

Dr. Custis.—Mr. President, it is a surprise to me that I should have this congratulation given to me in this manner, and I thank you very much indeed. I assure you that I will do everything that I can to bolster up homœopathy as represented here. I want to say further that I have, as you know, been a constant attendant at both organizations. The homœopathy of the American Institute has been growing better each year. There will not be a paper in the proceedings proper that would cause a blush on the cheek of any member of this organization, as far as I know. The meeting just passed has been a most remarkable one, and I can assure you that for the last two years there has not been a word of disrespect spoken of any homœopathic sentiments that were there voiced. This statement may surprise many of you now, but I will vouch for its truth, and you certainly can be assured that in the future Hahnemann's name will be respected at all their meetings and under all circumstances. I do think that it is the duty of every member of the homœopathic profession, regardless of individual opinions, to be connected with that Institute, because it is the oldest and the largest organization that we have, and it is by virtue of the work done by members of the Institute that any of us are able to have the standing that we enjoy to-day.

Dr. Wesselhœft — I agree with you in everything that you have said, Doctor. They go further and talk about our institutions. For some peculiar reason the men who have done the greatest work for us in organizing and caring for the institution of homœopathy, have not been members in this organization as a rule, and they have not been the best practitioners. Now I don't know how to explain it except that it takes a different temperament to make schools, to found and build hospitals, from that required to cure sick people. The fact remains that those who found and care for these institutions are not among our best practitioners,

yet there is not one of us that is not proud that the homœopathic school has the number of hospitals and dispensaries which exist to-day.

Dr. Custis — While we may not agree with the teachings of the schools, it is the only place where men can be fitted to practice homœopathy at all, and it remains for us to refine the results of their work, after they have given them diplomas. For these reasons I think it is the duty of every homœopathic physician to be connected with the American Institute and on its floor stand up for the principles, which we, as a Homœopathic body, profess. As I had occasion to say last night, I think it is everyone's duty to be a member of his local society, and to be a member of the American Institute, and if he has seen sufficient light to become a member of the International Hahnemannian Association, it is one of his greatest privileges. I hope to see you all with us next year.

BUREAU OF MATERIA MEDICA.

ARTHUR G. ALLAN, CHAIRMAN.

INOCULATION.

THE ALLŒOPATHIC MODE OF ADMINISTRATION OF MEDICINES.

B. FINCKE, M. D., BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Jenner could hardly have expected when one hundred years ago he vaccinated the first child (an event which gives to the allœopaths the opportunity of celebrating a centennial of their own) that in the latter part of this century, after going through several phases of medical lore the old school would accept his mode of protecting people from smallpox by vaccination, as the general *modus operandi* in curing the sick. Likewise Hahnemann could not foresee

that Jenner's invention of trying to shield a child from smallpox by inserting a morbid substance into his sound body would, at the end of this century be adopted as the common allœopathic practice. The simple experience that a dairy-maid infected with the lymph of cowpox was proof against the infection with small-pox induced Jenner to inoculate this fluid into the healthy body as a measure of prevention. It was a mere experience from hearsay, which he ventured to utilize, and the whole medical world followed his lead and vaccinated the multitudes in the mistaken idea, that it would prevent not only the infection of the individual vaccinated, but also the breaking out of small-pox epidemics, nay stamp it out for evermore. By perseverance and strategy they finally succeeded to enjoy the privilege of compelling every child born to be vaccinated. From reliable data we know now that this compulsory vaccination is a despotic measure of the greatest import, and works incalculable mischief in transferring diseases to many, often tedious to heal and frequently leading to a precocious death. These so-called representatives of science have no better ground for their tyrannical action than the experience of Jenner's dairymaid and the superstition that it will protect from and eventually stamp out small-pox. It has been shown repeatedly how mendacious the statistics in this relation are and that therefore they can not be trusted. The immense power of the allœopathic profession has been employed to enforce measures having no better foundation than empiricism and superstition. They should be founded upon the firm basis of science arrived at by experience, experiment and correct observation but not upon motives foreign to science, and supported by the emanation of unjust laws from the governments. Alas! Instead of thinking of really scientific means to prevent the evils of spreading diseases, they accomplish the contrary by rendering the vaccinated still more susceptible to the infection. In spite of all their

