

L. M. Mason
Ramsay (H. A.)

✓ TO THE
MEDICAL PROFESSION.

HAVING recently seen a pamphlet containing a correspondence with Dr. F. M. Robertson and myself, in reference to a certain *allegation* he unnecessarily preferred against me at the late meeting of the American Medical Association at Charleston, I deem it a duty I owe to my reputation and the medical profession, to place the matter in its correct light, particularly with regard to the circumstances specified in Dr. Robertson's letter of the 10th July. The publication of Dr. Robertson, so far as my own letters are concerned, is, I suspect, correct, with the exception of a few typographical errors. The reader will observe, by reference to that pamphlet, that I have proposed an *arbitration* of this matter repeatedly to Dr. Robertson, which he refused, and offered me *only his author* and the *circumstances*, when no man, apart from himself, was known to the profession as the *author*. If Dr. Robertson had have proposed to give me his *author*, and withdraw the *charge* upon my proving it false, I would have acceded, but he never for a moment suggested such a thing, until the 10th of July, and then I accepted. In reply to my acceptance I received his *pamphlet*, and subsequently the following letter, which acknowledges the acceptance. Dr. Robertson evidently misconstrued my anxiety to adjust the matter, into an inability for defence.

—
CHARLESTON, S. C., Aug. 2d, 1851.

Dear Doctor:—The communication of Dr. H. A. Ramsay, of the 18th July, addressed to yourself, was placed in my

hands after the publication of the correspondence in relation to my motive before the American Medical Association.

The only point in Dr. Ramsay's letter claiming any notice from me is, the surrender of my authority for what transpired at the meeting of the Georgia Medical Society. I have made every effort to ascertain who the Dr. Cooper alluded to is, and his residence, but have failed in so doing, and I now consider it just, in accordance with the declaration in my letter of the 10th July, that my informant's name would be given if necessary, to inform Dr. Ramsay, through you, that Dr. H. F. Campbell, of Augusta, was the delegate who informed me of what took place in relation to Dr. Cooper's Report.

The effort, first, to obtain information as to the residence of Dr. Cooper, will account for the delay in my reply.

Yours, very sincerely, F. M. ROBERTSON,
 Dr. H. W. DESAUSURE,
 Sec. A. M. As., Meeting-St.

Why did Robertson print before he could possibly hear from me, if justice was his object? I replied as soon as it came to hand, and accepted his own proposal—he jumped the fence and cried *wolf! wolf!* This was *purity* and *fairness*.

Why, again, did he force the matter upon private circles, by sending his pamphlet to private gentlemen. My acceptance of his own proposition should have suspended all proceedings. I offered to meet him in Augusta before any board of honorable men—I am ready yet to do it.

Now I will put it to the calm judgment of any candid man, if it was fair in Dr. Robertson to assail me in my absence, and then propose a settlement simply by yielding his *authority* and circumstances, without a proposed withdrawal of the allegation, when I repeatedly invited him before a board of investigation. But as my object is a *fair* and *candid* statement of facts, destitute of personal epithets, and unjust denunciation, I will remark, that I am not a member of the American Medical Association, was absent two hundred miles, or near it, when the assault was made, and had not the least intimation it was intended, or in contemplation. As to Dr. Robertson's authors,

I can only say, I know them—we live 18 miles apart; with his brother, Dr. J. J. Robertson, I have never had any professional intercourse; with Dr. Andrews, I have had very little, once in 1841, and once in 1844, I think, never more; to neither have I spoke for years; as to the extent of their practice, I know nothing, only so far as my own neighborhood is concerned, and here I am willing to let my neighbors speak. These gentlemen are not officially known to this controversy, to me they are in no wise amenable, and I shall use nothing offensive concerning them. In the conduction of this response, I shall observe a strict regard to decency and fair dealing, as to Dr. R. and evidence; the others I shall search truthfully, depending solely upon the justice of my cause to defend me. To obtain a thorough account of all the issues involved, the reader had best secure a copy of Dr. Robertson's pamphlet, in connection with this. The curriculum of circumstances, inducing Dr. Robertson's attack, will be found in his letter of the 10th July, and to this it is my intention mainly to respond, as a careful perusal of both parties letters, antecedent to this, will sufficiently explain themselves. I will now subjoin Dr. Robertson's letter, as forwarded to me by that excellent gentleman and disinterested mediator, Dr. De-Saussure. In commenting upon the letter, I shall confine myself strictly to the legitimate points, avoiding all allusions to unimportant matters, which easily disprove themselves. Prior to introducing the letter, I will inform the reader that I did deny the charge, in *unmeasured* and *emphatic* language, throughout the Union. I wrote to many medical gentlemen, I indited *cards* to several medical journals, some I suspended, others not, while some were refused admittance, for reasons purely impartial and satisfactory. After the reception of Dr. Robertson's first note, and the mailing of my reply, I came to the conclusion, from its *unconditional tone*, there was no reasonable chance for a peaceable adjustment. I therefore wrote to Dr.'s Kinlock and Wragg in *violent* and *abusive* language, and without the slightest acquaintance

with either. If I erred, by disregarding a social rule, Dr. Robertson is quite as amenable in attacking me without my acquaintance, in a *wanton* and *flagrant* manner, and that too *behind my back*. Having made this explanation, I will now descend to the material points in controversy, and here I shall give Dr. Robertson the full benefit of his letter, as I want nothing but *justice* and *fair dealing*.

CHARLESTON, S. C., July 10th, 1851.

