

Confessions of the faculty : a collection of curious and important facts, deeply interesting to heads of families and invalids / by Socius.

Contributors

Royal College of Physicians of London

Publication/Creation

St Neots, 1848.

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/mtcqxyw2>

Provider

Royal College of Physicians

License and attribution

This material has been provided by This material has been provided by Royal College of Physicians, London. The original may be consulted at Royal College of Physicians, London. This material has been provided by Royal College of Physicians, London. The original may be consulted at Royal College of Physicians, London. where the originals may be consulted. This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection
183 Euston Road
London NW1 2BE UK
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722
E library@wellcomecollection.org
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

FACTS 1
CONFESSIONS OF THE FACULTY.

A COLLECTION OF

CURIOUS AND IMPORTANT

FACTS,

DEEPLY INTERESTING TO

HEADS OF FAMILIES AND INVALIDS.

BY SOCIUS.

1848.

SOLD BY
SIMPKIN, MARSHALL AND CO., PATERNOSTER ROW;
AND ALL BOOKSELLERS THROUGHOUT
THE KINGDOM.

ST. NEOTS:
PRINTED BY J. TOPHAM,

Price 1s.

CONFESSIONS OF THE FACULTY.

No one who feels any interest in the subject of Medical Reform, (a subject which seriously affects all classes,) and has read or heard of the controversies and disagreements among different classes of the Profession, divided as they are into opposing parties, each contending for pre-eminence, but must be sensible that there is something radically wrong in the system.

Indeed, as we shall show, this is candidly confessed by the Faculty ; and a number of its members being dissatisfied with existing arrangements, and perhaps the increasing intelligence of the public, are very anxious to obtain a charter of monopoly, and to amalgamate the whole profession into *a single Faculty of General Practitioners*. How very improbable that such a scheme would be likely to answer or suit the public, may be inferred from the evidence of Sir Benjamin Collins Brodie, taken before the *Select Committee on Medical Legislation*. He said, "Such a Faculty would not do for the Public ;

and the result would be that it would force uneducated persons into practice. 'This was the mischief that occurred in former times when the physicians assumed to be the only medical practitioners, and required of their body very high qualifications.' Moreover, he added, in his evidence given before the same Committee, June 25th, 1847. "*I think it would be very unjust to prevent me consulting anybody I please about my own case, and that whoever I think proper to consult, should have a right to attend me, and that the Government should not interfere.*"

We venture to say the public generally, (excepting the general practitioner,) are of the same opinion, and in spite of legislators and intriguers will maintain their indefeasible right.

Before coming to a decision however on any subject relating to alterations in the existing state of the medical profession, unless it were to repeal the very objectionable Act of 1815; called the Apothecaries' Act, it would be prudent to pass in review the experiences and confessions of the most learned Professors of Ancient and Modern Physic. We should then be better enabled to form a correct opinion of the expediency or *inexpediency* of legislating on the subject;

and more especially with regard to the so-called "Registration Bill," which is evidently, though artfully intended to be made the foundation stone of a *Single Faculty College*.

Let us, as a preliminary, inquire what are the just pretensions of the common routine practice to certainty and safety,—what title it has on the whole, taking together all the cases in which it is followed, and all the medical practitioners who follow it, to be regarded as a method in which we ought to be content, of prolonging life, counteracting disease, and alleviating or preventing pain. We cannot do better in this inquiry than to take the declarations of men who have devoted the labour of their lives to this practice, and who, if any could, should be able to pronounce its eulogy.

Medicine was in its origin, nothing but a coarse empiricism which chance or instinct suggested to primitive mortals. But philosophers soon began to dogmatise, and to add their hypotheses to the already equivocal data of a science which was *not* one, since Medicine, as we understand it, escapes the most subtle investigations of the mind. There, is precisely where all the efforts of those illustrious thinkers terminated, (if we are to believe the history of Greece,) who succeeded

each other from Empedocles to Herodicus the inventor of gymnastics ; or if you will, from Pythagoras to Hippocrates.

The last named person it is true, effected a happy revolution in medicine, by separating it from philosophy ; but his successors, Plato, Aristotle, Diocles, Praxagoras, &c., soon returned to dogmatism, that is, they commenced reasoning beyond all bounds, on things of which they had not even an idea, and to deduce from misinterpreted facts, the principles of an ordinary art.

Setting out from this epoch, Medicine, (though human nature has not undergone the slightest modification, and has invariably continued the same,) Medicine, I say, ceases not to undergo alterations, and to change its principles:—there are empirics, humourists, pneumatists, humoro-pneumatists, eclectics, methodists, &c., &c., a real Tower of Babel, where every one deafens his neighbours with a jargon of which he understands not a whit more than those who hear him. Next came Galen, who by crying out louder, and perhaps for a longer time than the others, ultimately effected a predominance of his own ideas ; his profession of medical faith, (if he had any,) was a dogmatism so complex, that it would require more than one volume to give an abstract of it.

After the death of the Physician of Pergamus, there now remained but an extensive field of darkness where the Art of Asclepiades became changed into an occult science, the jargon of which old nick himself could not make out.

But was the ignorance of the physicians of that day more prejudicial to humanity than the sublime inspirations of our modern folk? God only knows; the dead are mute. However, towards the end of the middle age, Medicine shook the dust off its wings after three ages of lethargy, and resumed her ærial flight under the auspices of Paracelsus and Van Helmont. But what a restoration! We have no longer to consider, as in the time of Heraclitus and Aristotle, philosophy mixing up its dogmas with the precepts of the art of healing; it is all the sciences, all the liberal or mechanical arts which vie one with another in deforming and disfiguring it.

The great discovery of William Harvey produces no change in the course of things, for notwithstanding the circulation of the blood, which remained for a long time in dispute, we now come to have the molecular and mathematical medicine with Sylvius and Willis, just as we had the chymical and al-chemistical medicine with Paracelsus.

Next, the vitalism of Stahl, and Frederick Hoffman, puts the finish to the perplexities of the adepts. Without intending any disparagement to the apologists of this period, all was still a chaos. Let us now see how we have got out of it. Some indefatigable Nosologists, at the head of which we must place Sauvages and Pinel, had the heroic courage to dig the rubbish, to rake it up, to prepare it and turn it to account for the purpose of building up the new edifice which is to stand for all time. The edifice is raised; its plan is unobjectionable, its base is solid, and all that will remain for posterity to do is to complete the details. Henceforward then we are to have an inimitable—an eternal medical doctrine. Error! Illusion! Behold a man with the voice of thunder, with the eye of an eagle, the arm of a Hercules, comes hastening from the West. By *his* powerful blast, he will in one instant crumble all this scaffolding, one vestige of which will not be traced in less than twenty years. This man is Francis Victor Broussais, who after making a tabula rasa leaves nothing behind him but—his name!

