

the smelters where copper is made into "pigs" from copper pyrites; and I tell you that *said immunity is the effect of the smoke* from said smelters which same smoke impregnates the surrounding atmosphere with *Arsenious acid* in both instances (for *Arsenious acid* is in combination with other substances in both kinds of pyrites) which same *Arsenious acid* volatilizes at 180 (C.), and by its presence and by "virtue of its similitude combined with greater intensity" (which you will find in Chapt. 34 of "The Organon" Hahnemann offers as the probable *modus operandi* of all curative as well as preventive remedies) "that the drug disease is substituted for the natural disease, thus depriving the latter of its power to affect the vital force."

For this reason alone, that *Arsenic* is the most perfect *similimum* to the condition known as *Asiatic cholera*, is *Arsenic* recommended by me; and for this same reason alone, the *Cuprum* and *Camphor* which, as you say, "have been for years more used than *Arsenic*," are NOT recommended; for neither the *Cuprum* of Hahnemann nor the *Camphor* of Deiderich, et al., nor even the *Sulphur* of Hering nor the *Sulphuric acid* of the allopaths; none of these being equally a *similimum* to *Asiatic cholera*, *Arsenic* alone is commended; but NOT alternately with *Veratrum alb.*, nor in combination as the *Arsenite of Copper*; but as *Arsenic* alone and simply and solely because *Arsenic*, and no other drug known, is the *similimum* to *Asiatic cholera*; or what you describe as "the real cramp grip cholera." Crawford of "The Hahnemann," of Chicago says: "The most perfect picture of *cholera* is found under *Arsenic*." (I wonder if "the symptoms" here are not similar?)

Farrington says: "*Arsenic* also excites intestinal disease which is almost identical with *cholera*; even the organic growths of *cholera* are found in the discharges from the *Arsenic* proving." (This is from page 508 of his "Materia Medica," and I have often wondered if we have a better exponent of Hahnemann's ideas than this.)

But, referring to practical experience nearer home, I respectfully call to your mind the two different, though very similar, maladies which were reported from Helena and Little Rock, in Ark., in 1892, which required the intervention of a member of the marine hospital service at Washington, with his microscope and chemical analysis, to intelligently diagnose these two conditions (one *Arsenic* poisoning, the other what is known as

"winter cholera") and to advisedly prognose results. (I would respectfully ask my Philadelphia frater whether, in such cases, he would reassert that "As a matter of fact, the symptoms of *arsenical* poisoning are not very much similar to the real cramp-grip cholera?" And in this I do not include the assertions of Farrington and Virchow.)

But let us proceed; for further on I find you saying: "He will return poorer in pocket, etc., because he starts his little calculation in bacteriological supposition with a false quantity."

Does the above reasoning, my brother, look much like a bacteriological supposition? And then again you say: "Hahnemann, said in 1832, that *Cuprum* was the remedy" (and this, as you say, "without his having ever seen cholera"). May I ask, my brother, with all deference to the memory of that great and good man, does the fact that he never saw cholera, make Hahnemann's hypothesis of *Cuprum* prophylaxis of *cholera* any the more probably correct?

Remember, sir, that I, too, have never seen cholera, and yet I dare to say that Hahnemann was wrong in advocating *Cuprum* because *Cuprum* is not the most perfect *similimum* to the condition studied; and he was doubly wrong when he advocated the alternation of *Cuprum* and *Veratrum alb.*, and that I alone am right, for I advocate *Arsenic* and I can prove, (so far as convincing my homœopathic colleagues) my right to my hypothesis and logical deductions, or I will forever hold my peace.

Now, what we homœopaths demand, as I understand it, is a *similimum*, (the most perfect *similimum*) to the totality of symptoms (as a rule; but *not in this case*, which comes under the exceptions mentioned at the last of Chap. 100 of the "Organon") to the condition which, in this case, like *small-pox*, *measles*, *scarlet fever*, etc., is invariably the result of a specific morbid miasm (I will call it) which is endemic in some countries and epidemic in still others.

