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NEW ORLEANS

During the 1820's the little town of St. Francisville, Louisiana was one of the Utopias of those seeking to become wealthy from the growing of cotton. Planters moving westward from the eastern seaboard were establishing cotton plantations and were building those homes that were later so characteristic of the slave-holding period in Southern history. With wealth came the opportunity and leisure for the cultivation of the arts. Governesses were imported from the North and East for the education of the planters' children. Sons were sent to Northern schools. Libraries were collected. And so with this background, from St. Francisville came some of the outstanding leaders on the bench and in the legislative halls of the newly admitted state.

To this little town in 1820 came a young man, Edward Hall Barton, a native of Virginia, and a recent graduate of the Medical Department of the University of Pennsylvania. Why Dr. Barton elected to begin his career here can only be surmised. Louisiana at this period was the land of opportunity and was receiving annually a large influx of immigrants from the East. So probably Dr. Barton simply joined in this popular movement. Arriving in New Orleans, where he successfully passed his examination before the state medical examining board from the eastern district of Louisiana to practice medicine in the state, he no doubt heard of the opportunities awaiting a young physician establishing himself in St. Francisville.

For the next ten years nothing is known of the career of Dr. Barton. However, it can readily be assumed that during this time he was not idle, but was adding to his experience by his varied practice, and was accumulating an immense amount of facts which later when he began to publish his deductions and observations, showed him to be years ahead of his time. Without a doubt his keen powers of observation and reasoning were stimulated and strengthened by the intellectual and cultural atmosphere of which he was a part in St. Francisville and the surrounding plantations.

The first reference to Dr. Barton in the literature occurs in the August, 1830, issue of the American Journal of the Medical Sciences. Here he is listed as one of the collaborators, the first so listed from the South. From this it can be assumed that he was an active subscriber and reader of the medical literature of the day, well versed in the prevailing medical theories of that time.

In 1832 Dr. Barton published his first paper, a pamphlet entitled "The application of physiological medicine to the diseases of Louisiana." This paper is most interesting because of the light it throws on the author; for you are at once impressed with the advanced ideas advocated by the writer. This 55 page pamphlet strongly shows the tendency of the physicians of that day to theorize. However, there is this exception to the
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theorizing of Dr. Barton. His theory of "Physiological Medicine" has been carefully thought out from his own observations and deductions as drawn from actual treatment of patients. As he quoted from the works of Dr. Charles Caldwell, the only way to become acquainted with the properties of any remedy, and the states of the system to which it is adapted is not to theorize about it, but to use it, and to observe the effects which it produces.

You are at once made aware that Dr. Barton was well acquainted with all the medical theories and authorities of that day, for time and again he quotes from the works of contemporary medical authorities, both domestic and foreign. At this writing he was still under the influence of Victor Broussais and his theory of localized irritation of some viscus or organ as the cause of disease, but he was far from a follower of Broussais in his treatment of disease. He urged physicians to return to the principles of Hippocrates, emphasizing the natural history of disease, and showed that in every case patients were far better off when the physician only attempted to assist nature. He pointed out the foolishness of attributing everything that went wrong to the liver, and stated that this hypothetical assumption had been more destructive to the constitution than any single cause. Never in his experience had he found the liver diseased in performing autopsies on persons who supposedly died of a deranged liver.

He strongly attacked the practice of general bleeding, the administering of violent doses of emetics and cathartics, and had this to say in regard to the prescribing of calomel:

... some years experience of its application to practice, enables me to assure my less experienced brethren... not only that it has been much abused and empirically used, to the great injury of health and life, but that the most violent and gigantic diseases of this climate may be not only cured without it, but more safely and efficaciously controlled by other means.

This was quite a bold statement to make at this time for the empirical use of calomel was not only practiced by the profession, but supported by the public. If a physician was in doubt as to what drug to administer, he gave calomel with the assurance that if he did not give the correct drug he could not be far wrong. The public had the feeling that with the administering of calomel everything was being done for the patient that was possible.

In appealing for more sane methods in treating disease he made this comment: "It makes me shudder when I hear of 'heroic practice'; heroism in war
is built upon the slaughter of fellow creatures; it is little less in physic."

In conclusion he decried the "intemperate use of physic," and appealed for the beginning of a medical literature in Louisiana, as the primary means of advancing the cause of scientific medicine.

