



UNITED STATES OF AMERICA



FOUNDED 1836

---

WASHINGTON, D.C.





CINCINNATI WHIG

AND COMMERCIAL INTELLIGENCER—Extra.

---

AN

INQUIRY

INTO

THE CAUSES

THAT HAVE RETARDED THE PROSPERITY

OF THE  
Surgeon General's  
LIBRARY.  
W. 3568/69  
Washington

MEDICAL COLLEGE

OF OHIO.

31

173

# P R E F A C E

---

## TO THE CITIZENS OF OHIO.

FEELING a deep interest, as every citizen should, in the honor and prosperity of our State, I have devoted a portion of my time, within the last few months, to the examination of the history and present condition of your *only* State Institution for the instruction of youth in the *Science of Medicine*. The following pages, which were originally published in the form of numbers, in the "Daily Cincinnati Whig," are the result of my labors; and I trust that they will be found to have been written with that calmness and deliberation, which a subject of such vital importance to the community, demands. The science of *Medicine*, since it proposes to remove or mitigate those evils which are incident alike to the whole human family, is a subject which nearly interests every man in the State; and especially if he be the father of a family, or in any other way have the guardianship of others, is it his high duty to see that proper men are chosen to teach this science—and when chosen, that no obstacles be thrown in the way of their usefulness. In the performance of my task, I have had access to all the papers, records and other public documents, in any wise connected with the subject; and for the extension to me of this courtesy, I am indebted to several of our citizens, who kindly volunteered their services on the occasion. I beg them to accept my thanks. The *Medical College of Ohio* has had to encounter difficulties, such as, perhaps, would have destroyed any similar institution in the country. These difficulties have been created, chiefly, by the agency of *one man*, who, intent upon his own aggrandizement, has adopted *whatever* means were best calculated to work out his own ends. So long as the people permit this man to practice upon their credulity, so long will their institution have to contend with the same difficulties. That they may all know how much it is to their interest to come forward, in a body, and sustain the *Medical College of Ohio*, their common school of *Medicine*, and now under the auspices of one of the ablest Faculties in the United States—in opposition to the selfishness of individuals, who would prostrate it, to build their private fortunes on its ruins, is the design of these pages, which are respectfully submitted to their consideration.

## AN INQUIRY &C.

---

*The College is not, however, a private, but a public Seminary; and as such, I have the same right as any other citizen of Ohio to desire its prosperity and expose the abuses that have retarded its progress.*—Drake's Letter to the Xenia Committee.

---

MR. EDITOR:—Your paper of the third inst. containing the “manifesto” of the Cincinnati College lies before me. From this paper I learn, that a new medical school has been established in our city, for the purpose of delivering regular courses of lectures, and conferring diplomas upon its graduates. To the establishment of a new institution for the advancement of literature or science, if it be established wholly for these purposes, and be likely to conduce to these ends, I have no manner of objection. I agree with the mover of this measure, that there should be no such thing as a monopoly of science in any country, more especially in a free one, whose very institutions depend upon the intelligence and virtue of its citizens; but that the doors of her temple should be thrown open alike to the “peasant and the peer.” When I say, that I agree with the mover of this measure, I mean merely that I adopt a sentiment which he *professes* to believe. That he entertains any such opinion in reality, I am inclined to doubt; at all events I shall be able to show, that there *was* a time, when he held no such belief. But that the Cincinnati College was brought into existence with a view of advancing the ends of education, and thereby benefitting this city or the state, I deny; and I shall prove that it was not, by showing the *real* design of the individual who conceived the plan, and by whose agency it was mainly carried into execution—the motives of himself and associates, in raising up a systematic opposition to the regularly organized institution,

known as the Medical College of Ohio.—But it may be asked, why not give the Cincinnati College a fair trial! if both institutions can flourish, so much the better for the city! I answer that its faculty do not wish a fair trial themselves, and that nothing is farther from their intention than a permanent competition with the Medical College of Ohio—their institution was not organized for this purpose, but was gotten up as the ultimatum of a series of efforts, to “reform” the existing school; and that when this object shall be effected—when Dr. Drake, and his associates shall become seated in the chairs of the Medical College of Ohio, which they are now striving to reach through the instrumentality of the Cincinnati College, the latter institution being *functus officio*, will like the Miami Faculty on a former occasion, be suffered to dwindle into its original nothingness. That I am correct in this position I have only to refer *in totidem verbis* to one or two expressions used by Dr. Drake, the mouth-piece of the Cincinnati College, in a late publication bearing on this subject! “In making,” says the Doctor, “their appointments, the Board acted with fidelity to the principle on which they had started, (reform!) Selecting Dr. Eberle, Dr. Cobb, and Dr. Gross, from the Medical College of Ohio, they united with them in the completion of the Faculty, no gentleman who had not been strongly recommended to the Board of Trustees of that institution, by its own committee, and thus sought (to repeat the expression of an idea) to finish what the trustees of that in-

stitution had begun (reform?) but had been unable to accomplish, although an actual majority of the board were in its favor.— Thus it was not the design of the Cincinnati College to set up a permanent rival, for their professors were at liberty to resign, and the whole of them, had they all accepted, might by a simple resolution of the trustees of the Medical College of Ohio, be transferred to that institution.” Here we have a confession from the august founder of the Cincinnati College, himself, of the design for which that institution was created, viz: not to become a permanent rival of the Medical College, but to force the trustees of the latter, *volens volens* to invite Drake and his associates, to occupy those chairs which their vaunted talents, aided by plotting, and intrigue, had been unable to procure for them. Thus instead of our citizens having cause to congratulate themselves, upon the acquisition of a new medical school, which is speedily to enter the lists, as a competitor of the one already in existence, for the public favor and patronage, they have only been called, by this flourish of trumpets, to witness a struggle for the “loaves and fishes” of office—to behold a party warfare, waged by the “outs” against the “ins.”— Drake and his party having been driven from all their covert places, and by-paths, in which they sought to surprise the enemy, have at last been obliged, as a forlorn hope, to assume the lance and buckler. Unfortunately however, for the strategy of the gallant leader, his system of tactics is now too well known, and the people are no longer to be gulled—they recollect his having played the same game, once before, in the “affair” of the Miami Faculty. The Cincinnati College, says Drake, is to continue in existence permanently “*unless they (the professors) should be invited into the other institution, and wish to go.*” On the happening of this event, what is to take place? Why, the Cincinnati College must necessarily cease to exist; because its faculty being resolved into the Medical College of Ohio, cannot continue in existence *antiquo nomine*—the faculty being gone, the college will be gone also; and the good people who have been inveigled into the project, and who shall have expended their time and money, on the institution, will be left as they have been on former occasions, to reimburse themselves in the best way they can. Dr. Drake and his adjuncts having leaped out, will leave the poor ram, who innocently became their

dupe, in the well where they found him.— A man who has to resort to subterfuge, to sustain a bad cause, never makes a plain, *straight forward* tale; sophistry is ever tortuous, and continually contradicting itself. As an illustration of this I have only to refer to the same pamphlet of Drake’s from which I have already made an extract; the reader will find upon its perusal, that it is a tissue of contradictions; the wily writer varying his facts to suit whatever point he is endeavoring for the moment to carry.

For instance—we have already shown, out of Drake’s own mouth, that the sole object for which the Cincinnati College was established, was to carry out the work of reform, which he had piously begun, in relation to the Medical College of Ohio,— that the former was not designed to become a permanent rival of the latter, but that so soon as he had *coerced* the trustees to invite him and his colleagues to fill the professorships in the Medical College, he would abandon the Cincinnati College to its fate; the reform for which it was instituted having been effected, and it being therefore of no further use. He is here the reader will observe, labouring to exhibit himself as the champion of reform; now mark, as he goes on a little farther and finds it convenient to make use of another set of facts, to carry a different point, how prolific his imagination is, in producing those facts, and (strange to say of so good a tactician as Drake thinks himself) how completely, and palpably they contradict all that he had previously advanced. Some one alleges that the Cincinnati College is a mere ephemera, as it really is, and that therefore the people ought to take no notice of it; Drake in his hurry to repel this charge, and forgetful that he had in another place, made the same allegation in effect himself, uses the following language: “But it is said here in the city by those interested in keeping themselves in the college that the new project is ephemeral, and designed merely for effect. I reply that it *is* ephemeral, but in the same sense, that a nation is ephemeral compared with the human race;” that is to say, the new college is designed to be as permanent, as human institutions can be, in the ordinary course of nature. Now bring these two variant statements, divested of the rhetorical flourishes of the learned professor, side by side, and behold how they harmonize together.

1st statement. “Thus it was not the de-



sign of the Cincinnati College to set up a permanent rival, &c."

2nd statement. Thus it is the design of *aniel rake* to make the Cincinnati College as permanent as it can be. When a witness is called to the stand in court, and tells two different tales about the same transaction, the Court generally advise the Jury not to believe him—he is not a credible witness.

I propose to pursue this question in a series of numbers, and shall show by documentary evidence in my possession, that the efforts of Drake and his associates are directed to the demolition of the Medical College of Ohio, to effect their own private purposes, regardless of the interests of the community—that the Medical College of Ohio, notwithstanding the slanders which have been circulated to the contrary, stands high in the confidence of the people—that its present depressed state is attributable mainly, if not wholly to the machinations and intrigues of Drake and his party—and that it is only necessary for the people to remove these *incubi* by the force of public disapprobation, from a situation to do harm, in order to insure the existence among them of a flourishing Medical school, which shall do honour to the state. In the mean time it is not my intention to be drawn into a newspaper controversy; my sole object is to strip off the mask from designing men and give information of such facts to the people as it nearly interests them to know. I shall therefore not notice the communications which may be written in reply—but proceed continuously, and without interruption with a plain statement of facts, and the legitimate inferences which flow from those facts; uninfluenced by fear or favouritism—In the mean time my name is with the Editor, and may be given up, at his discretion, to any person making a proper application and having a right to demand it.

Since the first number of these articles, was published, Dr. *Joseph N. McDowell*, and several other gentlemen of this city, have demanded my name of the Editor, and it has been given up to them. If these gentlemen suppose, that I am to be deterred from pursuing the course I have marked out for myself, in consequence of any demonstration of hostility on their part, I beg leave here, to assure them, that they are very much mistaken. At the same time I deem it a duty I owe to myself, and the public, distinctly to state, so that my

position may not be misunderstood, that with the *private* character (except so far as that private character can be drawn from their public one) of *Dr. Drake*, or *Dr. McDowell*, or any other individual, I shall not intermeddle—it is foreign to my purpose. The *Medical College* of Ohio is a public institution, and belongs to the state; all those individuals, who are now, or ever have been connected with that school, are, *quoad* this connection, public men; and their views and objects, as *such*, are as legitimately the subjects of remark, by the public press, as is the political creed of any other candidate for the public favor. If an individual misdemean himself, *in* office, and when out, seek from improper motives to destroy *that office*, shall he screen himself from public censure, by incasing his public character in the mantle of the private gentleman? I shall not however seek to throw off any responsibility, with which gentlemen may think proper to charge me. I only make these remarks to vindicate my *motives* to the public. A word in relation to the Trustees of the Cincinnati College. I should be very sorry if any gentleman of the board apply to himself any *portion* of this discussion, which could, in the slightest degree wound his feelings; so far as I am acquainted with the Trustees generally, I entertain a high respect for them—at the same time, I regret that they have not studied more diligently the medical history of their city. Some of these gentlemen I am happy to number among my personal friends. But to proceed.

I shall in this, and the subsequent numbers, take little other notice of the *new* Cincinnati College, than, barely to allude to it occasionally, in the light in which I have already shown it to exist; to wit: as a mere *implement* in the hands of its master. It is *Daniel Drake* then, the master of this machine, and not the machine itself, with whom I shall chiefly have to do. And in the first place I propose to show, by a strong, and well connected chain of evidence, that this man has sown all the discord, that now exists in the medical community; that he has never placed his foot within the threshold of the *Medical College* of Ohio, without a blight's following in his train; and that when he has been hurled from his professor's chair by the indignation of his associates, or his own ungratified passions, have induced him to resign it; he has devoted a sleepless vigilance, a zeal that

never tired, and an industry and perseverance the most indefatigable, to ruin the fortunes and reputations of those high minded and honorable men, who had too much integrity, and self respect to become the minions of his power;—that he has concentrated all his energies for the attainment of a single object, and that object is the prostration of a school he could not control; that he is resolved to effect this end at the sacrifice of any and every thing; the interests of the state; the interests of the city; the noble ends of education even; and all this to gratify his insatiate and morbid appetite for rule. As the first link in this great chain of evidence, I shall briefly notice the origin, and sketch the eventful history of the *Medical College of Ohio*—the alternate idol and martyr of Drake's love and hatred; and I desire every reader of these articles, to fix well the important facts in his mind, as I shall frequently have occasion to recur to them in the course of my remarks. The *Medical College of Ohio* was incorporated by the state, in the year 1819; in the act of incorporation, *Samuel Brown, Coleman Rogers, Elijah Slack, and Daniel Drake*, were named as incorporators, and the same individuals are also constituted the Faculty. Thus besides being members of the Faculty, these four persons had the entire control of the school—were empowered to remove and appoint professors, and other officers; to make all necessary rules and regulations for the government of the institution, &c. &c. &c. In the mean time, until the Faculty should exercise this authority to elect officers, the following persons are designated as such, viz: *Daniel Drake*, President, *Coleman Rogers*, Vice President, and *Elijah Slack*, Register and Treasurer. There was no time fixed by the Legislature when an appointment of officers should be made—so that the gentlemen above named, would continue to be the officers of the College until the Faculty, that is the officers themselves, together with *Samuel Brown*, the remaining member of the Faculty, should otherwise ordain. Here we have the organization of the *Medical College of Ohio*, under the control of four persons with *Daniel Drake* at their head. If at any time, the number of professors ever exceeded three, it was speedily reduced to that number, and from that to two. On the 30th December, 1819, an amendatory act was passed, providing that no professorship should be created nor abolished nor professor or

lecturer, elected or dismissed, without the concurrence of two thirds of the whole Faculty. Under this last act, the Faculty, then consisting of three members, to wit: *Doctors Drake, Slack, and Rogers*, held a meeting, and *Rogers* was expelled by the votes of *Drake and Slack*. At a subsequent period, *Dr. Jesse Smith*, was elected a professor, and a member of the Faculty; peace however not long continuing, another Faculty meeting was held, and *Doctors Smith and Slack*, in turn expelled *Drake*.

During the whole of this period the institution was under the control of the men above named. Lectures were delivered in the school by the professors, in 1820 to a class of 25 students; in 1821 to a class of 30 students, and in 1822 to a class of 18 students—while according to Drake's own showing, the rival school at Lexington, had in 1820, ninety three students; in 1821, 138 students, and in 1822, 171 students—this institution being only two years older, than the Cincinnati School. In 1822 four years after the Medical College had been in operation, and that too, for a greater part of the time, under the especial auspices, and management of *Daniel Drake*, the number of students instead of having increased, as was the case with the Lexington School, had dwindled to *eighteen*; the professors were in a state of continual warfare with each other, and Drake was busied in sowing sedition among the students, and abusing his colleagues. In this condition of things, the school was finally abandoned by the professors, and entirely broken up.

"The Stygian council thus dissolved; and forth  
In order came, the grand infernal peers;  
Midst came their mighty paramount."

The patriotic *Doctor Drake*, who now prates so learnedly, of the dignity, and welfare of Ohio; and who pretends to have the interest of this people, so much at heart—where was he then? Hark! "*I will tell it softly; you crickets shall not hear it!*" Where was he? I repeat—Why, he had been invited into the rival school at Lexington, and seeing an opportunity to jump into a good fat office, beat a retreat from the late scene of his inglorious discomfiture, and decamped into the State of Kentucky, bearing his patriotism in his pocket, and leaving the scientific and literary reputation of your city which he is now so anxious to build up, to shift for itself. Thus ends the first act of the Drama. Let us pause here for a moment, to consider the agency *Drake* had, in the origin, and de-

struction of the *Medical College* of Ohio; not the present *Medical College*, because that is a distinct institution, acting under a different charter which repealed the former one, granted to *Drake*, and his associates. We behold him then, the prime mover of both these events. He selected from the whole state, three men whom he preferred as associates—men of whose integrity, and abilities he of course entertained a high opinion; otherwise it is to be presumed he would not have united with them—applied for, and obtained a charter—was appointed President of the board of controul, and at the same time made a professor; thus he had the whole institution, in a manner in his sling. Now it has frequently been said in this community that *Drake* ought to have a fair chance shown him, to do something for the *College*, before he is denounced as a turbulent, factious man, and a disorganizer—was there ever a more glorious opportunity, to build up a great *Medical* school in Ohio, than the period of which I have been speaking? and if this was not done, whose fault was it? *Drake* and his associates essayed that result under a combination of circumstances, the most favorable—Ohio had already grown into considerable importance as a state, and was annually sending her young men to the East, to be educated.—There was no rival of any consequence in the long valley of the Mississippi—the Lexington School, now the most important, being then in its infancy, and having but ninety three students. Cincinnati had sprung up, as if by the inspiration of magic, and was rapidly becoming a great commercial, and manufacturing city—emigrants were flocking in from all quarters, and men of capital were settling here with their families. Why then I repeat, was not *Drake* able, at this auspicious moment, and under these favouring circumstances, to do that which he confesses to have been the day—dream of his youth, and the hobby of his old age? Why were the reasonable expectations of the city, and the state disappointed? Why (to filch a little of his own smooth rhetoric) were not the halls of his college “vocal with the accents of instruction?” Let the history of his short reign answer—let the history of his whole public life speak—and speak it shall too, in the course of these papers, and that, in a language, not to be misunderstood. Soon after the college became defunct, in the manner above described—it was reorganized under different auspices, and in the year

1833 an investigation was had by the proper authorities, of certain matters, touching this institution—in the course of this investigation, among other things, the causes were developed, which led to its destruction in the year 1822; it is these causes I propose to consider in my next number—in the mean time I will here remark that its decay, and dissolution were owing wholly to *Drake*.