vaccinating the epidemics appear just in the midst of the vaccinated and become the more virulent as the facts show. It is almost fruitless to war against such a mass of error which in the course of time has spread and acquired more power than ever. The mode of inoculation has taken possession of the allœopathic mind also with regard to other epidemic and contagious diseases. The enormous mortality in diphtheria under allœopathic treatment ought to have staggered the physicians and the public long ago that their treatment was ineffective, but the patients died and nobody was to blame. Now since the discovery of the microbes they fell upon the idea that these were to blame for the cause and spread of every contagion, because they are found in the body in the respective diseases and seem to be the medium of contagion because on injection into animals the contagious disease appears. Here is the *materies morbi* of a by-gone age revived. Instead of the old adage, however, *tolle causam, i. e.* throwing the morbid matter out of the body by remedial measures of more or less severity, they now inject the very same morbid substance into the body of the patient affected with the disease. But finding ill effects from it as was to be expected, they then cultivated it as it is called, and in this way tried to weaken the poisonous nature to such an extent that it will counteract the action of the microbes or bacilli in disease, and give immunity in health. Oh! what a contradiction! Do they not bear in their coat of arms the motto: *Contraria Contrariis*? But here they are administering the very substance, which according to their theory causes the disease, by inoculation into the body for healing the disease or preventing it. Nay, it is not exactly the same because they cultivate it in order to weaken its virulence, and in this way they become burglars in the homœopathic house into which they break to steal the homœopathic motto *Similia Similibus*. Now burglary is a crime and if the common burglar is caught he is pun-

ished according to law. But unfortunately there is no law for the venerable old school and its scientific burglary. Nay, they do more, by their culture of bacilli they steal a mode of preparation of medicine from the homœopathic school viz.: Potentiation, in as much as they do not dare to apply the crude poison, but weaken its virulence through the medium of a nourishing substance by degrees, and preserve it in carbolic acid or camphor because otherwise it would spoil. This attenuated morbid matter removed only a few degrees from its crudity is injected into the body of the sick or healthy as the case may be. In the light of a homœopathician such a procedure is simply shocking. It militates just as well against the sense of propriety and adequacy of purpose, as against the simple rules of science, at least such science as is built up of experience, experiment and careful observation i. e. by induction. Why should it be necessary to make the Jennerian method of inoculation of vaccine the model in the treatment of diseases? Was it all along an outrage to inject morphine for every pain that man is heir to, it is much more reprehensible to apply morbid substances in this manner. Surely physiology should teach these savages of science a better lesson. They have always blood in their eyes. Blood-poisoning is their stock in trade. For them no higher authority is in the body than the blood. The blood is the supreme king on the throne for them. The poor dumb animals must yield their blood to furnish them with remedies. Has the blood any feeling? Does the blood move any limb? Does the blood do the thinking? No, it is only a means to the end in keeping the body in its proper state of preservation. It is assumed that the injection of the remedy by inoculation acts by its entering the circulation, a proceeding which should be shunned instead of being practiced. If in blood-poisoning so-called the minute quantity of septic poison is sufficient to cause its rapidly progressing symptoms toward dissolu-

tion, why should it be different in those cases where inoculation produced the very same conditions, dissolution and death? The unfavorable cases of vaccination as well as of the inoculation of anti-toxine are no doubt true cases of blood-poisoning. This the physician of the old school acknowledges but not that it is of his own doing, for was it not his own fault when he inoculated the fatal morbid substance? The ptomaines in the system are accused as causes of disease which poison the system, are the morbid substances introduced into the system from outside by inoculation any better? To be sure, those are most blind who do not want to see. Here is a specimen of alloëopathic reasoning.

The Commissioner of Health sends out a circular announcing that "recent developments in the technique of preparing toxines have rendered it possible to produce a diphtheria-toxine of a very high degree of virulence which induces a high grade of immunity in horses on account of the production of a large proportion of anti-toxine in the blood serum."

This is surprising. What need should there be for the manufacture of a more virulent poison if the one in use (Behring) has already given the proof of its power by killing a healthy child within two minutes after injection for the sake of securing immunity from *diphtheria?

*A servant in the house of the celebrated Professor Laugerhaus, Medical Director of a large hospital in Berlin, showed signs of diphtheria. As a precaution against the disease Behring's anti-toxine was administered by injection to the professor's child. The professor announced the result in the papers in these words:—"Our darling Ernest, aged twenty-one months, died suddenly in perfect health in consequence of an injection of Dr. Behring's diphtheria serum."

Two examples in our own country.—In Wheelersburg, Ohio, a practitioner of experience in the use of serum injected the usual prophylactic dose over the scapula of a sleeping child five years of age. An hour before he was known to be in perfect health, in less than five minutes the doctor, summoned from an adjoining room, found the child dead.

In Brooklyn, N. Y. a healthy child two or three years of age was inoculated with Behring's anti-toxine for the sake of immunization against diphtheria. The preparation came direct from the German factory and the bottle had not been opened before, bearing the seal of the manufacturer. In two minutes after the injection the healthy child was dead and the case was reported in the daily papers.

