

THE
Health Reformer.

OUR PHYSICIAN, NATURE: OBEY AND LIVE.

VOL. 4.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., OCTOBER, 1869.

NO. 4.

THE HEALTH REFORMER,
PUBLISHED MONTHLY AT

The Health Reform Institute,
Battle Creek, Mich.,

Under the Supervision of an Editorial Committee.

Terms: One Dollar per Year, invariably in Advance.
Address "Health Reformer," Battle Creek, Mich.

THE GOLDEN SIDE.

THERE is many a rest in the road of life,
If we would only stop to take it;
And many a tone from the better land,
If the querulous heart would make it.
To the sunny soul that is full of hope,
And whose beautiful trust ne'er faileth.
The grass is green, and the flowers are bright,
Though the winter storms prevaileth.

Better hope, though the clouds hang low,
And keep the eye still lifted;
For the sweet blue sky will soon peep through,
When the ominous clouds are rifted!
There was never a night without a day,
Nor an evening without a morning;
And the darkest hour, as the proverb goes,
Is the hour before the dawning.

There is many a gem in the path of life,
Which we pass in our idle pleasure,
That is richer far than the jeweled crown,
Or the miser's hoard of treasure.
It may be the love of a little child,
Or a mother's prayers to Heaven,
Or only a beggar's grateful thanks
For a cup of water given.

Better to weave in the web of life
A bright and golden filling,
And to do God's will with a ready heart,
And hands that are ready and willing,
Than to snap the delicate, minute threads
Of our curious lives asunder,
And then blame Heaven for the tangled ends,
And sit and grieve and wonder.

FRUITS, AND BOWEL COMPLAINTS.—Good
ripe fruits, taken only at meals, never induce
dangerous bowel complaints. Overeating
would cause colic or diarrhea, but not Asiatic
cholera, if nothing but pure food were eaten.

NEVER sport with pain or poverty.

The Human Temperaments.*

BY THOS. W. DEERING, M. D.

AS THIS subject is receiving considerable
attention of late in the various reform jour-
nals of Europe as well as in this country,
perhaps a few words concerning it, to the nu-
merous readers of the HEALTH REFORMER,
will not be amiss. If you imagine that I am
about to make a dissertation in advocacy of the
doctrine as generally advocated and taught by
temperamentologists, phrenologists and phys-
iognomists, allow me to at once disabuse your
minds of the idea. What I am about to say,
instead of approving and advocating such,
will be in refutation and denial, and in advo-
cacy of a theory directly contrary.

To this subject several writers attach a
great importance. They consider it the cor-
ner-stone, the alpha and omega of health
reform and all other reforms. That the study
and application of temperamentology is the
one great needful thing for this day and gen-
eration; that through it the world is to be
regenerated, and man enjoy health of body
and mind, is the aim of their several theses,
lectures, &c. They are not wrong when they
say that this subject is of great importance
to the generating of a finer organized race,
but I do affirm that they are vastly astray in
the placing of this subject ahead of all others.
I am of the opinion that they are totally
wrong in their teachings as relates to the
marital relation; the marrying of persons of
different or opposite temperaments. In this
view, I think, phrenology, general and sexual
physiology, historical and numerous other
published facts, and every day observations,
will sustain me.

The importance of the subject as regards
its bearing on the generating of more normal
men and women, or, more properly speaking,

*Extracts from the manuscript of a work on Soci-
ology, which I have in preparation.

children, is as nothing when compared with that of teaching the people how to eat, drink and dress, properly, and the true relation of man and woman. To me these are the first grand, necessary things for the world to know, and, knowing, to practise and live up to; to regenerate, advance, raise up in the scale of being; to generate man and advance all reform. These are the a b c's, the corner-stone, the only true, enduring, and lasting, basis for any and every reform. We cannot have any class of men, separately or collectively, healthy, as long as the bowels, kidneys, skin, &c., are torpid, clogged with effete matter; not only his own broken-down cell tissue, but that of beast, fowl, fish, and reptile, and the conglomerations and conjumbellations of scientific (?) modern cookery.

First make men and women healthy themselves. Teach them how to live normally, in accordance with Nature's unerring laws, before we inform them whether to marry this or that person. Get the masses healthy and they will think and act nearer aright on this, as on all other subjects. *Sana Mens in Corpore Sano*, is the finger-board indicating the great highway of progress. Whoever attempts to reach the goal by any other route will find himself or herself befogged at every step, and eventually have to come back and take the right track. We cannot end right if we start wrong.

Common sense alone should be sufficient to teach a man that, no matter however well mated he is temperamentally, if he is in a diseased condition he is unable to generate a healthy child. The good health or conditions of the opposite parent will not suffice to make a child healthy if generated from a diseased ovum and healthy sperm cell, or from a diseased sperm cell and a healthy ovum. In proportion to the health of both parents so will be the health of the child. I confess I am unable to see how the subject of temperaments is going to cause the generating of healthy children when the parents, one or both, are in a diseased condition. The one great law that pervades the whole organic world, holds good here as in the case of all other genus, species and classes—"Like produces like."

The subject of temperaments studied in its true light, and applied, would be productive of much good. Let us consider a few of the prominent features of the doctrine as now invariably advocated. But, by the way, they do not tell us what a temperament is, what it consists in or of. Powell, in his work on the subject, gives us no definition. Dr. Cowles, in all his writings, essays and discussions, on the subject, fails to tell us

And so of the other writers and advocates. If a certain diseased condition constitutes a temperament, then Powell is authority, for it must be patent to the mind of every intelligent, candid, unbiased, physiologist, that he deduces from, and takes for his starting point, diseased conditions and states. As regards the other writers, their views consist in a profusion of words, in common parlance, technical gibberish, jargon, bosh. Instead of making their classifications as simple as possible, as is, or should be, the aim of scientific men in all the various departments of science, they seem to take the opposite course, to lengthen it out as much as possible, having four times as much nomenclature as there is any need of. The classification adopted by Profs. Trall and Fowler seems to me to be the best extant, and, in nomenclature, the simplest, viz., Mental, Motive, and Vital; the Mental being that condition where the brain and cerebro-spinal nervous systems predominate over the framework (muscular and osseous systems) and viscera of the body; the Motive being that condition where the muscular and osseous systems predominate; the Vital being that condition where the organic nervous system and the viscera to which it is distributed being in predominance.

The person having the mental temperament would live in the realm of thought; like mental labor; and when compelled to do manual labor, do it on the nerve, and as a consequence, exhaust readily. One having the motive temperament would be adapted for, and take delight in, physical labor. The vital temperament person will like to take things easy; they will not care about protracted mental or physical labor. They are of the kind that let the world wag as it will. They take their ease, plenty to eat, and plenty of sleep.

Temperamentologists, phrenologists, &c., tell us that it is incestuous for two persons of the same temperament to marry; that there is not likely to be any offspring from the union; or that if there is, it will be of a scrofulous diathesis, &c. It never occurs to them that the begetting of children constitutes only one department of marriage. It may be right for some to marry, and wrong, very wrong, yes, a heinous crime, for them to beget children. In support of their affirmation they cite the case of Washington and Martha, and some few others. They tell us that the reason that the Father of his Country had no offspring was that Martha and himself were of the same temperament or classification of temperaments. They fail to tell us whether or no they were both anatomically perfect, or in

a pathological condition sexually, &c. Their conclusion is plausible, but science demands the veritable reason why, *the cause*.

If it is a law of the human constitution that marriage of the same temperaments is incestuous it must evidently hold good in all cases. Does it? By no means. I know several families in whom the parents are of the same temperament or classification of temperaments where incest or scrofulous progeny is not the result. I cite the case of Mr. and Mrs. P., of Bunker Hill, Ill., both of whom are classed as mental 5, motive 6, vital 4. They are the parents of five children, hale and hearty. Furthermore, they have children with each of the three temperaments in predominance. This case alone disproves the prevalent theory.

Why do we find children of the same parents of different temperaments? Because temperament is dependent upon the mental and physical ante-natal and natal conditions of the parents, *especially the natal condition of the mother*. Let the mother during gestation be engaged in mental pursuits, she develops that condition in the fetus. Let her be laboring physically and she will develop the motive temperament in her child. Let the conditions be favorable and she will develop the vital in her child. It is a universally acknowledged fact that the mental impressions of the mother affect the fetus. If so why does not the mother's physical condition during gestation also affect it? It does affect it, and the various results, mental and physical, are the several temperaments. I hold that parents can beget, and a mother give birth to, a child of any temperament that she desires. The temperament of the child depends more on the conditions of the mother during gestation than all else; although I must not be understood as ignoring the ante-natal conditions, for I am aware that they are of great effect.

To beget the highest type of a child there must be perfect at-one-ment or utter self-abnegation of both parties at the moment of conferring life. This I hold cannot be between parties of different temperaments. The more widely different they are, the greater the difference in this respect. This, of itself, appears to me to be sufficient to condemn the marrying of opposite temperaments. If at-one-ment is desirable, it can only be obtained by the union of the same temperament. The nearer alike, physically and mentally, husband and wife are, the better they are suited to each other sexually, and in all other places of life.

If there were less marrying of opposite

temperaments there would be less of the discontent now so rife in married life. I hold that the great mass of this discontent is attributable to this cause. To illustrate: A woman of a mental, is married to a man of the motive, temperament. Her amativeness will work more mentally than his; while his will demonstrate itself through the physical. Here we see inharmony of the very worst type. Their natures do not respond to each other. Her amativeness requires mental food, while his demands physical. This faculty acts differently in different temperaments. No man or woman should beget children unless they can fully appreciate each other. And to do this they must be mated, physically, mentally and spiritually. What kind of a companion, spiritually or mentally, for the man of scientific or literary pursuits, is a woman that lacks mental development? and *vice versa*? Many are the men and women who have been chained down in their field of labors, prevented from winning greater achievements, by being married to parties that were working in opposite directions. The man of conservative ideas is no companion for the woman of reform or radical ones, and *vice versa*.