In my last number, I alluded to an investigation, which had been made by a committee appointed for this purpose, in relation to sundry matters connected with the *Medical College* of Ohio, and stated, that among other things, the causes were developed which led to the destruction of this institution in 1822. This investigation was in the nature of a judicial proceeding, and therefore comes to us in the aspect of deliberation, impartiality and truth; the evidence was given in, under the solemn and impressive sanction of an oath—the most respectable men in the community, who were in any manner connected with the College, or who, from their position in society, were supposed to know any thing of its concerns, were examined. The mass of testimony thus taken, and which consisted of upwards of three hundred octavo pages, was transmitted in 1833, together with the reports of the committee, to the Legislature of the state; and the Senate of this body, appointed another special committee, to discharge the duties of a jury, in finding what facts were proven by the evidence submitted to them. The object of the Legislaturc was to ascertain whether the *reform*, which was loudly called for, by a certain medical party in this city, at the head of which was Dr. *Daniel Drake*, was in reality demanded, by the interests of the people, and the ends of education. The chairman of the select committee, *Judge Hitchcock*, now on the bench of the Supreme Court, and whose integrity and patriotism are too well known in this community and elsewhere, to need any eulogy from me, made a report, which was adopted by the whole Senate, present, with the exception of a single member—this member was Mr. Ellsworth, whose motives for dissenting I do not mean to impeach; but it may be as well to state here, that he and Dr. Martin, the prosecutor of the charges against the College, were from the same village and in some way connected together. Now, if in the course of human transactions, there is any such thing as

credible testimony, surely this report—the verdict of thirty-four senators, out of thirty-five, is entitled to be considered in that light. It is from this report then, and the evidence on which it is based, that I propose to sustain the allegation made at the close of my last number, to wit: that the destruction of the *Medical College* in 1822, was effected by *Dr. Daniel Drake*. The following extract is to be found in page 4, of the Report: “Under this act of incorporation, the institution was organized, and continued to exist, until the close of the year 1822. But if we are to credit the testimony before us, its history is little more than a history of strifes and contentions. The number of students was not large, and if at any time its number of professors exceeded three, it was soon reduced to that number, and from that to two.” Again from page 5. “An institution, which it had been hoped, would have done credit to the state, was held low in the public estimation, in consequence of the almost *continued quarrels* of its professors. The number of matriculated students, was but seventeen. It was without funds, and to use the expression of one of the witnesses, it had “become a *by-word and a hissing stock*.” *Dr. Drake* in a late pamphlet has adopted a mode of praising himself not unfrequently resorted to by gentlemen of his calibre; and which consists in putting his own opinion of himself into the mouths of third persons, and then speaking it out for them, to wit: The Doctor says, “I have been erected into a phenomenon—a teacher able to raise the school into immediate distinction, but still unqualified by my talents and sagacity, to judge whether its organization was such as would be successful!” We find it here announced to the wondering community, and that too, *modestly*, from the trumpet of the individual himself, that he is the only man capable of raising the *Medical College* of Ohio into immediate distinction. Oh! for the ancient days of the Republic; when instead of *fighting* one’s way to office by vaunting of our talents, and boasting of our patriotism—real merit was wont to hide itself from the scrutinizing gaze of the public—when the father of his country declared himself unfit to be the President of the United States, but was willing to accept the trust from motives of public duty. Who these persons are, that entertain this exalted opinion of *Dr. Drake*, I have not been able to learn.—Whoever they *may* be, let me propose to

them a few plain questions. Who had the almost exclusive control of the *Medical College* of Ohio for nearly four years!—Was it not *Dr. Drake*?

Who was at the head of the school, which, (in the words of the committee,) at the expiration of four years, “was held low in the public estimation, in consequence of the almost *continued quarrels* of the professors?” Was it not *Daniel Drake*? Whose school was it, that struggled on “*without character*,” and which had, in the words of the same committee, “become a *by-word and a hissing stock*?” Was it not *Daniel Drake*’s? Is *Daniel Drake* then, the fitter man, to raise a school into “*immediate distinction*,” or to deprive it of its character, and sink it into such utter contempt as to become a “*hissing stock*” for the people? It is not my province to answer these questions; *Judge Hitchcock* has done it, as I have already shown, by the extracts I have made; and which will more fully appear by the record itself. The charges above alleged against Doctor Drake, are of so grave and serious a nature, viewing him as a professional man, that I should not have *dared* to make them myself, unless they had been sustained by evidence of the highest nature: and it is upon this evidence I give them to the public: “*records can’t lie*.” I have another extract from the same paper, bearing upon this point, and which sustains my position more completely, if such a thing can be, than those already published—but I think proper to reserve this until I come to treat of *Dr. Drake*’s second exit from the *Medical College* of Ohio, after the amalgamation of this institution with the Miami Faculty.—But it may be said, that although I have proven discord to have existed in the Faculty of the old College, and that it was destroyed in consequence, yet I have not shown *Drake* to be the man who threw the firebrand—inasmuch as there were three professors, and it might as well have been either of the other two—that although I have shown *Drake* to have failed in building up a Medical school, when he had an opportunity of so doing, I have not shown but that he might have been impeded, by the quarrels or incompetency of his associates. These are objections which might reasonably enough be raised, and as I wish to argue the question, in all fairness and candor, I shall proceed to obviate them.—First, then, as to the incompetency of his associates. It will have been seen from the previous numbers of these papers, that

those gentlemen were Doctors *Slack* and *Jesse Smith*, and a part of the time *Dr Rogers*; and that they were chosen by *Drake* himself. If therefore, they were incompetent, *Drake* ought to have known it; and if *knowing* it, he chose them, he practised a fraud upon the public—if they were not incompetent, the objection is overthrown. Was *Drake* then, a peaceable, public spirited, well disposed member of the Faculty, or was he on the other hand, the disturbing power, which kept it constantly embroiled!—the proof under this head consists of two kinds; the first, is the positive testimony given before the committee; and the second, is the amiable and quiet dispositions of Drs. *Smith* and *Slack*. The positive testimony, is that given in by *Dr. Jesse Smith*, who, it will be recollected, at the time this investigation was held, had ceased to be a member of the Faculty, and was therefore no more interested in its concerns, than any other citizen; from this fact, connected with the private character of the man, we are warranted in our conclusions of his veracity. I extract from page 229 of a manuscript copy of the record, in my possession. "Witness. When I first came to the institution in 1820, the fall of the year, there were four professors, who united with me in giving the first course of lectures,—during that session for two or three weeks, there was considerable harmony. A schism of a serious nature, then occurred—an effort was made by *Doctor Drake* to get all the professors out, [the reader will remark, that this was after he had already turned out *Dr. Rogers*, in less than a year from the commencement of this school,] which led to his *expulsion*; his operations were such as to lead to a disservice of all the professors—and he was expelled." Thus we see that *Dr. Drake* not being able to agree with *Dr. Rogers*, prevailed on *Dr. Slack* to assist in turning him out. *Dr. Jesse Smith* comes into *Dr. Rogers'* place, and in two or three weeks, *Drake* not being able to agree with him either, sets the different members of the Faculty by the ears, and "full fraught with mischievous revenge," endeavors to turn all hands out, but got turned out himself.

Now, for the circumstantial evidence—to wit: a presumption that *Drake* instigated all the quarrels of the Faculty, from the fact, that the other members were peaceable men. Soon after the dissolution of the College in 1822, it was reorganized, Doctors *Smith* and *Slack*, *Drake's* old associates being retained. In the winter of 1824-5,

lectures were delivered, (*Drake* being now in Kentucky, out of the way), and from this period until 1831, when *Drake* again entered the school, continued to flourish; each year increasing the number of its students. Extracts from the record, "*Dr. Rodgers* (Dentist Cincinnati) called, and testified—had attended courses, no dissatisfaction in class, in 1824-5 and 25-6, with any of the Faculty &c" *Dr. Killough* is called "Attended the M. C. O. in 1827-8, acquainted with the opinion of the class as to the competency of the professors—there was general satisfaction as far as I know." From the report of the Senate committee, page 19 "It is with pleasure that the committee learn, that the institution, (M. C. O.) during the present session, is in a flourishing condition; that the number of students is respectable, and that harmony prevails in the faculty." (*Drake* was not a member.) Thus it appears, that although *Smith* and *Slack* could not agree with *Drake*, they could agree with other men—so that the proposition, as sustained by circumstantial evidence, resolves itself into this. A. B. and C. cannot agree together, but A and B agree very well with D—now whose fault is it that there is no harmony among A. B. and C; that of A. and B, who agree so well with D, or that of C, who can't agree at all with A and B? Let C represent *Drake* and you have the application of this syllogism. We have then both positive and circumstantial proof, that *Drake* destroyed the *Medical College* in 1822 by fomenting "quarrels among the Faculty."

Although I have proved in my last number, and that, as I apprehend, by irrefragable testimony. that the troubles which existed in the Faculty of the *Medical College* of Ohio, under its first organization, and which led to the destruction of that institution, were attributable to the dictatorial bearing, and factious and intriguing spirit of *Doctor Daniel Drake*, yet I cannot take leave of this part of my subject, without adding some further corroborative evidence in support of my position—this evidence consists of sundry extracts taken from "a transcript of the Records of the *Medical College* of Ohio, up to February 10th 1823." "Thursday, March 7th 1822—The Faculty met" "on motion of *Dr. Smith*, which was seconded by Professor *Slack*, it was voted, *nemine contradiscente*, that *Daniel Drake*, M. D. be dismissed from the *Medical College* of Ohio." A short time after this dismissal, there was a

board of Trustees appointed composed of the most respectable citizens of Cincinnati, for the purpose of aiding the Faculty in the management of the College; the following gentlemen, were the members of the Board, viz: Hon. Wm. Burke, Samuel W. Davies Esq., David K. Este Esq. (now President Judge of the Com. Pleas of Ham. county) General Wm. H. Harrison, Nicholas Longworth Esq., Rev. Martin Ruter, Rev. O. M. Spencer, Ethan Stone Esq., Micajah T. Williams. The President of the M. C. O. the Governor of the state, and the Pres. of the Med. Con'n. "January 1823—the Faculty of the Medical College of Ohio convened at *Dr. Smith's*, and *unanimously* voted, that a communication which was then read, and which exhibited some features of the *History* of the College, its present state, and the policy contemplated by the Faculty of the institution, be *officially* transmitted by the Pres. to the Board of Trustees of said College, and that a copy of said communication be put on file.

(It is as follows.)

Gentlemen:—

Being advised by report, and the newspapers, of the transfer of corporate powers recently vested in the Faculty of the Medical College of Ohio, to your honorable body, we avail ourselves of the earliest opportunity, to offer congratulations, for the confidence reposed, in delegating this responsible trust. We would also express our pleasure in the reflection, that whether reorganized or not, hereafter, as professors, the institution will rest on the absolute and independent board, to whom its direction, and interests are entrusted.—Disclaiming every wish to renew our late responsibility, and the exercise of your present prerogatives; or even a desire to continue in the professorial chairs of a school, which has stood, and is now advancing despite of its *adversary*, [Here we observe, that so soon as *Drake* was dismissed, he had turned his battery, on the school] and which we believe may become one of the most useful and flourishing Seminaries of the West. We here transmit those particulars of its history, present state, and policy, which will enable you to receive it from us, as it is, a personally unprofitable, though hopeful concern. "In the summer of 1820, Benj. S. Bohrer, M. D. and one of the subscribers were enticed by a statement of prospects, which have proved delusive, to quit their homes—to sacrifice their profitable business, and in-

cur a heavy expense of travelling, purchasing books, instruments, various anatomical preparations &c, for as yet, little else, but the *privilege of being slandered*, and of labouring most assiduously, in the institution; which they have done, *to the entire satisfaction of every member of their classes*. On entering upon the duties of their respective departments, they were soon *compelled* to observe, that the *obstacles to the success of the College*, were not merely a depreciation of currency—a want of pupils, a library, Chemical and Anatomical Cabinets, and commodious buildings.

The *fetters* which bound it, were those of the *Inquisition*. The half of the Faculty could not even reciprocate the civilities of social life, *without censure*, and endangering an intestine quarrel. They could not employ the little leisure from College avocations, in abstract speculation, which might chance to be uttered or read, *without abuse*, and the imputation of unworthy motives. They are stigmatized as "young," inexperienced and imbecile, [Query—were they any *older* when *Drake* chose them, some time before?] save on the subjects of their departments in the lecture-room. The very men whom slander had not before ventured to assail, were reproached with the blackest calumnies, by a *colleague*; a colleague who had sought and *proclaimed their unexceptionable reputation*; and who under guise of a *hypocritic sanctimony*, was endeavoring at the same time, to excite the *disaffection of his class*, [Here is the *sedition* I mentioned in a former number,] towards a third associate, then his *unsuspecting friend*. In this state the Institution continued till the autumn of 1821, when *Johu D. Godnan*, M. D. accepted a professorship. For a time the *reputation-slaughtering demon of envy and malice*, courted his friendship; but the spirit which could not rest one short term in a sister Institution, (Lexington school!) without occasioning a duel—a challenge for a second—the application of whatever is opprobrious to a third—of imbecility to a fourth, and subsequently, the most open and undissembled hatred of a partner, could not long be concealed; and *Dr. Godman* openly avowed to his colleagues and others, that no person had ever before so *grossly imposed upon him*; and on this account, that he should resign his professorship—but would accept a re-appointment, if the subject of his remarks would leave the institution.

Thus the College struggled through a second term, languid, sick, and palsied, from the fountain of the ever active principles of moral corruption, which unceasingly preyed upon all the vital organs of the Corporate body, till at last the expiring effort of the *vis medicatrix nature* expelled the venom of the constitution. In this way was the school rid of a man, sometimes *respected by those at a distance*, and who knew him not; caressed by a few whom he *flatters*, and whose interests never interfere with his secret intriguing machinations; and almost universally contemned and despised by every honorable competitor, partner or colleague." The above is spread at large on the records of the College, it was written in 1823, and I give it to the public with a single remark: a late traveller in India, informs us that the descriptions of the country and people, given by the Journalists of Alexander the Great's expedition, would answer just as well for the present day; so invariable are the *face of Nature*, and the *manners and customs* of the people.

Lest the character and standing of Dr. Godman, whose name is mentioned in connection with *Drake's* treatment of him, should not be known to all my readers, I give the following extract from one of *Drake's* letters, [see *Xenia* pamphlet,] "In the following summer I succeeded in obtaining the co-operation of the late distinguished and lamented *Dr. Godman*, then a young man; [the reader will recollect the passage relating to young men,] and I fearlessly assert that the institution, young as it was, had then an abler Faculty than belonged to it for the succeeding ten years," &c. Doctors *Slack* and *Smith* who sent the letter to the Board of Trustees, which I have given in this number, were members of the Faculty here alluded to.

It is gratifying to remark, as we pass through life, that the secret plans, concerted for the destruction of others, almost invariably recoil upon the heads of those who originate them; to compare *small* things with great, the final operation of *Drake's* plot, for turning out *Dr. Rogers*, resembled not a little the guillotine of the noted *revolutionist*, Robespierre; which instrument had the honor, in due time, of taking off that worthy's head. It will be recollected that one of *Drake's* first acts, after entering the old school, was to quarrel with *Dr. Rogers*, and with the assistance of *Slack*, to expel him. Now this

could not be done without altering the charter of the institution, because under that instrument it required a majority of three fourths, to displace a professor. *Dr. Brown* never appeared and took his seat, having his eyes opened no doubt to the character of the man with whom he had unwittingly associated himself—so that there were but three professors. *Drake* when he had determined upon launching one of the thunder-bolts of his immortal prototype at the head of his antagonist, was "sorely puzzled" to find out, how he and *Slack* could make three fourths of three persons; he ultimately "gave it up" in despair, and forthwith petitioned the Legislature to alter the refractory charter aforesaid; so that two thirds, instead of three fourths of the Faculty, should have the appointing and dismissing power; which was accordingly done. *Rogers* was turned out, and the very act which had enabled *Drake* and *Slack* to do this, afterwards empowered *Smith* and *Slack* (*Oh rank treason!*) to expel *Daniel Drake!*—he was dismissed "according to the statute, in such cases made and provided." Here we behold too, the commencement, or rather the first outbreak (in this state) of that indomitable spirit of revenge and persecution, which characterises the man—when his enemy cannot otherwise be reached—laws must be enacted—the aid of the Legislature must be invoked. I will now pass on, to the consideration of what I shall call the second era of the College; that is, the period of its re-organization after it had been destroyed by *Drake*; and here for a while, we get once more into smooth water and plain sailing, after having been tossed to and fro on the boisterous ocean of *Drake's* love of power and intrigue; but let us not rejoice too soon in our deliverance, for as we shall presently see, our bark is destined again to buffet the waves of strife and contention—again to bend to the fury of the storm—again to be lured by the Syren, and again to be dashed on the rocks. When the tumult and confusion which preceded *Drake's* departure for Lexington, in the character of professor in the Transylvania University, had subsided into order, and the community was left once more in repose, public attention was directed to the wreck of the College.

"O Eve, in evil hour thou didst give ear  
To that false worm, of whomsoever taught  
To counterfeit man's voice;"

The Legislature renewed its labors—took the subject again into consideration, and appointed a Board of Trustees; transferring to them a portion of the power which had before been lodged in the hands of the Faculty. The preamble of the statute making this alteration, gives the reasons for the change: “Whereas the visiters from the *Medical Convention* to the *Medical College* of Ohio, have represented to the General Assembly, that it is necessary that a board of trustees be appointed,” &c. The Trustees who were to perform the duties assigned to them by this act, without fee or emolument, and who therefore accepted their office with an eye single to the public good, commenced their labors early in the year 1823; and at the same time the former organization of the College ceased. These gentlemen had to contend with innumerable difficulties—to use the words of the Senate’s report: “An institution was thrown upon their hands, without funds, & perhaps it might with propriety be said, without character. To organize it, and put it again in operation, the Committee believe, was attended with more difficulty than would have been experienced from the establishment of an entire new school.”

One would suppose, from his previous history, that the people had already seen too much of Doctor Drake’s moral unfitness to build up a Medical School among them, again to entrust him with power; such, however, was not the fact, and one of the first acts of the new Board of Trustees, was to invite him to take a chair in the College, which he refused. Dr. Drake was at that day, as he is now, at the head of a party; a small but determined band, who waged uncompromising war against the “ins.” The Board of Trustees saw this, and they saw too that Drake’s talent was of that peculiar kind, which if it could not enable him to build up, yet gave him power to pull down; and they therefore, no doubt sought to buy him, rather than pay any merited compliment to his professional attainments; but they came into the market too late, a higher bid had been offered by a sister state; and there was then a treaty on foot for its acceptance. This is one of the dark deeds in Drake’s life,—it strikes more directly than any other, at that feeling upon which he most prides himself—his love for Ohio; and he has hence devoted page after page to palliate it. In the first place he denies most positively that the Board sought to engage his servi-

ces, until after they had held one session, and made arrangements for appointing three of his enemies—that he had already engaged to go to Lexington, and therefore could not accept. Now in order that both parties may speak, I will here give the allegation and denial, *verbatim*.

Allegation:—“One of the first efforts of the Board was to induce Doctor Drake to return to the school, which he refused to do, choosing rather to give the weight of his talents and character to the rival institution of Lexington. Although disappointed in this calculation, and sensibly alive to the consequences that would naturally result from the opposition of Doctor Drake, and the exertion of all his powers, with the weight of his character, in favor of a rival institution; the board did not despair. (Signed.)

William Corry, Oliver M. Spencer, Samuel W. Davies, Alexander Duncan; Nathaniel Wright, William Burke, Jacob Burnet, George P. Torrence, Joseph Gest, Bellamy Storer, Daniel Gano, Trustees.”

Denial:—“The new body met early in 1823, and as a considerable re-action had taken place in the public mind, I was credulous enough to expect that their first act would be, to reinstate me in the places from which I had been violently expelled; but they adjourned without considering my case, and left me to speculate on the future. (Signed.) Daniel Drake.”

