Medical History, 1991, **35**: 50-77.

MEDICALLY QUALIFIED NATUROPATHS AND THE GENERAL MEDICAL COUNCIL

by

P. S. BROWN *

Thomas Richard Allinson (1858–1918) and Joseph Stenson Hooker (1853–1946) both obtained the licentiateship of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh in 1879 and were duly entered on the Medical Register, Hooker having qualified LSA two years previously. In their practice of medicine both came to favour "natural healing" and both came into conflict with the medical establishment. In 1892 Allinson, aged 34, was brought before the General Medical Council (GMC) and found guilty of "infamous conduct in a professional respect": his name was erased from the Register. In 1925 Hooker, aged 72, was found guilty of the same offence and was also struck off the Register. Neither man considered his actions in any way discreditable, but it is not surprising that doctors who supported natural healing, otherwise known as "nature cure" or "naturopathy", should fall foul of their professional brethren. Naturopathy, though it embraced many familiar and generally acceptable hygienic principles, differed radically from orthodox medicine in its concept of disease and the consequent requirements of therapy, notably in its condemnation of treatment with drugs. Its social and professional attitudes also differed substantially from those of medical orthodoxy.[1]

In this paper, the careers of Allinson and Stenson Hooker will first be traced to illustrate the professional problems of registered practitioners who came to embrace heterodox views. Allinson rebelled against medical authority early in his career and seems to have followed the tradition of nineteenth-century health reform. Hooker developed his unorthodox views much later and, it will be argued, was one of a group of older doctors who were actively deviating from the direction being taken by "scientific medicine" as it entered the twentieth century. Members of this group rejected many of the basic concepts of orthodox medicine, such as the germ theory, and some subscribed to the whole package of beliefs characteristic of naturopathy. Like Allinson and Hooker, they too were liable to come into conflict with the GMC.

Study of these deviant practitioners necessarily reveals some of the characteristics of the profession from which they were ejected, particularly how it defined its boundaries. The Medical Act of 1858 had required the GMC to maintain the Medical Register of appropriately qualified doctors: registration confirmed a practitioner's

* P. S. Brown, B.A., B.M., M.R.C.P., 65 Northover Road, Westbury-on-Trym, Bristol BS9 3LQ.

[1] See P. S. Brown, 'Nineteenth-century American health reformers and the early nature cure movement in Britain', *Med. Hist.*, 1988, **32**: 174–94.

professional status and conferred certain privileges, but it did not grant a monopoly of medical practice. Removal, or the threat of removal, from the Register was a sanction that could be imposed by the GMC if it judged a doctor guilty of "infamous conduct in a professional respect"; but such conduct was difficult to define and difficult to detect and prove. The GMC formally charged both Allinson and Hooker with self-advertisement for professional gain; this served as a basis upon which they could be penalized, though it related to only one of many naturopathic attitudes to which orthodoxy objected.

Professional organizations such as the British Medical Association (BMA), the Royal Colleges, and the Medical Defence Union all exerted pressure on deviant practitioners but professional discipline was ultimately imposed by the GMC. Its disciplinary actions will be discussed mainly as they were directed against the naturopathic practitioners; but this has some wider relevance because legal action, brought by Allinson to challenge the GMC's action against him, was the occasion for scrutiny of the GMC's powers and resulted in an appeal court ruling that was subsequently used to provide a working definition of "infamous conduct".

ALLINSON'S MEDICAL CAREER

Allinson, born in Hulme, Manchester, studied at the Royal College of Surgeons in Edinburgh and first appeared in the Medical Directory of 1880 as an assistant in Hull. He then spent some time in Paris and returned as a club doctor in Shoreditch. He set up his own practice in Pentonville around 1883.[2] His next address was in West London and, by 1889, he had moved to Spanish Place, off Manchester Square, W1. Though Allinson's ideas had changed radically during these years, his speedy progress westwards through London would have done credit to any orthodox and ambitious young doctor. As appropriate to such a role, Allinson also drew attention to himself by letters to the medical press.[3] He worked hard for success and was still a bachelor when approaching the age of 30.[4]

If Allinson emerged from medical training with conventional ideas, his adherence to orthodoxy was brief: by his own account he became interested in "drugless healing" about a year after qualifying.[5] By 1881 he was already involved with the London Food Reform Society, which included T. L. Nichols and James Burns among its vice-presidents.[6] But Allinson had moved further from the professional norm than was implied simply by vegetarianism. The first issue of the Society's journal carried an article by him entitled 'Are doctors necessary?'. Except in cases of accident, he considered that the answer should be "No". When man learned to live by the laws of life, disease would become "an unknown thing". Doctors' medicines often delayed

[2] Unsigned obituary, *Vegetarian Messenger*, 1919, **16**: 6–7.

[3] T. R. Allinson, 'An anaesthetic car', *Br. med. J.*, 1881, **ii**: 110; 'Tapeworm', ibid., 1882, **ii**: 296.

[4] Allinson discussed the difficulties of a young doctor in *Hosp. Gaz.*, 1889, **17**: 453–4. A bachelor in 1888 (see *Weekly Times & Echo*, 1 Jan. 1888, p. 3), in that year he married Anna Pulvermacher, "a lady of artistic talent, who has exhibited at the Royal Academy, and who sympathised fully with his work", see obituary, op. cit., note 2 above.

[5] *Hospital Gazette*, op. cit., note 4 above. Allinson had however been briefly a public vaccinator, see *Vaccination Enquirer*, 1887, **9**: 44–5.

[6] After a year, Allinson became its treasurer; see cover notices, *Food Reform Magazine*, 1881, **1**; 1882, **2**.

recovery from illness because the patient had to fight both the disease and the drugs. Allinson explained

> I have not given any drugs for fourteen months, and I have to treat all kinds of cases. I stick to diet, fresh air, exercise, and baths, and get better results than I did when I gave drugs . . . I have to give some medicine, or people would not pay me: but they get only coloured and acidulated water.[7]

In the medical press, Allinson championed only vegetarianism,[8] but by the mid-1880s he was a thorough-going naturopath. In a pamphlet on rheumatism he developed the idea of illness being a curative process, a concept central to naturopathic thinking. Rheumatic fever he explained as a "crisis . . . a means of expelling morbid material from the system and, instead of trying to suppress it, we should aid nature in her efforts".[9] In 1886 his *System of hygienic medicine* was published, and in this he returned repeatedly to the theme that "Disease is not a devil in the body to be cast out, nor a humour to be expelled, or an acrimony to be neutralised, but a right action of the system whose ultimate aim is health".[10]

Allinson saw illnesses, including cancers and tumours, as indicating a disordered system caused by failure to observe natural laws: they do not show themselves, he wrote, "unless we have lived wrongly". He also wrote, "I strongly object to drugs of all kinds, because they do not act in the beneficial way they are supposed to do. Drugs, according to my reading, are so many poisons". Instead he relied on the *vis medicatrix naturae*—the healing power of nature—aided by diet with emphasis on wholemeal bread, with adequate sleep, plenty of exercise, and bathing in water, air, and sunshine. And, in his *System of hygienic medicine*, he explained another important idea of naturopathy, the moral responsibility of the individual for his or her own health. In his preface he wrote, "This work is one of medical free thought, its aim being to teach persons to act and think for themselves, and not to depend on others".[11]

Allinson also urged individual commitment to resisting the law in his pamphlet on *How to avoid vaccination*. Vaccination was a "ghastly risk" and, he argued, "A bad law must always be resisted". His advice was practical. Fathers should resist to the point of going to prison if necessary—and organize an "indignation meeting" on release. Mothers were advised on methods of outwitting the vaccination officer. But if vaccination proved unavoidable, the lymph should be quickly swabbed away with borax dissolved in water.[12]

In 1883, Allinson had extended his range of readers by writing a letter to *The Times* advocating a cheap vegetarian diet, and offering a book of relevant recipes. Five days later he had already received over 500 requests for the book: with the donations which accompanied them he promised to give a free dinner for the poor of the East End.[13]

[7] Ibid., 1881, **1**: 90–5.
[8] T. R. Allinson, letters, *Lancet*, 1883, **i**: 393; ibid., 1882, **ii**: 463–4. *Br. med. J.*, 1883, **i**: 441, 600.
[9] *Idem*, *Rheumatism, acute and chronic*, London, Nichols, 1886, pp. 5–8, 14–16.
[10] *Idem*, *A system of hygienic medicine*, London, F. Pitman, 1886, pp. 14–21.
[11] Ibid., pp. 6, 37, 39–52.
[12] T. R. Allinson, *How to avoid vaccination*, London, the author, 1888.
[13] *Idem*, letters, *The Times*, 9 Dec. 1883, p. 4d; 14 Dec., p. 2c.

The response must have surprised him, and probably encouraged him to seek further exposure in the newspapers.[14] He wrote answers to medical queries for the *English Mechanic*,[15] and, in 1885, took what proved a most important step by becoming the medical correspondent for the *Weekly Times and Echo*.[16]

Each week, Allinson wrote a short article and answered postal enquiries. From 16 answers in his first issue the number soon rose, often to more than 100 each week. Allinson received a salary and the public had its answers free.[17] As well as containing practical advice, his regular articles allowed him to cover such basic concepts of naturopathy as the healing power of nature, the unity of disease and the consequent unity of cure.[18] He urged the avoidance of alcohol and of vaccination, and claimed that most operations were unnecessary.[19] Drugs and drug doctors, he explained, could not cure disease and "The sooner the public gets to know that their health is in their own hands the better for them".[20] Always Allinson came back to the dangers of medicines and, from October 1888, he included a regular paragraph which read

> Avoid all drugs and medicines; all pills, powders, salves, and ointments. Stop using caustic, painting with iodine; blisters, inhalations, etc.[21]

Occasionally Allinson advised an enquirer to consult him personally, and frequently he advised the purchase of his book. All his articles were signed with his name, qualifications, and address.

Another of Allinson's ventures was the Hygienic Hospital in Willesden, which he proposed early in 1888. He was at first backed by prominent vegetarians like A. F. Hills: but it became increasingly apparent that Allinson insisted on being clearly in control. When fund-raising ran into problems, according to the vegetarian faction, Allinson tried to control the committee by announcing himself as secretary.[22] Eventually Allinson opened the hospital in 1890 on his own initiative and, after two years, reported treating 350 patients with notable success.[23] Allinson claimed to be out of pocket, and patients were required to contribute 10 shillings a week.[24]

[14] That was the view of Charles W. Forward, *Vegetarian Review*, new series, 1897, **1**: 345.

[15] For example *English Mechanic and World of Science*, 1884, **38**: 179, 224, 271, 521.

[16] This penny weekly publication, which described itself as "A Liberal Newspaper of Political and Social Progress", was owned by Passmore Edwards, MP and edited by E. J. Kibblewhite, both of whom had vegetarian sympathies according to Forward, op. cit., note 14 above.

[17] *Br. med. J.*, 1892, **i**: 1203–5.

[18] See for example *Weekly Times & Echo*, 7 Feb., 12 Dec. 1886; 24 Jul. 1887. The weekly articles were reprinted as a series of booklets starting with T. R. Allinson, *Medical essays*, vol. 1, London, F. Pitman, 1892.

[19] *Weekly Times & Echo*, 17 Jan. 1886; 18 Sept. 1887; 5 May 1889.

[20] Ibid., 8 Nov. 1885, p. 4.

[21] Ibid., 21 Oct. 1888, p. 3.

[22] *Vegetarian*, 1888, **1**: 6, 46, 91. *Herald of Health*, June 1888, p. 70; July 1888, p. 77; Nov. 1888, p. 128; Dec. 1888, p. 133. See also Charles W. Forward, *Fifty years of food reform*, London, Ideal Publishing Co., 1898, pp. 170–1.

