

**Mental hospitals and the public : the need for closer co-operation / by  
Lt.-Colonel J.R. Lord, C.B.E., M.D., F.R.C.P. Edin.**

**Contributors**

Lord, J. R. 1874-1931

**Publication/Creation**

London : Adlard & Son, Limited, 1927.

**Persistent URL**

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/fgnqvtv3>



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

11  
*With the Author's Compliments.*

# MENTAL HOSPITALS AND THE PUBLIC: THE NEED FOR CLOSER CO-OPERATION

BY

LT.-COLONEL J. R. LORD, *C.B.E.*, M.D., F.R.C.P. EDIN.

PRESIDENT OF THE ROYAL MEDICO-PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION (1926-27);

CO-EDITOR OF THE JOURNAL OF MENTAL SCIENCE;

HON. SECRETARY OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR MENTAL HYGIENE

IN AID OF THE WORK OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR  
MENTAL HYGIENE.

LONDON:

ADLARD & SON, LIMITED

21, HART STREET, W.C.1

---

1927

Price 1/6 net.



*Made and printed in Great Britain.*



# MENTAL HOSPITALS AND THE PUBLIC.\*

---

## SUMMARY.

- I. *The "group mind" defined and described, and then compared in respect of ancient, medieval and modern times, especially in its attitude to mental disorders and mentally afflicted. Arguments in support of the proposition that the public attitude towards the latter is in a measure atavistic and regressive and still tainted with medievalism.*
- II. *Why do the public view mental hospitals differently from general hospitals? An answer is attempted: Historical research in regard to the origin of both kinds of hospitals—origin the same. History of the treatment of mental disorders in ancient and medieval times sketched. Lecky and the first hospital or infirmary to be supported by public subscriptions. Reasons for supposing that the public hospital system received its greatest impetus from the establishment of the hospitals of the Order of Knight Hospitallers. The word "asylum" defined and its history described. Its use as regards the public is not so appropriate in these days as "hospital." The word "hospital" similarly defined. History of the voluntary general hospital system in England from the 11th century. The story of a failure to found an adequate voluntary mental hospital system in 1750 onwards.*
- III. *The renaissance of psychiatry in Europe. Pioneer work of John Howard, Shaftesbury and the late 18th and 19th century psychiatrists. Estrangement between mental and general hospitals regarded as a calamity and to have retarded progress in psychiatry. Present-day attitude of the public to the mental hospitals.*
- IV. *Future prospects: Importance of the admission of voluntary patients to all mental institutions, of affiliation and reciprocity between mental and general hospitals, of mental clinics, and of a closer practical union between psychiatry and general medicine. What the public ought to know about the mind and mental disorders and how it can be best disseminated. What the public ought to know about mental hospitals and how it can be best disseminated.*

Being a Thesis sustained by the Faculty of Medicine for the Degree of Doctor of Medicine  
University of Edinburgh, with some additional annotations.



V. *The attitude of the Press to mental disorders and mental institutions criticised as retarding enlightenment and progress.*

VI. *Isolation of mental institutions deplored. Its causes and effects. mental hospitals need and why they can never be entirely "open" institutions.*

VII. *One solution of the isolated position of mental hospitals to be found in the appointment of independent, unofficial, and voluntary mental hospital visitors as intermediary between patients and their homes.*

VIII. *Psychiatric field work and workers. The dynamic approach to treatment the only sound and successful one. The necessity for environmental investigation in regard to mental disorders.*

## I.

IN these pages I have tried to put in words some small things achieved perhaps it were better put, on the way to being achieved—which are designed to improve the lot of the mentally afflicted person, to soften the attitude of the "group mind" commonly called "the public" towards him, to find for him a place in the community during his necessary segregation as we do those sick in body, and not one *outside* of it, or on the fringe of it, estranged from the world as though he were a pariah or outlaw; to improve and facilitate his treatment by bringing in the aid of the psychiatrist the great body of medical science to bear upon his infirmity at the earliest possible moment; and finally, on his recovery, to welcome him to full citizenship, and to find him suitable work so that he may live and thrive which is the birthright of all men.

These objects have been the ambitions of over a century down to the present day, a task yet to be completed. Much has been done, but during recent years progress has been slow. Changes in the law are required, and, above all, a change in the attitude of the public to mental maladies, to those so afflicted and to the institutions which treat and shelter them, and also a building up of a psychiatry on a broader basis, not separate from, but in close co-operation with the general stream of medical science.

Every successful effort, however small, in these directions is important, and when co-ordinated with others, it helps towards the solution of a great and social problem which for long ages has faced mankind.

Why then is public opinion so apathetic, prejudiced and unsympathetic in regard to those whom the law labels as "insane," and why is it so stubborn, so resistant to education in all matters connected with the care and treatment of mental disorders?

First of all, what do we understand by "the group mind"? Obvious



tion of a group or race of people—always a social group—to environment. It is quite the same as “public opinion”—which is more discriminative and unstable but it may be said that the latter has its roots in it.

The “group mind” or “social mind” contains nothing but what is to be found in the “individual mind.” It is really an attitude of mind of the many—that which develops and functions reciprocally in relationship to the herd and environment.

In studying the group mind of primitive mankind and comparing it with that of to-day, one must have regard to mythology—which was an attempt to explain phenomena of life without scientifically acquired knowledge, and, therefore, wholly speculative in character. To the outcome of this attempt we now apply the term “superstition.” The credulity and mysticism, the fantastic behaviour and beliefs (all as a rule associated with primitive religious thought), having regard to the period at which they occurred should not be regarded as mental aberration more than are the beliefs and practices of the present time.

Conolly Norman says :

“When any belief tends to reappear in various races from age to age and under conditions of civilization and education, it acquires a special interest because it probably depends on some general trait in the mental organization of our species.” “The sense of mystery from which we can never wholly rid ourselves is probably one of the primitive phases of human thought. It is perhaps connected with that great human desire to look beyond the surface of things, and to be unsatisfied with that mere recollection of phenomena which apparently satisfies our fellow creatures who are lower in the mental scale.” (*Journ. of Ment. Sci.*, vol. li, 1905, p. 116.)

A. Marie says :

“Mankind will always require a religious faith or ideas of some kind, but there is a regular progression in theological conceptions from primitive savagery onward. When civilized man, by a kind of atavism returns to animism, fetichism, magic or other primitive religious conception prevailing among primitive man, then and then only can religion become a morbid mental state.” (*Mysticisms et Folie*, Paris, Giard et Briere, 1907.)

It is feasible to think that the very common endemic and epidemic psychoses of the middle ages were evidences of regression to primitive beliefs and conduct. Civilization has rendered the occurrence of these more difficult, yet they still break from time to time as strange forms of religious or sexual excitement in groups of people.

The animism and demonology of ancient Egyptian and Jewish times, also the prevalence of lycanthropy, were perfectly logical, and the belief in them was justifiable, having regard to the state of knowledge in those days. Unusual, strange



and inexplicable or extraordinary conduct was thought to be the outcome of "possession" from external sources. Just as the works of the spirit were for good or evil, so was the spirit viewed as angelic or satanic, and the reaction of the state group was in accordance therewith. In either case the occurrence was considered to be an act of God or gods. Similarly the lycanthrope attributes his feelings of weakness and misery to his being possessed by some strange personality—usually a vampire.

The demonology of medieval times must be regarded differently.\* It was a disintegration of the social state, a regression of the group mind to the reactions normal to an earlier age of mankind. At one time the highest level attained by human intelligence was now a fall to a lower type of mentalization. It was the symbol of the impoverished mind-play of groups of people belonging to a higher civilization seeking satisfaction and overcoming its feeling of inferiority (fear often a basis) by taking up again the moral and intellectual supports of a more primitive stage.

This was an age of plague, pestilence and famine and of constant war and commotions largely religious in origin and purpose.† The belief in witchcraft and sorcery attained its highest level and the conditions under which the peasantry lived aroused all that was cruel and brutal in human nature. Mental disorder abounded and was often, even commonly, mistaken for witchcraft; an

\* "They are a portion of history, and will never return in the form in which they are there recorded but they expose a vulnerable part of man—the instinct of imitation—and are therefore very much connected with human life in the aggregate. It appeared worth while to describe diseases which were propagated on the beams of life—on the wings of thought; which convulse the mind by the excitement of the senses, and wonderfully affect the nerves, the media of its will and of its feelings. It seemed worth while to attempt to place these disorders between the epidemics of a less refined origin, which affect the body more than the soul, and all those passions and emotions which border on the vast domain of disease, ready at every moment to pass the boundary. Should we be able to deduce from the facts of history here developed a convincing proof that the human race, amidst the creation which surrounds it, moves in body and soul as an individual whole, the author might hope that he has approached nearer to its ideal of a grand comprehension of diseases in time and space, and be encouraged by the co-operation of contemporaries, zealous in the search of truth, to proceed along the path which he has already entered, in prosecuting the investigation." (Hecker's *Epidemics of the Middle Ages*, Syd. Soc., 1844, p. 85.)

