MILLER

REVIEW

OF

DR. S. A. LATTA'S PAMPHLET,

Bind cover in front.

ENTITLED

"THE CHOLERA IN CINCINNATI, OR A CONNECTED VIEW OF THE CONTROVERSY BETWEEN THE HOMŒOPATHISTS AND THE METHODIST EXPOSITOR: ALSO, A REVIEW OF THE REPORT READ BEFORE THE HOMŒOPATHIC ASSOCIATION,"

BY

ADAM MILLER, M. D.

Port

SURGEON GEN'L'S LIBRARY 38371 Washington, D.C.

CINCINNATI:
BEN FRANKLIN PRINTING HOUSE.

1850.

INTRODUCTION.

A sense of obligation to the cause of truth, as well as to the cause of suffering humanity, could alone have induced me to notice the different and contradictory statements which have been made in reference to the comparative merits of Homœopathic and Allopathic treatment of Cholera in the city of Cincinnati, during the past year. This is a matter in which the public are deeply interested, and upon which they should have correct information. Should the scourge visit our city again, all who are within the reach of its influence will feel disposed to avail themselves of the safest and most successful method of preventing and curing this alarming disease. False statements, calculated to mislead the public, are certainly very censurable, and would most likely result injuriously to the health and life of many an honest inquirer after truth. A controversy on this subject, was commenced in the papers of this city, during the prevalence of the Cholera, between Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann, and the Editor of the Methodist Expositor; the former making statements in reference to their success in the treatment of Cholera; the latter denying the truth of those statements. After the controversy progressed for some time, the Homœopathic Association of Cincinnati appointed a committee to examine the matter and "to inquire into the complaints of the Editor of the Methodist Expositor." This committee, in complying with the request of the Association above referred to, made especial inquiries into the matters in controversy, and rendered a report, which report was published in a pamphlet of 48 pages.

Dr. Latta, of the Expositor, not satisfied with this report, follows with a pamphlet of 40 pages.

When Dr. Latta's pamphlet first made its appearance, Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann determined at once to make no reply, abounding as it did with misrepresentations they considered it beneath their notice and undeserving of an answer. After having read it carefully, and no-

ticed the contradictions in which the author involved himself, I thought myself that there would be nothing gained by any attention that might be bestowed upon it. It was found, however, that extraordinary efforts were made to scatter the pamphlet broadcast through the community, among the friends, as well as among the enemies, of Homœopathy, and sent free of charge to a number of families that have for months past been under Homœpathic treatment. As the pamphlet attacks Homœopathy in *general*, as well as two of our most respectable Homœopathic Physicians *especially*, and as the persons more immediately concerned refuse to reply, we may, without exceeding the bounds of propriety, notice some of the inconsistencies and errors into which the writer has by some means been betrayed.

If the pamphlet had given us a fair and impartial view of the controversy, no one would have a right to complain; but, as Homœopathic Physicians, we think injustice has been done to a cause, in the blessings of which thousands are daily rejoicing, and which is still rapidly increasing and spreading its salutary influence over the length and breadth of our land.

We also believe that the committee, whose report Dr. Latta professes to review, has been assailed with an unwarantable severity, magnifying *supposed* inconsistencies, and passing over, unanswered and unnoticed, some of the strongest arguments of said report in favor of Homœopathy.

Whether there was a necessity for a reply to the pamphlet, the reader must judge after perusing the following pages.

REVIEW.

In his introduction, Dr. Latta gives us the motives which prompted him to enter the arena of controversy with the Homœopathists. He says—

"In May, 1849, soon after the appearance of the Epidemic Cholera, in this city, the Homœpathic, Eclectic, Indian, and Negro Doctors, with other irregular practitioners, put forth, through the secular press, reports so extravagant, of success in the cure of Cholera, that the regular profession were completely disgusted, and, as a consequence, few, if any, could be found willing to report as desired by the board of health. They readily perceived that it would be impossible to retain a reputation for truthfulness, whatever might be their success in practice, and keep pace with the mongrel tribes of irregulars, who, indeed, were then already too far in advance to be overtaken, even though the dictates of conscience had been disregarded. The strictly scrupulous in the regular profession were deterred by the first consideration; while others, if any there were, whose conscience did not interpose a bar, were, doubtless, deterred by the second, that of utter despair of ever overtaking the gentlemen above alluded to, who had already astonished the world with their reported success. In unobtrusive silence, the members of the regular profession pursued the even tenor of their way, contending by day and night with the angel of death, as he silently struck among the masses in the street, or in the family circle of the mansion, the cottage, the garret, or the cellar. Two months of alarm and terror the most appalling, had come and gone, and still no voice was heard through the public journals, from all the ranks of the regulars."

We do not wish to be unnecessarily severe on our old friend, Dr. Latta, neither do we wish to indulge in hard words; but as his pamphlet has gone forth to the public, under the sanction of his name, and he professing to be a man of candor and honesty—an editor of a religious paper—it is our right, our privilege, and our duty, to review his assertions, and compare them with facts well known to this community. And what are the facts in reference to the publication of reports with regard to the treatment of Cholera?