[23] *Weekly Times & Echo*, 29 Jan. 1893, p. 2.

[24] *Lancet*, 1892, **i**: 1264. *Medical essays*, op. cit., note 18 above, end-page advertisements. The obituary, op. cit., note 2 above, states vaguely that Allinson closed his hospital "after some years", but that a Dr Allinson Testimonial Hospital was opened by others.

Allinson's continuous attacks on regular medicine, and by implication on regular practitioners, eventually provoked an official response. He had been writing his newspaper articles for 16 months when, early in 1887, he told his readers that "I am censured by the Edinburgh College of Physicians for helping people on to health, and for preventing people being drugged to death".[25] The Council of the College became particularly concerned about the incitement to law-breaking in Allinson's pamphlet on vaccination, which he was therefore asked to withdraw.[26] Allinson agreed to issue no more copies, but he failed to provide an apology which the Council had also requested: and he provoked it further by allowing its secretary's letter to be published in the *Vaccination Enquirer*.[27] The pamphlet meanwhile had become the property of the Anti-Vaccination Society, which continued to publish it, and Allinson simply referred enquirers to that organization.[28]

Despite such provocation, the Edinburgh Physicians, and their colleagues of the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh, could do little to check Allinson's activities. In March 1889 they concluded that "there seems to be no powers on the part of either College to deal with such a case", and had to pass the problem on to the GMC.[29] By this time the medical press had taken up the issue and the *Hospital Gazette* was urging the Colleges or the GMC to act against Allinson.[30] But the matter grumbled on, and it was not until the end of 1891 that the Royal College of Physicians, at an extraordinary meeting, resolved to deprive Allinson of his licentiateship, on the grounds that he persisted in countenancing the issue of his pamphlet on vaccination by indirect means, and "in advertising himself and vilifying other medical men in the public newspapers". But its resolution was not put into effect because the Surgeons were either unable or unwilling to take parallel action, so that, even if Allinson were deprived of his LRCP, he would retain a registerable qualification.[31]

The GMC could not discipline Allinson simply because of his heterodox views: the Medical Act stipulated that a practitioner's name should not be removed from the Register "on the grounds of his having adopted any Theory of Medicine or Surgery".[32] The charge eventually brought against him in May 1892 was that

> he systematically seeks to attract practice by a system of extensive public advertisements containing his name, address, and qualifications, and invitations to persons in need of medical aid to consult him professionally, the advertisements so systematically published by him being themselves of a character discreditable to a professional medical man.[33]

[25] *Weekly Times & Echo*, 6 Feb. 1887, p. 3.

[26] Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh, Council minute book, 2 July 1888, p. 23. I am grateful to the College and to Miss J. P. S. Ferguson, its Librarian, for access to College minutes.

[27] Ibid., 23 July 1888, p. 25; 28 Sept. 1888, pp. 54–5. See also *Vaccination Enquirer*, 1888, **10**: 88–9.

[28] *Br. med. J.*, 1892, i: 1203–4.

[29] Council minute book, op. cit., note 26 above, 15 March 1889, p. 101. See also *Minutes of the General Medical Council for 1889*, 1890, **26**: 211–18.

[30] 'It this professional?', *Hosp. Gaz.*,1889, **17**: 56–7, 70; 'Allinsonia', ibid., pp. 318, 372–3, 453–4.

[31] Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh, Typescript of College minutes, 23 Dec. 1891, pp. 6665–6; 3 May 1892, pp. 6700–1. Allinson was deprived of his LRCP Edin. in August 1892, but not of his LRCS Edin. until 1904; see *Minutes of the GMC for 1905*, 1905, **41**: 165.

[32] Medical Act, 21 & 22 Vict. 1858, c. 90, s.28.

[33] *Minutes of the GMC for 1892*, 1892, **29**: 79–81.

The Medical Defence Union, as complainants, presented evidence drawn from his newspaper column. Allinson's writings on vaccination were not mentioned in the charge but were brought into discussion by his own legal representative.[34]

Armed with copies of the *Weekly Times and Echo*, the complainants had little difficulty in establishing that Allinson constantly drew attention to himself as a medical practitioner, and that he sometimes advised correspondents to consult him personally. Despite Allinson's protestations that he attacked not individual doctors but their medical theories, the derogatory tone of his articles was also easily established. While he denied calling his professional brethren "murderers", he had to admit to phrases such as "wholesale poisoners": he explained that, as he believed all drugs to be poisons, those who gave them were necessarily poisoners. The GMC considered his case *in camera* and, finding the charges against him proved, judged him guilty of "infamous conduct in a professional respect". Allinson's name was erased from the Register.

Allinson did not submit meekly to this treatment and started legal action, claiming that the GMC had really reached their conclusion because of his heterodox views. Allinson lost his case at the appeal court, but claimed that removal from the Register had little effect on his practice—which was probably true.[35] He remained an irritation to the medical profession, the *Lancet* still reporting his "advertising" years after his erasure. He was successfully prosecuted by the GMC in 1895 for incautiously using his medical diplomas, even though they had been withdrawn. From then on, he described himself as "Ex-LRCP".[36]

Allinson's newspaper column continued to flourish and, when the paper amalgamated with *Reynold's Newspaper*, he continued to contribute, replying to correspondents until near his death in November 1918 at the age of 60.[37] From the 1880s, Allinson had issued "certificates of excellence" to bakers producing good wholemeal bread, and after erasure he developed his commercial interests. In 1892 he acquired an interest in the Cyclone Mills at Bethnal Green and in 1895 took over these mills, forming the Natural Food Company.[38] By 1927 three mills (in London, Castleford, and Newport) were supplying Allinson's Wholemeal;[39] and today his name, like those of the health reformers Sylvester Graham and James Harvey Kellogg, is most widely known in connection with food.

ALLINSON AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES

Allinson saw himself as an isolated figure. He claimed to be the only person capable of running the Hygienic Hospital because, while there were many vegetarian doctors

[34] *Lancet*, 1892, **i**: 1263–6. *Br. med. J.*, 1892, **i**: 1203–5.

[35] Allinson v. General Council of Medical Education and Registration, *Law Reports, Queen's Bench Division, C.A. 1894*, pp. 750–66. *Weekly Times & Echo*, 2 July 1893, p. 2.

[36] *Lancet*, 1895, **i**: 1656; 1895, **ii**: 1313, 1520. *Minutes of the GMC for 1895*, 1896, **32**: 103. *Weekly Times & Echo*, 7 July 1895, p. 2. When summoned again in 1899, the use of "Ex-LRCP" proved a successful defence; but Allinson was fined for calling himself "Dr" in various pamphlets, see *Lancet*, 1899, **i**: 1108.

[37] 'Death of Dr. Allinson', *Reynold's Newspaper*, 8 Dec. 1918. Allinson also received a brief obituary in *The Times*, 30 Nov. 1918, p. 11b. Ages quoted range from 60 to 63: the former fits with his own account of his age, see *Weekly Times & Echo*, 1 Jan. 1888, p. 3.

[38] I am grateful to the firm of Allinson, and Mr Howell Roberts for this information.

[39] 'The story of an ideal', *New Health*, 1927, **2**: 76–8.

and teetotal doctors, he was the only "genuine hygienist".[40] He probably exaggerated his isolation, and increased it, because of his strongly individualistic or even aggressive personality. He antagonized his potential supporters over the hospital; he was forthright in advising contravention of the law over vaccination; and he landed, briefly, in prison for refusal to pay his church rate.[41] He told the GMC that he was only interested in a medical qualification for its social advantages and as a public indication of his years of medical study.[42]

Allinson had good grounds for claiming that there was no group among contemporary regular practitioners with which he could identify. Earlier in the century, the hydropathic doctors had practised something approaching his "hygienic medicine". The "water cure" had flourished under these regular practitioners who, though attacked as medical heretics, managed to retain their professional status. But by the 1870s, hydropathy in the hands of the medical practitioners was in decline caused largely by the death or retirement of its major figures.[43] In 1872, James Manby Gully had handed over to William T. Fernie, whose *Plain guide* to the water cure dealt severely with various types of drug therapy.[44] But Fernie left Malvern for London in 1887, and his subsequent books contain no forceful pleas for any heterodox systems.[45]

As hydropathy declined in the hands of the registered practitioners, some of the initiative passed to practitioners not on the Medical Register. Most important was John Smedley, whose *Practical hydropathy* Allinson was reported to have read early in his career.[46] The two men shared similar views on drug therapy but, although Allinson advocated frequent baths, he could scarcely be called a hydropath.[47] Smedley's death in 1874 was listed by Richard Metcalfe with the deaths of the Malvern doctors as signalling the cessation of progress in British hydropathy. Metcalfe, himself a hydropath, admitted gloomily that in the lifetime of these pioneers there was "stir, movement, growth": but this vigour had died with them.[48] There was left no exciting body of hydropathic practice likely to inspire the young Allinson.

[40] *Herald of Health*, July 1888, p. 77.

[41] *Weekly Times & Echo*, 27 March 1892.

[42] *Br. med. J.*, 1892, **i**: 1203. Allinson had already explained his attitude to qualification and registration in *Hosp. Gaz.*, 1889, **17**: 453–4.

[43] This is suggested both by R. Price, 'Hydropathy in England 1840–70', *Med. Hist.*, 1981, **25**: 269–80, and by W. H. McMenemy, 'The water doctors of Malvern', *Proc. roy. Soc. Med.*, 1952, **46**: 5–12.

[44] W. T. Fernie, *A plain guide to the principles and practices of the water cure*, London, Simpkin, Marshall & Co., 1872, pp. 22–35.

[45] See for example W. T. Fernie, *Health to date*, Bristol, John Wright, 1911. On hydropathy see also Kelvin Rees, 'Water as a commodity', in R. Cooter (ed.), *Studies in the history of alternative medicine*, Basingstoke, Macmillan, 1988, pp. 28–45.

[46] Op. cit., note 2 above. For information on Smedley see P. S. Brown, 'Social context and medical theory in the demarcation of nineteenth-century boundaries', in W. F. Bynum and Roy Porter (eds.), *Medical fringe and medical orthodoxy, 1750–1850*, London, Croom Helm, 1987, pp. 216–33.

[47] Allinson, op. cit., note 10 above, pp. 46–7.

[48] Richard Metcalfe, *The rise and progress of hydropathy in England and Scotland*, London, Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent & Co., 1906, pp. 284–5. Father Sebastian Kneipp produced a further wave of hydropathic enthusiasm in continental Europe and his chief work was translated as *My water cure*, Edinburgh, William Blackwood & Sons, 1893. Regular practitioners were dismissive of Kneipp (see

One aspect of hydropathy, particularly in its declining years, of which Allinson would not have approved was its frequent association with homoeopathy.[49] The (British) *Journal of Health*, which in early issues had carried the message of the American health reformers as well as that of hydropathy, was largely a homoeopathic journal during its terminal years in the 1860s.[50] Allinson recommended that patients consult a homoeopath if he was their only alternative to an allopath, but purely because the former would, at least, do no harm with toxic drugs.[51] And, like hydropathy, homoeopathy was not in an inspiring phase in the late nineteenth century.[52]

An individual who probably influenced Allinson, at least through his writings, was Edward Wicksted Lane (MD Edin. 1853) who took over from the non-medical James Ellis at Sudbrook Park.[53] Lane developed the concept of hygienic medicine, publishing a book in 1859 entitled *Hydropathy: or hygienic medicine*. He explained that "hydropathy" covered only one aspect of the medicine practised by a small group who held "a totally different conception of the philososphy of the cure of disease" to that of most practitioners, and who believed that nature was "constantly endeavouring to work out her own cure". Doctors of this minority relied on "air, exercise, water, diet, healthy mental and moral influences", and their system was better described by the more comprehensive term of "hygienic medicine".[54]

Lane pursued similar themes in his optimistic *Old medicine and new* (1873) and, one year before Allinson's *System of hygienic medicine* appeared, Lane published his *Hygienic medicine: the teachings of physiology and common sense*.[55] Lane lived for some years in London and remained in the *Medical Directory* until 1889. But, while Allinson was popularizing his message in the newspaper, Lane was still publishing with the orthodox medical publisher, Churchill. And, while Allinson's hygienic medicine was focused primarily on vegetarianism, Lane's was not.

