

I fell to wondering what was passing through his mind. He was sitting on the ground in the conservatory, and I could see him through the window. His face was expressionless. What, again, are the Saki thinking—the people who lived in Malaya even before the Malays? It would be interesting to know. An old chief of the Sakis was once speaking to a friend of mine, and referred to the time when the monkeys could talk. 'But you don't really believe the monkeys ever talked?' asked my friend. 'Of course they did, Tuan, before the white man came.' 'But, if that were so, why should they have stopped talking when the white man came?' 'Well, you see, Tuan,' was the old man's reply, 'the monkeys are wise folk, and, when the white man came, they saw that those who could talk had to work; and, as they did not wish

to work, they stopped talking and never spoke again.' I often thought of that story when I watched the old kabun silently pulling the cord of the punkah, and wondered if he and some of his Malay friends, and the Saki too, say little—little, at any rate, that the white man can hear and understand—lest more strenuous work might be demanded of them.

Whither are all these thoughts of the youth of Malaya leading? When I was in Singapore I visited the new naval base, and thought of this great country as it is to be. I thought of the flow of emigrants coming in from China and of the boundless natural resources of a country that, until a few years ago, was largely covered with jungle. The youth of Malaya cannot say, at any rate, that it has not its opportunity to-day. How will it meet it?

OSTEOPATHY AND THE PUBLIC¹

BY WILFRID A. STREETER

OSTEOPATHY, as a system of healing which differs from ordinary medicine not only in its view of the causation of disease but in its technique and methods of treatment, has become a subject of acute controversy. Through the ill-advised action of the General Medical Council in victimizing registered medical men who associate themselves with the work of osteopathic practitioners, the public generally has begun to suspect the existence of a conflict between two schools of medical thought—between the or-

thodox, established school, and a new school struggling for recognition against the opposition of vested interests. This suspicion is not ill-founded. Such a conflict is actually in progress in this country. Osteopathy, as a new development of the science and art of healing, is seeking to obtain recognition and legal status on the basis of claims which orthodox medicine is unwilling to allow.

Much misunderstanding exists, even among medical men, in regard to the claims of the osteopaths. In a sentence, what the osteopaths aim at is nothing less than the creation of a

¹ From the *Empire Review* (London public-affairs monthly), August

school of mechano-therapeutics, as representing a branch of the healing art which orthodox medicine has never understood or hitherto attempted to practise. To achieve their end the osteopaths claim the freedom to develop the principles taught by the founder of osteopathy, Dr. Andrew T. Still, half a century ago, and to apply these principles to the cure of disease without interference from the representatives of orthodox medicine.

Osteopathy is a system of healing based upon the theory that the fundamental and predisposing cause of disease is structural derangement or impairment of the physical integrity of the body. It teaches, therefore, that the first step in the cure of disease is to deal with structural derangements which cause functional disturbances of the vascular and nervous systems and impede the flow of the vital fluids in the organs and tissues of the body, thereby lowering the body's powers of resistance to the invasion and propagation of pathogenic germs. Holding these views concerning the causation and treatment of disease, the osteopaths consider that they are entitled to say that osteopathy is a system of healing standing apart from the older systems which regard the pathological invasion of the body as the most important factor in the diagnosis and treatment of disease.

But the propaganda conducted by the General Medical Council, nominally in defense of the standards of the medical profession but actually as an attack upon the practitioners of this new system, unfairly confuses osteopathy with various irregular and empirical forms of medical treatment, such as chiropractic, faith healing, bonesetting, and the like. Thus the official representatives of orthodox medicine have certainly tried to create the impression that osteopaths are no

better than quacks and charlatans, practising upon the credulity of the public.

In meeting this attack some osteopaths seem disposed to adopt an apologetic attitude. They appear to be more anxious to obtain the recognition and approval of the General Medical Council than to assert the full claim of osteopathy for such legal equality with orthodox medicine as it has already obtained in the United States, where it originated more than fifty years ago. I am, personally, quite indifferent to the General Medical Council's views of osteopathy, and I strongly oppose any proposal to place the control and regulation of osteopathy in the hands of such a body. The difference between osteopathy and ordinary medicine is not merely one of treatment; there is a radical difference of principle and of method between the two systems of therapy, and those who practise the one cannot logically espouse the other. Certainly they cannot practise both with advantage to their patients. There is no more reason for thinking that an ordinary medical man, taught to believe in the efficacy of drugs, can understand and practise the osteopathic technique by taking a post-graduate course in manipulative surgery than that the osteopath can qualify for the practice of medicine by taking lessons in making up prescriptions.

