

Reply to Dr. J. Dickson Smith's pamphlet on "Lobeliaism" / by M.S. Thomson.

Contributors

Thomson, M. S.
Smith, J. Dickson.
National Library of Medicine (U.S.)

Publication/Creation

Macon, Ga. : Telegraph Steam Printing House, 1860.

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/xt3fbxtr>

License and attribution

This material has been provided by This material has been provided by the National Library of Medicine (U.S.), through the Medical Heritage Library. The original may be consulted at the National Library of Medicine (U.S.) where the originals may be consulted.

This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection
183 Euston Road
London NW1 2BE UK
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722
E library@wellcomecollection.org
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

Thomson M. S.

REPLY

TO

DR. J. DICKSON SMITH'S PAMPHLET

ON

“LOBELIAISM,”

BY

M. S. THOMSON, M. D.,

*Prof. of Obstetrics, Diseases of Women and Children, Therapeutics and Materia Medica in the
Reform Medical College of Georgia.*



MACON, GEORGIA.

TELEGRAPH STEAM PRINTING HOUSE.

1860.





REPLY

TO THE CHARGES MADE BY J. DICKSON SMITH, M. D. IN HIS RECENT PAMPHLET

ON LOBELIAISM,

BY M. S. THOMSON, M. D.,

*Prof. of Obstetrics, Diseases of Women and Children, Therapeutics and Materia Medica in the
Reform Medical College of Georgia.*

WHEN J. Dickson Smith, M. D., of Macon, Georgia, undertook the correction of abuses and the eradication of errors as wolfish intruders from his own "borders", we wished him God speed, and, after correcting his statement with regard to us, tried to help him, because we considered that much good might be done by discussing before the public in a fair spirit the doctrines upon which Allopathy is founded, as well as some of the practices to which a belief in those doctrines gives rise, and which it seemed to be the the doctor's object to expose.

In this "labor of love" on his part it seems he did not wish assistance, so, no sooner did we interfere, than like the wife who was scratching her husband's face, he turned on us, and has done his best to leave the marks of his talons on our countenance, and it must be said that the effort has assumed not a few of the feminine characteristics that are usually exhibited in such a contest. The boasted "ventilation" of Thomsonism was a tremendous effort to destroy our comeliness, and but for the readiness with which it was in our power to turn aside the uplifted and outstretched *claws*, might have resulted in rendering us "*hard featured*" for life. Having satisfied ourself, however, with merely parrying the *wifely* attack, while planting a few well directed and vigorous blows upon the frontispiece of the spouse, we left them to make up their differences as best they could, and awaited with placidity the conjoint result of further cogitations—and here we have it, *womanish* to the last. Another pamphlet has appeared, in which the original Controversy is abandoned, and all the positions so vauntingly assumed, are surrendered at discretion, for hard knocks don't suit some stomachs—because they produce "*nausea*"—and hence nothing is now attempted by force of argument, every thing by length of tongue. Strength of argument gives way to strength of expression, and invective takes the place of cogency of reasoning; hence we have been well scolded, and called almost every thing but a gentleman, in the last pamphlet of Dr. Smith, so that it almost seems that it requires for the proper "Vindication" of *his* articles an extraordinary proportion of vindictiveness. The temper and the tears, the stamping of the foot and the spitefulness of expression are all present, and the impotence that can think of

nothing else, breaks out in "I'll tell"! "I'll tell"! and bursts forth in an *exposure* of all the secrets that are known! Happy is he who has nothing to fear from such exposure, thrice happy he who can keep his temper, and clad in the panoply of truth, smile at the "envenomed darts" that are hurled against him, knowing as he does that they are pointless as regards himself, and therefore fall harmlessly at his feet! This is exactly the condition in which we find ourself, as can be very easily shown, but it gives us no pleasure to dwell upon such subjects; we desire to "ventilate" the systems, not the men who advocate them, and hence would do almost anything rather than quote even the Doctor's own words where they fit pointedly in his own case; and although he complains of our seeking "fresh pretexts" for attacks "*personal* upon himself" in the articles we have already written, we beg to assure him that in this he is mistaken—we have sought no such opportunity; for it has been our especial wish that the controversy should be conducted in a *friendly* spirit, with a view to the elucidation of truth, for the benefit of science as well as that of the community in which we live, and of others who might take an interest in the questions, *pro* and *con*, as they may have been presented.

