

The Role of Laymen in the History of German Homeopathy

Dörte Staudt



THIS PAPER IS CONCERNED with a homeopathic association, *the Hahnemannia*, which, as a pure lay organisation in Württemberg, gained considerable importance during the last third of the nineteenth century. Not only was this organisation in the hands of its individual members, but soon it became a type of model organisation for numerous other local organisations. Thereby, *the Hahnemannia* achieved a dominant position among the lay organisations in the German Empire.¹ The analysis of the development of *the Hahnemannia* and its work during the first decades of its existence will show that a considerable amount of the popularity that homeopathy had and still has today, is due to the lay organisations.²

The Founding of the Organisation and its Aims

DURING THE SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY, the question was discussed by a range of educated professional delegates 'whether the organisation – like before should work quietly or whether the organisation should start to work more in public [...] Furthermore, he (Government inspector Clausitzer, D.St.) was strongly in favour of the enrolment of doctors and pharmacists, supposed that they were friends of homeopathy, because it would be of great value for laymen, especially with regard to diagnosis, to have real professionals among them [...] The chairman emphasised that we will do more good for the case of homeopathy through practical experience than through public speeches.³ Thus, the most important aim of the lay

association, which at the time was in the process of being constituted and was to become the largest homeopathic association of laymen, within a few years. However, there was controversy about the means of achieving this status for a disagreement remained as to whether this aim should be achieved through practical instruction of the members or through public relations targetted at opponents. Furthermore, it was not made clear whether professional physicians should be involved or not.

The basis of the Association was a small group of homeopathic laymen, who had been meeting regularly since 1863 and on February 24, 1868 the official founding of the *Hahnemannia* and the first election of the board of directors took place.⁴ The membership of the first committee was composed of persons belonging to the educated classes and to higher social spheres with as its first chairman Count Cajetan von Bissingen-Rippenburg.⁵ The Association had 116 members.⁶ Yet, only two years after the founding the Association was described as one of the two most important organisations of laymen, besides the homeopathic association of Annaberg/Sachsen.⁷ In 1871, the Association already had commission-members or agents in eighteen 'Oberämter' of Württemberg.⁸ Those members, with the help of medical literature lent free of charge, tried to achieve 'the further distribution and general knowledge of the homeopathic cure... In rural areas, we hope to achieve the same aim through our board members.'⁹ The Association published its own journal, the *Homöopathische Monatsblätter* from 1876, consisting of two parts: an editorial section, which was mainly concerned with medical questions, and various supplements, in which subjects of the Association could be voiced.¹⁰ The degree of professionalism in the Association's work rose steadily; thus in 1879, the factory owner August Zoeppritz was engaged as the Association's secretary at a monthly allowance of one hundred marks.¹¹ Twenty years after the founding, the Association had 3467 members (of which 2008 were free members, and 1459 were organised in local organisations). Furthermore, there were 363 subscribers to the Association's monthly publication.¹² By 1902, the number of members had risen to c.7000.¹³ In 1904 an agreement between the *Hahnemannia* and the *Homöopathischer Verein* (Association of Homeopathy) in Baden was reached allowing the mutual sending of representatives who were entitled to vote at the respective general assemblies. On this occasion, the *Hahnemannia* was included under the 'Homeopathic Association of the Kingdom of Württemberg.'¹⁴

Form and Contents of the Association's Work

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN *the Hahnemannia* and the individual local organisations, which came into existence after 1870, was that it did not merely devote its activities solely to the Association's own members.¹⁵ Instead, it considered public relations to be of great importance. In 1869, the report of the board of directors' activities stated that their main task was to send scientific works¹⁶ to allopathic physicians as well as to distribute a work entitled *Truth in Medicine* to teachers and to the clergy.¹⁷ During the war between France and Germany, *the Hahnemannia* was eagerly sending out booklets to physicians working in the sick bays. In these, dressing wounds according to methods recommended by homeopaths were described. These methods were also made public in advertisements.¹⁸ There were, of course, other means for the further education of members.¹⁹ In 1904, the Association's secretary Erich Haehl could look back to 300 speeches of that kind, which had taken place during the six years he had held his post.²⁰ Only a minority of these meetings were organised solely for the association; instead, their most important aim was 'to keep the interest of the newly founded branch associations in our work alive.'²¹

