

before several homœopathic societies and published in some of our Journals. In this account Dr. Barnes the Surgeon-General, was mentioned as one of those called in consultation, probably on account of his position. Hence the following telegram to the associated press of New York, published in the daily papers of June 28th.

Vindication of the United States Surgeon-General.—Boston, Tuesday, June 27. "At the late session of the American Medical Association, it was charged that Surgeon-General Barnes had been guilty of unprofessional conduct, by consulting with an irregular practitioner in the case of the Swards. It is officially announced by Dr. H. R. Stover of this city, one of the Secretaries of the Association, that the charge was dismissed in consequence of its emphatic and unequivocal denial by Dr. Barnes. The publication of this fact is important, as it had been omitted in the newspaper reports."

The following is from the *New York Evening Post* June 28th, 1865 :

Medical Bigotry.—"At the late session of the American Medical Association at Boston, it was charged that Dr. Barnes, Surgeon-General of the United States army, had been guilty of unprofessional conduct, by consulting with an 'irregular' practitioner while in attendance upon Secretary Seward and his son. The allegation was promptly denied, but as the reporters present omitted to make a note of denial, it has been considered necessary to telegraph it to the newspapers.

"We infer from the language of the denial that, in the opinion of the association, it would have been more 'professional' to let the Secretary and his son die from want of proper surgical advice than for Dr. Barnes to give his skill to a patient at whose bedside he would have to meet a practitioner, no matter how skilful, who did not happen to be 'regular.' Similar bigotry has been displayed all through this war. A persistent effort was made in a majority of the loyal states to exclude Homœopaths and Eclectics, without regard to merit and scholarship, from the service. Occasionally a Governor was found, like Morton of Indiana, who would not permit this middle age intolerance to control his surgical appointments.

"The people happily have outgrown this infantile condition, and will not suffer a few men to prescribe what shall be considered 'regular' in medicine, or orthodox in religion. The despatch to which we have alluded might have answered for an encyclical letter a century or two ago, but will hardly receive much respect at this period of the world's civilization."

THE
AMERICAN
HOMŒOPATHIC REVIEW.

Vol. VI.

NEW YORK, AUGUST, 1865.

No. 2.

PROFESSIONAL TRIALS AND DANGERS.*

BY A. R. MORGAN, M. D., SYRACUSE, N. Y.

A cursory examination of medical writings from the earliest records, reveals the same inveterate spirit of bigotry, egotism and intolerance, which characterizes and disgraces the schools of the present day.

Medicine seems to form an exception to the other learned professions; we find prevailing in them, a sort of genuine, fraternal bond, which insures not only all the common courtesies and civilities of life, but extends to generous and sympathetic expressions of respect and esteem beyond the grave; while with us, on the contrary, it is an exception to the rule to find a physician exalting his colleague, especially if he be a neighbor and competitor, and almost equally rare, to find us heartily eulogizing the memory of a professional brother, even after he has been removed from our midst by the inevitable fate which awaits us all.

Why is this so? Does the study of our profession necessarily dwarf the humanity within us and develop the Ishmaelite and the bigot? Does the professional experience

* Read before the Onondaga, Oswego and Cayuga County Homœopathic Medical Societies.

of the prating physician—do his peculiarly confidential relations to his patients tend to blind his eyes, stop his ears, warp his intellect and stifle his generosity until there is no possible escape from the petty egotism of his own circumscribed stand point?

I am led into this vein of thought, by a survey of our own chosen field of Homœopathy as it presents itself to us to-day. In point of intolerance and egotistical assumption, it affords but slight exception to the sad experience of the past. With a profound conviction of its substantial basis, its scope and its opportunity, let us take heed and avoid the dangers which beset us.

In Homœopathy, based upon an immutable natural law, we find the first real union between science and the healing art. It is the first successful step towards establishing a system capable of philosophic demonstration. By it, the chaotic vagaries of the past, held together by no central principle are reduced to comparative order, and the art of medicine aspires to a position among the exact sciences.

We claim for Homœopathy an approximation to the exact sciences, because it is based upon a fixed law. Thus, a complete analysis of all the phenomena presented by a given malady and a thorough knowledge of the pathogenesis of drugs, will guide each practitioner to the selection of the same curative remedy. It teaches us by a simple and undeviating rule, without cruel and hazardous experiment on the sick, what remedies are adapted to the cure of certain morbid conditions.

No wonder its early advocates full of zealous enthusiasm, saw in the ultimate perfection attainable by this new science, a system so complete, so harmonious and so irresistible as to, promise a millennial future, wherein the fugitive evils, errors, and absurdities of the past would be bound together and cast into the pit of oblivion, forever.