† "Thus, throughout the western parts of Germany, and especially in the districts bordering the Rhine, there was a wretched and oppressed populace; and if we take into consideration that among their numerous bands many wandered about, whose consciences were tormented with the recollection of the crimes which they had committed during the prevalence of the black plague, we shall comprehend how their despair sought relief in the intoxication of an artificial delirium. There is hence good ground for supposing that the frantic celebration of the festival of St. John, A.D. 1374, only served to lead to a crisis a malady which had been long impending; and if we would further inquire how a harmless usage, which, like many others, had but served to keep up superstition, could degenerate into so serious a disease, we must take into account the unusual excitement of men's minds, and the consequences of wretchedness and want. The bowels, which in many were debilitated by hard and bad food, were precisely the parts which in most cases were attacked with excruciating pain, and the tympanitic state of the intestines points out to the intelligent physician an origin of the disorder which is well worth consideration." (*Ibid.*, p. 96.)



ch persisted for many centuries. Reginald Scott, by a visit about 1580, to hlem, became "the first in England to diagnose the element of insanity in the eh and the bewitched" (O'Donoghue). Insanity was generally regarded as a ine punishment for spiritual wickedness, or as being evidence of the operations he Devil.

Melancholia, the commonest type of insanity, often took on its primitive form of anthropy, and masses of degenerate, downtrodden and despairing people became ected with this terrible disorder.

But dancing mania, witchcraft, sorcery and lycanthropy were not all hysteria,\* ania and melancholia. They were also survivals of the primitive religions of ope, which continued to exist, even flourish, side by side with a Christianity fly dogmatic and enjoined for the most part on a people without the accompani- t of an enlightened education. In addition they were often a mask for roguery criminality, and a cloak for debauchery and cruelty, and there were good ons, civil apart from religious, which led popes, kings and parliaments to take on against persons suspected of these practices, condemning those convicted to severest penalties, including hanging and the tortures of the stake. The pity t was that bigotry, ignorance and superstition prevented the sorting out of se whose insanity took on these characteristics.

Lecky records that :

"A French judge named Bognet especially to the subject (the assuming of animal ns) burnt multitudes of lycanthropes, wrote a book about them, and drew up a e in which he permitted ordinary witches to be strangled before they were burnt, ecepted lycanthropes—who were burnt alive." (Lecky, *Rationalism*, i, p. 97.)

The term "insanity," or mental aberration, cannot, strictly speaking, be applied he "group mind." Even the many outbreaks of endemic and epidemic insanity ing the middle ages, and occasionally since, were individual mental disorders ch spread from person to person by sympathy and imitation—picking out of rse those with suitable soil, both physical and mental, for their manifestations. The group mind, however, can regress and become active at a more primitive level. e individual insane cannot and will not unite for any one purpose, *i.e.*, a sustained pose. This fact was probably the reason for the failure of the Crusaders, for among n undoubtedly were included many frenzied, hysterical and paranoic persons.

"Different characteristics of morbidly excited vitality having been rendered prominent by tarantism fferent individuals, it could not but happen that other derangements of the nerves would assume orm of this, whenever circumstances favoured such a transition. This was more especially the case hysteria, that proteiform and mutable disorder, in which the imaginations, the superstitions and ollies of all ages have been evidently reflected." (*Ibid.*, p. 126.)



To come to modern times, the comparative freedom of the group mind from gross atavistic and regressive characteristics is undoubtedly the outcome of the advance of education and civilization. A knowledge of nature, of the cosmic forces of which it is the emblem, and rational ideas as to the why and wherefore of our environment and our relations thereto, spells the decay of superstition and of the practice of incantations, spells, sorcery, witchcraft, etc.

Undoubtedly Buckle, in his *History of Civilization* (Vol. II, p. 148), was right when he says that the two principal sources of superstition are ignorance and danger — "Ignorance keeping men unacquainted with natural causes and danger making them recur to supernatural ones."

"Human power failing, superhuman power is called in; the mysterious and invisible are believed to be present; and there grows up among the people the feelings of awe and of helplessness on which all superstition is based and without which no superstition can exist." (Vol. i, p. 88.)

Ignorance and danger give rise to wonder and fear. Now do not wonder and fear, with ignorance and danger behind them, characterize the present-day group mind in regard to mental disorders and those mentally afflicted, and prejudiced attitude to all and everything connected with the insane? Is not this a survival of the medieval attitude in these matters?

These factors are, in my opinion, at the root of that obstinacy, that reluctance to be educated, that apathy and that resentment displayed by the public in lunacy matters.

If McDougall's views on "laughter" are right—that it is an instinctive reaction to circumstances and happenings we either cannot understand or have reason to fear—then the tendency to laughter and witticism so commonly exhibited by people generally when referring to "madness" and the doings of "mad people" gives further support for the view I have put forward that the public attitude to insanity and the insane is in a measure atavistic and regressive and still strongly tainted with medievalism. As to how this can best be met in the interests both of the individual and of the community is the principal matter dealt with in the following pages.

## II.

I think it would be idle to dispute that the public do not view the asylums, as they are now commonly named, the public mental hospitals, in the same light as they do the general hospitals, and it appears quite legitimate to ask "Why



answer is not difficult to find, though it is not so easily given. Yet so near is it to my subject that some attempt must be made.

It is to be noted that the origin of both kinds of hospitals is the same. They are children of the same parent, but have grown up so differently that they are now practically strangers to each other.

To understand how this comes about involves some historical research. Now as regards to the care and treatment of those sick in mind, in the Greco-Roman times following the teaching of Hippocrates, who lived about 460 B.C., insanity was recognized as a disease or disorder to be treated by the science and art of medicine in the hands of the physician. The doctor succeeded the priest and magician in the care of the insane. Mechanical restraint was first abolished about 150 A.D., and ultimately the mental institutions, such as existed at that period, rivalled those of the most up-to-date of the present mental hospitals. Solon [630-558 B.C.], one of the seven wise men of Greece, long before this, made wise lunacy laws and defined the forms of mental disorder which called for detention.

All this enlightenment was swept away during the Dark Ages, and became a thing of the past for centuries. Philosophy was replaced by scholasticism. Science became alchemy, astrology, theosophy, necromancy and charlatanry. The insane were again, as they were in the days prior to Greek culture, regarded as afflicted by God and possessed by devils, though not a few were treated as men of genius and met with great consideration—even worship and reverence—depending upon the form their mental disorder took. Some were cared for in monastic institutions, but otherwise they became outcasts and less thought of than slaves. Thousands upon thousands of insane were cruelly executed on conviction of witchcraft. This lasted for 1300 years or so, and matters did not improve very much with the Renaissance until about the end of the eighteenth century.

The care of the sick, from very early times, has been closely associated, even identified, with religious organizations and communities and their houses. In ancient Egypt, Assyria and Greece, also in Italy under the Romans, the sick were brought to the temples, which were largely supported by the gifts and fees received from patients in return for treatment. The oldest records of such treatment date from about 3,500 B.C. In ancient Greece the sanctuaries founded by the priests of Asclepius, the God of Healing, were commonly resorted to by the sick and injured, and the Greek physicians, especially those bred at the famous medical school at Cos, were above superstitious practices and, like the present-day general medical practitioners, probably treated most of the patients who consulted them at their homes.



There appears to have been little distinction made in actual practice between those sick in mind and those sick in body until about 100 B.C., when we read of Asclepiades setting up practice in Rome as a psychiatrist, and he has since rightly been regarded as the Father of Psychiatry.

On the rise of Christianity, the care of the sick was continued by the monks and nuns, but probably now in a great measure in conjunction with the Christian physicians, especially those who were famous as specialists in the treatment of particular diseases, for the first Christian hospitals appear to have been for the care of lepers and the insane,\* and came into existence in the days of Constantine the Great during the latter years of the third and the early fourth century.

Somewhat later, in 362, the Emperor Julian founded "houses for the sick" presumably in Rome—and the Emperor Valens somewhere between 370–380 established a hospital of celebrity in Cæsarea (Palestine). Prior to this, there were hospitals in Rome called "meritoria," similar to the present Chelsea Hospital for old and decrepit soldiers.

There are two reputed founders of the first hospital or infirmary supported by public subscriptions, namely St. Ephraim (who died in 381), and St. Fabiola, of whom lived about the same period.

Lecky says :

"A Roman lady, Fabiola, in the fourth century founded at Rome, as an act of penance, the first public hospital, and the charity planted by that woman's hand spread the world." (*European Morals*, ii, p. 25.)

I cannot find a definite reference anywhere to the character of this hospital, from the nature of its origin it would be undoubtedly administered by one of the religious orders, and may, of course, in point of date, be the oldest precursor of the present hospitals, but with all due respect to Lecky as an historian, it would appear to be more true to say that, of Christian times, hospitals for the care of the sick owe their origin principally to the rise of monasticism and the institutions connected therewith, and in this relation the hospital founded in Jerusalem by Pope Gregory the Great at the close of the sixth century, had a more potent influence than any of those I have mentioned.

