

A statement of facts / by George McClellan.

Contributors

McClellan, George, 1796-1847.
National Library of Medicine (U.S.)

Publication/Creation

Philadelphia : [publisher not identified], [1822]

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/zw8ef3w9>

License and attribution

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

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

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

**wellcome
collection**


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


W
M1265
1822

MCCLELLAN

STATEMENT OF FACTS







A

STATEMENT

OF

FACTS.

=====
BY GEORGE M'CLELLAN, M. D.
=====

NE CEDE MALIS.

Gen'l's Office
18614

PHILADELPHIA:

JULY 18, 1822.

W
M1265
1822

Film No. 2165, No. 4

A STATEMENT, &c.

MY name has recently been brought before the public in connexion with circumstances of a very unpleasant nature;—my person as well as my character has been made the object of unfair and malignant attack; I consider it due to myself, therefore, to arrest the progress of misrepresentation, by offering a statement of facts, supported with unimpeachable testimony and appropriate illustrations. The sole cause of all the aspersions, which it has now become necessary for me to notice, is the fact, that I published in the 18th No. of the Medical Recorder, a review of Dr. Gibson's Essay on fractures of the thigh. In reply to that review angry circulars, and contradictory handbills have been issued, which, not availing to refute my positions, have been made the instruments of attack upon my reputation. The same feelings that gave origin to these have also created other difficulties, and lately I have been forced into contentions quite extraneous to my scientific undertaking. It may, therefore, be expected that I should explain the motives which influenced me in the commencement of this unpleasant controversy.

For two years past I have been a teacher of Anatomy and Surgery, and have delivered each winter to a class of Students, a course of public lectures on those branches of medical education. It is not necessary to insist upon the importance of professional reputation to a professional man; all know and feel its value. Perhaps among several professors in a college, the deficiencies of one may be so far overlooked, in consideration of the excellence of his associates, that character is to him a matter of less serious moment. But to a public lecturer, in whatever science, who ventures to stand upon his own merits, independent of any patronage, and resting his hopes of success exclusively on his efforts to deserve it, reputation is essential; and it behoves him to be particularly studious of accuracy in the information which he imparts to his pupils, and watchful to defend the truth of the doctrines which he inculcates.

I have been and shall continue to be guided by these principles, and whenever errors are promulgated that I conceive to be hostile to the cause of true science, and dangerous to my own reputation, I shall endeavour not to let them pass unrefuted, and this whether their consequences would be directly or indirectly injurious, and whether I may be myself the intended or only the incidental subject of their mischief.

The sixth number of the Philadelphia Journal of the Medical and Physical Sciences, published in February last, contained an elaborate communication, entitled "*Reflections on the Treatment of Fractures of the Thigh, with an account of a new apparatus, by Wm. Gibson, M. D. Professor of Surgery in the University of Pennsylvania.*" A principal object of that paper was to denounce as absolutely worthless, and in a great degree pernicious, a certain apparatus known by the name of Desault's splints, and another called Astley Cooper's triangular frame, together with some other modes of treatment less frequently adopted by surgeons. The author, having advanced many objections to the established practice, endeavoured to corroborate them by a detail of his own remarkably unsuccessful experience. After condemning, in the most unreserved terms, the inventions of other surgeons, he finally introduced his "new apparatus" to the public—not on the authority of a long experience, but of one solitary case, in which he asserted it was attended with "the happiest effect."

My attention was first particularly called to this essay by the conversation of two young gentlemen who attended my last course of lectures. At the close of the session they called to take leave of me, before setting out for their homes. Cooper's "Surgical Essays" being on the table, they examined the book, and expressed great surprise at finding the description and plate of his triangular frame so different from the account which had been given of the same apparatus at one of the lectures in the University. They also explained to me in what manner the Professor of Surgery had discredited Mr. Cooper's apparatus, by demonstrating its application to a patient in a posture at once ridiculous and insupportable. I then read the "Reflections," and was surprised to find the same misconstruction of Mr. Cooper's plan reiterated in that publication. I was equally astonished at the manner in which the Professor condemned the universally received apparatus of Desault; and still more at the boldness with which he had founded his conclusions upon the authority of *one* experiment. I rose, therefore, from the perusal of his essay with a sincere conviction that the Professor was altogether wrong in his views, and that the publication, emanating as it did from the University of Pennsylvania, was calculated to be extensively and seriously mischievous. I am still of that opinion, and believe it is general among the profession.

Such being the nature of the publication, it was desirable, for the cause of humanity, as well as truth, that its errors should be exposed, and that correct doctrines on the subject of the unjustly decried splints should be as widely disseminated. Gladly would I have seen a refutation proceeding from 'another' and an 'abler' pen; but several weeks had elapsed, and a daily newspaper of extensive circulation and celebrity had called the attention of the general public to the "Reflections." I by no means think it necessary to say any thing in justification of my assuming on this occasion the part of a critic. It is obvious that I had a perfect right to do so. A new theory, or the claim of a new invention in art is always a

fair and legitimate subject of examination. It was besides particularly incumbent on *me*, in justice to myself and my pupils, not to suffer his public condemnation of the approved modes of practice to remain uncontradicted. I had been instrumental in procuring the republication of Sir Astley Cooper's book in this country; and it was known to most of my professional friends that I had published a review in the 14th No. of the Medical Recorder, extolling his essays and approving of his apparatus. In my surgical lectures I had also recommended the same contrivance, but more particularly the splints of the celebrated French surgeon Desault. The gentlemen who had attended my lectures had dispersed and many of them had gone to distant homes, carrying with them a part of their preparation for the active duties of professional life, my instructions respecting these modes of practice. The professor's "Reflections" I knew must soon meet their attention, and if uncontroverted would both unsettle their confidence in the methods of treatment which they had been taught to value, and also oblige them to doubt the correctness of the surgical instruction derived from my lecture room.

Had there been need of a precedent I could easily have found one, for it will be recollected that when the gentleman, who preceded me in the occupation of my lecture room, once made public what he considered an important discovery, *this same Professor* then thought it incumbent on him immediately to come forward, and in the newspapers, in pamphlets, in lectures, and in the Medical Recorder, to assure the world that the supposed improvement was unreal, and the alleged discovery merely an imposture. Having, therefore, abundant reasons for writing the review which was published in the number of the Medical Recorder for April last, I have only to show that the manner of doing it was as justifiable as the act itself.

1st. The argumentative discussion in Dr. Gibson's essay was answered by arguments, in the course of which it became necessary to expose some unaccountable misconceptions of Mr. Cooper's apparatus, and also the singular demonstration to which I have already alluded.

2d. With the Professor's unsuccessful experience in the common modes of treatment was contrasted the successful experience of other surgeons, particularly that of my lamented friend and instructor the late Dr. Dorsey, as detailed by him in his "Elements of Surgery."

3d. The "new apparatus," invented by the Professor himself was next discussed, and a decisive objection to its utility, derived from the very description of its form, was advanced. Here the review might have closed with a few remarks on the futility of establishing a system upon the faith of a single experiment, however happily that experiment might have resulted. But a communication had been voluntarily made to me by Dr. John Moore, stating that the case in which the Professor's experiment was tried, was in fact one of total failure. It appeared, therefore,

*McClellan
states
Dr. Moore
report
to him
respecting Foulke's Case*

that the new splints had not even the support of *one* successful trial, and my refutation of Dr. Gibson's essay, by the addition of this fact, was rendered full and conclusive.

The following detail of the manner in which I became acquainted with the actual results of Dr. Gibson's experiment, will, I think, justify the notice that was taken of them in my review; and it will at the same time illustrate several other circumstances, which must be discussed in this publication.

