

psychological gentlemen. The New York *Medical Record* in commenting upon Guiteau makes the following very sensible remarks :—

“Guiteau, and all Guiteaus, should, in the present stage of society, be considered responsible, and should be punished. The protection of society and the demands of justice alike call for it.

There has been much said of late about ‘the best leading experts,’ and how sure they are that Guiteau is insane. These experts are quite entitled to their opinion, but it is a mistake to suppose that they represent all the best and widest experience in psychiatry. That in the future Guiteau will be considered insane and irresponsible we cannot believe, assuming that futurity will interest itself in the assassin at all.

Guiteau was the victim of a peculiar psychosis. He was not sane, but we hold that future jurists and experts will find themselves in trouble if they class this psychosis strictly among the insanities. The difficulty that will arise has already shown itself. The insane man cannot do a criminal action; he is not, and cannot be, criminally responsible. This truth has rarely been questioned. Yet society cannot and will not tolerate the idea that so-called ‘reasoning maniacs,’ of the Guiteau type, are irresponsible and require no punishment. Difficulties, disputes, injustice, even social danger, will arise if an original moral perverseness, developed by self-indulgence, makes a man a lunatic, incapable of crime.

Moral insanity has been the bane of the code, and it will continue to be as long as experts insist that Guiteaus are irresponsible. There is such a thing as ultra-expertness, as too much specialism. It sees an uncanny light in every eye. Its psychology deserves to be written.”

CONSULTATIONS WITH HOMŒOPATHS.

Unusual interest has been manifested in the proceedings of the American Medical Association, which met recently at St. Paul, Minn. Some months ago the Medical Society of the State of New York, chafing under the restraints of the American Code of Ethics, framed and adopted a new code, permitting free consultations with competent practitioners of any school. It was claimed that thereby all semblance of prejudice and bigotry would be removed, and the tone of the whole profession elevated. In the millennial days

which would then assuredly come, medical men of all descriptions would lay aside their own particular creeds, dogmas or pathies, and meet together amicably as “true and honest practitioners.” This revolutionary action of the New York Medical Society aroused a perfect storm of opposition throughout the length and breadth of the land, and the journalistic war became fierce and bitter. The Medical Societies of other States hastened to condemn the New York Code, and instructed their delegates to the American Association to oppose any change in the American Code. It soon became evident that professional opinion throughout the United States was almost unanimously against the innovation, and that the New York State Society stood alone, championed only by its faithful ally, the New York *Medical Record*. At St. Paul, the American Medical Association refused admission to the New York delegates, and pronounced emphatically against any relaxation of existing rules. It also repudiated the name “*Allopath*” as applied to members of the regular profession, and defined the position of medical men under the code by the following resolution :—

“In order to correct a misconception which largely prevails in the public mind, and to some extent prevails among members of the medical profession, as to the liberty of action authorized by this Association in the treatment of disease, we deem it proper to make a declaration of principles broadly applicable to the healing art, as sanctioned and practised under our code, to wit: Rational medicine, being based upon experience and pathological research, demands absolute freedom in the selection and administration of *medicamenta*; and there is nothing in the code of ethics of the American Medical Association prohibiting the use by its members of any known and honorable means of combating disease. Furthermore, as contributing to the alleviation of human suffering, we hail with pleasure and gratitude every discovery in etiological and therapeutical science by whomsoever made.

We therefore reject as untrue and obnoxious the term “*Allopathists*” as applied to the members of this Association by dogmatists and extremists without its fold.

First.—Because it tends to convey the erroneous impression that we are restricted to the choice of remedies and the method of using them by other than the limits of rational science.