American Homeopathy Confronts Scientific Medicine

Naomi Rogers

BY THE FINAL DECADES of the nineteenth century homeopaths in the United States claimed proudly credit for the transformation that had taken place in American therapeutic practice. Although Hahnemann's laws were denied by the world, John E. James told a graduating class of homeopaths in 1897, the consequences of his teachings were not, 'as is clearly demonstrated by the modification of the practice of every school of medicine.'[1] Only rarely did orthodox physicians bleed or blister their patients or dose them with calomel as they once had. Indeed, one homeopath boasted to a public gathering in 1886 that for the previous sixteen years he had not seen a single patient bled.[2] Yet, homeopaths did not feel that regular doctors had replaced these heroic therapies with anything other than scepticism. American medicine was changing, but it had not necessarily drawn closer to the homeopathic ideal.

American homeopaths could assert justly that their profession had achieved impressive successes. Like leading orthodox educators, by the 1890s they had begun to attach hospitals to their schools, to introduce more laboratory and clinical instruction, and to lengthen their course of studies. Homeopaths had won support from local and state politicians, sat on the newly revived state boards of health, and walked the wards of some city hospitals.[3] Reform-minded homeopaths were working also with regulars to introduce state licensing laws, and most states had established mixed boards of examiners to test regulars, homeopaths and eclectics.[4] In addition, not only were orthodox doctors forsaking heroic therapies, but the new

bacteriological serums seemed to confirm Hahnemann's law of similars. A few regular medical societies were even ignoring the ethics code that forbade members of the American Medical Association (AMA) to consult with irregulars.[5]

Yet, these gains had not been won without a price. Although homeopaths had adopted the institutional symbols and structure of the orthodox profession – journals, societies and schools – their claim to a distinctive identity had rested chiefly on their therapies. However, by the 1860s, regular physicians were growing less inclined to point to therapy as the chief source of public respect and professional unity. Where once differences between regular and irregular therapies were defining elements of American physicians' professional identities, now orthodox physicians, particularly those who had studied in Germany, called for a new kind of medicine, whose authority was to be drawn from the methods and ideology of laboratory science.

Some regular reformers, particularly elite specialists and educators, believed that this new scientific medicine would enable physicians to value intellectual worth irrespective of professional creed. The term 'scientific' was often used by both regulars and homeopaths as a weapon in the war between the schools. Before the Civil War homeopaths had claimed that their practices of clinical observation, drug purity and self-experimentation showed that they were far more scientific than doctors of the Old School, and closer to the ideals of anti-rationalism and empiricism of the Paris Clinical School. Nevertheless, by the late nineteenth century, a redefined German-oriented scientific medicine involved a commitment to laboratory investigation, and extrapolations from animal physiology and from microscopical study of tissues and fluids rather than from external symptoms. The new sciences, their proponents believed, would undermine antagonisms based on 'systems' or 'theories,' and form the foundation for professional unity. As some regular physicians argued, a truly scientific man did not need to fear consulting with an irregular physician because science overcame all unorthodox thinking. In a similar manner, homeopaths turned the pejorative term 'sectarian' against their rivals, using it to condemn orthodox doctors who clung fiercely to heroic practices and restrictive codes of ethics, and calling for both schools to come together in 'a non-sectarian spirit.'[6] Nevertheless, like many of their regular counterparts, homeopaths were hesitant initially to give their allegiance to a new scientific order in medicine that seemed to value knowledge gained from microscopical and chemical pathology over judgements made by listening to and observing the patient.

This paper will explore some features of what it meant to be a

homeopath in the United States during the decades between the Civil War and the 1920s, a period that encompassed both the Golden Age of American homeopathy and its precipitous decline. By the early twentieth century, most American homeopaths had embraced this redefined place of science in medicine, and were beginning to build what they saw as a New Homeopathy. Yet, by claiming the mantle of the new definition of 'scientific' they were compelled to rethink what it was that made homeopathic professional identity and knowledge distinctive. In this era of redefinition, many New Homeopaths felt obliged to sort out how to be scientific and forward-looking while remaining faithful to the legacy of Hahnemann. At social functions, at meetings of boards of health, and even by the bedside, daily relations between the two schools were strained but cordial.[7] However, in the heightened atmosphere of ritual events, at college and hospital openings, graduations, and formal meetings, the battle over the New Homeopathy was fought more fiercely, its banners of combat brightened by the lights of the halls and by the reflection in the eyes of students who were to carry on the crusade. Although this next generation watched the battle and studied the weapons, by the 1920s the struggle was largely over and most had retired from the fray.

The development of homeopathy, which was introduced into America in the 1830s and 1840s by immigrants from Germany and other parts of Northern Europe, had not been smooth.[8] Homeopaths were unable to establish consensus on interpreting Hahnemann's works, defining homeopathic practice, or resolving relations with orthodox and other medical groups. During the years before the Civil War, American homeopaths criticised Hahnemann's mysticism, his notion of the 'vital force', his theory of the itch, his belief that drugs were made more potent through 'dynamisation', and his use of highly diluted drugs.[9] Even Constantine Hering, a German homeopath who had come to Philadelphia in the 1830s and established a successful practice, a medical school, and an international reputation, asked in his 1849 preface to Hahnemann's *Organon*, 'What important influence can it exert, whether a Homeopath adapts the theoretical opinion of Hahnemann or not, as long as he holds fast [to] the practical rules of the master, and the Materia Medica of our school[?]'[10] In appealing to the public, however, homeopaths mostly played down these divisions, and stressed instead their distinctiveness from regular practice and practitioners: effective and pleasant medicines contrasted with debilitating purging and bleeding; an interest in symptoms described by the patient rather than the use of obscure disease categories; and, above all, the theory of a natural therapeutic law not understood by regulars. Patients and

practitioners were impressed especially by orthodox failures and by homeopathic successes during the devastating epidemics of cholera in the 1840s and yellow fever in the 1850s.[11]

Before 1870 most American homeopaths were converts from regular medicine, and many sought to continue their membership in regular medical societies and other professional activities. Yet, growing resistance from their former colleagues led them to seek to reform American medicine from the outside through a distinct and competing professional structure. In 1844 a small group organised a national society, the American Institute of Homeopathy (AIH). The first permanent homeopathic college was established in 1848, and, in the 1850s and 1860s local and state societies and other schools were founded. By the 1880s there were homeopathic schools and dispensaries in most major American cities. Yet, throughout the ante-bellum period, homeopathy drew much of its image and strength from its appeal to values of egalitarianism and populism. Few homeopaths may have agreed with botanic Samuel Thomson that 'every man [was] his own physician', but, nonetheless, homeopathic domestic guides and medical kits were the main way that the American public first learned of homeopathic ideas and therapies.[12] The first homeopathic societies were made up of 'physicians and believers,' and homeopathic journals were directed to both practitioners and the lay public.[13] Before the Civil War, therefore, homeopathy appealed to the public simultaneously as a populist anti-orthodox medical alternative, and as a professionalising sect.

Homeopaths' critiques of orthodox therapies resonated also with those from within the orthodox profession itself. By the 1840s and 1850s orthodox therapies were coming also under attack from members of the regular profession, particularly by physicians who had studied in Paris and who had committed themselves to a new notion of science based on empirical observation. Paris medicine, as interpreted by American proselytisers, offered a way to raise the standing of their profession in the public's eyes, as well as to improve their practice, the target of so many anti-orthodox attacks.[14] Some homeopaths were suspicious of French clinicians who rejected *all* theoretical systems, had little interest in therapeutics, and, like Gabriel Andral, purported to have discredited homeopathy through statistical studies.[15] Still, many homeopaths, no less than regulars, embraced the Parisian belief that medical truth was best sought through the direct experience of the senses, and prided themselves on their record-keeping and use of medical statistics.[16] Before and even after the Civil War some continued to draw on this ideology in depicting homeopathy and its founder. 'Neglect no opportunity to acquire knowledge by self-experiment', Charles

Mohr warned his students in 1888. Hahnemann 'was not satisfied to get his materia medica second-hand ... I urge you, gentlemen, to make, as far as possible, your own materia medica by provings on your own bodies.'[17] Hahnemann, John Clarke told a group of homeopathic supporters, had 'his foot upon the solid ground of fact. The weakness of all previous systems of treatment that had been proposed lay in their having been founded on the quicksands of theory.'[18] Until Hahnemann pointed out the way, Clarke explained, no one had any notion of how medicine was to escape from 'the darkness of erroneous theories, and the chains of dead Authority.'[19]

By the 1870s and 1880s, however, the language and ideology of the Paris School, particularly its emphasis on empiricism and the importance of bedside observation, was giving way increasingly to a new ideology of science from Germany. Laboratory-oriented medicine was integrated less easily into homeopathic ideology and practice than the Parisian science had been, and, combined with other social and political changes in American society, it proved a more profound threat to American homeopathy. It must be stressed that this was not because the new sciences of pathology, physiology and bacteriology provided physicians with immediate therapeutic successes: until the late 1890s, regular physicians could point to few concrete advances, something that homeopaths gleefully noted. It was instead the ideology of laboratory science that inspired American doctors.[20] Yet, integrating the theory and practice of laboratory science into medicine threatened to shift medical authority away from the bedside. By the 1880s and 1890s most homeopaths saw clearly that this shift could undermine potentially the lingering features of homeopathy that made it distinctive in the minds of both patients and practitioners.

Homeopathy had changed significantly since its pre-Civil War days. No longer domestic or populist, it appealed to the public as a scientific profession with claims to state funding, distinct from emerging irregular groups such as osteopaths, chiropractors, and Christian Scientists. Four private homeopathic schools were founded in the 1870s, and by the 1890s of some twenty schools nation-wide five were part of state universities.[21] At most of these schools students were taught both homeopathic materia medica and once-orthodox subjects such as microscopical pathology, and many of their younger teachers had followed their regular colleagues and gone to Germany for post-graduate study, especially in a clinical speciality.[22] Yet, the integration of the new sciences neither unified homeopaths nor provided them with stronger weapons to fight regular medicine. Not only did homeopathic theory and practice vary widely, but the symbols of orthodoxy that had once been so easy to caricature were no longer prominent features

of regular practice. Now, instead of the lancet and calomel, regular reformers spoke of the microscope, the laboratory bench and the experimental animal.

