

those who write so much on the subject know, and Dr. Kirkbride's efforts to change that condition of things were earnest and persistent, and while not a believer in absolute non-restraint, he yet held firmly to the opinion, as he did to all that he had formed cautiously and deliberately, that restraint should be used only when the condition of the case, and the benefit of his fellow-patients, really demanded it, or, in other words, on the same principle that a surgeon would apply a splint to a broken limb; and the truth was strongly expressed by Dr. Bucknill, of England, that while Dr. Kirkbride believed in restraint, he rarely used it.

Dr. Kirkbride was one of the founders of "The Association of Medical Superintendents of American Institutions for the Insane," and for eight consecutive years was its President. He was also a Fellow of the College of Physicians of Philadelphia, an Honorary Member of the British Medico-Psychological Association, and a member of the American Philosophical Society.

---

*Correspondence.*

*To the Editors of THE JOURNAL OF MENTAL SCIENCE.*

GENTLEMEN,—In Prof. Cleland's rejoinder to my reply, which appeared in the last number of the Journal, he refers the reader to his paper in the July number, and to his previous memoir which it supplements; and he goes on to say that he "suspects that those who pursue this course will have a great advantage over Dr. Mercier." I do not for a moment impute to Dr. Cleland any intentional discourtesy, but the passage I have quoted might mislead a hasty reader into the belief that Dr. Cleland accuses me of the dishonourable course of criticising a paper that I have never read. Against such an interpretation of this passage I am bound to protect myself. My reply concerned only Dr. Cleland's paper in the July number of this Journal; it was not intended as, nor did it pretend to be, an answer to any other paper. As his article was written, as he avows, with the intention of explaining "more fully" his views on the relations of the nervous system to the operations of consciousness, I was under no obligation to go back to his previous utterances. As a matter of fact, I tried to procure a copy of the paper which he read before the British Association in 1870, but as it was not published in the "Report of the Association," I was unable to do so. Had I read that paper, however, I should certainly not have thought it fair to nail a writer to opinions expressed by him thirteen years before. That I read the article to which I did reply, and read it pretty carefully, is, I think, apparent not only from the detailed nature of my reply, but from the fact that in nine pages I have quoted Dr. Cleland's own words no less than twenty times. I feel sure that most of his readers will disagree with Dr. Cleland's opinion that no advantage to science would result from another contribution by him to the controversy; but as to this he is, perhaps, the best judge.

Will you allow me to make another explanation? Dr. Huggard, in his very interesting article on "Definitions of Insanity," quotes my definition as "a failure of the organisation to adjust itself to its environment," and proceeds to demolish it. This, however, is not my definition. I have defined insanity as "a failure of the process of adjustment of the organism to its environment," an expression which carries, to my mind, a meaning quite different from the one that Dr. Huggard ascribes to me. I should now substitute the term "disorder" for "failure."

Feb. 15.

Yours truly,  
CHAS. MERCIER.