In which of these statements, the truth is to be found, I leave the reader to determine. If the word of Daniel Drake is worth more than that of the eleven men above named—you must believe *him*—if on the contrary, you should be inclined to think, that his word is not worth quite so much—you must believe *them*. Dr. Drake then notwithstanding the efforts made to retain him—very fortunately for the school, as its prosperity during the time he was unconnected with it, will show—was bought up, by the larger price put upon his services, and left the State. Such was the bad odor into which Drake and his partisans had brought the school, that the Trustees, notwithstanding their zealous and indefatigable exertions, were unable to organize a Faculty, until the summer or fall of 1824. In the fall of that year, the following gentlemen, viz: Drs. Cobb, Smith, Slack and Moorhead, having been chosen professors, a course of lec-



tures was delivered to a class of fifteen students. In the next succeeding session, the class increased to the number of forty eight; in the session after, to eighty, and in the session of 1827-8, to one hundred and one! Thus in four years, from the second organization of the school, the number of its students increased from fifteen to one hundred and one; while during a similar period—as we have already seen—when the school was under the management and control of the great lion of the West—the skilful architect of our scientific fame—the number of its students?—*swindled to eighteen!* “What a fall was there my countrymen!” Facts speak louder than the railings of the demagogue, or the half famished cries of the revolutionist, who seeks to overturn the existing state of things, in order that he may batten on the fragments, which his pernicious doctrines have scattered around him; in order that he may riot on the ruins of other men’s fortunes. If the “*continued quarrels*” of the first school, as Judge Hitchcock has declared, were the *causes* of its destruction, and the second school, up to this period, was not only in existence but flourishing beyond anticipation, it follows that there must have been harmony in its Faculty.—Independently of this presumption, we have positive testimony of the fact; that testimony I have already given to the public, for the purpose of sustaining another point, and need not repeat it here; but who ever heard of the quarrels of Dr. *Cobb* and Dr. *Moorhead*, or of Dr. *Cobb* and Dr. *Smith*, or of Dr. *Smith* and Dr. *Slack*?—whereas, the first thing a stranger will hear, upon landing at the quay, will be Dr. *Drake’s* quarrel with Dr. *Some-body-else*. The prosperity of the school did not stop here, but continued to advance until 1831, in the fall of which year, the number of students was one hundred and thirty one—its increase, however, for the last four years, was only thirty, while for the previous four, from 1824 to 1828, the increase was seventy six. Now here is a result for which a *cause* must be sought. The Medical College of Ohio, during the first four years of her *second* life, was making rapid strides to distinction; suddenly, in 1828, these strides become less rapid, her vigor is less apparent, and she is evidently struggling under the weight of some incubus that sits heavily upon her. What can it be? Does the reader recollect that for the first four years alluded to, Dr. Drake was out of the state, rendering his servi-

ces for his pay—identifying himself with the prosperity of Kentucky, and had therefore neither time nor motive for battering down our own College, with the hope of reforming himself into it; and that from causes, which I shall explain hereafter, he *left* his new domicile, in 1827, and to the good city of Cincinnati,

“Full fraught with mischievous revenge,  
Accursed, and in a cursed hour, he hies.”

We have seen, in my last number, that the Medical College of Ohio, so soon as that institution and the state had rid themselves of Dr. Daniel Drake, was re-organized, and immediately began to rear its head, proudly on the ruins of its predecessor—that its prosperity kept pace, *pari passu*, with the prosperity of the city; the increase of its students being 76 in the space of four years; and we have also seen, that when the said Daniel Drake again put his foot upon our soil, and raised the war-cry of opposition, a blight was thrown on its promise, and its career of prosperity was checked. In order that the chain of our history may be more complete, I shall find it necessary to *track* the principal subject of these papers to Lexington, and there take a short review of his connection with the Transylvania University. We find him here for the first time, in 1816; in that year he says, “I had the honor to be elected Professor of *Materia Medica* and *Botany*, in the projected medical department of the Transylvania University; and in the autumn of the next year entered on my duties. A winter’s residence in Lexington, convinced me, that Cincinnati even then was, and in future would more decidedly be, far preferable to that town, for such an institution; and in the spring of 1818, I resigned, with the determination of attempting to found a Medical school in this place.” (See the *Xenia pamphlet*.) Dr. Drake here tells us, that the *cause* of his leaving Lexington, the first time, was his being convinced that Cincinnati was a better place to establish a Medical school in. Indeed! How strange, that this discovery was not made before he left Cincinnati, and that it *was* made the very first winter of his residence in Lexington!—Was it necessary to visit Lexington, to learn its locality, and compare its advantages with those of Cincinnati? Could not Dr. Drake have prevailed on some *school-boy* to loan him his Atlas and statistics, for the purpose? But no, this was *not* the cause, and Drake knew it was not, at the

time he made the declaration. It so happens, unfortunately for the statement of Dr. Drake, that I have seen and conversed with several gentlemen, (their names can be given if required,) who are acquainted with the circumstances under which he left Lexington, in 1818; those circumstances are such as the reader has no doubt anticipated. Dr. Drake, as the whole course of his professional life will show, being unable to live harmoniously with any set of men, very soon after taking his seat, quarrelled with his new associates, among the rest with Dr. Blythe, and left the institution in consequence.

Thus we see, that in the course of one short winter, after Drake's installation into office, he succeeded in setting the Faculty "by the ears," and when the storm was at its height, returned into our own state; where as the reader has already observed, the same drama was acted over again, in the *Medical College of Ohio*—the only difference being a partial change of the *dramatis personæ*. It is needless here to remark, that the Medical department of the Transylvania University, was entirely broken up by this event, and that it did not recover from the shock it had received, until by a manly effort it threw the incubus from its own bosom upon that of the Ohio College; where it sat with the fatality of Brutus' evil genius at the battle of Phillippi. When by these means the Transylvania school was destroyed—when Drake had returned to Cincinnati, and in like manner the Medical College of Ohio was destroyed—he, notwithstanding the wonderful discovery he had made four years before, that Cincinnati was preferable to Lexington as a location for a Medical school, returned to the latter place, as a professor, and re-entered the Transylvania University; which during his absence had begun again to flourish. In this second connection with the Lexington school, Dr. Drake remained *four long years!* In 1824, the institution had 234 students; in 1825, 281, and in 1826, 190; this was the last year Drake remained in Lexington, and if the falling off of the class, from 281 students to 190, indicates any thing, it shows very clearly, that the same fire-brand of discord was thrown among the Faculty, about this period, which Drake had hurled with so deadly an effect, on two former occasions. Now mark the following contrast:—from 1825 to 1826, the class in Lexington was *reduced* from 281 to 190; while during the same period, the class in Cincinnati had *increased* from 80 to 101;

Drake was in Lexington prostrating that school, and the Medical College of Ohio being freed from his trammels, was fast rising into reputation. In order that the reader may see more clearly, and at a single glance, the influence which Doctor

Dr. Drake was connected four years with Drake's connection with a Medical school is calculated to exert upon its destiny, I will here briefly recapitulate a few statements, which are spread *passim* in these papers:

the Medical College of Ohio; at the expiration of this time, it was broken up.

Dr. Drake was connected four years with the Lexington school, from 1823 to 1827, during the last of which years, the number of students *decreased* from 281 to 190.

Dr. Drake was *unconnected* with the Lexington school for four years, from 1819 to 1823, during which time its number of students *increased* from 93 to 200.

Dr. Drake was *unconnected* with the Medical College of Ohio for four years, from 1824 to 1827, during which time the number of students *increased* from 15 to 101, &c. &c.

For the accuracy of the above statements, I refer to the "Western Journal of Medical and Physical Sciences," edited by Daniel Drake, M. D., No. 30, Vol. 8, page 313.

Now although it might happen, in a single instance, that there might be an increase or decrease of students without the fault of any of the professors, it can hardly be, that a result of this kind could be produced, so uniformly, and so frequently, under the *same combination of circumstances*, without the *maker* of those circumstances being the *cause* of the change. Dr. Drake then left the Lexington school a second time, and why? Let *him* speak first, and then let facts speak: "After passing four winters at Lexington, in uninterrupted harmony with my colleagues, and the different classes, I became tired of librating between that city and this, from which the treatment I had received had never alienated my affections, [*Oh! amor patriæ,*] and I resigned for the purpose of making this my sole residence." (Drake's electioneering pamphlet to the Xenia committee.) I have already shown that the *harmony* here spoken of, reduced the class of the Lexington school from 281 to 190; in addition to this it is *notorious*, and there are twenty physicians in this city who know the fact, that Dr. Drake *quarrelled* incessantly with his associates in the Faculty,

and among the rest with Dr. Dudley—that he occasioned a duel between this gentleman and Dr. Richardson,\* and that in consequence of these difficulties he was obliged to abandon for the *third* time his professor's chair. Being again out of *employment*, he was *patriotic* enough to return to this city, in 1827, and immediately commenced that *system* of efforts to reform himself into the Medical College, then a prosperous institution, which with a short intermission, (the cause of which will hereafter appear,) he has followed up to the present time. Let every citizen of Ohio, for it is his solemn duty, calmly review the history thus hastily traced in these papers, and ask himself the question, whether he is *again* willing to entrust any portion of the honor and prosperity of the Medical College of Ohio to the keeping or building up of Doctor Daniel Drake?—whether a man who has torn down two colleges, and thrown a third into confusion, is likely to build up a fourth? In my next number I shall continue the history of the College; in the course of which my readers will be even more surprised than they yet have been, at the disclosures I shall make.

We have seen in the last number, that Doctor Drake having resigned his professorship in Lexington, in consequence of difficulties in the Faculty, returned to this city. At that time the chairs of the Medical College of Ohio were all full; Dr. Whitman having been elected to fill the newly created chair of Obstetrics. Under this state of things, what would have been the first suggestion which would naturally have presented itself to a wily politician intent on securing a portion of the “*loaves and fishes?*” Why, the very one which Dr. Drake proceeded forthwith to carry into execution; “*reform.*” He saw that the Faculty was complete—that the institution was prosperous, and that the only hope he had of gaining admission into it, was by the forcible displacement of one of its incumbents. To this end then, he addressed himself.

“On some great change employed, he seemed,  
Or fixed, in cogitation deep.”

*Prima facie*, the prosperity of the College proclaimed the ability and harmony of the Faculty; and upon further inquiry he found, that it stood as it deserved to stand, high in the estimation of the pupils, and Trustees. In order to effect a reform

then, or rather a change, as no reform was necessary, Drake found himself under the necessity of waging open and undisguised war. The means by which this war was prosecuted, will appear in detail, in the course of these papers; but that the reader may be enabled to connect the various parts of them into one uniform system, as he progresses, it may not be amiss here to give a brief outline of the campaign, or which we are about to enter. We must bear in mind, in the first place, that the *main* object which Drake had in view, was a seat in one of the chairs already filled—but as he could not carry on the war alone, he was obliged, secondly, to *guaranty* seats to his allies, for their contingents of labor and faithful co-operation in his designs.—To show that this was the fact, I have only to refer to Drake's testimony before the committee, in 1833: “I told one of the Trustees that I could not enter the College, unless my colleagues entered also.—That Dr. Henry was unprovided for; [a partisan *unprovided* for!] That I was under *guaranties* to them.” page 111, Test.

This preliminary contract being settled, among the belligerents, the next step is, the adoption of such measures as will enable them to carry it into execution. In order to vacate one or more of the Faculty, it was necessary, First, to gain over the Trustees and induce them to create the required vacancies, from personal considerations; or secondly, to destroy the individual reputation of the incumbents, and effect their removal under pretence of the public good; or if both these schemes should fail, thirdly, to prostrate the whole College and then point to its wreck, as imperiously demanding the interposition of the Trustees, in effecting a re-organization under different auspices; to wit: under the auspices of those, who having won the victory were entitled to the spoils. And finally, if the Board of Trustees should, notwithstanding the endeavors of the *party* to *coerce* them into measures, still prove refractory—if they should be possessed of sufficient intelligence and tact, to discover the *true* motives of Drake and his men; and if they should be too honest and independent to become the dupes of their artifice and intrigue—they *must themselves* be sacrificed—the Legislature must be appealed to, and in the last resort, the people, their constituents, to “*reform*” the Board of Trustees which refused to “*reform*” the Faculty, which refused to vacate its chairs voluntarily, to

\* See Note—end of the work.

gratify Doctor Drake and his adherents. Here we perceive a deep-laid scheme of policy, one worthy of the best days of Talleyrand himself, and which, as I shall hereafter show, was but too faithfully carried out in all its details. The reader may start with surprise and exclaim, can it be possible that the people of Ohio have allowed themselves to be so grossly imposed upon—have permitted their best interests to be sacrificed to the Moloch of *party*, for the gratification of private ends? I answer—they have; but it was because they have not been permitted to know the true state of things;—the public press, whose duty it was to give them such information, has been recreant to the high trust confided to it—the sentinels of public opinion have slept at their posts, and during their slumbers, the secret process of mining has been carried on. I shall pass over the attempt of Dr. Drake to gain the Trustees to his interest, by the arts usually employed on such occasions, and proceed to consider his efforts to depreciate the character of the Faculty of the Medical College of Ohio. To effect this object, numerous letters were written, and pamphlet after pamphlet was published, and industriously circulated among the people. In this way it was attempted to create a *counterfeit* public opinion, which coming back to the centre, from which it was originally disseminated, was asserted to be a legitimate cause for reform. At the period of which we are writing, the Faculty consisted of Drs. Cobb, Smith, Slack, Moorhead and Whitman; these gentlemen were all included, in one sweeping charge of incompetency. This charge was not made directly to the Trustees, but in the circuitous manner I have already mentioned. Dr. Drake was not the engine brought to play against the Board, but the engineer who put the *machine* in motion. The reader will recollect that we are now reviewing the transactions which took place in the years 1827-8-9-30, and that the charge of incompetency was reiterated through the whole of this period. It is this charge which I shall now seek to disprove, and that out of the mouth of Daniel Drake himself; how far I shall succeed in the attempt, I leave the public to determine. First, then: with regard to the allegation, as it relates to Drs. Smith and Slack, we have seen that Drake *selected* them himself, as suitable men to be associated with him as colleagues, in the first organization of the college. They were then comparatively young and inexperi-

enced men, and if they were fit to be professors, they were surely not the less fit, in 1827, eight years afterwards. Dr. Drake has not only by this act proclaimed their ability, but so long as it suited his interest, bulletin after bulletin was sent forth to the people making the same declaration. Speaking of the obstacles which the citizens of Cincinnati had thrown in his way, for the purpose of preventing him from building up a Medical school, and in order to show that these obstacles must have been insuperable, since they crushed *him* and an able Faculty beneath them, he says, (I have had occasion to quote this before,) "In the following summer, I succeeded in obtaining the co-operation of the late distinguished and lamented Dr. Godman, then a young man, and fearlessly assert, that the institution young as it was, had then an abler Faculty than belonged to it for the succeeding ten years;"—(Drake's etectioneering pamphlet to the Xenia committee.) Drs. Smith and Slack were the *able* men, or at least two of them, here spoken of.

Thus we have the admission, that these gentlemen, were not only members of an *able* Faculty, but were fit associates for Daniel Drake himself! Now let us see how prettily, the said Daniel Drake can asperse the character of these men when it is no longer his interest to sustain them, and he is trying to drag them from their chairs, for the purpose of filling them himself. Drake it will be recollected was turned out of the College by Professors Smith and Slack, and speaking of that event, and the re-organization of the Faculty, he says, "After my expulsion Dr. Smith and Mr. Slack were the only members of the corporation. They immediately proceeded to an election of officers, and the former was chosen President, and the latter Registrar. They then cast about among their friends, & the friends of those physicians, who had laboured at my overthrow, and selected a body of thirteen counsellors, whose office it was to sanction, whatever they might do; and who I believe seldom disappointed the speculations under which they were chosen."—Here we find Smith and Slack, who were such honest and able men, so long as they submitted to be made *use* of, as catspaws, by Dr. Drake, charged—it is genteely done, it is true—but still charged, with the basest motives in their subsequent official acts.—Is any man to be believed, who can thus "blow hot and blow cold," in the same breath? Nor is this all, the same reflections are cast upon the "thirteen counsel-

lors," whose names I have in one of my previous numbers, given to the public, and whose integrity in this community is known to be above reproach. So much for the charge of Smith's and Slack's incompetency. Now let us proceed to investigate that of Drs. Cobb, Moorhead, and Whitman. Dr. Cobb although first appointed to fill the chair of the Practice of Medicine, was very soon removed to that of Anatomy. Dr. Drake says "Soon after my departure for Lexington in 1823, instead of casting about, for some developed, and experienced man, to fill the chair of the Practice of Medicine, the Trustees on the recommendation of Dr. Smith who had moved my expulsion, assigned it to Dr. Cobb of the State of Maine, who had been a student in the same office, with Dr. Smith, and had just graduated." Now here are several reasons, why Dr. Cobb was thought to be incompetent. The first is, that he was recommended by Dr. Smith, who was a bad man, because he had assisted in turning Drake out of the College. This is really so powerful an objection to Dr. Cobb that I am utterly at a loss how to reply to it. I leave it to the sagacity of the reader. The second objection is that Dr. Cobb is from the State of *Maine*. How infatuated the Trustees must have been, to suppose, that any person from Maine or Georgia, or any other State, than that which gave birth to the great Drake, could be a man of talents or acquirements! I must confess, that little as I am disposed to view Dr. Drake with a favourable eye, I did not suppose him to be a mere man of *latitude* and *longitude*. The very fact of his belonging to a liberal, and enlightened profession—of his being a labourer in the cause of science which is omnipresent, had given me a better opinion of him. But I find him, instead of looking from the eminence, which he is supposed to occupy in this community, over our *whole* country, and priding himself upon being an *American* citizen, drawing lines of demarcation between the several States—endeavouring to excite the local *prejudices* of the people against a man, whose reputation being unassailable, could be reached in no other way. If a man's worth in these United States is to be tried by the touchstone of soil, then let each State go to work, and pass her *alien* laws. We are here in a new section of that *same* country, which the united exertions of our common ancestors, without distinction of North, or South, or East, or West, rescued from oppression,

and rendered free and happy—we have assembled from all parts of the *Union*; have become citizens of Ohio—identified ourselves, with her interest and honor, and are we to be told by a man who preceded us a few years in emigration that he is Lord of the manor and we his copyholders? It is time, that these things should be put astop to—it is time that those persons, who have no better claims on the community, than such as arise, from their having been chained a little longer to the soil, should be made to give place to better men. I do not of course mean any disrespect to those of our older residents, who have too much good sense, to surround themselves, with the narrow minded prejudices, which distinguished, the ferocious, and ignorant clans of Scotland, some three centuries ago; my remarks are only meant for such as would if they had the power, renew the old feudal relation of vassal and Lord, and sell a man on the soil, on which he was born, as "appurtenant thereto."