This, however, is not the phase or shape in which Dr. Smith wishes the controversy to progress; the *personal* gives character to all his writings, so much so, that when we would have smoothed over the attack he made upon his own brethren and turned the edge of his invective towards the system they had espoused, we were taken sharply to task, and reminded with some sternness it was the *persons*, not the system, that were subjected to his cutting criticisms. From his treatment, therefore, of them, *we* had no right to expect immunity from like attacks, and have not been at all disappointed; though we have not the slightest wish to complain; ours is not a whining disposition, thank Heaven, but we are tenacious as to our positions, sensitive as to character, and perhaps "exquisitely sensitive" on the subject of unwarranted attacks upon the practice we have adopted; and however much more it might be to our credit to pursue the Christian method of turning the other cheek, we yet own to too much of the Scottish leaven for that, and hence the motto of "*Nemo me impune lacessit*," has generally been carried out by us in practice, and those who have "wantonly assailed" us, "without provocation," have had to look out for their own positions, and if the files of the *Macon* papers "attest" any thing in regard to this matter, it is, that those who go shearing sometimes return shorn, and those who go plucking should be careful of their own feathers; and also, that those who attempt to run us down, should mind their own boat; but so "quiet and unobtrusive" are we generally, that unless some such attempt is made, the "little-st apple" of them all may "swim" beside us unquestioned even as to its seeming, and may revel in all such enjoyments as "little apples" may, if it only knows its

place, and keeps clear of the weather-side of our "sensitive" olfactories; and so, also, might Dr Smith, for it has been our desire to say as little of him as possible, nor shall we now do more than *quote* him upon himself, dose him with his own pills, and then—treat him as he does disease or that celebrated "flea"—let him "go."

As a specimen of what may be done in this way, it is only necessary to transpose and substitute a few words of the first paragraph of his late pamphlet, when it is presumed, but few "readers of recent pamphlets" will fail to see the exactness of the fit as well as the head it applies to, thus: A pompous Practitioner of Allopathy,—which was "inaugurated" by, say, Paracelsus, the Prince of Quacks, and of course founded in *presumptuous* "ignorance"—"had nothing to recommend him to the good sense and favor of the people, save the noisy clamorings of self constituted "censorship" and "self-inflated" gasconade "and whether from force of habit, or from some motive of necessity, he still pursues the same course, even down to the closing paragraph of a recent sixteen page pamphlet, issued in the city of Macon." "So notorious indeed, is this Practitioner's habit of boasting, gassing and abusing other people, that almost every page of his pamphlets and articles "are" (sic) full of it, and every discourse deeply imbued with the same spirit." "And yet, so exquisitely sensitive is he, that the slightest allusion" to the candid admissions of Allopathists in regard to the alarming defects of their own system, "nauseates" him and causes so much "bitterness" and biliousness that the very fountain of thought becomes tainted and all his perceptions are jaundiced. "Have not many of the quiet and **unobtrusive** medical practitioners" where he has been, "been thus wantonly assailed without provocation?" "That this is true, let the files of the Macon," Savannah and Atlanta "papers attest, and that I have been similarly attacked, no candid reader of recent pamphlets will question"!!

The Doctor seems to take it very hard that we should have taken him so much to task for charging *criminality* upon the Botanics, and reiterates the former statement that he "alluded passingly" "to the Lobelia Practice, but with no disposition to attack that system", and seems surprised, and feels aggrieved, that "notwithstanding the remark was accompanied with complimentary credit to modern Thomsonians," yet he was forthwith '*assailed*,' he says, through the city papers by us, who assumed the championship with avidity, and seized upon this as a *fresh* pretext for an attack *personal* upon himself, and a general onslaught upon the Medical Faculty"!! Why don't somebody take pity upon such a badly abused gentleman? Is it not shameful that so "quiet and unobtrusive a medical practitioner should have been so wantonly assailed without provocation"? It is true, that about the first the Macon people knew that such a quiet gentleman was among them,

was by the appearance of some of the most abusive articles ever written by mortal man, against the very men, probably, that had taken him most kindly to their hearts and warmed him into life! but then, he merely did it for a "pleasant pastime," it seems, and "not from necessity", and therefore as an amateur had he not a right to say just what he pleased? He did not mean any thing by it, and though he did charge the Botanics with *criminality*, did he not at the same time compliment them, and should not that suffice to mend *their* wounded honor, especially as not even that was vouchsafed to his own friends, and *they* seem satisfied? But no, this man Thomson, "Professor" Thomson, "*who has not departed from the truth in twenty years*", and who is so exquisitely sensitive that "the slightest allusion to the practice he follows (merely calling it *criminal*, for instance) is repelled with bitterness and scorn"—"assumed championship with avidity, and seized upon this as a "*fresh* pretext," Dr. Smith says, to "attack him *personally*", though it is strongly surmised he never heard of him before.

Is it not "passing strange" that a gentleman should expect to enter a city amid such a flourish of trumpets, with arms bared and ready for the fight, accusing young and old of almost every kind of crime that is possible of commission by any medical man, and then when he is fairly met upon ground of his own choosing, and confessedly vanquished in the contest—for silence gives consent, they say—is it not "puerile," to say the least of it, to assume the whining tone of a martyr, cry "peccavi," and take refuge in the declaration that he did not mean to fight, all he did was for "pleasant pastime", and like Jack in the lion's skin, call out, Good people, kind people, don't be afraid, it is only me, whom all know, and may henceforth consider one of the quietest and most unobtrusive gentlemen alive! if that exquisitely sensitive "Professor" can only be prevented from "*attacking*" me again!

