

**POPULAR LECTURES ON
HOMEOPATHY: DELIVERED IN
HAHNEMANN MEDICAL
COLLEGE OF CHICAGO DURING
THE SESSION OF 1899 TO 1900**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649346516

Popular Lectures on Homeopathy: Delivered in Hahnemann Medical College of Chicago during the session of 1899 to 1900 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

**POPULAR LECTURES ON
HOMEOPATHY: DELIVERED IN
HAHNEMANN MEDICAL
COLLEGE OF CHICAGO DURING
THE SESSION OF 1899 TO 1900**

- misc /
Mar 21/01

From Dr. W. A. Sewey

H 615,53

Oct. 1, 1900

H 15 (16)

Popular Lectures

on

Homeopathy

DELIVERED IN _____
HAHNEMANN MEDICAL COLLEGE
OF CHICAGO, DURING THE SESSION OF
1899 to 1900.

Lecture I—By Benj. F. Bailey, M. D., Lincoln, Neb.
Subject—A Reply to An Address by Dr. Quine, of
Chicago, "Why I Am Not A Homeopath."

Lecture II—By Charles E. Fisher, M. D., Chicago, Ill.
Subject—"The Practical Side of Homeopathy."

Lecture III—By Charles E. Walton, M. D., Cincinnati, Ohio.
Subject—"Why Study Homeopathy."

Published by _____

Hahnemann
Medical College and Hospital
of Chicago, Ill.
1900.

Reprinted from the Medical Century.

A Defense of Homeopathy.

A REPLY TO AN ADDRESS OF DR. W. E. QUINE, BY DR. B.
F. BAILEY, LINCOLN, NEB., DELIVERED IN THE
COURSE OF POPULAR LECTURES AT HAHNE-
MANN MEDICAL COLLEGE AND HOSPI-
TAL OF CHICAGO, NOV. 9, 1899.

I deem it both an honor and a pleasure to be invited to defend a principle and a law which are dearer to me than life itself; and if possible I deem it even a greater honor and pleasure to defend a master whose memory I shall always revere, and my colleagues throughout the United States who have dealt so kindly with me, and who have my hearty good will, yea, my love, from the imputation of commercialism and dishonesty. I will try and remember, in the words in which I shall speak, that "moderation is the noblest gift of heaven."

I honor the gentleman to whose address I reply for the position which he has won in his profession and for his genuine ability, which I do not question. I will admit his honesty and will forgive him for an inherited prejudice which taught him opposition before investigation, which led him to assumption without experience. "To blow and to swallow at the same moment is not easy." And, judging from the writings which have come from this gentleman's hands, I am led to infer that he has blown a great deal and spent very little time in studying and assimilating the truth.

As our friend has said he should call upon the adherents of our school to do a large part of the talking so I shall call upon the members of the so-called "regular" school to speak the truth concerning the case upon trial, as they see it. I must admit that it seems to me that in reading the address delivered before the students of the Dunham Medical College "The mountains have been in labor and a

mouse has been born." But, as the little, "foxes spoil the vines" and the mice injure the granary, I presume it is only proper that we should give our attention to an attack which could never come from any of the broad-thinking men whom I shall quote.

The word "prejudice" means "adverse opinion formed without due consideration of the subject." This is the definition quoted by our former speaker, who claims that he has been unduly accused of prejudice. Taking his own definition, I challenge the gentleman to prove to me that he has made a careful study of the theory, practice, and materia medica of the homeopathic school; that he can or ever could pass such an examination in the same as we demand of our students upon graduation; and I further challenge him to show that he has, under proper tuition and with proper homeopathic education, for one twelve months tested the methods of similia in the treatment of disease; and I still further challenge him to show at what time and place he watched through a three years' course of study the diagnosis, prescriptions, and results of any competent and well-known homeopathic clinician.

There is another definition of prejudice, the legal definition given in the "Standard Dictionary:" "A prejudgment of a charge or an opinion touching any matter involved in it, such as would prevent a person if impaneled as a juror from doing impartial justice."

I am not willing that the cause of homeopathy should rest in the hands of self-constituted and prejudiced jurors. In the case as presented before the class of the Dunham Medical College, or at least as reported in the Chicago Medical Century, the speaker was prosecuting attorney, witness and jury. We will let the testimony then offered rest as the testimony of the prosecution. We will present our testimony and let the students and the people act as our jurors, as they have for more than one hundred years; for homeopathy has now lived for more than a century, and Sophocles said, "A lie never lives to be old." The testimony of the prosecution denounced Hahnemann as a plagiarist, accused him of claiming for his own the discovery of the law of

similia similibus curentur and said, "I think that there are few men in the world so well versed in the history of medicine as Hahnemann was." "It was not ignorance, then; which led him to claim the doctrine of *similia* as his own invention, it was dishonesty." Let us see. In Hahnemann's lesser writings he mentions Hippocrates, Detharding, Major, Brendelius and Dankwerts as having referred to such a probable law, and in the "*Organon*" he further mentions Bertholon, Thoury, Storck, and the Dane, Stahl, as having farther mentioned the law of cure. In Hufeland's Journal, he says, in 1807, "Though here and there a wise man was found who had the courage to oppose the general ideas and to advocate *similia similibus*, this proposition did not find general acceptance. He adds later, in the "*Organon*" (Dudgeon's translation), "I do not bring forward the following passages from authors who had a presentment of homeopathy as proofs in support of this doctrine, which is firmly established on its own merits, but in order to avoid the imputation of having suppressed these foreshadowings with a view of securing for myself the credit of the priority of the idea." "It is much easier to be critical than to be correct."

