

Medical patents : a letter on the patenting of inventions in connexion with medicine / by John Chapman.

Contributors

Chapman, John, 1822-1894.
Druitt, Robert, 1814-1883
Royal College of Surgeons of England

Publication/Creation

London : Trübner, 1867.

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/a8cckuqp>

Provider

Royal College of Surgeons

License and attribution

This material has been provided by This material has been provided by The Royal College of Surgeons of England. The original may be consulted at The Royal College of Surgeons of England. where the originals may be consulted. This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection
183 Euston Road
London NW1 2BE UK
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722
E library@wellcomecollection.org
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

R. (Dr. Smith Esq^r. M.D.,
with the Author's kind regards

91 MEDICAL PATENTS:

15
A LETTER ON
THE PATENTING OF INVENTIONS
IN
CONNEXION WITH MEDICINE.

BY
JOHN CHAPMAN, M.D.,
M.R.C.P., M.R.C.S.
PHYSICIAN TO THE FARRINGDON DISPENSARY.

[Reprinted from the "Medical Press and Circular," of October 16th, 1867.]

✓
LONDON:
TRÜBNER AND CO., 60, PATERNOSTER ROW.

M DCCC LXVII.

THE HISTORY OF THE
CITY OF BOSTON
FROM THE FIRST SETTLEMENT
TO THE PRESENT TIME
BY
JOHN HUTCHINGS
OF THE BOSTON BAR
IN TWO VOLUMES
VOL. I.
BOSTON: PUBLISHED BY
J. B. ALLEN, 1829.

are
the
beg
the
can
for
se
co
w
re
to
p
o
v
I

PREFATORY LETTER.

To the Editor of The Medical Press and Circular.

SIR,—A few weeks ago I sent to each of the weekly medical periodicals a letter concerning sea-sickness. In that letter I gave a summary of the evidence now accumulated, proving the reality of my discovery of a remedy for the “evil of the sea” (*mal de mer*), as the French expressively call it. I invited medical men about to cross either the Irish Channel, in order to attend the meeting of the British Medical Association at Dublin, or the English Channel, in order to attend the Medical Congress at Paris, to test the value of my discovery; and, by way of inducing them to do so, I offered to lend an ice-bag, and to supply gratuitously the requisite quantity of ice, packed ready for transit, to each medical man willing to try the experiment. The *Lancet* ignored the letter; the *Medical Times and Gazette* both inserted and called attention to it; the *Medical Press and Circular* did the same; but the *British Medical Journal*, instead of inserting the letter, said,—“Dr. Chapman’s views as to the prevention of sea-sickness by the use of an ice-bag to the spine have already been made widely known by his various publications, and as the patenting of inventions in connexion with medicine is not in accordance with the principles generally approved by the profession, we shall content ourselves with stating that he offers,” &c. The reason alleged for not publishing my letter seemed to me so extraordinary, that I was induced to write an expostulatory letter to the editor of that journal; but he refused to publish it. Now, sir, I am of opinion that the question on which the *British Medical Journal* has given judgment, before hearing counsel, deserves thorough discussion; but the Directory of that journal seems to think otherwise: this is one of those questions in respect to which, for reasons, I suppose, of profound medical “state policy,” it deems discussion in the organ of the British Medical Association dangerous, and therefore suppresses it. Indeed at times I have felt as if my brain were beginning to reel with wondering doubt whether on this subject my poor thoughts which I have been wont to regard as at least innocent, if not sound, are not in fact both dangerous and wicked; for I have been told that in the

bosoms of the presiding genii of the metropolitan branch of that Association there burns an intense flame of "strong feeling" against me, that in presence of it the editor of the *British Medical Journal*, after asking me to allow him to propose me as a member of the Association, was obliged to abandon his friendly purpose, and that for my sin of having patented the spine bags which I devised there is no expiation.

But surely, sir, my fate is a hard one: I am precluded from communicating with a large body of my professional brethren; I have been condemned in their presence without a hearing; and when I claim the privilege of appealing against this *ex parte* judgment I am answered:—"We are unwilling to open the subject; many important members of the Association would strongly disapprove of its discussion; and were it discussed in the organ of the Association they would be greatly offended." Why this shrinking from discussion? After the utmost effort to find out "why" my doubts have vanished, and I have become convinced that the said "Directory" is conscious that the position it has assumed in respect to the subject in question would prove untenable were a battery of logical arguments turned upon it. In the belief that I shall be able to demonstrate the truth of this conviction to the satisfaction of your readers, I ask you to publish the following letter—rejected by the *British Medical Journal*.

Yours truly,

JOHN CHAPMAN.

THE
PATENTING OF INVENTIONS
IN
CONNEXION WITH MEDICINE.

To the Editor of the British Medical Journal.

