It is also impossible to say how often the patients would have recovered of themselves without treatment, as in three very mild cases, where all medicines were refused by the patients, complete recovery took place within a few days.

The number of relapses was 8 on 117 recoveries. Owing to the uncertain results obtained by the various anti-dysenteric sera they were not tried at all in this series of cases.

Diet.—The diet in the majority of the cases consisted of milk and arrowroot while the diarrhœa lasted, and was gradually increased afterwards, fruit and green vegetables being withheld for at least two months after the disappearance of symptoms.

In conclusion, I should very much like to know what forms of treatment are adopted by members of the Association and with what success, especially in regard to anti-dysenteric sera, as the present rate of mortality of 1 in 5 or 6 is a very large one.

(1) A paper read at the Autumn Meeting of the South-Western Division, held at Bristol on October 28th, 1910.

On Insanity and Marriage.(1) By G. H. SAVAGE, M.D. Lond., F.R.C.P., Consulting Physician for Mental Diseases, Guy's Hospital.

THE subject of marriage and insanity is one which is at present beyond practical legislation in this country, but is of immense importance for the social stability and for individual welfare. Though we cannot legislate we have to advise, and our advice is sometimes taken. The lay public as a whole, and the majority of medical men, would at once reply to the question as to the insane ever being allowed to marry in the negative, but I shall contend that a dogmatic statement of this kind is unscientific and unpractical. Such a declaration is taking it for granted that all insanity is alike and is to be treated as of equal value. I shall begin, then, by saying that in my belief certain persons who have suffered from a degree of mental disorder which may be classed as insanity may yet recover and marry with no real increase of risk to their partner or to their children. If I say this, you will next expect me to give examples of the forms of insanity which I should consider as not being of vital importance.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.57.236.97 Published online by Cambridge University Press

First, then, I have seen a good many adolescent cases with melancholic symptoms, many with marked hypochondriacal ideas who have recovered, and have after the interval of some years married and have borne the burden and heat of the world with sanity and well-being.

Again, I have met with a good number of adolescent cases with maniacal excitement who have recovered completely, and have had no recurrence of mental disorder, and who have married and have remained healthy and sane.

Rather apart from such cases, I have met with cases of women who, having had attacks of insanity before the menopause, have married when past child-bearing and have remained well; but few would recommend such unions.

I have seen a few cases in which there was acute delusional insanity, probably toxic in origin, in which recovery has taken place and in which satisfactory married life has followed, but I admit at once that I should hesitate before advising marriage in such cases. I think in all these cases the question of family neurosis must be considered, and would influence one's advice. Again, cases in which after recovery the patient had been free from dread of recurrence are more favourable than those whose dread may act as auto-suggestion. Doubtless many of my audience can give examples of other forms of cases of insanity in which marriage might be justified.

And now as to the cases in which marriage should be hindered or prevented. In no case should it be allowed where there is a history of periodical recurrences, and it is certain that there is very grave risk in those cases of adolescents who at puberty and with adolescence have periods of depression and buoyancy. I have seen a good many such cases in which there has been marriage in haste with a leisure of repentance. I think suppression of the facts as to such attacks should really be a ground for declaration of nullity.

It is so firmly established in the public mind that direct heredity is the chief cause of insanity that the question as to marriage of persons with insane relations is constantly brought before one. It is impossible to prevent marriage of all related to the insane; if you did you would not benefit the race, and I have seen many instances of breeding out of neurotic types.

Neurotic heredity certainly must influence your advice when you have to decide when the patient has symptoms of some

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.57.236.97 Published online by Cambridge University Press

form of insanity, such as delusional insanity, which is generally met with in members of insane families.

I would never allow marriage in any cases where there are fully organised delusions or hallucinations. I have met with cases in which a man has slowly isolated himself as the result of concealed ideas of persecution, and in one case I have known such a one marry with the one idea that he thus was getting a protector between him and his tormentors. In this case a nullity was decreed. I learnt some years ago of the danger of acting on what appeared to be justifiable grounds in such a case.

A middle-aged man of independent position had developed general alopecia, and had become terribly sensitive to the notice of the persons whom he met. Doubtless they looked at him, but he misinterpreted their looks and gradually shunned society. He would only go out after dark, and then alone. He had hallucinations of hearing, and was profoundly suspicious. He contracted influenza, which was followed by pneumonia, and during his very severe illness he was nursed most carefully by a woman of middle age. He was very grateful, and was persuaded that there was at least one human being who did not detest him. He offered her marriage, and after seeing her I decided that, being past child-bearing and understanding the possibilities of a future re-development of the disorder, she might marry him. It was arranged that in any case a fixed income should be settled on her. All went well for a time, but again the delusions arose, and he nearly murdered his wife, and had once more to be sent to an asylum. Next, I cannot think that marriage should ever be permitted in cases in which there has been epilepsy with any mental symptoms. I am in doubt whether any epileptic should be allowed to marry, but I have in my mind at present several instances of women subject to *petit mal* who have lived and had healthy children though epileptic. Yet the risk is very great. There can be no doubt that with any form of mental disorder epilepsy should be a bar to marriage.

It is, I admit, difficult, and apparently hard, to say to a girl of twenty, subject hitherto only to nocturnal attacks, that she ought not to marry, but my experience makes me say this strongly.

I feel equally strongly about marriage in cases of moral

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.57.236.97 Published online by Cambridge University Press

perversions; I have seen so many wrecked lives of women who have married drunkards with the notion of reforming them. Marriage, like other events in life, may check a few in their downward course, but I should be strongly opposed to advise the risk to anyone whom one loved. Again, in cases of sexual perversion and in cases of impotence the advice to marry is certain to be dangerous, or worse.

Nearly allied to these cases one has to consider those of general paralysis of the insane, and I fancy many of us have had difficulties in these cases. Men with early acute symptoms may apparently recover before you are really certain that the disease is general paralysis of the insane, and then after a short period with the feeling of buoyancy and with general amorousness the patient wishes to marry, and I have to admit that I have been obliged in some cases to say, "Well, I think it is a mistake, but I cannot be certain as yet that the disease is general paralysis of the insane." I have known disaster follow rapidly after marriage in such cases. In fact, I always feel grave risk in not preventing marriage in any case in which there has been clear evidence of constitutional nerve trouble depending on syphilis. I have seen miserable results following marriage of tabetic subjects, as well as in those who have had some local cranial nerve affections.