But to proceed, Dr. Cobb is called a *young* man, and therefore incompetent. Was Dr. Godman a young man when Drake invited him to become a colleague? "Grey hairs are venerable," but I have not yet learnt that a man's brains are to be measured by his years. Besides, this objection was made to Dr. Cobb several years after he had been in the chair of Anatomy; and this is a chair which a man who has been well educated in the dissecting room, may fill with credit to himself, and his school, without ever having been by the bedside of a patient. Dr. Moorhead was objected to because he also was not born in the right place, being a native of Ireland; although he has been in this country a long series of years, and has become heart and soul, as the noble Irish generally do, an American. But let us see how nimbly Drake can leap over these objections himself, when he has no longer a  *motive* to urge them. Drake towards the close of the late war in 1831, having made a breach in the *Medical College* of Ohio, found an opportunity of entering with *all his colleagues*, on condition that Drs. Cobb and Moorhead were retained. Now the reader will perhaps suppose, that in as much as Drake, thought these men incompetent, he could not of course, consent to associate with them. No such thing; he had no longer any *object* to gain in holding out; he had secured seats for himself and his colleagues, to whom he had given *guaranties*, and Dr. Cobb and

Moorhead, being no longer in the way, suddenly became endowed in his eyes, with all the qualities of first-rate professors, as the following letter from Drake to the Trustees will show :

Cincinnati, July 7th, 1831.

Gentlemen:—In further reply to your note offering me the professorship of the *Institutes and Medical Jurisprudence*, in the *Medical College* of Ohio, I beg leave to suggest the following plan of consolidation, as the only one, as far as I know, that can leave me at liberty to accept a chair in the Institution.

PLAN OF CONSOLIDATION.

*Anatomy*, Dr. Cobb—*Institutes of Medicine and Medical Jurisprudence*, Dr. Pierson—*Theory and Practice of Medicine*, Dr. Moorhead," &c. &c. Here we see the man, who in 1830, to suit certain views, attempted to ruin the reputation of Dr. Cobb and Dr. Moorhead; in 1831 to suit certain other views, recommending those very gentlemen to fill two of the most important chairs in the Medical College. Thus I have shown that Drake's opinions of Smith, Cobb, Moorhead and Slack, have like the sails of a ship, been trimmed to suit every breeze of selfishness and interest—that he has pronounced these men, honest or dishonest, competent or incompetent, as the one allegation, or the other, was calculated to serve his purposes. In relation to the charge against Dr. Whitman, it is sufficient to observe, that this gentleman was associated with the four persons above named—that he stood high with his colleagues, who were competent judges of his merit—and that he labored diligently and efficiently in assisting to raise the school, to that prosperity, which we have seen it once enjoyed.

The objections to Dr. Whitman, belong to the same genus, with those preferred against Drs. Cobb and Moorhead. The first named gentleman it seems had been guilty of the unpardonable sin, in the eyes of Dr. Drake, of having studied his profession, together with Drs. Cobb and Smith, in the office of a New England Physician! Oh ye Gods, what sacrilege! that the soil of Ohio should be stained with the talents and learning of New England! Drake says "Thus at the same time three of the professors of the College had been the private pupils of one New England Physician."—(Drake's electioneering pamphlet to the Xenia committee) I call the especial attention of my Eastern friends in the state to this passage, and

the others above quoted to the same point. It behooves them to oppose a determined and united front, in the outset, to the promulgation of such doctrines, as if carried into practice, threaten to disfranchise them as American citizens—to render them incapable of holding an office of honor or profit, in the state of Ohio. One would think, that Dr. Drake was a man possessed of too much knowledge of human nature; and too ambitious of popularity, thus openly to avow his prejudices against particular portions of our country, to the world, however he might hug those prejudices to his bosom in private—but the reader must recollect that when Dr. Drake made these impolitic disclosures, he was writing an electioneering letter (published afterwards) to a Medical Society for the purpose of cheering them on in the good work of reform—that under the impulse of strongly excited feelings himself, he was endeavoring to operate upon the passions of others with the hope of infusing new vigor in the lungs, and strength in the arms of his agents—so that they might throw up their caps higher, and shout longer, and louder, hurrah! for Drake and reform!!! down with the Medical College of Ohio. Dr. Drake, aware of the injury which was likely to result to his cause, from having permitted his passion to run away with his discretion, seeks in a late pamphlet, *Gazetting the new college*, to palliate the unguarded outpourings of his heart by putting a plausible construction on his intemperate language—it is true he does not refer to that language, and offer to explain it away, but he asserts *de novo*, that the reason why professors should come from a particular section of country, is, that they may bring influence with them. This is all very ingenious, but it reminds me of a little incident I once witnessed, and which as it is a good illustration of an idea I wish to convey to the reader, I will here relate. A Captain of one of our men-of-war, called up a seaman, on one occasion to punish him for abusive language to his officer—the seaman when he was ordered to prepare himself to receive the usual punishment, pleaded in defence that, he was "drunk," hoping to get off, under the old maxim "when wine is in, wit is out." The captain very coolly replied, "that plea won't answer my lad, I have some how or other taken up the notion, that when a man is drunk, he is very apt to say what he really thinks, but is afraid to say when

he is sober—go on Boatswain's mate;" and the man was punished. The reader of course perceives, the similarity in the conditions of *Dr. Drake* and the seaman; the only difference being that the former was thrown off his guard by the excitement of his feelings. Subsequent to the appointment of *Dr. Whitman*, another professorship was created, being the sixth, and *Dr. Pierson* was added to the Faculty. So soon as this gentleman had taken his chair, he came in, as a matter of course, for a portion of *Drake's* denunciations; but as usual, when *Drake* found it to his interests, to sustain him, he trimmed his sails, on the other tack, and recommended him, as we have seen in my last number, to the Trustees, as a proper appointment, to the chair of *Institutes of Medicine, and Medical Jurisprudence!* We have now arrived in our History at the winter of 1829—30. The war we have seen, has lasted three years, and has been prosecuted with vigor and ability, by the assailants. Notwithstanding the *fame* of the engineer, at the head of the besiegers, the rebellious College still holds out; no breach is made in its walls, nor is there a prospect of its soon capitulating. The troops are clamouring for their pay, and affairs are growing desperate. The ingenuity and skill of their leader, have so far, been exhausted in vain, and some new expedient is rendered absolutely necessary. One more effort must be made, before resort is had to the "forlorn hope"—the Miami Faculty. The students of the College must be gained—sedition must be sowed among them, and they must be arrayed in phalanx against their teachers. This is a deed of such "high emprise" that its execution can only be entrusted to their leader, who forthwith declares

"Wherefore do I assume these royalties, and not refuse

To reign, refusing to accept as great a share  
Of hazard, as of honor, due alike to him  
Who reigns."

Will my professional readers believe, that *Dr. Drake* in the winter of 1829—30, in violation of all etiquette and propriety, entered a *debating society* of the pupils of the *Medical College of Ohio*; and might have been heard during their sittings, *haranguing* its members, who were generally youths of, from seventeen to twenty one, on the different subjects connected with the administration, of their school; and with which he had no sort of concern?

Will they believe that *Dr. Drake*, whose motives are always so *disinterested*, during these *nocturnals*, vented his spleen, against the different members of the Faculty, and induced the class, to petition the trustees to make *him* a professor, in the College? And yet he did *all* this. We thus have seen, that *Dr. Drake* in waging "war to the knife" against the *Medical College of Ohio*, laboured to remove the professors, by destroying their reputation, as honest men, lecturers, and men of science; preferred charges of corruption, against the Board of Trustees—ingratiated himself with the students of the College, and detached them from the Faculty; circulated, by letter, and otherwise, such reports of the sinking condition of the school as were calculated to keep students aloof from it; and all this, to deprive men of their chairs, *whom he had before, or has since, sustained, and recommended to the public, as persons worthy of their trust, and confidence.* Nay more, he has from time to time convened Medical Societies, in various parts of the State to re-echo his denunciations—he has assembled them together in general convention and has caused them to send memorials to the Legislature, to induce that body to remove the independent board of Trustees, whom he could not make *plastic* enough, to carry out his measures; and to appoint *Drake-men* in their stead. To show that this was the case, I extract from, vol. 7, No. 23, page 624 of the *Western Journal*, edited by *Daniel Drake, M. D.*, and devoted, not as the reader might suppose, to politics, but to *Medical Science.* "As far back as the year 1827, [the reader will recollect this was the first-year, *Drake* took the field] the *Third District Medical Society* [which subsequently, as the reader will see, became the *pack-horse* to the party,] sent a circular [by whose order the deponent sayeth not] to the other societies of the State, expressing the opinion, that the professorships in the College were not adequately filled. In 1828 the *Medical Convention*, consisting of delegates from the District Societies, passed a resolution, desiring the *General Assembly*, to do something for the improvement of the school" &c. &c. &c. Now how does it happen that these societies slept so quietly during the four years of *Drake's* absence in Lexington, and were suddenly aroused from their slumbers, for the first time, immediately on the return of that person to our city? The same men who held pla-

ces in the College, in 1827, were in in 1824, and if there was cause for complaint in 1827, there was the same cause in 1826-5-4—but no, we hear not a syllable—the repose of these District gentry is as sound and complacent, as though there was no such institution in existence. These things are too plain to be misunderstood; no man can look at the facts, without being convinced how these affiliated societies were strung together, and who was the author of the concert among them. Thus we see, that *Drake* being unable to destroy the Faculty—failing in his efforts to prostrate the school, by keeping away its students; by means of his emissaries, stump orators, and societies, made a bold attempt to “reform” the fountain head of “reform,” the Trustees. Will it be believed, that the College, not only withstood all these assaults, but was actually advancing in prosperity, and yearly increasing the number of its students? It is even so—but *Drake succeeded* at last in making his way to the faculty, when—farewell prosperity.

When a man quarrels with *every body*, if there were no other evidence than this single fact, the presumption is that he *must* be wrong; and I have shown that *Dr. Drake* has been at “swords points” with every set of men with whom he has been professionally connected, from the commencement of his career to the present period. To recapitulate briefly, and not to go out of our own state, he has quarreled (the reader will recollect I am not speaking here of the transactions, subsequent to 1830) with Professors, *Smith, Slack, Bohrer, Godman, Brown, Rogers, &c.*, of the old school; with Professors, *Cobb, Smith, Slack, Morehead, Whitman, Pierson*, of the second school; with these latter gentlemen, he was not connected, but was quarrelling for *their* places, (I am speaking of course of the professional quarrels of *Dr. Drake*; with his private matters I have nothing to do.) He quarrelled with two Boards of Trustees, composed of Messrs. *Burke, Davics, Este, Harrison, Longworth, Ruler, Spencer, Stone, Williams, Corry, Duncan, Wright, Burnet, Torrence, Gest, Storer and Gano*. He has not only quarrelled with the gentlemen last named, but he has impeached their integrity, and abused them to the public, as the following extracts from his electioneering pamphlets, together with those already given, will show. Speaking of the appointments made by the Trustees,

*Drake* says “The simple fact was, that each of the Professors was the favourite, family physician, personal friend or relative of some one or two of the Trustees; and as the former were equal to a majority of the latter—six to eleven—a majority of the Board were at all times ready to resist changes in the Faculty. A sort of feudal relation of vassal and lord was established; and as long as the Professor recommended himself by personal considerations to the Trustee, the latter owed him protection.” (*Xenia pamphlet*.) Now I request my readers to put these charges, together with the name of *Doctor Daniel Drake*, in one scale, and the names and *known* standing of the Trustees in the other, and ask themselves in a spirit of inquiry, after the truth, as to the *motives* of the former, and the honesty and public spirit of the latter, *which* of the two scales will preponderate. Are our public officers, who *quoad* their particular duty, represent the sovereignty of the State, to be assailed in this manner by an individual, and when an attempt is made to parry this assault, and others, and cast back the arrows on the assailant himself, is the cry of “personality” to be raised, as it has been, with the hope of deterring the citizen from a discharge of his *duty*? But to proceed, *Dr. Drake* not being able to obtain seats in the Faculty for himself, and his partisans, notwithstanding the nights of vigil and toil he had spent by the lonely glare of his lamp—notwithstanding the letters and pamphlets which were concocted in secret, and distributed, “far and near” among the people—notwithstanding his plots and intrigues to revolutionize the Trustees, when all other means had failed, once more takes leave of the idol of his heart—once more deserts that fair city, which he would fain have the people *now* believe, has ever been hugged to his *fond* bosom, with the enthusiasm of a lover. In 1830 *Dr. Drake* was elected a professor in the Jefferson College at Philadelphia, (this being the *fourth* college he had entered in the course of twelve years,) accepted the appointment, and forthwith repaired to his post. In doing this, *Doctor Drake* either designed to become a permanent resident of Philadelphia, or he did not. If he *did*, then he has misrepresented the fact, for he expressly says “Finding that by this event [his removal to Philadelphia] I should soon be placed under favourable circumstances for selecting Professors, for a new Western Institution,



I applied to the Trustees of *Miami University* for a warrant." Here *Dr. Drake* plainly states, that he had projected a new medical school in the West, and that the only object he had in accepting a professorship in the *Jefferson College*, was, that he might have a better opportunity of selecting professors for his new school. If he did *not* design to become a permanent resident in Philadelphia, then he deceived the institution he was about to enter, as the following extracts will show. Extract from the letter of *Dr. Ely*, secretary to the Board, informing *Dr. Drake* of his appointment; "your acceptance will complete our arrangements, and much gratify us; while it will afford you, we flatter ourselves, an extensive field for usefulness, and even for increased celebrity." Here we find, that the Trustees looked to a permanent union of *Dr. Drake* with their institution, because they say, that when he accepts their arrangements will be complete. *Dr. Eberle* also in a letter to *Dr. Drake* says "I have just received your favour of the 3d inst., and am exceedingly gratified with its contents. Be assured, that we all rejoice, at the prospect of having your valuable services in our institution, and we trust that your connection with it, will turn out as satisfactory, and advantageous to yourself, as we believe it will to us." Now what could *Dr. Eberle* have meant, when he spoke of the advantages to be derived from *Dr. Drake's* connection with them; and what sort of a connection could he have alluded to? He could not surely have meant that the *Jefferson College* was to be benefited, by *Dr. Drake's* making a convenience of it for a few months, while he could select professors for a Western School; and then abandoning it. *Dr. Drake* did not, he says, accept unconditionally, but stated that he was to be at liberty to resign, at the expiration of twelve months if he saw fit—now this condition was perfectly nugatory, and was put in no doubt, for the sole purpose of making it appear, that he was not over-anxious for the appointment—a common rule with some great men, when they know they have their appointments securely in their pockets. His letter of acceptance containing the condition, could not alter the expectations of the Trustees, as to the permanency of his connection with them, because every professor has the right to resign, whenever he may think fit, *independently* of any stipulation; and if it *did* produce this effect upon them, he

must have written a letter of a different sort, to *Dr. Eberle*, as this gentleman's answer shows plainly, that *he* at least, looked to a permanent union with *Dr. Drake*. Thus we see, that *Dr. Drake* when he accepted an appointment in the *Jefferson College*, held out the idea to the Trustees, that he was about to become a permanent member of their institution, at the same time that he tells us, in effect he meant only to make a convenience of them. View this matter which way we will, *Dr. Drake* has been guilty of one of two things, either of *expatriating* himself from his *dear* Ohio, or of insinuating himself into an institution under the garb of friendship, with the *secret* design of drawing off the members of its Faculty, and thus breaking up the school—to serve his own purposes. It is my own opinion—drawn from all the circumstances attending the transaction—that he has been guilty of both. I believe that *Dr. Drake* designed to take his final leave of Cincinnati, when he accepted a professorship in the *Jefferson College*; but that in a few months, finding that he could not play the Dictator in that institution, and that he was not so great a man as he had imagined he was to be—he then resolved to gratify his restless prosensity for change—by committing a deed which I will not name. I will give the facts however, and my readers will by this means be enabled to assign it that nomenclature, which it deserves. *Dr. Drake*, as we have seen, repaired to Philadelphia in 1830, and entered upon the duties of his chair—he, having accepted, the arrangements were complete, and the lectures commenced. While he was thus engaged, *advantageously* for himself, and the College, as the Faculty believed, he conceived the design of making one more effort to revolutionize the *Medical College of Ohio*—this effort was to be made by means of a new school—the celebrated "*Miami Faculty*." Now I have elsewhere stated that this institution, was gotten up by *Dr. Drake* for the express purpose of serving him, as a "spring-board," from which he and his party were to take their grand leap into the chairs of the *Medical College of Ohio*—and here I must exonerate those gentlemen from Philadelphia, whom *Drake* inveigled into his project, from any participation in his *real* designs; they were not informed of the *true* state of things. *Drake* told his own story in his own way, to them, as he has to every one else. To show that I am

not in error, as to *Drake's* object in establishing the "Miami Faculty," I shall refer to one of his own letters, written to the Xenia Committee; here it is: (he is speaking of the "Miami Faculty") "I believed if an able Faculty could be organized, one of two consequences would ensue—the General Assembly would either reform the Trustees of the College, and appoint men who would bring the new professors into that institution; or they would turn over the College edifice, and other property to the University (Miami) in trust for its Medical department; and by vacating the Board of Trustees, and Faculty of the former, terminate all its operations:—either of which results would benefit the public, as far as the new Faculty might be superior to the old." We have it here declared in as plain language as a man can use, that the sole design for which the new school was organized, was to effect the prostration of the *Medical College of Ohio*—that this was to be done in one of two ways—either, the Trustees were to be reformed, and new men appointed in their stead, who would give Drake and his partisans professorships, or the Legislature was to be frightened, or coerced into annihilating Trustees, Faculty and all, and giving up the college edifice, library, apparatus, &c., to the said Drake and his colleagues. When I alluded to this institution in my first number, I stated that the present Cincinnati College, brought into existence under the auspices of the same men, was intended to effect the same object; and to prove this allegation I quoted Drake's own words, taken from a bulletin, announcing his new project to the people. Now if any man has still a lingering doubt as to the justness of this allegation, let him compare the circumstances under which the two institutions were created. He will find from these papers, that the circumstances in both cases were precisely the same; and if he believes that the "Miami Faculty" was designed to effect the object which Drake declares it was, he must also believe that the Cincinnati College stands in *consimilitudo*—because it accords with our experience of human nature to believe, that if a man under certain circumstances, does a certain act, with a particular design—when he does that same act under similar circumstances, he is actuated also by the same design. In short we have no other way of judging of men's motives—there is reason to believe that if a man under the influence

of revenge stab another, under the same influence, the same result will follow; and it is upon this rule, that our whole code of presumptive evidence is based. *Dr. Drake's* finding of late that the new school "wont take" as a battering ram, has endeavored to dress it up in the borrowed clothes of a rival—the wind blows thus, and the weathercock, has shifted its position. Hear him, "It is the policy of the State, to encourage salutary emulation, to multiply the places and means of instruction, and to raise our young men above a dependence on a single institution, which becoming defective may disappoint their hopes." (Supplement to the Western Journal &c. edited by *Daniel Drake*, M. D.) *Dr. Drake* applies these remarks to his new school, in order to show that a "salutary emulation" between it, and the *Medical College of Ohio* will be the consequence of its creation, and that we ought to have at least two permanent schools, so that if one should become defective, the other may supply its place, until the defective one gets under way again.

