

**Homœopathy : report of the speeches on irregular practice delivered at the nineteenth anniversary meeting of the Provincial Medical and Surgical Association, held at Brighton, August 13 & 14, 1851.**

**Contributors**

Provincial Medical and Surgical Association. Meeting 1851 : Brighton, England)

**Publication/Creation**

London : John Churchill, 1851.

**Persistent URL**

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/cws6xskv>

**License and attribution**

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](mailto:library@wellcomecollection.org)  
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

HOMŒOPATHY.

---

REPORT

OF THE

SPEECHES

ON

IRREGULAR PRACTICE,

DELIVERED AT THE NINETEENTH ANNIVERSARY MEETING

OF THE

PROVINCIAL MEDICAL AND SURGICAL  
ASSOCIATION,

HELD AT BRIGHTON, AUGUST 13 & 14, 1851.

LONDON :

JOHN CHURCHILL, PRINCES STREET, SOHO.

---

1851.

HOMOEOPATHY.

REPORT

SPEECHES

IRREGULAR PRACTICE

DELIVERED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE BRITISH HOMOEOPATHIC ASSOCIATION

PROVINCIAL MEDICAL AND SURGICAL

ASSOCIATION.

LONDON:

JOHN CHURCHILL, 15, GREAT QUEEN-STREET, BOND-STREET.

LONDON:  
RICHARDS, 37, GREAT QUEEN-STREET,

## CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE
EXTRACT FROM THE ADDRESS OF DR. JENKS, THE PRESIDENT . . . . .	5
EXTRACT FROM THE REPORT OF THE COUNCIL . . . . .	6
APPOINTMENT OF A COMMITTEE ON IRREGULAR PRACTICE . . . . .	7
SPEECH OF DR. CORMACK INTRODUCING THE REPORT OF THAT COMMITTEE . . . . .	8
THE REPORT, EMBRACING THE RESOLUTIONS REGARDING THREE CLASSES OF PRACTITIONERS WHO OUGHT NOT TO BE MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION . . . . .	16
ADOPTION OF REPORT MOVED BY DR. MALDEN . . . . .	19
SPEECH OF DR. CHARLES J. B. WILLIAMS IN SECONDING DR. MALDEN'S MOTION . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
SPEECH OF DR. E. CRISP . . . . .	22
CONVERSATION REGARDING THE EDINBURGH COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITY . . . . .	23
SPEECH OF DR. COWAN . . . . .	24
UNANIMOUS ADOPTION OF THE REPORT . . . . .	26
APPENDIX, CONTAINING RESOLUTIONS OF THE SCOTTISH COLLEGES . . . . .	27

CONTENTS

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2019 with funding from  
Wellcome Library

## FIRST GENERAL MEETING.

---

WEDNESDAY, 13<sup>TH</sup> AUGUST.

---

DR. JENKS, of Brighton, who was warmly greeted on taking the chair, vacated by Dr. Horner, of Hull, delivered an admirable address, in which occurred the following paragraph on quackery.

“ An earnest and truthful endeavour to improve our professional knowledge is the best foundation for public support, and the surest weapon wherewith to defeat the bold pretenders who rise up daily around us. Men of this description, whose maxim is, *Ibi fas, ubi maxima merces*, have only themselves to serve : medical men serve their country and mankind. Let not any man wonder that quacks and impostors should abound even in these enlightened days. They have abounded in all times and in all professions, and probably will never cease, for there is nothing so irrational or extraordinary that some men will not maintain it for truth, feeling sure that the credulous and ignorant vulgar, rich and poor, will receive it with implicit belief. I do not mean to treat of the fashionable follies of the day, the mystifications and legerdemain of Mesmerism, the unreal mockeries and sublimated jargon of homœopathy, nor the more dangerous excesses of hydropathy. All this has been admirably done lately by an accomplished member of this Association. I would merely observe, that such aberrations from the path of true medical science should be abjured and repudiated with firm and solemn resolution, while the professors thereof may be left to an avenging Nemesis, which will one day or other over-

take them. I would, however, turn your attention to an evil which has developed itself within our own ranks—

*Iliacos intra muros peccatur et extra.*

There is treachery within, and war without. Open adversaries we know well how to deal with; but it is another thing when a man's foes are of his own household. I am grieved to hear that some, even of the legitimate sons of physic, are tainted with the leaven of these new doctrines; that others, like the bat in the fable, take either side as it may suit their purpose; while a few have not scrupled, from indifference or crooked policy, to countenance this defection, or to shield it by a sort of compurgation. Against this laxity of conduct, the opinion of the profession should be unmistakably pronounced. To admit seceders, or doubtful allies, to the privileges of regular practitioners, or to an equality in consultation, is the same sort of treason to the profession, as the admission of the wooden horse into the walls of Troy. Enough has been said of late, I hope, to induce those who have extended an ill-timed indulgence to these false brethren to withdraw from further communication with them; for there must never be peace with quackery in any of its monstrous shapes. As to the apostates themselves, it would be well, that by a self-ostracism, they quitted altogether the ranks of a profession which, by a two-faced fellowship, they dishonour and betray; lest, neglecting such admonition, they find, at length, "forbearance no acquittance". Their secession would prevent much embarrassment; and their hostility would have no other effect than to strengthen our mutual confidence, improve our discipline, and incite us to increased exertion.

THE COUNCIL also alluded to the same subject, in their Report, from which the following is an extract:—

"MEDICAL ETHICS.—The subject of medical ethics is very important, and from the commencement of our institution has attracted more or less attention. A committee was appointed at Worcester, to report on the subject, but has not hitherto done so, partly because of the death of one of the members, and the ill health of another, and partly in consequence of the great difficulty of carrying on any deliberation where differences of opinion exist, by any means except *vivâ voce* communication. Some progress, however, has been made in the work, and portions of the rules are already in type. At the present juncture, it is highly desirable that we should give a calm

and judicious attention to medical ethics ; for it is to be regretted, that many regularly educated members of our profession have connected themselves, in doctrine and practice, with some of the popular delusions of the day.

“ It will be by the judicious consideration of such important matters that the advantages resulting from this Association will become more and more apparent. The inflexible adherence to correct principles and upright conduct, will thus continue to be the rallying-point of the Members of the Association, and they will evince their determination to maintain among them a sound philosophy and an unblemished honour.”

DR. CORMACK (of Putney) at a subsequent stage of the proceedings moved, “ That the prevalence of irregular and unprofessional practice ought to be considered at this annual assembly of the Provincial Medical and Surgical Association : and that a small committee be appointed to report tomorrow upon the course which it is proper to adopt.” He thought that it was essential for the respectability of the Association to take some proceedings in this matter. The motion followed as a corollary to the vote by which the Council’s Report had been approved, and was a response to an eloquent passage in the President’s address, to which they had listened with so much pleasure and instruction. As it was expressed in general terms, the discussion had better be deferred till tomorrow, when something more tangible would be submitted for consideration.

DR. TUNSTALL (of Bath) seconded the motion ; which was put from the chair, and carried.

Dr. Cormack, Dr. Tunstall, and Dr. W. H. Ranking (of Norwich), were then constituted a committee in terms of the motion.

---



## THIRD GENERAL MEETING.

THURSDAY, 14<sup>TH</sup> AUGUST.

THE PRESIDENT took the chair at Twelve o'clock, and immediately called for the Report of the Committee on Irregular Practice.

DR. CORMACK said :—I have the honour, Sir, to be commissioned to offer, for the acceptance of this great meeting, the Report of the Committee, which was yesterday appointed, to consider the course which the Association ought to adopt, with reference to the prevalence of irregular practice, and unprofessional conduct. The great amount of important business to be disposed of before we separate, suggests the impropriety of a long speech; and yet it does seem essential for me briefly to state the general principles upon which the committee have proceeded, and in particular to mention the grounds upon which they have founded certain Resolutions, which they hope the Association may adopt as its own.

