

Trustworthy Book

Oct. 17th,

Furniture.

Subscriber would respectfully return sincere thanks to his numerous customers, for their very liberal patronage, bestowed on him the last seven years...

FURNITURE TRADE.

would now respectfully invite the inhabitants of Woodstock and surrounding country to call and examine themselves, before purchasing elsewhere, as my stock is large and varied and from a thorough knowledge of business myself feels safe in stating that I cannot be under sold.

BEADSTEDS CHAIRS,

Rich Chamber Setts, not to be surpassed by any in the province

Seatreans, Wash Stands, Sinks,

Splendid looking glasses Mahogany, Walnut, Gilt Inlaid, Gilt, Oval and square frames.

TABLES.

Quiet Tables, Spinning Wheels, Woodstock, Feb. 1st. R. B. DAVIS.

Land for Sale.

000 Acres on Coldstream, Beckagumic, vicinity of William Co.ks. Will be in lots to suit purchasers; one quarter down, the balance in annual instalments extending for five years.

Also, - A wood lot of 200 acres on the second

adjoining the farm of Thomas Edgar and six miles from the Iron Works. Same terms above.

For further information apply to David Munro,

Iron Works, John Edgar or Journal Office Woodstock, or to the subscriber, NATHANIEL SCOTT, Coquit Settlement, York County, June 27, 1861.

BRITISH HOUSE!

REMOVED TO KELLEY'S NEW BRICK BUILDING, OPPOSITE Blanchard & Co's Store.

AND NEXT BUILDING TO RENFREW HOUSE.

DOHERTY & McTAVISH, Woodstock, June, 13.

OBERT ARMSTRONG, of the City of Saint

John, Grocer, having by deed bearing date Eighteenth day of October last, assigned and transferred to us certain Real and Personal Estate in said Deed

Notice.

Estate Robert Gurney by his late Will and Testament imposed upon the undersigned, (who is the Executor appointed in said will,) the duty of seeing that Gurney his widow is decently maintained during life.

Notice.

Estate Robert Gurney by his late Will and Testament imposed upon the undersigned, (who is the Executor appointed in said will,) the duty of seeing that Gurney his widow is decently maintained during life.

Notice.

Estate Robert Gurney by his late Will and Testament imposed upon the undersigned, (who is the Executor appointed in said will,) the duty of seeing that Gurney his widow is decently maintained during life.

Tin and Sheet Iron Ware

WILLIAM HAMILTON has removed since he first to his new building, adjoining on the sheriff's square T. L. Evans's, where he is prepared to furnish Tin Ware in kinds, and all descriptions SHEETIRON MANUFACTURES, including COTTON

Land for Sale.

Apply on premises to EDWIN BEDELL, Oct. 16, 1860.

Alcohol, Molasses, Sugar, &c.

1 hhd. Bright Sugar; 2 hhd. Molasses OWEN KELLY will be sold low for 30c

The Woodstock Journal.

Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy Might.

VOLUME 8.

WOODSTOCK, N. B., THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1861.

NUMBER 13.

HYGIEO THERAPEUTICS vs. DRUGS.

To the Editor of The Woodstock Journal.

Sir:—As Dr. Smith is at last "willing to admit" "that the most enlightened" of the Allopathic School "urges the remedial use of bathing," and "that the members of that profession who occupy its humbler ranks have not accepted that truth as fully as they should do," I have no further dispute with him regarding water "as one of the remedial agencies powerful to cure" of the Hygieo-Therapeutists. But having purposed, in another communication, to make some further observations regarding the citation from Dr. Holmes on account of his persistency in trying to induce the reader to believe that I was endeavoring to mislead him by improper quotations, I will in this give the exact words of Dr. Holmes, and some further corroborative testimony in support of his views, cited by physicians of the same school. And while doing this, there are some remarks in his last letter to which I shall make a closing allusion.

In Dr. Smith's reply to my first letter he makes the following statements:—

"Another strikingly unfair use of an authority, I notice in Mr. Hovey's letter. Dr. Holmes' words quoted as Mr. Hovey gives them are very nearly a direct contradiction to what was his real statement." And he tells us that he has seen the extract to which I alluded given at length, and "recollects distinctly" the "meaning" of the "statement" to be such as he has given, and which of course was intended by him to be a meaning very nearly in direct contradiction to that which I gave. The address in question created quite a sensation among the partisans of the drug school, at the time it was pronounced, and likewise produced quite a discussion among the members of the association as to whether it should be published among the transactions of that body, on account of the ultra views therein put forth. When it came before the public it was extensively commented upon both in the medical journals and in the newspapers; and was published in full in a separate pamphlet in New York, to supply the public demand for it, created by the unusual statements touching the use of drugs by so high an authority as Dr. Holmes. I have seen the extract which contains this quotation given at some length and must say that I cannot gather the precise meaning from it that Dr. Smith's interpretation gives.