In conclusion, I would say as relates to the marital relation, that health is the first thing desirable. Then a companion of the same temperament or classification of temperaments; the predominant temperament in both always the same. The companion should have as nearly as possible the same phrenological development. For I hold that marrying a person of small, to one of large, amativeness is a great, if not greater, fallacy, to say nothing of the misery entailed by such, than the marrying of opposite or different temperaments. Having these, and understanding the laws of life, health, and especially sex, also physiology, which all should be conversant with before entering the marital relation, you can have children of any temperament that is desirable, and have them healthy.

Notions from Latitude 45°.

LATITUDE 45° is delightful! The climate is beautiful, being of the temperature of "ice cream," is cold enough in winter and warm enough in summer. A good place to live in, and a tip top place to die in. Persons have been known to die here without the assistance of an M. D., though they had "stimulus" to "carry them through," I believe.

"Consistency is a jewel," though I never saw but one consistent person, and he con-

vinced me that he was by calling himself a fool. But an inconsistent person is one who lectures on temperance; has any quantity of tears to shed for tipplers, but not a tear for the person pickled in tobacco juice; is willing to show statistics proving that there is enough expended for intoxicating liquors every three years to pay the national debt, but helps swell up an amount for tea, coffee, and tobacco sufficient to pay it in one year. How economical! to say nothing of consistent. Logical conclusions are fully as bad as facts, but most people can dodge them.

People talk altogether too much for what they have to say. The masses think but little, and that is of the cutaneous kind—believe a thing because they heard their grandfather say so.

Reasoning by analogy—those chemists who think salt is necessary as food because it is found in the human body, as they say, would dislike, I think, to dine on horse shoes, and sup on shingle nails, because iron is found there also.

A No. 1 thing for foul stomach is "Hostetter's Bitters," but if that is not sufficient eat pork occasionally, fine flour bread, and doughnuts, spice, pepper, and vinegar, tea, coffee, and tobacco, and if this does not produce the desired result, "double the dose."

A good way to make water *impure*—add a bottle of "Green Mountain Renovator,"—a good way to make the blood *pure*, add a bottle of "Green Mountain Renovator!"

The most popular way to cure disease is to kill the patient—the most common way to kill or destroy pain is to kill the nerve that causes it. This is good medical orthodoxy, and if medical orthodoxy has its way much longer the human race itself will become suppressed.

There must be more faith in nature and less in drugs. The American race must pay more attention to the proper development of the whole man, or take the consequences.

Our scientific men realize, what the press begin to scatter, "that the American race are fast dying out," and what is true of America is, *always was and always will be true* of any nation that takes a similar course and ignores natural law.

M. L. PERRY.

East Dickinson, N. Y.

Shall We Eat Pork?

FROM the earliest times it has been known that in the bodies of man and other animals there are worms. They may be found in the intestines, in the lungs, in the liver, and in the stomach. It is only of late years that

the attention of the medical faculty has been particularly called to the pork, so freely eaten by thousands; but, by careful examination, it is seen that in the flesh of swine are to be found some of the most disgusting and hideous insects, called the *trichinæ*, which may be transferred to the human body by eating the flesh of the hog or pig.

The use of pork is one of the most common causes of blood impurities. It overloads the blood with carbonic acid gas, thus exerting a most pernicious influence on this vital fluid. Shall we eat pork, when we see the hog trying to satisfy its eternal cravings for food in every field or gutter? Shall such an article of diet as the hog, which is an inveterate gormandizer, which finds a lodgment in its capacious stomach for all the filth, and which not only eats filth, but wallows in filth, and is a mass of filth itself—shall such an article be placed upon our tables for us to consume?

The inflammatory effects and humoral properties which pork imparts to the blood, tend to germinate vermin in the system. Grub in the liver, kidneys, lungs, and other organs, not unfrequently have their origin in the use of this unwholesome article of food.

To a refined spectator, nothing could be more disgusting than to look at these bloated, besotted creatures. A few years since, in two villages in Germany, more than three hundred persons died from eating mealy pork, or the flesh of hogs affected by the *trichinæ*; and when sections of the muscles of those who died were examined under the microscope, they were found to be abounding with these worms.

We Americans, of all nations, are supposed to be the greatest flesh-eaters in the world; and it is not unlikely, nor unreasonable to believe, that there may be some connection between this assertion and the equally notorious one that we are the most unhealthy people in the world.

The use of flesh during the hot months is the cause of an untold amount of disease and misery. Putrefaction is promoted by heat; and as the change in meat is very rapid in warm weather, we cannot be too cautious in regard to partaking of flesh-meats. The process of putrefaction may commence in the stomach if too much is eaten when the body is in an abnormal condition, or if the digestive organs are not sufficiently strong and active.

Shall we eat pork, which is mainly composed of the worn-out materials of the animal? How can we be pure and healthy when thus our systems are impregnated with filth? Pork, when eaten, tends to fire the blood, derange the functions of the system, bring the

nerves up to a high state of excitement, and a precocious development of the sexual passion is produced.

It has been observed that nations who live on vegetable food differ in disposition from those which live chiefly on flesh. Those whose principal diet is flesh, appear, in general, to be more pugnacious. Had Nature intended that human beings should be made fighting animals, their finger-ends would have been ornamented with huge, unbending nails, and their jaws distended with savage tusks. To use flesh excessively is, therefore, sinful, and leads man to forget his present duty and his heavenly destiny, because it excites those lower faculties or animal passions which are so prone to prevent the exercise of reason, sociability and morality.

VALENTINE HAMMAN.

Why Swallow Poison?

THE apostle would have all Christians ready always to give to every one a reason for the hope within them. Were this good advice observed in all we do, our conduct would doubtless be less silly and hurtful. By such reason let us test the all-important question heading this article. Is there any good reason why, at any time, sick or well, we should swallow poison? In all systems, good or bad, there will be found one leading, governing principle. As the nature of this gives character to all issuing from it, or clustering about it, it is of the first importance in studying the system that we comprehend accurately this center principle. The fruit, as our Saviour teaches, will always be like the tree that bears it. As all concede that drugs, which are poisonous, should be given only to the sick, it is proper to inquire,

1. What is it to be sick? Disease comes neither by chance nor miracle, but by breaking the laws of health. As there can be no effect without a cause, and disease is an effect, as is intoxication, then it is manifestly caused. As well say that pure water intoxicates, as that pure living sickens. A fine watch never falls into disorder by chance: nor does the human system—a much grander specimen of fine mechanism—ever imbibe disease at random. As all disorders are in themselves abnormal and unnatural, so must they be induced by abnormal and unnatural conduct.

This leads to a more careful definition of disease, which the common reader is entreated to consider carefully before he rejects it. Dr. Trall says that "disease is vital action in relation to things abnormal"—"Vis medicatrix nature." So must all say who are learned

in the nature of animal economy. But what is vital action and things abnormal? Simply living action, touching wrong things; in other words, disease is a well-directed effort on the part of the body, to overcome injuries done it. It is a defensive action against an enemy—a happy, wise, benevolent effort to maintain its own well-being. Hence the general expression concurred in by most all doctors, that prescriptions should aim to assist nature to get well. Not indeed, as is too often supposed, to cure disease, but to cure the patient, or, more properly, to remove the cause of his disease. A wise effort to restore should never be doctored, nor by any means treated as a foe. It is always our best, and indeed, for the time being, dearest, friend.

Some months since, a young man applied to me to dry up two running sores on his neck. I said, No; they are the safety valves to avoid an explosion—the sewers to drain effete matter from your much-abused body. "Well then, doctor, what am I to do? always carry about these offensive sewers?" Yes, sir—so long as you continue to swallow the filth which they most kindly carry off. When told to change from an impure, to a pure, diet, and to cleanse his skin, and practice other needful hygienic reformations, he lapsed back into the old ways of darkness, filth, and death.

2. Once more, it must be borne in mind that the stomach is the laboratory of the whole body. It is a central, indispensable organ. Keep it in order, or, in other words, never abuse it, and its work is well done, and its healthful supplies in due time conveyed to repair and renew the whole system. Abuse the stomach, force it into disorder, and of course the entire body in all its parts must suffer. Hence bad food and overquantities of even that which is good, is more prolific of sickness than all other causes. We come next to inquire:

3. Can any good result from swallowing poisonous drugs, when sick or well? So many facts conspire to answer this query in the negative, that I am at a loss to select the best one to begin with. Adhering, however, to the center principle, with which we set out, let us begin with the stomach. No physiologist can find the first part or plan of this central organ pointing to any other design in its construction but that of digesting food for the nourishment of the body. As the use of articles is readily learned by their make-up and their workings, so can the design of the human stomach be certainly ascertained.

None too stupid to see that a watch was made to mark the hour, the foot to walk with,

the ear to hear with, and the eye to see with. No less certain can it be, upon examination, that the stomach is contrived exclusively to digest nutriment. How, then, can anything be gained by forcing on it that which is indigestible, and with which it can do nothing but to expel it as a foe? This is true of all emetics and physics. They are heaved up or purged out, because they are unfit to lie upon it to contaminate the body. The same is true of every drug, properly so called, that may be forced down the throat.

4. We say forced, because no natural taste ever welcomed a nauseating drug. As sentinels guard the army from dangerous attacks, so was our taste designed to guard the stomach and the body. Indeed, the mouth, with its fine set of nerves, is but the beginning of the great digestive apparatus. Whatever, therefore, is offensive to it, standing as it does at the head of the system, is offensive to the entire system as a whole. Hence it follows conclusively that no commodity if of a bad taste, or destitute of a good taste, should ever be allowed to pass the mouth, any more than the enemy, without the countersign, should be allowed to pass a sentinel. This fact clearly proves drugs unfit for the stomach, and always of injury to the body.