SIR,—I observe that you decline to publish my “communication on seasickness,” the receipt of which you acknowledge in your number published August 3rd, and content yourself with merely stating the offer contained in the last paragraph of my letter, because, as you say, after observing that my views are already well known, “the patenting of inventions in connexion with medicine is not in accordance with the principles generally approved by the profession.” Believing that an examination of these “principles” will conduce to professional edification, as well as to the justification of myself, I request you to be good enough to publish the following remarks:—

The so-called quack medicines, the ingredients of which are kept secret, and the virtues of which are vaunted as adequate to cure almost every disease which “flesh is heir to,” are undoubtedly designed by their owners, in the great majority of cases, as means of trading on the ignorance and credulity of the public; and as these compounds (Holloway’s and Morrison’s pills for example) are taken by those who trust in them as antidotes for a great variety of maladies, often diametrically opposite in nature, they are likely, while doing no good, to do much harm to the bodies as well as to the pockets of their victims. Moreover, as a general rule the administration of drugs, the nature of which is unknown to the prescriber, is incompatible with the progress of medicine as a science, or the systematic growth of a reliable power of understanding and subduing disease. These considerations render it not only expedient but imperatively necessary on public grounds that every physician and surgeon should resolutely refuse professional recognition of any one who deals in secret or quack-medicines. Indeed the government of this country has become so strongly convinced of the impolicy of encouraging the custom of vending medicines the composition of which is kept secret, that for some time past it has, I believe, ceased entirely to grant letters-patent securing to any one an exclusive right to

compound and sell such medicines: the only legal privilege a dealer in them can now obtain is that of labelling his articles with any peculiar trade mark which he may choose to adopt. The imitation by a rival of such a trade label, the legal character of which is identical with that of the labels on Bass's beer bottles, the law holds to be a species of forgery and punishes it as such.

Thus a right appreciation of the claims of medical science and a due regard for the public welfare have conjointly necessitated professional repudiation of men who deal in secretly compounded or quack-medicines, as well as earnest reprobation of the custom, so long as it was continued, of protecting such medicines by royal letters-patent. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that, influenced by the law of mental association, the great body of medical men, who feel a wholesome horror of patent medicines and of the whole system of secret nostrums, should confound with them, and feel the like horror towards every remedial agent to which the word patent is attached. Hence, as you observe, "the patenting of inventions in connexion with medicine is not in accordance with the principles generally approved by the profession."

But, sir, I venture to predict that this *indiscriminate* condemnation of all patents in connexion with medicine will be reversed, and that the medical profession, in order to justify and maintain the "principles" which animate it in reprobating patent medicines and the whole system of secret nostrums, will be obliged to appeal to the only true standard of right and wrong—the great doctrine of utility, expounded with pre-eminent cogency and clearness by John Stuart Mill. Guided by that doctrine, I have shown above what is the true basis of the "principles" in question—viz., the well-established conviction that the vending of medicines, the composition of which is kept secret, and the granting of letters-patent empowering the exclusive manufacture and sale of such medicines, are impediments to the progress of medical science and injurious to the public at large. But the same cannot be said of the grant of an exclusive privilege, for a term of years, of making and vending a surgical instrument, or any mechanical apparatus for a medical purpose. This privilege involves no secrecy: any one can make medical or surgical apparatuses for accomplishing the same purposes as those for which the patented articles are designed; the mode of their construction is not and cannot be concealed; and all the privilege the patent confers is that of an exclusive right for a term of years of making the patented article.

It is objected that no medical man ought to have a pecuniary interest in anything he recommends, for, if he has, he is likely to recommend it in cases when it may not conduce to the welfare of his patients, and may even prove injurious. In support of this objection it is urged—(1) that medical practitioners who supply from their own dispensaries, and charge for, the drugs which they prescribe, are often tempted to dose their patients with medicines which they would be quite as well, and perhaps better, without; (2) that alienist-physicians who themselves possess houses for the residence of the insane, may be induced to recommend the seclusion of patients in those houses in cases in which seclusion is unnecessary, and even cruel; (3) that if, for example, the Director-General of the Army Medical Department were to invent and patent a portable bed alleged by

him to be peculiarly desirable as a part of the camp equipage of soldiers, he would be tempted to order the soldiers to be supplied with it, and thus, supposing the bed were not superior to others already obtainable, would, in so doing, abuse his official authority; and (4) that even if without acquiring an exclusive patent-right in an article a medical man has any private interest in its sale, he is likely to recommend it in cases in which his patients may be at least as well without it.