Marriage should never be recommended as a means of cure. In so-called hysterical cases the prospect even of relief is small, and the risk of permanent alienation is great. I have seen several cases in which after such marriages there has been separation, and others in which application for divorce has been made. I would speak equally strongly against marriage as relief for so-called neurasthenia or hypochondriasis, and I have already said that for sexual disorder it is dangerous.

Allied to the above subject is that of insanity and divorce, but as this is likely to be brought before the Commission at present sitting I shall not speak on the matter.

I leave, then, the points for discussion to be:

Should anyone who has been certified as of unsound mind be allowed to marry? If so, which cases or which forms of insanity may be considered as not barring healthy unions and healthy offspring?

Should not the recurrence of any form of insanity be a bar?

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.57.236.97 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Should evidence of syphilitic affection of the central nervous system bar marriage?

Should marriage ever be recommended in cases of mental disorder?

Should insanity be a plea for divorce?

(1) Opening paper read in the Section of Psychology and Neurology at the Annual Meeting of the British Medical Association, London, July, 1910. Reprinted from the *British Medical Journal*.

Joint Discussion

on

Dr. Savage's paper, "On Insanity and Marriage," and Dr. Ewart's paper, "Eugenics and Degeneracy" (see *Journal of Mental Science*, October, 1910, pp. 670-685).

At the Quarterly Meeting held in London, November 15th, 1910.

Mr. Crackanthorpe said that the most gratifying thing to him as an outsider and a social inquirer was to find that the subject which had been dealt with by Dr. Savage and that of Dr. Ewart's paper were engaging the attention of an important scientific meeting like the present. It was now forty years since Sir Francis Galton published *Hereditary Genius*; and he followed it up twenty years afterwards by another book called *Natural Inheritance*. The beginning was small, but the subject was now assuming enormous importance. One had only to consider what had happened in regard to the Divorce Commission, which had been alluded to by the authors of both the papers. The Commission started with the notion that the venue of divorce should be extended to county courts. Now that the question had grown so much it was encouraging to all social inquirers, not only throughout England, Scotland and Wales—Ireland did not look at those things—but on the continent generally. He was much interested and gratified to hear Dr. Savage's paper, and desired to congratulate that gentleman on it. Dr. Ewart and Dr. Savage had traversed different lines of thought. In Dr. Savage's paper he rather missed that which he found so fully developed in Dr. Ewart's contribution, namely, a consideration of the effect of insanity upon children. Dr. Savage did say he discountenanced the marriage of epileptics and of those suffering from other forms of mental disturbance; but he did not insist, at all events so much as did Dr. Ewart, on the transmissibility of insanity. What eugenists, like himself, wanted to know was to what extent and in what forms insanity was hereditable? He ventured to say to the Divorce Commission, who pressed him on the point, that the recurrent insanity which Dr. Savage dealt with was a much more dangerous thing than permanent insanity; because the subject suffering from recurrent insanity was periodically given his or her liberty, and the woman often became the mother of children, had a relapse, and went back again. The same thing happened with them as Miss Dendy stated with regard to the feeble-minded —that the feeble-minded, when they were let out, became mothers. And as Nature seemed to have ordained that these people should be more prolific than those of sound mind, they populated the country in their own districts with feeble-minded children, and that was very much to be deprecated in the interests of the community as a whole. Dr. Ewart dealt with a large field of both positive and negative eugenics. With regard to negative eugenics, he (the speaker) wished to submit to the meeting that the time had arrived when public opinion should insist that people did not marry, or rather that they were not given in marriage—which was much more often the case in regard to young women of good social standing—without some previous inquiry being made as to the sort of family into which the girl, in the one case, or the young man in the other, was going to enter. In his own personal experience he had known many people who had married blindfold, and after having been married two or three months something queer had happened,

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.57.236.97 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the husband had displayed some erratic quality, and on inquiry—of course, after the door had been shut by the marriage—it had been found out that the aunt, grandmother, or brother, or all of them, had been under restraint from time to time. That was a most distressing thing, distressing to the parties, and distressing to the next generation. It was time that sort of thing was stopped, and it was to the medical profession the general public looked to put a stop to it by saying, as he hoped it would be shown they were able to say, what was and what was not transmissible disease. The evil did not stop at insanity, but included all the disorders which meant mental deterioration or physical degeneration as the result of producing in the world children who never could support themselves and must be a burden to their parents. If that time should come merely by the growth of scientific knowledge on the one part, and of lay enthusiasm on the other part, we should probably arrive within reasonable distance of the State requiring that there should be produced some *primâ facie* testimony of fitness before people were allowed to marry. How could anything be more absurd than the state of affairs at present existing? Two people, presumably belonging to the Church of England, became engaged to be married, and the only precaution taken was that the banns were published in churches which they and their relatives probably did not attend, and the lawful impediment which one was asked to declare in the vestry—the *only* lawful impediment—was that the man was the uncle of the bride, or that there was some other forbidden affinity between them, or a consanguinity, which was specified in the table of kindred hung up in the church and to be found at the end of the prayer-book. If anyone present at such a ceremony were to say: "The marriage you are going to celebrate next moment you ought not to celebrate, because I know the man's and lady's families are brimful of lunacy," he would render himself liable to an action for slander, and if the marriage did not proceed the bishop might hold that the minister was not performing his duties as prescribed by his Church. It was the opinion which he had expressed that one wanted to see grow, and those interested in the question were looking forward to meetings of that kind, where there were scientific men, and not mere enthusiasts, to forward the cause which they had at heart—a cause which would ultimately lead to the elimination of the unfit, the propagation of the fit, and the raising to a higher level, moral, intellectual, and spiritual, of the human race.