It seems that 80 page pamphlet has been an over-dose for him, and has resulted in the "alarming symptoms" accompanied, confessedly, with excessive "nausea" which it will be charity to relieve, according to the Thomsonian rule, by the administration of a little "Pepper," so that even in his own experience he may be able to recount the wonderful effects of the "Lobelia and Pepper Practice" in quieting nervous irritability after the removal of so much bitterness through the medium of his last little pamphlet in which he, in effect says, like the blatant boy that got whipped, "If—I—can't—whip—you—I can make mouths at your sister!" and accordingly attacks the Faculty of the College!! and undertakes the role of the "informer" as a dernier resort, with a view, to the exposure of the "gross frauds" that he says are being perpetrated in the midst of the public! and in order to get a side stroke at "our Professor," undertakes by way of implication to show up some of his "*ad captandum* tricks" and "hoaxes" that

he is playing off upon his readers, by which, he says, they are "greatly *deceived*," and "impressed *falsely*"!

Now, if that were true, we should feel very badly on the subject,—but we have no wish to "deceive" any body, nor the slightest desire to "hoax" or "impress any one *falsely*"—and to prove that we do not, we with confidence point to the very statements Dr. Smith has made, and show that *there is not a word of truth in the accusation!!*

The first "announcement" to which he refers and characterizes "as any thing in the world *but correct*" is "That Prof. Bennett the 'highest medical authority' hailing from the 'highest seat of medical learning' has sounded a new 'key note,' and that the whole medical choir "*is* striking up the same tune." Having *thus* quoted he goes into an elaborate statement with quotations and references to show that the medical men of Great Britain have not endorsed Bennett's views, and "are" not striking up that same tune, predicating the whole, splenetic words and all, upon the unfair, "tricky," "deceitful" and "false" quotation that he himself has made, in which by *slipping in* an "is" for a "will" he has changed the whole sense, and thus he himself has *made* the only part of that statement that is "*not correct*," and the question naturally arises is this done from ignorance or design. If from the former, which is the most favorable construction we can put upon it, then it but furnishes another proof of what we stated in reference to Dr. Arnold's recommendation to study the classics, which is often done at the expense of a common knowledge of good plain English. If on the other hand, this substitution was made from design, then it shows that the Doctor himself is the "trickster," and is chargeable with one of the most unwarrantable attempts to impress *falsely* and *deceive* his readers that any writer could be guilty of, and which but ill becomes the dignified position to which he aspires or the character for fairness that we have been disposed to award him.

But though Dr. Smith must in this instance admit that the statement he characterized as "*not correct*" is the very opposite and true as truth itself, he yet brings up another instance in which he tries to make the reader think he "has me sure," and discourses at considerable length upon the presumption that what he says is so. This too is the text on which he predicates his statements to show the pending down fall of Medical Reform throughout the country!!

That those who have not read our former pamphlet may understand the point involved in these statements it will be proper to premise that in Dr. Smith's first he charged among other naughty Thomsonian practices, the want of strict adherence to truth, vituperative expression, slander, &c., to which we replied thus:

"The most vituperative expressions *we* ever indulge in, are quotations from his own or his brethren's writings; and unless truth be "slander," we claim en-

tire exemption from the charge of using any such weapons of attack, for we have ever exhibited such a "scrupulous regard for truth" in all that we have ever published as fact of our own knowledge that we will give Dr. Smith or any other man five hundred Dollars to produce a single instance in which we have departed from it during the long period in which our name has been before the public! And since he has called it up we hereby *dare* him to make a like proposition in regard to what he has published in the last three months."

We also directly offered him a like sum to substantiate if he could one of his own voluntary statements. Having failed to do either by way of clearing his own skirts, his object seems now to be to pull us down to a like position by making it appear that, we "cannot make our own statements harmonize," and finding it difficult to make out a fair case, we shall now see to what shifts he is reduced, as in the first instance, to make even a semblance of a case against us. Hear him:

"The" Professor "speaks boastingly of his '*Thomsonian Colleges throughout the country*,' and in doing which he *pointedly contradicts* what he said only last year in his Reform Journal about the *shipwrecked* condition of *all* the Thomsonian Colleges, except his own in Macon."

"This article distinctly declares that, 'to-day the College at Macon is the only Reform Medical school in the world, now above wind and tide.'"

Now listen to his exordium and note its exuborent richness!

"Professor" Thomson! refer to your own '*Pepper Journal* (how pungent) page 270 and read what *you* said about the effects of the true light of Medical Reform having been scattered."

"Tell me whether *you* meant what *you* said, and if so, how is the public to reconcile that statement with what *you* now say about Thomsonian Colleges throughout the country? A man who *has not departed from the truth* in 20 years can certainly make his own statements harmonize!"