Although the terms of our appointment might have justified a more general notice of the prevailing delusions and impostures of the day, we have thought it best to direct your attention solely to what is called *homœopathy*, as along with it are almost invariably associated some of the other fashionable systems of charlatanry. I am anxious to state, at the outset, that we have not thought it necessary to adopt the language of controversy; and that we have conceived the main duty of this body to be *defensive* and not *offensive*. If there were no fear of quackery, in one of its most seductive and demoralizing forms, creeping into our society, to spoil our social meetings, and canker the integrity of our professional intercourse with each other and with the public, it might be wrong to enter on this discussion; but when we see members of the medical profession fighting the battles of a mis-

chievous charlatanry, under the banners of legitimate medicine, it is time for us to be stirring, lest these apostates, when actually sheltered by this Association, damage its respectability, and perhaps ultimately endanger its very existence. Unlike the Colleges, we have no royal charters upon which to rest in supine and dignified tranquillity; our only charter is the association of numbers in defence of truth and high-toned professional honour. This charter—the best of all charters—it is our duty and our privilege to defend. We are not required, however, to make an aggression upon the allied armies of quackery; but the aspect of society and of the profession do loudly call on us to raise bulwarks and defences, sufficient to prevent this enemy from stealing a march upon us, and destroying our citadel ere even the cry of danger has been heard.

Such then are the general principles which ought to guide us; and which, when applied to the actual relation of the profession to homœopathy, mark out *the necessity of excluding from this Association three classes of practitioners: first*, those who really (and some of them honestly) practise homœopathy; *second*, those of a mixed or bastard breed, who practise homœopathy, in combination with Mesmerism, hydropathy, allopathy, or *any-pathy* which the patient may fancy the most; and *third*, those who, under various pretences, hold professional intercourse with homœopathic practitioners. [*Cheers.*]

It would be an unseemly waste of time to prove before this assembly that homœopathy is a mere chimera—a system opposed to reason, common sense, and all medical experience; but I may be allowed to state in a few words what Hahnemannism is, and briefly to explain who are the incongruous crew who range themselves against us, under the flag of homœopathy.

Three leading doctrines, or rather dogmas, were promulgated by the German dreamer. First, that all diseases depended upon three inherent taints, the principal one being the itch, or psora, as he called it; second, that “like cures like”—*similia similibus curantur*; and third, the giving of infinitesimal doses. It has been often and elaborately shown, that these dogmata—these chimeræ—have not only no scientific basis, but have neither facts nor even probabilities to rest upon. The statements made about medicines acting when divided into the millionth or decillionth of a grain, are so transcendently nonsensical as to be enter-

tained even as a subject of consideration, for an instant—only by an unhealthy mind. The simple fact is this, that Hahnemann's doses cannot be demonstrated to exist, and are so small, that the mind of man can form no conception of their minuteness.\* Some homœopaths repudiate, in a sort of half-and-half way, the small doses; but the public who fee homœopathic doctors generally conceive that their medicines are given to them in the attenuations of Hahnemann, in quantities ranging from a millionth to a decillionth of a grain. "Little pills" were yesterday lauded by a platform speaker at the Homœopathic Meeting in Freemasons' Tavern; but his laudations were perhaps applauded by men who give as freely, or more freely, than many of us would dare to do, strychnia, aconite, and other such like drugs, the most terrible doses of which may be administered in drops, and fractions of a grain. Large doses of our common medicines, as I well know, are also every day prescribed by men who come forward as candidates for homœopathic practice among the wealthy and the noble. "Little pills" may be, but certainly a little quantity of physic is not a criterion by which to know the practitioners who range themselves under the flag of homœopathy. Dr. Quin openly advised what I may term very large doses of camphor in cholera; and in my own experience, I have found that patients had been taking along with the globules, (under the name of adjuvants), the same medicines, and in the same doses which we employ, and which experience has sanctioned. What is now called homœopathic practice may, I aver, mean any kind of practice. [*Hear, hear.*] I have said enough to show you how vain it is to define what is meant by homœopathic practice, when I mention, that, at a recent meeting of the "Annual Congress" of homœopaths, there was present, as a large participator in the business, Dr. William

---

\* DR. ALEXANDER WOOD, in his *Homœopathy Unmasked*, gives the following tabular view of the doses of some substances as employed by the homœopaths:

CHARCOAL, one or two decillionths of a grain.

CHAMOMILE, two quadrillionths of a grain.

NUTMEG, two millionths of a grain.

TARTAR EMETIC, two billionth of a grain.

OPIUM, two decillionths of a drop of a spirituous solution.

ARSENIOUS ACID, one or two decillionths of a grain.

IPECACUANHA, two or three millionths of a grain.

M'Donald, who, besides being a homœopathic practitioner, is a leading man as a believer in, and lecturer on the highest degrees of mesmerism. Then Dr. Macleod (whose autobiography I hold in my hand), the keeper of a water-cure inn at Benrhydding, in Yorkshire, is a chosen champion of homœopathy,—a man whom the *Homœopathic Times* delights to honour, and who treats his patients by globules and wet sheets. Dr. Henderson of Edinburgh, Dr. Calvert Holland, and Mr. Kingdon of London, prescribe infinitesimal or ordinary doses, according to their own or their patient's fancy. I select these gentlemen as my examples because their acts are before the public in print. The medical creed of these practitioners it is impossible for us to comprehend. They are, however, a large and increasing class, and on that account they seem to claim special attention in our Report. It is, then, the opinion of the committee, that both the real homœopathic practitioners, and those who practise homœopathy in combination with other systems of treatment, ought not to be members of this Association.

But, besides the legitimate and the bastard homœopaths, there is another class of men who have no right to be associated with us in this society. Regarding this class, I wish to say little, but that little must be plain, and it is this,—that we must not—not one member of the Association must for the future hold professional intercourse with those traitorous men who meet at the bedside with practitioners whose medical creed and character I have (though perhaps too mildly) depicted. A broad line of demarcation must be drawn, and it must be done this day. [*Loud cheers.*] Private friendships have perhaps made some of us too long in adopting the painful, but only right course. To error or imposture there never can be made an honourable concession. [*Hear, hear.*] I would here remark, that no retrospective legislation is contemplated; nor is it proposed to enact new laws to-day. We only wish certain general principles to be sanctioned, as the basis upon which laws for the future governance of the Association are to be framed, and afterwards submitted to the next annual meeting for ratification. By adopting this course, the respectability of the Association will be sufficiently guarded and maintained; and no one will be able to bring against it the charge of having acted precipitately, or under the influence of excitement. [*Hear, hear.*]

One of the most curious features of the homœopathic quackery is this, that while its professors vilify the science of medicine as we follow it, and abuse us through the press, the platform, and the pulpit, they yet eagerly seek their credentials from our Colleges, and even try to enter our more private Medical Societies. This, however, must not be allowed; and it is incumbent upon us, as representing the medical practitioners of England, to tender hearty thanks to the Scottish Colleges and Universities, for refusing licenses to practise, and academic degrees in medicine, to homœopathic practitioners.

The mention of *the pulpit* brings to my recollection a topic which cannot be passed over; and which I approach with feelings of the deepest pain and sorrow. I will not yield to any man in my respect for the sacred office of the ministry; myself the son of a clergyman, I have always felt that the only other calling more noble than our own is that of preaching the everlasting Gospel; but, when clergymen assail us from the pulpit, and injure our influence with our patients, by their zeal in converting proselytes to Hahnemann, neither delicacy nor duty can justify our silence. Numerous facts have been laid before your Committee, from which we have ascertained, that in some districts of the country the zeal with which the clergy have taken up quackery knows no bounds, and many of our brethren have had their patients wiled away, by clerical canvassing, to homœopathy, hydropathy, and Mesmerism.