How bitterly have they been disappointed! We behold to-day, instead of a united brotherhood, advancing sturdily and triumphantly, shoulder to shoulder in one common cause,

bitter rival factions, yet lingering upon the very threshold of the temple, squandering their precious time in furious contention over minor features, with scarcely a ray of that magnanimity which should distinguish the noble profession to which we belong.

The chief element of discord with us, is the subject of the dose.

Homœopaths are divided into three classes, viz., high-attenuationists, low attenuationists, and those who, without exclusiveness, believe in the efficacy of the entire range of potencies, each under proper circumstances.

The exclusive high-attenuationist is subject to the charge of fanaticism, (the term fanatic is often but the synonym for pioneer, his chief offence is in being in advance of his contemporaries). In his zeal, he *may* occasionally indulge in the self-confident assumption, "I am holier than thou;" yet he at least, merits commendation and praise for his unflinching and fearless advocacy of his opinions—with him there is no skulking—he may in his earnest devotion to his ideas, indulge in terms of indignant denunciation against those who wilfully and utterly decline to follow him in his pathway of exploration; but one significant fact may always be observed, he never palavers of compromising with Allopathy, he never falters in his loyalty to the fundamental principles upon which the whole science of Homœopathy is built.

Upon the other hand, the exclusive low attenuationists is apt to sink into a method so loose and unprincipled as to even involve his confidence in the law *similia similibus curentur*, and to permit his practice to degenerate into more eclecticism.

This assertion is verified by the practice of too many low attenuationists, even in the circle of our own acquaintance. Their disregard of Hahnemann's precautions, their frequent departure from our law of cure, their habitual resort to cathartics, anodynes and other palliatives, is not only disgraceful to their intelligence as Homœopaths, but dishonorable to them as men. They claim to be Homœopaths when they are but mongrels.

Many of them serve under the banner of Homœopathy because of its popularity and for mere mercenary and selfish purposes. They do not elevate it, they do not sustain it, but, like the horde of camp followers which hang around, disgrace and encumber an army, they are ever ready to trample the sacred symbol under foot, to riot in the spoils.

As an apology for a mongrel practice, the humiliating excuse is sometimes made, that, having tried homœopathic remedies and failed, they have no alternative but to resort to Allopathy or see their patients go elsewhere for treatment. Oh rapacious pocket! They have not yet even found, much less tried the true homœopathic remedy, if Allopathy is capable of affording relief.

Such an apologist (when not too far gone) will generally acknowledge the universality of our law of cure, but remonstrates thus, "If I do not know the appropriate homœopathic remedy, it is as unfortunate for my patient as though no such remedy existed." It *is* unfortunate for his patient—unfortunate to have such a physician!

Shade of Hahnemann! What profundity! What sublime resignation to ignorance!

If all Homœopaths were to fold their hands and smother their consciences in this way, there would be an end to all farther advancement with us.

Study, laborious, persevering, self-sacrificing study, unswerving and inflexible fidelity to our law, have made Homœopathy what it is. Without these, we should still be groping in the obscurity and uncertainty of old physic.

The sole argument used by the low against the high attenuationists, that of ridicule and the mathematical demonstration of the absurdity of infinitesimal doses, is the identical one with which the old school has so frequently attempted to demolish Homœopathy.

It is the self same bludgeon with which Homœopathy has been so often pounded and crushed, until (like the fresh water polypi, of which, when they are divided and subdivided into a thousand fragments, each part becomes a perfect living

whole) it has steadfastly established itself in the confidence of the people throughout the land.

This matter of the dose cannot be evaded by us as a mere trifling affair of personal conviction or caprice. "It is not a matter of theory and speculation but a matter of fact and experiment," to be decided only after cautious, deep, searching, unprejudiced, and intelligent investigations. Upon it hangs the future usefulness and destiny of our system of cure.

The flippant assertion of Dr.———that he has no confidence in this or that especial attenuation or dose, is of no importance whatever. We must decide for ourselves and our conclusions should be drawn from a thorough and impartial study of the whole range of potencies and their effects.

Let us not remain in the valley, believing nothing exists in the wide universe beyond the bounds of our own limited horizon.

Every motive prompts the conscientious physician to cure his patients in the most speedy and effectual manner possible. It seems that no one can be so obtuse as to reject that method which experience proves to be the best. The question then is, how can we most surely arrive at the truth? It can only be done by a candid, unbiased and thorough examination of all the evidence presented.