For my own part I should much prefer the charge of misunderstanding an author to that of attempting willfully to mislead with regard to his meaning by an improper quotation. But if I have misunderstood Dr. Holmes, I have journalistic and newspaper writers for company, and one of them at least an M. D., and a member of the orthodox school. I here give Dr. Holmes' words as they occur in the remarks and enquiries of a writer in one of the New York weekly papers.

"Dr. O. W. Holmes of Boston, said a few days since, in his address before the Massachusetts Medical Society, an organization second to none in this country for scientific and literary attainments, 'that mankind had been dragged to death; that what would injure a well man would injure a sick one, and that the world would be better off if the contents of every apothecary shop were emptied into the sea, though the consequences to the fishes would be most lamentable.' Now, Mr. Editor, is it possible that this bold assertion can be true? Surely the source from which it comes ought to command respect, and investigation as to the truth of such a statement. If this singular assertion is false, it ought not to go before the world unrebuked, for there are thousands among us, yes, nineteen twentieths of our whole community, who put their trust in the family physicians and in drugs, when sick, and is it right, is it prudent, to let such a sweeping charge as the above (if false) pass unnoticed by our scientific and learned physicians?"

"It will destroy our confidence in those things that we have been taught to believe in for theills to which all are liable. And what is of much more importance, we shall lose our confidence in the family physician, one to whom we have looked up, in the hour of sickness and sorrow, for succor, and often not in vain. But if what Dr. Holmes says is true, or even one half is to be believed, let us look to it carefully and understandingly, for every father and mother are (or ought to be, deeply interested in this question. It concerns us all, not the physician alone, but we parents who have dear children committed to our care, to love, to make happy, healthy and wise. Look around you, kind reader, and see how many fathers and mothers are now mourning the loss of a son or a daughter! yea, how many families have been bereft of their all, with in the last five months by scarlet fever alone!"

"In New York, within the last six months, fifteen hundred children have died with scarlet fever, and over five hundred in the City of Brooklyn, within the same time and by the same disease. Is it possible that drugs have been instrumental in this fearful mortality? It cannot be other wise if what Dr. Holmes says is true, for all that have died within that time have been drugged. And not only those who have died from scarlet fever, but the same rule will apply to all that have died from other causes, from acute diseases particularly.

There are in New York some eight or ten physicians and five or six in the adjoining city of Brooklyn, who never under any circumstances, give drugs or medicine to their patients. And the writer of this article has taken pains to enquire of these physicians how many deaths have occurred from scarlet fever, diphtheris, croup, and measles for the last six months, who have been treated without medicines. The answer was, not one. This was not merely an assertion, but they gave us the proof of what they said.

"Put the above facts and Dr. Holmes' statement together. It certainly makes out a strong case against the use of drugs. Now, if these things are true, there is not another subject of equal importance or one that concerns the public weal, as does this subject of treating disease. That God has created us for wise purposes no one will deny, and are we not responsible for thus thwarting his purposes by drugging ourselves and our children, when sick, with the most deadly poison? For, observe, Dr. Holmes says 'what would injure a well man would injure a sick one,' and who will deny that a dose of arsenic, calomel, or suxovonia will make well persons sick if it do not kill them outright?"

To show that Dr. Holmes is not alone in his opinion, I will just add a few more of these medical opinions, which induce enquiry regarding the use of drugs as they have been in the past or are now employed by Allopaths. But I have only space to insert a few.

"Less slaughter I am convinced, has been effected by the sword than by the lancet." Again "Of the causes of mortality in the earlier months of our existence no small proportion consists of those who have sunk under the oppression of pharmaceutical filth. More infantile subjects in this metropolis, are perhaps diurnally destroyed by the mortar and pestle, than in ancient Bethlehem fell victims to the Herodian massacre." And again, "Conscience feels little concern in cases of medicinal murder."—Dr. Reid's essays on Insanity.

