

The actual medical fees paid out work out on an average to a contribution of 1d. a head a week for each member.

This small experiment shows some interesting results :

- (a) The actual fees amount to almost the same as ordinary club practice.
- (b) The men run the club with enthusiasm. They appreciate the freedom of choice of doctor, and feel they are treated like other people.
- (c) If they are not ill, they do not trouble the club.
- (d) The doctor feels that he is treating some one who desires his services in preference to any one else.
- (e) The existence of the club tends to increase the good feeling in the profession locally.

It may be true, as we are told, that payment per head is the easiest plan to adopt, and the plan sanctioned by years of abuse—in fact, the “good old way”; but I sincerely hope the State will refuse to lend the enormous prestige of its sanction to what is not the best way.

I am convinced that payment for work done is best for us as a profession, but equally and certainly best for the patient. We must surely stand up for the standard which is going to enhance the dignity and progress of our profession, however great the forces of inertia are.—I am, etc.,

Leetchworth, Dec. 18th.

NORMAN MACFADYEN.

#### ALCOHOLISM AND DEGENERATION.

SIR.—Sir Victor Horsley appears to have descended to some very slight extent from his pontifical position, and accordingly I will venture again to bring to his notice two questions, to which not only I, but I have reason to believe a good many others, would much appreciate his answers :

First, Why does he quote with approval in his work on alcoholism, not only Dr. MacNicholl, but a variety of other writers, who have not investigated whether the alcoholism of the parent preceded or followed the conception of the child? The answer to this question has nothing to do with our forthcoming criticism of Dr. MacNicholl. It is a criticism of Sir Victor Horsley, and if he does not answer it the readers of this controversy will draw their own inferences.

Secondly, Will Sir Victor explain how it is possible for two groups of persons, one of whom were alcoholic at a given epoch, and one of whom were not, to have children showing no marked difference in age distributions, if the alcoholic habit were largely acquired as the parents grew older? Perhaps he will explain at the same time in which of the two groups—the sober, with no police, employer's, or local record of insobriety, or the alcoholic, reported by police, employers, and local visitors to drink in excess—he places the parents whose alcoholism does affect the health and mentality of their children; for in one or other of these classes (if such a group exists, and he confidently asserts in his book that it does) they must be placed. If parents who were alcoholic before the conception of their children are not in our alcoholic group, but all those parents became alcoholic after the birth of their children (*whether those children be of age 5 or age 14*), where, then, are the parents whose alcoholism before the conception of their children is producing the extensive evils on which Sir Victor Horsley discourses at such length in his book?

These are the questions which it is absolutely necessary for Sir Victor to answer, if he wishes to retain the position he claims for himself as an authority on alcoholism. He will find the less difficulty in doing this in the pages of the BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL, because he informs us that Dr. Sturge and he have faced the figures “frequently.” I have been so unfortunate as to be unable to discover any serious treatment by either of them of the memoir by Miss Elderton and myself. Their only references that I have seen to our memoir are :

(a) A speech by Sir Victor Horsley made on July 28th of this year at a National Temperance League annual breakfast. There was no analysis of our figures, only post-prandial oratory, concluding with a serious misstatement of the circumstances under which our first memoir was published. This misstatement was corrected in your issue of August 13th. We have been awaiting an apology from Sir Victor ever since. The misstatement is repeated

<sup>1</sup>The youngest group of children is relatively slightly larger in the alcoholic group!

again under Sir Victor Horsley's name in the September number of the *National Temperance Quarterly*.

(b) An extract from the new edition of Sir Victor Horsley and Dr. Sturge's *Alcohol and the Human Body*. This is purely a rhetorical production, largely interspersed with notes of astonishment, and apparently intended for readers of a shilling edition of their book issued as a temperance manual.

What I demand from Sir Victor is that he shall descend from the temperance platform, where his attitude may impress a popular audience, and condescend to discuss points in a logical and scientific manner such as befits the pages of a scientific journal. If Dr. Sturge and he have “faced the figures” of our memoir, then it must be quite easy for him to reply to the questions I have put to him, and, instead of dogmatically asserting that “fundamentally important figures” are wanting, state what these figures are and how they affect the argument as developed above. If Sir Victor does not do this, I can draw no other inference than the one that he is more keen to defend certain preconceived opinions than to discover actual truths.—I am, etc.,

KARL PEARSON.

Eugenics Laboratory, University of London, Dec. 17th.