A large amount of testimony has been gathered having an important bearing upon this point.

Many of our most eminent, profound and discreet physicians, close observers, in this and other countries, after long and critical deliberation have pronounced in favor of the superiority of the higher attenuations. (By the high or higher attenuations, I mean all those preparations wherein the drug is attenuated beyond the recognition of any material test, say, from 5th or 6th cent., upward.)

The mass of clinical experience they have given us cannot be ignored without calling in question either their integrity or their ability. On the other hand, we find opposed to this

carefully detailed testimony, the simple, unqualified negation of the unbelievers.

Perhaps the most conclusive and comprehensive testimony yet furnished, is that of Dr. Eiherr of the Leopoldstadt Hospital, Vienna, (see article on "High-Potencies," by C. Dunham, M. D., published in Transactions of New York State Homœopathic Medical Society, Vol. II. 1864).* It should be remembered, that these experiments were conducted by men whose convictions were decidedly on the side of the superiority of the low potencies.

The experiments were extended during a period of ten years; the disease treated was pneumonia; the conclusion arrived at was favorable to the higher potencies.

The potencies employed were the 30th, 6th and 15th decimal, equal to the 13th, 3rd and 7.5 centesimal.

The duration of the disease under the 6th avrg,	d	19.5	days.
"	"	15th	" 14.6 "
"	"	30th	" 11.3 "

These experiments by Dr. Eiherr are spoken of briefly, as doubtless the report has been read by you all. The paper of Dr. Dunham is one of the ablest arguments yet presented in favor of the high potencies.

In seeking for progress in our science, we should never forget, that it is the imperative duty of each and every one of us to bear his portion of the burden. Indolence is a formidable enemy to our future growth. To be drones is unworthy our high calling, and must necessarily result in professional degeneracy. Let us, therefore, shake off the shackles of apathy and prejudice, and consecrate our hearts and our energies anew to the elevation and improvement of Homœopathy.

In setting out, it is indispensable that we bear in mind the "three precautions" of the Author of Homœopathy, viz.:

1st. Beware of thinking your doses too small.

* See AMERICAN HOMŒOPATHIC REVIEW, Vol. III, p. 259.

2d. Beware of an improper selection of the remedy.

3d. Beware of too frequent repetition of the dose.

The first can only be determined by careful and continued experiment. The second by a rigid and intelligent compliance with the formula, *similia similibus curentur*. Want of success in practice arises from neglect of this second precaution, more frequently than from any other cause. In order to make a proper selection of the remedy, we must first make an exhaustive analysis of all the phenomena presented by the patient. Both objective conditions and subjective symptoms are necessary to this end. Second, we must have a thorough knowledge of the true pathogenesis of drugs.

We fail, oftener, through ignorance of the provings we already have than from imperfect ones, yet the most intelligent, diligent and concise student is liable to become bewildered amid the sometimes questionable mass of records furnished us as provings.

Compare Hull's edition of *Jahr's New Manual*, with the English edition or Curie's *Jahr*; compare *Hull's Jahr* with either the French or the original German editions, and you will be astonished at the disagreements revealed! The differences are so palpable as to awaken unpleasant doubts as to the reliability of the books used by the great mass of American Homœopaths. This fault to a great degree lies with the translators, and necessitates new provings and new and more accurate and reliable translations. We have much better data and fuller material from which to create a good *Materia Medica* than was possessed by the original publishers of the immortal works of Hahnemann and Jahr, for we are now able to introduce much new and corroborative evidence from a wider range of clinical experience.

This desideratum would be accomplished in the most satisfactory manner by the proposed new *Materia Medica* of our learned colleague, Dr. Constantine Hering, were it not for the proposition to print a bulky, unwieldy and inconvenient double edition, with English and German in parallel columns.

Let Dr. Hering give us a convenient, concise and practical

edition in English alone, and we shall be able to go forth stoutly armed and equipped for our work while he will merit and receive the gratitude of every true Homœopathician and will render a service to humanity second only to that of the revered Hahnemann.

A pernicious disposition with some of us is that insatiable desire for change which allures us to wanderings after new remedies before we half know the old. This over anxiety for new things tends to make us superficial in our study and comprehension of the old. It is more important to the genuine Homœopathician to have a complete knowledge of the pathogenesis of the polychrest remedies alone than to possess smattering ideas of all the roots and herbs in the Eclectic wigwam. *Let us avoid using new remedies except when it can be done in strict compliance with our law of indication.*

The third and last of Hahnemann's admonitions, can only be rightly observed by allowing, so far as practicable, each dose to exhaust its action before it is repeated.