Where then is the truth now, Gentlemen Doctors? What! you have been pursuing it for the last two thousand years

without overtaking it? three centuries of debates, and the suit is not yet over? there is error then: we are the dupes of some mistake. Let us change our route if you wish to know where the truth in Medicine lies.

Boerhaave, an illustrious name in Medicine, uses the following remarkable language. "If we compare the good which half-a-dozen true disciples of Æsculapius have done since their art began, with the evil which the immense number of Apothecaries have inflicted upon mankind, we must be satisfied, that it would have been infinitely better for mankind, if medical men had never existed."

But, it may be said, Boerhaave lived a hundred years ago, and was himself a reformer in medicine; since his time the methods of the Art have become more rational, and more safe.

Hear then Dr. Pereira. In his Lectures on Pharmacology, published in 1835, in the London Medical Gazette; he says, speaking of the common practice,—“We can hardly refuse our assent to the observation of the late Sir Gilbert Blane, that in *many* cases patients get well *in spite of the means employed*: and sometimes, when the practitioner fancies that he has made a great cure, we may fairly

assume the patient to have had a *happy escape*."

That eminent Physician Dr. Abercrombie of Edinburgh, in his book entitled, "*Inquiries concerning the Intellectual Powers, and the Investigation of Truth*," remarks, that the uncertainty, and of course the danger of Medical practice, is principally felt in two respects; first, in regard to the characters of disease, and secondly, in regard to the remedies employed. Of the first, he says, "Since medicine was first cultivated as a science, a leading object of attention has been to ascertain the *Characters of Symptoms* by which internal diseases are indicated, and and by which they are distinguished from other diseases that resemble them. But with the accumulated experience of ages, bearing upon this important subject, our extended observation has only served to convince us how deficient we are in this department, and how often, even in the first step, in our progress, we are left to *conjecture*. A writer of high eminence has even hazarded the assertion, that those persons are most confident in regard to the character of disease, whose knowledge is most limited, and that more extended observation leads to *doubt*."

As to the effect of Medicines upon the Patient, Dr. Abercrombie adds,—“An equal, or even more remarkable uncertainty attends all our researches on the second head to which I have referred, namely, the action of external agents upon the body. These engage our attention in two respects, as causes of disease, and as remedies; and in both these views, the action of them is fraught with the *highest degree of uncertainty.*”

Dr. Abercrombie acknowledges that the General Practitioner of the routine school, is perplexed at every step with painful doubts, and is *obliged to grope and guess his way in darkness.*

Girtanner* says;—“*As the art of healing has no fixed principles*, as nothing in it is positive, as we have but little sure experience, every Physician and Apothecary has a right to act upon his own opinions. Where there is nothing but *conjecture*, one conjecture is as good as another. In the gloom of ignorance in which the Practitioners of the routine school grope along, there is no ray of light to guide them.”

He also says†:—“*Our materia medica is*

* Darstellung des Brownschen Systems, 2. 608.

† Darstellung, 2. 600.

a mere collection of fallacious observations. There are in it *some* correct ones, founded upon experience; but who would waste time in seeking for a few particles of gold in that immense dung-hill which Physicians have been collecting for these *two thousand years*."

"We feel daily," says Krüger Hansen*, "that we are far from possessing a fixed and sure method of cure. The works on Therapeutics furnish the most eminent proofs what confusion exists, even among those Physicians who stand the highest in their Art. Its state, which has long and deservedly been the object of the lowest jokes, *demands*, for the benefit of mankind, *extensive improvements*."

"Whoever," says Schweickert†, "attends the progress of medical science, must observe, that its practice has *not advanced one step* since Hippocrates and Galen: but that on the contrary we are perhaps much behind them; for *fifty years ago* the greater number of sick persons were killed, according to the prescriptions of their Physicians, by bleedings;—*forty years ago*, by purgatives;—*thirty years ago*, by clysters;—*twenty years ago*, by the Bruonian System; and a celebrated Physician

* Brillenlose Reflexionen, &c., p. 9.

† Schweickert's Journal, 4. 120.

asserts that that system has made victims of a greater number of human beings than all the whole revolutionary War, from 1793 to 1815."

"*The routine practice*," says Luther, "does not merit the name of a system ; it wants order, coherence of parts, and scientific unity ;—it is only an aggregate of incongruous matters, a mere rhapsody."

Hoffman says*, "Perpauca sint remedia quorum virtutes et operationes certæ ; plurima vero infida, suspecta, fallacia, ficta." (*Few are the remedies whose virtues and operations are certain ; many are those which are doubtful, suspicious, fallacious, false.*)

We are told by Luther, that Dr. Joerg, a celebrated professor, convinced of the uncertainty of the usual *Materia Medica*, resolved, some years ago, to make regular experiments on the effects of medicaments ; and he owns that he was astonished to observe that *no one of the substances tried, produced such effects as are taught by the doctrine of Materia Medica*. He calls that doctrine, *a medical romance*.

Speaking of the *mixture* of drugs, Montaigne said, "of the whole heap having compounded a potion, is it not an idle fancy

* *Medicina Rationalis*, t. 3, s. 2, c. 3, s. 1.

to hope that its various virtues shall proceed to separate and extricate themselves from that mixture and confusion, in order to execute missions so diversified ? ”

“ Do they consider the stomach,” says Luther, “ to be a general post office, where all the drugs arrive at once, and are thence dispatched each to its proper destination, one to the nerves, another to the circulation, another to the lungs, another to the brain, &c. ? ”

What else can they think who prescribe compound mixtures : can any thing be more absurd ?

Speaking of violent medicines, “ they employ ” says Krüger Hansen*, “ for the simplest diseases which *nature* alone, if not disturbed, would overcome. Medicines so violent that *they* form the cause of many chronic diseases.”

Medical Prescriptions are written in Latin : “ but this practice,” says Dr. Buchan†, “ is not only ridiculous, it is likewise dangerous. However capable Physicians may be of writing Latin, I am certain Apothecaries (*and Chemists and Druggists,*) are not in a condition to read it, and that dangerous mistakes, in consequence of this, may, and *do often occur.*”

* Brillenlose Reflexionen, &c. p. 9.

† Domestic Medicine.

Have we not even now daily proofs of this fact, and would it not be better for the Public if *Physicians* would dispense their own Medicines? Let the Public encourage them to do so, and they will find their advantage in it.

