

## PRESCRIPTION FACTORS

By John Hutchinson, M. D., New York, N. Y.

The striking importance to homeopathy of diagnostic symptomatology may not be depreciated. Detection of the nature and the pathological manifestations of illness—the diagnosis of disease—is inevitable routine in successful practice of medicine. Whatever serves to outline the *status praesens* which the physician has to meet, he will investigate. In a very large sense recognition of the location of implied disorder is indispensable as holding his attention to the definite task thrust upon him. Diagnostic symptomatology is always available.

Prescription symptomatology grows out of the same pathological field. It is intimate in origin with all the diagnostic detail, so that it would be useless to try to establish any barrier whatever between the two classifications. It is true that sometimes a sharp line of demarcation has been drawn, due doubtless to the distinction made in comparative practical values, but may we not say that this line is often more imaginary than real? We certainly have no quarrel with its possible reality, however, provided both classifications exist. While the function of each may be studied separately, it should be remembered that the origin of both is the same sickness and the same patient. As a matter of fact, the background of the case—its diagnostic character—heightens the picture of a special or unique therapeutic demand.

While the prescription is not made on the diagnosis, neither is it properly made without a diagnosis. No one who understands homeopathy is bewildered by diagnostic requirements, for the simple reason that those requirements are uncovered by the finer examination of the features of the case—the very highest grade of diagnosis—an examination concerned with the most delicate departures of the whole organism from its normal.

Popular diagnosis often deals with a small section of the patient. It may isolate and even remove that section, and yet become no wiser than before. Consequently, much antemortem designation and conclusion is disproved postmortem. The tendency to lay most of the blame of some specified malady to one or two organs does not secure proper indorsement. In the case of an interstitial nephritis it has not always been safe to declare it the cause of death; too often the autopsy discloses a fairly competent kidney, while nearly every other viscus is advanced in dis-

ease peculiar to itself. In fact, the statistics of diagnosis and pathological findings nowadays in the ranks of their specialists evidence that in some way the great point of the curative effort is missed. We take it that this would not be the case if prescription symptomatology were better accomplished. The latter often calls for a remedy whose proving discloses a veritable diagnosis in the given case.

Fever, dicrotic pulse, facial herpes, intense headache of sudden onset, inability to think while at work, make an important group of diagnostic symptoms, and point the way to further research. The latter being made, all subjective items elicited, along with important modalities, we have not only our diagnosis but our prescription as well, and the two are in no way antagonistic. Neither would they have been antagonistic if the order of the consideration of the two classes of symptoms had been reversed.

How often has the symptom-complex at the onset of pleurisy enabled us to prescribe the curative remedy that has put an immediate end to invasion. The characteristic dorsal chilliness, the thoracic pain with or without respiratory effort, coupled with the peculiar complaints including mental states sure to accompany the condition, have promptly led to the aconite, ranunculus, or other clearly-indicated remedy, with the result of complete triumph of the only order of preventive medicine related to purely medical care.

What is the diagnosis when a malignant case has been surgically operated and the malignant process permitted to enter the general circulation, making the organism much worse off than before? That is a diagnosis that only homeopathy can make—perhaps only its remedy detect—and so follow it with a prescription of what is demanded, though it be too late to cancel the harm already done.

What is the diagnosis after serum treatment when the patient is dying? It is all very true to say "cardiac failure," but such a certificate is silent on what ought to be known.

What is the diagnosis in ptomain poisoning when remedial efforts have been wholly inappropriate, and homeopathy provides lachesis, or carbo vegetabilis, or arsenicum, or whatever remedy the simillimum may be?

What is the diagnosis in diphtheria when antitoxin has not helped but hindered? What in pneumonia when the call for a remedy is imperative, and the patient does not get it because the

law of correspondence between a remedy proving and a pathological process in different stages is not understood? Adequate diagnosis takes all these things into account.

Hahnemann made most thorough physical examinations of his patients, employed the general diagnostic appellation, but also went much further by setting his individual patient apart by describing his illness as a "*species*" of the named complaint; emphasizing by this means that each case differs in some respects from all others under the same heading.

The species of diphtheria calling for apis is not the same diphtheria as that calling for carbolic acid, the point of necessity being to attach our scrutiny less to the broad than to the narrow classification. That is what diagnosis is for. It may be that ordinary diagnosis is responsible for the misapplication of "the totality of symptoms" for so long now degenerated to the numerical totality, and having confused in many minds the peculiar and important symptoms of the patient with the inevitable and typical symptoms of the disease.