Nevertheless, the primary objective of *the Hahnemannia* was to become the advocate of the cause of homeopathy to the general public, to the representatives of allopathy, and to the official personnel and institutions. Thus, for example, the question of compulsory vaccination, established by law in Württemberg in 1875, was extensively debated. *The Hahnemannia* repeatedly sent petitions to the Royal Ministry for Internal Affairs on, for instance, the establishment of a chair in homeopathy and a demand for integration of the homeopathic method into the syllabus for medical schools.²² Most of the demands and inquiries were repeated over and over again and in various directions.²³ This problem – the appreciation of homeopathic methods and cures – is a central theme in *the Hahnemannia's* area of responsibility. Whether the examination of pharmacies, the work of experts in criminal proceedings,²⁴ or the setting up of a medical college of the Chamber of the State of Württemberg was in question – the inclusion of people trained in homeopathy was always demanded.²⁵ A further subject of concern was the request to allow homeopathic medicines to be freely distributed.²⁶

All these subjects were dealt with not only in the form of petitions to official institutions, but also were made known to the general public.²⁷ Its monthly journal was printed by the publishing house of the *Stuttgarter Neues Tageblatt* but cancelled this arrangement in 1883 after the editorial staff had

refused to publish further articles concerning 'compulsory vaccination.'²⁸ This action demonstrates clearly that *the Hahnemannia* did not behave as a mere petitioner but as a self-confident pressure group effectively putting into practice the few means of exercising power that were available to it. The relationship between *the Hahnemannia* and the *Stuttgarter Neues Tageblatt* was strained for a number of years. However, in 1895, a polemical discussion started in the newspaper, when *the Hahnemannia* attempted to publicise the success of homeopathic psychiatrists at the Boston Hospital for the Insane and thereby to attempt to reform German lunatic asylums.²⁹ In a request to the Württemberg Chamber of Deputies *the Hahnemannia* asked for an examination of 'facts claimed on the spot [...] and if the allegations should turn out to be true, to take appropriate steps in order to introduce homeopathic methods into lunatic asylums in Württemberg. In case it should turn out that homeopathic methods do not lead to superior results in American lunatic asylums, *the Hahnemannia* offers to pay the entire costs of the journey and furthermore offers 2500 Marks as a security under the condition that declared opponents of homeopathy should not be charged with the examination.'³⁰ The *Stuttgarter Neues Tageblatt*, however, took the view that *the Hahnemannia's* arguments were based on facts which could not be compared to each other: on the American side nursing homes were talked of, whereas in Württemberg the institutions in question took care of clearly incurable cases.³¹

The integrating and leading role of *the Hahnemannia* as the principal organisation for Württemberg can be seen in one of the central problems of homeopathic organisations: local organisations automatically turned to Stuttgart for advice in questions concerning the possession of medicines and their distribution.³² From 1892 there were on-going debates under the category 'prosecution of homeopathy' for the instructions concerning the distribution of medicines left considerable discretionary powers to respective judicial interpretations. Thus, even in the second court, previous judgements were frequently revised.

The revision sees the facts of the case in the circumstance that the accused had [...] given the right of disposal over medicines, which had been in his safe-keeping, to other people, that is, to members of his association. By these measures the aim of the law about the authoritarian control over the circulation of medicines could be achieved; thus, it would be rather difficult, if the division for criminal matters took the civilian notion of co-property [...] in the sense of the statute book into account. The court of appeal was unable to share this view of the prosecution; on the other hand, it can be concluded that, after the medicines had been transferred from the concession pharmacy in Leipzig into

the co-property [...] of all members of the association in Königsbach, a further 'leaving into the care of others' through the merely administrative action of the accused did no longer occur.³³

The custodians of the Association's pharmacies had always been uncertain about the legality of their actions, so *the Hahnemannia* did not only try to solve this matter through repeated petitions to official institutions but also by legal action. Thus, for example, in another judgement of the second court the accused was found guilty.³⁴ Zoeppritz asked the Association's legal adviser for a juridical examination of the question as to 'whether it was possible to circumvent the law, when every member deposits his own small box containing the smallest quantities of cures with the custodian of the pharmacy.'³⁵

At the same time the Association supported other local organisations not only verbally, but also financially in underwriting legal costs.³⁶ Director Puhlmann, chairman of the Central Pharmacy Willmar Schwabe in Leipzig, for example, criticised the Association for its energetic persistence, and urged it to act more calmly. 'Nothing can be achieved through newspaper articles, but only through sticking to objective appeals.'³⁷ It is evident why the possession of cures was a particularly problematic theme for the lay organisations when there was a powerful lobby on the side of the opponents such as the *Pharmazeutische Schutzverein*. It noted in a statement to the Royal Medical College that:

the builder Weberheinz from Tettwang had made it his business [...] to praise the homeopathic method as the only true one. At the same time this person disparages the character and achievements of allopathic physicians in a way which is not to be repeated here and tries systematically to discredit the pharmacies [...] The Pharmazeutische Schutzverein now takes the liberty to make a request to the medical college in order to preserve the legitimate interests of the pharmacists harmed in this way, to see to it that the establishment of such club pharmacies be prohibited without delay on the basis of the state order dating from January 1890, concerning the selling of cures and paragraph 367 Z3 of the R.St.G.B.³⁸