Some time in the latter part of February last, Dr. Richard Wilson called on me, and stated that he was requested by Dr. Moore to inform me of a gross misrepresentation contained in a paper which the professor of surgery had just published, on fractures of the thigh. He said that from the striking coincidences between the case which Dr. Gibson had described, and one which Dr. Moore had just before been called to attend, there could be no doubt that they might be identified as one and the same. He specified Mr. Charles Foulke as the subject of his remarks, who he declared had been confined to his bed for several months with a broken thigh, had undergone a long trial with Dr. Gibson's new apparatus, and instead of having experienced the happiest effects from this management, still remained uncured. He said that Dr. Moore was anxious to have the case noticed in the Medical Recorder, as a matter of justice to the profession, and that if I would either write a review of it myself, or persuade Dr. Eberle to do it, he would give a full account of the circumstances which really attended Dr. Gibson's experiment.*

I had then no visiting acquaintance with Dr. Moore, and almost the only time I had ever exchanged words with him was three years ago, when he brought this same Dr. Wilson to me, intro-

* Dr. Wilson has now left this city to reside in the West Indies. Before his departure, however, he acknowledged to me, in the presence of Dr. Brick, that the above statement, which was then exhibited to him in writing, was substantially correct. He declined signing it because he had made a *positive promise to Dr. Moore not to give me any certificate* in regard to those circumstances. The following certificates, however, will corroborate my statement.

"Shortly after the publication of Dr. Gibson's essay on fractures of the thigh Dr. Richard Wilson called on me at the office of the Medical Recorder, and stated, that the assertions of Dr. Gibson, in relation to an experiment with his new apparatus, were not true, and that Mr. Foulke, upon whom the experiment must have been performed, was then uncured. He observed that such things were calculated to do injury and ought not to be tolerated, and that if the editors of the Recorder would notice the affair he could furnish certificates from Dr. Moore contradicting Dr. Gibson's statements. I replied that he had better call on Dr. Eberle, which he declined doing on the ground of not being sufficiently acquainted with him. He then said that he would call on Dr. McClellan, to inform him of the circumstances for Dr. Moore.

DAVID HANNA."

"During his residence in this city Dr. Richard Wilson repeatedly informed me that he had been requested by Dr. Moore to explain to Dr. Eberle or Dr. McClellan the circumstances attendant upon Dr. Gibson's experiment upon Mr. Foulke, with the view of having them noticed in the Medical Recorder.

J. BIGONET."

The certificates of Drs. Colhoun and Eberle, also confirm the same facts.

McClellan
states

Dr. Wilson's
report -
by
request of
Dr. Moore

Dr. Hanna
states that
Wilson
promised
certificates
from Dr. Moore
contradicting
Gibson.

ducing him as his particular friend, and soliciting my assistance in obtaining for him a situation in the Alms-house. Dr. Wilson having been thus accredited to me by Dr. Moore himself, and coming now to my house, avowedly at his request, to communicate circumstances, which could be known only through him, for the express purpose of making them public, and without any injunction of secrecy as to facts or names, I could not but regard the communication as a message from Dr. Moore, indicating a desire that the Professor should be publicly contradicted. I did not, however, give any promise to Dr. Wilson in regard to these circumstances; and it was not until I had subsequently examined the "Reflections," and found them to be of the character already mentioned, that I determined to write a review. Some time after I had come to this decision, Dr. Colhoun informed me* that Dr. Moore had expressed to him a desire to have a correct representation of Mr. Foulke's case published in the Medical Recorder, had requested him to urge me to write a review, and had said that if I would come to his house, he would give me all the particulars. As I had the greatest confidence in the candour of my friend Dr. Colhoun, at the same time that I recollected the previous message of Dr. Wilson, I did not hesitate to believe that I should gratify the feelings of Dr. Moore by attending to his information. Accordingly I accompanied Dr. Colhoun in a call at Dr. Moore's house, where we were certainly received with much cordiality. We found Dr. Moore warm with indignation against the Professor and his splints, and eager to have a public exposure of what he called the Professor's misstatements respecting the case of Mr. Foulke, with a desire, however, that his own name should not, in the first instance, be brought forward. He related the circumstances that were subsequently stated in my review, with many comments which I did not think it necessary to publish: and when I recollect the vehemence of his anger towards the Professor, and the ardour of his zeal for publication, as evinced in this conversation, as well as by his sending Dr. Wilson and afterwards Dr. Colhoun to me, his asking Dr. Schott to carry information to the editors of the Recorder,† and his endeavours to persuade another surgeon, as mentioned by Dr. Eberle, to write a review, I know not whether to consider it more strange or ludicrous that he should now be the one to accuse me before the public of seeming "peculiarly fond of controversy," and "desirous of stating every thing which could excite irritation"—the only controversy in which he has ever seen me engaged being this into which he led me, and the only circumstances mentioned which could excite irritation being those communicated by himself for the purpose of publication.

Having accepted Dr. Moore's information, it was obviously my duty to be very careful not to misquote his testimony in the slight-

* See Dr. Colhoun's certificate.

† See the certificates of Drs. Colhoun and Eberle.

Dr. Colhoun
report

Colhoun
calls
with
McClellan

on
Dr. Moore
whom
they find

very
angry

with
Dr. Gibson

and
decisions
that

McClellan
should
review

Dr. S. papers

est particular. I therefore carried to him the manuscript of all that part of the review which related to Mr. Foulke, and requested him to suggest whatever alterations might be required to render it perfectly correct. With a pencil I then interlined every thing which he suggested,—exchanging the words “a distinguished physician was called,” &c. for “*a highly respectable gentleman called,*” &c.—the phrase “altogether dissatisfied,” for “*somewhat dissatisfied*”—“Hagedorn’s original and single splint,” &c. for “*several other modes of treatment,*” &c. The words “dark entry” and “caught his foot in the carpet,” &c. were also introduced by him. To the use of Mr. Foulke’s name also the doctor once threw out a slight objection, but he appeared willing to withdraw it when I observed that some one name must be brought forward in connexion with the case. Indeed, he afterwards stated some powerful reasons for retaining it; but as these were somewhat disrespectful towards Mr. Foulke I cannot venture to disclose them.

After these amendments I felt quite at liberty to publish the information thus obtained, without giving myself more trouble to ascertain its correctness, because I placed the most implicit confidence in Dr. Moore’s representations, and because I believed him as an honourable man bound to substantiate all his assertions. I was induced to call again, however, for the purpose of requesting him to procure a certificate from Mr. Foulke, corroborating our statement, and preventing all danger of his being persuaded to contradict our assertions. The doctor at once objected to this plan, and, after declaring that there could be no possibility of disputing the facts which he had stated, promised to give his full testimony if Dr. Gibson should ever venture to contradict me.* He appeared very solicitous, however, that I should call upon Mr. Foulke in person, and once appointed a time to accompany me. In consequence of his urgent solicitations upon this point, Dr. Colhoun, who had been included in this particular invitation,† went with me a little after the appointed hour, when we found Dr. Moore engaged. He then proposed that we should go without him, and we did so, not so much for the purpose of enquiring more particularly into Mr. Foulke’s case, as to obtain his approbation of the manuscript detail of Dr. Moore’s information. Being denied access to Mr. Foulke, however, on account of his severe illness, we left his house without making any enquiries respecting his situation, and I determined to depend exclusively on my confidence in Dr. Moore’s integrity. Before the review had gone through the press, however, I submitted the *corrected* manuscript to Dr. Moore’s inspection, and as he did not recommend any further amendments, or offer any objection to the use of Mr. Foulke’s name, I felt authorized to publish it with his most unreserved sanction.

* See the certificate of Dr. Calhoun, who was with me at the time.

† See Dr. Eberle’s certificate.

