

Frothingham



REPLY
OF
DR. FROTHINGHAM
TO A
MEMBER OF THE MICHIGAN STATE SOCIETY,
ON THE SUBJECT OF
HOMŒOPATHY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

*(Reprint from the September Number of the Peninsular Journal of
Medicine.)*

EDITOR PENINSULAR JOURNAL OF MEDICINE—In your August number is a letter from G. K. Johnson, M. D., of Grand Rapids, which I feel compelled to reply to, as it contains certain unfounded charges against myself, and erroneous explanations of late action of the Michigan State Medical Society.

In regard to the charges against myself, I will say that I have never “appealed from professional to popular tribunals,” nor “enlisted a hostile press to assail the State Society.”

I have never written a word for any paper or medical journal, (until my open letter to the Board of Health, published in this number of the JOURNAL,) except to correct erroneous or libellous statements concerning myself or the faculty, of which I am a member. And whoever asserts the contrary is misinformed or deliberately falsifies.

It is not I who enlisted a hostile press to assail the State So-

ciety, but Dr. Johnson and others of the sixty-three who voted resolutions "assailing" the educational system of the State, making even a friendly press "hostile," and bringing popular contempt and ridicule upon a profession whose honor and good name they ought to have maintained. When those resolutions were reported I remonstrated against their passage, declaring that before no civilized people could such a position be sustained, and the result has corroborated my statement. I was by some answered that they did not care for the opinions of the press or the people. I can only say in this connection that whoever loves his profession more than his own interests, opinions and prejudices, will labor to increase the public respect and esteem in which it is held. It is that more than anything else that determines the average of morals and intellect that enters it, and the history of civilization shows nothing plainer than that a diminished public esteem and confidence in any profession has been the un failing prelude to its decay. If public sentiment is wrong it is our duty to educate it and set it right, and not to demean ourselves and increase the contempt it already has for us.

I also deny having "loaded the State Society with epithets, or having carried on against it a wanton crusade." Not until *it* had "wantonly" assailed my character, impugned my motives, and advertised me as an "apostate" throughout the length and breadth of the country; not until forbearance ceased to be a virtue; not until a party of men whom I deemed to be dishonorable schemers, had assumed the control of that Society in furtherance of their own selfish interests, did I arraign it before the American Medical Association for its flagrant violation of ethics, and attempted degradation of our profession. Not with malice, but with a desire to obtain from the authors of our code, a decision of the questions vexing the profession of this State, a settlement of which a year of conflict had shown to be impossible, and a continuance of which could but add to the scandal this controversy has caused to the profession. When I criticise

the State Society, I do not intend to include *all* its members, *but only those who by their inconsistent conduct have brought this discredit upon it*, and who *evidently packed* the last meeting hoping to destroy the regular medical school at Ann Arbor. The whole of Dr. Johnson's charges against me I pronounce *untrue*, and demand of him the evidence by which he would substantiate them. It is not I who have "joined hands with popular ignorance and prejudice," but Dr. J. and his co-workers who have falsely accused me and others of our faculty of "aiding and abetting" homeopathy, and thus exciting "prejudice" against us.

I must also deny that the object or meaning of the resolutions was such as given by Dr. J. in his letter. He says the first resolution means that the "State Society was 'not content' with homœopathy in the University, 'not content' that it should be fostered by the State, and further, that the teaching of Hahnemannian vagaries in the University, 'is not, in our opinion, calculated to maintain or advance medicine as a science, nor is it consistent with the honor or interest of the profession.'"

Now I have the most conclusive proof to show that this was not the meaning of that resolution, *nor opposition to homœopathy* the object of *any* of the resolutions reported by the committee of which Dr. Johnson was a member. It should be remembered that two of this committee, although agreeing to present the first three of the resolutions, voted against the passage of the first and second. To the third *no* member of the Society objected.

Let us quote the resolutions entire, in order more fully to consider and analyze them.

Resolved, 1st, That we are not content with the existing situation of the medical department of the University, because in our opinion it is not calculated to maintain or advance medicine as a science, nor is it consistent with the honor or interest of the profession.

2d, That a State under our form of government cannot successfully teach either medicine or theology, and that the medical profession ought to be its own teachers, and the guardian of its honor.

3d, That we regard all legislative interference with the government of the University as unconstitutional, wrong in principle and harmful in its results.

