

# SCIENCE

FRIDAY, APRIL 2, 1920

## THE UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE

### CONTENTS

<i>The University Department of Medicine:</i> DR. RUFUS COLE .....	329
<i>Raymond B. Earle:</i> PROFESSOR EDWARD S. BURGESS .....	340
<i>Resolutions on the Death of Members of the Mellon Institute</i> .....	340
<i>Scientific Events:—</i>	
<i>Memorial to Sir William Osler; The Cornell University Entomological Expedition to South Africa; The American Chemical Society; The United States Forest Service....</i>	341
<i>Scientific Notes and News</i> .....	344
<i>University and Educational News</i> .....	346
<i>Discussion and Correspondence:—</i>	
<i>The U. S. Geological Survey:</i> DR. ELIOT BLACKWELDER. <i>The Award of the Nobel Prize to Professor Haber:</i> JEROME ALEXANDER .....	346
<i>Scientific Books:—</i>	
<i>A Handbook of Physics Measurements:</i> A. DEF. P. ....	348
<i>Special Articles:—</i>	
<i>Notice of a Recent Contribution to Statistical Methods:</i> DRS. GEORGE F. MCEWEN AND ELLIS L. MICHAEL .....	349
<i>The American Chemical Society:</i> DR. CHARLES L. PARSONS .....	350
<i>The American Association for the Advancement of Science:—</i>	
<i>Section B—Physics:</i> PROFESSOR G. W. STEWART .....	352

MSS. intended for publication and books, etc., intended for review should be sent to The Editor of Science, Garrison-on-Hudson, N. Y.

THAT all is not well with medical education is obvious from the number of investigations, addresses, polemics, plans and schemes which at present center about this subject. In the writer's opinion the root of the difficulty lies in the extremely close association which has always existed and exists to-day between medical education and practise, and in the idea which generally prevails that the problems relating to medical education and those having to do with the practise of medicine are inseparable. While many persons admit for purposes of discussion that a line of separation exists between the science of medicine and the art of the practise of medicine, yet when these individuals begin to think in practical terms, they fail to take this fact into consideration. Indeed, in their inmost souls, most medical men refuse to admit that medicine is a science, or they think of the scientific side of the subject as something apart from medicine itself, as though scientific medicine were simply the group of underlying sciences upon which medicine depends for sustenance. Even Sir Clifford Allbutt, in his remarkable essay on the "New Birth of Medicine," speaks of the new birth as an "enlargement from an art of observation and empiricism to an *applied* science . . ., from a craft of tradition and sagacity to an *applied* science." Why is it that we can conceive of medicine only as an application of science to an "art" or "craft," and not as a new, real and independent science replacing an obsolete mass of tradition and empiricism?

It is true that the science of medicine is in the process of making—but so is every other science. There is no such thing as a rounded, completed or finished science. At any given time any science is but the result of all previous attempts to arrange in order and to explain