5. We say always, because a disordered body by no means so changes its nature as to require a change in the elements necessary to its well-being. Sickness never demands another kind of air to breathe, water to drink, or food to eat. A sick man lives, or ought to in a certain sense, precisely as does the well man. He breathes, drinks, eats, sleeps, and all the same way. Hence the old, absurd, allopathic idea, that when sick he needs a poison which when well would at once sicken him, ought no more to be entertained. It cannot be true, it must be false. It is the same as to say that a sick man ought to go from the pure, mountain air, to the malaria of the bottoms, or into a confined room, or to breathe through a liquid tinctured with unhealthy drugs, as is in many cases done for decaying lungs.

Can it be possible that a sick person should have air, water, or food, less pure than a well one? What can there be in the nature of any distemper which requires the body that it afflicts to be handled more roughly than if it were well? There can be no reason to doubt that all the administrations needful to health, are needful to restore to health when it is lost; nor that everything conducing to disorder a well person must conduce, even more dangerously, to increase the disorder of a sick person.

6. We come in the last place to consider the notion that one disease may be cast out with another. This is virtually the meaning of allopathy and homeopathy. All drugs, as they are foes to the stomach, beget disease. That is, being inorganic and dead, they cannot act upon it, nor upon any part of the body; but, in self-defense, the body acts upon them to expel them. This vital action in regard to things abnormal, is disease. Now, as the same process is already going on to right the wronged system, can anything be gained by obliging the already-injured body to double its work? On the boat, not long since, we saw a large man grapple a smaller one, and, while trying to hold him down, call for a second aggressor to aid him. All, at once, cried out, "Foul," and he was taken off. When, then, mince pie, or pickle, or radish, or lager beer, singly or combined, are found grappling with a poor sufferer, and he calls, as did the man on the boat, for help, must we put a worse poison on him, or in him? When in distress he calls for a fish, shall we give him a filthy serpent? How can it be that a mixture of drugs, with, as Shakspeare would express it, a "villainous smell" and taste, making at once a well person sick, can even conduce toward making a sick person well? The idea is too absurd to be entertained by any truth-loving, lucid mind.

One more fact as a logical inference with which to conclude: "By their fruits ye shall know them." Drugs do not cure. Patients taking them may not, indeed, always die, but sometimes recover in spite of them, as the poor man on the boat rose above the grasp of two antagonists. The candid admissions forced from many of the most learned drug doctors, are sufficient to put this assertion beyond all cavil. This journal has published some of these admissions, and, if convenient, I hope will repeat them again and again, that more of our fellow-beings may be saved from the death of drugs.

W. PERKINS.

Food.

HYGIENISTS, as well as the world's people, hold ideas as various as "all out of doors" in regard to the simple, yet all important matter, of food. Most live as their fathers and mothers did, while some eat that which "agrees with them," and a few believe in the "simplicity of the gospel," and seek the food adapted to their own nature.

We find as a fundamental principle, in studying nature (for nature is the only source of truth in this matter) that food for plants is *inorganic*, while that for animals is

organic, or that which has cell structure. Destroy this cell life, to any extent, and to that extent you render it food for plants and make it unfit for animals.

We write especially for the benefit of those hygienists who "see men as trees walking," but have not yet abandoned certain abominations, such as salt, sugar, butter and milk, on account of the gustatory pleasure derived from these articles, and because they are able to apply to their reason the stupefying process so effectually, that they do not seem so very objectionable.

SALT

never had cell life; therefore it is excluded from animal's food. We have never heard a hygienist advocate its use except on the plea of appetite. Some give it to the domestic animals because they learn to crave it. On the same principle we should give them old shoe leather, and let them drink from cess-pools, as some animals will crave those things. The subject of

SUGAR

has been pretty thoroughly ventilated in the REFORMER, but let us apply our principle again. No cell structure can be found in it; it is destroyed by the extracting process. When matter crystallizes it ceases to be organic

BUTTER

making is the second, and cream rising the first step in the disorganization of milk. In butter making the process is carried so far as to destroy all the nutritive quality of the milk, which is fit food only when first drawn. The process of disorganization speedily commences after it comes in contact with the air.

Dairy-women understand this, and arrange their milk rooms so as to give the milk as much air as possible.

These theories are abundantly corroborated by facts. Animals fed on butter or sugar have invariably died as soon as they ordinarily do when deprived of food.

"Magendie found that dogs fed exclusively on starch or sugar perished after a short time.

"Boussingault performed a similar experiment with a like result upon a duck which was kept upon an exclusive regimen of butter. At the end of three weeks it died of inanition." (*Dal'ou's Hum. Phys.*, p. 92.)

Many have given up the use of flesh, and use greater quantities of milk, sugar, &c., than before, thus "taking to themselves seven devils worse than the first."

The best health is produced by making other things equal, and eating nothing but food so prepared as not to diminish its nutritive value.

J. A. TENNEY, M. D.

West Cheshire, Conn.

Filthiness of the Flesh.

WE clip the following from the *Voice of the West*:

Bro. E. D. Kentfield writes from Brandon, Vt.:
 "Bro. Himes: I am glad to see you bring out the tobacco question. I do not see how any one can ask God to cleanse them from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit and perfect them in holiness, while they are polluting themselves with its use. Brethren and sisters, can you ask God's blessing on it as you use it? A gentleman of this place experienced religion this spring. He used tobacco, and had for thirty-five years. One morning as he arose from his knees, after family prayers, he thought of his tobacco. He took his box. Just then he happened to think, Can I ask God's blessing on this? It gave him such a shock that he came near falling, and he commenced to weep. He said it went over him like a shock of electricity. He took his box and all his tobacco and started on a run for his hog-sty, not daring to stop lest he should be tempted to take some. He is entirely cured; not the least hankering for it; is gaining strength, and has not felt so well for twenty-five years."

Now while we approve of the decision of "the gentleman" referred to, relative to the disuse of the "filthy weed," yet we think he needs a word of enlightenment as to another unclean creature that it seems he keeps on his premises. We refer to the inmates of the hog-sty. It seems he decided that the tobacco was too filthy a product for his own consumption, hence he ran for the hog-sty, and fed it to the hogs. We doubt whether they would eat the stuff, however; but the "gentleman's" course illustrates a point, viz., that what is not fit for any other use is good food for hogs. Then, in turn, the hogs are consumed by man, as good food for him. This is a mistake. Good, healthy flesh cannot be produced on any animal existing, only so far as it is brought into harmony with natural laws. Animals contract diseases from neglect and inattention to these laws, as well as man.

Our conviction is, that the hog, as fed and kept by people now-a-days, is about as filthy and unhealthy an animal as can be found. Scrofula is entailed on thousands by means of its use as food. Sore eyes, salt rheum, pimpled faces, and scabby diseases of all kinds, owe their origin, in many instances, to its use. It was a creature that God saw fit to prohibit to his chosen people as food, and we have no liking for it as food for the people of his choice to-day. We believe that they would preserve themselves from many fleshly ills and ailments if they would forego its use in any shape whatever.—*Herald of the Coming Kingdom*.

CLEANLINESS and godliness are twins.

The Health Reformer.

Battle Creek, Mich., October, 1869.

What is Disease?

THE editor of the *Western Rural* appreciates the health reform, sufficiently at least to copy into its column headed "Hygiene," an occasional article from the REFORMER. Its readers, however, as might be expected, are not all so appreciative; and once in a while some one takes exception to the positions advanced in the articles referred to.

A few weeks since, the *Rural* copied an article from our pages, entitled "The Prevention of Sickness," which one Dr. Axtell regards as pregnant with error; and as the root of the article is the statement that disease is a remedial process, he concludes to make his *ax tell* by laying it at the root of the tree, which he does as follows:

The essay under consideration contains some good advice; but with the wheat is much chaff, and it needs careful sifting.

After speaking of the prevailing opinions as to health and disease, it says: "The health reform explodes this absurdity by proving,

1. That disease is simply a remedial process, or the effort of nature to expel impurities, or remove obstructions from the system, and,
2. That all sickness proceeds from the violation of law."

We propose to look a little at proposition No. 1; for to let such absurdities go to the thoughtless and the young, is decidedly wrong.

To quote "That disease is simply a remedial process"—well, perhaps it is; but if, in our capacity as a medical man, we were called professionally to see one of these health reformers, the writer of said article for instance, we can imagine a conversation something like this: We will suppose he has had the fever and ague about four weeks:

Patient. "Well, doctor, you've got here at last, have you? Oh, dear! how my head aches."

Doctor. "Why, my man, why did you send for me? you are doing finely."

Patient. "Oh, doctor! don't joke with me. I never was so sick. Can't you give me something to stop these chills? Oh, my head! it seems as if it would burn up."

Doctor. "Why, man, you are doing well enough; this is a 'remedial process'—an effort of Nature to"—

Patient. "Hang Nature, and you too. I sent for you to break up this ague, and you come and insult me. I don't want your presence; you will oblige me by leaving the room."

Who will say the foregoing is an overdrawn picture? It is but an attempt to reduce the theory advanced in proposition No. 1 to practice; and theories that will not stand that test are valueless.

The fault in the doctor's illustration con-

sists in the fact that he has not "imagined" an imaginable case. What spoils his story is the fact that "one of these health reformers" knows better than to call a drug M. D., in a professional capacity; hence his imaginary conversation loses its force.

But does not the illustration prove that the fever and ague is not a remedial process? By no means. It simply shows that the ignorant doctor fails to appreciate the nature of the case; and, instead of supplying the conditions by the aid of which Nature can continue the work to a successful completion, and the patient recover without a drug disease fastened upon him, he administers his poisons to "stop these chills." This is further apparent from the doctor's question, which he asks in all seeming confidence:

If disease is a remedial process, why seek to check such a process?

