

"... has since gained 15 pounds of flesh; is getting stronger daily; walks and exercises by the hour.

"His sputum has been examined weekly since his return and there have been found only slight traces of tubercle bacilli, which are gradually disappearing."

Such is the information we get from the pamphlet. As a result of our investigations we could take up in detail various claims and statements and show their cruel mendacity, but probably the following reproduction from the Sidney (Ohio) *Daily News* of Dec. 2, 1908 will tell the tragic story more eloquently than anything we could say:

SAD DEATH THIS MORNING

RAYMOND FORSYTHE, PROMI-
NENT YOUNG MAN, PASSED
AWAY AT HOME OF HIS
PARENTS

Had Been Sick for the Past Two
Years. Was a Graduate of
the Sidney Schools.

After an extended illness covering a period of about two years, Raymond Forsythe, one of Sidney's best known young men, died at the home of his parents, Mr. and Mrs. W. B. Forsythe, on West avenue, about 8:30 o'clock Wednesday morning of consumption.

The deceased was born in Sidney

As we have said, this young man's father, W. B. Forsyth, is vice-president, business manager, and, we understand, one of the principal stockholders in the "Institute." Yet the misfortune of a member of his own family is used as capital for "boosting" the business in which he is financially interested. Forsyth, senior, from all we can learn, has, like his associate Miller, been connected with more than one more or less shady concern. In his home town—Sidney, Ohio—he seems to be considered a "slick" individual who would not be deterred from going into any business because it happened to be only barely within the pale of the law. If we are correctly informed, he was some years ago mixed up in a concern known as the Bohemian Oats and Red Line Wheat Co., whose operations were such as to become the subject of enquiry by the courts. Forsyth also, it is said, exploited a wonderful "corn cure" for some years, later going into the oxygen business. Says a correspondent, "land schemes, irrigation schemes, patent car-coupler schemes and possibly others of greater or less notoriety can be charged up to this man, who thus makes capital out of his son's misfortune."

TWO MORE DEATHS.

Another case which was inquired into was that of a married woman from a small town in Illinois. The family physician, to whom we wrote, replied (Sept. 18, 1908) in part as follows, concerning the patient:

"She is not there on my advice, but at the earnest solicitation of Mrs. ———, whose husband had tuberculosis and was there doing so nicely, improving every day, but who was consigned to the grave yesterday—cured, I presume! I am sure she will be in the Sanitarium Above within six months."

From a later letter (Nov. 26, 1908):

"She [the patient] was brought home October 24, arriving here about 2 a. m. and died in her home about 11:45 a. m. of the same date."

Other cases are under investigation and but for the urgent need of giving physicians such facts as we have already at hand publication of this matter might have been further postponed. We shall publish in the future the results of such investigations if a continued pernicious activity of this concern makes it necessary.

Correspondence

The Viscosity of the Blood.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK, NOV. 24, 1908.

To the Editor:—In THE JOURNAL, November 12, Dr. G. W. McCaskey has published a paper on the viscosity of the blood, taking especially into account its value in clinical medicine. I judge that Dr. McCaskey has not consulted a number of physiologic papers which have been published in recent years, and which, to a considerable degree, forestall his article.

Making no reference to the early and late work on the viscosity by Hürthle and myself, Dr. McCaskey has the kindness to refer to me in a footnote as follows:

"The following references may also be consulted: Burton-Opitz: *Am. Med.*, Phila., 1900, vii, 111; *Jour. Exper. Med.*, 1906, viii, 59, 240; *Abstr. Am. Med.*, new series, i, 42; *Arch. f. d. ges. Physiol.*, cxii, 189." I am grateful to Dr. McCaskey for bringing my name so prominently before the readers of THE JOURNAL, but as I do not desire credit rightly belonging to others, I beg to state that I have not used *American Medicine* as a medium for publication.