This pamphlet was followed by a paper which appeared in the American Journal of the Medical Sciences in which he presented several cases illustrating his method of treatment.5

Probably realizing that greater opportunities awaited him in New Orleans he accordingly moved to that city about 1833. From a professional standpoint this move was most opportune for it gave him a chance to enrich his experiences by being present during the great epidemic of yellow fever of 1833.

When his next paper appeared in 18346 one could almost be certain that he was reading a paper by that great French clinician, Pierre Louis. For here Dr. Barton began to compile facts and statistics, and by carefully analyzing these statistics to arrive at conclusions; a method, introduced by Louis, which ushered in the era of scientific medicine. It seems highly possible that Barton was not aware of Louis's work at this time for nowhere does he mention Louis in any of his papers; and as he was very generous in quoting from the works of contemporary medical authors, it seems probable that he would have mentioned Louis's works, if they had been known to him. Then, when it is considered that Louis's polemics against Broussais did not appear until 1835, and only became known in this country when translated by Dr. G. C. Putnam, it seems highly probable that Barton's use of statistics antedated even that of Louis's.

At this time Dr. Barton began to correlate facts pertaining to the weather and their relation to epidemics and diseases. He made the interesting observation that from recording temperature readings over a period of fifteen years and from temperature data obtained from the readings of other cities, he had observed that in every instance when the temperature rose above the average reading of 79° F. for at least two months during the summer, an epidemic of yellow fever was sure to follow. Of course, the phenomenon, as is known now, was that mosquitoes, the hosts for the transmission of the yellow fever virus, breed at temperatures above 80° F.

In the conclusion of his paper he presented in statistical form the record of 75 patients whom he treated. These tables showed the symptoms, general history, and finally the treatment these patients. His treatment included the administering of a laxative at first, generally an oil, followed by the administering of a cathartic of hot and cold baths, castor oil, plasms, ice, lemonade, emollient drinks, and the limited use of blood-letting, mostly local as he termed it. By this method 69 of his patients recovered and 6 died. Finally he noticed and commented on the large number of births after the epidemic, as if nature was attempting to compensate for the large death roll.

It seems logical to assume that with the organization of the first medical college in Louisiana he should associate himself with this movement. Accordingly, on the resignation of Dr. Edwin R. Smith before the opening of the college, Dr. Barton was unanimously elected to succeed him as professor of materia medica. Dr. Barton was editorially commended by a local newspaper, the New Orleans Bee, as "a gentleman of extended information, great experience as a physician, having
resided for more than 15 years in Louisiana, and in every way fully qualified for the trust."7

It was customary in those days for the professors to extend, through the medium of the press, invitations to their friends to attend their opening lectures. Accordingly the following notice occurred in the New Orleans Bee for December, 1835:8

Dr. Edward H. Barton will deliver a lecture this afternoon at 41 Royal Street —his Introductory for the season. From his known ability in his profession and diligence in accumulating observations and statistical details, we have no doubt of his being highly interesting. . . .

In this lecture which was later published in pamphlet form,9 Dr. Barton attempted to show the healthfulness of the city and its suitability for a medical school by presenting statistics showing the salubriousness of its climate based on a comparison of the ratio of children under 10, and adults over 60 and 100, with other cities. According to his figures, in Boston the ratio to the whole population of those over 60 years of age was 1 in 3.161, while in New Orleans it was 1 in 2.486. In Boston there was but 1 over 100 years of age in every 61.392, while in New Orleans there was 1 in every 997. He also expressed the opinion that since there were many diseases that were peculiar to this section of the country, anyone intending to practice medicine in the South could more advantageously study medicine here where he could better familiarize himself with the diseases. Two other papers were published by him in 1837, both dealing with statistical data pertaining to the climate of New Orleans.10

In July, 1836, Dr. Barton became dean of the medical college, serving in this capacity until June, 1840, at which time he resigned his deanship as well as his professorship. The cause of his resignation is not known. Changes in the faculty were frequent in the early sessions of the college, and in the literature no significance was attached to it.

From the perusal of many of his papers one is made aware that Dr. Barton was most temperate in all of his personal habits, for he was constantly urging his students to cultivate moderation in their mode of living. In some respects he was quite a contrast to the pleasure-loving population of New Orleans; for in an address before the New Orleans Temperance Society in 1837,11 he deplored the excessive use of alcoholic beverages and pointed out that excessive drinking was costing the people of New Orleans directly and indirectly $7,449,989 annually; and that a total of 1,824,471 gallons of alcoholic beverages was being consumed by the New Orleans population for the same period, with resulting increases in abuse and lowering of moral standards.