Vegetarianism seems to have been Allison's crucial point of departure from orthodox medicine. And, although he thought that vegetarian doctors were rarely "genuine hygienists", one vegetarian with medical training, but not on the British Medical Register, must have influenced Allinson considerably. This was Thomas Low

---

obituary, *J. Balneol. Clim.*, 1897, **1**: 254), but he was influential in the subsequent nature cure movement: see for example John A. R. Gray, 'The Kneipp cure', *Scottish Health Reformer*, 1903/4, **1**: 74–6.

[49] See McMenemy, op. cit., note 43 above: Brown, op. cit., note 46 above; *Br. med. J.*, 1861, **ii**: 310–12.

[50] See for example, *Journal of Health*, 1866, **15**: 63–4, 78, 95.

[51] Allinson, op. cit., note 10 above, p. 57. *Weekly Times & Echo*, 7 July 1895, p. 2.

[52] P. A. Nichols, *Homoeopathy and the medical profession*, London, Croom Helm, 1988. Allinson might have had some sympathy with individual homoeopaths like Garth Wilkinson, who was also opposed to vaccination and vivisection and who would have "thrown the treatment of the sick open to all who chose to engage in it"; see C. J. Wilkinson, *James John Garth Wilkinson*, London, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1911, p. 263: also Logie Barrow, *Independent spirits*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986, pp. 156–7.

[53] Metcalfe, op. cit., note 48 above, p. 57; Brown, op. cit., note 46 above.

[54] Edward W. Lane, *Hydropathy: or hygienic medicine*, 2nd ed., London, John Churchill, 1859, pp. 1–19, 102. The title of the first edition did not contain the words "hygienic medicine". Lane did not claim to have invented this term, and, because "hygienic medicine" had "long been so much prostituted by imposters of every kind", he felt it could not be "safely allowed to stand by itself".

[55] Edward W. Lane, *Old medicine and new*, London, J. & A. Churchill, 1873; *Hygienic medicine. The teachings of physiology and common-sense*, London, J. & A. Churchill, 1885.

Nichols, who had been active in the American health reform movement and had moved to England, with his equally active wife, in 1861.[56] Nichols had practised hydropathy but, in England, his emphasis shifted to give pre-eminence to diet; he lectured and wrote pamphlets to popularize a simple and economic vegetable diet, including a wholemeal cereal. He was a founder of the Food Reform Society, with which Allinson became involved and, by 1888, the similarity of the two men in aims, methods, and achievement was noted in the *Vegetarian* with the comment that "Dr. Nichols and Dr. Allinson have long been teaching the people how to heal themselves by the common observance of Nature's laws, and with abundant success".[57]

The similarity in outlook between Allinson and Nichols was close. Allinson recommended books by Nichols,[58] and when the *Vegetarian* was launched by A. F. Hills in 1888, Nichols wrote a regular article followed by replies to readers' queries—a format that Allison had been using for over two years.[59] Allison also recommended books by Lorenzo N. Fowler, another American health reformer who had moved to England.[60] Though Allison must have been influenced by British traditions, his ideas seem to have accorded particularly well with those of the American health reformers. He may have absorbed their ideas without consciously documenting their origin, and this would explain why he found it necessary to add a postscript to his *System of hygienic medicine*, noting the similarity of his views to those of the American, Russell Trall, whose *Handbook of hygienic practice* he claimed to have read only after completing his own book.[61]

STENSON HOOKER'S CAREER

Stenson Hooker practised first in Midhurst, Sussex, and, like any ambitious young doctor might, was soon publishing reports of "interesting cases" in the *Lancet* and involving himself in social activities.[62] When, in 1886, he moved to Hastings, there was still nothing to suggest that he had yet broken with medical orthodoxy. In 1895, his subsequent suspicion of drugs was certainly now foreshadowed by a communication advocating the use of "tribromide of gold combined with oxybromides of arsenic".[63]

In 1899, at the age of 45, Hooker obtained the MD (Durh) and soon moved to London. From 1903 he practised from various West London addresses and, after Allinson's death, took over his address in Spanish Place. Once established in London, Hooker's communications to the *Lancet* began to indicate his fringe interests. He advocated bathing patients in coloured light, particularly to "bring out the rash" in

[56] Brown, op. cit., note 1 above. See also Bernard Aspinwall, 'Social Catholicism and health', in W. J. Shiels (ed.), *The church and healing*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1982, pp. 249–70.

[57] *Vegetarian*, 1888, **1**: 46.

[58] T. R. Allinson, *The advantages of wholemeal bread*, London, F. Pitman, 1889, advertisements.

[59] See *Vegetarian*, 1888, **1**: 1; but the correspondence side soon dwindled.

[60] Fowler's main interest was phrenology, to which both Nichols and Allinson lent qualified support; see Brown, op. cit., note 1 above.

[61] Allinson, op. cit., note 10 above, p. 88.

[62] Stenson Hooker, 'On a prolonged case of tetanus', *Lancet*, 1883, **i**: 361–2; 'An unusually severe case of syphilis acquired without any primary sore', ibid., 1884, **ii**: 1045. See also ibid., 1886, **i**: 524.

[63] J. Stenson Hooker, 'Therapeutics of the gold salts', ibid., 1895, **ii**: 281.

fevers.[64] Even further from the professional norm were letters on the radiation given out by plants and human beings. Those who had "the gift of inner perception" (of whom there were "some even in the medical profession") could distinguish emanations of different colours which characterized persons of different temperaments.[65]

In London, Hooker joined the food reform movement,[66] and his first, short book, *The letters of little Mary*, was a gently entertaining plea for vegetarianism.[67] In his next two books, Hooker developed what was to be his characteristic theme, critical of the inadequacies of contemporary medicine but aggressively optimistic. *The trend of modern medicine* (1905) was subtitled "Being notes on the decadence of the drug system and the value of psychotherapeutics, electricity, light-baths, and the finer forces in general".[68] These "finer forces" were the enthusiastic focus of his next volume, *The higher medicine* (1907), which ended in optimistic crescendo with the comment that the successes already achieved by the finer forces were merely "Forelights Of A More Radiant Health That Is To Be".[69]

Hooker saw orthodox medicine as "still in the period of groping for light". Allopathic drugs usually treated only the symptoms, and most physicians were satisfied merely "to meet matter with matter".[70] But no healer could neglect the psychic side of human nature, and the doctors of the future must "realise that they will be dealing, not with a cast-iron machine, but with a psychic, responsive, throbbing, living sentient being. They must be schooled to treat the Man in addition to the disease". But mankind was already beginning to understand that disease was abnormal "and should in reality form no part of our lives".[71] Much illness was simply due to living incorrectly, and diseases were "often nothing but the action of a beneficient nature endeavouring to cast off impurities", frequently resulting from an incorrect diet.[72]

Hooker disliked drugs and relied on vegetarian diet, fresh air, exercise, and other physical aids: he opposed both vaccination and vivisection, advocating the "simple life" and emphasizing the importance of mental attitudes to health.[73] Already he was promoting the full set of ideas characteristic of naturopathy, and in his chapter on "Nature Cure" in *The higher medicine*, Hooker virtually equated its natural methods with his "finer forces" in medicine.[74] Even so, it was perhaps surprising that he and

[64] *Idem.*, 'A new light and colour bath', ibid., 1903, **ii**: 434; 'Electric light baths for hospitals', ibid., 1904, **ii**: 173–4.

[65] *Idem.*, 'Human and plant rays', ibid., 1904, **i**: 686; 'Human rays and their spectra', ibid., **ii**: 1380–1.

[66] According to his own statement; see *idem*, *The newer practice of medicine*, London, C. W. Daniel, 1932, pp. 5–9.

[67] *Idem*, *The letters of little Mary*, London, Jarrold, 1905.

[68] *Idem*, *The trend of modern medicine*, London, the author, 1905.

[69] *Idem*, *The higher medicine*, London, Evan Yellon, 1907, p. 238.

[70] *Idem*, op. cit., note 68 above, pp. 9–10; op. cit., note 69 above, p. 36.

[71] Ibid., pp. 109, 237.

[72] J. Stenson Hooker, *How not to grow old*, 2nd ed., London, L. N. Fowler, 1913, pp. 6–24.

[73] For a brief but useful exposition of his views see *idem*, 'The abolition of disease', *Nature cure annual*, 1907/8, pp. 13–19.

[74] *Idem*, op. cit., note 69 above, pp. 65–7.

his wife joined the newly-formed British Nature Cure Association in 1907 and were soon on its executive committee, he being the only registered practitioner involved with the organization.[75]

In the British Nature Cure Association, Hooker consorted with healers and health reformers all lacking registerable medical qualifications. The Association was broadly based in naturopathy and, even during its short life, showed increasing interest in psychotherapeutics.[76] Emphasis on mental health was common among naturopaths like, for example, the Swedenborgian Rev. Charles Hall, who edited the pioneering *Scottish Health Reformer*. When this journal ran out of funds, he advised readers to turn to the journals of the British Nature Cure Association and of the Psycho-Therapeutic Society.[77]

The Psycho-Therapeutic Society had been founded in 1901 for the "Study, Investigation, and Practice of Health Reform, Medical Hypnosis, Suggestive Therapeutics, Curative Human Radiations, and Drugless Healing, with due regard to Diet, Hygiene, and the observance of Natural Laws of Health". Its founder, Arthur Hallam, was a non-medical psychotherapist and its president, George Spriggs, offered "Clairvoyant Diagnosis and Advice" at the Society's rooms. Despite these non-medical officers and their advertised activities, several of the Society's vice-presidents were registered medical practitioners, and among them was Stenson Hooker.[78]

Hooker was an appropriate vice-president: he had already selected "psychotherapeutics" as the most important of his finer forces. He favoured suggestion in the conscious state because hypnotic suggestion, being imposed from without, was not as potent a force for healing as that which could be called up from within the individual himself. Suggestion from a sensitive physician *en rapport* with the conscious patient could reach "beyond even the subconscious mind, and awaken that spirit power which lies at the back of all and everything". Prayer in sickness also called on the power within, for "there is no power apart from that which is resident in ourselves, for God is within us, in every cell and atom".[79]

Hooker pursued these themes in *A new suggestion treatment* (1914) and, with a plea for "spiritual therapeutics", in *A spiritual basis of health*.[80] But he also continued to write on such mundane matters as diet and catarrh, and gave practical advice on *How*

[75] *Nature Cure*, 1907, **2**: 156, 222–5. Hooker's wife, like Allinson's, was highly supportive of his work and both women were described as artists. For brief comment on the British Nature Cure Association see Brown, op. cit., note 1 above.

[76] See for example, *Nature Cure*, 1909, **4**: 30–4, 116, 162.

[77] *Health Reform* (formerly *Scottish Health Reformer*), 1907, **4**: editorial of final issue, Oct. 1907. For Charles A. Hall, see his *The art of being healthy*, Paisley, Alexander Gardner, 1903, pp. 19, 24.

