

PHYSICIAN - 1882

has produced symptoms most similar to those of the patient shall be chosen and given. This is a true homeopathic prescription." So wrote Carroll Dunham. We accept this great law, let us then abide by it.

UNIFICATION: A FATAL ERROR.

AD. LIPPÉ, M. D., PH.D.

It is a fatal error to suppose that partition walls, separating the medical schools are to come down. Following the inductive method of Hahnemann, we find him from the outset exposing the follies, the the varying hypotheses, and the want of success of the then prevailing school of medicine. This foundation for his subsequent argument was a logical necessity; and the argument following these declarative exposures of the condition of the prevailing school of medicine did build up an insurmountable partition wall, separating forever the Healing-Art, promulgated by Samuel Hahnemann, including his exclusive therapeutics, from the prevailing medical school. The partition walls can surely not come down till some very learned chemist has discovered the method of mixing oil and water. Any person, comprehending the absolute and irreconcilable differences existing between the two schools, can no more dream of the possibility of uniting them, than can the modern chemist see the possibility of uniting oil and water. As these differing schools cannot unite, the taking down of the partition wall implies a "surrender" of one side or the other: this also seems very problematical, as progressive homeopaths, who are a godly number, get still further away and out of the harmful influence of the prevailing school of medicine. Some members of the ordinary school are already innocently adopting the various doctrines taught by Hahnemann. It is a logical necessity that in the course of time, in the very dim future, these materialists, who shun light and progress, now must leave their dearly-beloved, conservative but untenable ground. Thus, gradually, without any aid from our side, they will remove by their own strong exertions, portion after portion of that partition wall; and as they do so, more light will strike them, and the more they are illumined by the ever-increasing light, the faster will progress the level

ling work until there shall be no partition wall any longer. The signs of the times disclose the fact that an occasional glimpse of light reaches over the partition wall, yet is evident that the conservatism of centuries still pervades the common school of medicine. They are, have been, and will for some time continue to be, conservative in their materialism; the progress they make being very slow, and under pressure of public opinion. To make good our argument we must show the position the common school of medicine holds to-day, and illustrate their persistent conservatism. Prof. Pasteur read before a Medical Congress, assembled at London during last summer, his famous paper on "Preventive Medicine." The famous Pasteur is a "chemist," and as such, deals exclusively with organic matter; his observations are of the greatest interest to every scientific man. Pasteur addresses the allopathic physicians, who are still engaged in searching out the material causes of diseases; they fill well understand that the homeopaths accept with the law of the similars also the law of dynamics, as two inseparable and homogeneous doctrines, promulgated by Hahnemann and accepted by his followers,* rejected, of course, by the old school still adhering to materialism. Pasteur claims to have laid the foundation of an entirely new system and method of research into the nature and causes of a large class of diseases in man and the higher animals; he proclaims that a large class of diseases is curable, under the maxim, "*equale equibus curantur*," and he, not adhering to a strict inductive method of reasoning, bases his experiment on the discovery of the immortal Jenner; but Jenner vaccinated mankind with a "similar" virus, obtained from a lower animal, and therefore—it being only similar—he prevented men from being afflicted by small-pox. Jenner did not claim that the lymph taken from a small-pox patient would either prevent or cure the disease in other persons. The profession at large could not possibly accept Pasteur's newly-discovered law of cure, because they were observing and practical men. From times immemorial have men of undoubted learning vainly searched for specific remedies for specific diseases. It could not be otherwise as their very first proposition, the existence of specific diseases, is a fatal error, an error first and last. From times immemorial diseases have continually changed their nature and forms. What at present appears to correspond with

* London Lancet, June, 1881, page 553.

248

the *genus epidemicus*, the various phenomena which appear to be strongly expressed in all forms of the now prevailing disease, will no longer be characteristic accompaniments of this same disease, probably three months hence. From times immemorial persons suffering at the same place and at the same time from epidemic diseases were all afflicted similarly, but not alike; while there existed an apparent great similarity between the afflicted, the close observer readily discerned a great difference between the symptoms of the similarly-sick. These close observers were Hahnemann and his disciples, and as illustration we may be allowed to refer to some very frequently indicated remedies in the Asiatic Cholera. While some cases corresponded with the characteristic sick-making properties (ascertained from provings on the healthy) of Camphor, other cases corresponded with Veratrum or Cypripum or Arsenic, etc. Each of these remedies had its characteristics, and became thereby and therefore a curative agent under the law of the similars. Pasteur, as well as Koch and others, profess to have found the germs of infectious diseases, and believing that they have found these germs, they come to the conclusion, following their deductive method of reasoning, that they also know how to stamp out these diseases. When, heretofore, an infectious disease broke out in a certain locality, there were necessarily several conditions present, allowing the germs to develop themselves and their infectious character: after a certain time the germs, now having rapidly multiplied, were found to become harmless, as persons long exposed to their influences remained well, having no susceptibility to that specific poison; then, what became of these multiplied germs? Can chemistry or any other exact science explain? No more than they can explain why A, B and C became ill when exposed to these poisonous germs, and why D, E and F were not at all affected by the same influences. If, after a long lapse of time, an epidemic breaks out where it formerly raged, is not that new epidemic invariably very different from the former one? If we are accustomed to individualize, it is hardly to be expected that we should even think of accepting such positive generalizations as are offered us by these scientists, certainly we should not accept them as therapeutic guides. The allopathists have not accepted as a body, nor any considerable number of them, the newly-discovered law of cure promulgated by Pasteur—that the product of a disease would cure the disease itself, or if others were inoculated with this product, would serve as a preventive for that form of

a disease. This formula, *aguiolia equidibus curantur*, was rejected; and how could it be otherwise? Pasteur is a scientist, but not a practical man, nor was he the first man who offered this formula.

