

**IN DEFENSE OF
HOMOEOPATHY.
HOMOEOPATHY: A DIALOGUE.
HOMOEOPATHY: WHAT IT IS**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649250288

In Defense of Homoeopathy. Homoeopathy: a Dialogue. Homoeopathy: what it Is by Various

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

VARIOUS

**IN DEFENSE OF
HOMOEOPATHY.
HOMOEOPATHY: A DIALOGUE.
HOMOEOPATHY: WHAT IT IS**

Aut... *...* *Med 3600,5*

In Defense of Homœopathy.
Homœopathy: A Dialogue.
Homœopathy: What It Is.



The Prize Essays in the Medical Century Competition.
Evangelistic Series.



Library of
Univ. of Michigan

"They who have not tried Homoeopathy have
not half tried to get well."

"We do not prescribe for the name of the dis-
ease, but for the sick individual."

"Homoeopathy stands confident and strong
with a firm faith in its resources and its ability
to cure the ills of the flesh in a manner easy,
gentle and permanent."

IN DEFENSE OF HOMŒOPATHY.

BY ROYAL S. COPELAND, A. M., M. D., ANN ARBOR,
MICH.

Every man for himself or his family must, on occasions, take a personal interest in the "pathy" problem. Most of the time he may feel as did the invalid who was asked whether he preferred a "Homœopath" or an "allopath," and whose answer was: "It makes no difference, both paths lead to the grave!" But when illness stalks into the household and possesses one of its inmates, it is no longer a question of physician or no physician; the kind of a doctor and which particular doctor then become burning problems demanding instant solution.

One of old said: "In time of peace prepare for war." The foresight and circumspection which prompted this maxim would probably lead its author to advocate the idea that in time of health preparation should be made for a possible illness, trifling or serious. It is the purpose of this essay to show why the physician determined upon as the one to call, when illness comes, should belong to the homœopathic school.

Health and Disease.

To the lay mind, health and disease are terms which define conditions, one desirable and the other to be avoided. Beyond this vague mental description no further thought is given the problems which vex and perplex the scientists and divide the medical profession into great factions or "schools." With the conflicting and vacillating opinions of the past, it was necessary to be something of a mental gymnast to keep abreast of the rapidly changing ideas of scientific thinkers. Fortunately, however, this chaotic condition is giving way to an orderly arrangement of established facts, and to-day we know for a certainty many very interesting things about health and disease.

It is now believed that life depends upon the activity of bodily cells. Going from the gross mass

of the body to the separate and distinct tissues and from these to their minutest portions, it has been determined that the smallest possible division of living matter, capable of form and function, is the cell. The infinitesimal size of the cell is something amazing; in the liver, for instance, it has been found, by careful measurements and estimates, that a single cubic inch of that organ consists of 156,000 million separate and distinct cells.

Health depends upon the well-being of every cell of the body. The cells must be nourished and refreshed, waste products must be carried away, and new material supplied as required. In the light of present knowledge, disease consists of some disturbance in the metabolism of the cell. By this term, metabolism, we mean the balance or equilibrium which exists between food supply and waste; normally, this condition is reached when the active cell constantly receives and assimilates precisely the right amount of exactly the proper food. In disease this balance is disturbed, insufficient or improper food interferes with the cell, causing it to be over-active or under-active or to die. Then the individual becomes conscious of certain symptoms which are indicative of disease, and the physician's duty begins.

The Size of the Dose.

With this much scientific knowledge, briefly stated though it is, the lay mind will at once appreciate that medicine, to be of use to one of these bodily cells, must be administered in such form and quantity as such an infinitesimal thing is capable of receiving. One might as well attempt to patch a pin prick with one of the pyramids as to expect a teaspoonful of medicine to be appropriated by a cell. Only a very, very minute portion of such a dose, relatively so enormous, can be appropriated by the diseased cell, the untouched portions of the dose are in the system menacing myriads of other cells, which may and probably will be poisoned by the unwelcome drug. Perchance the cell or cells originally diseased may be restored to health, but the patient has gone from Scylla to Charybdis by having thrust upon him an illness quite as bad or worse, the direct result of drug action.

The quantity of medicine to be given in each dose has nothing to do with Homœopathy; it is the privilege of the prescriber to administer a grain, an ounce, or any amount which appeals to him as required by the patient. The homœopathic physician believes, however, that the "minimum dose" should be administered, that is, that the smallest possible quantity capable of relieving the need of the patient should be given. This is the ideal prescription, because it exactly supplies the demand of the diseased cells without disturbing other normal cells. In practice, therefore, the Homœopathist usually dispenses small doses.