[78] Psycho-Therapeutic Society, *7th Annual Report*, London, 1908. It was reported that, during the previous year, 4,474 free treatments had been given to 510 patients. Arthur Hallam's views are developed in his *The key to perfect health and the successful application of psycho-therapeutics*, London, St Clements Press, 1912. Hooker lectured to the society and, in 1911, was giving psychotherapeutic treatments on behalf of the society, see its *11th Annual Report*, London, 1912.

[79] Hooker, op. cit., note 68 above, p. 9; op. cit., note 69 above, chapters 13–17, especially pp. 104, 117–20, 170–3.

[80] *Idem*, *A new suggestion treatment (without hypnosis)*, London, C. W. Daniel, 1914; *A spiritual basis of health*, London, C. W. Daniel, 1921. Hooker also wrote on 'The broader aspect of medicine' in *Healing*, 1925–6, **1**: 260, in which he saw religion as "a source of cure which has scarcely been tapped at all".

not to grow old.[81] And surprisingly, it was his public advocacy of a parenterally-administered remedy for tuberculosis that brought him into confrontation with the GMC.

Ever-enthusiastic, Hooker had become interested in a "serum" prepared by Oliver Newell, a bacteriologist without medical qualifications. Convinced of its efficacy, Hooker interested a group of colleagues and, perhaps naïvely, gave an interview to the editor of *John Bull* with the result that, in March 1925, an article appeared under the heading

CONSUMPTION CURED—STARTLING EVIDENCE EXCLUSIVE TO "JOHN BULL"
Remarkable claims by West End Specialists—Records of miracle cures
Secret test in East End clinic—Introduced into German state hospitals
British official tests demanded—Ministry of Health must take immediate action.

The article, in the inflammatory style promised by the headlines, claimed that the "cure" was "either criminal quackery or the most stupendous discovery of modern times". And the pages were enlivened with photographs of, among others, the Minister of Health and the President of the GMC.[82]

Hooker insisted that none of the medical men should be named in *John Bull* and that the remedy should only be administered by doctors. The editor had complied with these stipulations but forwarded letters of enquiry to Hooker, who replied to potential patients, offering to supply the remedy to their doctors or, failing that, to arrange that the patients be treated by his own colleagues.[83] Hooker also wrote a circular letter to doctors advocating the Newell treatment but, on the insistence of the inventor, not disclosing its composition.[84]

The GMC, which must have been angered by the tone, let alone the content, of the article in *John Bull*, chose to intepret Hooker's actions as seeking to attract patients for his own professional advantage. He was summoned before the GMC in November 1925. The Medical Defence Union acted as complainants and Hooker's association with the articles, his circular to doctors, his letters to patients, and his advocacy of a secret remedy were all cited in the charge. He was found guilty of infamous conduct in a professional respect and his name was erased from the Register. He was then aged 72 and, because he suffered from angina pectoris, had not been subjected to cross-examination.[85]

The GMC's verdict was a serious shock to Hooker. He could not shrug off professional rejection as Allinson had seemed to do: but his enthusiasm proved irrepressible. By 1926 he was writing of embarking on a new campaign to "bring matters to a climax" and, in 1929, it was announced that he had founded a "New

[81] See for example, *Food reformer's year book*, 1920, pp. 21–6; 1921, pp. 23–8; 1922, p. 13. Hooker, op. cit., note 72 above.

[82] *John Bull*, 21 March 1925, pp. 18–19. This and subsequent articles (ibid., 28 March, pp. 14–15; 4 April, p. 13; 30 May, p. 14) contained photographs of other personalities.

[83] *Lancet*, 1925, **ii**: 1192–3. *Br. med. J.*, 1925, **ii**: supplement 195.

[84] A subsequent article, in *John Bull*, 28 March 1925, pp. 14–15, explained that the "serum" was compounded of orthodox and official drugs.

[85] *Minutes of the GMC for 1925*, 1926, **62**: 104–5. *Br. med. J.*, op. cit., note 83 above.

Order of Medicine".[86] In *The newer practice of medicine* (1932) he remained true to his enthusiasm for nature cure, quoting extensively from the manifesto of the Nature Cure Association:[87] and he developed an increasing interest in herbal treatments, which figured large in *The humane family doctor* (1937).[88] He made long lists of new and heterodox therapies which he considered worth intensive investigation; and he was still naïvely confident enough to request the Middlesex Hospital to test a new cancer cure.[89] But his great new enthusiasm was for the "Biochemic" system.

The Biochemic system, not to be confused with the biochemistry of orthodox science, considered disease to be due essentially to an imbalance of tissue-salts, i.e. the inorganic constituents of the body. Disease could therefore be cured by the administration of the deficient salts, but these had to be given in specially prepared form, and in seemingly arbitrary dosage.[90] Hooker was impressed by the work of Henry Gilbert and wrote an effusive foreword to one of his books.[91] He also identified with the British Biochemic (Therapeutic) Society by becoming an honorary fellow, and with unqualified practitioners in general by appearing in a published list of nature cure practitioners.[92]

After 1937, Hooker moved away from central London and his articles ceased to appear in journals sympathetic to naturopathy. Then, surprisingly and without explanation, in late 1942 came the announcement that Joseph Stenson Hooker, now aged 89, had been re-instated on the Medical Register.[93] He died suddenly in 1946, aged 93, reportedly active and mentally alert, and still president of the Edgware branch of the British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection.[94]

STENSON HOOKER AND LIKE-MINDED COLLEAGUES

Prior to 1925, Hooker saw himself as firmly established within the medical profession. He might criticize contemporary medical practice but he respected his professional colleagues.[95] His desire was to reform medicine from within the profession: he hoped, and confidently expected, to see his new and refined methods taken into the compass of orthodox practice. Even when associating with unregistered practitioners, he clearly identified himself with the profession. He wrote

[86] *Health and Efficiency*, 1926, **25**: 77; ibid., 1929, **28**: 376.

[87] Hooker, op. cit., note 66 above, pp. 42–6.

[88] *Idem, The humane family doctor*, London, C. W. Daniel, 1937. Hooker commended William Henry Webb's *Standard guide to non-poisonous herbal medicine*, Southport, the author, 1916.

[89] *Idem*, op. cit., note 87 above, pp. 48–51, 95–8, 100 fn.

[90] See for example, Henry Gilbert, *Home treatment with tissue remedies*, 4th ed., Grantham, Biochemic Publishing House, 1928.

[91] J. Stenson Hooker, foreword to Henry Gilbert, *Bio-therapy*, Grantham, British Biochemic Association, 1935. It is difficult for a person schooled in scientific biochemistry to read the biochemic literature with anything approaching sympathy. Hooker, then in his 80s, wrote in his foreword that the biochemic remedies "contain perfectly ionised and highly developed cell-salts and other tissue constituents which are animative, super-nutritive and reintegrative".

[92] Hooker, op. cit., note 88 above, title page. *Health and nature cure handbook*, vol. 2, London, Nature Cure Education Association, 1934, p. 83.

[93] *The Times*, 27 Nov. 1942, p. 2e. *Minutes of the GMC for 1942*, 1943, **79**: 82. Hooker emphasized his return to the professional fold by listing his membership of the BMA in the *Medical Directory*.

[94] Obituary, *Vegetarian Messenger*, 1946, **43**: 229; *Abolitionist*, 1946, **47**: 37.

[95] Hooker, op. cit., note 69 above, pp. 25, 222.

> we are . . . playing more and more into the hands of the quack and the unqualified practitioner, simply because so many of us are averse to opening our medical eyes and thus seeing what a great deal of undoubted good is being effected by methods which we have, as a body, elected to scorn and ignore.[96]

From this position, his erasure from the Register was an extremely bitter blow.[97]

Even after erasure, Hooker identified not primarily with unregistered practitioners but with regularly qualified medical nonconformists. He sensed "a big and ever increasing defection from the belief in much of the orthodox medicine". It was among the perceptive defectors that Hooker saw himself: he wrote, for example, "We have now quite a good little company of non-conforming doctors, men of independent attitude of mind". And he hoped eventually to see "the whole of the profession roped in upon our side, so that, sooner or later, our present unorthodox and heterodox treatments will become the orthodox and the usual practice".[98]

These medical nonconformists were not simply a figment of Hooker's imagination. In the early decades of the twentieth century there were many doctors who disagreed with particular aspects of orthodox thinking, and there was a small group whose set of alternative ideas may appropriately be described as "naturopathic". Five such individuals will be discussed briefly with emphasis on their unorthodox views, their affiliations, and their conflicts with medical authority.

Walter Richard Hadwen (1854–1932) was certainly a non-conforming doctor. Although not a member of the British Nature Cure Association, that organization described him as "the most prominent Humanitarian . . . Anti-Vaccinist, Anti-Vivisector, Vegetarian and Naturopath". As the proprietor of a chemist's shop in Somerset, he had become a vigorous and well-known opponent of vaccination. Then in 1893, at the age of 39, he obtained the conjoint medical qualification, and later the MD (St Andrews). He was invited to Gloucester and settled there in 1896 at the end of the smallpox epidemic. He then switched much of his energy to opposing vivisection, becoming the leading figure of the British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection.[99]

In 1885, Hadwen had written of the prevalent misconception "that because the breaking of nature's laws is not succeeded *immediately* by results which cannot be mistaken, no harm will result from the errors we have committed".[100] Such a view, combined with vigorous support for vegetarianism and temperance as well as the activities already mentioned, show Hadwen as subscribing to many of the naturopathic beliefs. Perhaps because of his pharmaceutical training, he does not seem to have attacked drug therapy; but his passionate rejection of orthodox germ

[96] *Idem*, *A new suggestion treatment*, op. cit., note 80 above, pp. 8, 12–13. He expressed similar views in *A spiritual basis for health*, op. cit., note 80 above, p. 32.

[97] *Idem*, 'Leaves from a physician's notebook', *Health and Efficiency*, 1928, **27**: 256. Hooker, op. cit., note 87 above, p. 84 fn.

[98] Ibid., pp. 15–19, 32, 104–5. Hooker, op. cit., note 88 above, p. 6.

[99] For a highly sympathetic biography, see Beatrice E. Kidd and M. Edith Richards, *Hadwen of Gloucester*, London, John Murray, 1933. See also *Nature Cure Annual*, 1907/8, p. xxii, photograph opposite p. 24; also obituaries in *Citizen* (Gloucester), 28 Dec. 1932; *Vaccination Enquirer*, 1933, **55**: 20–2.

