

Appendix.

The following quotations are from letters received during the inquiry.

1. *From Dr. Bernard Hart, University College Hospital.*

I have for some years employed one of these workers in connection with my Department of Psychological Medicine at University College Hospital. I regard her as an indispensable member of the staff, and I cannot speak too highly of the assistance which I receive from her.

I have found no disadvantages. The only one which suggested itself when the experiment was first tried was that the social worker would create difficulties by entering patients' homes and making inquiries. In practice I have never found that this difficulty has arisen, although it is obviously necessary that the social worker should be a picked person, combining a thoroughly adequate training with reasonable tact.

2. *From Dr. R. Worth, Springfield Mental Hospital.*

The psychiatric social worker at Springfield commenced duty in October, 1933, and has since that date been engaged in work on more than 120 cases. In the majority of cases, full histories have been obtained, and these have proved of value from various points of view, notably in diagnosis, preparation for discharge, and in the after-care carried out by the social worker where deemed necessary, after discharge. It has also been found that the histories are of great value where any research work is undertaken in the hospital.

In connection with the work of preparation for discharge, the social worker has worked under the instructions of and in close co-operation with the medical staff, this enabling her to have the fullest knowledge of the patients in her efforts to secure a good adjustment in the homes and in employment.

Good after-care work is so closely linked with the prevention of mental illness that it is worth a great deal of consideration if the social worker's services are to be used to the fullest extent. At Springfield Hospital a great deal of importance is attached to the value of the Out-Patient Clinic. Attendance at the clinic, combined with the follow-up work in the homes of selected discharged patients, is found to help ex-patients to adjust themselves without too great a strain in the community.

A great deal of very excellent social work in the form of after-care is still carried on by such societies as the Mental After-Care Association, but that in no way eliminates or diminishes the need for psychiatric social work as an integral part of the direct hospital administration, under the direct control of the medical superintendent.

The type of social work outlined above, however, demands a high degree of training and experience, and it is to be hoped that in the training of all workers great care will be taken to select those with a wide experience in general social case work, and who have the personality which will enable them to make full use of the specialist training in mental health which is necessary to good work, such as that given at the London School of Economics. The taking of reliable histories in mental cases is in itself highly skilled work, and is an indication of the need for a sound training.

CORRESPONDENCE.

"HYPNOTISM, THE FRIEND OF MAN."

To the Editors of the 'Journal of Mental Science'.

SIR,—A review published in your issue for July, 1934, has been sent to me. It is of my last-published book, *Hypnotism, the Friend of Man*, but lamentably fails to represent me fairly. In one instance quotation marks are inserted as if the included passage were mine, whereas it is curiously mutilated. Worse still, the reviewer scornfully remarks: "It seems that, when used in the right way, hypnosis is more or less the panacea for all ills." In reality I have invariably emphasized the contrary. That fact is readily demonstrable:

In the first article written by me on hypnotism, I stated: "To pretend to cure all, or nearly all, complaints by hypnotism is sheer quackery" (*Weekly Times and Echo*, October 29, 1911). In my first book on hypnotism (*viz.*, *Rational Hypnotism*),

published in 1914, I stressed the same fact. In *Hypnotism, the Friend of Man*, I devoted a whole chapter to "Hygienic Auxiliaries", and towards the end of the book (p. 270) I declared: "There are some cases wherein hypnotism, even if backed by the most skilful of other treatment, is powerless, or only of use for the alleviation of coincident and aggravating troubles." Nevertheless, in view of the mental factor in complaints, and the harmlessness and, indeed, efficacy of skilfully applied hypnotism, I deemed myself justified in affirming that "there are extremely few cases of disease or disability in which the employment of hypnotism is counter-indicated". Medical practitioners of note have stated to the same effect.

I have no grievance against medical men as a body—indeed, much to the contrary. Here, for example, are two extracts taken from recent letters written to me by Dr. W. R. McGlashan, Physician to the Mental Health Services, Guernsey:

"Until I read your books the theory of hypnotism appeared so insulting to my reason that I did not take the trouble to investigate what, even if it was doing any good, seemed to be bluff and bunkum; your theory and explanations convince me that hypnotism is a rational reality and if the operator be convinced he is likely to do more good than an operator who blunders along with something that appears to him to be a shadow and a sham" (December 7, 1934).

"I wish to assure you that whatever expression of mine may seem to you useful in the interests of truth regarding the subject of hypnotism is at your service to reproduce whenever and wherever you may deem it appropriate" (December 15, 1934).

