

The Agnostic in Medicine

BY

JAS. W. WARD, M. D.

For Private Circulation Only



American Institute of Homoeopathy

PRESIDENT.
GAIUS J. JONES, M. D., CLEVELAND, OHIO.

FIRST VICE PRESIDENT.
WALTER E. NICHOLS, M. D., PASADENA, CAL.

SECOND VICE PRESIDENT.
MARGARET HASSLER SCHANTZ, M. D., READING, PA.

SECRETARY.
J. RICHEY HORNER, M. D., CLEVELAND, OHIO.

TREASURER.
T. FRANKLIN SMITH, M. D., NEW YORK CITY.

REGISTRAR.
WILLIAM O. FORBES, M. D., HOT SPRINGS, ARKANSAS.

HONORARY PRESIDENT, O. S. WOOD, M. D., OMAHA, NEB.

THE NEXT MEETING WILL BE HELD AT
HOTEL MATHEWSON, NARRAGANSETT PIER, R. I., JUNE 25-JULY 1, 1911.
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.
659 ROSE BUILDING, CLEVELAND, OHIO.

Dec. 15, 1910.

Under instructions of the American Institute of Homoeopathy,
I beg to transmit, herewith, copy of the presidential address delivered
at the Sixty-sixth Annual Session held at Pasadena, Cal., July 11th to
16th, 1910.

Would you kindly acknowledge receipt of same to Dr. James W.
Ward, 391 Sutter St., San Francisco, Cal.?

Thanking you, I am,
Very sincerely,

J. Richey Horner, Secretary.

The Agnostic in Medicine

*Presidential Address delivered at the sixty-sixth annual
session of the American Institute of Homœopathy
held at Pasadena, Cal., July 11, 1910.*

By JAMES W. WARD, M. D.

1910:

THE MURDOCK PRESS
SAN FRANCISCO

Under Instructions of the American Institute of Homœopathy.

Dec. 12, 1910.



American Institute of Homœopathy

The Agnostic in Medicine

The story of Medicine is the story of the ages. Its dawn taps the viewpoint of earliest knowledge. Its development has been concordant with the culture and development of the race. Throughout its history one comes more and more to overlook the merely temporary, constantly shifting border-lines of cults and faiths, and to see medicine as a whole, to watch its uprise as a unit, guided by a corresponding thirst for knowledge repelled by similar stirrings of the heart, taking part in but a single story—the marvelous tale of man's advance. This sense of all-enfolding unity, an ever-advancing common destiny is best disclosed by watching the current of philosophy, as it has constantly intermingled in the growth of medicine.

Philosophy, the speculative ground of the world, has for centuries held a challenged place in intellectual pursuits and sought that which is fundamental without in nature, and consciousness within itself. It has stamped its impress sometimes permanently, but more often irrelevantly, on the page of science, in its effort to seek the goal of human life. At this hour let me rivet your attention on the part which the agnostic has played and is playing in the creative, the conservative, the practical and the progressive as essential elements in the evolution of medicine. By agnosticism, as it may apply to medicine, I mean the theory of things which abstains from either affirming or denying the existence of scientific facts. It is a state of suspended judgment, all it undertakes to affirm must be that upon existing evidence, upon demonstration, upon experience and occupies itself with one world at a time. The agnostic perceives that there is a mental horizon that we cannot pierce and beyond that is the unknown—possibly the unknowable. He sees only natural causes and natural results, and seeks to induce man to give up gazing into void and empty space, that he may give his entire attention to the real world in which he lives.

He is one of a class of thinkers who disclaims any knowledge of the ultimate nature of things. The old-time agnostic believed

human knowledge was limited to experience, and that since the absolute and unconditioned, if it exists at all, cannot fall within experience, there was no right to assert anything whatever with regard to it. He sheltered his claims behind a rampart of distrust where no appeals could reach him. The modern agnostic, on the other hand, is constructive, fertile, magnetic and honestly maintains that his opinions are the very foundations of science. His point of view conceives ultimate cause and essential knowing of things, but to him infinite things are unknowable or at least unknown. He delights in setting forth what medicine is not, rather than what it is.

Life is full of mystery. It is in many particulars too deep for the human mind to fathom. To instance, there is no use laying rude hands upon the veil that enshrouds death and trying to take a peep into the darkness. No operation of mind, no flights of fancy, no straining of the soul, has ever been able to add one tittle to the knowledge which the world has always possessed concerning the future existence. We listen to men of science because we anticipate the sequence in natural phenomena which they uncover. We love whatever affirms, connects, preserves. We dislike whatever scatters or dismembers. Skepticism must be the attitude assumed by the student at all times in relation to the particulars of nature. The ground occupied by the skeptic in science is the vestibule of the "temple of health." Bigotry does not like to have any breath of question blown upon existing order, but to the agnostic the interrogation of method at all points is but an inevitable stage in the growth of every superior analysis.

The agnostic plays with a miscellany of facts, and dissects those superficial views which we call skepticism, but which will finally appear in that order which makes skepticism impossible. If agnosticism more thoroughly prevailed in the world of affairs there would be no place for egotism, hypocrisy or pedantry. The basis of the true agnostic is that of consideration, of self-containing, not all of unbelief, not at all of universal denying, not of universal doubting—doubting even that he doubts, least of all of scoffing and profligate jeering at all that is stable and good. Agnosticism lights up the vast background of medicine and clearer view is seen of the night, of its pitfalls, imperfections and unrealized aims.