Dear Sir :—Since my note to you of the 28th ultimo, I have received two communications, through your hands, addressed to yourself, from Dr. H. A. Ramsay—one dated June 30th, the other July 4th. I am really at a loss to know what Dr. Ramsay desires. I concluded that my note of the 28th June, to you—and I have no doubt you have drawn the same inference—the receipt of which is acknowledged by Dr. Ramsay, had thrown the door, to a full and thorough investigation of the whole matter, wide open. You can well imagine my astonishment on finding him unwilling to meet the point at issue, on the only fair or proper grounds upon which it could be placed. If he has not demanded, and does not desire, as he states, either the *authority* or *circumstances* upon which my motion was made, then I am at a loss to know *what is* wanted, or *what will* satisfy Dr. Ramsay.

It is evident, from the tenor of Dr. Ramsay's communications to you, and his multitudinous letters to, and inquiries of, various other persons, that he wishes to make a purely personal issue with me, without allowing the facts and circumstances, upon which my action in the matter was based, to come before the public. In other words, there seems to be an instinctive dread, at the mere meeting of the authority upon which my motion was made, and which I have repeatedly and freely tendered him through you. Hence, I am reluctantly constrained to infer, that a collateral issue is sought to be made, solely for the purpose of diverting attention from the true merits of the case. Now, Sir, this I do not intend to allow; and I will simply say to you, in reference to Dr. Ramsay's personally abusive letters, written to numerous persons at the very time he was making overtures through you—for I have never received a line from him directly—for an *amicable adjustment*, as he terms it, of the difficulty between us, that nothing that Dr. Ramsay has said, or may say

in relation to the matter, can be personally offensive or insulting to me.

After what has transpired, I deem it due to you, as one of the Secretaries of the American Medical Association, to place a plain and candid statement of facts before you, leaving you free to make such disposition of the communication as you may deem proper.

Soon after the delegates to the late meeting of the American Medical Association in our city commenced to assemble, reference was made by some one—I do not now recollect who—in a casual conversation, to the obstetrical statistics of Dr. H. A. Ramsay of Georgia—I had not, up to that time, seen the tables referred to. Dr. Reyburn, the Chairman of the Committee on Medical Literature, stated that he had referred to them in his report, and would like to have further and authentic information on the subject. I introduced him to Dr. J. J. Robertson and Dr. Andrews, of Washington, Georgia, who were in attendance as visitors to the meeting of the Association, though not delegates; and, subsequently, to other medical gentlemen from Georgia, who were delegates. The result of his conference with these gentlemen was a determination, on the part of Dr. Reyburn, to erase all allusion to the contributions of Dr. Ramsay from his report, before presenting it to the Association, which I understand was done. This occurred some days previous to the presentation of either the report of Dr. Reyburn, or that of Dr. Storer.

From this time, the reliability of the statistics of Dr. Ramsay became the subject of free conversation among many members of the Association. It was ascertained from the gentlemen mentioned above, and some of the delegates from Georgia, that he had been a practitioner only about ten years, and not continuously in the same place. When the fact was considered, in connection with the number of cases reported—amounting, with the 200 of which no particular notes were taken, to 673—it struck many old and experienced practitioners as an unusually large number of cases for the first ten years practice, in a portion of country not densely populated, and in which there were the usual number of competitors for public patronage. For ten years practice, admitting that he was, immediately upon graduating, introduced into a general obstetrical practice—which is not the case—would give an average of 67 cases, and a fraction over, per year; or an average of more than one case a week, for the entire ten years. If the cases comprised those which came under his

notice in six years, this will give 112 cases, and a fraction over, per year; or an average of two, and a fraction over, for each week of the six years. This simple analysis, made by several persons in casual conversation on the subject, struck every one—and particularly practitioners from the country—with much force. One gentleman from Philadelphia remarked that he had considered the statistics unreliable, upon reading them at the time of their publication, without knowing anything of the contributor, or the circumstances he had heard here. It was stated by many practitioners from the country, and by the gentlemen first named, who were personally acquainted with Dr. Ramsay, and who practiced in the adjoining county—and frequently in Dr. Ramsay's own neighborhood—that it was not generally customary to employ a physician in obstetrical cases among the blacks on the plantations, unless in cases of difficulty or apprehended difficulty; and that it was by no means a universal custom to employ them among whites—many still adhering to the old custom of sending for the midwife. It was not a difficult matter for each to refer to his own experience in the practice of obstetrics for a series of years, or for any single year; and when they did, and then considered the number of cases reported by Dr. Ramsay, the length of time he had been in practice, the nature of the country and population in which he practiced, and the necessary interruptions occasioned by a removal from one location to another, the conviction seemed to be forced upon every mind, that the statistics carried with them the strongest internal evidence of their unreliability, aside from any other considerations. But, further, I was informed by a member of the Georgia State Medical Society,* a delegate to the American Medical Association—whose name can be given if necessary—that at the annual meeting of that body, previous to the National Association in Charleston, Dr. Cooper read a report, by appointment, on obstetrics, and referred to Dr. Ramsay's tables, as authority for certain views. The next day he begged leave to retract what reference he had made to Dr. Ramsay's cases, as he had heard they were *not reliable*. The permission to alter the report was granted.

I have made the above statement to show you what had actually taken place in relation to Dr. Ramsay's statistics, before the subject was brought before the Association, and that, too, in the Medical Society of his own State.

*Dr. Campbell.

When Dr. Storer's report on Obstetrics was read, on the afternoon of the 7th of May, it was found that the statistics in question had been incorporated in it. The following is an extract from the official report of the proceedings of the Association, contained in Vol. 6, No. 4, of the Charleston Medical Journal and Review, at page 576, and which is the only accurate and authentic report that I have seen: "Dr. Storer, of Ms., Chairman of the Committee on Obstetrics, presented and read the report of the Committee.