4th, That section four of the constitution of this State Society be amended so as to read as follows, viz :

SECTION 4. The resident members shall be elected by a vote of a majority present at any regular meeting, their eligibility having been previously reported by the Committee on Admission ; provided, that no person shall be admitted to fellowship who proposes to practice in accordance with any so-called "pathy" or sectarian school of medicine, or who has recently graduated from a medical school whose professors teach or assist in teaching those who propose to graduate in or practice irregular medicine."

Now does not this first resolution distinctly state that they are not content with the "*Medical Department?*" If they meant *University*, why did they not say so? Such a confusion of terms is not to be expected by a committee the chairman of which is such a stickler for *literary* culture. No, they did not mean that they were not content with homœopathy in the University, for if they did, and *had so expressed it, there would not have been a dissenting voice in that Society.* The evidence of this I have, first, in the admission of members of that committee.

I offered to Dr. Pratt, chairman of that committee, a set of resolutions that protested against the introduction of homœopathy into the University on the ground of its being sectarian in character, and asking that all sectarianism be eliminated from the University, and was answered by Dr. Pratt that he could not entertain those resolutions; that he did not wish to open the "*old fight*;" that "he could say nothing against homœopathy." The next day Dr. Ranney, Secretary of the Society, formally presented similar resolutions, but no mention was ever made of them by the committee, *and no word was said in their own resolutions questioning the right of the State to teach homœopathy in the University.*

I argued that on the set of resolutions that I offered, we could do battle without incurring the charge of *bigotry.*

It is contrary to the genius of our educational system to sup-

port sectarianism. It was one of the recommendations in the President's last message to Congress (then published) to so change the constitution that no State could make such appropriations as the one made by our last Legislature in support of sectarian medicine, and it has since then been incorporated as a plank in the republican platform. On this line we could have successfully fought homœopathy, without disgracing our profession, and exciting the ridicule of the intelligent portion of our commonwealth. I said, if under this principle, the regular medical department is proved to be sectarian, let it be abolished. No one will go more cheerfully than I when I see the gun "spiked" and not left for the enemy to use upon us as an engine for the promotion of error.

But no, *homœopathy was not what they were fighting*, so in effect said Dr. Pratt to me then. So afterward did Dr. G. K. Johnson himself acknowledge to me, declaring that it was the regular medical department of the University that he wished to break up. And so declared Dr. Brown, another member of this committee, and not *only* to me, but also to others, as I am informed.

For one I deny the right of any set of men to assassinate the Medical Department of the University, and I shall resist such an outrage to the extent of my ability. And if our "code of ethics" is published as a show of honorable and noble purposes, but is to be used merely as a screen from behind which to stab our rivals, the sooner it is known the better.

That it could not have been on the ground of opposition stated in the preamble, that these resolutions were framed and that the members of the society voted for them, is plainly shown by an analysis of the past and present attitude of the society toward homœopathy and other irregular medicine. The preamble states as a reason for their action the following, the italics being their own :

The present position of the Medical Department of the University and our relations to it bristle with difficulties—difficulties springing on the one hand, from the legal relations of the school to the Legislature and to the Board of Regents and, *on the other hand, from the unwillingness of the*

profession to hold any parley or make any compromise with irregular medicine.

Let us examine the history of the Society for the past few years and see how that unwillingness has been shown.

When at a meeting of the Society in Grand Rapids in 1872, a member of the Society read an able paper showing the active efforts homœopaths were taking to establish themselves in the University, and calling upon the Society to take some efficient steps to defeat their object, he was insulted by having his paper referred back to him *as unfit for publication in the transactions.*

In 1873 a committee of the State Society was appointed under the following resolution :

Resolved, That a representative committee of five members of this Society, be appointed by the President, to confer with the Board of Regents and the Medical Faculty, in respect to the relations of the Medical Department of the University, to the medical profession of the State, and in respect to the future conduct of the said department under any contingencies, necessitating a change in its organization.

This resolution was passed at the time when the question of introduction of homœopathy was under consideration by the Regents. Dr. Pratt, of and for this committee, read a long report before the Regents, prefaced with the assertion that their mission did not "regard any contingencies that might affect the *internal* organization of the medical school under their charge." Both he and Dr. Hitchcock reproved a member of this committee for making a minority report representing that the State Society objected to the introduction of homeopathy into the University.

