

Allopathic drugs, it should at least arrest attention sufficient to receive an impassionate investigation.

In the treatment of Cholera, Yellow Fever, &c., we have the satisfaction of knowing that Homeopathy is far in advance of her contemporaries. In Vienna, (Austria,) where it was subjected to the most rigid scrutiny by the Government, and a Board of Allopathic Physicians, the result was, in the treatment of Cholera, a mortality of 8 in every hundred patients; while under the same circumstances, in the same city, the mortality under Allopathic treatment was 31 in the hundred.

We cite this instance from many, because no where has Homeopathy encountered more opposition, or underwent more jealous scrutiny. Equally favorable results have been obtained in different parts of the world, when properly introduced. We might give other statistics, and shall in future Nos. of the Journal, but this will suffice for our purpose.

We are not alone in our opinion of facts, but have Allopathic testimony of the favorable results of our treatment. Dr. Forbes, whom we have quoted before, says, in his Review, after giving a statistical report of Drs. Henderson and Fleishman, "We do not hesitate to declare, that the amount of success obtained in the treatment of these cases, would have been considered by ourselves as very satisfactory, had we been treating the same cases according to the rules of ordinary Medicine."

If Homeopathy has no foundation in truth, and patients recover by the unaided efforts of nature, as our opponents frequently assert, will they not be so kind as to inform us why 23 more should die under Allopathic treatment than under *no treatment*, as they are pleased to call it? or if 92 in every hundred will recover with no remedies to assist, who is responsible for the 23 in every hundred, who would have recovered without treatment?

The next position is an arithmetical calculation based on the attenuation of Medicine, to prove the "inadequacy" of Homeopathic remedies. Perhaps the writer can tell by his arithmetical deductions, when matter ceases to be, from being divided, or demonstrate just how many rays of light are necessary to produce the most intense pain to the highly inflamed eye: how much virus of small pox is necessary to convey the disease; or how much miasm it requires to develop an intermittent fever. When he can do this satisfactorily, and get the figures in a small volume, we shall feel compelled to show just how much Medicine appertains to a thirtieth dilution.

3rd. Homeopathy must be wrong, because many of those who have tried it, and should know it best, have no faith in it.

In proof of this, the writer, (who signs himself M. D.; and we should have mentioned it before, but we scrupled that there was so ignorant an M. D. in the country, but recent developments show that they are not few,) proceeds to say,—"Look at Dr. Henderson, who, because he became Homeopathist while holding a Professorship in the Edinburgh University, is held up by the small pill men as an object of veneration. How does he act when those most dear to him are laboring under disease. Let Dr. Simpson (Allopathist.) answer. "He (Dr. S.) had on two occasions watched for some hours with Dr. H. at the bedside of Dr. H.'s own wife, but she was assuredly treated most Allopathically, not Homeopathically. What shall we say of those who *pretend* to be Homeopathists, but *act* as Allopathists,—who doctor people as people wish, either with drachms of drugs, or the decillionth of a grain of the same,—who wish to be considered Homeopathists, but, as has often been detected, drugged their globules and tinctures with active doses of the most powerful Medicines,—who spread out the snare of Homeopathy as a golden man trap to catch credulous and trusting patients, and afterwards, either openly or surreptitiously apply to them all the usual means employed in the *Armentarium of Rational Medicines*."

When our old school friends lack for arguments against Homeopathy, they usually assail the motives of those practicing it. So long as a Physician will tread the beaten path marked out by ancient Medical literature, and accept, unquestioned, all the dogmas, doctrines, notions and conjectures of its Authors, unquestioned, he may merit the esteem and confidence of his contemporaries; but the moment he dares to doubt or dispute their foundation in truth, he at once becomes an object for the most malignant invectives,—his motives are impugned, and his ears assailed with *empiric, quack, charlatan, deceiver*, and such like choice expressions, to be found in the vocabulary of ancient Medical lore.

But was the treatment of the case alluded to Homeopathic or Allopathic? old school Physicians constantly exhibit their ignorance of Homeopathy by confounding the principle of cure with the size of dose; and I will state, for the edification of those who are daily exhibiting their ignorance of Homeopathy, by their pretended explanations of it, that the amount of Medicine given at a dose by Homeopathists, has nothing to do with the principle