In the evolution of philosophy, as in the evolution of an organ-

ism, it is impossible to fix with any precision the period of origin, because every beginning is also a termination and presumes the results of a whole series of preceding evolutions. The immediate effect of endeavoring to construct the whole world according to the laws of human thought has been stated by Homan herewith, "Natural philosophy, in consequence of an excessive impulse toward systemic production, passed from a general knowledge of the possible to a general ignorance of the actual." What is science now, was then mystery. Mystery overhung the thinkers of antiquity. The element of wonder and magic held the ancients to the firm belief that disease was punishment inflicted by gods or demons. The Greeks ranged with equal energy over every field of human knowledge as a conglomerate study, because no differentiation had been made between priests, philosophers and doctors. This gifted race, however, with marvelous activity threw off the trammels of religious formalism and superstition. In them the free abandonment of preconceived ideas is united with the precision of a geometer. The natural force and versatility of their intellect made them impatient of knowledge when supported only by external evidence. The excessive employment of deductive philosophy, ever finding the general in the particular, from which sweeping deductions were deduced, was their besetting error and inimical to the best interests of progress. Hippocrates brought order out of chaos, not so much from any special observations, but because he separated medicine from Ionian religion. "The healing art does not exist for its own benefit," said Plato. It was Hippocrates, as the first medical agnostic and vitalist, who pointed the way to real progress through observation of individual facts. His was an original mind in the exercise of original powers. However much we in our day appreciate this point of view, the "Sage of Cos" did not realize the importance of his own work as a logical instrument for scientific growth.

It was Hippocrates who said that "the physician who is also a philosopher is godlike." Platonic philosophy adhered to this motto, but changed from one pole of thought to another, and ended only in keeping alive powers of reason, to the absurd degree of seeking to prove the futility of all reasoning to a direct and concrete experience. This philosophy of doubt had the effect of limiting investigations to the narrow sphere of sense knowledge, while it encouraged the powers of observation, which must

ever prove the handmaid of research. This post-Hippocratic period paid special attention to the totality of symptoms as a collective unit, but regarded the study of ultimate cause of phenomena as futile. Here we first discern the recognition of symptoms of disease as a basis for therapeutics, without, however, seeking facts of prevention.

"Nature makes nothing vain," said Aristotle, and borne upon the wings of his philosophy the "doctrine of final cause" appeared, and proceeded to prove that every human tissue and function created was the cause of its existence. The influence of philosophy on medicine all through the Middle Ages, rather than the material facts of advancement, gave zest to further study and acceptance through succeeding centuries. They were intent upon verbal triumphs rather than solid acquisition of knowledge, leading only to a stasis in progress. In their day the practice of Galen, the principle of "*contraria contrariis curantur*" took deep root, analogous but antagonistic to, the philosophy for which, at a later period, Hahnemann stood. Soon the center of gravity in philosophic thought shifted, becoming chiefly a refuge against the sorrows of life.

Some one has said that "life is a strife of opposites." Paracelsus' life seems a good example in the world of thought of the "falsehood of extremes." He was opposed to authority because it was authority. Born in an age when speculation was in excess, he was awakened to enthusiasm for the happiness of men, and sought freedom of opinion as a means of reaching an harmonious form of life. In dealing death blows to the comparative anatomy of Galen, who never dissected a human body, he blazed the way for substitution. He was the "philistine in medicine," that in turn was to be slain by the youthful David—the better system—the 18th century medicine.

The doctrine of "general toleration" was now born with observation, as the key with which the secrets of nature might be unlocked. Dr. Moon says that in the "Therapeutic doctrine of signatures we see the forerunner of the modern doctrine of homœopathy," and that Hahnemann was "the lineal successor of Paracelsus." In this passing reflection upon homœopathy by this brilliant English author, there can be no element of creed implied. What he means is, that Paracelsus revolted against Galen and against post-Galenic doctrine, and declared he had not read a medical book in ten years. Hahnemann also declared

against the widespread therapeutic paralysis of his time. Here the parallelism ends. Paracelsus originated the doctrine of signatures and substituted that theory for all that had pre-existed. Paracelsus declared "Man invents nothing; the devil invents nothing; it is God only who unveils all to us by the light of nature." I take down Hahnemann's Lesser Writings and read what he says when in the throes of disappointment over medieval medicine. I quote: "Well, since there must be a certain means of cure, as sure as there is a God, the wisest and best of beings, I will quit the barren field of autological illustration; I will no longer listen to arbitrary opinions with whatever art they may be reduced to system; I will no longer bow to the authority of celebrated names. But I will seek close around me, where must be this means of which no one has dreamed because it is too simple and does not appear learned enough; because it is not encircled with crowns for the masters in the art of building hypotheses and scholastic abstractions." Hahnemann's genius had just received the spark that was to illumine his pathway and ours, and he exclaims: "What! has not the infinite wisdom of that spirit which animates the universe been able to furnish means to relieve the suffering caused by disease which has been permitted to afflict mankind!"