Dr. Barton early associated himself with the Physico-Medical Society, one of the then active medical societies of the city. Apparently for some time he was a member of the Comité Médicale, the medical examining board for the eastern district of Louisiana, for his name appears as one of its members in 1837 and 1840.12

Dr. Barton was one of the very few medical men from this state who was a member of the American Medical Association from its organization in 1848 to the day of his death in 1857. He was the only delegate from Louisiana to attend the organizational meeting of the Association in 1848, at which meeting he was appointed a member of the committee on Public Hygiene. The following year he presented a report before the convention on the sanitary condition of New Orleans.13 Here can be
seen the first signs that Dr. Barton was beginning to be disturbed over the high
death rate in the city. He mentioned
the difficulty he had in assembling data
over a forty-year period in order to draw
some accurate conclusions in regard to
the health of the city.

It can naturally be assumed that Dr.
Barton was active in organizing the first
state medical society in Louisiana; for
when a group of physicians assembled
in New Orleans in December of 1849
for that purpose, Dr. Barton was ap-
pointed one of a committee of four to
draft a constitution. At this first meet-
ing eight standing committees were ap-
pointed, and Dr. Barton was appointed
chairman of the Committee on General
and Social Hygiene of the State, Vital
Statistics and Meteorology.

At the 1851 session Dr. Barton was
elected president of the Society, and
in his presidential address the following
year he reviewed the progress of medici-
ical science in Louisiana up to that
time. He was again elected president
of the Society in 1854, and in his mes-
sage to the members at the sixth session
he deplored the lack of interest in the
Society by the members of the medical
profession in the state. Dr. Barton’s out-
look on the prospects of the State Soci-
ey was not unduly pessimistic, for no
further meetings seem to have been
held after the sixth session of 1855.

At the second annual session of the
Louisiana State Medical Society held
in March, 1851, Dr. Barton, as chair-
man of the Committee on General and
Social Hygiene of the State gave such
an interesting report on the vital statis-
tics of New Orleans that on the re-
quest of a signed petition by thirty-six
New Orleans citizens he published his
report in pamphlet form and also in
Dr. E. D. Fenner’s reports.

After laboriously compiling data on
statistics pertaining to the health of
New Orleans for forty years previously,
Dr. Barton was forced to repudiate his
previously published statements as to
the healthfulness of the city of New
Orleans. It took courage to do this. But
as he stated, the facts were there; he
could not doubt them any longer. His
figures showed the average mortality
for the city to be in the neighborhood
of 5 per cent annually, in many years
much higher. Dr. Joseph Jones, in
1882, in his annual report of the Board
of Health, not only verified Dr. Bar-
ton’s figures, but in many cases his fig-
ures placed the mortality of the city
much higher. It was in keeping with
Dr. Barton’s character that his report
analyzed the cause of the high death
rate, and showed how this could be
remedied. He attributed the cause of
this high mortality to bad air, unsanii-
tary conditions, bad water, bad habits,
and bad milk. The remedies he advo-
cated were the removal of filth of all
kinds by sewers; the immediate empty-
ing and filling of all open privies; the
drainage of stagnant water; the clean-
covering of all open places; the remov-
ing of all garbage and filth every day;
the appointment of health wardens; the
sanitation of drinking water and milk;
and the cultivation of temperate habits by
the population. In addition to these excellent
recommendations there were also in-
cluded some theories attributing the
cause of epidemics to poisonous gases
arising from the filth of the city or to
the disturbance of the soil in the dig-
ing of canals or ditches.

One can imagine the shock of such a
report to the population of a growing
metropolis like New Orleans, particu-
larly when the Boston Medical and Sur-
gical Journal commented as follows:
That people die, and have in past times died, in New Orleans in appalling numbers, is most certain; while various publications make it clear as noon-day that it is one of the healthiest residences in the world. . . . It has been no part of Dr. Barton's effort to go farther than he was strictly warranted by facts; and it is only doing him simply justice to say that he has produced a masterly document. . . .

The two most prolific medical writers of that day, Dr. Bennet Dowler and Dr. Samuel A. Cartwright, were quick to attempt to repudiate the conclusions of Dr. Barton. Dr. Cartwright made a point of how Dr. Barton had turned tail, so to speak; for after publishing data showing the healthfulness of the city, he now attempted to disprove his own conclusions. He showed that from Dr. Barton's own figures the mortality for the year was only 2.9 per cent, instead of the high figure claimed by Dr. Barton. A copy of Dr. Dowler's replication cannot be located, and knowledge of it is confined to Dr. Cartwright's paper, in which it is quoted freely.