The Power of Drugs.

The popular notion that the strength or power of a chemical is in direct proportion to its mass, is no longer the view of scientific men. It is now held that a very small amount of a drug or chemical, when perfectly dissolved in water or some other liquid, is much more potent than a thousand times as much of the same chemical in the dry state or imperfectly dissolved. This is the teaching in every laboratory of the world. Practical application of this fact is found in the modern use of blue vitriol in purifying water.* A quantity so small as to have no effect upon the cells of the human body is yet capable of causing the death of certain algæ which possess a selective affinity for this particular chemical.

In the human body, the cells of particular parts possess this same selective affinity for certain drugs or chemicals. When an infinitesimal amount of silver, for instance, is taken into the system, it may be found in certain tissues of the brain and always there, when it cannot be discovered elsewhere. Thus it is apparent that when any cell of the body lacks a given element necessary to its well being, its power of selection of the missing element, or "tissue proclivity," as it is termed, enables it to appropriate the same from the blood stream if it be there in ever so minute quantities.

*An entertaining article on this subject was printed in the Century Magazine for November, 1904.

It will be seen, therefore, that the efficiency of the small dose and the capability of the human system to appropriate and utilize medicine administered in minute quantities are facts based, not upon a vagary of the imagination, but upon the most modern of accepted truths.

The Selection of the Remedy.

Not only does the homœopathic physician prescribe the "minimum dose," but also, in selecting the remedy for given symptoms of disease, he employs a fixed formula, expressed by the Latin phrase, *Similia similibus curantur*, translated "Similars are cured by similars," i. e., Like ailments are cured by like remedies. The possible existence of a law of cure is denied by the dominant school.* The latter scoffs at the "theory of similars," and in prescribing, depends largely upon experimental and empirical methods. That is, the physician of the dominant school in treating scarlet fever, for instance, tries this, that, and the other remedy, which he thinks might possibly be of some use, until he hits upon one which seems to control the issues of the disease. Or he prescribes in the condition this, that, or the other remedy, which has obtained a reputation for usefulness in this disease. The first of these methods is, of course, experimental, and the second empirical in the extreme. Besides these, excluding the use of remedies which act simply in a chemical sense as neutralizing agents, a physician of the dominant school has but one other method of therapeutic procedure. This is to prescribe "allopathically," that is, to give a remedy which, by reason of its drug action, produces symptoms the opposite of those induced by the disease. To illustrate: If the patient have fever some drug is given to forcibly hold the heart, thus preventing its rapid action with the resulting increase of temperature; or, in flagging heart, that organ is whipped on and forced into more rapid action by the administration of a simu-

*In this essay the "Old School," that is, the so-called "Regular" or "Allopathic," since it predominates in numbers, will be spoken of as the "Dominant School."

lant, like whisky or strychnine. Such practice is too often fatal in its results, and in any case, the reaction from or secondary effect of such treatment is bound to be pernicious.

With no fixed formula and no unity of thought regarding the use of medicine, every physician of the dominant school is authority unto himself in the selection of remedies. The result is, that for any given disease or set of symptoms there may be as many different prescriptions as there are doctors of the dominant school.

All this is different in Homœopathy. For a given set of symptoms, no matter where the homœopathic physician was educated, or where he may practice, be it in Maine or California, the Dominion of Canada or the British Isles, the remedy selected will be the same. As in the selection of glasses for a definite error of refraction scientific oculists from one end of the world to the other will reach the same conclusion as to the need of the patient, so in homœopathic practice, definite and positive symptoms of disease will call for the same remedy with every prescriber.

The Reasonableness of the Theory of Similars.

The reason for this marked difference between the schools, as has been said, is because the homœopathic physician believes that in disease and health there are certain laws, as there are in every other department of the physical world, while the physician of the dominant school denies this, or at least denies the value of the so-called "law of similars." It is not possible, perhaps, to explain the rationale of this law of cure, but the Homœopathist is not the only scientist forced to acknowledge ignorance of the underlying laws of his specialty. Where is the physicist who can explain the law of magneto-electric induction, or the law of gravitation? He can demonstrate the law by showing experiments to verify it, but to explain sensibly or convincingly why or how, he cannot. The theologian has the same difficulty with the doctrine of the immaculate conception, and the chemist can hardly account for some of the chemical affinities familiar as working