Now in a *specific condition*, such as *Asiatic cholera*, Hahnemann, in his wisdom, has taught us (and left us examples) to generalize in our prophylaxis against said *specific condition* with a *specific* remedy; and although Hahnemann very evidently concurred in the belief in the alleged *specific* prophylactic effects of *vaccine virus* (Chap. 46 of his "Organon") he always chose a mineral or vegetable in his examples of *generalization* in prophylaxis (*Bell.*, *Cuprum*, *Verat. alb.*, *Hepar Sulph.*, etc.,) and we, as true

homœopaths, of course choose some vegetable or mineral drug in preference to any extract from a similar disease or some one of the laboratory productions sold under the title of animal *toxines*; for we are taught, in Chap. 33 of the "Organon," that: "*Extraneous, noxious agencies (such as similar diseases and animal toxines) possess a subordinate, and often extremely conditional power; but drug potencies possess an absolute and unconditional power, far superior to the former in its ability to produce ill health (morbid discordancy) of the human body.*" (And of course, we, as homœopaths, know that this is the key note to the curative and the preventive powers reposed in drugs.)

In chapter 30 of the "Organon" Hahnemann also asserts that "Natural diseases are cured and overcome (which includes prevention) by proper medicines, because the ill health of the human body seems to be more readily affected by drugs (*and because it is in our power to regulate their dose*) than by the, natural morbid agencies." (Whose exact effect cannot be intelligently prognosed nor the dose always regulated).

Now, my Philadelphia friend, if you are a homœopath, you doubtless by this time recognize why "the man from Texas" (of vast domains and cowboys, *and so forth*) advocates *Arsenic*, pure and simple, and from an ivory "point" (which insures the most perfect *asepsis*) and *not* filtered through any animal; and why the antidote will always prove effective, if ever needed ("*because it is within our power to regulate the dose.*")

As for the remainder of your fulsome assertions, my frater, I will pay them no attention, but will simply add that although I advocate *generalizing* as homœopathic when I advocate *Arsenization* against *Asiatic cholera*, I do so advisedly and have such approval as the following from no less an authority than our distinguished colleague of Boston, Dr. Conrad Wesselhoeft, who, under date of September 24th, '96, writes me that: "Hahnemann's *generalization* regarding *Copper, Camphor, Veratrum, etc.*, were brilliant; *Arsenic* may be included in that number;" but, my brother, I *generalize*, as before stated, with the most perfect *similimum* to the condition, for in the study of the repertory to Majumdar's work on *cholera* I find he enumerates 205 probable symptoms to be found in all cases of *Asiatic cholera*; and, relatively speaking, the four above-mentioned alleged prophylactics of this disease are to the disease in the following ratio:

The *Sulphuric acid* (of the allopaths) is to *cholera* as 3 is to

205; the *Camphor* (of which Deiderich alleged so much in the epidemic in Rheinisch Prussia, in 1865) is to *cholera* as 65 is to 205; the *Sulphur* (of Hering) is to *cholera* as 40 is to 205; the *Copper* (of Dake and Hahnemann) is to *cholera* as 58 is to 205; the *Verat. alb.*, (of Hahnemann, with which he advised the *alternation* of *Copper*) is to *cholera* as 107 is to 205; while my chosen drug, and alleged most perfect *similimum*, *Arsenic* is to *cholera* as 161 is to 205. (This work of Prof. Majumdar, of the Calcutta Homœopathic Medical College, is published by Boericke & Tafel, 1893).

Again, if the most perfect *similimum* is what we, as homœopaths, need, and you still think *Arsenic* is not, according to your studies of Hahnemann, the most perfect *similimum* to *Asiatic cholera*, I respectfully recall to you the following, from Chapt. 212 of his "Organon," ("The effect upon the state of the mind and disposition is the principle feature of ALL diseases and seems to have been specially ordained by the Creator of all healing powers") and then to the fact that under the caption of "Mind and Mood," (in that same repertory in Majumdar's work on *cholera*) you will find that *Camphor* is mentioned but twice, and *Veratrum* is mentioned but twice; that neither *Cuprum* nor *Sulphur* are mentioned at all; while you will find my drug *Arsenic* mentioned as a *similimum* to every one of the five disease symptoms mentioned; and you will notice that all these symptoms are, as Hahnemann demands they shall be, "the more prominent, uncommon, and peculiar (characteristic) features of the case." ("Organon," Chapt. 153, edition of 1875; by Wesselhoeft).