And so he can, Dr. Smith, however wonderful *that* fact may appear to *you*, and perhaps there could be no better proof given to the public that what we state is "veritable" than the attempt you thus make to call it in question. Is that the best you can do? Is that the way you establish *your* boasted "FACTS" and make but "*few*" of them at that? Verily unless the others you bring forward are a little more reliable you will have to change the heading of your first and title pages, from "a few facts" to the very antithesis of the statement and then your readers would not be impressed "*falsely*" as to their character. There is but one thing lacking, however, in this comparison and statement to make all that Dr. Smith says true, but it is very material, for *I never made any such statements in the Journal or elsewhere*, but maintain now that "this system *has* its Colleges throughout the country" which is all that we said on this point in our pamphlet.

It is true that an anonymous writer over the signature of "Reform" did make some such statements, but as we were neither writer nor editor, we were not responsible for them, and especially not committed to the endorsement of mere matters of opinion, that might find their way into the columns of the Reformer even though we be part owner; and this effort of Dr. Smith to make it appear

that we "*pointedly contradicted*" ourself, is the most "*pointed*," endeavorer to "hoax" "deceive" and "falsely" impress, his readers that can be imagined and shows the straits to which he is driven to make out his case!!

Why at this rate, every Editor or part-owner would be a mixed up conglomeration of every shade of opinion that could possibly be conceived, and put in print by anonymous scribblers, and might be called on by just-such men as Dr. Smith—who is evidentially a "know nothing" in regard to newspaper ethics—to square his matured statements of to-day, by the opinions of somebody that had written for his columns more than a year ago and be branded as "contradicting himself pointedly" if he did not do it. If that were the rule what would become of our worthy friend Clisby, cautious as *he* is, or of Rose, Knowles, Andrews and all the rest of the Editorial fraternity who have full controul of what goes into their columns? how much less culpable should we be esteemed, who had no control of them at all? and how far fetched must be the accusation that is founded in such a state of facts?

And then, as to the Colleges themselves. Why! Dr. Smith thinks no more of blotting out a college on the statement of an anonymous writer, than he would of taking breakfast, and seems to do it with as much gusto too, as could be exhibited by him in the demolition of one that was not too much "routine!" and we have not the shadow of a doubt that his celebrated "Jurist" too, would render a verdict on the same evidence, especially if it were his interest to do so.

But thank Heaven the opinions of "Reform" like those of Elijah when he imagined himself the only one left of all the faithful, have not been confirmed. The colleges so vauntingly maintained as being defunct are still surviving and progressing favorably.—Even that in New York about which fears were entertained has fallen back on first principles and finds as all others do who try it, that the closer they adhere to stern honest principle the better they succeed, a course, which, without intending the slightest offence, we would cordially commend to all gentlemen who desire a *legitimate* success nearer home. Of the "Memphis Medical Review," it is sufficient to say, that the *one* number that saw the light did not represent the Memphis College, but a faction that tried to kill it, but who, not unlike other parties whom we wot of, succeeded only in convincing the world of their own vindictiveness, and showed for a time how possible it was for even "little apples" to "swim."

Having succeeded so well (?) in showing up the "*ad captandum* 'tricks' of the Professor," Dr. Smith next attacks the Faculty, and criticises with a great deal of apparent satisfaction the book, that for reasons stated in the preface they were compelled to publish, and in order to show the depth of his research and his familiarity with authorities on medical subjects, traces up the *descriptive* part

of the work—which has been literally the same for generations—to the very authorities which the Faculty designated in the Preface! and pointed out by *name*, and then endeavors to “*impress*” his readers with what “*falsity*” we leave them to Judge, that *he ferreted* them out!!! What was there to “*ferret*?”—Nothing, absolutely nothing, for they had acknowledged of their own free will, all the real facts that Dr. Smith says *he* has “*ferreted*” out, and yet *he* talks of “*frauds*” “*gross frauds*” being perpetrated upon the public!!

“*Fraud!*” Can “*fraud*” exist where there is no concealment? or is it common for those who intend the commission of “*gross frauds*” on the public to proclaim the fact?

Is it not proclaimed by the Faculty themselves that part of the work referred to is a “*compilation?*” Do they not say so in as many words, and that they have obtained “*from every available source within their reach the fullest, most recent, and accurate description of diseases, their causes, history, diagnosis and prognosis, and that on these points they have drawn “freely” on the authors by name that Dr. Smith says he has ferreted out? (See Preface.)*

Was it not they who put that *ferret* in the hole, or at least pointed it out to him? Yea verily! and they make him welcome to all the game he can find there, as well as all the credit he is likely to obtain for such burrowing work, which seems so congenial.

Well, then, admitting that that part of the work is a “*Compilation,*” does it invalidate the statement that we made in our pamphlet that Dr. Smith takes exception to? Not at all, for the fact still stands plainly forth, that “*this system*” not only “*has now its Colleges throughout the country,*” but “*its principles are elaborately set forth in large volumes of more than a thousand pages*”, and we refer all to the same book, a part of which Dr. Smith criticises, to show it. In that our principles are *elaborately* set forth by Prof. Bankston in a paper the originality of which cannot be questioned, and it will, moreover, be seen, that those principles are confirmed and are identical with those enunciated, thus late in the day, by Prof. Bennett, though they are no more like Allopathic principles, as hitherto known, to use Dr. Smith’s *elegant* comparison, “*than is a chimney sweep like a wood-sawyer,*” and could not be copied. The practical part speaks for itself, and would hardly be claimed, by even Dr. Smith, as Allopathic, and *as these are the only two departments in medical science on which we materially differ*, there surely can be no harm in incorporating the facts of science, as by all acknowledged, into our medical works, though we may not have had the honor of their discovery.