#### DR. HADWEN AND THE “CRIMSON CROSS” REMEDIES.

SIR.—After evading my questions for several weeks, the “thickheadedness” of which Dr. Hadwen accused himself has at last been penetrated. He expresses a hope that his answers will satisfy me. They do on one point, at least, since they confirm the opinion which most readers will have derived from this correspondence, that Dr. Hadwen is a past-master in the art of evasion. “How do I know?” (I did not ask how he knew, I asked if he did know.) “I don't carry these things about in my head.” These are examples of answers which it is suggested ought to satisfy me. At last Dr. Hadwen has frankly confessed that the information “collected independently” in the manuscript books about the Gloucester small-pox epidemic, to which he attaches so much importance, was collected by himself. The value of so-called independent information on that subject, collected by one so full of prejudice, is, in my opinion, a very doubtful quantity, and I am not so anxious to see those large manuscript books, now that I know by whom and for whom they were compiled.

Dr. Hadwen seems to gloat over the offensive attack on the medical profession made by him in a speech from which I quoted. Although I was “a bit spiteful” in introducing it, he now adds further insult. He stands by every word contained in his base insinuations, and goes further by his allusions to the “tyranny and despotism” of the “medical priesthood.” He complains that no one has proved the latter more “bitterly” than he has in his own personal experience. If by this he refers to any annoyance he may have bitterly experienced because his fellow practitioners keenly resent his repeated insults, surely he cannot cavil at this, and has only himself to blame.

He concludes by giving me the direct invitation to meet him in public debate, which he has not given before. As I said in my previous letters, such a challenge has come indirectly on many occasions from various sources, and I have answered that I would deal with Dr. Hadwen if he cared to communicate direct with me. He has the temerity in his last letter to throw doubt on the veracity of those assertions. “I know of no one,” he writes, “who has ever received such a message. No such message has ever been conveyed to me.” Dr. Hadwen has evidently a convenient memory. In August, 1908, Miss Beatrice Kidd, the Secretary of the National Union for the Abolition of Vivisection, wrote to me on behalf of Dr. Hadwen, seeking to arrange a debate. My reply was to the effect that I would deal with Dr. Hadwen if he himself would communicate with me. On August 28th, 1908, Miss Kidd replied, and informed me that she had submitted my reply to her previous letter to Dr. Hadwen. I have her letter before me now. What of Dr. Hadwen's audacious attack on my veracity in this matter in view of this exposure?

My answer to the invitation to debate, and the unanimous generosity in offering to bear the whole cost out of his own pocket, is an emphatic No. My reason is, that in my opinion he has forfeited all right to expect medical

men to meet him as suggested, because of his offensive attacks on the honour and integrity of the medical profession. This may have been an example of another bitter experience. If Dr. Hadwen cares to introduce the subject before any medical society at which I might be allowed to do so, I am quite prepared to be present—not at his expense—to stand up for the faith that is in me.—I am, etc.,

Halifax, Dec. 17th.

ARTHUR DRURY.

#### PUBLIC DEBATES ON VACCINATION.

SIR,—The identity of the writer of the article bearing the above title in your issue of December 3rd is not difficult to detect. When Artemus Ward sent a business letter to the editor of a paper asking for a "puff" for his imaginary waxwork show he appended the postscript: "You scratch my back & I'll scratch your back." That is allowable, but that your columns should be open for self-aggrandizement passes comprehension.

We do not get debates with Dr. Drury so frequently as we get General Elections! At the end of practically ten years' trying my score with him now amounts to one, and the sooner it is increased the better shall we all—apparently—be pleased. Therefore, permit me to reiterate what I have so often said—namely, that anywhere and at any time mutually agreeable I shall be glad to meet either Dr. Drury or any other member of the profession to discuss the vaccination question. There need not be any quibbling over details.

With the personal element introduced by your contributor I have little concern, but would like to point out that what I said at Lewisham is typical of my speeches elsewhere, and that even Dr. Drury congratulated me openly upon my "moderation." That scarcely bears out your statement that—

Paid lecturers . . . attack in a virulent manner the honour and integrity of the medical profession, and vilify all who practise vaccination.

Further, I may draw attention to the fact that these lecturers are not rate-paid, but are voluntarily supported by those who believe in the value of and necessity for their propaganda.

If my chief qualification is what you state, the League must be getting very bad value for the handsome salary they pay me, and for several years I must have held the present position without any substantial qualification whatsoever, for it was long after my appointment that I "endured the penalty of the law." A further inference is advanced that Dr. Drury's experience at this debate whetted his appetite for more. Is it unreasonable to assume that a similar effect was produced upon myself? and it may interest your readers to know that a friend of mine has already challenged the doctor for a debate in Halifax.

