

Thus we see how disreputable were these institutions and how they continually shifted and changed as though seeking to hide something. But, it will be asked, was the "Penn Medical University" ever, in any sense, a homœopathic medical school? Did it ever, in spite of its character, pretend to teach homœopathy? We answer most emphatically, No! it never even pretended to teach homœopathy. Had it made any pretence at so doing, it could not have done, as only two of its faculty—at the time they were connected with the "University"—pretended to be homœopaths, even in name; and these two lectured, respectively on Botany and Pathological Anatomy. These branches scarcely permit much instruction in the principles and practice of homœopathy, even were the lecturers inclined to such teaching. That they were not so inclined is well proven by their teaching. *Afterward* in an avowedly "eclectic" college. The historian boastfully says of this "University:" "during the ten years of its existence, its graduates numbered about one hundred and twenty-five, of whom eighty were men and forty-five women. A large proportion of these are now practicing homœopathy in different parts of the country."\* A large portion! truly a noble record for a homœopathic medical school. The graduates must have been well taught!

Furthermore a list of an *ideal* faculty is given, in this history. We say ideal, for such a faculty never existed as a whole, at one time. It is a piece of patchwork.

We have endeavored to give a fair statement of the status and purposes of this college and its branches. If any one thinks we have exaggerated in any respect, let him investigate for himself. Let the American Institute of Homœopathy investigate this matter and see if the Penn Medical University deserves to be placed in history as a homœopathic institution. If not, it certainly should not be sent forth under the seal of that body as a homœopathic college. The Institute owes to itself and to the historian, whom we have accused of *perverting* the

\* See, History, etc., p. 802. Italics ours.

history of homœopathy, that this matter be thoroughly investigated. On the other hand, if the historian considers himself wrongfully accused let him demand an investigation? If we are shown to be in error we will most willingly acknowledge it.

#### FATAL ERRORS.

BY DR. LIPPÉ, M.D., ПРИЛАДЬЯНИА.

It is a fatal error to contend that the posological question divides homœopaths into "High Potency" and "Low Potency" parties. This fatal error is designedly made by *The Observer* in its issue of February, 1881.

It is an indisputable fact that there has existed, for a long time, a difference of opinion as to our posology; but that question never, at any time, formed the line of demarcation between homœopaths and eclectics. It was and is a historical fact that the men who followed the strict inductive method of Hahnemann cured the sick by means of infinitesimal doses, while the others, who claimed the right to be governed by their own individual opinions, irrespective of Hahnemann's strict inductive method, resorted to massive doses and finally, to palliatives, in their vain efforts to cure the sick. All the time they facetiously claimed superior successes, which they never showed or demonstrated, and also claimed to be as good homœopaths as any. But now, it is also a historical fact that the posological question no longer exists, at all. Prof. Gustav Jaeger, in his communications on Neuroanalysis, which were published in the January (1881) number of *The Organon*, says: "The numerically shown, generally very considerable, increase of the physiological action of a medical substance by potentization elevates homœopathy, by one stroke, to the rank of an exact, physiologically based method of cure, undeniably of equal birthright with allo-

pathy. In consideration of the easy access which neural analysis offers for the formation of a verdict, it will hereafter be impossible for our Universities to continue their systematic and persistent persecution of the homoeopathic school." Not only this, but under Sections five and six, are mentioned subjective effects caused by the inhalation of high potencies, for a quarter of an hour: "showing such strong results as far exceeded my expectations." Among all the men of learning, among the allopathic physicians who, *ex cathedra*, deny the effects of homoeopathic dilutions, there is not to be found one who has made the experiment, as becomes an expert; if he had done so he would at least have halted, and been surprised at his results. The defenders of allopathy will herewith suffer not only a scientific, but also a moral, defeat: as the heaviest charge one can bring against an expert is that he rendered a verdict without taking the least pains to institute an examination becoming an expert. And especially a verdict of such gravity that, with it, if it were just, numerous persons of the educated and professional class were to be stamped as swindlers, cheats or as cheated.

Be it remembered that Prof. Jaeger is a professor of natural sciences in an allopathic school. Be it remembered also that it is a fatal error to claim that any progress in science ever modified or annulled any of the strict inductive methods of Hahnemann; to the contrary, all and every advance in science develops and proves the correctness of our healing art. Here we have seen a scientist, *by one stroke*, settle the burning posological question and all disputes growing out of it; this scientist proves by ocular demonstration that the sick-making power of drugs is increased manifold by potentization! Where are the heroes of Milwaukee memory? Where are the diligent microscopists? Why wiped out *by this one stroke*? And where is the sage and philosopher, Hahnemann? Why, endorsed by every new discovery made in any of the sciences.

### INTERMITTENT FEVER, WITH CASES.

BY GEORGE H. CLARK, M.D., PHILA.

THAT at this day it is necessary to offer cases cured homoeopathically in order to convince those who pretend to practice that exclusive system, is a cause for wonder, not to those who follow the law as laid down by Hahnemann, but to many outside of the medical profession, who have seen, and who have experienced, the benefit arising from applying that law.

To endeavor to prove the truth of a law without rigidly adhering to it, is an absurdity. To condemn without having attempted to learn whether it is true or false, is prejudice; and such condemnation is not entitled to the least respect. Many self-styled homoeopaths, by their practice, (their precept in many instances, savoring of truth), are constantly engaged in attempts—let us hope, in ignorance, or for want of knowledge—to show that the law is to be used only in some cases, while in others it is inapplicable; and notwithstanding their desire to be classed as homoeopaths, they rarely try to follow, in the treatment of the sick, rules whose application is prerequisite to success.

False in one, false in all, is as true of the law governing homoeopathy as of any thing, and if it can be satisfactorily shown that it is false, after an honest endeavor, it has no right to exist, and should be condemned by all right thinking, honest-minded persons. There is no affection in which rules for treatment are more explicit than in intermittent fever, and the orthodox treatment of this disease being so very easy, calling for no effort upon the part of the prescriber, that, without even trying to effect a cure homoeopathically—though desiring their treatment to be called by that name—which demands mistaking labor, many are found to proclaim the inability of homoeopathy to effect a cure, especially in malarial regions.