"Thereafter the serum issued by this Department under the white label will contain 200 units to each cubic centimeter or 2000 units to the vial of 10 cub. cent. which is just double the strength of that heretofore used."

The unit is 10 times the amount of anti-toxine required to protect a guinea pig against 10 times a fatal dose of diphtheria toxine. This anti-toxine is prepared by cultivating the diphtheria bacilli in beef tea for about seven days at a temperature of 98° degrees, then $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. carbolic acid is added to kill the bacilli. These dead diphtheria bacilli contained in the culture fluid are injected into a horse. Every immediate reaction upon the injection of the toxine by rise of temperature and other symptoms shows an increased strength of anti-toxine in the serum. After the reaction subsides another injection is made, and thus the process goes on for months without regard of the well-being of the animal. The greatest strength of the anti-toxine is at the end of the operations. The serum then shows no live bacilli and this is the serum said to prevent and cure diphtheria by inoculation.

"The average of a curative dose of diphtheria is about 1000 units, but in severe cases or when the serum is not used until late in the disease, a large dose of 1500 to 2000 units is required. Serum of a still higher grade will be issued in smaller quantities under a blue label and is intended for use in severe cases only." This is grade No. 2 and is estimated to be of still greater virulence than the hitherto used preparation, No. 1, of doubly greater strength, than those used before these new preparations. This is then counting from the crude morbid poison, a so to say third potency, according to a scale which no mortal, be he even a mathematician of the first class, can unravel.

Formerly the normal anti-toxine was a unit for every cubic centimeter of serum, and this would protect a guinea pig inoculated with ten times as much normal toxine. But

now the anti-toxine contains 200 units in a centimeter and is said therefore to be double the strength heretofore used. How can it be double the strength if the normal anti-toxine was 1 in a centimeter?

The repetition of the dose of inoculation of toxine causes a progressive strength of the anti-toxine in the serum. There is, therefore, instead of a weakening of the poison in the culture of the toxine, quite the contrary effect in its passage through the horse, because an increased strength can be shown by the effect of the thus obtained anti-toxine upon guinea pigs.

It is not difficult to trace in this process of the preparation of a remedy for the disease called diphtheria a distorted picture, a caricature of the Hahnemannian potentiating process which excels by its ingenuity, purity and simplicity, and meets all the requirements of scientific exactness.

There is in this a simple scale from crudity to infinity, whilst on the other side there is a double scale first decreasing and then increasing, but never leaving the condition of poisonousness.

Leaving aside that these alloëopathic physicians try to cure a disease by name, which they persist upon to consist in the sole presence of the diphtheritic bacillus though there are different phases of it, as there are patients suffering from it, the remedy is on the face of it reprehensible in every respect, being a morbid poison poisoning a horse, the serum of which after repeated onslaughts on his system by inoculation must furnish the panacea for the dread disease. But they are careful before inoculation to kill the bacilli of the diphtheritic deposit, and claim that it is the toxine secreted by them which is the poisonous substance under the simple name of toxine. But what in the world could induce them to herald the dead diphtheritic bacilli, mixed with the toxine coming from them somehow and suspended in the medium used for cultivation after their passage through the

horse, as the remedy for diphtheria? If they would acknowledge the homœopathic principle, they might claim this for the reason to apply the similar remedy of the same disease, similar by their caricature of a potentiation in order to weaken the toxic quality of the poison they deal with. But refuting that principle with scorn, they have no reason whatever for applying that alleged secreted toxine left by the dead bacilli, which is just as if Hamlet were left out of the play. What this anti-toxine is they cannot tell beyond that it looks like a liquid brown substance, they cannot even say that the toxine is secreted by the bacilli, for who ever has described the organs of these microscopical dots, lines, commas, etc? Can they with certainty say that they are animals, or are they of vegetable origin? There is no criterion on hand but the ostensible fact that they multiply by division or otherwise in a primitive way, if they find the necessary pabulum to subsist upon. Have they ever tried the dead bacillar substance alone? They have tried the live bacilli and poisoned with them guinea pigs, and then they saved them again by injection with the preparation from the dead bacilli cum toxine, passed through the horse and appearing in its blood as anti-toxine. That is all the ground they stand on. The dead bacillus plus its refuse kills the live bacillus plus refuse—*contraria contrariis* again—but only in the human subject. The toxine injected into the guinea pigs for the sake of testing the antidotal power of the anti-toxine contains confessedly only the dead bacilli plus their refuse, therefore no live bacilli are introduced into the guinea pig and the dead bacilli plus refuse cure the dead bacilli plus refuse by *similia similibus*. With regard to the mixtures of toxine and anti-toxine there is no thought that they might have anything to do with the action. It is the old polypharmacy again in a new shape. Yet there seems to be no certainty about the curative power of the anti-toxine, for the poison heretofore used has not been

strong enough, because now two new grades double and more as strong as before are offered.