Some homeopaths, like their regular counterparts, began to use the language and ideology of the new scientific medicine in efforts to reform their profession. This movement aggravated tensions already present in the ante-bellum years between traditionalists, who tried to practice 'pure' homeopathy, and other homeopaths, often of a younger generation, who offered criticism of some elements of homeopathic theory and therapies, sometimes by drawing on the ideology of orthodox science. The issue of diluted dosing came to symbolise the split between these factions; but the real issue was what should inform change in practice. 'High-potency' traditionalists, calling themselves 'Hahnemannians', established their own medical journals and schools, and, in 1880, left the AIH to set up the International Hahnemannian Association. In their interpretation of Hahnemann's work, homeopaths were valued as healers not laboratory workers, and the new sciences of pathology, physiology and bacteriology were irrelevant.[23] The more therapeutically-liberal majority remained in the AIH, and continued to argue amongst themselves about homeopathic practice, arguments that were resolved less and less conservatively in the next few decades. In 1883, for example, the president of the AIH declared that high potencies were not a universal law, and in 1899 the association altered Hahnemann's principle of similars from *similia similibus curantur* to *currentur*, i.e. from 'like is cured by like' to 'let like by cured by like.'[24] Yet, as therapy itself came to be seen as less important (both in defining a doctor's standing and a profession's identity) the debate was widened to include epistemological problems, and particularly the place of the German ideology of science. Which aspects of homeopathy's legacy should be retained if the system was to be considered 'scientific'?

In understanding the ways homeopaths answered this question, it is critical to recognise that, for much of the nineteenth century, homeopathic identity in America was founded not only in a body of medical knowledge and practices but also in a set of social and political commitments. Like other medical sects in mid-nineteenth-century America, homeopathy drew part of its popular appeal from its links to progressive social reform; that is, from its critique of not only heroic therapies but also gender, race and other social relations.[25] One of its greatest successes was having Hahnemann's pejorative term 'allopathy' adopted by anti-orthodox practitioners and their lay supporters throughout America. By the late nineteenth century, however, as homeopaths debated the place of science in their professional identity, they began also to reject more broadly the image of homeopathy as a movement

against orthodoxy. Confronting scientific medicine compelled homeopaths to rethink both their social identity, and to sort out the relationship of the profession's past to its present and future, a task made especially difficult by changing popular expectations that the new post-bellum era of science and efficiency should rely on professional experts able to stand aside from the social and moral passions of the day and offer detached, objective solutions. By and large, in their efforts to make homeopathy both modern and scientific, homeopathic reformers chose to shake loose their association with politically divisive social causes.

During the 1850s and 1860s, many homeopaths had allied themselves with social and political liberalism, especially abolitionism and race equality. A number of leading reformers became ardent supporters of homeopathy, seeing in it an equivalent rejection of social orthodoxy, including humanist Daniel Webster, abolition novelist Harriet Beecher Stowe, and poet Henry Wadsworth Longfellow.[26] In Boston the support by middle-class intellectuals and liberal reformers was strong enough to convince the state legislature after the war to allow the newly founded Boston University to choose as its medical faculty homeopathic rather than orthodox physicians. At the 1869 AIH annual meeting in Boston, local homeopath David Thayer greeted the delegates with a speech praising recent events which had led to the emancipation of race and 'made liberty national and no longer sectional.'[27] The following evening the delegates were offered a 'poetical welcome' written by abolitionist reformer Julia Ward Howe, which included the stanzas:

> Knights of hygiene, the growing day
> Binds nature in your plastic rule;
> Your foemen throw their arms away
> And seek the blessings of your school.
>
> Pale forms from prison beds arise,
> And follow you with strength renewed,
> While age and childhood lift their eyes
> And sing the psalm of gratitude.[28]

Homeopaths contrasted their support of liberal causes with the conservative behaviour of orthodox physicians, an image exaggerated for the purpose of rhetoric but reflected in some aspects of orthodox policy. In 1870, for example, the AMA refused to accept delegates from a racially integrated society.[29] The banner of the New School, declared James B. Wood, president of the Homeopathic Medical Society of Pennsylvania, was, by contrast, 'the banner of *progress* and *medical freedom*'; that of the Old School '*no progress*

and *medical slavery*.'[30] A toast to 'Reform and Reformers' at the Boston meeting similarly urged that 'striving as we do to emancipate our profession from the errors, traditions and authority fastened upon it, we have ready sympathy for those who seek to help mankind by urging the claim of freedom against the pretensions of precedent.'[31]

As a profession, however, homeopaths were not strong supporters of black colleagues, although Philadelphia's Hahnemann Medical College did graduate at least six black students between 1884 and 1912.[32] Indeed, the historian Harris Coulter has suggested that homeopaths' identification with abolition in the North may have led to their lack of success in many Southern states.[33] By the 1880s, American society in general retreated from a concern with race equality, and public debates by homeopaths about links between medical and political liberty largely disappeared as neither medical conservatives nor liberals found them a potent symbol in professional debates.[34]

The link between homeopathy and the women's rights movement, on the other hand, remained a central element to homeopathic identity throughout the nineteenth century, particularly among the urban middle-class. In the 1850s, Elizabeth Palmer Peabody, the daughter of a homeopathic physician, ran a bookstore that not only sold homeopathic medicine and literature, but was a gathering place for Boston intellectuals.[35] A number of leading women suffragists, including Susan B. Anthony, chose women homeopaths as their physicians, and many women attended homeopathic schools.[36] Although conservative homeopathic colleges in Philadelphia and New York remained closed to women, most of the homeopathic schools established after the Civil War, including those connected to state universities, were co-educational.[37] By 1900, women made up 17 percent of homeopathic medical students and 12 percent of all homeopathic doctors.[38]

A number of male homeopaths publicly and privately supported women as colleagues.[39] In the 1880s female and male homeopaths in Washington D.C., for example, worked together at the Homeopathic Free Dispensary and the National Homeopathic Hospital, and in Detroit and Boston women were on the faculties of co-educational schools.[40] Support for women's medical education was clearly part of the larger reform ideal. The encouragement of all physicians 'without any arbitrary distinction of sex, or color, or nationality', one homeopath argued in the 1860s, was part of homeopathy's wider goal to achieve 'professional equality, liberality and toleration.'[41] This support reflected also the significant influence of women as patients and fund-raisers for homeopathic causes.[42] In his 1877

book *How I Became A Homeopath* William Henry Holcombe claimed that his conversion was spurred by a mother who adamantly refused to allow her son to be bled.[43] Similarly, Reuben Ludlam of Chicago, newly elected president of the AIH in 1869, chose as his presidential address at the annual meeting 'The Relation of Women to Homeopathy.' Referring to the 'natural relation between women and Homeopathy', he noted their 'tact and influence' and the 'thousand and thousands of dollars' they had contributed and helped to raise for the homeopathic cause, remarking on 'the settled reliance of the women of this and other countries upon the merits of Homeopathy. And, if they are for us, who can be against us?'[44] Ludlam called on his fellow homeopaths to support women as colleagues: 'Is there any good reason why a woman may not properly qualify herself for the practice of medicine?' Ludlam asked, affirming that 'in our calling, as in others, real merit is not an affair of gender, but of genius and industry.' He urged delegates to support women's medical schools and, using the language of the 15th Amendment still under debate, to try to mould public opinion in support of 'all physicians, without any arbitrary distinctions of sex, or color, or nationality.'[45]

Support from male homeopaths, though, was not uniform, nor did it unify the profession.[46] Women continued to suffer discrimination and condescension. After Ludlam's rousing speech, for example, the evening concluded with 'The Female Doctor', a humorous poem written and recited by a male homeopath.[47] In spite of women homeopaths' pleas for equality, the special role of women in treating their own sex, and even the example of Hahnemann's support of his wife's medical training, a number of homeopathic societies remained closed to them, and in 1869, perhaps with the knowledge that a year earlier the AMA had refused to admit women, delegates at the AIH annual meeting refused to admit two women as members despite their formal eligibility.[48] In 1882, in a journal published by students of Philadelphia's Hahnemann Medical College, the author of a hoax article on 'Why Women Can Never Become Successful Practitioners of Medicine' told the well-worn story of the beautiful young woman homeopath who is unable to prescribe for a young man with a chill, because the patient's symptoms change to a fever the closer his doctor comes.[49] Even at co-educational schools male and female homeopathic students were usually taught in separate classrooms, and were organised into separate and unequal student medical societies.[50] As late as 1892 homeopath Millie Chapman concluded a talk on 'Women in Medicine' to the Homeopathic Medical Society of Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, by pleading 'Brethren, *we* enter medicine *not* as a disturbing influence, as monsters, or those out of

place, but in the line of human duty, an element in relieving pain, an aid in education, an influence for reform.'[51]

The inconsistent support for women colleagues can be explained in large measure by an image of homeopathy that male homeopaths had begun to battle, namely, that it was weak, feminised medicine, good only for delicate patients, such as women and children.[52] Homeopaths sought to present a masculinist image of their profession, stressing their successes in combating powerful epidemic diseases such as yellow fever and cholera. 'No stretch of allopathic ingenuity', argued one man, 'can make of cholera a mild disease.'[53] Similarly, at a meeting of the medical staff of Philadelphia's Hahnemann Hospital, the doctors praised a colleague's 'splendid manhood' that had 'made him an example before those who have been associated with him and the profession generally.'[54]

Homeopaths had also to confront the orthodox claim that homeopathic therapies were so weak that their prescribers did nothing but trust to the healing power of nature, an argument such leading regular reformers such as Oliver Wendell Holmes, Worthington Hooker, and Jacob Bigelow in the 1840s and 1850s used to attack both homeopathic and orthodox treatments.[55] In vain did one Philadelphia homeopath quote proudly a 'celebrated test treatment of pneumonia in the Vienna hospitals' where 'non-interference' was compared with homeopathic and allopathic treatments, and homeopathy was shown to be the most effective.[56] A popular joke described a mother who, distraught after her children had ingested secretly the family's homeopathic medicines, was reassured by her homeopath doctor that she had no reason for concern.[57] In recounting orthodox objections to homeopathy, convert William Holcombe noted 'the story of little Johnny Smith, who swallowed all the sugar pellets in his mother's box, without being hurt, is, of course, never omitted.'[58] Homeopathic practitioners were accused also of pandering to the fears of patients, particularly mothers who sought mild therapies for their children, and curing only through psychological persuasion. In addition, homeopaths were unable to dismiss the continuing populist and unprofessional image represented by the editions of domestic homeopathic guides republished throughout the 1870s and 1880s.[59]