The state government of Württemberg reacted to this request by prohibiting the establishment of club pharmacies to the 'Oberamt' Esslingen on the grounds 'that this could lead to the destruction of the entire state established pharmacies, as the Royal Medical College had remarked quite rightly.'³⁹ In addition, the handing over of cures to the laymen of various organisations provided the best target for the opponents of homeopathy and numerous cases of outright denunciation were passed to *the Hahnemannia*.⁴⁰

The Hahnemannia and Other Associations – Rivalry instead of Co-operation?

THE HAHNEMANNIA EXPECTED SERVICE in return for its involvement. In its leading role towards the local organisations *the Hahnemannia* felt unchallenged. The staff of the *Homöopathische Monatsblätter* were under the supervision of an editor appointed and paid directly by the board of directors. Thus, the journal became a mouth-piece of *the Hahnemannia*. When, in 1889, the *Homeopathic Association of Canstatt* called a meeting of the whole country's laymen to discuss the founding of another union of lay organisations, the secretary of *the Hahnemannia* suggested that there should be an immediate cancellation of delivery of the *Homöopathische Monatsblätter* as a counter action.⁴¹ In Stuttgart the great distrust of the Central Pharmacy in Leipzig led, in 1892, to a request by a member of the board of directors for the complete publication of the lay organisations' names and their members. Zoeppritz replied, that Mr. Schwabe, chairman of the pharmacy wanted to find out the addresses of the organisations' chairmen and, thus, wanted to 'turn the organisations in question away from *the Hahnemannia*' by the sending of books 'and accordingly could diminish the sales of the 'Homöopathische Monatsblätter'.⁴² The Association's attitude towards other lay organisations was marked by surprising ignorance. In 1895, the board of directors decided 'neither to visit nor to mention in the *Homöopathische Monatsblätter* an international conference of homeopathic lay organisations.'⁴³ No reason was offered. Since 1896 a local organisation, Göppingen, had been calling for the foundation of a southern German association. The 'Purpose of the latter is to bring the local organisations closer together, in order to promote the common aims.'⁴⁴ Their attitude towards *the Hahnemannia* was stated at the first assembly: '[...] The ongoing isolation from the side of *the Hahnemannia* means that it is our duty, to come closer together in order to protect our interests. But if possible this should happen in accordance with *the Hahnemannia*. Since [...] it would be an ingratitude on our side, if we were failing to acknowledge the previous successes and achievements of *the Hahnemannia* and its leaders.'⁴⁵ *The Hahnemannia* decided not to oppose this new foundation on the condition, that 'the present association Hahnemannia, Stuttgart, [...] would become the leading branch of the organisation.'⁴⁶ However, in the following year lively debates took place in the meetings of the board of directors about the position of *the Hahnemannia* within the southern German association. In May 1897, just after the official founding (2nd of May, 1897), the entry was discussed again and the condition was imposed that the *Monatsblätter* was to

become the official organ.⁴⁷ Unfortunately, the entry never took place, because of various disagreements between the 'Verband' and the *Hahnemannia*.⁴⁸

The *Hahnemannia* and Politics

THE HAHNEMANNIA TOOK A STRONG PUBLIC STAND, but did it have a political point of view? Two aspects are remarkable here. On the one hand, the *Hahnemannia* never refer to other than homeopathic matters, actual political questions were never addressed. On the other hand, the *Hahnemannia* turned against the agitation of the Social Democrats even if this was being used in favour of the cause of homeopathy. In 1887 the board of directors decided to remove the Social Democrats from the list of members and to list only them as subscribers to the *Homöopathische Monatsblätter*.⁴⁹ In the following issue of the *Homöopathische Monatsblätter* the opinion was voiced that party politics should not be the concern of the Association, instead all political parties should be asked about their opinion regarding matters of general welfare.⁵⁰ There were many such general statements. Thus, before elections the readers were regularly called upon to 'examine' a candidate as to 'whether he, by any means, will further the cause of the abolition of the compulsory vaccination' and 'whether he pledged not to welcome further steps towards the restriction of homeopathy'.⁵¹ The bias against Social Democrats was evident for many years, without any explanation being given. Even the main precept, making the support of homeopathy a main criterion for decisions in elections, was completely left aside. On the contrary, the *Hahnemannia* tried to use its own disapproval of social democracy as a means of political pressure: 'to our great disappointment we see that social democracy here and there is trying to get hold of the fight for equality of homeopathy and allopathy in order to make profit out of it for its own purposes. It lies with the government to snatch this new means of agitation from the Social Democrats by measures which the friends of homeopathy have asked for so often.'⁵²