Dr. Hyslop said he thought that these two papers had come before the Association at a very opportune moment, because, in consequence of various reports and royal commissions, the general public was becoming alive to the fact that there were conditions which brought about degeneracy in the community, and that it must be dealt with sooner or later, first of all by education of the people; and, if that did not suffice, by legislation. He had the honour of being in the Chair at the meetings of the Neurological and Psychological Section of the British Medical Association, to which Dr. Savage had referred, and at which he read his paper. It received a full discussion, but he agreed with the author that before the Medico-Psychological Association it was likely to be dealt with much more thoroughly in discussion. Subsequently it struck him very forcibly, when giving evidence before the Commission on divorce, that divorce was not really the main question; and he thought the Chairman himself, Lord Gorell, had come to the conclusion that before inquirers could get down to the bed-rock, they must get at the conditions which regulated marriages. By the time the Divorce Commission had finished, which would probably be a year hence, there would be available a good deal of information which could be laid before the public, and which he felt almost certain would lead to a second commission, whose duty would be the consideration of reform of the conditions under which marriages were entered into. With regard to Dr. Savage's paper, before that Divorce Commission sat, he, Dr. Hyslop, mentioned the same conditions as those referred to by Dr. Savage, and agreed with what he now said as to the various conditions under which marriage should not be allowed. And he believed, for instance, that marriage should not be permitted in cases in which amorousness was a symptom of breaking down. Though it was difficult to detect, early general paralysis and the condition of early senile dements should be a bar, and under no condition should marriage be recognised as a remedy for either the male or the female. Of course, his experience was not nearly as extensive as that of Dr. Savage; but there were two classes of people who came to one for advice as to marriage. The first class were very

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.57.236.97 Published online by Cambridge University Press

much afraid that the physician in question would stop the marriage, or advise against it. If one told such people they should not marry, they went away and took no notice of the advice; they wished to be married, and they were. The other class of individual came to one as a forlorn hope, trusting that one would forbid the banns. To this end they raked up all sorts of family eccentricities, and appealed to the physician for comfort and for some justification of their desire to break off the match. Later on, when the alienist physician had succeeded in educating himself, the education of the public would follow. Then came the question as to how one was to fall into line with the methods of the Church. He had had many conversations on that point, and he thought it might be taken for granted that the Church generally would be vastly relieved if they could have the responsibility of sanctioning marriages removed from their shoulders. He believed that in course of time, as happened with nearly every other movement, if the public did not act upon the knowledge they had gained, if they did not act from an eugenic point of view, or if they did things which were harmful, and even dangerous, to the community, remedial legislation would follow. He thought—though he had no authority for stating it, except as the result of conversations with members of the Church—that the Church would welcome being relieved of responsibility if a sufficient guarantee could be forthcoming from the medical faculty, either by certificate or by some other means, that such and such persons were in a fit condition to marry and propagate children. The Church would not be found to be adverse to the idea of a certificate being given before marriage. The present was a most opportune moment for the discussion of the subject, and he hoped it would be thrashed out thoroughly. Ultimately he felt sure the subject would be widened so as to include other diseases and other questions, which were shelved by the meeting of the British Medical Association because they covered too wide a field.

Dr. DONKIN said he would like to offer a few comments on Dr. Ewart's paper, and particularly his division of the subject of eugenics into positive and negative. His own opinion, which he would like to express very strongly indeed, was that the time was not yet nearly ripe, if indeed it ever would become ripe, to begin to act upon the principles of positive eugenics. By that he meant that the time had not yet come when one could think of saying, "These are the qualities shown by men and women which will be inherited, and these are the qualities which will not be inherited." But a little positive knowledge was possessed on the negative side, *i.e.*, there were certain classes of people who were obviously defective in mind or body, and in regard to which there were strong reasons for believing, if not in many cases absolute proof, that that defect would tend to be inherited; that it often was inherited, and, to the best of one's belief, it tended to be so. And the only example which he would give on that occassion was obvious mental defect, which was shown by many signs, and not merely because the person affected took up one line of action. He meant the cases of so-called congenital imbecility and feeble-mindedness. He thought that was the class of case in which detentive restriction of procreation should be undertaken. And that function should, he thought, be undertaken by the State. He was of opinion that this was the limit which existing science should sanction in any efforts to control this evil. It need be scarcely said that there was another side to the question if the State should undertake to say "These were the people who should marry and procreate, and these others should not." It was certain that if this were done by the State it would be done with imperfect knowledge. And if our knowledge on these matters became more perfect the law would not be followed. It would result in marriage being diminished, but no doubt individuals would still do as they liked, and numbers of children, healthy or unhealthy, would be propagated.

Dr. C. MERCIER said it had occurred to him in listening to the debate that in seeking to interfere by legislation with marriage and the procreation of children, members were rather in the position of persons who would mend a watch by stirring its interior with a skewer. There was not yet sufficient knowledge available on the various factors to enable members of the profession to tender trustworthy advice to the Legislature. Medical men did not yet know sufficiently accurately what qualities were hereditable and what qualities were not. In the first place they did not know sufficiently how to discover the possession of what the Mendelians called "recessive qualities" in various people who proposed to marry; neither did they

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.57.236.97 Published online by Cambridge University Press

