

## ARE WE THEIR EQUALS?

April 15, 2002

Richard W. Vilter

Physicians account for ten percent of all Literary Club members over the years and though we cannot boast of any US presidents as our lawyer members can, or of a Farney or a Duveneck as can our artist members, I have been impressed by the many civic and cultural contributions that these physicians made. Russell Flick has already told us about John C. Crawford (1883<sup>1</sup>), Consul General to Russia and translator into English of many Finnish literary works, particularly the epic Kalevala. John Diehl told us about Lawrence Carr (1885), contributor of 93 papers and a major club endowment who also helped to stamp out Yellow Fever in the Philippine Islands.

There are many other interesting characters from the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries (dates chosen to avoid any hurt feelings among our present members who, of course, are supermen one and all). I will make brief

---

<sup>1</sup> Literary Club election date.

comments about a few, long since dead, and report in greater detail about three, for whom I have more complete data, even copies of Literary Club papers. Where I have titles only, I will speculate on what lies behind these titles from information about the lives and foibles of the authors. When actual papers are available my comments will be more expansive modeled on the monthly reports of our secretaries.

Brief mention should be made of the following:

John Shaw Billings (1860) one of the great medical bibliographers of the United States; Cornelius George Comegys (1860) one of the main advocates of the merger of the Medical College of Ohio and the Miami Medical School to become the University of Cincinnati College of Medicine during the years 1888-1910; Frederck Roelker (1855) who, as an influential member of the Cincinnati School Board, was responsible for the Cincinnati School System being based on two languages (English and German) until the sinking of the Lusitania by a German submarine in World War I, as well as great grandfathering John Wulsin, an esteemed modern member.

In addition, there was:

- H. Kennon Dunham (1901), who headed Hamilton County's Tuberculosis Hospital (the Dunham Hospital, 1914-1940) until shortly before antibiotics eliminated the need for it;
- Frederick Forchheimer (1876), Professor of Medicine and Dean of the Medical College of Ohio, facilitator of the creation of the College of Medicine, University of Cincinnati;
- Otto P. Geier (1908), founder and director of the Department of Industrial Medicine at the Cincinnati Milling Machine Company (now Cincinnati Milacron), and one of the founders

of the American Association of Industrial Physicians;

- Reuben D. Mussey (1856) and his son, William Heberden Mussey (1861), both Professors of Surgery in the Medical College of Ohio and Miami Medical School, respectively, and later President and Vice President, respectively, of the American Medical Association.
- Benjamin K. Rachford (1896) completes this list. He founded the discipline of Pediatrics in Cincinnati and became the first Professor of Pediatrics, University of Cincinnati.

My most interesting and rewarding discoveries occurred in regard to the following three physicians: Roberts Bartholow (1864), Gustav Brühl (1873), and Martin Fischer (1912).

1) Bartholow: A very early prototype of the consummate professorial scientific physician;

2) Brühl: A poet and world traveler who just happened to be a physician; and

3) Fischer: A charismatic academic physician who often was a pseudoscientist.

Roberts Bartholow was born of Huguenot and English ancestors in New Windsor, Maryland, November 18, 1831. He attended Calvary College, a religious school, where he excelled in languages, correct style and elegance of diction. He was a great public speaker. He was devoted to the study of chemistry and other sciences and believed correctly that these were the foundations of medicine. It is said that he never in his life had a close friend, that he was the embodiment of cynicism, especially regarding empiric medical therapy. He became optimistic only when he considered the advancement of medical therapy through evidence

obtained by experimentation, not by anecdote. In this regard he was 130 years ahead of his time. Frequently he was at odds with the Academy of Medicine and the majority of the medical community. I remember asking my physician father in the late 1920s why he was pressing an unwilling patient, to eat a pound of beef liver daily for his pernicious anemia and was given the cryptic answer "Does good". This was one anecdote that was proved true by Nobel Prize Winner George Minot through experimentation in 1929, but that was the exception.