Still more decidedly did Drs. Pratt and Johnson show their willingness to "parley" and "compromise" with irregular medicine by their efforts to secure a law preventing any *regular* from commencing the practice of medicine in this State until he had received a certificate from a Board of Medical Examiners the majority of which should be composed of *irregular* practitioners.

From the bill which they framed I make the following quotations, italics mine :

“SECTION 1. The Governor shall, by and with the consent of the Senate, appoint nine practicing physicians of good reputation, * * * who, together with a secretary, shall constitute the ‘State Medical Board.’ * * * *The appointments shall be made from members of the State Medical Society, the Homœopathic State Medical Society, and the Eclectic State Medical Society, in proportion to the number of their respective members.* * * * All vacancies shall be so filled as to maintain the relative proportion of members from the several medical societies, on the said Medical Board. * * *

“SEC. 3. The Board shall appoint from its own members, a President, a Treasurer, and not more than six Medical Examiners. * * *

“SEC. 5. The Medical Examiners shall hold examinations at least twice in each year, * * * *and shall examine all applicants for examination who shall have paid to the Secretary of the Board an examination fee of ten dollars, as to their attainments in the following branches of learning, and no other, viz.: Normal and Morbid Anatomy, Physiology, Sanitary Science, Surgery other than medical, Midwifery other than medical, Chemistry, Medical Jurisprudence and Toxicology. They shall cause a certificate to be issued to every person who shall satisfactorily pass the required examination.* * * *

“SEC. 6. It shall be unlawful for any person to practice medicine, in any of its departments, in this State after the first day of October, A. D. 1875, who is not at the time of such practice, duly registered according to the following provisions of this act.

“Any person actually engaged in the practice of medicine in this State, who shall register his name with the county clerk of the county in which his office is located, prior to the first day of October, 1875, in accordance with the provisions of this act, and *the requirements of the Medical Board*, shall receive from such county clerk a certificate of registration, *by virtue of which he shall be entitled to practice medicine in this State for the period of one year from the date above specified*, and any person who shall on or after the same date, present to the county clerk of the county in which his office is situated, a certificate of previous registration under this act, or *certificate from the medical examiners that he has passed a satisfactory examination before them*, shall receive from such county clerk a like certificate of registration by virtue of which he shall be entitled to practice medicine in this State for the period of one year from the date of such certificate.

“SEC. 12. *Any member of said State Medical Board who shall violate any of the provisions of this act, or any of the By-laws adopted by said Board, * * * shall be fined in a sum not exceeding five hundred dollars, or imprisoned not exceeding three months, or punished by both fine and imprisonment in the discretion of the courts.*”

The committee appointed by the State Society to secure the passage of this bill reported their action at the meeting of Society held June 9, 1875, and can be found in full in the published transactions of the Society for 1875, p. 319, *et seq.* I gather the following facts from their report:

A meeting of the committee was called at Jackson on the 16th of December, 1874, to which the following irregular physicians were invited: Chas. Hempel and DeForest Hunt, of Grand Rapids; — Lodge, of Detroit (homœopathic); Wm. B. Church, of Marshall; R. A. Brown, of Albion; A. R. Beach, of Hudson (eclectic).

Among those who met in response to this call were Drs. Stoddard of Albion, Hitchcock of Kalamazoo, and two of the Committee of Nine, viz: Foster Pratt and G. K. Johnson. Of the irregulars, only one condescended to "parley." This was Wm. B. Church, M.D., an eclectic. At this meeting the bill was drawn up from which the above extract was made, no one dissenting to its provisions. A copy of this bill was sent to every member of the State Medical Society (regular), all the members of the Eclectic State Medical Society, and about twenty homœopathic physicians, (all whose addresses could be obtained). This committee called another council to meet in Lansing, February 5, 1875, to which, in the language of the report, "medical gentlemen of all schools, and those especially who had expressed dissent, were invited."

A special meeting of the State Society (regular), was called and held on the 11th of February, 1875, to urge the passage of this bill upon the Legislature.