It is of course a truism that there is no custom, however good, which may not be abused by bad men; but they who use the above objections as arguments against patenting any invention in connexion with medicine will scarcely be prepared to maintain, as a general rule, the necessity of abolishing good customs in order to prevent their abuse; and yet if the argument derivable from the first three of the objections just named is valid at all, there is no escape from its logical application to the full extent here indicated. Indeed I am sorry to say this is often done, but generally only for a time. The practice, long prevalent among medical men, of supplying their patients with medicines, is advantageous for several reasons. In a large proportion of the villages throughout the country there is not a sufficient demand for drugs to enable an intelligent and duly educated druggist to live on the profits of their sale, so that patients are forced either to trust to the village-grocer to supply them with medicines, or to incur the expense and delay of getting them from the nearest market town, unless their own doctor dispenses them himself; whereas it answers his purpose to keep an adequate supply of good drugs always on hand, which can not only be had immediately, but can be dispensed by himself, or by a person whom he can rely upon for accuracy. Moreover, as he reaps the profits, which otherwise would be taken by the druggist, on the drugs supplied, he can afford to charge proportionately less for his professional advice; and thus patients while being saved the delay and the expense of sending to a distant town for their drugs, or the risk of grave mistakes committed by the village-grocer in dispensing them, can actually obtain medical help not only better and more promptly but cheaper when the doctor supplies the drugs than when he does not. But because this excellent custom has been often and greatly abused it is being abolished. I predict, however, that when the people become sufficiently enlightened to appreciate the wisdom of the doctor in withholding, as well as in giving, drugs, and therefore to pay for advice even the more willingly when drugs are not needed, the country doctors will re-establish the good old custom of supplying medicines to their patients, who, learning to appreciate quickly the tendency of any man to abuse the custom and their trust in him at the same time, will effectually check it by refusing to call him in.

The custom, common to many alienist-physicians, of possessing houses for the reception of the insane, and of recommending their patients to be placed in these houses, though often perhaps much abused, has several substantial advantages: numerous and peculiar conditions in the character, situation, and arrangements of such houses require to be complied with in order to make them suitable residences for insane patients. Moreover, there is no other class of sufferers needing such constant and peculiar care as those mental sufferers whose maladies

have not yet become chronic, and of whose recovery by judicious means there is still hope. They need the highest order of attendants on the sick,—men and women who by original constitution, careful training, and adequate experience, have acquired a peculiar aptitude to discharge their important duties rightly. Such houses and such attendants are not obtainable suddenly, but only in the course of a considerable time ; and the selection of both, as well as the training of the latter, implies the exercise of the peculiar knowledge and experienced judgment of the alienist-physician. But when he has duly realized his ideas on the subject, is it expedient that he should relinquish his control of the organization he has originated as soon as he has completed it, or let it become disorganized as soon as the case or cases for the treatment of which he improvised it may have passed from under his care ? Surely considerations for the mentally afflicted, reason, and common sense, as well as economy, forbid it ! And who is there at once so likely and so competent to ensure the continued existence and improvement of these houses as the physicians whose therapeutic agents they are ? Moreover, as medical aid can be obtained cheapest from the country doctor who dispenses his own medicines, so the alienist-physician, by holding these agents in his own hands, can treat mental maladies at less cost to his patients when the profit derived from their payments for residence, instead of going to other persons, forms a part of his professional remuneration. This last argument may have no weight in respect to “the upper ten thousand,” but in respect to the classes below them, constituting the great body of the nation, it is of the utmost importance. The custom in question, then, is a good and beneficent one, and instead of being abolished because it may be, and I dare say often is, gravely abused, ought to be encouraged, the more especially as the abuses to which it is liable are peculiarly easy of detection and remedy.

In the supposed case of a director-general of the army patenting an article forming part of soldiers' camp-equipage, if his own good sense did not prevent him from abusing his authority he would soon be effectually restrained from doing so : his first recommendation of an article in which he was known to have an interest would be considered with the suspicion attaching to that circumstance, and were he to use his authority unduly to cause its adoption by the army, he would incur the risk of losing his appointment. Moreover, in every grant of a patent, the Government reserves the right to make use of the patented article without paying the patentee anything for it, and might justly avail itself of that right in the case of a patent by one of its own servants.

The answer to the fourth objection is very simple. A medical man who takes advantage of the trust reposed in him by his patients to recommend their use of an article in the sale of which he has a *secret* interest, commits a species of fraud every time he recommends the article : such a proceeding when detected would be condemned by the public as strongly as by the profession ; and justly so, for the secrecy of it precludes the possibility of analysing and estimating the motives of the recommendation, which are therefore presumed to be as unselfish as they appear. But how different is the case of a physician or surgeon who has patented an invention in connexion with medicine or surgery, and who avows it ! He is always conscious that he is liable to the imputation of seeking to

promote his personal interest when he recommends his own patients to make use of his invention, and therefore will probably hesitate to do so even in cases where he is sure it will prove beneficial, unless he is either a genuine enthusiast or possesses more moral courage than most men. If, however, selfishness, self-delusion, or enthusiasm induces him to laud his production unduly, he quickly encounters a wholesome check: his patients learn to appreciate his advice at its worth, while his professional brethren deride or ignore the claims of a man who distinguishes himself by the loudness of his self-praise. And though he may exaggerate the importance of his invention, the evil of doing so is in any event limited within the circle of his own patients: no others are likely to avail themselves of a novel discovery without first consulting their own medical advisers; and those who know best how slowly mankind recognises new truths or the utility of new discoveries, know equally well that those advisers will generally hesitate long before examining and expressing any approval of a procedure which is new to them.

