

**A HANDY REFERENCE BOOK GIVING
BRIEFLY THE SPECIFIC INDICATION
FOR REMEDIES, PAYING PARTICULAR
ATTENTION TO EACH ORGAN OF THE
BODY DISTINCTIVELY**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649501175

A Handy Reference Book Giving Briefly the Specific Indication for Remedies, Paying Particular Attention to Each Organ of the Body Distinctively by Joseph S. Niederkorn

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

JOSEPH S. NIEDERKORN

**A HANDY REFERENCE BOOK GIVING
BRIEFLY THE SPECIFIC INDICATION
FOR REMEDIES, PAYING PARTICULAR
ATTENTION TO EACH ORGAN OF THE
BODY DISTINCTIVELY**

A HANDY REFERENCE BOOK

GIVING BRIEFLY
THE SPECIFIC INDICATION FOR REMEDIES,
PAYING PARTICULAR ATTENTION TO
EACH ORGAN OF THE BODY
DISTINCTIVELY

BY
JOSEPH S. NIEDERKORN, M. D.
VERSAILLES, OHIO



CINCINNATI, OHIO
PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR

H616.08
N666h

COPYRIGHT, 1905, BY
JOSEPH S. NIEDERKORN

Hermann
Nietzsche

INTRODUCTION.

WHEN the old German pathologist declared that no rational system of therapeutics existed, he undoubtedly entertained the opinion that everything known about medicines was in possession of the dominant school. However, we know that time and experience have proven that statement to be erroneous in a positive degree; we know that the old ingrained faith and belief of the uncertainties in medicine, as commonly followed, was and is a false beacon to positive and certain therapeutic research; and we also know that in direct, specific medication we have the nearest approach to scientific therapeutics, because the knowledge of it was gained by proper research and study, and its principles have been verified by positive observations of thousands of able medical men. Years ago our friend and able parent of Specific Medication, Dr. John M. Scudder, declared that the medicine of the future "will very certainly be *direct*;" he also proved that there were agencies directly opposed to processes of disease and which could be employed with certainty, and this he proved by actual practice. He was then, and we certainly are now, in position to realize why the dominant school never could fully discard their belief

of the "uncertainties of medicine," and why they decry the proposition of "specifics" in medicine.

Specific Medication does not teach that medicines will alleviate or cure certain diseases; that is to say, they will not cure an aggregate of symptoms arranged according to the much practiced nosology. Specific Medication is the study by which we determine the direct action of remedies with special reference to their direct relation to pathological conditions; a study which determines a definite condition of disease, and points out the direct remedy for such condition; a study which considers drug action as it relates to disease expression.

Specific Medicationists (Eclectics) use the term "specific" with relation to definite pathological conditions, and say that certain well-determined deviations from the healthy state will always be corrected by certain specific medicines. That is the way Dr. Scudder puts it in his work on "Specific Medication," and that is the way the thoroughbred Eclectic of to-day defines his position in therapeutics.

"There are no specifics in medicine" is a phrase pretty nearly correct when it is intended to mean that no remedy is a specific for any named disease, such as typhoid fever, pneumonia, etc.; but that we have specific medicines prescribed with the intention of overcoming or opposing well-defined pathological conditions is a fact positively established.

The physician who is always looking about him for a new remedy for typhoid fever undoubtedly is sincere in his search; he either has been prescribing in a routine manner at a nosological arrangement and deplorably failed, or he has but a limited acquaintance with the *Materia Medica* and falls an easy victim to the inducements held forth by fanciful fads. Specific Medication has stood the test of experience, and has proven to be the most rational system of therapeutics extant. Its principles are true; it is applied in a positive and well-defined manner; results are definite and positive; in fact, its position in therapeutics to-day leaves no room for the great amount of guess-work and uncertainties so evidently displayed by those who profess prominence "on the other side," and who deprecate the practice of their forefathers, but have nothing definite themselves to offer but a "may or might be," and who become ingrained advocates of such fads as serum therapy because of their want of a better knowledge of therapeutic agents. Mere guess-work and uncertainties in medicine can with truth be relegated to oblivion.

Specific Medication implies Specific Diagnosis; both form the basic principles upon which the system of direct medication depends and exists, their relation to each other is so intimate as not to permit a separation of associate ideas. They establish and confirm such positiveness in medicine not imagined by those unfamiliar or who can see nothing in medicine, who prefer to adopt

laboratory conclusions to clinical observations, and who train all their energies to prevent germ invasion or effect their destruction, insisting upon the employment of germicides in quantities, and enveloping themselves so firmly with the germ theory as being the causative factor of disease, that they can see no comfort from their reluctant admission that a perfect, healthy state of the human organism is a protective against germ influence.

Disease is a departure from the normal, healthy state; our familiarity with the conditions which indicate health should be such that we can readily recognize any manifestations from the healthy state; nature has a way of her own to display signs of distress, and these, as they are manifested to our senses, are called symptoms. Symptoms are disease expressions through which we arrive at positive conclusions concerning the existing wrong; symptoms are indicative of pathological wrongs; symptoms guide us to the seat of the trouble, and directly, too, lead to the selection of the remedy which experience has proven to be the direct agent to assist nature in overcoming the wrong.

Specific Diagnosis is "the study which will show us the relation between symptoms of disease and the curative action of drugs; it is a study of the prominent expressions of disease with reference to the administration of remedies. Our belief is that the expressions of disease are uniform and always have the same meaning, and that the action of

remedies are definite and uniform; that like causes always produce like effects, and *vice versa*." Such study is certainly not more difficult than the practice of classification of symptoms and the exhibition of remedies as they apply to any named disease; and when certainty and results are considered, it is surely preferable to the practice of exhibiting a routine, stereotyped treatment. And there is the advantage of administering remedies singly—a fact denoting confidence and exact knowledge of the efficiency of the remedy and its direct indication. If a certain combination of remedies is to be the invariable treatment for a given disease, and another combination is considered the treatment par excellence for another disease, then it behooves the practitioner to exercise caution with his nomenclature or he *could* be prescribing at a wrong *name*. It does seem that such practice can lead to nothing else but disgust and a shaky confidence in anybody's theory or *Materia Medica*. If a name is necessary before a treatment can be selected—in other words, if the name of a disease should influence the selection of remedies—then I fear for the definiteness of that treatment. Such practice will certainly lead to promiscuous, indiscriminate prescribing, and will cause the fact to be lost sight of that the practice of medicine is a science and an art. By the method of direct medication there is not the danger of erring; and the advantage of knowing which remedy proved curative and under what condition is