LETTERS AND REVIEW

OF

PROF. P. F. EVE,

UPON

DR. R. W. JANUARY.

Bot Philo

DR. ARNOLD'S LETTER

TO

J. E. M'DOWELL, M.D., OF KENTUCKY,

AND HIS ANSWER.

ALSO,

A REVIEW OF AN ARTICLE PUBLISHED BY PROFESSOR EVE, UPON DR. JANUARY, IN THE NASHVILLE MEDICAL JOURNAL, FOR OCTOBER, 1854.

By PROFESSOR PHILO, O. S. R.,
OF TRIUNE COLLEGE, HOPEWELL.

"Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor."—*Exodus*, 20: 16.

"Thou shalt not raise a false report: put not thy hand with the wicked to be an unrighteous witness."—*Exodus*, 23: 1.

"Whoso privily slandereth his neighbor, him will I cut off.—*Psalms*, 101: 5.

For sale at No. 30 *Market street, next door to Union Hall.*

NASHVILLE:
W. F. BANG & CO., BOOK AND JOB PRINTERS.
1855.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To J. E. McDowell, M. D., of Ky.

Dear Sir:—On your account, and that of your Lady, and Dr. January, and, what is more, for the cause of humanity, I am glad that, in your case, one infidel is converted to the true faith, in a manner, and under circumstances, which will do some good. What I call the true faith, upon this subject, is this: That sores, or tumors, such as the Medical Profession have always called cancers, or scirrhous affections, and such, as cannot be cured by any course of treatment laid down in the medical books, are cured by Dr. January, and that frequently, but not always.

You say that before you came to Murfreesboro, you were as far from believing that Dr. January could cure Cancers, as other Doctors, of your good old Alopathic School. You were as far from believing it as Dr. Dudley himself; for, like him, you "*had never seen one cured.*" You agree with me, that unbelief, in opposition to good and sufficient evidence, has only the advantage of making a man appear both foolish and ridiculous, except when it may help his pocket, and keep others from turning him out of their society, not because he *is* an infidel, but because he is *not* one.

Some are unbelievers, just because it is for their interest to be so; and others, because they shut their eyes against the light which would convince them of their error. "None are so blind as those who will not see;" and while they pride themselves in their unbelief, they are not aware how ridiculous their conduct appears to those, who are not blinded by interest or prejudice.

At Murfreesboro, where you now are, and where Dr. January lives, as your Lady is under his treatment for cancer, and you have an opportunity of seeing his patients, you certainly

have a chance to see demonstrated, before your eyes, the efficacy and value of his treatment in various diseases, and to learn his character for honesty, integrity and fair dealing. And, with all your opportunities for information on these matters, I understand that you fully agree with me in this: that among all the efforts at deception, humbug and imposition, you have never known Honorable Medicine disgraced and dishonored, by a greater humbug, or imposition, or one more base, than the effort to make people believe, that Dr. January is an *impostor* and an *ignoramus*, who knows nothing about his business, but whose principal aim is at deception and fraud, for the sake of gain. And, what is more, if he is not a useful man, will it not be hard to find one who is, at least in the Medical Profession? I can say with you, that I have seen and heard enough to satisfy me, that his treatment operates in a manner more desirable, and is attended with greater and more remarkable results, than any other we know of, which has ever yet made its appearance in the medical writings, which have been published to the world. And, for my own part, I love to see a man possess merit, and the more the better; and it affords me pleasure to acknowledge it. But it always arouses my indignation, to see a good man, who is eminently useful, *falsely* accused of grave offences.

Men who repudiate, and violate the laws of evidence, when they do not suit their humor, or work to their interest, ought to live in a country where evidence is little considered, but the will of the despot controls the fate of the subject. While so many are rejoicing in the benefits which they have experienced from Dr. January's treatment, it is ridiculous, in the extreme, for a person who knows nothing about it, to give those patients the lie, and to contend that they were not benefited at all.

I congratulate myself, my dear Sir, on making your acquaintance, and that of your Lady. The scene which occurred in your room, and at her bed-side, has often been a subject of melting and tearful tenderness. My feelings strongly respond to yours in expressing the sentiment, that you had rather give your countenance and support to the treatment of Dr. January,

because it involves, so deeply, the cause of humanity, under all the reproaches you might incur, than to make the opposition which some have made, to the enterprise, even if that opposition, had the promise of being rewarded with all the laurels which ever clustered upon the brow of Napoleon, or Alexander, or all the gems that ever shone in the diadems of the Cæsars. It is not only the more agreeable, but, also, important, that I should address this letter to you, because you have seen and examined the documents, on which Dr. January depends for his defence against the false accusations which have been published against him in the Nashville Medical Journal.

In relation to this article, against Dr. January, as you have seen and examined it as well as myself, let me say to you, Sir, If a man's principles and conscience will allow him to put forth such an article as the one just mentioned, so deceptious, so fraudulent, so libelous, I would like to have you show me, you can, how it is possible for us, with any safety, to put any dependence in any statement which he may choose to make.

In conclusion, my dear Sir, I would observe, that there is one important fact, which for your own enjoyment, as well as for the cause of truth and humanity, I hope you will enquire into, while you are at Murfreesboro, and that is this: that numbers of persons have come to Dr. January, and been relieved, and even cured, who had been as unsuccessful in their efforts to obtain relief, as the woman mentioned in the New Testament, "who had spent all her living with physicians, and was nothing better, but rather grew worse." In cases of this kind, Dr. January not only worked for nothing, and found himself, and the medicine, but he also boarded the patient, or paid the board, or gave the money to do it. But the good Samaritan, who binds up the wounds, and pours in the wine and the oil, and relieves the sufferer, must be cuffed, and kicked, and knocked about, and trod on, as the mire of the street, just for the gratification, the sport, the amusement and interest, of some, who glory in their power of station, and pride of place. You are aware of these facts, and I was going to ask how they sit upon your feelings, and the feelings of your excellent

Lady; but I know already. How are they calculated to sit upon the feelings of any person, of a liberal mind and a benevolent heart, who is not bound, hand and foot, with the shackles of party, or imprisoned among the everlasting triple icebergs of pride, prejudice, and spleen?

With sentiments of respect and esteem,

I remain yours, affectionately,

S. ARNOLD.

MURFREESBORO, Dec. 19th, 1854.

DR. SAMUEL ARNOLD,

Dear Sir:—I received your letter of the 17th, a day or two since, and I cheerfully and heartily respond to its sentiments; and it affords me pleasure to know that some persons feel an interest in our welfare, at a time when we seem to be incurring considerable reproach on account of an effort to save life, in a way which is not agreeable to some members of the Medical Profession. But the Apostle tells us that "If any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel."

My wife has been afflicted with a cancer four years. Several months previous to our arrival at Murfreesboro, she had it removed with the knife, by one of the best Surgeons in the West, and the wound cured up in a short time, but, in a few months afterwards, it made its appearance again, with still greater malignity. We used all the means within our reach, and had the best medical assistance which could be obtained, but the treatment seemed to aggravate the disease, which we all agreed was cancer.

About the first of October last, we accidentally heard of Dr. January, and we came directly to Murfreesboro, and he commenced the treatment of the case; but my wife had not been able to walk for six or eight months, and she was suffering from great debility and prostration.

Since Dr. January has been treating the case, his medicine has acted like a charm, on the disease. When I came to this place, I was as great an unbeliever in Cancer Curers as any man, for I had never seen one cured; but I differ with some

persons in this, I am open to conviction, by the force of evidence, on this subject, as well as others. You are right in believing that I am a convert to Dr. January's treatment of cancer, for I have seen its effects on my wife, and a great many others, and I think a few days more will make a cure of her case.

