AN EXPOSITION
OF THE CHARACTER OF
PROF. J. R. BUCHANAN,
IN REPLY TO HIS DEFAMATORY ATTACK UPON
L. E. JONES,
AND OTHERS.

TO THE FRIENDS OF MEDICAL REFORM:

From the position which I have heretofore occupied in the E. M. Institute, and in the ranks of Medical Reform, I feel it a duty I owe to myself and to my eclectic friends to repel the base and malicious slanders of Prof. Buchanan, in the February and March numbers of the Eclectic Medical Journal.

I will take occasion here to remark that the "Meeting of Eclectic Physicians," to which reference is made, was not called at my request—I did not even suggest it; yet I am the one against whom Prof. B. has level ed his artillery. His malicious and unjust assault necessity forces me to a reply, however reluctant I may be to engage in the conflict. I regret exceedingly that I am not permitted to communicate with my eclectic friends through the same channel which transmits to them the slanders of Prof. B. I hope the circulation of the antidote may be co-extensive with the poison. To reply fully to all his falsehoods and perversions would require a large volume.

It is your right, as Eclectics, to know the man who is now amassing the most contemptible species of humbuggery with the once eminently practical teachings of Eclecticism. Behold his malice: Even the aged Beach, and the unwavering reformer Baldridge, are not permitted to escape his scurrilous abuse; and Dr. Morrow would have received a full share of his impalpable hatred had Dr. B. known his views. These men who have done so much to establish the American Re form system of medicine are now assailed by him. The chameleon has raised his many colored flag, and, like the chicken cock, is now crowing over his ephemeral triumph and the downfall of Eclecticism, achieved by his own base trickery.

If Prof. B. lectures others on "moral obligations," he would do well to take lessons first from his old preceptor, the veteran Reformer, scholar, philosopher and teacher, Prof. Bird Powell. The lessons which he could give might serve to remind you, (Dr. Buchanan,) of the past and improve your morals in future.

I will attempt to notice a few of the falsehoods, perversions, and garbled statements found in the February and March numbers of the Journal, may not refer to them in their exact order, but this can make no difference to the reader. The author of a seventeen resolves purporting to emanate from the class, cannot be mistaken. The language clearly shows who was prompter. I have not a single unkind reflection to cast upon the class, or a single student, for any part he may have taken against me. The desire for diplomas, and the fear of displeasing the Faculty, especially after so many truces of abuse had been hurled at me by them, forced the class into submission, or at least, into silence. Prof. B. asserts "there were but two members in the entire class who did not wholly approve the sentiments and character of the resolutions." The truth is, instead of the entire class approving or having anything to do in getting up these resolutions or in their adoption, but about sixty remained in the city, nearly fifty of whom were candidates for graduation, and of that number but a few, probably not more than twenty, voted for their adoption. Two had the courage to vote against them, and a large majority did not vote at all. The same afternoon the Faculty announced the names of those who had graduated, and in medias terit, several of them came to me, voluntarily and signed that most emphatic New York Letter, concerning the Faculty, in which it is stated "they the Faculty) slandered him, [that is me] to give a semblance of justice to their proceedings." "He is the student's friend," &c.

This very letter was written by one of their most talented graduates, and dated New York City to deceive the Faculty. (See Proceedings of Eclectic Physicians.) Its author's name, as well as that of several other graduates, is now appended to the letter. They feared to affix their names before graduation, as they alleged, lest perchance a vindictive Faculty should learn it, and disgrace them by withholding the honors of the Institution.

The various emphatic printed documents which came from the class after it was reduced to less than one-third of the whole number that attended during the winter, are signed by thirty-six of the students; and many more would have gladly affixed their names, had an opportunity offered. They desired me to suppress their names for reasons already intimated. This clearly shows the entire falsity of Prof. B.'s declarations. I will most cheerfully exhibit the original documents to those desirous of seeing them. Furthermore, many of the students who remained during the vacation, would not matriculate in the E. M. Institute for the spring session until they came to me and learned that a new school would not be organized this spring. Many assured me they would attend another school; and said at least one-half that had remained would do the same, and even now many of the very small class in attendance, I am told, came here not knowing of the changes that had occurred, and would not.
have been there had not the faculty studiously concealed the facts.

The assertion of Prof. B. that "the faculty which Dr. Jones would vilify, are substantially the same faculty which he himself vindicated against the charges of Baldridge and his associates is "not only ridiculously true but basely false." [Prof. B's elegant notion.] I. G. Jones, and L. E. Jones, are neither of them in the Faculty, and they gave entire character to the teachings of the school according to the assertion of Prof. B and Newton, as stated in the E. M. Journal, of Oct., '51. The article published in the Nov. No. of the Journal, written by myself, to which Dr. B refers as showing my course inconsistent, was written early in Oct., '51, before we knew that Dr. Hill was going to withdraw from the Faculty. It did not appear till Nov., owing to the crowded columns of the Oct. No. From this it will be seen that the three who gave "entire vitality to the school" after the death of Dr. Morrow, are neither of them in the present Faculty. This shows the falsity of Dr. B's declaration. Furthermore my assertions in that article were based upon the asserted Eclectic orthodoxy of Prof's Band N.

At that time Dr. B. was demeaning Homoeopathy, and I believed, [as I had every reason to,] that he had abandoned his predilections to that doctrine, and was strongly Eclectic. He deceived me. Since then he has shown in his teachings, that he is Homoeopathic, and his classes have regarded him as such, notwithstanding he claims to be Eclectic. Nothing can better exhibit his inconsistency, and at the same time illustrate the old adage "that great liars have short memories," than a few extracts from his writings. I will present them for the edification of Eclectics, and let them determine whether hybrid or not.

I quote from his introductory lecture, published in the Dec., No. of the E. M. Journal, pages 547, 548, and 550. Hear him ridicule Homoeopathy, "Supposing these infinitesimal globules and tinctures, [tinctures did I say—about as strong as a spoonful of salt in the Ohio River] supposing that these essences, shadows and ghosts of departed medicines had all the power ascribed to them—what is that power? nothing at all upon the healthy constitution. A healthy baby will swallow the whole contents of the Homoeopathic Laboratory—a hundred pills of a hundred different kinds of medicine, making ten thousand doses, and will not distinguish any difference of effects from those of common sugar candy.”

Again—"This very delicate and wonderful method of overcoming disease by the ghosts of Acouite, Mercurius and Belladonna, etc., is really marvelous. The spirits of departed medicines, which are quite invisible and imperceptible to the healthy, are supposed to become real spiritual apparitions, whenever they are properly fitted to a diseased.

Again—"But the Homoeopathic doses are worth less than that, [pinch of snuff] for they are equal not to one good smell at a pinch of snuff.

Again—"The shadow of a Ghost is not more delicate and imperceptible than the high refinement of Homoeopathy. If you should place a copper cent in your mouth for one second, and then return it to your pocket, there is more copper left upon the point of your tongue than a Homoeopathic physician would consider necessary to treat a dozen cases of cholera.”

In assigning the cause for vacating the chair of Homoeopathy, he says, “Another reason was that Homoeopathy, as taught by an exclusive Homoeopathic physician, is incompatible with the spirit of our school—it is anti-eclectic. Its teachers claim that Eclecticism is false, delusive, unscientific.”

Living men, ye ghosts of the departed, what strong proof do you ask of Prof. B's orthodoxy? Is he not Eclectic say you? But stop, my Eclectic friends, there is a periodical styled "Buchanan's Journal of Man," in which he endorses Homoeopathy; nay, more, he maintains absurdities far exceeding those quoted, or that of Hahnemann, in which he asserts that "hard shaking" rendered his medicines so "furiously powerful as to endanger the lives of his patients, by which he was compelled to reduce the number of shakes from "ten to two,” which Prof. B ridicule as grossly absurd.

But to the proof. See his Article on Sympathetic Impressibility.

Page 413—"Those of a high grade of impressibility, are capable of feeling the characteristic influence even when the Mexico is enveloped in paper, or contained in a glass vessel hermetically sealed.

Page 416—"I have no doubt that hereafter, impressive persons will be found who will place their hands upon the forehead of any one who may offer and bring forth their most secret thoughts. Some of my experiments already are little short of this result."

Page 417—"In like manner, you transform him into any other character that you wish, by making him embody any of your passions or faculties. You may make him a perfect hypochondriac, coward, bragart, servant, gamblor, drunkard, profigate, thief, liar, murderer, suicide, miser, trauer, traueller, savage, etc., etc., by giving him the influence of appropriate organs."—[Borrowed Mesmerism.]

Page 415—"He is enabled to determine your health, to locate and describe your disease, and often to appreciate the morbid train of causes which the present condition is produced by. Thus, we have a most important means of diagnosis for the investigation of disease, and but for the injurious effects of the examination upon the subject, the method would undoubtedly become one of general application. Unfortunately their synthetic constitutions realize too vividly the symptoms of disease, and although we may very promptly remove whatever injury is thus produced, the very frequent and long continued repetition of such examinations must ultimately harass and exhaust the vital powers.

"PHILOSOPHERS, CHRISTIANS & MEN OF SCIENCE!"

I invoke you by all the powers that be, to look down upon this problem of the nineteenth century. I beseech you to view with awe and adoration the vast and glittering verdant fancy, this prodigy of science. Allopaths—believing Eclectics—can you long doubt its importance, when I tell you that not long since a young Neurologist—a mere scion of the great Neurological trunk,—a graduate of the E. M. Institute, astonished the stupid medical world for five hundred miles around, by his marvellous powers of "Sympathetic Diagnosis." Men of Science were made to see their littleness and defects in diagnosis—authors thrown into the shade. This mere boy in Neurology was called
to see a feeble young lady—he grasped her hand, felt her pulse, and in a moment—wonderful to tell—caught her "pulsoier sensations" as by inspiration, and correctly decided that her "rectum" was the field of fun and frolic—that it was literally full of worms.

The story is "vulgar," I admit, but "men of Science" will pardon its insertion, as it is all for the cause of Science. Now, I ask how much more could have been done by his sire, the great father of Psychology, himself. If the chrysalis can do these wondrous things, what mighty deeds cannot the parent do.

Page 422—A very small portion of medicine lightly touching the foot, or the epigastrium, affects the whole body powerfully.

Page 489—Here he says he makes them "not only to believe in ghosts, but to see them." I caused a young lady to see her deceased mother.

Page 219—Prof. B. asserts that Medicine affects the "impressible" subject without being introduced into the stomach, or brought in contact with the surface, or even by its "aroma or gaseous emanation,"—"for if the medicine be enclosed in a glass vial hermetically sealed, individuals will be found, of a high grade of susceptibility, who will recognize the same medicinal influence." * * * The experiment, however, is not limited to medicines enveloped in paper; fluids contained in vials or bottles will answer the same purpose, for the glass interposes no great obstructions.

He says, "Large doses of drastic medicines, profuse purging, depletion by the lancet and other measures, which might have been tolerated by the rude constitutions of a barbarous age, are entirely unnecessary as well as injurious, and that the gentler agents of the Materica Medica, the delicate appliances of Homœopathy, Animal Magnetism, and Psychological Medicine are entirely sufficient for the treatment of disease."

"The delicate appliances of Homœopathic, Animal Magnetism and Psychological Medicine are entirely sufficient for the treatment of disease!"

Eclectics, do you now understand why so many students and graduates of the E. M. Institute are so strongly tainted with Homœopathy? You now see why Prof. Hill refers to Prof. B's doctrine "as being the first cause of directing his attention to Homœopathy, and confirming him in its teachings.

Here the old adage, "great liars have short memories," again applies; for if the "delicate appliances of Homœopathy are entirely sufficient for the treatment of disease," and if purging and other agencies of cure resorted to by Eclectics are unnecessary or injurious, as Prof. B. states, he cannot be Eclectic, unless the term be applied as by Prof. Bell, an old hunker, and Prof. Gatchell, an Homœopathist, both of whom claimed to be Eclectic. The term has never been used by Eclectic Reformers without bounds or limits.

As to Prof. Newton, when I wrote that article, I supposed him Eclectic in the sense in which the term is accepted by American Reformers. I knew not that he had so recently prescribed calomel. When that question was fastened on him I was in New York, and knew nothing of the controversy and proof until many months after. I did not know that the year next that Prof. N. both authorized and endorsed the Memphis circular, in which it was most emphatically asserted that the Memphis Institute was not Eclectic, but as thoroughly Allopathic as any school in the country, I now have the most indubitable evidence that such was the case. Although his practice may now be mainly reformatory, yet I know from positive proof that it differs widely from that of Drs. Beach, Morrow, I. G. Jones, Baldridge, or that of my own, and I suppose those men knew as much about Eclecticism as a recent convert from Allopathy.

As to Prof. King's practice, it consists, in the main, in the use of six or eight agents, rarely used by the founders of the Eclectic Institute. He makes "hobbies" of them to the exclusion of other means, more general in application and more strictly reformatory and Eclectic in character.

As to Prof. Hoyt, I never regarded him an Eclectic—he said he was, and I merely repeated what he said. His homoeopathic friends, as he stated, told him he was only Eclectic for the sake of the "chair," and I was fully satisfied of the truth of the assertion; but as Chemistry was not a practical "Chair," his Eclectic orthodoxy was not submitted to a rigid test, and as none of his predecessors had been Eclectics [embracing Profs. Oliver, Stallo, Buchanan and Sanders], I thought it too late to commence ostracizing. He is Eclectic in the same sense in which Profs. Gatchell and Bell claimed to be. I will give you his remarks to the class, showing the superiority of Homœopathy over Eclecticism in the cure of Ague, as reported to me by members of the class: "Homœopathic dilutions in homœopathic doses of Arsenicum and Nux Vomica will blow Aguesky. While Eclectic remedies have failed or proved unavailing. Such Eclecticism will sink the cause below redemption."

As to the remainder of the Faculty, they have had but little practical knowledge of Eclecticism, and I pass them with no further comment.

I have ever been opposed to private pay lectures. I regard them a fraud upon the student's rights—as dishonest in their object—a species of swindling—as designed to obtain money by false pretence—as prompted by "avaricious meanness," instead of the good of the pupil. If the matter given is important, it justly belongs to the student without extra pay, and should be given in the regular course; if not practical and highly useful, it consumes important time, and diverts the mind from the proper objects of study.

Each professor is both legally and morally bound to impart to his pupils all the important practical knowledge, appertaining to his department of the science.

Such has been the policy of the school from its first organization. Any new facts acquired by any professor were to be given to the class without extra charge. Profs. Morrow, Hill, Baldridge, and myself, always pursued this policy, and it is the only one upon which a liberal reformatory school can be based. No one should think of "robbing" the student for private gain. No one sought more to impart ample, thorough and practical knowledge to the class than myself. And the declaration that I wanted to "restrict or limit" the student in the pursuit of knowledge is a malicious slander. I did not like to see valuable time squandered in listening to unfathomable, intangible nonsense, to the neglect of useful matter; nor did I want to see young men who had placed themselves under the guardianship of the faculty, swindled out of their money. I most readily admit the constant bitter complaints made to me on the subject, by several hundred of my
Now for the facts.