A few days after the publication of my Review, I accidentally met Dr. Moore, when he expressed some regret that I had alluded to Dr. Dewees' connivance with the Professor, although he by no means appeared to disapprove of the general tenour of the Review. I then understood him to say, that he had called upon Mr. Foulke, when, in company with his brother, he was in the very act of reading my Review, and that both the Mr. Foulkes appeared pleased with it, declaring it to be altogether just and correct. That Mr. Foulke was at first perfectly satisfied with the publication of his case, and the strictures on his surgeon's "new apparatus," I have since learned from authority too respectable to be disregarded.

A young gentleman, of unquestionable veracity, and now a student of medicine, told several of his friends, who have repeated it to me, that he borrowed the April No. of the Recorder from the Dispensary, expressly for Mr. Foulke, and carried it to him soon after its publication, and that Mr. Foulke then expressed his heartiest approbation of my Review.* Thos. G. McCulloh, Esq. of Chambersburg, also told Dr. Colhoun that when he saw "Mr. Foulke about the middle of May, that so far from being displeased, he seemed amused at the dispute, and stated that the case, as described in the Review, was correct."†

It will easily be credited, therefore, that I was greatly surprised when, on the 28th of May, I received the circular of Dr. Gibson, which contained two letters, signed by Messrs. Foulke and Wright, to the editor of the Medical Recorder, contradicting the statement published on Dr. Moore's authority, and reflecting in the harshest terms on the motives of my publication. Dr. Gibson had been absent from town during the first two or three weeks after the appearance of my Review, and I could only account for this sudden change in Mr. Foulke's sentiments, by supposing that the return of his surgeon had been connected with the exercise of some undue influence over his judgment. This opinion was strengthened by Dr. Moore, when I called on him immediately afterwards for a certificate respecting the information he had before so freely volunteered to give, for he then, in the presence of Dr. Colhoun, asserted that Mr. Foulke had been bribed to sign his name to the letter in question.‡ It was necessary, however, that I

* This young gentleman is now unfortunately very ill, and cannot therefore be consulted upon this subject.

† See Dr. Colhoun's certificate.

‡ I would not myself be so uncharitable, as to suggest the operation of any unworthy motive. Certain it is, however, that he has since allowed himself to be represented before the public as greatly displeased with the introduction of his case into my Review; and Dr. Moore, who now calls him in an equally public manner, his "friend Charles Foulke" for whom he "felt much interested," and says he visited him "only from a FRIENDLY motive," besides the assertion to Colhoun and me above alluded to, has since informed at least one other gentleman, that the change in Mr. Foulke's sentiments was produced by a bribe from the Professor of Surgery, and Dr. Dewees.

I mention this chiefly to show how far Dr. Moore then carried his zeal, and what was his real state of feeling, before he changed his own sentiments, and published his circular against me. Whether his assertion respecting the bribe

*Dr. C.'s accidental
conversation
with Moore in
wh. M. says he
found ^{Foulke} reading
the acct of his case
and that he was
pleased with it.*

*A man who never lies
says Foulke was
pleased with the
review. †
McCulloh tells
Colhoun that
Foulke seemed
amused by it.*

*Assertion of Dr. Moore
that Foulke was
bribed to sign
the circular &c.*

should reply to such an unexpected attack upon my character, and my friends anxiously looked for the promised support of Dr. Moore. I therefore repeatedly solicited that justice at his hands, which I conceived he had no right to refuse. But his prudent fears had begun to predominate over his sense of duty, and I soon found it necessary to adopt a more decided course of conduct.

As Dr. Colhoun had been present with me at my first interview with Dr. Moore, I solicited his assistance on this occasion, and after I had drawn up a number of queries concerning Mr. Foulke's case, we called on Dr. Moore for the purpose of obtaining answers from him. The questions were then categorically put to Dr. Moore in regular order, and his answers carefully noted down on the spot. Although he made some objections to the two first queries, alleging them to be unnecessary, &c. we finally obtained positive answers to all, with the exception of one which, at his urgent request, was wholly omitted. Before I published the testimony thus collected, in corroboration of my former statements, I placed a copy of it in the hands of Edward Ingersoll, Esq. and requested him to submit it again to Dr. Moore for the purpose of preventing misconception. It was afterwards returned to me with the assurance that, although Dr. Moore was unwilling to have it published, he had acknowledged its entire correctness; and I therefore felt myself authorized to use his testimony just as readily as if he had acted with the most honest independence.

As the handbill which Dr. Gibson published in reply to my Review, has been widely circulated,* and as Dr. Moore's subsequent publication may appear to invalidate his own testimony, it again becomes my duty to analyze the statements of my opponents. In the first place, however, it may be proper to observe, that the only part of the Review which has yet been assailed by the professor and his friends, is that which is contained in the two concluding pages, and relates to the now celebrated experiment upon Mr. Foulke.

Mr. Foulke stated in substance, (or the person, whoever he may be, that wrote the letter,)

is true or false, is no concern of mine: it is for him to settle that between his own veracity and his *particular friends*, to whom he has attributed the giving and receiving of a bribe.—*Plectantur sylvæ*, &c.

* I have lately received a letter from one of my professional friends in a remote part of the country, informing me that Mr. Foulke's letters had been received among his acquaintance in abundance; and a gentleman who has just travelled through a part of Virginia and Maryland, found them in all the villages—*Lippis et tonsoribus notas*. I have just received from a gentleman in Virginia the following copy of an envelope to the handbill which was directed to one of his friends, and as I wish to allow Dr. Gibson the advantage of his own opinion, I will insert it here:—"Herewith you have a candid statement from the gentleman himself of the successful use of my improvement of Hagedorn's apparatus, which, sooner or later, will prove highly beneficial to the world. I have no objections to reviews, provided they are conducted with liberality, but such as the one published in the Recorder, are unfair, and not calculated to promote science."

1st. That his "name had been wantonly and indelicately introduced."*

2d. That he has "never been dissatisfied with the professional attendance of Dr. Gibson."†

3d. That he fractured his thigh in January 1821. Desault's splints were then applied by Drs. Dewees and Horner, and severe ulceration occasioned.‡

4th. A second fracture of the same bone occurred in September last, the opposite arm being broken at the same time. Desault's splints were first applied by Drs. Gibson and Dewees, with the same inconveniences in a greater degree.§

5. Dr. Gibson's newly invented splints were then applied with the "happiest effects."||

6th. *That a cure was not performed in the usual time, "owing,"* he believed, "to some constitutional or other cause, attendant on a second fracture."¶

7th. That it is not true several other modes of treatment were adopted; "Hagedorn's apparatus improved by Dr. Gibson being the only one after the removal of Desault's.**

8th. That a triangular frame was afterwards placed under his

* Dr. Moore virtually took upon himself all responsibility on this head; and as he was then in the habit of visiting Mr. Foulke, and had been long intimate with him, it was to be presumed he would know what his friend's feelings were. He also assured me, that Mr. Foulke was perfectly satisfied with the publication of his name until the return of his surgeon from Baltimore, and accounted for the change by imputing bribery. See Dr. Colhoun's certificate, section 5th, for proof that Dr. Moore did not really object to the use of Mr. Foulke's name, also that Mr. Foulke expressed himself to Mr. M'Culloh as not displeased with my Review.

† Dissatisfaction with the professional skill of his surgeon, was not attributed to Mr. Foulke in my Review. "*Somewhat dissatisfied with his situation,*" was the expression. At all events, it was an adopted expression of Dr. Moore's, and one of the "material alterations" which he directed, the stronger phrase "altogether dissatisfied" being modified into the one retained. But in fact, Dr. Moore did say that Mr. Foulke was dissatisfied with Dr. Gibson's attendance. See the certificate of Edward Ingersoll, Esq.