"On motion of Dr. Robertson, of So. Ca., the report was recommitted, and made the special order for the morning session."

At the time of making the motion, I stated distinctly, that it was made to give the Chairman an opportunity of striking out the statistics of Dr. Ramsay, as it had been asserted, on the most undoubted authority,* that they were not reliable. I mentioned that the parties upon whose authority the motion had been made, were in the Hall, and the Chairman of the Committee would have an opportunity of conferring with them, and other gentlemen from Georgia, before he acted in the premises. Although there was a large delegation from Georgia, in attendance at the time, yet not one objected to the motion, or uttered a word in defence of the statistics or the author, although many of them were personally acquainted with Dr. Ramsay. Moreover, I have been since informed, by a member from Georgia, that the Georgia delegation held a conference in relation to the motion, previous to the final adoption of the report, and decided not to interfere in the matter. Among the delegates from Georgia, who were acquainted with Dr. Ramsay, were Doctors Ford, Garvin, and P. F. Eve, who were Professors in the Medical College at which Dr. Ramsay graduated.

The above, sir, constitutes the authority upon which my motion to recommit was made. Under the circumstances, I considered it a duty which I owed to the Chairman of the Committee and the Association, to offer the resolution; particularly as Dr. J. J. Robertson and Dr. Andrews were not delegates, and therefore could not do so; although they both hold themselves responsible for the authority upon which it was made, and will cheerfully respond to any call which Dr. Ramsay may think proper to make on them.

In the part which I have taken in the matter, I have been

*Andrews and Robertson.

actuated by no personal feelings towards Dr. Ramsay, as I have no acquaintance whatever with him. With similar facts before me, in relation to the statistics of any other medical writer, I should have felt bound, as a member of the Association, to have pursued the same course. In making the motion, on the authentic information which had been given, I have done no more towards inflicting an injury upon Dr. Ramsay, than those who assented, upon the same authority, to the erasure of his statistics—no more than Dr. Cooper, and the Medical Society of his own State, who requested, and was granted permission by the Society, to erase them from his report; and I should be most happy to be informed of the code of Ethics that can deprive any body of medical men of the right to entertain and act upon such a motion under similar circumstances.

I have thus, I trust, placed the whole affair in a clear light. If you can be satisfied—and I shall not require unreasonable evidence—that the authority upon which my motion was made, is unworthy of credit, and that I have been misinformed, I will most cheerfully make the amende honorable to Dr. Ramsay, in the most ample and public manner. In the failure of this, however, I shall still feel convinced that Dr. Ramsay has no grounds for a complaint of injustice on my part.

Yours, very sincerely,

F. M. ROBERTSON.

Dr. H. W. DESAUSSURE, *Meeting-street.*

The reader will discover the preceding letter is entirely *circumstantial, vague and contradictory*, it fixes no point, and establishes no fact. This, apart from all other considerations, will satisfy consistent men, of the character and nature of the assault. The attempt of Dr. Robertson to divert attention from the true issues, by saying I wish to make a purely personal matter with him, without allowing the "*facts and circumstances*," to come before the public, upon which his action was based, is lame and impotent, when it is recollected, and can be seen by reference to his own pamphlet, that in my notes of the 12th, 26th, and 30th of June, I invite him before a board of investigation. On the 4th of July I offered to leave it to Dr. DeSaussure alone. *Was anything fairer?* This, it strikes me, any man would have accepted, unless

he was intently bent upon *ruin* and *detraction*. Dr. Robertson attempts to slide the responsibility upon his brother, Dr. J. J. Robertson, and Dr. Andrews, of Washington, Ga., in doing so, he unintentionally, doubtless, convicts himself of being previously engaged in it, as his own letter abundantly exhibits. He says: "Soon after the Delegates to the late meeting of the American Medical Association in our city, commenced to assemble, reference was made by some one, I do not now recollect who—in a casual conversation—to the obsterical statistics of Dr. H. A. Ramsay, of Georgia. Dr. Reyburn stated he would like to have "farther and authentic information upon the subject." It is evident Dr. Robertson had made an attempt upon Dr. Reyburn, or he never would have said he "wanted farther and authentic information upon the subject." Dr. Reyburn was evidently incredulous from his remarks, and was introduced by Dr. F. M. Robertson to Dr. J. J. Robertson and Dr. Andrews, merely to give force to the previous attempts at detraction made upon Dr. Reyburn by Dr. F. M. Robertson. The result, Dr. F. Robertson portrays in his letter.

From this time, Dr. Robertson says, "the reliability of the statistics of Dr. Ramsay became the subject of free conversation. It was ascertained," he says, "from the gentlemen mentioned above, (Dr.'s Robertson and Andrews) and some of the delegates from Georgia, that he had been a practitioner only about ten years, and that not continuously in the same place. When this fact was considered, in connection with the number of cases reported, amounting, with the two hundred of which no porticular notes were taken, to 673, it struck many old and experienced practitioners as an unusually large number of cases for the first ten years practice in a portion of country not densely populated and in which there were the usual number of competitors for professional patronage."