know what effect a combination of various qualities in the parents would have upon the offspring. In fact, on that question the ignorance was many-sided and extensive; and he thought that for the profession, in the present state of its ignorance, to presume to tender advice to the Legislature as to what enactments should be made with respect to restrictions on, or as to permissions for, marriage, would be exceedingly dangerous. It was not sufficiently recognised, when restriction of procreation was spoken of, that restriction or limitation of procreation had always prevailed in every language and people, and in every age. There was no tribe of savages which did not practise restriction of families. There was no particular reason why every healthy woman who married at, say, twenty, should not have twenty children; the only barrier was voluntary restriction. It was absurd to suppose that that voluntary restriction would be stopped; it never would. And if there was to be restriction of marriage in the case of persons who appeared to be notoriously unfit to marry, then one had to face the alternative which had just been stated by Dr. Donkin, and which seemed for the moment to have been forgotten, that marriage was not an essential preliminary to procreation. It must be borne in mind that there was such a thing as illegitimacy. With regard to the duty of the physician, nothing impressed him more in Dr. Savage's address than the caution with which he stated his main propositions, a caution which was justified, he thought, by the present state of knowledge. One found that it was not those of most experience who spoke most dogmatically on that subject. It was extremely doubtful what would be the effect on the spouses and what effect would be produced on the offspring as a result of any particular marriage. With certain of Dr. Savage's dicta he would most cordially agree, and those he would strongly endorse. One of those was that marriage should never be entered into as a remedial measure. Even if it were successful it would not be justifiable, and, in fact, it practically never was successful. But when Dr. Savage came to the restriction of marriages on the ground of insanity, and the probability that such marriages would be disastrous in consequence of the subsequent insanity of the person who had been insane before contracting the marriage, then the author became exceedingly cautious and spoke only tentatively. And that was an attitude which he thought all who had had experience would endorse. He would conclude by saying that he thought any legislation on that subject, either negative or positive, would be extremely premature. He did not consider that the profession was in a position to tender advice to the Legislature; there was not yet sufficient advice available to go upon. But in matters which were exceedingly obvious, such as that feeble-minded girls at sixteen years of age should not be turned out into the streets, resulting in their becoming prostitutes, which was what occurred now, it was a case of common sense, upon which all would agree. But to say medical men could predict what marriages should be contracted, and what marriages should not be, was going much beyond their last.

Miss DENDY expressed her great appreciation of the opportunity of hearing the discussion. It was not possible to have 225 feeble-minded boys and girls and young men and women under one's care without wishing to know all that could be said about the subject. Having enjoyed the privilege of reading carefully Dr. Ewart's paper, and having seen the report of Dr. Savage's paper and heard it again, there were one or two comments which she would like to offer. With regard to insanity, she could not say she had had much experience of it, except that it was constantly found, in inquiring into family histories, that the feeble-minded had insane progenitors. The parents of a particular child may have been sane, but one or more grandparents had been in asylums. She could quite confirm what Dr. Ewart said about the difficulties of getting reliable family histories without considerable experience of the people who gave them. Only on the previous day she saw a woman who had reported her child to the school attendance officer, and who had not reported any family history of the child at all. She put it to the woman that if that little person were received into the special residential school, she would require to be detained for life, and the reply was, "Yes, I wish her to be kept; I have had too much bother with her father." "Was there trouble there, then?" "Yes, he died in an asylum, and his sister died in an asylum." A point was stretched in favour of that little girl, and she was admitted, because it was not desired that she should be added to the unhappy class to which reference had been made. Much stress had been laid upon the case of girls in this matter,

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.57.236.97 Published online by Cambridge University Press

but she thought it was usual to regard the case of the boys as of less importance than it really deserved. The woman came under more notice than did the man, and that was true at every point in her career. But boys were nearly as weak and quite as mischievous; and there were three boys to every two girls. The Sandlebridge Colony began with boys, and though it started with equal accommodation for boys and girls, there was now a difference—225 altogether, of whom 86 only were girls. There was a passage in Dr. Ewart's paper on which she would like to comment: "Many of the high-grade type of feeble-mindedness are capable of earning their own living under favourable circumstances, although, perhaps, not of competing on equal terms with their normal fellow-beings"; and later, "Think for one moment of the cruel injustice which would be meted out to these unfortunate cases by locking them up for life in colonies." She thought that if Dr. Ewart had seen more feeble-minded, and fewer insane people, he would not have thought it a cruel injustice to keep those people from the stress of the streets. Weakness of will, in proper circumstances, made for morality and for happiness. She had had the great pleasure of spending three weeks with Dr. Fernald, of Waverley (State Institution for the Feeble-minded, Massachusetts), and he taught her many things. Happiness was the normal condition of the feeble-minded; they had neither remorse for what had gone, nor any apprehension concerning what might happen in the future. At Sandlebridge they built upon the weakness of the will factor. That was the fact which was common to all of them: they had practically no will-power. She had always held that if those people were so easily guided for wrong in improper circumstances, they could be equally well guided toward right in proper circumstances. Therefore Sandlebridge took such cases very early, and treated them as they wished them to go on, as good children. Many so-called moral perverts or natural criminals had been made over to the home. That was the character they came with. But she was able to say that of all who came there, only two had been of that type really. That one exception who was in the home was so weak in his will that his evil propensities could be overcome. He was now nineteen, and could be managed as if he were a baby. Many of the children had been in the home over eight years; four were over twenty-one years of age, and she could assure the meeting at their coming of age party their only conversation was as to what they should do with the farm stock in future years. They had no wish to leave, and the only inclinations and ideas which seemed to exercise them were those which were put into their heads by the responsible officials of the home. Yet there were thousands of similar people abroad in the land, who were left to take their ideas from their evil-disposed associates. Such a state of things was the height of folly. Three brothers in one family were sent to the home, their father having died in the workhouse. There were three elder brothers and one sister outside, all of the same type as the three in the home. One of the brothers and one sister married, and now had children, all of a very low type. Two other brothers had joined the ranks of the unemployed, and one of the lads in the home occasionally became restless, and said he wished to join the unemployed; that was what would occur if he left. Many such people belonged to the unemployed. She wished to be careful how she spoke of such things, because some had accused her of saying that all unemployed people were feeble-minded. There were many more such people about than was generally supposed. She herself had a list of over 3,000, and additions were pouring in day by day. But where it came home to one was that when the Royal Commission appointed Dr. Melland to make his investigation in Manchester, she gave him every assistance, and so did the Education Committee and Dr. Ashby. What any man could do in the time was done. She believed that since that investigation was made the number of such cases had been doubled, simply because the school medical officers were on the look-out for such cases, and detected them in school. It would thus be seen that it was a question which could not be allowed to go much longer without very serious action being taken. She hoped an attempt would be made to obtain some measure of relief from the Government. It was all very well for people to run homes like her own—that was kept going privately only by very hard work, and at present they had only the Government grant for the ordinary school work. What was now being done was altogether inadequate, and she hoped that all interested in the question would stand out for some part of the recommendations of the Royal Commission. If a beginning were made she hoped more would

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.57.236.97 Published online by Cambridge University Press

be asked for, and that there would be a good prospect of obtaining it. With regard to the question as it concerned epileptics, she wished to speak with all deference, but it had been her experience, after having had many epileptics under her notice, that they were very often the grandchildren of epileptics, the parents themselves being normal. That seemed to her to have been a constant occurrence, as did also the occurrence of deaf-mutes in the grandchildren of feeble-minded persons. Those things were frequently met with in the histories of feeble-minded children.