I have been visiting the Doctor's patients very frequently, and I have seen some of the most shocking cases you could conceive of. Since my stay here, several bad cases have been cured, and dismissed, and among them a Lady whose eye was the seat of the disease, (having lost it three years ago,) and when I first saw her, all the world could not have made me believe that Dr. January, or any being, short of God, could have cured her; but she is well, and going home rejoicing. Some of those cases which were cured, have healed up in such a way, and skinned over so finely, that, if you were not told, you would not know they had ever been diseased.

The Lady, with the disease of the eye, says she has been laboring under the disease for seven or eight years, and, the greater part of the time, has had the best medical assistance in the country; but, in spite of all the efforts, the disease progressed, until she came to Dr. January.

As to the humbug, and imposition, you speak of, I was certainly *humbugged* and *imposed on*, for I was told, before I got here, that Dr. January was an *ignorant old quack*, who could not do my wife any good, and that he had killed several persons, all of which I find to be false and malicious. Indeed, his treatment has no tendency to kill, or to increase the sufferings of the patient, but directly the contrary effect, even when the patient is so much reduced, by disease, that it is impossible to save life. There is one thing that injures Dr. January very much; and that is, taking patients from feelings of sympathy, and, by their urgent request, even when he has little, or no hope, that they can be cured. In this way he has to suffer, on account of the goodness of his heart, which makes him anxious to relieve the sufferings of others, when almost any other man would turn off such cases. Of this hopeless kind of cases, I will here mention that of an old gentleman from Ohio, who

is seventy-three years of age, by the name of James Bennet, who came a week or two since, directly from under the treatment of Dr. Gilbert, of the city of New York, where he had been for five or six months, without receiving the least benefit, at the expense of *One Thousand Dollars!* He states, that Dr. Gilbert's applications gave him the most excruciating pain, and his sore was as large again, when he left Dr. Gilbert, as it was when he commenced treating his case.

When I first saw the case, and that was the next day after Dr. January commenced treating it, I thought a cure was out of the question, and that Dr. January would do himself great injury to treat such a case. The disease was located on the front, and side of the head, involving the left eye, the upper part of the nose, the skull bone eaten through both plates, the brain left exposed the size of a quarter of a dollar, and at every pulsation had the appearance of bursting out; but, to my great surprise, the old gentleman seems to be getting better, and does not complain, in the least, of the medicine. As to the character and standing of Dr. January, (from all that I can learn, after being in the place where he lives, for three months,) it is that of an *honest man*, *gentleman* and *Christian;* and he is, certainly, very pleasant and agreeable in his own house, and also in the sick room, and I not only believe in him as the "*good Samaritan*," but, until he does something worthy of stripes, I am with you, in defending him, heart and hand.

Yours respectfully,

J. E. McDOWELL.

To Dr. January.

Dear Sir:—It was with feelings of esteem, and confidence in you, as a good and worthy citizen, a man of honesty, integrity, and fair dealing; and as one engaged in a great and good cause, and in that cause eminently successful and useful, and, at the same time, basely slandered and persecuted, that I volunteered in your defence.

I am old, and grey-headed, and know that I must soon be laid by to rot; and I feel less and less interest in common matters, but more and more, in those great and important princi-

ples, which give *value* to this life, and *hope* in another. And, Sir, it is, especially, because the sacred principles of truth and justice, have been so wantonly violated, to abuse and injure you, that the following sheets have been written; and they are now submitted to your disposal, as an honest and candid expression of the views, feelings and sentiments, of

Your Friend and Fellow-Citizen,

PHILO.

P. S.—It might be supposed, by my readers, that I am a Baptist; but I am unwilling to give an impression which is not true; and I must, therefore, say, that I am, decidedly, of a different faith. P.

REVIEW, &C.

"Seize on truth wher'er 'tis found,
Among your friends, among your foes;
On Christian, or on heathen ground,
The flower's divine, wher'er it grows."

We have always felt no small amount of veneration for the great and good, in the Medical Profession.

"For such we've more than mere respect,
Whose actions show that they respect themselves."

And never did we listen to any Medical Lectures, with more unfeigned satisfaction, than Dr. Eve's. It was then a luxury to indulge the belief, that every thing he said was strictly true, and might be received without any hesitation, and save the trouble of inquiry and examination, as to its correctness. The time was when the name of Cæsar would have stood against the world. But *times* change, and *men* change with them. We have known some men to commit suicide, and others have, accidentally, fallen upon their own weapons, while making a violent effort to ruin honest men.

But we were never fond of controversy. It is unpleasant to be placed in a polemic attitude. A repugnance to controversial strife is one of the strong principles of our nature. But when we see persons violating the sacred principles of truth and justice, and the rights of man, we do not, always, feel at liberty to decline the conflict. In such a case, the subject is not a mere *personal*, or *local* matter, but it is the cause of society, of the nation, and of God; and especially when, as in the present case, a preacher of the Gospel, and the cause of the Redeemer, are involved, by false accusation. The interest of earth, in such a case, is the interest of heaven. Some

duties are not as pleasant as others, but they should not be neglected on that account.

The matter, which has occasioned these remarks, is contained in an article prepared by Dr. Eve, upon Dr. January, and published in the Nashville Medical Journal, for October, 1854, on page 332. It is an article of no common character. It is one which demands public attention, and it will have it. It is calculated, and, no doubt, intended, to find its way into the different journals of this country, and then travel in Europe, and other regions, till it makes the circuit of the world; and, in its course, it will have an opportunity to do a heavy business in the work of *defamation*.

If we make any pretensions to the dignity of men, who care anything for the cause of truth, or the great interests of society, or for the principles which give life its value, we are called upon to put this article into the *crucible of candid investigation*, and see how much of the element of truth, and how much of libelous matter, it contains.

For the sake of effect, it is commenced in a manner which reminds us of the lamentations of Jeremiah. We are first informed of the "deep regret and mortification of the Profession." But, here is the Article—Head, Body, and Extremities.

"DR. DUDLEY AND THE CANCER CURER.—THE OLD TRICK OF QUACK IMPOSTORS.

"The Profession has seen, with deep regret and mortification, the venerable and distinguished name of "DR. DUDLEY, M. D., of Lexington, Ky.," published among the references of a self-styled Cancer-Curer, in a religious newspaper of this city. We are happy to relieve all suspicion on this subject, by announcing that B. W. Dudley, over his own signature, dated Lexington, 20th August, 1854, writes: "I have received your note in regard to the Cancer Empyric, the third communication I have received from Tennessee on the same subject. *I know nothing of this man. He has no authority for using my name;* while the young physician, to whom he refers, has not, at any time, been a citizen of Lexington. My nephew, Dr. E. L. Dudley, knows the case in question *not to be cancerous*. He saw the face of the Rev. Mr. D., when it had been rendered

smooth and healthy, by abstaining from gross food, and by avoiding physical and clerical excitement, to the exclusion of all medical means, whether local or general. In this age of credulity, the enlightened and the ignorant would seem to be alike accessible to every species of ridiculous, mischievous and destructive imposture. The Statesman, Judge, Philosopher, Medical Teacher, and Physician, are found among the advocates of Mesmerism, Homœopathy, and Spirit-Rappings; we ought not, therefore, to be surprised, when a stupid Ass gains the confidence of the public as a *Cancer-Curer*."

Here, then, is another great and worthy name in the Medical Profession, used without authority for the *ad captandum* effect of deceiving the community—this, in the face of the opinion of our eminent Brother, expressed in 1850, in which he declared he had never removed a schirrous breast, but with recurrence of the disease; and that while he has kept carcinomatous action in check for years, by severe abstinence, *he had never seen it cured.*

In exposing this vile, deliberate and wilful fraud, and denouncing this gross, mercenary and meretricious imposition. on our profession, we are but in the discharge of duty; and leave to this slanderer of Honorable Medicine, and of a good name, all the glory he can create by fraud and deception upon the people. As'T. ED."