“The abuse,” says the Heidelberg Clinical Annals*, “that the servile herd of Apothecaries make of medicaments, of the effects of which they are ignorant for the cure of diseases, the form of which they seldom, and the nature of which they never know, is indeed dreadful. It is an indisputable truth, that many more die from intermeddling of Apothecaries, than are saved by them.”

Kieser says†, “In most cases the proverb is true, that the remedy is worse than the disease, and the doctor more dangerous than the disorder. The history of medicine confirms it; every method and system has *hitherto* made a greater number of victims than the most contagious epidemics, and the longest wars.”

“I know very well,” says an old Practitioner‡, “that perhaps more than sevenths of mankind die, not from disease, but from the *unsuitableness and excess of medicine.*”

* Physical Education.

† System der Medizin.

‡ Allgem. Anzeiger d. Deutschen. 1833. 235.

“ Medicine, as it has *hitherto* been practised,” says Krüger Hansen*, “is a pestilence to mankind ; it has carried off a greater number of victims than all that murderous wars have ever done ; and it appears to be rather a means of preventing overpopulation than the art of saving lives.”

“ Very few of the valuable discoveries in medicine,” says Dr. Buchan||, “ have been made by Physicians ; they have, in general, been either the effect of *chance* or of *necessity*, and have been *always opposed by the Faculty, till every one else was convinced of their importance*. An implicit faith in the opinions of teachers, an attachment to systems *and established forms*, and the dread of reflection, will always operate on those who follow medicine as a trade. Few improvements are to be expected from men who dread that they might ruin their characters, by even the smallest deviation from the established rule.”

The late professor Gregory used often to declare in his class room, that ninety-nine out of a hundred medical facts were so many medical lies, and that medical doctrines were for the most part little better than stark staring nonsense.

* Brillenlose Reflexionen, &c. p. 18.

|| Domestic Medicine.

Dr. Forbes deplotes the well known *fact*, that from the earliest days of the world's history, medicine, *as generally practised*, has shewn less tendency towards improvement, than any other branch of science. He says,—“what indeed is the history of medicine, but a history of perpetual changes in the opinions and practice of its professors, respecting the very same subjects,—the nature and treatment of disease? And amid all these changes, often extreme, and directly opposed to one another, do we not find these very diseases, the subject of them remaining (with some exceptions,) still the same in their progress and general event? Sometimes, no doubt, we observe changes in the character and event, obviously depending on the change in the treatment,—and alas, *as often for the worse as the better*; but it holds good as a general rule, that amid all the changes of treatment, the proportion of cures and of deaths *has remained nearly the same*, or, at least, if it has varied, the variation has borne no fixed relation to the difference of treatment.”

On the treatment of Asiatic Cholera, M. Bally, whose name is attached to the most important therapeutical researches of the French School, and whose long career has been devoted to the study of epidemic

maladies, makes the following statement. "No sufficient treatment has yet been adopted, and it is not the fault of medical practitioners:—the cause of the inertness of treatment residing in the abolition of the absorbing powers of the intestine. In countries where *no treatment* was employed, one half of the patients *recovered*; and in countries where the patients were submitted to the most rational methods, one half *died*, often more, seldom less."

With regard to the treatment of Asiatic Cholera, by English Practitioners, Dr. Elliotson remarks,—“As regards this country, I cannot but think that if all the patients had been left alone, the mortality would have been much the same as it has been. If all the persons attacked with Cholera had been put into warm beds, made comfortable and left alone,—perhaps many would have died who have been saved,—yet on the whole, I think the mortality would not have been greater than after all that has been done; *for we are not in the least more informed as to the proper remedies, than we were when the first case of Cholera occurred.* We have not been instructed in the least by those who have had the disease to treat. Some *say* they have cured the disease by bleeding: others, by calomel; others, by opium; and others again

say that opium does harm. No doubt many poor creatures died uncomfortably, who would have died tranquilly, if nothing had been done to them. Some were placed in hot water, or in hot air, and had opium and calomel, and other stimulants; which altogether were more than their system would bear, and more than could have been borne, if they had been so treated even in perfect health."

In the *Bulletin de Therapeutique*, (quoted in the *Medico-Chirurgical Review*,) we have the following: "The art of healing, it is very generally admitted, is one of those branches of medical knowledge in which there exists the greatest amount of *errors, defects, and prejudices*, and where experience is alike most difficult and deceptive. The mistakes that are *daily* made, are often far greater than we are willing to admit. And then, how little do we know of the extent of Nature's own curative resources, and how much she will often effect, unaided by, or perhaps even *in spite of* the interference of art.—In the practice of our profession, it should ever be borne in mind that we have to do, not only with the existing disease, but also with the conservative and reparatory efforts of nature,—which by itself is often sufficient to produce a cure. Hence

those reputations of medicines and modes of treatment which so rapidly start up, and are as quickly forgotten; and hence those false Gods of Therapeutics that to-day are adored, and to-morrow are despised."

Here again, is a paragraph from the British and Foreign Medical Review; "Certain writers, (amongst whom is Gideon Harvey, Physician to William 3rd,) have advocated systematic deception and chicane in the practice of Medicine. Harvey's book was a refined satire on the Therapeutics of *his* day. He knew, what all men of ordinary penetration now know, that the conflicting theories and mode of treatment adopted in the profession, have nearly similar results;—that *nature cures*;—and that the triumphant pœans of the pretender are raised for a victory not his own." Dr. Laycock, in the same journal, likewise observes,—“What is to be done? Shall we give up the attempt (to achieve a reformation in medicine,) in despair? Surely not. That course would be equally cowardly and impolitic. Impolitic, *because the intelligent public is treading fast on our heels*. People already begin to say,—‘When we send for a Doctor, he can only tell us what we already know,’ or, they slyly hint to you, how they would attain to successful practice. *I* would always let nature cure the disease.”

Dr. Andrew Coombe says, "Disease, as already remarked, is a mode of action of a living organism, and not an entity apart from it. In accordance with this view, experience shows, that when we favour the return to a normal action *by simply natural means*, recovery will ensue in most cases, without the use of drugs at all."

In Dr. W. Fergusson's Professional Notes, recently published, it is remarked, "There can be no treatment of fever by physic, but in studying the *juvantia* and *loedentia* of the case,—cultivating the first, eschewing the last, and never forgetting that there is a mighty power always operating in your favour, the *Vis Medicatrix Naturæ*. Do not thwart her beyond the mark, and she will get you through difficulties with which without her aid you could not cope; but the physician who believes that he possesses beyond these, medicines of specific power in fever, really should have his own license suspended, and himself be put under cure, until the monomania subsides."