Consequently an undecided but, in principle, conservative political position of the *Hahnemannia* can be discerned. This assumption is supported by repeated addresses to the monarchs, yet, in concrete issues the Association showed itself surprisingly progressive. As early as 1882 the purchase of a brochure entitled *Über facultative Sterilität* – that is contraception – was recommended to physicians as 'the cure of a sore point in our social conditions'.⁵³ Even earlier, in 1876, the *Homöopathische Monatsblätter* published an enthusiastic report about the increasing number

of female students in the homeopathic colleges of America. 'It is [...] pleasant to see, how the opinion forces its way, that women as well as men can become physicians.'⁵⁴

Self-assessment of *the Hahnemannia*

EVEN THOUGH HOMEOPATHY, like bio-pharmacy, electro-homeopathy, and other non-regular methods were categorised as quackery by orthodox medicine⁵⁵, the term quackery was also used by its representatives to stigmatise others. In an article entitled *Who is a quack?*, August Zoeppritz wrote: 'Health insurances [...] will soon judge by their purses, that not the natural physician is a quack but very well the certified physician [...]. Is it not a reason to become suspicious, that all petitions concerning the prohibition of quackery do not originate from the circle of the 'cheated' public, but from the circle of physicians, threatened in their trade [...]'⁵⁶ Finance was emphasised often in connection with their own public image for the homeopathic method was praised as the 'simplest and cheapest' cure, let alone having the lower costs compared to allopathy.⁵⁷ However, as soon as the propaganda was directed towards the homeopathic public rather than outside observers, *the Hahnemannia* emphasised especially that the method could be handled easily, even by laymen. The editorial in the first issue of the *Homöopathische Monatsblätter* stated that part of the organisation's programme was 'to enable a layman for whom no homeopathic physician is available, to treat and cure himself and his family in the case of illness without causing heavy expenses.'⁵⁸

Laymen and Homeopathic Physicians

THE CONFLICT IMPLIED in the last quotation was to occupy *the Hahnemannia* for a long time to come. On the one hand, it was stated in the same editorial that physicians were not considered dispensable. On the other hand, it was a clearly defined aim to offer laymen equipment by means of which they were able to reach a certain degree of autarchy. An insight into the undecided attitude at the first General Assembly is given by the discussion as to whether it was more important 'to convert one doctor or twenty laymen'.⁵⁹ This discussion was inconclusive yet a speech in summary noted that: 'No sooner will we pin the laurel wreath on our chest, than every young physician is committed by the government to pass a homeopathic exam apart from the allopathic one. Only then we as homeopathic laymen can quit the scene with our minds at rest.'⁶⁰

However, in medical questions, the judgement of physicians was also

relied upon. Accordingly, in 1871 it was decided not to lead the opposition to vaccination, because even homeopathic physicians were divided amongst themselves.⁶¹ Medical competence was never doubted though to what extent physicians within the *Hahnemannia* were able to promote the interests of laymen was discussed. When August Zoeppritz stepped down as the editor of the *Homöopathische Monatsblätter*, a violent discussion ensued about his successor. Erich Haehl was proposed by Zoeppritz, and, because of his education he seemed to be suitable. Nevertheless, he was denied the position by some of the members because he was a physician.⁶² It was thought to be difficult for homeopathic physicians to judge the practice of laymen. When the homeopathic *Centralverein*, the professional counterpart to lay organisations, decided in 1877 to expel non-physicians, this was done against the will of its chairman, Dr. Goullon. In a vitriolic speech he pointed out the significance of the common 'opponent war-guidance'.⁶³ Two years later, in a speech celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of this *Centralverein* it was asked: 'What would our position as homeopathic physicians be like, if not countless trusting laymen clung to our principles, often even more devoted than we are [...] Where it is necessary to promote homeopathy in social life, laymen can do this with much more emphasis and success [...] the layman can speak out loud about the splendid cures [...] while we physicians are supposed to grace ourselves with modesty and silence [...]'⁶⁴ Like the *Hahnemannia* itself, the doctors' associations saw the main focus of laymen's work in public relations. Thus, there was no reason to fear any trespassing into each other's domain. Yet, actual lay-practice was commented upon in a not wholly negative way, 'because essentially it rose from the shortage of qualified professional physicians.'⁶⁵ It was agreed that homeopathic cures practised by laymen were to be preferred to the complete disappearance of this form of therapy. Nonetheless, in 1883, August Zoeppritz complained that the co-operation between laymen and physicians left a great deal to be desired.⁶⁶ There were, therefore, temporary discrepancies in the nature of the public relations of the *Hahnemannia*. One of their petitions to the Landtag of Württemberg (State Parliament), on the pharmacies of homeopathic associations, was opposed at a meeting of homeopathic physicians as it was 'undiplomatic and hopeless'. In addition, 'through well-meant but careless behaviour [...] the case of homeopathy was brought to harm especially in the eyes of the educated public. While the auditory was amused our good cause became the target of derision.'⁶⁷ Obermedizinalrath Sick remarked: 'Laymen we have to endure, because Hahnemann infected homeopathy with it.'⁶⁸ Yet, despite this derogatory statement homeopathic physicians generally supported lay-propaganda.