The principal features of the bill above quoted, were ultimately incorporated into what was termed the "Thomas bill," and so amended in the Senate as to have the Board composed of six censors, two to be regular, two homœopathic, and two eclectic physicians. In this the State Society's committee acquiesced, and labored to secure its passage as thus amended. "In the house," they report, "it (the bill) met a flood of re-

monstrance, mainly from the homœopaths, who having already received the *lion's share in the composition of the Board of Censors*, openly opposed its passage on the ground that by its terms the graduates of medical colleges, as well as others, would thereafter be subject to examination. On the 26th of April it was tabled by its friends to save it from a worse fate." They charged the failure to the *apparent apathy* of a large share of the regular profession, and recommended the appointment of a new committee to continue the work, and on motion of Dr. Foster Pratt, such a new committee was created, and he and Dr. Johnson are still members of it, instructed to continue the same work by the society which records not one dissenting voice against the action of the old committee. In addition to the acts reported I am credibly informed that several members of the society held a meeting in Detroit to discuss the above bill, at which irregulars met by invitation with them. At this meeting Dr. J. A. Brown, one of the Committee of Nine reporting an unwillingness to "parley," acted as chairman, and Dr. E. R. Ellis, a professor in the Detroit Homœopathic College acted as secretary !!

In the discussion of this question it is not unimportant to know that the men who furnished the chief data upon which the above bill was framed, and who suggested inviting these homœopaths to meet in consultation upon this bill that was to determine the standard of medical qualifications in the whole State of Michigan, were Drs. Foster Pratt, chairman of the committee of nine, and Homer Hitchcock, President of the State Board of Health, the latter of whom wrote the clause of the bill requiring the Board of Censors to be composed of members of the three State Societies. At the late meeting at Ann Arbor, Dr. Hitchcock was particularly censorious upon the faculty for occupying their positions, reminding them of that good old time when there was *honor* in the profession. If the inconsistent conduct of Dr. Hitchcock in this matter is a fossilized specimen of this extinct "honor" that *once* existed in the profession, I much prefer that more common kind still extant, and which, it is to be hoped,

exists in conformity with that law which provides for the survival of the fittest.

Was "an unwillingness to parley with irregular medicine" the feeling that prompted their wanton attack upon the regular school at Ann Arbor? Is inviting them to their meetings to take part in the discussion and settlement of important medical matters, a parley? If it is not I do not know what would be so considered. Was an "*unwillingness to compromise with irregular medicine*" the cause of their action? Did they not agree to strike out all knowledge of therapeutics and materia medica from the qualifications which the law should demand of the physician? Did they not agree to give a *certificate* which was in effect a recommendation of medical qualification, to any homœopath, eclectic, or cancer doctor who passed a satisfactory examination in anatomy, chemistry and other branches mentioned in the above bill? Did they not offer, under penalty of fine and imprisonment, to obey all the "by-laws" of a Board, composed of four irregular to two regulars? Is this compromise? If it is not, what would be? I am finding no fault with the bill, it is a question whether it is not a wise provision to secure that kind of knowledge that is the *antidote* of quackery and visionary medical systems. What I do complain of is that hypocrisy which is shown by men, who having voluntarily held this "parley," offered this "compromise," and who having labored to secure the passage of this law, have morally committed all the acts that the bill contemplates, then advertise to the world, that "unwillingness to hold parley with or make any compromise with irregular medicine" is their excuse for a mean stab at their professional brethren, degrading their profession in the eyes of the people and giving the lie to the facts of history by a formal resolution.

Let us consider just what this Board of Censors amounted to. It would in effect be a Medical College, only with greater power than any college possesses, because nowhere in the whole State could any one begin the practice of medicine, who did not

first pass an examination and receive from them a certificate of recommendation. It would be a college consisting of a faculty composed of four irregular to two regular physicians, and in the original bill, that was drawn up by a committee of the Society, this examining board was to be called the College of Physicians and Surgeons of the State of Michigan. This bill, with the name last designated, requiring a mixed faculty, was freely circulated at the meeting in Saginaw where it was presented, and so far as I remember, but one member objected to it. It was referred to a new committee to get the bill in shape to present to the next Legislature. They, without being so instructed by the Society, changed the objectional name without otherwise essentially changing its features.