‡ It appears, by Mr. Foulke's own representation, that his first fracture was cured by the use of the so much despised Desault's splints: the second, it seems, is not yet cured by the newly invented apparatus. From the first fracture, he says, he recovered with his limb "*quite straight.*" His friend Mr. Wright, says it became "*short and crooked.*" *Non nostrum tantas componere lites.*

§ The first time that I became acquainted with the existence of the former fracture, was when the statement of Thos. G. M'Culloh, Esq. was brought to me some weeks after the publication of the Review. It was not from want of candour, therefore, that I did not originally allude to it. Dr. Moore must have been aware of it: why did he not mention it to me when he first gave his information?

|| What these "happiest effects" were, is not very comprehensible. The limb was uncured at the time when the new splints were removed; and the sound limb, according to Dr. Moore's statement, was then "exceedingly swelled and painful."

¶ Here we have an admission of all that is material in regard to the new splints. *A cure was not performed by them.*

** Here again Mr. F. and his friend are at variance. Hagedorn's improved apparatus was the only one (says Mr. F.) used after Desault's. Mr. Wright says *Astley Cooper's* was used, but *only to flex the knee!*

limb to create "a gradual flexion of the knee, and prevent its becoming stiff."*

9th. That his thigh had then (May 27) become useful, so much so, that he had walked a considerable distance to dine with a friend without any inconvenience.†

10th. "It is not *deformed*, as G. M^cC. states, but is quite straight, though somewhat shortened, as it was after the first fracture."‡

11th. That two young physicians called at his store under false pretences, to obtain information; that if they had informed him of their business, he could have prevented the publication of their "misrepresentations."§

The letter signed "J. M. Wright" asserted the following facts:

1st. That he was in constant attendance on Mr. Foulke during his first, and (with some interruption) his second accident.

2d. That the splints of Desault, applied after the first accident, afflicted him more than the new ones of Dr. Gibson.||

3d. That "the thigh became short and crooked" after the first accident.

4th. That after the second accident, *Desault's* splints were used with the same painful consequences as after the first.

5th. Dr. Gibson's improvement on Hagedorn's splints was then tried, and "had the happiest effect, viz. in relieving you from the intolerable counter-extension, and at the same time, as far as possible, putting a stop to that motion which was manifestly delaying the union"¶

6th. That "an assertion having been made, that Dr. Gibson resorted to Astley Cooper's machine in your case, with a view of curing the fracture, I declare it to be false, and can state that Dr. Gibson had no such intention."

7th. That Astley Cooper's machine was used "to produce a flexion of the knee."**

* This is precisely *Cooper's* apparatus. Dr. Moore stated explicitly that Mr. Foulke was upon that apparatus when he first saw him after the removal of the new splints, and that the broken limb had not then united.

† The thigh being useful at the end of May, eight months after the accident, is no proof of its having been cured in February. But how useful? Could he even then, can he even now walk across his room without crutches? I am informed that he cannot.

‡ A limb shortened more than two inches, as Mr. Foulke himself confessed to Thos. G. M^cCulloh, Esq. must be also deformed.

§ The visit of the "two young physicians" has been already mentioned;—nothing could have been more open or well meant. What could have induced Mr. Foulke to talk of "knives," "grindstones," and "false pretences?" Dr. Moore says *bribery*. I hope not.

|| That Mr. Wright should assert this, is not at all extraordinary, considering how warm a partizan he appears to be in favour of Dr. Gibson. In alluding to the reviewer in the commencement of his letter, he speaks of "personal animosity," &c. and he afterwards contradicts Dr. Moore's statements in the following manner: "It is not a fact"—"I declare it to be false"—"It has been misrepresented," &c.

¶ Here Mr. Wright attempts to explain the meaning of the unfortunate phrase "happiest effect," exactly in the technical language that one would suppose a professor of surgery alone could employ.

** Who could be so well acquainted with Dr. Gibson's "intentions" as Dr.

8th. That Mr. Foulke's sound limb was not injured by the new splints, but had been tender for two years, in consequence of jumping out of a carriage.*

9th That Mr. F. did complain, but not of Dr. Gibson, merely of the disease, and that this circumstance "had either been misunderstood or misrepresented."

In answer to these allegations, it would only have been requisite for my entire justification to adduce the authority upon which the history of Mr. Foulke's case was founded; but as Dr. Moore appeared so unwilling to remain steadfast in his resolutions, I thought it necessary to bring forward the name of Thos. G. McCulloh, Esq. whose testimony had been put into my hands. for the avowed purpose of publication; and I also judged it proper to make some comments upon the contradictory statements contained in Dr. Gibson's handbill. I have already alluded to the reason which Dr. Moore assigned for the appearance of Mr. Foulke's letter, and I need not enumerate the arguments which go to prove that Dr. Gibson or Dr. Dewees was the author of the paper which they circulated. I was wholly unacquainted with Mr. Wright, and as I strongly suspected that no man unconnected with Dr. Gibson and the profession, could write such sentences as are contained in the letter to which his name is subscribed, I charitably concluded that his support had been afforded, from motives of good will, to the allegations of his medical friends. What confirmed me in this belief, was the assertion of one of his friends to the same effect, and the fact that Drs. Gibson and Dewees were the only individuals who could be detected in circulating the handbills. In canvassing Dr. Gibson's evidence, therefore, I made no hesitation in avowing my belief of his immediate agency in the business; and this was done chiefly with the view of avoiding collision with his friend Mr. Wright, whose assertions, if I had recognized him as the author, I should necessarily have been forced to contradict.

Where Mr. Wright was personally alluded to in my statement, every possible delicacy was observed. The letter signed by him, as the friend of Mr. Foulke, besides containing the harshest language of contradiction, imputed to me the most improper motives. If he was the real author of the letter, therefore, his conduct was at least unnecessary and ill-timed. A statement of the facts, as he recollected them, would have been much more appropriate for one who avowedly came into the affair merely as a witness. Nevertheless, in remarking on the letter, I avoided all

Gibson himself? and who will venture to suppose that the Professor of Surgery would ever dismiss an original apparatus which had the "happiest effect," and exchange it before the limb had been cured, for one so ill calculated, as he thinks Mr. Cooper's is, to effect union,—and that merely for the purpose of bending the knee!—*Credat Judæus.*

* Several of Mr. Foulke's friends say that the sound limb is still swelled exceedingly so as to confine him to his bed, and that the family do attribute the swelling to its confinement in Dr. Gibson's new apparatus. Dr. Moore at first declared that Mr. Foulke entertained the same idea, and he has not contradicted himself on this point since.

severity of retort, and, declaring my belief that Dr. Gibson was the real author as well as publisher, I at the same time protested that I had "too much respect for the characters of Messrs. Foulke and Wright, to suppose that they could have made such representations." If this was not literally turning the left cheek after being smitten on the right, it was at least the mildest possible reply to a very rude and unfounded accusation from a person who had not the slightest provocation, nor any particular occasion to express an unfavourable opinion of my character.

Great, therefore, was my surprise, when I ascertained that Mr. Wright, instead of feeling contented with my forbearance, had allowed himself to be persuaded into the revengeful purpose of threatening me with a challenge.

Returning home one morning, I found my family in great agitation and alarm, occasioned by the repeated visits of two men who had enquired for me with a fierceness of manner that evinced a determination to quarrel. Soon after, they again made their appearance. One of them announced himself as Mr. Wright, and said he had come to complain of the manner in which I had spoken of him in the "Statement of the Evidence," &c. His whole ground of complaint appeared to be, that I had attributed to him the signing of a paper which he did not write, and the consequent implication, that he was not a well educated man. He informed me, that in fact, he did write the whole of the letter which had been published with his name, and that it was written at the request of Dr. Dewees and Dr. Gibson, who brought him two letters ready written for his signature, but that he chose to write one entirely for himself, rather than sign either of those prepared for him.