The above quotation contains a palpable absurdity, entirely destitute of *fact*. Dr. Robertson makes me amenable for

two hundred cases, which I never reported, never claimed, and do not know from whence he derived his authority for them, as they are not to be found in the article he attacked. Again, he says 673 cases were considered extravagant for the *first ten years practice*, amid a *thin population* and "where there was the *usual number of professional competitors*. Now I have never reported but 473 cases of premature and full births, (from 7th to 9th month) but simply thought I had had six hundred or more; *I think so yet*; but if I can establish, according to Dr. Robertson's analogy, that I have had no *competition*, and the country where I practice is *densely populated*, I, at once, establish that 673 cases were not an extravagant practice, particularly as I shall prove, that I have done a *heavy midwifery practice* all the while, with the additional fact, that I have been *continuous* in the same neighborhood. But Dr. Robertson makes a very simple analysis,—he discovers a "*mare's nest*"—unfortunately for him there is nothing in it. This calculation is correct, provided I had had the cases he gave me; but I beg leave to inform Dr. Robertson that I am not responsible for his figures, especially when not backed by the potency of *truth*. The "simple analysis" of Dr. Robertson yields an average of 67 cases per annum; when, in fact I only claim about 47 and a fraction. My article will speak for itself, here is the quotation :

"In the early part of my professional career, I carefully recorded all my difficult obstetrical cases, leaving the simple labors to fare for themselves, hence the reader will find an aggregate of 473 cases only, when I am confident I have attended six hundred or more. This table exhibits all my recorded cases of every description from the 7th to 9th month."

From the above it will be seen that my simple list was not complete, that the table embraced my *premature* and *mature* labors, that I only claimed 473 cases, and thought I had had 600. I have no reason to alter my opinion. By reference farther to the article, it will be seen that all my data, all my *premises, conclusions, and deductions*, were founded alone upon the 473 cases; not the first idea promulgated, was de-

duced from the six hundred I think I have had. The article will farther exhibit, that I only claimed for it an account of my own experience, and would pleasurably rectify any error that had crept into it. Now it is impossible for any man in this country to keep a correct statistical record, only as to his own particular locality. When we remember, we have no means for the advancement of correct statistical knowledge in the South, we at once see how necessarily imperfect the general statistics of any man must be, and it is quite as impossible for any man to prove his individual cases for any length of years. The death, removal of persons, and destruction of records, present insuperable barriers to such a proceeding. In my own case, I have a note book containing only the *number, presentation, &c.*, of my cases in Obstetricy, they amount in all, from the beginning, to September 1850, the time of writing my article, to 473 *simple, complex, and instrumental* cases, from 7th to 9th month. My Obstetrical career began in 1838, I practised in 1839 and 1840, which can be easily ascertained by application to my friend and distinguished preceptor, Dr. Thomas F. Gibbs, Atlanta, Georgia. From the time of my graduation, to the time of writing my article, I had been in constant practice ten years and six months; add to this my practice in 1838 and 1839, and it will make an aggregate of nearly thirteen years; but, to be certain, say twelve years. If I had six hundred cases in this period, it would yield only fifty per annum, or not one a week for the whole time. My record counts for 473 cases, embracing a period of about ten years; this will give me an average of 47 and a fraction per annum, or not one a week, and not four a month. I suspect many physicians in this State do sixty and seventy cases per annum. I have had four a day, and often eight a month, and in one instance twelve. Men who *do none* never think any one else does. This will leave me minus 20 cases per annum, according to Dr. Robertson's calculation, and I would suppose I was at least the best evidence of my own cases, and the period embraced

But to put the matter in a more tangible form, I hereby invite all *honorable medical men* to call and examine my *record*. The authority of Dr. Robertson being entirely circumstantial, I shall confine myself to the disproof of the circumstances, without producing a voluminous record, and I opine I shall disprove them to the satisfaction of all reasonable men, and Dr. Robertson says "*he will not require unreasonable evidence.*"

Dr. Robertson says his simple analysis "struck every one—particularly practitioners from the country—with much force," and one gentleman remarked that he considered the statistics unreliable, from reading them at the time of publication, and he was from Philadelphia. The article was doubtless ungenial to his *sable heart*, for it defended Southern negroes to the following effect: "we hazard nothing in saying the negroes of Georgia are better provided for, obstetrically and dietetically, than any other dependent class upon this continent." We aver it yet, in contradistinction to the tender feelings of the *pallid faced, fanatical, and base* automaton, who made the remark. This evidence proves, what Dr. Robertson doubtless expected—nothing—but a mere circumstance, elucidative of what was put in motion by himself. But Dr. Robertson says it was stated by many practitioners "from the country, and by the gentlemen first named, (Dr.'s Andrews and Robertson*) who were personally acquainted with Dr. Ramsay, and who practiced in the adjoining county, and frequently in Dr. Ramsay's own neighborhood, that it was not generally customary to employ a physician in obstetrical cases among the blacks on the plantations, unless in cases of difficulty, or apprehended difficulty, and that by no means was it a universal custom to employ them among the whites." In another place I have said I knew Dr.'s Andrews and Robertson of Washington. As I have prescribed a course for myself, I will adhere to it, as these gentlemen are not responsible to me; Dr. F. M. Robertson having preferred the

*(My brackets.)

charge. Dr. Robertson, after stating the above specifications, in connection with his prior charge of being in a thinly settled country, and me not living in the same place, says these facts seemed to carry conviction to every mind, of the *unreliability* of my statistics, and in no other part of his letter does he allege another point to disprove them, except the State society *farce*. But, on the other hand, at every step of his letter, he dwells upon these circumstances, and their "authentic authority," as proof against my statistics, and in conclusion says, "If I (he) can be satisfied—and I (he) shall not require unreasonable evidence," that his authority is not incorrect, or that he has been misinformed, he will make ample amendment. I now propose to exhibit these facts to Dr. F. M. Robertson in the *kindest, clearest, and most unquestionable light*. It is amusing to behold Dr. Robertson in his voracious attempts to convict and immolate me, only proving positively what I assert. He says Dr. Andrews and Robertson said it was not a universal practice to have a physician among the whites in obstetrics here. This is precisely what I said in my article, here is the quotation :

"A large majority of obstetrical cases among this class (blacks) are at the present day exclusively under the control of the physician, and I am happy to add, the white ladies of Georgia are fast falling into ranks."

