is perfect; and the accumulating testimonials of casual visitors to the beautiful order and splendid appointments of the magnificent building, afford no proofs of the superiority of the medical treatment.

I had intended, before I closed my letter, to offer some observations upon the minor topics of employment and diet; and especially to have animadverted upon the treatment of the criminal lunatics (a class of patients so peculiarly interesting to the judicial as well as medical inquiry), as compared with the large sums paid for their maintenance, and the vast fund of knowledge of their character and habits which is lost, by the entire neglect of all reports and journals and registers respecting them; but want of space now forbids, and my subsequent letters must be limited to an inquiry into the causes of the torpor existing in the governing body, and suggestions for its improvement. I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

PHILANTHROPOS.

Jan. 7, 1841.

TREATMENT OF THE INSANE.

DR. COOKSON'S REPLY TO THE QUESTIONS OF
"A LOOKER-ON."

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

MR. EDITOR:—In answer to the queries put to me by "A Looker-on," in his letter, dated Nov. 12, 1840, and published in THE LANCET of Nov. 21, I beg to make the following replies:—

1. Yes.

2. In this paragraph there are three distinct questions, the first ending at the words "Miss A."

a. To this question I answer, that to the best of my knowledge and belief, my first entry tending to impugn the Lincoln non-restraint system, was made on the 4th of Aug. 1839.

b. 2. The second ends at the word "restraint."

Complaints were made by me, as I saw occasion, from this period.

c. I opposed the report of 1839. I protested against a part of it, and my protest is upon the minutes. I opposed none of the reports prior to that report.

3. This question is unintelligible to me; but were it perfectly clear what is meant, I should decline answering it, because, as far as I can make out any part of it, it appears to relate to a controversy between Mr. Hadwen and Mr. Hill. The question ought to be put to Mr. Hadwen, who is perfectly able,

and I dare say perfectly willing, to reply to it.

4. Three questions, first ending at "tied up."

a. By having my hands tied up, I mean that, that standing alone as I do, an opponent of the Lincoln system, I could not, with common prudence,—I may say, with safety to my professional character,—treat patients on any other system than that recognised as the Lincoln non-restraint system.

b. Ending at "case."

By the rules, full power.

c. My course of treatment was adapted to the Lincoln non-restraint system, because it was an experiment in course of trial to which I wished to give fair play; my adopting any other course of treatment would have been only wanton opposition, so long as the merits of the new system were on trial.

5. Two questions, one ending at "restraint."

1. I once did recommend instrumental restraint, when I thought a patient's health was suffering from the effects of protracted "seclusion," but that instrumental restraint was not administered.

2. I have said above, that by the rules I have full power; but in deference to the opinion of the majority, and in consideration of the experiment which has been going on, I have forborne to make use of that power.

6. A mere reduplication of the latter part of 4 and 5.

7. Two questions, one ending at "her."

a. 1. In my visits I did not see Miss A. in her bed-room: I never do (except in cases of sickness or infirmity) see patients in their night apartments. Miss A. was always, when I saw her, in one of the day-rooms* in the gallery, or in the airing-court.

b. 2. It is the duty of the house-visitor, and not of the physician, to attend to the domestic arrangements. It is the duty of the house-surgeon to provide the requisite furniture and utensils, and to point out to the visitor any deficiencies he may wish to have supplied. I repeat that Mr. Smith, the new house-surgeon, first pointed out the state of Miss A.'s cell to me: he asked me if I did not think it was "bad practice." I repeat

* When it was necessary to seclude Miss A. during the month of May, 1840, she was locked up by herself in one of the day-rooms, and the rest of the patients occupied the other. The weather grew hot, and the patients' day-room crowded: Miss A. was then locked up in her bed-room. When I heard of this in the month of August, I moved the reconstruction of the "noisy cells," which had been converted to other purposes during the period when restraint was abolished. These cells are now called "seclusion-rooms," and are considered absolutely necessary to the conducting of the house.

that I was guilty of no dereliction of duty in having failed to make a discovery in the department of another person at an earlier period; and I assert that it was my duty to report the discovery the moment I became aware of it.