Peculiarities of *the Hahnemannia*: A Summary

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF *the Hahnemannia* differed from that of other southern German associations as the objective was not the actual practice of homeopathic methods, nor the practical instruction in diagnosis and therapy. It was activities directed at the public in the form of various publications and petitions which were to be the major part of the Association's work. *The Hahnemannia* rapidly gained a leading role within the homeopathic movement, through these measures and the further education of smaller local organisations. *The Hahnemannia* claimed its leading role and defended it against competitors, no matter from where they came. *The Hahnemannia* itself legitimised its autocratic rule, arguing that it had always wanted to achieve the good of homeopathy. Indeed, this prior aim of *the Hahnemannia* was evident in the Association's conduct as in the example of political orientation. Obviously, the Association's politics were not influenced by striving for power or promoting individual interests; in principle, the views of politicians on homeopathy were taken as guide lines for the recommendation of candidates.⁶⁹ The only exception can be seen in social democracy which may be explained by the positive basic attitude of leading members of *the Hahnemannia* towards the royal dynasty of Württemberg and by their specific middle class background. However, on various other points, the assumption of the Association's conservative stand cannot be confirmed as, for example, on the subjects of 'women' and 'endowment'

Work of the Lay Organisations and *the Hahnemannia*

IT CANNOT BE DENIED that *the Hahnemannia*, in particular, by having an integrative position for the local organisations, by its regularly published journals and by its astonishing persistence in dealing with official institutions increased considerably the degree of acceptance of the homeopathic method. This was welcomed by those physicians whose major interest was devoted to research and teaching. In addition, the group of physicians trained in homeopathic methods and well-disposed towards them was never large enough to act as an influential pressure group. Yet, the membership numbers of homeopathic lay organisations – even more so in smaller places – show that a potential for pressure existed which could not be neglected.⁷⁰ Even more important for the physicians was that laymen constituted their own clientele. Advertisement for or conversion to homeopathy was for their own good. Finally, it was easier for a great number of lay organisations to negotiate obstacles or to circumvent police regulations than it was for

medical staff who were subject to stricter legal control. Thus, the spread of homeopathy, as seen from today's point of view, was unthinkable without the powerful lobby of the lay organisations. The positive role of *the Hahnemannia*, an association that was the nerve-centre of most of the local organisations in Württemberg, therefore, can be emphasised with complete justification.

Notes

- 1 For this analysis, various sources of the *Hahnemannia*, consisting of reports, correspondence and different files, have been evaluated for the first time. Since September 1993, these sources have been kept in the archives of the Institute for the History of Medicine of the Robert Bosch Foundation. These records are considered to be of great value in the critical assessment of the Association's history. But as these minutes only record the results of the negotiations, the process of how the decisions were made is a matter of conjecture. Furthermore it is not known whether the correspondence, which has survived, is complete or not.
- 2 This cannot be said about the genesis of romantic medicine. The question of therapeutic effects is not dealt with here. See, for example, Dietrich von Engelhardt, 'Romantische Mediziner' in Dietrich von Engelhardt, Fritz Hartmann (eds.), *Klassiker der Medizin* (Munich, 1991), vol. 1, pp. 95–19, here p. 117f.
- 3 *ibid.*, p. 32. But the *Hahnemannia* was not accepted in the register of associations of the district court in Stuttgart before January 13, 1902, and then with newly formulated statutes dating from 1900. See Hom-arch, V 42, record books 1894–1904, Supplement.
- 4 Hom-arch., V 8, 1.
- 5 Members of this committee were also Baron Wilhelm König von Königshofen, two teachers, a chemist, a civil engineer, a factory owner, the secretary of a church council and a priest.
- 6 See *Homöopathische Monatsblätter* (hereafter quoted as *HM*), 14 (4/1889), 56, 'The History of the Development of Homeopathy in Württemberg'.
- 7 *Leipziger Populäre Zeitschrift* (hereafter quoted as *LPZ*), 1 (1/1870), 17.
- 8 The equivalent of English counties.
- 9 See, Hom-arch, *Hahnemannia*, V 8, 12.
- 10 It was the second journal of a type in which matters of laymen were especially pronounced. The *Leipziger Populäre Zeitung für Homöopathie* was first published in 1870.
- 11 Hom-arch., *Hahnemannia*, V 7, record books 1878–1893.
- 12 *ibid.*, record of March 5, 1879. All members received the journal without additional charge.
- 13 Hom-arch., *Hahnemannia*, V 42, record books, 1878–1904, 165.
- 14 Hom-arch, *Hahnemannia*, V 8, 17, record of the 36th General Assembly of the *Hahnemannia* on May 15, 1904.
- 15 The activities of smaller associations are shown, for example, in the existing records of the homeopathic organisations in Fellbach (1905–1945) and Laichingen (1910–1943). These activities were mainly hiking excursions to the countryside which took place once or twice a year, or lectures held by specialists in front of the

