

**ARE WE TO HAVE A
UNITED MEDICAL
PROFESSION?**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649175437

Are we to have a united medical profession? by Charles S. Mack

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

CHARLES S. MACK

**ARE WE TO HAVE A
UNITED MEDICAL
PROFESSION?**

H 610
M 15

Are We to Have a United Medical Profession?



BY CHAS. S. MACK, M. D.

Copyright 1904, C. S. Mack.



PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHOR,
LA PORTE, INDIANA.

CONTENTS.

Introduction.....	3
-------------------	---

CHAPTER I.

The Particular Cure of which <i>Similia Similibus Curantur</i> is the Law. Why the Name <i>Homeopath</i>	6
--	---

CHAPTER II.

Dr. Alfred Stillé, Dr. T. Lauder Brunton, Dr. H. C. Wood and Dr. F. W. Headland—each betrays a Lack of Knowledge as to what Homeopathy is, or Purports to be.....	8
---	---

CHAPTER III.

The Universality of the Law of Similars.....	18
--	----

CHAPTER IV.

An Address to Some Students in a Non-homeopathic Medical College.....	21
---	----

CHAPTER V.

Conclusion.....	44
-----------------	----

ARE WE TO HAVE A UNITED MEDICAL PROFESSION ?

INTRODUCTION.

J 1-18-05

Enthusiasm over a platform which I believe to be as broad as truth itself and as just as the light of day, does not so carry me away as to let me suppose that any great proportion of the profession will promptly accord to homeopathy the place I do. My claim for this little book is that, by *defining different cures* and by classifying practices, it makes obvious the tenability of an attitude friendly toward both homeopathy and rational medicine, and that it thus illumines a platform from which no man would be excluded because of his friendly attitude toward either.* For years there has been a growing sentiment that an acceptance of homeopathy does not preclude an acceptance of rational medicine; but there seems to have been wanting so evidently logical an expression of this sentiment as to satisfy all that one can consistently accept both rational medicine and homeopathy. It is a common thing to hear one graduated from a college where homeopathy is taught, as a part of medicine, apologize for his use of the other part. This

*Empiricism is not here discussed. I have elsewhere recognized wherein lies its essential feebleness, but that we can never entirely outgrow the practice.

129095

4 *Are We to Have a United Medical Profession?*

ought not to be. Each graduate from such a college ought to be able to clearly show the consistency of his position in accepting both homeopathy and rational medicine, and also the propriety of his making himself known as a homeopath. Believing that he cannot do this to the best advantage without accurately defining different cures, and showing that the particular cure of which *similia similibus curantur* is the law transcends the possibilities of rational medicine, I offer him this book as of exceeding value to him. It affords a platform upon which he can fight for homeopathy to the death, if need be, and can at the same time pursue rational medicine with an enthusiasm not in the least modified by his enthusiasm over homeopathy.

A very common thing is for one graduated from a college where homeopathy is not taught, to enter upon practice a confirmed opponent of homeopathy—a system of which he has acquired none but most superficial impressions. This statement is abundantly illustrated in *An Address to Some Students in a Non-Homeopathic Medical College* contained in this book. The young gentlemen asking these questions were within a few weeks of graduation. I have not had the pleasure of further acquaintance with any of them, but the presumption is that within a few weeks of formulating their questions they had assumed relations in medical societies which, to say the least, did not conduce to any further knowledge of homeopathy. To graduates of old-school colleges who feel that they lack satisfactory knowledge of what homeopathy really is, I commend this book confident of its adequacy to their needs.

There is among those physicians who do not accept homeopathy as worthy of any particular regard a growing

sentiment in favor of a platform broad enough for themselves and for those who accept homeopathy as well as rational medicine. So far as I am aware no expression of this sentiment has evinced anything like an adequate appreciation of the issue between the schools. The depth and breadth of that issue are simply immeasurable. If, as I believe, *similia similibus curantur* is a law of nature, it is as old as creation, and obtains in all worlds—in the world of thought and feeling as well as in the world of flesh and blood. To the universality of this law we shall presently devote a chapter. So far as I am acquainted with adverse criticisms of homeopathy, no man living has offered such criticism without betraying a lack of appreciation of the real issue between the schools. I offer no apology for this sweeping statement. It is not made upon the spur of the moment. Within the dozen or more years which have passed since I first made it I have become more and more confirmed that it is true. In this book will be found discussion of several adverse criticisms of homeopathy by men distinguished in the field of rational medicine, but evidently not informed in the philosophy of homeopathy. To those who do not themselves accept homeopathy, but are advocating a union of the schools I offer this book as likely to aid them to some adequate conception of the difference which they would adjust. That that difference will sooner or later be adjusted I firmly believe, but never will the schools convene upon a platform which accords less than absolute freedom in regard to homeopathy as an issue. To adjusters I offer this book as suggestive of a platform upon which he who believes in homeopathy and he who does not believe in it could together work in the field of rational

6 *Are We to Have a United Medical Profession?*

medicine, which is common to them both. A *sine qua non* to union upon such a platform is that no one should insist upon forcing his views, *pro* or *con*, in regard to homeopathy upon another: in other words, homeopathy, as a plank in this platform, would be matter of opinion. That there should, at any early day, be a union of the schools seems unlikely. Facts of human nature and of private interest will long postpone such union; but that come it will I believe. This book suggests what, I think, the platform will be when, whether sooner or later, such union is deemed practicable and desirable.

A view frequently advanced is that it is best the schools should not ever unite, but should continue separate until one or the other dies of inanition. If that view proves the right one, well and good. This book will still have been useful by helping to make clear the real issue, and by thus hastening the death of error and the general acceptance of truth.

CHAPTER I.

THE PARTICULAR CURE OF WHICH SIMILIA SIMILIBUS CURANTUR IS THE LAW. WHY THE NAME HOMEOPATH.

In much that has been offered as adverse criticism of homeopathy, the subject of homeopathy really has not been touched upon at all—this, because the critic has not recognized, as different from other cures, that particular cure of which *similia similibus curantur* is the law. The peculi-

arity of that cure lies not in the final outcome, but in the immediate effect* of the medicine. In a case of typhoid fever the outcome, or remote effect, may be health whether the medicine given be homeopathic, or be stimulant, or be germicidal, or be chemically antidotal, or be something else; or the outcome may be health when no medicine at all is given. In a case of typhoid fever the immediate effect of a stimulant is different from that of a germicide, and the immediate effect of either is different from the immediate effect of a chemical antidote. Unlike the immediate effect of any one of these, the immediate effect of a homeopathic medicine is a change from what is abnormal to what is normal (or approximately normal) in vital processes. Of course when these processes become normal (or approximately so) their effects too will. This, then—an immediate change from what is abnormal to what is normal (or approximately normal) in vital processes—characterizes the particular cure of which *similia similibus curantur* is the law. One cannot in rational practice attempt this cure, for in rational practice there must always be sought an immediate end *in itself* knowable, as a change in vital processes is not: it is knowable only *in its effects*.

That the cure of which *similia similibus curantur* is the law transcends the possibilities of rational medicine is a reason which, were there none other, would be all-sufficient for one's identifying himself by name with homeopathy. By the name *homeopath* he would make known his attitude upon what is far and away the most important issue in the

*The word *immediate* here has no reference to time. It simply means the effect to which no other effect is mediate.