This is a bold article, and it shall be boldly handled. Let us take the bull by the horns, for he has gored the "STUPID ASS," which is much the most valuable animal of the two. Here, let us enquire, 1st. WHAT IS THE OFFENCE COMPLAINED OF? According to Dr. Eve, it was this—The name of Dr. Dudley, "*published among the references*," WAS THE OFFENCE. But in WHAT MANNER, was the "name of Dr. Dudley" "*published among the references*," in the article referred to? At the close of an article, in the paper, the name was published in the manner following:

"REFERENCES."

"Dr. Boyd, M. D., McLemoresville, Tenn.

"Dr. J. M. Fort, M. D., Missouri.

"Dr. Dudley, M. D., Lexington, Ky.

"Dr. Dillard, M. D., Lexington, Ky. (D. D., instead of M. D.)
"Warner Spindle, Fredericksburg, Va.
"Elder W. C. Buck, Columbus, Miss.
"Hon. Joel Berry, Mississippi.
"Dr. Norfleet, M. D., Port Royal, Tenn.
"Dr. Sayles, M. D., Ridgely, Mo.
"Dr. Dillard, M. D., Chicago, Ill.
"Peterson Tanner, M. D., Athens, Ala.
"J. H. Eaton, L. L. D., Murfreesboro, Tenn.
"J. R. Graves, Nashville, Tenn.
"Col. John McGee, Dalton, Ga."

But 2nd. How came Dr. Dudley's name to be "*published among the references?*" Was there *no good reason* why his name should be mentioned, as one who knew something about the matter in question? We will answer this question in a short statement, and then give our authority for the statement we shall have made. Well, now for the answer:—Elder Dillard, Doctor of Divinity, after being under the treatment of Dr. January, returned to Lexington, and when Dr. Dudley saw him, he said: "You have got rid of that pet upon your face." He took his magnifying glass, and examined it, and said it appeared to be cured, and, that a remedy, which would cure such old sores, ought to be purchased by the Government, and published to the world, for the benefit of mankind. He saw something of the *efficacy* of Dr. January's treatment, in a case with which he was well acquainted; for the man was his RELATIVE, his NEIGHBOR, his PATIENT; and the case had come under his own observation, every few weeks, for years. Here are the circumstances which caused Dr. Dudley's name to be "*published among the references,*" as one who knew something of what he was talking about, when he made the statements, just mentioned, to Elder Dillard. Dr. January expected that Dr. Dudley would express himself with common honesty and candor; and, as this was all the favor he had to ask, and as this was no more than what we have a right to expect of every honest man, without asking, Dr. January did not consult Dr. Dudley in the matter, whether he would treat him with common honesty and candor, or not. In these facts, we have a *conclusive answer* and *refutation*, of the whole article in the Journal.

But Dr. January has suffered, not a little, for his good opinion of Dr. Dudley; and what is more lamentable is, that he should have occasioned such "*deep regret* and *mortification*, in the Medical Profession," *only by presuming* that Dr. Dudley would treat him with common honesty and candor. Dr. Eve says, he is "happy to relieve all suspicion on this subject, by announcing that B. W. Dudley, over his own signature, dated Lexington, 20th August, 1854, writes: "I have received your note in regard to the Cancer Empyric. . . . . *I know nothing of this man. He has no authority for using my name.* . . . . My nephew, E. L. Dudley, knows the case in question *not to be cancerous.*" And Dr. Eve states, that Dr. Dudley says: "we ought not to be surprised, when a STUPID ASS gains the confidence of the public as a cancer-curer." But, although Dr. Eve is so "happy to relieve all suspicion on this subject," yet, how affecting to think what some members of the Medical Profession did suffer for awhile!

> "Kind souls!" you are still affected to think of it.
> "O! now you weep; and I perceive you feel
> The dint of pity. These are gracious drops.
> Good friends! Sweet friends! let me not stir you up
> To any sudden flood of mutiny."

What a pity that men should be so tender-hearted! But there is a circumstance mentioned, as an aggravation, which increases the grief. It is said that Dr. Dudley is "venerable and distinguished;" and to this we agree. Noah, who built the ark, was, also, venerable and distinguished, even beyond that of any man of the present day; but his conduct was a matter of *shame* and *grief*, to his good son Shem, and a subject of ridicule to his other sons. The cloak of charity was used to cover the nakedness of Noah, but Justice and Truth sometimes require charity to stand aside, until inquest is made.

When Dr. Dudley is speaking of Dr. January, and says: "*I know nothing of this man,*" we think the expression a very unlucky one, which might, with propriety, have been marked as a quotation from the New Testament, as the words of Peter, when they were crucifying his Lord and Master: "*I know not this man,*" said Peter.

The Savior was called a Deceiver, and an Impostor, and, as such, was crucified. And it is enough that the disciple should be as his Master, and the servant as his Lord. If they have called the Master of the house Beelzebub, how much more then they of his house-hold?" If the Savior was charged with fraud, deception and imposition, upon the people, when he was innocent, it shows that a man's innocence is not a sufficient guarantee and protection, against slander and libel of the basest kind. They "that will live Godly, shall suffer persecution." So says the Apostle; and the Savior says, to His Disciples: "If they have persecuted me, they will persecute you; if they have heard my sayings, they will hear yours also."

Again. When Dr. Dudley, in speaking of Dr. January, says: "*He has no authority for using my name*," it occurs to us that a man might have authority for using Dudley's name, even if he did not give him authority.

In this Government, *circumstances* are the foundation of authority, for using a person's name, and not the *will* of the individual.

Let us look at this subject in the light of our *civil policy*. One distinguishing feature of our Republican form of Government, is equality of rights and privileges. Through all our civil polity, each citizen has certain rights and interests invested in the other, which are mutual and reciprocal for the good of all. The most humble citizen is authorized, by the law, to refer to any other citizen, and to demand, that he be called on to testify to any matters and things, touching the question at issue, whether he is *willing* or *not* willing, and if he does not express himself honestly and candidly, it is generally the worse for him.

Because I have not authorized another to use my name, by referring to me, this does not prove that he has no *authority* for using my name; for, if he has the authority of the *circumstances*, the *facts* of the case, the *law*, and the *evidence*, he has authority enough. Each has a right to demand of the other, that he treat him honestly in all things; but this right is not always agreeable to those who are naturally tyranical, or to

those whose minds have been thrown out of a Republican balance, by the "*power of station*," and the "*pride of place*."

The mutual and reciprocal rights which we have in each other, as members of society, authorize us to demand of every man, that he treat us with common honesty and candor, in all matters, whether we consult him or not; as we have a right to demand that a man be brought into a Court of Justice to testify, without asking him whether he is *willing* to come, or what he will say, when he gets there. The principle applies, as well to testifying *out* of Court, as *in*.

Again. Let us take a candid and *common sense view* of this matter, which will bring it still closer to our business and bosoms. Let us make it our own case.—If we knew that a distinguished man had expressed himself strongly, on a matter which deeply affected us, it would be natural for us, under the pressure of circumstances, to mention that man's name, as one who knew something about the matter in dispute. Nothing would be more natural; but for any one to suppose that we did it for the purpose of *deception* and *fraud*, would be a most *un*natural supposition, and one which would only be resorted to by a person who was, himself, in an "error of position," which would not allow him to see things in their proper light, but only through a perverted vision.

But every reader of the article in the Journal meets with an expression, which leads him to enquire: What does this mean? The expression is this—"while the young physician, to whom he refers, has not, at any time, been a citizen of Lexington." This means that the Printer, by mistake, put M. D. to the name of Elder Dillard, instead of D. D., as he should have done; for the Elder is Doctor of Divinity, but not Doctor of Medicine. His name is the fourth among the references; and the reader can see the mistake printed, as it was made, by turning back to the references, which we have quoted for illustration, in this review. By this mistake, the name was supposed to refer to a son of Elder Dillard, who is a physician at Chicago, but who, according to Dr. Dudley, has not, at any time, been a citizen of Lexington. His name is also among the references: "Dr. Dillard, M. D., Chicago, Ill.;" but his father, Elder Dil-

lard, should have had D. D. put to his name, instead of M. D., and then his name would not have been mistaken for that of his son, the "young physician" mentioned.