He also observes,—"The term *fever* is as mysterious as it is comprehensive; it is in a great degree peculiar to the human race, and never, as an idiopathic disease affects the lower animals. The uncivilized man appears

to possess to a certain extent an exemption ; for the Negro tribes feel little of malarious fever, and the Indian races are far less subject to it than the European. Have we any safeguard ? None, but in the good keeping, good condition physical and moral, of the troops : no remedy after the disease is established, *none whatever in the way of physic* ; for the best physician that ever existed will lose more patients than the most ignorant hospital mate if he neglects the precautions of discipline, and cleanliness ; and if both be on a par in this respect, the event will, in nine cases out of ten, *be precisely the same*. Hence it appears that *physic does nothing*, and *has done nothing* towards establishing a better mode of treatment, since the days of Hippocrates."

In the Anniversary Address delivered by Dr. Chambers, Physician to the Queen, before the Royal Medical and Chirurgical Society, on the 22nd of March, 1847, when eulogising the late Dr. Robert Williams, one of the physicians to St. Thomas' Hospital, who had seen thousands of human beings suffering from disease, and had watched the application of remedial measures upon them, asked,—what was the opinion he had formed after his long experience ?

He had, in truth, little faith in Physic !

In the transactions of the Provincial Medical and Surgical Association, vol. 14, 1846, Dr. Cowan presents in his numerical report on the diseases in the district to which that report refers, the following conclusion :—

“ From the extensive comparative investigations of Mr. Watt, it seems that the deaths by various diseases are nearly identical at the same age, and that whatever the total amount of deaths by each disease may be, the proportion which the deaths falling at certain periods of life, bear to the whole deaths of these respective diseases, *remains the same*. This interesting law proves the existence of general influences regulating the life and health of the community, however variously expressed by the greater or less prevalence of particular complaints, and also indicates how difficult must be the correct solution of a therapeutic problem where agents, *other than those we are employing*, are so materially influencing the result.—In fact the whole physiology of medicine can be very imperfectly apprehended by a being so limited in capacity and duration as man ; and a juster estimate of the vast extent and difficulty of the inquiry would tend both to repress much hasty and presumptuous generalization, and establish a juster estimate of the true limits of human instrumentality.”

The simple idea which Dr. Cowan wished to convey, was this ; that notwithstanding all the skill and exertions of the Physician, that mortality among society is still the same as ever it was, and that notwithstanding all the experience of medical practice, (according to the old system,) people still die *in just the same ratio as before*.

Dr. Forbes, in the British and Foreign Medical Review, for 1846, uses this language:—

“Who amongst us, in fact, of any considerable experience, and who has thought somewhat, as well as prescribed, but is ready to admit that in a large proportion of the cases he treats, whether his practice in individual instances be directed by precept and example, by theory, by observation, by experience, by habit, by accident or by whatsoever principle of action, he has no positive proof, or rather *no proof whatever*, often indeed, very little probability, that the remedies administered by him, exert *any beneficial influence* over the disease?”

If a reasonable physician were asked what is the therapeutic action of Bark, he would answer that Bark *under certain circumstances*, strengthens the stomach, raises the circulation, restores the appetite, puts a check to perspiration, in a word, acts as a tonic, and

cures principally intermittent fevers and periodical Neuralgia.

But how does Bark cure the latter affections? Is it by strengthening the digestive organs? Is it by restoring the appetite? Is it by rousing the circulating system? Now then, gentlemen, physicians, generals, and apothecaries, say that you know nothing about the matter if you want us to believe you. How does *Mercury* cure Syphilis? How does *Opium* cure Delirium Tremens? How does the *Subnitrate of Bismuth* cure Spasms of the stomach? How do *Meglin's Pills* cure Tic Doloireux of the face? How does *Tartar Emetic* cure pneumonia? How does *Sea Salt* cure phthisis? How does bloodletting cure a multitude of diseases widely differing from one another? But we should never be done if we set about adducing instances to shew the *defect of medical sagacity*. Human penetration has its limits; and the conquests of Empiricism constitute the *only* indisputable progress that medicine has made *for the last two thousand years*.

But perhaps the most extraordinary testimony of all, was that given by Magendie, the chief physician of the Hotel Dieu in Paris, and who, as such, must have had perhaps greater experience than any man living.

Addressing his pupils, he said, “ *Medicine,*

as generally practised, *can only exist but inas-much as Patients have faith in it, and claim its assistance. It is not by theories that it lives, but by Clients.*" And he added, "Medical men are always inclined to attribute the cure of the disease they treat to the means which they have employed; but recollect that disease generally follows its course without being beneficially influenced by the medication employed against it." And this is positively true as regards the old school systems of medicine.

The Experiments with Diaphoretics instituted by Professor Semmola, of the University of Naples, may be interesting *and instructive* to the reader.

In order to ascertain whether those medicines usually denominated Diaphoretic, had really the power of exciting perspiration, the Professor submitted to the test of experiment, the most celebrated Sudorifics, (so-called.)

The following are the results of his observations :

1. *Cream of Tartar.* This was given to various individuals in doses of from five to twenty grains a-day. Out of ten individuals who took the medicine for ten successive days, only one was affected with perspiration. In the others there was not the slightest increase of transpiration.

2. *James' Powder.* Given to twenty persons in doses of from five to twenty grains, it did not excite perspiration. Given by accident to the extent of five drachms, instead of Epsom Salts, it occasioned no other inconvenience except the ordinary effect of purgatives.

3. *Kermes Mineral.* In twelve cases in which it was given, not the slightest increase of the transpiration was observed. It was frequently given to the extent of from one to four grains per diem, and this continued for a fortnight. The same happened with the hydrosulphuret of mercury.

4. *Tartar Emetic.* This was given in a great many cases in which perspiration did not spontaneously ensue: but in none was diaphoresis induced except in those cases in which vomiting occurred, and in them the perspiration could not be ascribed to the immediate effect of the medicine.

5. *Nitre.* Large doses of Nitre were given in a considerable quantity of water, but out of twenty cases, scarcely one had a little perspiration during the night; the urine on the contrary was much increased.

6. *Acetate of Ammonia.* The professor thinks that no proofs can be adduced of the diaphoretic qualities of this substance; he could never observe perspiration, although he

gave it every day in doses of four or five drachms.