The study of medicine is not the proper qualification for the osteopath, and the practitioner who attempts to do both will not succeed with either. Even the basic sciences common to both systems — anatomy and physiology in particular — receive a different interpretation in osteopathic institutions from that given in the orthodox medical schools. Anatomical and physiological facts are studied by the osteopath in the light of the osteo-

pathic theory concerning the causation of disease, and with a view to the acquisition of the characteristic osteopathic technique. This differentiates osteopathy from ordinary medicine. But osteopathy is also differentiated from chiropractic, which is an unscientific and empirical adaptation of osteopathic principles imperfectly comprehended and inadequately taught. It is a parasitical excrescence upon osteopathy, which had been developing both scientifically and practically for at least a quarter of a century before chiropractic appeared, and had been placed by the laws of the United States on a totally different footing from that held by chiropractic, both in respect of educational standards and of professional rights and responsibilities. To identify osteopathy with chiropractic is as confusing and misleading as it is to identify bonesetting with osteopathy.

- Osteopathy is often misinterpreted as meaning nothing more than some form of bonesetting treatment. The name is admittedly something of a misnomer. But it is probably no more misleading than the term 'allopathy' (which means literally 'another suffering') employed as a description of eclectic medicine, or 'homœopathy' (meaning literally 'similar suffering'). In so far as the word 'osteopathy' signifies merely the treatment of bones or bone disease, it is unsatisfactory; but it is difficult to invent a better term for a system which is founded upon the fact that derangements or maladjustments of the body framework, especially the spine, as well as disturbed relations of ligaments, tendons, blood vessels, muscles, nerves, and body tissues generally, are the predisposing factors in all disease. On the analogy of such words as 'allopathy' or 'homœopathy' used as a means of describing the therapeutic action of

drugs, 'osteopathy' is the word coined by the founder of the system to define the principle that the first step in the cure of disease is the correction and removal of all abnormalities in the body framework.

Herein lies the essential cause of the antagonism between the osteopath and the orthodox medical practitioner. They approach the problem of disease from opposite angles. To the osteopath the important thing is to ascertain the *cause* of the trouble he is called upon to treat, and he eschews the use of drugs as far as possible on the ground that the action of most drugs affects symptoms and not causes. Orthodox medicine, on the other hand, attaches the utmost importance to the therapeutic action of drugs. Orthodox medicine has had a long and instructive history. No part of that history is more significant than the efforts that have been made to shut out the ignorant and reckless use of drugs, to rationalize the system of drug-therapy, and to eliminate from the pharmacopœia the thousands of worthless and baneful concoctions which have been prescribed as 'remedies' for various diseases. Modern medical science recognizes that from ninety to ninety-five per cent of drugs are worthless, and is beginning even to doubt the specific value of the remainder. In advanced medical practice the limitations of drug-therapy are admitted, and there is an increasing tendency among physicians who keep abreast of scientific knowledge to rely more and more upon the body's own powers of resistance and recovery rather than to depend upon drug medication. The theory of the immunologists, like the remarkable developments of Sir Almroth Wright's methods of treating open infected wounds during the war, tends to reinforce the leading principles of osteop-

athy as defined and applied in present-day practice.

By its refusal to admit the curative action of most drugs, and by its insistence upon the theory that the body contains within itself all the forces necessary for the maintenance of health and the cure of disease, osteopathy is clearly differentiated from ordinary medicine. Its essential principle is not compromised by the osteopath being willing to admit that there are some drugs and serums—a very limited number—which have been empirically proved to be beneficial in certain contingencies. Drugs and surgical operations may even prove to be necessary when disease has been allowed to make such progress in the body that vital organic processes are threatened. But there is all the difference in the world between the medical practitioner who relies on drug-therapeutics, or the surgeon who resorts ruthlessly to the knife as the natural and necessary treatment, and the osteopath who bases his practice upon the principle that the predisposing cause of disease is an impairment of the structural integrity of the body.