I would not have ventured, however, to bring this prominently before you, did I not hold in my hand a sermon preached by a Reverend Vice-president of the Hahnemann Hospital, in Bloomsbury-square, from which it is necessary that I should read some extracts. The preacher was the Rev. Thomas R. Everest, Rector of Wickwar. He selected his text from the Gospel of St. Matthew: "And as ye go, preach, saying, the kingdom of Heaven is at hand: heal the sick, CLEANSE THE LEPERS, raise the dead, cast out devils; freely ye have received, freely give."—Chap. x, 7, 8. In this text the rev. gentleman finds revealed the doctrine of Hahnemann! But I will give you his own explanation of the words of the Evangelist.—"Heal the sick and cleanse the lepers? *Cleanse the lepers?* Why pick out disease at all from amongst all the ills of men? And if so, why THAT particular one? Why not blindness, or madness, the

stone, or the dropsy, rheumatism, or the gout?" (p. 29.)\* The leprosy of St. Matthew, and the psora of Hahnemann, are the same thing. That, in fact, is the grand idea of the sermon.

This Reverend Vice-president of the Hahnemann Hospital broadly and plainly proclaimed from the pulpit of St. Augustine, Cheapside, that our Saviour's atoning sacrifice was scarcely available to fallen man till Hahnemann appeared! [*Sensation.*] Bear with me while I read a short passage to make good my assertion. It is almost too bad to read aloud; but I must do so, to save me from the charge of misrepresentation.—“At the fall of man, sin entered into the soul, and disorder into the physical frame (with which that soul is connected) at the same moment. God sent His Son to repair the mischief, and He bade His ministers preach the Gospel, and heal the sick; that is, cure the moral disorder and the physical disorder together; and for 1,900 years that precious wisdom has cried in the streets unheard. The preacher of the Gospel, not aware that that Gospel could never have free course until the physical leprosy of man was cleansed and his chronic tendencies cured, has handed over to a separate profession the business with which his Lord entrusted him. And that profession, unconscious of its privileges, its duties, its powers, has, so to speak, ignored the whole question. It leaves those mad whom it might have cured, or it maddens men by large doses of powerful medicines; and then we wonder at the crimes and folly that mark the career of man.”

“Let us be assured, brethren, that there is in the Gospel of Jesus a life, a power, a spirit, which is so much in harmony with man's happiness, and brings with it so much good, that if it had been understood by those who teach it, and had had fair play, it would long ago have altered the whole face of society. But in spite of Moses, in spite of Jesus, in spite of the law of Nature, alike deaf to God's voice and blind to facts, the medical profession has left the leprosy of the flesh to entwine itself with the leprosy of the soul. Between the two, man's tendencies to sin are increased by the disorder of his reason, caused by the abnormal working of his machinery; and the Gospel finds in that individual in whom God intended that all should be normal, but with whom it can only communicate by means of nerves in a chronic state of irritation and

---

\* The extracts from the sermon are accurately reprinted. The punctuation, the capitals, and the italics, are those of the original.

a brain in discordant working, not a gentle convert but a hardened criminal, a perverse unbeliever, a furious fanatic, or an eccentric, unreasoning lunatic. But old things are passed away, behold all things are new made unto us. Let us now see what the new system proposes to do for the human race." That is to say, let us see how homœopathy is to render available the hitherto almost useless Gospel of Jesus Christ—till Hahnemann appeared, unable to make head against "large doses of powerful medicines". [pp. 40, 41.]

The preacher traces all the diseases and vices of the human race to our "frantic medicines": and this he brings out in many parts of the Sermon: and, as an example, I quote one paragraph—it is his appeal to the pockets of his audience on behalf of the Hahnemann Hospital:—

"Mothers! do you wish to see your children washed clean of that leprous tendency to disease which fills our grave yards with sweet young flowers cut off untimely, and which, to those who survive, transmits a legacy of pain, sin, and sorrow? THEN AID US! Fathers! do you wish to see your sons grow up faithful Christians, and sensible men, with a normal allowance of health, able to use calmly the reason which God has given to man for his comfort here, far from all extravagance, and all eccentricity, holding a course of life steady, reasonable, religious—such a course as man, healed, God-fearing, and intellectual, should hold? THEN AID US! Governors of God's heritage, monarchs, parliaments, magistrates! There is a gloomy thunder-cloud collecting on the horizon, rolling its deep masses over the face of day, threatening, lurid, portentous; but no man knows exactly of what. It is called Socialism, Communism, the Rights of Man, the Rights of Labour, the Red Republic. It is earnest, dark, sombre, avenging. It has been lashed up by hunger, low wages, glaring inequality, wicked passions of psoric origin, roused by alcohol and medicines, maddened by burning eloquence. It has no strain of gentleness in it. It is arrested by neither ridicule nor menace. There is not one smile, or one jest hidden beneath its fantastic Swirls. The sword has cleft it, but it re-unites more baleful than before. The cannon has poured its hail against it, but it rolls on as dense and as red as ever. The priest has cursed it; society trembles to hear of it; but there it hangs, in the calm that precedes the earthquake; baffled, perhaps, but biding its time till the 'hour come, and the man'. Shall I teach you to draw the lightning quietly from it ere it bursts

upon your throne and your altar, and piles all your institutions into one heap? AID US!"

I must still inflict two other extracts upon you: they give more concisely than any other which I can select, the preacher's contrast between homœopathy (which he designates the "Good News of Great Joy",) and our system of medicine, which he maintains to be the origin of "gaols and gin-palaces; terrible crimes, for which scarcely the siege of Jerusalem could find a parallel; bands of prostitutes gathering round the dome of St. Paul's", &c. &c. After pointing out that from the womb the infant must be prepared for heaven by means of globules, he thus announces the result of such treatment:—

"The medicine of love has prepared the soil for the Gospel of love. The seed of the Word will soon strike root in such a soil, and bring forth much fruit; not the fruit of thievery and crime, afflicting folly and snarling religion, that exists at present, but a wholesome crop of sensible actions and sound opinions ripened by the steady rays of reason and religion. Growing up thus amidst calm, and sunshine, and love, and harmony, induced by the medicine of harmony, the education of the young candidate for heaven commences. The first care of the parents is, by proper dynamic medicines, (for medicines in a brute, material state, having a totally different action on the human organism, are perfectly useless, or rather merely injurious), to eradicate all those psoric tendencies which cause or increase all our aches, pains, ill tempers, obstinacies, rebellions, cachexies, and all chronic diseases. Life in the beginning does so long for harmony, that if thus gently aided, it soon overrides all discordant tendencies. The molecular attraction proceeds normally. The infant developes into a normal child of the normal type, in whom all tendencies to irregularity, whether of body or mind, growth or disposition, are much weakened and simplified. It has never been exacerbated by frantic doses of powerful medicines, never been excited by poisonous diet, never been beaten into obstinacy, never imitated the quarrels of its elders, never been spoiled into selfishness, never indulged into evil tempers; continuing the physical education, and watching carefully the cries which life utters for assistance, in order to relieve her just where and when she wants aid—never by mere palliatives, but always by dynamic remedies, whose energu-  
menic power, akin to life itself, has been subtilly awakened and



called forth from the brute mass in which it lay slumbering, and, if well chosen, will, by its unfailing elective attraction, restore to life at the very spot, by the very nerve wherein it labours, the very FORCE in which it is deficient—you commence the moral and religious training of the child. Plain, simple, easy, and charming, is THE GOOD NEWS OF GREAT JOY." [pp. 48, 49.]

So much for "the medicine of love": now let us hear one or two of his sentences regarding our system:—"There was once a marriage made in Heaven; but you put asunder those whom God joined together in heaven when you separated the healing of the sick from the preaching of the gospel, and made two professions out of that which Jesus made one; and therefore it is that the art of cure separated from the holy principles of love has lost its way, and fallen into foul company, and consorted with all unloveable things—cathartics, moxa, the lancet, emetics and blisters. [*Laughter.*] And therefore, too, the Gospel parted from its earthly yoke-fellow, and preached by those who share in the sickness and leprosy of the race, has succeeded so partially, and brought forth the harvest of contradictions that you see in the Christian world." [p. 35.]