Bartholow received his M.D. degree from the University of Maryland after two years of study. He did postgraduate work for two more years in the clinics and hospitals of Baltimore and then became an Assistant Surgeon in the US Army. He was involved in the Indian wars and in our Civil War where he gained so much experience in sanitation that he was placed in charge of several large army hospitals. He married and found army life incompatible with marital happiness. After hostilities ended he resigned his commission and settled in Cincinnati where he was taken under the wing of Frederick Roelker, M.D. whose name has already been mentioned. Bartholow became Professor of Chemistry in the Ohio Medical School over the objections of the Academy of Medicine which preferred a professional chemist. His hypothesis, that Cincinnati's cholera epidemic of the mid 1860s was due to a contaminated water supply, was also opposed by the Academy, but Bartholow was vindicated and in 1866 he took charge of Cincinnati's Cholera Hospital with great success. He became Professor of Materia Medica in 1869 and revolutionized the teaching of therapeutics by illustrating the action of drugs in experimental animals thus substituting demonstration for dogmatic rationalization. He rose to a position of great prominence in American medicine receiving honorary fellowships from four prestigious medical societies. He never went out of his way to avoid a good fight. He had one with the head of his medical school's surgical department, George Blackman. In 1860 Blackman had

joined a colleague named Tripler to write a Handbook of Military Surgery. Bartholow accused Blackman of plagiarism, the source of Blackman's ideas and data being Guthrie and McCloud's Surgical History of the Crimean War from which, according to Blackman, much of the contents had been liberally borrowed. Blackman was incensed by Bartholow's accusations. He was given his chance to even the score when Bartholow published an article in the Cincinnati Journal of Medicine on Progressive Locomotor Ataxia in which Bartholow had given credit to M. Paul Topinard's prize essay on this subject writing that he had made liberal use of this reference.

Blackman wrote "there is a world of difference between liberal and literal." Bartholow published a pamphlet in his own defense in which he refers to Blackman's "vanity, egotism, self assertion, jealousies, impertinence, and meddling" and states that "Blackman had been quarreling with everybody including God Almighty and that the cause of the present difficulty was Blackman's insane envy of Bartholow who had just won the Jewett and Russell prizes." These kinds of feuds at one point had lead to the resignation of the entire faculty of the Ohio Medical School except for Blackman and the imperturbable Dr. James Graham, head of the Department of Medicine. To resolve the situation without firing Blackman, who was very popular in the National Surgical community, the trustees of the school resorted to the creation of Chairs of Clinical Medicine and Clinical Surgery which would have kept Blackman and Graham in the commercial hospital (the forerunner of University Hospital) rather than in the College of Medicine. Graham (to restore the peace) and Blackman probably for the same unspoken reason accepted the new arrangement as well as an ironclad rule preventing professors from speaking discourteously or rudely of each other. However, the rest of the faculty promptly resigned over the loss of their academic rights. Then the school's trustees, also, resigned over the faculty's evident loss of confidence. The governor of Ohio accepted their resignations but the

next day promptly reappointed all them. Apparently fatigue had set in by that time; the faculty met, reorganized, and a temporary peace reigned. This cataclysmic conflict around the use of two words, liberal and literal, had been stirred up by Bartholow, who in his Literary Club paper Quarrels Among Doctors, compared this episode with one described by George Elliott in Middlemarch about which I will comment later.

In 1870, Bartholow became Professor of the Practice of Medicine (Head of the Department of Medicine) when Graham died. His fame as a clinician and teacher spread worldwide. He carried out some experiments on a patient who had lost a large part of the skull due to cancer. Using electrodes and galvanic current he demonstrated that what had been learned about the functions of various parts of the brain from similar studies in laboratory animals applied also to human beings, but his patient died, possibly because of these studies. He published them in The American Journal of Medical Sciences and was widely criticized for invading what was considered the most sacred part of the human body. To his critics he responded that he had no reason to expect that the current would prove electrolytic and that the tissue would be damaged, citing a celebrated case of a man who recovered after a crowbar had been passed through his brain, demonstrating that the brain is tolerant of injury. He published an apology which was accepted by the British Medical Journal whose editors said that the apology disarmed further criticism. In 1879 at the peak of his career he accepted the appointment of Professor of Materia Medica at the University of Pennsylvania, the premier medical school of that day. He died in Philadelphia in 1904 after a long illness, probably Alzheimer's Disease or, since he was a diabetic, of the Multiple Small Stroke Syndrome.

He was reported to have read seven papers to the Literary Club. In The Cholera [November 10, 1866] in the midst of the cholera epidemic, he probably

recounted his experiences running hospitals in the US Army camps during the Civil War leading to his conclusion that cholera was due to poor sanitation which, in respect to the cholera epidemic in Cincinnati, only Cincinnati could eliminate by cleaning up the water supply. He probably belabored the Academy of Medicine for not accepting his theories speaking of their meetings, which in the words of Juettner were "solemn occasions where mutual incense offerings were made, where any disturbance of convention and deviation from the noiseless tenor of long established tradition are looked upon as sacrilegious. Nothing reveals the mettle of a man better than self dependent disregard for petrification, a hatred of that conservatism which is synonymous with stagnation and consequent decomposition."