1st. Those students who did not attend his private lectures and pay two dollars extra, did not derive any advantage from them—his treatment and views were said to be peculiar and important, and every student was urged to take a ticket.

In order to acquire this new and important knowledge, was not the class compelled to pay two dollars extra, or fail to obtain it?

Again, were not those students who lacked means to pay the demand, or were unwilling to encourage the cheat, forced to do without lectures which were said to be of great importance, ("worth fifty times their cost," and without which their medical education must necessarily be imperfect?

Now if any part of the class were "compelled to pay extra for them, or "compelled" to do without them, then is not my assertion true?

2nd. In the winter session of 1852–3, he gave lectures upon the same diseases in his regular course with the ordinary treatment in full, reserving his new and peculiar treatment and views, (equally important to all, if as valuable as asserted,) as the material in part for another, "course of private pay lectures," and gave it.

Now if any part of the class were forced or compelled to pay extra for this knowledge, or if any part were forced or compelled to forego it, then again, is not my assertion true? I leave the answer to those gentlemen who composed the classes—not to Prof. B.

Reserved private pay Medical knowledge belongs to Quackery and not to Education. It is not in accordance with the free spirit and fundamental character of the school as set forth in all its circulars. It was annually announced that all that was new and valuable, known to the Profession, was to be freely imparted to the students without charge. Hence I maintain the policy attempted to be enforced, is in direct violation to that upon which the school was established.

Dr. Buchanan was permitted by the Faculty, [not in accordance with their convictions of truth, but out of courtesy to him, still with a fear of injuring the school,] to insert a brief notice of his "peculiar views" in the Circular, in which he stated they would be fully discussed, no additional charges being specified—one hundred dollars being the entire charge: matriculation and dissection excepted. An extra tax of two to five dollars is a violation of the letter of our Circulars, and of the spirit of reform.

The student is not expecting to be ensnared by his preceptor, for it supposes him incapable of "extraordinary meanness." Many have learned their mistake.

Dr. B. says I abused him, because he did not "supersede all the higher doctrines of Phrenology, Pneumatology, Mesmerism, etc., to his regular course of lectures," etc. The charge is basely false.

In common with my associates, Prof. Morrow, Beuch, Baldridge, Oliver and Hill, I thought his teaching visionary, speculative and calculated to confound and bewilder the student, and lessen his progress in the acquisition of sound physiological truths, owing to the web or mist of Neurology, with which he completely enveloped them. I now have the positive proof that each of the gentlemen named entertained the sentiments which I now express.

I give the names of the Professors who were associated with Dr. Morrow down to 1849, as proof that neither he (Dr. M.) nor they subscribed to Prof. B.'s "peculiar doctrines." They have permitted the use of their names for this purpose, (Hill excepted.)

I know such to have been the sentiments of Dr. Hill, for he so expressed himself to a roommate of his, while a boarder at my house, and also to myself, in the summer of 1851, while he was giving his last course of lectures in the E. M. Institute.

Profs. Carter and Childs both authorize me to say that they heard Dr. Morrow express a want of confidence in Prof. B.'s teachings, and that Dr. Hill said he "neither approved or endorsed his doctrine." See Drs. Avery and Childs' letters confirmatory of the above declarations. Drs. Wallace and Kelly both permit the use of their names in proof of the same.

Dr. K. says Dr. M. expressed fear that his teaching would ultimately injure the school and furthermore that he was not an acceptable teacher, which I know to be a fact—with all his boasted knowledge, he is the poorest instructor that was ever in the E. M. Institute up to 1852–3; he has the capacity of selecting but little that is practical, and of impressing less—every scholar has not the capacity of a teacher: it is true in this case, for certainly the clamor of different classes against him has rarely had its equal, owing to his unsatisfactory mode of instruction. Conceive a professor cheating the class out of eleven weeks of a short session, then oppressing them with lectures from three to five hours daily,—or again, condensing the lectures into half the term, and then so mystifying by commingling them with intangibles that progress is utterly impossible, and you have features of Instruction against which the class have had just right to make emphatic protests.

The question then arises,—if Prof. B.'s teaching was disapproved by every member of the Faculty why was it not interrupted?

I have already answered the question; it was from mere courtesy—a friendly regard for him, and not because they approved of it—they submitted passively to his encroachments. At first Neurology was barely noticed; but by degrees he became more assuming, and now asserts that the Faculty endorsed it fully, whereas in private conversation they often expressed the belief that its tendency was injurious.

The Dr. asks, "what more public and emphatic endorsement of the scientific discoveries of Prof. Buchanan could possibly be required?"

We permitted him to allude to his "hobby," but so fearful was Dr. Morrow of its bad influence that he absolutely required him. (Prof. B.) to omit two or three pages of his fulsome eulogy
on Neurology after it was prepared for the Circular and ready for the press. Dr. Morrow and his colleagues were unwilling to permit more than a simple allusion to his favorite theme in any of their public announcements, and that merely to gratify his vanity.

The "Report of Eclectic Physicians," asserts that four of the present Faculty regarded "Prof. B.'s views as wild and visionary," to which they responded by declaring it untrue. I know not their present views. I know they have heretofore said they did not believe them, etc.

In private conversation which I had with Prof. King, he ridiculed and sneered at Prof. B.'s "peculiar doctrines, and teachings," and said they were injuring the reputation of the school, and that we would find it so. Dr. T. J. Wright, a trustee of the College, says he has repeatedly heard Prof. K. make similar remarks, and has permitted me to give his name in confirmation of my statement.

Dr. Wright also authorizes me to state that he has often heard Prof. Newton sneer at, and ridicule Prof. B.'s views, and express the belief that they were wild and visionary and injuring the school. them which he would not endorse, and that he had heard Prof. Newton "ridiculed Prof. B.'s teachings and views, and said he could not comprehend them."

The remarks, he said, were made within a few months past. To these assertions of Prof. N., Dr. Kyle said he was ready and willing any day to make solemn oath. No man will question the veracity of Drs. Wright or Kyle. As to Prof. Freeman, the sentiments expressed by him relative to the brain, during the sessions of 1851-2 were regarded by many students, [as have been informed, and by one recently,] as designed to ridicule and throw contempt upon Prof. B.'s "views." I have heard him speak of them as wild and visionary, and calculated to injure the reputation of the school.

With regard to Prof. Hoyt—while he was in terceding with me, in June and July of 1852 for the Chair of Chemistry in the E. M. Institute, [he being a member of my family,] and while I was urging his appointment, he learned by letter from Dr. B. to me, that he, [Dr. B.] was opposing him [him—said he was unwilling to place him upon a level with men of established reputation—in short, strongly opposed to his appointment, in consequence of which he held Prof. B.'s reputation for a sound practical teacher was but trifling—that any man of ordinary talent could soon acquire more than he had; that he was regarded as a wild visionary character; conspicuous for nothing, except his gasseous, intangible, impracticable and incomprehensible doctrine; that he [B.] could not explain his doctrine, nor any student comprehend it; he said he never did or could understand him—that the best scholars and the brightest intellects of the class, had always said the same, and as a proof of this assertion, named Dr. Warriner, and many others, who had asserted this; and to

firm all, said that such was the unanimous declaration of each class during the three sessions of his attendance at the E. M. Institute. His daily table-talk consisted in bitterly ridiculing, sneering, and scoffing at Prof. B.'s Neurological views. He said by mixing them with Physiology proper he had rendered his entire course of teaching almost worthless to the class, and injurious [as he thought] to the reputation of the school abroad."

I have given but a few of the many remarks made by him and reiterated from day to day for many weeks in succession. How is it possible for him to give the certificate he has after saying what he has I cannot conceive.

Now, if the present and past Faculties and the brightest students could never understand his doctrines, and if he could never explain them, ought they not to be "discontinued and discontinued?"

I have too much confidence in Profs. King, Newton, Freeman and Hoyt to believe that either of them endorses the "doctrines" of Prof. B., notwithstanding the certificates of three of them to that effect. He has played a game upon them which they will long regret—he has caught him in his trap in an unguarded hour; he has decoyed him into his snare and they cannot escape.

Alas! my eclectic friends, they have struck down the colors of Eclecticism to its intriguing and witty foe, and hoisted those of the odious Neurologist. That once noble ship, erected by the money and talents of the lamented Morrow and his associates, is now without rudder, compass or ballast; with 'tattered sails; a rickety and caky hulk, and shattered masts, floating upon a dead sea, enveloped in the fogs and the miasmatic vapors of the ethereal and attenuated speculations of Neurology. A day of bitter repentance awaits their suicidal act.

Who attempts to guide the ship by imponderable, subtle, and ethereal agencies, is a perfect 'spiritual reaper,' constantly being humbugged himself and constantly striving to humbug others—he sees many spectral illusions, ghosts, etc., and is fully competent to chase the shadow of a musquito by moonlight or follow the path of a fly through trackless ether by its 'nerve-auro'—he can limb a floating cob-web higher, without endangering life or limb, than any living man, owing doubtless to the extreme levity of the Neurological gas with which he is always fully inflated. In these respects, the nineteenth century furnishes him no competitors. Sift his doctrines and fine spin theories from Phrenology proper, as inculcated by O. S. Fowler, and Prof. Bird Powel, [from whom Prof. Buchanan learned all that he knows of any value on that subject, he having been a private student of Prof. P.'s as I have been informed.] and from Mesmerism, and Animal Magnetism as taught by Chauney Burr, and Prof. Rogers, and called by the former Electro-Biology, and they dwindle into utter insignificance—they are the mere ghosts of the imaginary emanating from the miasmatic carcass of putrescent Neurology.

Impertinent, insolent, dictatorial and tyrannical in the extreme, his hatred knows no bounds to any who do not bow to his insulting mandates, or endorse his vagaries. To confirm these assertions, I need but give a letter of his to a most worthy member of the "Meeting of Eclectic Physicians," the Rev. W. B. Witt, M. D., a graduate
of the E. M. Institute, and a Physician of extensive practice in this city. It will be seen that all are liars knaves and swindlers who do not endorse his absurd views and irrational acts; he assumes the right to act as umpire in the case. He is a perfect aristocrat—haughty, proud, over-bearing and insulting, with gold spectacles, a gold headed cane, rings on the fingers, and a Kossuth hat, he desires and expects all to doff the hat, and bow to him in abject submission. But to the letter, read it:

"SIR.—Having supposed heretofore that I might regard your personal friend and correct sentiments, I am a little surprised to learn that you participated in a caucus of the enemies of the Institute, and that you made no opposition to the adoption or issuing of a similar pamphlet, that none but a knave could write and none but a knave could endorse it. Of course I do not accuse you of endorsing it—but that you should not have had the manhood to oppose this piece of treachery and swindlery I do not clearly comprehend. I wish as early as possible to see you upon the subject, and see you place yourself in an honorable position, remove it from sympathy and association, and the enemies of medical reform. Name the earliest hour practicable, etc.

Yours Respectfully JOS. R. BUCHANAN.

Dr. T. J. Wright, received a similar letter from Prof. B.

The language of this insolent, impudent and tyrannical mandate is about this:

R. W. B. WITT M. D.: Sir I summon you before me—take of your hat—make your bow—now, sir, render an account of your crimes. What right had you to turn soudrel and participate in, and of course, become one of the active members of a caucus made up of liars, knaves, swindlers and the enemies of Medical Reform, and that too, without my permit. Account for your heinous crimes sir, immediately or I visit you with my extreme displeasure.

My opposition to his course, and to the enroachment of one professor upon the department of another secured for me a most contemptible and scurrilous letter, under date of August 26, 1852. (Signed) Jos. R. Buchanan.

It was filled with language of the most abusive and insulting character. I will give short extracts from it, and my reply, or at least sufficient to show wherein Prof. B. uttered another wilful falsehood when he said "I had never expressed a word of disapproval of his doctrines until the subject of his own [my own] expulsion gave him [me] a peculiar stimulus to thought." The length of the letter forbids its entire insertion. I was in New York when it was written.

NEW YORK Sept. 4th, 1852.

PROF. R. BUCHANAN.

DEAR SIR:—Your communication of the 26th ult., came to hand this morning. Your caustic and bitter remarks, your vitriolic, insinuations, half suppressed threats about what must and will have to be done relative to my connection with the school, are read, and placed to your credit.

I trust I shall be pardoned in the use of the language I am about to employ, if I use the words and phrases which you have so freely applied in your letter to me. If they are correctly employed by you in reference to me, I may venture upon their use with quite as much propriety. You use the phrases, "rule or ruin—laughing stock,—insolent tyranny,—ridiculous and absurd,—meanest features of Hankerism,—nothing but downright robbery,—most amusing piece of impudence,—how tyrannical, how overbearing, and unjust—you know our views, and our course,—a separation will be necessary," etc., etc. Such are a few of your remarks inuendoes and threats.

I was the advocate of Eclecticism in 1850 when the friends of the school in all parts of the country were writing and saying "Eclecticism is destroying the last Eclectic in the Faculty," "you are the last man in the school on whom we can place dependence," "all have gone over to Homoeopathy but you," "stand by the Institute or it is gone," stand by it or the cause sinks.

Many remarks and extracts of letters of this character could be given, but where were you at that time? You had committed the cause in your introductory lecture and other remarks, to the special charge of Homoeopathy, and hence the above extracts. You were then "urging most emphatically" the appointment of the supernumerary Caldwell, who had been grown out of the Eclectic Institute, and you now want to act as umpire. I would have acceded had it not have been for my strenuous opposition. It seemed to "rule or ruin."

I received most pressing letters, calling me to the city "to arrest your wild schemes" as to the appointment of Caldwell, and the removal of the school to Kentucky. You gave the first lecture on Homoeopathy in the E. M. Institute, exciting it as superior to all else, and have been consulting a member of the Faculty as to the propriety or impropriety of the course! it looked like "rule or ruin,—like insolent tyranny." Who introduced Dr. Gatchell into the school, saying "we could now have a regular course of lectures on Homoeopathy, as he was a thorough Homoeopathist. You dictated that you would have inflicted upon the school, as Dean of the Faculty, in encouraging Prof. Gatchell to deliver a course of lectures on Homoeopathy just in the midst of the session, and that, too, immediately after we had seen the imperative necessity of abolishing that chair. This you did without the consent of I. G. Jones, or myself, to our utter opposition to it. I thought the policy injurious, owing to the excited feeling of Eclectics on that subject. In this case your inconsiderate course was "rule or ruin."