In the uplift of his reasoning he recognized cause and defined the necessity of relief. Paracelsus' lament was the wail of discontent. Hahnemann's outcry was that of the philosopher searching in the dark. Paracelsus' desperation was that of intellectual obscurantism; Hahnemann's interrogation, that of the analytical mind, believing in Nature's secret near at hand and searching through inductive methods the balm for the healing of the nations. Paracelsus held in contempt all knowledge acquired by toil and reflection, relying solely on inward illumination. Hahnemann, on the contrary, held in fitting regard historic medicine, himself a past master of all the sciences of his day, and by his matchless labor he drew the veil off the face of nature to the unfolding of the law of *similia*. Paracelsus was a true child of his age; Hahnemann, a man born for centuries that were to come. The prayer of Paracelsus was that of helplessness and benignity—the supplication of Hahnemann that of courage and a benediction.

Medical knowledge must ever be "immersed in the particulars of sense," and although philosophy may broaden its conception and accentuate its tone, no metaphysical or mystic conceptions can ever be a substitute for that balanced judgment essential to

scientific growth. It was only at the renaissance that medicine rose from the bondage of medievalism. Medieval physicians were impressed so strongly with the idea of unity of knowledge that they failed in constructing that solid groundwork upon which each department must rest. As they lifted up the obelisk they did not lay below the proportionate base. The validity of knowledge can only be tested by logic. It was however, repulsed at this period and the pure Hellenic spirit was drowned in a sea of mystic entanglements. The barrenness of medicine was always in evidence during these centuries, because experimental philosophy was an impossibility. No specific contributions to science were made and but feeble evidence of the right path for attaining truth was in sight.

The world waited nearly 2,000 years for Bacon to forge anew the weapon of inductive reasoning and lend the weight of his genius to the formulation of his method. The science of medicine, independent as it seems to us to-day, seems not to have developed in isolation, but always has been associated with, and a part of the philosophic theories of the day. It is ever true that measures of constructive medicine are the outcome of periods of constructive thought, and development is always commensurate with activity of the latter. Bacon recalled men from the study of words to that of things, pointed out the power to be gained from a true knowledge of nature and the methods by means of which such knowledge could be obtained. He claimed his true mission was rather one who sounded the "trumpet call" than one who "marshalled the troops." He insisted on the importance of experiment and research. He did for inductive logic what Aristotle had done for the theory of syllogism. This does not imply that Bacon invented the inductive method of reasoning. His strength of mind is like the momentum of a falling planet, and his discretion the return of its due and perfect curve. What Bacon endeavored to do was to analyze the inductive procedure and to interpret what conditions must be fulfilled in order that truth might be reached in this way. The world has agreed to date from Bacon the systemic reforms of natural philosophy, the beginning of an intelligent attempt to place investigation of nature on a sound basis, teaching science for all time the great idea of reality and boundless worth of knowledge.

"It was long after the Baconian system that medicine was applied with a method appropriate to facts." Great generalizations

advance slowly. The deductions which Bacon abolished were from premises arbitrarily assumed, and not tested by verification through specific experience. Until the eighteenth century had well-nigh closed, we find philosophy confounded with metaphysics and science with physics. This was dispersed by the spirit of agnosticism engendered in the human mind, fostered by the promptings of science.

Truth, not based on sound comprehensions of its right place and meaning, proves little better than error. It is within the power of inductive reasoning to explain the facts, whereas formerly the hypothesis must harmonize with their shiftless theologians. The possibilities of human life analyzed through logic, the instrument of philosophy, has only been appreciated in keeping with the unfolding of medical science in its protection of public health to the attainment of the ideal and of existence. The study of inductive philosophy created a spirit of criticism which was destined at a later period to stimulate the study of anatomy and physiology, making clear that science comes by observation and not by way of authority. Clearer vision now developed by the right of private judgment and abrogation of precedence. Much disappointment, reversals, pain and anguish had to be suffered before real intellectual freedom could be born. In the reaching of higher levels, there must of necessity have been much good lost along with the dross—the true lost with the irrational.

The ferment in the medical world had taken new impetus by the far-reaching philosophy of Bacon. His inductive logic drew attention to the actually small amount of positively ascertained truth that antiquity had developed. His was the duty of pointing the way to the stability of science. In this stability truth was to come forth. The importance which he attached to facts and correct observation made error less possible. Science has ever won out through induction to certified facts. Certified facts have led to concrete experience.

Bacon was the torch bearer to lay the basis of all science. In him experimentation was scientifically founded to the larger fulfillment through observation to correct conclusions. Spencer says: "Before deductive interpretation of the general truths there must be some deductive establishment of them." John Stuart Mill claims the deductive method to imply "that mode of investigation by which the law of an effect is ascertained from

the consideration of the laws of the different tendencies of which it is the joint result. This method consists of three kinds of operation—the first induction, the second ratiocination, and the third verification. To the three the human mind is indebted for its most conspicuous triumph in the investigation of nature.” Now, as a matter of fact, deductive reasoning is commonly opposed to inductive.

Deductive reasoning is meant to include all necessary reasoning together with those probable reasons which predict results as true in the long run, but excluding those inferences which are generally regarded as being open to correction in the long run. Descartes passed through the period in which he doubted everything except his own existence, because of the power of thinking. The ultimate test of this proposition being, that truth is intrinsic not extrinsic. The laws of action and reaction, of refraction of light, and of conservation of energy are all elements in our everyday experience. The materialistic tendency of these philosophers was a powerful reaction from the ultra-theological conceptions of the time and became a powerful aid to science, even if, together with Spinoza, they rejected the idea of “final cause” from their conception of nature.