Now, Sir, you have perhaps had more than enough of homœopathic divinity, but I was anxious to let the preacher speak for himself. Remember that Mr. Everest is Vice-President of the Hahnemann Hospital—that the sermon was preached in aid of that establishment, which is under the immediate patronage of much of the wealth and aristocracy of this country. Advertised upon this sermon we find, as Hospital office bearers, (along with the name of the preacher,) His Excellency Chevalier Bunsen, His Grace the Duke of Hamilton, the Earl of Wilton, the Earl of Shrewsbury, Lord Robt. Grosvenor, M.P., and many others, prominent in society, both for rank and riches. To such lists we are generally referred triumphantly: and I admit that it would not be difficult to add to them the names of several members of Parliament, noblemen, bishops, and, at least, one archbishop—Dr. Whately: but alas! has not the train of St. John Long, and many other noisome London quacks, been swelled by a similar throng of noble and reverend personages? Might not the same authorities be cited on behalf of the flimsy impostures of the present idol of fashionable fools, Mademoiselle Julie? Medicine cannot be acquired in leisure hours; it must be learned by patient and painful study at the bedside and in the closet; and I have therefore yet to learn that states-

men and archbishops, even though they be good men, are authorities in matters of medical experience. Not all the coronets and mitres in England can give dignity to error, or transform a lie into the truth; and layman though I be, I hesitate not to proclaim in this public Christian assembly, that the sermon from which I have quoted is replete with quackery, heresy, and impious doctrine. [*Applause.*]

There is one other point in our Report which requires notice, and it is a recommendation to give great publicity to our determination not to have any kind of professional intercourse with homœopathic practitioners. It is necessary that the public be told authoritatively, and through the usual channels of information, that *they must select*; that as for us, we positively refuse, under any pretext whatever, to hold professional intercourse with such persons: that with them we have no principles in common, and that, therefore, to take fees for meeting with them would be something worse than degrading—it would be appropriating money under false pretences; for a consultation without common principles would be a mere sham—it would be no consultation at all. [*Hear, hear.*] It is in this way that the public will be led to inquire into what homœopathy is; for I feel persuaded that not one in a thousand of its dupes have the slightest conception of the vastness of its absurdity, and the Protean wiles with which, setting honesty, consistency, and common sense at defiance, it bewitches the sick and the silly.

Without further introduction or comment I now read the

#### REPORT ON IRREGULAR PRACTICE.

*Brighton, 14th August, 1851.*

Your Committee have, after consultation with numerous Members of the Association, maturely considered the subject referred to them, and beg respectfully to suggest the adoption of the following Resolutions.

1. That it is the opinion of this Association, that Homœopathy, as propounded by Hahnemann and practised by his followers, is so utterly opposed to science and common sense, as well as so completely at variance with the experience of the Medical Profession, that it ought to be in no way or degree practised or countenanced by any regularly educated medical practitioner.

2. That Homœopathic practitioners, through the press, the platform, and the pulpit have endeavoured to heap contempt upon the practice of

Medicine and Surgery as followed by members of this Association, and by the profession at large.

3. That for these reasons it is derogatory to the honour of members of this Association to hold any kind of professional intercourse with Homœopathic practitioners.

4. That there are three classes of practitioners who ought not to be members of this Association, viz.—1st, real Homœopathic Practitioners; 2nd, those who practise Homœopathy in combination with other systems of treatment; and 3rd, those who under various pretences meet in consultation, or hold professional intercourse with those who practise Homœopathy.

5. That a Committee of seven be appointed to frame laws in accordance with these Resolutions, to be submitted to the next annual meeting of the Association.

6. That the thanks of the Association are eminently due, and are hereby given, to the Presidents and Fellows of the Royal Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons of Edinburgh for their determined stand against Homœopathic delusions and impostures.

7. That the thanks of the Association are also due, and are hereby given, to the Universities of Edinburgh and St. Andrew's for their resolution to refuse their diplomas to practitioners of Homœopathy; but the Association feels imperatively called on to express its disapproval of any School of Medicine which retains among its teachers any one who holds Homœopathic opinions.

8. That these Resolutions be printed, and transmitted to all the MEDICAL LICENSING BODIES AND MEDICAL SCHOOLS in the United Kingdom; and that they likewise be inserted in the *Times* newspaper, the *Morning Post*, the *North British Advertiser*, *Saunders's News Letter*, all the British and Irish Medical Periodicals, and in such other Journals as the Council may sanction upon the recommendation of the BRANCH ASSOCIATIONS.

In proposing these Resolutions for the adoption of the Association, your Committee are anxious to state that they are actuated by a strong sense of the importance of the subject in its relation both to humanity and morals. They most conscientiously believe that the countenance afforded to the form of charlatantry herein alluded to is detrimental to the true interests of the public, as it is subversive of that strict integrity which ought to characterise practitioners of Medicine, and which has ever distinguished the profession in these Kingdoms.

JOHN ROSE CORMACK, M.D. Edin., Fel. Royal  
Col. Phys. Edin. (of Putney).

JAMES TUNSTALL, M.D. Edin. (of Bath).

W. H. RANKING, M.D. Cantab. (of Norwich).

[The reading of the Report was followed by prolonged applause.]

Such, then, is the Report of your Committee. It has been carefully considered: and it was not framed till the opinions of many Associates had been collected and weighed. We, therefore, earnestly, and with confidence, as to the propriety of the course indicated, ask you to adopt it as an expression of the sentiments of the Association. It is a plain, straight-forward manifesto; and I sincerely trust that it does not contain one expression which is in any way distasteful to a single Member who now hears me. We must not think of what we are about to do as a matter of good or bad policy—we must only feel that we are this day called on to maintain, in the face of the world, the honour of our noble profession, and to express, in simple phrases, what we conscientiously feel to be the truth. Let us say our mind plainly, firmly, and calmly. Silence would be far better than the giving forth of a feeble and uncertain sound. [*Cheers.*]

DR. MALDEN (of Worcester), said:—I move “that the Report be adopted”. After what you heard from me yesterday, you cannot doubt my sincerity; and it is therefore needless to detain you.\*

DR. C. J. B. WILLIAMS (of London), said:—Having been asked, since I entered the room, to second the adoption of the resolutions, I cannot hesitate to do so; and, unprepared as I am, I cannot help saying a few words on the subject, although, so far as I can judge from the demonstration of feeling which has greeted the Report, the meeting seems pretty unanimous already. It might be a question whether it is the province of this Association to take up matters of this kind and express a decided opinion upon them: but, I only ask, if you do not take them up, where is the body that will? You see all sorts of quackery, with homœopathy foremost, rampant through the land, deluding, by its unaccountable infatuations, the powerful, the learned, the rich, and, worse than all, the poor in multitudes: and not only are riches placed at the command of the instruments of these fallacies, but what are far more precious, and this is far more terrible to contemplate,—the lives of our fellow-creatures. In fact, there is at this moment throughout this country an awful system of trafficking or gambling with the issues of life and death, a perilous tamper-

---

\* Dr. Malden alluded to a very interesting and able paper on Empiricism which he had read on the previous day.

ing with the elements of mortality ; nay, a jeopardizing, not of the body only, but even of the soul ! For who can say, where victims are hurried out of the world by a delusion, and for want of proper treatment, who can say that some of such might not have been saved alive, and given time for repentance as well as recovery ? It is altogether an awful consideration ; and I quite shudder when I look back, at the number of melancholy cases which have come to my knowledge, where, at the eleventh hour, the regular practitioner has been called in when it was too late ; when the precious time, in which medicine might have availed, had been wasted with homœopathy ; and we could only shake our heads, and lift up our hands, and exclaim, “ Alas ! what folly ! ” and I fear we might add, “ What knavery too ! ”

But do not such heart-sickening scenes—do not the general interests of humanity and science loudly call for some guardian influence to warn the infatuated public with a voice of some authority ? We naturally look to our Colleges and to the corporate heads of the profession, who are, or ought to be, the guardians of the public health, the protectors of the medical commonweal. But what have our Colleges done ? With the honourable exception of the Edinburgh Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons, the aristocracy of the profession has done nothing. Then we must look to the practitioners at large ; and I do think it most fitting that this great Association, so largely and ably represented at this numerous meeting, should speak out clearly and decidedly on this subject, and your voice will in truth be the voice of the whole profession.