Furthermore, in order to show how valuable the viscosity of the blood has appeared to a physiologist, and how widely many of the facts given in Dr. McCaskey's paper have been circulated prior to the publication of his article, I may be permitted to add the following references: Burton-Opitz: *Arch. f. d. ges. Physiol.*, 1900, lxxxii, 447-463 and 464-473; *ibid.*, 1906, cxii, 1-5; *ibid.*, 1907, cxix, 359-372; *Jour. Exper. Med.*, 1906, viii; *ibid.*, 1906, viii, 240-243; *Zentralbl. f. Physiol.*, 1904, xviii, No. 16, *Jour. Physiol.*, 1904, xxxii, No. 1; *ibid.*, 1905, xxxii, Nos. 5 and 6; *Am. Jour. Physiol.*, 1902, vii, 243-259.

I also desire to call attention to the last volume of the Proceedings of the Society for Experimental Biology and Medicine, where will be found described a method for the determination of the viscosity, which has many points in common with Dr. McCaskey's, in spite of the fact that the said method has gained priority by publication.

I submit that the above references will show that the largest number of Dr. McCaskey's "conclusions" have been, to say the least, anticipated by others.

R. BURTON-OPITZ.

A proof of the above letter was submitted to Dr. McCaskey, who replies as follows:

FORT WAYNE, IND., NOV. 30, 1908.

To the Editor:—After re-examining my article on the viscosity of the blood, since reading the letter of Prof. Burton-Opitz, kindly submitted by you, I hasten to say that I have not given due credit to the work of that able investigator. It is scarcely fair on his part, however, to say that I do not refer to the early work of Hürthle, the fundamental character of which is distinctly mentioned on pages 1563 and 1564. The intimation that I am not familiar with the literature is also unjust. The abstracts alone which furnish a part of the literary basis of my paper occupy nearly fifty type written pages, legal cap size, and comprise nearly the entire literature of the subject. There was appended to these abstracts a bibliography which was as complete up to about April, 1908, as a capable abstractor, himself a physician, could make it from the material accessible in the surgeon general's office at Washington. It was manifestly impossible to utilize in my

article more than a small part of this mass of material. The article was prepared by a clinician for clinicians, and I simply selected without much reference to the personality of the investigators such facts as would enable me to best present the subject for the purpose intended. I have very full abstracts of several of Professor Burton-Opitz's papers, more than one fact which he helped to establish being woven into the discussion without the acknowledgment which could properly have been given, and which should not have been entirely omitted. This was simply an unfortunate oversight, for which I am glad to have the opportunity to make amends, but which in no way affects the importance of the facts or the validity of the conclusions. There are other investigators who probably should have received more specific notice, although I particularly regret the present instance. In canvassing the literature alleged facts were carefully collated, and brought in touch with my own experience and observation, with the intention, of course, so far as practical in a brief paper, of crediting them to their source.

After all, however, the real questions of actual criticism, of this or any other paper, which most deeply concern the profession are the reliability of the facts, and the soundness of the conclusions set forth by the writer as fairly representing the present status of the subject. Individual facts, when poured into the common treasury, become common property and investigators must not expect clinical workers to label each fact with its paternity. This would burden clinical literature to an impossible degree.

Professor Burton-Opitz says that he has not used "*American Medicine* as a medium for publication." I did not say that he did. I only cited the location of the reference. With regard to one of the references to *American Medicine*, namely, the one to volume vii, page 111 (the other one is not at this moment accessible), the following are the facts: It is in the form of a special article reporting the Proceedings of the Society for Experimental Biology and Medicine. The article was furnished by William J. Gies, the secretary of the society, who says that the abstracts which he furnished were written by the authors themselves. If there is any issue here, I think it lies between Professor Burton-Opitz and the secretary of the Society for Experimental Biology and Medicine, and I will leave it to the readers of *THE JOURNAL* to decide whether such a bibliographic reference is or is not entirely proper, and also to form their own judgment of this sort of criticism.

His statement that the "largest number of my 'conclusions' have been, to say the least, anticipated by others" does not disturb me in the least. Among other things, it indicates that they are well founded. They might just as well have been labeled a summary, as they are nearly all of them based on the data contained in the article to which they are attached, and certainly, so far as I can see, do not contain even a suggestion of the absurd claim that they are based on individual research or investigation. They simply state in brief epitome what is my own judgment of the entire subject, based on a decidedly extensive and very nearly exhaustive review of the literature, and on clinical observation.

