

The evil effect of idleness has been a matter of common observation of those caring for the insane and in most hospitals Occupational Therapy has taken a large place in their treatment. As soon as possible after their reception all patients should be encouraged to engage in employment of some kind and whether their stay in the hospital be long or short they should be constantly supervised so that they will not fall a prey to idleness. Before the value of Occupational Therapy was recognized, with the exception of out-door work, idleness was the rule and our institutions are filled with patients who have forgotten how to work. Nevertheless there should be a constant endeavor to arouse them from their apathy and stimulate their interest in some occupation.

Entertainments should be a daily routine, for it is in hospitals as elsewhere that "all work and no play makes Jack a dull boy." It is impossible with a small medical staff and an eight hour nursing shift to provide much amusement for the patients and I have long been of the opinion that our hospitals should have on the staff some one to plan and carry out the entertainments so beneficial to the mental health and happiness of the patient. It seems to me that here would be a place for the social entertainer in our state hospital. Such a one should exude cheerfulness, as the social life in a hospital should be made a joyous one and there is much that could be done to relieve the monotony of hospital existence. Unless the medical and nursing staff be large, it is impossible for them to give to the patients that individual attention which they should receive.

Dr. Isaac Ray in writing of a visit to foreign hospitals in 1846 says "that in the English hospital at Hanwell some attention is given to the instruction of patients and in the French hospitals schools for instruction in the rudiments of learning form part of the ordinary routine of moral treatment." I believe that the school has an important place in the therapy of our state hospitals. For many years a school for patients has been conducted in the Rochester State Hospital by a patient, an ex-school teacher, and the eagerness of the pupils to learn and their joyousness in the acquisition of knowledge has convinced us that such opportunities should be further extended.

Beauty parlors have been installed in some state hospitals and I believe can be of very great therapeutic value enabling the patients to see themselves as others see them and stimulating their pride in their personal appearance. I think that if every one in this audience were potential cases of mental disease requiring treatment in some hospital and were empowered, in anticipation of such a calamity, to select and develop their own environment, there would be many wonderfully pleasant, homelike hospitals prepared for their reception. I am sure that every one knows the value of pleasant surroundings in any condition of life.

With all the advancement in the care and treatment of the insane, there is one common evil that still continues to flourish and that is the overcrowding of all state hospitals. Is it a condition, that, because it

has always existed, must continue to exist and are we willing to acknowledge that such a condition can never be corrected? The only way to prevent it is to anticipate the overcrowding by providing suitable accommodations for the estimated increase.

As you may realize, modern treatment of the insane in our state hospitals is not dependent alone on advanced psychiatry but on the interest, encouragement and support of our citizens, who, not begrudging the small amount contributed by each individual, may be willing to undergo still greater sacrifice in furthering the better care of those dependent upon their bounty.

Dr. C. Floyd Haviland in his presidential address before The American Psychiatric Association, stated that in New York "when the proposal of a fifty million dollar bond issue primarily for state hospitals was first advanced in 1923, considerable opposition immediately develop-

Proceedings of the Minnesota State Conference and Institute of Social Work - Thirty-fifth Annual Session of the Conference and Fourth Session of the Institute, St. Paul, Minnesota Sept. 12-17, 1927

THE STATE'S PROGRAM FOR THE FEEBLE-MINDED

F. Kuhlmann, Director, Division of Research, State Board of Control, St. Paul, Minnesota

Minnesota's program compares favorably with that of any state in the Union. It includes nearly all the more progressive phases of such programs to be found elsewhere, as well as a few items which, we hope, may be called Minnesota's own contributions. But it is not the object of this paper to make detailed comparisons, however, well the facts might lend themselves for emulations. Continued progress can be achieved only by a constant effort to see and to attain what still lies ahead, and is helped but little by dwelling on the excellencies of past records.

Let me state first some of the basic facts about the feeble-minded that any program must aim to meet. I shall then outline the program Minnesota is carrying out, and discuss points wherein it is still lacking.