It will be recollected that the "regulars," as Dr. L. calls them, made regular reports to the board of health from the commencement of the epidemic, while not one word was heard from any of the Homœopathic physicians until late in May; and then, because they did not report their cases to the board of health, as the "regulars" had been in the habit of doing, a law suit was commenced against them. Upon their trial before the Mayor, the defence for Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann proved that the board of health was not legally organized, and, consequently,

had no right to make the demand they had made, and so this suit, brought by some of those who "in unobtrusive silence pursued the even tenor of their way" was dismissed. Does not Dr. Latta recollect this whole matter? Surely he has not forgotten it; and yet he says, "soon after the appearance of the Epidemic Cholera, in this city, they put forth reports so extravagant of success in the cure of Cholera, as a consequence few, if any, could be found willing to report as desired by the board of health." Why then, this law suit to compel the Homœopathists to report to the board of health. "The regular profession" he says, "were completely disgusted" and this he assigns as a reason why they would not report; and yet some of these same "*regulars*" bring a law suit to compel the Homœopathists to report to the board of health; and this law suit it will be recollected, was in the latter part of May, 1849. But mark his language on this point. He says, "in unobtrusive silence the members of the regular profession pursued the even tenor of their way." Surely this is silence with a vengeance. It is sometimes said of such extra flourishes that they contain more truth than poetry; but alas, here we have neither truth nor poetry. He says, "two months of alarm and terror the most appalling, had come and gone, and still no voice was heard through the public journals from *all* the ranks of the regulars."

Who, it may be asked, made all the reports to the board of health during this time? It is well known that they came from the Allopathic physicians, and yet Dr. L. says, "no voice was heard through the public annals from all the ranks of the regulars." He may say that they only reported to the board of health, but still their report went to the public through the daily papers. Now we are willing to allow that physicians of the Allopathic school are sincere and honest in their profession, and pursue that system of practice in which they believe that they will be most successful in relieving the suffering of mankind, and we have a right to claim the same from them; yet we cannot but look with disgust and contempt upon such resorts, with a view to degrade those who do not fall into the beaten track of the Old School.

Dr. Latta seems, however, to have been quite conscientious in the matter, and says in reference to his first attack upon the Homœopathists—

"In doing this, he was aware that many would be offended, and that combinations would probably be formed for defence, if not for defamation and slander; but duty called, and he was disposed to risk the consequences, rather than forfeit the answer of a good conscience and the claims of manly independence, which should ever characterize those having the editorial control of the press. The duty he had to perform was one of a delicate character. The people were being misled with respect to matters of vital importance to themselves, by reports the most extravagant in their details."

Now if those reports were false, as Dr. Latta contends they were, is it not remarkably strange that the people in Cincinnati, who were constant eye and ear witnesses to the scenes that transpired around them, did not make the discoveries for themselves. Leaving out of the question those with whom he associates Homœopathists, calling them the "mongrel tribes of irregulars" we will notice a few facts which will contrast strangely with the Dr's. statements. From the time that Cholera first made its appearance in the city, to the close of the epidemic, the practice of the Homœopathic physicians steadily in-

creased; and since the cholera prevailed in the city, there are a number of families who employ Homœopathic physicians who previous to that time employed Allopathic physicians. Yea, further, we know of a number of families who previous to the Cholera employed our old friend Dr. Latta, and who have since employed Homœopathists. And what is the reason of this strange revolution? What has induced them to make the change in their family physicians? Not the faithful warnings of our friend Dr. L. heralding forth his invectives against Homœopathy, from the tottering walls of a temple that has been shaken to its foundation for a few years past by the progress of reform which is the peculiar characteristic of the age in which we live. No. It was a candid and careful observation of the success of this new system of practice that has induced them to make this change. We are aware that Dr. L. has endeavored to account for some of his old friends leaving him, in consequence of the change in his church relations; but this will not help him out of the difficulty, for some of his intimate personal friends, members of his own church, have made this change since last fall.

Is it not singular that people should be seized with such a strange infatuation as to run headlong into destruction? for we are told on the 4th page of the pamphlet, "the issues involved were more than the loss of fortune; they were the issues of life and death. * * * Hence, he ventured to the rescue of truth, regardless of consequences." What wonderful benevolence, after he knew "that combinations would probably be formed for defence, if not for defamation and slander." Willing, however to run the risk, he enters the field, booted and spurred, to fight the Homœopathists, and convince the good people of Cincinnati that they were dying off by hundreds by trusting to Homœopathy; and in his effort to make out a clear case, he publishes some for dead and buried who are still alive and well. We would suggest that those whose lives and fortunes have been saved by the Drs. timely interference, (if any such there are?) should erect a suitable monument to his memory, that his name and deeds of noble daring may not too soon be forgotten by an ungrateful community; and let all who have been cured of a Dyspepsia by the "tonic mixture," if any such there are, contribute a mite to this object.