Gross methods of treatment multiply, and barbaric medical efficiency or culture—as you will—is forced on the public. Why should civilization welcome the invasion of any therapy in its experimental stage? It would seem that a larger protest should be made against the traumatic exhibition of foreign substances into the body directly through the circulation. The organism is left without the option of rejecting the agent, often rank poison, and so must give it license. It is surprising that "Safety First" has not disposed of this easy hypodermatic method. It is more than surprising that later disasters shown in ultimate processes should not appear significant to both physiologist and pathologist.

The abuse of normal salt solution in the blood stream is being recognized. The heart is described as embarrassed by the excess of water and the kidneys by the salt. Such is the explanation; but, while perhaps perfectly true as far as it goes, how much more eloquent is that which has been left unsaid, while some laboratory experiment tells the world how medicine should now be practiced according to the new and revolutionizing discovery that is about to issue full-armed from experimental stages.

The much-persecuted and long-suffering tonsil is at last being given a theoretical place in the economy of the human body, because it appears to some laboratory workers that this organ really possesses an internal secretion. The animals to which tonsillar substance is administered evidence its effect as a cardiac

and circulatory depressant, a diuretic, laxative, uterine stimulant of contraction, stimulant of bladder contractions; it lowers temperature, lowers blood pressure.

If we limit ourselves to bacteria as the solution of first causes we do not cover the whole equation. Bacteriological work is being done in experimental pneumonia, with the use of a given case of the disease as a starting point. The pneumococcus will produce pneumonia when conveyed directly to the bronchial tubes by intrabronchial insufflation. The same lesion could be caused by streptococci, but much less readily. The right lower lobe was the favorite site of invasion; fatalities were 16 per cent.

Now, potencies of aconite, bryonia, spongia, phosphorus, iodine, lycopodium, sulphur, and a large group of further remedies were not given in their provings to cause pneumonia, neither should they to be given in their re-proving to that degree; but the fact is established that they cure pneumonia, each and every one when clearly indicated. And that is why the mortality rate in our school is so low—lower, much lower than any other statistics. Witness the extraordinary success of homeopathy in epidemic influenza, the only success that has made a record.

It has become a smart saying that if the cause of a condition is known the condition can be cured. Like many epigrams, this may sound well, but it is no nearer truth on that account. In fact, it is false. Knowledge of cause does not guarantee cure. If it did there would be no deaths from serum therapy. The knowledge that the germ of meningitis causes the disease, coupled with the antimeningitic serum therapy, would not be followed by deaths in as many instances as recorded. If the knowledge that smallpox is prevented by vaccination were reliable we should not have to read reports of deaths from smallpox of those who were vaccinated. If typhoid prophylactic-vaccination were entitled to a high place in preventive medicine—so often proclaimed as better than cure—we could not become familiar with so many cases of cardiac, pulmonary and other maladies following this procedure. No, not yet in the great medical world can it be held that knowledge of cause guarantees cure.

The removal of cause does not establish cure. The disordered organism may demand a prescription based on the factors of depleted and perverted function that has practically become *nil*. The cause may have operated too long. Again, in the case of the bacterium, if regarded as first cause, *its* annihilation is not synonymous with cure, nor even recovery.

Bacterial invasion seems not always to precede illness, and illness often culminates without such discernible exciting origin.

Homeopathy deals with the human organism as if it were in itself exactly what it is, the most perfect laboratory in the world. It esteems this laboratory as one in which no abuses may be tolerated, no experiments of hazard condoned. This laboratory that invites and responds to homeopathy offers to the ear of science the accumulated results of its learning and its art as measured in the scale of human vitality and function. The laboratory of homeopathy offers to medicine a stable means of determining remedial values.

Preventive medicine worthy a name is exact homeopathy at the very first sign of disorder. So-called preventive medicine that depends on hygiene and sanitation is hardly an approach to its title as demanded by medical science and practice. The mother who rears her children well and sees that their faces, hands and bodies are kept clean has made no tax on medical science; nor is medical science the sole creditor in the matter of sanitation, proper systems of water and milk supply, and all the cleanly habits of the public incumbent on ordinary civilization. These things belong naturally to other departments of economics. They are not medicine at all. They do remind medicine that the sick of all stages still await healing. There has been altogether too much shirking by medicine of her scientific duty to heal the sick, and the public has been almost forced to believe that sleeping the whole night with the head out of the window will cure everything.