If none but the discoverers of scientific truths had any right to use them, of how many could Allopathy boast as exclusively hers? Is it not notorious that the greatest and best remedies known to, and in use by that profession, are discoveries of some naked sav-

ages, wandering Arabs, red Indians, or South American Aztecs that had no more claim to scientific knowledge than Dr. Smith has to a knowledge of the size of the knife with which the man in the moon cuts his cheese? but do not all belong to the common stock of knowledge, no matter how attained to?

If then the research of scientific men or the observations of savages in all ages be the common property of all, have not Reformers as good a right as anybody to the appropriation of so much of it as suits their legitimate purposes? and if so, is it a "gross fraud" on anybody to detail the facts of such knowledge as this research has brought to light and observation has confirmed, or can anybody claim the exclusive possession of such scientific knowledge as belonging exclusively to any system? If nay—then the descriptive part of medical science belongs to all, and is the same to the Reformer, the Allopathist, the Homœopathist or any other pathist in existence, and the symptoms of particular forms of disease are just as determinate to-day as they were in the days of Gregory, and if Dr. Smith had read the descriptive works of Authors at a considerably earlier period than "*twelve years ago*," he would have been able to discover such a wonderful sameness throughout the whole, that it might have been hard to definitely say which was the originator or which the copyist. It is true, that some care has been taken to disguise many of those little descriptive pilferings; an alteration in style here, a transposition there, and a half acknowledgment elsewhere, but all evincing to the honorable mind that whatever might be said about the right, the honest way is to copy and acknowledge, as has been done in that particular department by Prof. Comings, who had in charge the getting up of that portion of the book, and so, notwithstanding the determined effort of Dr. Smith to implicate us "*individually*," while acting for the College or the Faculty, as their agent, it turns out that though we furnished the Capital, we had nothing to do with the writing of the work, and so it was stated in the Preface, a fact which Dr. Smith knows, and if, therefore, there was any "trick," or breach of "American Ethics" in this matter, it was done or made by an American, and it must be said—considering the manner of American Publishers, who do not merely quote, or even copy from, but republish entire, without leave or license, the works of foreign Authors—that the Ethics or usages so designated, seem all to be the other way; and the argument advanced by Dr. Smith in reference to "satisfying a scrupulous public" on this point, must all be thrown away as inapplicable, or Dickens, Bulwer, Thackeray, and all the rest of the foreign Authors, medical included, are greatly mistaken as to what constitutes "American Ethics" in this particular. Indeed the fact is rather notorious than otherwise, that more of the American Medical Authors than one, is so much indebted to the *foreign element*, that were it removed, a much greater collapse of their volumes would take place than could possibly arise if the same process

were carried out on the Reform Practice! Without it, what would the great Dunglison's voluminous works be? But Dr. Smith might not wish to take our say so on that point, and we therefore refer him to the authority he himself quotes, The British and Foreign Medico Chirurgical Review. On page 253 of the October number for 1859, he will find these words: "Until within a very recent date, American works on Physiology were almost entirely unknown in Europe, *a circumstance solely due to the fact of their being LITTLE ELSE than Crude Compilations of European works*"!! LITTLE ELSE! and yet American Allopathic Medical Authors have amassed enormous fortunes by the sale of just such works as their *own*, "but as to whether it was a legitimate speculation," "and whether the rights"—not guaranteed, alas!—"of other authors were not grossly infringed upon"—the public must decide! The witness in this case, is the doctor's own, nor can even he deny the truth of the statement!

Dr. Smith would like to "impress" his readers with the idea, too, that all borrowing, to be honest, must at least be "placed within quotation marks," but whether that be so or not, "American Medical Ethics" do not demand it, for, to say nothing of others that might be named, we would point him to one of the most recent works published in America, being a treatise on Human Physiology, by Jno. C. Dalton, Jr., M. D., 1859, a Philadelphia book, in which in the first chapters we find "little else than a recapitulation of Robin and Verdeil's views on the Constituents of the human frame," and what is more, in that comparatively small work, "he reaches his thirty-fifth page before he even hints at the source of the views he had adopted!!" So that it seems Prof. Comings is in excellent company, and before Dr. Smith can—as an American Allopath—take the *mote* out of our eye, he must remove the *beam* from his own, and before he preaches "honesty" to us, he must keep his own hands out of his neighbor's pockets, and consider whether it cannot be made to appear that the less some people have to say about "American Ethics", as connected with the publication of Medical books, "the more credit they will enjoy for common prudence"!