Dr. FLETCHER BEACH said he rose especially for the purpose of making some remarks on the paper by Dr. Ewart, which appeared in the *Journal of Mental Science*, and which he had read with great interest, pleasure, and profit. He thought all would agree with the statement that national progress could only take place when means were taken to increase the fit and decrease the unfit. Dr. Ewart then pointed out that the proper way to decrease the unfit was to put them into permanent institutions for the feeble-minded. He, Dr. Beach, had for a long time held that cases of what was termed "moral imbecility" should be put into institutions where they could be employed, and be no longer in the position of social defects in the State, but where, on the other hand, they could lead happy lives and contribute towards their own support. And after devoting further thought to the subject, he was convinced of the fact to which Miss Dendy had alluded, that the only way in which feeble-minded cases could be treated and their numbers reduced was by putting them into permanent institutions. He had had the opportunity of visiting Miss Dendy's institution some years ago, and he was very much pleased with it. The National Association for the Feeble-minded had established a permanent home near Tonbridge in Kent. But those institutions were only drops in the ocean; it was necessary to have a large number of them established. The difficulty was how to get those institutions taken up and supported. Charity alone would not do it, and until the State could be prevailed upon to take the matter up he feared it was not likely that the requirements would be carried out as well as they should be. The important fact which had been brought before the Commission appointed to inquire into the question of the feeble-minded was that many feeble-minded girls went out of the workhouse and became mothers, their children also being imbecile. The mothers then went into the workhouse, after a time went out again, and the same thing happened over again. In that way the increase of the unfit was going along to an alarming extent. He agreed with what had been said as to the difficulty of obtaining reliable family histories. Some years ago, when he was superintendent of the Darenth Asylum, he analysed a considerable number of cases in conjunction with his friend, Dr. Shuttleworth, who was superintendent of the Royal Albert Asylum, and they both found great difficulty with the parents, who always seemed anxious to say that their children's imbecility was due, not to any congenital cause, but to something which occurred after birth, because they thought it was a stigma on themselves that it should be thought they had brought an imbecile child into the world. Dr. Ewart went on to speak in his paper about the dangers which thrifty and far-seeing members of the community ran in postponing their marriage, and, when married, in restricting the number of their offspring. He feared that that danger did exist, and Dr. Ewart admitted in his paper that it occurred; he said the better class restricted the number of their offspring, whereas people who had neurotic tendencies always begat large families. He, the speaker, did not consider himself a pessimist, but he believed that we were travelling towards a fall, and that the only way in which that fall could be arrested was for the State to interfere to prevent the unfit getting married. Dr. Ewart also said that the State might honour and reward those in all ranks of life who could produce, and did produce, healthy and able children. He, Dr. Beach, regarded that as Utopian. The State appeared to devote so little attention to the people that the remedy seemed far off.

Dr. HAYES NEWINGTON said he felt thankful to Dr. Mercier for his remarks, by means of which he had given the meeting a true lead. Dr. Mercier had warned the Association not to express anything like a definite opinion, although one would feel only too anxious to gratify Mr. Crackanthorpe after all the labour he had expended in that direction. He hoped the Association would not be beguiled into expressing an opinion, for its members did not know enough about that particular matter. Before venturing an opinion the subject should be debated, not only in meetings, but by very strong committees. It was a matter of regret to him, and, he believed, to others also, that the question of marriage and divorce, which, like

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.57.236.97 Published online by Cambridge University Press

King Charles' head, turned up periodically in debate, was not dealt with in the same way. He did not forget that in that matter humanity was the subject of tremendous laws, laws which were above human laws. The law of selection was known, and it might be right in time, when more was known about the subject, to interfere with Nature. Until that knowledge was in our possession it would be very dangerous to proffer advice on the matter. If alienists looked into the matter very carefully and had more time to work up the subject, it would be found that there was considerable evidence of the ill-effects of interfering with Nature on insufficient premisses. He could call one to mind on the spur of the moment, namely, with regard to the marriages of the old days in the upper circles; how this young lady was sacrificed to the ambitions of the family, and had to marry a certain old man for his name's sake, or marry a rich stock-broker for his money's sake. Society held up its hands and was aghast at it. Some impression was made, and the young people of the day threw on one side the restraining influence of the seniors. But what had it ended in? They went to the Gaiety for their wives. Directly one set to work to try to check Nature, Nature would have its revenge and turn matters the other way. He would not desire to take up the attitude that nothing must be done; something must be done, but one must set to work in a very slow and cautious way. If he had not some suggestion in that direction he would not have risen to utter what he regarded as truisms. But Dr. Savage, in his paper, suggested that before marriage there should be a definite right to ask a definite question on each side; that one might ask the other as to the occurrence of pre-existing insanity. That was a most valuable suggestion, and was the best outcome of the whole of the talk on the subject of the direction of marriage, divorce, and eugenics. That would be a very great beginning. It might, perhaps, have an effect in the upper classes first, but it would surely extend to the lower classes; that each side should have the right to ask that question of the other; and that any suppression of the truth should form a sufficient ground for annulment of the marriage. And one would not necessarily stop at the question of insanity. One might very well, as in the case of filling up a form for life assurance, be expected to answer a series of questions. And it would be far better to start that line of inquiry, which, after all, was likely to elicit the truth, than to depend on medical certificates, which, however well given, must very often lead to exclusion of the truth, because truth was suppressed from want of knowledge. If everybody had to answer in a definite form the questions in the same spirit in which they had to answer their Maker when they made the marriage contract the effect of that must be of some value in the end; and he commended the idea to the meeting.