I have addressed thousands of audiences, both medical and lay, and have never yet known one to get out of control. Perhaps those whose language is calculated to produce that undesirable effect will consider the advisability of moderation. The solitary approach to anything of the kind at Lewisham was when the seconder of the vote of thanks classified antivaccinators as "ignorant." When such meetings as that have been freely advertised and admission is open to all, does not the fact that the majority present are antivaccinators prove that their views are held by the great bulk of the people? I fail to understand what other deduction can be drawn. My opinion is that the case against vaccination as presented by pro-vaccinist publications and official reports is far too strong to call for either "unrestrained bitterness or animus" on the part of its opponents, but I would like to say that pro-vaccinists in their advocacy, either by pen or voice, do not monopolize the gifts of politeness and fairness.

I take it as a compliment—possibly quite unintentional—that my name is not included amongst the champions of the so-called letter-writing ring who have not been spared by this Colossus of controversy, seeing that he and I have frequently antagonized each other in the public press. The verdict of the readers of the effusions of Dr. Drury and the gentlemen you specify would furnish interesting information.—I am, etc.,

Leicester, Dec. 18th.

JOHN H. BONNER.

#### THE BRADSHAW LECTURE ON CANCER.

SIR,—On opening my JOURNAL this morning my eye was caught by the following strange words: "It is evident that the only advance made by the Cancer Commissioners in our knowledge of the subject is that cancer can be inoculated from animal to animal of the same species," to which is appended the signature, "Kenneth Campbell, F.R.C.S." It is to be concluded that by "Cancer Commissioners" Mr. Campbell can only refer to that earnest and energetic body of inquirers who are trying to unravel the tangled skein of the cancer question at the laboratories of the Cancer Research Fund on the Embankment. If so, I would ask your correspondent a few plain questions. Does he know of his own knowledge that the only thing which has been accomplished by the staff of that important centre of research is that cancer can be inoculated specifically from one to another animal? Has he not overlooked the important fact that the discovery of the inoculability of this disease and the practice of transplantation of it beneath the skin of another animal is not only—nay, not even primarily—to create another growth of the same nature as the other? Is he not aware that the absorption of a spontaneous new growth by an animal into which it has been transplanted exerts an inhibitive, even an immunizing, influence on the body fluids of the recipient, and, so far as it does so, is working for the limitation of new growths in the members of that species to which the preventive measure has been thus applied? Has not Mr. Campbell overlooked the massive labours connected with "early stages" research which have solved for ever the enigma of the actual workings of the implanted graft, in order to establish its new foothold in the new host for the beginnings of its beneficent work of inhibition and immunization? Is it nothing that by such research the resisting power against the incidence of cancer to a given animal may be greatly strengthened by the inoculation under its skin of various specific body tissues, with the enumeration of which, however, I will not weary you? Time would fail me to remind your correspondent of the important truths already brought to light on haemorrhagic mammary new growths of mice, their susceptibility and resistance to inoculation; of the effects of surgical interference with the blood supply on growth of transplanted carcinoma and sarcoma; of the study of the development of sarcoma under experimental conditions; of the "natural and induced resistance of mice to the growth of cancer"; and many others which are quite obviously connected with the question under discussion; but finally Mr. Campbell might be able to inform us if he has really considered the important truths bound up with that most recent achievement—the patient tracing of the evolution of a carcinoma into a mixed tumour first, and then into a round-celled sarcoma in the second place, accomplishing its own final extinction in the process. With all these questions his "Cancer Commissioners' names appear to me to be inseparably connected.—I am, etc.,

London, W., Dec. 16th.

FREDK. W. WRIGHT.

SIR,—The cases of the cure of cancer reported by Sir Alfred Pearce Gould in the BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL of December 10th are extremely interesting, including, as they do, cases of cure *after* removal by operation as well as cases of cure *apart* from operative removal. I have myself seen one such case of cure, in a lady of 70, who was attended by two medical men and by myself for carcinoma uteri, and who is still alive and well, six years after the cure. I have also heard from medical men in England and in Germany of other cases of such cures personally known to them. All these were cures of cancer, apart from operative removal. The case of the lady of 70 resembled, in many of its clinical features, the case of Mrs. E. W., reported by Sir Alfred Pearce Gould, on p. 1843, but the exaggerated peripheral neuritis was severest in the left upper limb, and the fingers of the left hand did not *fully* recover all their former strength and power.

With regard to treatment, Sir Alfred Pearce Gould's statement that "all therapeutic cures are obtainable only by the working of physiological forces" is fully endorsed by Dr. Kleinschrod's "inherent law of life," but Dr. Kleinschrod's book<sup>1</sup> takes us one step further in know-

<sup>1</sup> See Franz Kleinschrod's *Eigenesetzlichkeit des Lebens*, or the English translation, *The Inherent Law of Life* (Bell and Sons).