Thus it appears that while customs good in themselves may be dreadfully perverted to evil purposes (the very devils are said to be fallen angels), such pervertibility is no valid reason for abolishing those customs; and that it is much wiser and better to deal with each case of perversion or abuse separately, and on its own grounds, than to forego the indisputable and great advantages which those customs confer.

Indeed, if, for the reasons just adverted to, physicians ought not to have an interest in any apparatus, the use of which they may recommend, then, *à fortiori*, they ought not to have an interest in any therapeutical theory, system, or method, the practice of which they may prescribe. For what influence is so powerful to obscure and pervert mental vision, to vitiate the arguments of the ablest reasoner, to cloud and warp the judgment of the most sagacious judge, and to render the medical practice of even the most experienced man both dangerous and absurd, as that of the interest of an enthusiast in a dearly-cherished theory? Who is able to write the history of all the medical theories which, since the time of Hippocrates, have risen, have had their day, and have passed away, and which, during their successive possession of the medical mind, have caused their professors to hasten the deaths of countless numbers of human beings! And yet, even now, every day, a legion of doctors are doctoring their patients at the bidding of theories which they zealously espouse! Surely here, if anywhere, is the sphere in which there is the most urgent need for medical legislation. And nevertheless the supreme guardians of the public health—the Royal College of Physicians—sit unmoved by the contemplation of the vast evils resulting from this calamitous practice! Why not institute an examination, for the passing of which the chief qualification shall be mental indifferentism? In the religious sphere, the ancient sages of India declared this to be a characteristic of the highest wisdom, and “the condition of the Supreme Being;” why then should not the supreme authorities in the medical world declare those only of the candidates for their diploma duly qualified to practise medicine who give evidence that they regard all medical theories and systems with equal indifference, and that the allurements of new ideas have no power over them? Indeed that far-searching pioneer of medical legislation, the *Lancet*, which is ever crying aloud in the wilderness for more and more law to protect us com-

pletely on every side, has already *implicitly* pointed out the need of such an examination. When reviewing my work on *Diarrhœa and Cholera*, it announced that, "in fact, the time appears to have come when it is necessary to check rather than to aid public enthusiasm" for one theory at least—viz., that which I have propounded. (*Lancet*, 13 April, 1867.) But until the College of Physicians has become alive to the fact that the time has really come for it to institute the new order of diplomas just mentioned, we must, I fear, accept the world as it is, and deal with its laws and usages as we find them.*

The State confers exclusive rights in the shape of patents, not merely as a reward to the inventor for his invention, but as an encouragement to him to expend his energies in directing public attention to it; for no one is so likely as himself to do this if his remuneration for it is dependent on the extent to which it is made known; and as, however greatly his discovery is capable of contributing to the public weal, it will remain fruitless so long as it remains in obscurity, the nation is directly interested in stimulating inventors to diffuse as widely as possible a knowledge of their inventions. And this remark is in the highest degree applicable to medical discoveries. There is, therefore, even greater reason for according the exclusive privilege granted by a patent than there is for granting a copyright; and were it not for the magic influence of 'a name,' the exclusive right to make and vend a surgical or medical apparatus would never have been confounded with patents of secret nostrums.

I am aware that in the minds of certain professional gentlemen, who do not adequately analyse their ideas on this subject and trace them to their foundation, there lies a certain sentimental notion that physicians are in some mystical sense a species apart from and far above the rest of mankind, and that it behoves them to forbid any one of their caste patenting any medical or surgical apparatus, lest by doing so he should degrade himself to a lower level. I do not hesitate to affirm that the great majority of those who flatter themselves by nourishing this sentiment would find it wither in a night if exposed to the rude blast of experience. The fact is, so few mechanical appliances really worth patenting are devised by professional men that they are scarcely ever "led into temptation" and so tested: were it otherwise we should soon see that the sentiment in question is but

—————"such stuff
As dreams are made of."

In the absence of any such trials, a certain class of men doubtless find pleasure in encompassing themselves with a halo of moral grandeur from the region of dreams, and were it not that this seductive habit is inimical both to the progress of medical science and to the public good, I should hesitate to dissipate this halo by the breath of reality. But I am constrained to affirm that in so far as the policy, the expediency, the morality, the dignity, in short "the principles generally approved by the profession," condemn the "patenting of inventions in connexion with medicine," precisely so far do they condemn the holding of copyrights in medical and surgical books, and in the titles of medical journals—that of

* This paragraph was added to the letter after its rejection by the *British Medical Journal*.

"*The British Medical Journal*" not excepted. All professional proprietors of such books and journals can only be at once logical and consistent either by cordially recognising the right of their professional brethren to patent any apparatus devised by them for surgical or medical purposes, or by surrendering their copyrights *pro bono publico*. If within the pale of the profession there should be a third party the members of which are so very "pure" as surgeons or physicians that they regard the Copyright Law as a "stumbling-block," and those who avail themselves of it as an "offence," I beg humbly to suggest to such persons that they ought to give their advice gratis to all who ask it. For what is the meaning of a patent or a copyright? Obviously no other than to secure to each man a right of property in the product of his own brains. Is he wrong in availing himself of this right? If so, then the "pure" physicians and "pure" surgeons are equally wrong in refusing to allow the public to profit freely of their advice without paying for it. I believe, however, that these dignitaries of the profession, who, according to its avowed "principles" rigorously interpreted, ought to practise their calling without seeking for fee or reward, do indeed exact the largest fees demanded by any member of the medical body!