Dr. CARSWELL said he was sure all the members must have been much impressed by Miss Dendy's remarks. One observation which struck him very forcibly was that the feeble-minded were characterised by loss of will-power; and her description of the process which led to the contentment that prevailed in the homes indicated a tendency towards facility of mind. That he regarded as practically universally true of the feeble-minded whom one got to know in infancy and childhood. But everybody knew, who had had experience of the mentally defective who became troublesome in after life, that facility of conduct was by no means a characteristic. It was important to recognise that there was a mental defect which showed itself in only a very limited degree in infancy and childhood, which was no bar to the passing of the ordinary examination tests for mentally defective school children, but which occurred after puberty and showed itself in a certain inability to adjust himself or herself to the ordinary environment. Such people became aggressive and anti-social as well as asocial. That class of mental defectives was a very numerous one. When followed out they were found to be able to pass the third or fourth standard tests, but were able to go little further. And he had found the same characteristic in children of the richer class who had been educated in boarding schools; that there was a stunting of their intellectual capacity; and that though they could manage to go through the school without being absolute dunces, yet their capacity seemed to be arrested, and they presented during adolescence and later life many of the features of mere juvenility, along with qualities which characterised acquired criminality and other qualities which need not now be described. It was very important to keep in mind that the mentally defective—those who, in the main, had been dealt with in this discussion

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.57.236.97 Published online by Cambridge University Press

—were, as shown by school examinations, of a facile type, and presented a comparatively easy problem. He used the phrase "comparatively easy problem" because Miss Dendy's closing remarks left the impression that the remedy was all a question of organisation and money. When one viewed that mass of feeble-mindedness—whether it were the feeble-mindedness of the facile type or time of life, or the feebleness of intellect which he had attempted to describe which came on, or, at least, was manifested, after puberty and in adolescence, and which was not to be confounded with dementia præcox—it was a significant fact that those who had been dealing with that mass of feeble-mindedness in the community listened with a very sympathetic ear to the suggestions which came to them from their friends who had been advocating and pushing that view of eugenics. But he confessed that the remedies which had been suggested did not appeal to him, and he wished to endorse every word which Dr. Mercier had said. He had been particularly struck with the fact that from first to last in the course of this discussion, not a single word had been heard with reference to the influence of alcoholism in the production of unfitness. He wondered what had come of that view of the causation of mental defect. It was extremely significant, this silence of those who had been speaking so strongly on the inherited influence of alcohol in producing feeble-mindedness in children, that in a discussion such as this probably no one would be found to get up and say that was the root cause of all the trouble. When one turned to the question of congenital or inherited defect, he was personally very unwilling to argue the question, because he was not sure that he could define exactly what he meant by congenital; and he was certain he could not say very much positively about inheritance. But when he faced the children whom he had to examine, and the adolescents who came his way, he was struck with the fact that the element of inheritance and congenital defect did not appeal to him. He rarely traced the characteristics which were seen manifested in the children to the parents of those children; and when one did get a positive history of real insanity or a positive history of actual mental defect—and in rare instances one had seen a case in which there was a history of that very limited and curious defect, word-blindness or letter-blindness—it was a rare event, for frequently one could find no correspondence between the mental condition of the feeble-minded child and the mental condition of its parents. Yet it was the commonest occurrence for mentally defective children to have brothers and sisters in the same school who were quite bright and intelligent. No man who had experience of these cases would say that congenital influences and the transmission of inherited qualities were elements which could be disregarded in this qnestion, and he was very far from saying that. But a matter which had not been so far mentioned that day was that there was some fault or failure or accident in the developmental process of the child, either intra-uterine or occurring after birth. That seemed, when one considered each case by itself, to be, if an unknown and undetermined, at least a tangible influence in the production of mental defect. Therefore he would say that the profession was very far from being in a position positively to say anything which would be of the slightest value to the Legislature on the question of the transmission of qualities from parent to offspring. They were of course aware that the children of neuropathics who became insane and the epileptic and the deaf-mutes ran very parallel; but one was frequently surprised to find that even the children of those people were normal, and apparently were able to live out a normal life. While he listened with great eagerness and great sympathy, in the hope of getting light and leading from this new inquiry, which had been called eugenics, he had to say that, based upon his own experience, the profession was only in the stage of listening with great respect to what was advanced, willing to gather their material together and see whether some common ground of understanding could be arrived at. He wished to point out the following consideration: If it had been proposed fifty years ago that no person in whose family history there was marked evidence of tubercular taint or phthisis should be allowed to marry, probably that proposition would have met with universal acceptance, because at that time it was considered that the one element in the production of phthisis was the inherited or congenital quality. And yet in fifty years' time the phthisis death-rate had been reduced by 50 *per cent.* without interfering with the arrangements with regard to marriage. And it had been discovered that, even in spite of the fact that it must be admitted there was a

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.57.236.97 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tubercular diathesis which might be transmissible, the profession were in the past neglecting the environmental conditions. He submitted that although the environmental conditions of the really feeble-minded and the insane were as yet imperfectly understood, there was a great field for investigation, for inquiry, and for work in that domain. He wished to make one more remark germane to the present discussion, namely, that wherever one moved among the working classes in large industrial centres, one never, by any chance, heard the suggestion made that there should be divorce on account of insanity; working people did not think an unbalanced mind should be a ground for divorce. He regarded that as a significant fact, and it was one which the Legislature should pay great attention to, particularly because those people had votes; moreover, the people determined the subjects which the Legislature would turn their attention to. This was not a live subject to the working classes, who did not seem eager that the State should make legal provision for the divorcement of insane couples. He could not help feeling that in this latter connection—its connection with insanity—the word "divorce" was an unfortunate one. He was quite prepared to speak on the whole subject with a perfectly frank and open mind, but divorce had come to have a specific meaning attached to it, that meaning being one which suggested what our modern master of phrases would call "moral turpitude." He regarded it as unfortunate that those who had to take care of the insane, and who had to sympathise with the insane, to protect their interests and look to their future, who were their friends in the last resort, should add to the misunderstanding and the burden which the insane had already to bear by lending any countenance to the suggestion that insanity might be a ground of divorce. Annulment of marriage was recognised at present by law, and that was all which could be done at present. If in connection with insanity and the dissolution of the marriage tie the word "annulment" were used instead of "divorce," it would have a much less objectionable flavour.