On December 21, 1867 he gave a paper entitled Physiology of the Brain in which he probably defended his experiments on the human living brain to which reference has already been made. He probably argued incorrectly that the end justifies the means in a hopelessly ill patient.

On December 2, 1871 he read a paper entitled Quarrels of Doctors in which he probably referred to his encounters with Blackman and similar encounters of his idol, Daniel Drake, and Drake's nemesis, John Moorhead. In previous generations these quarrels often were settled by duels with pistols. So some progress has been made.

On March 6, 1875 he read a paper entitled The Physical Degeneracy of the American Woman. Since nothing that I have read about him reveals his feelings about women, even his wife (though he retired from the army in order to be with her more frequently), I can only suspect that what he saw around him led to a negative reaction because that was his habit, and pictures from that period suggested that he was correct.

The next paper was the Gymnasium Folly on February 26, 1876 probably poking fun at the Turnverein rage in the Cincinnati German community of those days. Beer, bad jokes and squandered good fellowship, lead to the expenditure of much energy which could have been devoted to better ends.

Another paper was entitled Influence of the Mental State on Disease. It was probably devoted to speculations on the earliest glimmer of psychosomatic medicine and the influence of the brain over the functions of the rest of the body in which he had an intense interest (see above).

Finally, on June 29, 1878 he presented Microscopic Disclosures - The World of the Microbe harkening back to the 1866 cholera epidemic and Cincinnati's water supply. This must have been terrifying when viewed under a microscope. He was a devotee of microscopic observations.

I was able to find a copy of only one of Bartholow's Literary Club papers Doctors of the Modern Novel, read on November 22, 1873. He states that: "The doctor is becoming more and more a conspicuous character in modern fiction. Rarely does he appear as a hero. Usually he plays a humbler part of simply contributing to the dramatic situation in which hero and heroine are placed. Having to deal with the physical side of human nature, he becomes monotonously practical and unpoetic." He points out that: "In Shakespeare's writings, doctor's skills are frequently depreciated" and that "Hogarth, the artist, satirizes some of the most prominent physicians, accoucheurs and quacks of his time, grouping their heads in the undertaker's arms". In other works doctors are portrayed as fools. For example Dr. Slop, an obstetrician who had invented a new delivery forceps, was forced to play second fiddle to the she midwife. Bartholow's final comment was: "In the 1870s doctors are treated with more respect, yet authors still poke fun at them."

He wrote extensively about Middlemarch, a famous novel by George Elliott pointing out the author's tremendous knowledge of medicine and the interpersonal relationships of physicians of her period. From Middlemarch he recapitulates some of his very recent experiences in particular his feuds with Blackman to which I have already referred. He wrote, "Lydgate, the hero of Middlemarch, was placed in charge of a hospital as superintendent to practice those forms of medical treatment that he strove to carry out with his private cases. There was also a consulting staff. Here as elsewhere the hospital staff fell to quarreling. The consulting staff resigned leaving Lydgate in possession, but in possession that only invited future warfare." He continues: "Nothing could be more life-like than the contentious bickerings and jealousies of the Middlemarch doctors. None realize the high ideals with which they commenced their careers." The sad lesson which the author teaches in the career of Lydgate is that: "Circumstances are stronger than our wills." This statement is true even today.

Bartholow applauds "The tendency of medical practice to more exact and scientific methods, the rejection of dogmas and obsolete theories, the recognition of the powers of nature, the awareness of the natural history of disease and the superiority of the expectant and restorative plan in the treatment of self-limited disease." He urges physicians to increase their knowledge of the microscope, the thermometer and the stethoscope, high tech for those days. Bartholow's message throughout this paper is to rely on scientific evidence, not anecdote-based medicine. We are still using the same words though our technology has advanced by a quantum leap.

A famous member of German descent, Gustav Brühl (1873), remembered more often as a poet than as a physician, was born in 1826 in Herdorf, Rhine Provinces. He studied medicine in Germany, principally in Munich, immigrated to America in 1848 during one of the great German migrations and located in Cincinnati

for the same River Rhine nostalgia that had infected many of his confreres. He developed a large medical practice, helped in the organization of St. Mary's Hospital, and was the first laryngoscopist in Cincinnati having studied the technique in Germany before coming here.