I feel assured, sir, that both you and the Council of that organization which the *British Medical Journal* represents will admit that the foregoing argument is a *reductio ad absurdum* of the doctrine that the patenting of an apparatus for a surgical or medical purpose is an immoral, dishonourable, undignified, or in any sense unworthy act. Otherwise you are bound to justify your exclusion of my letter on sea-sickness from your journal by showing wherein lies the difference of moral complexion of the following acts:—

The holding of a patent-right in his spine-bags, by Dr. Chapman.

The holding of a copyright in his *Principles and Practice of Physic*, by the Ex-President of the College of Physicians, Sir Thomas Watson.

The acceptance of a fee, by the President of the Council of the British Medical Association, Dr. Sibson.

Among the many beneficent consequences of my discoveries is the power of preventing or curing those two hitherto incurable maladies—the sickness of pregnancy and sea-sickness. It is unlikely that I shall ever receive a fee for advice in a case of sea-sickness, for I have published gratuitously a detailed description of the remedy, with such directions for its application as render further advice, unless in very special cases, unnecessary. Is there any reason forbidding me to receive remuneration from those who are saved from sea-sickness by the use of spine-bags, which does not equally forbid Sir Thomas Watson from receiving remuneration from those who are instructed by his classical and delightful book, and Dr. Sibson from receiving remuneration from those who consult him? Why must one of the results of my mental labour—the discovery, for example, of the nature and remedy of sea-sickness—be *given* to the world, while the labour expended by Sir Thomas Watson in his two volumes of lectures is paid for by a contribution from every purchaser of those volumes, and while Dr. Sibson receives a fee from every one who deems his advice a desideratum? Or can you point out a difference in the

quality of the mental labour in these three cases so essential as to justify the doctrine you implicitly propound—viz., that whereas in the second and third case the labour should be paid for, in the first it should not ?

The fact is, men who, instead of being led like sheep, think for themselves know quite well that no such difference is discoverable. I have been informed that soon after Dr. Richardson invented his æther-spray instrument Her Majesty's physician, Dr. Jenner, said if he were Dr. Richardson he should patent the instrument ; but the inventor, fearing, it is said, lest he should be deprived of his fellowship by the Royal College of Physicians, deemed it expedient not to do so. And now, partly on the ground that he gave his invention to the public, a committee of gentlemen are asking subscriptions in order to present him with a substantial testimonial ! How "substantial" will that testimonial be at best after the utmost straining to collect it ? If Dr. Richardson deserves it, as I am sure he does, who can be so properly called upon to contribute it as those who use the instrument ? Moreover, they would willingly do so in the shape of part of the price paid for it ; their aggregate contributions would really amount to a *substantial* testimonial, and Dr. Richardson would have the satisfaction of feeling that he was receiving money from those only whom he had directly benefited. Does it not seem, therefore, that Dr. Jenner was right, and that it would have been better for Dr. Richardson, and no worse for the world, if the opinion of Dr. Jenner had been acted upon ?

Before I patented the spine-bags I consulted the President of the College of Physicians, Sir Thomas Watson, and the head of the medical department of the Privy Council, Mr. Simon, as to the propriety of doing so. I acquainted them with all the circumstances of the case ; and both these gentlemen expressed the opinion that I was justified in doing so. It may be that neither of them arrived at their conclusions by the path indicated in this letter ; and it is probable, I think, that in forming their judgment on the subject, they were mainly influenced by the consideration of the peculiar circumstances of the case, and especially of the fact that I could derive no direct benefit from my discovery of the nature and means of preventing sea-sickness.* I acted on that opinion, and though, as a punishment for doing so, the Medico-Chirurgical Society denies me access to its valuable library by refusing to admit me as a member of the Society, I have at least the consolation of remembering that Sir Thomas Watson, and several other physicians scarcely less eminent than himself, deemed me worthy of being honoured by their recommendation for admission.