But we will proceed to notice the charges preferred against Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann. They state that they treated, during the prevalence of the epidemic in Cincinnati, from the 1st of May to the 1st of August, 1116 Cholera patients, and that only thirty-five of this number died, of whom two were Americans and the remainder foreigners. They also say that "besides the above 1116 Cholera patients, we treated, during the same time, 1350 cases of a mixed character, mostly diarrhea, with rumbling in the bowels, (cholerina,) and toward the close of the epidemic, a great number of dysenteries, some of which were of a very malignant character (we lost none of them, however): also a good many nervous fevers, with typhoid tendency." It must be recollected here, that the expression in the parenthesis refers to what precedes, and not what follows. They do not say that they lost none of their patients with nervous fevers of typoid tendency. This at least is the plain construction of their language. The editor of the Expositor charges them with the loss of nine Americans instead

of two. This charge was examined into by the committee appointed by the Homœopathic association ; and by the showing of the committee, they found that the nine cases reported by Dr. Latta, and the two acknowledged by Drs. Pulte and Ehrman, might be reduced to one ; for all the others, published by Dr. Latta, it was found upon inquiry, were either the patients of other physicians, or died of other diseases ; and one of the nine reported by Dr. L., as having died of Cholera, under Homœopathic treatment, by Drs. P. and E., was found to be "*alive and well.*"

Dr. Latta, in reviewing this report, still contends that he was correct in his charge, as Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann professed to have included in their report all that they had attended themselves, even if they were called at too late a time to be of any real service. But, as a candid man, Dr. Latta should have paid some attention to their note of explanation, which he undoubtedly saw; but found it convenient, in trying to make out his case, to say nothing about it. They say in their note, "we mean by this all those cases which were not attended by Allopathic or other physicians."

The committee, with this explanation before them, found the report of the Homœopathic physicians correct, except in one case, and in this case the lady refused to follow the directions of the medical adviser ; and Dr. L. himself would very readily, we presume, throw off a responsibility from himself, if his patient had refused to follow directions. Dr. Latta says—

"It might be inferred that Mr. Taft, who is a distinguished lawyer, and Mr. Barrett, a celebrated pulpit orator in the Swedenborgian Church, would not assume a position in the medical profession unless they were duly authorized to do so by some regularly chartered medical institution in this or some other country ; but we assure our readers that neither of these gentlemen have any claims to public confidence on the score of competency in the investigation of medical subjects.

It must be recollected that the committee was not appointed to investigate "*medical subjects* ;" it was a mere question of veracity ; and we never knew that it was necessary to be "*duly authorized by some regularly chartered medical institution in this or some other country,*" in order to be able to ascertain the truth or falsehood of statements made in reference to the success of medical treatment. Does Dr. L. expect to invalidate the correctness of their statement with regard to a plain matter of fact, merely on the ground that they have not received a diploma from some medical college. We would ask the Dr. whether those who had reported to him, were all "duly authorized by some regularly chartered medical institution either in this or some other country ?" We presume not. But the Dr. may reply that the committee did assume to give an opinion in reference to different modes of treatment ; and this, we reply, they might do by reference to the prescriptions laid down in the books, so as to give a fair view of the two systems even without a regular medical education.

The Dr. knows himself, that many have done a considerable business in the different branches of medical science even without a diploma from some "regularly chartered medical institution." He is himself a living witness to this fact. If an embargo had been laid on all such, the public would have been deprived of his valuable labors

for a number of years: for he actually wrote a book on medical subjects. "The Nurses Guide" I believe, was the title of it, before he had passed the green-room of some "regularly chartered medical institution." The valuable remedy called "Tonic Bitters," in the manufacture of which it was shown in an examination some years ago, many barrels of whisky had been employed, and which has strangely enough gone out of use, was discovered by Dr. L. long before he had his diploma. The same is true with regard to his practice of the art of curing dyspepsia, by kneading the stomach and bowels in a peculiar way. And what may appear more strange than all, Dr. L. actually prevailed on a friend to procure some Homœopathic medicines for him, and before he was a regular legalized M. D. commenced the practice of Homœopathy without any correct knowledge of the system, (as we will show from his writing hereafter.) He published, or his friends did for him, that he was now prepared to practice Homœopathy, or Allopathy, just as his friends wished it.

We mention these things as matters of fact, to show the inconsistency of the Dr. when he manifests such an unwillingness to allow men to make inquiry into a subject at once plain and simple, in reference to the treatment of Cholera, merely because they have not received diplomas. We hope no one will think the less of Dr. Latta now for the struggles and difficulties he has had to pass through to gain his present notorious position as defender of the Allopathic faith; and he should certainly learn to exercise a degree of charity toward those who are yet somewhat in his rear in the department of medical science.

To prove our assertion that Dr. L. undertook to practice Homœopathy some years ago, without understanding the system, we need only direct attention to the following extract from his pamphlet: (See page 7.) He says—"For instead of giving infinitesimal doses of medicine, as we supposed, which would produce the disease for which they were prescribed, we find them adopting the very sure treatment employed by the regular profession. In this we confess we have been prodigiously gulled by these pretenders."

We wish to direct attention to two points in the above quotation. 1st. The consummate ignorance the Dr. betrays of the doctrine or law of Homœopathy. Medicine is never given by Homœopathists to "produce the disease for which it is prescribed." We challenge Dr. Latta, or any other man, to find such a doctrine taught by any of the standard authors on the subject. If Dr. L. started out to practice Homœopathy on this principle, no wonder he soon abandoned it; for according to his view of the subject, a person after having brought on Cholera by an imprudent indulgence in eating cabbage, would only have to take an infinitesimal dose of cabbage to cure himself. Now it is well known that Homœopathists have never taught nor believed any such ridiculous nonsense, and we scarcely know whether most to pity the D's. ignorance or to blame him for a wilful misrepresentation.