In "conclusion," I venture to express the hope that Professor Burton-Opitz, along with other original investigators, will continue to broaden and deepen our knowledge of scientific facts. For my part I will continue to plod modestly along the thorny clinical road on which every gleam of light from experimental science is more than welcome, and will be utilized to the fullest extent in solving the problems of practical medicine.

G. W. McCaskey.

Dr. John H. Rauch—A Pioneer in the Fight Against Quackery.

GALESBURG, ILL., Dec. 5, 1908.

To the Editor:—To one who knew the late Dr. John H. Rauch, it is gratifying to read the appreciative letter of Dr. George Homan of St. Louis, in *THE JOURNAL*, December 5, regarding the work of Dr. Rauch while secretary of the Illinois State Board of Health. The committee on necrology of

the Illinois State Medical Society for 1894 reports that Dr. John H. Rauch died at his birthplace, Lebanon, Pa., March 24, 1894. Whether or not he was buried there is not stated.

Dr. Rauch was the unconscious product of the demand for greater things in medicine. With clear vision he saw that the great thing, as well as the first thing, was the preliminary education of the individual seeking to practice medicine in Illinois. I well remember that when I entered this state from Minnesota to practice my profession, I was considerably worried to be told that I could not obtain a permit to practice until I was examined, not only from a literary, but from the medical point of view. After passing the literary examination before the late Newton Bateman, then president of Knox College, and also a member of the State Board of Health, I was able to secure a permit to practice by presenting proofs that I had taken a four-year course in one medical school before graduation. Before this time, I had never heard of such a procedure as a requisite to practice medicine in any state.

This personal experience was not coincident with the beginning of Dr. Rauch's greatest work, the promotion of higher medical education; but it was evidence of the work which he had already well started on the way, at least ten years before. It is said that when the Medical Practice Act of 1877 went into effect in Illinois, "about 3,600 non-graduates were practicing medicine in the state," and of these about 1,400 left the state or quit practice within a year of the passage of the law. It was said of Dr. Rauch at that time: "To him more than to any one else, indeed, more than to all others, are due the medical practice acts of other states, weeding out quackery, and the extended terms of medical colleges from three to four years, requiring additional study preliminary to conferring the medical degree." (Quoted from the *Sanitarian*.)

The promotion of higher medical education was but a small part of Dr. Rauch's activities. He was by instinct and training a scientist. He began his training as a private pupil of Prof. Louis Agassiz of Harvard College, and lived for some time in his family. It would be a pleasure to me, did space permit, to repeat here what the earlier chroniclers of this man's strong and efficient life had to say of him. These things influenced me and made me to know, as it did every other man and woman practicing the healing art in this state, that there was some one at the head of our State Board of Health who was potent. We felt the intensity of his strength. We knew that he had force and vigor and power, as well as the energy of achievement.

Dr. Rauch had faults; those of us who knew him can relate them. But back of some of his worst faults could be seen the cunning of the diplomat, whose consuming desire was the real advancement of his cause. Dr. Rauch was greater than his faults. He created. He had a mind and a brain, and above all a spirit that is still working among us.

He taught legislators how to bend the altruism of the medical profession to the public good. His professional life had in it the same essence that will make the names of Tyndall, Pasteur, Virchow, Koch and Lister immortal. It is no disparagement of those who have taken up his work since he left it in their care, that none has come who did more than work along the lines that he laid out. Dr. Rauch was a scientific sanitarian. In addition, he was a politician. How much of this latter training is now needed in our health boards is a question; but one thing is certain, the day has gone by when the state can afford to get along without a trained sanitarian as a part of its official health family.

All of which goes to show that, as pointed out by Dr. Homan, Illinois has not yet, in recognition of Dr. Rauch, her adopted son, done the *amende honorable*. At the present time, when the profession and the public have been taught the value of the work which he initiated, it would seem to be an opportune time to take up the question, as has been suggested, of putting in some permanent form the record of his great achievements. Just what form this memorial should take can well be left to the Illinois State Medical Society, of which he was an honorable and conspicuous member.

J. F. PERCY.