Homeopaths were never able to resolve fully the tension between relying on patients and the lay public for professional and political support, and yet creating and maintaining a sense of distance between patient and practitioner, and between doctor and society.[60] Nonetheless, to combat the view of homeopathy as a simple domestic healing system based on placebos and persuasion, many homeopathic educators tried to establish strict

professional guidelines, and to use the system's German heritage to advantage. Particularly in the North-Eastern cities where homeopathy flourished among elite families, many physicians adopted an authoritarian style, quite opposed to any notion of 'medicine for the people', and sought to project an image of the typical homeopath as a sombre, well-educated man who maintained a distance between doctor and patient.[61] In one case, a Philadelphia homeopath rejected his patient's efforts to relate his doctor's therapies to a particular body part. Arthur Eastman, while a student at Philadelphia's Hahnemann Medical College in the 1870s, visited Charles Raue, one of his teachers, and saw Raue showing a patient out of his office after a consultation. 'The patient said "Doctor, what is this medicine for, my heart, my lungs, my liver, or [my] kidneys?" Dr. Raue replied, "That medicine is for Mr. Miller. Good Day."'[62]

The issue of anti-vivisection divided homeopaths in their efforts to distinguish themselves from social activists of the mid-nineteenth century. Anti-vivisection was often aligned with the temperance and women's rights movements, reforms with which a number of homeopaths had sympathy. Some physicians feared also that reliance on experimental physiology as a teaching method and source of medical authority would create not healers but unfeeling scientists.[63] Orthodox professors, warned one homeopath in the 1880s, fill their books 'with the records of their labours in torturing dumb brutes', and, argued another, they 'strangely ignore Hahnemann's materia medica, which records the pure effects of drugs on man.'[64] 'It is now the fashion to ascribe the discontinuance of blood-letting to certain experiments on animals performed by Marshall Hall', John Clarke suggested in 1886. 'This is a very pretty story and quite good enough for those who wish to believe anything rather than the truth of their indebtedness to Hahnemann.'[65] This 'barbarous method of class demonstration', agreed the editor of the *Hahnemannian Monthly* in 1880 has a 'degrading influence' on both students and the experimenter; 'human sympathy becomes, at first blunted, then entirely perverted into cruelty.'[66] By the early twentieth century, however, as the ideology of laboratory science was integrated increasingly into homeopathy, these arguments became rare. In 1911 the editor of a New York homeopathic journal scornfully dismissed an anti-vivisection exhibit that showed 'colored drawings of dogs torn and bleeding at the hands of operators of cruel visage.' 'The more sensational and extreme features of vivisection are exaggerated', he commented, 'for the purpose of working upon the sympathies of the poorly informed public, while the beneficent results are wilfully ignored.'[67]

In their efforts to lose the identification with wider social reforms that

had been a key element in their identity and public appeal, New Homeopaths began to refashion their founder and their history.[68] Hahnemann's spiritualist roots and belief in a 'vital force', for example, came under critical scrutiny.[69] Rather than see Hahnemann as a medical revolutionary, reformers portrayed him as part of a continuing medical heritage, an explicator of medical laws already established by other great men. In 1888 one lecturer linked Hahnemann with Hippocrates and Galen, who formed, he believed, 'the oldest trio of medical history.'[70] Hahnemann was less often depicted as a despised fighter of orthodoxy; the father of homeopathy, Charles Mohr told his students, had a 'thorough medical training', a 'knowledge of all the known sciences pertaining to medicine in his day, was a distinguished graduate of the old school, and was highly esteemed by ... [many] allopaths.'[71] Hahnemann, his followers now claimed, had always relied on the basic sciences of his day to attack reigning medical theory; he even became a proto-bacteriologist. Commenting on Hahnemann's reference to 'invisible (probably animated) matter' in discussing cholera, Augustus Korndoerfer reflected in 1892 that 'words of such import might well be attributed to a believer in the germ theory to-day. Yet we still find within and without our school those who ignorantly attribute to Hahnemann a belief in the spiritual essence of disease.'[72]

Furthermore, while Hahnemann continued to be praised in religious metaphors, his works were less often seen as a medical gospel.[73] In 1880 a homeopath who urged AIH delegates not to neglect the study of the *Organon* – 'this great work, the very Bible of homeopathy' – felt obliged to introduce his point by saying he spoke 'not as a blind bigot, or a fanatical enthusiast, or a mere hero-worshipper.'[74] 'It has been absurdly stated that Hahnemann rejected pathology', Thomas Wilson declared defensively in his AIH presidential address at the same meeting. 'On the contrary we assert that he was the most profound pathologist of his age.'[75] 'Homeopathy was born of experiment', the editor of the *Hahnemannian Monthly* wrote in 1881, placing his School firmly within the ideology of the new sciences; Hahnemann's 'theories were secondary in origin and altogether subordinate in importance.'[76]

In addition to characterising the New Homeopathy as an experimental rather than theoretical system, one element of homeopathy's former identity that reformers did try to preserve was the ideal of liberalism, now used to combat regulars' accusation of homeopathic dogmatism. 'We are not slaves to any medical sect, or dogma', argued a New York homeopath in 1909, 'and there is nothing in our creed or practice to prevent us from taking and using anything and everything which is of value in medicine.'[77] The true

scientific mind was to be open to all ideas, a characteristic homeopaths attached to the New School but not to the Old. 'Homeopathy is progressive ... in the sense that it can be adapted to the progress of science. This is the glory of it', William Goodno told students at Hahnemann Medical College in 1887, and, in a medical parade several years later, Philadelphia students carried banners which read 'The world moves – so do we.'[78] Exclusiveness in thinking and practice was a sign of sectarianism; regulars, thus, were seen as not only close-minded but unscientific.[79] In the future 'the teachers and students and practitioners of medicine will see and care as little for sectarian lines as do the teachers and students of chemistry and geology and astronomy', argued one homeopath in 1886.[80] 'I am sorry to say that in the past there has ever been an element of arrogant assumption and bigoted egotism seemingly inseparable from the medical profession', one lecturer told his class in 1888, 'which has ever hindered the march of progress, and ... in the present is still found casting its foul blot upon the noblest of professions, as witnessed by the arrogant claim of one medical body to be the repository of all medical knowledge.'[81] These defences became more common as homeopaths acknowledged the changes in homeopathic practice, and warned against the use of routine prescribing and diagnosing by disease category rather than individuated symptom.[82]

Such criticisms were not unique to homeopathic reformers. Regulars, too, particularly those infused with the spirit of German science, had begun to reject the notion of 'orthodoxy' and embrace a universalist definition of science.[83] The AMA restrictive consultation code became a symbol in these debates, one both homeopathic and regular reformers used in their efforts to redefine professional identity.[84] In the 1880s members of the Medical Society of the State of New York agreed to consult with 'legally qualified practitioners of medicine', rejecting the AMA's stricter exclusion of anyone 'whose practice is based on an exclusive dogma, to the rejection of the accumulated experience of the profession.'[85] Regulars in a number of states also violated the AMA code by sitting on examining boards with homeopaths, and, after the 1894 ruling by the Association of American Medical Colleges, by allowing homeopathic students to transfer to orthodox schools.[86]

Some homeopaths welcomed enthusiastically these changes. 'No test of orthodoxy in medical practice should be applied to limit the freedom of consultations', declared Hahnemann Medical College Dean Pemberton Dudley. 'Medicine is a progressive science. Its history shows that what is heresy in one century may and probably will be orthodoxy in the next.'[87] However, others viewed the restructuring of professional relations with more

scepticism. 'It is the old invitation of the spider to the fly', wrote one man in 1882, and others pointed to the role of New York specialists who had the most to gain from consulting with homeopaths who had wealthy patients.[88] Similarly, in a hoax on the code published in the *Hahnemannian Monthly*, a regular student receives full marks from the examiner for arguing that regulars should sit on a board of health with a homeopath, and, under certain circumstances, even consult: 'If the patient be some poor, unknown wretch, the code remains in full force. But if he be distinguished and wealthy, we should not hesitate to obtain all the honor and emolument we can from it, being careful, however, to state publicly that there really are no homeopaths nowadays, and that men only pretend to be such in order to make money out of it.'[89]

Some aspects of the new sciences seem to have been relatively easy to incorporate into homeopathy. While homeopaths before the Civil War had vacillated over the question of smallpox vaccination, the methods if not the theoretical implications of Listerism and the new serum therapies generated by Pasteur's and Koch's bacteriology were quickly integrated into homeopathic practice.[90] Lister, claimed one homeopath, was 'the Hahnemann of surgery.'[91] 'Believers in homeopathy need not approach the study of bacteriology with the slightest fear that it will destroy the well-grounded temple into which they have built their hopes and allied their destinies', another physician assured members of the Organon Club of Chester, Pennsylvania, in 1892.[92] The use of antisepsis could be clearly linked to Hahnemann's call for physicians to prevent disease, and many saw serums and vaccines as an expression of homeopathic law.[93] The lay public's support of germ-killing policies also played a role in urging physicians to ignore sectarian differences. In 1887 Philadelphia homeopath Frank Betts praised Hahnemann Hospital where 'the necessity for disinfection is recognized.' Other than relying on Hahnemann's law to treat disease, 'in all things else our hospitals are conducted as other hospitals', he explained, for such institutions need 'liberal aid from the charitably disposed citizens of this city; and *they* should know that in the matter of care and sanitation they compare favorably with the best.'[94]

Integrating the concepts of pathology and experimental physiology, however, raised more serious epistemological problems. Homeopaths' traditional reliance on symptoms – as described by the patient and seen on the patient's body by the physician – suggested a different way of understanding pathological disorder than did laboratory-oriented medicine. Initially, the work of French clinicians and German researchers were praised in homeopathic journals. 'Since we, all of us, take into account those

pathological states, which *we do see on the surface*', one homeopath had argued in 1868 praising recent advances in pathology and physiology, especially the work of Virchow, 'should we wantonly ignore those which *we do not see?*'[95] Yet by the 1880s the epistemological dangers were more clearly visible. If pathological changes lay beneath symptoms that could be seen and felt, what then was the nature of the patient's condition? What should the physician try to treat? In order to answer these questions in terms of the new sciences meant rethinking fundamentally the homeopathic understanding of disease and the homeopathic relationship between doctor and patient.