More than fifty years ago Mr. M. Lux published a pamphlet, declaring the law, *aguiolia equidibus curantur*, superior to the law of the similars. Mr. Lux was a veterinary surgeon. Men of that profession were not compelled to show themselves to be graduates of a classical college like the matriculants in the universities, who enter upon the study of medicine. It could, therefore, not be supposed that Mr. Lux would take in the inductive method of Hahnemann, and fully understand and appreciate his Organon, when so many, nay, the great majority of well-educated medical men rejected Lux as an enthusiast; a few followed him, and among them, Dr. Gross, a true homoeopath. There was a prospective partition wall to be erected between the homoeopaths and isopathsists, but in his wisdom, Hahnemann made that utterly impossible, when he wrote a long footnote at the close of his introduction to the 5th edition of his Organon. Dr. Gross saw his error and renounced it, and from that time till now, isopathy was remembered only as a medical folly.

It is a historical fact that Hahnemann, the founder of the Homoeopathic Healing-Art, rejected isopathy in 1830; it is also a historical fact that isopathy was offered the allopathic school in 1881 by Prof. Pasteur, and that it was not accepted. It is also a historical fact that men who never fully adopted Homoeopathy, and only pretended to belong to that school for reasons best known to themselves, but not to be publicly questioned, have declared from time to time a strong wish to have the partition wall, which separates the two great medical schools, thrown down. The supposition that such an event could take place has been discussed above, but a very ingenious medical journal* (ostensibly homoeopathic) has, of late, made quite a smart proposition—he lets the wall stand and mounts it, holding in his hand an olive-branch, with the motto: "A scientific basis for Isopathy." This paper is written in a truly allopathic (materialistic) style. Individualization, the prerogative of true Homoeopathy, is set aside entirely. Products of diseases (so-called) may and will become curative agents after they have been proved

* *United States Medical Investigator*, Nov. 1st and 15th, 1881.

on the healthy; may and will be applied for the cure of the sick under the homœopathic fundamental law of the Similians, the single remedy and the minimum dose applied, not singly, but jointly. The same decisive cures as we now get from treating the sick with the greatest known poisons, and with substances formerly considered inert, will follow. Whether the ingenuously offered olive-branch will be accepted by a small minority of dissatisfied allopathists, and if so accepted, whether a new medical school will be the outcome of this novel exhibition, a school advocating the principle, "*agnatia cognatis curantur*," and named isopathy, time alone will show. But that the partition wall will not be removed by this most novel peace-offering is a certainty.

HOMŒOPATHIC THERAPEUTICS AND PATTIO-LOGICAL ANATOMY.

P. P. WELLS, M. D., BROOKLYN, N. Y.

(Read before the American Institute of Homœopathy, 1868. Revised by the author, December, 1881.)

Early in the controversy which arose on the announcement of the homœopathic doctrines, it was objected to them by their opponents, that both they and their author ignored the whole science of pathology, as then taught in the schools. This was cast at him as a reproach, and cited as evidence of his ignorance. It was held as a proof that the doctrines he taught, were inadequate to guide the practitioner in his endeavors to apply science to the art of healing. It was thought to be conclusive as against Homœopathy, that it excluded so large a part of the science of the schools. In reply, it was shown that much of what then constituted the received science of pathology, was no better than sheer hypothesis which had but recently taken the place of other equally baseless hypotheses, and that none of these had ever been given to the profession as proved facts; that their only existence, indeed, was in the imaginations of ingenious men. In the place of these hypotheses, Hahnemann demanded a pathology based on facts. He would admit nothing till proved true, and he abstained from inculcating principles till he re-

garded them as abundantly established by careful and adequate observation. To replace these hypothetical doctrines he gave to the profession a philosophy of disease, which he claimed to have verified by the slow and sure process of induction; so that the reproach that he ignored the science of pathology was met by presenting to the world a better system, a true philosophy, which, being founded wholly on observed facts, he claimed should take the place of the old which was based so largely on mere imagination.

Here the two schools stood, each claiming exclusive authority for its teachings, when a new thought struck the leaders of the old. It was to study the results of diseases, as these might be visible in the changes wrought by them in the material tissues of the organism. From this has resulted the modern science of Pathological Anatomy. So the new thought has not been without its fruits. Such as these are, they are of recent growth. In the beginning of the controversy they were the property of neither school, for they had no existence. Now, when it is alleged by the old school against the new, that the latter practically rejects the science of pathology, it is to this new element of that science that reference is chiefly made. It is claimed—and not without show of reason—that this is the child of the old school; that by it this has been begotten, and has reached its present age and proportions by its own almost unaided efforts. And now, while it cherishes with peculiar love, this, its youngest darling, the sole offspring of its ripest age, and the only one which has been born of observed fact, it fails not to throw all its bitterness into the complaint that this is not received by the new school with equal tenderness, and that homœopaths do not share with the authors of this science all their fond expectations of its practical benefits.

It is forgotten apparently by the complainants that, while their care has been concentrated on this object of their love and pride, those whom they thus accuse of want of co-operation in their labors, and of appreciation of the results, have been quite as actively, and more exclusively, employed in developing and perfecting another member of the family of sciences, one of far greater importance to the art of healing than is this science of the results of diseases.

They coolly ignore the sublime labors which have given birth to a new materia medica, and presented it in its present proportions to the world. They know nothing of, and care nothing for, the coils, the watchings and waitings, from which this has grown. Nor are they