He was a great traveler and visited every part of the world accessible to visitors in that period. In Central America he studied the remnants and artifacts of prehistoric races and wrote a book of great scope on the civilization of the Aztecs. Another of his books was a travelogue picturing the people, the scenery and the natural history of the Western American continent entitled Zwischen Alaska und dem Feuerlande (between Alaska and the tropics). He wrote five volumes of poetry, including Charlotte patterned in the style of Goethe, Hermann and Dorothea with many similarities to Longfellow's Evangeline, Poesins des Urwalds dealing with mountains, forest and pioneer life in the Middle West, and Skanderbeg, an epic poem taken from the medieval history of Western Europe. His poetry non de plum was Kara Giorg. Many of his literary works can be found in the Cincinnati Public Library but all are written in German. I found one of his Literary Club papers in the library of the Cincinnati Historical Society. It is entitled How Ancient America Wrote. This paper (in English) begins "When the savage hunter of the dark forests of the north put each day a pebble in his moshkimut to mark the days of absence from his loved ones - when the herdsman made knots in a string to record the number of his flock, they were leading the way to wampum and quippo (quipu). The former were strings of small beads made of shells and bits of colored wood strung in a manner to form figures and characters that were used by North American Indians as money. The latter was a contrivance employed by ancient Peruvians for arithmetical purposes and as mnemonic devices to register important facts and events. The apparatus consisted of a main cord from which hung, at certain distances, smaller cords of various colors, each having a special meaning. Knots

were tied in the smaller cords representing definite numbers. The abacus may have developed from this or similar types of apparatus."

"The native dialects abounded in figurative and paraphrasical expressions thus furnishing the symbols for an ideographic notation. How much labor and time did it save the Blackfoot Indian when he could represent the moon with his curved finger, which in words he called natoocoucoui or the war club, with a simple emblem which he called meniquapecocsaque."

"The Incas used woolen strings or threads of different sizes and colors, variously knotted, intertwined and fastened to a large base cord as a means of keeping records."

"As long as these quippos were the sole treasuries of learning of these (Inca) rulers, they had nothing to fear from progress and enlightenment, those dangerous foes of despotic authority. Inca rules' motto was Science is not intended for the masses."

"All attempts in our day to read the Incas' records have proved futile nor have we the verbal commentary to explain the subject matter of the documents." He discusses the Hieroglyphics of the Incas both on stone and on portable substances and made of leaves or cloth. Picture writing developed embellishments around the pictures. The pictures originally meant the object that was drawn. Gradually, with the embellishment, they represented an idea and ultimately a sound of the alphabet. "The contemplative mind of the Mayas, the Grecians of this continent, seems not alone to have reached this climax of the pictorial art, but even to have broken down the thin barrier that divides it from the alphabet. The Mayan alphabet had 27 letters and several syllabic characters. They employed figures and signs within figures. What is badly needed is a Mayan Rosetta stone."

In addition, on November 28, 1873 he read A Novelette of the Greek War of Independence (presumably from the Turks). On January 2, 1875 he read The Original Seat of the Human Race. This probably was a travelogue through Egypt and Mesopotamia. On unknown dates he read Doctors and the Healing Arts (all art and practically no science then); An Ancient Center of Learning and Commerce, probably a description of Alexandria, Egypt; and on March 4, 1876 Historical Errors. There were so many that I can only guess that he may have commented on Napoleon at Waterloo, or his invasion of Russia, the division of the Roman Empire, east and west; the building of the Great Wall of China symbolizing the isolation of the Chinese people and the European Central Powers Drang Nach Osten, that is, March to the East, which lead to disaster.

Of all our physician members of the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> Centuries, Gustav Bruehl and Martin Fischer, whom I am about to describe, came closest to being Renaissance Men.

Martin Henry Fisher (1912), a more modern German import, was born November 10, 1879 in Kiel, Schleswig-Holstein. At the age of 6 he was brought to the United States of America by his Grandmother. He grew up in Chicago and proved to be a very precocious student graduating from Rush Medical College at age 21. He had rheumatic heart disease and was not given much chance of a long life, but as in other matters he dumbfounded his biographers and lived to the age of 83, dying of a carcinoma of the mouth and throat.