Apart from this fundamental difference of view concerning the cause and cure of disease, the osteopath has no reason to quarrel with orthodox medical practitioners. Whatever quarrel there is between them has been forced upon the osteopath by the necessity of having to fight for freedom to develop his system of healing without interference from the representatives of the dominant school of medical thought in this country. For more than half a century, osteopathy has been developing both scientifically and practically in the United States, on a footing of complete equality with ordinary medicine. In this country, on the other hand, osteopathy is not regarded as legally a branch of either medicine or

surgery. And this is the issue which vitally concerns the British public.

In this country at the present time osteopaths have to carry on their practice under the stigma of being 'irregular practitioners.' They are classed with chiropractors, herbalists, faith healers, and so on—as untrained and incompetent persons who pretend to be able to cure disease. The fact that the reputable osteopath in the United States has been required to undergo a course of training that is actually more exacting than the average minimum requirements of the standard medical colleges in America is ignored. The public is misled by the propaganda of the General Medical Council, which asserts that osteopaths are not qualified to treat or even to diagnose some forms of disease. As a consequence the public is led to believe that there is something dangerous in submitting to osteopathic treatment, that at best the scope of the treatment is definitely restricted, and that in the last resort a cure for bodily ills must be sought from drugs or the knife, according to the nature of the trouble.

Thereby, as I profoundly believe, the people suffer a grievous loss. It is, in my view, contrary to public policy that any obstruction should be placed in the way of developing the science and art of healing. For several hundred years orthodox medicine, professedly an eclectic system, ready to take account of all extensions of scientific knowledge and to use the fruits of research, has been practically at a standstill so far as the actual cure of disease is concerned. There has been a vast amount of investigation by learned and able men—but what has been the result for the sick man? Leaving out of account the marvels of modern surgery, what has the system of orthodox medicine done to assimilate

the far-reaching theories and careful work of scientific men?

For the answer to this question one has only to refer to the curriculum of the medical schools which still painfully educate their students in the properties of thousands of drugs, more than nine tenths of which the intelligent physician would never dream of prescribing for any ailment whatsoever. To all intents and purposes modern medical practice has definitely parted company with the tenets of the established medical schools, and the popularity of new health cults, such as heliotherapy, attests the changing direction of medical thought away from the traditional ideas concerning the curative action of drugs, except in so far as a certain very limited number of drugs may, by their action under certain conditions, raise the specific immunity of the body and assist it to repel and recover from the onset of disease.

But, if this is an accurate description of present-day tendencies in medical practice, what ought to be the attitude of the official representatives of orthodox medicine toward the development of a newer system, based on rational anatomical and physiological principle? It should not be an attitude of sneering superiority or unteachability. Whether the claims made for osteopathy are well founded or erroneous is a matter for intelligent argument and the practical tests of experience, not for supercilious disparagement of the qualifications of osteopathic practitioners who have, to the number of many thousands, given as much time and ability to the study and practice of osteopathy as the orthodox medical men have given to their system. All that the osteopaths claim is freedom to demonstrate the soundness of their principles and the value of their technique. And, surely, all that the custodians and guardians of medical

ethics and educational standards can justly insist upon is that the representatives of the newer system of healing — which has just as much right to be called a system as that of orthodox medicine — shall not lower the standards of professional training and competence while their methods and principles are being proved.

This is precisely what the osteopaths seek to do by proposing the establishment of a separate osteopathic board to prescribe the standards of education and technical competence for their profession and to regulate its practice in this country. Nobody claims for the osteopath any special privileges or immunities. On the contrary, we insist that the course of training pursued in the recognized osteopathic colleges of America is as thoroughgoing in all respects, save one, as the course prescribed for medical practitioners. Osteopathic students have the same fundamental training in the basic sciences, and a longer and more careful training in physical, clinical, differential, and X-ray diagnosis than the medical student is given in the orthodox schools. The only subject upon which the osteopathic student is not required to spend any time is *materia medica* — and the time saved from the study of useless and often harmful drugs is devoted to the acquisition of the difficult technique of manipulation which, combined with the intensive study of anatomy and physiology, supplies the osteopath with his characteristic equipment as a healer.