It has been my wish to avoid the obscurity of which "A Looker-on" complains, I have, therefore, answered his questions as concisely as possible. To those which are categorical, I have replied by a simple affirmation; to those which demand explanation, I have given the briefest possible answer. The interrogatory method is of all the best for the purpose of eliciting truth when there is privilege of explanation; and of all the worst when that privilege is withheld, because it is then in the power of the interrogator to elicit exactly so much of the truth as may suit his purpose, and no more. I cannot think that "A Looker-on's" intention is to gain his point by a trick of this nature; I therefore claim the right of offering a few remarks, tending to throw light upon my replies to his question.

Your correspondent, in Q. 2, asks me whether any complaints were made to me during that period; I understand, period of three years of the abolition of restraint. Whether my entry of August 4, 1839, falls within his period of three years I know not; but I will explain to him the reason why I made no complaint earlier than the date given. When the total absence of restraint first began to be talked about, I did not think it would answer. We had before seen, in Mr. Hadwen's time, considerable periods in which instrumental restraint was disused, but they were never sufficiently long to induce me to think that it could be dispensed with at all times and in all cases. I did not, however, oppose a method of treatment with which I was almost unacquainted: the other medical officers were favourable to its adoption. Its soundness or unsoundness would be tested by experiment, and could be tested by experiment alone.

Time advanced; the treatment appeared to answer; I was shaken in my preconceived opinion, and I began to think that a great and novel discovery had been made. I was in this frame of mind, when, in the summer of 1839, I received information from a quarter claiming attention, to this effect, that if belts and hobbles had disappeared from our galleries, severity had not, and that much secret violence was committed.

I entered upon my duties in August, with the determination of reporting to the board (of which I was not then a member) through my official journal, every occurrence of which I had the slightest distrust. In fact, a report of mine, in February, 1840, led to an investigation; the result of that investigation convinced me that the specious "non-restraint" of Lincoln Asylum was infinitely more dangerous and more inhuman than a

well-regulated system of treatment, recognising the use of proper instrumental restraint, when such restraint might be judged necessary. From that hour I have never ceased to oppose and expose the non-restraint system of Lincoln; but until I was convinced that my suspicions respecting it were founded in fact and in truth, I offered no factious opposition. Was I right or was I wrong in so acting?

As respects the reports, they were published by the board, without my being consulted in the slightest possible degree. I was not a member of the board, and I had no voice in their publication or in their non-publication, until 1840. I had not even the right of remonstrance; but in 1840 I acquired that right, and I made use of it, and my protest is upon the minutes. The report I protested against is in your paper of to-day (Dec. 8th), and I will only further remark upon that subject, that it was in the pocket of the gentleman who wrote it until ten minutes before its adoption; had it passed in the hurry *nem. con.* I could not have blamed myself, for the passage I protest against is most judiciously worded; but I now see the snare into which I *might* have fallen.

I now come to my assertion that my hands are tied up. Conceive an asylum where there are three physicians and one house-surgeon; three of these four medical attendants agree in a new mode of treatment, they declare it to be practicable, they declare it to be the humane—the only humane mode of treatment; they procure its adoption by the board; it is every where talked of and boasted of as the system of the house: What course, pray, is left the physician in the minority? Are not his hands tied up from practising on any other system than that recognised by his colleagues and by the board? The system peculiar to the institution? The system to which they have given birth, and of which they boast? If his hands are not tied up by the laws of the institution, are they not tied up by courtesy? The only course it appears to me for a medical man so situated, is either entirely to withdraw himself from the institution, or to work the new system with his colleagues as well as he can, not carrying his complaisance, however, to such an extent as to overlook anything which he may deem flagrantly wrong, nor to fail to comment upon it in the *strongest terms he can command*. This, I think, is the common-sense view of the case, and I assert that I am justified in saying that my hands are tied up: but again, they are tied up in another way. It is the law of the Lincoln Asylum that the physicians shall rotate by months—thus the patients are subjected to the treatment of one physician one month, and of another the next. What would be the consequence of adopting my own mode of practice on any patient? Why that at the

end of my month the treatment would be altered, perhaps totally reversed by my successor, intent on carrying out the peculiar system called the "Lincoln restraint system."