I explained to him how little reason he had to be offended with me, and how much greater right I had to ask an apology from him. He was evidently disposed, after a little free conversation, to view the matter in a more favourable light, and we should have had no difficulty in coming to a good understanding, if it had not been for his companion, who appeared determined to make us quarrel if he possibly could. A paper was then produced which had been prepared for me to sign, but which I could not with any propriety be expected to confirm. I positively declined, therefore, to sign it or any part of it, and they finally left my house, after repeatedly busting through the entry, and intimating that I should hear from them again in the afternoon.

All this occurred within the hearing of my family, no wish having been evinced by either Mr. Wright or his companion, to conduct the interview with any thing like the privacy usually desired when such communications are made.

In the afternoon, Mr. Wright's companion, who, I afterwards learned was a Mr. Gwinn, of the U. S. navy, but whose name* and character were at that time unknown to me, came again; and, holding out the same paper which I had before decidedly refused to

* Mr. Wright did once call his companion by name, but in so unintelligible a manner, that I could not understand it.

confirm, declared, in a manner extremely offensive and ill-bred, that I must either sign that paper or meet Mr. Wright in the field.

I am no duellist in practice or profession. I despise the custom and shall always do what is in my power to discountenance it. But if I had been, there was no sufficient cause for Mr. Wright to ask me to murder him; and even if this had been the case, and I had been willing to meet him in a duel, still the *manner* in which the challenge was delivered would have been considered insufferable.

Mr. Gwinn was not introduced to me, nor did he announce himself—he brought me no written challenge, asked for no apology or explanation—but held out a paper prepared for me to sign, in which I was to acknowledge Mr. Wright as the author of Dr. Gibson's letter, and at the same time admit the correctness of its contents, and threatened the alternative of a meeting in the field.

In matters of this kind, the utmost courtesy is always looked for, the deportment of one gentleman towards another gentleman is never to be omitted, and the challenge bearer should, if possible, be the peace-maker, or, at least, the moderator, and rather endeavour to procure an honourable adjustment than to prevent a reconciliation. Mr. Gwinn, however, I saw was determined to get up a duel if possible, while Mr. Wright was disposed for conciliation upon honourable terms.

Indignant at such a wanton attempt to make mischief, at the ungentlemanly disregard which he had shown to the peace and tranquillity of my family, and at the indescribably odious manner in which he announced his alternative, I struck him as if he had been a blackguard and a ruffian, and the conflict which ensued was terminated by one of my students, who ran out of the adjoining office, and interfered to restore peace.

I believe that every man of generous feeling will always regret, when the moment of excitement has passed, that he struck a blow upon whatever provocation. Accordingly, upon subsequent reflection, although I had acted from the impulse of a just indignation, excited by conduct which did not appear less inexcusable when more deliberately considered, yet I could not but feel some regret, that I had even, under such circumstances, used violence towards the offender, and I did not hesitate to express this regret to an estimable officer in the naval service, who called to make enquiries on the subject. To the question, however, whether I would be willing to accept a challenge from lieut. Gwinn, I gave a decided answer in the negative; at the same time declaring (in substance) that as he had neither come to me nor acted as an officer or a gentleman, I did not feel obligated to make any particular reparation for the violence I had committed upon his person, although I sincerely regretted the act itself. As Mr. Gwinn held a respectable rank in a highly dignified profession, and as it is generally considered peculiarly disgraceful to the character of an officer to receive a blow, I certainly felt more disposed to make a sufficient reparation, than if he had proved to be the same character which his conduct had induced me to imagine. As Mr. Gwinn, also, upon subsequent reflection, must have felt that his conduct had been very improper, my friends anticipated but little difficulty in foreclosing all further disturbance by mutual concessions. They were informed, however, that nothing would satisfy Mr. Gwinn but an opportunity of beating me, which he was determined to do on the earliest occasion, and they therefore advised me to place him, and Mr. Wright also, in the hands of the police. This advice was repeated with increased earnestness, when it was discovered that both those individuals, attended with others, had been watching for me at several places in the night.

I steadily refused, however, to claim any protection from the police. Having struck a blow, I considered that it might not be quite manly to tie the officer's hands, so as to prevent him from returning it at his leisure. I did not avoid a meeting, but walked and rode about as usual upon my professional and other engagements.

I saw nothing of him, however, for nearly two weeks, although I *heard* constantly of his threats. I began about this time to carry a cane, which I had not usually done before; but a friend of his calling upon a friend of mine, assured him, that Mr. Gwinn carried only a *small rattan*, and suggested that it should be mentioned to me, as an inducement for me to walk as slightly armed. I accordingly laid aside my stick, and walked as before, entirely unprovided with a weapon of any kind.

About two days after this, being called early in the morning to attend a lady in immediate need of surgical assistance, I was walking down Chesnut street in company with Mr. Jos. H. Lawrence, who had come for me, when I met Mr. Gwinn carrying (notwithstanding the intimation to the contrary) a very large walking stick. He raised it to strike me, but I easily wrested it from him, and had him completely in my power. I returned the stick, however, on his promising and *swearing* not to attack me with it again. He then offered me his hand, and I carelessly accepted it just as we were parting.*

As I had shown that I could exercise forbearance on a proper occasion, and had refrained from striking after I had disarmed him, I supposed my quarrel with this person was now ended. When, therefore, I met him three hours after in

* The following certificate will corroborate my statement.

"On Friday morning last, about seven o'clock, I called on Dr. M'Clellan to request his immediate attendance on my mother, who had been seriously hurt by a fall. He came with me instantly, and as we were walking down Chesnut street very fast, we met, nearly opposite the United States Bank, a man carrying a very large walking-stick. He was just passing the doctor, when suddenly raising his club, he rushed upon the Doctor who was next to him; the Doctor sprung upon him (without receiving a blow,) seized the club, took it out of his hand, and struck him in the face with the other hand. I then ran between them, and succeeded in parting them. The assailant had torn off a piece of the Doctor's shirt ruffle. I then stood to one side: the Doctor brandishing the club over the man's head, asked him if he "was satisfied." The man turned towards me, and said "you interfered before," and then said to the Doctor "it is not fair for you to have your brother with you always." Both of us then assured him that I was not Dr. M'Clellan's brother, but that I was taking him to see my mother, &c. The doctor then holding up the club again in a threatening way, repeated his question "are you now satisfied?" The man said in the same complaining begging tone that he had used before, "why Doctor, you ought to make an apology first, because you struck me first," or words to that effect. People now began to gather round, and I observed to the Doctor, that my mother must be suffering, while they stood disputing there. The Doctor then said, "well, this is no place to talk, I have always been disposed to treat you honourably, and if you'll come to me, you'll find it so." The man then asked for his stick; the Doctor did not give it immediately; the man then said, "I won't strike you with it again, I won't by *God!*" The Doctor then handed him the stick; the man received it with his left hand, and stretched out his right hand, open, towards the Doctor, who accepted it, and they shook hands and parted.

The man that thus attacked Dr. M'Clellan, was an entire stranger to me; I had never, to my knowledge, seen him before. Dr. M'Clellan was also almost unknown to me, I having seen him but a very few times.

The Doctor had no stick nor other weapon, so far as I could see; he received no blow at all, and evidently had his assailant completely in his power at the time when he first asked "are you satisfied?"

The above is a true and impartial statement of the circumstances to the best of my recollection, and is given at the request of Edward Ingersoll, Esq. a friend and relative of Dr. M'Clellan.

JOSEPH H. LAWRENCE."

June 29, 1822.

another street, I had no expectation of an attack from him; and as I saw an older and respectable looking officer in company with him, I supposed he was desirous of an open reconciliation in the presence of his commander. But to my astonishment, he suddenly raised his club, and taking me thus by surprise, succeeded in giving me one blow, which occasioned a considerable suffusion of blood. I immediately seized him, however, and threw him upon the pavement, and he was saved from that severity of chastisement which he deserved, only by the interference of the gentleman who accompanied him. I then returned, with his club in my possession, to the residence of a friend, for the purpose of adjusting my dress; and immediately afterwards attended to my official duties in the Alms-house.*

I by no means desire to claim reputation for animal courage in either of these rencounters. My profession requires the exercise of discretion and forbearance rather than of valour and muscular power. But, as misrepresentations have been circulated among the public, greatly to my disadvantage, it cannot be expected that I should remain contented under their influence.