7. *Sarsaparilla*. Experiments were made with this substance on twenty healthy persons, and the results of these, together with his and his colleagues' daily experience, satisfied Professor Semmola that the cases are extremely rare in which *Sarsaparilla* causes sensible perspiration, even when taken in doses of an ounce daily.

8. *Guaiac*. This was never found to excite perspiration except when the patient was subjected to influences sufficient of themselves to produce it.

9. The only Mercurial preparation which was found to be occasionally diaphoretic was *Mercurial Ointment*; but out of twenty cases scarcely three were observed to give evidence of this action.

The Professor thinks that Diaphoresis is in most cases not the result of the so-called diaphoretic medicines administered, but of the drinks, additional bed clothing and rest which are imposed on the patients, or of natural crises in the disease.

The Professor shows that each diaphoretic substance has a mode of action peculiar to itself, and considers it a great error to talk of the action of remedies being identical, *whereas*

each acts very differently, and to prescribe indifferently one medicine in place of another without paying attention to the speciality of their actions.

He thinks that the Sudorific property, when it exists, is but a small part of the medicinal virtues which the so-called diaphoretic medicine possesses. The mere knowledge that a medicine possesses a diaphoretic power, he says, can be of no use in medicine.

He further adds, that the error he has pointed out with respect to sudorific medicines, *prevails with regard to all other orders of medicinal substances.*

The foregoing extracts, culled from medical periodicals and the writings of the most experienced of the Faculty, prove the miserable state of darkness in which the practice of medicine still exists in 1848.

Can it be wondered at, that the greatest medical authorities on every subject in medicine should be so completely at variance, that *there is scarcely a single disease in which you will find any two of them agreeing.*

And what are we to infer from all this?

That medical men of the old school have neglected to make themselves acquainted with the true principles on which remedies act, and know as little of the true nature of

the diseases whose treatment they so confidently undertake.

They are self-condemned. Yes! "The intelligent public fast treading on their heels," are beginning to see through the arts which have so long concealed *that huge and monstrous system of Quackery.*

Well might Moliere, so long the terror of the Apothecaries, say, "call in a doctor, and if you do not like his physic, I'll soon find you another who will condemn it."

Dr. Forth's remark also, is applicable to the present time. He said, "It has always appeared to me most unaccountable, how mankind can continue to have the slightest confidence in medicine, *as generally prescribed,* and its prescribers !

This is explicable only by the carelessness with which they look at this destroying Art: they could not otherwise fail to see that medicine, as generally practised, is only a *subtle imposture*, and its prescribers either impostors or ignorant. A monarch who should free his state from the pestilent set of Apothecaries, and entirely interdict the practice of medicine would deserve to be placed by the side of the most illustrious characters who have ever conferred extensive benefits on mankind."

Dr. Paris, in his 'admirable work' on *Materia Medica*, has justly observed, "that observation or experiment upon the effects of medicine is liable to a thousand fallacies, unless it be carefully repeated under the various circumstances of *health and disease*, in different climates, and on different constitutions."

This has been the main object of the Homœopathist. A further quotation from the above distinguished writer will illustrate the importance of their labours.

"It is impossible," continues Dr. Paris, "to cast our eyes over such multiplied groups of medicinal substances, without being forcibly struck with the palpable absurdity of some, the disgusting and loathsome nature of others, the total want of activity in many, *and the uncertain and precarious reputation of all*, without feeling an eager curiosity to inquire from the combination of what causes it can have happened that substances at one period in the highest esteem, and generally acknowledged utility, have fallen into total neglect and disrepute. That such fluctuation in opinion, and versatility in practice should have produced, even in the most candid and learned observer, an unfavorable impression with regard to the general efficacy of medicine,

can hardly excite our astonishment, much less our indignation ; nor can we be surprised to find that another portion of mankind has at once arraigned physic as *a fallacious Art*, or derided it as a *composition of Error and Fraud*.

A late writer impressed with this sentiment has given the following flattering definition of our Profession.

“ Physic is the art of amusing the Patient, while Nature cures his disease.”

So much for the old system of medicine. So much for ignorance, error, and fraud, and CONFESSED QUACKERY. Well may Dr. Forbes deplore the well-known fact, that Medicine, as generally practised, has shown less tendency towards improvement than any other branch of science.

With such a mass of condemning evidence as the foregoing, showing the terrible ignorance, uncertainty *and danger* attending the practice of medicine as taught in the schools, it is not to be wondered at, that that certain class of general practitioners who stubbornly refuse to investigate an important doctrine because new to them, and who in their own characteristic way meet the subject with abuse and denounce it as a fraud, should endeavour still to mystify the Public ; but it is surprising that our intelligent Representatives, should

waste their time on a thing so silly as a "Registration Bill," or listen to the noisy clamour of some General Practitioners for a separate charter of Incorporation. These desire to establish one Single Faculty of General Practitioners, and to obtain powers which would create an injurious monopoly.

As to the proposed 'Register,' it may be charitably looked upon as a subterfuge,—a pure piece of trickery. Are not all the members of the Profession already registered, each in his different College, University or Hall? Would the advocates of the 'Single Faculty College' become more learned in that monopoly Hall, or would 'the intelligent Public' be in any way benefited by more physic, or any kind of Medical Register?

Whoever heard of an invalid consulting a Register before calling in a medical practitioner; or of asking him to show his credentials or certificate, that it might be first ascertained whether he is duly qualified by a *Licence* to take care of him? as though a certificate or Licence could ever be a *proof of ability*!

Preposterous as such an idea is it has been disseminated by men who ought to know better.

The foregoing confessions have been

published with a view to enlighten the Public, and to stimulate the Faculty to alter their course, and the prevailing system of educating students in *Medicine*.

We strongly deprecate the present erroneous plan of teaching *opinions*, when professors should be engaged *in teaching facts*; and we would tell the student, that blind acquiescence is not a virtue, but is rather the characteristic of an imbecile : and that on the other hand, honest and manly investigation is the characteristic of a virtuous and independent mind. To all we say, Awake! Arise! Examine!

We see that the old system of medicine has no title to be regarded as a method with which we ought to be content, for it has been *most justly* denounced as a *destroying Art*, by those intelligent and upright men who have devoted the labour of their lives to its practice.

We often see that fashion and *self-interest* prompt men to the course they pursue, and we are convinced that with a vast number, an original defect in their moral and intellectual training, renders them pre-disposed to receive the *opinions* of their teachers as truisms which brighter intellects have propounded,—which the lapse of time has encircled with authority,—but with an inquiry into the truth of

which *they* are not fitted to grapple. It is thus that the head settles down, and men degenerate, and become mere automata.

