

I thought he must be suffering from a dislocation, and asked him to allow me to examine the joint. I did not give him ether in the reduction of it. I told him we would first break up the adhesions if he was willing to stand it. He agreed to this, and after the adhesions were broken up, the dislocation was reduced very readily. I did not give an anæsthetic. Another case, a man fell from a moving train, falling on his shoulder and simply stated to the physician that he had fallen off the train and struck his shoulder. The physician did not look for a dislocation. It was allowed to go for about ten days. So that I think it is always necessary to inquire carefully, and in some cases to use an anæsthetic when in doubt.

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

Shall The Journal be Removed to Washington?

To the Editor.—As a member of the Association I oppose the removal of THE JOURNAL to Washington City. I cannot see any advantage to be gained from the more central point—Chicago.

If a removal is demanded, and the convenience of the members is to be considered, why not seek a central point, and establish headquarters at St. Louis, Mo.?

JNO. W. TRADER, M.D.

Sedalia, Mo., Jan. 26, 1891.

To the Editor.—Views of Dr. W. F. Rochelle, in No. 4, January 24, endorsed. Keep THE JOURNAL in Chicago. Nothing to be gained by the change.

T. R. LUFF, M.D.

Cincinnati, O., Jan. 27, 1891.

To the Editor.—The pride of the American physician consists in his success, his success in his advantages, and his advantages of reading THE JOURNAL at an early date will be greater if allowed to remain in Chicago than if taken to Washington. I mean the M.D.'s of the West.

J. H. LYON, M.D.

Roslyn, Washington, Jan. 22, 1891.

To the Editor.—If I remember rightly, the proposition was made, at a recent meeting of the Association, to select a permanent location for our annual meetings; I do not remember decision, but if in the affirmative, I certainly deem said place to be the proper one at which to publish THE JOURNAL, otherwise, I cannot see any benefit, pecuniary or other, to be derived by moving from Chicago. I therefore vote that no change be made.

A. PARKER CHAMPLIN, M.D.

Biloxi, Miss., Jan. 27, 1891.

To the Editor.—I prefer that THE JOURNAL should stay where it is; for it is in the midst of a thriving, stirring medical people, and it is all the time growing fuller and richer in practical ideas. To be sure we have a great body of cold science in the East, but it needs to come to life and be clothed for practical work. Now the free, warm spirit of the great West is just the thing to move upon the medical bones of the East to cause them to stand up and give an efficiency to American practice that beats the world; for with our constitutional make-up, with proper training, and with the most wide-awake journals in our hand, we ought to be the ablest bedside

practitioners beneath the sun, and if we are not we disgrace the Yankee name.

E. CHENERY, M.D.

65 Chandler st., Boston, Mass., Jan. 27, 1891.

To the Editor.—Please record my vote in favor of continuing the publication of this journal in Chicago.

J. G. BEMIS, M.D.

161 W. Madison St., Chicago, January 30, 1891.

To the Editor.—Please register my vote against moving THE JOURNAL to Washington or anywhere else.

F. E. YOAKUM, M.D.

Shreveport, La., January 29, 1891.

To the Editor.—In the last issue Dr. Solis-Cohen considers the matter of the removal of THE JOURNAL. A careful perusal of his letter shows it to be a conglomerate admixture of argument and assertion, seasoned with a few facts.

Dr. Cohen in his letter starts with the question, where can THE JOURNAL be best edited and best serve the interests of the Association. Then he proceeds to find fault with the management of THE JOURNAL, stating that it has identified itself with local interests, that it has not attracted the work of the best men, that it has not been sufficiently careful in rejecting poor papers, and finally, that its abstracts and selections have not been up to standard. The editorial department he considers to have been one of the strongest features of THE JOURNAL.

With this sufficiently perspicuous statement of the shortcomings of THE JOURNAL, the writer proceeds to find a cause for it in the fact that the home of THE JOURNAL has been in Chicago. That it must be due to some evil and malign influences that surround the publication in its present location, the doctor thinks is attested by the fact that the *personnel* of the editorial staff could not be better, and therefore it must be due to local restrictions. It should be gratifying to the profession in Chicago, as misery is said to love company, to know that the same peculiar miasm is present in Philadelphia, New York, Boston and Baltimore. We cannot refrain from congratulating the profession of Washington upon their singular exemption from this kind of infection. We had supposed that there were some fairly representative journals published in this country, notably the *American Journal of the Medical Sciences*, but it is only necessary to read Dr. Cohen's letter to be convinced that its influence is purely local, and that it would have had a wide and grand success had it only been removed to Washington.

Granting, for the sake of argument, that the doctor's strictures regarding the management of THE JOURNAL are true, what guarantee have we that if it is moved, local influences or the advancement of individual interests will not dictate its conduct in its new home? Have the profession of Washington alone those self-effacing qualities that will allow them to remain invisible while they conduct THE JOURNAL into higher and ever widening plains of usefulness? What covenant will they enter into? What bond will they give that such shall come to pass?

The reasons in favor of Washington are delightfully simple. The removal would immediately relieve local influences, and this would raise the standard; this improvement would attract the best minds, and so all would go on in ever increasing grandeur. As near as we can analyze Dr. Cohen's statement, there seems to be in Washington a great, intangible, psychic entity, that has its being as an incorporeal body working in and for the good of the but not of it, for they are of the earth, and this is of the spiritual and invisible. For convenience we may name this influence the *Great Good*, just as we may call that other equally intangible thing existing in Chicago, New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore, the *Great Evil*.