Medicine is intensely inductive. We collect our facts not by starting from prior principles to conclusions, but in orderly sequence and gradually rise from facts to principles. Induction proceeds from the known to the unknown. A real induction is never made with absolute confidence, but the belief in the conclusion is always qualified and shaded down. Both induction and deduction to the agnostic reveal two worlds of thought. They are rivals, side by side, seeking to explain and balance the honors due to each. Mathematical exactitude of method in both thought and experiment has produced the achievements of modern laboratory research. This exactitude has in its brief but marvelous career of three centuries, altered the face of the globe. Whether its success has been due to abstract reasoning or to the practical experiments like Harvey's, it is equally valuable. We may regard Harvey's discovery a fine example of inductive method, because the complete proof of it was not found until a later date. His education and probity gave him the more solid grasp of facts as the birds of highest flight have the strongest alar bones. Harvey from definite experiments and observations induced the fact of connection between the arteries and veins, but the actual anasto-

mosis through the capillaries was not demonstrated till four years after his death by Malpighi. Thus it is plain that the scientific method harmonized with the materialistic ideas of Bacon and Descartes, and thus a bold advance was felt to the mechanical conceptions of life.

The study of the phenomena of fermentation in the 17th century, amplified and bacteriologically explained in our time by Pasteur, the chemist, the inevitable thirst after more complete knowledge of botany; the clearer ideas of physiology all combined to fashion a period when disease could be classified by the great Sydenham, and still greater of practitioners, Boerhaave. As in the center of a circle all the radii come together, so do the eminent philosophers and physicians whom I have mentioned, tend to focus all ascertained facts to the establishment of a medical science, rendering possible the great discoveries of the 19th century. That all-embracing genius, Haller, alike renowned as the botanist and physiologist, discovering the existence of “nervous impulse,” laid the foundation to that knowledge which Hahnemann later called the “vital principle.” He formed deduction from experiments to facts, as the ultimate appeal must be facts, which true science arranges, combines, interprets. The age was carried away by the rapidly swelling current of knowledge then decisively setting out in the direction of science. It is Haller's glory to have seen vision of the coming greatness, to have expressed in terms of splendid power the thoughts which were dimly stirring the age, and to have sanctioned a new movement of drug proving by his authoritative genius.

The destruction of scholasticism was now complete. He came to direct the construction of a grander temple. He represents the power of carrying up any fact to successive platforms, and so disclosing in every fact a germ of expansion. These expansions consisted in continuing the scientific sight where the horizon falls on the ordinary man's vision and through this labor aided in discovering the law which led to the unfolding of true drug pathogenesis. It has ever been true, there can be no advance without liberty of opinion; suppression of honest inquiry is retrogression and must end in intellectual night. Suppression is the enemy of individuality. Through it philosophy would be branded as infamous; science would again press its pale and thoughtful face against the prison bars, and around the limbs of liberty would climb the bigot's flame. Medicine became now to

be honored as a part of natural science, theoretically and practically, as a science devoted to the ideal aim of mankind. Natural philosophy with its over-systemic production separated from natural science, and, passed as Homan says, "from a general knowledge of the possible to a general ignorance of the actual."

It is now plain that the old materialism has been repudiated and an agnosticism has come in its stead. Naturalism has no philosophical existence; it rejects the reality not only of mind but even of matter. Once materialism is abandoned and naturalism found untenable, a vital force remains the one stable position. It is, therefore, only in terms of mind that we can understand the unity, activity and regularity that nature presents. It is here where the agnostic starts his study into the unknowable. If with the history of science and the results of science before us we pass straight on to the construction of philosophy, idealism has no chance save as an incentive for action. From a confusion of probable opinions and fanciful surmises, there gradually emerges the clear circle of the sciences waxing brighter as they advance in coherence and continuity, while the void of nescience beyond grows too dark for shadows, too empty for dreams. That a single atom should deviate from its predetermined course were as much a miracle as if Halley's comet should break away from its track and set the whole solar system in commotion. So in the human body, matter and energy are the two fundamental conceptions as elsewhere. Matter in motion in the body follows physiological laws, as certain as any law of the universe.

In searching for truth in every direction, it is possible to leave its outposts behind and to reach the open where speculation may enter. It is more profitable, however, to discuss the existence of the serious gaps within the bounds of science itself. A working hypothesis has been the rule of the ages. Nowadays there is nothing that science resents more indignantly than the imputations of materialism. It is a past philosophical dogma. It professes to start from the beginning, which science can never do, and when it is true to itself, never attempts to do. It is agnosticism that has led modern science to separate itself from the pronounced materialism so common in scientific circles a century ago. True science will not dogmatize either by offering or denying. Knowledge in the determinate sense is the knowing that we do not know. So far as knowledge extends all is law, and law ultimately and most clearly to be formulated in terms of matter and mind.