Dr. Dudley says, that his "nephew, E. L. Dudley, knows the case in question *not to be cancerous*. Now if any body *knows* the case not to be cancerous, that settles the question, because it is impossible, for any one, to know any thing which is uncertain; for *knowledge* excludes all uncertainty.

It is said that E. L. Dudley "saw the face of the Rev. Mr. D., when it had been rendered smooth and healthy, by abstaining from gross food, and by avoiding physical and clerical excitement, to the exclusion of all medical means, whether local or general." But his condition was very different from this, as we shall presently see, for *two years previous* to the time when he came under the treatment of Dr. January. This fact will be proven, directly, by the statement of Elder Dillard himself.

We will now proceed to give our authority for the statement which we made, to show, that it was *not without good reasons*, that Dr. Dudley's name was "published among the references" mentioned. We have before us a letter written by M. Gist, to Dr. January, dated Lexington, October 17th, 1854. In this letter, Mr. Gist makes the following statement: "Now, Sir, as regards the conversation you speak of, you have not misunderstood me. I will here relate the substance of that conversation, as related to me by Elder Dillard. He said, after his return from Murfreesboro, he visited Dr. Dudley, and the Doctor observed to him: You have got rid of the pet on your face. Said Elder Dillard: I think I have. He then took his magnifying glass, and examined his face, very minutely, and pronounced him cured, saying: *that was more than the Faculty could have done for him;* that the remedy ought to be purchased, and made known to the world."

A letter written to Dr. January, by Elder Dillard, Doctor of Divinity, dated Lexington, October 23rd, 1854, reads as follows:

My Dear Brother:—Yours is received. I have this morning had a long conversation with Dr. Dudley; and he

thinks you had no right to refer to him in the manner you did, as he is opposed to that method of publishing remedies. He also told me that he had received three or more letters from Tennessee, in relation to your practice—two, at least, from Nashville, and one from Murfreesboro—the one from your town he *thinks*, was from Dr. Avant—of this he is not certain. He was somewhat excited in receiving so many letters that did not concern him. He remembers well the conversation with me on my return, and did say, after examining my eye and face with his glass, that it had the appearance of being cured. And furthermore, that if you had a remedy for cancer, and they did not return, that the Government ought to purchase it for the good of mankind. He said, this morning, that from what he had seen and heard of your medicine, whether it cured cancer or not, (the evidence of which he did possess,) nevertheless, you were doing good in curing old chronic sores; and that the Medical Profession had enough to do to remedy their own diversity of opinion and practice, too, of diseases.

As to my own case, Dr. Dudley saw me every few weeks, and did refuse to cut it out at my request. It is true, some years ago, the scab would come off, and be smooth for a few days—to this period Dr. Dudley refers, no doubt—but for two years before I came to you, when I would apply oil to the place, and the scab came off, instead of being smooth, it was covered with matter; and for a year before I came down, it was painful, and enlarged rapidly, until it had invaded the lower eye-lid, and gave me pain every time I winked my eye.

* * * * * * * * *

With sentiments of warm affection.

I am, dear Brother, yours,

R. T. DILLARD.

We will also introduce here a letter from W. D. Dillard, M. D., dated,

CHICAGO, Oct. 10th, 1854.

DEAR SIR:—I received your letter this morning, and reply immediately. As to the sore that was on my father's face, I believe it to have been a cancer. I never heard Dr. Dudley

express his opinion. He remarked to Father, that he could cut it out, and heal it over in two weeks; but that he would not do it for his right hand. From this I suppose he thought it a cancer.

I have hunted Chicago over for a cancer, but have not succeeded in finding one. I have not despaired, but will continue till I find one, &c.

Yours with respect,

W. D. DILLARD.

We are aware that some Doctors do not allow themselves to be controlled by evidence any more than the greatest tyrant on earth. They take evidence when it suits their humor, and so does he. This is true, especially, of some who stand prominent among the *Ultra* Medical party, which they call "*Honorable Medicine.*" But the better, and more honorable of the Medical Faculty, who have greatly the majority, are *Republicans*, in faith and practice. They believe in the good, old-fashioned principles of rational liberty and independence. They know, THAT IN MEDICINE, AS IN OTHER MATTERS, WE MUST BE GOVERNED BY THE ESTABLISHED LAWS OF EVIDENCE, IF WE WOULD BE REGARDED AS CANDID AND HONEST MEN, OR ESCAPE THE CONTEMPT OF THOSE WHO ARE SUCH.

The *Ultra party*, embracing the tyrants of the profession, frequently show great *contempt* for the testimony of all who are not of their *style* or *degree*, which they consider a very high degree. The testimony of others they will not receive, only when it is *with* them, and *for* them, and it suits their interest to do so. They contend for more than is meant by the Scripture, which says, that "men of *low* degree are *vanity*," and we must remind them that the same Scripture says, that "men of *high* degree are a *lie*; to be laid in the balance, they are altogether *lighter than vanity.*" But vanity and falsehood are both manifest, in the article under discussion, and as to the *degree* of its author, one thing is certain: it is *low* enough for meanness, and *high* enough to mislead and deceive the readers of the Journal. In this way, he has perpetrated a gross fraud and imposture on his readers, the Medical Profession, and the people at large. He must have considerable ambition

for "the *glory he can create, by fraud and deception upon the people.*" In this way, he has displayed some talent, "IN THE OLD TRICKS of QUACK IMPOSTORS;" and he has an abhorrence of competition, in this game, unless it suits his prejudices, or works to *his* interest, or that of his Clique. And

> The man who goes for click, click,
> With all his sense and power,
> Is like a worthless tick-tick,
> Which never keeps the hour.

Neither has much claim to our confidence, when great interests are at stake. Either can be more depended on for running at random, for lack of useful results, than for correctness.

In the light of the evidence presented, and of our discussion generally, some things are very manifest, and deserve particular notice.

1st. That "*the old tricks of quack impostors*" can be proven upon distinguished advocates of the *Ultra Policy*, who pride themselves in being prominent among the supporters of what they call "Honorable Medicine." Among these tricks, are efforts to mislead, deceive, and impose upon the people, by falsehood, misrepresentation, and false pretences, with some ignorance also.

2nd. The article in the Journal reminds us of one of the strong features of the advocates of the Ultra Policy, which is this: A GREAT READINESS TO DECIDE UPON THE MERITS OF PERSONS AND THINGS WHICH THEY KNOW NOTHING ABOUT.

Even Dr. Dudley gives his decision on the character of Dr. January, and his practice, by calling him a STUPID ASS, though he had just before said, "I KNOW NOTHING OF THIS MAN." How is it possible, for one who knows nothing about Dr. January, to decide upon the merits of his character and practice? This is one of the prominent features of "HONORABLE MEDICINE!!!"

3rd. We see that it is a suspicious circumstance, and one which causes "deep regret and mortification" in the Ultra Medical Party, when one of a different faith, or no faith at all, has the presumption to expect that one of their number will treat him with *common honesty* and *candor*, though he indulges

such expectation with feelings of "simplicity and godly sincerity," and has his "conversation honest in the sight of all men."

4th. The article in the Journal leads the reader at once to conclude, that Dr. B. W. Dudley was not acquainted with the case of Elder Dillard; but in this the reader is misled, deceived, and imposed upon; for Elder Dillard was Dudley's relative, his neighbor, his patient, whose case was frequently seen, and well known, and understood, by B. W. Dudley, who says: "my nephew, E. L. Dudley, knows the case in question not to be cancerous. He saw the face of the Rev. Mr. D., when it had been rendered smooth and healthy, by abstaining from gross food, and by avoiding physical and clerical excitement, to the exclusion of all medical means, whether local or general."

