

should lead us to regard the treatment by inhalation with much favor, for if the inhalation of marsh miasma will do this, as it unquestionably has done, why may not some remedy similar to it be yet discovered, which, inhaled into the lungs, shall prove the exact specific in phthisis, and enable us to control that most insidious and most surely fatal scourge of the human race?

## Journal of Homeopathy.

### NATURE OF EVIDENCE.

In philosophy the accumulation of atoms, so that it is cognizable to the senses, is considered evidence of the existence of matter; while of motive power the effects produced upon matter through the agency of dynamics is believed to be proof of its existence. And while the one is appreciable more especially to one or more of the senses, the other appeals to the understanding for its reality. This application of motive power to inert matter produces all the various effects upon animate nature. We cannot always ascertain the *modus operandi* of its working, but see only the effect produced. The causes of many of the most sublime manifestations in nature are still shrouded in impenetrable darkness, but yet we never think of denying the existence of revealed effects because we cannot comprehend their hidden cause. Scientific men are constantly prying into the arena of nature for a solution of her mysteries. And how is the result of their labors frequently received? If it is to upset an old philosophy by which a class have been sustained, how soon is its truth questioned, and followed by denial. Let a new principle be developed in mechanics or arts, and men versed in that particular branch of arts welcome it to favor as soon as respect-

able evidence proves its utility. But homeopathy proposes to the world something far more valuable than any improvement in arts or mechanism—the ameliorization of suffering, and saving of human life. Do those to whom are entrusted the preservation and restoration of health, give that attention to its claims that justice to their obligations and patrons demands? Homeopathy claims, and has successfully maintained its superiority in the treatment of disease, as may be ascertained by referring to statistical evidence of results. It claims to do no violence to the organism or constitution, but cures disease in a speedy, prompt, and efficient manner. It has maintained its superiority in chronic disease and the most fearful epidemics, and brought the bloom of health to many a cheek that was blanched under the power of old physic. Have we evidence of the truth of these assertions? Scientific men—whose word is undoubted on every other subject—after careful scrutiny of facts, and comparison of results, attest to their truth. Men whose whole sympathy and confidence is with allopathy, acknowledge that a less ratio of mortality occurs under homeopathy than under the heroic management of allopathy, and then attempt to explain away the conclusion on the ground of superior regimen or diet. So it would seem they ignore the evidence of their own understanding, and invite their allopathic brethren to a false conclusion.

Will not the old school physicians give their attention to that which is of so much interest to themselves and their patrons when it comes before them with the evidence of so many respectable witnesses? The people do not hold them to full responsibility. The non-profes-