The St. Louis Medical Society of City Hospital Alumni and Medical Advertising.

The question of the character of advertising in medical journals has been brought to the fore by the Medical Society of City Hospital Alumni in St. Louis.

A paper was read before that society February 6 and the author declined to hand it over to the journal that prints its scientific proceedings for the reason that the advertising columns of that publication contained notices of more than twenty-five preparations not found in the list of remedies tentatively approved by the Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry. In a letter to the president of the society, Dr. William E. Sauer, the author of the paper in question, Dr. George Homan, says:

Presumably their omission from that list signifies a lack of pharmaceutical merit or therapeutic value as judged and decided by the only competent court officially constituted by the organized profession for that purpose. This body has built a highway and set clear lights burning across what a few years ago was a quagmire in which the profession helplessly floundered, and for such light and deliverance every consistent member of the American Medical Association owes thanks and loyal support in further works to the same end.

This observation is pertinent for the reason that the publisher of the journal in question is a physician in presumed good standing in his local society, and by that fact pledged professionally not only to advance the just efforts and aims of the body mentioned, but to refrain from acts calculated to discredit such work or to encourage among physicians any departure from the tests and standards declared by the Council and approved by the Association. This is a matter that touches the honesty and good faith of the profession, for without clean hands and clean skirts how can the local societies, the state associations, and the national body with good grace wage war on practically the same sort of advertising in the non-medical press?

The status of medical men holding membership in the American Medical Association, who are publishers of such journals and responsible in a business sense therefor, is different from that of all other classes of publishers, being thereby amenable to discipline, and their good professional standing is bound to be sharply challenged because of the dual rôle assumed, and by reason of an attitude that does not square in morals with the purposes of the profession as repeatedly and officially declared. In such cases the dividing line between the claim of the counting room and that of the consultation room must be extremely difficult to locate, for all human experience shows that no man can serve two masters whose interests lie at opposite points of the compass.

The underlying moral question is a weighty one to the profession and may become a burning issue, and while the society of which you are the head has no official relation to the American Medical Association, still a great many of its members belong to the organization which does stand locally for that body, and it can hardly be thought that the ethical standard of one would be lower than that of the other; and, consequently, no uncertain sound should be given forth as the ultimate demand for accounting and quittance on those who transgress may yet be voiced as of old: Choose ye this day, therefore, whom ye will serve, God or Mammon!

The matter was referred for consideration to a committee, which reported on March 5 that in view of the existing engagement between the society and the journal the obligation to deliver to the latter copy of its scientific work could not be repudiated until next December; this report was accepted, but not until a unanimous expression of opinion was made, by all who spoke, in condemnation of the character of the advertising mentioned, and of the obligation resting on the profession to clean house in this respect.

It is likely that this matter will shortly be pressed on the attention of the organized profession of Missouri in another form.

Efficiency.—The best possible equipment for the practice of medicine is the best possible medical education. But as Burns has said, "A man's a man for a' that." Therefore, the man rich in qualities of soul with the highest scientific attainments is he who will acquire most easily and retain most permanently the confidence of his patients.—*Leucocyte*.

Correspondence**Subphrenic Abscess Complicating Appendicitis.**

STOUGHTON, WIS., March 21, 1908.

To the Editor:—Dr. D. N. Eisendrath, in *THE JOURNAL*, March 7, states that few cases of subphrenic abscess have been recorded as a complication of appendicitis. I wish, therefore, to report the following case:

O. J. E., male, aged 27, a laborer, had an attack of acute appendicitis Jan. 12, 1908. He had never been ill before. He had the symptoms of a bad case, and became steadily worse until the second day, when his temperature and pulse dropped to nearly normal and vomiting stopped. The pain, however, became worse. I therefore diagnosed gangrene of the appendix. He was at once removed to the hospital on a stretcher and I operated on him within an hour. The appendix was found gangrenous, black with greenish flakes and with a perforation near the tip; it was lying in a collection of thin, very bad smelling serum, yet there was no macroscopic pus. The appendix was removed and the wound drained. There was a complete recovery, so far as all clinical symptoms go. The patient left the hospital in fourteen days with a good appetite.

He returned March 14 with fever and a pain in the right side under the ribs. He complained that he "could not breathe" and that he had not slept for two nights. Examination disclosed a tender place between the axillary lines over the ninth and tenth ribs, plainly edematous. His pulse was 120, respiration 24 and temperature 102. He passed a poor night. I operated in the morning by Eisendrath's method and after removal of the tenth rib inserted the needle repeatedly until I found the pus in the anterior axillary line. I opened and found a channel between the liver and diaphragm leading two inches up to the cupula of the liver and ending in a cavity in the liver substance about the size of a walnut. The diaphragm was intact. The pus was thin pinkish with yellow stripes and flakes in it and had no odor. A drain was put in and most of the wound sewed up. Temperature fell to normal and within sixteen hours the man was hungry. He is doing well.

M. IVERSON.

Unauthorized Reference in Advertisements to Physicians.

PHILADELPHIA, March 18, 1908.

To the Editor:—Some years ago my attention was called to an advertisement in a religious newspaper of a nebulizing apparatus vaunted as a catarrh "cure" by Mr. Ernest J. Stevens, president of the Physicians' Standard Supply Company of Philadelphia.

Mr. Stevens "referred" to Dr. J. Solis-Cohen, Dr. Charles Turnbull and myself. As our only connection with Mr. Stevens had been to prescribe for him or to purchase instruments from him, he was immediately notified to withdraw the advertisement, and the editor was informed that the names had been used without the knowledge or consent of their owners.

Mr. Stevens apologized, stating that he had intended the reference to apply only to his business responsibility and had not supposed that it could be construed as an indorsement of his wares, and promised to suppress the advertisement and not to offend again. As my purchases from Mr. Stevens had been satisfactory and I had no reason to doubt his word, I accepted the apology and supposed that that would end the matter.

To-day I am in receipt of a circular issued by the Physicians' Standard Supply Company of Philadelphia advertising a "perfection douche." What it is I do not know; I have never seen it, much less used or indorsed it, but I find again the same "references," namely, Dr. J. Solis-Cohen, Dr. Charles Turnbull and myself—all used equally without authority and without the knowledge of the persons concerned.

Whatever kindly feeling toward Mr. Stevens I might previously have entertained can not survive this evidence of his duplicity—this persistent misuse of names of professional men in an equivocal connection. I desire, therefore, to give notice through your columns that Mr. Stevens has no authority whatever to refer to me, and that my opinion of him is one that would not look well in print.

SOLOMON SOLIS-COHEN.