members. See Eberhard Wolff, *Gesundheitsverein und Medikalisierungsprozeß; Der Homöopathische Verein Heidenheim/Brenz zwischen 1886 und 1945* (Tübingen, 1989).

- 16 They distributed Eduard von Grauvogl, *Das homöopathische Ähnlichkeitsgesetz. Offenes Sendschreiben an Herrn Prof. Dr. Justus Frhr. v. Liebig* (Leipzig, 1861) and Hahnemannia (ed.), *Die Wahrheit in der Medizin. Eine populäre Darstellung aus Allopathie und Homöopathie nach ihren Heilprinzipien* (Stuttgart, 1870).
- 17 Hom.-arch., *Hahnemannia*, V 8, 7. Report of the board of directors' activities from February 24, 1869.
- 18 Ibid., handout from December 1870 as supplement.
- 19 An example of such a 'typical' meeting is that of February 23, 1879. On this occasion, a military physician held a lecture 'against vivisection as it is now practised in all universities'. Furthermore, Dr. med. Bilfinger from Hall spoke about diphtheria and August Zoenpritz talked about obligatory vaccinations. See Hom.-arch., *Hahnemannia*, V 7, record book 1878-93.
- 20 Hom.-arch., *Hahnemannia*, V 8, 17. See also Erich Haehl (ed.), *Richard Haehl: Zum Arzt berufen. Heilkunst der alten und neuen Welt im Lichte eines ärztlichen Lebens. Nach dem Manuskript von Dr. med. Erich Haehl* (Stuttgart & Leipzig, 1934).
- 21 HM 12 (1/1887), 1.
- 22 HM 3 (3/1887), 16.
- 23 With reference to the petition for the setting up of a chair, a circular letter to 'His Excellency, Herrn von Sawey, Minister of State for Culture and Education' followed even a decade later. 'Your Excellency surely will not permit that professors of the Protestant Theology in Tübingen will judge irreverently about the development of the Catholic Church and its head, the Pope and thus harm the reputation of the Catholic Church [...] an analogy to these instances takes place in Tübingen in the medical field, where the allopathic professor, Dr. Vierodt, sometimes lectures about homeopathy, and represents this cure, which is estimated by a great amount of the citizens of Württemberg, in a false light, of course, he does so only out of lack of experience.' Quoted in HM 13 (7/1888), 105.
- 24 Hom.-arch., *Hahnemannia*, V 12, 34; Letter of the Royal Ministry of Justice in Württemberg to August Zoenpritz from March 24, 1893. This letter is a direct response to Zoenpritz' petition, that 'the Ministry of Justice should arrange that in all criminal proceedings dealing with the assessment of homeopathic matters, a homeopathic physician should be consulted as expert.' The Ministry replied that the inclusion of experts was up to the decision of the judge in question.
- 25 Hom.-arch., *Hahnemannia*, V 7, record book 1878-1893, copy of a petition dating from November 21, 1892 to the 'medical college' of the Kingdom of Württemberg.
- 26 Hom.-arch., *Hahnemannia*, V 42, record books 1894-1904, 15; letter from Zoenpritz to the director of the Royal Medical College concerning a visit to this institution on July 6, 1894. 'Promemoria - Homeopathic concerns prior to the edict of the Royal Medical College from April 16 and 21, 1892. Homeopaths had acted in