We know that our enemies have often created an image in their own fancy, as different from Homœopathy as day is from night, and then set to work to demolish it, without coming within the range of the truth as taught by our standard authors. This has evidently been the case with our friend Dr. Latta. Does he understand the etymolo-

gy of the term Homœopathy? The 2nd point to which we wish to call attention in the above extract, is the assertion that they adopted "the very same treatment employed by the regular profession." And in this he says, "they have, (the Allopathists,) been prodigiously gulled." Here we have a strange contradiction. Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann have given their treatment; and surely Dr. L. knows full well that there is a vast difference between Allopathic treatment, as prescribed in Cholera last summer, and this treatment, even allowing that they gave camphor in larger doses than medicine is usually given by Homœopathic physicians. Where, for instance is the Allopathic physician that depended upon camphor alone during the prevalence of the epidemic? He also charges Homœopathists with giving corrosive sublimate, which he said he "found at the bedside of the sick more than once during the prevalence of the epidemic in this city." This cannot be true. In the first place, corrosive sublimate is not a remedy for Cholera, and it is not used by Homœopathists as such; and secondly, it would be impossible for Dr. Latta to detect the 30th dilution, or even the 3rd of this drug, as administered by Homœopathists. We presume very little confidence will be placed in this assertion, when it is recollected what a mistake he made in the outset, in his statement with regard to reporting cases. A man that is capable of making so gross a mistake in one instance, to accomplish an object, is liable to do it in another. But if we were even to admit that Dr. L. did find corrosive sublimate, as he says, where will he go to find that Allopathists were regularly in the habit of giving their patients corrosive sublimate? And yet he says they adopted "the very same treatment employed by the regular profession." Truly this is blowing hot and cold with the same breath, just as it suits his cause. At one time they are quacks, and community is in great danger from falling into their hands. Their patients die under their treatment. The conscience of the pious editor troubles him, and he exclaims, "We regret exceedingly that we are called on to make an expose like this." But then before he thinks of it, he says, "they adopted the very same treatment adopted by the regular profession." Does the reader ask why the Dr. involves himself in such strange contradictions? The only answer we can give is, that a strong case was to be made out against Homœopathy. This was the great end to be accomplished: and it appears that the end was to justify the means as taught in another quarter. We may well call this medical Jesuitism. We will notice in this connection another instance of Dr. Latta's unfair mode of reasoning. He says—

"But were we even to admit that this patient died of nervous or typhoid fever, still the committee will have failed to acquit Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann of misrepresentation; because, in their report, they affirm that during the same time they had "1,350 cases of mixed character," such as "rumbling in the bowels," "dysentary," also "nervous fever with typhoid tendency;" but of these they say "they lost none." Of what avail, then, is it to these gentlemen or the committee to assert that this patient died of typhoid fever? since they declared with equal boldness that they lost none with typhoid fever, during the period embraced in their report."

We reply that Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann do not claim to have lost none of their patients of nervous fever with typhoid tendency, and we

must express our astonishment that Dr. Latta would put such a construction upon their language. The following is their statement :—

"Besides the above eleven hundred and sixteen cholera patients, we treated during the same time, thirteen hundred and fifty cases of a mixed character, mostly diarrheas with rumbling in the bowels, (cholerina,) and toward the close of the epidemic, a great number of dysenteries, some of which were of a very malignant character (we lost none of them however,) also a good many nervous fever with typhoid tendency."

The expression ("we lost none of them however.") evidently refers to what precedes, the dysenteries only, and not what follows. They do *not* then "declare with equal boldness that they lost none with typhoid fever, during the period embraced in their report." Here then we have a gross perversion and misconstruction of their language. To make out that they misrepresented the results of their practice, Dr. Latta makes himself guilty of the act with which he charges Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann. We cannot, however, in whole, adopt his own language and call this wickedness "in *high* places." But it is wickedness in a *low* place, and we are now prepared for almost any thing from this quarter. In trying to prove a falsehood upon others, he makes himself guilty of the crime with which he charges them.

Dr. Latta appears to be dissatisfied with the committee, and asks, "but why did the committee limit their investigations to nine cases only?" The answer to this question must be obvious to every reflecting mind. They found in the main no contradiction between the reports of Drs. P. and E., and the facts in the case, and had a good right to believe that any further investigation would most likely result in the same way.

Dr. L. however, still contends that he has found nine more who have died under Drs. P. and E's. treatment, and gives their names and residence as follows :

1. Mrs. Andress, Sixth street, north side, near Mound.
2 and 3. Mr. Black's wife and child, Sycamore street, near Franklin.
4. Mrs. Reddington, Homœopathic Doctress.
5 and 6. Mr. Ennis and Mrs. Lock, Seventh st., n'th. side, 4 doors above Linn.
7. John M. C. Krider, Main st., west side, bet. Fifth and Sixth.
8. Mrs. Enis, Seventh street, just above Linn.
9. Mrs. Banks, Kemble street, between Western Row and John.

The above nine American cases, have all been reported to us by responsible individuals, and hence we have no reason to doubt the correctness of the report. We have also a list of some fifty or sixty German patients who are said to have died of cholera in the hands of Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann, including a few Irish ; but as the list is very lengthy, we will not publish it until called for by the Homœopathic committee, at which time we may be able to give them more."

It may be proper to make a few remarks in reference to the above nine additional cases.