And now, sir, I beg to ask you, in conclusion, whether you think you are contributing to the progress of medical science, the object of which is to prevent or lessen human suffering, by closing your pages against me

* Mr. Simon, after expressing his opinion as stated, added that he thought the advertisement of the spine-bags ought not to be appended to my medical works. In saying so, he no doubt expressed a general feeling of the profession, having the same origin and justification as that entertained respecting "the patenting of inventions in connexion with medicine." The convenience of every one desirous of procuring spine-bags, in order to test or practise my therapeutical method, is consulted by giving within the covers of the books expounding that method, the indispensable information where those spine-bags may be obtained ; but medical etiquette—which, though very good, is unfortunately blind—cannot see the advantage of this proceeding, and so forbids it.

because "the patenting of inventions in connexion with medicine is not in accordance with the principles generally approved by the profession"? It is now four years since I announced my discovery that the circulation and nutrition of remote parts, or of the periphery, of the body may be increased by the application of ice along the spine, and may be decreased by the application of heat to the same region; also that the functional activity of the spinal cord may be depressed or exalted in the same way. The reality of this discovery has been verified by many physicians. As stated emphatically by Dr. Routh, in the debate on my paper on Epilepsy, recently read to the Medical Society of London, "the facts are thoroughly established and indisputable, and being so they open up the prospect of a great therapeutical revolution." And yet, except in one derisive leading article (on my work on *Diarrhæa and Cholera*), written, I imagine, by a physician whose notorious "Cholera-theory" I had previously subjected to careful criticism, the *British Medical Journal* has studiously ignored that discovery. Does it thus consult the interests of humanity, or merely minister to the feelings of self-satisfied conservatives in high places, and the prejudices of that large class of men who, instead of judging for themselves, prefer to listen to the echoes or "variations" of mere time-honoured dogmas as if they were infallible oracles? I know that some physicians of the former class, like the priesthood of every religion, assume the book of revelation to be closed: I once asked one of the officers of your Association, whom the doctors of Dublin are now delighting to honour,* whether he had examined at all the therapeutical power derivable from my discovery just referred to. "No," he said, "I am quite satisfied with the therapeutical means already at my command, and am not inclined to look for others!" But I hope and trust, sir, that this is not the spirit in which you consciously conduct your journal, and that your endeavour is to direct and develop, rather than merely to reflect and repeat, the ideas of your readers, although I am painfully aware that, as a general rule, English journalists, like American statesmen, can give effect to their own convictions within but a very limited sphere, and that they must do the will of the real masters—the public whom they serve.

I am, sir, yours truly,

JOHN CHAPMAN.

LONDON, 25, SOMERSET-STREET, W.

August 6, 1867.

* This letter was written during the meeting of the British Medical Association in the Irish metropolis.

Preparing for publication,

EPILEPSY, PARALYSIS,

AND OTHER DISEASES OF THE NERVOUS SYSTEM:

Cases illustrative of their Successful Treatment, chiefly by means of Ice.

"Under the influence of these remedial measures, Dr. Chapman has succeeded in six cases, related in the *Medical Times*, in effecting a cure or marked improvement in epilepsy. This is a result assuredly deserving of attention, and fresh researches may possibly fecundate this ingenious application of a discovery highly creditable to contemporary physiology."—*Journal of Practical Medicine and Surgery*, Oct. 1863.

"Dr. Chapman has contributed [to the *Journal of Mental Science*] some cases of epilepsy, paralysis, and other diseases of the nervous system, treated successfully chiefly by means of ice. These cases clearly prove the inestimable value of his treatment—a treatment that has not received justice from some of his professional brothers in England.—*The Medical Mirror*, Oct. 1866.

"It is clear that we possess from his discovery, an excellent remedial agent in the treatment of convulsions and paralysis, and in diabetes."—*Medical Mirror*, April, 1867.

Now ready, in 8vo, price 2s. 6d.

FUNCTIONAL DISEASES OF WOMEN:

Cases illustrative of a New Method of Treating them through the agency of the Nervous System, by means of Cold and Heat;

ALSO, AN APPENDIX, CONTAINING CASES ILLUSTRATIVE OF A NEW METHOD OF TREATING
EPILEPSY, INFANTILE CONVULSIONS, PARALYSIS AND DIABETES.

"This is an interesting monograph, by a man of original mind and considerable ability. . . . Dr. Chapman states that, by the application of cold to the middle of the spine, it is possible to increase the force and frequency of the heart's action, and by heat to diminish it. This is opposed to the dicta of Dr. Todd and other clinical teachers, but Dr. Chapman alleges it as a fact, and challenges experiment. Carrying on his experiments, he erects into a therapeutical system the application of cold and heat to the spine in various parts, and for different periods of time, and claims for this treatment a philosophical interpretation and wide practice. His *brochure* requires reading and testing clinically. It is original in its views."—*Lancet*, Feb. 20, 1864.

"Dr. Chapman expresses his belief that many maladies not usually held to depend on nervous agency—such as those in the title (diabetes and constipation)—really originate in that manner. . . . The subject deserves the serious attention of the profession, not only from the high character of its originator, but also from the amount of evidence which he has already brought to bear upon it. He, however, seems to be as yet only at the outset of his investigations, and promises more detailed information hereafter. In so doing he will confer a great boon on physiology and practical medicine."—*Medical Times and Gazette*, Jan. 23, 1864.

"Nor should he [the student] fail to study the brief monograph of Dr. Chapman on cold and heat in the treatment of the functional diseases of women."—*Clinical Notes on Uterine Surgery*, by J. MARION SIMS, M.D., p. 41.