Now let us see what there is at the University that these men who made no objection to this affiliation between regular and irregular practitioners, so loudly condemn. It is not as Dr. Johnson now alleges because "homeopathy is fostered by the State," for when resolutions are offered condemning this thing, they are not entertained, and when at a meeting of these fault-finders, I offered a resolution asking the profession to unite with the medical faculty to eliminate homœopathy from the University, it was by a motion of one of these agitators laid on the table. *It is not the Homœopathic College of the University of Michigan that they are not content with.* It is the "existing situation of the Medical department of the University" that they condemn, and for the information of those not fully conversant with the matter, I will say that homeopathy is not connected in any way with the regular medical department, but is taught in a separate college, so distinct and separate that no association between its faculty and the regular medical faculty is ever required. During the past session I never met a member of the faculty of the Homeopathic College, and do not know either of them by sight. The regular faculty are required to teach nothing but regular medicine, *and are not asked to recommend the graduation of irregular physicians.* The curriculum of the regular school is not

changed in the least, and *no irregular medicine is taught as a part of it.*

It is true a portion of the faculty have in their lecture rooms some homœopathic students and some literary students, as by the system on which the University is organized there is a certain latitude allowed in the election of studies, and some of the literary students elect chemistry instead of some of the studies marked in the regular course for their class. In these cases, the professor is required to receive such student and at the close of his course of study, he gives him a certificate of his qualification in this branch. To the regular medical student a different certificate is given, signed by the dean of the faculty, stating the length of time he has attended the *full course* of lectures. When a regular medical student applies for a diploma, he is examined by each professor, but no intimation is given him as to whether or not he has passed satisfactorily, until the whole faculty have met, or sent their statement of the student's standing to the dean, and then, after comparing the votes, if no objection is made, and the average proficiency reaches the required standard, the student is considered passed, and his name is sent by the dean of the faculty to the Regents, *recommending* him as worthy of the degree of Doctor of Medicine. If he has failed to fulfil the requirements of a single professor, he cannot be so recommended, if that professor objects, unless that objection is overruled by a vote of the faculty. It will thus be seen that what the faculty does for the homœopath's student, is in no sense a recommendation of that student for the degree of Doctor of Medicine. To say a student is proficient in chemistry is not saying that he is qualified to practice. He may have learned his anatomy, chemistry, and kindred branches all perfectly, and yet, if he has no knowledge of *materia medica*, and *therapeutics*, we could not say he was qualified to become a physician. Should one of our own students, though brilliant and accomplished in all the branches we teach, have the absurd notion that ten grains of morphia was a proper dose, and avow his inten-

tion of using this remedy in that dose, we would not grant him a medical degree. Neither, while we hold our present views, could we recommend as qualified for the duties of a physician, any person who believes the doctrines of Hahnemann.

What the regular faculty do, is to teach what the regular medical profession regard as true medical science to all who come to their lectures, feeling constrained to do so by the spirit of our Code of Ethics, and every principle that should govern our profession. And I am individually of the opinion that only the most narrow-minded and degrading policy which our profession could adopt would require of us any course different from the one we took as regards our teaching these homœopathic students.

Our code of ethics forbids any secrecy concerning any invention or knowledge that is necessary in the prevention or relief of human suffering, declaring any such concealment to be "inconsistent with beneficence and professional liberality." Now, unless we admit that regular medical studies are of no "real efficacy" for this purpose, our code forbids us to make any secret of them. There was a time when the *Asclepiadae* forbade revealing such knowledge "except to the elect," and Hippocrates bound his followers by an oath not to reveal their art to any not bound by an oath, but in modern times a more liberal policy has been declared and followed. If it were not, then should every author on regular medicine be compelled to bind his publisher to sell his work only to those bound by an oath never to lend or sell the book to an "irregular" or a student that avowed his intention to become an "irregular."

As a mere commercial policy, I do not attempt to defend the principle that shall command us to make other competing physicians more dangerous rivals, but, as a benevolent and humane profession, we are bound to ask but one question, and that is, will this knowledge contribute to the relief of suffering and disease?

The faculty have been charged with "aiding" and "abetting" the graduation of irregular practitioners by this teaching and ex-

amination of the homœopathic students, but whoever will examine the matter closely will see that by exacting the same standard of requirements in the fundamental branches that is required of regular students we constitute a *check* on their graduation. Every regular physician will admit that the tendency among irregular students is to study anatomy, chemistry, and kindred branches, much less thoroughly than regular students do, and they graduate from schools under the control of their own sect, more readily, and with less expenditure of time and money than from regular medical schools. There are but two plans for the organization of the homœopathic college in connection with the University. One provides for a complete homœopathic college, with no further study by, and qualification of, the homœopathic graduate than that demanded by a homœopathic faculty. The other plan, the one now adopted, prevents their sending out graduates that are not as well qualified in anatomy and other kindred branches as regular students are.