Now, my dear Dr. Bradford, that I may not appear to wilfully mislead you as to Dr. Wesselhoeft's beliefs concerning *generalization* in general and *Arsenization* in particular, I will quote you further from his recent communication to me upon the subject; and it reads to this effect: "If *generalization* proves even partially true it is a mark of genius which not everybody should dare to imitate;" so you see, that while our distinguished Boston colleague recognizes the great danger to promiscuous *generalizations* (as, in fact, do all students of Hahnemann) he also recognizes the apparent *similitude* between my drug and *Asiatic cholera* in words to this effect: "Hahnemann's generalizations regarding *Copper, Camphor, Veratrum, etc.*, were brilliant; *Arsenic* may be included in that number, *but it*" (he goes on to say) "*like the rest must be established on safer grounds than we now see it on;*

especially the method of applying it as advocated by you."

Dr. Wesselhoeft struck "the key note" right there, my colleagues, for this is exactly my reason for applying to the homœopaths of America, particularly, for their signatures to a petition which calls upon our government to test *Arsenization* in some one of the, at present, stricken countries (preferably Egypt and, of course, preferably, through its author)

This is the reason that I have repeatedly asserted that my dosage, as at first advocated, is not at all arbitrary, but merely a suggestion from the author who does not know, from practical experience, any more of the true *practical* inwardness of *Arsenization* than you all; but it is an hypothesis pronounced, by the medical department of our government, as "incontrovertible except by test" (which they also promised to make, but have not made) and by President Gibier, of the New York Pasteur Institute as "theoretically perfect;" and now respectfully submitted again to any unbeliever with the above commendations from such especially distinguished homœopathic colleagues as Drs. Kraft, of Cleveland, and Wesselhoeft, of Boston.

Should any of you all still consider me, as did Dr. T. P. Wilson, of Cleveland, "a *generalizing* allopath," "*you will now see in me but one more generalizing homœopath with the example and didactics of Hahnemann as concurrent authority for my statements.*"

But I must close this now, as I would fain imitate that beautiful and pertinent hint from Bryant, which says:

"I would not always reason. The straight path (homœopath)
Wearies us with its never-varying lines,
And we grow melancholy."

Yours very truly,

R. B. LEACH.

Paris, Texas, October 3d, 1896.

DR. BRADFORD'S LAST WORD ON ARSENIZATION.

Editor of THE HOMŒOPATHIC RECORDER.

Will you permit me through your journal to whisper gently to Dr. Leach that if I have said anything I oughtn't I am awfully sorry. There is lots of cholera in Egypt; let the doctor really prove the assertion he makes. It can never be proven by writing allopathic articles to the allopathic journals and homœopathic articles to the homœopathic journals. When Hahnemann whom he quotes so much (in the homœopathic journals) thought

he had discovered a new law of healing he just went quietly to work to prove it and for six long years he experimented until when he spake from the pages of Hufeland's Journal he really had something to say. "Q. E. D.," at the tail of an assertion does not prove its truth.

I have nothing but the kindest feelings for the gentleman from Texas; indeed, when I wrote my article I did not know he was a homœopath; but when a man makes an assertion to the scientific world he must expect criticism, and indeed I meant mine to be goodnatured. I will wait and when the Doctor has proven to us all that in *Arsenic* we have a prophylactic for cholera I will be the first one to doff my hat and "do him proud."

T. L. BRADFORD, M. D.,

Phila., Oct. 15, 1896.

THE TRUE NAME.

Editor of HOMŒOPATHIC RECORDER.

In the *New York Medical Journal*, I notice a small paragraph on the "Proposed medical legislation in Vermont," and is here appended.

MINOR PARAGRAPHS.

PROPOSED MEDICAL LEGISLATION IN VERMONT.