Now no where in that article did I claim anything only so far as my experience went to confirm it. I never said it was a *universal* custom to send for a man midwife with either the *blacks* or *whites*. A thing may be *customary*, but this does not render it *universal*. It is a custom to rain, not universal, but occasional. The term universal means *all, total*, and I undertake to say there is no *universal* obstetrics in America. But I think now the obstetrics of this State is largely in the hands of professional men; in this I may err, it is human, I claim no infallibility. This position is peculiarly true, so far as my own particular locality is concerned, as the following evidence will specifically establish, and it is from the most *reliable sources in this country*.

There may be some places in Georgia where the obstetrical fee is so high among medical men, that the practice is confined to some extent to women, but these points are rare, I imagine, and dependent upon what I say. Here we attend for *five dollars*, and when we fail to get a *case* it is not from choice for a woman generally, but for the reason we can't be had conveniently. The difficult practice is invariably done by *physicians*, and, we are sorry to say, there is much ignorance among medical men upon this subject.

I will now introduce the following evidence to prove my position, and leave the reader to flounder as he may in the world of wonder, as to the causes of the singular display at Charleston.

In presenting this testimony, I have regarded no particular system, the truth will out, and can easily be culled from the mass of evidence, without reference to order.

GEORGIA, WILKES COUNTY:

This is to certify that I am intimately acquainted with Dr. Henry A. Ramsay, and equally so in his neighborhood, having been his former partner. I know that he did a heavy obstetrical practice up to 1851, and, judging from what I *know* of his *practice* and *reputation*, I would say his Report was a *minimum* not a *maximum* of his experience. This conclusion is founded upon *personal observation of his practice*—comparative results of my own—together with the fact that Dr. Ramsay has no *midwife* competitor, nor has had, of reputation; nor has he ever, to my knowledge, had a professional competitor, independent of a partner; and, farther, his neighborhood is *thickly settled, prolific*, and accustomed to send in *simple* and *difficult* cases for a professional obstetrician; and, again, his practice extends to the counties of Lincoln, Wilkes, and Columbia, and to my certain knowledge he never moved from the neighborhood, prior to 1851; (Feb.) and if any physician or physicians from Washington ever had frequent calls to Dr. Ramsay's neighborhood, I *never knew it, or heard it*.

Given under my hand, July 26th, 1851.

S. B. STOVALL, M. D.

CANAL, FULTON, Ohio, June 17th, 1851.

Dr. Ramsay:—Dear Sir:—I have just received yours of the 8th inst., and as you request an immediate answer, I must necessarily be brief, as my professional engagements are, at present, pressing.

I infer from a reference to the proceedings of the late meeting of the American Medical Association held in Charleston, that Dr. Robertson's attack upon your reputation for integrity, was by reason of the chairman of the Committee on Obstetrics, incorporating your contribution in the same department, in his report! If I am correct in this supposition, I can say, that having read your article as published in the Medical Examiner, Philadelphia, I had no reason then, nor since, to doubt its accuracy. The opportunities I had while in Georgia, of knowing personally, the extent of your field of practice, and having since that period, frequently learned from other sources, that your professional business had increased, I did not, think it necessary for you to draw upon imagination for the details you have given. From the relationship of preceptor and pupil, that existed between us from the spring 1841 up to the time you left Bookersville, I had no reason to suspect you guilty of fabricating. I have heard of physicians, ambitious of notoriety, *manufacturing* reports of cases for publication; indeed, I have read articles, in some of our medical journals, that I considered as unreliable as the absurdities of homœopathy; but I have no reason to pass any such judgment upon the several articles I have read emanating from your pen.

In haste, LEWIS SLUSSER, M. D.

The above gentleman is a very excellent practitioner of Ohio, a physician of talent and a contributor to the journals of the country.

I will now introduce Dr. Hanson, an aged and highly distinguished physician of Columbia county—now dead:

GEORGIA, COLUMBIA COUNTY:

This is to certify that I have known Dr. Henry A. Ramsay, of Lincoln county, Ga., for a period of ten years, by reputation and personal acquaintance. From his reputation as an *Obstetrician*, and from what I know of the comparative results of such practice, founded upon an experience of *thirty-five years*, in this region, &c., I should deem his report not only *probable*, but if any error existed it was in his favor, as

to the number of his cases, &c. I farther state, I am intimate in the practice of *obstetrics* in this county, and am confident my practice in the same time has transcended Dr. Ramsay's reported cases. From these facts I could not question his Report or Statistics. I will also state, that I am in the habit of visiting Dr. Ramsay, and speak much from personal knowledge of his *practice*, and I do certify that I deem him, in all the relations of life, both *honorable* and *reliable*, and I speak knowingly.

Given under my hand, July 3d, 1851.

Attest, H. O. WILLIAMS. WM. HANSON, M. D.

I will now introduce Dr. Wm. McLean, an *honorable, talented, and excellent physician*:

MY DEAR RAMSAY:—Please excuse me for not replying to yours of Monday's date, but as I anticipated seeing you at Camp Meeting to-day, I felt easy on the subject.

The queries which you submit in your letter I shall endeavor to answer to the best of my knowledge and belief, and as our intimacy has been close, for a period of five or six years, my opportunities for judging are considerable.