[100] Walter R. Hadwen, *W. R. Hadwen's red book and diary*, Highbridge (Somerset), the author, 1885, pp. 35–47.

theory was apparent in many public arguments.[101] Hadwen had been judged enough of a naturopath to be made medical officer to the Gloucester Medical and Hydropathic Association, founded by two supporters of naturopathy—Edwin H. Spring, pastor of the East End Tabernacle, and John Pickering, a non-medical hydropathic practitioner in Leicester.[102] And later, Hadwen's Hydropathic Home was listed among those where full naturopathic treatment could be obtained.[103]

Hadwen came into serious conflict with some doctors in Gloucester where, his biographers claim, he was black-balled from membership of the BMA. The *British Medical Journal* published material apparently linking Hadwen with the advertisement of a proprietary medicine;[104] and the Central Ethical Committee of the BMA charged him with advertising in a local newspaper. Hadwen had announced times at which he, as a magistrate, would witness declarations of conscientious objection to vaccination. After an exchange of letters, the committee had to accept that Hadwen was acting as a magistrate rather than as a doctor in this context.[105]

Professional animosity towards Hadwen became fully apparent when he was tried for manslaughter in 1924. Hadwen was found not guilty of the charge, which hinged upon his not having given antiserum to a fatal case of supposed diphtheria. One local doctor admitted approaching national newspapers with offers of information, presumably damaging, about Hadwen: and another had written to Hadwen that he would be ashamed to sit on any public body of which Hadwen was also a member.[106] After the trial, Hadwen claimed, probably with justification, that "there would have been no trial... had I not been so unfortunate as to estrange a fellow practitioner".[107] But when Hadwen died eight years later, the *Lancet* accorded him a not disrespectful obituary.[108]

In the Psycho-Therapeutic Society Hooker was associated with other registered practitioners, and two of its vice-presidents can reasonably be described as naturopaths. One was Robert Bell (1845–1926), who had been in general and

[101] See for example, *idem*, 'Malta fever and goats' milk', *Contemp. Rev.*, 1909, **96**: 222–36. R. Hardie, ibid., pp. 485–92. Walter R. Hadwen, *Jennerism and Pasteurism*, London, British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection, 1914.

[102] *Gloucester Journal*, 1896, 25 April, p. 3; 2 May, p. 8; 17 Oct. p. 2; ibid., 1897, 23 Jan. p. 5. For claims of the success for hydropathic treatment of smallpox, see ibid., 1896, 13 June, p. 7; 1 Aug. p. 3, and *Citizen* (Gloucester), 1896, 22 and 23 Oct. Edwin H. Spring, *The nature cure at Gloucester*, Gloucester, the author, 1896. John Pickering, *Which? Sanitation and sanitary remedies, or vaccination and drug treatment?*, London, E. W. Allen, 1892; *The smallpox epidemic in Gloucester*, London, E. W. Allen, 1896.

[103] *Nature Cure Annual*, 1907/8, p. 130.

[104] 'The antivaccination germ killer', *Br. med. J.*, 1910, **i**: 1130. 'Dr Hadwen and the Crimson Cross Remedies', ibid., **ii**: 1535–7.

[105] Kidd and Richards, op. cit., note 99 above, pp. 169–77. These authors comment that Hadwen "must have possessed the wisdom of a serpent to escape persecution as long as he did, and manage to remain upon the medical register at all".

[106] *Verbatim report of the trial and acquittal of Dr W. R. Hadwen*, London, British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection, 1924, pp. 3, 17, 28.

[107] *Dare doctors think?*, London, British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection, 1925, pp. 11–15. That Hadwen's trial was "a very unhappy example of a man persecuted on account of his unorthodox views on pathology" was also the opinion of Leonard A. Parry in *Some famous medical trials*, London, Churchill, 1927, pp. 310–26. For an opposing view, see P. H. A. Willcox, 'The trial of Dr. W. R. Hadwen', *J. roy. Coll. Phycns Lond.*, 1970, **4**: 227–33.

[108] Obituary, *Lancet*, 1933, **i**: 59.

gynaecological practice in Glasgow after registration in 1868 and subsequently becoming MD and FFPS (Glasgow). He became progressively disilusioned with the efficacy of surgery for cancer and, in 1894, ceased to operate in such cases.[109] He also set out, in a book of popular medicine, to educate the public to "trust more to the *vis medicatrix naturae* than to the meddlesome interference of ignorant practitioners".[110] But the non-surgical treatment and prevention of cancer became his main preoccupation. He believed that the avoidable factors of constipation, lack of fresh air and exercise, worry, and over-indulgence acted perniciously on an organ "which in other circumstances might be able by its inherent vitality to resist successfully the onset of malignant disease".[111] In 1904 he moved to London where he would have met others sympathetic to his views.

Bell saw cancer not as a localized disease but as a general poisoning and was convinced that inherent vitality, if encouraged, could defeat cancer. He generalized such ideas to the basically naturopathic view that man, "if he rigidly obeys dietetic, hygienic and sanitary laws, is quite capable of so fortifying his system as to render it invulnerable to disease".[112] He recommended a vegetarian diet with judicious fasting, but he did not abandon medication entirely, sometimes prescribing dried thyroid. He had experimented with other glandular extracts, believing them to supply vital "nuclein": but later he recommended instead the eating of uncooked vegetables because they also supplied nuclein.[113]

Bell took charge of cancer research at Battersea Anti-Vivisection Hospital, and even used the popular press to spread the message that cancer was preventable and surgical treatment unnecessary.[114] In 1911, the *British Medical Journal* published an article by the director of the Imperial Cancer Research Fund on 'Cancer, credulity and quackery'.[115] In it, Bell was virtually accused of quackery and consequently sued both the author and the journal for libel—and won.[116] This success may have earned him some respite, but ten years later Bell, aged 77, was called before the GMC because local practitioners had reported that he had prescribed by post for a patient in Warrington with inoperable cancer, without having seen her or communicated with her doctor. The GMC considered the facts proven and that it "was open to the Council" to judge Bell guilty of infamous conduct. Judgement was however deferred for a year, at the end of which his name was not erased from the Register.[117]

The other relevant vice-president of the Psycho-Therapeutic Society was Henry Valentine Knaggs (1858–1954), who, like Stenson Hooker, can be traced through

[109] *Br. med. J.*, 1912, i: 1404. 'The campaign against cancer', *Daily Mirror*, 27 Aug. 1908, p. 5.

[110] Robert Bell, *The deputy physician*, Glasgow, R. L. Holmes, 1900, pp. i–iii.

[111] *Idem, Cancer. Its causation and its curability without operation*, London, Baillière, Tindall & Cox, 1903, pp. 35–6.

[112] *Idem, Dietetics and hygiene versus disease*, London, Psycho-Therapeutic Society, 1910, p. 24.

[113] Ibid., pp. 8–14, 26–8. Bell, op. cit., note 111 above, pp. 260–1.

[114] Robert Bell, *Reminiscences of an old physician*, London, John Murray, 1924, pp. 241–5; 'The war with cancer', *Daily Mail*, 11 June 1907, p. 4; *Daily Mirror*, op. cit., note 109 above. The latter publication might well have been construed by the GMC as advertising.

[115] E. F. Bashford, 'Cancer, credulity, and quackery', *Br. med. J.*, 1911, i: 1221–30.

[116] *Br. med. J.*, 1912, i: 1403–7, 1461–7.

[117] *Minutes of the GMC for 1922*, 1923, **59**: 19–23; *Minutes for 1923*, 1924, **60**: 12–14. *Lancet*, 1922, i: 1102–3.

initial adherence to orthodox views into a thorough commitment to naturopathy. Knaggs was from a medical family and, after conjoint qualification in 1881, practised at first with his father and as a ship's surgeon. He was soon publishing substantial papers in medical journals, showing a positive interest in medication and apparently accepting the germ theory and supporting vaccination.[118]

By 1908, Knaggs was diverging sharply from orthodox theory with ideas, based on those of Antoine Béchamp, that "germs" were not the cause of disease but rather the products of tissue breakdown.[119] Soon he was offering thoroughly naturopathic advice. Rheumatism was due to the deposition of impurities and could only be made worse by continuing to disobey nature and relying on analgesic drugs: the only cure was a vegetarian diet, aided by baths and perhaps osteopathic manipulation.[120] Similarly, indigestion called for elimination by naturopathic measures:[121] later, Knaggs claimed that such agencies as vaccination, syphilis or a "septic colon" could trigger cancerous changes in tissue deposits caused by improper diet.[122] His ideas were strongly vitalistic and he explained that the human body took in three streams of "solar life essence", as light, as air, and as food and water: and that uncooked vegetables were "fully charged with magnetism" drawn from sun, earth and water.[123]

Knaggs derived many ideas from continental European, rather than American, naturopaths and was particularly enthusiastic for Guelpa's system of short fasts combined with free purgation.[124] His naturopathic affiliations became explicit with the publication of *An epitome of the nature cure system of medicine*. He explained that the nature cure practitioner sought to remove the causes of disease rather than simply suppress symptoms: and he encouraged the active participation of the patient in discussion and treatment of the illness. This contrasted with the attitude of orthodox doctors, who, he believed, would eventually become unnecessary.[125]

Like Hooker, Knaggs believed that medicine was "on the eve of many wonderful discoveries", though he expected these to come "not from within the charmed circle of orthodoxy".[126] But he did not write in an aggressive style about orthodox medicine and seems to have avoided any well-publicized confrontations. An obituary admitted

[118] H. Valentine Knaggs, *A short treatise on the cure of diphtheria by the frequent administration of small doses of sulphur*, London, Gurney & Jackson, 1886; 'Sulphur in diphtheria', *Ther. Gaz.*, 1888, **12**: 153–5, 226–31, 310–17; 'On the treatment of gout by salicylates', *Prov. med. J.*, 1887, **6**: 249–50. See also ibid., pp. 388–9, 545–7; and ibid., 1888, **7**: 2–3, 50–1, 98–100.

[119] H. Valentine Knaggs, *The "microbe" as friend and foe*, London, Jarrold, 1908; *Indigestion. Its cause and cure*, 4th edn., London, C. W. Daniel, 1916, pp. 13–18; *The misunderstood microbe*, London, C. W. Daniel, 1930, pp. 7–9.

[120] *Idem*, *Rheumatism and allied ailments*, London, C. W. Daniel, 1913, pp. 8–12, 23–4, 26.

[121] *Indigestion*, op. cit., note 119 above, pp. 20, 34–9, 43–9, 60–4, 84–94, 96–103. In his preface, Knaggs thanked Edgar J. Saxon, a well-known non-medical naturopath, for help with the book.

[122] H. Valentine Knaggs, *How to prevent cancer*, London, C. W. Daniel, 1932, pp. 17–41. Knaggs believed that cow-pox was derived from human syphilis, see his *The truth about vaccination*, London, C. W. Daniel, 1914, pp. 14, 37.

[123] Knaggs, op. cit., note 121 above, pp. 19–20.

[124] He referred to Lahmann, Kuhne, Schroth, Rikli, and J. P. Muller, see ibid., pp. 66–7, 78, 80, 83, 92–3, 99–103. For G. Guelpa, see his *Auto-intoxication and disintoxication*, transl. F. S. Arnold, London, Rebman, 1912.

[125] H. Valentine Knaggs, *An epitome of the nature cure system of medicine*, London, C. W. Daniel, 1925, pp. 9–14, 19–25.

[126] *Idem*, op. cit., note 121 above, pp. 7, 103.

that his books aroused controversy;[127] and his vitalist ideas couched in apparently scientific jargon were ridiculed in the *British Medical Journal*, though the article did not mention that Knaggs was on the Medical Register.[128] In his mid-seventies he was answering health queries in *Health and Life*, edited by Edgar J. Saxon; and he lived to the age of 96.

Another practitioner who became a committed naturopath was Reginald Francis Edward Austin (1866–1939). He was slightly later on the scene, having obtained the conjoint qualification in 1891 and having spent most of the subsequent 30 years in military service in India. In the 1900s he studied posture and respiratory mechanics;[129] and in the next decade investigated diet, recommending a sparing protein intake with plenty of raw fruit and salads, and lightly cooked vegetables. He sometimes added bran or agar to the diet.[130] From there, Austin moved on to a full acceptance of naturopathic ideas. He argued that the cause of disease was always "internal" and that "microbes or germs" were "only the special exciting (secondary) cause".[131]

On returning to civil practice in London, Austin wrote *Direct paths to health*, which was an exposition of naturopathy. He argued that all diseases were essentially one, so that different names for manifestations in different organs were misleading because "the body does not work in parts but as a whole". Disease was caused by "poisons or impurities taken into the system from without, and effete or waste matter retained in the body"; and the symptoms of an illness reflected nature's efforts to remove the impurities. Health was not promoted by "drugs, serums or vaccines", but by diet, true moderation, fasting, and respiratory exercises, sometimes with osteopathic or chiropractic manipulations.[132]

Austin also associated with other non-conforming doctors. He offered to be a witness for the defence in Hadwen's trial: he was not called but spoke at the meeting to celebrate the not-guilty verdict.[133] Austin also delivered a naturopathic address to the British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection, of which he was a committee member.[134] And he spoke against vaccination at a meeting under the auspices of the People's League of Medical Freedom.[135] But it was his articles in *Health and Efficiency* that forced a confrontation with the medical establishment.