Probably the majority of references in ancient history anent the treatment of the sick, whether of mind or body, refer to people able to pay for such ; as to what happened in this respect to slaves and the poor there is little definite information.

The famous hospital in Jerusalem was originally served by the Benedictines.

\* Many lepers were insane.



anks from the Mount of Olives and dedicated to St. Mary. In those stormy days went through many vicissitudes and was refounded by the merchants of Amalphi 1048, and became the centre of the Knight Hospitallers, being re-dedicated to John. Its first Grand Master was Gerard, who died in 1120. The whole foundation consisted of a monastery, a chapel and a hospital. The patients cared for were largely drawn from the pilgrims of whom there was a continuous stream to Holy Places from the beginning of the Christian era.

I think we may conclude then that hospitals first arose as religious foundations; certainly for centuries afterwards the monks and nuns nursed the sick, and still do in the European countries.\* Even in France it was not until 1880 that the hospitals were secularized, which curiously coincided with the commencement of the period of antiseptic surgery. As regards medieval institutions for the insane, they have existed in Europe since the fourteenth century, their birthplace apparently being Italy, but it is recorded that one existed in Cairo (called a morostan) in the ninth century—a Turkish establishment.†

In England, hospitals, almshouses and Bede houses increased greatly in number after the dissolution of the monasteries, as would be expected from their traditional connection with the care of the sick, and the design of the buildings which arose in consequence of this partook of those they supplanted.

The word "asylum" is a Latin word derived from the Greek *ασυλον*, which signifies a place exempt from plunder. It means a *fixed* place in contra-distinction to its companions "refuge" and "shelter," which words mean *occasional* places. We may say an asylum is a home, and a "refuge" or "shelter" a temporary dwelling. All three words mean places of safety. "Asylum" came to be used in the sense of a sanctuary (strictly speaking a "refuge") for criminals, debtors and fugitives, seeking a temporary place of safety, usually a sacred place, from which they could not be dislodged without sacrilege or the breaking of the civil law. It became a privilege of the Church to afford asylum from the time of Constantine the Great which was regulated by law in 392. In the middle ages hospitals likewise acquired this privilege.

\* Every monastery had its *infirmaria* for the sick, weak, aged and blind which was in charge of the *infirmarius*.—See Ducange's Glossary, s.v. *Infirmaria*.

† The first Italian asylum was founded in Rome in 1300, in Spain at Valencia in 1408, and in England (Stone House, London) even earlier than either of these. An asylum at Ghent was founded in 1472 and the colony at Gheel commenced its unique career soon afterwards. Some of the 17th and 18th century asylums had been formerly monasteries. Insane patients were first admitted to the Hotel Dieu, Paris, in 1660, and a large asylum opened its doors at Avignon in 1665. The first American institution for the insane was founded in 1773 at Williamsburg, and in many the asylums at Frankfort (1785) and at Bayreuth are ancient institutions.



For a long time now the word "asylum" has been used to denote an institution for receiving, maintaining and ameliorating the condition of people suffering from physical or mental defects and maladies.

Its specific use as the designation of an institution for the insane seems to date from the early part of the seventeenth century, and became common during the following century. It cannot by the greatest stretch of imagination be rightly applied to a place of detention. From 1845 onwards it has had a legal definition. In the preface to the first edition of Archbold's *Lunacy Law* occurs the following paragraph:

"Public asylums are provided, private establishments are licensed, and hospitals are registered, etc." "Every precaution is taken that none but persons who are really insane, and proper objects for detention under care and treatment . . ."

It is clear then that "asylum" should never have been used to designate an institution for those mentally afflicted, because it implies (a) a place which people *seek* as a fixed "home," and (b) a place which shelters and cares for those who need shelter and care, but does not detain them.

The same objection might be raised in this connection to the word "hospital," but the latter is a better word in that it essentially denotes a *temporary* resting place, and as regards meaning its companion words are "Inn" and "Hotel."

It is interesting to note that psychiatry as far back as July 27, 1841 was beginning to feel the incubus of the terms "lunatic" and "lunatic asylum" imposed by law, for at the first meeting of the Medico-Psychological Association held on that day the following resolution was passed:

"That by the members of this Association the terms 'lunatic' and 'lunatic asylum' be abandoned except for legal purposes and that the terms 'insane person' and 'hospital for the insane' be substituted."

The term "hospital," applied originally to travellers' rest houses, has now come to mean an institution for the care of the sick or injured, or of such as require medical or surgical treatment, and, as we have seen, came about through the latter being cared for in the hospital of the Knight Hospitallers in Jerusalem. Others were established in Europe soon afterwards, at the initiative of the religious military orders and religious houses, chiefly to combat plague and other infectious diseases from the East. No doubt many of those treated in these institutions were mental cases whose sickness in mind was associated with obvious bodily disease. Later, as we have seen, most of the insane were not so fortunate for several centuries.

Two of the oldest separate hospitals in this country were those founded



Abbot Lanfranc at Canterbury in 1080-84, one for lepers (St. Nicholas), the other (The Hospital of St. John) for general diseases and infirmities.

I need not go in detail into the origin of earlier English general hospitals such as Bartholomew's, St. Thomas's, in London; their names are significant either directly or indirectly as to how they began and from whence came their original endowments. A mental hospital arose in the same way, namely Bethlem, as far back as 1247 A.D., which admitted its first mental patients from Stone House in 1377, and is now about to take on a fourth lease of life on a better site.\*

St. Luke's Hospital was founded in 1751 as a second Bethlem, and it is noticeable that the hospital buildings of Bethlem at Moorfields and St. Luke's both embodied their structure long galleries and single rooms, like most of our older mental institutions, confirming the tradition that the monastery, with its corridors and cloisters, was considered the proper model for a mental hospital.

Now the circular appealing for funds to establish St. Luke's Hospital for the insane issued by the Founders in 1750, "who were certainly wise and good men in their generation," contained this remarkable paragraph:

"Although the only end proposed was to establish a charity for poor lunatics, in such a manner that hereafter all persons who shall be found proper objects may, for the sake of the public as well as themselves, be admitted without delay, and (should they succeed in answer to our expectations) without expense also. Yet some advantages of a very interesting nature to the good of all mankind certainly will arise in consequence; for more gentlemen of the faculty making this branch of physic their particular study, it may from thence reasonably be expected that the cure of this dreadful disease will hereafter be rendered more certain and expeditious, as well as less expensive. And from the many improvements already made in other arts and sciences, as well as in the several parts of physic, the same may with reason be concluded in the present instance." [*Vide Journ. of Ment. Sci.*, January, 1856, p. 220.]

It is obvious that St. Luke's was expected to function also as a school for the teaching of psychiatry. Pinel, the great reformer of the treatment of the insane in France, was only five years old at this time, yet these simple citizens had visions of a better psychiatric service in the future, and St. Luke's, with Bethlem, indeed became precursors of the psychiatric hospital ideal of Greisinger, of the Salpêtrière, of Newington, of Brudenell-Carter, and of Maudsley. So this period is a convenient one from which to commence our consideration of the attitude of the public to the insane and to mental institutions.

\* The five Royal Hospitals in London, all enriched by monastic and church property following the Reformation, were St. Bartholomew's, St. Thomas's, Bethlem, Bridewell and Christ's. The last-named became a famous school. Bridewell Hospital and Prison, founded in 1553, was destroyed in the great fire of 1666.



In the year 1750 there were in existence in London the following voluntary general hospitals :

St. Bartholomew's, 1123 (refounded 1547); St. Thomas's, 1200 (refounded 1553); Westminster, 1719; Guy's, 1721; St. George's, 1733; London, 1735; Middlesex, 1745; together with the British Lying-In, 1749; the City of London Maternity Hospital, 1750; Queen Charlotte's, 1752; the General Lying-In opened its doors three years later.

In the English provinces there were voluntary general hospitals at Bath (1735), Bristol (1735), Exeter (1741), Liverpool (1745), Northampton (1743), Shrewsbury (1747), Winchester (1736), Worcester (1746), York (1740).

During the following century voluntary general hospitals sprang up like mushrooms, also many special hospitals; and both, especially the latter, have continued to multiply with the increasing necessities of a growing population.

People of all classes have continued to pour out their money and treasures to provide for the care and treatment of the poor suffering from physical diseases and disorders.