By that act a quarrel was excited between the students, etc., * lectures given which resulted in driving from ten to twenty of our students to the Homoeopathic school at Cleveland last winter. As Dean of the Faculty of the E. M. Institute you should have prevented this. * This act caused Prof. I. G. Jones to make this emphatic remark—raising his hand to his head, he said, "if this course is to be tolerated and encouraged while I occupy the chair of Theory and Practice by G—d I leave the school."

You said we were wrong in opposing the course by Gatchell. *

Your policy greatly facilitated the building up of an adverse school at the expense of the E. M. Institute. * Dictating the appointment of Prof. Bickley as you did, was "insolent tyranny," one of "the meanest features of Hankerism." I am emphatically opposed to private-pay lectures. * They are calculated to injure the school— they have injured it for years past as I honestly believe—every friend of Eclecticism, and the Institute ought to oppose the practice. *

A majority of the Faculty for years entertained the same views especially with regard to your course. I state this statement not unfriendly feelings to you. I should not have written what I have this day, [May 22d] learn from reliable authority that Dr. B. said he was decisively in favor of Homoeopathy, and wished to remove him to Co circulum, and establish it there on the principles adopted by Hahnemann abandoning Eclecticism entirely. D. S. Hill and Gatchell were to be associated with him; he fur her said to the same individual he was calculating to go into regular Homoeopathic Practice in the spring, (1853).
Dr. Morrow thought if you would drop your "private pay courses," and say less on your "peculiar views" in your regular lectures it would be better for your reputation and that of the school.

He thought, furthermore, that if seven professors, did their duty faithfully, the class would have as much as ought to be forced upon it—that any addition would be calculated to oppress and exhaust both the mental and physical powers of the student; Dr. M. expressed these views to me distinctly at least ten times even if your views had a basis as you said, he thought so much time should not be spent in urging them upon classes and the public.

My own views fully coincided with those he so often expressed. Drs. Baldridge Oliver and Hill were still more adverse to your course. The same views have been emphatically by hundreds of students. No one of the faculty would have been permitted to go on thus if the Morrow often said he feared asking you to desist, lest you should take offence. One of the present faculty [Dr. K.] often said to me before he was connected with the College, that you were injuring the cause.

You know at least I think you do, that students who have taken your private ticket and paid $56 have said it was much taken for $100—that the act was fraudulent after paying their money they received the same and no more was promised in the circulars for $100—that you "practiced duplicity," "deceived them," etc., and after getting their money, "gave the same as in the regular course." Such complaints were often heard in the school, Dr. Morrow often said to myself and some of them swore most bitterly they would never attend again or send students to the Institute on that account.

I will say to you frankly, I believe your course has diminished our classes and receipts at least twenty per cent. by the influence it has had on young men, and the profession abroad. You did not state in introducing Dr. I presume you did not as much as you did any. Others, with whom I have thought differently for years. Had you done this knowingly it would have been "nothing but downright robbery." In the first place it would have been robbing the students—secondly, your colleagues, which would have been "impudent"—"tyrannical"—"false"—"robbery"—"wanton murder"—worse. And if not to suit him and the case would not have been changed even if I were driven from among you as you intimate unless you can "rule or ruin."—"you know our views and our course." As to the extra course of Dr. King I will now take occasion to say that I regarded it an encroachment upon my department—a flagrant outrage—a gross abuse, and an insult. Some I still think so, and that it was peculiarly calculated to create discord. No professor of any spirit will submit to an imposition so degrading.

I was not the great "Free School Mover" who went to Cleveland and other places, and appropriated eleven weeks out of a session of fourteen on my own gain, to the gross neglect of the class.

I must remember I have used the same language which you in your letter applied to me.

No one has more interest in the cause of Eclecticism and the E. M. Institute than myself, but I feel, and know you have seriously injured it at different times, and in others ways. I am wrong, I am honestly so. I am willing to cooperate with any one who has the cause and not the cash at heart. * * * for one am not disposed to Deify any man, or obey a mandate so "impudent" or so "insolent" as yours. * * * I remain us heretofore, your friend.

L. E. JONES.

To exhibit still further his treachery and dishonesty it remains for me to state that the very language of his letter which he applied to me, as "downright robbery," "insolent tyranny," etc., etc., which I hurled back by way of retort, by letter, marked as quotations from his letter, he embodied in a charge against me, as unctuous and abusive, and presented it to the board of trustees last Oct., during my absence in New York, and demanded my immediate expulsion for so gross an insult. He was the aggressor—he applied the insulting language to his senior, and when I hurled back his pernicious charges he claimed immediate redress at the hands of the trustees. Such insubordination and base rascality require no comment from me.*

He is now practicing a similar piece of perfidy relative to Prof. Freeman and his discou. tinance as a Professor in the Institute in 1852. Long anterior to the vacation of that chair, and before I had ever heard any other man speak of the dismissal of Prof. F., Dr. B. became much dissatisfied with Prof. F. and wished Dr. Sherwood appointed to fill his chair. Now because I subsequently concurred in that sentiment with Profs. B. N. and I. G. Jones, he declares me the chief agent in removing Prof. F. He has forgotten, probably, that he wrote from Cleveland last April or May, to Prof. N. relative to the removal of Prof. F., that "amputation," (to use his own words,) would be necessary. Prof. N. will recollect our remarks on that letter—"great liars have short memories."

Dr. B. asserts I demanded money as a compensation for withdrawing from the College, or as he stated to the Trustees, I would not resign without I could make a "lory of black mail." I offered to resign if the Faculty would buy my stock in the Institute. I had no doubt it would be lost if left in the hands of the wildcard improvident, incompetent, and squandering Buchanan.

The amount ($5,000,) is nearly equal to my entire cash receipts for services to that college, since it was chartered in 1845. I would trust my life in a powder magazine with sparks of fire flying through it, as readily as my pecuniary affairs in his hands. His financial capacity is far inferior to that of most boys at ten years of age. Allow him to control, and ruin and disaster are absolute.

As pernicious as he says I was, relative to college expenditures, I have the s satisfaction of knowing that Dr. Morrow always feared him, and invariably concurred with me as to the finances of the Institute, and the same may be said on the part of Profs. Hill, Baldridge, and Oliver.

Prof. B. asserts that Prof. Bickley was never chisled by any portion of the class. This is false. Dr. E. E. Beach says "more than one, two or three hissed him—that Dr. C. C. and he hissed at him, but he did not think the c—d fool would make such a fuss about it. Dr. B. authorizes me to make the above declaration. Dr. B., (a student of the present class) says he both saw and heard Dr. McC and other they hiss Prof. B. Dr. H. (another student of the present class) says Dr. Weeks, stated, "at least a dozen hissed him." Here is another of his falsehoods nailed to the counter:

The reader will bear in mind Prof. Bickley was—

* I now learn that he said some two years ago I would also to be removed, as I was "not sufficiently liberal and progressive to suit him and the wants of the school. Even the first session, after he became one of the Faculty, he pursued the same treacherous course toward myself and others who have elevated him to his present position.
hissed when he passed his fulsome "eulogy on the 'social benevolent and christian virtues' inspried by the use of tobacco." It was for this evidence of good sense on the part of the class, that he threatened to kill; cried like a 'a-b-b-y—lost utterance and sank in brightest powerless.

Dr. B. decides the ignorance of a member of the Faculty, selected by Dr. Baldridge, because he could not, [as he states,] distinguish "nitre from muri te of so'da." What right has a great Bagatelle to criticise ignorance of others, if he is unable to distinguish a head from a wretched presentation. Pompous, boastful professors may revert to blunders which did not occur prior to Aug. 11, 1850, for instruction; such lessons might serve to improve the wise and rebuke the vanity and egotism of the foolish.

As to Prof. B.'s literary attainments, I most cheerfully yield him all the superiority his consummate vanity and egotism claim. ["I can make my mark." As to clear and practical instruction I am quite willing to submit our respective claims to the consideration of each class. In 1844 and 1845, as well know the claimans against his teaching, owing to its confusion and mysticism, have been incessant.

Prof. B. now claims the entire credit of abolishing the Homeopathic Professorship; his claim has no foundation. I came from Northern Ohio soon after the death of Dr. Morrow, and made the first move to have the chair vacated. I urged it emphatically, on the ground of general dissatisfaction among both Eclectics and Homeopaths—obtained Prof. B.'s assent—left my written vote for him to cast, as I could not remain for the board of trustees to assemble—returned by Columbus, and by great effort secured the services of Prof. J. G. Jones, while Prof. B. was urging most vehemently, the claims of Homoeopathy, as I am informed he did to Mr. Bindley, a trustee of the E. M. Institute, and a most worthy and substantial man.

In connection with his name I will state that although he was a large stockholder in the Institute, yet Dr. B. was constantly urging his own lva leca so he did not fill the donatives' eyes, as to "dres' a and address." Dr. Morrow's prices against this puerile objection, ceased with his life.

The arrogance of Dr. B. in assuming the entire responsibility, [as I am informed he did] of carrying out the treatment of Dr. Morrow has afforded [in my opinion] just and well merited grounds for the severe strictures which it has received from Drs. Carter, Wright. Black, Chase and others. Their conclusions as to the cause of the final sad result, are believed by many to be well founded.

Prof. B., for self glorification, attempts a gross deception, when he says the number of matriculants increased from 50, in 1845, to 220, in 1847. The number at the winter session of 1845 only, is given, while he gives those of both sessions in 1847 '48, with a view to deceive the reader, and to gratify the vanity of the "Great I Am"—self.

The annual matriculation of 1845 and '46 was 82, that of 1846, and '47 was 128, and that of 1847 and '48 was 221. In 1843 the number was not over 20 at both sessions. This shows the increase from 1843, to 1845, and from that period up to 1847.

When it is recollected that four years had elapsed in which to make known the school, and a charter having been secured two and a half years before the time named, [1847] it shows the if I were a Professor and the "sole vitality of
the most flourishing medical school, west of Philadelph ia. "Would it not look like avocuous meanness!"—like intense selfishness" and like being basely "avaricious?" I defy man to point to any circumstance in my life, that so clearly indicates the "contemptible" character so graphically portrayed by our hero.

Again, gentle reader, after viewing him, acting in the capacity of a kitchen maid for two or three months, in the little, dark, dingy apartment described, follow him to the Burnet House and behold him aping the aristocracy, by paying an enormous price [$14, per week] for his board, indulging in the luxuries and mingling in the pomposity, display of kind spirit at that house, and cutting suels that throw ordinary don dies into the shade. These elements of character, with the indebtedness of the Institute and its poor faculty and small finances, may aid the friends materially in explaining some of the sources of discord among us.

Dr. B. denies that some seventy or eighty students had left after my expulsion up to February 7th, as stated in the "Report of Eclectic Physicians." He says "the class has even increased." Now he knows this to be false, and every student in the College will sustain my assertion. But 140 or 150 were in attendance at the time stated.

Prof. B. thinks that myself, Drs. Beach and Baldridge "should have been removed whenever it became obvious that their services in the Institute were not longer desirable." To whom desirable? to Buchanan—I appeal to my Eclectic friends to decide the question. I know my removal was desired by Prof. B. 'many years ago,' but I ask the proof that Eclectics desired it.

Prof. B. says there are but about twenty Eclectic physicians in and about Cincinnati, and that the "Report of Eclectic physicians" is but little less than a "forgery" etc. For the benefit of Prof. B. I will say to him, that meeting was composed of eleven of the best men in our ranks [and not a single student as he asserts], viz. Drs. Kelley, Martin and Galloway, from the country, and Drs. Murray, Kyle, Baldridge, Carter, Wheet, Witt, Reynolds and Jones of the city. The names of thirty six students are attached to the N. Y. and other letters noticed in the pamphlet. So far from being a forgery, he will find it the voice of thousands.

The present meager class shows that the proceedings of the faculty have been "acted upon," [as stated in the letter of those students,] and that "their acts have been efficient," as was predicted. Last year with but four weeks to make known the "Free School," we had over ninety students in the spring, now some seventy with fourteen months to spread the news.

The cause of Eclecticism cannot be better subserved than by giving a few out of some hundreds of remarks or extracts from letters now in my possession, showing in what aspect Prof. B.'s doctrines are viewed by our friends abroad. Names are suppressed except in those cases in which their publication has been permitted:

"He is no friend to the cause of Eclecticism."
"He [Prof. B.] is nothing but an Homœopath."
"He is a flowery speaker, but there is nothing real or practical."
"Prof. B.'s teachings will ultimately ruin the school."
"He is wild, visionary and ethereal—nothing tangible."
"Prof. B. is too credulous—humbuggery is his darling."

Slen-
der theories." "I will never support that school as now organized." "Do not take Prof B.'s private-pay ticket—it is nothing but a d—d humbug.—Advice to a Friend."

"If you design starting another school, it shall have my support." "He [Prof. B.] is a gas-bag."
"Speculative, and to some extent, the meanest humbuggery." "I consider Buchanan's course a public outrage—a reproach and disgrace."

"Buchanan's course of private lectures was a perfect humbug.—J. Snyer M. D."

"I would not give a dose of Homeopathic pills for the whole of Buchanan's Neurology, and all else I ever learned from him."—J. W. Hough, M. D.

Dr. P. boarded with me, and attended Dr. B.'s private lectures at his house, for fourteen weeks, for the purpose of qualifying himself to deliver lectures on Neurology and his [Dr. B's] peculiar views, and at the close of his instruction, said he was more in the dark than at first—that Prof. B.'s powers of imagination and ideality were so great that he could portray in living colors a mere fantaisy or chimera and make it appear as natural as life.

"I have long been aware that your view of Prof. Buchanan, is correct, as also the noble stand you have taken in reference to the Eclectic school at Cincinnati. I can assure you too, that in this feeling, the mass of the intelligent and educated Eclectics throughout the "Empire State" fully participate."

"I was surprised to hear of your leaving the college. There is not one Eclectic left in the institution now, and it will be a school of "isms" from this until it falls through, which will not be long.—L. P. Taylor, M. D.

"This irrational practice of professors will curse the school."
"He held out false inducements—got me to take his private ticket and pay $5, and gave no more than to the whole class. He will never practice his deceit on me again and no one else if I can prevent it."

"I do not believe that B.'s 'teachings' were of any practical advantage to the student, but had a tendency to bewilder and divert his mind from the more solid and useful branches of the profession."

"My opinion has been on seeing the effects of such teaching carried out, that it is detrimental to the student and should not be tolerated in any Medical College."

"I am down on all such cupidity, and money peculations—I heard much complaint last winter about the many plans got up to tax the students' pockets."

"I could see evidently a squinting towards Allopathy and Homeopathy, and no small degree of speculation.

"And I had my serious doubts whether there was sufficient conservatism to save the school from the worst species of quackery and irregularity. I predicted that if any one should stand up and defend the principles of true medical reform, the house would become "divided against itself," and I thought you had the stamina, independence, and moral courage to do it—in that event I knew you would be "ousted sans ceremonie.""

