

tator can be at least temporarily made aphasic, it may save a situation.

Two German papers which I read and from which the quotations in the *Detroit Saturday Night* were made are now squealing about "Hetze." Let them cease their own baiting, which they will do when they deem it expedient, but never before.

To discourage for the present at least the teaching of German in this country would be equivalent to extracting poison fangs from the copperhead. Tearing tributes to the kaiser from spelling books is not enough. In the language of a recent writer, it is more important to know who is responsible for their introduction there.

I have no distinct recollection of the resolution to which you referred in *THE JOURNAL* comment of August 18, but hereby proclaim aloud my approval of it, provided its terms are as you outlined.

C. B. BURR, M.D., Flint, Mich.

Member Michigan State Board of Registration in Medicine.

THE ROLL OF HONOR

To the Editor:—Kindly allow just a word regarding Capt. H. H. Roberts' misconception of "sacrifice" when in a letter published in *THE JOURNAL* (Aug. 18, 1917, p. 583) he refers especially to those physicians who, in accepting military commissions, have relinquished practices that yielded from "thousands of dollars" to \$100,000 annually. I trust that no one would have the temerity to assert that men in that financial class are not sacrificing heavily when they go to the front; but I do wish to emphasize that while their absolute monetary loss is in six figures, the real sacrifice involved is far smaller than that offered by men of meager earnings.

I ask, Which man gives more—he who has the reserve income that goes with a \$100,000 practice, whose family will suffer no financial deprivation, whose life is heavily insured, whose repute is such that he can easily revive his practice after a long absence, or he who has had to live on a meager income of four figures, whose hard savings yield a negligible income, whose life insurance is small, whose practice evaporates during a six months' absence, whose family must suffer deprivation when his income is reduced, and who must again painfully climb the ladder from the lowest rung on his return?

I repeat that both are to be greatly admired for their patriotism and sacrifice. But let no man believe that the rich physicians are sacrificing more than, or perhaps as much as are the poorer ones.

EDWARD VON ADELUNG, M.D., Oakland, Calif.

END MONOPOLY ON SALVARSAN

To the Editor:—To the communication of Dr. S. Pollitzer (*THE JOURNAL*, July 28, 1917, p. 305) concerning the price of salvarsan in this country, I wish to add one thing, and I will ask a few questions.

In Athens, Greece, in 1913, I used to buy either salvarsan or neosalvarsan, the full dose, 0.9 gm., for 8 drachmas, or \$1.55, and the minimum dose, 0.45 gm., for 4.50 drachmas, or \$0.89, and the same drugs were sold to the hospitals for 20 per cent. less.

What then, makes the price of salvarsan in the United States so high? Does it pay duty? How much does the same thing cost in Germany? What is the price of arsenobenzol in comparison of that of salvarsan if "the chemicals that enter cost normally only a few dollars per pound"? Why pay \$3 per 0.3 gm. of galy, another arsenical, in this country?

G. KATSAINOS, M.D., Boston.

Typhoid in 1898.—In our war with Spain we had 20,738 cases, with 1,580 deaths, among 108,000 men, all occurring within three and a half months; one man in every six had the disease, while this proportion was increased to one in five among those regiments which never left the United States.—Keefer, *Military Hygiene*.

Queries and Minor Notes

ANONYMOUS COMMUNICATIONS and queries on postal cards will not be noticed. Every letter must contain the writer's name and address, but these will be omitted, on request.

LITERATURE ON DIET AND NUTRITION

To the Editor: Please supply me with information or advice as to the best work, that is, the most accurate work, dealing with nutrition and clinical dietetics, as the workers vary in their opinions concerning the food values and estimated calories to be found in the various kinds of foods.

The great number of such workers makes it difficult to select the best works that can be accepted as giving one the most accurate knowledge as to the work that has been carried out.

I feel that you can advise me without being influenced by any works which may have been put on the market by any of the numerous publishing companies.

THOMAS H. POTTER, M.D., Detroit.

ANSWER.—It is always embarrassing to attempt to select a best treatise on most subjects because many good books have individual features of merit that specially recommend them. The problem is somewhat like the one involved in the request to name the best breed of dairy cattle. That depends!

Our correspondent will find a thoroughly up-to-date presentation of the subject of nutrition both in health and in disease in the newest edition of Graham Lusk's "The Elements of the Science of Nutrition," Philadelphia, W. B. Saunders Company, 1917. It is in many respects one of the best general reviews of the scientific substratum on which present-day knowledge of the subject rests. Some of the debated aspects of metabolism are attractively presented by Otto von Fürth's "Problems of Physiological and Pathological Chemistry," translated by A. J. Smith, Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott Company. Individual features are treated more exhaustively in a series of "Monographs on Biochemistry," published by Longmans, Green & Co., New York. This includes detailed expositions of such topics as the carbohydrates, the fats, the proteins, the nucleic acids, etc., and their behavior in the body. The volume by F. P. Underhill, "Physiology of the Amino-Acids," New Haven, Yale University Press, will introduce the reader to the significance of one of the most important fields in the science of nutrition. Various excellent treatises, such as Joslin's "Treatment of Diabetes" or H. G. Wells' "Chemical Pathology," deal with the intricacies of metabolism in disease. Among numerous books on dietetics, attention may be called to Friedenwald and Rührh's "Diet in Health and Disease," Philadelphia, and W. G. Thompson's "Practical Dietetics." In a category by itself is the excellent book by Mrs. M. S. Rose, "Feeding the Family," New York, Macmillan Company, which combines the latest contributions of physiology with practical directions for the dietary in a singularly effective and readable manner. Here, too, will be found a large collection of selected data on the calory values of foods, as well as rational guidance in the selection of foods for individuals of all ages. As a compilation of analyses, Bulletin 28, Office of Experiment Stations, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C. (for sale by Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., price 10 cents) on "The Chemical Composition of American Food Materials" is *facile princeps*, and should be in the hands of every progressive physician. We also urge those interested to obtain a copy (without charge) of Farmer's Bulletin 808, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., on "How to Select Foods, I, What the Body Needs." This gives a simple method of selecting and combining food materials to provide an adequate, attractive and economical diet. It also contains a long list of the excellent publications of that department of interest in connection with the subject. The newer aspects of nutrition study have been reviewed in *THE JOURNAL* in recent years by L. B. Mendel, "Nutrition and Growth" (May 8, 1915, p. 1539), and by E. V. McCollum, "The Supplementary Dietary Relationships Among Our Natural Foodstuffs" (May 12, 1917, p. 1379). To these may be added Graham Lusk's "The Fundamental Basis of Nutrition," New Haven, Yale University Press, 1914, and F. C. Gephart and Graham Lusk's "Analyses of Ready-to-Serve Foods," Chicago, The American Medical Association Press, 1915.