[127] *The Times*, 24 July 1954, p. 8e.

[128] H. Valentine Knaggs, quoted in '"Herbalists" and medical practice', *Br. med. J.*, 1911, **i**: 1274–7. The passage quoted had been taken from the *Herb Doctor*, the journal of the People's League of Medical Freedom, dedicated to fighting the medical monopoly of registered practitioners; see *First report of the departmental committee on coroners*, part 2, Cd 4782, 1909, Q.2110.

[129] R. F. E. Austin, papers on respiration and its relation to disease, *J. roy. Army med. Corp*, 1906, **7**: 376–9; ibid., 1907, **8**: 460–1, 574–7; *Br. med. J.*, 1906, **ii**: 1890; ibid., 1909, **i**: 1093–4; ibid., **ii**: 918–19.

[130] *Idem*, 'Some principles of nutrition', *Indian med. Gaz.*, 1918, **53**: 214–16; 'Cellulose and chronic constipation', ibid., 1919, **54**: 56–60. The diets recommended were not specifically vegetarian.

[131] *Idem*, 'A plea for simplicity in the prevention and cure of bacterial infections', ibid., pp. 331–6; 'The natural cure and prevention of dysentery', ibid., 1920, **55**: 405–8.

[132] Reginald F. E. Austin, *Direct paths to health*, London, C. W. Daniel, 1922, pp. 13–23, 91–5. Austin acknowledged particularly the influence of E. H. Dewey and H. Lahmann (p. 71), quoted from J. H. Tilden (p. 41), and cited Guelpa (p. 50).

[133] *Dare doctors think?*, op. cit., note 107 above: Austin's contribution, pp. 5–6.

[134] *Abolitionist*, 1925, **26**: 104, 115–17. See also ibid., 1926, **27**: 75–6, 83.

[135] *Herb Doctor*, 1927, **23**: 19–20.

In 1926, *Health and Efficiency* was a journal of naturopathy and physical culture, and was an appropriate vehicle for Austin's article entitled 'This way to health. Naturopathy'. In it he presented illness as a purifier, and stated that germs were not the causative factor in disease. He avoided specific attack on the medical profession, but in his next article on 'The aspirin peril. Our most popular poison', he attacked Sir Thomas Horder for his praise of this drug.[136] In 1927, the editor announced a series of articles by Austin, one of the "enlightened band of medical men" who "forsake the shibboleths of respectable orthodoxy in order to bear witness to the light".[137] The early articles attacked only orthodox ideas: then followed three attacking orthodox practice.[138] The first was on the nature-cure treatment of cancer, the next on 'The tonsil and adenoids scandal', and the third claimed that operation for appendicectomy was unnecessary but implied that the medical profession had a financial interest in its continuation.[139]

The article on appendicectomy had been dressed up by the editor with a picture of a young woman—"the late Florence Mills. Yet another victim of operation for appendicectomy". Soon Austin received a letter from the BMA "asking for an explanation" and shortly afterwards was summoned before the GMC, the Medical Defence Union acting as complainant. The accusation of advertising by promoting his own treatment while deprecating that of others was considered as proved, but the GMC delayed recording a judgement of "infamous conduct". Austin was given a year in which to repent: this he did, and his name was not erased.[140] Subsequently he was more cautious but he did not cease writing. In 1936 he was still contributing articles, critical of endocrine therapy and of blood transfusion, to lay naturopathic journals which were inherently anti-medical.[141] Austin died in 1939.[142]

In rather a different category was Josiah Oldfield (1863–1953), an Oxford graduate in law and theology who became a barrister and received a DCL (Oxon) for a thesis on capital punishment. While a student he adopted vegetarianism, editing the *Vegetarian* until 1896 and then acting as secretary of the Vegetarian Union. He entered medicine with the conjoint qualification in 1897. Before qualifying he had cooperated with A. F. Hills in founding the Oriolet Hospital in Loughton, of which he became warden: and he was a founder and physician of the Humanitarian Hospital

[136] *Health and Efficiency*, 1926, **25**: 390–1, 590, 602.

[137] Editorial, ibid., 1927, **26**: 162. For Austin's early articles, see pp. 166–7, 220–1, 274–5, 314, 328–9, 365, 380–1. The articles gave his name and qualifications.

[138] Reginald F. E. Austin, 'Cancer—nature versus knife', ibid., pp. 432–3, 456; 'The tonsil and adenoids scandal', ibid., pp. 548–9, 585; 'The truth about appendix operations', ibid., pp. 606–7. The article on cancer was reprinted, with approval, in *Herb Doctor*, 1928, **25**: 35–6.

[139] In the article, Austin recounted the joke: Student—"What did you operate for?". Surgeon—"For 100 guineas". Student—"Yes, but I mean, what did the patient have?". Surgeon—"He had 100 guineas".

[140] *Minutes of the GMC for 1928*, 1928, **65**: 52–4. *Minutes for 1929*, 1930, **66**: 11–13. *Br. med. J.*, 1928, **i**: supplement 245–6.

[141] Reginald F. E. Austin, 'Endocrinology exposed', *Animals' Champion and Medical Freedom Advocate*, June/August 1936: 91–2; 'Blood transfusion. Unscientific and useless', *New Life* (a quarterly journal of health and nature cure), Dec. 1935–Feb. 1936, p. 37. The former article was reprinted with approval in *Medical Herbalist*, 1935/6, **11**: 231–2.

[142] For his obituary, see *The Times*, 4 Nov. 1939 (not all editions), p. 8b.

of St Francis in the New Kent Road, London.[143] From 1903, he was the leading figure of the Lady Margaret Fruitarian Hospital in Sittingbourne, Kent. He founded the Society for the Abolition of Capital Punishment and was a council member of the Order of the Golden Age, a philanthropic, humane, and vegetarian society.[144]

Oldfield's medical advice centred on a fruitarian diet. He believed that health was "from within, and not from without", and wrote that medicines might have value, just as a ceremony might in religion, but that they did "not contain in themselves the essentials either for health or healing".[145] Later Oldfield wrote that people had begun "to understand what a dreadful risk they were running when they allowed doctors to dose their stomachs with indigestible and poisonous substances which only tended to hide symptoms and produce greater evils".[146] Instead he recommended "Air and water, sunshine and fruit, toil and abstinence".[147] Sometimes he prescribed an "eliminative fast", pointing out that skin eruptions were often evidence of the life force protecting the internal organs "by driving out poisonous matter from the tissues through the skin". At all times he stressed the spiritual and psychological aspects of health, so that the first stage in self-healing lay in "creating the mental state which makes physical repentance possible".[148]

Oldfield was moderate in his writings and did not indulge in aggressive criticism of the medical profession. He advised patients undertaking a fast or the "raisin cure" to do so under medical supervision or, at least, to be assessed by a doctor beforehand. Further, he advised would-be medical reformers, before condemning the ignorance of doctors, first to pass the examinations required for medical practice.[149] His obituary in *The Times* noted that he tended to address the general public rather than fellow practitioners and that "there were those who felt sometimes that his methods went a little beyond professional etiquette".[150] Oldfield was well aware that, while "everything is forgiven to the orthodox practitioner", the pioneer of the unorthodox might set "a whisper going among the stately pillars of the profession" that might condemn him to be an outsider for all time.[151] But Oldfield appears to have steered a peaceful course and when he died in 1953, shortly before his 90th birthday, the medical journals accorded respectful obituaries to this "reformer of the old school".[152]

[143] Forward, op. cit., note 22 above, pp. 91, 148, 170–1, 186. *Medical Who's Who*, London, London & Counties Press Assoc., 1915, p. 636. Josiah Oldfield, 'Proteins', *Vegetarian Messenger*, 1945, **42**: 4. *Burdett's Hospitals and Charities*, London, Scientific Press, 1900, pp. 268, 418. Obituary, *Lancet*, 1953, **i**: 350–1.

[144] See, *The Order of the Golden Age*, Paignton, the Order, 1904. The founder was Sidney H. Beard, whose ideas appeared in his *Comprehensive guide book to natural hygiene and humane diet*, 7th ed., London, Order of the Golden Age, 1913. Another council member was the Rev. A. M. Mitchell, president of the Peoples' League of Medical Freedom.

[145] Josiah Oldfield, 'The temple of healing', *Scottish Health Reformer*, 1903/4, **1**: 114–15.

[146] *Idem*, *Fasting for health and life*, London, C. W. Daniel, 1924, pp. 67–75.

[147] *Idem*, 'The temple of healing, Part 3', *Scottish Health Reformer*, 1904/5, **2**: 35–6.

[148] Oldfield, ibid., pp. 6–7; op. cit., note 146 above, pp. 121–31. See also the advice in *idem*, *Get well and keep well*, London, C. W. Daniel, 1926, pp. 277–8.

[149] *Idem*, op. cit., note 146 above, pp. 79, 142. *Idem*, *The raisin cure*, London, C. W. Daniel, 1923, pp. 46–7.

[150] *The Times*, 3 Feb. 1953, p. 10d.

[151] Oldfield, op. cit., note 146 above, pp. 77–8.

[152] *Lancet*, 1953, **i**: 350–1. *Br. med. J.*, 1953, **i**: 407.

Hadwen, Bell, Knaggs, Austin, and Oldfield all qualified in medicine during the nineteenth century, and publicized their naturopathic views during the twentieth. All were actively doing so during the 1920s, when Stenson Hooker came into conflict with the GMC, as did Bell and Austin. The group was joined by another important twentieth-century naturopath, representing the second generation of Allinsons. Bertrand Peter Allinson had been brought up not to eat meat and had qualified in medicine in 1914, having avoided all classes involving vivisection.[153] He was active in vegetarian societies and in the anti-vaccination and anti-vivisection movements: and he expounded naturopathy in lectures and articles. He wrote, for instance, of the injurious effects of drugs and of how they only hindered the "automatic cleansing process" which was the basis of much disease:[154] and he neatly outlined the principles of naturopathy in an article in *Health and Efficiency*.[155]

Hooker, when both a registered practitioner and a naturopath, was not an isolated figure as Thomas Allinson had been in the previous century. He had like-minded colleagues and there were organizations in which they could associate. In 1912, for example, Oldfield was a vice-president of the National Antivaccination League of which Hooker, Hadwen, and Knaggs were council members; and later Austin and B. P. Allinson were vice-presidents. Hooker, Bell, Knaggs, Austin, Oldfield, and B. P. Allinson were all at one time officers of Hadwen's British Union for the Abolition of Vivisection, or at least wrote in its journal. Hooker, Bell, and Knaggs were vice-presidents of the Psycho-Therapeutic Society; and Hooker, Knaggs, and B. P. Allinson were all at one time physicians to the British Hospital for Mental and Nervous Diseases. Oldfield was a council member of the Order of the Golden Age, to which Hooker and Bell delivered lectures: and Bell was a physician to the Lady Margaret Fruitarian Hospital, where Oldfield was senior medical officer.[156]

ORTHODOX MEDICINE AND THE NATUROPATHS

Orthodox medical practice has frequently shown undue attachment to particular modes of treatment, either because it has clung to old theories or because new discoveries have induced uncritical enthusiasm. Protest against such therapeutical excesses has often formed the basis for alternative medical cults. Thus both the herbalists and the homeopaths objected to the excessive and frequently toxic medication of the regular practitioners; but each group developed an alternative and distinctive pharmacopoeia of its own. The nineteenth-century naturopaths rejected drugs more wholeheartedly, relying solely on the *vis medicatrix naturae*. Their doctrine that health came from within, stressed the individual's moral responsibility for health and tapped the great power-source which had sustained the various manifestations of "physical puritanism".[157] American teaching based on this outlook

[153] *Vegetarian Messenger*, 1921, **18**: 126. *Abolitionist*, 1927, **28**: 27–37.