The writer insists upon organizing a new college.

"I would not give five cents for all I ever learned of Prof. B."
"I know less of Physiology now than I did last fall. I
attended Prof. B.'s "private pay course" of lectures and as in the same classes in his regular course with no exception.

"I would not give five cents for all I ever learned from Prof. B. His Neurology seemed to bewilder and confuse the "ori". The course of about five sessions I attended under the instruction at the Institute, and though I have learned from students, has been the expression since—G. W. Wallace, M. D.

Dr. Kelly, in the best respect, but as a medical teacher, he is unsafe—his ideas are beautiful in the try-in practice they have no application, Dr. L. E. Jones, I always regarded as a sound medical teacher. His course on botany recently taught, was undoubtedly stands out as the great champion of American Eclecticism in the West. * G. W. Leonard, M. D.

The sentiment therein contain'd, (Proceedings of Eclectic Seminary) fail, I am sure! I proceed with the necessary approbation of all who read them—that is all true Eclectics. * Get up a new organization that will be both better and the best system, the most iustified Eclectic, as taught by the present set of medical pretenders, for a portion of the present Faculty are nothing more. M. A. Kelly, M. D.

Dr. Kelly is ready to testify that he had expressed dissatisfaction with Dr. B.'s teaching and said he feared it would seriously injure the school—he, [Dr. M.] ridiculed it as wild and visionary. Dr. Kelley is one of our most worthy and successful physicians.

"Always regarded you since the death of the esteemed friend, Moriv, and own him with a prop and pillar of the Institution—the chief corner stone as it were. My opinion in regard to the principles promulgated since I left the Institution, is certainly very different from what it was then. Your Eclecticism has been brought to its severest test. to its fearful extent. I believe the Faculty will run out. I believe that in the proper acceptance of the term, 'they are already Hybrids.'—E. B. Roe, M. D.

Dr. Roe is an able practitioner, and most excellent medical scholar. We have heard of your late difficulties with Lord Chasellor Buchanan. It is high time we had one of our largest lecturers, Dr. Buchanan. It is high time we had one of the greatest lecturers. It is high time we had one [of] the greatest lecturers. It is high time we had one of our largest lecturers, Dr. Buchanan. It is high time we had one of our largest lecturers, Dr. Buchanan.

"On my return, I had not been in the public conclave on his own excelors qualifications for teaching as well as writing, ("without books",). I asked this student—one of his first born—some questions. He could not tell the difference between a gum, and a gum resin, nor between an essential and fixed oil, nor give the signification of the terms, sexual system, gonads, class, and order as used in botany yet the subject of mysticism ("Eclectic"), he was sure to be on that head. I never knew a man amount to much when "d. m. f. i. a." was always the hero of the story—"without books", This selling diplomas on such a base as he bore one to a student with private-pay-course professors, but it approaches a laughable farce. I much rather have a diploma from a deficient school, so graphically portrayed by Prof. Bickley, than his and Co.—Dr. A. J.

Here follows a part of a letter written by three of the oldest and most experienced practitioners in our ranks—hear them:

"As to the proceedings and course of the Faculty of the E. M. Institute, we say that we have no opinion on the subject that we are unwilling to give, any time to a man. We have attended the school in the days of the lamented Dr. Morrow and his associates, believed we were thoroughly instructed in Science, Medical Reform, and presumed to claim the honor of Eclectic physician. We have been among us, in those days of struggle for the Eclectic principles in the theory and practice of Medicine, not now, creeping in as a thorough Scientific Medical Scholar, and truly able and competent to teach the true principles of Eclecticism, (Dr. J. R. Buchanan's statements to the contrary notwithstanding). We have thought much of the subject, while we could not imagine the cause. It could not be that you were not a firm, and consistent Eclectic both in theory and practice, or that you were unfaithful, and inattentive as it has been the task of the conscientious student for all these qualifications, you have heretofore sustained a character unprecedented by any man connected at any time with the school, except the ever faithful Dr. Morrow, who always bore testimony to the above statements of your character. The question again arises, what then is the matter? We think the reason why you were expelled was because not a convert, and an admirer of Dr. Buchanan's peculiar notions of Eclecticism. This is perhaps the real cause, he having an ascendency in the Faculty, and feeling anxious to convert the E. M. Institute into a Neurological machine, he must diffuse more successfully his visionary notions. Now if it is necessary to swallow all Buchanan's notions to be thorough Eclectics, we are not now, and never were. We rather think many of his speculations and visionary. The medical student had better study something real, and when he has time to spare, then attend to visionary speculations.

We cannot in conscience encourage any young man to attend the school under its present influence and organization. The Faculty should be men of practical experience, not merely visionary theorists.

J. W. Smith, M. D. J. Snyder, M. D.

Gentlemen, I will dispel your doubts.

1st. The berths in the E. M. I were narrow—I would not, peaceably, permit another to force himself into mine.

2nd. Buchanan's bubbles, phantoms, and vagaries, I became convinced, were undermining the very foundations of Eclecticism—were designed to merge all into Homeopathy—the wilder speculation was to prevail until the cause, and all identified with it, were disgraced and ruined.

3rd. Neglect of duty—Each session the class had cause to murmur, from the absence and irregular attendance of the Prof.'s, and from waste of time and money on undefinable nonsense.

4th. The drones obtaining money by duplicity, I declare unceasingly opposed to such modes of deception. The policy pursued will ruin the school—expulsion was honorable—submission would have been degrading.

5th. I opposed the appointments of two of the new Faculty, because they were "unfit to be made"—time has confirmed my judgment."

"Dr. A. R. Balbridge:

Dear Sir:—We the undersigned Eclectic Physicians, having received and carefully read the "Report of Eclectic Physicians" do fully endorse the sentiments therein contained.

We have no confidence in the Faculty of the E. M. Institute as now organized and in their teaching. Some of us know positively that Dr. Morrow did not subscribe to, nor was identified with the doctrine and "peculiar teachings" of Prof Buchanan.

We regard Prof. B.'s teaching as "wild"—"impracticable"—"and such as he cannot "demonstrate" nor the most ignorant intellect comprehend." We believe the inculcation of his "peculiar doctrine" is "absolutely injurious to the reputation and prosperity of the school, and that it ought to be discontinued and abandoned."

We have felt it to be our duty to say this much in favor of Eclecticism, and against the encroachments of Prof. Buchanan and his associates.

We hope at no remote period to see a new organization which we can con vincingly assert were the sound principles of true Eclecticism.

Very Respectfully, Yours,

H. Hubbard, M. D. M. A. Kelly, M. D. H. M. Chatterton, M. D.

Since obtaining the above communications the following reliable intelligence has been received:

"He, [Prof. Buchanan] pronounced Dr. Morrow ignorant and illiterate, and said he could not write a decent sentence, or one fit for any man to read."

Dr. Morrow, was made to share his malignity as well as myself and others. He is restless and dissatisfied unless traducing his associates—witness his envy and hypocrisy.

Prof. Childs has favored me with the following note for publication. It may not be amiss to state that Dr. Childs was a private student of Dr. Mor-
row, and a room-mate of Dr. Hill at Dr. Buchan-

an's with whom they boarded; the most implicit
confidence may be placed in his statements:

The course most cordially, the sentiments set
forth in the 'Proceedings of Eclectic Physicians
relative to the wild, visionary and speculative doc-
trines' of Prof. Buchanan. I took his private pay-
ticket and attended four of his 'private pay courses
of lectures' while a student of the E. M. Institute,
and do say so solemnly I never derived a single
practical or appreciable idea from them; and
that I received letters from both of them, (have some
reasserting in most emphatic terms the same senti-
ments.- C. J. Chidds M. D."

Here follow portions of three letters from Dr.
Avery. Dr. A. was a bosom friend of Dr. Mor-
row—a graduate of the E. M. Institute—one of
its incorporators, and a trustee until after the
death of Dr. M. His knowledge of the school—his
judgment, candor and veracity cannot be ques-
tionable.

I received the "Proceedings of Eclectic Phys-
icians" last evening. I heartily concur in
their movement. The remains of my lamented
friend, Dr. Morrow, had been in their resting place
but a few days before this movement commenced.
While I was languishing on a bed of sickness, I
heard of it and sent for Dr. Buchanan and apprised
him of my fears. He contradicted the report and
pledged his honor, that there should be no
movement. The above statement, as also every essen-
tial point urged by myself and others as to Dr. M's views
of Buchanan as a teacher and of his doctrine.

Mrs. Morrow informs me that Dr Buchanan had
the unblushing effrontery and 'egregious vanity' to
say to her personally, he had given character to Dr.
Buchanan. The members of Dr. M's family could
never have a more bubble claims to have given greatness to Dr.
Morrow! Eclectics will long remember him for his
gross arrogance and impudence. Oh! shame
where is thy blush!!!

Dr Ball says Dr Hill called on Dr Morrow one
morning while at the breakfast table and insisted
that he (Dr. M.) should put an immediate stop to Dr
B's objectionable teaching or, said he, the dissat-
sfaction among the class is so great, the school
will be ruined. The members of Dr. M's family could
never have a more bubble claims to have given greatness to Dr.
Morrow! Eclectics will long remember him for his
gross arrogance and impudence. Oh! shame
where is thy blush!!!

It remains now for me to give a short extract from
the pen of the venerable Dr Beach, who has done
more to build up and sustain a systematic course of
Medical reform than any other man. I do not say
he may not have erred, but who has not? His
errors are but few, while those of his calumniator are
legions. He, too, has not escaped the 'poison of the
serpent's tongue'; but his fame will survive, when
that of the plagiarist is consumed. The prac-
tical plagiarist shall be forgotten. It would have been
far more commendable had he passed the names of
Beach and Ball on to the future, and without an
attempt to crush them or bring them down to his de-
graded level. They have done much for the cause of
Eclecticism, and to build up the very institution
which now affords the 'worthy professor' his bread
and butter. Their services have done even more to
give character to his vagaries and 'incoherent
teachings' than any marvelous deeds of his own.

Read the few truthful and emphatic words from the
pen of the aged American reformer, and ponder
well upon their import. He has been associated
with Prof. B. Dr Beach knows what is to be true, and
is not afraid to say what he knows:

"I have heard of the rupture betwixt you and
the school and I am glad of it, as it will separ-
ate the chaff from the wheat. It ought to have
been done long ago; but really I did not expect
such a malicious libellous attack from that Nee-
skerker, Buchanan. But what is to be done,
awful surrender of such from a man. W. Beach, M. D."

As an apology for presenting so many extracts
from letters, I will say I wish all interested in
true Eclecticism to know the uniformity of senti-
ment on this point now existing among its advo-
cates. Within a few months past, I have re-
ceived some two hundred letters from Eclectics, and

in the school when Dr A. first attended) the students
complained of Dr Buchanan's style of lecturing.
They said they could not comprehend his Neurolo-

They made their complaints to a more practical
way. They reasserted the complaints of the class. Dr.
Morrow complained of the school. He had consumed so
much time in giving his 'peculiar views.' I know
Dr Morrow never approved them—he said but little
[except confidentially,] for fear of injuring the
school. This is the reason he did not take a
more decided stand against Dr B's views. After
the death of Morrow I think Prof. L E Jones was the
main support of the school, and the greatest obstacle
in the way of those who wished to divert it from the
object of its founders. Now it is without a rudder,
it will float on the ocean of speculative theory, and
soon be lost in the mist that surrounds it. I hope it
may yet be redeemed, and the fog swept away, and
that it may yet stand erect on the foundation upon
which it was originally established." I J. Avery,
M. D."
n early every one the writers express a want of confidence in Prof. Buchanan and his teaching—they think it has, and must necessarily injure the school and the cause, and express the belief that both require such aid as his no longer.

Dr. B. asserts that Dr. Bickley "was selected and assigned to the department which he now occupies, by Dr. Jones himself," etc.—a falsehood. I had no agency in his appointment—I did not vote for him, and often said to Dr. Buchanan by letter, that the selection was a bad one—his own recommendation was a sufficient proof of the injudicious choice, and Dr. B.'s letters in reply to mine, (now in my possession,) advocating his, (Bickley's), claims, show my opposition to his appointment, and prove the old adage true, "at great expense, but short memory.

I suggested the names of Prof. Stockwell, Dr. T. J. Wright, and several other gentlemen, who were known to be true Reformers, and competent men, as being preferable to Dr. Bickley, from mode of education, experience in practice, association etc., and my judgment remains unchangeable; and I truly believe his pamphlet will confirm it.

I trust I have said enough to convince Eclec- tics that there is an Executioner—a How now in the faculty of the E. M. I., and some of his colleagues have yet to learn it. Their period of probation may be protracted by their truckling subserviency, in the shape of certificates, endorsing an old but newly vampped species of humbuggery. In this however, they have done an irreparable injury to Eeclecticism. Had their certificates disapproved instead of approved the humbug, they would have retained, to some extent, the confidence of Eclec- tics; but they have erred—fatally erred, in pampering to his pride and subtle intrigues: he will ere long be lost to what he has been to myself and others—their official executioner. Beach, Baldridge, Oliver, Freeman, Jones, (and he says Rosa;) have all suffered by this headman; and Morrow would have experienced the same fate had he lived, and had Dr. B. possessed the desired control over the Trustees.

I now have proof positive, and that from declara-tions made by Dr. Morrow himself, that no sooner had Dr. B. entered the Institute than he began to traduce his colleagues, and make efforts to undermine them, and secure the removal of some of the very ones who were most in building up the school, and in elevating him with his frotthy popularitv to a post of honor and profit.

"Treachery, and intrigue, seem to have marked his whole career since he came into the Insti-tute.

He always strove to mortify and embarass his colleagues by silly, childish criticisms, on their language, and fancied defects in teaching, and that too while the class expressed the most unbounded confidence in the defective teachers, but were constantly murmuring about being so "bored" by this self-constituted critic.

To show that he, (Dr. B,) loves to humbug, and to be humbugged, it is only necessary to state that Dr. Lane, a student of the E. M. I. who had acquired the art of "Spiritual Rapping," practiced a cheat upon him. He informed Dr. B. that he was to be the great messenger to proclalm the will of spirits in the spirit land, to his benighted fellow men—that the spirits would make known his sublime mission, and fully instruct him in his new office as their vicegerent, ten days from that time, etc., which threw Prof. B. into perfect ecstasies, so much so that he seemed to be in a state of almost delirious excitement for many days. He gave a full endorsement to the whole phenomena in a certificate in which he expressed his entire conviction in the authenticity of the raps as emanating from departed spirits in the eternal world, etc., etc.; but alas! the poor humbugger learned he was the subject of a cruel humbug before the lapse of ten days—that he was hoaxed—

that Dr. Lane was practicing deception, and was obtaining certificates from such credulous and stu-did mortals as himself, (could others be found,) for publication, to warn the weak and silly to do the same fate of the lunatic and monomaniac. The death of Dr. L. prevented the issue of this pamphlet. I hope to obtain Dr. B.'s certificate for publication. Prof. Carter saw it and has promised to secure it for me if possible. Dr. Reynolds also saw it.