Now let us look at the case of the sick in mind. I am not at the moment concerned with those well blessed with this world's goods and chattels. Their interests were mentally afflicted were always protected by the State, though, like the insane poor, they suffered in the private mental institutions—now called licensed houses—from the barbarous practices then thought to be right in the medical treatment of the insane. One reads of the old Metropolitan Commissioners in Lunacy discussing the comparative efficiency of chains and handcuffs, iron girdles, collars and strait-waistcoats. They once reported that handcuffs and chains were preferable to strait-waistcoats as less heating. From voluntary sources beds existed at Bethlem (Moorfields) (1377), Guy's Hospital (1744 to 1859), Bethel House, Norwich (1777), and a few at some of the provincial voluntary general hospitals and infirmaries. Before the end of the century there came into existence St. Luke's Hospital (1777), Bootham Park (1777), Liverpool Asylum (1792), and the Retreat (1792). From 1800 onwards to this day there has been founded only nine other registered hospitals for the insane—a total accommodation of less than 2500 beds from voluntary source, and the beds in the voluntary general hospitals and infirmaries became things of the past until recently.\*

\* In Scotland, public and private response was much greater, and the Royal or Charitable Asylums, seven in number and one without a Charter, date from 1781 onwards until the Scotch Lunacy Act of 1857 led to district pauper lunatic asylums being established. The Royal Hospital at Morningside opened in 1813, the result of nearly 40 years' agitation by Dr. Andrew Duncan, the Scottish "Tuke."



Thus, in 1750 nearly the whole of the indigent mentally afflicted were either at home, living by such few wits as they possessed from birth or were left to them after the acute attack, and subjected to the jeers, jibes, rough humour and sport—even violence and brutality—of the public; or, if considered dangerous, they were confined by a magistrate's order, under an Act dated 1744, in jails, houses of correction, work-houses and houses of industry, where they were in an infinitely worse plight than when at large. They were placed there not so much for their own welfare and protection as for the safety of the public.

I do not propose to harrow the reader's feelings with a description of the housing and general treatment of these poor and mentally afflicted brothers and sisters, or of the horrors of the then recognized medical treatment by restraint and repression, which had existed since medieval times. In some of these institutions there were separate apartments for the insane, but as often as not vice, crime, misfortune, mental infirmity and chronic diseases of the most revolting kind were all sequestered together and treated alike. The insane were, as a rule, chained or tied with ropes, utterly filthy, in filthy surroundings, with beds of straw rarely renewed, or with no beds at all save the cold stone floors. Often they were without any covering either by day or night. They were starved, not infrequently flogged, and sometimes killed. Of course the death-rate was enormous. The conditions at Bethlem and St. George's Hospital and other hospitals were but little better, and the medical treatment in the private houses or asylums was equally brutal, though housing conditions were apparently not so appalling. The general public were callous to all this, but in this connection it must be remembered that it was difficult in those days to arouse the public conscience. Travelling was expensive and dangerous and the means limited. The Press had not developed to any extent. Still, the conditions generally must have been well known—certainly to the local authorities.

John Howard [1726–1790] was probably the first to set the ball rolling towards reform. In the famous report on his visits to the prisons throughout England, which he laid before Parliament in 1777, he drew attention to the shocking conditions he found in regard to the confinement there of idiots, imbeciles and lunatics.

The bicentenary of his birth occurred last year, and the debt of gratitude our nation owes to him is incalculable.

The insanity of King George III and his treatment also drew public attention to the subject of lunacy. Parliament had already inquired into the matter and the Act of 1744 had resulted, which was but a poor attempt to right the great wrong that existed.



Theobald says about the private asylums :

“ When once a person had been placed in a private asylum it was not difficult for the keeper to prevent him from having any access to the outer world, and a person who had disappeared into a lunatic asylum was very often not heard of again. Patients were wrongfully detained ; they were treated with great cruelty ; they were often unsufficiently clothed and underfed ; they were subjected to the terrors of solitary confinement and to methods of mechanical restraint which rivalled in cruelty the torture chambers of the Middle Ages.” (*The Law Relating to Lunacy*, p. 65.)

Parliament, in 1774, at last became convinced that something must be done, and that year saw the commencement of a series of Lunacy Acts culminating in the famous Act of 1890.

However, it was in consequence of the agitation of a few that the Act of 1808, which empowered the County and Borough magistrates to establish public asylums for the poor was passed.

Efforts to make this provision on the lines of the voluntary hospitals were ineffectual to meet the growing need. The tendency showed by voluntary general hospitals and infirmaries in early days to house the insane, limited to a few beds for chronic cases, received little or no encouragement from the public. It was opposed to the lunacy policy of the times and discouraged by the Lunacy Commissioners on legal and treatment grounds. Private benevolence largely stood aside, and so the tax-gatherer came to step into the breach, and the fate of psychiatry was sealed for many years.\* The ignorance and superstition of the public in regard to the insane were too great. The Act of 1808 was not popular, as is shown by the fact that no action was taken until 1812, when Nottingham County Borough Asylum was opened at Sneinton (now disused). It had, however, been projected since 1789 in connection with the Nottingham General Hospital and £6,000 collected, but in 1809, under the Act of 1808, the County and Borough Authorities came to the rescue and united with the subscribers. Only 10 county asylums had been established by 1818, and 20 by 1850. By the Lunacy Act of 1845, lunacy provision was made obligatory.

*À propos* of the medical treatment of the insane in those days, I cannot do better here than quote from a speech I made at a dinner held in honour of the founder of the Royal Medico-Psychological Association on November 17, 1925 :

“ As regards general medicine, the old-time notion which had prevailed throughout the Dark Ages that disease was a something foreign which had entered the body and had, at all costs, to be driven out, still influenced treatment to a large extent—h

\* See Lord Shaftesbury's evidence on March 14, 1859, before a Select Committee of the House of Commons.



blood-lettings, sweatings, purgings, blisterings and other reducing measures which were largely practised, though to a diminishing extent. But the idea was gaining ground that much disease could be viewed as normal body-processes endeavouring to carry on under adverse and unnatural circumstances, that these normal processes needed to be strengthened and built up and that under the watchful care of the physician the body would cure itself.

"The treatment of the mentally afflicted, however, remained entirely unenlightened, and the ideas of the Dark Ages were still in the ascendant in all their terrible malignity. The 'devil possession' notion guided all care and treatment. There was restraint and oppression of every kind, some of it most ingeniously devised; blistering, purging, starvation, flogging, shock-baths, bleeding, and cruelties too horrible to mention were recognized as legitimate forms of medical treatment. That anybody in charge of the insane in those days could bend the knee and bare the head and offer up a prayer inconceivable to us nowadays; yet the doctors, at any rate, were good-living and respectable men, many of them held in high esteem. So ingrained was the heritage of religious bigotry that both justice and humanity were dethroned.

"But the period 1798 to 1835 saw the beginning of the salvage of an ancient and honourable branch of medicine from the dominance of superstition and cruelty, and psychiatry began once more to take a place among the medical sciences."

### III.

Now the resurrection of the science and art of psychiatry and the humanitarian care and treatment of the insane was a movement which seemed to spring up about the same time at numerous points in Europe towards the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries, and the birth of modern psychiatry owes much to the work of Daquin, Pinel and Esquirol in France; Fricke, Langerman, and others in Germany; Chiarrugi in Italy; Guislain in Belgium; Evert in Holland; Rush in America; Duncan in Scotland; and Tuke, Gardner Hill and Connolly in England.

I cannot pause to narrate the fine work of Tuke at the Retreat, or speak of that humanitarian movement in this country which owed so much to Lord Ashley (afterward the Earl of Shaftesbury) for its success: sufficient to say that from 1812 onwards county asylums began to dot the country-side. Gardner Hill and Charlesworth at Lincoln in 1835 commenced the non-restraint treatment, which was taken up and perfected by Connolly at Hanwell, whose influence and writings led, in a few years' time, to its general adoption throughout the public and private mental hospitals; though it lingered for some years longer in the workhouses, as is shown by the dreadful conditions revealed in the supplement to the 12th Report of the Commissioners in Lunacy dated April 13, 1859.



Referring to the pauper lunatics entrusted with the custody of their more weak-minded fellow prisoners, the report says :

"To such individuals, strait-waistcoats, straps, shackles, and other means restraining the person are not unfrequently intrusted; and they are, moreover, possessed of the power of thwarting and punishing at all times, for any acts of annoyance or irregular conduct, which, although arising from disease, are nevertheless often sufficient to provoke punishment from an impatient and irresponsible nurse."

The *Journal of Mental Science* of July, 1859, in reviewing this report remarks

"Here we must conclude our notice of this most important, and, we may say, painfully interesting report; for it is painful to find our insane poor placed under such circumstances, not only discreditable to us as a Christian, but also as a civilized and humane people; and society owes a debt of gratitude to the Commissioners in Lunacy for the complete manner in which they have pursued their investigation into the condition of establishments only indirectly and secondarily subjected to their supervision. The ill-results of their deficiency of power in dealing with lunatics in workhouses, and in controlling the provisions made for them, appear in almost every page of the report, and we trust that this defect will no longer obtain, but that Parliament will lodge in their hands the power to supervise and control the lunatic wards of workhouses to an equal extent, as it has empowered them to act in county and other asylums for the insane, which have derived so great an advantage from the existence and the activity of the Commission."

Now the great progress general medicine has made has been intimately bound up with the evolution and expansion of our voluntary hospital system and the founding and growth of the nursing profession.