This is, practically, the most difficult one to heed, particularly in a country ride, or where there is not abundant time and opportunity to revisit your patients.

With these precautions ever in mind, we cannot greatly err.

OUR MATERIA MEDICA.

BY CONSTANTINE HERING, M. D., PHILADELPHIA, PA.

(Continued from page 12.)

Berberis is a good illustration; when the proving of this remedy reached Allentown, it created surprise on account of its numerous symptoms, comprising one thousand two hundred and twelve in all. The students thought they could more easily eat their way through the mountain of pudding, like the mouse in the fable, than conquer this remedy. The

translation of *Jahr's Manual* was then in progress. The tedious work was accomplished, and an extract made; one thousand two hundred and twelve symptoms were reduced to two hundred and ninety-six, the juicy grapes became dried and shriveled raisins, pressed singly or in bundles into various compartments. The seeds, nevertheless, yielded the following prolific vines upon this soil.

Dr. Jeanes cured by Berberis a fistula of the rectum, with short cough and other chest symptoms. This curious complication of fistula ani with consumption, was discussed among us in 1834, and corroborated by many analogous cases. With the appearance of fistula ani, the chest symptoms sometimes disappear; but after the so-called operation for fistula, the patients often die with irremediable consumption. The alkaline Phosphate of Lime which we proved at that time, but which is not yet printed, produced symptoms corresponding to both the above named conditions. Our knowledge of these facts led to the frequent exhibition of the remedy with great success.

Dr. Jeanes reported the case of a fistula recti of three month's standing, combined with frequent, troublesome short cough, sallow color of face, etc. After Berberis¹⁸, the cough ceased within forty-eight hours, and the fistula improved for a few weeks. Then the patient had an attack of bilious colic, to which he had been much subject three years ago, and which was relieved by Colocynth. Then the fistula continued to improve, and healed completely, after the eruption of boils, which took place after several weeks.

Dr. Jeanes ascertained that another patient, frequently suffering with so-called bilious colic followed by jaundice, was permanently cured by drinking an infusion prepared from the bark of the root of Berberis.

Dr. Lingen cured a painful diarrhœa preceded by rumbling, with burning sensation and pain on the left side in the descending colon. The burning extended down through the anus, but did not come at night. In another case, old yellow blotches about the navel had vanished, with desquamation,

after Berberis. Dr. Lingen pointed out how frequently the symptoms of Berberis corresponded to chronic gonorrhœa.

Dr. Kitchen used it successfully in affections of the kidneys, marked by continuous straining to urinate, and pain in the neck of the bladder, particularly burning; and passing but little urine. Subsequently it was also used in a case where the burning was felt at the extremity of the *glans penis*, but within the urethra particularly.

Dr. Neidhard used it in many affections of the kidneys, marked particularly by burning and soreness in the region of the kidneys. Also particularly when kidney disease is followed by sour or bitter taste in the mouth with *congestion of the neck*, together with good appetite, bolting of food and reddish sediment in the urine. He reports another very important case, in which he was governed entirely by the symptoms. A patient who had been operated upon for strabismus suffered from violent stinging pains, at first going from the knee toward the eyes, then passing through the eye inwardly, or from the temple toward the eye, sometimes flying toward the arm; Berberis brought relief, and a farther application of this experience may be expected.

Dr. Lippe used it in very many cases of renal and vesical affections and passage of small calculi, whenever the urinary symptoms of Berberis were accompanied by the pain in the hips which characterizes this remedy. He cured by means of Berberis a severe stinging behind the right ear appearing in paroxysms, with aggravation every evening. It was also used in several cases of stiffness *in the neck*, (throat?) sometimes one-sided, also with internal puffiness, similar to *Pulsatilla*.

Dr. Pehrson used it when indicated by a feeling of a lump in the throat, with very violent pains before and during stool, resembling constriction, "fæces could not pass through," also heat of the body in the afternoon.

Dr. Williamson cured with Berberis a case of violent burning and stinging in the urethra of a woman aged fifty, since the cessation of menses.

N. N. used it in a case of chronic ovarian disease, in four doses of the 6th in absence of voluptuousness during coition.

Dr. Ingals wrote that Berberis had decidedly improved the following case: A man aged 70 or 80, suffered from a cord-like induration along the dorsum of the penis, reaching to the end of the corpora cavernosa, causing a considerable curve of the glans upwards during erection, the symptom of Berberis being "the penis harder and retracted."

This list of cases might easily be prolonged, particularly if the accumulation of reports and memoranda, collected around the mines of our experience should be sifted.