Oh! but I shall be told, you want moral courage; if you are right, pursue your own plans, care for no one; adopt restraint when you like, for the laws allow you to do so. Yes; the laws allow me, I admit—the laws allow me to stand up single-handed with the other medical officers and their friends at the board opposed to me, and reprobating my attacks on their system. The laws allow me for one month to adopt any system I like at the hazard of all consequences that may result from a certain and immediate change of treatment at its termination, at the hazard of all obstacles which may be thrown in my way during the month, and with the pleasing prospect of being heartily abused for my endeavours both personally and in print. Let the law which appoints the physicians by rotation be changed. Let each physician have his own patients, and let him superintend their treatment, from the admission to the termination of the case. I will not shrink from my opinions, but will willingly measure my treatment with that of the "non-restraint system of Lincoln." I am in earnest in this matter, and I have already given notice to the board of a motion for the repeal of the law, but so long as that law exists my hands are tied.

Q. 6 is a mere reduplication of the latter clauses of 4 and 5, but I do not wish to shirk it, and therefore at the risk of being tedious I return to it. I repeat, nothing prevents my employing instrumental restraint if I choose to do so; I *have not* employed it, because I would not wantonly oppose or interfere with the fair trial of a new experiment. That reason now no longer exists, for I consider the *Lincoln* non-restraint system a complete failure, specious, dangerous, and infinitely more inhumane than a properly-directed system recognising the use of restraint in cases where it appears to be necessary. But even now, I see nothing but extreme dissension and extreme ill-will likely to arise from one individual endeavouring to alter the received system of the house. It is a matter for me to think upon; but from the consideration I have given it, it appears to me that the very worst consequences must flow from two different systems being in use in one and the same institution, unless—mind what I say—unless each physician is to treat his own patients on his own principles, and on his own responsibility, without let or hindrance from any one during the whole of their stay in the house, from their admission into it to the termination of the case.

I have now done with "Looker-on's" questions. Before I conclude, allow me to

ask, How it comes that I have been compelled to enter at full length upon a defence of myself? It is because my motives and not my facts have been impugned. Look at the whole of the "Looker-on's" queries, Do they question the facts respecting the Lincoln system?—No! They are only questions, the mooted of which are calculated to raise doubts about the purity of my object and motives.

"Looker-on's" plea is what is generally termed an Old Bailey plea, an attempt to lead away the attention from the facts, by bullying the witness and insinuating things against his credit; but I will set "Looker-on" and all other motive-mongers at rest. I will and do hereby admit myself as cruel as Nero, and as jealous as the Moor, if it is the slightest satisfaction to them. Does that throw the least shadow of doubt upon the fact, that six attendants, out of an establishment of twelve, have in this year, 1840, been dismissed by the board, for abusing and ill-treating patients? Does the circumstance of my having a cruel and jealous disposition, disprove that five out of ten were dismissed by the board last year for similar causes? Does the hypothesis of my spleen and cruelty satisfactorily account for the mismanagement of Miss A.'s case during the superintendence of my colleagues; or does it tend to prove that Miss A.'s case is *not* a scandal to the house, and perhaps to the profession? Does, but I will conclude, Mr. Editor, by assuring you that this is the last letter I shall condescend to write in explanation of my motives. I have now done it fully, and I shall not allow myself again to be driven out of the main tract of this inquiry.

I am very much afraid that I do not feel sufficiently grateful for the considerate and delicate wording of "Looker-on's" last paragraph; I am unused to these refinements—the truth I hold to be true, and the untruth I hold to be untrue. I acknowledge no nice shadings, no delicate transitions between truth and falsehood, nor do I wish to take advantage of any, the existence of which, his kindness might dispose him to imagine in my behalf.

Perhaps "Looker-on" will like to answer a few questions himself. I append some for his amusement, the answers to them will put him on the right scent of his wishes to dive into the mysteries of Lincoln non-restraint, and tend to wean him of that truly bilious habit of thinking, that in inquiries of this sort, MOTIVES are of more consequence than FACTS. I have the honour to be your humble servant,

Dec. 9, 1840.