1. Mrs. Andress, on Sixth street, was Dr. Shotwell's patient, and given up by him.

2 and 3. Mr. Black's wife and child were *never* treated by Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann. *They know nothing about them.*

4. Mrs. Reddington was not Dr. Pulte and Ehrmann's patient alone.

5. Mr. Ennis was the patient of Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann, but had been forgotten in making out their report in the hurry and press of business.

6. They never knew any thing about Mrs. Lock, consequently never attended her.

7. John M. C. Krider was a German, and could not be counted among the Americans.

8. Mrs. Enis had been under Allopathic treatment; was only visited by Drs. P. and E. in her *last moments*; did, however, not die of cholera, and never had this disease. She died on the 28th of Feb., 1849.

9. Mrs. Banks was Dr. Burnham's patient from first to last, and reported by him.

In reference to the facts with regard to the above named cases, we have only to say that any one doubting the truth of our statements, may be satisfied by calling on the relations of the deceased. Dr. L. says "they have all been reported to us by responsible witnesses."

The witnesses who reported the cases may be responsible and respectable, but may have been imposed upon. One thing is certain, however, and that is, that Dr. L. did not make a true statement with regard to them, no matter who reported the cases.

We proceed to notice another point in the controversy in which Dr. L. evidently seeks to degrade the Homœopathic practitioners as unlearned and ignorant pretenders, but with how much fairness and honesty, the reader will judge.

It will be recollected that among other charges he brings against Homœopathists, he charges them with having administered corrosive sublimate, which he says he found more than once at the bedside of the patient during the prevalence of the epidemic. Dr. Pulte, rather amused at the idea of this discovery by his sharp-sighted opponent, intimates that it would astonish the chemist to discover, or "find out the true nature of *our* corrosive sublimate." Dr. Pulte evidently had reference to the high attenuations or dilutions used by Homœopathists, which can no more be detected by chemical tests than miasma of an infected atmosphere, yet as the one spreads disease and death in its train, the other may become a curative agent when properly applied, and intended his remarks as ironical. But Dr. L. finds here another grand opportunity to demolish the whole tribe of Homœopathists, which have proved such a prodigious annoyance to him and some of his medical friends for a few years past. Now he has proof positive that they are all a set of ignoramuses, for he says, "if these lions of the profession be thus ignorant, what must be the condition of their subalterns? * * Can the people be safe in such hands?" He now has to tell these ignorant doctors that corrosive sublimate can be detected, and how it can be done—all about it. Yes, the secret is out, and the world knows it now; but the poor Homœopathists did not know it, as he would have his readers believe. Yet he must have known that if Homœopathists use corrosive sublimate at all, they use it in such attenuations that no chemical test can detect it, and hence the term, "*our* corrosive sublimate;" and also that every school-boy who makes the least pretensions to chemistry, knows how to detect

the presence of this drug in its crude state. And yet Dr. Latta enters into an explanation how corrosive sublimate can be detected, and says, "if any should think us severe, let them consult some work upon chemistry, and they will have to admit that our comments are just."

Dr. Latta knew very well that Drs. P. and E. had no reference to corrosive sublimate in its crude state, and why does he make this ungenerous turn upon their words? The fact is, he found himself in a rather awkward predicament. He said he had found the corrosive sublimate at the bedside of the sick, and Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann challenged him to prove the fact, and to disclose the *modus operandi*, how he could find out the true nature of *their* corrosive sublimate, and said "that will astonish the chemists." But he knew very well that he would not be believed in his statements if he took the term as used by Drs. P. and E.; hence he endeavors to make a serious matter of it, leaves out their expression, "*our corrosive sublimate*"—pretends to know nothing about the dilutions or attenuations of Homœopathy. At one time he raises a great cry against infinitesimal doses—now he finds the crude substance—then again he asserts "they adopted *precisely* the same treatment employed by the Allopathists." And to this day has left the question unanswered, how he can detect the presence of corrosive sublimate in a Homœopathic dose.

Surely we might say of Dr. Latta's office what was once said of a church where theological subjects had been twisted, and tortured, and misconstrued, the proper inscription over his door would be—"*All manner of twisting and turning done here.*"

As another specimen of Dr. Latta's twisting and turning, and of his unjust conclusions, we quote the following from his pamphlet: He says—

"If Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann had eleven hundred and sixteen cases of cholera in ninety days, how many cases would there have been, provided all the other practitioners in the city, amounting in all to about two hundred, had attended each as many as either of these gentlemen, which is no doubt the fact, for the reason that all, as everybody knows, were busily employed during the cholera."

Now Dr. Latta knows very well that his assertion, "which is no doubt the fact, &c," is not the fact. All may have been, and no doubt were busily employed a good part of the time; but this does not prove that all the other practitioners had each as much to do as Drs. P. and E. It only proves that many who had but little to do in ordinary times, were now called into active service, and those who usually had much to do were now called upon to make very extraordinary efforts to meet the demands upon them. It is well known that Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann have a more extensive practice than any two Allopathic physicians in Cincinnati. We say this fearless of successful contradiction; and Dr. Latta himself acknowledged sometime ago, that their office presented more the appearance of an election day, where people were crowding to the polls, than a doctor's office. House, hall, and steps, were full a good part of the time, and this he saw with his own eyes, as he lived in sight of their office.

