

[Sept,

to the selection of the remedy, and corresponding to similar symptoms in our *Materia Medica*. This I consider a very different thing from characteristics, and, I repeat, no one knows this better than Dr. Berridge. If Dr. B. will take the trouble to look at page 115, Vol. VI, he will see what a mess he has made of it. Let him read DIAGNOSIS OF THE REMEDY, and he will find that the italics are not confined to *Sulphur* alone, but to Sulphur, Calceare, Lycopodium, and Pulsatilla. Yet an "explanation" is "wanted." If I mistake not, not only is an explanation wanted from another quarter, but an apology as well.

By italicizing the symptoms corresponding to those in our *Materia Medica*, in describing almost every case cured or relieved which I have published, I have received the hearty congratulations and thanks of many homeopaths in all quarters, and it would be well if Dr. B. and every one did the same, instead of frequently giving us a learned-looking array of some twenty or fifty remedies, not one of which resembles the totality of the symptoms, or is ever dreamt of as fit for administration in the case, and the characteristics of which are generally, if not altogether, ignored.

My answer to Dr. Berridge then is, homeopathicity and characteristic Homeopathy are two very different things indeed, and in the present instance he has mixed them, I have said *willfully*, and I sincerely hope I may be wrong.

FATAL ERRORS.

Ad. LUPPE, M. D.

The progressive wing of the homeopathic school is advocating persistently such gross, fatal errors that it appears timely to expose them, as an acceptance of them would make our healing art a laughing-stock.

One of the leading fatal errors is the promulgation of a frequently repeated assertion that we, as homeopaths, are bound to be governed by an exclusive dogma, that we are asked to be *stares* to an exclusive dogma, and that we must be liberated from this slavery. None of the writers or speakers have ever told us what this imaginary exclusive dogma which interferes with the freedom of action and practice really is. Even in the last century a learned Frenchman conceived the idea that there could be no certainty in medicine till we were governed by some natural law in our practice. This natural law existed always—from the creation of the world—and cannot be modified or set

1896.]

323

aside by any argument, dictation, or contrivance whatever. As a natural law, it can no more be set aside or ignored than the human and divine laws that regulate our civil society, as attempted in these modern days by the Communists.

Natural laws are divine laws and will prevail, even if a succession of Presidents of the American Institute represent them as *dogmatic* and interfering with the liberty of the profession. They address themselves to professing homeopaths, and, boldly pretending to be expounders of our great text-book, the *Organon of the Healing Art*, by Samuel Hahnemann, make reckless statements and uphold opinions not in harmony with the teachings of the master. They of late seemingly exhibit an utter ignorance of the fifty-third to fifty-sixth paragraphs of the *Organon*. The last orator surely has never read the foot-note to the eleventh paragraph, nor the eleventh paragraph itself neither, else he would not have said: "*The belief is increasing that symptom is only another word for effect, and it invariably implies a cause—some definite, impression-producing thing, which has acted or is acting in conflict.*" (Dr. O. S. Runnel's address before the American Institute of Homeopathy.) If ever there was an absurd heresy uttered, here is one, and any logical mind must draw the deduction from Dr. Runnel's address that the belief is increasing that Hahnemann and our noble healing art are all wrong, and that it would be best in these days to come to the relief of and sustain the still large majority of our dear allopathic brethren in their desperate effort to stick to the germ theory, now abandoned by the most progressive and observing men of their school. Does not Professor T. F. Allen blow the germ-horn in the June number of the *North American Journal of Homeopathy*, page 518, and spread himself before a grazing majority, as if he really knew nothing of the law of nature governing the healing art, and address himself solely to kindred spirits, ignoring Hahnemann and his school, going back to the easy-going practice of administering Quinine as a specific remedy for malarial fever, on the theory and belief that Quinine is a germicide and kills the supposed plasmodium? Yet such men stick to the name! The late Presidents of the American Institute may do what they please; they may blow hot and cold in their addresses, profess to follow Hahnemann, and thus flatter the numerical majority of pretenders, who, ignorant of the *Organon* or of the application of a natural law for the cure of the stock, are entertained with a trade against an exclusive dogma which their chosen presiding officer opens, not suspecting that all this talk is absurd and a fatal error. The homeopaths who