It is indeed high time that the profession should boldly and intelligibly speak out ; for the public are profoundly ignorant in the matter ; they really know little what homœopathy is, and still less can they perceive how utterly irreconcilable it is with all that is established and true in medical experience and science. I often hear people talking of medicine and homœopathy as merely exhibiting instances in which doctors differ, which they are privileged to do, and one side may be as right as another. It seems a common mistake that homœopathy is a new system of medicine, which may or may not be true ; but that it is entitled, as much as the old system, to compete for public favour, and claim public confidence. Thus they make no distinction between that which has resulted from the accumulated experience of ages ; which is

continually undergoing the tests of judgment and experience at the hands of hundreds of thousands of regular practitioners throughout the civilized world; which is receiving innumerable accessions and improvements from the careful labours and discoveries of skilful men in all the departments of science and art ancillary to medicine;—they make, I say, no distinction between this noble and enduring, although unfinished structure—and a wild chimera of the day—which, reared by a fanciful mystic, and worked out by his designing followers, is fostered and flattered into an ephemeral notoriety by the patronage of a few whimsical lords and ladies, and other well-known victims of charlatanry.

I say the public, and the profession too, ought to know a little better what homœopathy is;—I mean *honest* homœopathy, as propounded by Hahnemann, and practised by the consistent and genuine of his followers—not that dishonest mixture of homœopathy with hydropathy, and Mesmerism, and ordinary medicine, which I can only call professional swindling, and obtaining money under false pretences [*Hear, hear*]; which, if possible, is more disgraceful and disreputable than quackery itself. [*Cheers.*] But genuine homœopathy needs only to be known to be scouted by all soundly thinking men. You have heard enough to laugh at, to pity, and to deplore, in the extracts read by Dr. Cormack; but do you really know what is meant by infinitesimal doses, which are the curative agents in this system? In the *Times* of yesterday, there is a report of the proceedings of the Homœopathic Association; and the reporter, by way of ridiculing the whole affair, remarked, that probably any one of the ancestors of the speakers had taken medicine sufficient to have doctored all the homœopathic patients in Golden Square. But this shows that he did not know the value of an infinitesimal dose. Our ordinary doses could be reduced to homœopathic tenuity only by dividing one man's dose among ten thousand times (I speak much within bounds)—ten thousand times the inhabitants of the whole earth! Such are the absurdities of the homœopaths. In fact, they deal with figures and numbers that are quite incomprehensible and inconceivable. It is all easy enough to talk of the trecillionth and the decillionth of a grain, but I would appeal to the chemist and the natural philosopher, who are accustomed to appreciate minute realities, whether such numbers are not nonsensical when applied to experimental agents? One of the most delicate tests known, sulphuric acid, might possibly detect one

hundred thousandth of a grain of lead in solution ; and perhaps the same might be said of chlorine and silver. But the one hundred thousandth part of a grain would have to be diluted a million times more before it would reach the homœopathic tenuity. And homœopathy teaches that the disease that attacks the body, —disease of the most destructive kind, tending to subvert functions and destroy structures—disease that is clogging the very springs of life—that such disease is to be counteracted by something a million times less than the smallest quantity to be detected by the finest chemical test that was ever discovered ! It is by such preposterous notions as these that homœopaths delude themselves and the public. It is on such ineffable absurdities that fashionable fools rely for aid in sickness ; and (who would believe it ?) it is with men who profess and believe in such inanities that some of our profession have degraded themselves by consulting. I quite agree in the spirit of the resolutions, that there should be no shadow of compromise ; and that under no pretext of meeting for diagnosis, for surgical aid, or for any other purpose, should there be any intercourse between regular practitioners and the abettors of this monstrous and mischievous delusion. [*Loud cheers.*] Believing, nay, knowing, as we do, that homœopathy is entirely a fallacy, we must feel it our bounden duty to discountenance it in every way, and boldly to warn the public against its mischievous sophistry and fatal infatuations. [*Cheers.*]

DR. E. CRISP said :—I trust, Sir, that I may be permitted to say a few words upon this subject. Although I agree to the full extent with the gentlemen who have drawn up this report, I think they have not gone far enough, and have overlooked the *fons et origo* of the mischief. The fault, Sir, rests especially with the members of the legislature, who encourage quackery in every form : not only does the government of this country take money from the legitimate practitioner for his diploma (and many are present who have paid a large sum for diploma stamps), but it also legalizes quack medicines, and derives a profit from their sale ; thus raising legitimate medicine with one hand, and knocking it down with the other. Look again at our medical corporations, and what have they done towards the discouragement of quackery ? The President of the London College of Physicians has appointed a professed Mesmerist to deliver the Harveian Oration ; and in his *Pharmacologia* he says that one quack-medicine—

Dalby's Carminative—is constructed upon philosophic principles : whilst our President of the London College of Surgeons, in his *Household Surgery*, recommends the public to have a doctor's shop in their houses, and that the key should be kept by a clear-headed person. The University of Edinburgh has for several years had an homœopath among its Professors, and has only recently protested against this monstrous inconsistency ; and, Sir, I do not give the College of Physicians of Edinburgh the same amount of credit that many have done for the step they have taken against the homœopaths ; for I believe that the pressure from without has driven the Council to this, and that the act was not a voluntary one. As regards the merits of this so-called science of homœopathy, I think, Sir, it is beneath the dignity of this Association to enter upon the question, for it puts reason at defiance, and one might as well try to bottle a shadow, or pocket a sun-beam, as to find the virtues of these infinitesimal doses. I also question the propriety of entering into a discussion with non-professional persons upon this subject. The duty of the medical man appears to me to be clear, both towards his patient, and towards the homœopathic practitioner—to warn the former of the folly and of the danger of this delusion, and to hold no intercourse with the latter.

DR. HORNER (of Hull) : I should be sorry if anything went out to the public, from such an Association as this, that was not in accordance with the fact. I think I can contradict Dr. Crisp when he states that the University of Edinburgh permits a gentleman to hold a professor's chair, who professes and practises homœopathic doctrines. If I recollect rightly, the College at Edinburgh expelled Dr. Henderson. [*Cries of "Not yet".*] Is that not so ?

A VOICE :—They wished to get rid of him.

DR. CRISP :—It is notorious that Dr. Henderson practises homœopathy, and is now a Professor.

DR. HORNER :—I am very sorry for my own Alma Mater that it is so.