We therefore conclude that "in proportion as psychological facts are physiologically interpretable, and in proportion again as their physiological concomitants are physically explainable, in that same proportion will every fact of mind have a definite and assignable place as an epiphenomenon or concomitant of a definite and assignable physical fact and our empirical knowledge approximate towards a rounded and complete whole." It is plain that on the physical side we have a single system governed by unvarying law, quantitative exactness, complete concatenation of events—in a word, one vastly complex but rightly adjusted mechanism. To set out then from this permanent material scheme of inductive research and to trace its working through the fleeting multitude of vital sparks as one follows the stem of a tree into its branches with their changing leaves and fruit, that is a sure synthetic and direct method of analysis. We have in the foregoing the basis for intelligent study of pharmacodynamics—the laws governing cause and effect in drug pathogenesis, and the scientific basis for intelligent operation of the law of *similia*. In dealing with drug pathogenesis we follow a line regimental in fashion, with such definite co-existence, successions, resemblances and differences as fall within the range of actual experience.

John Stuart Mill in his discussion of the deductive method with reference to its application to cases of the "composition of causes" says: "It is obvious that we cannot expect to find the law of tendency by an induction from cases in which the tendency is counteracted. It has been judiciously remarked that pathological facts, diseases in their different forms and degrees, afford in the case of physiological investigation the most variable equivalent to experimentation, inasmuch as they often exhibit to us a definite disturbance in some one organ or organic function, the remaining organs or functions being in the first instance at least unaffected. It is true that from the perpetual actions and reactions which are going on among all parts of the organic economy there can be no prolonged disturbance in any one function without ultimately involving many of the others, and when once it has done so, the experiment for the most part loses its scientific value." Hence Mill continues: "The experiments are best tried, not in a state of disease which is essentially a changeable state, but in a condition of health, comparatively a fixed state. In the one, unusual agencies are at work, the results of which we have no means of predicting; in the other, the course of the accustomed

physiological phenomenon would, it may generally be presumed, remain undisturbed, were it not for the disturbing cause which we introduce.

"If, for instance, we try experiments with mercury on a person in health in order to ascertain the general laws of its action upon the human body, and then reason from these laws to determine how it will act upon persons affected with a particular disease, this may be a really effectual method, but this is deduction." Then he proceeds to lay down the conduct for these experiments as follows: "In the first place we introduce the agent into the midst of a set of circumstances which we have exactly ascertained." Again, "Moreover the difficulty may be attenuated by sufficient multiplication of experiments in circumstances rendering it impossible that any of the unknown causes should exist in them all." Further on he states: "We take the utmost pains to exclude all causes capable of composition with the given cause, or, if forced to let in any such causes, we take care to make them such that we can compete and allow for their influence, so that the effect of the given cause may, after the subduction of those other effects, be apparent as a residual phenomenon."

Now, my friends, do you not recognize in these quotations the full exposition of Hahnemann's conception of drug proving and the precision of methods as well, the very foundation of our science which was suggested by the immortal Haller, but brought into practical form by the "Sage of Coethen."

Thus we see the law of *similia* dogging the steps of advancing science; here seen and then apparently for a time gone, like the longest wave is quickly lost in yonder Pacific Ocean. Everything in the world of matter is subject to invariable law, as the reaction of chemicals, and this very relationship of science demonstrates the domain of homœopathy. The sharp distinction which Christian Wolff brought into view between empirical and rational knowledge has been of vast import. What we have to note is the existence in our time of a vast circle of empirical knowledge in the whole range of medicine. The criticisms on homœopathy have merely touched the periphery of its philosophy, but have not weakened its center.

It is ever plain that as a vitalist and agnostic Hahnemann stood conspicuous and foreshadowed the facts which later were explained by philosophy. His life resembles one of those winter mornings when the air sparkles with crystals. To-day his law

marks the zenith of intellectual activity in the evolution of therapeutics. The continuity of the tale is now established from Hippocrates to Bacon, from Bacon to Hahnemann, from Hahnemann to Mill, from Mill to the laboratories of our day. To the clinician the law of *similia* is as the voice of a guide in an avalanche of the Alps. Observation and experiment alone can determine it, and it is to those he has a right to confidently appeal. The law of induction has been the pathfinder, the facts of deduction the road-builder in our science of therapeutics.

Agnosticism is not a disease of thought. Query, Is not the satisfaction of doubt essential to all manliness? Belief in Homœopathy does not alone consist in accepting the affirmations of Hahnemann, but rather through the impulse of deductive logic shown through inductive process, ratiocination and verification, we reach the conclusion—

"Rightly seeing,
Rightly seen."

Throughout the historic past there have been two influences in operation, that of Greece with Hippocrates in the background; that of the Fatherland with Hahnemann in the foreground, standing in close relationship, by the influence upon medicine through the respective eras and in undeviating parallelism in moulding all modern thought. Both laid their ears close to Mother Nature to interpret the voice, as to her teachings and as to application of her lessons.

There are in these two thinkers certain marked features of resemblance, and others equally marked of difference. Both were agnostics, in that they sought through the unknown to acquire truth. We see their difference most strikingly in their descendants. The sincerity and marrow of Hahnemann reaches in his writings. He always worked with solid ground and stones underneath. He interrogated nature with the query, "What do I know?" Not until Hahnemann touched the essentials of scientific agnosticism with the keenness of his introspective mind, do we see dawning the age of inductive reasoning in medicine and progress in therapeutics. Homœopathy is a science by induction; it is an art by deduction. Hahnemann knew by sad experience what medicine was not, before stating what it was. As a natural seeker for truth, which grew with lapse of time, he foresaw the natural connection between cause and effect.

"Behold he watches at the door,
Behold his shadow on the floor."