"How I ever came to believe one half of the rubbish propounded by medical teachers, I cannot now understand, for the whole doctrine of the schools are a tissue of the most glaring and self-evident absurdities." "Could you only see as I have seen the farce of a medical consultation, I think you would agree with me, that the impersonification of Physic, like the picture of Garrick might be best painted with comedy on one side and tragedy on the other.—An English Practitioner."

"The profession believes that mercury is good in liver complaint, and is to be tried in all complaints, when all other remedies have failed; that opium is always demanded; that bleeding, opium, and emetic sudorifics, are fit for rheumatism; that colchicum defiest gout; that sal-volatile, valerian, and sundry other ill-flavored substances are requisite for hysterical women; that indigestion, that puzzling protean fiend, is to be combatted pell-mell by all the above remedies. According to this mode of doing business, what does it matter whether a man be well versed in medical science or be a mere novice; he can easily proceed in the old beaten track, because the remedies are named in the prescription book opposite to the disease, may more there are remedies—'Acts to amend certain acts passed'—in the last prescription moreover, the remedies are known to themselves, unknown to their patients, whose queries if any, are answered in an unknown tongue of technicality. The whole process, in fact, is one of jogg-trot routine, whereby if the patient recovers, so—'he must take some tonics; if he dies, so he swallowed the pharmacopoeia, and what can a man do more.'—An English Authority.

"There has been a great increase of medical men it is true, of late years, but upon my life, diseases have increased in proportion."—Aber-nethy's Surgical Lectures.

Now let us turn to the other side of the question. "Where, in the history of drugs, and drug doctors, shall we find a man who like Priessnitz, has had under his charge nearly 3000 patients within two years, most of whom had exhausted the resources of science and drugs; who can say with him, that during that time he has not lost more than two individuals?"—A Practitioner of celebrity in London.

Priessnitz at Graffenberg, in one year, and many left behind them their complaints, for which they had been treated in vain, for years, by the most eminent of their brethren! In like manner at Malvern, under Water-Cure treatment, ten medical practitioners became converts to the new system and the majority of them are now practicing it."—An Author of note.

"Dr. Smith tells us that the 'light of Priessnitz was simply first stolen from the flame which had been kept burning on the altar of orthodox medicine from the earliest ages of medical literature.'" Sir John Forbes after giving a short account of the manner in which water was employed as a remedy for the cure of disease by those who had proceeded Priessnitz says—"It will be obvious that from none of the writers mentioned could Priessnitz have learned his bold and comprehensive practice." He was a poor farmer peasant residing in an obscure village, without more education than usually falls to the lot of such persons he must necessarily have been debarred access to those exceedingly rare works treating of water as a remedial agent. But the records of his discovery of its efficacy himself purely through an accident which befel his own person, and which ultimately was the means of bringing his useful and brilliant career to a close. And tho' professed the water part of the Hygieo-Therapeutic system, from the time of Hippocrates or Esculapius all the way down through the dim light of medical history, to the day in which the discovery was made by Priessnitz. Sir E. Lytton Bulwer says, "Priessnitz is a man who will venture who have ever benefitted the human race." And further Priessnitz has contributed no small share through his discoveries in the field of therapeutics in bringing the Hygienic System to its present state of beauty and symmetry. But he is not the only one who has made contributions to this end. The immortal Liebig has probably done more than Priessnitz. And other honorable names not a few might be referred to as having aided in this work.

It would be a matter of some curiosity among all the various schools of medicines to ascertain precisely to which of them Dr. Smith does belong. But if he accepts fully the tenets of the old bleeding, leeching, digging and olistering School, it is not an error and a sneer to call it the Allopathic School, even on account of the etymology of this word, leaving the dogma of curing by setting up a counter disease out of the question. As I before stated, usage gives us the proper sanction for the employment of this or any other term, and that without reference to its true derivation.

For instance the term virtue is not used now in its true derivative sense; we use it to signify moral goodness, whereas the Latin virtus and viceo, from which we get the term, were used among the Romans to signify bravery or valor. The same thing is true of many of the terms now in use, especially with regard to their application to the sects in religion and medicine. And hence the Dr. might with as much propriety in the one case as in the other say it was "a sneer and an error" for me to call A. and B. virtuous men, because the term virtue, primarily, meant bravery, strength, valor, and did not mean moral goodness, as is now understood by the term. Archbishop Whately says "use" is "the only competent authority for the employment of a term." and this term is used by eminent writers of the drug school in designating their own system, and it is extensively used by some of the writers of all the different Schools, and though it was first used, I believe, to distinguish the orthodox practitioners of the day from those which professed to cure by "similars," it has been since and is now, likewise used to distinguish the same class from that of the Hygienic and Hydropathic school which has already by its labors very much changed the practice of drugging—at this moment is spreading its principles far and wide throughout the world—and is a school to which the French, Prussians, Austrians, and United States Governments have given their approval by placing its qualified professors on equal footing with those of their Allopathic brethren.