1. Questions. Would you consider 473 cases, from 7th to 9th mo., (obstetric) *an extravagant midwifery practice* for about 10 years, from what you know of my practice, and also from comparative results in your own.

Answers. I would not. I know that your practice must have ranged many years over a hundred cases a year, because your reputation in that department of practice was of a very high order, besides your charges were reasonable, and I know that you had no one to contend with in such cases in all your section. My obstetrical cases will average about 30 per annum, but I have had considerable opposition to contend with, besides with a very questionable reputation to recommend me. It is very uncommon, and has been for a number of years, to send for any one else than a Doctor in such cases, and I think that you, as well as myself, attend to families negroes and all, whenever occasion offers. Since I commenced the practice, two Old Grannies have moved off for *lack of bread*, and one still lingers here, but she is nearly supported by the bounty and generosity of Mr. Lockhart, and others in her locality. Expecting to hear from you soon, believe me, very sincerely, Your friend,

WM. McLEAN, M. D.

Double Branches, Lincoln Co., Aug. 1st, 1851.

I will now present the evidence of Dr. R. Goodloe Harper, who came into this neighborhood, after my removal in Feb. last, as he states. Here it will be seen that Dr. Harper, who is only partially acquainted to the neighborhood, says, from the results of his practice here amid a new acquaintance, he would regard *fifty* cases per annum a moderate practice for this settlement, while my practice has been extended for miles around me, in the counties of Wilkes, Lincoln, and Columbia. Do these facts prove nothing!

GEORGIA, LINCOLN COUNTY:

This is to certify that I came into Dr. Ramsay's neighborhood after his removal in Feb., 1851—*found it densely populated*; no competition *professional* or *midwife*; and even now none save Dr. Ramsay. From the comparative results of my practice, and that incident to a new acquaintance to some extent, I would say fifty cases would be a moderate practice, per annum, for this settlement.

Given from under my hand, this the 8th August, 1851.

R. GOODLOE HARPER, M. D.

Dr. O'Farrall, who practised in Wilkes Co., Ga., and not far from me, who knew my neighborhood and practice, states to me, in a letter under date July 4th, 1851, as follows:

Dear Doctor:—From the fact that the theatre of my practice was adjacent to yours, it is a matter of course that I should know something of the extent of your practice, and the position you occupy in the estimation of the public. I can bear you witness that your practice has been and is extensive in both ordinary medicine and obstetrics, indeed I should say very extensive, the most so in my acquaintance. Judging from my own obstetrical cases, which were "*few and far between*," and still amounting to between *ninety* and a *hundred*, I have no hesitancy whatever in saying you had six times that number, nor would I discredit it if I had been told you had *eight times*, and I am quite satisfied every physician around you will concur with me in opinion. I do not remember ever seeing you without your having been very recently in a case, and ordinary report in your neighborhood gave intelligence to a like effect.

Yours, Respectfully,

JOHN O'FARRALL, M. D.

After I had received the evidence of Dr. O'Farrall, I received Dr. Robertson's exposition, and wrote him again, giving in detail the circumstances. As he says the following will exhibit his views, I will here remark, Dr. O'Farrall is my relative by *alliance*, and is not at all objectionable, when it is remembered Dr. J. J. Robertson is the brother of Dr. F. M. Robertson.

APPLING, July 20, 1851.

Dear Doctor:—You stated in your letter of the 23d inst., that Dr. Robertson of Charleston had made his motion in the Convention, that your obstetrical statistics should be discredited, relying on the information given him to the extent of your practice, by Dr. J. J. Robertson, his brother, and Dr. Andrews of Washington, Ga., which information itself was derived from circumstantial evidence, which you mention, and which I say, those who gave it not only knew themselves, but were perfectly well aware, that everybody else in that part of the country knew to be egregiously erroneous.

JOHN O'FARRELL, M. D.

I will introduce the evidence of some of the most respectable and worthy gentlemen of this country,* who have known me, and the *custom* of the county, ever since I came into it. We presume they at least ought to know *what they do*, and what *I have generally done*. Upon this testimony alone I would willingly let the matter rest.

GEORGIA, Wilkes County :

This is to certify that Dr. Henry A. Ramsay has lived among us and in this vicinity since 1840 to 1851, inclusive, that he has done the practice of this county with great *unanimity*, that he has had no competitor during the period mentioned, in his neighborhood, (save his partners,) that he has done a *heavy midwifery* practice, our population being thick, and we have had no midwife of reputation among us, since 1841, conse-

*As the evidence is so voluminous, I refer to the following gentlemen in Lincoln and Columbia counties: W. F. STROTHER, A. SAMUELS, J. L. PASCHAL, J. M. COTLIFF, JAMIESON MABEY, JOHN HOLLIDAY, O. H. WALTON, ASA PASCHAL, and DR. W. A. L. COLLINS, an eminent practitioner of Columbia county, offered me a certificate, which was not received when this went to press. If these cases were not reliable, they certainly could be proven so by somebody in my neighborhood, at least by Dr. Stovall, my partner, who was and is very intimate with me and my practice. If it is required, I will publish, at the house of Lindsay & Blakiston, Phila., an attested copy of the note book.

quently professional aid was necessary in simple and difficult cases, from choice and necessity, as well as custom. We state farther that no physician or physicians from Washington to our knowledge, have been *frequently* in practice in Dr. Ramsay's neighborhood, and we have known him and the neighborhood ever since he came into it. We know nothing against his credibility.

Given under our hands, July 25th, 1851.