Hahnemann has been assailed by carping critics as regarding the "study of the cause of disease as utterly futile and absurd." This is absolutely false, for in the third section of his conception of law, the "Organon," in laying down his formula for curing the sick, he says: "If, finally, he knows the *obstacles* to recovery in each case and is aware how to *remove* them, so that the restoration may be permanent, *then* he understands how to treat judiciously and rationally and he is a true practitioner of the healing art." Sections 4 and 5 he gives over entirely with specific emphasis, pointing out the absolute requirement as a first consideration, removal of cause of disease or obstacles against the cure. Hahnemann's declaration of the constitutional nature of all chronic and most acute diseases, was ahead of his time and is being confirmed by twentieth century pathology. The relationship that infection bears to causation in disease has made plain how many diseases have a constitutional basis which were formerly regarded as purely local. For example, pneumonia, formerly considered an organic pulmonary disease, now more and more is being regarded as a true septicemia, of the pneumococcus, which has long been so advocated by our colleague, Dr. Thomas McConkey.

Hahnemann has been accused of neglecting pathology. His standard of health was the normal body. He, therefore, founded his science on anatomy and physiology, and regarded the totality of the symptoms in disease to be the objective and subjective expression of the pathology. Contemporaneous with Hahnemann, pathology was conceived by the inspiring genius of Morgagni and the meteoric career of Bichat. The short life of that famous Parisian, Bichat, dying at 23, gave birth to only fragmentary suggestions in this vast field of physical research. Modern pathology was not born until 1856, fifteen years after Hahnemann's death. It is much to the latter's credit that he did not build the system of homœopathic therapeutics on the shiftless sands of earlier morbid anatomy.

Therapeutics has been a "bundle of perceptions," and it has been hopelessly at a loss to find the "principle that unites the bundle." This principle is found to be the law of *similia*, that has been the synthesizing activity which has yielded the marvelous results of the nineteenth century. Prof. Ward says: "Moreover, when we divest ourselves of the scientific bias and con-

template medicine in its historical concreteness, we can see the true reality to be not a mechanism but a realm of ends. It is plainly seen that science is concerned only with the conceptions, ignores the elements due to the conative and practical interest of the subject."

With the publication of the "Organon of Rational Medicine" and the "Materia Medica Pura" Hahnemann provided both theoretically and practically the requirements of homœopathy as a distinct method of therapeutics. The high water mark of his medical philosophy was now reached. He was the first to apply the inductive method of research in therapeutics. He says, in the preface to the second, the 1819 edition of the "Organon," "The true healing art is in its nature a pure science of experience, and can and must rest on clear facts and on sensible phenomena pertaining to their sphere of action. Its subjects can only be derived from pure experience and observation, and it dare not take a single step out of the sphere of pure well-observed experience and experiment." And again, "Every one of its conclusions about the actual must always be based on sensible perceptions, facts and experiences, if it would elicit truth."

Hahnemann's philosophic conceptions were a protest against materialism; his conclusions, the results of years of observation and experiment. He proved that therapeutic science cannot be built on any insecure foundation. His teachings entertain a practical acceptance of the existence of a vital principle animating the body, and at the same time a similar force embodied in every medicinal substance. It necessitates, therefore, a substantial world of causes. From this conception follows the pathological deduction, that the disturbance of the harmonious play of life manifesting itself in symptoms affecting the functions and sensations which we call disease is a disturbance of the same vital force. The most marked feature of early homœopathy was its entire freedom from all theory and hypothesis. It was a protest against all and any pathological theory as a basis of therapeutics. William Boericke says. "Whatever Hahnemann published as a fact has never yet been disproved, but his theories are not proved. It is the genuine Hahnemann spirit to disregard all theories when they are in opposition to the results of experience. Hypotheses are of value in so far as they lead to suggestive experimentation." It is enough to say that modern laboratory research is making plain and is in harmonizing accord with Hahne-

mann's therapeutic doctrine. Newton and D'Alembert's famous treatise on dynamics do not pretend to reveal spiritual mysteries as synonymous with mental but rather the relation of the forces of matter, and that the vital forces of an organism are superior to material parts. Hahnemann did not invent the dynamization hypothesis of matter. This was announced by Boscovich in 1759, when Hahnemann was only four years old. No better refutation to the ridicule of attenuations which has been heaped upon Hahnemann and his followers, than to mention the dosage of the vaccines now in clinical use, or again the power of triturations, as shown by the photographical action of the radioactive agents, so accurately demonstrated by the indefatigable Bailey and Blackmar. Moon says of Hahnemann that "apart from his peculiar theories he was a great advocate of hygiene, and in his book, 'The Friend of Health,' appears to have been far in advance of his time as regards preventive medicine." To this if we add his far-reaching declaration of the germ theory of cholera and other infectious diseases, we find him standing alone on the threshold of 19th century medicine, pointing the way to future researches. Can we doubt his right place in medicine as an agnostic and inductive philosopher, when we note the establishment of his, the first physiologic-chemical and hygienic laboratory this world ever saw? Over the portal of its door we see inscribed, "Dedicated to Modern Therapeutics, based upon Drug Proving in Health." Now, what the science of therapeutics stands in need of to-day is a form of induction which shall analyze experience and take it to pieces, and by a due process of exclusion and rejection lead to inevitable conclusion. Such we may rightly expect from the Bureau of Clinical Research of the American Institute of Homœopathy.