The issue did not end there, as Dr. Barton soon replied in his own defense. In his paper he referred to the "anonymous scribbler," but here the editor of the Journal adds a footnote stating that Dr. Cartwright's article was fully signed, and unfortunately the printer failed to include his name in setting the type. Dr. A. Hester, the editor, adds: "We make this correction both as an act of justice to Dr. C. Cartwright and to inform Dr. Barton for the second time of the authorship of that review."

Evidently the editor was also annoyed with Dr. Barton.

Dr. Barton offered to discuss in the Journal with any fair opponent: (1) What has actually been the sanitary condition of New Orleans for the last thirty or forty or more years? (2) The cause of that condition? (3) Why and how is it that the public has been kept so long ignorant of that condition? (4) The remedies to remove it. So far as can be ascertained, there were no takers of this offer.

On March 21, 1853, five gentlemen of New Orleans, Drs. Bennet Dowler, N. B. Benedict, Howard Smith, I. S. Copes, and H. D. Baldwin, met to discuss the possibility of organizing an Academy of Sciences with a view to the promotion of the medical and natural sciences. On April 25, 1853, twenty-seven gentlemen assembled and organized the "New Orleans Academy of Sciences." Needless to say, Dr. Barton was one of the charter members of the Academy. The Academy was active up to 1860, being discontinued during the war years. The members met once a week, usually on Monday evenings, to hear original papers read and discussed by its members. On June 6, 1853, Dr. Barton exhibited a chart of the mortality of the city of New Orleans since 1787, with only slight interruptions, for a period of sixty-six years. Dr. Barton was then specifically asked as to the possibility of an epidemic during the coming late summer or fall, and he made this reply: "Judging from the past, if the facts exhibited by the chart were not merely coincidences, he was compelled to apprehend that the present year would be marked by a great augmentation of disease. . . ."

Did Dr. Barton's prediction prove true? His prophecy was more than fulfilled. New Orleans in the fall of that year suffered its worst epidemic of yellow fever in its entire history, and its mortality for that year totaled at least 10 per cent from all causes.

What was the result of the epidemic of 1853? As usual after every epidemic a wave of remorse and a desire to do
something to prevent the recurrence of these epidemics swept over the inhabitants of the city. Usually after every epidemic a board of health would be appointed, and after functioning for two or three years would quietly pass out of existence. It so happened that in the year 1854 a board of health was in existence, and after much urging on the part of the public, it appointed a sanitary commission to investigate the cause of the epidemic and to make recommendations for the future prevention of same.

The members appointed to the Sanitary Commission were the Hon. A. D. Crossman, Mayor of the City, Drs. E. H. Barton (chairman), A. F. Axson, S. D. McNeil, J. C. Simonds, and J. L. Riddell. These members were deputed in special instructions for inquiry and investigations and were assigned as follows: To Drs. Axson and McNeil, the investigation of the origin and mode of transmission or propagation of the late epidemic of yellow fever; to Dr. Riddell, the investigation of the influence of sewers on health, and their adaptability to the situation in our city; to Dr. Simonds, the investigation of quarantine, and the advisability of establishing quarantine for the city; and to Dr. Barton, the investigation of the sanitary condition of the city and to suggest the measures necessary to remove or prevent yellow fever epidemics, also to investigate the cause of yellow fever in other localities having intercourse with New Orleans.

One can imagine the effect of such a commission on Dr. Barton. At last the people were awakened to the realization of the needs for sanitary reforms. It must have seemed to him as if his entire life's work had been awaiting just such an opportunity. He had been trying to convince the medical profession for some years of the need of sanitary reforms without any success, and finally, the people themselves were taking the matter into their own hands and demanding the cleaning up of the city.

The Commission went immediately to work. It sat as a court of inquiry daily for about three months eliciting and inviting information from every conceivable source. Members of the Commission visited other cities in the North and East to obtain information regarding their sanitary conditions. Information pertaining to sanitary conditions throughout the yellow fever zone.
was secured through the diplomatic service of the United States Government. Throughout the report the members attempted to avoid speculative opinions, and to adapt all principles and suggestions to practical ends. With the presentation of its report, entitled "Report of the Sanitary Commission of New Orleans on the Epidemic Yellow Fever of 1853, published by authority of the City of New Orleans," the authority of the Commission ceased. It had no power to enforce its suggestions. Its authority was to make recommendations.