W. D. COOKSON.

QUESTIONS FOR "A LOOKER-ON."

1. Were there, or were there not, five attendants, out of an establishment of ten, dismissed from the service of Lincoln Asylum,

for beating and otherwise cruelly treating patients during 1839?

2. Were there, or were there not, others who were cautioned and reprimanded by the board for similar offences, of less degree of flagrancy?

3. Have, or have not, six, out of an establishment of twelve, attendants been dismissed from the service of Lincoln Asylum, for beating and otherwise cruelly treating patients since January, 1840?

4. Have, or have not, others been reprimanded by the board for similar offences?

5. Have, or have there not been witnesses examined before the board of Lincoln Asylum, whose evidence goes directly to prove that patients of the institution have been shamefully beaten and abused by the nurses and keepers during the last three years?

6. Have, or have not, these witnesses been at least fifteen in number, and of the following classes?

a. 1. Convalescents leaving the house?

b. 2. Patients considered cured, and following their callings in the world at the time of making deposition?

3. Attendants at the time in the service of the house?

4. Attendants at former periods, not at the time in the service of the house?

5. Individuals not connected with the house, who saw from walls which overlook the premises, brutalities of the grossest nature committed on the patients?

7. Is this evidence on the minutes, or is it not?

8. Were not other witnesses in attendance, ready to be examined by the board of May 25?

1. Had, or had not, these witnesses been called in virtue of an order of a former board?

2. Were, or were not, those witnesses refused a hearing?

3. Did, or did not, the chairman sit until 7 P.M. hearing other evidence not specially appointed to be heard?

9. Are there not letters from recovered patients on the minutes, charging particular attendants with acts of cruelty?

10. Has there been one single witness brought to contradict this evidence?

11. Has there been one single witness brought before the board, to deny the infliction of the alleged blows and other violence?

12. Is the following a regulation of the board, or is it not?

"Ordered, that the person of every patient be examined, especially and carefully, by the house-surgeon and matron respectively, on the morning before the meeting of each board, and at other times; and that marks (if any) found upon their persons, be reported in the 'Memorandum-book' forthwith to the board."

1. Was the practice prescribed by this re-

gulation observed during the non-restraint experiment, or was it not?

2. Were the weekly reports made as prescribed, or were they not?

3. If made, where are they?

13. Has "A Looker-on" admitted that Miss A.'s case is a scandal to the house, or has he not?

"A Looker-on" asks on whom the censure ought to fall?

14. I ask, ought it to fall on the officer who reports the case?

Admit that some officer is to blame.

15. Is the non-restraint system, which allows such neglect in any of its officers to pass unnoticed, a sound, healthy, and improved system?

16. Does "A Looker-on" think that the system, as carried out at Lincoln, works well?

17. Does he think it a humane system?

W. D. C.

THE HUMANE SYSTEM OF TREATING THE INSANE.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR:—I have to apologise for addressing you so soon after you were kind enough to publish my letter on the *impropriety of the total abolition* of all restraint in the treatment of insanity, and I should not now venture to intrude myself on you did I not feel it incumbent on me to answer an insinuation contained in an article headed, "Coercion of the Insane; Reply of 'A Looker-on' to Mr. Stilwell and Dr. Blake;" which has since appeared in your Journal of the 26th instant; I shall pass over that part of the *reply* alluding to Mr. Stilwell and Philalethes, and only notice what applies to me. The learned "Looker-on" attacks me on three points. First, he says, *facetiously*, "Dr. Blake surprises me, I wish he would get out of the Lincoln atmosphere, and not join in the cry against Mr. Hill, who seems to have raised a jealousy in that neighbourhood, because he has ventured, as a young man, to give a lecture on insanity, which nothing will allay." Now I beg to say that your anonymous correspondent had no grounds for this accusation; I never found fault with Mr. Hill for having given a lecture on insanity, I only objected to the assertion contained in *his book*, that "restraint is never necessary, never justifiable, and always injurious, in all cases of lunacy whatsoever;" and it is satisfactory to me to find that your correspondent, at the conclusion of his reply, admits the validity of my objection, by saying, "His cases, illustrative of the necessity of restraint, answer themselves." The second attempt at finding