"There can be no doubt that any man who will, with an unbiassed and philosophical mind, consider Dr. Chapman's cases, must admit that he has made a discovery which promises to do much good to suffering humanity. . . . Not only is the result of ice effective towards increasing the vitality of the uterus, and promoting the period, but the pain is diminished. The dysmenorrhœa is, in fact, cured. . . . It would be well for the patients who are supposed to be suffering from mechanical dysmenorrhœa, if before the uterus was cut with hysterotomes—a proceeding in the hands of some practitioners not always free from danger—that Dr. Chapman's plan was made the preliminary treatment. Drs. Marion Sims, Greenhalgh, and Routh, would probably cut less often. . . . Section III. is the first philosophical essay that we seem to have read on cold feet. . . . We must with him admit that ice, applied to certain parts of the spinal cord, will promote the menstrual flow, and produce warm feet; and the nine cases mentioned are fully confirmatory of this view. . . . It cannot be doubted, but that the obstetric physician may derive from these views of Dr. Chapman's great assistance in the treatment of many uterine cases, hitherto almost incurable, always tardy and tedious both to patient and himself. Section IV. treats of hæmorrhage and menorrhagic pain cured by means of heat. We are almost better pleased with Dr. Chapman's results here than with the former. The correctness of former results following the use of ice is greatly enhanced when we find exactly the opposite effects following the use of heat applied to the spinal centre. We cannot fail to be struck with the rapidity with which the menorrhagia is controlled. Ergot has not the same power; and the advantages of this plan in many cases of fibroids, change of life, flooding, is very conspicuous. We have read Dr. Chapman's book with pleasure, and we are pleased with his manner of working. It is clear he has made a very useful discovery, and more useful applications, and he knows it. He is not an enthusiast simply. He is a devoted learner and a modest teacher."—*The Medical Mirror*, April, 1867.

LONDON: TRÜBNER & CO., 60, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

WORKS BY DR. CHAPMAN.

Just published, in 8vo, cloth, price 7s. 6d.

DIARRHŒA AND CHOLERA: THEIR NATURE, ORIGIN, AND SUCCESSFUL TREATMENT THROUGH THE AGENCY OF THE NERVOUS SYSTEM.

SECOND EDITION, ENLARGED.

"This is a remarkable book, and worthy the serious attention of every one of our readers. . . . It contains a speculation which exhibits the essential features of a well-constructed theory. . . . Dr. Chapman's remarkably ingenious theory of cholera is in harmony with the results of the most recent physiological investigations; it is clearly put, happily illustrated, logically argued. . . . It is only by a close examination of the detailed application of the hypothesis as a means of rendering intelligible the proximate cause of every special symptom, that a comprehensive conception of the hypothesis becomes possible. . . . Each receives a consistent and intelligible explanation. . . . The strength of the theory lies in its comprehensive and simple explanation of seemingly contradictory phenomena, by the application of a recognised general truth. . . . The chapter on the causes of cholera displays great originality and ingenuity in reconciling and explaining the various modes of action of causative agencies, and a singularly happy power of using his knowledge for the setting forth of new analogies, and the bringing together apparently the most contradictory phenomena for the support of a general law."—*Medical Times and Gazette*, Nov. 3rd, 1866.

"A theory which, from the large number of phenomena of which it offers an explanation, deserves the fullest attention. The author's doctrines appear to be the natural deductions from the experiments of Claude Bernard, Brown-Séquard, and other renowned physiologists. In fact, where those authorities stop Dr. Chapman begins. . . . We are bound to say that we see no flaw in Dr. Chapman's logic, and we believe that those who accept his premises will find no escape from his conclusions. The volume is one elaborate and consistent argument, a carefully reasoned and complete work, which, without lacking the earnestness of an enthusiastic advocate, is destitute of the least approach to offensive dogmatism. We commend it to the serious attention of the profession."—*Medical Press and Circular*, October 9th, 1867.

"Dr. Chapman applies his well-known views of the pathology of disease, and of its treatment, through the agency of the nervous system, with wonderful ingenuity to explain all the phenomena of cholera. His principle of treatment is confidently recommended as promising the best success in this formidable disease. . . . Apart from all peculiarities of theory on the author's part, the present work will be found to contain a clear and complete account of what is known of cholera, and an acute and instructive criticism of the theories of its nature, which have been propounded by different writers."—*Journal of Mental Science*, January, 1867.

"Whatever amount of truth Dr. Chapman's hypothesis may possess, his view is worked out with a display of logical reasoning, formidable facts, and erudition, such as is seldom met with in medical essays. . . . Of the hundred and one treatises on cholera which have been published during the past year, Dr. Chapman's is at once the most interesting, the most scientific, and the most scholarly."—*The Popular Science Review*, January, 1867. Edited by Henry Lawson, M.D.

"The section criticising Dr. George Johnson's castor-oil treatment and lung-capillary theory is very ingenious."—*Indian Medical Gazette*, January, 1867.

