

between a "physicians' journal" and a "publishers' journal," which you thought unfair; and 2, that no one had ventured to explicitly name the objectionable advertisements.

At this lapse of time I have had to repeat your argument as above, in order to make my answer intelligible.

While I have no concern in the question between you and your cotemporaries as to which is "pot" and which "kettle," and whether or not the etiquette that should prevail among culinary utensils has been violated by cries of "Blacky" from a soot-covered vessel, I have very much concern with the main issue, and on it I beg to respectfully differ with you in both your contentions.

1. Is a "physicians' journal" bound by more stringent rules than a "publishers' journal?"

Let me answer this by an apt illustration: At the time I brought to the attention of the Philadelphia County Medical Society the question of nostrum advertising in medical journals, I had some correspondence on the subject with a friend, an honorable gentleman, a member of a well-known publishing house. His answer to my request that his house should decline nostrum advertising was about as follows: "So long as the journal of which you are part owner sets the example of receiving such advertisements, you have no grounds on which to criticise us. When THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION declines to advertise secret preparations, we will likewise take the matter into consideration."

So you see, there is a very important difference between a physicians' journal" and a "publishers' journal." I am "part owner," to quote my friend, and every other member of the AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION is likewise "part owner" of a journal which persists in a course of conduct that we believe to be wrong and that we seek to prevent in others. Our reform must "begin at home."

But even if this argument were not so forcible, there is one that you have persistently ignored. The Code of Ethics, which is not yet repealed, and which will not, I trust, be repealed, prohibits not only the use of nostrums by physicians, but *any action that tends to increase their use*. Surely, advertising them "tends to increase their use!" Were it otherwise, the "enterprising proprietors" would not waste their money on advertisements.

Furthermore, even if you ignore this special provision of the Code, there is the resolution adopted at the instance of the Medical Society of the State of Pennsylvania at the Detroit meeting of the AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, which expressly forbids the Trustees of the JOURNAL from advertising secret preparations.

The ingenious evasion by which the Trustees have sought to nullify this resolution, and which they must be aware is only laughed at by intelligent men, does more credit to their acuteness than to their straightforwardness. Nor does the fact that their action was passed over in silence at the Milwaukee meeting, render it any the less blameworthy. The fact apparently is that the Trustees have deliberately decided to disobey not only the spirit but the letter of the Code and of the Detroit resolution. They do not even "keep the word of promise to the ear, to break it to the hope," but break it to ear and hope alike. On the surface, their action seems to highly deserve a vote of censure; I will be very glad to learn that there is some justification for it, not apparent. If it be said that without the money received for this prostitution the JOURNAL could not exist, it would be very difficult to answer such a plea in respectful terms. I have no doubt that you can elicit a similar plea from nearly every strumpet. We can pity the strumpet, but surely the JOURNAL does not wish to be an object of pity!

2. Has no one explicitly pointed out the objectionable advertisements?

A number of them were mentioned in my paper before the Philadelphia County Medical Society, "Shall Physicians become Sales-Agents for Patent Medicines?" which was reprinted in the JOURNAL, and editorially commented upon. The *Pittsburg Medical Review* has frequently named them. In my letter mislaid by you I ventured to give you another list. In this communication I will content myself with naming only one—the one which is very properly headed "An Affront to the Medical Profession." But you need no other rule than that of the Code—which makes *secrecy* the sign and test of a nostrum. Yours very truly,

SOLOMON SOLIS-COHEN.

The Prevention of Pauperism.

OTTAWA, OHIO, January 8, 1894.

To the Editor:—Dr. Bryant's paper is to the point and timely, but he does not prescribe the right remedy, in my opinion. And I am sorry to see so many eminent and erudite men, in the discussion of his paper, laboring under the same delusion—*educate them to labor*.

My experience and observation corroborates Dr. Lloyd. The early settlers of this country were not paupers, but the introduction of a foreign element diseased with crime, immorality, etc., has given issue to not only paupers, but criminals. The inter-marriage of criminals and paupers not only begat criminals and paupers, but it has a contagious effect upon others not strongly endowed with energy and self-protection.

Not to give a lengthy dissertation of my convictions, I would castrate every male and female who proved non-self-supporting, caused by their own vicious habits, be such a character or habit acquired or hereditary; after a final judgment rendered by an expert jury of twelve free-born American citizens. Further, I would recommend the same punishment, if it could be so classified, for crimes, as homicide and grand larceny. I am morally sure, if such were the laws, three to five generations hence, jails and penitentiaries as well as almshouses would be of the past, and remembered only as monuments of the world's ignorance in the selection of the fittest, as we now remember the Spanish Inquisition, or of the burning of witches at Salem.

C. E. BEARDSLEY, M.D.

Dr. Howle Replies to Dr. Lewis.

"How to manage criminals"—Howle. "How to encourage criminals."—Lewis.

Doctors are better judges of disease than are laymen but not necessarily better versed in criminal law. I did not "define crime" because it was unnecessary. Your definition of criminal is incorrect by having "knowingly" inserted. I had no intention to defame our law-makers. I approve of "laws made by majorities." A "riot" may result in great good but to say that a "riot is lawful" is a contradiction of terms. I do not believe that the "absence of all human laws" "would destroy all force," nor do I believe that "law causes riot and justifies stealing," but I do believe that the object of the law is to "prohibit riot and other crimes." "Being imperfect in organization and training" would not be a satisfactory excuse for crime. "Malformation of the brain" is difficult to diagnose in a strong *healthy* criminal. The "inability to adjust one's self in complete harmony with his surroundings" is a calamity that befalls most of the human race, but is not necessarily criminal. The word "fad" may not be euphonious nor a "philological" success, but it is very expressive and easily understood. "Emotional outburst of fury" is oftener met with in the criminal than in the judge.

"Judicial revenge" is another contradiction of terms. Jokes aside, Doctor, the JOURNAL is not the place to discuss politics. If you really believe that "crime is the result of disease," say so, but don't poke fun at me.

Respectfully,

W. P. HOWLE, M.D.