The higher grades of the feeble-minded, commonly called morons, are rarely recognized as such by their relatives, friends or other lay associates. Morons constitute over three fourths of all feeble-minded. They produce the great majority of feeble-minded of all grades of any generation. They constitute about a third of the population of our corrective and penal institutions, and in general contribute around five times their share to the delinquency and dependency found in the general population. Under certain conditions, they are capable of earn-

ing their own living, and of conducting themselves in accordance with the laws and ordinary customs of their community. These conditions are a good home from early childhood and permanent guardianship throughout their lives. This constitutes their real needs, rather than confinement in state institutions. Half or more of them lack the good home and these establish habits that lead to dependency and delinquency. But many, on the other hand, get at least approximately the required guardianship from relatives or friends, and do not become social problems, except by the reproduction of more feeble-minded. Institutional care and training is absolutely required only for the lower grade cases who cannot or should not be cared for at home, and for morons whose lack of training, habits, or other traits make outside guardianship inadequate. No state at present makes provisions that reach as much as five percent of its existing feeble-minded. In a word, there are many varieties of feeble-minded, covering a very wide range of mental abilities, temperamental traits, and fixed habits; and they receive a variable training, good and bad, and various kinds and degrees of guardianship from relatives and friends without assistance from the state. The first requirement for any program is the recognition of these varieties, both in the feeble-minded and in the circumstances surrounding them. Let us see now how Minnesota meets the needs.

Commitment. Our compulsory commitment law was enacted in 1917. In most states now commitment may be compulsory, but there are still some opponents to the compulsory phase. I believe we are so well agreed in Minnesota on its merits and desirability that any discussion on it would be out of place. Commitment is by a board of examiners, consisting of the Probate Judge and two physicians whom the judge appoints. The County Attorney may appear in behalf of the person examined. This board is called on for the decision of two questions. First, is the case mentally defective? Second, is state guardianship required? There are really three aspects to the procedure in a hearing on feeble-mindedness. The first is strictly psychological and concerns the determination of the mental condition of the case. The second concerns his conduct, management of his affairs, circumstances of his guardians and home, and may be called the sociological aspect. The third is the legal aspect, concerned with the manner of conducting the hearing as required by the law. I have always contended, as many of you know, that our commitment law has some serious short-comings, which can and should be remedied. The first fault is the failure to have any one on the examining board with any special training or experience in determining the mental condition of the case. Putting two physicians on this board is the result of the popular opinion that mental deficiency is a disease and therefore a medical matter. The second fault lies in the power given the judge in appointing two members on the examining board, with himself as the third member. This makes it possible for any judge to exercise full power to determine any case as he alone wishes. Some

judges have done so in the past. Others will do so in the future. Whatever degree of success has on the whole attended the operation of this law on this matter has been due not to any merit of the law itself, but to the integrity of our probate judges, who for the most part have refused to take advantage of this weak spot in the law.

There is another aspect of our commitment law which, I believe, is found only in Minnesota. The Probate Court commits cases to the guardianship of the State Board of Control, not to an institution for feeble-minded. The Board of Control determines what form of guardianship shall be exercised in each case. This is a valuable provision, where several different forms of guardianship are provided for and practiced. Putting this task into the hands of one and the same agency for all cases makes for uniformity and efficiency. The Board is equipped with means of investigating each case *after* commitment and deciding on the basis of such investigation what the particular needs in each case are. In a few other states where cases are committed to the institution, but where other forms of guardianship are also used, the institution makes this decision for each case. This, however, does not provide for uniform practice, and requires duplication of departments at each institution for feeble-minded in the state.

Kinds of Guardianship. There was a time in the history of the care of the feeble-minded when life-commitment to the institution for all cases was regarded as the only method. This was perhaps the correct view for most of the cases received at institutions twenty years ago. But it is no longer true now, especially not of all cases recognized as feeble-minded, and Minnesota is one of an increasing number of states that provides several different kinds and degrees of guardianship, fitting them to the needs of individual cases. We will name these Institutional Guardianship, Boarding Home Guardianship, and Private Home Guardianship. They represent three stages in a process of gradual release of guardianship and return to society under as nearly normal living conditions as possible. The plan is based on the general idea that the higher grades of feeble-minded can be trained so that the only guardianship needed will be a little vocational guidance, and some kindly counsel on such matters as spending earnings, and time when not working. A very large proportion of the feeble-minded do not receive such a training during childhood, and very quickly drift into trouble on reaching maturity or soon after. If this leads to commitment as feeble-minded it becomes the task of the state to rehabilitate them, or, failing in that to provide a permanent place for them in the institution. This is, in a word, Minnesota's program. Let us consider it in a little more detail by describing further the three kinds of guardianship named.