It only remains necessary to examine the allegations brought against me in a recent and extraordinary production of Dr. Moore. From the detail which I have already given of that gentleman's connection with my Review, it might be inferred that I had a perfect right to throw the whole burden of proof upon his authority. He not only voluntarily communicated all the information which was first published concerning Mr. Foulke's case, but he gave a positive promise to testify to the truth of his statements, if ever they should be denied.† Although I was, therefore, somewhat irritated, as well as disappointed, at his refusing to perform what he had before unequivocally promised, still, when I published my statement of evidence in justification of the Review, I resolved to treat Dr. Moore with the greatest possible delicacy. Before I published his answers to the written queries which had been regu-

* In consequence of the unfounded and disagreeable reports which were circulated, my friend and neighbour, Samuel Badger, Esq. called on captain Oellers, the friend of Mr. Gwinn, soon after the transaction, and received from him a full account of the circumstances. He lately drew up a statement of the facts which were then communicated to him, and placed it at my disposal. That statement has since been submitted to the inspection of captain Oellers by Edward Ingersoll, Esq, who, with Mr. Badger's consent, erased every affirmation which does not still remain in the recollection of captain Oellers. The following certificate, therefore, as it now stands, may be considered as the testimony of the intimate friend of Mr. Gwinn, and eye-witness of the transaction to which it relates.

“ Captain Oellers gave me in substance the following statement of the second rencounter between Dr. McClellan and lieut. Gwinn. He said, that he was standing at the corner of Tenth and Spruce streets with the lieutenant, and was in conversation with him, when the lieutenant said “ There is the Doctor now.” That he then turned, and saw a young man coming towards them, whom he had never seen before, with his gloves on, and his hands clasped together; that he addressed the lieutenant, *smiling at the same time*, and said “ I hope we shall have no more difficulty in the street;” that the lieutenant said “ well, Doctor” and then struck him a severe blow on the head with a walking stick; that the Doctor was a little stunned by the blow, but that he immediately recovered, and rushed on the lieutenant; that they struggled a moment, until the doctor threw him on the pavement; that he struck Gwinn three or four times upon the head, when he (capt. Oellers) interfered, and took McClellan off from Gwinn. Captain Oellers further said, that the Doctor was too strong for Gwinn; that he acted bravely and magnanimously, and that he should like to make his acquaintance.

S. BADGER.

26th July, 1822.

† See Dr. Colhoun's statement, article 1st.

larly proposed to him, I requested Mr. E. Ingersoll to lay them before Dr. Moore a second time, for the purpose of ascertaining their correctness, and the nature of his objections to their publication. As he then admitted them to be true, I did not hesitate to publish them as such: and as he excused himself for opposing their publication chiefly on the ground of having formerly objected to the use of Mr. Foulke's name, I allowed him full credit for that objection, although I clearly recollected the slight manner in which it had once only been made. The following extract from my statement, will show that I gave him all the advantage which his plea could afford:

"It is due, however, to the feelings of Dr. Moore, that we should state the original intention which he now wishes to have expressed, of introducing no other name than that of Dr. Gibson before the public," &c.

I also introduced into the same publication, the testimony of Thos. G. M'Culloh, Esq. with elaborate comments upon the inconsistent statements contained in Dr. Gibson's circular, solely for the purpose of supporting Dr. Moore, and relieving him from individual responsibility.

As far as my own conduct towards him, therefore, is concerned, I cannot conceive at what circumstance Dr. Moore could have found it necessary to take offence. Inexplicable, however, as the fact may appear, in connection with his avowed principles, that gentleman has indulged himself in some very ill-natured observations, to which I do not feel inclined to make any reply. He has also made some representations respecting his former conduct, which appear to contradict several affirmations in my preceding "statements," and as the "circular" in which they were published has been widely disseminated, it becomes my unpleasant duty to oppose his assertions by argument and by testimony.

The first charge which Dr. Moore has advanced against me is, that I used his name improperly. "I find by a statement lately published, that I am brought into view in consequence of some remarks on a paper of Dr. Gibson by Dr. M'Clellan. I say Dr. M'Clellan; for, as *he has taken the liberty of using my name, contrary to my express direction*, and has been so inconsiderate as to sign the initials of his, I shall not hesitate," &c.

From this quotation, it plainly appears that Dr. Moore intended to convey the idea that he had no agency whatever in the publication of Mr. Foulke's case, and that I had most unjustifiably as well as impudently dragged him (innocent man) into the affair. In the detail, however, which I have already given, it has been proved that I had a perfect right to bring forward Dr. Moore's name, independent of his express promise to come forward himself, whenever the statements which I made on his unsolicited authority should be contradicted. This step, it must be obvious, was one of just and necessary self-defence. He had volunteered to communicate facts which he desired to be made known; and I had stated them publicly in my Review, withholding his name, because he thought it was probable there would be no denial. The liberty of using his name, if necessary, to support his assertions, was a condition without which I should not for a moment have thought of

accepting his information;—no man in his senses would; and if this condition had not been explicitly granted by him, Dr. Moore himself never could have asked me to publish his statements. It was proper, in bringing his name forward, to allow him to make out his narrative in his own language, and with such corroborative or explanatory additions as he pleased. This opportunity was offered by asking him to write a *certificate*, which he says in his circular he refused to do. Subsequently, when he saw that he could not avoid being brought forward, he offered a *statement*, on certain conditions. What his ideas of the difference between a *certificate* and a *statement* may be, I cannot say; it appears, however, from his circular, that one was refused, and the other afterwards tendered. But the indispensable condition, viz. a note from Dr. Eberle requesting the information, could not possibly be complied with, because that gentleman declined addressing Dr. Moore on the subject. Besides it was evident that Dr. Moore's recollection was daily becoming less vivid: and we have indeed, in his jesuitical circular, a lamentable specimen of the sort of "*statement*" he would have given to the editor of the Medical Recorder.

The questions which I had proposed to him, applied to all the material points, and his answers were plain and perspicuous: they showed that I had not made assertions without good authority, and they were therefore sufficient for me. If they implicated Dr. Moore with any of his friends, that was an inconvenience which he should have foreseen when he was making his original disclosures, but probably overlooked in the excess of his eagerness to attack the Professor's splints.

If Dr. Moore has taken offence at the *manner* in which his name was introduced into my statement, his temper must be of a more delicate composition than I imagined. I first designated him as "*a distinguished physician,*" and, at his own suggestion, I called him "*a highly respectable gentleman;*" I have since styled him "*an eminent preacher of the Friends' Society,*" and "*a physician of the highest character for integrity and propriety of conduct.*" If he is really principled against applause, I can only say that I regret my unintended offence, and that in consideration of his subsequent conduct, I shall probably never again have occasion to load him with such disagreeable epithets.