This is exactly the question which health reformers have been constantly and persistently asking for years; and on this basis stands the opposition to drug medication. The fault we have to find with the doctors is, that they *do* seek to check the remedial processes of nature, and that they cure *disease*, but do not cure the patient; for, although the patient may cease to have the fever and ague, he has in his system the morbid matter which caused the disease, and the drugs he has taken into the bargain; and on the recurrence of unfavorable conditions, the chills again make their appearance, again to be "stopped" by doses of quinine, until the system becomes clogged with impurities, Nature refuses to do her work, and the patient dies, while "Providence," instead of the doctor and his drugs, gets the credit of his death.

But, after having fortified the "thoughtless and the young" against the "absurdities" of our positions, Dr. A. proceeds to give a lucid definition of disease, as follows:

What is disease? We know that the HEALTH REFORMER has erred; but can we give any better definition? We will give some of the definitions of men who have made the human system, both in health and disease, a life-long study.

Andral says, "Disease is any derangement whatever in the physical or vital laws which govern the economy."

Chomel says, "Disease is a notable alteration in the position or structure of parts in the exercise of one or more functions."

MM. Hardy and Behier define it to be "every modification of the economy occurring accidentally and out of the regular course of organic action."

Prof. Wood says, "Disease is a derangement of the organization, or of one or more of the functions of the body."

Now we submit it to the reader, whether these definitions are not as "clear as mud." And Dr. A. is evidently very much of the same mind; for, after having given the ideas of some of the best minds in the "profession," he attempts to improve the matter by giving a definition of his own:

Now, in substance, these different definitions are identical; with Andral and Wood it is derangement; with Chomel, alteration; with Hardy and Behier, modification; with Williams, change. But a derangement, alteration, modification, change, of what? Doubtless the pre-existing condition of health. Now it is clear that instead of giving the above ingenious definitions, it would be as clear, and fully as much to the purpose, to say, *Disease is a deviation from health.*

Astonishingly lucid! "Disease is a deviation from health"! But what is health? If, according to his authorities just quoted, disease is a "modification of the economy," which is "out of the regular course of organic action," health must be, by parity of reasoning, a condition of the economy in "the regular course of organic action;" or, in other words, health is a condition in which all the functions of the body are normal or physiological. "A deviation from health," therefore, must be a condition in which some of the functions of the body are not physiological, and therefore abnormal.

But how much nearer are we to an understanding of the disputed question? Not a whit. The veriest simpleton knows that when sick he is not in health! and that is all that Dr. A. has told us.

In his own article, however, he makes use of language which ought to have arrested his attention, and which might have enabled him to arrive at a correct solution of the question. He says:

The morbid material which enters the system, and causes disease, may be compared to the moon, which, by passing between the sun and the earth, causes an eclipse; darkness more or less intense follows; this may be compared to disease.

"The morbid material which enters the system causes disease." Now let us take this for a starting point. What is the morbid material? Not the disease, certainly, but the *cause* of the disease. And what is the disease? According to the definitions above, it is simply abnormal action. To simplify the statement, then, the morbid material enters the system, and causes an unusual and abnormal action. But what is the object of this abnormal action? It would seem reasonable to suppose that its object is to remove the morbid material which is the cause of the trouble; and inasmuch as Nature existed some time before the doctors were created, it

is fair to conclude that curative power was given to her, and not left to be supplied by blundering M. D's, who have cursed the world for centuries, with "systems" as contradictory and self-destroying as it is possible for human ingenuity to invent.

And now mark the consistency of the drug practice. It is found that morbid material in the system is causing disease, and straightway the doctor places some more morbid material in the system, in the shape of his poisonous drugs! The inconsistency of this course would be sufficient to prevent it were it not for the fact that the nature of disease is misunderstood. The disease—vital action to expel the impurities—is looked upon as an enemy, and efforts are made to silence it. As this is accomplished by the use of drugs, the end sought for is apparently reached, and the inconsistency of the practice is therefore lost sight of.

But, says the objector, the disease is cured, and what more can be asked for? Yes; the disease is cured; Nature has ceased the work of purification because overpowered by the administration of the poison; but the *patient is not cured*. The morbid material which caused the disease has not been removed, and, worse than that, Nature has been deterred from doing that very work of removing it; hence it is that so many persons are *cured* of one disease to "take on" another; and, as in the illustration quoted, the doctor gives the patient "something to stop these chills," with the assurance that he has secured him as an "ague patient" on the recurrence of every "bad spell of weather." Why shouldn't the doctors defend the drug practice?!

But, lastly, it may be urged that, if disease is a remedial process, the best thing we can do is to let it alone. Unquestionably this would be true, so far as "medicating" it is concerned; but when it is remembered that disease is often caused by a failure to supply the requisite conditions of health, as pure air, wholesome food, &c., it will be apparent that Nature frequently has to work against odds. Common sense would suggest, therefore, that the proper treatment of the sick consists simply in *regulating* the curative action of the vital forces by supplying the proper conditions. Or, to speak more simply, to cool the patient when hot, warm him when cold, to equalize the circulation, &c., and let Nature do the work to the best advantage, resting assured that poisonous drugs have no power to cure, but that, as admitted even by some of the most eminent M. D's of the drug school, *all curative virtue is inherent in the living system.*

W. C. G.

To Correspondents.

J. C. S. writes from Iowa :

Will you please prescribe for the following through the REFORMER: A child, six months old, naturally weakly, has been troubled, more or less, with its food curdling, and throwing it up. Has not commenced teething yet, but drools considerably. His bowels are quite irregular, and passages are green, slimy, and far between. He only nurses, but not very precise as to the time.

The nourishment furnished this child, in all probability, is not of the right kind. We would recommend that the child be fed, every four hours, with nice graham gruel, having a little milk or cream from a new milch cow mixed with it. And the child's arms and limbs should be warmly clad.

A correspondent wants to know what to do for

"A boy three years old, who has always eaten fashionable cooking, nuts, candies, apples, &c., at all hours, but lives some plainer this summer. Has taken a great deal of medicine, bowels out of order more or less, but seems middling well now, except that one knee is swollen very badly, making him a little lame. Do'n't seem to pain him any. He is very irritable and cross."

It is no marvel that this child has a swelled knee, and other derangements, after having been fed and drugged in the manner that he has. It is a greater wonder that the child is not in a worse condition than he is. His difficulties are the natural result of bad dietetics and drug medication. He is suffering from disease of liver and stomach, and hypersensitiveness of brain and nervous system. The first thing to do in this case is to strictly forbid the administration of all drug poisons, and to give him nothing to eat but hygienic food, at regular hours, not to exceed three times a day, and nothing between meals. Then clothe the child so as to secure warmth and free circulation to all parts of the body, and let him live most of the time in the open air. Twice a week give him a sponge or towel bath, over the entire surface, and let him have abundance of sleep.

G. W. B. writes from Maine :

Please tell me through the REFORMER if tomatoes are unwholesome of themselves, without seasoning.

When ripe, they are perfectly wholesome.

J. McM., Wis.: The description which you give of the case of J. B. B. is too limited, and the case itself too complicated to be benefited by the limited advice that can be given in this department of the REFORMER. The

case requires a personal examination by a competent physician.

In the last No. you stated that a cancer could be cured by freezing, if taken in season. What I want to know is how this freezing process is performed. Will you please inform in the REFORMER? S. E.

The refrigerating process is performed by the use of ice and salt, but never should be attempted by the inexperienced, as much injury might be done by an incompetent person.

What kind of sugar do you consider the most pure and healthful; the brown, the clarified, or the maple? C. W. B.

Neither of them are healthful. The clarified and the purest maple are probably the least objectionable.

I should like to know through the HEALTH REFORMER whether it is best for a person to confine himself to two meals a day who has to eat breakfast at 6 o'clock, and dinner at twelve o'clock. I have men in my employ, and must eat at these times. A part of the time I only take two meals a day, and when I feel hungry, at six at night take a very little to break my fast. I feel the most comfortable when I eat sparingly of healthful food three times a day, from the fact that the time is too long in the afternoon from 12 to 9 or ten o'clock at night. I work hard every day in connection with my business (carriage making), and work in my garden every night till dark. I wish to live healthfully, and do right by obeying physical law, and no sacrifice with me is too great to make in behalf of health. J. S.

As a general rule, two meals a day are much the best. There may be cases, but these are exceptions to the general rule, that persons will do better with three, than with two, meals a day. But in this case, if the gentleman will work a less number of hours, he will obey the laws of his being much better than he now does, and would probably have no desire for his third meal. We know of many persons, eating but two meals a day, and taking the last one at 12 o'clock, that do well. It would be better, however, to have the dinner at a later hour.

Dr. Lay :

1. Please answer through the REFORMER what diet you prescribe for a mother that does not have nurse enough for her infant child. I suppose teas, ale, &c., would not be deemed proper. 2. What treatment for a child with dysentery? 3. Also, what is the best treatment for pin worms. Should not some means be used to get rid of them? You say if we live hygienically we will not have them, but that don't help us to cure the evil. J. T. E.

1. A diet composed of grains, fruits, and vegetables. Under some circumstances it is well to drink freely of crust coffee, bran tea, &c., to induce a more copious secretion of milk. 2. Full directions for treating a case

of dysentery would require more space than we can give in this department of the REFORMER. We would refer you to Dr. Trall's "Encyclopedia," or Dr. Jackson's "How to Treat the Sick Without Medicine," both of which we keep for sale. 3. Copious enemata will frequently dislodge them; also, the application of sweet oil to the internal surface of the rectum is beneficial. But hygienic living is the true antidote.

A. H. B. writes from Wis. :

Will you please prescribe in the next REFORMER for the following case: As I and my brother were returning home the other night from haying, I commenced to grow dizzy, to reel and stagger, and it all began to grow dark. I still kept growing worse, so that my brother had to lead me about three miles. Part of the time I seemed to see houses where there were none, and I nearly lost my speech. I continued thus until my power of speech came to me again; then I began to get better. Will you please name the disease, and the remedy?