But can any author lay claim to originality in any thing that is merely descriptive in our day and time? Could an entirely original work be written on Anatomy or Physiology, or even on the phenomena presented by the Pathological conditions of the human body? As well might we expect that an original Geography of the United States could be written, or that two men could give the names of the Streets of Macon without in effect saying precisely the same thing! but yet Dr. Smith proclaims that "gross frauds" are being perpetrated on the public, by giving them such information as may be useful to them—and which he admits to be the *best* that can be given on these subjects—deprived of the usual accompaniments, of antiphilogistic theories, and poisonous appliances, that with students not far enough advanced to winnow

the good from the bad might have a deliterious effect upon their minds and imbue them with those principles that it has taken a lengthened period of years to convince even the great Bennett that they are "*erroneous*" and which, judging from the tenacity with which they cling to him, will never be got rid of, by Dr. Smith at all!

Speaking, however of Bennett; reminds us that he also comes in for a goodly share of Dr. Smith's abuse, which certainly ought to be very consoling to us and the other parties who share it, seeing that we are all in such reputable company, but we imagine it will take more than the doctor's say so to convince the world that the learned "Professor's theoretical views are not sustained by clinical facts!" or that he is wrong when he declares "that a *revolution* is going on in the practice of Medicine! or that that revolution points "to the establishment of scientific laws, instead of empirical rules," as well as to "the abandonment of a *palliative* in favor of a *curative* plan of treatment," and that that same "revolution," the existence of which Dr. Smith denies, is founded on the "conclusion that the *principles* which led to an anti-philogistic practice in acute inflammations are *erroneous*, since it is found that when "instead of lowering them the vital powers are supported, and the excretion of effete products assisted," the value of human life is increased eight fold, and when it is known likewise, that "recent success has been great, just in proportion as heroic remedies have been abandoned," it will be conceded that old things *are* passing away and as Bennett says, "it is in vain telling us to adhere to the routine of our forefathers when the principles which guided them are known to be erroneous." "But when"—as he adds—"in addition to change in theory, actual experience demonstrates that we are right, when modern pathology and modern practice harmonize with and support one another, then it appears to me that the time *has* arrived for demonstrating the *errors* of former teaching, as well as of past empirical observations."

But Dr. Smith denies that modern pathology and practice, as contended for by Prof. Bennett, do harmonize, and says that "clinical facts do not sustain his views." While challenging the strictest enquiry into the accuracy of the statistics of his 78 cases which were treated in open day in the public hospitals, every one of which is authenticated with the name of its reporter in the hospital books, Prof. Bennett concludes thus: "When it is shown that of 78 cases of pneumonia which entered my clinical wards, only 1 in 26 died, but that of 75 similar cases which entered the wards of La Charite, under M. Louis, 1 in 3 died, then I think it reasonable to conclude that as in my cases the vital processes were *furthered* and *supported*, whereas in those of M. Louis they were *diminished* or *subdued*, the great mortality of 1 in 3 was owing to the treatment, and that such is a legitimate applica-

tion of statistics." It is needless to say that this constitutes the true difference between Allopathy as understood by Dr. Smith and Thomsonism as understood and practiced by us, the one "*diminishes and subdues*" the vital processes, the other "*further*s and *supports*" them, and great though the difference in result be as between the treatment pursued by those two gentlemen, it is not less marked here, we make bold to say—between Allopathy and Medical Reform; so much so indeed is this the case in some sections, and so well known is the fact, that many of the most intelligent planters and farmers in the country would no more think of entrusting a bad case of pneumonia to an Allopathist with his depleting appliances, than they would of having it to bury if they called a Reformer with his *invigorating* and *supporting* means! and if Dr. Smith is curious as to instances he can be pointed readily to cases in which ruin stared men in the face in consequence of the loss of patients by the dozen almost, under Allopathic treatment where the hand of death was staid as if by magic on the appearance of the true Reformer. So that whatever Dr. Smith may say to the contrary, there *is* a *revolution* taking place in medicine, and Thomsonism if not in name, in very fact, *is* in a fair way of being "universally adopted," and we have not the slightest doubt that fifty years hence the medical doctrines of the "immortal Thomson," whether credited to him or not, *will* pervade the world and be everywhere received as medical truth, and that his identical views are being expounded and insisted on by the "highest medical authority," hailing from the "highest seat of medical learning"—the University of Edinburgh, that counts its students by the thousand—is itself a triumph, for whether, for the present, that great exponent Bennett, be considered the "text book of modern medicine" or not, he is still the occupant of the most advanced position, medically, in the world it is believed, and acknowledgedly honors that position by its occupancy; and the facts of the case are so apparent of themselves that it seems to us that the effort of Dr. Smith to "*impress*" his readers with the idea that these plain statements are not "veritable" but a '*hoax*' and *ad captandum* '*trick*' on our part, is an attempt on their 'gull'ability not at all complimentary to their understanding or character for common sense, and is so plain a case of an attempt at 'trick'ery and 'hoax'ing on his part that it carries its own 'deceit'ful character indellibly stamped upon its face!