Our primary interest in this report is that section which was the work of Dr. Barton, namely, the recommendation to make "a thorough examination into the sanitary condition of New Orleans ... and to suggest whatever our wisdom will tend to improve and preserve the health of the metropolis."

Dr. Barton began his section of the report with some rather strong statements, as for instance:

In no part of the world is a thorough sanitary reform so much needed as in New Orleans. In no country on earth has a place been so much injured through a want of insight into her sanitary condition by her municipal officials ... and further on;

New Orleans is one of the dirtiest ... and is consequently the sickest city of the Union, and scarcely anything has been done to remedy it.

Dr. Barton included this interesting statement, which he probably felt would appeal to the inhabitants of New Orleans:

(That health is wealth, and the cause of the high cost of living in New Orleans was that) comparatively few cared to risk their lives or trust their capital, without additional compensation, for the additional risks run!

And then he stated that he felt it was the highest test of patriotism to make an attempt to alter conditions as they were at present. He pointed out the experiences of other cities in inaugurating sanitary reforms. Epidemics had been eliminated, annual mortality had dropped to an inconceivably low figure, and the longevity of the lives of its citizens had increased. He urged the citizens of New Orleans to arouse themselves from their apathy, and to realize they were sitting on a "powder keg."

To carry out the needed sanitary reforms in the city, Dr. Barton made a number of recommendations which as a whole seemed quite logical. The recommendations included the adoption of a sewerage system, the drainage of swamps, extension of the waterworks to all portions of the city, the filling in of all low places, removal of all slaughter-houses from the city, the adoption of a system of privies as recommended by the Commission, the discontinuing of interments in the city, the establishment of a health department as outlined in the report, and the establishment of a quarantine station below the city. There were a number of other recommendations of minor or question-able value, such as the building of an extensive shed the entire front of the business part of the city, the planting of trees in all parks and along avenues, the removal of all forest growths, and the prevention of any but the most superficial disturbances of the soil of the city from the 1st of May to the 15th of October.

As a whole, the editorial support of the reforms advocated by the Commission met with strong support in the New Orleans newspapers. They were extremely critical of the efforts put forth by the City Council and the Board of Health in attempting to prevent the re-
The New Or-leans Bee made this comment in regard to the city authorities: 25

The Sanitary condition of our city demands public attention. The Corporation of New Orleans has always exhibited most culpable neglect of everything essential to the health of the city.

On the appearance of the report of the Sanitary Commission the Bee again urged the City Council to action and made these pertinent comments on the report: 26

[Following the epidemic of 1853] A sanitary commission was appointed, and vested with authority to institute and elaborate investigations into the subject, and report thereon. This commission was composed of some of the ablest and most learned members of the medical faculty, and at its head was placed Dr. Edward H. Barton, whose prolonged experience, profound study of epidemics, admirable qualities as a careful and minute observer, and thoughtful and sagacious reasoner, make him eminently fit for the position. As a monument of individual industry; as the evidence of what can be performed by a single earnest, well taught, inquiring intellect, this work is probably unrivalled in the annals of medical investigation. We fervently trust that this subject will not, with habitual recklessness and indifference, be suffered to die away and be forgotten.

The New Orleans Medical News and Hospital Gazette commented on the report as follows: 27

This work is a flattering record of the zeal, labor, and ability with which the members of the Commission have fulfilled the task imposed upon them. There is no citizen of New Orleans who can fulfill his public duties as intelligently without the information given in this report, as he can with it.

Medical journals throughout the North and East were high in the praise of the report and the efforts put forth by Dr. Barton. The Buffalo Medical Journal stated: 28

The report of this Commission will, in itself, be a monument of Dr. Barton's untiring industry and devotion to the public good. Should his suggestions and recommendations be faithfully carried out, he will have a nobler monument in the health and prosperity of the great city which he is so valuable a citizen.

Dr. Barton urges upon the authorities the old means of prevention. With him, sewage, paving, cleanliness, are the Trinity whose unit is health.

The Boston Medical and Surgical Journal made this favorable enjoiner: 29

They have spoken out boldly, like honest men and medical philosophers. The report is a monument for transmitting the names of those who have recorded their observations in it, to after ages. They discovered filth enough in the city to create a plague, and have had the honesty and fearlessness to proclaim it in the ears of the magnates.