It is thus that the existence of many abuses is prolonged, and it is thus that the tameness, sameness, and want of originality, which we have such great reason to deplore, is to be explained.

There is a numerous class of persons in the Profession, playing the game of 'follow the leader,' —men, who look not at principles, but persons ; pinning their faith upon the sleeve of some individual who has managed to ingratiate himself with them ; who denounce what he denounces, and praise what he praises ; who look up to this one person be he a teacher or an *Editor*, as a kind of fogleman, by whom it must be determined whether they shall shout or remain silent, whether they shall clamour for this or that ;—who investigate not any *principles* on which measures are founded, by their consequences on individuals and society, or the results to which they may tend, but who think it enough that *the Master* has said such measures must be adopted ;—thus making themselves *tools* in the very worst sense of that word.

How preposterous would it be to attempt in this the nineteenth century, to perpetuate the

old destructive system of medicine by any act of the Legislature, or by the grant of any new Charters or Powers. The soi-disant Guardians of the Public *Health*, the would-be Monopolists have yet to learn the true art of healing. That knowledge can only be obtained by paying more attention to the neglected Semi-ology, more attention to rules of diet,—by studying the virtues of each medicinal substance *separately*, and by establishing a correct system of proving.

Until this requisite knowledge has been attained, and is taught in the Schools, let the field be open,—let there be no monopoly,—no restrictions on practice.

Until then, we hesitate not to say that every member of the community will reciprocate the sentiments of Sir Benjamin Collins Brodie who in his evidence given before the Select Committee on Medical Legislation said, “*I think it would be very unjust to prevent me consulting anybody I please about my own case, and that whoever I think proper to consult should have a right to attend me, and that Government should not interfere.*” Those who would by penal enactments endeavour to compel the public to consult and employ only a certain class, (*cure or no cure*,) should remember that prohibition too frequently promotes the evils which it is designed to check.

We have now seen that the *True Art of Healing* is not known to the Practitioner of the prevailing System of Medicine, and we have seen in the foregoing Confessions that that System not only does no good, but is a very destructive one.

Where then shall we turn for relief, comfort, and consolation in the hour of sickness and disease? The foregoing confessions may be likened to the mariner's chart wherein the rocks and shoals are correctly laid down, and by avoiding which, he will escape shipwreck.

We must shift our sails, and change our course, and then perhaps we shall discover the Eldorado either by the sea of Hydropathy, the lethian stream of Mesmerism, or in the smooth and safe waters of Homœopathy. This last word brings Dr. Forbes again to my memory. Of Homœopathy, he says,—“As an established form of practical medicine,—*as a great fact* in the history of our Art, we must *nolentes volentes*, consider Homœopathy. If, as is maintained by its advocates, it cures diseases in a larger proportion than is done by ordinary treatment, it matters but little whether *its theory* be true or false. If it can prove to us that it does what we have just stated, we are bound to admit, and we are prepared to admit that this is a kind of evidence sufficient

to overthrow *all* the arguments we can bring against it, and all our reasonings however just: improbabilities however glaring, and even what *seem* impossibilities, must go for nothing."

As Mr. B. Sampson says,—“this is evidence of a very satisfactory advance.”

Dr. Andrew Coombe's remarks on the same subject, are also worthy of being remembered, and may serve as a guide to the inquirer. He says, “Of all methods of advancing the interests of science, that which consists in the supercilious neglect of alleged new discoveries, merely on the ground that they differ from what is already known, (or rather from what is *supposed to be known*,) is essentially the worst. We know far too little of the constitution of Nature to be able to decide *a priori* what can or cannot be true regarding the mode in which vital operations are conducted, or in which they may be modified by external influences.

Medicine itself is in its very essence an *estimative* science, and the truth of the principles on which it rests, can be ascertained or verified only by careful and extensive observation.

Homœopathy as a question *of fact*, claiming to rest on the irresistible ground of its superior power of curing diseases and preserving human life, and on the alleged experience

of able and honest men, *as competent to judge as any of those who oppose them*, I cannot venture to pronounce as untrue, because I have no experience bearing especially upon it to bring forward, and we are still too ignorant to predicate *a priori* what may or may not be true in the great field of Nature.

In the *Antologia medicale*, there are the following remarks by Professor Brera, undoubtedly one of the most distinguished authorities in the old school. These remarks were penned by the learned Professor in 1834 ; since that time Homœopathy has made rapid and immense strides, not only in his own country, (Italy,) but also all over the world.

After noticing the constant progress of the new doctrine, he goes on to observe,—“Homœopathy, though it may appear vain to some, singular to others, and extravagant to a great number, does actually reign in the scientific world just like any other school ; for it has its chairs, its books, its journals, its hospitals, its cliniques, its professors who teach, and its public who listen. It is consequently established as well as any other system, and its present position has already assigned it a place in the history of medicine. Such being the case, it can no longer be treated with contempt : it merits that calm

examination, that severity of judgment, which have been applied to all systems of medicine successively, proofs of which we have in our own days had with respect to the systems of Boerhaave, of Cullen, of Brown, of Rosari, of Broussais, &c., and so much the more reason have we to treat it in this way, for, as we must in truth allow, the Homœopathists have their principle, on which they act and prescribe, and by which they only administer a substance of such a quality, and in such a quantity that *no danger* can thereby accrue to their patients directly. If Homœopathy announces *facts* and *theories* beyond the sphere of *our* present knowledge, this is no reason for despising it, and rejecting it as an absolute illusion. That physician is greatly mistaken who imagines that he cannot learn to-morrow, what he is ignorant of to-day! Is not the insufficiency and incertitude of medicine a constant subject of reproach?—and do not the sagest and profoundest practical physicians honestly mistrust the solidity of their knowledge? And without doubt it is to conviction of this sort, that we must attribute the resolution taken by a considerable number of celebrated physicians, more especially amongst our transalpine brethren, to conquer the repugnance naturally felt at abandoning principles formerly adopted, in order to devote

themselves to an impartial examination of new ones; and, if necessary, to profess such as might be of use to suffering humanity, even if by so doing they should abjure their former medical faith. Let us not forget the animated controversies that have always ensued before the admission of the greatest discoveries. We need only instance the circulation of the blood in the seventeenth century; the employment of bark, and of inoculation in the eighteenth, as well as the discoveries of Galileo, of Newton, of Descartes, &c.