Hahnemann did believe in the "*vis medicatrix naturæ*" as is shown by his declaration of the effect of appropriate well-proved remedies exciting the "vital force" to normal pitch. In this belief he did use the current idea of "nervous responses," which had only a little while before been formulated by Brown. Hahnemann's inductive philosophy led him step by step from the unknown to the known in drug pathogenesis. We find him advancing in the face of authority, taking the drug, observing effects, recording all changes and noting reactions. Under the spell of his reasoning we discover his recognition of causes as obstacles to cure and the measure of vital force his curative index. It has

been proven, clinically, to be true for a century, but we have waited just 100 years to have it proven at Ann Arbor and Boston University by laboratory research, through opsonic index registration by our distinguished colleagues, Burritt and Watters.

In Hahnemann's lifework there is a co-ordinate body of accurately ascertained facts. He aimed at differentiation of diseases apart from their names, and the individualization of remedies as a choice to their cure. The false perspective of ancient posology was forever raised, and a better adjustment between the individual and the disease appeared, making clear rational practice. Medical knowledge will not be enduring unless combined with philosophy, which both Hippocrates and Hahnemann regarded as essential to a physician and of enormous service to the common weal. Philosophy is forever seeking to establish among mankind the basis of a rational existence. Science must foresee as well as explain. As the drop of rain starts but does not create the life dormant in the grain of wheat, as the flash of lightning reveals but does not produce the visions of the night, so the *simillimum* arouses the life force in disease and reveals the inherent power of nature to respond to normal impulse.

Hippocrates discovered the glimmer. Hahnemann saw the light. In the midst of the law of *similia* is the light, in the midst of the light is the truth, in the midst of the truth is the imperishable opportunity. If inquiry is to be independent, if reason is to walk alone, in what direction must we walk? We must walk with a dual object in view—on the one hand our intellectual growth and expansion, on the other, with sincerity of purpose seek the philosophy of the enlightenment as it pertains to the treatment of disease, and lastly defend ourselves against discrimination.

We move toward progress.—In accepting truth through the open door, come from whatever source it may, for observation is that noble indigenous plant which grows like the palm, from within. The primary impulse of philosophy is the hunger for unity.

In coming more and more to realize that homœopathy is a specialty in therapeutics which seeks the treatment of the patient rather than treatment by name of the disease.

In realizing that through scientific agnosticism alone the philosophy of homœopathy has been kindled and when applied through laboratory research broader confirmation will be ac-

quired. The future agnostic in medicine will be just as potent a factor as in the past. Science is no mystery; it is simply the effort to reduce facts to laws and laws to law.

In realizing that at all turns our progress can only come through independence of thought and freedom of action. It is in the hunger to know the objective truth of things, in the immense impetus given to the scientific spirit, in the fresh awakening in the inductive study of the real world, that the intellectual inspiration of our epoch in medicine has centered. Closely allied to these elements of progress, is the *present social movement towards idealism*. We detect the marvelous wave, intense, determined and widespread, moving towards the ideal in medical reform. It is a movement we cannot stem. It ought not to be stemmed. It should not be stopped,—rather assisted and directed. It is a revolt against the tyranny in medical practice of the old school, and the shiftless practice of the new. It is a recoil against materialism in practice and an application of idealism in method. We cannot deny that to-day medicine as a whole is in the trough of the wave, where nothing is seen but unrest. The world's cry is ever for more light and the prayer ever for more truth.

In the current idealism of practice the aim is centered on safeguarding the rights of the individual against the undue limitation of the past, and will in turn be answered by assuring the full and free play of activities in all lines of the healing art, composing the social organism. It is a movement destined to end in abandonment of crude measures in therapeutics and a better adjustment of intellectual and moral beliefs.

Kant worthily said: "Two things fill the mind with ever new and increasing wonder and veneration, the more often and steadily we reflect upon them: the starry heaven above me and the moral law within me," and of the two, it is the spiritual within us to which we return in the last resort of science and philosophy.

This movement will ultimately enrich the respect for the best in medical practice and deepen the regard of the world for all we have that is substantial and true. The universal significance will be revealed in the essential setting of the reciprocal rights of the patient and the duty of the doctor. It is for the homœopathic school to take hold of this idea, move on the crest of the wave and without letting go of any of its basic philosophy, seize the opportunity to influence the laity towards Hahnemann's prin-

ciples. The tide is drifting in the exactitude of the compass toward the gentle power in the healing art, towards truth as we see it. It must be grasped and made to encircle the outposts of our work and the confines of our faith. This is our duty! This is our opportunity! Shall we prove ourselves worthy?

Again, defense *against discrimination* is the school's preservation. Its practice and its colleges are in the balance. Mental freedom meets us at the cradle,—opportunity leaves us at the tomb. Our first questions are answered by asking another, and our last by pointing to the boundless unknown.

That spirit of self, with a consciousness of power, with an intense sense of right and of truth, and a disposition to project it upon others, is of necessity a domineering spirit, and it is that which attempts to make men bend to your sense of what is true and what is right. I do not, therefore, wonder when this is wrongly conceived that there is a spirit of despotism.

It is not the fault of the garden pole that is put into the ground for the morning glory to twine around about it.