The second representation in Dr. Moore's Circular, which I feel obliged to oppose, is, that he made no communication respecting Dr. Gibson's paper, with a view of inducing me to write a criticism. Although he conveys this idea in a very artful manner, ("can any one suppose, for a moment, that I was anxious that *he* should review it," &c. still there can be no difficulty in comprehending his full intention from the following words—"I sent no message to any one." "As to the editor, he states that he never received any direct message from me, and I certainly never received any from him." The first of these assertions, I regret to state, is positively contradicted in the certificates of Drs. Colhoun and Eberle, and virtually also in those of Mr. Hanna and Mr. Bigonet; the second, although not equally unfounded, is certainly disingenuous in the extreme. Some time before the publication of his Circular, Dr. Moore sent a friend to Dr. Eberle, requesting a written answer to the simple question—Whether he had received any direct communication from Dr. Moore respecting Mr. Foulke's case. To this question Dr. Eberle could not give an unqualified answer in the form of a certificate, and he therefore wrote that he had "not received any *direct* communication *anterior* to the publication of" my Review, although he had received an indirect one through

Dr. Wilson before that period, and subsequently a direct one through Dr. Schott, as well as another from Dr. Moore in person. Before his Circular appeared, it seems to have been the favourite policy of Dr. Moore to close the mouths of all those who might possibly be brought forward to testify against him by extracting from them partial and artfully constructed certificates. Thus Dr. Wilson, as I have been informed, was made to sign a paper acknowledging that he had never conveyed any information from Dr. Moore to Dr. Eberle, and Dr. Schott another to the same effect; although Dr. Moore must have perfectly well recollected that he had made such a request of both those gentlemen, and that the former had obliged him by calling on me, and at the Recorder office—while the latter only delayed the delivering of his message during a few weeks, for want of a suitable opportunity.

Dr. Moore next denies the truth of the information conveyed in the answers which he formerly gave to the two first queries in my "statement." "I always said, and wish it to be distinctly understood, that I did not call on Charles Foulke in consequence of the *request of any one*, or from any other than a friendly motive." "How, therefore, Dr. M'Clellan should, in the first instance, get the idea of his (Mr. Foulke's) dissatisfaction, I do not know; for even were it true!" &c. &c. "there was no idea of dissatisfaction with Dr. Gibson intended," for I have no recollection of his name having been mentioned while I was with Charles Foulke"!—Now the two first questions which were put to Dr. Moore, and the answers which he gave to them, were as follows:—1. Were you requested by any person to visit Mr. Foulke in February last? I was—by his sister. 2d. Did Mr. Foulke then express himself dissatisfied with the treatment he had undergone? Yes: he did so. That he really gave these answers, is proved by the certificate of Dr. Colhoun; and that he afterwards acknowledged them to be true is also proved by the certificate of Edwd. Ingersoll, Esq. He also stated the same circumstances in conversation at other times, as is mentioned in the same certificates. What, therefore, shall be said concerning his denial of my statements?

Dr. Moore next asserts, that "*When Dr. M'Clellan called on me for information, I refused at first to give it, because I was not desirous of having the case published*"! As I have already stated, I first called on Dr. Moore in company with Dr. Colhoun, in consequence of an express invitation transmitted through Dr. Colhoun, and we neither of us recollect that Dr. Moore ever refused to give me information respecting Mr. Foulke's case. In relation to his not being "desirous of having the case published," my readers must make up their minds from an examination of the facts.

Dr. Moore also states, "Dr. M'Clellan called a second time, and read a *small* part of the Review to me, which I directed to be altered materially,"—evidently intending to convey the ideas, that I concealed from him parts which he should have seen, that he disapproved of the *small* part which I did show him, and that I neglected to adopt his material alterations. The facts, however, are, as I have before mentioned, that I twice exhibited to him all that part of my Review which concerns Mr. Foulke's case, with which alone Dr. Moore had any concern, and I adopted all the alterations, "material" and immaterial, which he chose to recommend. The several alterations in my original manuscript, which were made at his request, have been already detailed; and I am only surprised that Dr. Moore could have displayed so much disingenuousness on so trifling a subject. Respecting the two first queries before alluded to, he again says—"When they were proposed to me a second time, *I objected to the first and second queries as not being correct.*"

When I first read the "Circular," I was astonished at these as-

sertions: before I contradicted them, however, I gave Dr. Moore an opportunity of explaining himself, as will appear by the following note, which I sent to him by Edward Ingersoll, Esq.

“Dr. M'Clellan requests Dr. Moore to inform him at what time, under what circumstances, and in whose presence it was, that he refused to give information respecting Mr. Foulke's case, as is stated in Dr. Moore's “Circular.”—Also, what was the “small part” of the Review which Dr. Moore says was read to him, and what were the sentences which he “directed to be altered materially?” Dr. M. will please designate the sentences on the copy of the Review which Dr. M'C. sends to him, and also the part that was “read” to him. Dr. Moore will also please to say when and to whom he “objected to the first and second queries as not being correct”

Walnut-street, July 3d, 1822”

To this note Dr. Moore would not venture to give Mr. Ingersoll an answer. I leave my readers to imagine the cause of his refusal. I understand that Dr. Moore explains the last question, by stating that he did not mean to represent *the answers* which I published to the two first queries as not being correct, but that he only referred to the queries themselves! Although he would not send me a written answer to my note—(fearing, forsooth, that I should publish it, and turn his confessions against himself) still he confessed, that the “small part” of my Review to which he referred, was all that concerns the history of Mr. Foulke's case.* How striking, then, is his want of candour in attempting to represent that I could be capable of deceiving him.

The “Circular” next imputes a very unhandsome artifice to me, as well as Dr. Colhoun, in relation to the manner in which we obtained Dr. Moore's answers to my written queries. “When the questions were proposed to me, I did not know that I was then catechized for publication”—And “to have what could not be called more than desultory conversation, placed before the public as direct interrogatories with their answers, as if I had been examined before an inquisitorial tribunal, and that too contrary to my express direction, is a liberty which Dr. M'Clellan and his friend ought not to have assumed.”

Surely Dr. M.'s recollection must be strangely clouded, or he would not assert that he did not know the object of the interrogations. The certificate had been requested for publication, and refused: that he remembers and states. When the written queries were shown or read to him, what could he have imagined was their object? *desultory conversation!!!* I am yet to learn that it is usual to carry on desultory conversation by written questions and answers, unless one party be deaf or dumb. Why should he object to answering the two first questions; and why should a second call be made for the express purpose of insisting on answers to them? This does not look like “desultory conversation.” Why should he wish any part of his answers erased, unless he knew the rest were to be published? But he says, “he objected to the publication of any of them in the form in which they then stood.”

* See Mr. Ingersoll's Certificate.

Thus out of his own mouth he condemns himself; for he could not object to a publication without knowing that a publication was intended.

Next, after denying all "hostility towards" me, and declaring his respect for "the apostolic injunction"—to "*overcome evil with good*," Dr. Moore charges me, in the form of a postscript, with having mal-treated "the name of Thos. G. M'Culloh, Esq." by publishing his testimony "not only without his consent, but contrary to his express prohibition."

I know not what may be the "unquestionable authority" on which the Doctor founds this assertion. No such "prohibition" ever came to my knowledge. I have no personal acquaintance with Mr. M'Culloh; but I received the memorandum of his inquiries into Mr. Foulke's case from an intimate friend of his, expressly with a view to publication. I had no right otherwise to have used his name, as *he* had never given me a promise, nor communicated information. But his testimony being handed to me, in his own writing, by a particular friend, I of course used it as that friend advised.

It is remarkable that Dr. Moore cannot move a step without involving himself in fresh inconsistencies. He has complained bitterly that I did not procure additional evidence, and yet, when I support his veracity by the corroboration of Mr. M'Culloh's testimony, he exclaims against me for doing the very thing which, he says, he insisted upon, and I promised him to do.

Dr. Moore also charges me with being "*so inconsiderate as to sign the initials*" of my name to my publications, and I am gratified to see him consistent in this one opinion. His whole conduct towards Dr. Gibson has been extremely sly and cunning, and all his enmity against the "new splints" has been marked by covert movements. It is not surprising, therefore, that he should censure me for being "*so inconsiderate*" as to attack the professor's writings openly and without disguise. But I have yet to learn the advantages of Dr. Moore's policy—the success of his last undertaking certainly does not appear to recommend it.