[Sept.,

fully see the fatal error very naturally inquire after the motives of the men dealing and trading in fatal errors, to the disgrace of our school. What is the motive? The brave Richard H., from Great Britain, has committed the fatal error over and over again of telling us how, if the fatal errors committed by Hahnemann were eliminated from Homœopathy, the medical world at large would honor us with their recognition. And this would-be reconstructor of our materia medica—who forever has tried in vain to bring distrust on Hahnemann and now disgraces himself by slandering the departed brethren who have sacrificed themselves while living that they might add their mite to enlarge our knowledge of the sick-making and (therefore) curative action of drugs—this same man finds followers among men this side of the water who, like him, have done absolutely nothing to advance our healing art! The motive thus is clearly "RECOGNITION" by the dominant school of medicine. Another fatal error. As it has always been our habit to sustain our propositions by documentary evidence, not dealing in shallow phraseology like the "exclusive dogma," we will now astonish the RECOGNITION-seekers by a copy of a letter from a prominent and very active allopathic physician who has undertaken, with a Committee of the Philadelphia County Medical Society, to show irregular, unlicensed doctors that the law of the land is supreme and that the medical laws must be obeyed.

Here is a copy of the letter, dated Philadelphia, July 7th, 1886:

"An. LIPP, M. D.:

"Dear Doctor:—I have read with great interest your address on 'What is Homœopathy?' and while disagreeing with you in doctrine, am in full accord with your estimate of those who steal the liberty of Heaven in which to serve the Devil. I have the most profound respect for all who are true to their principles, no matter how much I may disagree with them, but the deepest disgust for those who preach one thing and practice another. Could you spare me a few more copies of your address, as several of my friends are anxious to have your opinion on the subject?"

After this time the aiming after "recognition" does clearly appear to be "a fatal error" if it is undertaken by "pretenders," sailing under false colors does not pay; it is "piracy." The motive of the homœopaths is to show the rocks on which the piratical craft is surely running if they take no warning and do not hoist an honest flag.

The fatal error of the fear of an exclusive dogma governing our school, as well as the fatal error of recognition-hunting on a piratical craft, have been exposed, and we now will attempt to show to pretenders, if still a spark of sense is left them, that

1886.]

325

the natural law governing our school is an ancient law. They may then probably obtain a copy of the *Organon* and learn what is not taught generally in the medical schools, how safely and surely to apply that law for the cure of the sick. Hippocrates knew the law, acknowledged the correctness of it time and again; but a natural law, like the law of the similars, must be always true; not only reflecting medical men see it, but also the poets. The great poet Shakespeare has given frequent evidences of this knowledge, but on this occasion we will indulge in only one quotation from *Romeo and Juliet*, Act I, Scene ii:

That man! one fire burns out another's burning,
One pain is lessen'd by another's anguish;
Turn giddy, and be help'd by backward turning;
One desperate grief cures with another's languish;
Take thou some new infection in thine eye,
And the rank poison of th' old will die.

The immortal poet fully explains the law of the similars, and when he says *turn giddy, and be help'd by backward turning*, he fully illustrates the law of the similars. Giddy dancer, reverse your steps and you will be helped; standing still is not your remedy; *folle casum* is not your remedy; but keep up a similar motion in the opposite direction and you will be helped. Mind that, you defenders of the hypodermic-injection-of-Morphia, sailing under false colors and defamers of the true healer. Even the great poet tells you that "one fire burns out another's burning"—an artificially burning producing drug will remedy burning pains—not your progressive squirt-gun. But *qui bene!* Men who cannot appreciate Hahnemann surely can't appreciate or learn from Shakespeare; these men will forever be led by designing men into "fatal errors," such a fatal error as Dr. Runnels advocates in his late address, when he said: "It is puerile that formula, *'sublata acaua, tollitur effectus'* (the cause being removed, the effect ceases), or *forbade the mitigation of the intense suffering of pronounced incurables by the most effective palliatives within human reach.*" It is a heap of fatal errors we find in this short sentence. It is really excessively puerile to attempt to draw from any of Hahnemann's writings the deduction that he ever countenanced the silly formula, "*sublata acaua, tollitur effectus.*" Has he not protested against and condemned severely the prominent formula of the allopathic school, "*causam tolle!*" and Dr. Runnels undertakes to assert that Hahnemann countenanced such absurdities! What do we know about the "*prima*