Psychiatry has undoubtedly suffered from its enforced detachment from the general movement, and its story and the attitude of the public to the insane would have been vastly different had it been decreed otherwise, and the present burden of chronic insanity in all probability would have been much lighter.

It is nothing short of a calamity that these two children of the ancient hospital, the general hospital and the mental hospital, should not have grown up as comrades, and that the sociological factors which led to the founding of voluntary hospitals for physical diseases should not have included an adequate number for the treatment of occurring mental diseases.

It is also to be regretted that it was not found possible to encourage the tendency general hospitals and infirmaries one time had to make some provision for mental cases. Had this been fostered by wise enactments to secure humane care and treatment it might have led to an "open door" instead of the "closed door" policy to mental disorders being adopted by these institutions which is very generally holds good.



is estrangement has never been so marked in Scotland as in England. To-day scarcely, if at all, exists in the former country, which fact is largely due to the thoroughly systematic teaching of psychiatry at the medical schools and general hospitals in association with the mental hospitals, which are attached to them for purpose.

The isolation of psychiatry from the main stream of medicine would in a large measure have been prevented, and the study and treatment of mental disorders would have had that mutual collaboration and co-operation within the fold of general medicine which has been so beneficial to all its other branches.

The country willingly pays about £8,000,000 a year for the upkeep of the general hospitals with their 46,000 beds, and had it adopted a voluntary system of mental hospitals a more advanced psychiatry might have unloaded by several millions the present cost (£7,000,000 for about 105,000 mental hospital beds) by having a considerably less number of chronic insane to support.

Now to come to the present-day attitude of the public to the mental hospitals. This is not a problem which stands alone: it is bound up with that of the relationship of psychiatry to the law, of psychiatry to general medicine, and of the relation of mental hospitals to the general hospitals. All these factors have adversely affected the progress of psychiatry. Not only so, but every one of the foregoing factors have added their quota to that continued lack of active interest of the public generally in those mentally afflicted and in the welfare and work of our public mental hospitals. And, furthermore, what is a matter of still greater regret is that public opinion has never really emancipated itself from the thralldom of medieval thought in its ideas of insanity.

This is very evident from the attitude which the public take up in regard to those discharged from mental hospitals and the disinclination to employ them.

The medical officers of mental hospitals are also keenly aware of it from the expression the friends of patients show on their first visit. It is often difficult, if not impossible, to make them believe that there is no disgrace in being mentally affected, that mental disorder should be looked upon in the same light as physical disorder and that the ideals and functions of mental hospitals and general hospitals are fundamentally the same. They are therefore often difficult to satisfy, being suspicious, over-anxious, querulous and imbued with wrong notions, not only as to the nature of insanity, but also as to the nature of the work of the mental hospital. But of them soon learn, however, that things are not so bad as they had thought; indeed, as a rule, the relationship between the hospital staff and the patients' friends becomes most cordial and, but for the publicity which would be given to the



private affairs of the family, there would be no lack of individual expression and appreciation of the care and treatment patients in public mental hospitals receive.

However, in most of these respects, the future gives promise of shaping things for the better.

#### IV.

Psychiatry and general medicine are undoubtedly drawing nearer each other and the proposals to establish mental clinics at the general hospitals and to affiliate mental hospitals with the general hospitals will do much to cement ties which are gradually linking up psychiatry and general medicine.

The movement for mental hospital nurses to acquire general hospital training and to a less extent *vice versa*, is an active one and is extending.

The loosening of the legal restrictions as to the care and treatment of mental disorder in its early or acute stages is now being called for with greater unanimity and, of all points put to the Royal Commission, the proposal to allow the public mental hospitals to admit voluntary cases has secured a more general support than any other. I am one of those who believe that this concession will prove a powerful factor for good in regard to both medical administration and treatment in public mental institutions. The best is never absolute and can always be improved upon, and public mental hospitals avoided by voluntary patients will need to look into their nursing and medical administration a little more closely. For the first time there will be an element of competition, the absence of which is one of the drawbacks to public mental hospitals in all institutions depending solely upon the State or local authorities for maintenance.

The final object which remains to be dealt with is to bring the public generally to look upon those sick in mind and the work of the public mental hospitals in the same light and with the same active sympathy and interest as they do those sick in body and the work of the voluntary general hospitals.

The problem presents difficulties in two directions :

(1) Public mental hygiene education requires much thought and for nothing is more likely to sap the stamina and courage of a nation than the over-consciousness of nervous and mental processes on the part of its citizens and on the whole it is perhaps better that a community should not know that it has any mental processes or nerves at all than to become hypochondriacal and neurasthenical, and

(2) having arrived at the range of facts it would be advantageous for the public to know, how can these facts best be disseminated ?



regarding (1), no body of knowledge is more difficult of comprehension than psychology unless it is that commonly known as metaphysics, which includes epistemology and ontology. It is not given to everybody to be capable of achieving insight into this subject, hence it tends to be confused with ethics, morality and religion about which the public are very responsive, and prone at all times to entertain unhealthy and bizarre notions. Under these circumstances I think it much wiser to teach the simple facts of mind and mental disorders in close relationship with physiology, and preach mental disorders as the manifestation of a deranged brain and other physical functions.

As to (2), a suggestion as to the education of children in these matters is made but here I may state that as Secretary of the National Council for Mental Hygiene, I contemplated the broadcasting, in the form of a pamphlet, of the simple facts regarding the mind, mental disorder and mental hospitals. This, however, was an operation of some magnitude and considerable expense, and was judged to be feasible. It therefore occurred to me that such knowledge was the most urgently needed on the part of those with relatives or friends mentally afflicted, especially if they were in care in a public mental hospital. I then fell back on the idea that such a pamphlet should be sent to the relatives and friends of every patient admitted to such institution throughout the land. I am glad to state that one very large authority in fact has moved in this direction by commenting upon the mind and health and disease and the nature and functions of mental hospitals in an introduction to its *Mental Hospital Visiting Rules*. Such information does much to relieve the anxiety of relatives and friends and corrects their frequently mistaken notions and tends to establish from the first a good understanding between the friends of patients and the nursing and medical staff of the mental hospital. I am hoping that the example thus set will be followed by every local authority.

First of all, then, what are the facts the public in general should be brought to appreciate regarding mental disorders? These may be stated as follows:

In the first place it may be remarked that what is known as the "mind" depends upon the activity of a healthy nervous system and upon the harmonious working of all the bodily functions.

It follows that there is a wide range of causes for mental unhealthiness, many of which are comparable to the causes which are responsible for bodily diseases. The problem presented by the occurrence of mental disease is essentially a medical one.

But when a person mentally afflicted is unfit to be at large and incapable of attending to his own affairs, the problem has also a social and a legal aspect.



Now there are many degrees of mental unhealthiness short of actual breakdown. Feelings of being "run down," "fed-up," "needing a change," but expressions of mental fatigue or anxiety and are as common as colds in the l Cases of "nervous exhaustion" or "nervous debility" or "nervous breakdown" are less common but still everyday occurrences and have good chances of recovery without institutional care if treated early. Such cases usually are fully conscious of their illness and naturally seek medical advice and treatment.

Grave forms of mental breakdown commonly present a different picture and are not so readily understood. The onset may be sudden or slow. As a rule the patient declares himself to be quite well and, indeed, often looks the picture of health and resents the suggestion of medical advice. His mental infirmity has to be judged outwardly by his conduct in regard to his surroundings and ordinary mode of life.

The important point to be remembered is that both the slighter and the severer forms of mental unhealthiness—the case of "nervous exhaustion" and the case of "certifiable insanity"—are fundamentally the same, and should be regarded in the same way: also that superstitious views regarding insanity or mental disorders belong to the past, and that the adoption of a superior, scornful, derisive or face-saving attitude to an insane person, or one who has been mentally unsound, is unkind and foolish, prevents the early treatment and recovery of such cases and favours the accumulation of incurable insanity, which is a burden to the community.

It is the universal experience in mental hospitals that the cases which most readily recover are those of short duration prior to admission, and that the longer the patient who is ultimately admitted is kept at home the fewer the prospects of recovery. At the same time there is undoubtedly a "stigma" attached to an ex-mental hospital patient.

By avoiding mental hospital treatment the case may become a hopeless one and adopting it a life may be partially wrecked, because of this "stigma" which is so ingrained in the minds of the people. The rising generation need not, however, be brought up in ignorance of fundamentals regarding insanity. The educational code of our national schools should decree a course on both mental and physical hygiene for senior pupils. This would do much to remove the "stigma" of "lunacy" which handicaps all the mentally afflicted both in the early stages of their illness and after recovery.

Now as to the public and the mental hospitals. The public should be brought to understand the following facts:

That mental hospitals are merely special hospitals for the treatment of the severer forms of mental disorder which cannot be adequately treated at home.



Insanity is not only associated with faulty brain function, but it involves the whole organism in a greater or lesser degree. A mental hospital has therefore to undertake the functions of every kind of hospital. It is at once a place of safety and refuge, a maternity home, a hospital for special diseases, a general hospital, and a psychiatric clinic.

