame. The same fevers now are treated, if it can be called medical treatment at all, by copious supplies of water or brandy, and free ventilation.

It is this total want of a guiding star of settled principle that has given rise to all the host of quacks and impostors which has in all ages disgraced the medical profession. Hence has sprung the Valentine Greatrakes, the St. John Longs, the Morrisons *et hoc genus omne*, the theories and practice of some of whom are too abominable to be recorded. The grand error of even the most respectable of these is, that one medicine or mode of treatment is maintained as a *panacea*, a cure for all diseases. No one mode of treatment, whatever it be, can possibly cure every form of disease. Each must be examined on its own merits, and treated accordingly. Herein Homœopathy differs from all the quackeries above adverted to, and in the possession of a sure and certain guide in the selection of the medicines suitable to each particular disease, it differs from, and rises superior to, Allopathy, which, properly examined, is the most gigantic system of ill compacted quackery which the world has ever seen.

MANCHESTER :—H. TURNER, 41, Piccadilly,
And Sold by all Homœopathic Chemists.