5th. It is certain that no person can fail to get a *wrong* view of the subject, from the article in the Journal, without any glimpse of a *right* view. This can be seen by any candid, intelligent reader, who will examine it carefully. The reader who depends upon it for information, in this matter, is certain to be misled and deceived, by Dr. Eve's effort at fraud, deception, and imposition. No fact in theory, or practice, can be made more evident. Here we have demonstration.

6th. In the light of our subject, we see the reason why, "In this age of credulity, the enlightened and ignorant would seem to be alike accessible to every species of ridiculous, mischievous, and destructive imposture." It is because they are misled, deceived, and imposed upon, by the editors of *some* Medical Journals, on whom they depend, as reliable men.

7th. If "an honest man is the noblest work of God," we see, in the light of our subject, that a man may be in worse company, than to be among the *honest* "advocates of Mesmerism, Homœopathy, and Spirit-Rappings;" and, especially, whenever he happens to be in close, fraternal union with those who are willing, for self-interest, or for the interest of party, to bear false witness against their neighbor.

8th. As the Jack Ass feature of the article in the Journal, is a matter of so much *taste* and high flavor, of the magnolia style, we must take another look at it before we pass on. Dr.

Dudley says: "We ought not, therefore, to be surprised, when a stupid ass gains the confidence of the public as a *cancer-curer.*" But, in speaking of the effect of Dr. January's treatment upon Elder Dillard's face, Dr. D. said, "It was more than the Faculty could have done for him." Here, it is evident, from Dr. Dudley's own showing, that *the Faculty had been beaten by an ass*; and that, not one of common sprightliness, but even by a "STUPID ASS." This reminds us, that we have frequently noticed, and, especially, of late, that when some Doctors make a special effort to degrade a man, they compare him to a long-eared animal; but we were not so well aware what was the occasion of their antipathy to the long-eared fraternity, till we were informed of the singular circumstance, that the Medical Profession had been beaten by an ass, and even by a stupid ass. We ought, however, to remember, that there is one subject on which the knowledge of the ass is equal, if not superior, to that of any being which walks the earth, and that is this: *he knows when he hears braying.*

9th. Here let us notice a remark made by Dr. Eve, which is this: "here, then, is another great and worthy name in the Medical Profession, used, without authority, for the *ad captandum* effect of deceiving the community." Now, Dr. Eve has used the name of Dr. Dudley in such a manner, as to lead his readers to believe, that when Dudley's name was "*published among the references,*" there was no reason for doing so, only a desire "*of deceiving the community*;" but in doing this, Dr. Eve, and not Dr. January, produces the effect of "deceiving the commuuity," by the fraud of imposing upon them falsehood for truth; for there were *good and sufficient reasons* for referring to Dr. Dudley, as we have already seen, in the testimony of competent and credible witnesses; and the *supposition*, that it was done to *deceive the community*, must have originated in a bad state of feeling, very different, we would suppose, from that charity which "worketh no ill to his neighbor."

How Dr. Eve came to omit adding the word *vulgus* to his "*ad captandum,*" we do not know, when men of his faith are so partial to the word; but we presume the *ad captandum effect* will not be *ad deliquium animi.* Such, indeed, may be the effect upon some, but not upon the community.

Dr. Eve seems to be affected to think, that a person should have the presumption to intimate, that Dr. Dudley would speak favorably of a course of treatment which is *successful*, where his has *failed*. But why should he not, if he is a man of a liberal mind and benevolent heart? Has the hot fat of *party* fried up his benevolence to a crackling? But it shocks Dr. Eve to think of the intimation just mentioned, because it is "in the face of the opinion of his eminent Brother, expressed in 1850." And what if it is? We know Doctors who are good men and true, who look back to their opinions and practice, in former years with a feeling of mortification at their own greenness and want of candor, in not admitting evidence in favor of important improvements, the value of which are now beyond dispute.

Further:—Suppose Dr. Dudley "had never removed a scirrhous breast but with recurrence of the disease?" Must the same want of success always attend the efforts of every body else? If there is any truth in philosophy, different causes produce different effects, and different methods of treatment must be followed with different results. Suppose Dr. Dudley found "*severe abstinence*" the best means of relief in cancerous affections? Must we take this circumstance for proof that no other means of importance can possibly be known to any body else?

Again:—Suppose Dr. Dudley *had* never seen a cancer cured? Does this prove that nobody else ever saw a case cured? Such an argument would be a good one, if Dr. Dudley possessed omniscience, but if he does not know *every* thing, others may know some things which he does not know, and some things may have taken place which he has never seen. The suggestion made by Dr. Eve, seems to be intended for an argument, but it does not seem like sound philosophy, though Doctors ought to be philosophical men. If *one* cause, or a *half-dozen*, cannot produce a certain result, this does not prove that the result desired, may not be produced by *other* causes. The person who knows only the causes which are *un*successful, is not qualified to decide on the efficacy of those causes of which he knows nothing.

According to the ground occupied by some distinguished medical men, in relation to Cancer, the *decisive* part of the diagnosis cannot be made out, till about the time of the patient's death; for, if he is cured, they decide against their own former opinion, that the disease was not cancer. This reminds us of a method which was adopted, in former times, for the trial of witches. They were thrown into the water, and if they swam, they were *guilty*, but if they sunk and drowned, they were *innocent*. Proof of innocence could only be obtained by their death. What a change in the condition of society, and in jurisprudence, when that which used to be required as proof of innocence, is now the highest penalty known to the law, for the worst of crimes, which have been proved, conclusively, before hand.

Dr. Eve evidently takes the ground, that we ought to believe that a cancer is *never cured*, because Dr. Dudley has *never seen it done*. Now, it would not be strange, if men of this faith were sometimes left behind, when the car of improvement starts, for it cannot wait for them, in the crowd of business, which urges its headway in these days of invention and discovery. The good old Dutchman believed that traveling on horse-back, or in something drawn by a horse, was the fastest way of traveling, because he had never seen any faster; and when his neighbor showed him a rail-road car, to convince him of his error, he said that was not traveling at all, it was flying; and he did not believe in such new improvements; he liked the old way the best yet. But still, the car rolls ahead, doing a good business, and leaves the Dutchman behind, with his eyes and mouth both upon the stretch, in amazement, but still an unbeliever in rail-roads.

Dr. Eve evidently seems to think that we ought to pin our faith to Dr. Dudley's sleeve,

> Until it gives way,
> By natural decay,

or the opinion is worn out, by friction with society;

> Which may be far sooner
> Than some men suppose,
> Who only believe us
> When led by the nose.

We have often heard the exclamation, what can be the matter with Dr. Eve? It really seems as if his head must have been turned, by some means. We have supposed it possible, that he may have been engaged in a *dance of Fairies*, of which things are related as wonderful as the ancient stories of men being rode by witches. A fairy dance, of this sort, is reported by a distinguished medical friend and associate of Dr. Eve's, who tells us that the occasion was one of *all absorbing* interest. In indulging the thought that Dr. Eve may have been affected by such an occasion, we are not only justified by the symptoms of his case, but, also, by having understood that it is generally believed, that he was with the principal editor of the Journal in the "QUACK FESTIVAL," and the bewildering evolutions of the mazy dance of that joyous night. And this is not all; Dr. B., who was the poet of the occasion, and the reporter of the proceedings of that festival, refers to *some* "*Regular*" present on the occasion, who was so affected by the surprising feats of the Fairies, that he became too giddy to stand upon his feet. The poet says:

"A Regular came to view
The wondrous capers of a kept Yahoo,
And he fell prostrate in a fit!"
Choaked and strangled, by one *agile* "*Bet*."