accordance with the edict of the Ministry of Internal Affairs from February 16, 1872.' (This edict concerned the free selling of all homoeopathic medicines from the seventh potency onwards.) 'Following the State Edict dating from January 4, 1875, the Ministerial Edict of December 30, 1875 appeared, which superseded the edict of February 16, 1872. The postscript expressly excludes from the prohibition all those homoeopathic medicines between the first and the third decimal dilution, which include one of the components mentioned previously, which are not allowed to be circulated freely. On October 6, His Majesty, King Carl, died. Thus, Queen Olga, on whose advocacy the homeopaths could rely, was no longer the governing monarch. This could be noticed directly in the edict of the Royal Ministry for Internal Affairs of December 19, 1891. By this edict all allopathic surgeons were still permitted to possess six allopathic cures, whereas the few homeopathic surgeons still practising then, were reduced to all those means available at the time, which were completely inadequate.'

- 27 *ibid.*, 104, meeting of the board of directors on July 3, 1883.
- 28 In 1879, the *Hahnemannia* made the *Stuttgarter Neues Tageblatt* publish an article about the inadequate work of the vaccination commission installed by the German Association of Physicians, 'which had to examine all those cases where damages done to health were originated by vaccinations.' See Hom arch., *Hahnemannia*, V 7, record book 1878–1893, letter of December 31, 1879. This article was actually printed on January 13, 1880. Further articles followed during the next two years until in 1882 an official order and a notice of payment was issued against the *Stuttgarter Neues Tageblatt*. In September 1882, the *Hahnemannia* paid the fine under the condition that articles about this theme would be further published. Because of the editorial staff's refusal to agree, the *Hahnemannia* withdrew its printing order for the journal in 1883. This example makes clear to what extent the *Hahnemannia* opposed compulsory vaccinations.
- 29 Hom-arch., *Hahnemannia*, V 13, 5, negotiations of the Württemberg Chamber of Deputies on July 4, 1895, point 8. 'Debate about the Petition of the Committee for Matters of Internal Administration concerning the petition of the *Hahnemannia* about homeopathic psychiatrists', 1268–1273, printed matter.
- 30 *Ibid.*
- 31 *Stuttgarter Neues Tageblatt* – General-Anzeiger für Stuttgart und Württemberg from August 14, 1895, 2.
- 32 Hom-arch., *Hahnemannia*, V 11, 21–26, petitions of members from Kirchheim, Göppingen, Glatten and others concerning quantities and potencies allowed in the Association's pharmacies.
- 33 Hom-arch., *Hahnemannia*, V 13, 40, copy of the judgement in the criminal case against Heinrich Heidenreich from Königsbach, concerning the illegal selling of medicines from March 17, 1892.
- 34 Hom-arch., *Hahnemannia*, V 11, 80, copy of the judgement of the second court against Schlotterbeck from July 13, 1893.

- 35 Hom-arch., *Hahnemannia*, V 12, 48; letter from Zoeppritz to a Mr. Hausmann, advocate. Similar advice was already given in 1889 in the *Leipziger Populäre Zeitschrift* 'To the Homeopathic associations of Germany' concerning the associations in the East and Middle-East. See *LPZ für Homöopathie* 21/22 (1/1889), 17.
- 36 Hom-arch., *Hahnemannia*, V 42, record book 1894–1904, 166, meeting of the board of directors on October 22, 1902. At this meeting, it was decided that 'the associations should be instructed in the matter of the pharmacies, in order to avoid conflicts with official institutions.'
- 37 Hom-arch., *Hahnemannia*, V 12, 31, letter from February 10, 1893.
- 38 Hom-arch., *Hahnemannia*, V 11, 11, copy without date.
- 39 Hom-arch., *Hahnemannia*, V 11, 8, copy of a letter: The Royal Government of Württemberg to the Oberamt Esslingen from August 3, 1892.
- 40 For example, Hom arch., *Hahnemannia*, V 11, 53, letter from Schlotterbeck to Zoeppritz: 'Very distressing it is indeed, that Mr Schultheiss also turns out to be a 'country policeman.' He learned, probably from our teacher, that I had given cures out of my own pharmacy to a carpenter [...].'
- 41 Hom-arch., *Hahnemannia*, V 7, record book 1878–1893, note of December 2, 1889. 'Zoeppritz demanded, that the Canstatt association which almost entirely consists of Social Democrats [...].'
- 42 Hom-arch., *Hahnemannia*, V 7, record book 1878–1893, entry from February 24, 1892.
- 43 Hom arch., *Hahnemannia*, V 42, record book 1894–1904, 26, assembly of the board of directors on January 16, 1895.
- 44 *ibid.*, 65; General Assembly of May 1, 1896.
- 45 Hom.-arch., *Hahnemannia*, V 13, 23, record of the assembly of representatives of homeopathic organisations of Southern Germany which took place in Waldhorn, Plochingen, on March 15, 1896.
- 46 *Ibid.*
- 47 Hom.-arch., *Hahnemannia*, V 8, 15. General assembly of May 1, 1897.
- 48 For further information see: *HM* 24 (3/1899), supplement, 57–59.
- 49 Hom.-arch., *Hahnemannia*, V 7, record book 1878–1893. General assembly of March 14, 1887. In the same meeting the application of a member to hire another print house for the printing of their journal was denied, 'mainly for the reason that the 'Glaser'sche Druckerei' is at the command of the Social Democrats'.
- 50 *HM* 12 (4/1887), 53.
- 51 *HM* 16 (4/1881), 61. This course of action was also recommended at the meeting of the board of directors on December 17, 1894 and at the General Assembly in 1903. See Hom.-arch., *Hahnemannia*, V 42, 24 and 172.