Homeopaths had traditionally framed the orthodox conception of disease in opposition to their own rejection of nosology and speculation, and their resolve to treat not for a theoretical category but only on the basis of visible individuated symptoms. Homeopathy had developed an odd combination of valuing empirical symptomatology for diagnosis and a systematised theory of therapeutics. Homeopathic professor William Goodno recognised that he was undermining this homeopathic ideal when he urged his students to embrace the new sciences, saying 'I repudiate the idea that disease is a mysterious something no one knows what, which acts, no one knows how, and that we simply see the results of disease.'[96] Even Hahnemann, Goodno claimed, 'in spite of all he said of individualizing', had believed in 'the *class value of drugs* – i.e. value of drugs in certain diseases', and had prescribed mercury for syphilis.[97] Hahnemann, agreed Charles Hempel in his text *The Science of Homeopathy*, 'repudiated pathological speculation; he did not repudiate Pathology.'[98] By the 1890s, a Chicago homeopath who suggested that it was neither possible nor necessary 'that all physicians should become experts with the microscope', was attacked by a colleague who replied that there was not a day in his life that he was not 'heartily ashamed' of his lack of knowledge of laboratory work. Scientific medicine, the latter made clear, did involve the homeopath in a new relationship to the patient: 'In these days we don't look at but into a patient. For correct diagnosis it is absolutely necessary to have laboratory knowledge.'[99]

Both regulars and homeopaths recognised significant changes in homeopathic practice. New Homeopaths admitted that their practice was often an eclectic mixture of orthodox and homeopathic therapies. In defending these changes, homeopathic reformers made traditionalists who remained suspicious of knowledge gained from pathology and bacteriology their new targets. 'Few may be the excursions from his favorite method made by the consistent homeopathist – but they must be made – and it is the stout denial of this that has led to much of the opposition we have met, and much

of the discredit which has been thrown upon our practice', declared Goodno.[100] Although 'never in the history of medicine and surgery has ... progress been so rapid', John E. James told graduates in 1897, yet homeopaths have 'scarcely kept abreast of the times in scientific accuracy and usefulness.'[101] A mixed audience at Boston University's homeopathic school was warned by Richard Hughes that 'there are some who think they are best following Hahnemann by shutting their eyes and ears to all that has been learned since his time.'[102] New Homeopaths complained that traditionalists were unable to contribute to the advance of medical science. Even the tone of homeopathic journal articles was attacked for 'smack[ing] more of a theologic fervor than of critical analysis.' 'Their very eloquence betrays their origin as being rather from the realms of emotion and sentiment then those of judgement and reason.'[103]

As a result of these changes in professional relationships, public image, education and practice, homeopaths in the 1880s and 1890s faced more urgently the problem of maintaining a distinctive identity. Adhering to Hahnemann's teaching was no longer seen as a transforming experience that called upon doctors to 'convert', to explain the workings of the body and the effects of drugs in ways that differed profoundly from orthodox theory. Reformist homeopaths agreed increasingly with regulars that most of the medical knowledge of the 1880s and 1890s could be taught properly by anyone, and that there was no special homeopathic understanding of pathology, physiology or chemistry.[104] Indeed, New Homeopaths tried to raise the standards of homeopathic education by integrating more fully the ideology of science medicine. In 1888, after a detailed comparison of the medical course of the University of Pennsylvania with that of his own school, the Hahnemann Medical College, Charles Mohr reflected 'how false the charge often made by bigoted allopaths that the students of our college are not taught general medicine.' 'The allopaths know very well', he argued, 'that the early teachers of homeopathy came directly from their own ranks; that the fundamental branches are not neglected, and that homeopaths of the present day are alive to all the modern advances in medicine.'[105] A year later, Edward Jackson, professor of ophthalmology at the orthodox Philadelphia Polyclinic, concluded after his study of Hahnemann Medical College that, apart from its homeopathic teaching in materia medica and therapies, the college should be considered a regular school.[106] However, this concession opened up homeopaths to the derision of orthodox proponents of scientific medicine. Regulars ridiculed homeopaths for seeking to keep the old faith and integrate the new sciences. In his 1910 *Report* Abraham Flexner mocked the efforts by homeopathic reformers who taught students

scientific medicine for their first two years, and at the beginning of their third year introduced them to the precepts of homeopathy. Such teaching 'produces a novel principle and requires that thenceforth the student must effect a compromise between science and revelation', Flexner argued. 'The ebbing vitality of homeopathic schools is a striking demonstration of the incompatibility of science and dogma ... One cannot simultaneously assert science and dogma; one cannot travel half the road under the former banner, in the hope of taking up the latter, too, at the middle of the march. Science, once embraced, will conquer the whole.'[107]

By the 1890s homeopathy, at least as understood by many New Homeopaths, had come to be presented as merely a useful therapeutic specialty. Even as homeopaths defined their system as an important addition to medicine, they knew that they had lost the fervour and confidence of an earlier age that had pitted a whole way of medical thinking against the orthodox profession. In a rather dispirited tone, John E. James told his students in 1897, 'You, gentlemen, have been taught a law of therapeutics which has its limitations, of course, but, in so far as it is applicable, is as true and sure as any other law of God which the human intellect has discovered and formulated for practical use.' Hahnemann's 'law of therapeutics', he continued, is a 'worthy specialty to which you should devote your lives.'[108] Reflecting this change, in 1899 the AIH altered its definition of a homeopathic physician to 'one who adds to his knowledge of medicine a special knowledge of Homeopathic therapeutics. All that pertains to medicine is his, by inheritance, by tradition, by right.'[109] The debate over what constituted a truly scientific physician led some homeopaths to reject the notion of sectarian identity. 'Among progressive allopathic physicians there is being exhibited a greater tendency to distrust their own teachings, and less prejudice with regard to ours', argued one Pennsylvania homeopath, suggesting that the by-laws of the Homeopathic Medical Society of Pennsylvania be changed so that the presidential address was no longer restricted to the subject 'The Progress of Homeopathy', as 'the restriction is calculated to confirm the idea that we are simply homeopaths, and not physicians.'[110]

Even those who promoted the latest in scientific advances recognised the potential dangers of this redefinition. At the same time as he urged the use of bacteriology, Frank Betts told students that homeopaths should keep separate their colleges, hospitals, dispensaries, and state bodies, for 'there is a necessity for a separate and distinct organization. The lion and the lamb might lie down together, but the lamb would be consumed and annihilated, except, as it furnished nutriment for the lion.'[111] Yet, it was not simply

professional distinctiveness that concerned homeopaths; it was the loss of their identity as healers. One man wrote to the *Hahnemannian Monthly* in 1891 praising the advances in medicine, but pointing out that there had been few in therapeutics. All this 'combined progress', he argued, 'will amount to nothing if we do not cure the sick. This is our mission, and for that only are we paid! To call oneself *scientific* sounds very nice, but our patients do not understand this class of talk.'[112] If homeopaths would only administer a drug which 'conforms to the totality of symptoms and is of sufficient potency to vibrate in harmony with the sick man', a Nebraska homeopath agreed some years later, then 'order in the house is restored. Just glue to the object glare of your microscope, so that every time you look at a germ you will see this fact first. The man himself must be doctored first, last, and all the time.'[113]

By the 1920s it was clear that the powerful image of the laboratory researcher had overpowered the notion of homeopathic physician as a healer.[114] The homeopathic sense of distinctive identity was weakened by the 1903 alteration in AMA policy allowing regulars to consult with all legally recognised doctors.[115] Homeopaths' experience during the Great War solidified a feeling of homeopathic fellowship, but introduced also a number of homeopaths to the techniques and ideas of orthodox medicine.[116] In addition, changes in medical education and career patterns, spurred by Abraham Flexner's 1910 report which had attacked devastatingly irregular schools as both inadequate and unscientific, furthered the decline in student enrolment. The number of homeopathic schools in the United States peaked in 1900 at twenty-two, around 15 percent of all medical schools; in 1920 there were only five, around 6 percent. The numbers and proportion of homeopathic graduates also fell from a high in 1903 of 420, around 7 percent of the nation's medical graduates, to ninety-seven by 1920, around 3 percent.[117]

Most important, however, was declining state and philanthropic support of homeopathic medicine. Just as many private colleges were starting to disappear, a number of state-funded universities began to withdraw support from their homeopathic faculties, as state politicians began to accept the argument that scientific medicine made sectarian conflict irrelevant. In the 1880s state legislatures had supported homeopathic schools in Massachusetts, Michigan, Iowa, Nebraska and Minnesota; by 1922 there were no longer any homeopathic university departments, and only two private colleges, in Philadelphia and in New York, remained.[118] These changes contributed also to the severe decline in women's medical enrolment, the final blow severing homeopathy from feminism.[119]

Furthermore, despite the growing importance of funding by foundations to orthodox schools, hospitals and laboratories, homeopaths were unable to turn John D. Rockefeller's personal support of homeopathy into public policy. Rockefeller's advisors dissuaded him from funding homeopathic research by assuring him that scientific medicine had 'rendered obsolete' the distinction between homeopathy and allopathy, and that the New York Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research made no distinction as to where the 'qualified men' it hired had been trained. The Institute, however, did not hire any homeopaths.[120]

In 1922 Clarence Bartlett, an eminent Philadelphia homeopath, announced sadly that in the previous year the homeopathic departments at the universities of Michigan and Ohio had closed. His defence of homeopathy had a new and quieter tone, reflecting calls in medical journals for less strident rhetoric.[121] As a separate school, Bartlett argued, homeopathy had done much in the past for the advancement of medical science, and it remained a 'school of therapeutic optimism', offering 'a therapeutic principle' opposed to the 'therapeutic pessimism' of too many current practitioners. But homeopathy, he argued, 'must be modernized to meet the requirements of the advancing medicine of the Twentieth Century.'[122] Bartlett's model for modernisation is telling. Homeopaths, he argued, must utilise 'all the medical sciences', and, therefore, needed well-endowed pharmacological laboratories attached to medical schools.[123] Although Bartlett reiterated the rhetoric of an earlier era by urging his colleagues to be 'practitioners of the healing art and not merely scientists or naturalists', this was only a nod to convention.[124] Even in his portrayal of the great laboratories that would help to establish homeopathy's scientific legitimacy, Bartlett grew defensive, reflecting the problem for homeopaths of stressing clinical skills in a laboratory age. The laboratories he envisaged, he suggested, would need not only pathologists and chemists but also 'clinicians of analytic minds.' 'Some would contend', he continued, 'that the latter will do more harm than good in the study of pharmacology, a fallacy surely, for there is no greater laboratory than that of clinical observation and experience.'[125]

Bartlett's vision of the New Homeopathy lacked the fervour and passion of earlier generations of homeopathic reformers. With the experience gained in the post-Flexnerian years, Bartlett and other older homeopaths recognised that the embrace of the new scientific medicine posed significant and distinctive problems for homeopaths. His speech exemplified the profound transformation in American homeopathic philosophy and self-definition by the 1920s, a vision of homeopaths not as

bedside healers but as part of an expansive laboratory-oriented Big Medicine that required significant state and philanthropic support, a vision that reflected a wider notion of professional identity in American society. Homeopaths, who had defined themselves as practitioners, concerned with identifying symptoms and the appropriate drugs, could no longer claim, as they had in the early and mid-nineteenth century, that homeopathic practice and theory were the most scientific and progressive; indeed, a new group of conservative homeopaths in the early twentieth century reclaimed proudly an older Romantic and spiritual medical tradition. Embracing the new authorities of European science – a movement that American homeopaths had begun as early as the 1860s – left many modern homeopaths unable to defend or even define clearly what was distinctive in homeopathy. Further, in their making of the New Homeopathy of the 1880s and 1890s, homeopathic reformers rejected increasingly the other important element of their nineteenth-century professional identity: the reformist and anti-orthodox legacy that had been a significant part of its popular appeal.