It is not the fault of the despot that turns the educational machinery of American medicine so that all have to keep step to the music exactly. He may turn that despotism into dogma—it is not his fault. He himself was first the subject and then the master, and then the despot. If there were not men who wanted to be governed, there would not be so many men who want to govern them; and if men in our profession assuming to direct educational standards and state medical legislation and would-be national health board creations or its doctrines, are imperious, if they are arrogant, *you make them so*.

It is inherent in the fundamental falsity of this idea that any body of men in America are commissioned to govern any other body of men by reason of the supposition that they are nearer to right than others. True brotherhood with its uplift never harmed any body, because brotherhood proceeds ever with justice for its instrument in the spirit of true medical development, and works by right as well as by head.

Now, the moment that any man stands among his fellowmen and says: "I alone am right, and I own all human decrees, and I am empowered to enforce them upon you, and I bring down all that is restrictive in the world of medical legislation to lay it upon other schools of practice and their colleges that have not a vast endowment, and upon the conduct and life of others than

dominant medicine;" the moment that any organization has taken possession of that vast and un-American realm, that very moment, of necessity, it becomes an enemy to liberty, a leader towards captivity and men are bound by it to be servants. So then, if homœopathy in 1910 is oppressed by the tightening cordon of organized inimical legislation, it is only because through weakness it has invited it—it is because through indifference it has permitted it.

Who are makers of organized medical despots? Weak men, apathetic men, for power is not easily oppressed. Strong, robust and sun-crowned men are not often oppressed. It is the indifferent, the ignorant, those that do not know how to defend themselves, that in civil or in intellectual things are oppressed and in medical realms as well; and the remedy for professional and educational oppression is, measure your own strength and power in activity, translate your thoughts into deeds, make the common people stronger, wiser and better informed of the needs of liberal medicine. Let the homœopath wake out of his somnambulistic state and make him understand that carelessness in practice, indifference to matters of school and to matters of education and state laws, is an invitation to despotism; and give him to understand that our statesmen who have faith in the common good for our common country, believe also in manhood, fair play and in men. Give to your state legislators an earnest of your faith, urge upon them the recognition of duty and importance of equal rights, and then insist upon the obtaining of fair play to all men. Give to them this spirit and there shall be found no association or monopoly that shall govern you except as the air governs the flowers, except as the sun governs the seasons, for the sun wears no sceptre, but with sweet kisses covers the ground with fragrance and with beauty. Government by consent of the governed is democratic, but by authority of organization and machinery and systematic creeds or dogma, no man has a right to govern another, nor can he if those other men are not weak, effeminate or indifferent.

I regard all men and organizations who are working towards the enlargement of their fellowmen as being worthy guides towards setting men free. He too is a prince among men, and belongs to that host of scientists and philosophers who are saying to the rock and the sky and to the realms of nature—

"What secret hath God told you, Tell it to us!"

They, too, are making men free and are uplifting the human mind, and every artist who paints upon his canvas or sculptor carving the stone or mason rearing up stately marble expressing something noble to men—every such man also is working for the largeness and so for the liberty of men. Whosoever teaches men to be earnest, to be seekers after truth; in short, whoever teaches manhood makes men free, for liberty means not license but such largeness and balance of manhood that "men go right, not because they are told to, but because they love that which is right."

We honor Hahnemann because his pure soul loved that which was right; because his stored mind of varied learning and questioning spirit sought the truths of nature; because he ennobled our race; because he has contributed as much as any man living or dead to the real prosperity of the world; because he left a legacy of helpfulness to every human being. We associate his name with other scientists who are honored throughout the world. Millions are doing homage to his genius at this moment and pronouncing his name with veneration. Never for one moment did he abandon the sublime standard of truth. He investigated the phenomena of nature. He studied the laws of drug action. He thought much to advance more. He separated the scientific gold from the alloy in the crucible of his mighty brain. He was never found on his knees before the altar of insincerity or authority. He stood erect by the grand, tranquil column of Reason. He was an inquisitor, an admirer, a lover of nature. Close to the age of 90, bowed by the weight of years, covered by the insignia of honor, beloved of two continents with royalty to do him homage, he laid his weary head upon the bosom of universal Mother, and with her loving arms around him sank into that slumber called Death.

On the starry scroll of the immortals, medical history has added another name! The good he did in the world is his monument; within the hearts of her suffering peoples he inscribed his name, and there upon everlasting stone at Père La Chaise to his genius is written this, the sublimest of truths—

"Non inutilis vixi."

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES.

- Aristotle—Biography.
Hippocrates—Biography.
Plato—Biography.
Hahnemann, Samuel—Organon of Rational Medicine—Dudgeon.
Bacon—Novum Organon.
Ward, James—Naturalism and Agnosticism.
Mill, J. Stuart—System of Logic.
Moon, R. O.—The Relation of Medicine to Philosophy.
Paracelsus—Philippus Theophrastus Bombast of Hohenheim, Life of
Boericke, William—Compend of the Principles of Homœopathy.
Burford, George—The Medicine of the Future.
Emerson, R. W.—Representative Men.
Descartes—Biography.
Spinoza—Philosophy.
D'Alembert—Spirit of Laws.
Newton—Principia.
Kant—Critique of Pure Reason.
Hibben—Philosophy of the Enlightenment.
Conway—Dogma and Science.
Griggs—The New Humanism.
Spencer—Principles of Psychology.
Descartes—Principia Philosophiæ.
Haller—Life by Frey.