Before I leave this part of my subject, I must connect *Dr. Drake's* entry into the Jefferson College at Philadelphia, with another transaction, to which I have already alluded. It will be recollected that in 1817 *Dr. Drake* removed to Lexington as a Professor in the school at that place. Of course the gentlemen who invited him into that institution, expected, as did the Trustees of the *Jefferson College*, that *Dr. Drake* was to become a permanent member of their Faculty, and was to identify himself with their interests. Now what was the fact. Will it be believed, that *Dr. Drake* in the year 1816 after he had consented to become a co-labourer in the Transylvania University, formed a partnership in this city, with *Dr. Rogers* for the purpose of establishing a school in Cincinnati? That he was full of this project when he left the city! and that he went to Lexington with the design of breaking up that school, and that when this should be done, having no longer a rival, he was to return here and carry out his project with *Dr. Rogers*? *Dr. Dudley* in a pamphlet bearing on this point, expressly charges *Dr. Drake* with this treachery, and I refer my readers to that publication.

*Dr. Drake* having obtained permission from the Trustees of the Miami University, to establish a medical department in that institution, and being himself made a professor, and charged with the selec-

tion of the remaining members of the Faculty, departed, with this commission in his pocket to Philadelphia. (See Drake's letter to the Xenia Committee.) While here, employed as a professor in the Jefferson College, and looked upon of course, as a *co-labourer* in the institution, he was secretly at work, endeavouring to effect a schism between his colleagues, with the view of drawing off a portion of them, to fill chairs in his newly projected college in Cincinnati. By misrepresenting the actual condition of the Medical College of Ohio, and painting in imaginary colours, the bright prospect which awaited his new undertaking, and by alienating the professors from each other, by means of those little arts, which he knows but too well how to use, he succeeded in effecting his object—the Jefferson College was thrown into a state of disorganization, and Dr. Drake returned to Cincinnati, with several of its professors. Upon his return to the state, the Trustees of the Medical College of Ohio, anticipating, what could not fail to be the result, of the establishment of a new school in Cincinnati, under the auspices of Dr. Drake, and with the avowed purpose of making war upon the old one, to wit: the deterring students from entering either, offered for sake of peace and harmony to compromise matters, by vacating one half the chairs of the old Faculty, and filling them with Dr. Drake and two of his colleagues. This proposition however, was rejected; not because Dr. Drake had any objection to entering the old school, and abandoning the new one; not because he was unwilling to give up a  *rivalry*, which by engendering "salutary emulation" might confer benefits on the community; but because he could not go in, full handed; some of his colleagues to whom he had made pledges, would remain unprovided for. "While the subject was under consideration, its chairman, [the chairman of a committee of the Legislature] and the agent of the Board, requested an interview with me, when, they jointly proposed as a compromise, that myself, and two of my colleagues, Drs. Eberle and McClellan should leave the University, and enter the College; three of its (able and lauded) professors being displaced to make way for us. I told them at once that I felt myself pledged, both publicly, and privately, not to desert any of my colleagues, for the purpose of entering the college; that Drs. Mitchell, Staughton, and Henry would re-

main unprovided for, and that *nothing* could induce me to leave them behind;" &c. (Drake's letter to the Xenia Committee.) The Board of Trustees, now added another chair to the Faculty, making seven in all; and in order to effect a reorganization which would please all parties, and thus put an end to the strife and contention in the medical community, declared all the professorships vacant. The revolution which Dr. Drake had laboured so zealously to produce for years, was thus partially accomplished—the Faculty which stood between him, and the gratification of his desires, was thus overthrown, and the next step to be considered was the order, and manner in which he and his adherents, should take possession of the vacant chairs. We perceive in all these transactions, an earnest desire on the part of the Trustees of the Medical College of Ohio to do every thing in their power to advance the interests of medical education in the state. They felt that if they could conciliate the enemies of the college by blending the two institutions in one, in addition to securing the combined talents of both, they would put an end to those feuds, which are ever destructive of that peaceful atmosphere, which Science must breathe, in order to be healthy. But, although the Trustees were actuated by the best of motives, they erred in taking the steps they did, as no doubt every member of that Board is now convinced. They did not *know* the man with whom they were about to unite, or they never would have permitted him to re-enter the college. The institution, at the period of this proposed amalgamation, had about 130 students—it had set *Dr. Drake with all his influence* at defiance, and was yearly increasing in reputation; but in an evil hour he is permitted to vault into one of its seats, and in less than six months afterwards, it is almost entirely broken up!!! But the Trustees having gone so far as to vacate all the chairs in the Faculty, went a step farther, and made Dr. Drake in effect *their agent* for the selection of the new professors. To oblige him, they created another professorship, and not only permitted him to bring in *all his colleagues*, but gave him the privilege also of assigning to them such chairs as he thought proper. Dr. Drake consented to go into the college, *on condition*, that the Board would adopt, a plan of consolidation, drawn up by himself, and *not otherwise*. This condition was acceded to, and

he accordingly entered. The following letter will show how he disposed of the chairs.

“Cincinnati, July 7th, 1831.

GENTLEMEN,—In further reply to your note, offering me the Professorship, of the *Institutes*, and *Medical Jurisprudence* in the Medical College of Ohio, I beg leave to suggest the following plan of consolidation, as the only one as far as I know, that can leave me at liberty to accept a chair in the institution.

PLAN OF CONSOLIDATION.

*Anatomy*.—Dr. Cobb.

*Institutes of Medicine and Medical Jurisprudence*, Dr. Pierson.

*Theory and Practice of Medicine*, Dr. Moorhead.

*Surgery*, Dr. Staughton.

*Obstetrics, and diseases of women and children*, Dr. Henry.

*Materia Medica and Botany*, Dr. Eberle.

*Chemistry and Pharmacy*, Dr. Mitchell.

*Clinical Medicine*, Dr. Drake.

I would prefer the chair to which I have affixed my name, to the one offered to me by the Board; but if the friends of Dr. Pierson, would prefer to place him in that chair, I will acquiesce. If the Board fear an injurious augmentation of expense, I will accept either of these chairs, without having it obligatory on the students, to take my ticket. I am induced to make this suggestion, by the hope that it will promote that consolidation, which your honorable body have expressed a desire to effect, and which could not fail to prove beneficial to the interests of society.

I have the honor to be, respectfully  
your obedient servant,

DAN. DRAKE.

To the Hon. Board of Trustees of the Medical College of Ohio.”

Thus it appears that Dr. Drake in entering the Medical College of Ohio, not only chose his own chair, but designated that of every other professor. This is a fact which I request my readers, particularly to note, as it will have an important bearing on the subsequent part of this inquiry. On the same day, on which the Board of Trustees, received Dr. Drake's letter, his plan of consolidation was adopted, and the reorganization of the Faculty, rendered complete. At the same time, the “Miami Faculty” being *functus officio*, died *naturally*. The Medical College of Ohio being revolutionized in this

manner, we find Dr. Drake occupying the same position in relation to it, which he stood in in 1819-20-1—he is once more a member of its Faculty, and associated with colleagues of his own choosing. Here then I repeat the question which I asked in one of my previous numbers. Why did not Dr. Drake, whose friends now claim so much for him, build up, when he had so favourable an opportunity, the splendid medical school, of which he is incessantly declaiming to the people? Could circumstances have been more auspicious? Could his friends have asked *more* for him? Could he have required more himself! The college was as effectually changed by the revolution it had undergone, as though it were a distinct institution—the old order of things was broken up, and the new, established—in short the reins of reorganization were placed *wholly* at Doctor Drake's disposal, for the express purpose of giving him *another* opportunity, of doing that, which he had boasted of his ability to do, for the previous ten years. Let those friends of Dr. Drake, who still insist that injustice has been done him in this community, recur to the period (1831) of which I am treating, and ask themselves if ever the will of *one man*, was so humbly bowed to before. If Dr. Drake had been forced into the Medical College of Ohio, with colleagues who were obnoxious to him, personally, or who were men of inferior talents, and a quarrel had ensued, there would have been no great cause to complain. But when we see him on this occasion, as on previous ones, *choosing* his men, and in less than six months setting them all “by the ears,” and breaking up the Faculty in confusion, there *is* cause to complain—there is reason to believe, that Dr. Drake is so unfortunately constituted, as to be incapable of living harmoniously with *any* set of men—that he is a disturber of the repose of society, and unfit to be entrusted with power.

In 1831 Dr. Drake took his seat as a professor in the Medical College of Ohio, under the circumstances above stated; of his conduct after this event I propose to speak in detail. In the mean time the following extract from a report made to the Legislature, by the Board of Trustees, composed of Messrs. Birnet, Spencer, Storer, and others, will show in a few words, how speedily his brilliant career in the College was run. (Among other things, they are speaking of the efforts of the Board to conciliate him.) “In proof

of that, we refer to the minutes of the Board, which show, that in 1823 he was appointed by the Trustees to the chair of Theory and Practice [the highest chair in the school] which he refused. In 1827, when he left the school at Lexington, a committee was appointed to invite him to become a member of our Faculty, by offering him a chair, which he also declined, and in the year 1831, for the purpose of accomplishing this object, the Trustees vacated all the chairs in the school—created two new ones, and appointed to each chair, the person mentioned by him, and gave to himself the chair he had selected. When this arrangement was completed, we had reason to believe, that further opposition would cease, and that the institution would enjoy repose, but to our great surprise, before the close of the first session the Doctor became dissatisfied, with his own arrangements, instigated the class to apply to the Legislature, to change the government of the institution, and having failed in that project, resigned his chair, and resumed his opposition. Thus it appears we are doomed to meet the opposition of men, who are resolved, not to be satisfied with any thing, short of the unlimited control of the destinies of the institution." This paper comes from high authority, and I would particularly impress it upon the mind of the reader. It appears then, that although Dr. Drake had guided the course of the revolution, which he had himself brought about, to its final termination, he no sooner found himself out of the excitement, and turmoil of intrigue in which he had been engaged so long, that it had become a second nature to him, than he insisted upon tearing up his own foundations—turning out all the Trustees, and involving himself, and the school "head and ears" in another revolution! The reader will naturally suppose that there must have been some adequate cause to produce these disorganizing movements, in so short a time—that Dr. Drake must have discovered some flagrant abuse, calling loudly for reform. No such thing—the whole secret is, that Dr. Drake's dissatisfaction, arose from his inability to take away another man's chair; for the purpose of adding its perquisites to his own!!! This allegation, however unwilling the reader may be to believe it, will be amply sustained by the proofs. Here they are. Dr. Drake not finding his chair, that of *Clinical Medicine*, as profitable as

he had imagined it would be, soon became dissatisfied with it, and charged the Board of Trustees, with favouritism, in having given Dr. Pierson the chair which they did, in preference to giving it to him (Drake) as they ought to have done! "Soon after this the session opened; and although the Faculty was in a state of decomposition, till after the time, when a circular should have gone forth; and I was placed in a station, which my intelligent medical friends could not fail to perceive, would not admit of my doing much, and therefore the little attraction I might have exerted on the pupils was greatly reduced, still the class was larger than the College ever presented before." (*Xenia* pamphlet.) Dr. Drake is here telling the public, that *he was placed*, in a chair, in which his genius was cramped—that he had not that opportunity given him, of reflecting honor upon the school, which he ought to have had—that, in fact, he had been assigned to a chair, in opposition to his own wishes, and those of his "medical friends." Now who *placed him* in the chair of which he is complaining? Did he not choose it himself! (See his "plan of consolidation.") Does it become him to say, after having stated in his letter to the Board, that he would rather have the chair, which was ultimately assigned to him, than the one which was offered him *by* the Board, that he was forced into a chair, not of his own choice? When he makes this statement does he not contradict the plain fact, as it is proven out of his own mouth? Dr. Drake in another part of his *Xenia* pamphlet, informs us, by way of reconciling his contradictions, that *circumstances* induced him to *pretend* a desire for his chair, when in reality he was averse to occupying it. (Page 31.) What! *circumstances* induce a man to dissemble! *Circumstances* drive a man from the paths of rectitude, and plain-dealing! Why, this is the palliating plea for every crime that is committed in the country. Admit that he did mislead the Trustees in his "plan of consolidation," how were they to know, that they were deceived, and that Dr. Drake had made a misstatement to them? They took him at his word and gave him the chair he asked for, and when he finds them disposed to gratify him, he rails at them for being so stupid as not to discover, that he did not mean what he said! This was the first link in the chain of measures, forged by Dr. Drake for the purpose of

dragging another man from his chair—he endeavoured to bring odium on the Trustees, by convicting them of partiality. He next proceeds to state that his chair did not afford sufficient employment for him, and that therefore the duties of some other chair ought to be added to it. The lectures commenced, and the first three weeks were sufficient to establish the unpleasant fact, that *Clinical Medicine* could not be sustained as a *separate* chair.” (*Xenia Pamphlet.*) If it could not be sustained as a *separate* chair who was to blame for its establishment? Did not the Trustees create it at the suggestion of Dr. Drake? These two positions being assumed to wit: 1st, That the Trustees did injustice to Dr. Drake by appointing him to an inferior chair, and secondly, that there was one chair too many; the next thing to be done, was to decide on whose chair Dr. Drake would rather have added to his own. Let him speak for himself. “Dr. Pierson had no claims upon them, to allow him a year for preparation; one third of that period would actually elapse, before he must lecture; by refusing his request, and uniting the *Institute* to *Clinical Medicine*, I would have a good professorship, and the number would be reduced to seven, which the Board had professed to regard as the most suitable.” (*Xenia Pamphlet.*) Now such language amounts in effect to this—Gentlemen of the Board of Trustees, my chair is not quite as profitable as I could wish it, but if you will take Dr. Pierson’s chair away from him and give it to me, why then, I shall have a good fat office, and be a more important man in the Faculty. You may think this will violate your compact with Dr. Pierson, gentlemen; and perhaps it would not be *strictly* honest to deprive that gentleman of his bread, without any cause of complaint against him; but you must recollect, that I am the great *Daniel Drake* of the Mississippi valley;—that I have revolutionized more medical schools, than any other man in the United States—that I have been elected *six* times a professor, in *various* institutions—that I have founded Hospitals, Orphan Asylums, and Infant schools—that I am an *old* man—that I have been twenty five years in the “Backwoods”—in fine that your school cannot possibly do *without* me, and therefore, gentlemen, you *must* come into my measures. If you do not, I’ll instigate the class to apply to the Legislature to turn every man of you out; and if I fail in

this, I’ll turn the school “upside down,” and leave it; both of which threats, the reader will find, he put faithfully in execution. Before Dr. Drake, however, proceeded to this extremity, he endeavored to effect his object by other means. With this view he wrote a letter to Dr. Pierson in which he endeavored to “bully” that gentleman off the course, by frightening him into a resignation. He knew very well, that every honorable man would prefer saving his feelings, by resigning, to being turned out of an institution, and he therefore told Dr. Pierson very plainly in this letter, that *if he did not resign, he (Drake) would use all honourable means to turn him out.* I wish the reader particularly to recollect, that the chair of the *Institutes* which Dr. Pierson held, and from which Dr. Drake was thus endeavoring, *honourably* to oust him, was, during the organization of the Faculty, offered to Dr. Drake himself, who declined it, and insisted that Dr. Pierson should have it—saying that he preferred the chair of *Clinical Medicine* for himself. That in order to gratify Dr. Drake, Dr. Pierson was removed from the chair he originally held, to the one thus designated by Dr. Drake. That Dr. Pierson lest he should interrupt the harmony of Dr. Drake’s “plan” consented to the removal, at an immense sacrifice, of time, and labour, on condition that the Trustees would give him time to prepare for his new duties, which was agreed to by them. The reader will naturally be anxious to know, what objections, Dr. Drake had to Dr. Pierson. None in the world save that the latter gentleman stood “between him and his ambition,” and did not come from the right part of the country—New York. It is true, he very indelicately accused Dr. Pierson of incompetency, which he has disproved himself, by recommending him for a chair; in addition to which Drs. Eberle, Cobb, Moorhead, Mitchell, and others have stated unequivocally, that they conceived him, every way qualified to discharge the duties of his station.

Dr. Drake having failed to force Professor Pierson’s resignation, next addresses himself to the class, and endeavoured to enlist their prejudices in his favour, by making them believe, that the Trustees had dealt unjustly by him, in giving him an inferior chair in the school. Here we behold another attempt on the part of Dr. Drake to sow sedition among the pupils, and array them in opposition to their

teachers. Now I would particularly call the attention of every candid man, in the community, more especially those who have children to educate, to this transaction. Are our citizens willing that their sons should become the arbiters of all the disputes which arise in their various schools? Are they willing to pay their money to make their sons, partisans of this professor or that professor. Is it dignified, in a member of a Faculty—a man of some fifty years of age, and of abundant experience in the world, instead of endeavouring to heal the little wounds of himself, and his brother professors—instead of *hiding* their little bickerings from the gaze of their pupils—instead of endeavouring to reform abuses, if any exist, by making a proper representation, to the constituted authorities, who are legitimately charged with the matter—to win over by attention, and flattery, the youth whose education is confided in part to his care, for the purpose of effecting indirectly, and by revolution, that, which an enlightened body of men—the representatives of the people, and sustained by *them*, refused to do? Are the halls of our Colleges, instead of being “vocal with the accents of instruction,” to become the *arena* for juvenile politicians, where by the midnight torch, they are to be harangued on important points of state policy, and taught to forget their studies, in party conflicts, to serve the interest of him who instigates them to revolt? Every enlightened and judicious parent, must unhesitatingly avow his disapprobation of such proceedings—he sends his son to a medical school, to be taught the science of *Medicine by those persons who purport to teach it by the circulars*, and not to become an instrument in the hands of one professor to deprive an obnoxious colleague of his seat. A large number of the young men being gained by these means—and what professor may not gain his pupils, by the same arts of flattery, and declamation, coming from one who is their superior in age and standing—they were induced to send a memorial to the Legislature, praying, that a change might be made in the Board of Trustees—that men from a distance might be appointed, (because, as in the words of the poet, “*’tis distance lends enchantment to the view,*” they would have a better opinion of Dr. Drake,) and that men should be chosen, who would abolish one of the professorships, (Dr. Pierson’s!). For a