He loved people and was a very accomplished communicator. At age 17 he served as a substitute teacher. He was, he reported, a class of 300 in organized disorder. He did postgraduate studies in Europe returning to Rush to teach Pathology, then to the University of Chicago, the University of California and the University of Oakland College of Medicine and Surgery. Finally he was lured to Cincinnati where his friend, William Wherry, was Professor of Microbiology.

At age 31 he became Professor of Physiology and headed that department for 40 years. He fitted his lecture hall as a medieval pharmacy shop with attractive urns and bottles of all sizes gracing the walls. The windows of beautiful stained glass depicted the great events in medical history. He taught by the Socratic Method, pinning one student after another to the wall trying to draw out of them explanations, new ideas, and concepts. At least half of his students knew they learned no physiology and found it a waste of time. The other half regarded Martin Fisher as god. He developed many theories based on half-truths, such as organic tissues are colloids and colloidal chemistry rather than the chemistry of solutes must apply, and therefore he became a colloid chemist. He had another theory that many diseases then of undetermined etiology were due to hidden foci of infection, the infection working its deleterious results by noxious humors carried by the blood stream to the body's organs producing damaging effects. The teeth and gums were one such locus, the gallbladder and colon, others. Ergo cure the disease by removing the cause and remove the cause early to prevent disease. He practices what he preached and had all of his own teeth pulled and the alveolar ridges scraped to such a degree that there remained no safe resting place for false teeth. This explains one of his typical gestures, holding his handkerchief to his mouth while he lectured; but woe to his friends if they were in the way when he sneezed. Also many colons were removed from schizoid patients who were inmates of Longview Mental Hospital. As far as I can tell none were cured or even improved.

He was a gracious entertaining host in his home - impeccably dressed - even courtly. He was an artist of some reputation and became a pigment chemist trying to improve the materials with which artists worked. He was a skillful biographer of his colleagues, a frequent Literary Club contributor, but his most lasting memorials are his "Fischerisms." Here are some samples preserved for us by his students.

- Knowledge is a process of piling up facts; wisdom lies in their simplification.
- Be a god to the outside but not to yourself. Don't wobble outside, wobble inside.
- Get busy! Michelangelo carved his satyr at 14; Grotius represented his Holland in a peace conference at age 15; Galileo discovered the isochronism of the pendulum at 19, and Voltaire had a book at 20.
- The new appears as a minority point of view and hence is unpopular. The function of a university is to give it sanctuary.
- Every discovery in science is a tacit criticism of things as they are, that is why the wise man is invariably called a fool.
- Life is a ticket to the greatest show on earth, as a doctor you have a front seat.
- The specialist is a man who fears the other subjects. He is too often hypertrophied in one direction and atrophied in the rest.
- Here is good advice for practice: Go into partnership with nature. She does more than half of the work and asks none of the fee.
- In the sick room ten cents worth of human understanding equals ten dollars worth of medical science.
- Half the modern drugs (of his day) could be thrown out the window except the birds might get them.

Among the many Literary Club papers that Martin Fisher wrote (all in the Medical Heritage Library of the College of Medicine) are four that carry the same

message: "Though Darwin and Mendel's theories of evolution hold the public fancy in the twentieth century (survival of the fittest and the earliest glimmer of a genetic code evolving over millions of years through chance mutation controlling what we are and do), Lamarck many years earlier and his disciple, Casper Redfield, also have proposed ideas, the inheritance of acquired characteristics, that are very attractive and compelling, explaining the how of the proposals of Darwin and Mendel." These papers are entitled The New Hope in Heredity (1920), Stirring Up Strife (1923), Evolution and Casper Redfield (1958), and Intelligence and How You Got That Way (1960).

"The winners of a new generation are the progeny of hard working parents, the losers are the sons and daughters of the retired best families." This is the thesis of his paper, New Hope in Heredity (1920) and more or less the others in this series. Hard work on the part of the progenitor is the how of the transmission. He pits Lamarckism as Lamarck conceived of it versus Mendelian genetics and Darwin's survival of the fittest. Fisher says his dictionary defines an acquisition "as something gained through ones' own efforts, not in a passive way." My dictionary apparently differs from Lamarck's and Fisher's in that the qualifying word usually has been inserted before gained. Fisher's thesis is that a winning race horse is more likely to pass on its progeny that desirable characteristic if the winner is bred at the peak of its prowess on the track rather than later when it has been put to pasture and that hard work is the key to this breeding success. He reports data on racehorses, hunting dogs, milk cows, and even the giants of the human race, all very convincing were it not for the fact that his are not pure experimental data and he has no controls. Darwin was writing about evolution over eons of time, not developments within one or two generations. Survival of the fittest had to be true to allow the appearance of transmission of characteristics seemingly acquired through hard work, whereas an indolent life seemed to lead to loss of these

attributes (or from rags to riches and back to rags in three or four generations). These successes (or failures) are not genetic or evolutionary but rather the effect of environment on an already evolved individual capable of reacting in either way to a positive or negative environmental stimulus.