The cause of this difficulty is probably an engorged condition of the liver, produced by some errors in his habits of life; but not knowing what his habits are, cannot designate what may have produced it. It may be the result of bad habits of eating, or it may proceed from overlabor, or from both.

In April last I was suddenly taken with sore eyes; a hurting sensation if closed for a few moments, and, when waking in the morning, a difficulty of seeing, until they are washed, or until they wash themselves by their own tears. Question 1. Did I probably catch them from some sore-eyed person? 2. Will a solution of the sugar of lead be a good application? 3. Or, must they be treated by hygienic applications to the other parts of the system. s. n. w.

1. Probably not. 2. No. 3. Yes; two packs a week, and two sitz-baths; and keep head cool and feet warm. Avoid overtaxation of body or brain, and do nothing to unduly heat the blood. Take abundance of sleep. Never use the eyes by artificial light.

A friend of mine is much troubled with asthma. He is a young man, and otherwise has good health. What should he do for this? m. m. w.

No one has good health who is troubled with asthma, for no person with a healthy liver and stomach will have it. The indications of treatment are, to restore health to these organs, and this would require a strict adherence to the laws of life in all his habits. And for hydropathic treatment we would advise fomentations over stomach and liver, once or twice per week; occasional sitz-baths and general ablutions sufficiently frequent to keep the skin clean.

Health Reform the Basis of all Reform.

HEALTH reform reduces all reforms to one, since it underlies the whole perfection of man. A sanitary condition of things regulates the whole machinery of the universe. Men cannot breathe nor act without *obeying* or *violating* a law of nature. Hence no condition of things is right unless based on the laws of health. Humanity stands first, and above all other considerations. All arts and sciences should have reference to health, development, and the perfection of the human race, irrespective of sex, color, or country. Slavery, mental or physical, is incompatible with the perfect health of body and mind. All must be physically, morally, intellectually, religiously, and spiritually free, to have the power to conform to the laws of health in every department of nature. Cities, villages, and isolated dwellings, barns, stables, etc., must be constructed on sanitary conditions, else they hinder, rather than assist, prosperity and happiness. Man's relation to air, water, food, rest, sleep, exercise, etc., must be scientifically adapted to his health, or he perishes prematurely.

Intemperance in no form can exist where health is the uppermost aim. Wickedness and debauchery, dens of infamy of every name and nature, cannot exist in the light of health reform. Passional excess, improper dress, filthy habits, impure air, water, food, and nuisances of all kinds, must cease through the progress of health reform. Church and State, and all falsehood and crime, would be reformed by observing the laws of health. Drugs, rum, tobacco, kingcraft, priestcraft, idleness, and meanness of all kinds, would pass away under health reform. Ignorance, superstition, and filth, would be superseded by intelligence, liberality, and cleanliness, by health reform. All the rights of women, children, and men, would be vouchsafed under health reform, and the world would be redeemed from its follies and injustice. All legislation, teaching, manufacturing, farming, traveling, propagating in every department, etc., should have reference to health, long life, prosperity and happiness. Then truth would be sought before gold, and the happiness of every creature, before selfish aggrandizement at the expense of the misery of millions.

"If men cared less for wealth and fame,
And less for battle-fields and glory;
If writ in human hearts a name
Seemed better than in song and story;
If men, instead of nursing pride,
Would learn to hate it and abhor it;
If more relied
On love to guide,
The world would be the better for it."

DR. TRALL'S
Special Department.

Chologology.

CALOMEL is *not* a chologogue. So says the British Medical Association, after a learned and lengthy investigation. But, what of it? The liver is only one of a dozen important vital organs, and calomel is only one of two thousand drug poisons. The subject, however, has an importance. Indeed, it may well be regarded as the test question of the whole drug *materia medica*. For scores of years it has been taught in all the drug-medical schools that calomel has a specific action on the liver; hence, physicians everywhere prescribe it as the most efficient chologogue, or liver medicine. Longer than the memory of the "oldest inhabitant" it has been supposed to act peculiarly on the liver in virtue of some "special affinity" it has for that viscus. *Why* calomel prefers to "make an impression" on the liver more than on the stomach, or bowels, or heart, or lungs, or brain, or pancreas, or kidneys, has always remained (and always will) among the unsolved mysteries of medical science. But that it does, some how, of its own accord, by its own inherent nature or law, exercise a preference for acting on the liver, has long been the universally-recognized doctrine of the medical profession.

Now it so happens that almost everybody who is ailing in any manner has more or less "liver complaint." The organ is torpid, or congested, or engorged, or irritated, or inflamed, or atrophied, or hypertrophied. It can't act, or won't act, or don't act. Calomel, *a la hocus pocus*, will act on the liver, and then, *presto abracadabra*, the liver will act. Or, in more technical phrase, the calomel goes to the liver, rouses the liver to action, and causes it to perform its function; as when one treads on a torpid rattlesnake, who lies basking in the sun, and the snake, being acted on, rouses up and bites the traveler, and makes him perform his function!

Such is the beauty of the philosophy of the theory of the *modus operandi* on which hundreds of thousands of human beings have been mercurialized out of their constitutions and into chronic invalidism. As the liver is more subject to disease than any other organ in the body (from the fact that it is a sort of strainer for the venous or impure blood of all the digestive organs, and is more or less implicated in all diseases or morbid conditions,

so calomel naturally becomes, and has long been regarded, as the Samson of the *materia medica*. And if the theory of its operation be true, it is super-eminently entitled to this "distinguished consideration." Millions of mouths have been salivated; billions of teeth have been rotted out; bones innumerable have decayed, and countless glands have ulcerated, because of the administration of calomel on the supposition that it is a chologogue, and the only chologogue that is always and absolutely certain, positive, infallible, invariable, and unquestionable. Yea, verily, graveyards without number have been prematurely populated on the theory that calomel exercises a preferential affinity for that portion of the living organism known as the liver.

But, now, we are startled with the announcement, from the highest medical authority on this earthly planet, if not in the universe, that it is all a mistake. *Calomel is not a chologogue at all!* The observation and experience of a hundred thousand physicians for two or three centuries is all a delusion!

But does not this discovery legitimately throw suspicion on the pretended virtues of all the other agents of the drug shop. They are all based on precisely similar false assumptions. Each is supposed to have some special elective or selective affinity for some part, structure, or organ, on which it acts, or makes an impression. And if the doctrine is fallacious with regard to calomel, why not equally absurd in relation to the nineteen hundred and ninety-nine remaining drugs? It is—"and that's what's the matter."

We recommend the British Medical Association to carry this investigation all through the *materia medica*, from calomel to catnip. We will guaranty the members of the Association that, if they conduct their investigations properly, they will sooner or later come to the final conclusion that the whole drug *materia medica* is a sad blunder and a tragical delusion; they will discover that poisoning persons because they are sick has been a disastrous error from the beginning, and is now the greatest curse of the civilized world. They will ultimately learn, what we have been teaching for more than twenty years, that no drugs act on the living system at all; that there is not and cannot be "affinity" between living tissue and poisons, and on this fundamental truth they will be able, as we are, to predicate an explanation of the *modus operandi* of all remedial agents, and to give a satisfactory reason why no drugs of any kind should be administered in treating the sick.

But, although the British Medical Association is entitled to credit for having exploded a prevalent and pernicious error, its members cannot justly claim to be the *original discoverers*. Laying our pretensions and those of all Health Reformers aside, the same discovery was made several years ago, by a learned French physician, and published in the current medical journals. The learned French physician made a series of carefully-conducted experiments to settle the question whether calomel really does or does not cause the liver to excrete bile, as is commonly supposed, and he settled it that it does not. No doubt the members of the British Medical Association are familiar with the French experiments. It is hardly supposable that they could have either overlooked or forgotten them. Probably they have repeated and verified them. Perhaps they have varied them and instituted new ones. However this may be, the conclusion is eminently auspicious. It is a consolation to know that we shall not longer be obliged to have our tongues swollen out of our mouths, our teeth loosened out of our jaws, our bones made carious, our constitutions ruined, and our lives destroyed, for the sake of having our livers roused to action by that potent hepatic and parent of chologogues, calomel. Blessed discovery—provided the doctors won't seek any substitute, and go from calomel to something else as bad or worse.

Ever since Paracelsus, some three centuries ago, introduced the calomel, antimony, and opium practice, calomel has been the specific medicine for all affections of the liver by nearly all the regular physicians of all the civilized nations of the earth. Now it is ascertained that the practice is all wrong. But, will physicians now abandon it. No—unless the people peremptorily refuse to take it. It has been discovered, and proved, and demonstrated, time and times and again, that alcohol is neither “respiratory food” nor a “supporter of vitality;” yet do physicians prescribe any the less of it? No; nor will they until their patients refuse to swallow it. The medical profession is perfectly satisfied with things as they are; with dosing and drugging the dear people for the fees. It gives it position, power, influence, money, and caste. It will resign these when the people execrate its drugs, and not until then. The announcement of the British Medical Association that calomel is not a chologogue, like that of its French predecessor, will be passed over as one of the sensational incidents of the times, and the doctors will go on dosing, drugging, alcoholizing, calomelizing, chologogue or no chologogue, as though nothing

had happened, just so long as the ignorantly-good-natured people will open their mouths, shut their eyes, and go it blind.

Women vs. Men Doctors.