Dr. BRISCOE remarked that "Raro quisquam non aliquam partem corporis imbecillam habet" was written in the days of the Emperor Tiberius (*Celsus*, Book I), and he commended that passage to some of his friends with regard to this question. He had no right to prolong the discussion after so much had been said by others, but the study of human breeding was full of pitfalls, especially the diseases thereof. The "canker worm" had often been discussed, not only in that Society, but at the medical societies in London. Before attempting to teach the public how to marry properly they must at first make the "canker worm" of disease notifiable, for undoubtedly syphilis spoiled the genealogical table of inheritance, not only physically, but also mentally considered. In the preface of *Celsus* occurred the following: "Verique simile est inter nulla auxilia adversa valetudinis plerunique tamen eam bonam contigisse ad bonos mores, quos neque desidia neque luxuria vitiaraut: siguidem hæc duo corpora prius in Græciâ deinde apud nos afflixerunt." He asked, Were not these two vices the prevailing cause of disease at the present day? Thus, to specialise on diseases would also mean specialising on the physical symptoms generally. Celsus further said, "Ideoque vis corporis melius ex venis quam ex ipsa specie æstimatur." He would therefore like to propose that the President, during his year of office, should institute within the Association a collective investigation for the consideration of the question of the forms of insanity which were transmitted. There should be a clear plan for the Legislature to act upon, and forms could be filled up according to the nomenclature of the Association. Such a subject would require much thought and consideration on the part of the President and those who would act with him, but he thought some facts might be collected which could be crystallised and placed before the world at large. The leading daily papers had so much each day on the subject of divorce that it grated on him considerably. After all, marriage must be looked upon as a religious ceremony, and in talking about what was usually meant by marriage he preferred to use the term "human breeding." The report of such committee as he suggested could be drawn up on the principle of diseases like cancer and tuberculosis, which were dealt with by the Medical Society of London many years ago, in which he believed Mr. Butlin took a leading part. A considerable amount of valuable material was collected in that way. If each member would take the trouble to give his time to the investigation of one family the nett result would be a very useful compilation. He could trace back one family in regard to insanity in the great-great-grandfather, to a grandmother

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.57.236.97 Published online by Cambridge University Press

who had puerperal mania, and to the birth of a child, after which the mother died from acute delirious mania. Her child married and she had puerperal mania, and when she married her husband was syphilitic. He himself attended the syphilitic man, and, remembering the circumstances, he said, "Take my advice, and do not get married." But he did marry the woman from a very insane family, and that marriage produced a son, whom he constantly saw. That son spent money freely, and was now engaged to be married. While the mother was carrying this child she was under mercurial inunctions and potassium iodide, and when the child was born there was no superficial evidence of congenital syphilis about him. If that kind of thing could be crystallised down, much would be done towards getting exact information.

Dr. BEVERIDGE SPENCE said he would like to say a word on behalf of a class in which he had been much interested during forty years. He commenced his work amongst the insane at Earlswood, where he had to do with many unfortunate weak-minded people, who were cared for in the most generous fashion, and, he regretted, without assistance from the State. The debate that day appeared to have divided itself into two parts, notwithstanding that it had been the intention of the President that the subjects of the two papers should be taken together. In the first place there had been the consideration of marriage and divorce, and in the second the consideration of the treatment of the weak-minded. From the point of view of marriage and divorce he was in agreement with Dr. Mercier and Dr. Hayes Newington that the profession had not yet sufficient data in its possession to go upon, nor to say what were the views of the Association on the matter. But when it was a question of the treatment of the feeble-minded he thought the Association might very well support the efforts which were being made by Miss Dendy and those who worked with her on the same lines, by calling upon the State to do something for the feeble-minded, even to the extent of asking for a State grant, in the same way as the State assisted in the education of the child who was not sufficiently advanced or capable for the ordinary elementary school. He quite saw that if one waited until the time arrived when all defective children who might propagate their species and produce their like could be isolated it would be a long time hence. But he thought a beginning might well be made, and it might be the duty of the Association to give a lead, and endeavour to induce the Legislature, or the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to make some allowance for the maintenance of such feeble-minded children, in the same way that a grant is now made for a similar class in county lunatic asylums and similar institutions.

Dr. EDEN PAUL said he took it that most of the members were agreed that to advise, as an Association, for legislation in the eugenic direction would be premature, because there was not sufficient knowledge available. But as a profession they could at least use what influence they possessed to promote the diffusion of sound eugenic conceptions. To fold their hands and say, "We have no knowledge," would be a mistake. The profession had as much influence as it deserved to have, though perhaps not so much as it would like to have. It was certain it had some influence. Medical men did not know precisely what marriages would produce feeble-minded children, nor precisely what marriages would not; but, as Dr. Savage had insisted, there were certain elements of knowledge available, and Dr. Savage was not as guarded on all points as Dr. Mercier suggested he was. For example, he said that people who were epileptics and had any indication of mental disorder certainly should not marry. As such marriages were so disastrous, the profession could use its influence to spread the idea that there should be something in the nature of a dossier; a clean personal and family history should be the pre-requisite to any sane marriage. That was not a matter for legislation but for public opinion; and the growth of opinion of that kind would largely depend on what was done by the profession. People often spoke about Nature without realising the enormous force exerted by opinion in modifying Nature. He would give one example in illustration of that. In several of the ancient civilisations, the Egyptian among others, it was considered right and natural, at any rate amongst members of the royal family, for brother to marry sister. But with us at this time such a union was so beyond our conception that the question of sexual affection between brother and sister never entered our heads. That was simply due to the growth of education and of public opinion. In that way a profound influence could be exerted. And if the profession were to

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.57.236.97 Published online by Cambridge University Press

use its influence to promote the idea that marriage should not be undertaken without a disclosure of details affecting the personal and family history, such knowledge being shown to influence the future progeny, and that unsuitable unions were likely to result in unsuitable progeny, much would be done to promote the growth of public opinion in the right direction.