And the poet gives a trait of the Regular's character, in these words:

"Prone, like the crawfish, in the dirty dance,
Downward to climb, and backward to advance."
"Go it ye cripples, while you're young," some cried,
"And go it boots," their quackish lord replied,
"His neck-tie off, his collar open wide,
And sweat and whiskey oozing from his hide.
E'en old Baba shook his sides with glee,
At quackish efforts at dexterity."

In view of these circumstances, we must be excused for believing that Dr. Eve might have been brought under the influence of that Fairy,

Who mounts aloft, and lights upon the head and sits,
And whirls it round, and throws one into fits.
Next comes "*gyrations*," which we can't explain,
As our poet did in case of Poll McLean.
Some things were said which we cannot repeat,
Cause food, *once eaten*, will not do to eat.

While we are disposed to commend the report as an able one, we are aware that some ladies and gentlemen of refinement think it is not, exactly, in good taste; but it certainly displays a great ability in *rhyming* well, on a very difficult subject, and in the use of materials which have as little harmony and symphony as a fight, in which a cat is depended upon for the treble, a dog for the bass, and a panther is thrown in to strike the counter. And, indeed, we are not alone in having something to say in praise of the report, for we are told that the reporter was congratulated on his performance by one of the Professors, who is a Presbyterian Preacher.

It is true, we were not so well pleased with the idea that the reporter should undertake to pass upon us, at the highest price, certain articles, as luxuries, after having gone through the process of digestion, and been deprived of their nutricious properties, and strongly impregnated with carburetted and sulphuretted hydrogen gas; because such articles usually pass off *below* par.

To tell the honest truth, we attach great value to the report of the Festival, for the same reason that some people value Cuttle fishbones, who use them for Canary birds to sharpen their bills on. We use the report as a *bill-sharpener*, whenever we are obliged to do an extra job of pecking, in a good cause.

When we saw a package in Dr. Wells' drug store, marked "*Cuttle Fish bones*," and inquired of Mr. Porter what use he had for them, and he told us they were used for Canary birds to sharpen their bills on, we then inquired what he did for the people when their bills needed sharpening, and he said "he gave them Dr. Arnold's Union Pills." And from experience in our own case, and with others, we know them to be a most excellent pill; and when we feel a sort of torpor of the liver, or of the system generally, or stupefied, and unfit for a mental effort, and we wish to sharpen up, we not only take a little of the *secret preparation* called the "Quack Festival," but we also occasionally take a *Union Pill*, which seems to bring on a more supple and oily condition of the system, and helps our mental operations, and gives us a chance, if we *ever have* any,

To hope for "wit and fancy then,
In the effusions of the pen;"
Also a chance to take a turn
"In thoughts that breathe and words that burn."

In this way we are frequently assisted in calling to remembrance such thoughts which have come from others, if we cannot originate them ourself.

But in speaking of the conduct of Dr. Eve as being unaccountable, in a man of his station, we are reminded, that we have not yet mentioned the *worst feature* of his conduct in this affair, for the *sealing*, *crowning* act, which caps the climax of the whole, is yet to be named.

Dr. January wrote him a candid and respectful letter, presenting evidence to show Dr. Eve that he had greatly injured him, and that *most unjustly*, and, as a matter of justice, he asked Dr. Eve if he would give the letter a place in the Medical Journal. But Dr. January received no answer, and it was difficult to get any one to call on Dr. Eve to know about the matter, and return an answer. This small favor was finally requested of Prof. Winston, and he attended to it, and answered Dr. January as follows.

NASHVILLE, Nov. 14, 1854.

BRO. JANUARY:—Your letter came duly to hand. As soon as I had opportunity, I read it to Prof. Eve. He instructed me to say to you, that he could hold no communication with a man who was engaged in humbugging the people, by the irregular practice of medicine.

Yours, truly,
CHAS. K. WINSTON.

Here is a tall figure, beyond the stature of "Goliah of Gath, who defied the armies of the living God!" Here is lofty travelling, and tremendous strides!

"Sink down, ye mountains, and ye vallies rise!
With heads *declined*, ye *cedars* homage pay;
Be smoothe, ye rocks. ye rapid floods give way!"
The DOCTOR comes! by more than "bards foretold:
Hear him, ye deaf! and all ye blind behold!"

He tells you, that after he has made an effort to ruin a man, even if he has proof of his innocence, he will not condescend to an effort for his relief!!

He could notice Dr. January to *injure him greatly*, but he informs you that he could not condescend to notice him, to *repair that injury*. What magnanimity! What lofty conceptions! What elevation of sentiment and feeling! What a specimen of *honor*, from a distinguished advocate of "*honorable medicine*!" This leaves behind, and throws into the shade, the description given by an Arab, of a giant among the pyramids of Egypt, who could walk over tree tops, as a mere circumstance, without hardly knowing there was any brush in his way. The tallest pyramid, according to Morse, is five hundred and ninety-nine feet in height; and the Arab says: "A giant stood behind the highest pyramid of Egypt, looking over its top, towards the river. He had been to the city of Alexander, and came from the utmost springs of the Nile. His shoes were of wood; they had formerly been two large canoes; he had one of them on each foot, which it completely fitted and filled. His walking cane was the mast of a seventy-four gun ship, which he had hauled on shore from the harbor of Alexandria, and then pulled out. His course from the pyramid, was toward the Nile, which he seemed inclined to cross. I doubted whether he would wade, or swim, or sail the river; but he did neither: he jumped over from the eastern to the western shore, at a single bound, but split his shoes by the leap."

As we have remarked, Dr. Eve could notice Dr. January to *injure* him, but he was entirely above noticing him to *repair that injury*. The one was a mean act, but the other would be highly honorable, in *any* man, and besides, it was an act which justice imperiously demanded. But he could not stoop to so honorable a deed.

As to malice, in case of libel, the law is, that "malice is to be presumed, until the contrary be proved." In this case, the malice which the law *presumes*, in the absence of proof, Dr. Eve has proved by his *own act*, after time for reflection, and evidence of his own error. This is the more strange, as it comes from one who exults in his own course, as that of "*honorable medicine!*" How true is the expression of the poet:

"Honor's a puff of noisy breath,
Yet men expose their blood,
And venture everlasting death,
To gain this airy good."

A man may readily be fooled by the word "*honorable*," for *honor* is not always of the right kind, if the proverb is true, which says "There is honor among thieves." Now, here is a proposition, which is as plain as any in the whole science of mathematics; it is this: that any man is a mean man, who can notice another to *injure him*, but will not try to repair the injury he has done. To the truth of this proposition, heaven and earth will testify, now, henceforth and forever. The proposition is supported by the immutable principles of justice, and by the universal sentiments of mankind, both christian and heathen. Can any man, who is so far above doing *right* in such a case, and so willing to do *wrong*, be an honor to a cause which is respectable? He may be an honor to what is (falsely) called "*houorable medicine*," but he would not be to *right* honorable medicine. There are greater and better men to be found, and more of them, than what are embraced under the deceptive appellation of "*honorable medicine*." The *right* honorable class will not take advantage of ignorance, to impose upon persons by false pretences, and flagrant misrepresentations as was done in the article in the Nashville Medical Journal. What strikes us most forcibly is, that Dr. Eve should hold himself above noticing Dr. January, even after he had done January the injury of filching his good name (as Shakspeare calls it), which is considered worse than stealing a man's purse, and had done all this by communication, such as was called for to *repair* the injury.