While we do not feel ourself specially called on to reply to the Doctor's remarks—referring to Prof. Bennett's position,—predicated upon his non appreciation of the difference between the present and the future tense, and the "trick" of slipping in an "is" for a "will," in the *mis*-quotation he made, (itself an *old* '*trick*' of his,) we may yet remark that the Appendix referred to,—containing as it does the objections to the new theory and his replies to them—but confirms all we said of them and is perhaps the most

triumphant "vindication" of their truth that is possible to be conceived of by any mind capable of "rational" deductions, and the fact that Dr. Smith has read them and risen from their perusal "a mere treater of symptoms, a bleeder, and a believer in anti-phlogistic principles and remedies" but proves as we before said, that he is more incorrigible than we thought him, and far more conceited or prejudiced than we gave him credit for being."

But Dr. Smith thinks he has the majority on his side, which it appears is for him, quite sufficient guarantee of correctness of position, hence his great objection to the Reform Practice is that it is not "popular," and almost half his pamphlet is devoted to the purpose of making that appear, and in his anxiety to make out his case, descends to the quotation of anonymous articles, and predicates his statements upon *them*, regardless of the facts that but await the opening of his eyes to make them palpable! The "hosannas" of the people are necessary to assure him that he is right it seems, and as, for the present, these are withheld both from us and Bennett too perhaps, it is conclusive proof, to him at least, that both must be indubitably wrong! What a persecutor such a person would have been of Harvey who discovered the circulation of the blood, but whose ideas were not generally adopted by the medical fraternity for a century? Gallileo would have had as little mercy from such an one as he had from the priests! and poor Wickliffe might have had an extra torch applied to him and the miserable Massachusetts witches would have had nothing to hope for from such a hand, nor could any one doubt that the slanderer of the "immortal Thomson" in his grave would have added 'fleas' to the plague of lice that infested his wintery dungeon! The man who is governed in his judgment by popular opinion has a hard task master, and is ready at its bidding to be among the Jews the strictest of his sect, a Catholic among Catholics, a Protestant among Protestants, a whig among whigs and among tories, the greatest tory of them all. Such we trust the Doctor would not be, but such we generally find "majority men" and when we see such earnest enquiry, as to who else believes, before the committing step is taken, suspicion is aroused and the inference is drawn that self reliance and independence of spirit are elements greatly lacking in such a character.

In the case of Bennett, the Reviewers give him confidence, and he therefore pitches in, and wonderful to relate *their* report "*corroborates exactly*" what *he* said "in relation to the prevalent diseases of Middle Georgia!" and he is happy to find the position *he* assumed is so "*fully sustained*" "by the ablest American and British authorities!!" So far so good, but it seems that in *exactly corroborating* him they "*quote the very language of Dr. Watson*" which appeared in the July number of a British periodical as well as later in the year 1858 in an American one!! Does any body see the tip end of a little mouse's tail just here? What

a wonderful coincidence? What Watson says in England in July, 1858, is repeated in America in the same year, and Dr. Smith assumes positions early in 1859, that are "exactly corroborated" and "*fully sustained*" by parties in Britain who quote Watson's "very language"!!! Ah! Dr. Smith, have you yet to learn that "people who live in glass houses should be careful how they throw stones? Having nothing of the weazel in our composition, however, we forbear to "*ferret*" this matter farther, but it might be proper for us to warn Dr. Smith that other people take the Reviews as well as he, and are not quite so charitable as we are; for one of the Allopathic Physicians in this city broadly declared in our hearing, that, parts of his articles containing those "*corroborated*" and "*sustained*" positions were "mere plagiarisms", but not knowing of ourself, and really not wishing to know whether it be so or not, we cannot say, but these coincidences, and *claims* are of his own making and, therefore, legitimate for criticism, and with those who can tell from a little what a great deal means, they will have their weight, and at least give an idea of the means to which "little apples" sometimes betake themselves to keep their heads above the "tide", in order that they may "swim."

Having answered the challenged "thorough investigation as to the *truth* of his assumed "facts," and having *proved* them to be "any thing in the world *but correct*," we may now admit that the system of "Reformed Medicine" which we advocate—no matter how much it may have grown since the time of Thomson—is still too "lilliputian" for our aspirations, and our classes are still much smaller than we think they should be, though even at the number stated by Dr. Smith, 50 or 60, much larger than they have been, even in Macon, and is, therefore, a singular evidence of decline! but as the Doctor wrote about the time the "Calliope" came to town, and of course shortly after the opening of the session, it will not do to take even that statement as true now; and hence we are pleased to say that small though the number be, it is smartly understated, though we have pretty good reason to know that at that particular period, that number even could not quite be counted in the Halls of the Georgia Medical College at Augusta, and how many less at the Colleges in Savannah it would be hard to say, so that small though we be, we are still in good company even in Georgia, and we trust that while all we "*little apples*" are doing our best to "swim," "*big*" ones like Dr. Smith will not try to discourage us. Speaking of decline in systems, however, is Dr. Smith aware that on the 31st Dec'r last, he, as an "*eminent* Allopathic physician of Georgia," is quoted to prove the decline of Allopathy in a New York paper that is not Thomsonian? Yet so it is, and the honor is thus awarded him of association with the famous bird that did not hesitate to speak ill of the nest it lived in!