"In conclusion, we feel bound to say that Dr. Chapman's hypothesis embodies a great amount of novel truth; that it is ingenious, well reasoned, admirably supported, and not only in harmony with, but in advance of, the results of the highest investigations of the time. The subject is treated with real perspicuity and candour, and with a remarkable desire to appreciate every fact at its true value: and the work, as a whole, lacks nothing that is needed to make it a rare specimen of the application of the severest logic, and the most precise manipulation of language to practical science. Indeed, the book is characterized not only by great ability, by originality of thought, by judicial acumen, and by familiarity with the spirit and tendencies of modern research, but also by a rare power of reconciling apparently contradictory phenomena, and marshalling them together for the support of a common purpose."—*The Medical Mirror*, March, 1867.

"The apparent positive results obtained by the application of the ice-bag in collapse have been the promotion of a more steady reaction and the relief of cramps. One or two of the cases recorded seem to leave little doubt in these respects, and these facts command attention. . . . We cannot afford to throw aside a suggestion supported even by so small a number of cases as Dr. Chapman records. Should cholera again reappear among us, this practical question here at issue should not be left again in doubt."—*Half-Yearly Abstract of the Medical Sciences*, vol. xlv.

The Sickness of Pregnancy and of other Uterine Affections:

*its Pathology and Successful Treatment through the Agency of the Nervous System
by means of Ice.*

[Preparing for Publication.]

LONDON: TRÜBNER & CO., 60, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

WORKS BY DR. CHAPMAN.

Recently published, in 8vo, price 2s. 6d.

SEA-SICKNESS:

ITS NATURE AND SUCCESSFUL TREATMENT

THROUGH THE AGENCY OF THE NERVOUS SYSTEM BY MEANS OF ICE.

[The work contains reports of Seventeen Cases, proving that Sea-Sickness is both preventable and curable by means of the Spinal Ice-bag. Its application is agreeable; it gives immediate comfort and relief; while arresting the sickness, as well as any cramps or spasms which may be experienced, it restores the impaired circulation of the blood to its normal standard; and thus the patient, who may be cold, pallid, apathetic, and completely prostrate, quickly regains the ruddy glow and the mental and physical energy of health.]

"Certainly, so far as the history of these voyages across the Channel goes, it is highly in favour of the author's ingenious recommendations. . . . We advise, both for practical and theoretical purposes, that the pages of this pamphlet be carefully perused."—*Lancet*, March 4, 1865.

"I had some difficulty in persuading passengers to try it (the spinal ice-bag), but those who did were benefited."—*Capt. White, Commander of one of the Newhaven and Dieppe boats.*

"In severe cases, where other remedies have failed, I have very generally found it (the spinal ice-bag) do great good. I have applied it to young children, delicate women, and old people. In no case does it do harm; but in the great majority of instances it soothes the nervous irritability which so commonly accompanies sea-sickness, induces sleep, and so enables the stomach to receive light food, and consequently relieves exhaustion.

. . . . I order it to be kept on a couple of hours; though, if the patient sleeps, as is often the case, I never remove it until after waking."—*Letter of S. M. Bradley, Surgeon, Ounard Service, in the "Lancet,"* December 3, 1864.

"The following is an extract from a letter addressed to me, June 3rd, 1865, by Dr. Hayle, of Rochdale:—"I recommended a patient about to cross the Atlantic to try one of your ice-bags for sea-sickness. The result was most satisfactory. He was never sick when wearing the ice-bag. Once he went without it, and then, and then only, was he sick."

"In the latter part of 1865, Mrs. Charles Darwin wrote to me, that her son had recently experienced the benefit of the spinal ice-bag, while passing from Holyhead to Ireland 'on a rough morning.' She said, 'He is very subject to sea-sickness, and is convinced that, without the ice, he would, on this occasion, have been very bad. He put on the bag soon after starting, when already disordered, and at once felt relief.'—"Diarrhœa and Cholera." By JOHN CHAPMAN, M.D. *Second edition*, p. 132.

"If Dr. Chapman has proposed to us a means of alleviating, with almost perfect certainty, that most distressing malady, sea-sickness, we are criminally neglectful if we refuse to employ it. . . . The case (in question) is as conclusive as a single case can be, in regard to the great practical value of his discovery. . . . The effects of the application of the ice-bag were little short of miraculous. In three minutes the retching ceased and the spasms were calmed. In a quarter of an hour she (the patient) had fallen into a quiet sleep; and in half an hour her hands and feet were of natural warmth, and her face had regained its wonted colour. In two hours she awoke, greatly refreshed, and from that time did not miss a single meal. I can see no reason why the process may not be successfully extended over twelve days as well as four (the treatment was continued during the whole voyage—a rough one, lasting four days and a half—with complete success), with proper care and management."—*Report of "Case of Sea-Sickness successfully treated by Ice to the Spine."* By B. LEE, M.D., in the *Philadelphia Medical and Surgical Reporter*.

Now ready, in 8vo, price One Shilling,

CHLOROFORM AND OTHER ANÆSTHETICS:

THEIR HISTORY AND USE DURING CHILDBIRTH.

LONDON: TRÜBNER & CO., 60, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.