Since writing the above, I have obtained the manuscript of Dr. Lane, but so far have failed to secure Dr. Buchanan's certificate, that being in the possession of Dr. Lane's brother who is now absent. The manuscript however reveals some rich items relative to our hero of marvels and credulity. I will give a few of the incidents which occurred at the different interviews.

On their first interview he discovers a "Heavenly charm" a "celestial ether" emanating from the person of Dr. Lane—it affects him very sensibly—it is doubtless the "aura," which he feels. He inquired whether Dr. L. felt any mental "excitement or depression" when he sat as a medium—as to the state of mind and body etc.—finally the spirit of John McGruder made a communication which greatly excited Dr. Buchanan—the Dr. with pencil and paper called out the alphabet and the spirit said, (I am sorry that Dr. Buchanan is to leave the city so soon.) "You have (Dr. B,) a great work to perform and I want you to do it justice," "You are to be made acquainted with the whole mystery of spiritual manifestations within ten days. I want your mind prepared for these truths, that you may proclaim them to the world. Will you do it? Good night. The spirit of John McGruder left and the Dr. now inquired if the spirit of his father was present, and received a faint response—and said he was happy, and glad his son was soon to remove to Louisville Ky., where his good grandfather died, (Dr. Lane was much fatigued at the late hour, (11 o'clock P. M.) so Dr. B. received but a faint demonstration from his father's spirit, through the foot of Dr. L.

"The Dr. soon gave evidence of his gratitude for the high honor that had been conferred upon him, in selecting him as the first individual, to whom should be made known the greatest mystery of the world; a mystery that had so long bid defiance to the learned philosophers, preachers, lawyers, doctors, and all others, great and small."

The Dr. felt the "Heavenly charm" plainly, which rendered him happy—he saw wonders and heard the "raps," and why should he not believe—"he did believe.

Dr. Lane says, "By this time, thought I to myself, if some of the feathers were plucked from the wings of your imagination, and stuck in the tail of your judgment, you would steer a much straighter course over the rougher sensations that so often wrack mortals of this earth,"

At the next visit of Dr. B., says Dr. L., he "be-
He called on the spirits, when the name of Sarah Kelly was given by alphabet. "Where did you die? A. Springfield, Ky. Of what disease? A. Consumption. Have you any message to send to Alice? A. She should not worry so much about these manifestations—they will all be made plain to her soon." Dr. B. states in his duplicate, this was appropriate for Alice, his wife, as she had been much troubled in mind about these things.

"The raps continued—you are thinking about your father-in-law's estate. The Dr. went home and returned, and says in his own written duplicate, 'not so much as to myself, but true as to Alice, who was at that time talking on the subject with much excitement at my residence.' The spirit continues—'My uncle could not help his insolvent,'—Dr. B. says he was embarrassed by a debt, but not insolvent. The spirit says, 'He died more happy than people think.' The Dr. says 'this I believe is true.'

"He then asked for the name—the following was spelled out, 'Judge John Brown of Louisville, Ky.' The Dr. said Brown was incorrect—it should have been Rowen. He asked what relation is he to Alice. A. 'Father'—correct. He asked to have the name spelled again, and it was given—'John Brown.' He inquired if John Brown was correct?—no answer. He asked 'what relation did he be to myself?' Ans. 'Father-in-law.'

"What did you mean by his insolvent?" Ans. 'Left the family reduced from high standing.' The Dr. says 'all correct, except the name, Brown and dying insolvent.'

Faint sport this for Dr. Lane—the great humbugger is now humbugged. Behold his childish credulity while he asks the spirits of John McGrunder to write as Sarah Kelly and John Rowen, (his father-in-law) great and grave messages, and receives correct answers from the foot of Dr. L. Dr. B. said 'he was satisfied the sounds were accountable, and that human agencies were not employed in making them.'

"Tuesday, June 24th, 1851, Dr. Buchanan came again to test spiritual communications and if possible, to learn the whole secret, as it had been promised him by the spirit of John McGrunder on the Thursday evening previous at Mr. Norton's. The Dr. seemed quite impatient for fear the slow way of communicating would not unfold the entire mystery within the short space of two days, as Mr. McGrunder had said it should be. He seemed to think there was a great deal of ground to go over, to clear up every doubt, and mystery, that had so long bedeviled, and kept the world at bay, and if the whole was to be done in ten days, the time must be well improved: so at it we went. He baited himself as a grave questioner and received correct answers, as I was thinking, Oh! thou man of wonders! and I was thinking, Oh! thou man of wisdom! He thought I was earnest, and I knew he was deceived. He was interested in my raps, and I interested in his sincerity. He asked questions and I rapped, while the following communications were received.

As the duplicate lays before me, given by the Dr.'s own hand, before he left the room, I will just insert it, though there are some things he left out, that I would like better to be in.'

"Third communication by raps.

Question. What is your name? Ans. John McGrunder. Will you give me a message? Ans. I find your mind will not be prepared so soon as I expected. You have too much business at present to investigate this subject. I remarked that my mind was always open for the reception of truth. It continued—Your mind was not settled on going east when I conversed with you before.


The raps then came as follows. To consult the propriety of publishing there. You will learn much about spiritual communications while you are gone. I remarked that I was not going east at present, and asked what Mr. McGrunder would say upon the subject, to which the raps responded, good bye, and nothing more could be heard." Here ends Dr. B.'s third interview with spirits. Having given a few short extracts from the manuscript of Dr. L. as proof of my assertion I drop the subject. Dr. Lane says he merely inserts this interview with Dr. B., to show the interest he felt in the subject rather than give anything mysterious or wonderful, which is not to be found in these communications." Knowing I had deceived him far enough to satisfy himself and others, that he had been cheated, I thought it wrong to excite his curiosity and interest farther.

Now I think I should have no difficulty in telling the fortune of Dr. B. by looking into his hand, and that too without inquiring the spirit of John McGrunder. Dr. B. thinks I have bestowed very little, if any thought upon the brain or its functions. There is one brain perverted in function, which has caused me much deep reflection since 1846.

Alas! for Electicism when such men are its teachers. Humbuggery must now constitute a part of its tenets—our friends abroad see it, with heartfelt sorrow and mortification, in the certificates of the Faculty endorsing his phantoms, and hence the immense number of most caustic denunciations now in my possession, a few of which I have given.

One thing I will say to conciliate the Faculty of the E. M. I. They will get along more quietly for a time, as I shall not be an obstacle in their way to the pockets of the students. The practice of lighting upon them like hungry canines, I have for years held with pain and disgust, and when I found it was to be the established policy of the Faculty of the Free School, I raised my voice against it. Though charged with avaricious meanness by Dr. B. yet I know not that students ever charged me with gross neglect of duty, falsehood, and deception, to obtain their money. I think I am not obnoxious to the charges of Prof. B., and he would not have made them had he had a proper regard for truth.

I pledged myself to the Trustees to defend the student against the wrong inflicted upon
them by the *drones* of the Faculty, (for they have been *the drones*,) and as great a liar as Dr. B. says I am, I have no doubt he believed my decla-
ration. I have the consciousness of knowing my course was just and right: although it caused my expulsion, yet, I feel more satisfaction in knowing I was faithful to the college, and to the best interest of my pupils than I should, had I submitted to the *wrong* perpetrated by my colleagues. When I saw a portion of the Fac-
ulty resolve to abandon the long established and important practice of weekly quizzing of can-
didates for graduation, and in its place introduce a "private-pay-lectures," and one member pro-
tected the institution by every sort of hero-
or, to the student who had placed himself under my instruction, to oppose, and *expose* the fraud; and especially when a member of the Faculty neglected his own department and stepped upon that of another for material to make up the course, and fill his pockets, thus degrading and insulting the colleague, upon whose department the encroachment was made, Making use of our official stations to *dupe* and *fleece* the students, I thought dishonest in the extreme. It is em-
phatically wrong.

But a short time since, several students made complaint that a Professor sold them old books that were out of date, above the market price, and by this kind of intrigue had made (as they said) over one hundred dollars out of the students. This fleecing students for books, for tickets to a private Hospital with empty wards, and no pa-
tients excepting such as should have been exhib-
ited without charge at the college, and private-
pay-lectures for that which should be free, or re-
jected as injurious or worthless, must injure the reputation of any Faculty or any school.

Dr. Morrow gave more lectures on subjects not included in his regular department, and those of a highly useful and practical character than any other professor. He would have secured the idea of extra pay. Dr. Hill and myself gave more ex-
tra lectures than any other members of the Fac-
ulty, except Dr. Morrow, and without remunera-
tion. This *fleeing* practice has already greatly reduced the receipts of its advocates, and still more of those who took no part in it. They will yet learn, that "honesty is the best policy."

Grave questions now arise. What results will fol-
low if Dr. B. & Co.'s policy be carried out? He has already cursed Elocution and will finally crush the school.

Not simply by being absent eleven weeks, out of fourteen during the session—not by condens-
ing the exercises of sixteen weeks into eight or-
less—not by failing to lecture on one-half of the ordinary diseases—not by spending one half of the session on pathology to the neglect of matter of far more practical importance to the student—not by the defective lectures on Materia Medica, they affording little more than a blank on that important branch—not by withholding what should be given in the regular course, for *private-
pay-lectures,* to fill the pockets of the professors by employing those of the student—not by neg-
lecting the weekly quizzing of candidates for graduation—not by absence and irregularity on the part of professors, or lack of clear and impressive lectures on physiology and some other depart-
ments—not from selling old books above the mar-
ket price to students—not from the charge of five-
dollars to visit the empty wards of a private hos-
pital—not by the false assertion of a professor to de-
ceive his class, by telling them he has "with-
in two years past treated fifteen hundred cases of *Chronic diseases,*" independent of obstetrical practice and acute disorders, and following that assertion only eight months after by one more flagrant, that he had "treated twenty-five thousand *Chronic diseases within the last eighteen years,*" and only three short months after forget-
ting the former falsehood, and asserting that he had "treated thirty thousand *chronic diseases within this eighteen years, besides acute diseases,*" thus giving fifty-five and a half cases of chronic diseases daily for ninety days past, although known to have been in a state of comparative idleness for nearly the entire term specified—not from Prof. B.'s falsehoods and slanders in the February and March numbers of the Journal, to crush Dr. B's Beach, Baldridge and Jones, (which will revert back with fearful force upon the school and upon his own guilty head)—and not alone from the foregoing causes and many similar ones which might be assigned, but from the incalculable **wild** irony, etc., and the most *obnoxious* to the gnat mass of the medical pro-
fession.

While ninety, if not ninety-nine, in the hun-
dred, desire something practical and tangible in medical lectures, the remaining fraction are after shadows, spiritual rappers, the spirit of John Mc-
Gruder, ethereal speculations, and what is still less tangible, that of Neurology—that portion of the subject claimed to be original with Dr. B. is con-
jured up by his vivid, but perverted imagination. Its adoption and reign in the E. M. I. renders the school odious and hateful, while it subjects its graduates and pupils to contumely, opprobrium, and disgrace. As a proof of this, a graduate of the E. M. I. selected a country town in this State as the field of his professional labors. On learning the school from whence he emanated, the promo-
citizens of the place advised him to leave, saying they were familiar with the doctrines of the school, as many had taken Buchanan's Jour-
nal of Man—that its author was a professor in the E. M. I. and that spiritual rappings, mesmerism, psychometry, neurology and all sorts of humbug-
gery were inculcated in that school, owing to which the public had no confidence in the prac-
tical qualifications of its graduates. In the most scantily heard of several similar instances, in which the graduates (as in the preceding case,) were dis-
honored and forced to leave the field in disgrace.

The students of the past session saw, and those of the present now see the ultimate result, and hence large numbers have declared they will nev-
er more give support to the E. M. Institute. Want of confidence in the *fantasms* of Dr. B., now said to be fully endorsed by the entire Faculty, and the exceedingly defective course of teaching on The-
ory and Practice and Materia Medica—depart-
ments most important to the student, with mysti-
cism and jargon mingled with Physiology, must and will destroy the school. Can a student sustain an honorable examination on either of those depart-
ments? The session is now nearly half gone and not since the lecture has been granted to two of them and but few on the other. Now how is it possible for the student to become familiar with the im-
numerable number of ordinary diseases, not to name those more rare, even the lectures clear.
and impressive, during the remaining short space of six or seven weeks, it is utterly impossible—then what must be the character of the graduates as compared with those who have heretofore left the Institute, especially when the weekly reviews of the class for graduation are entirely omitted? Drs. Morrow, I. G. Jones and myself found sixteen weeks too short a period to do justice to the diseases incident to this country, and that too by giving from eighty to ninety lectures during the course, and commencing immediately upon special diseases.

On that other all-important department, Materia Medica, but four or five "speeches" have been made, and it is now the middle of the seventh week of a fourteen weeks session. Upon a careful retrospect the knowledge acquired during the last seven weeks is blank, blank.

Judge you, Eclectics of my feelings and deep regret, when I clearly foresaw the woeful degeneracy in the course of instruction, and struggled to save the institute and cause, for both of which I have so faithfully labored, and which have ever been so dear to my heart.

I learn from students that Prof. Bickley gave a lengthy review on Botany, [fifth week,] and received but one correct answer, [composition of water,] and three imperfect ones—all other questions unanswered. Many of the class are disgruntled with the course of instruction and conduct of some of the teachers. They have not forgotten that while one of the Faculty said he would kill the student who kissed him, another said he was "ready to meet the student in any way, shape, or form," [any kind of fight was understood,] as no cowardly blood run in his veins, because the new student "American" placed a note upon his desk, asking the professor if they were to have no lectures on Theory and Practice, and that too, while he was eclipsing the medical world in lectures on that department. The temerity of the student came near a forfeiture of his life. Silence saved him.

My interest has been, and is now, identified with the prosperity of the Institute and the cause. My stock in the college exceeds that of any other and I defend myself against the charges of Dr. Buchanan, and to expose his ruinous policy. I have not caused his dirty, low and base epithets, as also the harsh language found in many of the printed letters, not being permitted by his copyright to do so, unless I pay his demand, which he says is "not less than ten thousand dollars." If I have denounced to a level with him and employed severe or vulgar language, I have but followed his example. Stoop to meet him is a sacrifice of dignity, but a deep and abiding confidence in the truths of American medical reform, and my connection with it have called upon me to defend myself against the charges of Dr. Buchanan, and to expose his ruinous policy.