Nothing was experienced in Germany in the first decennium after the appearance of this proving, notwithstanding the inviting report of Widemann, (*Hygea* iv, p. 97, 1836,) who, notwithstanding his neat cure, thinks it his duty and according to fashion, to complain of the one thousand two hundred and twelve symptoms, as well as to protest against drawing hasty conclusions regarding the case reported by him.

So little did Widemann comprehend Hahnemann's *Materia Medica*, that he thought it fit to remark, p. 99, "no great inventive faculty is requisite, in order to hunt up several appropriate symptoms corresponding to many and various diseases, among those (one thousand two hundred and twelve!) enumerated by Hesse!" What dreadful conceit! What an entire want of clear conception of given facts, furnished on the one hand by the case itself, and by the symptoms of the remedy on the other! What has "inventive faculty" to do with such a case? There is nothing at all to be invented, and why this contempt of one of the most significant intellectual functions of the human mind, serving the high purpose of curing disease?

Nothing but the absurd fashion of those days has called forth the above remarks. The onions of doubt were cut up, till the pungent vapor obscured clear vision and distorted the objects standing clearly in view. Almost all symptoms presented by Widemann's patient were to be found among those

of Berberis, and the most important, decisive symptoms of the case were at the same time prominent and peculiar indications of the remedy. No other remedy of the *Materia Medica* presented an equal similarity, and more than this, the remedy administered in $\frac{3}{8}$ produced new symptoms which likewise corresponded to symptoms found among the one thousand two hundred and twelve! These, too, were plainly specific. The patient, whose case had dragged along several years, has been well for four weeks, "having danced at a party." But lo! The doctor shrugs his scientific shoulders, because "we cannot know what might follow." Suppose now, the entire case of the woman had reappeared, and the same remedy, instead of being given in higher and higher dynamizations "must," from prejudice, be given stronger and stronger without benefit etc., what conclusions could have been drawn? None, except that the industriously collected facts of Hesse were, singly and collectively, corroborated. Could Hesse have survived the success obtained by homœopathic physicians, returning to the alone-curing method of Hahnemann, he would have experienced the pleasure of seeing the inexhaustible fountain of his excellent production giving relief for all generations to come. Rosenberg's case of coryza (Oehme 166) is sufficiently important to lead to further results. Also Buchner's case of Berberis (A. H. Z. 47. 176.) is useful in confirming many facts. But the best of all these cures is that of Veit. Meyer, in the A. H. Z. 53. 176. Oehme 5. 270. More are ardently hoped for.

If all these cured symptoms were underscored in the provings of Hesse, they would at once bear a defined and determined aspect, like a painting which cannot deceive.

Why should we be detained and bothered by erasing? What would it avail to scrape and erase the strong dark lines of a line engraving, representing a human figure? Look at the face and take it as it is.

"But not a single scraper or eraser or broom-maker has assailed Berberis." For this very reason this remedy furnishes the best example; its numerous symptoms having

been lamented. But this was the first thing to be done away with; this fear of insurmountable numbers is a miserable delusion. On the contrary, the more symptoms a remedy has, even were they an hundred thousand strong, the more surely and distinctly—for it cannot well be *more easily* in matters of such importance—the experienced reader will discover at first sight, the character of the whole. Would it not appear singular if a well schooled violinist should be afraid of the number of notes in a symphony of Beethoven? Why should a physician shrink from such labor?

Supposing Berberis were "pure," and the rest really impure, which, however, cannot be admitted, *could we not, in a similar manner form a correct idea concerning them?* Would not this process lead to certainty in the course of years?

Suppose now the attempt were successfully made, and prior to all other experiments patients were cured; whereupon all the cured cases were remembered or noted with red ink in the registers of symptoms; then suppose, we were thereby enabled to achieve more cures, placing them among the "conglomerations of symptoms," would not that gradually define the character of the one dim picture in strong relief?

But one condition still exists, no matter whether great or small; we must have cures, and consequently achieve cures, even at the risk of blundering a little. Our own cures should be numerous, and the more of them we have, the better; else the reports of others would not be credited. For a "man of education" (so-called) never believes what he cannot understand, particularly not the physician if he has a "medical education." That has been proved by the Petersburg folios, wherein all homœopathic cures were crushed to pulp. The same was done by the little imitations of those great folios, on the part of "scientific" Homœopathists versus the Hahnemannians in general. Only our own cures enable us to judge the cures of others.

But how stands the case if these cures should fail occasionally, or even in most instances, what then? We could not