copy of this memorial, I refer to page 21 of the Xenia pamphlet. To show that Dr. Drake instigated the class to petition the Legislature, on this occasion, and the Trustees on another, I shall extract some portions of the evidence, which was given before the Senate-committee in 1833. Dr. Drake is on the stand as a witness. “Dr. Drake—I was privy to both petitions. I knew the terms of both, and encouraged them.” Page 165 Copy of Record. Dr. Ford is on the stand, as a witness. “Dr. Ford—Great excitement, and memorializing by the class—much stump oratory—the course of instruction was impeded by it—was present at the Hospital, [this is another institution, with distinct Trustees, against whom Dr. Drake had also prejudiced the class,] Dr. Drake rather influenced than otherwise, the passions of the pupils, and recommended them to petition the Trustees.” *Ibid* 367. Notwithstanding all Dr. Drake’s threatening letters, and stump oratory, he was unable either, to induce Dr. Pierson to resign—or to *coerce* the Trustees, to violate their faith by removing him, or to *memorialize* the Legislature into reforming the Trustees. The Legislature very properly treated the memorial as it deserved to be treated, with contempt. Having failed thus far, what was to be done next? It would not be *Drake-like*—it would not be heroic, to abandon an enterprize, however unholy, *in medias res*. No, another effort was made, which as we shall see, resulted in the final overthrow of Dr. Drake himself, instead of Dr. Pierson. It will be recollected, that five of the professors of the Medical College of Ohio, including Dr. Drake, were taken from the Miami Faculty. The latter gentleman, therefore, calculated on the adherence to him, of his old associates, in any movement he might think proper to make. Believing that by the withdrawal of himself and colleagues, at any time from the school, he could compel the Trustees into his measures, there is no doubt, that he deliberately formed the project of turning Dr. Pierson out of his seat, *at the same time* that he recommended this gentleman as a proper appointment—he had been his bitter enemy for the previous three or four years, and had never ceased to persecute him, until he found it *necessary* to dissemble, and put on the garb of friendship the more effectually to destroy his victim. Dr. Drake then, being unable, as I have be-

fore stated, to "reform" the Board of Trustees, determined as a last resort to resign, and if possible to draw off his colleagues with him. He says "Thus all hopes of a radical reform, and a just, impartial and liberal administration of the affairs of the institution were blasted. [The same institution which he had revolutionized to suit his own fancy but a few months before; that is, if we may believe what he says in his "plan of consolidation."] The Trustees were elected for three years, unless the Legislature should please to supersede them with others; and not choosing to remain for that length of time a supernumerary of the Faculty, [in which he had had the choice of seats.] I saw that no alternative was left me, but to resign—" &c. (*Xenia Pamphlet*.) He accordingly tendered his resignation to the Board of Trustees, and with a clear-sightedness (if I may be allowed the expression) which that Board have manifested ever since, it was promptly accepted. And Dr. Drake was as promptly disappointed, as to the course he expected his colleagues to pursue. These gentlemen with an independence which does credit to them, refused to become participators in Dr. Drake's unholy scheme of persecution, and when he resigned they permitted him to retire *alone* to his closet—where he might review the past transactions of his life at leisure, and "hatch new plots" for the destruction of harmony and order. How does Dr. Drake's conduct on this occasion, comport with the professions which he is continually making *viva voce*, at the corners of our streets, and distributing in electioneering pamphlets, all over the State, of his *disinterested* devotion to the interests of Medical education, and more especially of his *patriotic* efforts to build up a great school in Cincinnati? If he had been so desirous of adding to the honor and prosperity of the Medical College of Ohio, independently of personal considerations, why could he not have contributed his portion of labour and skill, in the chair of Clinical Medicine, although it did not turn out, to be so important as he had supposed it would when he first chose it? Although the chairs of Clinical Medicine, and the Institutes might have been less *profitable* or *respectable*, when sustained as *separate* chairs would their duties have been less ably performed by Dr. Drake and Dr. Pierson, jointly, than by Dr. Drake alone? And if the two chairs could be better filled, by the *united*

exertions of these gentlemen, than by the *sole* exertions of either of them, was Dr. Drake likely to advance the prosperity of the school, by insisting upon Dr. Pierson's dismissal? A plain answer to these questions will convince us that Dr. Drake could have been actuated by none other, than the most *selfish* motives, in endeavoring to deprive Dr. Pierson of his chair; and that therefore, when he talks of his *patriotic* exertions to build up the Medical College of Ohio, we must henceforth understand him to mean—his *honourable* efforts to build up *himself*, by pulling down another. Dr. Drake having resigned his professorship, in the words of the Trustees, "renewed his opposition." Nor ought we to be surprised, at the Doctor's being in a bad humour with himself and every body else, in consequence of his recent discomfiture. He had not anticipated such a result of his schemes, and may therefore be supposed to have been exceedingly chagrined, and mortified. He had like all other-*adroit* tacticians, outwitted himself—he had run beyond the "length of his line," and was thunderstruck when the Trustees accepted his resignation, which he, in his good opinion of himself never dreamt they would have the moral courage to do. There is something too, so humiliating in dropping a man's title, more especially if he has been fighting for it all his life—the unexpected descent from Professor, to *plain Doctor Drake* was enough of itself, to have induced him, to rear high the banner of opposition, and gallantly resolve to conquer, or die, beneath its folds. Soon after Dr. Drake retired from the school, the professorship of Clinical Medicine, which as I have before stated, was created at his suggestion, was abolished.

The Trustees still believing, that there were too many professorships in the College, consulted most of the respectable physicians in the city as to the expediency and propriety of reducing the number to its present standard. *Dr. Drake* gave his opinion among others, but as he had left behind him in the Faculty one of his especial protégés, whom, as he had acknowledged him to be an "untried man," he was fearful the Trustees would dismiss, in the event of a reduction, he professed himself decidedly opposed to such a proceeding. (See *Xenia pamphlet*, page 23). Now behold the inconsistency of the man. We here find him contending for seven professors. How many professors were



there in the Medical College of Ohio, from 1819 to 1822, when it was under Doctor Drake's control? How many professors did Dr. Drake choose to associate with him, when he applied for the charter? I extract from the Senate-report, page 4. "Under this act of incorporation, the institution was organized, and continued to exist, until the close of the year 1822. But if we are to credit the testimony before us, its history is little more, than a history of strifes and contentions. The number of students was not large, and if at any time, the number of professors exceeded, three, it was soon reduced to that number, and from that to two." How does it happen, that in 1831 *seven* professors were requisite to teach a science, which in 1822, *three* were thought competent to teach? The great science of Medicine had undergone little or no change, and therefore could not have required a greater number of teachers, at the one time, than at the other. True, but those circumstances, which formed Dr. Drake's opinion in 1822, did not conspire to form it, in 1831—At the former period, he was "in," and President of the school, and therefore the fewer men, he had associated with him, the better he could control them, and play the master. But in 1831, he was one of the "outs," and being fearful that *one of his men*, would be turned out also, if a reduction took place, we have seen that he opposed that measure. We have seen also that prior to his entering the College, in 1831, he recommended that the number of professorships, should be increased to *eight*, so that all his Miami colleagues might be provided for, but that he and his associates were no sooner scattered, than he insisted, that one of the chairs should be abolished, for the purpose of getting rid of a man, whom he could not control, and seizing on his chair himself. Thus whenever Dr. Drake has been out, and it was necessary to create a chair, to bring him in, the College has had one professor too *few*, but whenever he has been in, and one or more of the professors stood between him, and his dominion, then the College has had too *many*. In short, it appears, that Dr. Drake believes for the time being, just what it is his interest, to believe, and *no more*. It being the opinion of disinterested men, that there was a supernumerary chair in the Faculty, it was abolished. As a matter of course, one of the chairs being removed, there

was a professor to be removed also, and the Trustees, dismissed Dr. Henry. This gentleman immediately enlisted in the ranks of the opposition, and in accordance with the Drake-system of tactics, wrote a *pamphlet*, abusing his late colleagues and the Trustees, and administering flattery in large doses to Dr. Drake; which doses were not lost on the patient, as they gave him the nerve, forthwith, to take up his pen, and return the compliment—so that our good citizens had an opportunity of witnessing, on this interesting occasion, the "laughable farce of You tickle me, I tickle you." In the fall of 1831 the college had 131 students. In 1832, it will be recollected, that the Cholera spread its terrors throughout the United States, and among other places, visited Cincinnati, with its desolating breath. The prevalence of this disease, not only shut up, most of our schools, but suspended, or greatly impeded the operations of commerce. The Medical College of Ohio partook of the general stagnation, and in the following session, the number of students, was reduced to 72. The next year however, when the alarm had subsided, and the people were resuming their occupations, the class rose to 102. In 1833 *Dr. Staughton*, the Professor of Surgery died, and *Dr. Alban G. Smith*, of Kentucky, was elected to the vacant chair. During all this time Dr. Drake had been unrelenting in his enmity to the College—he panted for a while, it is true on the death of Dr. Staughton, and *condescended* to apply for the vacancy, which that event had created, but being foiled by Dr. Smith's being chosen, he resumed his opposition with more bitterness, than ever. I wish the reader to remember this disappointment of Dr. Drake's, as it will serve to show whence a portion of that gentleman's spleen and ill will for *Dr. Smith*, proceeds. There are few vain men, whose friendship, can survive, the successful competition of a rival, however worthy that rival may be. There is another light in which I wish Dr. Drake's application for an appointment, in the Medical College to be viewed. This gentleman had heaped unsparing abuse on most of the members of the Faculty; he had denounced them, as incompetent to discharge their duties—he had accused them of the most dishonest transactions, and when he saw an opportunity of re-entering the College, from which he had so unintentionally hurt

ed himself, he *solicited* to become their *associate*. Yea, he *asked* to be associated with Dr. Moorhead, against whom, in a late pamphlet, he has *reopened* the flood gates of detraction. What will those persons at a distance say, who have heard the *auto-biographic* notes of the *Drake-bugle*, when they learn, that the Doctor's *neighbours*—those who live in the same city with him, refused to give him a VACANT chair, in the Medical College? If a man is not known where he *resides*, he is not known any where, and that man who is no longer considered worthy of confidence, by his *neighbours*, ought not certainly to be confided in, by his fellow citizens at large. The avenues of approach to the College being all closed, and Dr. Drake seeing no other means, by which he could regain his lost seat, resolved to impeach the Trustees of various high crimes, and misdemeanors, to the Legislature. For this purpose he drew up a number of charges and specifications, and as he is rarely the *visible* agent to do any thing himself, he put them in the mouth of a Dr. Martin of Xenia, who with an amiable docility permitted himself to become the prosecutor. The Legislature, anxious for the prosperity of their school, and consequently willing to reform abuses, if any should exist, promptly appointed a committee of investigation, who forthwith proceeded to Cincinnati, to execute the trust confided to them. I have already made extracts from the report, which was based on the evidence taken by this committee, pointing out Dr. Drake's course, during his early connection with the Medical College of Ohio, and I shall therefore, now confine myself principally to such parts of it and the evidence, as relate to recent transactions. I have elsewhere stated that Judge Hitchcock, now on the Bench of the Supreme Court of this State, was chairman of the committee, who made the report to the Senate, and that it was adopted by thirty-four out of thirty-five Senators. Dr. Drake had been, for some time, complaining of the apathy of the Legislature, but was at length, about to be gratified by a judicial investigation, of what he supposed to be a rotten system of policy, pursued by those in office, since that system had of late excluded him from a participation in the affairs of the College. How he was gratified we shall see. Extract from the Senate report, page 8. "The first charge is, "That

for several years past, the general policy of the Trustees of the Medical College of Ohio, in the city of Cincinnati, has been marked by partiality and prejudices, and indicates an indifference to the reputation and welfare of said College, and to the advance of medical science therein.' "This charge is a grave one, and if supported by the evidence, must operate very much to the disadvantage of the Trustees. Under it are fifteen specifications. It will be impossible for the committee to state them minutely, nor is it necessary, as many of them contain substantially the same accusation, although expressed in different words. The evidence relative to these different specifications, is to be found principally in the depositions of Dr. Daniel Drake, and Dr. John F. Henry, or rather the evidence, which is intended to sustain them. In the first specification, the Trustees, from their appointment in 1822, are charged with having employed, unknown, and incompetent professors, [the same charge, which Dr. Drake is still reiterating,] in defiance of the interests of the Institution and of public opinion, and of continuing to uphold them, until forced by a rival institution to abandon them in 1831. The committee find from the evidence, that the Trustees had difficulty, in the first instance, in organizing a Faculty; nor did they, for some years, organize one to consist of more than four members. They appear to have been anxious to engage the services of Doctor Drake, but he refused. At length Drs Slack, Moorhead, Cobb, and Smith, were appointed, and commenced lectures. Dr. Drake in his testimony, speaks of the incompetency of these men, or rather states his objections to them. His objections, however, do not go so much to show, that they were destitute of qualifications, as that they were not just the men he would have appointed; as for instance, it is objected to Dr. Cobb that he was a young man, but more particularly, that he did not come from the right section of country, he being a native of the State of Maine. To Dr. Moorhead it is objected, that he is a foreigner, having been born, and educated in Ireland. Drs. Slack and Smith had been first introduced to the school by Dr. Drake himself, and if they were incompetent, the Trustees might have been deceived by his recommendation. Let this be as it may, the committee are induced to believe from the evidence, that

the Trustees did the best they could, under existing circumstances, and that the gentlemen appointed professors, were well qualified to discharge the duties of their appointment. They do not believe, that because a man is born and educated in one of the New-England States or in Ireland he is disqualified from being a professor, in a medical or any other college." The substance of this extract has been stated by way of argument before, but as it belongs more appropriately to the period of which I am treating, 1833, I give it the reader in the words of Judge Hitchcock himself.

Another of the charges against the Medical College of Ohio, was, that it educated its pupils too *cheap*. Dr. Drake is called to the stand as a witness, and *inter-alia*, testified as follows;—"I believe a low price to be calculated, in the estimation of the profession, to disgrace a school. It is regarded as a means of drawing pupils.—I believe from what I have seen and heard, and known, that it creates an impression that the Trustees believe the professors cannot attract students but by saving them money. Students who have means, have gone to other schools, from pride. *It draws poor people who do no credit to the school.*" Now let every citizen of the state mark well this language, and draw from it the character of the witness who used it, and his notions of the *utility* of a medical school. Instead of rearing up among us an institution which would diffuse its usefulness throughout all classes, and ranks of society, we are told, that we ought to confine the benefits of medical education to the rich. We are told that the rich man's son, must not be associated, in the halls of our Colleges, with the poor man's son—that if we admit the honest farmer's or mechanic's son, to the benefits of instruction, the rich man's son, will from *pride* seek some other institution, and that our school will be *disgraced* in consequence! Are our people prepared to tolerate the distinction of *ranks* and *orders* among them? and are they willing to contribute to the support of an institution, within whose aristocratic walls none but the *privileged* can enter? Who are the "*poor people who do no credit to the school!*" Are they not the majority of our hardworking population? men who till the soil, and drive the loom, and wield the instruments of their trades! and are all these to be counted as nought? Are

their sons less intelligent, less honest, less worthy of the patronage of the state than those of the rich Banker, who perhaps has built his palace on ground moistened by the tears of the widow and the orphan? Is the poor man to have the *privilege* of paying a *tax* to educate the rich man's son, while the doors of the institution which he is taxed to support, are forever barred against his own? I put these questions to a sensible and discriminating people—believing that they have heretofore been duped into supposing a man their friend, whose every interest is opposed to theirs; who to gratify his insatiable ambition for power and *fame*, is striving to build up a *splendid* school, whose halls shall be the resort of wealth and influence to the exclusion of our own honest citizens. When I speak of Dr. Drake's desire for *fame*, I do not mean that sort of fame which a successful prosecution of scientific or literary studies bestows upon a man—no, he does not seek such fame as Dr. Eberle for instance, has acquired, by making his name familiar alike to the American and the European student of medicine, as the author of one of their most valuable text books—if he did, his course would be different—he would speak and write less of himself and more of his profession; but he is ambitious of being at the head of an aristocracy of young men, who returning home from their studies will carry his name with them—who will speak of him as the great *politician* and master spirit of the West. Hear what Judge Hitchcock says on this subject; he is speaking of the testimony of Dr. Drake, as above quoted: "The committee cannot agree with the witness, in this opinion upon this subject. They suppose that it depends upon the attainments of a student, whether he does credit or not to a school, and not upon his pecuniary means. They have yet to learn, that a good scholar disgraces a school, because he is poor, or that a bad scholar adds credit to it, because he is rich. Nor do they believe it is desirable to retain a student whose pride is such as to induce him to leave a school *merely* because he is not charged an extravagant sum for tuition." Let the poor man ponder well on these sensible remarks of the committee, and ask himself if he will longer hesitate between Judge Hitchcock and Daniel Drake—between a man who would educate the sons of the *people*, and one

who would make them "hewers of wood and drawers of water" to the sons of the rich. The reader will recollect that soon after Dr. Drake took his seat in the Faculty, in 1831, he conceived the idea of depriving Professor Pierson of his chair, but that having failed in this, he resigned himself.

In 1833 Dr. Drake alleged that the Trustees had forced him to resign. The committee say, "In review of them [the facts] they find no evidence, that Dr. Drake was compelled to resign. On the other hand, the resignation appears to have been voluntary, and to have been made, because the Trustees, would not suffer their ideas of propriety, to be controlled by one of the professors in their employ. This accusation then, is not sustained by the proof, but on the contrary, it is completely disproved." The report goes on to remark, "The next accusation in order is, that the Trustees, expelled one of the Faculty without cause, thereby giving offence to the students. To sustain this charge, the facts are simply these. After the resignation of Dr. Drake, the Trustees, after consultation, with the Faculty, were induced to believe, that the interests of the institution required, that the number of professorships, should be reduced to six, which reduction was made. After the reduction, there was one supernumerary professor, and they selected Dr. Henry, as the one who should be discharged. This is termed an expulsion. The Committee view it differently, and they have seen nothing in the evidence, to satisfy them, that this arrangement, was inconsistent, with the best interests of the College. In the next place the Trustees are charged, with having improperly abolished one of the professorships. From the testimony, the committee are induced to believe, that in abolishing the professorship alluded to, the Trustees acted, not only properly, but discreetly, and wisely. The next charge is, that the Trustees employed incompetent professors, and retained them, when more competent ones could have been employed. The committee suppose this accusation to have referred to the professors employed, at the time of, and subsequent to the amalgamation of the Miami Faculty, with the Faculty of the Ohio College. Of these professors, three were taken from the old Faculty, or the Faculty of the Ohio College. Although Dr. Drake doubts the competency of these professors, the commit-

tee are induced to believe, by the whole evidence, that there is in truth, no cause to doubt. The other five were taken from the Miami Faculty, and although the same witness, has some doubts, with respect to part of these, it is worthy of remark, that with the exception of himself, they are men of his own choice, and received their appointments, on his recommendation. The committee are not informed, when the Trustees could have employed better professors, unless they had continued Dr. Drake himself. They have no doubt of his qualifications, and believe he is capable of doing honor to any medical school. But they are compelled to say, from the facts disclosed in this case, that it is extremely problematical, whether peace and harmony could prevail for any length of time, in a medical institution, with which he should be connected, unless it was entirely under his control, and management." I call the attention of the reader, particularly to the closing paragraph of the above extract. He will remark that the whole state senate, with the exception of a single member are of opinion, after calmly reviewing, the whole of Dr. Drake's professional career down to 1833, that this gentleman is *incapable of living in harmony with any set of men unless they are tame enough to become his puppets*. If Dr. Drake, in 1833, was the turbulent factious and overbearing colleague, which the senate report represents him to have been, is there any reason, to suppose him altered for the better, in 1835. That Dr. Drake may answer this question himself, I will give an extract from one of his late letters to the Board of Trustees. He is speaking of his aversion, to being associated with Dr. Moorhead, with whom, the reader will recollect, he *solicited*, to be associated in 1833.