That in addition to mental nursing the nursing staff of a mental hospital are required to nurse all kinds of physical diseases. The treatment of the patients is in the hands of an expert medical staff who have the assistance of a dentist and a chemist, and when necessary of specialists in all branches of medicine and surgery. The head of the hospital is a medical man who co-ordinates the work of the whole staff with a view to making the patients' lives as happy and as home-like as possible, and securing for them the best medical attention and nursing obtainable. The greatest possible liberty in the gardens and grounds is allowed the patients; there is no mechanical restraint, and suitable cases go out for walks and shopping in the surrounding country and villages. Ministers of religion look after the spiritual needs of the patients.

That although it is one of the functions of a mental hospital to detain patients against their own interests and for the security of the public, its principal function is the treatment of patients so that they may be discharged recovered, or with their mental condition so far relieved as to render possible their restoration to friends and home surroundings.

That the power to discharge patients (wholly or partly) chargeable to the rates rests in the Committee of Management of the Hospital. In the case of patients in the private class, this power is shared with the relatives and friends. Also that the members of the committee are often well known and highly esteemed in the district in which the patient lives when at home.

That the work of the "Mental After-Care Association" (and allied societies) is worthy of the support of the public. This voluntary association undertakes the task of re-starting in life poor persons discharged recovered from mental hospitals, and their supervision when out "on trial" prior to final discharge.

And lastly, but not least, that there is also attached to not a few mental hospitals a lady visitor who is in many directions a source of great comfort to the patients, especially those recently admitted. She acts as a connecting link between them and their homes, thereby relieving their anxiety and materially assisting towards their happiness and contentment. In this work she is assisted by social workers.



## V.

It is to be regretted that psychiatry does not seem to obtain a good Press. We do not blame the Press, for after all, one of its principal functions is to voice public opinion and, if the latter be prejudiced, uninformed and commonly apathetic regard to the welfare of the insane and the work of the public mental hospitals, the attitude of the Press generally can hardly be expected to be otherwise. Some of the great daily newspapers are very fair-minded on this subject, but we suffer from the occasional enterprising journalist who has succumbed to the wiles and plausibility of the half-cured lunatic (often a quasi-paranoic) or, worse still, the really vicious high-grade imbecile with a bone to pick, and who has been discharged from a mental hospital. This pandering to the taste for sensationalism cannot fail to have a very prejudicial effect on the practice of psychological medicine, especially as the other side of the picture rarely obtains the same publicity.

Wild stories, often with only a semblance of truth, sometimes find easy credence and, after being written up into sensational articles, are served to the public without established facts, and the closest inquiry demanded. As a rule the name of the institution or doctor is not mentioned. Neither the Board of Control nor the public institution concerned if named can prosecute, not being industries or establishments run for profit. Public inquiries cost time and money, and as regards the doctor, he would probably find great difficulty in initiating legal proceedings. The psychiatrist is constrained to ask: How long is progress in the enlightened treatment of the insane to be hindered and discouraged (for this is the effect) by irresponsible journalism? It is not that those whose lot it is to undertake the care of the mentally afflicted claim immunity from criticism, but it is only fair to the public service that some inquiries should be addressed to those concerned by inviting public condemnation; some regard should also be paid to the relatives and friends of patients before creating an atmosphere of anxiety and uneasiness.

The late Dr. R. H. Cole, in his Presidential Address to the Section of Psychiatry of the Royal Society of Medicine (November 10, 1925) has something to say about this.

If "the relationship of psychiatry to law reflects a lack of progress, what can be said of the public attitude to our branch of medicine? It is disappointing, to use a mild expression, to find a recent leader in a highly respectable daily journal refer to the devoted men who have laboured for psychiatry in the past as 'keepers of lunatic houses.' Such an expression, applied to the memories of a Maudsley or a Maudsley, can only reflect a deplorable ignorance on the part of educated public opinion.

"A novel has lately appeared, written by a distinguished author, and dealing with the adventures of an elderly psychotic who is finally admitted to a mental hospital."



terms in which the descriptions are written are disquieting and reminiscent of the past. Prejudice and unfamiliarity with existing conditions indicate the want of sympathy and understanding shown by the general public to the psychiatric physician in his work."

Let me quote here some paragraphs from my *Social Workers and the Insane*, recently amended. In reply to the question, "Are kindness, sympathy, pity, charity, wasted on the insane?" I say—

Truly a mental hospital is a house of comedy and tragedy. Reasoning and argument have no practical value therein. Only sympathy, kindness and true friendship are of any avail. The mind-commotion in insanity is deep-seated. A man thinks and feels as he likes—his thoughts and feelings being his own; but when the foundations of his mind (those inherited and acquired impulses, strivings, motives, passions, emotional reactions and natural intelligence—common sense—which are the basis of human character) become disorganized and his conduct is involved, the social conscience has something to say, hence the restrictions the community places on his freedom.

The power of love and kindness to control the conduct of others is unlimited. Are the insane kept in a mental hospital? If they decided to go home, home they would go. Our light hospital buildings and the proportionately few nurses would not detain them a moment; yet escapes from asylums are perhaps fewer than from prisons. Bars to windows, physical restraint, etc., are unknown nowadays in mental hospitals. The chains are there, however, although not forged from iron or steel. Kindness is much stronger and more effective, being links of kindness and persuasion, with attendants being the doctor and the nurse.

So it is not that the ground is barren for the exercise of these virtues. On the contrary, they are the only crops that flourish."

It will be long before the general public will be brought to believe this. I for one at least do not despair that they will in time, but it behoves the mental hospitals to make these ideals more and more to heart and thus make them more and more effective for good. Now, if these notions were to prevail generally among the community, most of the troubles regarding the treatment of mental diseases would disappear. There is no doubt in my mind that the work of mental hospitals suffers because of the continuance of public ignorance as to what insanity really is and the prejudiced attitude adopted to the insane and the ex-mental hospital patient.

## VI.

Many mental hospitals lack public sympathy and support. They need the public with them and not apathetic or against them. They work in too much isolation and secrecy and fall thus easy victims to misrepresentation and abuse. There should



be more opportunities for public co-operation, and for public criticism and standing of the work of the mental hospitals.

It must be remembered that mental hospitals are of necessity bound by law and, despite the goodwill of the local authorities, they are not as free to contract, expand, evolve and progress with the general advancement of medicine as general hospitals on a voluntary basis, which have more liberty and less restriction in the matter of expenditure.

Furthermore public mental hospitals, in addition to their primary function of curing or alleviating mental disorders, are called upon to carry out an essential duty to the community by acting as the guardians of the insane who are incurable. The general hospitals, speaking figuratively, put their incurables on the door-step for removal elsewhere and wash their hands of them.

There is a tendency nowadays to forget, in the enthusiasm for the home treatment of early and curable cases, that one wholesome function of the Lunacy and Mental Deficiency Acts is the segregation from the public of those who, by reason of mental disorder or defect, impair the social machine by their inefficiency as citizens, and that the more thoroughly this is done the better for the home and the nation.

We thus reduce the intensity of many other costly social problems. In the majority of cases the private care of the chronic lunatic is but a poor substitute for institution care and, unless there is exceptionally suitable environment, the proper place for such a person is undoubtedly a mental institution.

Nevertheless mental hospitals should, as far as practicable, be thrown open to the same spirit as are the general hospitals, and the cleansing and stimulating influence of a correctly informed public opinion brought constantly to bear upon mental hospital care and treatment. Mental hospitals, like general hospitals, should be a part and parcel of the everyday life of the community and not excrescences hidden away from the public eye.

How this could best be brought about has exercised my mind a good deal. Several points arose for consideration.

The isolated position the mental hospitals undoubtedly occupy in the community organization is the outcome of the endeavour, actuated by motives of public decency and regard for the feelings of patients and their friends and relatives, to avoid pandering to idle curiosity and morbidity, and to secure rest and seclusion for the patients.

There is no doubt that indiscriminate visiting of the wards by the public should not be allowed. Such would appeal too much to the morbidly inclined, though



that they would find little to satisfy them anywhere in a mental hospital. It would it be fair to the patient or his relatives and friends that his loss of privacy and distressed state of mind should be freely open to prying eyes of the public, prone to uncharitableness. Mental hospitals harbour no secrets except the identity of the patients and their individual sayings and doings. To say that the insane are treated "behind a shut door" is not quite the truth, and is thus very misleading. The visiting-rooms and a good number of wards of the mental hospitals as a rule swarm with visitors twice weekly and on public holidays. Anybody who gives the name of a patient can gain admission on visiting-days. All the seriously ill can be seen at any time of the day or night. But visitors are not to see individual patients—not to the hospital generally. It is rare that the medical authorities have occasion to forbid a visit. Thus the mental hospital always has strangers at its gates.