Until recently, most homeopaths had proudly stripped their system of its spiritualist, holistic, feminist and populist roots. Yet the appeal of homeopathy today in the United States seems to draw less on its status as a scientific alternative to orthodox medicine than on a new social identity drawn from the counterculture values of the 1960s and 1970s and New Age medicine of the past two decades. American homeopaths now find patients through natural food markets, holistic health magazines, and alternative book stores.[126] Homeopaths, thus, have remained self-conscious medical reformers continuing to carve out a distinctive identity.

Notes

1 John E. James, quoted in 'The Healing Art: Forty-Ninth Commencement of Hahnemann Medical College', *Public Ledger* (May [n.d.] [1897], in 'Scrapbook of Newspaper Clippings 1896–1906', 14, Hahnemann Collection, Archives and Special Collections, Allegheny University of the Health Sciences, Philadelphia. I am using the spelling 'homeopathy' throughout.

2 John H. Clarke *The Revolution in Medicine: Being the Seventh Hahnemannian Oration delivered October 5th 1886, at the London Homeopathic Hospital* (London & New York, 1886), p. 67. On the decline (although not abandonment) of heroic therapies during the 19th century, see Charles E. Rosenberg, 'The Practice of Medicine in New York A Century Ago', *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* (1967) 41, 223–253; and especially John Harley Warner, *The Therapeutic Perspective: Medical Practice, Knowledge, and Identity in America 1820–1885* (Cambridge MA, 1986).

3 On homeopaths on state boards of health and the ill-fated National Board of Health, see William G. Rothstein, *American Physicians in the 19th Century: From Sect to Science* (Baltimore, 1972), pp. 310–312. On the political influence of homeopaths in one state, see Elizabeth Barnaby Kenney, Susan Eyrich Lederer and Edmond P. Miniham, 'Sectarians and Scientists: Alternatives to Orthodox Medicine' in Ronald L. Numbers and Judith Walzer Leavitt (eds.), *Wisconsin Medicine: Historical Perspectives* (Madison, 1981), 51. On homeopaths on wards of city hospitals in Boston and Chicago, see Martin Kaufman, *Homeopathy in America: The Rise and Fall of a Medical Heresy* (Baltimore, 1971), pp. 63–68 & pp. 150–152.

4 In 1901 only four states (Alabama, North Carolina, South Carolina and Texas) had state examining boards consisting of only regulars; see Rothstein, *American Physicians*, pp. 307–308; see also Kaufman, *Homeopathy in America*, pp. 144–145. Homeopaths were denied access to the army medical corps during and after the Civil War, but were accepted during the 1898 Spanish–American War; see Kaufman, *Homeopathy in America*, p. 153.

5 For the major studies of homeopathy in the United States, see Kaufman, *Homeopathy in America*; Rothstein, *American Physicians*; Joseph F. Kett, *The Formation of the American Medical Profession: The Role of Institutions, 1780–1860* (New Haven, 1968); and Harris L. Coulter *Divided Legacy: The Conflict between Homeopathy and the American Medical Association*, 3 vols., especially vol. 3 *Science and Ethics in American Medicine 1800–1914* (Berkeley, 1973). One of homeopathy's greatest successes was having Hahnemann's pejorative term 'allopathy' widely adopted by anti-orthodox practitioners and their lay supporters throughout America; on this point, see Norman Gevitz, 'Perspectives on Unorthodox Medicine' in Norman Gevitz (ed.), *Other Healers: Unorthodox Medicine in America* (Baltimore, 1988), 18.

6 Stuart Close, *The Genius of Homeopathy: Lectures and Essays on Homeopathic Philosophy* (Philadelphia, 1924), Preface, n.p. For a brief study of these issues see Naomi Rogers, 'The Proper Place of Homeopathy: Hahnemann Medical College and Hospital in an Age of Scientific Medicine', *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* (April 1984) 108, 179–201.

7 See Gloria Moldow, *Women Doctors in Gilded-Age Washington: Race, Gender, and Professionalism* (Urbana, 1987); and John Harley Warner, 'Medical sectarianism, therapeutic conflict, and the shaping of orthodox professional identity in antebellum American medicine' in W.F. Bynum & Roy Porter (eds.), *Medical Fringe and Medical Orthodoxy, 1750–1850* (London, 1987), 234–260.

8 See Coulter, *Divided Legacy: Science and Ethics*, pp. 102–103.

9 See Kaufman, *Homeopathy in America*, pp. 113–124.

10 Preface to *Organon* (3rd edition, 1849), quoted in Rothstein, *American Physicians*, p. 164.

11 For a brief mention of homeopathic successes in the 1853 New Orleans yellow fever epidemic, see John Duffy, *Sword of Pestilence: The New Orleans Yellow Fever Epidemic of 1853* (Baton Rouge, 1966), pp. 162–163; and on the Homeopathic Yellow Fever Commission of 1878–1879, see John H. Ellis, *Yellow Fever and Public Health in the New South* (Lexington KY, 1992), p. 74. On battles between regulars and homeopaths on cholera in the 1840s and the 1860s see Rosenberg, *The Cholera Years*, p. 163 & p. 224; and on homeopathic success in dealing with cholera in 1849 leading to the founding of a medical college, see Kaufman, *Homeopathy in America*, p. 29.

12 Homeopath Frederick Humphreys, for example, sold fifteen million copies of his domestic homeopathic guide and one million of his domestic kit; Kaufman, 'Homeopathy in America: The Rise and Fall and Persistence of a Medical Heresy', in Gevitz (ed.), *Other Healers*, 101–102.

13 Thomas Lindley Bradford, 'Homeopathy in New York' in William Harvey King (ed.), *History of Homeopathy and its Institutes in America*, 4 vols. (New York, 1905), vol. 1, 112–113.

14 See John Harley Warner, The Selective Transport of Medical Knowledge: Antebellum American Physicians and Parisian Medical Therapeutics', *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* (1985) 59, 213–231; and John Harley Warner, 'Remembering Paris: Memory and the American Disciples of French Medicine in the Nineteenth Century', *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* (1991) 65, 301–325

15 On Andral, see Kaufman, *Homeopathy in America*, p. 39; and James H. Cassedy, *American Medicine and Statistical Thinking 1800–1860* (Cambridge MA, 1984), p. 134. For an attack of Andral see William H. Holcombe, *Why I Became a Homeopath* (New York & Philadelphia, 1877), pp. 11–12.

16 Cassedy, *Statistical Thinking*, pp. 125–127; Coulter, *Divided Legacy: Science and Ethics*, pp. 171–172.

17 Charles Mohr, 'Introductory Lecture: On the Occasion of the Opening of the Forty-First Annual Session of Lectures at the Hahnemann Medical College of Philadelphia', *The Medical Institute* (Oct. 1888) 3, 58. 'Physicians are too prone to depend on the labors and experiments of others for knowledge', ibid, 58.

18 Clarke, *The Revolution in Medicine*, p. 23. Hahnemann did not invent names or categories that embodied 'at the best only partial experiences.' He allowed a drug to 'write out its own character in the symptoms and changes it produced in his healthy body; he performed the simple clerical duty of writing, so to speak, to the drug's dictation', ibid, pp. 31–32.

19 Clarke, *Revolution in Medicine*, pp. 71–72.

20 See John Harley Warner, 'Science in Medicine', *Osiris* (1985) n.s. 1, 37–58.

21 Rothstein, *American Physicians*, pp. 237–288.

22 Debates over the place of science in homeopathy became more pointed as homeopathic medical schools, like regular ones, began to incorporate aspects of the new sciences, and advertise them to attract potential students. An 1886 advertisement for the Hahnemann Medical College of Philadelphia, for example, stressed not only its 'unsurpassed' anatomical museum and medical library, but also the 'unlimited clinical advantages' offered by the adjoining Hahnemann Hospital and the 'Microscopical Laboratory' where 'the student becomes familiar with the microscope ... and studies the tissues both normal and pathological', [Advertisement], 'The Hahnemann Medical College and Hospital of Philadelphia', *The Medical Institute* (Feb. 1886) 1, back page. See also Rogers, 'Proper Place of Homeopathy', 189–193.

23 See Coulter, *Divided Legacy: Science and Ethics*, chapter 6; and Kaufman, *Homeopathy in America*, pp. 113–124. On the splits in Philadelphia during the 1860s, see Rogers, 'Proper Place of Homeopathy', 181–182. In 1892 the Hahnemannians claimed that there were only 200 true homeopaths in the world; see Rothstein, *American Physicians*, p. 241.

24 Rothstein, *American Physicians*, pp. 239–244.

25 For explications of these issues in the case of hydropathy see Susan E. Cayleff, *Wash and Be Healed: The Water-Cure Movement and Women's Health* (Philadelphia, 1987); and Jane Donegan, *'Hydropathic Highway to Health': Women and Water-Cure in Antebellum America* (Westport, Conn, 1986). For a recent examination of a Seventh Day Adventist women's medical college, see Clark Davis, 'Called by God, Led by Men: Women Face the Masculinization of American Medicine at the College of Medical Evangelists, 1909–1922', *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* (1993) 67, 119–148. On the support by male eclectics of women, see Ronald L. Numbers, 'The Making of an Eclectic Physician: Joseph M. McElhinney and the Eclectic Medical Institute of Cincinnati', *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* (1973) 47, 160–162.

26 For a long list of eminent homeopathic supporters, see Coulter, *Divided Legacy: Science and Ethics*, p. 317 n 1.

27 'American Institute of Homeopathy: First Day [June 8 1869]', *Hahnemannian Monthly* (July 1869) 4, 487.

28 'American Institute of Homeopathy: Second Day [June 9 1869]', *Hahnemannian Monthly* (July 1869) 4, 498–499.

29 Moldow, *Gilded-Age Washington*, pp. 100–102.

30 James B. Wood, 'Annual Address', *Transactions of the Homeopathic Medical Society of Pennsylvania* (1867) quoted in Charles E. Rosenberg, *The Cholera Years: The United States in 1832, 1849, and 1866* (Chicago, 1987 [1962]), p. 224.