It is surely not in the public interest that any official body, in the exercise of powers conferred upon it by Parliament for the protection of the public and the safeguarding of the interests of a vitally important profession, should be allowed to use those powers to impede the development of new knowledge and new methods. Yet that is what the

General Medical Council has done and is still doing. Medical men who have become convinced of the scientific *bona fides* and practical value of osteopathy cannot associate themselves with the work of qualified and reputable osteopaths of high professional standing and competence without running the risk of losing their own professional status as medical men and being removed from the Medical Register.

Such was the fate that befell the late Dr. Axham. A similar fate may yet befall my own colleague and friend, Dr. Frank Collie, who has joined me in my work after having satisfied himself by personal investigation that the claims made for osteopathy are well founded. It is a fate which may befall any medical man, however eminent, as

long as the General Medical Council is permitted to pursue its present mistaken policy in relation to the practitioners of osteopathy. Nothing in the history of the General Medical Council warrants the belief that such a body can be entrusted with the responsibility of prescribing the standards and regulating the practice of this new system of healing. If the medical profession is satisfied that it is a body which has acted wisely in protecting the interests of medical men, they are entitled to rally in defense of it. But neither the public interest nor the cause of scientific education will be advanced as long as the General Medical Council is allowed to interfere with the development of new principles of healing of which it does not approve.

VALE

BY Æ

[*Irish Statesman*]

THIS was the heavenly hiding place
Wherein the spirit laughed a day,
All its proud ivories and fires
Shrunk to a shovelful of clay.

It must have love, this silent earth,
To leap up at the King's desire,
Moving in such a noble dance
Of wreathed ivory and fire.

It will not stir for me at all,
Nor answer me with voice nor gleam.
Adieu, sweet-memored dust, I go
After the Master for the dream.

A JOURNEY TO ABYSSINIA. IV¹

BY JEAN D'ESME

SEPTEMBER 26 is the most important day in the Abyssinian calendar, when everyone, from the Empress to the humblest peasant, celebrates the *Meskal*, or great religious and national holiday.

For eight days participants and spectators have been pouring into the city. Addis Ababa is athrill with joyous impatience, and, as if in anticipatory honor of the occasion, all the country around has suddenly become abloom with little yellow flowers. Upon a turfy plain below the city, and not far from the railway station, thousands of laborers are smoothing the ground for the coming exercises. Numbers supply the place of machinery. Hundreds of men are busy with simple pointed sticks cutting square sods, which are piled into baskets and borne away by long files of willing carriers to the place where the pavilion of Prince Taffari is to stand.

Dawn of the eventful day itself finds an endless procession of people winding toward the site of the festivities — a steady stream of white *chammas*, jostling in its tumultuous progress mules and horses bearing in the same direction lords and ladies of the realm. Almost every man carries a rifle over his shoulder and wears a bright-colored cartridge belt, while above the white flood toss straw umbrellas, constantly colliding with the troubled movement of the throng beneath.

At the field itself the procession is

¹From *L'Écho de Paris* : (Clerical daily), August 20, 25

deflected by rigid ranks of soldiers drawn up around a vast empty rectangle, and overflows the surrounding plain and eucalyptus-dotted hillsides. This flood of humanity, through which the columns of soldiers constantly arriving from all directions plough their way, is in incessant agitation, and roars its joyous greetings whenever a great feudal chieftain or a favorite regiment appears upon the scene.

As we make our way slowly toward the Prince's pavilion, we are completely blocked by the closely packed mass of humanity, so that our animals cannot take a single step forward or backward. It is a good-humored, helpful crowd that surrounds us, although it takes mischievous delight in our predicament. In vain we shout to attract the attention of an officer a few yards away; his back is turned as he watches with rapt attention the preparations for the fête, and our voices are drowned by the uproar. Wild cheers greet the arrival of Prince Taffari-Makonnen, the Minister of War, the Minister of Justice, and the Prince's son-in-law, who rides at the head of his troops.

Meanwhile the ceremonies have begun in the square below. An Armenian band, whose leader's tightly laced uniform fails to disguise his extreme obesity, strikes up the national air of each country as its minister arrives.

Prince Taffari has already taken his place in his pavilion, and the first troops are entering the farther end of the parade ground. Marooned in the sea of shouting and gesticulating spec-