There must be at least 20,000 people actually employed in mental hospitals. Every employee belongs to some family circle or other, and so, through them alone, many thousands of people scattered throughout the land the happenings in mental hospitals can be no secret. About 10,000 patients pass through the mental hospitals annually—in 10 years 100,000. These also, in the main, have relatives and friends. Under these conditions it would be difficult to keep anything secret in a mental hospital except personal details like the names of patients, etc.

"behind a shut door" is not really truly descriptive of mental hospitals. It is rather one of those sayings dear to the hearts of smart journalists and other purveyors of sensationalism.

Now all these facts regarding the mentally afflicted and the work of the public mental hospitals should be laid to heart by all social workers, who can do much to influence public opinion and help to remove that ignorance and prejudice which stand against progress being made in regard to the care and treatment of the mentally afflicted.

## VII.

*What, therefore, is the solution of the problem of the isolation of the mental patients and the insane, and the disabilities to both patients and staff which arise from it?*

I concluded some six years ago that the way out of the difficulty would be to leave the outside community to bear upon the daily life of the mental hospitals in the form of hospital visitors and social workers—level-headed, discreet and kindly



women, and in some cases men, with some idea of mental disorders, who would into the wards regularly a breath of fresh air from the outside world to institution conventionality and narrow-mindedness. These social workers, others, would pay particular attention to friendless patients. They would a communicating link between the patients and their homes. They would reliable information regarding the patients' home environment of great v the medical officer, and thus help him materially as regards causation, tre and subsequent disposal of the patients on recovery. They would interest selves in the social life of the wards, the entertainment and recreation of the p and be a consolation and comfort especially to those confined to bed for p reasons. Above all, it would be a way in which the public could be broug closer touch with the mental hospitals. To such social workers when they s say in annual conference—the public would listen and have confidence in wh said.

And so it came to pass that, with the approval of the London County Mental Hospitals Committee, a beginning was made at Horton Mental Hospi the appointment on June 9, 1922, of Miss V. M. Dale as Hospital Visitor, and conclude I will relate something of her work.\*

There are now hospital visitors to all but one of the London County Hospitals.

The movement has spread to the provincial mental hospitals, where making some headway, and I hope that in due course medical administra any public mental hospital will not be considered complete without a hospital assisted by a sufficient number of social workers for service in the war in the homes of the patients.

I can speak of the value of a hospital visitor's work from first-hand ledge at Horton Mental Hospital. There she has been a source of great cor the patients and, as an intermedium between them and their homes has solve difficulties in not a few cases. She has assisted in organizing social parties hospital and picnics to pretty spots in the neighbourhood, etc., and in mar added to the patients' happiness. Her visits to the patients' homes have nev resented: on the contrary, they have been much appreciated. The nurses v her visits, and value her help in providing for the patients' contentme doing many little services for them which nobody else is in a position

\* The author takes this opportunity of expressing his appreciation of the valuable given in this provision by the Society of the Crown of Our Lord which now maintains time visitor at one of these hospitals. Miss Dale is the head of the Society's Hostel.



ff at Horton would not like to lose the Hospital Visitor. There was never difficulty in finding the directions in which she could be of most service; her work has been consolidated, and the part she plays is now an integral part of hospital administration.

It should be noted that she does not, as a rule, undertake "after-care" work, which is done by the workers of the After-Care Association, and it is very advisable that it should continue so, as it is work for which special training and knowledge is required.

After-care is best centralized in an organization which can direct the operations throughout the land and keep in touch with employers over a wide area, and also with convalescent institutions, rest-houses or hostels, which are absolutely necessary in dealing with cases not quite fit to be given entire freedom. Such a central association can follow up cases however widely they scatter on complete discharge. Local branches or after-care societies can materially aid the parent organization in this work.

New York State hospitals for the insane and the mental hospitals of most of the other American states have very complete organizations for carrying out the work I have just been describing, and its importance is very thoroughly appreciated. The officials appointed to do this work are trained psychiatric social workers, and they are regular officers on the staff of the hospitals.

In America happier relationships exist between the public on the one hand and mental hospitals and their staff and patients on the other, and there is but little of the regrettable element of superstition, suspicion and mistrust which unfortunately characterize such relationships here.

In this country I think it will be essential for some years that hospital visitors should not be paid officials of any particular hospital or mental service. If they become officials, their work, like that of all mental hospital employees, will be looked upon with suspicion and their influence weakened accordingly. To gain and to have the respect and influence they should have, they must be independent, but such arguments cannot be advanced against their receiving out-of-pocket expenses.

Some day of the time when perhaps the mental hospital visitors will establish an organization of their own and become a power in the land, to which both the public and the mental hospital authorities and their servants may look for help and counsel as being specially qualified to envisage difficult social psychiatric problems from both points of view. Some such body of opinion is badly needed at present.



## VIII.

It is necessary to say something more regarding the field work of the hospital visitors.

The late Dr. R. H. Cole, in his Presidential Address, Section of Psychiatry, Society of Medicine, in quoting the statistics of the Board of Control in regard to the recoveries and total discharges of direct admissions of certified patients, and the recovery rate at an American psychopathic hospital, says, "Such figures would doubt compare favourably with the same number of patients admitted to a general hospital." I have no grounds for disputing this statement, though if I had my choice as to whether I would be afflicted with a physical or a mental complaint, from the point of view of the chances of recovery, I should select a physical ailment and I fancy he would have too.

He did not, however, mention the really important point, though it doubtless occurred to him, and that is the future of the 50-70% who do not recover. In regards general hospitals, they either die or return to outside life and do not return, very largely a charge on the public.

The public not only expect mental patients to recover, but they object to the accumulation at their charge of the chronic insane—so much so that from time to time a really certain cure, the lethal chamber, finds its advocates.

Thus the public expect better results from the mental hospitals than they do from the general hospitals. They have in reality no justifiable complaint on this comparison as to the proportion of cases returned to their homes, either cured or alleviated, but there is something to be said for their objection to maintaining those who cannot or cannot be cured.

So the psychiatrist has a hard task before him if he is to satisfy all the requirements of the public and he cannot afford to lose a single curable case.

Now for some years before the war, and especially since, it has begun to be said of him that he has been expending too much time and energy in painting pictures of mental disorders—clinical pictures, anatomical pictures, chemical pictures—very descriptive of the diseases with which he is dealing, but far from being of any factory as guides to their successful treatment—his real aim and object.

Up to that time psychology largely limited itself to answering the question "How?" of life and behaviour, and found itself at a full stop when the question "Why?" was put. It was still at the descriptive stage and had not yet entered into the dynamic stage of a science.



Then, however, dynamic conceptions in psychology have made their advent and have been exerting a powerful influence on psychiatry to this day.

Psychiatrists slowly but surely came to realize that the answer to the question "What?" of all the pictures they had been painting hitherto was the all-important factor in the treatment of mental disorders. Now, these dynamic conceptions in psychology and psychiatry are based upon biological and genetic data of two kinds—hereditary and individual. The former have to do with innate dispositions or instincts and their racial evolution purpose, and the latter with the individual's strivings or efforts in relation thereto and their subservience to the social instinct and the consequences that follow.

As it has come about that the clinical psychiatrist is tending less and less to view cases from the descriptive and static point of view of reason, judgment, ideas, sensation, hallucination, association, incoherence, retardation, amnesia, in favour of the more dynamic conceptions of instincts, motives, wishes, desires, emotions and, above all, character—which embraces natural intelligence, disposition, temperament, sentiment. He is not satisfied with descriptions, but wants to know "Why?" and searches the patient's mind from its infancy for this purpose. He goes further and invades that psychic underworld—the phylogenic mental past in which are to be found those stores or springs of energy which lie at the base of all human behaviour. Speaking figuratively, he is no longer satisfied with surface appearances, which do not help him very much, but seeks with the aid of microscopes those facts which are essential to the proper understanding of cases.

As T. H. Morgan says: "Doubtless we think with only a small part of our past, but it is our entire past, including the original bent of our soul, that we desire, will, and

in the building up of a case of mental disorder must commence from this historic view-point if treatment is to be direct and effective. Clinical pictures, mental and physical, though very necessary, merely reflect deeper psychical disturbances which can only be arrived at by a close examination of the history of the patients in its three main directions, namely (a) family history, (b) personal history, commencing from childhood, (c) history of the present illness. But this treatment can only be empirical, or limited to that designed to remove the physical accompaniments of mental disorder.

In order to obtain these very vital historical facts, merely interviewing the patient and his friends at the hospital is not sufficient, and the information thus obtained is often unreliable and sometimes purposely misleading. Insanity in the family,



directly exciting causes and even previous attacks are not uncommonly covered for the not altogether inexcusable reason that thereby such information must be given to the length of the patient's detention.

The chief fact concealed is the relative's own participation in the cause. For example, the attitude of the husband, whose treatment of his wife may be all important. Naturally his account is designed to attribute blame to anybody or anything but his own personal actions. The same of parents and children and visitors. The ascertainment of the circumstances which lead to the patient's admission is also important.

Furthermore, the information so obtained is incomplete inasmuch as full knowledge of the patient's previous environment cannot be ascertained.