My stock in the college exceeds that of any other and I defend myself against the charges of Dr. Buchanan, and to expose his ruinous policy. I have not caused his dirty, low and base epithets, as also the harsh language found in many of the printed letters, not being permitted by his copyright to do so, unless I pay his demand, which he says is "not less than ten thousand dollars." If I have denounced to a level with him and employed severe or vulgar language, I have but followed his example. Stoop to meet him is a sacrifice of dignity, but a deep and abiding confidence in the truths of American medical reform, and my connection with it have called upon me to defend myself against the charges of Dr. Buchanan, and to expose his ruinous policy.

A REVIEW OF PROF. BICKLEY'S ANNINHILATOR.

The above Review scarcely merits a passing notice, owing to its puerility. I shall give a few quotations from it and make a few remarks on some of its silly paragraphs. It exhibits the extreme egotism and weakness of its author.

He says his course was popular and exhibited my (his) scientific attainments! How silly—how foolish. The truth is, the dissatisfaction was continuous. It was said, hundreds of times by his class, "they would not give three cents for all they should learn from him—that they should leave knowing as little about Materia Medica as when they came.

He says that one day he saw me he thought if there was any truth in Gall, etc., I was a very selfish man and would strive to control the Faculty. In reply, I will say when I first saw Prof. B. (August 4th,) I thought Phrenology had marked him as her victim—that he was a weak man and great egotist—totally incompetent to sustain Eclecticism—energy, firmness, and perseverance on the part of Morrow and his associates were the elements of its successPro, together with a thorough knowledge of its practical importance, and I knew Prof. B. possessed none of these qualifications. I stated to Prof. Newton next day my convictions as to his incompetency, as here set forth, and this 'Annihilator' affords the best proof of the correctness of my "prognosis."

I thought Prof. Buchanan had more regard for truth than common, when he wrote me, and the best recommendation he could give of Prof., Bickley's fitness for the important chair he now holds...
was that he "is a showy man"—"dressed fine and has a good address"—and again, "I don't consider him a deep man, nor a very strong man"—all true, Dr. Knowing Dr. Buchanan's propensity to exaggeration, and his partiality for Dr. B. I drew conclusions of his incompetency, now fully corroborated by his own writings and lectures.

"We are not made of that material which would shrink from the defence of our own vitals"—how fursom Your pamphlet lacks "vitality." Why did not Dr. Buchanan infuse a Neurological spark into it, that psychometry "might not pronounce it an entire blank.

"I employ two amanuensis, one of whom is a phonographic reporter, to whom I am in the habit of dictating [without the aid of books] sixteen to twenty pages of foolscap manuscript each hour when in a hurry to have my lectures prepared—at other times I usually dictate about twelve or fourteen pages per hour. While my phonographer is engaged in reducing my lectures, or other matter, to the ordinary system, I dictate to my private amanuensis about seven pages per hour, he being a rapid and beautiful penman, to whom is intrusted my private correspondence. When not thus engaged with either the one or the other, I am usually occupied in writing myself, or in perusing scientific works calculated to refresh my mind with the truths of science. Proceeding thus, during the past four months, I have written an octavo volume of 209 pages on Physiological Botany, which has just been issued from the press; prepared a course of lectures occupying 2,700 pages of closely written matter on Congress paper; and written articles for many medical journals, and kept up a correspondence with five weekly newspapers, furnishing some of them with matter enough to fill six columns each week besides private and public lectures enough to make a volume of one hundred pages. Add to these labors an extensive private correspondence, and the public will perceive that the asserion that I am merely a good reader is not founded on truth.

"But hold his egotism—Eclectics read and appreciate the vitality of the "Young Novelist"—"Old Virginia" with his fifty negroes, "never tires." Marvelous to tell, all "without the aid of books." Dr. you are not disputed; authors use words as signs of ideas and their absence in your pamphlet is a proof of your honesty.

"I read all my lectures, but they are the product of my own brain, and are not taken from the original ideas of others,"—a self evident proposition, Doctor—their extreme weakness is a conclusive proof of the truth of your statement—a fair index to the "brain" in which they had their origin. The candor and veracity of the Doctor are doubtless the result of his "Christian virtues inspired by the use of tobacco"—what a wonderful regenerator that agent must be.

The Dr. says he is willing to have his lectures published that his abilities may be known, "providing Prof. Jones or the Eclectic physicians of Cincinnati will pay for their publication." Doctor, your desires will never be realized. The persons to whom you refer, will never give vitality to an aboration,—a production so devoid of good sense and practical instruction, though it be wholly "original" with you and not "the original ideas of others," and though you again bet "$30,000, it is all true.

Prof. B. admits he is a novelist, but he very modestly asserts his "scientific writings are far more numerous than those of "fiction. He exalts the great "I" as usual, when he plagiarizes his fictions "which however," (says he,) "have been of such a character as to induce my publishers to translate and publish them in German and French, on honor not often conferred upon the writings of so young a novelist."

The Dr. also says it requires him but 24 hours labor "in the completion of one hundred pages" of fiction. As to the veracity of the "young novelist," judge you, my Eclectic friends; novelists are permitted much latitude in the use of language.

It has been said by many who have seen his pamphlet, [doubtless his mightiest effort.] I got up coolly, and deliberately, to emulsify me, that he has again launched into the broad, and to him appropriate, field of "fiction, folly and frivolity" where his feeble intellect, should in future be wholly employed.

I am branded with the opprobrious epithets of traitor, an Arnold, a Judas, etc., because I have exposed the incapacity and unfitness of this man to Eclectics, and warned them of the downward tendency and ultimate ruin of the school under its present organization. Did I fail to speak my sentiments freely and truthfully to warn all interested of the impending danger, I should richly merit the name of "traitor"—I should be a traitor to the cause of Medical Reform, and to its friends abroad. I recommend a perusal of this pamphlet. Read and reflect! Can it be possible the author of so silly a production is a professor in the once noble Reformatory School of Medicine—a school which has been sustained, and can be sustained, only by men of energy, ability and sound practical attainments?

Think you, Eclectics, his feeble intellect is adequate to the dissemination of the great truths of American Medical Reform? Can graduates be honored and respected who have his insignia, even though he receive the empty muffs of Dr. Kyle's "frothy Professor Buchanan?" Oh! what a shooting thought! This flighty "Young Novelist," now descures the very stand, once occupied by the fearless, consistent, and uncompromising American Reformatory. Morrow! how great and how sad the change! If such frothy and frivolous minds are to control Medical Reform then may the independent spirits who have so long and so nobly fought for Medical Freedom, chant its final requiem.

L. E. JONES.

*Since giving the Dr. credit for what he claims,—i.e. that his lectures are the product of his own brain, and not taken from the original ideas of others,—I find I have been too liberal, for a review of his "Physiological Botany," reveals nothing but other works on the same subject—not a single new thought—all a plagiarism—I challenge the proof that it contains any original or new ideas. In a work styled "Popular Physiologjy of Plants," the reader will find the same matter—especially on the subjects of light and heat of plants, electricity, movement, contraction, reproduction, change of growth of the stem downwards, by reflected light from a looking-glass, endosmosis and exosmosis, and endogenes. Much of the language is verbatim—the coincidence is striking, as Prof. B. writes "without the aid of books."

*I have just been informed by students of the E. M. I. that Prof. B. has employed the janitor to peddle his novels at twenty-five cents each, among the students, signed, undoubtedly, to take the place of the Materia Medica. He has the carriages of papers scattering hand-bills over the City, extolling their merits and urging the lovers of novelty to purchase.

Again "Old Virginia neber tire."
AN EXPOSURE
OF THE CARICATURIST

BUCHANAN.

In a pamphlet, of sixteen pages, recently published by Prof. J. R. Buchanan, and also in the E. M. Journal, of Feb. last, my name is frequently mentioned in a way not very complimentary to myself, or creditable to the writer.

On the first page of the pamphlet is the following statement in reference to a meeting of Eclectics, held on the seventh of February last, to take into consideration matters relating to the Eclectic Medical Institute of Cincinnati.

"The meeting seemed to consist of the expelled Professors, Drs. Baldridge and Jones, their two Eclectic physicians, of Cincinnati, and we and your chair would have been vacated. Dr. Baldridge and Jones B. led him to attempt at Louisville the establishment of a model school of medical reform. Indeed, we have not met a member there approved the pamphlet. Morrow came to me in person and urged me not to resign, while he insisted that I should call solitary individual who does, except the authors, Baldridge and Jones."

In this short paragraph there are no less than six falsehoods. 1st. Prof. Baldridge was not expelled, but resigned, having given notice that he would do so a year before. 2nd. There were no students at the meeting. 3rd. Every member of the meeting was an Eclectic, counting Dr. Carter.—4th. Every member there approved the pamphlet. In its essentials. 5th. The "two Eclectics" do not approve the pamphlet. 6th. Baldridge and Jones B. led him to attempt at Louisville the establishment of a model school of medical reform. Again, he says, "the egregious vanity of Dr. Dr. Morrow assured me my chair, which was to be filled by the appointment of Dr. Powell. Fortunate would it have been for the Institute and the cause of reform, had I complied with Dr. Morrow's urgent request."

Dr. Morrow assured me my lectures gave entire satisfaction; the only complaint being want of punctuality. Let me say to you Dr. B., had it not been for your just memory, I should have been retained as an Eclectic, counting Dr. Carter. —Again, he says, "the egregious vanity of Dr. Dr. Morrow assured me my chair, which was to be filled by the appointment of Dr. Powell. Fortunate would it have been for the Institute and the cause of reform, had I complied with Dr. Morrow's urgent request."

Again, he says, "the egregious vanity of Dr. Dr. Morrow assured me my chair, which was to be filled by the appointment of Dr. Powell. Fortunate would it have been for the Institute and the cause of reform, had I complied with Dr. Morrow's urgent request."

In attempting to make any reply, or to show the entire worthlessness of such trash as the writer has seen proper to indulge in, with regard to my abilities and professional character, two obstacles were heard of by me; the first, is the stooping to notice them at all; the second is the poor satisfaction afforded in noticing a production so devoid of truth, manliness, and good sense. It will be my object to only regard them in what follows, as eminating from a small and muddy fountain, surcharged with the poison of the "corps mort." When reading the first part of the above section, it made me think the writer had stolen the livery of those who shot him, to shoot at me. Where he uses the language, "all the old students of the Institute know how the classes have been bored and oppressed in past times by sitting under the dull, tedious, illiterate, spurious, untrustworthy lectures of Dr. B.," if he had added after the word "untrustworthy" the words, ephemeral, intangible, unmeaning, incomprehensible nonsense of Dr. Buchanan, and many more from us, is false in every respect.
Dr. B says "the language of Dr. Baldridge was entirely friendly and complimentary, although, as a mere cypher in the institute, his opinion would not have been asked." The reader cannot fail to see the "contemptible spirit" of the man in this single remark—the fact is, he viewed each of his colleagues a cypher as he does his present associates. His "Egregious vanity" causes him to view the whole world as a mere cypher when compared with his blotted self. This is the misfortune—it will be his ruin and the ruin of the school. Reader mark my words! myself and others being "cyphers," in his view, he did not—

he would not receive a friendly advice, as he says as to the good or evil likely to result from his reckless and even vacillating schemes. To feed his own "egregious vanity" he must necessarily underrate the capacities of others; for surely it would be extremely humiliating to him if he thought he had equals, he must be elevated—they must sink, or he is envious and seeks their removal. While Dr. Morrow consulted freely with myself and others as to the good of the Institute, Dr. B. would propose measures to his colleagues, but seemed to think it degrading to him to await their concurrence. Dr. B. intimates that I was in favor of establishing a Homoeopathic chair in the E. M. Institute. This is untrue. I was emphatically opposed to it, and the resolution which I introduced into the Convention, in the spring of 1848, was to call out committees of Homoeopathy and those who were in favor of that measure. Whate'er his widespread faith of reliable intelligence that Drs. Buchanan and Hill were favorable to Homoeopathy, and had dismissed the propriety of introducing it into the Institute. I also learned they desired the appointment of two other professors who were Homoeopathic: hence the following resolution was introduced into the Convention, to ascertain who were orthodox and who were not. Here follows the resolution to which Dr. B. Refers in his letter, low, detractive way.

"Resolved. That the members of this convention and Eclectic Medical Reformers generally, cannot recognize, as true Eclectics, any known to depart from its well established principles."

Where is the true Eclectic Reformer that can object to it?

Again,—Dr. B says, Dr. Jones "being like his friend, Dr. Baldridge, incapable of any expansive ideas," etc. They are incapable of stopping to notice the trifling and silly vagaries which have ever engaged the attention of their detractor. His brain has become nearly an imponderable substance, and his mind an apparent wreck, owing to his constant pursuit after his favorite theories and doctrines of inappreciable and undefinable nonsense.

The Dr. says I have "written nothing, for very good reasons," etc., leaving the impression on the mind of the reader that I am incapable. It would be unbecoming in me to vindicate my abilities, against this charge. Let me say to you, Dr. B., I have written upon a large number of subjects within the last thirty years, with many of which you are as ignorant as an untutored Arab. I will refer the reader and Dr. B. to the second circular of the Louisville school, every word of which was written by myself. I say quite willing the Dr. and the public should contrast that production with Dr. B.'s own barren issues upon the same subject. Examine his "Journal of Man," ["Journal of nonsense," and what do you find. After deducting Dr. Vaughan's articles, few extracts from other writers, and "Table Talk," what is left? a mere gaseous, intangible, pointless mass of words, most sickening, unimpressive, and uninstructive to the mind of an intelligent man—all is void! void!! The whole work affords scarcely a single original, intelligible, practical idea—scarcely a point on which the mind can rest—"a tenous fit of effort, on the part of its author, to describe phantoms existing only in his own diseased imagination—to define undefinable illusions. No sane man can see what he sees, for the reason that no real object exists. Many of his subscribers do not pretend to read his journal as they freely assert, for the reasons stated.

Upon the 12th and 13th pages of his pamphlet and in the March No. of the E. M. Journal, [page 138,] the writer vindicates his own course, and attempts to destroy or injure the character of others. But few have so utterly failed to accomplish their object. His effort has sunk him—he has exhibited his true character. To substantiate this charge, it is only necessary to refer to one or two points on the pages named. He says, thirteen years ago "the highest and most lucrative positions of the medical profession were fairly within my reach"—not "any ordinary position but the very highest; not one, but many of them: not lucrative simply, but the most lucrative. But he "scorned" them and "turned away from the temptations." With holy horror he turned his back upon these exalted stations—stations of distinction, honor, and sure passports to the most splendid ease and wealth. Reader do you believe his story? not a word of it. No such positions, undoubtedly, were ever within his reach, or he would have seized upon them with the greatest avidity—he would have swallowed the bate in a moment. But hear him again; he turns his back upon them, "tearing the fell men of less reputation than myself into ridicule!!! Oh thou great and sainted Jos. R. Buchanan! hear—hear—".