What a college wholly under the homœopathic control would be may be inferred from a letter which I received from a prominent homœopathic physician of this state, declaring that many of the homœopathic physicians were wholly dissatisfied with the present arrangement, being desirous of a school entirely independent of the regular department. He submitted a plan of organization, in which the teachers of homœopathic practice and materia medica were to occupy the larger portion of the time and have a comfortable salary of \$2,000 each, but no provision was to be made for chemistry; and anatomy and physiology, combined in one chair, was to be taught by a lecturer, with a salary of \$200, and to occupy one or two months of the student's time.

Which system should one favor in order to *facilitate* "aid and abet" the graduation of irregulars from the University? The one that gives them a separate school under their own control, requiring little or no outlay of time or study, or one that exacts a long and thorough course before they can receive their degree?

Is teaching true science aiding and abetting an error? If so the more one learns of it, the more of a humbug he must be. *Is not knowledge the antidote for error?* Is it not a fact, that any class that desires to control the opinions of the world, seeks, if it is wise, to gain control of the education of the people, *and especially the opposing parties?* Will the catholic, if he can help it, send his children to protestant schools? Will he *refuse to educate the children of heretics?* No. And if true wisdom governs the followers of scientific medicine, it will invite to its halls those who are deluded, and teach them the true science and art of healing. How was a general belief in dreams and witches driven from respectable society? By ridicule? No. Only by the dissemination of more accurate knowledge of the laws of nature that served as an antidote for these delusions. So if we would remove the dreamy absurdities of Hahnemann, we must by an extensive course in the chemical laboratory and by other correct and accurate scientific studies teach the votaries of this absurdity, how to interrogate nature and learn her laws, instead of *creating imaginary laws for her*, as they do.

Let us briefly consider the second resolution. This declares that the State in our form of government cannot successfully teach medicine or theology.

Why? Is it because there are unsettled questions in medicine about which there is controversy. If so, what can the State teach? It is not grammar or orthography. Can it be history? Can it be Latin and Greek? Can it be geology? Political science? Mental and moral philosophy? Nay. There are disputed questions in all of these and also in astronomy the oldest in the sciences. Even the same system of mathematics that declares that two parallel lines are such as would never meet, how far so ever either way, both of them be produced, proves that two parallels would meet if produced to infinity, and bases important calculations upon this assumption, and if geometers had been as quarrelsome as doctors are, they would never have progressed, but would still be fighting over that definition of a point,

which makes something and nothing of it in a single breath. Engineers and architects differ much in their estimates, and the state could, consequently, neither teach engineering or architecture; and whoever thinks the state might teach law because it is more perfect and certain than medicine, had better get once in its toils, and he would speedily return to medicine for something fixed and definite. Would it not have been more rational for a society of medical men to have offered some proof to correct the false notion that medicine is unworthy to be ranked among the sciences, than to have helped to fasten this stigma long ago unjustly placed upon it by other professions? On what fact of history did this committee base its assertion?

If the State should teach anything, it should teach medicine, for as Spencer has truly declared, "first in importance to the individual is that knowledge necessary to self-preservation." "If it be possible to perfect mankind, the means of doing so will be found in the medical sciences," was a declaration of Descartes more than two centuries ago, and the learned Whewell in the last generation said: "*Medicine is one of the greatest divisions of human culture, and must be considered as taking in the whole of physical sciences.*" And still later another noted writer declares, that the "study of medicine is the one best suited to the development of the intellectual life." Does it become our profession to defame their own studies as too narrow, vague, and sectarian to be patronized by the State? Then, indeed, if the State can not discriminate what to *teach* in medicine, it can not discriminate what to *employ*. No medical charity can be sustained by the State. There can be no medical superintendent for an insane asylum, almshouse or State hospital. No State Board of Health can be maintained, at any rate in this State, since one of the duties of its Secretary, as defined by law, is to collect knowledge respecting disease, and all useful information on the subject of hygiene, and through an annual report, or otherwise, to disseminate such information among the people. The Secretary of our State Board of Health was on

the committee reporting this resolution, and voted for its passage.