DR. CORMACK :—May I be allowed to explain how the matter



really stands? I am glad to have an opportunity of doing so, as I know that there are in many quarters inaccurate ideas prevailing. This is the state of the case:—The Medical Faculty of the University and the College of Physicians are two entirely distinct bodies. The members of the former are not the patrons of the Chairs of Medicine, and they have no power to remove Dr. Henderson from the Chair of Pathology—that privilege can only be exercised by the patrons, the Town Council. The Medical Faculty, however, have done all they can to prevent Dr. Henderson from poisoning the minds of the students. They, by their influence with the Managers of the Infirmary, and their control over the department of clinical teaching, at once, on his heresy becoming known, removed him from teaching and practising in the clinical wards; and I can state, on the best authority, that Dr. Henderson has not dared to teach homœopathy in his chair of Pathology, in the University. The resolutions of the Edinburgh College of Physicians are, I am told, making some impression upon the patrons, who ought now to see that there is staring them in the face the ruin of the Medical School of Edinburgh, and with it of the University. I trust that the news of the enthusiasm and unanimity of this day may reach Edinburgh, and do some good. If the members of the Association wish to aid in relieving the University of Edinburgh—the Alma Mater of many now present—from an encumbrance, they must adopt this Report in its integrity. [*Cheers.*]

DR. COWAN, of Reading, said:—Allow me, Sir, to make a few observations in favour of the adoption of this Report. I am not a raw recruit in the anti-quackery ranks, having for many years done my utmost to expose and denounce the numerous delusions of the day, especially those affecting our own noble science. I am rejoiced to see the hearty and healthful tone of feeling with which the Report has been received; for it appears to me most proper and most important for this Association to take the present opportunity of pronouncing its formal and its unanimous [*cheers*] rejection of homœopathy. The increase of homœopathy, I look upon with a very grave view—I regard it as one of those portentous moral phenomena which are stealing over the age. It is not the *practice of medicine* only that is at stake—it is the *practice of sound thinking*. When we supplant by mushroom theories truths

which have hitherto occupied the minds of men, and been tested and confirmed by the experience of ages,—when we bring into existence new phantasies of the human mind, and give them the outward formality of facts, we surrender the stability of our judgment and depart from all soundness of thinking. With us, as medical practitioners, the rejection of homœopathy is a question of principle, not of doses,—a question of morals and not of etiquette. [*Loud applause.*]

The man who believes in homœopathy is a mystic—his creed is at variance with all rational experience, and subversive of all previously acquired knowledge. He has lost the ballast of his reasoning faculties, and set at defiance all those means by which the human mind is regulated. I distrust his judgment upon every subject. Belief in homœopathy is but the symptom of a mind without stay or ballast, liable to be driven hopelessly into every folly, ever ready to spurn to-day what it yesterday believed. Hahnemann, the founder of homœopathy, was an enthusiastic visionary who preferred the amorphous products of an inflated self-esteem and an extravagant fancy, to those slowly growing and ever deepening truths which ages had accumulated, and the wisdom of the wisest and the best of men had augmented and confirmed. If homœopathy be true, then are we all believing a lie, as all our forefathers have done; but if it be utterly baseless and false—as in my inmost soul I feel it to be—it can only be regarded as a deadly parasite upon Rational Medicine, which ought to be boldly excised, and cast aside by every sound thinking mind.

This is an age of moral and intellectual anomalies, not in Physic only, but also in Divinity. We have amongst us the monstrosity of Romish doctrines being consistent with Protestant preferment [*Hear, hear*], and the equally anomalous paradox of men educated as members of our honourable profession availing themselves of their titles and degrees, while adopting and practising opinions which, if previously avowed, would for ever have excluded them from their present qualifications. Were a homœopathist a consistent and honest man, he would at once disassociate himself from a school whose best philosophy he proclaims to be a lie, and spurn a diploma which only pledges him to error. To eject homœopathic practitioners from our ranks, and exclude them from professional fellowship, is no act of tyrannous intolerance or bigotry,

but a necessary measure of self-respect and self-defence—a consistent testimony to the principles we profess—the only method of extricating truth from apparent alliance with what we unhesitatingly assert to be a folly in philosophy and a dangerous delusion in practice. [*Applause.*]

In discussing homœopathy, I do not attempt its refutation by merely pointing out its arithmetical absurdities and physical impossibilities, but I banish it at once beyond the pale of discussion, and class it amongst the fallacies too extreme for investigation. If a man say to me, “Two and two make *five*”, I do not speak to him twice;—the man is *gone*. [*Loud applause.*] And if a man profess to me his belief in homœopathy, I am apart from him for ever. [*Cheers.*] He admits as facts things at variance with rational experience, and in these circumstances I must stand aloof from him. [*Long continued applause.*]

I believe homœopathy, in its very nature, as a therapeutical system, to be incapable of experimental demonstration, because the agent employed is subdivided infinitely beyond the means of chemical analysis, and, therefore, the fact of its existence can never be substantiated.

We have read of *mental epidemics* in the middle ages, but we are apt to forget how extensively they prevail in our own. In the midst of such restless excitement, such morbid extravagance, to adhere to the “old paths”, and to sobriety of judgment, is no easy task. To be for ever seeking *first principles*, and to be without a standard *within*, by which new pretensions can be tested, is the condition of multitudes of all classes among whom we live—it is one of the most dangerous characters of an age of over-heated intellectualism. We rush wildly forth upon the field of experiment—mistake our fancies for facts—our expectations for principles; and are soon hopelessly enrolled in the rapidly swelling ranks of the deluded and deluding.

But I must not farther enlarge. Let me only say in conclusion, that to me our present duty seems very plain—it is to repudiate principles at variance with an honourable and a scientific profession. Whether as an Association we perish or survive, let us nail our colours to the mast, and sink or swim in the good old ship of Rational Medicine. [*Great applause.*]

The motion was put from the chair and unanimously agreed to.

The following Committee were then appointed in terms of the fifth Resolution:—Dr. Cormack, Dr. Tunstall, Dr. Ranking (members of the Reporting Committee); Dr. Malden, Dr. C. J. B. Williams (the mover and seconder); along with Sir Charles Hastings, M.D., of Worcester, and Dr. Cowan, of Reading.

On the motion of Dr. Tunstall, seconded by Dr. Horner, it was unanimously resolved that the proceedings in reference to this subject be printed and circulated among the members.

---

## APPENDIX.

---

“THE recent Acts of the Scottish Colleges” alluded to, are the Resolutions of the Royal Colleges of Edinburgh, and of the Universities of Edinburgh and St. Andrew’s. They are here subjoined.

### I.

RESOLUTIONS UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS OF EDINBURGH REGARDING PRACTITIONERS OF HOMŒOPATHY.

“At Edinburgh, and within the College Hall there, the 9th day of May 1851, an Extraordinary Meeting of the Royal College was held, pursuant to a Resolution agreed at the last Quarterly Meeting, and of which Extraordinary Meeting due notice was given.

“THE PRESIDENT in the Chair. The following Resolutions were moved, seconded, and unanimously agreed to:—

“I. That the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh did, several years ago, publicly express its opinion of Homœopathy and Homœopathic Practitioners, by peremptorily declining to admit into its body a Candidate for its Fellowship who belonged to that denomination; and, consequently, that no Fellow of the College can possibly be ignorant of the light in which all those who practise Homœopathy are regarded by the College.

“II. The College regrets that, notwithstanding this decided expression of its opinion, more than one of its Fellows, after being admitted in a different character, have endangered the reputation of the College by becoming Homœopathic Practitioners; and the College expresses an earnest hope that these Fellows, seeing they have thus virtually separated themselves from the College, will spontaneously sever their further connexion with an Institution which repudiates them, and from which they can derive, as merely nominal Fellows, nothing else than a false position and a spurious credit.

“III. The College feels the more bound thus to express its opinion, seeing that those Fellows who have become Homœopaths, and any other Medical Practitioners who follow Homœopathy, must necessarily be aliens to the other Fellows, and to the profession at large; inasmuch as no Fellow of this College, or any other Physician can, by any possibility, without derogating from his own honour, and from the honour of the profession, meet Practitioners of Homœopathy in consultation, or cooperate with them in the other common duties of professional life.

“ IV. That although the College has not thought it expedient hitherto to take any active steps for disclaiming those fellows who have become Homœopathic Practitioners subsequently to their admission to the College, nevertheless, since it has the power of dealing summarily with those who act in a manner so unbecoming the character of a Physician, it reserves its right to exercise that power when it shall be so advised.