- 52 Hom.-arch., *Hahnemannia*, V 7, record book 1878–1893, entry of June 28, 1892, copy of a petition to Dr.v.Schmid, Minister of State for Internal Affairs.
- 53 HM 7 (11/1882), 167.
- 54 HM 1 (1/1876), 35. This article is not the only one about women, it is followed regularly by positive reports about women in pharmacy and medicine. The fact that at German universities women were not allowed to study until the first decade of the 20th century gives evidence of the progressive view of the *Hahnemannia*. See Laetitia Boehm, 'Von den Anfängen des akademischen Frauenstudiums in Deutschland', *Historisches Jahrbuch* 77 (1958), 298–327, here 305.
- 55 Generallandesarchiv Karlsruhe, section 234–5461, draft of a a medical training programme on the entire subject of quackery of January 7, 1926.
- 56 HM 12 (12/1887), 124.
- 57 Hom.-arch., *Hahnemannia*, V 7, record book 1878–1893, Petition to Her Majesty, the Queen of Württemberg, April 13., 1880.
- 58 HM 1 (7/1876), 1.
- 59 Hom.-arch., *Hahnemannia*, V 8, 3, record of the General Assembly on February 24, 1869.
- 60 Ibid., 6. In this context note also the scholarships for medical students without sufficient funds, first granted in 1880. This foundation was to support and increase the homeopathic junior set.
- 61 Hom.-arch., *Hahnemannia*, V 8, 12. General Assembly on May 1, 1871.
- 62 Hom.-arch., *Hahnemannia*, V 8, 15. General Assembly on May 1, 1899. Finally he got the position.
- 63 HM 2 (12/1877), 144.
- 64 HM 4 (12/1879), 115.
- 65 HM 7 (5/1882), 57, 'About homeopathic lay-practice and the limits of its legitimacy'.
- 66 HM 8 (3/1883), 42. Record about the General Assembly of the *Hahnemannia* on February 24, 1883.
- 67 *Allgemeine Homöopathische Zeitung* 127 (21/22–1893), 161f, here 164. Copy of a speech by Obermedizinalrath Sick, held on October 25, 1893, which is followed by a record of the discussion.
- 68 Ibid.
- 69 This attitude didn't change within the following decades, not even in the year 1933, when the Nazis seized power in Germany. out of necessity the *Hahnemannia* submitted to the 'Gleichschaltung' ("forcing into line") of the health-associations in the *Deutscher Reichsbund für Homöopathie und Gesundheitspflege*. As its chairman Immanuel Wolf stated at an assembly on May 21, 1933: '[...] we have to come to terms with the changed situation [...] still the members of homeopathic associations hoped that national socialism would give the movement a new impetus. that is the

reason why Wolf continues: '[...] yes, we even have to welcome the new movement that has come upon the people of Germany and the new government it has given us; for it's going to make us, our homeopathic movement, play an important role within the health life of our people.' Hom.-arch, *Hahnemannia*, V 43. See also Alfred Haug, 'Für Homöopathie und Volk; Protokoll des Süddeutschen Verbandes für Homöopathie und Lebenspflege an der Schwelle zum 3. Reich', *Allgemeine Homöopathische Zeitung* 1986, 228–236.

- 70 In checking both homeopathic lay journals, the *HM* and the *LPZ*, until volume 1937 444 lay-organisations could be found. Even though the time of their first mention cannot be equated with the date of their founding it appears that they turned their interest to the reporting of lay affairs more and more. Even though the date of the founding could not be detected in every case the following statistics give an overview of the quoted organisations. 1870–79: 35; 1880–89: 38; 1890–99: 84; 1900–1909: 79; 1910–1919: 135; 1920ff: 73.