"There is a regularly chartered Hydropathic College in the City of New York, where persons may become qualified to practice this new system successfully under the sanction of a diploma from the Institution. Hydropathic physicians are employed by the Government in the United States military service, the same as those who hail to be of a more orthodox class. As to that case which Dr. Smith winds up with about the celebrated Wilson, it may have been

designed by him for "a very hard case," nevertheless no one will fail to see that it is a case of his own evolving, and that I never made any such statement, but on the contrary, stated most distinctly that the use of drugs were commended by him as well as Water-Cure.

My "assertion," says the Dr., "that it would be difficult to prove from the works of eminent Physicians, that the use of bathing as a remedial agency has been urged upon the general profession, is therefore simply a proof of ignorance and presumption,—ignorance of what has been written by any other than a few men who were bent on forcing their one idea upon the world, as the only truth; presumption, in that he arrogates to himself the right to speak ex-cathedra on what he evidently knows little about." My statement was this; and not what he says was my "assertion." He will find some difficulty in showing us from the musty pages of Allopathic lore in England or America the proper evidence to uphold the truth of the statement that it (the Allopathic medical faculty) as a body, has ever urged on public attention the remedial use of bathing. This is something very different from saying "it would be difficult to prove from the works of eminent physicians" that they "had urged it upon the general profession." The conclusion which he seizes upon for "a proof of my ignorance and presumption," if the premises were correct, would be apparent enough but it so happens that they are not quite correct. Water-cure physicians are proud to refer to the ancient use of water as a therapeutic in the treatment of disease, and what was considered worth preserving on the subject, they have carefully re-published from those old authorities who have written in its favor. An author who has written much on the science of medicine, in giving a history of the use of water as a remedy for disease, and of the various medical doctrines which have been advocated by eminent physicians from the earliest period of medical history down to his own time says, "After examining such a flood of evidence in favor of nearly all that is claimed by the hydropathists, the question naturally arises, why is it, if regular physicians, in all ages, and of all countries have found water treatment so superior in the great mass of human maladies, that the medical faculty of the present day, as a body, employ it so little, in fact almost wholly neglect it, nay, bitterly oppose it?"

If Dr. Smith means, by that steady flame, which he says had been kept burning on the altar of medicine from such a remote period, to say that water as an agency for the cure of disease has been steadily urged on public attention by the profession as a body, by practice and by precept, from any period in the history of English practice down to the time of Priessnitz, I must allow that he has sources of information at command relating to this subject with which I am unacquainted. Bearing on this point, Dr. Forbes says: "We certainly can not quarrel with hydropathists for seeking to revive a method supported by so high an authority as Dr. Currie." If that flame had been kept steadily burning, why the necessity for hydropathists or any one else to seek to revive it. And in support of this position reference may be made to an eulogist of Priessnitz who remarks: "The knowledge acquired by anatomy, physiology, and pathology is indispensable to the full understanding of the Water-cure and to its practice without frequent error. It is true it has been discovered and brought to extraordinary perfection without this knowledge, but Priessnitz did not bring it to its present state without twenty long years of practical study of the power of water, of the vital phenomena, and those of disease. . . . But Priessnitz is a genius—an extraordinary case—one of those isolated instances which occur so seldom in the history of man; let not, therefore other uneducated persons attempt to practise Water-Cure, because Priessnitz has practiced it; the power of genius is no rule for ordinary mortals."

It should be borne in mind, that these citations express the sentiments of eminent members of the present orthodox school, and are not simply my "assertions." And it is therefore apparent, if Dr. Smith's statements mean what they seem to imply, that what he chooses to call "a proof of ignorance and presumption against me," furnishes evidence of a certain character against himself.

If Dr. Smith is as learned as he would have it believed I am ignorant, he would be compelled to admit that the history of medicine, all along from its commencement, has exhibited a constant series of revolutions, one school superseding another in the confidence of the public—and what at one time was considered orthodox practice, and what at another period was considered quackery at another period was considered orthodox practice. And since the promulgations of Priessnitz, and others there has been another revolution going on with