A SOMEWHAT hasty examination of the draft of a proposed act to create a State board of medical examiners for Vermont, which reached us too late for insertion in this issue, seems to warrant the provisional conclusion that the bill is a judicious one in the main. One thing in it, however, we do strenuously object to, and that is that it designates non-sectarian physicians as "allopathic." By all means, let this blunder be corrected.

I don't see the serious objection to the name. It seems as though the "Allopaths" are ashamed of their sign, are afraid to have the world know them by their *true* name. They call it a blunder the name is one who, prior to the existence of the Homœopathic school, were called Allopathic and why they should be ashamed of their name is more than I can understand, their assumption of being a physician is very uncertain, it is only *right* to give a thing its true name, to convey the meaning,

and the reason the Legislators of Vermont did it, is because they know that it is *their* name, thus they are known every where by layman and all. *Let them keep it.* Homœopathic physicians are proud and are made glad when called by their true name. Let Legislators make the laws, and do what they will, but we insist that they call us Homœopathic physicians and we also insist on their placing the name "*Allopathic*" over every "Old School" *College, Professor and Student.* *Call things by their true name.*

Yours for truth,

F. D. HUMPHREY, M. D.

Green Bay, Wis.

"HOMŒOPATHY IN CALCUTTA."

Editor of THE HOMŒOPATHIC RECORDER.

The above is the heading of a contribution sent by Babu Hem Chander Chowdhury L. M. S. to the International Homœopathic Congress of 1896, which met in London. The account of the contribution is slipshod and desultory, and lacks in faithful details. Many points have been discussed in the contribution with a view to display the writer's learning, and no regard has been paid to the subject matter of the contribution. All weak points have found a prominent place in the contribution and points worth noticing have been entirely left out. The existing defects have been shown but no remedies suggested. Much has been made of the party spirit which is rife and rampant among the members of the new school. This is a fact, that there is no unity but discord in the rank and file of Homœopathy, but who is to blame for it? Are not all the native homœopathic practitioners imbued with ideas of self-sufficiency, and are they not almost all strangers to the noble principle of altruism? Is not the respect for elders and superiors fast disappearing from the land of Aryavarta? This is the spirit of the age and who can stem the torrent of western civilization which advocates equality to all? Babu Hem Chander wants to oust Dr. Salzer from the field of practice by importing a raw recruit either from Europe or America, and holds out hopes of a large practice. This is a delusion, pure and simple. Dr. Salzer is a sound practitioner and a scientific man. He is also well-known in the republic of letters, and is just the man who can be safely consulted in all

contested and difficult cases. In truth he is an honor to the new school and has done a good deal towards the advancement of Homœopathy in this country. He has also enriched the homœopathic materia medica by the addition of new remedies. To bring out his equal is no joke. Even such a distinguished man as Dr. Hughes, the philosophic homœopath of London has a high regard for Dr. Salzer. As to homœopathic practice we have some misgivings. There was a time when homœopathic practice was slowly but surely gaining ground not only in Calcutta and Bengal but in different parts of India, but the tide has now turned against it. Homœopathic practice has now become the stock-in-trade of quacks and charlatans. Pedagogues, clerks, compounders, merchants, priests and *et hoc genus omne* leaving their own avocations have set up as homœopathic practioners and are in demand in this city and other places and Babu Hem Chander's condemnation of this set of practitioners bodes no good to the country, when they are encouraged by the cultured and intellectual classes. The metropolis has become a hunting ground of humbugs and charlatans and real merit is pining away unseen and unnoticed.