[154] Bertrand P. Allinson, 'Hints for physiological living', *Food Reformer's Year Book*, 1921, pp. 17–22.

[155] *Idem*, 'The cure of disease', *Health and Efficiency*, 1926, **25**: 23.

[156] For Hooker's lecture to the Order of the Golden Age, see Fernie, op. cit., note 45 above, p. 127. Otherwise these affiliations are drawn from the *Medical Directory* and from notices and announcements in the literature of these organizations cited in the notes.

[157] J. F. C. Harrison, 'Early Victorian radicals and the medical fringe', in Bynum and Porter, op. cit., note 46 above, pp. 198–215.

was brought to Britain by naturopaths like Nichols and, it is suggested, was a source of inspiration for Thomas Allinson. A primary reason for his confrontation with the medical establishment was his view that medicines were "so many poisons" and doctors "necessarily poisoners".[158]

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, one of the excessive preoccupations of orthodox medicine, and one against which naturopathic thinkers rebelled, was its emphasis on the pathogenicity of bacteria and its consequent interest in vaccines and serum therapy. The "Annus Medicus", appearing at the close of each year in the *Lancet*, from at least 1894 through to the first decade of the twentieth century showed clearly the interest and excitement aroused by these topics.[159] And the "Address in Medicine" given before the annual meetings of the BMA repeatedly gave pride of place to advances in this field.[160]

The successes of the "microbe hunters" figure in both popular and medical annals, but this period also had its excesses. Vaccines were prepared from all manner of organisms associated with such intractable infections as gonococcal arthritis, empyema, lung abscess, renal infections and furunculosis: Alexander Fleming, for instance, reported "exceedingly good results" in the treatment of acne with a vaccine from the "acne bacillus".[161] At a meeting on vaccine therapy in 1910, Sir Almroth Wright's opening address showed that he was well aware of the contentious status of some experiments in this field, and considerable caution was expressed by some, if not all, of the other speakers.[162] This was still a period for debating the significance of the new ideas, and it was not as irrational as it may now seem for both Hadwen and Knaggs to make an attack on orthodox germ theory one of their main themes.

Smallpox vaccination and antiserum therapy were doubly offensive to the naturopaths because, as well as introducing disease or the products of disease, they entailed the administration of material of animal origin. Hooker pleaded for the abolition not only of serum therapy, but also "of all employment of . . . extracts of organs of animals"; and, on similar grounds, Austin attacked all endocrine gland administration.[163] The organotherapy to which they objected was another of the enthusiasms of at least a section of the medical profession. It had its successes, such as the use of dried thyroid gland in hypothyroidism, but it also had conspicuous excesses, and its scientific standing was not improved by C. E. Brown-Séquard's uncritical assessment of his own response to testicular extracts.[164] It was not irrational of the naturopaths to object to much of organotherapy.

[158] Op. cit., note 34 above.

[159] See for example, *Lancet*, 1894, **ii**: 1545–6, 1549–50; 1896, **ii**: 1816–17.

[160] See for example *Br. med. J.*, 1902, **ii**: 313–21; 1903, **ii**: 233–40; 1908, **ii**: 248–54; 1910, **ii**: 246–51.

[161] N. Raw, 'On the value of serums and vaccines in the treatment of disease', ibid., **i**: 1538–9. W. Hale White and J. W. Eyre, 'The results of a year's use of vaccines in general medicine', *Proc. roy. Soc. Med.*, 1909, **2**: 145–65. Alexander Fleming reported in *Lancet*, 1909, **ii**: 472; 1910, **ii**: 889.

[162] Almroth E. Wright, 'Vaccine therapy: its administration, value, and limitations', ibid., pp. 863–74. For other speakers see ibid., pp. 885–9.

[163] Hooker, op. cit., note 69 above, p. 194. Austion, op. cit., note 141 above.

[164] For a critical assessment of organotherapy, see S. Vincent, reported in 'The present position of organotherapy', *Lancet*, 1923, **i**: 130–2. For Brown-Séquard, see A. T. Kenyon, 'Overture to 1956', *Endocrinology*, 1956, **58**: 285–91.

In the first decade of the twentieth century it seems that naturopaths attacked these excesses of medical practice as part of their opposition to "scientific medicine" in general. They objected to its medication, to its surgical operations, to bacteriology and associated developments in immunological manipulation, and to endocrine therapy. And they objected to vivisection as a basic technique of medical research. But, paradoxically, the naturopaths combined this reactionary attitude to current medicine with a genuinely progressive promotion of measures for improving individual and collective health. And they were intrigued, at least in a superficial way, by advances in the physical sciences. Hooker could "generally find something of interest in the little penny *Popular Science Sifting*".[165] The idea of radioactivity, with its unseen and previously undreamt-of radiations, was particularly attractive as it provided the naturopaths with an analogy for their ideas of human radiations and with terms which they did not hesitate to use in the loosest sense. Knaggs wrote that fresh air contained a "vital principle, or radio-activity", which was not one of its yet-defined constituents; and Bell believed that fruit and seeds contained "radio-active elements when in an uncooked condition".[166]

Their attitude to scientific medicine may partly explain why Stenson Hooker and many non-medical naturopaths were greatly preoccupied with the psychological aspects of disease. This field was still uncharted by mechanistic science and offered scope for vitalist theory and intuitive speculation. Interest in psychological and para-psychological phenomena was widespread: Hynes has suggested that the Society of Psychical Research was "successful, even fashionable" in investigating what would now seem to be quackery, owing to the "state of open uncertainty" of intellectual life at the turn of the century.[167] Hooker was aware that old standards were being questioned across a wide front. His early writings stressed that replacement of the old and coarse by the new and refined was a process as much in general ways of thought as in medicine in particular.[168] Later he wrote of both medicine and religion being "in the melting-pot of the Advanced Thought of today", and of orthodoxy being challenged in both medicine and religion "on curiously parallel lines".[169]

If the Edwardians were inclined to question authority, then there was plenty to question in orthodox medicine. This situation may have provided sufficient circumstances for the spread of naturopathic ideas, but the emergence of a group of practising naturopathic doctors must also have been conditioned to some degree by economic considerations at a time when starting on a medical career could be difficult. By the end of the century doctors believed that the growth in their numbers was producing undesirable competition:[170] and they showed great anxiety over two

[165] Hooker, op. cit., note 69 above, p. 95.

[166] Knaggs, op. cit., note 128 above. Bell, op. cit., note 112 above, p. 6.

[167] Samuel Hynes, *The Edwardian turn of mind*, London, Oxford University Press, 1968, pp. 139–45. Psychic research even interested eminent physicists, see Janet Oppenheim, *The other world*, Cambridge University Press,1985, pp. 326–90.

[168] Hooker, op. cit., note 69 above, pp. 1–30.

[169] *Idem*, *A spiritual basis for health*, op. cit., note 80 above, pp. 31–48; 'The broader aspect of medicine', op. cit., note 80 above.

[170] George Eastes, 'Our numbers and our work at the close of the century', *Br. med. J.*, 1900, **ii**: 137–9. See also 'Overcrowding in the medical profession', *Lancet*, 1890, **ii**: 28.

particular threats to their income—the exploitation of doctors by the conditions of contract practice, and the loss of fees because potential patients were receiving treatment free as hospital out-patients.[171]

Thomas Allinson, writing of the difficulties of a young doctor, admitted the importance of his earnings from newspaper articles.[172] But direct economic pressures are likely to have been of less importance to the naturopathic doctors who declared their position during the first decade of this century. Knaggs had started from the presumed security of practice with his father; Bell had already had an apparently successful career; and, rather later, Austin still had time to serve in the army when he showed an interest in naturopathy. Hooker was already approaching 50, but it is possible that for him, naturopathy was a distinctive badge that could aid him in competition when he set up practice in London. But Oldfield was already a well-established vegetarian reformer before qualifying in medicine, just as Hadwen was already a well-known anti-vaccinator. So economic pressures may have contributed to the emergence of this group of naturopaths, but they did not provide a common prime motivation.

The most striking feature of their careers is that, unlike the Allinsons, the remaining naturopaths were not young when they publicly adopted naturopathy. They were doctors trained in the nineteenth century, and presumably carrying nineteenth-century values, who were reacting against twentieth-century medicine. That this was a crucial circumstance is suggested by the apparent lack of a new wave of young medically-qualified naturopaths between the wars (apart from B. P. Allinson who represented, literally, a second generation). There was still plenty against which to react in orthodox medicine, which had not yet begun to accept many of the naturopathic ideas as it has begun to do in recent decades. Indeed, it was in the 1920s that several lay naturopathic societies were launched in Britain.[173]

Doctors qualifying after the 1914–18 war received a medical education which as a result of revisions of the curriculum and financial support for the medical schools,[174] had probably indoctrinated them more thoroughly than before in modern "scientific medicine".[175] Even if some of the naturopathic ideas were capable of attracting them, they may have been repelled by the pseudo-scientific jargon used by such naturopaths as Hooker and Knaggs, whose position must have appeared increasingly reactionary. If economic pressures had played a part in directing young doctors into naturopathy, their importance may have been diminished by the advent of the panel system, which provided almost double the capitation fee that had been paid to club doctors and

[171] Contract practice resulted in the "Battle of the Clubs", discussed in the first leader in the *Lancet* in both 1900 and 1910, and repeatedly in the 'Annus Medicus'. On "hospital abuse", see articles such as W. Moore, 'General practitioners and medical charities', *Br. med. J.*, 1889, **i**: 1138–9. A section specifically on this topic appeared in the *Lancet*'s 'Annus Medicus' in 1896, 1897, and 1898.

[172] 'Allinsonia. No. 3', *Hosp. Gaz.*, 1889, **17**: 453–4.

[173] See Brown, op. cit., note 1 above.

[174] E. Graham-Little, 'The history of medical education in the last hundred years', *Medical Press*, 1939, **201**: 110–14.

[175] A commentator believed that "the newly qualified man comes from his hospital every year better equipped for his profession"; see, Herbert C. Jonas, 'On general practice', *Br. med. J.*, 1920, **ii**: 129–31.

removed the financial responsibility for supplying medicines.[176] And for young doctors between the wars there were new outlets for the drive that might have been directed towards naturopathic reform. There were now politically progressive medical organizations to attract their reforming zeal,[177] and an increasing scope for specialization in medicine to provide intellectual excitement.[178]

Fear of disciplinary action by the GMC may also have deterred young doctors from heterodox activities. The medical establishment dealt with both Allinson and Hooker through the GMC, but that body's displeasure was not confined to out-and-out naturopaths. Sir Arbuthnot Lane thought it prudent to have his name removed from the Medical Register when he founded the New Health Society in 1926.[179] And, in Bernard Shaw's words, C. W. Saleeby had "actually had to remove his name from that register to secure his freedom to tell his fellow citizens that sunshine is better than poultices".[180] The disciplinary activities of the GMC would make an intriguing subject for study, but here they can be discussed only briefly and, for the sake of argument, as they might have been seen by the naturopaths.