"When *ex necessitate*, I was associated with him in 1831-2, I carried myself in every official interview, with whatever discretion, moderation, decorum and courtesy [ahem!] I possess; but in the spring of 1833, when he gave testimony to the commissioners appointed by the Governor, he represented me as overbearing, unjust and tyrannical. [After all which, in the following summer, I begged to be again associated with him.] If such was my deportment then, it would be bad hereafter; and the peace and dignity of the College require that I should not come into it, in connection with one [with whom I in vain

solicited, a connection in 1833 after all the above circumstances had transpired] who is strongly predisposed [as he was in 1833 when I made my application] to recognize in me those unamiablc qualities." (*Supplement to the Western Medical Journal* page 12.)

The report continues "In the fourteenth and fifteenth specifications, the Trustees are charged with having improperly abolished one of the professorships, to wit that of the Institutes, and also with having mismanaged the library. The first of these charges has been already considered. To sustain the latter, there is no sufficient proof. In the second general charge, it is alleged, that the Trustees have been guilty of gross negligence, in the management of the funds of the State, committed to their hands, for the benefit of the College. The committee have sought for proof to sustain this charge, but have not found it," &c. "The fourth general charge, is a reiteration of the charge of favouritism, contained in one of the specifications under the first,—which has been already considered, with the additional accusation against the Trustees, of having unjustly persecuted, able, respectable, and unoffending individuals, whom they were bound in good faith to protect. Under this charge, there are ten specifications, which it is unnecessary to report, as there is no evidence applicable to them, which goes to prove any impropriety of conduct, on the part of the Board of Trustees." &c. &c. &c. The reader will by this time, be able to judge, how Dr. Drake was pleased with the results of his investigation into the affairs of the College; and from the triumphant acquittal of the institution in 1833, he may form a tolerably correct estimate of the truth, or falsehood of the charges, alleged against it at the present day. The report concludes—"The committee have been thus particular, with respect to the charges made against the Trustees of the Medical College, because, if those gentlemen had been guilty of the improprieties, attributed, it would seem to be necessary, that there should be Legislative interference to correct the evil. Further, the Trustees are peculiarly the agents of the State, and being such agents, their conduct should be closely scrutinized. With the minority of the committee, appointed by the Governor to visit Cincinnati, we must say, however, that the charges against these agents of the State are *not sustained* by the

evidence." &c. One would think that Dr. Drake after being thus pointedly rebuked, by the Senate of the State, would have silenced his battery against the Medical College, but so far from this being the fact, he is daily dressing up the *same charges* which were "*not sustained*" by the evidence, and sending them in their new verbiage, all over the State, with the forlorn hope of carrying his point, in spite of public opinion. Having given a synopsis of the report, I shall now proceed to notice, some items of the evidence, on which it was based. I have alleged in sundry places in the course of this inquiry, that Dr. Drake's efforts are directed *solely* to the building up, of his own fortunes; *whatever* may be the result, to the interests of the community. I believe that an impartial review of Dr. Drake's professional career will convince the unprejudiced, that so far from giving his *bona fide*, and disinterested aid to the Medical College of Ohio, he has invariably, whenever the interests of that institution have conflicted with his own private views, abandoned the former to advance the latter. If any individual in this state, still has a doubt of the justness of this conclusion,—if he still believes that Dr. Drake in a twelve years war against the Medical College, was *right*, and all those against whom he warred were *wrong*—if he still believes patriotism to have been the main-spring of his actions, let him read, and read carefully the following additional testimony, as to the *motives* of the man, and the *passion* as well as interest, by which he has been actuated, in his toilsome, unwearying, and relentless warfare of half a life time, to pull down, our only State Medical Institution. Extract from the Record—"Dr. Mitchell testified—That his recollection of the conversation with Dr. Drake in Dr. Eberle's presence, on the subject of Dr. Henry's removal, was not vague, but as distinct and fresh as if it had occurred yesterday; and as Dr. Drake has denied it on oath, he would now repeat what he said yesterday. At the close of the conversation which I detailed yesterday, the circumstance which has been denied took place. I stated yesterday that Dr. Drake brought Dr. Eberle to my laboratory some days previous to the close of the lectures, early part 1832, and previous to the day of Dr. Drake's resignation. The subject in conversation was mainly relative to Dr. Henry. I mention this, because I was told, I was misunder-

stood yesterday. That Dr. Drake was using arguments and persuasions to us, to use our influence, for the retention of Dr. Henry in the Obstetrical chair. As I knew he was speaking for effect, I made a single reply—that we had quarrels enough in the Jefferson College [Phila.] and that we did not expect to have more, upon coming here. That Dr. Drake would get nothing out of us, but that we had made up our minds. He then said that if he did not succeed, or bring about, or accomplish his views in regard to this matter, *he would tear down [or blow up] the Institution, if he perished beneath its ruins.*” The same institution, which Dr. Drake affirms he has been near twenty years of his life, *patriotically* endeavoring to build up! The witness proceeds—“This was his substance, or his words—the latter part of the declaration is verbatim. There is a gentleman in this house who will swear, that this was communicated to him by me, that very afternoon. Dr. Drake was frequently in my laboratory using arguments and persuasions to this effect.—This was before the 19th of January, the date of his resignation.” Dr. Moorhead is called. “Witness testified, that a very short time after that conversation, [alluding to the above] Dr. Mitchell took occasion to repeat the terms which he has related here, and at the same time coupling them with certain observations, as to the impression they had made upon his mind.”

Dr. Eberle is on the stand. Dr. Eberle testified that the facts occurred under his observation, and that they varied nothing from Dr. Mitchell’s statement, “except that I regarded it as a threat by Dr. Drake to induce Dr. Mitchell and myself to abet in keeping Dr. Henry in the school, or prevent a removal. Dr. Drake came to my house or office, and said he had understood the Trustees were taking measures to remove Dr. Henry—that Dr. Mitchell and I could prevent it if we spoke to the Trustees in behalf of Dr. Henry.—He called on us to exert ourselves in behalf of Dr. Henry, and said that if we did not do so, and prevent the removal, he would ruin the school—he would blow it up if he perished beneath its ruins. I then requested him to go to Dr. Mitchell’s laboratory. There the same conversation took place, and he there made the same declaration, *“that if the Trustees did remove Dr. Henry, he (Drake) would blast the school, if he perished beneath its ruins,”*

*and called God to witness.* This circumstance is distinct on my mind—my recollection of it is as fresh, as if it occurred yesterday. It made an impression on my mind at the time.” Since Dr. Drake has denied under oath the statements made by Dr. Eberle and Dr. Mitchell, I will here introduce testimony, as to declarations made by Dr. Joseph N. McDowell, for the purpose of corroborating the evidence of those two gentlemen. And although it is a good rule in law, that one man is not to be prejudiced by the declarations of another, generally, yet it is a rule equally well established, that when you connect men together in a conspiracy to do a certain act—the declarations of one of the parties, *quoad that act*, are the declarations of all; and it is under this latter rule that I offer Dr. McDowell’s declarations—he and Dr. Drake have for some time past been striving in the same work of “reform,” and are at this time, members of the same institution, got up *avowedly*, with the design of reforming the Medical College of Ohio. Dr. Cox is on the stand; “During the session I attended a regular private course, by Dr. McDowell, on Anatomy and Surgery. I was anxious to obtain all the knowledge of Anatomy and Surgery possible, and in conversation with Dr. Cobb, asked if he would have a private class, he said his health would not permit it, and advised me to attend Dr. McDowell’s course. I knew that members of the Faculty have encouraged students to attend Dr. McDowell’s course also, and that his class was enlarged by it. Dr. McDowell on various occasions, both in and out of the class, used a great many hard expressions against the Faculty, and particularly on one evening, he spent the whole evening, instead of lecturing, in abusing them. He swore he had waged eternal warfare against them, and would never cease his efforts till he got Dr. Cobb’s chair, and that he was in combination with other individuals against the College.” Question by Dr. Mitchell.—“Do you remember his words on that occasion?” Answer. “Not circumstantially—he spent the hour usually devoted to lecturing, in this sort of harrangue. He offered to bet any sum of money, that the next winter the class would not amount to more than fifty. That he had a combination with his brother or cousin in Kentucky, a practising physician, and a man of great influence, in that State, and

would spare no pains to injure the College. *He would blow it to hell.* Whereupon I and several other friends of the Faculty, withdrew." Question by Dr. Mitchell. "What relationship is there between Dr. McDowell, and Dr. Drake?" Answer. "Dr. McDowell is brother-in-law to Dr. Drake." The public will be surprised after the foregoing, to read the following testimony given in, *under oath*, by Dr. Daniel Drake. Dr. Drake is on the stand as a witness, and among other things testifies as follows. "I told them [Drs. Eberle and Mitchell,] the expulsion of Dr. Henry, would be attended with very serious and embarrassing consequences. *I never did say that if the Trustees did not comply with my wishes, I would shake the institution, if I buried myself beneath its ruins.*" Which of these statements *under oath* is the true one—and one of them must be false, I leave the public to decide—the witnesses are before them, and they have heard the evidence.

I have stated in another place, that in 1831-2, Dr. Drake induced a part of the class to send a memorial to the Legislature, relative to the affairs of the College, and that in order to effect this, he held meetings, and harranged the students; here is the evidence. Dr. Cox is on the stand: "Witness—I did hear Dr. Drake harrange the class, considerably on the subject, in public; and thought the Board of Trustees ought to be enlarged, by gentlemen in the country, at a distance from the city," &c.

In prosecuting this measure, Dr. Drake engendered dissensions of the most bitter nature among the students—they were arrayed against each other, under distinctive *party* names. The Drake party warring against the constituted authorities, and setting the rules and regulations of the school at defiance. The studies of the more peaceable, and well disposed, were interrupted by the disorderly conduct of the "reformers" and it was not uncommon to behold the spectacle of young men sitting with *arms* in their pockets, and distrust and watchfulness depicted in their features, while listening to the abstruse lessons of science. Extract from the Record. Dr. Cox is on the stand. Question by Dr. Mitchell—"Were there not threats of such a nature, as if resistance would lead to violence?" "Yes; I was alarmed myself." Question by the same—"What was the cause of these disturbances?" "Witness—The opposition a-

mong the students, upon the memorials. I had much talk with the students, it was my opinion, and that of others, that we came here to study—not to memorialize—but to learn. They opposed the memorials and had a meeting to put them down, and stop them—they thought them altogether out of place. But the memorialists were determined to carry their point, by fair means, or by force of arms." Question by Dr. Mitchell: "Were not many of the class, in the habit of coming to the lectures armed?" "Answer. They were, I was obliged to do it in my own defence, for I felt seriously afraid," &c. Question by the same. "Were not the prime movers of this agitation, the special friends and students of Drs. Drake and Henry?" "Answer. They were." The father or the guardian, who may hereafter send his son, or ward to receive his diploma, at the hands of Dr. Drake, or to attend a course of lectures in an institution, with which that gentleman is connected, will find it necessary, from the foregoing statement of facts to add to the usual equipment of the student, a brace of pistols, or a Spanish knife, to serve him in the *party feuds*, which he will be destined to encounter. And if the student should have the good fortune to escape, being shot or stabbed, he will still run the risk, of being caught under some huge fragment of the college, when Dr. Drake, Sampson-like, shall "*bury himself beneath its ruins.*" The investigation which I have been reviewing closed, by the Senate committee's negating each and every charge preferred by Dr. Drake against the Medical College of Ohio. There were other charges brought against the Hospital Trustees, which as they are not relevant to my subject I will not introduce; it may be as well to remark, however, that they were likewise found *not to be sustained by the evidence.* From what motives these various charges could have sprung, the reader must determine for himself. Dr. Drake, nothing daunted by his signal failure in this attempt to reform the Trustees, continued his exertions to bring the College into disrepute. If this could be done—if public confidence could be destroyed, in the institution, his object would be equally attained, because then, public opinion would work out the reform, which he and his Third District Medical Society, with all their charges, and specifications had been unable to do. Nor was this any new device; he had practiced it

as often, as he had been out of the College, and found no other means of getting in. We recollect his efforts of a similar character, after his dismissal from the school in 1822. We recollect his efforts, after his return from Lexington in 1827, and his efforts prior to the amalgamation of the Miami Faculty with the Medical College of Ohio, in 1831. Dr. Drake, growing desperate, in consequence of the failure of all his previous projects, in 1834 called in a new engine to his aid. He had been, as he states, the editor of the Western Journal, of the Medical and Physical sciences, for the previous seven years. During this period he had sufficient respect for his character as a public journalist, devoted to the advancement of science, not to permit his pages to become the instruments of a party warfare. In the March number of this work, for 1834, Dr. Drake holds the following language. "This forbearance for which, no sufficient reason could at any time be given, has kept the readers in ignorance of the policy and progress of the school; when one object of Medical Journals should be to disseminate correct information concerning medical institutions. The editor is determined, hereafter, to advise the distant reader, from time to time, of the character and advantages of our Medical College; and to gratify their curiosity as to recent transactions, he proposes to devote a portion of the present number to the publication, and examination of several documents." Accordingly we find, several pages taken up with a *reiteration* of the same charges and specifications, which we have seen were negatived by the Senate committee. From this period henceforth, the editor of the *scientific Journal* has faithfully adhered to his rule, of *gratifying the public curiosity*, and his periodical has been almost monthly, freighted, with the proceedings of District Medical societies, arguments, essays, and orations, all intended of course to disseminate *correct* information concerning medical institutions." The following are specimens of the elegant, and courteous language of the Editor, and the "correct information" which runs from time to time, through this *scientific* common sewer to the people. Speaking of the Senate-report which told so many hard truths of himself, and the party, he says. "From beginning to end the Report is laudatory of the Trustees and the various Faculties—commendatory of the establishment—and abusive of the ed-

itor of this Journal, whose name is introduced more than twenty times! [what profanation!] It is certainly quite a distinction to be made thus, the subject of an elaborate and lengthened state paper, by a committee of the most dignified branch of our Legislature! Towards the close of this Report on the conduct and character of "Drake" as the committee courteously designated him, they declare, "*That the charges against the Agents of the State are NOT SUSTAINED by the evidence*, consequently the "Agents of the State" are acquitted, and *one* of fifty witnesses singled out for calumny, within the very walls, where he [the great Daniel Drake of the Mississippi Valley] once made those [great and luminous] explanations to the General Assembly, which led to the establishment of both the College, and the Hospital, [immortal founder! that he should be thus disgraced!]" "What influence could have induced the committee to palm upon the senate a declaration, so *foreign to the fact*, as that in the quotation just made, will perhaps, never be found out." Verily, we must admire the *spirit and tenacity*, with which the Doctor wars. He first abuses the Faculty, next the Trustees—endeavours to reform the latter—fails—then applies to the impartiality and justice of the Senate; an investigation is ordered—a report is made, but as it is not just *such a one* as he wished—he turns round and abuses the Senate, accusing them of having made a report "*foreign to the fact*." That is to say, he denounces the Legislature as a pack of corrupt liars, for upholding a still more corrupt set of Trustees and Professors—and yet this is the man who complains of his being called "Drake," and talks learnedly of "courtesy." We have here another cause to wonder, that the Medical College of Ohio has so long continued to weather the storm. It would be strange indeed if a man of Dr. Drake's talent for political pamphlet writing, could not succeed, with a press at his back, in creating a prejudice in the minds of a large portion of the profession, against any institution; especially if that institution had no similar means to counteract his misstatements. When statements are repeated, day after day, in a respectable periodical, under the imposing caption of "Facts," the readers of that periodical, who have no opportunity of inquiring into the truth or falsehood of such statements, naturally imbibe, after a time, the prejudices of the



writer. These readers are generally medical men, and when they are taught to believe, contrary to the fact, that there is no respectable school of Medicine in Cincinnati, is it not to be expected, that they will advise their students to attend courses of lectures in other and more distant institutions? This is the reason why Ohio, unlike Kentucky, has not patronised her own school. And this is one of the causes, which Dr. Drake, after having created himself, adduces, of the necessity of "reform."

I will give another specimen of the style and matter of Dr. Drake's *Court Journal* of the Medical and Physical Sciences, and then I will dismiss, *the thing* from my presence. I extract from the same number of March 1834. The Doctor is gratifying the curiosity of his readers, by publishing a letter from one of his "thousand and one correspondents," tending to disseminate "correct information concerning medical schools." The letter writer is commenting on the lectures of the Medical College of Ohio. He says, "The broad slang and low vulgar tales of Moorhead, reminded me of some of the discourses I had heard in the vagrant cellar of the Philadelphia Alms house. Cobb, for an introductory, read a translation of a description, of a painted paste board man he bought, during his seven-day sojourn in France, and after that, the report of the committee, of the House of Commons in England, on the subject of Dissection." Oh! for the courtesy of "Drake!" While the Western Journal was thus manfully performing its duty, its Editor was trying his hand at another species of warfare. He had seen, that in 1832, the prevalence of the cholera in Cincinnati, greatly reduced the number of students, and as he is logician enough to know, that *ceteris paribus*, like causes, produce like effects, he saw no good reason, why a report of cholera, industriously circulated, should not operate in 1834, as it had done in 1832. This conclusion being drawn, the citizens of Cincinnati, were delighted every few days, by the sight of "DAN. DRAKE" in large letters, appended to a bulletin of serious, and grave import, announcing to the world abroad, that, the "fell destroyer" had made his reappearance, and Cincinnati, was become once more, a charnel house. Now, what was the fact! It is true that there were a few cases of Cholera here, and so there were at almost all the towns on the Mis-

issippi and Ohio, but then it is well known, that the disease was *not contagious*, and that therefore strangers could run no risk in visiting us. Wherefore then, this alarm? it might operate seriously on the commercial prosperity of the city, and could do no possible good—it might frighten some poor people to death, but certainly could not save any. Besides, where was, our Board of Health—the proper sanitary guardian of the city, that Dr. Drake, should usurp its powers, and declare *himself* the DICTATOR to this community! These questions are hard to be answered, but there are others, more easy of solution. There are two reasons which prompted the Doctor to this course; One was, the effect which his bulletins would produce on the class of the College, by operating on the fears, of parents, and guardians; and the other was an effect of a very different nature, but one which is well understood, by persons, who are skilful architects, of a certain species of reputation. People abroad, when they perceived by our papers, that no other man in Cincinnati, dared open his mouth, naturally enough, concluded, that the said *Daniel Drake*, must be at least, Surgeon-general of the city. And I am not quite so sure, if any of his protocols, reached the Island of Cuba, the good people of Havana, did not imagine, that we, like themselves, were a *garrisoned town*, and Dr. Drake our *Captain-General*. The newspapers in various parts of the country, seeing our prints come to them, by every mail, in the lugubrious garments of mourning, caught up the alarm, and re-echoed the dismal notes "far and near." The few persons who did visit us, came with fear and trembling, and it was not until they had actually arrived, within the precincts of our city, that they found the report of the Cholera, a bug-bear devised to "warn them off." Notwithstanding the efforts of Dr. Drake, and his Journal, aided by the newspaper panic, the number of students decreased, but inconsiderably, and 92 were matriculated; being within thirty nine of the largest number the College had ever had. The following session of the Legislature, the term of service of the board of Trustees expiring, a new election was to be held; and as it was all important to the interests of the party, that Drake-men should be chosen, great exertions were made; every man and boy who could shoulder a musket, was called into the field, and proclamations were issued, ordering a ge-

neral rendezvous of the troops, at Columbus. The army being assembled there in great numbers, it was intended to draw lines of circumvallation around the State-house, when it was anticipated as a matter of course, that the members of the Legislature would surrender, at discretion. The following is a notice of the proclamation, and the assembling of the convention, in obedience thereto, "Pursuant to a circular letter, addressed to "all Scientific Practitioners of Medicine and Surgery, in the State of Ohio." recommending a General Medical Convention to be held in the city of Columbus, on the 5th day of January, A. D. 1835, for the purposes therein mentioned and expressed, the following persons assembled, in the basement room, of the Presbyterian church, in said city, on the day and year aforesaid, at 10 o'clock, A. M. to wit." [Here they were mustered.] The Medical College of Ohio foreseeing the tendency of these movements, deputed two of her Faculty Drs. Eberle and Mitchell, to be present for the purpose of contradicting such false statements as might be made, in relation to her condition, government, &c. Dr. Mitchell a few days previous to leaving this city for Columbus, had the honor to receive the following "courteous" and polite note, from *Dr. Daniel Drake*.

