carry on the work of this organisation are engaged in surgical practice. Further, members of the Council, while appearing (quite rightly as I think) as "ophthalmologists" when occupied with their special corporate responsibilities, do individually, in the volume where each member of the profession has the opportunity to describe the fashion of practice he follows, name themselves "surgeons" or "ophthalmic surgeons." The difference thus displayed exactly illustrates my submission that "ophthalmologist" stands with anatomist, botanist, physiologist, and similar terms as an index, not of professional activities, but of personal studies and interests. It is not a monopoly of those of a particular group of medical practitioners, nor, indeed, of the medical profession generally.

I am, Sir, Yours,

C. O. HAWTHORNE.

HARLEY STREET, W.1.,
September 16, 1922.

To the Editor of THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF OPHTHALMOLOGY

SIR,—Your courtesy in showing us Dr. Hawthorne's letter affords us an opportunity of stating that the Council of British Ophthalmologists is composed solely of members of the Medical profession. From time to time, however, committees appointed by the Council have co-opted certain non-medical scientists, e.g., Sir Richard Tetley Glazebrook, and others, to give the Council the benefit of their advice in subjects in which their knowledge and experience are pre-eminent.

We are, Sir, Yours faithfully,

J. B. LAWFORD, President,

M. S. MAYOU, Hon. Secretary,

Council of British Ophthalmologists.

59, HARLEY STREET,
October 19, 1922.

DICHOTOMY

To the Editor of THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF OPHTHALMOLOGY

SIR,—I received, not long ago, a letter enclosing a typed communication from an optician who writes from Gray's Inn Road, canvassing for work. The final paragraph of this letter runs as follows:—"Should it be your custom to receive a commission on each patient sent me, then I would be pleased to make it pay for your trouble and work to mutual advantage."

Apart altogether from the very bad grammar in which this sentence is couched, it would be a serious breach of professional ethics for a surgeon to receive commission for any patient sent to an optician for glasses. We are sure that the great majority of "pukka" ophthalmic surgeons who are in practice in this country will agree with us in thinking that such a custom is most reprehensible. Either we are members of a profession or of a trade; if we are tradesmen, then there can be no objection to our following the routine practices of trade, but if we call ourselves professional men we should avoid doing so, and it seems to us that if it really is customary for any ophthalmic surgeons to work on these lines, they should take steps to have their names erased from the Medical Register, and so save the General Medical Council the trouble of doing it for them.

If "dichotomy is essentially dangerous, unsound and incompatible with professional dignity,"* among two members of the same profession, how much more is it, when it occurs between a professional surgeon and a shopkeeper!

At the present time there is nothing to stop any man who can afford the cost of a set of trial lenses, a set of test-types and a lamp from setting himself up as an ophthalmic surgeon; we cannot help thinking that this letter must have been meant for one of those whom we will call pseudo-ophthalmic surgeons.

Yours faithfully,

R. R. JAMES.

* Surbled's Medical Etiquette.

NOTES

Deaths

WE regret to report the death from heart disease of DR. GEORGE MILBRY GOULD, at Atlantic City, after an illness of three hours. He was born in Auburn, Mex., in 1848. He graduated from the Ohio Wesleyan University with the degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1873, and later completed a course of study at Harvard University. He received his medical degree in 1888, after which he practised ophthalmology in Philadelphia. Gould was widely known as a writer, and edited the *Medical News*, the *Philadelphia Medical Journal*, and *American Medicine*, and was a Member of the American Ophthalmological Society. He was well known in this country from his strong views as to the harmfulness of eye-strain, and opened an important discussion upon "Errors of Refraction" at the Oxford Ophthalmological Congress, July, 1917.