“ Signed in Name, and by Authority, of the College,

“ J. Y. SIMPSON, *President.*”

## II.

RESOLUTIONS UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS OF EDINBURGH, REGARDING PRACTITIONERS OF HOMŒOPATHY.

At a meeting of this College, held on the 16th of May, the following Resolutions were moved by the PRESIDENT, and unanimously carried.

“ I. The College having considered a series of Resolutions transmitted by the Royal College of Physicians [of Edinburgh] in regard to Homœopathy, feel called upon to express their opinion, that the system so designated being entirely inconsistent with the principles professed by candidates for the diploma of the College of Surgeons, any Fellow or Licentiate who practises it, or countenances others in doing so, by meeting them in consultation, will justly incur the disapprobation of the College.

“ II. That a copy of the above Resolution be transmitted to the Royal College of Physicians.

“ Signed in Name, and by Authority, of the College,

“ JAMES SYME, *President.*”

## III.

THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH AND HOMŒOPATHIC CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR MEDICINÆ.

The following statement from the Medical Faculty of the University of Edinburgh appeared in the *Edinburgh Monthly Journal* for August 1851; and it is here, in justice to all parties, reprinted without curtailment.

“ Sundry printed letters and pamphlets in the homœopathic interest have been extensively circulated of late in this city and elsewhere, relative to proceedings in the Royal College of Physicians, and in the University, against the delusions of homœopathy. Our readers would scarcely thank us, were we to make these productions the subject of criticism. But, as several of them make use of an incorrect account, which has been given in a homœopathic periodical, of a recent decision of the Medical Faculty, in the case of a candidate for medical honours and homœopathic distinction, we feel compelled to supply the professional public with a true version of the whole matter. If we thus violate, for the first time, the well-understood compact between examiners and candidates in this University,—that the fact and circumstances of failure shall be confined to themselves,—the individual principally concerned has himself alone to blame. He must take the consequences of his own ill-advised publication, and his perverted report of the proceedings.

“ MR. ALFRED CROSBY POPE, having appeared before the Second Division of Examiners of the Medical Faculty in the middle of June, underwent the usual written examination on the practical branches of medicine and surgery, and was afterwards subjected to an oral examination on the same subjects. He had satisfied several of the examiners; but his surgical knowledge was evidently defective. While under examination in midwifery, he was asked what doses of calomel, opium, tartar-emetic, and aloïn he would give in certain diseases; in reply, he stated correctly the doses usually given in medical practice; when asked, whether these were the doses which he would himself prescribe, he replied that they were. He then underwent an examination on materia medica, the professors of that branch, and of clinical surgery, being present. His replies were satisfactory enough; the only objection of any moment indeed being, that his doses of medicine were somewhat large. The Faculty having been furnished with positive information that Mr. Pope had avowed his purpose to

become a homœopathic practitioner after graduating, it was determined that he should have an opportunity of answering to the charge. The question was put to him by Dr. Christison, and the following are the very words of the conversation that ensued: 'Well, Mr. Pope, I am satisfied so far with your answers; but there is another point on which I wish to be informed; and as it is best not to beat about the bush, I shall put to you a plain question, in order that I may get a downright answer. I am told by a colleague, that he has been informed on good authority, that it is your intention to become a homœopathic practitioner after you graduate; *after the answers you have this day given me*, I feel bound to say I do not believe it. Am I right?' To which Mr. Pope replied, 'I am not now a homœopathist; but, after graduation, I mean to inquire into the truth of it.' Professor Syme then remarked, 'Now, Mr. Pope, suppose that this inquiry which you meditate were to confirm your belief in the truth of homœopathy, what would you do with the diploma received from us? would you burn or return it?' 'No', he replied, 'I would keep it.' 'For what purpose?' 'To show that I had regularly studied.' 'Studied what? Delusions! Fallacies! Nonsense! It would only show that you had misspent four or five years of your life in studying what could not possibly be of any service, according to your own view; and I am sure that on reflection you must see, how inconsistent it would be with common honesty, or common sense, to use a diploma, after ceasing to entertain the principles which were professed in order to obtain it. But recollect, Mr. Pope, I offer this remark to you as a friend, and not as a professor.' Mr. Pope then withdrew, and in what remained of his examinations he made a satisfactory appearance, except in medical jurisprudence, in which, as in surgery, he was defective.

"The case being a new one, it was referred by the examiners to the whole Medical Faculty for decision. Of the thirteen members, eleven were present. After considering the whole circumstances, the Faculty unanimously resolved—'That serious doubts are entertained as to the soundness of Mr. Pope's principles of practice; and that on this account, as well as his insufficiency on some subjects of examination, he shall be remitted till the end of July, by which time he will have had ample opportunity of making the inquiry into the truth of homœopathy, which he says he contemplates.' This resolution, which admitted of his graduating this year, in the event of his satisfying the Medical Faculty, was communicated to him in conversation by the dean. Mr. Pope, however, withdrew at once from the list of candidates.

"This is a correct narrative of the whole official proceedings. Anything else that may have been said to the candidate privately by individual professors, could have been said in kindness only, and by them as individuals alone, and is wholly irrelevant.

"We must add a single word for the information of distant friends of the University, who may be led to surmise that the misfortune of this young man in some measure justifies the fears expressed in some quarters, lest students may be infected with the delusions of homœopathy while studying at Edinburgh. The Medical Faculty had distinct evidence, which will be produced, if necessary, that when Mr. Pope came to study here three years ago, he avowed that he had practised homœopathy, and came to study for a degree, in order to settle as a homœopathic practitioner. This determination was repeated afterwards; and it could neither have been engendered nor strengthened by any instructions received within the walls of the University, for the principles and practice of homœopathy have never been taught there by any professor." (pp. 196-198.)

#### IV.

##### THE UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREW'S AND HOMŒOPATHIC CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR MEDICINÆ.

MR. ROBERT DOUGLAS HALE, by means which the law does not allow to be characterised in print, recently obtained the degree of Doctor of Medicine from the University of St. Andrew's. In consequence of residence not being exacted

(as at Edinburgh), it was not known to the University that the candidate was a homœopathic practitioner. Upon a rumour of this having reached St. Andrew's, after the error had been committed, Dr. Day, the Professor of Medicine, wrote a letter to Mr. Hale; and the published correspondence fully justifies the University from the charge which had been brought against it, of having knowingly granted a degree to an unworthy man.

DR. DAY TO THE EDITOR OF THE LANCET.

SIR,—As I am led to infer by your leading article in this morning's *Lancet* that you charge the University of St. Andrew's with having conferred the degree of doctor of medicine on a homœopathic practitioner, I must beg you to publish the accompanying extracts from the answers given by the gentleman in question, as well as a copy of the note which I have addressed to him on the subject of your editorial remarks. I am, Sir, your obedient servant, GEORGE E. DAY, M.D., Professor of Medicine.

University of St. Andrew's, June 7, 1851.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF EXAMINATION.

1. Name the emetics included in the Pharmacopœia, and state the doses in which they should be prescribed.

*Answer.* Ipecacuanha, tartar-emetic, sulphate of zinc, and sulphate of copper. The doses are, of ipecacuanha, one scruple; of tartar-emetic, from one grain to two grains, acting better if in combination with ipecacuanha; of sulphate of zinc, from five grains to ten grains; and of sulphate of copper, from two to four or five grains.

2. Name the cases in which croton oil, aloes, jalap, gamboge, scammony, and elaterium, are specially applicable, and the form and dose in which *you* usually prescribe them.

*Answer.* Croton oil is administered in cases of very obstinate constipation, where other milder purgatives fail. It is used externally as a powerful means of counter-irritation.

Aloes is a useful purgative where there is inertia of, or accumulation of feculent matter in, the sigmoid flexure of the colon, or in the rectum, and in cases of atonic dyspepsia, chlorosis, etc.