In 1923 he presented to the club a paper entitled Stirring Up Strife stating "When to struggle is no longer necessary, civilizations die. Education delivered on a silver platter is useless unless we believe that our objective is to get through this world with the least possible personal effort - but this assumed utopia leads to intellectual, moral, and muscular atrophy," presumably inherited by our offspring. This is certainly a debatable platitude, but there is no proof that it has anything to do with evolution, though he tries to make it so.

Then he let a long time elapse before he approached this same subject again, but on December 8, 1958, never daunted, he read another paper, this one entitled Evolution and Casper Redfield. This paper begins "These remarks originally entitled Biological Maze AD 1958 might just as well have been written Biological Haze - Biological Daze - Biological Mysticism - Biological Confusion. The paragraphs about to follow will record things on one side questioning man's beliefs of the last century and one-half, on the other calling attention to some men and matters too much forgotten. I tried to do this 30 years ago in the club but with little response. These words are a second attempt."

His excuse for doing this was that the Charles Darwin year, the celebration of the publication Origin of the Species and therewith his concept of evolution and the survival of the fittest was drawing to a close. Among the greats of this epoch was Casper L. Redfield, 1853-1943, who tried to explain the how of evolution through the theories of Lamarck (inheritance of acquired characteristics). This paper is beautifully

written and in fact is sometimes poetic, but unfortunately incorrect for the reasons that I have already noted. He has no acceptable controls.

On December 5, 1960 he makes his fourth and last attempt to win over his audience to his melding of Lamarckism and Darwinism. He presented the paper Intelligent and How You Got That Way. He said "Just what is an acquired characteristic, and how might such be unleashed? A father or mother of mature years is more definitely possessed of acquired mental character than a younger one; and, if it is allowed that there is an important education which is not bounded by the walls of our famous red schoolhouse," (that is, education in the home), "even our so-called very old men and women may not yet have all entered into the state of their second childhood" (and presumably provide such education). He thinks that these folks produce more stellar progeny than do the young fathers and mothers. He suggests it is inheritance of acquired characteristics, though he does grudgingly admit that the older people provide a home environment which on average fosters the development of superstars. He repeats that hard physical and mental work on the part of the parents favors this process. He acknowledges the importance of the basic genetic background but offers a ray of hope in each paper growing fainter that it can be altered in the short term and the alteration acquired by and for future generations. He passes off lightly the many generations of rodents whose tails Weissman and his technicians cut off without producing at birth a single short tailed offspring, and Shakespeare's admonition that "There is a destiny that shapes our ends rough hew them how we will." I am a great advocate of hope but not to the degree Martin Fisher was.

Martin Fisher comes close to being a Renaissance man, a teacher, a scientist, an author, and development of pigments for painters as well as being a talented painter himself. Yet as I have pointed out, most of the theories that attracted attention in colloid

chemistry, in foci of infections and finally in the inheritance of acquired characteristics have gained no support in intervening years. However, if his students would listen, he taught them to think, to raise questions about the improbable and though he did not do it always himself, to follow the scientific method with concurrent rather than historical or no controls, to back up theoretical results. One thing is certain, Literary Club physicians were an interesting, varied and controversial group! Can it truly be said that we of another generation are their equals? I'll leave the answer to you.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Juettner, Otto - Daniel Drake and his followers 1909, Harvey Publishing CO., Cincinnati, Ohio.
  2. Flick, Russell D. - "Our Man in Russia", Literary Club Paper, May 11, 1998.
  3. Diehl, John; Carr, Lawrence C. - Literary Club Paper, October 31, 1983.
  4. Archives of The Cincinnati Historical Society, the Medical Heritage Library of the University of Cincinnati, and the Cincinnati and Hamilton County Public Library for other bibliographical and biographical data.
-