As for the possibility of their attending the number of cases specified in their report, it will be found upon calculation, that, according to *their* statements, they would only have to attend a fraction over

thirteen new cases a day for each of them, and in many instances most likely, three or four patients would be in the same family; and on an average we presume that they did not require more than three calls for each; hence by making from seventy to eighty calls a day, they could attend the number specified; and besides all this, many of them were prescribed for at the office. Dr. Latta's extravagant calculations are based upon a misconstruction of their language and unworthy of any attention. He, however, proceeds gravely to make a calculation by the rule of three, and says if they had 1116 cases of cholera in 90 days, how many cases would there have been if the 200 physicians in the city had each as many cases? and then adds, in addition to this, suppose all the others had as many mixed cases, and as many cases of dysentery and nervous fever, with typhoid tendency, how many of our citizens would have been sick during the 90 days specified in their report? Such reasonings and such conclusions are almost too absurd to deserve any notice. He may "suppose" a thousand things that are not true, and of course his conclusion must be false. But we will "suppose" another case for the D's. reflection. "Suppose" that the Homœopathic physicians were really as ignorant as Dr. Latta tries to make them out, and uniformly unsuccessful in their practice, is it not reasonable to suppose that the people would soon find it out and leave them, and seek the counsel and aid of such would be wise men as Dr. L. But alas here is the rub. The Homœopathists have too much to do to suit the Drs. taste, and hence this bungling attempt to put them down and degrade them. His brethren of the old school may smile at his effort to fight their battles, but as intelligent men they must pity his folly in thus exposing himself to just criticism. But as for himself, so far as his medical reputation among a great part of this community is concerned, he has the consolation of the old saying, "blessed is he that hath nothing, for he shall lose nothing."

Of course we only speak of him in these inconsistencies and misrepresentations as a doctor, leaving his christian and ministerial character untouched and untarnished. We have indeed all along endeavored to keep the doctor and the preacher separate and apart, yet in spite of this effort, the question would sometimes arise in the mind when the doctor shall be brought to an account, where will the preacher be?

Should any of our readers think us too severe in our reflections, let them look at another statement of Dr. L. and compare it with the facts in the case. After speaking of the thousands that died of cholera, he says, "who then, we repeat, are accountable for the thousands above alluded to? The fact that they were principally Germans, and that nearly all the German practitioners are Homœopathists, will furnish a clue to the answer."

Dr. L. may expect to be believed in this statement by those who live at a distance from this city, or by such who have taken no pains to inform themselves on this subject, but he cannot hope this from those who are acquainted with the German population of this city. What are the facts in this case? Why there were only four or five German Homœopathic physicians in the city of Cincinnati at that time. We have about the same number now, and the principal part of their practice is among the most respectable class of American citizens;

while there are a score or more of German Allopathic physicians; and this must have been well known to Dr. L. Why then, make the assertion that "nearly all the German practitioners are Homœopathists" when he knows that it is not true.

Dr. Latta's former charge, that the Homœopathists had abandoned their system, was ably answered by the report of the committee, and Homœopathy triumphantly sustained by an appeal to the standard authors on Allopathy. This report he endeavors to answer, first, by denying the committee the right to speak on this subject, on the ground that they were not regularly educated in the profession.

To this we reply that the committee was as fully qualified to enter into an examination of the subject submitted to them, as if they had been as well educated as Dr. L. It was a plain matter of fact investigation, without involving any of the technicalities of the profession.

The following gives us a view of the conflicting opinions of the "regular practitioners" on the subject of Cholera, which shows that all is uncertainty with them in the treatment of this dreadful disease. At an extraordinary meeting, called for the purpose, in London, where there were about fifty professional gentlemen present for the purpose of considering the treatment of Cholera, the "London Lancet" says—

"The greatest diversity of opinion prevailed respecting both the treatment of cholera and its nature. As respects its communicability, Mr. Wright, Dr. Murphy, Dr. Barlow, Mr. B. Evans, and Dr. Hughes stated their belief in the contagion of the disease; Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Dendy, &c., were of an opposite opinion.

Mr. Hicks thought that cholera cases might be divided into three classes; first, those depending upon neglected diarrhea, which might probably have existed for the greater part of a fortnight. This class of cases was amenable to treatment. The next class was infected with a poison of a more serious character; attacks were attended by purging and vomiting, but still the patients were not in a complete state of collapse, and the disease might be checked at this stage, if the patients were not too far gone in a state of collapse. But in the third stage, where the patients were in a state of complete collapse, although he had applied mustard poultices, together with brandy, chloroform, ether, ammonia, and other stimulants, yet in no cases, at this stage, had these remedies been attended with success. With regard to the second class of cases, at least, he believed the disease was not contagious.

Dr. Murphy regarded all epidemics as contagious. *He believed that the cholera was communicable even from a dead body.* With regard to the treatment in the stage of collapse, he feared that he only knew what remedies did no harm, for he knew of no certain means of cure. The cause of death from cholera was from the serum of the blood exuding and passing from the blood to the intestines. He, (Dr. Murphy,) was the first medical man who used saline injections. Out of the thirty-two cases at Liverpool, in 1831–32, in which he had used saline injections, eight recovered, and the rest died. These eight were the youngest persons; the older persons always died under this treatment; and as there was some reason to believe that the eight recoveries would have been effected without the saline injections, they were given up. When the collapse stage arrived, unless galvanism did something, no other remedy was capable of propelling the crassamentum of the blood through the veins, separated as it was from the serum.