Is it a wonder that an intelligent press should declare that these men forgot they were in the nineteenth century and thought they were in the fifteenth?

When the fourth resolution is considered, absurdity outdoes itself. If there was a violation of ethics, either in letter or spirit, by the admission of these homœopathic students into the lecture rooms of the regular medical department, it was Dr. Rynd, a Regent of the University, and the members of the regular medical Faculty, who belonged to the State Society, who should have been disciplined. Was this attempted? No. It would not have been so efficient in frightening students away from the regular school. Instead of this they propose to refuse fellowship with the regular graduates of the University. Why? Because they have been taught or believe medical heresy? No. Is it because they have done or declared their intention to do wrong? No. Is it because they are not as well qualified in their profession as others? No; but because their teachers had revealed our art to others than the elect, in violation of the old law, originally proclaimed by the priests of the temples of *Æsculapius*, who, having turned the therapeutic knowledge they possessed into a source of revenue and extortion, proclaimed that purely commercial policy that was lately ratified by the Michigan State Society. So these graduates, who, by their own acts, only offend by sitting in the same room with irregular students, whom they never invite to sit with them, are to be ostracized by men who for the past three years have been affectionately courting irregulars with a view to a closer union.

Let us briefly consider what effect this frightening of regular students or the destruction of the regular department would have upon regular practice throughout the State and country. The homœopath would argue, and many would believe, that it was because regular medicine could not stand the comparison. It would be said when homœopaths were admitted they had only twenty

students and the regulars more than three hundred, now the regulars have *none*, but the homœopaths have a flourishing school. Does any man doubt that such a result would bolster up homœopathy, and increase, *at the expense of the regular*, the homœopath's practice. In discussing this subject, the editor of a weekly paper, perfectly neutral on the question of homœopathy, declared that in his opinion, if the "regulars" were afraid to compete in the same University with the "irregular" practice, they would act just as they did at their last meeting of the State Society.

Another editor declares that: "In this State homœopathy owes a debt of gratitude to the men who passed these resolutions." Another says: "Such action as theirs goes far to prove to the people that if either school must be abolished in the University it should not be the homœopathic." It is a good rule in morals to avoid not only evil but the appearance of evil, and it would be wise for our profession to avoid not only bigotry but the appearance of bigotry.

Some, seeing the absurdity of urging the faculty to resign, strive all the same to force them into it, by joining their assailants, giving as an excuse for their attack that the faculty should have protested.

The faculty have been protesting for more than twenty years, and had succeeded in keeping homeopathy out of the University by representing that the profession were so adverse to any false system of practice that they would not tolerate any "compromise" with irregular medicine, and that its introduction into the University, *in any form*, would be regarded as an insult to the regular profession, and alienate them from the Medical Department. Seeing that the faculty were successful, these men who had determined to ruin the school, by the report of Dr. Pratt to the Board of Regents, and the activity with which they engaged in, and gave prominence to the "Board of Censors" bill, gave the *lie* to the faculty's protest, helped homeopathy into the University, and then in derision call on them for *another* protest. Such impudence is only equalled by their passage of resolutions

declaring our position to be inconsistent with honor, and then blandly assuring us that they intended *no ecnsure*, and that it ill-becomes us to resent their treatment!

Is it a protest these men want? The faculty made one for them and they repudiated it. Let them now make their own protests. Let their protest be worthy of liberal men, who are more desirous to elevate their profession than to aid private medical schools. Let them ask the Legislature and Regents to eliminate all sectarianism from the University, and there will again be Union in our profession, and this contest, so disgraceful, will be at an end. And, if it so be that an investigation shall prove, as the State Society in effect asserts, that regular medicine is too narrow, bigoted and sectarian, to be worthy a place in a public educational system, though in sorrow for this degradation of our science, cheerfully for *myself* will I leave a position the duties of which for the past years, by the reason of these attacks of base rivals, and defense needful for existence, have seemed to me more like Paul's fighting beasts at Ephesus than the legitimate work of a beneficent profession.

GEO. E. FROTHINGHAM, M. D.

ANN ARBOR, August 28, 1876.