SINCE the organization of the Hygeio-Therapeutic College, eighteen years ago, the proportion of woman students has been gradually and steadily gaining on that of the other sex. This is as it should be. Society needs more women than men physicians. The ailments of women and children afford the medical profession more than seven-eighths of its business and emoluments, and no intelligent and unselfish person will pretend to say that women, with equal advantages of education, are not as competent as men can be, to medicate the maladies of their own sex and of children. In the early years of our College, the proportion of men to women students was nearly two to one. For the last five years the number of each sex has been nearly equal; and now, for the first time in history, the preponderance, so far as applications are concerned, is on the other side. For the College term of 1869-70, we have thus far received more applications from female than from male students; and thus far, too, a greater number of female students have concluded their arrangements to attend. We cannot foreknow what a few weeks may bring forth; but, judging from our correspondence, we are morally certain that our next medical class will count as many women as men, if not more. We have also a fair prospect of a larger class than we have had since the war. It is our own private opinion, publicly expressed, that there ought to be ten women educated to the medical profession to one man, and that this man ought to devote himself mainly to surgery. But we cannot expect to change established usages and overcome the prejudices of centuries, without years, if not generations, of “line upon line, and precept upon precept.” So long as the people believe that they must be poisoned whenever and because they are sick, men will be most numerous in the field of professional and legalized poisoners. True, we have schools in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, where women are taught the absurd doctrines and horrid practices of the drug system; but they are the less of two evils. Women drug doctors, as a general rule, dose and poison less than men doctors of the same school; while they instinctively give more attention to Hygiene and proper nursing. And if doctors must administer the drugs, paints, and dye-stuffs, the earths, alkalis, oxides, salts, minerals, and metals, let

them be women by all means. But, a thousand times better would it be for society, and for the generations yet unborn, if the world could have a due supply of educated women physicians to practice the True Healing Art, who will never poison any person intentionally, sick or well, who will teach and exemplify the laws of life and the conditions of health, and thus arrest the downward tendency of the human race.

Women exercise a more immediate and far greater influence over the health, not only of families, but of communities, than men do. But, American women, though intelligent on most subjects, are strangely, not to say shamefully, ignorant and reckless of almost all considerations that affect their own health, or that of their nearest and dearest relatives and friends. They eat, drink, dress, sleep, awake, exercise, or rest, not according to the laws of vitality, but in obedience to the dictates of fashion. How few American mothers know how to feed or clothe an infant healthfully? This is not from any want of capacity. It is the fault, perhaps, of circumstances which she did not create. But her physical salvation, and that of the race, depends upon her becoming acquainted with these circumstances and controlling them. For this reason, we need women health reformers and women physicians of the Hygienic School, more than we do men, useful as these may be. And while we would like to have a still greater number of men coming to our College, we would be especially pleased to have two, or even ten, women in the class to each one of them.

Sewing Machines and Weak Backs.

A PATIENT called on us a few days ago, who had been running a sewing machine for two years. She was in fair health two years ago, but is now pale, thin, weak in the back, crooked in the spine, and suffering of various pelvic congestions, and chronic inflammations. She imputes her ruined health to the sewing machine. She has a sister who has worked a sewing machine for ten years, and is now a helpless, bedridden invalid.

We happen to know that similar cases are very common, and that they are increasing just as rapidly as sewing machines are coming into use. Our attention has been called to this subject for several years, and we have come to the conclusion that it ought to be commended to the attention of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty. Our patient told us of many cases which had come under her observation, of young girls losing their

health entirely after two or three years' work at a sewing machine. It is true that, properly used, sewing machines are a great blessing, as are all labor-saving machines. But in this commercial age, everything must be done on the principle of extorting from poor humanity the greatest amount of labor in the least possible time. To sit at a sewing machine for two or three hours a day might not seriously harm any well person, and to do a given amount of stitching by a machine would be much better than by hand; but to sit in a fixed and cramped position for eight or ten hours a day, and three hundred days of the year, is certain to destroy the constitutional stamina sooner or later. We doubt if any living person can run a machine all the working hours of the day for one year without very seriously damaging the health. A little reflection will enable any one to understand this matter. Sitting at a sewing machine keeps the body in a fixed, constrained position, permitting but little change or motion, except of the hands and feet. The muscles of the chest and abdomen have very little exercise, and, of necessity, become feeble and relaxed; the lungs expand imperfectly, and the bowels become torpid; while the constant strain on the muscles of the spine, and the continual pressure on the pelvic viscera, by the slight inclination of the body forward, occasion spinal curvature or chronic inflammation, or both.

We see no remedy for these evils without some modification or improvement of the machine itself. Perhaps the machine might be operated by clock-work, and so contrived that the operator could sit or stand at pleasure. But, if sitting or standing is to be the only position, there are many reasons in favor of the latter. In behalf of the suffering sex, whose avocations generally are more destructive to health than those of men, we commend this subject to the inventive genius of humanity.

Snake-Bite Antidotes.

A CORRESPONDENT has kindly sent us the leaf and flower of a plant which he assures us is an infallible cure for persons or animals who have been bitten by rattlesnakes. He tells us also a wonderful story of a dog which was poisoned by the snake and cured by the remedy—just as though we had not heard and exploded such pretensions a hundred times. If our friend was as well informed in the literature of medical works and newspapers on this subject as we profess to be, he would not be troubled with specifics or anti-

dotes for any venom, or virus, or infection, whether of rattlesnake, mad dog, or diseased person or animal. The supposition that God or nature has provided a specific antidote, and so concealed it that not one in a hundred millions can ever find it, seems to us ridiculously absurd. A little common sense ought to suggest all that is practical on this subject. If the virus can be destroyed or removed from the bitten part before inflammation occurs or absorption takes place, no serious consequences will follow. The virus may be sucked out, or destroyed by any strong caustic which will disorganize the injured part; or the part injured may be cut out. But, after the poison is absorbed and has passed into the mass of blood, it is impossible to neutralize or antidote it with medicines or counterpoisons of any kind, without destroying the blood itself, and this would be certain death, whether the bite be a fatal one or not.

The Stronghold of Intemperance.

It was well said by a medical gentleman in the International Temperance Convention held at London in 1862, that the last stronghold of intemperance would be the medical profession. He had learned the lesson we had tried to teach for twenty years, that the drug shop is the parent of the dram shop. So long as physicians can keep up the delusion that alcoholic poison is a "supporter of vitality," so long will drunkard-making flourish in the land. It is passing strange that so few of the friends of temperance can get their eyes sufficiently opened to see this subject in its true light; while a majority of the few who do see it are so enslaved to public sentiment, or so fearful of becoming unpopular, that they will neither say a word nor do a thing to arrest the flood of alcoholic medication which curses the world and crushes the cause they profess to love.

Every medical book and journal, and every medical society in the country, whenever called upon to meet this question, invariably, as if to damn the cause with faint praise, says a word for temperance, but gives an argument for intemperance. The rumseller, were he a fiend instead of a selfish human being, could hardly desire more efficient co-workers than the drug doctors. The devil can always work mischief most effectually when his cloven foot is disguised; and so the alcoholic physicians never forget to pass a resolution in favor of temperance, and to condemn all immoderate and improper employment of intoxicants, while they commend their necessary and judicious use.

We have seldom seen a more bungling at-

tempt to serve God and mammon, and to promote selfishness supremely, than is manifested by a recent report of a committee of the State Medical Society of Pennsylvania. The committee confesses itself unable to present a satisfactory report, for the reason that, "with very little literature and still less authority on the subject, it has been compelled to draw on its own limited observation and experience for most of its propositions and conclusions."

If there is any one subject on which literature, professional and non-professional, is abundant, and on which authority is multitudinous and voluminous, it is this. Can this committee be ignorant of it? No; it prefers to pretend ignorance, so as to make a meaningless report, delude the people, and leave the subject just where it finds it. Literature has been accumulating for centuries. The land is literally deluged with it. The temperance press has been scattering it broadcast for half a century in periodicals, tracts, books, and prize essays, while every medical library has all the "authority" that any reasonable committee could desire. And a very little acquaintance with history, police reports, records of criminal jurisprudence, with the daily accounts of assaults, murders, and suicides, should satisfy all persons except medical committees that the relation of grog to human well-being is not a very intricate problem. The committee, as a matter of course, regard the desire for liquor as a "natural craving" which may be indulged "moderately," but do not tell us where moderation begins nor ends. We have seldom read a paper to which the contemptuous phrase, "silly twaddle," will more pertinently apply; and yet, half the medical literature of the world which the masses of the people accept as authority, is made of just such stuff. The Philadelphia *Ledger* well says:

The committee take more pains in finding excuses than in assigning causes and remedies for drunkenness. They speak of the draught which "may exhilarate, strengthen, or compose," and but little of the maddening draughts which derange and destroy youth in its prime, bring dishonor on old age, want and woe in so many families, disorder in every community, and sap the very foundations of a nation's strength. Little stress is laid on social usages, and dram shops, and treating at public bars, as causes of intemperance. Nearly all is referred by the committee to a susceptibility or capacity for a condition of drunkenness which must always exist in the person who becomes an inebriate. How this susceptibility or capacity is to be ascertained, short of a man's becoming a slave to drink, we do not learn. With a show of logical precision, a dictum is held forth that "the cause is an *invariable antecedent*." Susceptibility to intoxication is an antecedent, but it alone will not make a drunkard, and there re-

mains as the only invariable antecedent, alcoholic drinking.

Chloroformism.

ALCOHOLISM is a vulgar and masculine habit, or disease, or vice. It is not a sufficiently genteel and refined mode of intoxication for ladies. They want something more delicate and ethereal, and chloroform seems to be the prevailing thing. There is no doubt that the use of chloroform is rapidly increasing among women, as an intoxicant. And why should not women have the privilege of debauching themselves as well as men? Is sobriety a matter of sex? If man has a right to make a set of himself and become a nuisance to society, has not a woman an equal right to get drunk and make herself a nuisance to man? Under the head of "The Feminine Tipple," the *New York World* tells a fearful and fearfully-true story:

The extent to which the habit of the secret use of chloroform prevails to-day among all classes of women, from the inmates of the shameful haunts of Greene street to the belles of the Fifth avenue and the pupils of fashionable boarding schools, is known to few except the apothecaries who supply the deadly drug—for deadly it is; and though its poison is sometimes as swift as the cobra's, it is at others slow in its vengeance, reaching through years of misery, but always sure and inevitable.