Hippocrates, Paracelsus and others did grasp something of the law of *similia*, but they did not realize the whole breadth of it as did Hahnemann; yet they spoke of it enough so that we may know that, like other scientific laws, it was first seen by those who barely caught glimpses, or "saw as through a glass darkly." Copernicus first wrote of the law of gravity; Galileo was persecuted for consenting to it, while later, when the world was ready to grasp it, Newton is lauded for his discovery and demonstrations of the force of gravity. All the time, from Hippocrates to Hahnemann, from Copernicus to Newton, the world was gradually preparing for the acceptance of new laws. They did not give us an invention, a term our speaker rather sarcastically applies to the doctrine of *similia*; they did not invent, meaning to "make or to fabricate;" they did not make the new, they simply discovered, uncover-

ed the old. It may be new to us, but not so new to us in ratio as we to the world. So we honor Hahnemann, for, as he honestly, candidly and publicly said, "Hippocrates and Paracelsus had observed the same law;" but Hahnemann observed this law as true not only in isolated cases, he followed it to a logical ending and found it universally true.

"Though old the thought and oft expressed,
'Tis his at last who says it best."

And thus Hahnemann is today entitled to the same credit for the demonstration of the law of similia that Newton is for the law of gravity.

Our writer quotes from Marcy's "Practice." I, too, will quote from him. Marcy, after speaking of the "brilliant intellect of Stahl" and of Paracelsus, and of their recognition of the law of homeopathy, says: "Both these reformers were possessed of gigantic intellects, genius indeed of the highest order, and the most exalted moral courage which enabled them to disregard the ex cathedra dogmas of antiquity, but they lacked the patient and self-sacrificing devotion in pursuit of acts and that unbounded benevolence and love of mankind which so essentially characterized the career of Hahnemann. To the latter therefore should be rendered all credit which attaches to this school of medicine." This is a dignified, appreciative and honorable recognition of Hahnemann and his work, and though the work of Dr. Marcy was published in 1850 and it would seem almost ridiculous to quote from any authority of the so-called regular school of fifty years ago, I am very willing to accept the quotation from Dr. Marcy's work as true then and still true today. I do not think it was a fair quotation, nor does it seem to me it could have been intended to be such, for Dr. Marcy states in this same chapter that "the allopathists often unconsciously encroach upon homeopathic ground and by practicing according to the law of similia effect their speediest and safest cures." He then goes on and names numbers of cases in which this is true and then comes the quotation which our writer has made, "That you pretend to be allopathists and antipathists while con-

stantly administering medicine after the method of the homeopaths." You will note that Dr. Marcy says or evidently intends to convey that he believes some do this unconsciously while there may be others who pretend to be what they are not.

I recognize the honesty of the great body of the so-called regular profession who read the works of their writers without seeking the origin of facts, but at the same time, while I will not accuse some of these writers of dishonesty, I must nevertheless condemn a neglect to give that which in the literary world is always considered a mark of honor, viz., credit where credit is due. Hahnemann gave aconite to the world in 1811. Did Sidney Ringer forget to mention that he drew his knowledge of aconite when he first gave it to the allopathic world in 1869 from Hahnemann and his followers? Probably Ringer took it from Hughes' "Pharmacodynamics," published in 1867. Was it a lapse of memory that made Ringer and Wood and Phillips and Woodhull neglect to mention that Hahnemann gave the same indications for the use of ipecac nearly three-fourths of a century before their writings upon the subject? Does the so-called regular profession know that Hahnemann nearly one hundred years ago commended belladonna for the uses to which it has been called during the past twenty-five years by the allopathic profession? Ringer in 1874 and Murell, in London, in 1896, gave to the world *hepar sulphuris* for exactly the same uses of which Hahnemann wrote in the early days of the century. Hahnemann published the pathogenesis of *bryonia* in 1816. Phillips and Lauder Brunton have given it to the world anew and without acknowledgment in later years. The *Therapeutic Gazette*, in 1889, discovers *rhus* for sciatica and rheumatism, while Phillips speaks of its use in paralysis. We have used it since 1816. *Cuprum* is another of the new remedies of the regular school. Hahnemann's pathogenesis of *cuprum* was published in 1805. These same words are true of *pulsatilla*, *ledum*, camphor in cholera, *thuja* as mentioned by Professor Kaposi, of Vienna, *cannabis sativa*, *euphrasia*, *nitro-glycerine*, and so on almost ad infinitum. I could name many more

remedies, which, together with these I have mentioned, have been properly proven, their pathogeneses published and the remedies themselves in common use by the homeopathic school for from fifty to one hundred years before they have been brought out as new remedies by the so-called rational school.

Understand me, I well know that ipecac, camphor, and some remedies that I mention were known many years before Hahnemann and his time, but they were not used in the same conditions, i. e., were not prescribed by the law of similia; and if, perchance, I refer to them as having been given to the profession as new remedies in these later days by writers of the so-called regular school, it is because they have been first recognized by that school at the time and by the writers mentioned for use in the conditions which necessitate their prescription according to the law of similia, which consequently means that the so-called new recommendations for the use of these remedies by said writers are but the repetition of the recommendations of Hahnemann so many years before. I think Dr. Marcy had a right to say what he did and I think in our day we have still a greater right to repeat it.

Our friend denies that the members of his profession are ever recognized by themselves as "allopathists." One Dr. Routh once published, at the request of "several distinguished friends," his researches on the subject of homeopathy. In that work in speaking of his own school he designates them as "allopaths," and though the gentleman tells me that there are not three physicians in Illinois who are registered as or who pretend to be allopathists I can but deem it passing strange, that a large per cent. of the members of the so-called regular school who apply to the Board of Health of Nebraska for a certificate to practice in that State write, as a reply to the question, "What school of medicine do you practice?" the word "allopathy." It is also true that a large number of these practitioners are educated in Illinois colleges.

Then the good doctor enters into a tirade as to the "senseless vituperation" against his own school