

*To the Editor:*—I cast my vote in favor of THE JOURNAL remaining in Chicago, the best place for it.

L. L. LEEDS, M.D.

Lincoln, Ill., March 13, 1891.

*To the Editor:*—In reference to the removal of THE JOURNAL to Washington, I have a high appreciation of the Eastern brethren and their journals, and their ability to conduct them. I have just as high an appreciation of the profession in the West, as I have of those in the East, and regard them equally competent to conduct THE JOURNAL as the former, and therefore object to the removal of THE JOURNAL from Chicago to Washington, as a useless and needless expense, besides the accompanying loss of talent which would follow.

J. W. CRAIG, M.D.

Mansfield, O., March 12, 1891.

*To the Editor:*—Dr. Comegys' letter in last week's JOURNAL was a most agreeable surprise to me. I feel that he has given a new interest to the subject, and made in reality a most convincing plea to have THE JOURNAL remain where it is. One or two more letters of this character would practically fix THE JOURNAL at Chicago for at least a generation to come.

While the text of his letter seems to favor a removal to Washington, the reasons he urges are the very strongest which have been published, showing the necessity of leaving THE JOURNAL where it is.

The charge of conservatism and want of aggressive spirit is the highest compliment he could pay to the present management. The unwillingness of the managers to select a highly competent editor to direct things, is equally flattering; the history of medical journalism shows that only through prudent conservatism, and with a non-aggressive spirit, can any journal hope to survive the perils of childhood. The sagacity of the managers is commendable who early recognized that highly competent editors were not on the market, but were products that had to be grown; also that the very laudable ambition to attain an exalted position, and become the leading journal in the country, was also a matter of growth hardly attainable in eight years—especially in view of the historical fact that for nearly half a century journals in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia have sought to attain this position, sustained by capital, enterprise, and very superior intelligence. Yet it is by no means clear that any one of these journals lead all the others, or have attained the exalted position of the great journal of the country.

It would appear to be of the nature of a miracle to expect a journal depending entirely on the good will of an association, and in the face of over a hundred rival journals, to become independent, and attain a degree of solidity and leadership that would command the Association, in eight years. It took over a quarter of a century of experience for the *British Medical Journal* to attain this, and many journals of longer experience sustained by large capital and shrewd management have not yet accomplished it.

It will be new to practical business men, that the consciousness of the National Capital is of so much importance in the life of a struggling journal. While this power in Chicago may not equal that of Washington, the value of this spirit entity would rank very low amongst business men. The same may be said of the social and political recognition possible at Washington. Experiments in the publication of journals have been going on for over half a century. Publishing houses, colleges, societies, men with capital, and ambitious physicians of all grades, have tried every conceivable plan to grow and build up a National journal. Change of location, consolidation, cheapness of rates, frantic appeals to the readers, selling out to advertisers, and yet all failed.

The same experiment is repeated to-day, and if Washington offered the slightest possible advantage over Philadelphia or New York or Baltimore, shrewd men would occupy the field at once. If Washington could infuse new life in any journal, or make its success any more certain in the future, many well established journals would move into this field in a week. Over thirty journals are published within a day's ride of Washington, and not one of them have yet discovered that this city offers any possible inducement, or promise of success for the publication of a medical journal.

To practical men who know what medical journalism is, there is only one road to success, and that is along the line of prudent conservative management, with the least possible risk in any direction. The change to Washington is a risk, it is leaving a certainty for an uncertainty, and the hunt for an ideal editor will go on while the world lasts.

Dr. Comegys' letter comes like a flash light along the shore, telling us of the danger of a change to Washington and warning the members to look out for breakers.

A wild rocky beach strewn with wrecks of journals is in sight, and I ask in the light of the history of journalism in this country, what reasons have we to expect that the change of location and change of management will not end in a wreck on the same shore? Will THE JOURNAL escape the same fate which has befallen others?

There can be no doubt that Dr. Comegys was obscure as to names, and that the central idea of his letter was to have a good practical journal grow up where it is at present, and be an honor to the Association. If this is not clear another letter from Dr. Comegys will settle the difficulty at once.

T. D. CROTHERS, M.D.

Hartford, Conn., March 16, 1891.

*To the Editor:*—I am *not* in favor of the removal of THE JOURNAL from Chicago to Washington, because I feel confident that such a measure, if carried out, would be a rash one, and would prove to be a serious detriment to the future prosperity of THE JOURNAL. The permanent establishment of THE JOURNAL at Chicago, and the selection of Dr. Davis as its editor-in-chief, gave indications of a grand success in the development of medical knowledge and practice, and in the evolution of a journal that should be second to none in this country, if not in the whole civilized world, and of a journal that all fair-minded persons would regard as worthy of its distinguishing title, "Our National Medical Journal." That these anticipations have been largely met there can be no question. We have ample proof that THE JOURNAL has been extensively read, and the reports of cases have been gleaned, incorporated in other papers published not only in our own language, but also in the languages of other countries.

Some fault has been found because all the papers published have not been up to certain individual standards. In answer to this I need only say that the appearance of such articles in our journals is not so much the fault of the editorial staff as it is from the crudeness of many of the theories of the medical profession generally. The profession was not made for THE JOURNAL; THE JOURNAL is but a mere reflection of the methods of practice of the individual members composing the Association. Since the American Medical Association was founded, and more especially within the last decade, there have been organized many different associations composed of specialists. The peculiar standards of many of these have directed the attention of their members toward the preparation of papers in accordance with their own requirements, to be included in volumes of their own publication. Notwithstanding all these drawbacks, the American Medical Association has had the good fortune to be able to publish some as carefully prepared papers as were ever offered as contributions to associations of such special class.

Should we change our location of publishing to Wash-