It was only the height and imaginary greatness, and the tall walking and striding of the giant, among the pyramids of Egypt, which caused him to be brought to our recollection by the subject on hand. It is not intimated that he trampled upon the rights of any one, in obtaining his walking cane and his shoes; and if he had, it would be considered that there was something so majestic in his conduct, that he should not be tried by the rules of common men; for the robes of majesty have always been considered a good excuse for meanness, and

it is well known that they cover "a multitude of sins." Anywhere within the reach of the giant's walking cane, it would be difficult to get a jury to decide the case against him, or even a lawyer to prosecute. It would perhaps occur to them, that they might not have an opportunity, or even occasion, to make the same inquiry in their own case, that a certain man did in the case of his dog. He was extremely vexed with his neighbor for striking his dog with the big end of his cane, when he came to bite him, and, says he, why did'nt you strike the dog with the other end of the cane? Yes, says the neighbor, and why didn't he come at me 'tother end first?

Dr. Eve has given Dr. January the benefit of both ends, by biting and kicking at the same time; and he would not have given any better view of the wrong end of the subject, or himself, if he had come "'tother end first." And what is his excuse? "He could hold no communication with a man who was engaged in *humbugging the people* by the irregular practice of medicine." But what is the meaning of the word *humbug?* According to Webster, it means "*to deceive, to impose on.*"

Now, we wish we had time and space here, to discuss the subject of "humbugging," but we have not; and we will therefore give somebody a chance to profit by our want of time and space. We have deposited with Joseph W. Nelson, of Murfreesboro, a ten dollar gold piece, to be awarded as a premium, to any one who can show a more *decided effort* at humbugging, and at the same time more *base*, and unlawful, and injurious, and where the meaning intended, as understood, is more evidently false than efforts which can be shown in the Nashville Medical Journal.

But, in justice to Dr. Eve, we ought to observe that there is a very important distinction, of which we are reminded by noticing his language, and that is, the difference between those in what he calls the *regular practice*, and those who are *not*, about holding communication with them. He does not say he could hold no communication with those in the *regular practice*, who are engaged in humbugging the people; but those who are doing so by the irregular practice of medicine. Now, in

relation to some, in what Dr. Eve calls the *irregular* practice, who are engaged in humbugging the people, we know that Dr. Eve holds communication with them; and we will take no offence if one of Dr. Eve's regulars turns upon us, in the language we have used, and says, we have deposited a ten dollar gold piece, to be awarded as a premium to any one who can show, from the Nashville Medical Journal, a more decided effort at humbugging, and at the same time more base, and unlawful, and injurious; and where the meaning intended, as understood, is more evidently false than any he can show, which has been made since the Nashville Journal was established, by any one who ever passes for a useful man in practice, in the neighborhood where he lives. And those who are in the regular practice according to the rules, by-laws and regulations advocated by Dr. Eve, are not more than one-eighth of the medical men in the Union who have a fair medical education, or enough to be respected as physicians. So that our competitor, in this case, for a premium, would have a much larger field for gathering his materials, than the one to which we have limited ourself, which is to *one* Journal, of the small Ultra Party. According to the ultra policy of the Ultra Party, if a doctor prescribes Bull's Sarsaparilla, or McLean's Vermifuge, or Carpenter's fluid extract of Sarsaparilla, or Gray's Ointment, or any secret or patent remedy, it is decided that the doctor so prescribing, and so transgressing, is not a regular, but should be called a quack, and be denounced as infamous, and "unfit for companionship in a *liberal* profession." And such doctors must not expect Dr. Eve to hold communication with them, without transgressing his own rules, or the rules of the American Medical Association. But those in what Dr. Eve calls the regular practice, may humbug as much as they please, without any fear that he will not hold communication with them on that account.

But as Dr. Eve considers Dr. January's offence against Dr. Dudley and the medical profession, such a great one, and, as he would have us believe, it comes so near being an unpardonable sin, we must recur to it again.

Although the facts of the case, as already recited, without argument, are a conclusive answer and refutation of the whole

article in the Journal, yet this is no reason why we should not mention *other facts*, which, of themselves, make a complete defence, independent of the one already made.

It will be recollected, that among the names referred to under the head of "references," as persons who knew something of the efficacy of Dr. January's treatment of sores, and the third name in the list, was found "the name of the venerable and distinguished Dr. Dudley, of Lexington, Ky." His name was undoubtedly "published among the references;" but *who introduced it into the list?* Dr. January has a friend on whom he depended to publish the article, which had the references attached to it, and he knew *good and sufficient reasons*, as he thought, why Dudley's name should be published among the references, and he (Mr. Graves) introduced it and published it accordingly; and we understand that Dr. January did not notice the circumstance till sometime afterwards; and he (Dr. J.) had Dudley's name *taken out* from among the references. Here, then, take notice, is what Dr. January had to do with Dudley's name "*among the references*"—He had it taken out of the list. This defence is sufficient of itself, if we had no *other*, and the other is sufficient without *this*. Each is sufficient *separately*, and *independent* of the other.

And, besides, here is another consideration worthy of notice: that, in publishing the other names in the list, under the head of *references*, he did not ask of the persons referred to the favor of using their names; but referred to them under the authority of the circumstances and facts of the case. It is derogatory to the character of a gentleman, for us to presume that he will not treat us with common honesty and candor; and if this is all the favor we have to ask, we need not consult him, except we choose, unless we doubt his integrity. If the course of Dr. January was not so *fashionable*, it was *honest*, and he is one of olden times, who is governed more by *honesty* than by *fashion*, who often amuses herself by manufacturing libels upon truth and soberness.

Dr. Eve's article involves Dr. Dudley in a *dilemma*, in this way: If Dr. Dudley's statement was *true*, when he said "*I know nothing of this man*," then, in calling "this man" a

STUPID ASS, he was giving his decision on character and practice, which he knew nothing about; and a man who decides on matters in *utter ignorance*, is not to be depended on; and if the statement, "*I know nothing of this man*," is *not* true, of course the man who made the statement is not to be depended upon.

> "A strong *dilemma*, in a desperate case!
> To act with infamy, or quit the place."

We know that Dr. Eve can take his choice, which *horn* of the dilemma he will swing to, but then he is in danger of being *gored* with both, because he has virtually reaffirmed every thing in his article against January, and taken the responsibility of the whole effect, which the whole article is calculated to produce, while it misleads, deceives, and imposes upon the readers of the Journal, and the people at large. The danger to Dr. Eve, and the responsibility we speak of, cannot be separated from his own act, when, with evidence of his error, and time for reflection, he refused to do any thing to *repair* the injury he had done.

Here is conclusive evidence against Dr. Eve, of what he calls "vile, deliberate, and wilful fraud, without authority, for the *ad captandum* effect of deceiving the community;" and "this in the face of " good and sufficient evidence, which declares that Dr. January is innocent in the matter, and that he is greatly and most unjustly injured, by a false, wilful and malicious libel. "In exposing this vile, deliberate and wilful fraud, and denouncing this gross, mercenary and meritricious imposition on our profession, we are but in the discharge of duty; and leave to this slanderer of Honorable Medicine and of a good name all the glory he can create by fraud and deception upon the people."

Here a friend reminds us of one portion of our text, to which we ought to invite more particular attention. It is that which tells us, that E. L. Dudley saw the face of the Rev. Mr. D. when it had been rendered *smoothe and healthy* by abstaining from *gross food*, and by avoiding *excitement*. Here is one great feature of sublimity—*great effects* from *simple causes*, which great men always contemplate with wonder and

admiration. To make a *diseased* part both "*smoothe* and *healthy*," without *medicine*, would seem like "the consummation most devoutly to be wished"—the *summum bonum* —the *ultimatum* of desire—but it may lessen our admiration of the great achievement, and sprinkle the dust of our enthusiasm a little, if we find the *great effects*, from causes so simple, only lasted "*a few days*;" but this is a mere circumstance; only a few dew drops upon the wings of our imagination, in comparison of another fact, close by, which strikes us in such a manner as to bring us down flat-footed, on the *terra firma* of sober reflection, while it stimulates the inquiry, what could be the object in view? We will catch up with this fact directly. The reader of the article in the Journal concludes at once, that he knows something about the condition of Elder Dillard's face, when he came under the treatment of Dr. January, because the article is the work of distinguished men, on whom he can *depend*; and the reader is surprised, when we tell him that the article gives him no information about the condition of the patient, *when he came under the treatment of Dr. January*; but it refers to his condition *two years before* he came to January. Hear Elder Dillard on this point: "It is true, some *years* ago the scab would come off, and be smooth for *a few days*; to this period Dr. Dudley refers, no doubt—but for *two years* before I came to you, when I would apply oil to the place and the scab came off, instead of being *smooth*, it was covered with matter; and for *a year* before I came down it was *painful* and *enlarged rapidly*, until it had invaded the lower eyelid, and gave me pain every time I winked my eye.