There is no question as to a certain negative attitude that obtains in respect to the cure of disease by internal medication. In the first place, less denial of any rule of practice opens the way for denial that there is any cure by practice. There is a great deal of talk about the way to "assist nature." In detail this means, "It is obvious that cartharsis should be induced," or "It is plain that this patient needs an antipyretic," or "Common sense would teach any one who is not a fool that this patient should be given a sweating." Unfortunately, everywhere this kind of logic is in active operation. Let us hope that no such allopathic use will be made of our own remedies. The art of it is bad, and its science is feeble or none at all.

It seems absurd today that when over a century ago the

world was shown in truly scientific demonstration the importance of mental and moral symptoms in disease conditions, there should have of late years sprung up so many cults exploiting this side of invalidism alone, and perhaps ignoring the body, at all times without any basis of scientific thoroughness. The relationship of mental, moral and body symptoms conveys to homeopathic prescription a value that it could never command otherwise.

The attitude toward diagnosis and prescription is expressed in the third paragraph of the *Organon*. They both rest with our knowledge of what is curable in disease and what is curative in medicine. Certainly no school of medicine outside homeopathy has demonstrated the "*curative indication in each particular case of disease.*"

Each particular case comes to us for one thing—a cure. The prescription is the first thing that a patient asks for; it is the last thing the doctor undertakes to supply. Before he can give it at all he is bound to conduct an extensive investigation. But the task is not forbidding. From the moment our patient appears the study begins. Before he delivers his own favorite diagnosis, analysis on our part is in progress. This is almost invariable. Did not Hahnemann incorporate within his surpassing structure of medical care the whole make-up of the patient? Did he not show with transcendental scholarly directness the significance of every individual and personal trait and attribute? Qualities that do not comport with the normal may have to do with anemia, hyperemia, pulmonitis, nephritis, enteritis, malnutrition, or any other of the innumerable conditions that flesh is heir to or succumbs to. By naming correctly a condition present we have not only made a beginning toward the diagnosis, but may also have approached the prescription.

Whether the great factors are on the surface or are to be dug for, our responsibility is the same. The sum of medicine is cure. And "cure" means essentially much more than "care," Latin or no Latin. The theory of opsonins, with care on that basis, presented at the bedside in place of a remedy indicated like, say, *veratrum album*, could hardly satisfy the insistent need of a single case. When the phenomena of disease as manifested, quite apart from theories of its materialistic *modus operandi*, are accepted as they have been duplicated by

the proven remedy, then and not till then will the patient get his due.

And so, all the factors of the prescription are mighty factors. Their proper assignment is what makes or unmakes the prestige of medicine. They must complement the selected symptomatology, not theories of vital operations, on which we speculate much, and of which we really know little. Medicine has no right to rest at any experimental stage in its service to human beings. How is to be estimated the promise of any prescription based on the fluctuating values of hypothetical medicine, formulated by gratuitous laboratory detail on arbitrary views and aims? No, we cannot avail today of the method that awaits degradation tomorrow. Prescription factors contemplate the existence of stable prescription material. Given a pharmacopoeia of specifics—homeopathic specifics—not for diseases but for patients—with definite and orderly understanding of their use, what more can be asked? Clinical observation must of necessity be of as many grades as there are grades of men. But its highest intent will be realized to an important degree. It will, quite as a matter of course, include the disease; and, better still, it will also include the patient: Herein the demand becomes eloquent for medical art. Homeopathy is of the greatest possible use, the greatest reliance in the diagnosis and cure of the most serious cases. Let us not only insist on this, but let us continually demonstrate it.

441 Park Avenue.

---

#### **Modern Therapy versus Homeopathy—*Dr. Theo. Bacmeister***

Science, dissatisfied with present therapeutics and striving for betterment, will some day attain to Homeopathy. We must establish scientific basis of Homeopathy, or some day be cheated out of our birthright by science.

Vaccines are perfect homeopathic remedies. Certain diseases are especially suited to vaccine treatment. Personal experience convinces us that vaccines are not equal in therapeutic value to the old homeopathic remedies. Several cases have come under personal observation after vaccine therapy failed and cleared promptly under homeopathic remedies.

Up to the present, there has been found no therapeutic measure so sure, safe and universal in application as the homeopathic remedy.