[Sept., 1886.]

causa morbi?" Again we call Dr. Runnels' attention to the sixth paragraph of the *Organon*, foot-note included. Paragraph seven deals with "*causa occasionalis*." Now it is a well-known fact, indisputable, that you must first catch the hare before you can cook him. If the *prima causa* has not been found, neither in the chemical laboratory or on Boock's dissecting-table, nor by the microscope, we have just as good a chance to cure the sick as we have to eat the hare that has not been caught. The next fatal error is still more ridiculous. The forbidding of the use of palliatives obviously follows the acceptance of a law of cure; there cannot be two conflicting laws both true and applicable. The acceptance of the law of the similars precludes the palliative practice, and if a greenhorn among the new graduates believes that the intense suffering of even the incurables will be relieved successfully, he will find out that fatal error in a very short time. The intense suffering so palliated will return more severely—increased doses of the most effective palliative will be rejected by the sufferer with his nervous system entirely prostrated, the stomach rejecting even the palliative, the physician at his wits' ends after his promises to give relief have failed—he is himself sick and disgraced also.

It is a fatal error to attempt to make Homoeopathy more acceptable to the common school of medicine by caricaturing it, depriving it of any of its characteristics and seeking recognition of Homoeopathy while in reality the worst medical caricature, "vile, unprincipled, communistic eclecticism" is offered by feigning recognition-seeking homoeopaths, who are a disgrace to any school of medicine.

THE LADIES' TIPPLE.—That popular abomination known as "Beef, Iron, and Wine," which is now sold so extensively not only by druggists but by tradesmen of various kinds deserves a little special attention from the medical profession. It is an agreeable mixture to the sight and taste; its name is a triple combination of seductive mononyms; and over-sensitive nerves, such, it acts as a gentle "pick-up" to the worn and over-sensitive nerves of the ladies. It has, in consequence, become a popular, if not a fashionable, tipple, and is indiscriminately used to an extent that is, we believe, not entirely free from danger. Every medical man knows that the amount of actual beef or food in these various preparations is insignificant, and that it is the wine, after all, that makes them liked, and that leads so many persons to purchase their second bottle.

There is no good reason why this mixture is allowed to be sold by those unlicensed to sell wines and if the law supports the practice it is the duty of physicians at least to try and lessen it. Inebriety can result from these tipples.—*The Medical Record.*

IN MEMORIAM.

ROLLIN R. GREGG, M. D.

The homoeopathic medical profession will learn with surprise and regret of the death, on Wednesday, August 4th, of Dr. Rollin R. Gregg, of Buffalo, after a lingering illness.

He was a well-known and consistent homoeopathist. We cannot do better than copy the following admirable notice of him from the *Buffalo Courier*:

"Rollin Robinson Gregg, M. D., was born in Palmyra, N. Y., August 19th, 1828, and removed, with his parents, to Adrian, Mich., when five years old. He began the study of medicine in 1849, with Dr. Rufus Kibbe, the family physician, an allopathist. In 1850 he went back to Palmyra, and began the study of Homoeopathy with an uncle, Dr. Durfee Chase, and took courses of lectures in the homoeopathic colleges in Cleveland and Philadelphia, graduating from the latter college in March, 1853. In May, 1863, he removed to Canandaigua, N. Y., where he practiced medicine in partnership with Dr. Lyman West, until 1861, when he came to Buffalo. His ability as a physician and a writer soon gave him local and national prominence. In 1869 he established a medical journal called the *Homoeopathic Journal*, which he edited for two years, when he was obliged to discontinue it on account of ill health. He was the author of *An Illustrated Repertory* and *A Treatise on Dysphtheria*, the latter of which has met with a large sale among physicians. He was a contributor to many medical journals; was senior member of the American Institute of Homoeopathy, member of the Erie County Homoeopathic Medical Society, New York State Homoeopathic Medical Society, Homoeopathic Medical Society of Western New York, Homoeopathic Medical Society of Central New York, and the International Hahnemannian Association, of which he was President in 1885. Articles from his pen have been published in the local press from time to time. One several years ago upon 'The Physical Evils of Alcohol,' created great interest, and was extensively copied throughout the country; and his more recent article, representing his decided views upon some of the most interesting and vital questions in pathology, excited wider than national interest, and will be remembered by many. He was a