Now if there is a new method of reasoning, or a new style, by which we can prove the condition of a patient at a certain time, by a little information about his condition *two years before* that time, it would be highly interesting to some to be made acquainted with it; for in this way we could prove that persons are not diseased at all, when there seemed to be occular demonstration of the fact that disease was upon them. In this way we could directly use up a man, who wished to make capital by performing cures. We saw a cancer the

other day, as large as a man's fist; but the side of the face where the cancer is, was "*smoothe and healthy*" one year ago. Now, to make the case appear a small matter, and to prevent a person from making any reputation by curing it, we could say that Dr. Maxey, of Kentucky, says that one year ago, the patient, his father, enjoyed fine health, and complained of nothing.

But what could have been the object of such an effort as that of Dr. Eve and Dr. Dudley? They knew it was considered important, that information should be given by persons on whom we could depend; and it was not expected that their statement would be called in question; and hence, if they would abuse the confidence we reposed in them, the occasion gave them a good opportunity to *mislead* and *deceive* their readers.

It is suggested, among other reasons for their effort, that they would rather spend a few minutes in the operation of removing a tumor, if the fee was only *two or three hundred dollars*, than to have the job fall into the hands of other persons; and they are equally willing to take hold when the fee is *five hundred* or a *thousand dollars*. And would they not rather have a patient die of a disease which they cannot manage, than to be cured by the treatment of Dr. January? Patients believe they would, and so do others. But who could have believed, without occular demonstration, that Dr. Eve and Dr. Dudley would have co-operated, in such an *ingenious effort* at "*imposture*," "*by fraud and deception upon the people*."

It was a decided effort to throw dust in the eyes of the people, when Dr. Eve called Dr. January "*a self-styled cancer curer*," because there are men as worthy, as talented, and as reliable as Dr. Eve, who believe "that Dr. January cures sores or tumors, such as the medical profession have always called cancer or scirrhous affections, and such as cannot be cured by any course of treatment laid down in medical books, and that *frequently*, but not *always*;" and they speak of him, in this matter, with respect and confidence. As to the evidence which has won their respect and confidence, and that of others, we have neither *time* nor *space* for its consideration here;

neither was it contemplated as a distinct object of this Review; and we cannot, therefore, at this time, go into the proof that Dr. January has cured cancers. We will, however, mention one case, among the number, which has some effect in giving us faith in his treatment.

Prof. Watson, of the Nashville Medical School, is a gentleman in whose opinion, on the character of a sore or tumor, we have *twice* as much confidence as in our own opinion, and *as* much as we should have in the opinion of Dr. Eve or Dr. Dudley. And here, take notice! Dr. Watson had every opportunity to know what was the matter with the face of Mr. Jones, of Rutherford county, for he was *Deacon* of the church of which Dr. Watson was *Pastor*. He conversed freely and frequently with his deacon, about his case; and Dr. Watson, without any hesitation, pronounced it *a case of cancer*, and told deacon Jones to *let it alone*, and *not doctor it*, if he did it would kill him. Now we believe it was a case of cancer, because Dr. Watson said it was; and we also believe that Dr. January cured the case, because deacon Jones says so, and Dr. January says the same, and the cure was effected a *year and a half since*, and every appearance, at the present time, is favorable to the opinion here expressed. We are aware that neither Dr. Watson nor Deacon Jones has authorized us, particularly, to use their names; but still, we have authority for so doing, because we have the authority of the circumstances and facts of the case, as given us by those who cannot easily be mistaken in a matter so plain. We do not wish, or expect, to have Dr. Watson *force* upon our recollection those memorable lines of the poet:

> "Prone, like the crawfish, in the dirty dance,
> Downward to climb, and backward to advance."

Nothing is more important for society, than a healthy and virtuous public sentiment; but that is not such a sentiment, which will sustain a man in bearing false witness against his neighbor, or in raising a false report, or in putting his hand with the wicked to be an unrighteous witness.

We know it is possible for some to consider their position so elevated, as to be almost out of danger from public feeling;

and all the considerations presented in this review, may be passed over as matters of little consequence. We know, also, that some men discover more courage than discretion, by indications of defiance to heaven and earth. But how presumptuous is the man who stands upon a plank, on the surface of the mighty deep, and bids defiance to Him "who hath measured the waters in the hollow of His hand," and "who hath gathered the winds in his fist!" And so, also, is the man presumptuous, under our government, who claims her protection and privileges, and, at the same time, bids defiance to the power of public sentiment and feeling, the laws of our country, the rights of her citizens, the laws of God, and the requirements of his word; for, in such a case, the ocean of public feeling is sure to heave from its very bed, and rise into mountain waves, like the sea under the power of a tempest, which is lashing it with all its fury.

In conclusion, we cannot help adverting to the bearing of this subject upon the cause of religion. When the good man falls, or it is believed he has fallen, and especially if he is a preacher of the Gospel, the infidel rejoices, and the enemies of religion reproach and blaspheme. The Savior is wounded in the house of his friends, and they weep for his cause. By the efforts made against Dr. January, one division of "the sacramental host of God's elect" has been clothed in sackcloth, and called upon to sit in ashes. It is the time of their tribulation, but the day of their deliverance is at hand. Weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning.

If any one feels like complaining of the bold and decided language of this review, we only ask him, as a candid and honest man, to consider well the merits of the case, and not to forget the great importance of the principles which are violated in every case of false, wilful and malicious libel. These principles have an importance which is vastly greater than the personal consequence of Dr. Eve, or any other man. The great interests of society, and the peace and prosperity of the nation, are at stake. Such a subject should, therefore, be discussed without any check or control from fear, favor, or affection, except what is consistent with the demands of truth

and justice, and the great interests involved. We know of nothing more important for ourself or others, in this life, than to be governed by our convictions of duty, according to the light we enjoy. Our opportunities for knowledge, distinction and influence, differ like the localities of our residence. Some are more elevated, splendid and imposing, while others are more retired, humble and obscure. Our own residence is where the early rays of the sun have to struggle hard and long to penetrate the foliage, before they can reach us in the morning, and in the evening their communication is shut off before the time. But some are more highly favored. They occupy a position where they are greeted with the earliest smiles of the god of day, and the benedictions of his countenance linger, to prolong the blessing, when he retires to rest. But with us, the distinctions of merit, and the sublimity of elevated character, are not a subject of *envy*, but of *admiration*. Yet we have no right to sell indulgences, by a sacrifice of the public good. Let great men feel the importance of good behavior, as well as small ones; and when they transgress, let them be called to order; and if they are obstinate, let them be compelled to behave, or like others, suffer the consequences.

As Dr. Eve has given us his *example* for using the strongest language, in denouncing a man when he is *innocent* of the vices charged, how strongly does such authority plead for denouncing Dr. Eve, when his *guilt is proved* beyond mistake. In this way we have the judgment of Dr. Eve *against himself*, and in *favor* of our review.

What accommodation can it be to us, or gratification to our feelings, to have one so outrage the principles of truth and justice, and the rights of man, as to make us feel compelled to undertake the defence, and at the close, to remind us of the words of Pitt, when remonstrating against a wicked policy, he said that his strength would not permit him to say more, but his indignation would not suffer him to say less.