Is that the place from which he looks with "*contempt*" upon all around him? Is Allopathy as he described it so pure that it can afford, through *him* who so bespattered it, to be contemptuous; Does the sneer at Medical Reform sit well upon the countenance of him who from personal "observation" declared that Allopathic physicians "bled down their patients irrecoverably," accused them of "too great precipitancy" in giving drugs, of "aggravating the malady," "officious interference," "abuse of trust," "the reckless and excessive employment of physic," "over-dosing," till "the doctor's heart is made to bleed with anguish and remorse at the mischief done," "giving Morphia inconsiderately," "too free indulgence in their propensity for dosing, thereby worrying their patients," "dreadfully abusing the powers of their remedies," which have been "prostituted" and "abused," and by "profligate" "use" "effected only mischief."

Is it Allopathy that sits quietly still under such a torrent of abuse, that sneers and is contemptuous? or is it only Dr. Smith that airs himself in this way, as the Fault-Finder General and "Ferret" in Chief of Medical abuses? If so, let him consider his own position and remember that his flourish about "*contempt*" does not relieve him from the unenviable position in which his own statements have placed him, and which that 80 page pamphlet so graphically exposed; though if it really be so "nauseating" that he dare not touch it, we doubt not the community will excuse him from the "task of reviewing" it, but until he does, is it not the judgment of "all readers of recent pamphlets" that the less some people say about "*contempt*" for money challenges, "the more credit they will enjoy for common prudence," especially when these challenges have direct reference to the proof of one's own statements! As to the "gassy" part of the charge, do we not put that at rest by the amount of bonds we voluntarily assume? Dare Dr. Smith do the same, and thereby test the *weight* of his own statements? If not, even on that point, then "the less some people say of" "*gas*", "the more credit will be theirs for common prudence!"

In regard to the weakness and necessities of our position, we are quite alive to them, and are ready to admit that it is not near so strong as we wish to have it, and that there is much yet needed to make it all we desire, but we are doing our best to improve and elevate it, and the success which has thus far attended our efforts is so encouraging that we shall persevere, and hope that with the assistance of such men as Prof. Bennett, of Edinburgh, Doctors Todd and Markham, of London, and the "many other able and distinguished physicians" who "essentially agree in our views," we shall yet be able to smile (we can almost do it now,) at the "*contempt*" of such "eminent" men as Dr. Smith, who seem proud of the Authorities and Books that are "LITTLE ELSE" than

"crude compilations of European works," and who so far from trying to elevate their branch of the Profession, are doing their best to pull it down.

While *we* are not unmindful of the humble source from whence we took our rise, we can but glory in the fact, and use it as an incentive to still greater effort till we reach the goal of that perfection to which other minds are tending and aspiring, and which Prof. Draper—a *really* "eminent" American Physiologist—says must be reached when the new doctrines of life (Thomsonism) are believed in, and when the present Allopathic practice of Medicine shall have been "*revolutionized*"!

But while this is *our* aim, are not the "eminent" Dr. Smith and the rest of the Georgia Allopaths frittering away the inheritance left them by their fathers? Are *they* elevating the standard of Medical acquirement? Are *they* pursuing a course that is calculated to increase the respect due to learning? or are *they* not rather doing their best to depress both? It requires but the statement of a single "fact"—one, too, that is much more "veritable" than those claimed as such by the "eminent" Dr. Smith—to show that such is the case, and that is, that in Georgia, the Empire State of the South, and nowhere else in the wide world, the Allopathic student of *nine* months' standing may be a graduate!!!

Is it likely that the intelligence of the nineteenth century will permit such proceedings to exist for even the forty years to come that remain of it, or is it not more *rational* to conclude that they will be swept away by it "as with the besom of destruction?" Even now, so "weak-backed" is that "hobby" and so "necessitous" the "position" of some of its adherents, that on entering a city the "*VULGUS*" *ad captandum* expedient of *soliciting pressly* puffs, like any other "quack" who has pills to sell, has been resorted to, a practice which, however necessitous the position of medical reform, *it* has never condescended to, nor has any of its Macon adherents that we know of. Can the "eminent" champion of Allopathic Medicine and expositor general of "weak-back hobbies" say as much? Or could it be said that even in this particular the less some people say of *ad captandum* "*VULGUS*" "tricks", the better would be their credit for common prudence."

But we have no disposition to press the Doctor farther, his position is a difficult one, and therefore we can excuse this last effort to make the best of it before the country, and if he could have arisen without such an unmitigated attempt to drag us down, we should have had nothing to say against it; as it is, we but defend ourself, with feelings for him, if not of love, at least of that benign description that is said to be a-kin to it, and wish him well, while we trust that the 'curiosity' of his Rev. Champion friend is thoroughly satisfied that even "*tables may be turned*" without *spiritual* aid!