We hear, with terrible frequency, of sudden deaths from chloroform, "taken only to allay a headache;" but we do not hear of the wreck of the brain and the ruin of the nervous system which its habitual use surely brings about. The swiftness with which it produces its dreamy intoxication, and the few apparent traces which it leaves behind, make it a favorite with women who know nothing of its ungovernable force, of its culminative effects, and of its terribly-dangerous nature.

Its use is far more to be deprecated than that of alcohol or opium, the effects of which can easily be foretold. Chloroform, on the contrary, is as subtle and sudden in its wayward vengeance as the most treacherous and dangerous of the women who use it. The dose that was seemingly innocent yesterday, may, if repeated, bring swift and resistless death to-day; and though the penalty should be delayed, it is certain to be inflicted sooner or later.

When, a year or two ago, a writer charged American women with drunkenness, the charge was easily repelled, for the delicate organization of the refined lady instinctively and notoriously shuns the rude grasp of alcohol. The charge that chloroform is largely used by women is, however, lamentably true. It is generally used in ignorance of its nature and ultimate effects, but the sad and disgraceful fact that it is habitually employed to an alarming extent, as an aid to female drunkenness, cannot be gainsaid.

A MAN had better be poisoned in his blood than in his principles.

Hog Milk for Humans.

PHYSICIANS, chemists, and physiologists, are continually writing up the praises of salt, sugar, and milk, as useful and necessary articles of food for adult human beings, regardless of the scientific facts that salt is a mineral poison, that sugar is not food at all, and that milk is only adapted to the stage of infancy preceding the development of the teeth. But, as to the milk, it is bad enough for full-grown men and women—children of a larger growth—who will adhere to breast-food, to take that of the cow, or mare, or ass, or sheep, or goat, or other clean and herbivorous animals. Even then they rob the calves, colts, lambs, and other little innocent quadrupeds, of what nature provided for them. But now these learned leaders of the public mind and taste, in all matters of food, drink, and medicine, not content to have us devour the carcasses, viscera, blood, grease, and entrails, of that pretty animal—which was cursed under the law, and has never been blessed under the gospel—the hog, are recommending us to suck its milk, and thereby do injustice to the little piggies. Says an exchange paper:

A recent analysis of sow's milk shows that it contains a larger percentage of butter, sugar, and mineral substances, than that of any of the domestic animals, or of woman, and in its proportion of cheesy matter is only exceeded by that of the ewe. On the whole, it contains fifty per cent more nutritive element than that of the cow, and its use is suggested in medicinal cases where a highly concentrated liquid food is desirable.

Great is analysis! It has proved that nobody can live without salt, although many do; it has demonstrated that sugar is essential to health, although the more we eat sugar the more we are sick; it has established that alcohol is "respiratory food," and a "supporter of vitality," although the more we take of it the less we breathe, and the more the doctors administer it as a medicine, the more people die. And now, in the marvelous strides of analytical investigation, it is discovered that the milk of the hog is "highly concentrated" food, and, of course, just the thing for all persons who are not sufficiently nourished. Dunglison tells us that fat, which is not food at all, is "pure nutrition." He judges so on chemical data—it contains *no water*, and hence is *all food*. Hog milk is judged by the same false standard. It contains a larger amount of oleaginous or effete material than woman's milk, and is absurdly regarded as more nutritious. Now, we have a notion that nature has managed things about right; that the best milk for human beings (in infancy) is human milk; the best milk for calves, cow's

milk; the best milk for pigs, sow's milk, &c., &c.

Hygienic Surgery.

THE success of many of the most formidable operations in surgery depends much more upon the hygienic treatment of the patient than most persons, or even most physicians, imagine. We have had patients under treatment on whom the most eminent surgeons in New York (Drs. Carnochan, Parker, and others) have operated, and they acknowledged that recovery was unusually rapid, requiring only one-half or one-fourth the time required under ordinary circumstances. In some cases these surgeons have expressed their astonishment at the facility with which healing took place under our regimen. They have each and all suggested wine, brandy, chicken-broth, beef-tea, &c., and we have assured them that the patients should have the best victuals and drink to be had on the face of the earth, but should have none of that stuff. Not only are operations of all descriptions more successful and less dangerous, but proper attention to Hygiene obviates the necessity for one-half of the operations that occur in hospitals and public institutions.

We are acquainted with many cases in which the patients, under allopathic regimen (alcohol, quinine, flesh, &c.), sunk and died soon after the operation; and these cases were not severe nor intrinsically dangerous. A few years ago, a neighbor of ours consulted us in relation to a sarcomatous tumor. We informed him that the knife was the only remedy, but advised him to put himself under the strictest Hygienic regimen for one month before submitting to the operation, and we offered to take charge of both the Hygiene and the surgery of the case. But his friends urged him to go to head-quarters, and so he consulted Dr. Willard Parker, Professor of Surgery in the New York College of Physicians and Surgeons. Dr. Parker assured him that a dose of purgative pills would be all the preparation he required. The patient acquiesced, the surgeon operated, and in one week the patient was dead. His foul blood caused the wounded part to "take on" erysipelatos inflammation, which run rapidly into mortification. Had this patient accepted our gratuitous advice, the operation would have been attended with no danger whatever.

We have now, fortunately, competent surgeons of our own school. Prof. O. T. Sines makes operative surgery a part of his general practice, while Prof. H. C. Stickney devotes himself to surgical practice exclusively, and

is prepared to perform all the approved operations known to the profession. A few weeks since he removed a tumor from the neck of one of our patients, in presence of several of our medical students. The tumor had become too firm and indurated to be removed by absorption, and was connected with a scrofulous enlargement of the glands on one side of the neck, producing a disagreeable deformity. Operations in this locality always require a delicate handling of instruments, as well as a very minute and precise knowledge of the anatomy of the part, on account of the proximity of great veins, arteries, and nerves of the neck. The patient was kept in a state of moderate anesthesia, from a mixture of equal parts of ether and chloroform, for about thirty minutes, during which time the tumor was neatly dissected out, and the integuments secured with sutures and adhesive straps. No appreciable inflammation followed the operation; the wound healed by the "first intention" (without suppuration), and the patient experienced *no pain whatever*, neither during the operation nor afterward. We do not regard ether or chloroform as dangerous if the patient is properly prepared and the administration of the anesthetic properly managed. The patient must be dieted very abstemiously for a day or two preceding the operation, and on the day of the operation eat nothing at all; and the room wherein the operation is performed must be well ventilated. We shall have other interesting surgical cases and operations to report occasionally.

Short vs. Long Dress.

"I FIRST liked the short dress for its obvious healthfulness, convenience, and economy; afterward for its looks; and now, will you allow me to say, I like it most of all for its *moral* effect upon the wearers. It changes women; it dignifies a social revolution; it increases home happiness; it is a long step towards Eden.

"The long dress as worn at this day means falsehood; means fashion-slavery; means wretchedness and ruin in the social relations of the sexes. See that fashionably-dressed woman. What is she? A mass of dry goods and millinery! Her life is in her flounces; self-consciousness is in every fold and pucker of her crinoline. Are they just right? Oh, lovely! Are they a little wrong? Ah! despair! She has thought dress till her mind is mostly back-hair and her heart bonnet. What is the motive? She wants admiration. She wants to be pretty. She hopes to fascinate men. Good heavens! Is man a maniac?

It would seem so by the bait she throws out. Paint, powder, and waterfall; hoop, hump, and trail; no matter how unnatural or hideous the novelty, if it will only lure the eye and provoke pursuit. The plan, it must be owned, succeeds: men are bedeviled by this nonsense as much as women, and, directly or indirectly, encourage it. The natural punishment follows. They pursue what they fancy incloses an angel, and capture—a figure of cotton, imported hair, whalebone, and silk.”

—*Exchange.*

Answers to Correspondents.

CANCEROUS TUMOR.—Mrs. A. T. M.: “Dr. Trall, *Dear Sir*: You will probably remember me as a consumptive patient under your care at St. Anthony three years ago. I am very much better—thanks to your system and your treatment. Had it not been for them I should not now be alive. About two months ago a small lump appeared in my right breast, attended with soreness. I feared it was a cancer; but it got better for awhile. It is now worse again, and the left breast is sore also. I am puzzled what to make of it, and had about concluded it was not cancerous, and might originate from the lungs; yet, as they are so much improved, it seems hardly possible. The lump is not superficial, but deep-seated, and can only be felt on pressure. Please tell what it is, and the treatment.”

The tumor is unquestionably incipient cancer. How rapidly it will develop depends on many circumstances affecting the general health. But the sooner it is treated the easier it can be removed. We cannot give prescriptions for the home-treatment of surgical cases. We can only treat them when the patient is with us. We have removed several similar cases by freezing the part a few times. If this does not succeed, cauterization is necessary. We use, as caustics, sulphate of zinc, chloride of zinc, concentrated sulphuric acid, &c., according to the vitality of the part, and the depth of the tumor. An experienced hand can manage caustics so as to cause very little pain.

NOSE BLEEDING.—A. T. M.: “My eldest girl, eleven years of age, has the nose-bleeding very much in the summer. She was always a weakly child, and very thin. What is the cause and treatment?”

Her liver is so torpid, and her chest so contracted, that the blood is pressed with undue force toward the head. The only remedy is in the expansion of the chest. She should

practice appropriate gymnastics regularly, but not severely. The dumb-bells, playing ball, rowing, Indian club exercise, pitching quoits, croquet, are adapted to her case.

HUMOR.—T. A. L.: The cutaneous affection which you describe is not itch, nor scabies, but a bilious humor. Purify the blood by means of a daily ablution, the wet-sheet pack occasionally, and a simple fruit and farinaceous dietary, and the humor will disappear in due time. Ointments, lotions, “pain paints,” and all similar trash, will only repel the eruption from the surface to the mucous membrane, and make a bad matter worse.