Jalap is a useful purgative in a variety of diseases, and is useful in cases of worms, etc., in children.

Gamboge and scammony are allied purgatives, the former being rather more drastic than the latter.

The dose of croton oil is usually from the one-eighth to the one-fourth of a drop, according to the strength of the patient, and the urgency of the symptoms. It is seldom given uncombined, and generally in the form of pills.

Aloes are given in pills, in doses of from five to ten grains—generally given in combination with scammony, calomel, or blue-pill. The decoction of aloes is a useful form, the dose being from half an ounce to an ounce and a half.

Gamboge and scammony, mostly in pills. Dose, from three to five grains of the former, and about the same of the latter.

Elaterium is a powerful hydragogue cathartic, useful in various forms of dropsy, in carrying off a large amount of serum from the intestinal mucous membrane. Dose, from one-sixth to one-fourth of a grain.

3. Write a Latin prescription for an expectorant mixture suitable for a case of chronic bronchitis; also for a warm aperient draught.

*Answer.*

℞ Misturæ ammoniaci, uncias quinque.

Tincturæ scillæ, drachmas duas.

———— opii compositæ, drachmas duas.

Misce. Fiat mistura. Capiat cochleare unum amplum bis vel ter in die.

℞ Decocti aloes compositi, drachmas sex.

Tincturæ rhœi compositæ, drachmam.

Misturæ camphoræ, drachmas quatuor.

Fiat haustus quamprimum sumendus.

## 4. Describe the treatment of iritis.

*Answer.* Mercury is the chief remedial agent, preceded by general or local abstraction of blood, if the strength of the patient will bear it. It should be given in small, frequently-repeated doses—half a grain or a grain of calomel. In small doses, first, because the system is more brought under the action of mercury when the doses are small and frequently repeated; and second, because opium being contra-indicated, owing to its effect in producing contraction of the pupil, it ought to be given in doses that will not irritate the intestinal mucous membrane, producing diarrhœa, by which it would be carried out of the system, and not absorbed into it. In the strumous diathesis, the mercury should be given with caution; the doses should be smaller; and the bichloride often acts better than the chloride, in such cases. In the gouty and rheumatic diathesis, colchicum may be combined with the mercurial; and iodide of potassium is advantageous in some forms of the disease. Besides the local treatment by leeching, the external application of belladonna and the exclusion of light are most important means to prevent the closure and adhesion of the free margin of the iris. Counter-irritation may be demanded, in addition to other treatment.

## 5. Describe the treatment of acute laryngitis.

*Answer.* The treatment consists in active antiphlogosis, bleeding, leeching, etc.; the exhibition of mercury (calomel, two grains, every two, three, or four hours; but this may be preceded, in most cases, by nauseating doses of tartar-emetic (one-sixth to one-fourth of a grain), every two, three, or four hours. Leeches should not be applied over the larynx, owing to the difficulty of using pressure to stop the bleeding. Cupping in the nape of the neck is often better than leeches.

## 6. Describe the treatment of enteritis.

*Answer.* Antiphlogistic treatment here must not be so rigorous as in many other inflammatory affections, as there is a tendency to prostration. Local abstraction of blood, fomentations and poultices; the exhibition of mucilaginous drinks with the cautious exhibition of calomel or hydrargyrum c. creta, in combination with opium or Dover's powder, include the principles of treatment. In this disease, the exhibition of opium alone, with other means tending to diaphoresis, will often be sufficient; and, under this treatment, the action of the bowels will become restored without the use of purgatives, which, in this disease, are questionable in any of the ordinary forms.

## 7. Mention the treatment of the various forms of intestinal entozoa.

*Answer.* For the tape-worm; the best remedy for ejecting it is the oil of turpentine, given in doses of from three drachms to five drachms, with castor-oil. The lumbrici are expelled by many purgatives, which have the effect of producing mucous stools, as calomel and jalap, scammony, &c. Ascarides may be got rid of by using, in addition to the above, enemata of infusion of quassia. In all cases of worms, the tone of the digestive apparatus should be improved by tonics and alteratives.

Although the above extracts from Dr. Hale's written answers "specifying the mode of treatment he is in the habit of adopting, and the doses of the medicines which he prescribes" [see the note to our third Examination Paper], are, I think sufficient to demonstrate that he cannot be a homœopath, I may add the additional evidence afforded by some portions of his oral examination in *materia medica*. Dr. Anderson was his examiner, but I was present, and noted down the questions and answers.

Dr. Hale stated that the doses of bichloride of mercury, when given as an alterative, varied from one-twelfth to one-sixteenth of a grain; that in croup (in the case of a child of three years of age), he would give one-sixth to one-fourth of a grain of tartar-emetic every four hours; and that in the pneumonia of adults he would give half a grain of the same medicine every three or four hours; that in prescribing hyoscyamus as a sedative, he gave eight or ten grains of the extract; and, finally, that he used arsenious acid in certain forms of skin



disease (the squamous forms), and in diseases of a periodic type, his dose being one-sixteenth of a grain, or from five to ten or fifteen minims of Fowler's solution.

GEORGE E. DAY.

---

DR. DAY TO DR. HALE.

DEAR SIR,—There is an article in *The Lancet* of this week asserting that you have been, and still are, practising homœopathy. As no homœopathist, without utterly denying his creed, and being guilty of the grossest deception, could have replied as you did to the practical questions, I entertain a sanguine hope that you will meet this charge with a prompt and distinct denial. In order at once to check a report equally injurious to yourself, and to the University from which you have received your degree, I forward by this post to *The Lancet* certain extracts from your answers to the practical questions, and a copy of the note I have now the honour of addressing you.

I am, dear Sir, faithfully yours,

GEORGE E. DAY.

Dr. Robert Douglas Hale.

---

DR. HALE TO DR. DAY.

St. Giles's-street, Norwich, June 12, 1851.

DEAR SIR,—It would have been more courteous to have waited for a reply from me before sending your communication to *The Lancet*. I shall therefore simply state, that it was not my business to declare myself a homœopathist, and that I think your expression of "grossest deception" is wholly inapplicable either to me or to any one who, under such circumstances, practises such reserve as I did. The obvious aim I had in view in replying to the questions put at my examination, was to prove that my knowledge of medicine was such as to entitle me to the certificate of competency to practise in the usual mode followed, and that it was not from ignorance of the old system that I had conscientiously adopted the new.

I cannot imagine that you, or any right-minded man who considers the present state of medicine, and of medical parties in these realms, would, after due consideration, apply the term you have used, to a reserve so necessary as that I practised, in not putting forward my therapeutical views.

For the censure or praise of a bigoted and prejudiced periodical I care but little, but I do regret that my conduct should for a moment appear in a light it ill deserves, in the eyes of the enlightened Professor of Medicine in the University from which I have had the honour of receiving my degree.

I remain, dear Sir, very faithfully yours,

ROBERT DOUGLAS HALE.

To George Day, Esq., M.D.

---

DR. DAY'S ANSWER.

St. Andrew's, June 14, 1851.

DEAR SIR,—I regret that your answer to my note is of so unsatisfactory a nature. While I beg to assure you that I have no wish to apply the term "grossest deception" to your conduct in a personally offensive view, I must still express my opinion that no honest homœopath, conscious that the examiners trusted to his honour "to specify the mode of treatment he is in the habit of adopting, and the doses of the medicines which he prescribes", could have obtained his degree at our last examination.

I am, dear Sir, faithfully yours,

GEORGE E. DAY.

To Dr. Robert Douglas Hale.

---

[Dr. Day successfully has vindicated the orthodoxy of his University, and has shown that it is impossible, for the future, for homœopathic practitioners to obtain a medical degree from that institution, except by prevarication and falsehood. Has Dr. Hale's name been struck off the list of St. Andrew's Doctors? This is an important question.]