This must necessarily change the unit of the normal anti-toxine. "The average curative dose of diphtheria anti-toxine is 1000 units" which in severe cases rises to 1500 and 2000 and that of still greater strength. The unit of the normal anti-toxine is 1 unit for 1 cub. cent. of serum and will protect the guinea pig against 10 times as much toxine. If the preparation is double and more than double the strength as the preparation used before, the poisoning dose of inoculation should be reduced by that amount since only a proportionate amount of anti-toxine is required if the reckoning is correct. Nay, according to the health officer, the severe cases require the most poisonous preparation. Nothing shows the contrast of the old school to the new more than this gruesome posology. According to homœopathic understanding the disease renders the body more susceptible to medicine than it is in health. This was the reason why Hahnemann reduced the strength of the dose in the earlier years of his homœopathic practice until he arrived at the new discovery that the least possible dose is sufficient to cure. Then the indication was to prepare the remedy through a series of potentiation to such a degree that it would be adequate to that susceptibility. Of course the necessity of selecting the right remedy according to law was self-evident, and if the susceptibility to the dose and to the remedy was assured, every requirement was satisfied to insure the cure, provided there was reactivity (*Leistrings fähigkeit*) enough in the body to sustain the action.

But here where angels fear to tread, fools rush in and they upset the natural law of susceptibility, not knowing anything about the selection of the right remedy, and give the poisons which anyhow they should not give at all, nay, they inoculate them, much the stronger and in larger doses in the proportion as the doses are more severe. If the case

is at death's door, will it help the suffering patient in his last agony to receive the poison as strong as they dare to make it, if it has already in the more moderate form shortened life even where there was no disease yet, and it was intended only to be prevented by the murderous onslaught of the physician? This calls to mind one of the professors in Vienna, who, at the epidemic of Asiatic cholera when the patients were already moribund, drew blood from all the accessible veins of the body, and squeezed it out when on account of its viscosity it would not flow any more. Of course the patients died.

Ceterum censeo macrodosiam esse delendam.

DISCUSSION.

Dr. Hastings—Mr. President, I would like to suggest that in printing this paper for the transactions, there should be some extra copies struck off. I should like some for my own use. I know I can place them where they can do some good.

It was voted that five thousand extra copies be printed for distribution.

Dr. Thatcher—It seems to me that we might do a great deal of good by having just such articles for general distribution in our offices. I at one time had five hundred copies of Dr. Flower's address, and my patients read those articles with a great deal of comfort and satisfaction. I think if we all could place just such articles as this before the public, it would do a great deal to educate the people as to the right choice of treatment.

Dr. Fincke—The people ought to be educated. They do not know anything about these doings of the old school. It is awful to see how they carry on. I think we could do a great deal if we put our foot down. They have always blood in their eye!

Dr. Allen—We had a very sad case last winter in Chicago. A homœopathic physician, one of my honored

colleagues, had two or three cases of malignant diphtheria, two of whom died, and at the close of his labors in that family he was himself attacked with malignant diphtheria. His father, a homœopathic physician, was in California at the time, and was telegraphed to come home. He was under the treatment of two of his colleagues, very able men, and on the arrival of his father the young man was considered to be doing very well. At that time there was a terrible hue and cry about the use of anti-toxine; that if the patient was allowed to die without anti-toxine, it would be criminal neglect. In accordance with the cry the father was induced by friends of the family to try anti-toxine, and one of the city dispensers of anti-toxine was called in to exhibit it. He received one treatment in the morning and immediately began to get worse. Symptoms of swelling of the glottis and terrible strangulation came on. He went on until evening and not getting any better received another treatment with the result that he died before morning. His father told me, and his attending physician told me, that he had no doubt whatever that the anti-toxine was largely responsible for his death, and still some of our homœopathic physicians all over the country are using anti-toxine in cases of diphtheria. It shows the recklessness of those who forget Hahnemann's law of cure and Hahnemann's method of practice.

Dr. Thatcher—And the boards of health will soon exact that every child shall be protected by vaccination, and we as homœopaths, will simply be debarred of giving the variolinum and thereby giving a certificate; those will be rejected and we will be liable to have our patients excluded from school unless we comply with the allopathic measure, which is undoubtedly coming in the city of Philadelphia. I invariably variolate my school children, and give a certificate to the fact, and so far it has not been rejected, but I think the time is close at hand when those certificates will