Dr. Barlow concurred in what had been said respecting the impotence of medical treatment when the disease was malignant, and had arrived at its latter stages. The worst cases that he had seen, where recovery had followed,

little or nothing had been done; perhaps a little calomel and camphor had been given, but the patient had not been exhausted by over-heat, or the heaping up of bedclothes.

Dr. Rees had tried the application of cold water to the surface; charcoal had also been greatly recommended, and he had used carbonic acid. The calomel and opium treatment had also been tried freely, and he was now trying the bichloride of mercury; but, so far as he had seen, no single plan, he repeated, showed any great advantage over any other. But, whatever plan of treatment be adopted in cases of Asiatic cholera, he always applied water to the surface, and gave saline fluids for drink. These two remedies did not attack the causes of the disease, but they tended to supply that which was leaving the system, and the practitioner had then to look for something to neutralize the poison. The true remedy for the disease would, in his opinion, be found to be something that would unite with animal poison, such as bi-chloride of mercury, arsenic, creosote, tannin, &c.

Mr. B. Evans said that the treatment he had adopted with the most success, had been to give one dose of three or four grains of opium, and from ten to twenty grains of calomel; and if the patient was not in the actual state of collapse, he found this efficacious, if followed up with ice occasionally, given internally, and plenty of water, stimulating the body with mustard.

Dr. Crisp stated that he had read with much interest the letters of Dr. Ayre, of Hull, in THE LANCET, detailing the successful results that had followed the administration of two grains of calomel every ten minutes, with one or two drops of the tincture of opium, occasionally, in a little water. He had tried it in one case, and he could not give a better proof of his confidence in this treatment, than by saying that if he were attacked by cholera, he would take two grains of calomel every ten minutes, with one or two drops of tincture of opium at intervals.

Mr. Dendy believed that the only real antidote for cholera was calomel.

Dr. Hughes said he knew very little of the subject-matter of discussion when he entered the room, and now he knew less. (A laugh.) All the gentlemen who had spoken appeared to hold different opinions as to the best remedy for cholera. It was a mistake on the part of the public press to suppose that drains and cesspools *produced* cholera; but if they were right, then the commissioners of public health had adopted the very means likely to produce that complaint. Instead of taking their measures years ago, they had stirred up all sorts of abominations. They had removed dunghills and cesspools, and added tenfold to the fire that existed. (Hear, hear.) Never since he could recollect had there been such accumulations of abominable odors as since the Health of Towns' Commission had attempted to purify the atmosphere. (A laugh, and hear, hear.)

Mr. Casey had seen cases in which the kind of active mercurial treatment recommended by Dr. Ayre, and others, had been pushed too far, and where a fatal vomiting had supervened.

Mr. Waterworth said, the calomel treatment had been tried in 1832, and had failed. Until they knew something of the nature of this poison, whether it was in the nervous system or in the blood, it was impossible and useless to go into the treatment of the disease.(!) In cases in which collapse had taken place, he thought that he had seen more recoveries where nothing had been done than where he had interfered, *if* the power of Nature were sufficient to throw off the poison.

It was suggested that the meeting should adjourn until that day fortnight.

The Chairman said, the ordinary meeting of the Society would take place in the early part of October. *They had not acquired much information to-night regarding the treatment of the disease.—London Lancet, Oct.* 1849, *p.* 327."

In addition to the above, we have the following from Dr. Reese, of New York, a distinguished Allopathic writer and editor of medical works: He says—

"Instead, however, of prescribing for the symptoms, as they present themselves in every individual case, and proportioning the remedies to the violence of the attack, it is to a lamentable extent the fact, that some physicians were filled with perturbation at witnessing the first symptoms of the epidemic.

Dreading the very name of Cholera, to which they had been taught to attach the idea of sudden and certain fatality, they prescribed as though they were doubtful whether their remedy would kill or cure the patient, and used some one of the varied and contradictory remedies which have been successively eulogized by foreign practitioners. Hence, as *calomel, opium, brandy, bleeding, cold* and *heat*, have each found advocates in other countries, by bold experimentalists, there were those who, unwilling to trust to either singly, in contending with this new enemy, would rapidly, and even simultaneously, adopt the whole. If they began by bleeding with one hand, they would give brandy with the other. If they gave calomel for its purgative quality, they would give opium for fear of accidents. If they used cold, whether internally or externally, they would counteract it by heat. And thus, if patients did not get well, they knew not whether they died of the disease or the remedies, for either would singly have proved fatal; and if they recovered, in spite of the treatment, then each and all of these contradictory remedies were lauded to the skies."

Finally, we may notice the report of the internal health department of the city of Boston, for 1849, in which we have an account of the treatment of Cholera, in the City Hospital, during the prevalence of the epidemic last summer. The report says.

" The remedies which were used were numerous. Of some of them it may be well to speak in detail.

Narcotics totally failed of any beneficial effect. Opium in no case, either single or combined, arrested the vomiting or purging, and it was often thought to hasten the fatal termination. *Camphor* always failed except perhaps to relieve the cramps, which it was sometimes thought to do. In two patients, to whom it was exhibited, the whole surface became before death very dark, and the lips actually black. In these cases narcotism was very evident.