There can be no question that the information gleaned by the medical officer in the usual way should always be checked, verified and supplemented by visits to the homes and prior surroundings of the patient, to arrive at the influence which he has been exposed as far back in his life as is practicable, to ascertain his habits, his family life, his character, his temperament, his relationships with his friends, neighbours, etc.—in other words, to find out what manner of man he is, how the world has treated him, and what he has hitherto done with his life, etc.; also to relieve the anxiety of friends and relations and to assure them that the patient is in good hands.

Let me put it another way: The psychiatrist cannot now content himself with pictures, however well drawn and coloured, of the damage done, and with the evidence as to its occurrence, but must proceed to the place (by deputy) where the accident happened, and hold an enquiry on the spot and thus obtain the evidence of eye-witnesses.

Now experience shows that a discreet, discerning and sympathetic visitor or social worker is needed for this work, which obviously cannot be undertaken by the medical officer in person. Even if he could be spared from the hospital he would often fail in his purpose, while success as a rule rewards the efforts of the visitor or social worker.

Too much emphasis cannot be laid on the fact that this information must be forthcoming before effective treatment can be commenced. It is not a question of inquiries for compiling statistics or for educational purposes or for ascertaining mental deficiency, but of the life or death of the mind, without which man cannot live. So the hospital visitor and the social workers generally of a mental hospital do really vital work, and upon their zeal, efficiency and loyalty in large measure depends the best that modern psychiatry can do for the cure of mental disorders.



## APPENDICES.

## I.

the spring of 1922 I heard that Colonel Lord was enquiring for someone to visit patients at Horton, not as an L.C.C. official, but as an authorized hospital doctor from the outside world, and I most gladly undertook to try and do this.

At first it was rather tentative, but soon I found that it developed in the following three directions :

1. Visiting the patients in the hospital.
2. Doing commissions for the patients.
3. Visiting the patients' homes and friends on behalf of the doctor.

*As regards the first.* I have been down to the hospital pretty regularly two or three times a week ever since 1922. I began by visiting chiefly the admission villa-  
gals and getting to know the patients as they came in. It is often to these newly  
admitted patients that one can be of most use and, if their stay in hospital is prolonged,  
usually are passed on to the main building, where I can follow them up; so that  
now I have friends in pretty well all the wards.

A great many of the patients are quite coherent and clear in their minds on most  
subjects, and they welcome a chat and the sight of someone from outside the hospital;  
as regards the more difficult people, I have found that however confused they are,  
apparently unconscious of their surroundings and of one's presence, they are often  
really unconscious of it, and some have told me afterwards that, my just sitting  
beside their beds, has made them feel that they had a particular friend in the  
hospital, and that has given them comfort and relief.

Besides actually visiting the wards, I am also often allowed to take patients for  
trips into Epsom, where they love to see the shops and have some tea, or else ten or  
fifteen of them come (with one or two nurses) for a picnic up on the Downs or Box  
where we spend the afternoon.

*Doing jobs for the patients* is also part of my work. They often ask me to go  
and see their friends, who cannot visit them just at first, and the effort of writing a  
letter to whom is often too much for them. It is an interesting fact, I think, that  
they never give me an incorrect address. Even after a silence of forty years I was  
able to get a reply from a long-lost brother in Canada for one old patient. The  
brother's letter began : "Forty years ago I wrote to you, and you never answered my  
letter." He had not tried again ! Sometimes by visiting the home one can reassure  
a patient on certain points. One young mother who had just had twins had the  
delusion that they and her house had been burnt. I went to Camberwell and saw the  
mother safely tucked up in bed and the house still standing. I suppose the delusion  
must have been weakening, for the patient really believed me when I told her and her  
husband was easier in consequence, though she said afterwards that she was not quite  
sure that I was not "pulling her leg."



3. As regards *visiting the patients' homes on behalf of the doctor*. I will only say of this from the point of view of the visitor, and from that point of view I think almost the most interesting part of the work. It certainly involves a great deal of journeying about London, but, apart from any value that the information obtained may or may not have for the doctor, one is amply repaid by the real gratification of the relations in nearly every case. It is often a very real relief to them to talk of about the patient and his misfortune to someone with some sort of understanding of it, after having kept silence as much as possible till then. Also they do well to hear news of a loved mother or wife or child during the first few weeks, when they cannot themselves visit the hospital, and I can tell them not only how the patient is, but also how well they are being cared for and how beautiful is the hospital and its grounds, and thus relieve their anxieties and correct many misconceptions, only too common as to mental hospitals and the conditions under which the patients live.

V. M. DAI

## II.

Since this thesis was written, the Report of the Royal Commission on Lunacy and Mental Disorders (England and Wales) dated July 7, 1926, has been made available. It very fully endorses the views set forth by the author on many matters, especially by the following recommendations:

"IV (b). Voluntary Boarders might be received in any public mental hospital, registered hospital, licensed house, general hospital, nursing home or in single care."

"XIX. We recommend for general adoption the practice initiated in certain mental hospitals of the London County Council by which voluntary unofficial visitors of suitable experience have been appointed to act as friends of the patients and the relations of patients are under care."

The Rt. Hon. H. P. Macmillan, K.C., LL.D., Chairman of the Commission, speaking at a public meeting of the National Council for Mental Hygiene on November 17, 1926, said:

Now the other matter on which I wish to say a word or two—again a matter intimately connected with your province—is this: it is the preservation of contact with the outer world in the case of patients in our mental hospitals. All of us know the admirable work that is done in our general hospitals by visitors from without. I am sure many a patient has been grateful for the kindnesses received at the hands of hospital visitors. Philanthropy has always done a great deal for the patients in our general hospitals—little attentions of all sorts, so welcome when one is feeling down and out, such as entertainments, means of communication with the outside, little services of one sick person to another. You cannot over-estimate the importance of those things to a sick person.

Now why is it that in the case of our mental hospitals so little has been done in this direction? Why is it that the general public take so little interest in what goes on inside the walls of our mental hospitals? I am afraid again it is just a relic of that age-long feeling of repulsion and aversion from those who are mentally afflicted. It is right to say that it is not everyone's work; it is perhaps, of a more difficult character than the pleasant task of going round the wards of a child hospital. It is most difficult work, and calls for greater qualities of mind and, perhaps, a deeper sympathy with human misfortune, but I would very strongly impress upon you the desire



ouraging the visitation of our mental hospitals by unofficial persons from the outside. It is very interesting to visit these places, and no one can visit them without seeing how welcome visitors from the outside.

A large part of the population of the mental hospitals of this country consists of people who, notwithstanding the fact that they are suffering from some form of mental aberration, are still largely able to appreciate kindness, and are susceptible to the pleasures of a visit from a sympathetic friend. Many of them are anxious about the state of their home affairs, and their anxieties are relieved and a more contented frame of mind induced by the news brought them by friends outside. We took note in our Report of the admirable work that had been done at Claybury Hospital by a lady visitor there, but I am happy this afternoon to be able to make good an omission in that Report. I fear we failed to do justice to one who, after all, has been truly the pioneer of the work; I refer to your Honorary Secretary, Lt.-Col. Lord. (Applause.) It was really through the instrumentality that the first lady visitor was introduced into Horton Hospital, and since then, we have, in the case of no fewer than seven out of the nine London County Council Hospitals there, a lady visitor, who makes it her business, her pleasure, her vocation, to go in and out among the patients, to render to them just those forms of service of which I have spoken. Col. Lord could tell you very much better than I can of the value of that service. It is a form of contact between the outer world and the patient which is of inestimable value. The most distressing thing to many patients is the feeling that they are cut off from the world, that the world no longer cares for them, that they are a people set apart as if some strange curse had fallen upon them.

Now a visitor from outside can do an immense amount to help in that respect, and I think lady visitors are perhaps the best. Why is it we like and admire hospital nurses so much—(Laughter)—why is it that Dr. Robertson has recognized how important it is to have women nurses to a certain extent as possible in mental hospitals? It is because of the sympathy and the refining influences which they can bring to bear that their services are so intensely appreciated in all circumstances of sorrow and distress, and therefore it is to the woman who may be disposed to take up that branch of work that I make a special appeal on this occasion. And it is a rewarding form of work, it seems to me. Sometimes it is distasteful, sometimes depressing, sometimes discouraging, but who choose to take it up will find an exceeding great reward in the gratitude of those to whom they minister. They are also able to contribute something to the medical side, because by being in touch with the homes of the sufferers they are able to find out many facts which can be communicated to the medical officers, and thus often to facilitate the diagnosis of cases which might otherwise seem obscure. This organization of mental hospital visitors which is springing up ought to be as little official as possible. We do not want the lady visitor to be an official in the ordinary sense.

The patient prefers to see someone who is not stamped with officialdom. It should be a labour of love than any official duty, and I would commend that form of social activity as perhaps one of the most valuable contributions to the treatment of the mentally afflicted which the Council might stimulate. (Applause.)