It must be admitted that nothing succeeds so well as success. People, we now find, have not the same appreciation for homœopathic treatment as they had in days gone by, and the reason is not far to seek. A graduate just after securing his diploma settles down and practices Homœopathy. In 90 out of 100 cases he fails and Homœopathy incurs the odium and displeasure of the people. Homœopathy is no child's play, and its abuse is inevitable in the hands of inexperienced practitioners. Expertness in Homœopathy can alone be acquired by extensive reading and observation, and he alone deserves the title of a qualified homœopath whose reading is large, who belongs to the republic of letters, and who has grown old with experience. We can make bold to say that Homœopathy would have supplanted Allopathy by this time had it been used and not abused by the majority of practitioners. It is true that the establishment of homœopathic schools has not furthered the cause of Homœopathy to an appreciable extent, because the education imparted in those schools is imperfect, and the practitioners that are sent out year after year are not well equipped to do justice to the cause of Homœopathy. They rather do incalculable mischief to places where they settle down. There is another potent cause which has im-

peded the progress of Homœopathy. Most of the lay practitioners have become authors of homœopathic works. They have translated into the vernaculars of the country many English works on Homœopathy and the translation is not a faithful rendering of the original, and how can it be when the so-called authors have no knowledge whatever of anatomy, physiology and other collateral sciences? The lay practitioners, it is generally observed, are an attraction to the people for their cheapness. Is life cheap? When people can squander away thousands upon thousands in lawsuits and when they try their best to secure the services of leading counsel to win their cases, is it not becoming and prudent to secure the services of the very best men in the profession to save their valuable lives? What is the worth of earthly goods compared with our valuable life? As long as we exist property has a value, but it has no value after death. Such is life and it is above all price.

Babu Hem Chander has omitted some names of qualified practitioners in his list. May we enquire why has he done it? For having suppressed these names, he has laid himself open to the charge of having done it purposely. Babu Hem Chander, as far as we know, is a stranger in the field of medical practice, if he is the same person who, after moving about like a rolling-stone in all the four corners of Calcutta in search of practice, has at last found a resting-place in his original citadel where none can molest him and he can molest none.

Calcutta.

TRUTH.

A SODÆ SULPHAS CASE.

Dr. G. E. Potter, of Newark, N. J., contributes a rather interesting reminiscence to the *California Medical Journal*, an eclectic journal. The patient was a child of six and had been down for seven weeks with "lung fever." On the day Dr. Potter was called in three "regular" physicians had held a consultation and said the child would die within a few hours, then Potter, who had just begun to practice, was called in. "At noon I saw the child and found him lying in a crib unconscious, eyes rolled upward, immobile and insensible to light or touch; face, ashy, waxen, cold and set—DEAD; tongue coated with a thick dry dirty white coating, cracked along the centre; lids,

pale; arms and legs cold and the skin seemed dead, no pulsation at the wrist; breathing imperceptible, except upon placing the ear upon chest when a slight respiratory sound and the heart fluttering could be heard."

On the strength of the late Dr. Scudder's teaching concerning the acid and alkaline diathesis, Dr. Potter reasoned that this case portrayed pallor "and called for alkalies." Twenty grains of *Sodæ sulphas* dissolved in two ounces of water. A few drops of this were placed on the tongue of the child every few minutes, and artificial deglutition resorted to. In a few days the child recovered.

HOW A SINGLE SYMPTOM MAY DIRECT TO THE RIGHT REMEDY.

Dr. Goullon, of Weimar.

Translated for THE HOMŒOPATHIC RECORDER from *Populaere Zeit. für. Hom.*

It is a great advantage to Homœopathy that it is enabled to find real remedies for certain diseases by attending to the characteristic signs or only a single pathogenetic characteristic of the remedy in question. It is well known that all homœopathic remedies have been proved on healthy persons and the summary of these proving symptoms represents the pathogenesis of this particular remedy. The interpretation of these proving symptoms is of eminent value, and the homœopath who investigates conscientiously and possesses the proper pathogenetic knowledge, can accomplish many a cure in cases where Allopathy is at the end of its rope. Professor Imbert Goubeyre in Clermont gives the following universally acceptable definition of Homœopathy: "Homœopathy, like every discovery, is a very simple matter and consists in this, that it proves the remedies on healthy persons in order that it may draw thence its conclusions as to the use of these remedies in cases of disease."

Many of these physiological symptoms, indeed, are of little value and unreliable and may also be repeated in other remedies; but where they are not thus repeated, they deserve all the greater attention. This is especially the case in our unbelieving times, when also homœopathic physicians beat a retreat more easily than in former times. This tendency is found most frequently with those who are disciples of modern surgery, and