"Cincinnati, December 30th, 1834.

DEAR SIR—

I understand that you are about to attend the Medical Convention at Columbus. If such be the fact, let me advise you as a friend, to curb your propensity for telling lies, so that you may not disgrace yourself among strangers, and bring discredit on the Convention. I do not of course [here a word is omitted in the copy which I have—it is probably the word suppose] that you can refrain entirely—but a strong resolution may enable you to hold in a little; I hope this advice will not be lost upon you.

Your Obed't. Serv't.

DANIEL DRAKE."

Prof. MITCHELL.

Comment on this note is unnecessary, it is sufficient to excite the indignation of every man in the community—more especially when we look at the circumstances under which it was written. In ordinary cases, a note of this kind coming from an individual whose standing in society, entitles him to be looked upon as a gentle-

man, would have been noticed in the way, in which such matters are generally settled, but Dr. Drake *knew* when he sent this vulgar production to Dr. Mitchell, that the latter gentleman was an officer of the Presbyterian church—was conscientiously opposed to duelling, and had frequently expressed himself to that effect. The reader will scarcely believe that the author of this note, as an additional means of drawing students to the *new Cincinnati College*, proposes to parents, to *preach* to their children every Sunday! The following extract is taken from a "Supplement to the Western Journal of the Medical and Physical Sciences," edited by Daniel Drake, M. D. and containing the circular of the *new College*. "In conclusion, the Faculty will add, that every Sunday morning, of the three last months of the session, the professor of Theory and Practice, will deliver a discourse on the social, moral and religious duties of students and medical men, which of course the members of the class will be at liberty to attend or decline, according to their respective tastes." The professor of Theory and Practice, is Doctor Drake.

The convention met, and the proceedings run somewhat as follows—On motion of Dr. Drake—On motion of Dr.—On motion of Dr. Drake—On motion of Dr.—On motion of Dr. Drake—&c. Dr.— moved that Dr. Drake be requested to deliver an *oration*, "and that both Houses of the Legislature be invited to attend;" which motion was carried—Whereupon, the next day to wit: the day of—cometh the said Drake in his proper person, with the oration aforesaid all "cut and dried" for the occasion—and delivereth the said oration to the unspeakable delight of the people there assembled—and the said oration was printed by the Convention, the better to enable the said Drake, to rehearse it occasionally, for the delivery thereof at other places, &c. &c. &c. When the election of Trustees came on, the Legislature, "reformed" the old Board, and with but two or three exceptions, installed new men in office; of whom *the party expected better things, to wit:—"loaves and fishes,"* alas! delusive hope, the *new men* were found to be made of the same stern stuff which characterized the old, and the fleeing prospect of promotion, like the shadow of the butterfly, kept retreating before them.

The new Board of Trustees was composed of the following gentlemen viz: John C. Wright Calvin Fletcher, William Burke, David K. Este, Morgan Neville, Jephtha D. Garrard, William Stephenson, George Lucky, William S. Hatch, John Cotton, Joseph Carter. But two of the above named gentlemen had ever served in the Board of Trustees before, so that Dr. Drake was apparently about to be gratified, so far at least, as an almost entire change of men, indicated a change of measures. Dr. Drake had not unceasingly vented his complaints against the former Trustees, accusing them as we have seen of almost every species of dishonesty, and whenever a change would take place, if he found the new members as difficult to be controlled as the old ones, he would say that the same "*animus*" directed the movements of the Board. If Dr. Drake's views in relation to the Medical College of Ohio, had heretofore been correct, and those of the various Boards of Trustees, with whom he had been at war, were erroneous, he had now, an opportunity of testing his measures, by *nine* new members, out of eleven. How they have given their verdict remains to be seen. Immediately after the appointment of the New Board. Dr. Drake took such steps towards winning them over to his interests, as he flattered himself, could not fail to prove successful. It is well known that this gentleman, has, like every other disorganizer, who possesses sufficient talents to assume the lead of a party, a number of men enlisted in his ranks, who on all occasions, when it is necessary for the interests of their cause, yield themselves up, the implicit instruments of his will. To these men scattered in various parts of the State, he addressed letters of "instruction" requiring them to suggest to the Board of Trustees, such measures, as they in their wisdom, thought it expedient for them to adopt. These letters were almost unanimously in favour of retaining at least three or four of the Professors—from which we may infer, either, that the writers disobeyed their instructions, or that Dr. Drake was willing to come into the school, and be associated with the old Professors, whose retention was insisted upon. If they disobeyed their instructions, then it shows that there was still some freedom of opinion left among them, and that their duty to their fellow citizens, and the State was not wholly merged in their *allegiance to the party*. It shows that notwithstanding the *mandate* of their leader, they had still enough of remaining virtue, to shrink from the proposal of sacrificing, able and honest men, to the insatiable revenge of their great Moloch. If, on the other hand, they wrote such letters as they were directed to write, then it appears that Dr. Drake, at the commencement of his late warfare against the opinion and independence of the Board of Trustees, did *not* require that two thirds of the Faculty should be sacrificed to make room for him and his partisans, but that this *requisition* was an *after* thought, taken up, because he thought he saw at one time a disposition on the part of the

Board to waver in their determination of retaining one half the Faculty at *least* and probably two thirds, as they eventually did. The Board read these partisan letters, but as most of the members had been in a political life themselves, they knew how such things "were got up," and put a proper estimation upon their value, as the *legitimate* and *unbought* expression of public opinion. One of the first acts of the Board was the dismissal of Drs. Pierson and Mitchell, not because these gentlemen were unworthy the stations they held, but they (the Trustees) believed, that the interests of the school required that they should make an effort to conciliate Dr. Drake and his party. They knew that this person, was waging a war of extermination against them, and that, from causes which I have in part already pointed out, he had considerable influence in the State, among a *certain set* of physicians, who being *small* men in the other party, were anxious to become "little great men," in *the party*. They knew too that Dr. Drake was *mentally* capable of making a good professor, and they thought, that by putting him under proper checks in the Faculty, his unfortunate *propensity*, might be kept under such control, as to render him incapable of doing *harm*. They accordingly invited him and Mr. Shepard to occupy the two vacant seats; which Dr. Drake refused to do because the Trustees would not turn out *two-thirds* of the old Faculty, to enable him to bring in two more of his partisans, with whom, having a majority, he could *control* the Faculty. To show, that Dr. Drake, himself did not believe that the *interests of the school* demanded the extensive reform in the Faculty for which he *latterly* contended—he endeavored in the first place, to take away Dr. Cobb's chair, in order to create a vacancy for his (Drake's) brother in law Dr. McDowell, and by this means to enable that gentleman, to put the *disinterested* threat in execution, which the reader will recollect, to have heard him make a short time since—but finding that Dr. Cobb was too *strong* for him—that his reputation as one of the first lecturers on Anatomy, in the United States, added to his personal worth, and the consequent determination of his friends to adhere to him, rendered his removal a "forlorn hope"—he secondly, directed his efforts against Dr. Smith, whom he supposed to be less firmly seated, and therefore more easily overthrown. Although this latter result, would not suit the views of Dr. Drake so well as the former, yet he found himself *ex necessitate* obliged to turn his arms in this direction, intending, after the dismissal of Dr. Smith should be brought about, to take away a part of Dr. Cobb's chair, and assign it, together with a part of the chair of Surgery, to his bantling Dr. McDowell. With this object in view he wrote several letters to the Trustees, insisting as a *sine qua non* to his entry into the school, that *all* the professors should be removed except *two*, and indicated indirectly, that these two should be Drs. Eberle and Cobb.

He of course assigned various reasons for

this proceeding; but as most of them have been noticed already in the course of this inquiry, I will not here repeat them. The Trustees after calmly reviewing the condition of the College, and listening to the objections, and arguments of Dr. Drake and his partisans, came to the conclusion, that it was their duty to retain at least *four* of the old Professors. Having decided upon this measure, and having unbounded confidence in the talents and integrity of the four gentlemen thus retained, they gave *them* the power, to choose suitable men to fill the two vacant chairs, and adjourned. Dr. Drake finding that he had failed in this, his hundredth and last attempt to gain the Trustees, forthwith wrote a pamphlet, in which he *lavished the same abuse* upon them, that he has done upon *all* their predecessors, and *every other* man, who has had sufficient penetration and firmness, to detect his unprincipled schemes, and expose them to public view. I shall notice but few of the points treated of in this pamphlet,—it is a perfect prototype of a hundred others that Dr. Drake has written, with the same view, to wit: that of glossing over facts, and working upon the prejudices of the people, by making false charges, and sustaining them by plausible, sometimes ingenious, but always fallacious reasoning. Supposing that the people are unacquainted with his previous acts and writings, he has taken the liberty to forget them himself, and consequently involves himself in a maze of contradictions, never dreaming, that his former misdeeds, will be raised up in judgment against him. As a specimen, he asks, “But what should be thought of the policy of attempting to combine Dr. Moorhead and Dr. Drake in the same Faculty?” He is here accusing the Board, of duplicity, in inviting him to become an associate of Moorhead, when they *knew*, that he (Drake) would not accept. Now the Doctor must have forgotten, that subsequently to the difficulties, which took place between Dr. Moorhead and himself, and which he alleges as the reason, why the Board *ought to have known* that he was unwilling to be associated with that gentleman—*he applied to become his associate*—as the reader has already seen. Again—he says, “But Dr. Drake’s [writing in the third person] refusal to serve with Dr. Moorhead, arose only in part from the fear of being involved by him in dissensions. *He wanted confidence in Dr. Moorhead as a professor,*” &c. Now see how completely, one of his former declarations, contradicts this. It had been stated before the committee of the Senate that Dr. Drake had said, that Dr. Moorhead was the strongest man in the Faculty. Dr. Eberle is on the stand, and Dr. Drake is cross-examining him. “Drake. Did I make a distinction, between the members of the College?” Eberle. “Yes! you dwelt particularly on Moorhead, who was at the head of the institution, and spoke as to his qualifications.” Drake. “Did you state yesterday, that in riding with you

I said, that Dr. Moorhead was, after all, the strongest man in the Faculty?” Eberle. “Yes.”

Dr. Drake in his pamphlet, takes an opportunity to assail the reputation of Dr. Smith—this being the same species of warfare, he has resorted to, in the case of every other professor, with whom he has ever been at enmity. He asks, “who is Dr. Smith?” Without stopping to throw back the question upon the querist and inquire, who is Dr. Drake, I will refer the public to the late circular of the Board of Trustees, for an answer to his question. The Board say, “Of Dr. A. G. Smith, as a surgeon, and accomplished operator, there is but one opinion in the West. He enjoys an equal reputation with Dr. Dudley of Transylvania, and it is but justice to genius to say, that such a teacher, would be an acquisition to any school in the Union. His ardent devotion to the profession prompted him, some time since, to visit Europe, and after spending between two and three years on the Continent, and in England, he returned, enriched with the fruits of much observation and research.” One of the charges against Dr. Smith is that he brings no influence with him to the school, his professional reputation, being confined to the State of Kentucky. If this were the fact, how was it that Dr. Smith, was sought for by the Trustees, and invited to enter the school? Dr. Smith was not *personally* known to any of them, and so far from having made an application for the chair of Surgery as Dr. Drake did—he was *invited* by a gentleman sent for the purpose, without the slightest previous knowledge of the steps which had been taken by the Board, to fill Dr. Staughton’s vacancy.

He was pursuing an extensive and lucrative practice, in Louisville, and it was at a great pecuniary sacrifice, that he consented to accept the chair, which was offered him. His practice was not confined to Louisville, but extended throughout the whole Mississippi Valley. The States of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Tennessee, Missouri, Kentucky, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Virginia, and Pennsylvania, annually sent subjects to Dr. Smith in Kentucky, to be operated upon, for the various, complicated and dangerous diseases, which usually come within the sphere of the Surgical knife. Several of Dr. Smith’s operations, were noticed, twelve years ago, in the North American Medical and Surgical Journal, in terms of the highest commendation, and were translated from this periodical, into the various languages of Europe, and extensively circulated. Dr. Drake has himself, in his Journal of the Medical and Physical Sciences, frequently, spoken of Dr. Smith, in connexion with different Surgical operations, and always in terms of approbation. Five years ago, Dr. Drake wrote Dr. Smith—“*who was not known out of Ky.*” a letter inviting him to this place, to practice his profession. But the reader must recollect that then Dr. Drake had *no object* to gain, by withholding, merited commendation. Quere, has he any object to gain,

now! Dr. Drake in order to carry his point—by prejudicing the public mind against Dr. Smith, asserts, directly contrary to the fact, that the number of students from Kentucky, has considerably diminished, since Dr. Smith has been connected with the school; and he attributes this to Dr. Smith's want of influence, in his own State. Now the fact is thus. In the fall of 1832—3, the year before Dr. Smith entered the Medical College of Ohio, the whole number of students, was 83; from Kentucky 4. In the session of 1833—4, the first year after Dr. Smith's entry into the school, the whole number of students was 114; from Kentucky 13. Now let the school-boy take his pencil, and say; If 82:4:114, answer, 5, and a fraction; but we have seen that the increase was more than double this—was the proportion from Kentucky, therefore less or greater after Dr. Smith's entry into the school! Again. In the session of 1834—5, the whole number of students, was 92; from Kentucky 15. Now let us here, make a similar statement. If 82:4:92, answer, 4 and a fraction—Whereas we see, that instead of 4 there were 15; the increase in two years, being nearly fourfold. For the truth of the above I refer to the Records of the College; and for the falsity of Dr. Drake's statement I refer to the powers of comparison of the reader—if increase is decrease, Dr. Drake speaks the truth—but if increase is increase, then he does not speak the truth. All those persons who have read Dr. Drake's veracious pamphlet, and who shall not see this refutation of the slander I have been noticing, will conclude of course, that Mr. Smith has not contributed to the increase of the school. And if they believe the other stories told them, they will conclude also that Dr. Smith has no professional reputation. Now let us pause for a moment and view the character of a man, who could thus wilfully and maliciously aim to destroy the hard earned reputation of another, because that other holds an office, which he covets. I have shown on a former occasion that if we believe the testimony of Drs. Eberle, Mitchell, and Moorhead, whose veracity has never been impeached, Dr. Drake, has deliberately forsworn himself, before a judicial committee, whether knowingly or not, so as to constitute the crime of perjury, I will not say. I have just proved by figures, which every man can examine for himself, that he has uttered a deliberate untruth, in relation to another matter; and I have shown in sundry places, and by proofs frequently under his own hand, that he has contradicted (I will not use a harsher term, although I think it false modesty, not to call things by their right names) himself, as often, as he imagined, he found it to his interest to do so, and believed there was no hand near to expose him. And is such a man to be tolerated in a virtuous community!—is he to be permitted to stab the reputations of honest men, in distant parts of the State, where he knows there is no one, to unmask him, and prevent the effects of his mal-

ice, by exhibiting his naked deformity to the public.

Dr. Drake asks triumphantly, what claims has Dr. Smith, on the Medical College of Ohio. Here I take the liberty of making an answer for Dr. Smith, which I know that gentleman would make for himself, and which every good citizen ought to make, in reference to public office. Dr. Smith has no claims—he makes none—his services belong to his state, or the state of his adoption, and the people may claim him to be their servant, but he does not claim to be the servant of the people—he does not boast of his long residence in the West, although he has been a Western man for the last fifteen years—he does not boast of his numerous exploits, and of the obligations under which he has placed the people—but he does boast of his professional reputation, however small that may be—because it has been the work of his own hands—because he has not waded to it through the ruined prospects of other men—because he can lay his hand on his heart, without feeling the writhings of his conscience. Now that I have been obliged to allude to reputation, let me ask of this community a plain question—In what does Dr. Drake's reputation consist?—How has he made it? Where are his Medical works? Where are his operations—his cures? He has made it by thrusting himself continually before the public, and if he could not come before it in the character of a physician, he has, Proteus-like, assumed that of the politician, the school orator—the 4th of July stump speaker, the founder of female schools; in short, he has sought, and gained that sort of notoriety, which every man of tolerable talents may attain, by laying aside the garb of self respect, and propriety, and interfering in every body's business, without any body's permission.—Dr. Drake charges Dr. Smith with having spent no money on the school. It is not expected, nor is it necessary at the present time, that the professors should expend their private funds on the institution, and Dr. Drake is well aware of this, at the same time that he endeavors to create a contrary impression. The State has granted an annual income, proceeding from the auction duties, amply sufficient for all its wants. But there was a time, when the school did stand in need of pecuniary aid—during that time of want, Dr. Drake was connected with it, and did he then, when there was a necessity for it, expend money on the school? So far from this being the fact, it is on record in this county, that he sued Drs. Slack and Smith, after he was turned out of school in 1832, for the paltry sum of about \$150, for house rent. The professors having held their meetings or delivered their lectures in a house over which Dr. Drake had the superintendence. We will not enter into the comparative merits of Dr. Smith and Dr. Ferne. The latter gentleman may no doubt be a good Surgeon, but we refer to the reputations of the two men, to designate the cele-

city of each. In conclusion I will remark, that the Medical College of Ohio, so far from being disorganized and broken up, as Dr. Drake alleges—is now as flourishing, and has brighter prospects before it, than it has ever had.

I am told that Dr. Drake intends to treat me with “silent contempt.” Now this is prudent in the Doctor—he knows as well as I do, that

“’tis written thus in the Bond,” and that the least he says the better. I have understood that I am not to be answered because I am a *young man*, and a *new comer*, and Dr. Drake an *old man*, and an *old resident*. But my system of Logic does not teach me to believe, that these considerations have any influence whatever upon the merits of the case.

**NOTE**—The duel between Drs. Dudley and Richardson, which *Dr. Drake* was charged with having occasioned, occurred immediately after *Dr. Drake's first* connection with the Lexington school, instead of the second, as erroneously stated in page 15.







Med Hist

WZ

270

G 270

1835

C.1