The truth is, as I have proved, Dr. Moore, for some reason, either of private pique or honest indignation, was extremely anxious to bring Dr. Gibson into difficulty, and thought he had an opportunity of doing so by making public the particulars of Mr. Foulke's case. He desired, however, to make an instrument of some one less cautious than himself, and hoped he could very cunningly prevail on me to assume the responsibility which he feared, so that he might himself still appear as the *friend* of Dr. Gibson, while, in fact, he was putting forth heavy charges against him. Knowing the facts which he communicated to be true, he flattered himself no denial would be attempted, and that he might therefore indulge his ill-will without an open breach with those whom he was betraying. He, therefore, used every effort to persuade me to introduce the particulars of that case into the Medical Recorder, and expressed the utmost indignation against the professor, and carelessness of offending him. The denial contained in the letters of Mr. Foulke and Mr. Wright took him completely by surprise; so much so, that he did not hesitate to explain it by the allegation of

bribery. From this time, he began to be overcome by his fears of the enmity which he might have excited. He, therefore, first refused the promised certificate, then was unwilling to answer the interrogatories; next he endeavoured to procure the suppression of two of his answers, afterwards protested against the use of any of them;—finally, took the decisive step, and threw himself at the professor's feet; published a "circular" full of unfounded charges against me, and having made the *prima libamina* of my character, proceeded to pray for forgiveness, declaring, he hopes no one will be "so illiberal as to suppose" that he designed "to injure Dr. Gibson!!" and "if he is offended, I regret it," &c.

It is to be hoped that this penitent humiliation will have its due effect, and that he will be restored to the favour of the gentleman who he so lately thought "deserved to have the new splints broken over his back."

To his disavowal of all "*hostility*" towards me, I give unqualified credence. It should be impossible for any man to feel hostility towards one who never injured him, nor spoke of him a word of disrespect or unkindness. His conscience tells him it is I that have a right to be offended; but I trust if I preach charity less, I practise it as much as he does; and I certainly cherish no enmity against him. I pity indeed the infirmity of purpose and weakness of nerve, apparent in his whole conduct; and I regret the necessity which he has imposed on me of disclosing his inconsistent affirmations. I take leave of him with a friendly admonition to know himself better hereafter, than to put his hands to any undertaking which his fears will not suffer him to accomplish; and if it ever happen that he shall be carried away by a momentary impulse again to commit himself by any representations, I earnestly advise him, as the only means of retaining the dignity of his character, and the esteem of the community, to stand manfully by his word, and allow no motive of fear, favour or affection towards any man, or body of men, to shake his steadfast adherence to the line of open, ingenuous and impartial truth.

"Justum et tenacem propositi virum
Non civium ardor prava jubentium
Non vultus instantis tyranni
Mente quatit solida."

GEORGE M'CLELLAN.

1. CERTIFICATE OF DR. COLHOUN.

Philadelphia, July 6, 1822.

At your request I subjoin my knowledge of the facts relating to the publication of Dr. John Moore.

I. Dr. Moore sometime after the appearance of the paper by the professor of surgery, requested me to ask Dr. M'Clellan to review it, and also to desire that gentleman to call on him, and he would communicate the case of Mr. Foulke. He also stated in a subsequent conversation, that he would certify the facts if necessary.

II. I met Dr. Wilson in Chesnut street on or about the 20th of June, 1822, who stated in my presence, that Dr. Moore had requested him (Dr. Wilson,) some time after a paper on fractures of the thigh, by the professor of surgery, had appeared, to inform the editor of the Medical Recorder through the publisher of that work, that the paper above mentioned was a proper subject for a review. Dr. Wilson also said that he told the publisher of the Recorder, that he would inform Dr. M'Clellan of the same circumstance, and that he could

furnish certificates from Dr. Moore, testifying the facts with regard to the case of Mr. Foulke.

III. Dr. Schott stated to me on the 23d of June, 1822, that Dr. Moore desired him to request the editor of the Recorder to review the above mentioned paper, if he met him.

IV. Dr. Moore also stated to me, shortly after the publication of the paper on fractures, the information conveyed in the two first queries, as also the state of the fracture: he gave the same account when his testimony was obtained previously to the publication of the reply to the letter of Mr. Foulke, which (testimony) is correctly stated in that reply.

V. Dr. Moore stated to me, in private conversation, that he did not wish his name to be used in the reply to Mr. Foulke's letter. In this matter I had no control. I heard no objection from Dr. Moore to the use of Mr. Foulke's name previously to, nor for some days after the publication of the original review. The dissatisfaction of Mr. Foulke should give neither party uneasiness. Mr. McCulloh stated to me, that at his first interview with Mr. Foulke, about the middle of May, that so far from being displeased, he seemed amused at the dispute, and stated, that his case, as described in the review, was correct. A short time after, in a handbill, he contradicted this statement. This sudden change of opinion is explained by a fact important to the discussion, which, however, cannot be made known by me, without the consent of Dr. Moore.

S. COLHOUN.

DR. EBERLE'S CERTIFICATE.

I. Sometime in the month of February last, Mr. Hanna informed me that Dr. Wilson had called at the publication office of the Recorder, and stated, on the authority of Dr. Moore, that the assertions of Dr. Gibson in regard to an experiment detailed in his paper on fractures of the thigh, were not correct. I also understood from Mr. Hanna that Dr. Moore had sent a message, through Dr. Wilson, desiring the editors of the Recorder to notice the affair, and offering his testimony in case they would publish a review of Dr. Gibson's paper.

II. Some time after the publication of G. Mc's. review, Dr. Schott informed me that Dr. Moore had related to him the correct circumstances of Mr. Foulke's case, and that he requested him to inform me of them.

III. Dr. Moore himself confessed to me, that he had stated the circumstances of Mr. Foulke's case to another surgeon of the first respectability, and had suggested to him the propriety of writing a review.

IV. Dr. Moore also stated to me, in the presence of Dr. Schott, that he had requested the reviewer and another gentleman who was with him, to visit Mr. Foulke, for the purpose of ascertaining the correctness of his information respecting Mr. Foulke's case.

JOHN EBERLE.

MR. INGERSOLL'S CERTIFICATE.

In answer to your inquiries, I can only say, that my recollection differs materially from Dr. Moore's as to one or two matters mentioned in his 'circular.'

I remember distinctly that Dr. Moore said Mr. Foulke expressed great dissatisfaction with Dr. Gibson's surgical treatment of the fractured thigh. His phrase was a strong one, and so peculiar, that it has remained on my memory.


He informed me also, in reply to a question distinctly asked, that the answers as set down by Dr. Colhoun to the written queries, were correct, but he at the same time declared, that he protested against the publication of them.


When he declined answering your note of the 6th July, he pointed out the paragraph on the tenth page of your *Review*, beginning "Mr. Charles Foulke" and ending with "their identity" as the *small part* which he had said was shown to him by you before publication.

I observe he complains of your not having sent him a copy of your "Statement of the Evidence," &c. I presume I must have brought this reproach upon you by my neglect. The copy which you left with me for Dr. Moore, I omitted to hand to him. Finding that he had already read one copy, I supposed he would not want another.

July 19, 1822.

E. INGERSOLL.






U.S. Department of
Washington, D.C.
Health, Education,
and Welfare, Public
Health Service
NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

U.S. Department of
Washington, D.C.
Health, Education,
and Welfare, Public
Health Service
NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE


U.S. Department of
Washington, D.C.
Health, Education,
and Welfare, Public
Health Service
NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

U.S. Department of
Washington, D.C.
Health, Education,
and Welfare, Public
Health Service
NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

U.S. Department of
Washington, D.C.
Health, Education,
and Welfare, Public
Health Service
NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

Gaylord 

SPEEDY BINDER

 Syracuse, N. Y.
Stockton, Calif.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE



NLM 02526906 9