Dr. GREENLEES said he thought the time had come when it was the duty of the profession not only to educate the public, but likewise to educate the Legislature. But that was not so if the Association consisted of such ignorant members as had been alleged. That, however, was not his opinion; he did not think it had ignorant members, but that it consisted of most scientific and capable men, who knew the subject. It was therefore the body to which the Legislature should look if it wanted any information at all. The public had been educated by it during the last seventy years; surely the time had now come when something more should be done. If he were in order, he would like to suggest that the matter be referred to the Parliamentary Committee of the Association, and that they be asked to consider it, and make a collective investigation, so that there should be some material to go upon.

The PRESIDENT said that before he asked Dr. Ewart to reply on the discussion he would like to propose a hearty vote of thanks to those visitors who had so kindly come to the meeting to take part in the discussion: he referred to Mr. Crackenthorpe, Miss Dendy, and Dr. Donkin, and for the interesting contributions they had given on subjects with which they, of all people, were most familiar. It had been his intention—he understood it was usual for the President of the Association on such an occasion to do so—to add something to the debate. But he found that every idea he could possibly have thought of had already been taken up by one or other of the speakers. Therefore, he believed that any remarks he might have to offer would not substantially add to what had already been said. He could not help being struck by the way in which each speaker shied off from the proposition of positive eugenics, and to what a degree the subject introduced by Dr. Ewart had been, either fortunately or unfortunately, left undiscussed. He could not agree with Dr. Greenlees that the action of the speakers and the line they took was an assumed ignorance of the subject. He thought it had been a confession of a very real ignorance, in which he, the President, participated. He did not think that in this country, in Europe, or in the world there had been any material contribution to biology as a science since the days of Darwin. Herbert Spencer and many others had contributed philosophical criticisms, but without any very material accession to biological knowledge as a whole. One branch, however, of biology had been carefully studied, namely, embryology. Failing the rising up of some great leader in the field of biology who would instruct the present generation, or collect together all the knowledge which was scattered abroad, he thought they were right in withholding a definite decision upon such an important subject as actually dealing with the defective and insane in a positive manner, or in such a positive manner as Dr. Ewart had suggested, along with those of his school. In saying that, he entirely agreed with what Dr. Mercier said about the necessity for regarding that question, not so much from the standpoint of the suppression and isolation of the degenerate, as from the point of view of maintaining public order and decency. He thought all must admit with considerable humiliation that we had not by any means attained as a State to the efficiency reached by some of our neighbours in that respect. He referred particularly to Germany. Until that had been done, until, at any rate, something had been accomplished along the lines of what was done, for example, in regard to consumption, it could not be said that everything had been exhausted before adopting the extreme measure of sterilisation, for which we were unprepared, because so little that was exact was known. But in making those remarks he had wandered far from the point which was in his mind when he rose, namely, to ask the meeting to accord its thanks to the visitors who had kindly attended to discuss the matter.

The thanks were accorded by acclamation.

Dr. Savage having been obliged to leave, the President called upon Dr. Ewart to reply.

Dr. EWART, in replying, said the paper under discussion was written with two objects in view: First, that it should invite discussion before the Medico-Psycho-

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.57.236.97 Published online by Cambridge University Press

logical Association; secondly, in the hope that the collective wisdom of that body might evolve a practical scheme whereby a polluting stream might be dammed and great good thus accrue to the national health. Lepers and those affected with plague are segregated for the good of the community, and why should not those suffering from feeble-mindedness, which is really much more dangerous? If a race is healthy, vigorous, and successful, the best citizens are those who approach the average. They would have well-balanced nervous organisations, and they would hand on the same characteristics to their offspring, for if physical strength is transmitted, so must mental strength. These men would be more useful than geniuses who are individuals with a disproportionate development of some particular faculty, leading to a disturbance of mental equilibrium, psychopathic phenomena, and emotional spasm. Can such be designated as Nature's finest handiwork? And whoever has heard of a genius being produced from an idiot or imbecile? These remarks are made because it is evidently the belief of some that by segregating the feeble-minded you will produce nothing but mediocrities. I am not touching the question of the "insane." Another important point to remember is the "transmutation of disease," which means that diseased organisms are apt to breed disease, but not always, though sometimes, their own disease. An alcoholic parent may have an epileptic child; a tubercular mother may have a child with Pott's disease; a man with syphilis may have a son afflicted with general paralysis; convulsions in one generation may be represented by hysteria; a neuropathic patient may have a psychopathic descendant. As to the methods to be adopted, the best might be the notification of these aments by the medical officers attached to the different schools to the asylums' committee of the county. They would then be certified before a magistrate and sent to some colony until the age of twenty-one, when they would again be examined, and a decision arrived at as to whether they should be allowed into the outer world, be segregated for life, or given the alternative of sterilisation. The rich should be notified as well as the poor, and they might be allowed to create private colonies. There is a large number of paupers receiving outdoor relief who are feeble-minded, and these could be weeded out by the medical officers of the workhouses and segregated for life. The habitual criminal, the "mental alcoholic," and the juvenile feeble-minded offender could be dealt with in a similar manner, these sections being carefully classified and sent to separate colonies. The crux of the whole question is this: Are the unfit producing children at the rate of seven per family and the fit at the rate of three? If so, it is not necessary to be a first class prophet to prophesy the result in the course of a few generations, especially as by State and private philanthropy the action of natural selection is stayed. As to heredity, it must be admitted by all that our start in life is no haphazard affair, but is rigorously determined by our parentage; it binds one generation to another, and its law is that "like tends to beget like." Grapes do not grow on thorns nor figs on thistles. Would anyone knowingly select either diseased seeds or diseased animals to breed from?

Clinical Notes and Cases.

Case of Melanotic Alveolar Sarcoma of Liver, Characterised by Rapidity of Growth and Abnormal Weight(1). By EDWARD D. O'NEILL, M.R.C.P.I., Medical Superintendent, Limerick District Lunatic Asylum.

M. D—, æt. 30, servant, was admitted to the Limerick Asylum on April 28th, 1910, from the Limerick Prison, suffering from recurrent mania with delusions. This woman was tried at the Connaught Winter Assizes, held in Limerick in December, 1909, for the manslaughter of

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.57.236.97 Published online by Cambridge University Press