31 'American Institute of Homeopathy: The Dinner to the Institute [June 10 1869]', *Hahnemannian Monthly* (July 1869) 4, 503. This toast was responded to by the abolitionist William Lloyd Garrison.

32 These figures are based on a conversation with Barbara Williams, Consulting Archivist of the Hahnemann Collection. Whether debates over race led to splits between New England and Southern homeopaths is a topic historians have not yet explored.

33 Coulter, *Divided Legacy: Science and Ethics*, p. 110.

34 Even the notion of reform itself began to seem out of place: 'Revolt against an established order of things has a wonderful attraction for the ill-balanced and noisy members of society ... from the '70s to the present day, we have changed from infancy and adolescence to full maturity; from the period of storm and stress into the one of quiet', [Editorial], 'The Fourth Phase of Homeopathy', *North American Journal of Homeopathy* (May 1910) 3rd s. 25, 335–336.

35 Kett, *The Formation of the American Medical Profession*, p. 155 n. 41.

36 For a development of these arguments, see Naomi Rogers, 'Women and Sectarian Medicine' in Rima Apple (ed.), *Women, Health and Medicine in America: A Historical Handbook* (New York, 1990), 284–293; and Moldow, *Gilded-Age Washington*, pp. 135–136; and see the dissertation in process by Anne Kirschman, *Women Homeopathic Physicians in the United States 1850–1920*, (University of Rochester). For a broad examination of American women and medicine, see Regina Markell Morantz-Sanchez, *Sympathy and Science: Women Physicians in America Medicine* (New York, 1985).

37 By 1880 nine out of eleven homeopathic schools admitted women; William Barlow and David O. Powell, 'Homeopathy and Sexual Equality: The Controversy over Coeducation at Cincinnati's Pulte Medical College, 1873–1879', [1981] in Judith Walzer Leavitt (ed.), *Women and Health in America: Historical Readings* (Madison, 1984), 422. In 1891, out of thirteen schools, only two (Philadelphia and New York City) did not admit women; see W.E. Leonard, 'Homeopathic Medical Education', *Hahnemannian Monthly* (May 1891) 26, 293, Table 1.

38 Rothstein, *American Physicians*, pp. 300–301, n. 5.

39 In 1869 the editor of the *Hahnemannian Monthly* argued that the private homeopathic colleges for women in Cleveland and in New York were 'worthy of

the encouragement and support of the entire profession', 'Editorial Notes: Medical Colleges for Women', *Hahnemannian Monthly* (Oct. 1869) 4, 114.

40 Moldow, *Gilded-Age Washington*, pp. 78–79. Moldow estimates that 20% of homeopathic doctors between 1870 and 1900 in Washington were women; ibid, p. 12. See also *Transactions of the World's Homeopathic Convention, held at Philadelphia, under the auspices of the American Institute of Homeopathy, at its twenty-ninth session, June 26th, 27th, 28th, 29th, 30th, July 1st, 1876*, 2 vols., *History of Homeopathy*, vol. 2 (Philadelphia, 1880).

41 Reuban Ludlam, 'The Relation of Woman to Homeopathy', [editor's extracts] from 'American Institute of Homeopathy: First Day [June 8 1869]', *Hahnemannian Monthly* (July 1869) 4, 492–493. For the argument that women practitioners were important as testers of homeopathic drugs, see Carroll Dunham who, in a discussion on materia medica, mentioned 'a proving by a woman' dealing with uterine symptoms and argued that 'if women were admitted to the Institute, they will become very useful members by giving us symptoms that only could be developed in their sex', 'American Institute of Homeopathy: Second Day [June 9 1869]', *Hahnemannian Monthly* (July 1869) 4, 495.

42 Coulter argues that homeopathy may have first entered many American homes through the support of mothers 'who were favorably impressed by its treatment of children's diseases', Coulter, *Divided Legacy: Science and Ethics*, p. 114 & pp. 114–118.

43 Holcombe, *A Homeopath*, pp. 7–8.

44 Ludlam, 'The Relation of Woman to Homeopathy', 491. Ludlam argued that homeopathy had benefited from the tide of popular opinion against 'the pernicious habit of over-dosing and maltreating our female patients', ibid, 491.

45 Ludlam, 'The Relation of Woman to Homeopathy', 492, 492–493.

46 On deep divisions in one Cincinnati school in the 1870s, see Barlow and Powell, 'Homeopathy and Sexual Equality', 422–428. On divisions at the Western Homeopathic Medical College in Cleveland, where women were admitted in 1859, and then rejected from 1867 to 1870, see Bradford, 'Homeopathy in Ohio', in King, *History of Homeopathy*, pp. 22–26.

47 'American Institute of Homeopathy: The Dinner to the Institute [June 10 1869]', *Hahnemannian Monthly* (July 1869) 4, 493. The author was William Tod Helmuth, later an eminent surgeon at the New York Homeopathic Medical College, Rothstein, *American Physicians*, p. 237.

48 'American Institute of Homeopathy: Third Day [June 10, 1869]', 'American Institute of Homeopathy: Fourth Day [June 11, 1869]', *Hahnemannian Monthly* (July 1869) 4, 510, 505–506. See, for example, Mercy B. Jackson, 'A Plea: For the Admission of Women to the Medical Colleges and Institutes of America', *Hahnemannian Monthly* (August 1867) 3, 21–25; and Millie Chapman, 'Women in Medicine', *Hahnemannian Monthly* (March 1892) 27, 150–155. See also

Kaufman, *Homeopathy in America*, p. 77. For a more positive interpretation of AIH policy, see Coulter, *Divided Legacy: Science and Ethics*, pp. 114–116.

49 [anon] 'Why Women Can Never Become Successful Practitioners of Medicine', *The Medical Institute* (Feb. 1886) 1, 36–37.

50 Barlow and Powell argue that education at the University of Michigan, for example, was segregated in all subjects other than chemistry, and that there was little integrated homeopathic education at all during this period; 'Homeopathy and Sexual Equality', 423. At the co-educational Boston school students were organised into sex-segregated medical societies, the male 'Hahnemann Society' and the female 'Gregory Society'. Only the members of the former could send delegates to the annual state-wide student meeting, and, although Boston women students applied for admission, the Hahnemann Society was closed to them until 1896; see Mary Roth Walsh, *Doctors Wanted No Women Need Apply: Sexual Barriers in the Medical Profession, 1835–1975* (New Haven, 1977), pp. 195–197.

51 Chapman, 'Women in Medicine', 155.

52 On 'the mild and gentle measures of Homeopathy' compared to the 'painful and debilitating expedients of our present system', see *The Christian Examiner (Boston)* (1842) quoted in Kaufman, *Homeopathy in America*, p. 41. On similarly gendered implications of attitudes to pain and suffering in nineteenth-century America medicine, see Martin Pernick, *A Calculus of Suffering: Pain, Anesthesia, and Utilitarian Professionalism in Nineteenth-Century American Medicine* (New York, 1985).

53 Clarke, *Revolution in Medicine*, p. 61. For a claim that the demonstration of homeopathy's superiority during the cholera epidemic of 1832 had attracted such popular and professional attention that it 'alarmed and disconcerted certain of its opponents and aroused their fiercest opposition and prejudice', see Pemberton Dudley, 'Medical Ethics and Codes', *The Medical Institute* (Feb. 1888) 3, 18. On homeopathy and epidemics, see Coulter, *Divided Legacy: Science and Ethics*, pp. 298–303.

54 Special Staff Meeting, February 25 1910, '[Hahnemann] Hospital Staff Minute-book 1896–1906', Hahnemann Collection. Their colleague John E. James had just died.

55 'Homeopathy has taught us a lesson of the healing faculty of Nature which was needed', Holmes wrote in 1861; quoted in Rothstein, *American Physicians*, p. 166. For the regular argument that homeopaths used placebos, see Oliver Wendell Holmes, *Homeopathy and Its Kindred Delusions* (1842), discussed in Kaufman, *Homeopathy in America*, pp. 39–40. The concept of homeopathic therapies as 'nihilist' has been uncritically accepted by a number of historians.

56 Mohr, 'Introductory Lecture', 56.

57 Dan King, *Quackery Unmasked* (1858) quoted in Sarah Stage, *Female Complaints: Lydia Pinkham and the Business of Women's Medicine* (New York, 1979), p. 58. See also the doggerel with the lines 'If it be good in all complaints to take a dose so

small / It surely must be better still, to take no dose at all', *United States Magazine and Democratic Review* (1848) quoted in Kaufman, *Homeopathy in America*, p. 30. In private, however, homeopaths recognised the usefulness of placebos. In 1892 the medical staff of Hahnemann Hospital in Philadelphia urged resident physicians 'when no treatment is urgently required' to 'administer a placebo or apply temporary dressing[s] until the arrival of visiting physician or surgeon'; staff meeting, April 1 1892, '[Hahnemann] Hospital Staff Minute-book 1896–1906.'

58 William H. Holcombe, *What is Homeopathy: A New Exposition of a Great Truth* (New Orleans, 1864), p. 29.

59 Ronald Numbers has pointed out that by this time many of these works offered less comprehensive instructions, and focused only on emergency care and minor illnesses; see Ronald L. Numbers, 'Do-It-Yourself the Sectarian Way', in Guenter Risse, Ronald L. Numbers and Judith Walzer Leavitt (eds.), *Medicine Without Doctors: Home Health Care in American History* (New York, 1977), 67. Compare, however, an advertisement in *The Medical Institute Advertiser* (Oct. 1886) 1, 18 for Dr. J. Bryant's *A Pocket Manual, or Repertory of Homeopathic Medicine. Alphabetically and Nosologically arranged, which may be used as the Physician's 'vade-mecum', the Traveler's Medical Companion, or the Family Physician. Compiled from the best Homeopathic authorities. Third edition. 352 pages. 18mo. Cloth.* On the important role of patients in promoting homeopathy in Germany, see Renate Wittern, 'The Origins of Homeopathy in Germany', *Clio Medica* (1991) 22, 58–59.

60 We have little concrete analysis of homeopathic practice. For one descriptive example, see a reference to Constantine Hering's method of prescription. Hering gave patients powders in envelopes, five of them 'saccharum lactus' and one envelope with a star containing a powder that the patient was to dissolve in water in a teaspoon four times a day; Arthur Eastman, *Life and Reminiscences of Dr. Constantine Hering* (Philadelphia: By Family for Private Circulation, [originally published in the *Hahnemannian Monthly*] 1917), 21.