FELIX SHANK,
WM. WOODALL,
MOSES HAMBRICK,
W. D. HOLLIDAY,
THOS. H. STROTHER,
GEORGE SHANK,
H. BUSSEY.

GEORGIA, WILKES COUNTY :

This will certify that I was once in connection with the late Allen Holliday of this county, who made the proposition to Dr. Henry A. Ramsay to take the obstetrical practice of this neighborhood at the price of *five dollars* per case; upon this agreement we stipulated to throw the practice of this neighborhood into his hands, which was *heavy*. Since then, Dr. Ramsay has done the practice of all classes, without reference to simple or difficult cases, in a large majority of cases, having no midwife or other competitor of any reputation, up to Feb., 1851.

August 11th, 1851.

DENNIS PASCHAL, Sen.

I have now exhibited the evidence to a considerable extent, upon which my defence rests; let us see how it tallies with Dr. Robertson's circumstances. Dr. Robertson said I had not been continuously in the same place—I have proved I have; he said my county was not densely populated—I have proved it is thickly settled; he said I had the usual number of competitors—I have proved I have had none in medicine or midwifery; he said it was not customary to send for Doctors in such cases with me—I have proved it was customary; he said his authors practised frequently with me in my own neighborhood—I have proved they have not.* If this is not satisfactory,

* Dr. Stovall says my report is a *minimum*; Dr. Hanson also; Dr. O'Farrall avers so; Dr. McLean thinks the practice not at all extravagant; Dr. Harper says likewise, if his results are averaged. This covers

I would inquire, what is? Dr. Robertson has given his authority and the circumstances, I have disproved them by the pamphlet *itself*, and *my neighbors and brethren who know me*, and by them I am willing to be judged. As to the number of my cases, Dr. Robertson has not disproved them, while I have substantiated them as far as any man can prove his cases, and am ready to show my note book, if farther evidence is required. The circumstances alleged by Dr. Robertson, failing to exist, of course establishes my facts, and confirms my positions. As to the attack upon me at the State Society, I know nothing; it was conducted in secret conclave, until Dr. Robertson informed me, for which I thank him, as I am not a member.

If it had not been for the exposition of Dr. Robertson, I would not have known it even now. This exemplifies the *meanness and baseness* of the transaction. The State Society does not contain more than a tithe of the medical men of the State, and they are *pert boys* and *inexcusable ignoramuses*, with some honorable exceptions. I am not surprised at the attack, when I know that any man who aspires in the medical profession, is always the victim of persecution, detraction, and vituperation, and in no place does it exist to a greater extent than in the State Medical Society. In this filthy concern there are always plenty of suppliant tools, to do the dirty work of corruption and slander, and that in the most secret and scandalous manner. The Dr. Cooper referred to, I wrote to Dr. David Cooper of Powelton, and he refutes it as a calumny upon him. It was transmitted from Dr. H. F. Campbell, Augusta, Ga., to Dr. Robertson, and for aught I know he may be the author of Dr. Cooper. I am not sure of this.*

all the ground, and clearly establishes—what Dr. Robertson never disproved by a single fact—my *report of cases and statistics*. These men know me and my practice. Then look at what my *neighbors* say. This evidence cannot be gainsayed! Where then exists a cause for this difficulty, will any sane man show me?

* I have just heard from one Dr. Cooper, of Perry, Ga., who proves to be the *man*. He says, in a note to me, Aug. 18th, 1851: "*I am not allowed to give my authority.*" as he says it was not designed to make a disturbance or *question my veracity*. The profession can judge of the force of such an excuse. While Cooper relieves himself by saying his authority he is not allowed to give, he perpetrates, according to Dr. R., an

A few other casual and collateral circumstances connected with Dr. Robertson's pamphlet, demand a passing notice, and I have done with this uncalled for affair.

Dr. Robertson says the only *true* and accurate account he has seen of the proceedings of the National Association, were published in the Charleston Medical Review. As I was absent I know nothing of this matter. I will here say Dr. Robertson is at issue with all whom I have addressed upon the subject. The report of many journals was quite different. But to put the question of reliability at rest, it being entirely a professional matter, I will bring forward the certificates of my brethren here, and if demanded I will adduce any number from private sources:

LINCOLNTON, Ga., June 10th, 1851.

This is to certify that I have known Dr. Henry A. Ramsay since 1845, and in our medical intercourse, I know of nothing to question his *reliability* or *integrity*.

J. L. WILKES, M. D.

GEORGIA, LINCOLN COUNTY:

This is to certify that I have known Dr. H. A. Ramsay since my first settlement in this county, (1845) have met him often, have had frequent professional intercourse with him, in all have found him to be a physician, and to the extent of my *own* knowledge, a man of reliability and integrity.

Lincolnton, July 2, 1851. J. M. MORAGNE, M. D.

Dr. M. is a physician of fine reputation in Lincoln, as also Dr. Wilkes. The first stated to me up to this period (Aug. 1st, 1851) he had had 35 or 40 obstetrical cases.

absurdity. If this was not designed to affect my veracity, why erase it from your paper. This is a clear case of sheer contradiction. Who is guilty, I leave the reader to determine. The author refused, why so, if I can so easily be ousted. Here is another evidence of the *secret clique of assassination* which existed at *Atlanta*, and Dr.'s Ford and Campbell were there; while I am not even a *member*, and *knew nothing* of the *rascally* deed until Dr. Robertson tells me. Is this not enough to make honest men blush! People of Georgia judge of it. Recollect Dr. R. brings this up to question my cases and statistics, while Cooper says it was not designed to question my veracity. When Doctors disagree, who must decide? There is a *lie* out, and I can't say who told it. Cooper is evidently a trained steed.