I could quote many medical opinions consistent with Dr. McGlashan's courageous utterances; and when my book on *Rational Hypnotism* was published (1914), Prof. James Sully, whose acumen as a psychologist is unlikely to be questioned, wrote to me: "You have brought to the consideration of the subject a good deal of knowledge as well as of critical judgment."

In the light of what I have written in this letter, unprejudiced readers will not place excessive reliance upon your reviewer's indictments, and will prefer to judge for themselves.

In asking you, Sir, to publish this letter, I am but asking you to do what I trust that, in any case, your sense of justice would have made you desirous of doing.

I am, Sir,
Yours faithfully,
J. LOUIS ORTON.

Dr. Stanford Read, in reply, writes:

"The reviewer regrets that Mr. Orton should feel that he has not been represented fairly in the criticism of his book, *Hypnotism, the Friend of Man*. However, on further consideration of what was previously said, no adequate grounds can be found for in any way changing the opinions expressed.

"Though Freud's theories have no special relationship with the main subject-matter under review, the author has, of course, every right to question their validity and reject them. Nevertheless, when it is stated that such doctrines are only modifications, extensions and corruptions of those of Janet, and that 'psycho-analysis' and 'catharsis' are only substitute terms for 'psychological analysis' and 'psychological dissociation', it can assuredly be said that any knowledgeable reader will, after such a flagrant misinterpretation, tend to look with suspicion upon further contents.

"The main grievance is that the reviewer quite erroneously concludes that the author regards hypnotism, when used in the right way, as more or less the panacea for all ills. It seems, though, that such a deduction is hardly ill-founded when it is vaunted as the cure for such a comprehensive list of 'nervous' disorders, heralded as of solid value for the prevention of imminent insanity and for the reclamation for a large proportion of criminals, and looked upon as such a valuable aid to health, efficiency and happiness. In his letter to the Editors Mr. Orton

seems to have himself confirmed this particular criticism by saying that he deems himself justified in affirming that 'there are extremely few cases of disease or disability in which the employment of hypnotism is counter-indicated'. The assertion is made that medical practitioners of note have stated to the same effect. One can only say that the modern psycho-pathologist respectfully differs from such an opinion. That there is much evidence of earnest study within the pages of Mr. Orton's book is apparent, but for readers of the *Journal of Mental Science* any other criticism but that given was hardly possible."

[*Note:* We regret that quotation marks were erroneously inserted in one passage of the review. However, we do not feel that Mr. Orton's views have been misrepresented thereby. The point is dealt with above by Dr. Stanford Read.—EDITORS.]

"A DISCLAIMER."

To the Editors of the 'Journal of Mental Science'.

SIR,—I am the author, jointly with Dr. Alexander Cannon, of two purely professional books dealing with psychiatry and neurology, published by Messrs. Heinemann in 1932 and 1934.

My co-author is, as is well known, the sole author of several "psychic" works, which have attracted a good deal of attention among the general public, and these works have had inserted therein, without my authority or approval, announcements relative to the joint professional works in question.

I desire to make it perfectly clear that had I known that references to the joint works referred to were intended by my co-author to be inserted in his psychic books, I should have prohibited this. I have intimated my disapproval in definite terms to Dr. Cannon, and requested his assurance that there shall be no further allusion to the joint work in any further editions of the "psychic" books, or in any other non-medical book whatsoever Dr. Cannon may write.

I should like to state, in fairness to my co-author, Dr. Cannon, that, on the matter being brought to his notice, he, unreservedly, agreed to comply with my wishes.

I am, Sir,

Yours faithfully,

E. D. HAYES

The Mental Hospital,
Berry Wood, Northampton;
March 1st, 1935.

OBITUARY.

DON SANTIAGO RAMÓN Y CAJAL.

ON October 17, 1934, death removed one of Spain's most eminent sons, who was of international fame in his special line of scientific research.

Santiago Ramón y Cajal was born on May 1, 1852, at Petilla, in the province of Aragon, his father being, at that time, a country practitioner. It is recorded that his original wish was to adopt an artistic career. His interest in art was maintained throughout his life, and doubtless contributed to the beauty of the illustrations which adorned his published work. He pursued his medical studies at the University of Saragossa, where his father had become Professor of Anatomy. Graduating in 1873, he entered the medical service of the Spanish army. He served in the Carlist war and in Cuba. After a severe illness he returned to Spain, where he introduced the microscope into medical study. He was appointed Professor of Anatomy at the University of Valencia in 1880; and in 1892 he was transferred to the Chair of Histology and Pathological Anatomy at Madrid, a post which he