61 Note that homeopathy has been described consistently as appealing primarily to the urban middle-class, but we lack detailed quantitative studies. On the role of middle and upper class patients and the affluence of homeopaths, see Coulter *Divided Legacy: Science and Ethics*, pp. 122–123 & 153–154.

62 Eastman, *Life and Reminiscences*, p. 14.

63 See Susan E. Lederer, *Subjected to Science: Human Experimentation in American before the Second World War* (Baltimore, 1995), especially chapter two.

64 Clarke, *Revolution in Medicine*, p. 81; Mohr, 'Introductory Address', 57–58.

65 Clarke, *Revolution in Medicine*, p. 48; and see his comment on students being introduced to animal torture in regular schools, ibid, p. 84.

66 'Editorial Department' [discussing a recent article in *Scribners*] 'Does Vivisection Pay?' *Hahnemannian Monthly* (Sept. 1880) n.s. 2, 559–560. For a discussion of the

wider social and medical concern around these issues, see Lederer, *Subjected to Science*.

67 'Societies and Current Events: Anti-Vivisection Society Exhibit', *North American Journal of Homeopathy* (April 1911) 3rd series 26, 46.

68 On the use of the term 'science' by eclectics, osteopaths, chiropractors and Christian Scientists, see Gevitz, 'Perspectives', 18–19.

69 As one Nebraska homeopath phrased it: 'nerve force, vital force, vibratory force, spiritual force, or whatever you may call it'; A.E. Collyer, 'Treatment of Puerperal Infection', *North American Journal of Homeopathy* (1912) 3rd s. 27, 290. On Hahnemann's view of symptoms as expression of the disruption of the body's vital force, see Wittern, 'The origins of homeopathy', 54. For examples of the regular attack on this concept, see Coulter, *Divided Legacy: Science and Ethics*, p. 161.

70 E.M. Howard, 'Outline of the History of Medicine: Abstracts from A Lecture Given before the Students of the Hahnemann Medical College of Philadelphia, September 26, 1888', *The Medical Institute* (Oct. 1888) 3, 64. 'Hahnemann was not the first physician to enunciate the doctrine of the similars, nor the first to suggest the proving of drugs on the healthy', Charles Mohr told his class in materia medica and therapeutics, referring to the work of Hippocrates, William Alexander and Albrecht von Haller; Mohr, 'Introductory Address', 56–57. On the remaking of Hahnemann see also Rogers, 'Proper Place of Homeopathy', 193–194.

71 Mohr, 'Introductory Address', 56. On Hahnemann as a 'great medical reformer', see Clarence Bartlett, 'Presidential Address', *Hahnemannian Monthly* (October 1922) 57, 579–580.

72 Augustus Korndoerfer, 'A Short Sketch of the Life-Work of Samuel Hahnemann', *Hahnemannian Monthly* (Sept. 1892) 27, 604–605. Hahnemann and his followers, Charles Mohr told his students in 1888, were 'hounded and ostracized ... simply because Hahnemann was a thinker, was imbued with a scientific spirit, developed a therapeutic principle long known, [and] dared speak the truth; Mohr, 'Introductory Address', 55.

73 See the flippant comment by a student: 'we have all read and re-read the homeopathic bible ('The Organon')'; [Editorial], *The Medical Institute* (Oct. 1886) 2, 66. As early as 1852 William H. Holcombe claimed he 'was so dissatisfied with the loose statements, the hasty inferences, and the dogmatism' of Hahnemann's *Organon* that he never finished it; William H. Holcombe, *The Scientific Basis of Homeopathy* (1852) quoted in Kaufman, *Homeopathy in America*, p. 114.

74 E.W. Berridge, 'How Can We Best Advance Homeopathy: American Institute Session', *Hahnemannian Monthly* (July 1880) n.s. 2, 394. 'So many say it is full of Hahnemann's theories. Leave out the theories then; Hahnemann merely gave them for what they were worth, as the best explanation he could give of certain facts'; ibid, 394. See the following discussion where delegates were not happy with this speech; 'American Institute Session: Third Day', *Hahnemannian Monthly* (July 1880) n.s. 3, 400–402. For the argument that 'Hahnemann at least knew what he

was striving to get away from, though he may have but dimly guessed whither his new path was leading'; see T.P. Wilson, 'The American Institute Session', *Hahnemannian Monthly* (July 1880) n.s. 2, 386.

75 Wilson, 'The American Institute Session', 387. 'What he did reject was the unscientific theories and the unmeaning jargon of those who assumed to teach pathology. What he especially rejected was the assumption that the tissue changes produced by disease was the disease itself, or was the thing to be treated by the intelligent physician;' ibid, 387. 'Were he with us to-day, he would heartily co-operate in all intelligent research tending toward the elucidation of facts pertaining to the tissue changes in disease;' Korndoerfer, 'A Short Sketch', 603.

76 [E.A.] F[arrington], 'New Publications [Review of Gonzalvo C. Smythe, *Medical Heresies Historically Considered* (1880)]', *Hahnemannian Monthly* (March 1881) n.s. 3, 181.

77 John Prentice Rand, '[Presidential Address:] Alumni Association: New York Homeopathic Medical College and Flower Hospital', *North American Journal of Homeopathy* (Oct. 1909) n.s. 24, 690

78 W.C. Goodno, 'The Practice of Medicine', *The Medical Institute* (Nov. 1887) 2, 82–83; Rogers, 'Proper Place of Homeopathy', 179. 'The flood of light which unfolding science has been pouring upon it with ever-increasing brightness, is only serving as a brilliant background for Hahnemannian law. The letters of that law are seen with increasing clearness, and the blur of uncertain doctrines surrounding it is gradually fading away' (his conclusion); ibid, 82–83. 'The Allopathic student who wraps himself in an imaginary cloak of science and assumes that Homeopaths are necessarily ignorant and unscientific, will sooner or later learn that there is nothing easier than to blunder, to commit a mistake' one student wrote in the 1880s; Editorial, 'To Beginners', *The Medical Institute* (Nov. 1888) 5, 93–94. 'The homeopathic student that believes in the theory of dynamization, diagnoses with discretion and prescribes carefully, although liable to err, will generally prove a successful practitioner ... irrespective of *creed*, the time has come when there should be a common coalescence for the protection of Medicine, as a science;' ibid, 93.

79 'Homeopathy is not sectarian medicine, even in the practice of those who are its acknowledged best exponents'; Goodno, 'Practice of Medicine', 77.

80 J.P. Dake, 'The Alumni – Past', *The Medical Institute* (Oct. 1886) 1, 87.

81 Howard, 'Outlines of the History of Medicine', 59. 'The old school claims great antiquity, and it certainly entitled to it as regards this spirit of dogmatic assumption. Medical liberty has had a much slower growth than either political or religious freedom'; ibid, 61.

82 See, for example, Samuel N. Watson, 'Practical Empiricism', *Hahnemannian Monthly* (July 1892) 27, 499. On changing practice see Philadelphia's Hahnemann Hospital, Hospital Staff Minute Book 1896–1916, Regular Meeting

January 7 1909, 101, for a reference to 'all drugs other than the ordinary homeopathic remedies'.

83 See, for example, the comments by the eminent regular pediatrician Abraham Jacobi, quoted in Rothstein, *American Physicians*, p. 302.

84 On the increasing importance of consultation as a way to guard against the raiding of patients by specialists, see Moldow, *Gilded-Age Washington*, pp. 96–97.

85 The New York society was condemned by the AMA and the AMA then expelled all delegates throughout the country who refused to sign a pledge to its 1847 code; see Kaufman, *Homeopathy in America*, pp. 48–62, 76–92, & 125–140; and Rothstein, *American Physicians*, pp. 170–174, 301–305, & 314–326. See also Donald E. Konald, *A History of American Medical Ethics 1847–1912* (Madison, 1962). On the broader social meaning of debates about the code see Barbara Gutmann Rosenkrantz, 'The Search for Professional Order in 19th Century American Medicine', [1984] in Leavitt and Numbers (eds.), *Sickness and Health in America*, 219–232; and see Warner, 'Ideals of Science and Their Discontents in Late Nineteenth-Century American Medicine', *Isis* (1991) 82, 454–478.

86 See Rothstein, *American Physicians*, p. 317; and Kaufman, *Homeopathy in America*, p. 146.

87 Dudley, 'Medical Ethics', 19. He believed that the AMA code had 'brought down upon it and its authors the ridicule and derision of intelligent people everywhere. It is doubtful if in all medical literature there can be found its parallel for deceit and craftiness. It is crowded full of tacit lies for the profession, and of deviltry and murder for the people'; ibid, 18.

88 *Hahnemannian Monthly* (1882) quoted in Kaufman, *Homeopathy in America*, p. 139; and see Rothstein, *American Physicians*, p. 303.

89 'Notes and Comments: The Final Examination', *Hahnemannian Monthly* (Aug. 1881) 3, 505–506.

90 Homeopaths' attitudes to smallpox vaccination remain largely unexplored, although they were clearly part of efforts to define themselves in relation to medical orthodoxy. Some homeopaths were openly antagonistic to smallpox vaccination. In the 1850s leading Southern homeopath William H. Holcombe organised a group of New Orleans lay citizens to defeat a compulsory vaccination ordinance; see Ellis, *Yellow Fever and Public Health*, p. 98; and see also the advertisement in *The Medical Institute Advertiser* (Oct. 1886) 1, 20 for Dr. George Winterburn's *The Value of Vaccination: A Non-Partisan Review of its History and Results*. But the arguments that irregulars were naturally against vaccination does not hold convincingly for homeopaths. Compare the claims by Martin Kaufman, 'The American antivaccinationists and their arguments', *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* (1967) 41, 463–478, to the view that anti-vaccination attracted a diverse group of physicians, including regulars, Judith Walzer Leavitt, 'Politics and Public Health: Smallpox in Milwaukee, 1894–1895', [1976] in Leavitt and Numbers (eds.), *Sickness and Health in America*, 372–382; and in particular the paper by

Eberhard Wolff in this volume. We lack a full study of the anti-vaccination movement in America.

91 Dr. McDonald, during discussion of the Bureau of Obstetrics at AIH annual meeting, *North American Journal of Homeopathy: Special Institute Issue* (June 1892), 6, 23. For examples of homeopaths' positive discussions of antisepsis and bacteriology, see Rothstein, *American Physicians*, pp. 259 & 278–279; and see S. Lilienthal, 'Hahnemann, Hering and Swan: Pasteur and Koch', *Hahnemannian Monthly* (Feb. 1891) 26, 91–93. For a discussion about the germs of cholera and yellow fever in which the only contention was over the methods of epidemic control, see 'The American Institute Session', *Hahnemannian Monthly* (July 1880) n.s. 2, 392. Note, however, that in 1891 only the Universities of Michigan and Minnesota required a course of bacteriology for graduation; Leonard, 'Homeopathic Medical Education', 293, Table 1.