SOLNOXY,—"I am Joseph R. Buchanan, upon whom the G.-ds, and celestial spirits have shed down all the glorious light of glory and all the glory of the multitudes. They have conferred upon me the office of imparting to igno- rant mankind, the great d mighty truths of the future: and will I confide to be a—the one and only equal of those or finite mortals, of so much less distinction, honor and renown that I, the immaculate! No! no! this must never be; and my dignity requires he announced." He turns his back upon these bright, but still trifling prospects, and floats about in his own ethereal air—his system, and finally he lighted down upon the E. M. Institute, "with which," says he, "I could conscientiously co-operate."

Reader, do you not think this school must have been above, far above the "bigest and most lucrative position" named, by Dr. B. and that its Faculty excelled in all that was great and good? Have you not heard his obloquy. What more could be desired? "Their good sense" kept them from error, and led them to truth, while their "capacities" and "powers" rendered them eminently successful teachers and enabled them to send forth zealous, thoroughgoing and
practical physicians.” “What more public and emphatic endorsement could give their capacities? They “proved their superiority at the bed-side” of the sick. “Perseverance, zeal,” “industry,” and “moral strength which arises from their possession of truth” “eminent” qualified them for imparting their knowledge to students.” —

Now reader see how this learned, inimitable, hypocritical writer can blow both hot and cold at the same breath. Hear him.

On the school, it was true, was rather an unpromising affair—there was nothing attractive in the school, but its liberal principles; neither capital, reputation, social influence, literary capacities, nor extensive scientific attainments were found in the Faculty.” Dr. J and myself were members of the Faculty at that time, yet he found them to be men “with whom he could conscientiously co-operate.” “Of Dr. J. he says, “It was surely a sufficient tax upon my liberality, to associate as a colleague with a man so utterly obscure, so destitute of reputation, and so iliterate in all respects as Dr. J.” “The association with Jones and Baidridge was regarded by my friends” [Departed spirits, I suppose, as a sacrifice of personal respectability] &c.

I ask the graduate of the E. M. Institute, or the reader that has an ounce of brains to look at the ridiculous position of this conceived and would-be-great reformer and talented fog-pipe. First, He found men with whom he could “conscientiously co-operate”—men of “good sense”—‘eminently successful” as teachers—they had a thorough knowledge of practical medicine, proving their superiority at the bed-side,” etc.

Second, They had no “reputation”—no “capital”—no “influence”—no literary capacities—no “scientific attainments”—nothing attractive—the whole school an unpromising affair—occupying small dingy apartments (same occupied by Dr. B.) “on Fourth Street”—and to associate with them, “a sacrifice of respectability.” You have your own declaration, reader, at what his capacities failed to so much as a sacrifice of his respectability, how much greater the sacrifice of his colleagues! By his association “they gained the reputation of being like the present Faculty” — the fog end of Spiritualism, Messmerism, Psychologists, (Dr., is the word appropriate?) visionary theorists, etc., and that of being the silly and deluded votaries of the wildest theorist of the 19th century.

Reader, think you his name added to their reputation in reference to anything useful or practical? Far from it—his connection lessened their capacities in their estimation of the medical profession, for the very efficient teaching that he himself said they were so eminently qualified to impart.

Look at his arrogance, conceit and impudence, in another particular, viz.: his written attack upon Dr. Beach, whom he charges with “utter incompetency as a teacher,” etc. With what bitterness does he hurl his missiles when he uses the phrase, “His silly undignified professional course and literary plagiarism,” etc. Who can thus speak of Dr. Beach, the man above all others in the ranks of medical reform to whose name a monument should be erected to perpetuate his memory, deserves the scorn and contempt of inconsistency and gross dishonesty does the case.

which his cruel and unprovoked attack will receive at the hands of all true Eclectics.

Of Dr. J. he says “I used my efforts to sustain his respectability by furnishing intellectual, (save the mark,) and literary assistance,” and that he had no “reputation” or was destitute of it, “except what he obtained from being placed in the Institute with Dr. B. for none others had any reputation” as he says. Notwithstanding all this, and “notwithstanding” my desire to add any public cause, expulsion, or discredit, I finally found “his services could no longer be retained, (for I is the pronoun,) end from his warfare on my dignity and reputation.”

“I exercised the prerogative of my high satenti, which did not permit me to extend him any further kindness.”

By his own declaration, it is seen the Dr. arrogates to himself all the authority of the institute to retain or expel a member of the Faculty at his pleasure. He presumes he is the only one capable of selecting and appointing members and giving proper and requisite instruction, and furthermore, he assumes the prerogative to command obedience to his mandates in all things appertaining to the Institute.

Soon after Dr. B., became a member of the Faculty he began to fancy he was far more distinguished and scientific than either of his colleagues. He grew rapidly in his own estimation. Gigantic phantoms were in his vision prompting him to measures calculated to further develop his greatness. As he increased in his own estimation his colleagues sank in the same ratio, and very soon their defects became so apparent, that he fancied it incumbent upon him to entrust his high prerogatives—i. e. to traduce his colleagues and resort to efforts to displace them. After sinking each to the same degraded level, he assumes the authority to pronounce sentence against them: he utters the shameful stigma, “there was neither capital, capacities, scientific attainments, nor social influence in the Faculty.

This imposed a great work upon Dr. B., but it was important; and he commenced it voluntarily and at once by traducing and making efforts to destroy the character and usefulness of his colleagues. During his first session in the Institute he made efforts, as Dr. Morrow informed me, to have Drs. Jones, and Oliver removed—and said the time had come when none but men of extensive literary and scientific attainments could attract the public, etc. To this statement from Dr. M. I replied, if they left, I would also leave. I told Dr. M. if Dr. B. made further efforts to remove them, we would have him displaced, to which Dr. Morrow not only assented, but desired me to take the necessary measures to effect that object, and said he, “let him,” [Buchanan] “go end lecture on his own visionary theories, for he is of no earthly benefit to the school.”

Soon after this I learned he desired my removal, and a re-organization of the Faculty.

The whole matter is this: Dr. B. found the Faculty not only qualified, but, as he says, eminently successful as teachers in malin. seious, thorough-going practical physicians,—abilities which he did not possess. If they had these powers, and capacities, what more could he have desired? What greater praise could be bestowed? He first exalts and applauds, and then attempts to traduce and degrade them. What

...
J. J.ers, "J.," and his associates, was erroneous. This praise for their abilities. If he must traduce, disgrace, degrade and sink all his other associates, could he not spare the lamented Morrow? no, his extreme enmity did not permit him to spare the slumbering ashes of him, whose fame is co extensive with Medical Reform. He does say, it is true, that Morrow, Hill and himself, constituted the sole vitality of the Institute, but he obviously meant himself alone, for he has said none of them had any reputation; but for once his returning modesty forbid him from saying I, I, I, as usual.

The truth is, he was totally ignorant of the doctrines and practice of the school, and infinitely the inferior to either of his colleagues, as a teacher. To be taught by them was too humiliating for this proud ambition of spirit—hence his detractions with a view to their final expulsion.

Let him squirm and quibble as much as he pleases, this was the true key to all his movements.

What else prompted his quarrel with Dr. Jones but his jealousy? I do not entertain a single doubt, [and I say it to you, boldly, Eclectics,] that fear of being eclipsed by him, [Dr. J.] aroused this petty—s jealousy, and caused the disruption.

But here he again.

"As one of the early co-workers, we felt a great willingness to remove him, [Dr. J.] and it was not even delayed acting upon the case unit imperative necessity compelled us to remove him."

Nothing but a respect for my own character, and a contempt for the author of the above paragraph, prevents the application of harsh terms to his false and defamatory assertions. He here again intimates that I was removed by the Trustees, as this he says with Dr. J. "We," says he, had delayed acting. Who delayed acting? I delayed acting. Yes, I again delayed acting, I, Jos. R. Buchanan delayed acting, and no one else. Reader, does not his own words prove his acts undermining and treacherous? No sooner had he been elevated by us above the pestiferous fogs of Neurology, than he sought our expulsion. But, "we (I) delayed acting." Did any action take place in my case? None! This delay, (says Dr. B.) was an erroneous policy. "Dr. J. and the others should have been removed whenever it became obvious that their services in the Institute were no longer desirable." Desirable to whom, Dr.? To Dr. Buchanan and no one else; for Drs. Morrow, Beach, J., Oliver, Hill and Baldridge composed six of the Faculty. They did not ask or desire the removal of each other. Then who but your mighty self did desire it? To whom was it obvious that their "services were not desirable," but to this intriguing colleague? Oh, treachery, hast thou no shame! He has ever been undermining his associates and urging the adoption of measures calculated to destroy the school. As Dr. Aver truly remarks, "the remains of my lamented friend, Dr. Morrow, had scarcely been laid in their resting place before this movement was renewed. His irrational career is as certainly destined to destroy the school and disgrace the cause as the sun is to rise and set.

Look again at his hypocrisy! He says, "we felt a great unwillingness to remove him," (Dr. J.) at the same time, in the opinion of the writer of this article, it was an erroneous policy. Who felt unwilling to remove Dr. J.? Not Dr. B. surely, for he says the policy of retaining him was erroneous. This again shows he has for years past designed the overthrow of Dr. J. and this he has lately more than intimated to the class [I am informed] for he says the delay arose from a want of the desired opportunity—really a pretext. Then we means I. If it implies the present Faculty; then it shows they are but mere tools in his hands to do the work of his bidding—that which should have been done long ago, as it "was an erroneous policy to retain Dr. J." Of the present Faculty, one member had held his place but eighteen or twenty months, and another but twelve months, up to Nov. 1st. 1852. Three of the other members were appointed but a few days before the session of 1852-3, commenced, and one other after the expulsion of Dr. J. This again shows that "we" meant I, I, as he reverts back to the time when Beach and Baldridge were in the school, and that he made the new Faculty help him do the work which "we" [J. R. Buchanan] had wanted done for years.

Again the arrogant creature says, "Our Institute is not a matter of private speculation." Whose Institute? Who established it? Where are the builders? Not a single one remains in the school. Treachery—foul treachery has removed them. Then to whom does it belong? Let Eclectics and the public answer.

He says, "it is not a matter of private speculation," while every act of his shows the falsity of his statement. The Institute has been prostituted to his, and his associates "private speculation," by "private-pay-lectures," and by withholding the knowledge the Faculty was bound to impart without extra charge.

The Institute, says he, "is not a place to pension off old and incompetent Medical Reformers." It is now but a pension office for this same arrogant pretender—it was not erected by his efforts, but he claims to be a pensioner, and declares, that Eclectics are bound to give him a bounty, and make him, the very man who has done more to disgrace them, and bring odium upon their profession than any other, a pensioner for life.

He says, "the ablest and most disinterested men should have a place." He has already there were men "eminently successful as teachers," but where are those men now? Does he forget to be one of the "ablest and most disinterested men?" He who does not visit a consumptive patient, or a child affected with whooping cough, so fearful is he of contracting the disease, (owing to his extreme improbability,) and the wildest theorist, and most intensely selfish, and jealous mortal living, is now prattling about "able and disinterested men" to fill the chairs in the Institute.

He who complains of a personal injury or loss of profit, when he is removed from his chair, proves by his complaints that he belongs to the class of hungry office seekers, who wish to pervert a public institution for the benefit of his private concerns. He is guilty of unworthy and decayed members of the profession who have been pronounced unfit for professorial duties.

I ask the Medical profession to point to a more "worthless and hungry office seeker" than this
name Joseph R. Buchanan. Where is there one less capable of teaching the great practical truths of Medical science, and especially, those belonging to the American system of Medical Reform? He is but an Homeopath—all his teachings and writings go to support that system, and to overthrow Eclecticism, and I do not believe it will be long until he will publicly avow it.

He is worse than "worthless" to the cause of Eclecticism—he is an active destroyer—and all true Eclectics, who are familiar with his senseless conceptions, can no longer pronounced unfit for professional duties. He is badly "decayed" already, and still rapidly decaying, and hundreds of Eclectics, now perceive the malarious vapors escaping from the decomposing member and are loudly demanding its immediate removal.

Since the foregoing pages were in type, Dr. Jones has received many additional communications, touching the present condition of the E. M. I., a few of which he desires me to insert in my portion of the pamphlet. They are emphatic, and to the point.

"I freely give my opinion, as to the present inefficiency and former efficiency of the course of instruction in the E. M. Institute. I had nothing of Physiology from Dr. Buchanan."

When I became a candidate for graduation, not finding myself prepared to stand an examination on his, (Dr. B's) department, I asked him to recommend me some small work on Physiology, that I could read in, a few hours. He recommended Edward's Physiology, from which I obtained more practical information, than I did from three entire days of the learned professor. I knew the course of instruction in the Institute was thorough and efficient—that the science of medicine was rigid, but practically taught—that the student was made to understand it thoroughly, as he proceeded, and that he himself was capable of understanding, and that no pains were spared to make him do so, by any and all the Professors, except him who filled the chair of Physiology, and I have and do now contend that he never has more than nominally fitted it.

The present course is entirely different from that of 46 and 47, for the old founders and pillars have been feebly removed, and new visionary men—men who think lightly the water of science, thinking its pearls are light and rise to the top, and need not to be doved after, to be obtained, be taken from their place, as they were congenial to its great motor goss machine.

E. B. HOLMES, M. D.

Dr. H. but reiterates what hundreds of others have said.

"I conversed with Dr. Morrow, relative to the visionary theory of Neurology, upon which much of our valuable time was wasted. Dr. M. advised me not to "waste my time" attending his, (Dr. B's) private-pay lectures, for said he, we have more than enough comprehended in the regular course." Dr. Morrow regarded Neurology as entirely worthless to the student.

I know the class generally, both sessions I was in attendance, and I was fitted with Dr. Buchanan. It was a general complaint that he spent nearly the whole of each session in giving lectures on Neurology (which he could not explain, nor they comprehend,) to the great neglect of phsyology.

Reader do you now know what were the sentiments of Dr. M? he pronounced Neurology worthless, and its study a "waste of time".

Here follows an extract from a letter written by an official agent of an incorporated society of Eclectics in the city of New York. His remarks require no eulogy from my pen. He speaks the voice of every true Eclectic in America respecting Dr. B's wanton abuse of Dr. Beach. Hear him:

NEW YORK, May 25, 1853.

"My colleagues and myself sympathize with you from the fact that we know that the attack on Dr Beach was wanton, wholly uncalled for, calamitous, ungrateful and outrageous, We think Buchanan & Co. are villainously in the wrong, and we are pledged to sustain Dr. Beach. For myself I say boldly whoever attacks Dr. Beach attacks me, I have known Dr. Beach for thirty years. He may be fallible, but let him that is without sin cast the first stone. These tyrants, as I call Buchanan & Co. must be made to feel that there are other men in the medical world besides themselves, which perhaps they will ascertain to their complete satisfaction before the controversy is ended. Reli. confidently on the support of the New York reformers. We know Buchanan like a book, and we laugh in scorn at the idea of such a man undertaking to crush Beach. One of the monkeys on the rock of Gibralter might as well expect to destroy it by a kick of his foot as Buchanan to injure Beach. The fame of our venerable reformer is secure."—J Coleman. M. D.