With respect to the dose, apparently so minute, administered by Homœopathists, there is not a physician of any practice or experience who ought to reject it as absolutely erroneous and inefficient in every case. The author of this paper had from his own experience in the year 1797, demonstrated that salivation excited by a mercurial preparation, was arrested by the administration of a smaller dose of another mercurial preparation.' (*V. Comment Medic. v. 1. p. 60.*) He has cured several intermittent fevers of a very severe nature, with mere atoms of arseniate of potash. (*Annotaz, medico-prattiche sulle diverse malattie trattate nella clinica di Pavia negli anni 1796,-97,-98, vol. 1, p. 228.*)

He has shewn that *belladonna* which

produces in the healthy individual phenomena similar to those of Hydrophobia, is a powerful remedy against this terrible disease. (*V. Com clinico per la cura dell' idrofobia, l'anno 1804, in più moriscati du un lupo arrabiato, nelle memorie della società italiana delle scienze* 7. xviii.) The same with respect to *datura stramonium* and *hyosciamus*. (*v. Dei contagi* v. 1. p. 91. v. 2. p. 85.) He has observed angina pectoris relieved in an instant, by a few drops of *stramonium*, which is itself capable of producing symptoms of cardiac affection, accompanied with dyspnœa. (*V. Prospetto clinico dell' anno scolastico. 1821-1822.*)

A hysterical gastrodynia which had for two years resisted antiphlogistics, sedatives, revulsives, and latterly *oxide of bismuth*, in ordinary doses, yielded as if by magic to small doses of oxide of bismuth, (one grain combined with sugar of milk, divided into one hundred doses.) Many similar facts might be adduced from his long practice. In the cases cited, it was observation and experience which led him to such results; but he was guided to the principle on which they were treated by the three following circumstances:—

1. By the consideration of a passage in Hippocrates, pointed out to him by the celebrated Blumenbach, when he attended his

course of lectures at Göttingen, '*diseases are sometimes cured by remedies capable of producing an analogous affection;*'

2. By the action of the contagious viruses, more particularly those of variola and vaccinia, which, attenuated to an almost immaterial state, and thereafter inoculated, develop after a certain space of time, such a powerful action, that a process is lighted up in the organism by which the contagious atoms introduced, are multiplied a *million fold*.

3. By a reflection on the ideas concerning the pathologico-therapeutical vicissitudes of the complex organism, first imbibed by the author, at the school of Reil, at Halle; and afterwards enumerated by himself in his *Practical Medical Annotations, anno 1796-98.*" We should always bear in mind that the more fine and subtle matters are, the greater are the effects they produce on living organisms. Light, heat, electricity, magnetism, are familiar examples of this. The phenomena which we every instant observe whilst studying nature, sufficiently convince us of the incomparable power of matter subtilized to an almost inconceivable extent. We need merely allude to the well known experiments of Spallanzi, in reference to the fecundation of frog's spawn.

The phenomena of sympathy and antipathy are apparently referrible to modifications of the most active and rapid character, excited in our senses by causes of a material nature certainly imperceptible and doubtless subtilized to a greater degree than any Homœopathic remedy. And how many chemical re-agents are there not, which do not act unless carried to an excessive degree of dilution by the addition of immense quantities of fluid? And do we not every day see the great productive power of *atoms* in the development and growth of vegetables?

A most important and characteristic difference between the practice of Allopathy, (*old physic*,) and Homœopathy, (*modern physic*,) is, that the Allopathists prescribe compound mixtures, of the curative powers of which they are always doubtful; whilst the Homœopathists prescribe only one medicine at a time, and of the therapeutic action of that, they have a perfect foreknowledge.

In allusion to the common practice, every appearance of treating diseases effectively and to the purpose, disappears in the manner of *associating* various medicinal substances to constitute what is called a *prescription*. The old school practice is to place at the head of

this recipe, under the name of *Basis*, a medicine that is not at all known in regard to the extent of its medical effects, but which it is thought *ought* to subdue the principal character of the disease admitted by the Physician ; to that basis is added one or two substances equally unknown in respect of their operation on the system, and which are destined either to fulfil some accessory indication, or to increase the action of the Basis ;— a *corrective* is then added, of whose special medicinal virtues the prescribers have no better knowledge ; they *mix* the whole together, sometimes adding either a syrup, or a distilled water, which likewise possesses distinct medicinal properties, and imagine that each ingredient of the mixture will perform in the diseased body the part that has been assigned to it by the imagination, without allowing itself to be disturbed or led astray by the other articles that accompany it :—a result which no one could reasonably expect :—one of these ingredients destroys, either partly or wholly, the operation of the other, or gives to it, as well as to the remainder, a different mode of action altogether, which had never been thought of, so that the effects calculated on could *not possibly* take place. This inexplicable enigma of mixtures *often* produces

that which neither was nor could have been expected, a *new modification of the disease*, which is not observed amidst the tumult of symptoms, but which becomes permanent by the prolonged use of the prescription. Consequently, a fictitious malady, joining itself to the original one, aggravates the primitive disease; or if the Patient does not use the same prescription for a long time, if one or several be crowded upon him successively, composed of different ingredients, *greater debility will at least ensue*, because the substances which are prescribed in such a case have generally little or no direct reference to the principal malady, and only make a useless attack upon those points against which its assaults have been the least directed.

Though the action of every medicine on the human body should already have been discovered, still he who writes the prescription does not often know the effect of one in an hundred. Mixing several drugs together, some of which are already compounds, and their separate effects imperfectly known, in order that such a confused mixture should be swallowed by the patient in *large and frequent doses*, and then to expect from it a certain curative effect, is an absurdity evident to every unprejudiced, and reflecting individual.

The Homœopathists on the contrary, wishing to bring the science of medicine to perfection, forbid the mingling many medicines together in one prescription. They say, the human mind is incapable of grasping more than one subject at a time—it can almost never assign to each of two powers acting at the same time on one object its due proportion of influence in bringing about the result; how, then, can we ever expect to bring medical science to a greater degree of certainty, when we deliberately combine a large number of different powers to act against a morbid condition of the system, while we are often ill acquainted with the nature of the latter, and are but indifferently conversant with the *separate* action of the component parts of the former, much less with their combined action? Who can say for certain, that the adjuvant or the corrective in the complex prescription does not act as the *base*, or that the excipient does not change the whole character of the mixture? Does the principal ingredient, if it be the right one, stand in need of an adjuvant? Does it say much for its fitness if it require a corrective; or why does it require the aid of a director?

They, the Homœopathists ask the question, “Are we in earnest with our Science?”

“Then let us make a brotherly compact, and all agree to give our patients but one single remedy at a time, without altering their mode of life, and then let us use our eyes to see what effect this or that medicine has, how it does good, or how it fails.”