Stimulants almost always failed. To some patients brandy and water was freely given. Three of these recovered after a severe secondary fever. Very few were relieved at all, and almost every patient treated in this way had secondary fever. The same may be said of the various preparations of ammonia, of the astringent stimulants, of coffee and of tea. Those who drank freely of strong coffee and tea and had no other treatment except external heat, died early. *Electricity* failed entirely.

Emetics. The usual emetic dose was ipecac : and capsicum in powder, about forty grains to a drachm each. This was always exhibited in the early cases, and at least with temporary benefit. The pulse, which was often gone, returned at the wrist, and with it, the warmth of surface. How much our omission of this treatment, if any thing, had to do with the greater mortality in later cases, we are unable to say.

Calomel was given alone, in large doses, in a few cases. We could not perceive that it had any effect. It has been said, that if you ever give a Cholera patient a mercurial sore mouth, he will recover. This is undoubtedly true, and is equivalent to saying, that if a patient lives long enough, he will get well.

Quinia, in the form of the sulphate, was used in a very few cases. We are not positive that these patients died any sooner than others : none of them recovered. The drug was administered in five, ten, and twenty grain doses.

Tannic Acid was frequently used in enemata, in proportions of five or six grains to the ounce of fluid, and almost always with temporary relief of the purging. By the stomach in doses of two or three grains it sometimes appeared to check vomiting.

The astringents and aromatics had usually but little if any effect. *Ginger* was almost always immediately rejected, in whatever form used. *Cinnamon* in tincture fared but little better. The aromatic powder of the United States Dispensary was oftener retained. But upon none of these drugs, do we place any reliance.

Ether could be given in large enough doses by inhalation to relieve the cramps, but we are not aware that any patient recovered, who used it to this extent, or that others were benefitted by it.

Cathartics were never used until the dangerous period was supposed to have

passed. *Elaterium* was suggested by one of the Consulting Physicians, as possibly having the power to set up a new action. It was administered in one instance, but without any apparent effect.

Venous Injection. Several solutions of alkaline salts were injected into the veins, as recommended by Dr. Stevens, of the West Indies, and in one or two cases simple warm water was injected. One patient, the first one upon whom this treatment was tried, after he had become apparently moribund, lived and appeared well for two days ; but the secretion of urine never returned, and he died comatose. In one or two other cases there was temporary relief, but death invariably followed shortly after. We were not inclined to make new trials of this mode of treatment after the first six weeks of the epidemic.

External Heat was freely applied, by mustard, hot sand, hot bottles, and by dry heat from a furnace ; but generally after collapse was marked, none of these had any other effect than to annoy and irritate the patients. Those patients who could be induced to remain covered with blankets fared the best ; with or without other artificial heat. Those who were restless and threw off the clothing invariably died. On this account, the bed-strap was sometimes used with advantage, and we can but regret, that, notwithstanding the apparent cruelty of confining the limbs of a sick man, it was not oftener applied.

Drinks, of whatever nature, were useless. Those, who drank the least, vomited and purged the least. The call was always for cold water. When taken in quantities of more than a teaspoonful, it was speedily rejected. A draught of half a pint was sure to be followed by the ejection of a pint and a half. Those patients to whom drink was steadily refused, neither vomited nor purged freely afterwards, often, not at all. They more speedily grew warm, and those who for an hour were kept closely enveloped in blankets, took no medicine, and got no drink, suffered the least, and were the most likely to recover.

Hot baths were painful to the patient, and they generally sank speedily after their use. *Cold sponge baths* were more grateful, and even during collapse they seemed for a short time to revive the patients. Bladders of ice to the head, and the *cold affusion*, were resorted to advantageously, in cases of violent delirium.

The wet sheet, (packing, so called,) was tried faithfully, but every patient upon whom it was tried, died. Reaction did not take place in any one of them, and we soon ceased to resort to it. Our experience is against the free exhibition of water either within or without.

Kreasote was used at first in many cases. It sometimes seemed to relieve the vomiting, but of its power to do this we cannot speak so favorably as of the

Wood Naphtha. In no case, and there were many in which this was administered, did it fail, after the second or third dose, to relieve the vomiting perfectly. It was given in various doses, clear, from twenty minims to a drachm. Even, in cases which ultimately proved fatal, we were perfectly satisfied of the power of this drug to check vomiting speedily.

Much benefit was thought to be derived from the exhibition of *Saline medicines.* Stevens's mixture of the chlorate of potash, in solution, with the hydrochlorate and bicarbonate of soda, was the form in which salines were usually given. We used larger doses of the chlorate generally than Stevens recommends, but are not able to say that this was an advantage.

Homœopathic Treatment. As the stimulating plan of treatment, the Hydropathic, and that called Allopathic, had been fairly tried, it might be asked why we did not practice Homœopathy, in some cases. The truth is, that no one of our number understood it."

What inducement could Homœopathists have to abandon their practice, based upon certain scientific principles, and to embrace a system where all is confusion and uncertainty ?

The principles of our system have been assailed by *learned* men, men of standing and character as writers, yet it has survived every attack that has been made upon it, and the system of Homœopathy is now spreading more rapidly and more extensively than at any previous time ; and we have no fears but that it willl prevail and be successful while the laws of life and health continue as they are.