The GMC became aware of a particular form of professional misbehaviour usually because an organization like the BMA drew its attention to what was considered a prevalent or increasing abuse. Sometimes complaints about a particular doctor forced the GMC to bring a disciplinary charge. After much discussion or experience of penal cases, the council liked to clarify its position on a particular misdemeanour by issuing a "Warning Notice" about it to practitioners. In the case of advertising, some was direct and blatant enough, but indirect advertising could be subtle and hard to categorize. Around the time of Allinson's erasure, the executive committee of the GMC had apparently not been able to agree on how to approach the problem.[181] It was not until 1905 that, in response to representations by the BMA, a relevant warning notice was issued. The offence was defined in broad terms as "issuing or sanctioning the issue of advertisements of an objectionable character, or of employing or sanctioning the employment of agents or canvassers, for the purpose of procuring persons to become their patients".[182]

The 1905 warning notice may have reduced the frequency of direct cavassing but it hardly approached the problem of indirect advertising. By 1922, the BMA had

[176] F. Honigsbaum, *The division in British medicine*, London, Kogan Page, 1979, p. 15. A leader in the *Lancet*, 1919, **ii**: 393–4, agreed that the young medical man could be "far better paid" than his father or grandfather. See also, ibid., 1923, **i**: 807.

[177] See Honigsbaum, op. cit., note 176 above, p. 54.

[178] Between the wars, specialization increased and specialist fields multiplied. A doctor who did not enter consultant practice might still combine general practice and specialization, while the municipal hospitals offered the possibility of specialist practice on a salaried basis; see Rosemary Stevens, *Medical practice in modern England*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1966, pp. 38–64, especially pp. 41, 55–6, 60. But for the drawbacks of the municipal hospitals, see B. Abel-Smith, *The hospitals 1800–1949*, London, Heinemann, 1964, pp. 375–6.

[179] See W. E. Tanner, *Sir W. Arbuthnot Lane, Bart. CB, MS, FRCS. His life and work*, London, Baillière, Tindall & Cox, 1946, pp. 28, 126–31. For his clash with the BMA, see 'Publicity by medical practitioners', *Br. med. J.*, 1926, **ii**: supplement 141–2.

[180] Bernard Shaw, *Doctors' delusions, crude criminology and sham education*, London, Constable, 1932, p. 132.

[181] W. Pyke-Lees, *Centenary of the General Medical Council, 1858–1958*, London, GMC, 1958, p. 12.

[182] *Minutes of the GMC for 1905*, 1906, **42**: 83–4, 138–9.

become particularly concerned about doctors allowing interviews or articles written by or about them to appear in the newspapers. The GMC did not respond initially to the BMA's request that the warning notice should be revised: but they were more responsive when the suggestion was taken up by one of the profession's direct representatives on the council.[183] A more comprehensive warning notice was agreed in 1923: it extended the prohibition to publications "commending or directing attention to the practitioner's professional skill, knowledge, services, or qualifications, or deprecating those of others."[184] The extended warning satisfied some of the requirements of the BMA but its Central Ethical Committee believed that the abuse was widespread, though its lesser forms shaded almost imperceptibly into accepted professional custom. The committee's chairman admitted that in the matter of indirect advertising, "The principle was easy, the application difficult".[185]

During the decade 1890–99, none of the other penal cases brought before the GMC was closely similar to that of Thomas Allinson.[186] Two doctors were removed from the Register for direct advertising and several were disciplined for association with organizations or unqualified practitioners involved in advertising. One homoeopath was removed because he translated a book on *Electro-homoeopathic medicine* and associated with its non-medical author. Another homoeopath was removed for association with his own father, who had himself been removed from the Register and now used men with sandwich-boards to advertise a private hospital.[187] Two were associated with the advertisement of "quack medicines", these in one case being Munyon's Homoeopathic Home Remedies. Four had their names erased for associating respectively with an unregistered practitioner who treated rupture; and with another who ran a sanatorium; with the Medical Battery Company; and with the Midland Homoeopathic and Magneto-Electric Institute.[188] No practitioner was censured for association with orthodox medical establishments that advertised their facilities.

During the decade 1920–29, in which Hooker, Bell, and Austin were summoned before the GMC, four doctors were charged for associating with advertising institutions which offered "sunray treatment", ultraviolet radiation or inhalation therapy. In addition to Hooker and Austin, four other doctors were charged with self-advertisement by means of books or articles in the popular press. They were not naturopaths, though two were putting forward ideas which formed a part of naturopathic thinking. One of these was John Kynaston, who had previously been involved with a physical culture practitioner, and was now proclaiming that tonsillectomy was almost always an unnecessary operation. The other was Haydn Brown, who was publicizing a form of psychotherapy that he believed encouraged the *vis medicatrix naturae* and for which the medical journals "could not find space". Of the other two, William Lloyd seems to have been an orthodox practitioner except that

[183] *Lancet*, 1924, **ii**: 246–7.
[184] *Minutes of the GMC for 1923*, 1924, **60**; 36–8.
[185] *Lancet*, 1924, **ii**: 244–5.
[186] The leader in ibid., 1892, **i**: 1249, commented that the charge brought against Allinson was "upon somewhat new lines".
[187] *Br. med. J.*, 1894, **ii**: 1334–5; ibid., 1896, **i**: 1455–6.
[188] Ibid., 1894, **ii**: 1332–4, 1337. *Lancet*, 1893, **i**: 1295–6.

he advocated a treatment of hay fever popular in America but not in Britain: a patient wrote a laudatory account of his methods in the *Daily Mail.* And finally, Charles Sampson, the only one of the four whose name was not erased, was a director of the London Clinic of Applied Psychology and Psychotherapy: he wrote a newspaper article attacking psychoanalysis. Further details of these cases are included in the Appendix.

The Medical Act forbade the erasure of a practitioner's name because of heterodox views but, in practice, when doctors were penalized for association with advertising institutions, the latter were commonly offering some marginal therapy and were situated on the medical "fringe". The GMC discussed penal cases *in camera* and was the final arbiter of what constituted infamous conduct. The judgement pronounced when Allinson took his case to the court of appeal was subsequently used to define such conduct. The Council might describe as infamous any conduct of a doctor in pursuit of his profession, "which will be reasonably regarded as disgraceful or dishonourable by his professional brethren of good repute and competency".[189] A self-regulating professional group could hardly have asked for a more favourable basis for dealing with deviants from their ranks.

APPENDIX

Notes on four penal cases heard before the GMC in 1922–25

JOHN WILLIAM KYNASTON, retired Lt.-Col. RAMC and qualified for 37 years, had his name erased from the Medical Register for producing a pamphlet "obviously addressed to the public", and for letters in *The Times* and a provincial newspaper, claiming that the removal of tonsils and adenoids was almost always unnecessary.[190] Kynaston believed that enlargement of these organs was "a natural defensive reaction against septic germs".[191] Announcements had also appeared in the *Daily Herald* and *John Bull* about a proposed Kynaston Institute. The pamphlet, which contained his portrait and professional address, was an open provocation to the GMC, so Kynaston tried, without success, to have his name temporarily removed from the Register at his own request to avoid penal erasure. This manoeuvre had succeeded in 1911, when he was associated with the physical culture practitioner, Eugene Sandow: the other doctors involved were disciplined.[192] Kynaston was active in politics, standing unsuccessfully as a Labour parliamentary candidate in 1918; after his erasure he had several legal battles over the matter.[193]

HAYDN BROWN developed a form of suggestion therapy that he called "neuroinduction".[194] This method had wide application and he believed it could even make some benign tumours disappear and secondary carcinomatous nodules regress, his explanation being that "Psychotherapy readjusts, permits, and encourages the *vis medicatrix naturae*".[195] Brown claimed that a letter on the topic was refused publication in the *British Medical Journal* and consequently he allowed an article on the use of his method in childbirth to appear in *John Bull,*

[189] Allinson v the GMC, op. cit., note 35 above.

[190] *Lancet*, 1922, **i**: 1103.

[191] John Kynaston, *Adenoids and enlarged tonsils curable without operation*, London, St Catherine's Press, n.d., foreword, p. 38.

[192] *Minutes of the GMC for 1911*, 1912, **48**: 167–8. For the Sandow episode, see *Lancet*, 1911, **i**: 1511–12; 1911, **ii**: 1643–4.

[193] See *Medical World*, 1918, **10**: 110–11, 399, 402. Kynaston's legal battles are described by his legal adviser, L. le M. Minty, *The legal and ethical aspects of medical quackery*, London, Heinemann, 1932, pp. 26–34.

[194] Haydn Brown, *Advanced suggestion. (Neuroinduction)*, London, Baillière, Tindall & Cox, 1918.

[195] *Idem*, *Vitality and diet*, London, Andrew Melrose, 1924, pp. 104–14.

with his name, qualifications, and portrait. In it, he explained that the method was "being discouraged as a result of the hide-bound conservatism of the leaders of the profession".[196] Brown's name was erased from the Register 32 years after his first registration; and he responded with a book defending the discussion of medical matters in the lay press and bitterly attacked the organization of the medical profession.[197] Surprisingly, Brown's name was restored to the Register three years later, only to be removed again because of articles appearing in the Glasgow *Daily Record* about the application of his methods to the treatment of asthma. His name did not appear, but enquirers had been referred to him by the editor and Brown had treated some for a fee. This erasure was again followed by a book attacking medical organization.[198]

CHARLES ADOLPHUS SAMPSON, director of the London Clinic of Applied Psychology and Psycho-Therapy, had a purely consultant practice and did not see patients directly. He was summoned before the GMC because of an article under his name in the *Daily Express*. Entitled 'Psycho-analysis is dead', the article had been intended as a rejoinder to one boosting psychoanalysis in the *Sunday Express*. The Council thought the article "most improper" to appear in the lay press but, satisfied that Sampson had not written it for self-advertisement, took no action against him.[199]

WILLIAM LLOYD, FRCS (Edin), held appointments as an ENT surgeon at a non-teaching hospital and a dispensary in London. His book on hay fever, though it ran to further editions, was coolly reviewed because it proposed a treatment common in America but not in Britain.[200] Lloyd was removed from the Register after 27 years because a patient who happened to be a journalist wrote a laudatory article on his methods in the *Daily Mail*. Lloyd's name was not mentioned, but the newspaper gave enquirers his name and address, and some were offered appointments at a stated fee.[201] Perhaps because Lloyd was a well-established practitioner, his case was used by those anxious to challenge the arbitrary powers of the GMC and was the subject of parliamentary questions. The answers received on that occasion were non-committal and simply outlined the powers of the GMC.[202]

[196] *Idem*, 'Childbirth: Amazing new discovery', *John Bull*, 19 July 1924, p. 13.

[197] *Lancet*, 1924, **ii**: 1201–2. Haydn Brown, *Modern medical methods*, London, Andrew Melrose, 1925, chapters 2, 10, 11.

[198] *Lancet*, 1929, **i**: 1215–16. Haydn Brown, *Fighting for life*, London, Liberty Press, 1929.

[199] *Lancet*, 1924, **ii**: 1203.

[200] William Lloyd, *Hay fever, Hay asthma*, 3rd ed., London, Straker, 1931. Review, *Lancet*, 1907, **ii**: 774–5.

[201] *Lancet*, 1925, **ii**: 1191–2.

[202] *Parliamentary debates*, 3 Dec. 1925, **188**: 2510–14.