Is it really more learned to administer a number of complicated combinations of medicines for one disease, (often in one day,) than with Hippocrates to treat the whole course of a disease with one or two clysters, perhaps a little honey and vinegar, nothing else? To give the right, not the many mixed, were the stroke of art.

Hippocrates sought the simplest from out an entire genus of diseases; this he observed carefully and described accurately. In these simplest diseases, he gave single simple remedies from the then scanty store. Thus he was enabled to see what he saw—to do what he did. It was owing to the simplicity of his treatment of diseases alone, that he saw all that he did see, and whereat we marvel.

We hope it will not be considered unfashionable to go to work with disease as simply as did this truly great man.

The founder of Homœopathy once said,—
“Any one who should see me give one medicine yesterday, another to-day, and a

third different from either to-morrow, would observe that I was irresolute in my practice (for I am but a weak mortal,) but should he see me combine two or three substances in one prescription, (and this is often done,) he would at once say, “the man is at a loss, he does not rightly know what he will be at,—‘he is wavering,’—did he know of one of these that it was *the proper remedy*, he would not add to it the second, and still less the third.”

Many persons have endeavoured to obstruct the onward march of Homœopathy by attempting to cast ridicule on its Posology; and some there are among the most illiterate of the profession who still continue to do so, being in total ignorance of the science which is slowly and experimentally perfected, and being under the erroneous impression that Homœopathy and infinitesimal doses are identical, whereas Homœopaths well know that *no* fixed amount can possibly be said *a priori* to be the proper homœopathic dose:—it may be grains, or drops, or scruples, or hundredths, or millionths of grains,—all are equally homœopathic as long as the principle *Similia Similibus Curantur* is kept in view, and that one is the best which experience pronounces in favour of. The principle of Homœopathy, ‘*Similia Similibus Curantur*,’ is a theory of *cure*, and not of disease.

From this principle of the *science* of medicine arise naturally the general principles of the *practice* of medicine, and therefore, it is by Homœopathy alone that the principles and machinery of the science and art of medicine have attained a definite foundation.

No theory of *disease* can ever lay a definite foundation for practice. A theory of *cure* can alone do this. Until Hahuemann, the labours of physicians were directed principally towards the establishment of a theory of *disease*, and this is characteristic of medical schools generally, even at the present day.

We have now, gentle reader, lifted the veil, in order that you may be enabled hereafter to avoid the numerous rocks and shoals with which the dead sea of old medicine abounds, and in which millions of valuable lives have been shipwrecked and lost.

In doing this, and in warning you not to risk your precious charges on so perilous a sea, we do but perform a charitable duty.

Doubtless you will hear from some of the *self-interested and illiterati*, many hard words against this book of truths, but be not deceived by such men. "Look at the number of persons who live *or try to live* by physic; apothecaries, druggists, cuppers, nurses, medicine venders, &c., and ask yourselves how

even one tithe of these can do so, but by alternately playing upon the passions and prejudices—the hopes, fears, and ignorance of the public? in one case inflicting visits too numerous to be necessary; in another employing draughts, mixtures, pills, or measures, *too frequently, too fruitlessly, and too expensive* to be for the benefit of *the patient!*”

Think not that such men will ever welcome a practical improvement in the art of healing which teaches them to give the system time to rest, and to recover itself undisturbed, and which, *par consequence*, must seriously curtail the profits.

Such men will be the most abusive of this exposé.

There has been much abuse of Homœopathy, and by many who scarcely know the meaning of the word. To them we say:—

Of all medicines, that one whose symptoms bear the greatest resemblance to the totality of those which characterize any particular natural disease, ought to be the most appropriate and certain homœopathic remedy that can be employed—it is the specific remedy in *this* case of disease. Specifics are medicines *homogeneous* to the morbid irritation, now called homœopathic. Homœopathy has never pretended to cure diseases by the *same* power which produces them;—it does so by a power

which is not identical, but only analogous; by a remedy which can only produce a morbid state *analogous* to that of the disease.

To play upon words, to distort the sense of phrases, to lose oneself in long unintelligible discourses to which a scientific varnish is supposed to be given, to accumulate injuries, and to attach doubts to the theory, when the contrary should be proved *by facts*, appears to be a too ridiculous system of attack against that which is termed Homœopathy.

It has nothing to fear from such miserable means, the effects of which will fall back upon those who employ them.

We will indicate a more powerful and infallible means of overthrowing, if it is possible, this doctrine which threatens to stifle *the conjectural art*.

Homœopathy is founded solely on *experience*, and cries aloud, imitate me, but imitate truly and well, and you will perceive at each step, the truth of what I advance.

That which no *Materia Medica*, no system of medicine, no therapeutics have done, or have been able to do up to the present time, she demands aloud:—she is willing to be judged by the results.

This then is precisely the position in which you would have her placed.

You may now deal her a death blow.

Take cases of disease, one after another; describe them after the rules traced in *The Organon*, describe them so clearly with all their perceptible symptoms that the author of Homœopathy himself could find no fault with the exactitude of the picture, and supposing that these cases are of those for which a remedy may be found among the medicines tried up to the present time; choose the medicinal substance most appropriate, speaking homœopathically, give it alone, and without any mixture, in doses as small as the doctrine prescribes, avoiding every other medicinal influence, and if the disease is not cured promptly, mildly, and permanently, let Homœopathy be publicly covered with shame, by proclaiming the unsuccessfulness of a treatment *rigorously followed according to its principles*.

But abstain, we beseech you, from all falsehoods.

Imposture sooner or later is unmasked, and branded with indelible disgrace.

If after you have acted conscientiously, others not less conscientious having repeated your experiments, arrive at the same results; if all that Homœopathy promises to him who follows her faithfully, does not happen, then this doctrine may be considered as lost.

Lost, if it does not prove itself efficacious, and even if it does not display a remarkable efficacy.

Do you know a better method to crush this doctrine, which has only to appeal to the good sense of the unprejudiced, to find admittance everywhere? If you do, we should be tempted to believe it.

Continue then, ye Critics to trumpet forth in your books and in your journals, even to satiety, the daily jargon of your schools, and to maliciously falsify sense so that ignorance can no further pervert it. Continue to calumniate and injure. The impartial man will but see the better on which side the truth is. Homœopathy will but appear to more advantage by comparison. She will dispel the cloud of absurdities consecrated by time, for she teaches how to procure *certain help* in diseases against which they, of the old practice, have not yet found any remedies.

We will now conclude with the following quotation :—

“Unenviable surely is the condition of that man’s mind which is closed against the admission of facts, of evidence, and of experience.”

FINIS.