"I am dissuaded with those who conduct the Ecletic Journ. The tirade of abuse, calumny and slander, that fills its pages, will crown them with imperishable, infamy. But like the gold that has passed through the hands of the assayer, you have been made brighter by the fiery ordeal."

"Dr. Jones, you need not fear the assaults of Buchanan they are only calculated to make you grow. His efforts to throw you, with so many others, into the lurch, and render the Journal which circulates his base and vicious doctrines, dies away in toto forward and organize a new school."—H. M. D.

PHILADELPHIA, June 3d, 1853.

"But I can hardly pursue myself that he, [Buchanan] seriously entertains the idea of placing himself in the same category with Beach. I am much pleased at the ingenious and much more than—a pustule; an imposthume—a fistula—a carbuncle—many other disgusting excrements on the body of New School Medicine, when compared to that eminent and renowned reformer. For my own part, I entertain no other feeling than that of the most entire detestation, and the most unmitigated contumely for the individual, and Jones will not suffer. A few more such blows and his prospects among Eclectics will be told.

TABLE TALK.

Dr. B. takes the liberty to use a catalogue of most vulgar and abusive epithets, such as the following: liars, knaves, swindlers, scoundrels, scoundrelism, treachery, mendacity, imposture, medical clownery, down-right robbery, levy of black mail, ignorance, imbecility, forgery," etc. Dr. B. has forbidden Dr. J. and myself the use of a part of his vocabulary, [if to be used as he does] unless we pay him for it. He values it worth $10,000, if applied to him as he applies it to others, as the following extract from his letter clearly shows.

"I shall institute suit and demand not less than ten thousand dollars damages.

Irresponsible may favor the use of abusive and indelicate language, and save the guilty from merited retaliation in the use of such epithets. "It is your bull that has gored my ox." Dr. —

The "Free School is a gull-trap, designed by its Parent, [as Dr. J. truly says], to fleece students. Dr. B. was first to reap the glory for his philanthropy—then the dimes for his private-pay-lectures, from students called together by the sacrifice of his colleagues, and by breaking down other Eclectic schools—he was to be the gainer, they the losser—his selfish philanthropy, merits no praise—it deserves unmitigated scorn and reproof.
Leutra the students of the E. M. Institute are promised a dissection of this pamphlet—indeed an attempt has already been made, but they failed; truth, justice and ability being the requisite instruments, which they do not possess.

The false assertion that Dr. J. was a "serious olog" to the school, and had been trying to break it down for years, and that we both were "pseudo Eclectics," was told to the class to excite their prejudice. Eclectics will repel the assault, and award the calumniator justice.

He may include first-course students, and those unacquainted with the former efficient course of instruction, but graduates and others will buck with contempt these slanders. Several hundreds have already done so.

Dr. B. in his polite letter, demanding $10,000, commands that this pamphlet be suppressed, for, says he, "it is designed to circulate abroad," etc as is the case. See the February and March numbers of the E. M. Journal, also the small pamphlet from the pen of Dr. B. Were they not designed to circulate abroad? He claims the right to circulate his abuse, but fears the effect of truth against himself, and hence commands its suppression. Again, "your bull has gored my ox.

Dr. B. gives Dr. J. some redeeming qualities, for he says he was "in a certain sphere, a useful member of the Faculty." Can the same be awarded to him? It is true he is the great gnomometer of the g-r-e-a-t-Neurological machine."

The students of the present class seem well pleased with Prof. Freeman as a teacher, and are boasting they are getting "some surgery this spring. He is a graduate of the "Faculty without reputation."

Dr. Jones desires me to say to his Eclectic friends that many of the remarks contained in their letters "are excluded for reasons already named, [i. e. use of too strong language, he not having a permit from Dr. B.]" which will account for many apparently careless omissions in the extracts given.

Have the vagaries of Buchanan attracted students? No! It was a frequent remark among the Faculty up to 1849, that his influence had attracted but a single student, so far as known, which was a matter of surprise to them. His as sumptions are gratuitous. The silly doctrines which he has forced upon the public have been used as a powerful weapon against the school and the cause.

The charge of Dr. B. that Dr. J. was unwilling to appropriate funds for college purposes, is absurd, for he advanced more money than any other professor, Dr. Morrow not excepted. Dr. Hill, assisted by Dr. Oliver, adjusted the unsettled account existing between the estate of Dr. Morrow and the Institute. He says in a letter, dated May 29th 1853. Dr. Jones "advanced more money than any other man except Dr. Morrow, and in fact, more than he did, when the true state of the account was known."

If so intensely selfish, how does it happen that Dr. J. advanced more cash than Dr. B. or any other professor? His facts reveal his gross dishonesty.

I know that Dr. Morrow did permit Dr. B. to over-draw his share of the cash in one instance at least, as Dr. J. states, leaving others to pay the debts and take stock. Dr. B., above all others, should have kept still on that subject.

The assertion of Dr. B. that there were but two students out of the entire winter class, who did not endorse the resolutions, purporting to emanate from the class, ensnuring Dr. Jones, I know to be absolutely untrue. I have seen the letter, signed the "N. Y. letter," and two others emanating from that class, strongly condemning the Faculty for their abuse of Dr. J., and expressing the utmost confidence in him, to which 37 names are attached, in the hand writing of each student. Drs. Carter, Witt, myself and others have subscribed, and are ready to testify to the fact.

This clearly shows the entire falsity of Buchanan's announcement, especially when it is known that a large majority of the class had dispersed before these voluntary expressions on the part of the class, were obtained.

New and Important Discovery in Psychology, by Prof. J. R. Buchanan.

We are in possession of a printed slip sent us from Indiana, which has been distributed co-extensive with the M. E. Journal, although, upon the most diligent search none are to be found in the city. It is designed to slander Dr. Jones and others, but to circulate beyond their reach. From it we learn Prof. B. had obtained an imperfect sheet of the first eight pages of this pamphlet. Upon its reception, he discovered by "domestic uses," [to which he no doubt appropriated it], the mental capacities of the writer, and its effects upon the reader, with as much certainty as when applied to his forehead. One test is doubtless as satisfactory and truthful as the other.

This fact was unknown until Prof. B.'s late announcement. It was long since known that he and his disciples could catch the sensation arising from worms in the rectum of their patients by a touch of the hand, but not until now has this new and important discovery been made known. Would the Journal of Man reveal as much to the credit of its author were it used for the same purposes? Have its pages been submitted to its learned author? But really Doctor what a decided tendency do you have? Well well, it is correctly said, everything seeks its level, and hence Dr. B.'s predilection to this kind of Psychometrical exploration, and the resulting benefit to science.

For this "New and Important Discovery," his name and his fame will doubtless be held in veneration in all coming time; and why should it not, since it is the only tangible, practical and valuable one of all his discoveries? Vive la Bagatelle.

I desire Eclectics to know the feeling existing against Prof Buchanan, for his arrogance and impudence in the abuse of Drs. Beach, Morrow and others who were the founders and builders of medical reform. They have been faithful and consistent supporters of its principles and practice, while Dr. B. has had no knowledge of it whatever, but has been encumbering it with his silly, visionary, theories most loathsome to every sound and discerning mind. He is now attempting to make it appear that his visionary theories have constituted true eclecticism—that they have been regarded as a part of the established doctrines of the E. M. Institute.

* The vulgarity of the printed slip, to which no name is prefixed, gives an unmistakable impress of its parentage. The wonder is that the parent was ashamed to christen his offspring especially when it is legitimate.
Dr. Jones has presented a few short extracts from the letters of a large number of correspondents, expressing the utmost dissatisfaction with Dr. B. as one of the professors in the E. M. institute.

The following article taken from a new eastern periodical, called the "Iconoclast," will give our hero, and the general reader a faint idea of the storm that is approaching:

**An Inquiry and Caution.**—We do not wish to signalize our advent by any beligerant demonstration toward any of those who may in some sense, at least, be considered like faith.

But there is no concealment of the fact, that the indications in certain quarters are of such a character that they cannot and will not be submitted to.

What do the wanton, uncalled for, and most calamitous attacks on Dr Beach mean, especially in the West? Can it be possible that the idea is entertained of repudiating and crushing him? If so, we can assure the parties who have that delectable design in contemplation that they have undertaken a task which they are wholly incompetent to accomplish. The twelve labors of Hercules were light in comparison to it. In attempting to crush Dr. Beach, they will have to crush quite a number along with him; and the tyros and novi homines are by no means bearded men and medical athletes in the arena.

We advise them to be more cautious in future, or they will find perhaps that they have wofully miscalculated their own prowess. If we are Iconoclastes we can be temuteces also. We can build up as well as pull down. Do the tyros understand Latin? If so, *verbatim sapienti suum.* If this is not heeded let them recall *quem Deus vult perire, presa detruit.* and learn its meaning. We are alive here in New York and Deo volenti, intend to make ourselves manifest, so that we may be known and read of all men.

This extract shows that the controversy has not yet ended. We are conscious of having truth and justice on our side, and shall have the sympathy and support of all the most substantial Eclectics in the United States, so soon as they know the true state of the matter.

We learn that the Faculty have again excited the young gentlemen of the class to attack Dr. J. in the shape of resolutions, laudatory of Buchanan and Co., and denunciatory of him.—These gentlemen know nothing of the merits of this controversy, and hence do gross injustice to Dr. J. These resolves, [which are prompted by misconceptions of their true interest, if true reformers,] with another long train of misrepresentations and detractions from Buchanan may be anticipated. Should a rejoinder to this appear, meriting a reply, one may be expected.

Fortunate would it be for the young men who have united with Dr. B. to crush Dr. J., if they knew what was for the best interests of Medical reform. Did they know who had been and still is the defender of their rights, and their most zealous friend? They would act differently. Did they know the truth, they could not (I am sure,) be prevailed upon to take steps against him who has done so much for them and the cause.

The readers of Buchanan's pamphlet know that he slandered Dr. Morrow as well as Beach, Jones and Baldridge. Were not his remarks slanders upon Dr. Morrow, when he said to the widow Morrow, he gave character to Dr. M. and also when he included him in the list of those he branded as ignorant, illiterate, unscientific, and without reputation, etc., and the whole school, with which he said he could so "conscientiously co-operate, an unpromising affair."

Who, but the vain, and self-conceit Buchanan, would so grossly insult Eclectics as to say Dr. Morrow had no reputation, no ability, no scientific attainments, no intelligence, etc., when at the same time his name had been familiar to Reformers for about twenty years before his traducers had heard of the school? As the E. M. institute is a continuation of the Worthington school, which had previously existed for many years and as Dr. I. G. Jones was a professor there, and the co-equal with Dr. Morrow, he must have belonged to the same illustrious and shabby category. Now if he can thus defame Drs. Morrow and Beach, as he has done, can others expect to escape? They need not expect it. He has made himself so notorious, that his slanders but serve to develop his real character.

What has he done for Reform? The school was established, as he says, long before he knew it was in existence. He had no agency in procuring its charter, nor in giving it notoriety, for all was accomplished before he had ever heard of the "unpromising affair." What has he added to the school? Has he introduced any new principles of medical reform, or any new and practical or available facts, or truths, or given support to those established? If so, let it appear—let him show their practical bearing—their utility—so far notwithstanding his loud pretension to new doctrines of utility or benefit, every test of his has resulted in a miserable abortion, and we apprehend all his boasted discoveries will prove "disgraceful failures." They are the mere visions of the dreamer.

Then, instead of adding anything of advantage to the cause or the school, he has been a serious detriment to both, as before stated—an active destroyer, and the sooner repudiated by Eclectics, the better for them and their cause.

**ITEMS.**

We are told, (June 11th,) by a student of the Spring class, that Prof. N. has spent about one-fifth of the session in abusing Dr. J. It will avail him nothing though it may have been instructive to his class.

On Saturday evening the Spring session closed—Dr. King reminded the students and audience that Dr. J. was penurious—that the class and Eclectics must heare of him—that he was a hard case, etc. The man who has done nothing by money or otherwise to build up the school, must slander those who have done most. Buchanan came in with his silly witticisms, exaggerated statistics, etc., as usual.

Discordant statement—Dr. J. has seriously injured the school—then he has done it no harm—has reduced the stock in value, from 66 to less than 30 per cent. So it goes.

Dr. Bickley tells the class, he heard his tobacco story in Philadelphia, New York, Boston and elsewhere.—said it hurt him badly—that he could shoot or kill Dr. J. So reports a student. Dr. take a little tobacco.

Several of the late graduates, had little or no reading previous to entering the Insitute. They attended but the last winter and spring session, as they say, before gradation—if not Med-
ical men, who are in fault? what must be the result.

Throughout his pamphlet he associates Dr. Jones and myself together. To this I have not the least objection. We have been associated on the principles of medical reform for twenty years, and were it necessary that I should make a choice of an associate, where talent and integrity were primary objects, and Drs. Buchanan and Jones were the two presented for my choice, the decision would be easily made. My old associate is as far superior to Dr. B. as truth is to falsehood.

A few remarks upon the general character of his shallow productions and I leave it with the lic.

On the first, the middle, and the last of these pages, the personal pronoun I stands most prominent. On the twelfth and thirteenth pages it occurs no less than forty-two times. The first, the middle, and the last are a bundle of ---s as to truth and manliness. Abuse and detraction are its prominent characteristics. Not the promotion of truth in the medical practice, nor a desire to do justice to others, prompted the writer of these pages to his attack on Dr. J. and myself, but a thirst after self-aggrandizement at the expense of truth, and the sacrifice of all whom he may surmise, are standing in his way. His ambition is to become the head and tail of the E. M. Institute. His self-conceited, yet imperfect views of medical reform are most notorious.

We are now done with this puerile production:—this vocabulary of abusive epithets of which the Dr. has partaken so bountifully as a repast, appears to be his natural aliment.

Doctor, let me say a word to you by way of exhortation. What you are is easily detected. What you might, or may be in the future. In order that you may erase the follies of the past and make good the future, betake yourself to deep study—examine your own frailties, and closely investigate the laws which at all times govern you—diligently search that book in which is contained all that can make you great and happy hereafter.

Great as you consider your attainments in the beauties and mysteries of medical science, you are as yet but a mere novice in the paramount principles of its intricate machinery.

A. H. BALDRIDGE.

N. B. I am credibly informed this braggart, Dr. Buchanan, has no diploma from a medical College save one from the very persons whom he now so furiously denounces. The question is submitted to the Doctor, is my information correct? If not from what school did you receive it?

A. H. B.