PERIODICAL HEADACHE.—L. A. L.: Your headache is symptomatic of your dyspeptic condition. It is periodical because your digestive organs become gradually obstructed, and require an occasional remedial effort, during which the liver excretes bile profusely. Milk and sugar, though favorite articles at some water-cures, are very objectionable articles for dyspeptic persons, and for those who are inclined to “biliousness.”

POACHED EGGS.—P. T.: “Dr. Trall: Are poached eggs objectionable in my case, which is regarded as incipient consumption, or slight tuberculosis of the lungs? What is the best way of eating eggs?”

They are objectionable in the sense that they are not the best food. They are better than pork, baker’s pastry, buttered biscuits, or sugar candy. But as food, they are far inferior to good wheat-meal bread and ripe fruits. If eaten at all, the only rule for cooking is, the less the better.

THE TRUE HEALING ART.—We have received a dozen copies of this work, and suppose it will be our duty to send the dollar to the person of whom we had the first copy. Thanks to all, a new edition will soon be issued.

SCROFULOUS TUMOR.—A. H. G.: The enlarged glands of the neck, which you describe, have probably become too much indurated to be removed by absorption. Nearly all such cases, if properly treated in their early stages, can be cured without surgery. But the knife is the last and only resort in your case. The operation is not difficult provided the surgeon has a perfect knowledge of the anatomy of the part. We use chloroform in such cases. Operative surgeons charge all prices—from \$25 to \$500—according to their reputation and the patient’s purse.

CALOMEL AND CORROSIVE SUBLIMATE.

—A. K.: The fact that calomel, or any milder chloride of mercury, may be changed into corrosive sublimate (bichloride) in the living system, though disputed by some physicians, is well attested by chemists. All that is required to change protochloride of mercury (calomel) into bichloride (corrosive sublimate) is an additional portion of chlorine, and this may be set free in the organic changes of the elements of the tissues and fluids, or it may be furnished by the table salt (chloride of sodium) taken as a condiment with food. It is well known that a small quantity of calomel or blue pill sometimes occasions violent salivation or sudden death. How can these results be accounted for, except as above?

SPINAL IRRITATION.—M. A. W.: Your symptoms do not indicate disease in the spinal cord, but inflammation or great distraction in the pelvic viscera, to which the nerves from the tender part of the spine are distributed. Avoid seatons, issues, caustics, leeches, and all drug abominations. If you can not do better than submit to them, do nothing. Hygienic treatment would cure you in about three months. You are too unfavorably surrounded for successful home treatment. A tepid abluion each other day, a hip-bath on the alternate day, and the wet-girdle two or three hours each day, are adapted to your case. Do not use the wet-sheet pack without a competent attendant.

PERIODICAL ASTHMA.—S. O. S.: This affection is frequently caused by extreme congestion of the liver, and often by chronic enlargement of that organ. In such cases the paroxysms of spasmodic breathing are induced by any exciting cause which aggravates the morbid condition of the liver, as overexertion, a surfeit, exposure to extreme heat or cold, &c. You do not give particulars sufficient to enable us to more than indicate the leading measures of treatment. A wet-sheet pack once or twice a week, an abluion daily, and a hip-bath once or twice a day, are applicable. In no disease is a rigidly simple and rather abstemious dietary more important.

PIMPLES AND BOILS.—S. P.: "R. T. Trall, M. D.: What can be done for pimples and boils on the face? I have taken the REFORMER, paid for it, read it, and endeavored to follow its teachings, from its first issue. My diet consists of those good things which the farm produces. I eat no flesh, very little butter or salt, and seldom so much as an apple between meals. My occupation is farming. For the last two years I have been much an-

noyed with pimples, blotches, and boils on my face. Otherwise I have experienced great benefit from the teachings of your journal. I have no eruptions of any kind except on the face."

Persevere in well-doing, and your face will become smooth in due time. Years are often required to overcome the effects of habits we have indulged in for twenty or thirty years, and conditions which we have inherited. You will expedite the process of purification if you will use no butter nor salt. You will do well, also, to abandon the use of sugar and milk. We regard sugar as one of the worst of the "dietetic abominations" in all cases of skin diseases and bilious humors.

ULCERATION OF THE BOWELS.—S. S. A.: Chronic diarrhea is often accompanied with superficial ulceration of the mucous coat of the bowels, and the discharge of purulent matter. The wet girdle is useful when there is pain and heat, and the diet must be as simple as possible. In all such cases, salt and every other seasoning must be carefully avoided.

CRYING BABIES.—A. R.: Babies seldom cry during the night unless they are improperly treated during the day. It is as natural for infantile humans to be quiet during the night as it is for young animals. Improper feeding is the common cause of their disquiet, distress, colic, gripes, and consequent yelling and screaming. Very few American mothers know anything about feeding an infant, or even dressing it. The only "remedy" we can propose is for all ladies who contemplate maternity to attend a course of lectures at the Hygieo-Therapeutic College.

NURSING SORE MOUTH.—S. A. J.: Hot drinks, salt, saleratus, &c., are among the most frequent causes. Astringent and caustic washes may relieve temporarily, but their ultimate effect is worse than useless. Take nothing unwholesome into the mouth, and attend well to the general health.

INFANTILE CONVULSIONS.—S. M.: Teething will not cause convulsions if the bowels are kept in order. Almost every case of spasmodic disease in infancy, unless depending on organic malformations or injuries, are occasioned by constipating or indigestible food.

OBESITY.—R. E. F.: A diet of lean flesh-meat, exclusively, will reduce fatness, or corpulency; but it induces a putrescent condition of the fluids, so that the remedy may be worse than the disease. A proper quantity of the best food is an infallible cure.

Items for the Month.

THE HEALTH INSTITUTE.—Because we say comparatively little through these columns relative to the Health Institute at Battle Creek, we do not wish it understood or implied that we are doing but little. The sole object for which the REFORMER is published is not to advertise a single Institution, and hence we give our space for the "greatest good of the greatest number," instead of occupying it for purposes of self-laudation and self-aggrandizement.

We would say, however, that our success during the past season has been exceedingly gratifying. Much of the time we have been crowded almost beyond our capacity, having been compelled to rent rooms in adjacent buildings for the accommodation of such of our patients as do not need the immediate and unremitting personal care of the physicians and helpers.

Of this large number of patients, some are now with us, improving more or less rapidly, according to the nature of their several cases, while others have departed to their homes, CURED, or so far recovered as to be no longer dependent upon our care. Others are still coming, to avail themselves of the benefits and instructions of what we modestly believe to be a first-class Health Institute.

And we still extend the invitation to the sick and the suffering to come. Come before it is too late. Come while there is yet hope in your case. Although you may have "suffered many things of many physicians," there may still be hope. Write to the physicians of the Institute. State your case fully and freely, and if there is a chance for you, they will tell you. Do not delay until all hope is fled, but attend to it at once.

The article on Temperaments, by Dr. Deering, is well worthy a careful perusal. His deductions are reasonable and logical, and the article is replete with common sense. We are familiar with dozens of cases which illustrate his positions, and are not compelled to go far from home to find them. Many of the ideas advanced by temperamentologists are absurd in the extreme, and some of these absurdities are shown up in this article.

The following recipe for a "delicious luncheon" is commended to all as an excellent dyspepsia-producer. It would be good for people who are in the habit of sleeping too sound. A liberal dose just before going to bed would secure any number of dreams of grandmothers and ghosts, or a first-class nightmare:

"TOAST AND CHEESE.—Cut a slice of bread half an inch thick; pare off the crust, and toast it very slightly on one side. Cut a slice of cheese

a quarter of an inch thick, not so large as the bread by half an inch on each side; pare off the rind, lay it on the toasted bread, place on a flat tin plate, and put in the oven for ten minutes or so. Mix a quarter of a teaspoon of salt and mustard and a sprinkle of pepper; stir into the cheese, and you will have a delicious luncheon."

Caroline Heminway sends six copies of REFORMER, Vol. i, but fails to give her post office; consequently we cannot give her credit for them. A. A. Wilson also sends five copies, and fails to give his post office.

"GOOD HEALTH."—We have received several numbers of a medico-literary magazine, bearing the above title. It is a compound of medicine and miscellany, neatly gotten up, and tastefully printed, on clear type and fine white paper. It is published by Alexander Moore, No. 21 Franklin St., Boston, at \$2.00 per year. Its advice on hygienic subjects is in many respects excellent, although tinged with the prejudices of the allopathic system.

In the editorial department for October, a page is devoted to the subject of animal food, in which one argument against vegetarianism is based on the failure of Sylvester Graham to make it popular, declaring that "most of his disciples went back to the use of meat." And so did the children of Israel go back to the flesh pots of Egypt on the occasion of the advent of the quails into their camp, and with most disastrous results to the "good health" of those who thus departed from the simple diet which the Creator gave them. The fact that the majority of the people prefer a mixed diet is no proof of its superiority.

The editor acknowledges, however, "that a diet wholly vegetable would be preferable to one wholly animal," and states that he has "not a doubt but more animal food is taken generally than redounds to the health of the community;" to all of which we heartily agree.

The *Bee-Keepers' Journal and Agricultural Repository* has just been removed from Cleveland and Nevada, Ohio, to New York City. It has rapidly acquired a large circulation, and is a valuable periodical, furnishing much useful and interesting matter, with appropriate illustrations in Bee-Keeping and Agriculture. The publishers offer to send a sample free to every applicant. Address, H. A. King & Co., 37 Park Row, New York.

Terms of Advertising in the Reformer.

	1 Month.	3 Months.	6 Months.	1 Year.
One square,...	\$2.50	\$6.50	\$12.00	\$20.00
Two squares, ..	4.50	12.00	20.00	35.00
Half column,...	8.00	20.00	35.00	50.00
One column,...	14.00	35.00	50.00	75.00
One page,.....	20.00	50.00	75.00	125.00

Twelve lines of nonpareil type, or one inch, constitute a square. Advertisements of less than a square, three months or less, 25 cents per line for each insertion. Over three months, 20 cents per line. The above prices are strictly CASH.