In my strictures upon the State Society, I design nothing for any *friend* or *honorable man*. (I speak of the *Pigs* and *Puppies* in *note* and *pamphlet*.) If Ford and Campbell are innocent, they are excluded of course.

GEORGIA, LINCOLN COUNTY :

I certify that I have known Dr. H. A. Ramsay, Raysville, Lincoln county, and have enjoyed his friendship and been favored with his professional counsel for a period of years, that I have ever found him a gentleman of unquestionable integrity and strictly reliable in the most extended sense, both privately and professionally.

WM. McLEAN, M. D.

GEORGIA, LINCOLN COUNTY :

This is to certify I am practising in Lincoln county, and know Dr. H. A. Ramsay, and concur in the above by Dr. McLean to the full extent of my knowledge.

Given under my hand, June 28, 1851.

B. F. BENTLEY, M. D.

GEORGIA, LINCOLN COUNTY :

This is to certify that I have known Dr. H. A. Ramsay since 1847, and being located at a distance of seven miles from him, it has been my pleasure to have his counsel on some occasions, and have been highly pleased with him in the profession and out of it, and look upon him as being *honest* in the *profession*, as well as every thing else,

June 28, 1851.

JOHN M. JENNINGS, M. D.

GEORGIA, LINCOLN COUNTY :

This is to certify that I have known Dr. H. A. Ramsay of this county for several years, prior and since, my coming into the profession, and I have no right to call in question his private or professional reliability or integrity.

Given under my hand, July 2d, 1851.

J. P. M. McCORD, M. D.

GEORGIA, DEKALB COUNTY :

This is to certify that Dr. H. A. Ramsay, of Lincoln county, was my pupil, and practised medicine with me. I have known him through the various gradations of life, infancy, boyhood and manhood; I know him well and thoroughly, and I have no hesitancy in saying he is both truthful and reliable in or out of the profession.

Given under my hand, this 14th July, 1851.

Atlanta, Ga.

THOS. F. GIBBS, M. D.

This is to certify that I have known Dr. H. A. Ramsay for two years past, both privately and professionally, having often spent several days at his house, and have ever found him a *perfect gentleman*—a gentleman whose character is above suspicion, and whose integrity and responsibility could never be questioned by those favored with his acquaintance. As for his professional attainments, I hold them in the highest estimation, believing, as I do, that he has no *superior of his age in Georgia*, and no one stands higher in his profession as a gentleman of *honor*.

D. S. CHASE, M. D.

Augusta, June 21st, 1851.

The last point in Dr. Robertson's pamphlet I shall notice, is his attempt to vindicate his attack by intimating the Georgia Delegation assented to it. It is true the part of the Georgia Delegation that met acted in a strange way, but there were some of them who were *innocent and just*, viz: Dr.'s Paul F. Eve and Garvin, whom Dr. R. implicates. Let them speak for themselves. Dr. Paul F. Eve writes me, under date June 6th, 1851:

"I know nothing, save from rumor, what was said or done."

Dr. Garvin, who was not a Professor when I graduated, writes me:

"I was neither present when Dr. Robertson brought the matter before the Convention, nor at any meeting our Delegates may have held."

Dr. R. D. Moore writes me, under date July 29th, 1851:

"So far as I know, the Delegation had no action at all upon the subject."*

Dr. Moore says, farther, to me, he did not wish to be considered as assenting to the charge. The facts prove certainly that a portion of the Delegation knew nothing of the

* Dr. T. B. Phinizy, Augusta, Ga., a delegate, *knew nothing* of the *secret assassination clique*, and condemned the course as he heard it. How many more in Georgia, I know not. To these gentlemen I tender my hearty thanks for their *justice*. I wrote one Dr. Ford to know what he knew or done, but he is as *dumb* as an *oyster*. *Lewis* where art thou! *Be honest, be just, and tell*, no harm is wished you; I want only *fairness and peace*.

affair, and could not have assented. The affair is one of *unparalleled persecution*—it is the *worst and most flagrant case of secret professional assassination* now upon record. The most *menial and foul* means were resorted to, and that under the sanction of a part of the Georgia Delegation. I put it to any honorable man, if it was *just* in the Georgia Delegation *clique* to take any action at all, unless I was permitted a *hearing*. Was it fair to *arraign, condemn, and execute* me, in my absence, and that too without the *privilege or chance of defence*? The red man of the forest, in his wigwam, would have extended me more justice. The barbarian Arab, amid the arid sands of his desert home, would have treated me better, and extended more *equity and respect*. As to the motives which induced the American Medical Association to inflict such an injury, upon such unsatisfactory testimony, I have nothing to say.

The profession will judge of this matter, and assure itself that the reputation of no man is safe, if such a proceeding is to rule. My article had been favorably received; my star bid fair to rise; to do it would retard some one else; the fact was, I must be put down, and that regardless of the *means resorted to*; hence the attack, and the collateral measures. The cry was *down with him at all hazards, and all events*. When I review this transaction, I can only exclaim, "Oh shame, where is thy blush!"

I have now done. I have proven, by the most irrefragible testimony, that Dr. Robertson's *circumstances* do not exist, and consequently I certainly establish my *statistics*, and their *reliability*. If I have done Dr. Robertson any injustice, I now stand ready to rectify it in the most *ample and amicable* way. With me the scene closes, and I would suggest to Dr. Robertson that trite old maxim, "*mind your own business*" hereafter.

H. A. RAMSAY.

Raysville, Ga., August, 1851.