92 D.P. Maddox [to the Organon Club of Chester, Pennsylvania], 'The Significance of Bacteriological Discoveries to the Homeopathic Method of Treatment', *Hahnemannian Monthly* (Feb. 1892) 27, 82. Maddox claimed that Pasteur had practiced the 'homeopathic treatment of anthrax', and praised his 'patient but brilliant, unconscious confirmation of the truth which Hahnemann promulgated', 89.

93 For other homeopathic analogies: 'To the homeopathic physicians it [vaccination] is another illustration clearly confirming the law enunciated by Hahnemann', M.O. Terry [Ithaca, New York], 'On the Relation of Inoculation to Homeopathy', *Hahnemannian Monthly* (March 1891) 26, 147; 'The great work now being done in ... vaccines, infection, immunity and serum therapy, is only proving the great truths of Homeopathy, and is gradually being acknowledged by the leading scientists and physicians today', Eastman, *Life and Reminiscences*, p. 24; and a reference to Pasteur's 'homeopathic treatment of anthrax', D.P. Maddox [Chester, Pennsylvania] 'The Significance of Bacteriological Discoveries to the Homeopathic Method of Treatment', *Hahnemannian Monthly* (Feb. 1892) 27, 89. On the resistance to bacteriology by homeopathic faculty at the University of Iowa, see Stow Persons, 'The Decline of Homeopathy – The University of Iowa, 1876–1919', *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* (1991) 65, 79–82; and for a debate over the use of asepsis in obstetrical practice, see George B. Peck, 'The Practical Relations to Homeopathists to the Germ-Theory', *Hahnemannian Monthly* (July 1892), 483–491.

94 B.F. Betts, 'Valedictory: Address to Graduating Class of the Hahnemann Medical College at the Thirty-Ninth Annual Commencement, April 7, 1887', *The Medical Institute* (March 1887) 2, 54–55. For a rejection of the argument that serum therapy was homeopathic, see Alfred Wanstall, 'Hahnemann's Law and Science', *North American Journal of Homeopathy* (Nov. 1909) 3rd series 24, 739–743.

95 Charles Heermann, 'The Value of Pathology', *Hahnemannian Monthly*, (Nov. 1868), 4, 171; and see J.H.P. Frost, 'The Study of Pathology', *Hahnemannian Monthly*, (Aug. 1886) 4, 39. Frost argued that works such as Virchow's 'being

strictly scientific, have in reality more in affinity with Homeopathy than with Allopathy' for 'between physiology, pathology and Homeopathy, there exists an intimate, profound and all-pervading connection.'

96 Goodno, 'Practice of Medicine', 82. 'Time was when the name of a disease was associated in the mind primarily with its symptoms;' Wanstall, 'Hahnemann's Law and Science', 749.

97 Goodno, 'Practice of Medicine', 80. Homeopathic practice was harmed by its traditional emphasis on symptomatology, he argued. 'Great errors have crept into our literature from this lack of knowledge of pathology and the general course of disease. Many of our older homeopathists especially, due to excessive zeal for a system, have devoted too much time to the study of drug symptomatology to the neglect of the study of the clinical history of disease'; ibid, 78.

98 Charles J. Hempel, *The Science of Homeopathy: or, A Critical and Synthetic Exposition of the Doctrines of the Homeopathic School* (New York, 1874), p. 71.

99 Joseph P. Cobb, 'The Province and Value of the Laboratory in the Medical Course', 'Homeopathy: Golden Anniversary of the Hahnemann College and Hospital', *Public Ledger* (May 12 1898) in 'Scrapbook', 10. Cobb [a professor at the Hahnemann Medical College of Chicago] was answered by C.E. Fisher, 'Homeopathy: Golden Anniversary' in 'Scrapbook', 10. On changing practice see the lecture notes distributed to Hahnemann Medical College's freshmen class in 1931 that make no mention of homeopathy; John. C Stolz 1935 [donor] 'Notes distributed to freshman class to be memorized. Most of the instruction gave notes – little collateral [sic] reading was expected or encouraged', Hahnemann Collection.

100 Goodno, 'Practice of Medicine', 78. 'The physician who dwells alone upon symptoms in his selection of drugs, ignoring the disease, the structural basis of the symptoms, is doomed to much hard work and disappointment'; ibid, 79. 'Symptoms are only of value to enable us to differentiate between several remedies known to correspond to a given pathology'; ibid, 81.

101 James, 'The Healing Art' in 'Scrapbook', 14.

102 Richard Hughes, *The Knowledge of the Physician: A Course of Lectures delivered at the Boston University School of Medicine, May, 1884* (Boston, 1884), p. 75.

103 Wanstall, 'Hahnemann's Law and Science', 754. 'Emotionalism and sentiment have no place in the art and science of medicine'; ibid, 753.

104 See, however, the protests by Iowa homeopaths at the proposal to abolish homeopathic teaching of these specialties; see Persons, 'University of Iowa' 85–86. In 1886 Philadelphia homeopathic students claimed that 'we are taught everything that any other college teaches, *plus* Homeopathy'; quoted in [Editorial], *The Medical Institute* (Oct. 1886) 2, 66. The editor added that 'nobody, not even the Faculty themselves ... is in a better position to give information as to *what is taught in a college than its students*.'

105 Mohr, 'Introductory Address', 54–55.

106 Edward Jackson, 'Against Sectarianism in Medicine', *Medical News* (1889) quoted in Kaufman, *Homeopathy in America*, p. 123. By the 1890s many homeopathic schools were using texts written by regulars; see Rothstein, *American Physicians*, p. 238 n 21; but compare Rogers, 'Proper Place of Homeopathy', on Hahnemann Medical College's continuing use of homeopathic works, 193.

107 Abraham Flexner, *Report on Medical Education in the United States and Canada* (New York, Bulletin 4, 1910), p. 157 & 161. In Flexner's familiar words, 'everything of proved value of homeopathy belongs of right to scientific medicine and is at this moment incorporated in it; nothing else has any footing at all, whether it be of allopathic or homeopathic lineage', pp. 161–162.

108 James in 'The Healing Art' in 'Scrapbook', 14. For a sceptical discussion of Behring's 1905 claim that his work drew on homeopathy, see Donald MacFarlan, 'Monthly Retrospect of Homeopathic Materia Medica and Therapeutics: Professor Von Behring's Acknowledgement of Homeopathy and Some of its Consequences', *Hahnemannian Monthly* (Sept. 1914) 49, 715–720.

109 'Minutes', *Transactions of the AIH* (1899) quoted by Rothstein, *American Physicians*, p. 245.

110 J.H. McClellard of Pittsburgh [abstract of address], 'Miscellaneous Contributions: Homeopathic Medical Society of Pennsylvania: Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual Session', *Hahnemannian Monthly* (Oct. 1881) 3, 601.

111 Betts, 'Valedictory', 53.

112 E. Fornias [letter to editor], *Hahnemannian Monthly* (Oct 1891), 723. The 'anxious sufferer' is little helped by 'how apt we are as chemists or microscopists or physiologists or sanitarians if we cannot eradicate the malady that destroys his comfort and threatens his life', Peck, 'Homeopathists to the Germ-Theory', 491.

113 Collyer, 'Treatment of Puerperal Infection', 290.

114 For another lamb analogy see: 'It is only a fool of a lamb that will lie down beside the lion without first securing proper guarantees that the lion is going to behave himself; and all past history shows that our allopathic lion is not a beast to be trusted'; 'Editorial Department: The Main Question', *Hahnemannian Monthly* (May 1880) 2, 310.

115 This change reflected in part the separation of professional identity from practice. In its new code the AMA attacked sectarianism which 'is inconsistent with the principle of medical science and it is incompatible with honorable standing in the profession as based on an exclusive dogma or a sectarian system'; 'Report on the Committee on Medical Ethics', *JAMA* (1903) quoted in Rothstein, *American Physicians*, p. 321; see also Kaufman, *Homeopathy in America*, pp. 153–155.

116 See Frederick M. Dearborn (ed.), *American Homeopathy in the World War* (Chicago, 1923). This under-studied work shows that there were a number of army units organised around homeopathic hospitals, including the Massachusetts Homeopathic Hospital, and New York's Flower Hospital and Metropolitan Hospital. 1,862 homeopaths were commissioned.

117 These calculations are based on statistics in Rothstein, *American Physicians*, Table XV.1, p. 287. In 1898 homeopathy had 20 medical schools, 9 national societies, 66 general hospitals and 74 specialty hospitals, 31 medical journals, for around 10,000 homeopaths; see Rothstein, *American Physicians*, p. 236.

118 See Rothstein, *American Physicians*, pp. 237–238. In 1909 the University of Minnesota homeopathic department was abolished, although homeopathic electives continued; in 1914 the Pulte Medical College closed; in 1915 Hahnemann College of the Pacific merged with the University of California Medical School of San Francisco; and in 1918 Boston University became a regular school; see Kaufman, *Homeopathy in America*, pp. 170–172. In 1936 New York Homeopathic Medical College dropped the term 'homeopathic'. In the late 1940s Hahnemann Medical College stopped awarding its Doctor of Homeopathic Medicine and in the 1950s abolished its course in homeopathic medicine; see Rothstein, *American Physicians*, p. 297. See also Parsons, 'The Decline of Homeopathy', 74–87.

119 See Moldow, *Gilded-Age Washington*, pp. 71–72. By 1910, the only private women's homeopathic school left was in New York; see Flexner, *Medical Education*, pp. 160 & 271.

120 Quoted in E. Richard Brown, *Rockefeller Medicine Men: Medicine and Capitalism in America* (Berkeley, 1980 [1979]), pp. 109–110; see also Coulter *Divided Legacy: Science and Ethics*, pp. 463–464 & 449–480.

121 See, for example, 'Notes and Comments', *North American Journal of Homeopathy* (May 1912) 3rd series 27, 313: 'He does not best serve the cause who talks much about the accomplishments of homeopathy, nor he who loudly denounces the adherents of non-homeopathic systems, but he who shows the value of homeopathy by steady, consistently good results attained by the use of homeopathy.'

122 Bartlett, 'Presidential Address', 579–580.

123 Bartlett, 'Presidential Address', 585.

124 Bartlett, 'Presidential Address', 580.

125 Bartlett, 'Presidential Address', 586.

126 See, for example, 'Homeopathy: Much Ado About Nothing', *Consumer Reports* (March 1994) 201–206.