Unfortunately, in the ranks of the medical profession in the city there was a diversified opinion as to the merits of the recommendation. The New Orleans Medical and Surgical Journal, edited by Dr. Bennet Dowler was extremely critical of the merits of the report. However, from a perusal of the attack upon the report, you are forced to conclude that Dr. Dowler's objections were based largely upon a personal dislike of Dr. Barton. One is amazed at the venom of Dr. Dowler's attack on Dr. Barton. Such sentences as these abound throughout the paper: 30

This Sanitary Report, or Dr. Barton's Report, is a solemn, pompous burlesque, unwittingly made on the English language, and all its fundamental principles of construction. Why did not the
Commissioners protest against his bad English, incoherent arguments, inaccurate statements, and numerous contradictions. . . . Of tautologies, affected verbiages, false metaphors, unwarranted hyperboles, obscure, incoherent, and involved sentences, and fruitless attempts at fine writing and sublimity, nothing will further be said.

There were other criticisms of Dr. Barton's work, and on May 1, 1855, Dr. Barton read a report before the New Orleans Academy of Sciences, the first of a long series of reports, in defense of his work. In the opening paragraph he made this gentlemanly reply to the remarks of Dr. Dowler: 31

The subjects involved in the discussion have long engaged the profession and the public in the mazes of controversy. It did not flatter itself with the expectation that all these were to be settled at once. But it anticipated from the courtesy of the Profession, in view, no less of the magnitude than of the complicated character of the points involved, (being strictly those of a scientific character,) that the discussion of their merits, their value and the new principles involved, would be temperate, courteous and strictly confined to the subjects at issue. In this, it has the honor to acknowledge, it has not been disappointed, and that, with one single exception, the Report has met, throughout the whole Union, with a kindness of reception unsurpassed in literary annals.

Two later editions were issued by Dr. Barton, including his part of the Report of the Sanitary Commission. The new material added were further explanations of his recommendations and answers to his critics.

What action was taken by the city authorities on the recommendations as contained in the report? Nothing. Editorially the New Orleans Bee became lukewarm over the proposed quarantine section of the report, as it would interfere with the commerce and trade of the city. Public sentiment had prompted the appointment of the Commission after the epidemic of 1853, and by this time interest on the part of the public had waned. Life in New Orleans was moving fast. There was much money to be made. What if the span of life in New Orleans was only twenty-three years? It was a gay twenty-three years. What was the public to believe when the city authorities kept assuring them that New Orleans was the healthiest city in the Union? Even the New Orleans Bee proclaimed this assertion, although it had the honesty to admit this was not true during epidemic years.

Probably the attitude on the part of the public can be summed up in an editorial which occurred in the Bee: 32

After all our knowledge respecting yellow fever, its causes and the means of preventing its appearance is equally empirical and unsatisfactory. What can we really know of the occult agencies which generate the disease, when we see some scientific men proclaiming it indigenous, while others affirm that it is imported; one stoutly maintaining that filth engenders it, while another strenuously argues the reverse; Medicus No. 1 confidently asserting that quarantine is our only salvation, Medicus No. 2 ridiculing with inextinguishable laughter the idea that the disease is of foreign origin. The upshot of these diametrically opposite conclusions is that we are wholly ignorant of the causes of yellow fever.

Dr. Barton then had the unhappy task of attempting to introduce sanitary measures in a city which cared very little to be cleaned up. Also he had against him the indifference or the hostile attitude of a part of the medical profession which did not believe in his reforms or were indifferent to them. So indifferent were the city authorities
to their obligations in defraying the expense of the Commission which they had authorized, that Dr. Barton and his associates were forced to sue the city government for expenses and obligations incurred in conducting the investigation.

Information regarding the last year of Dr. Barton’s life is meager. He is simply reported as lying in 1857 in North Carolina. What caused his death and his departure from the state and city where he had resided for thirty-seven years can only be surmised, undoubtedly keen disappointment and a bitter disillusionment in his fellow citizens. A broken heart probably caused his death.

Dr. Barton was one of those unfortunate individuals who lived years ahead of his time. The reforms that he advocated were long in coming. The torch that he lighted was never quite extinguished; but it remained for the medical reformers of the 80's, notably Dr. Joseph Jones and those who followed him, to fan the feeble flame into a beacon of enlightenment.

To Dr. Barton truly may be assigned this quotation:

A prophet is never without honor, save in his own country.
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