Institutional Guardianship. With the opening of our new institution at Cambridge, Minnesota has two institutions for feeble-minded and epileptics. The epileptics at the Faribault institution are being transferred to Cambridge, and the plan is to have only feeble-minded

at Faribault and only epileptics at Cambridge. The advantages in the separation of these two classes in two different institutions concern chiefly the epileptics, and will not be considered in this paper. Concerning the institution for feeble-minded we may ask two questions, "What kind of cases does it receive, and what does it aim to do for them?"

It receives cases of all ages, of all grades of mental deficiency, and, of course, of both sexes. Nevertheless, they are a selected group, and in several respects do not at all represent accurately the group of all existing feeble-minded. A relatively very small percent of the higher grade cases are sent to the institution. Those that are sent are largely adult delinquents, and dependent children, dependents being defined as children without homes, or with improper or inadequate homes. Among the adult delinquents of high grade there is a preponderance of females over males. The lower grade cases of both sexes and of all ages are sent relatively much more frequently. These are delinquent or dependent much less often than are the higher grades coming to the institution. It is well to remember these facts. They have a very important bearing on what the institution can do for them. If the feeble-minded going to the institution were entirely unselected the great majority of them would be high grade, most of them would be non-delinquent, and many would come from homes that could take care of them in a satisfactory manner. But the institution cannot make low grade cases into high grade cases, cannot supply or reform their homes, and has at best an exceedingly difficult task in attempting to reform and rehabilitate high grade adults with fixed habits of delinquency.

I cannot give a full and detailed account here of what the institution does for its inmates. Its general aim is to provide a permanent home for those who can never be taken care of outside, and train as many as possible for outside guardianship. School training is furnished for every child admitted, and each case has an opportunity to go as far in regular school work as his capacity permits. Regular school work is supplemented by several lines of occupational training, and this connects up directly with the various adult occupations that the work in running the institution calls for. Only the majority of idiots and a few imbeciles of adult age are left entirely without employment. All other adults receive occupational training along the lines that the management of the institution requires. Medical care, proper mode of living, with reference to meals, sleep, clothing, and recreation, are, of course, included in the daily regime.

The nature of employment given any adult inmate is determined chiefly by the try-out method, guided by the results of a Binet test examination, the medical findings, and any special traits obvious to ordinary observation. The attendants and matrons in charge of the work of an inmate furnish the observations on how well he is doing in any particular work and determine shifts to be made. This is the common procedure followed in most institutions. It could be consider-

ably improved, I believe. Attendants are not always good observers, besides being frequently influenced in their judgment by minor matters and prejudices. A more thorough personality study of each case, and especially systematic observation on his actual performance on different jobs by some one with special training and qualifications for this sort of work would result in a better classification of the inmates.

There are some persistent popular misconceptions about what the institution can and aims to do with the feeble-minded. One is that it can materially improve or even cure mental deficiency by medical treatment. Another is that the special *training* the institution can give improves intelligence. A third is that with its special methods it can make skilled artisans, technicians, and school graduates out of mental defectives, in spite of their limited capacities. These being all impossible, cannot be a part of the institution's program.

There are other things that the institution aims to do for its inmates, but in which it does not progress far toward fulfillment. These could be all summarized in one statement, namely, making life and living conditions as nearly like living outside the institution like normals as possible. This, in a general way, would call for three things. First, housing the inmates in small cottages, if not in individual residences. Second, opportunity for training in all the jobs and occupations found outside and from which they would not be excluded by their limited capacities. Third, remuneration for their employment in proportion to the services given. In the first of these all institutions have failed almost entirely. We treat our defectives collectively in large groups, with the large buildings, large dormitories, large dining rooms, large living rooms, and one central kitchen for all. When obtainable funds are never sufficient to house all of even the committed cases in our present type of institution it is useless to even think of an institution built on the small cottage plan. In the second and third matters we are making a bare beginning, and progress in these may be said to be among the aims of the institution. We have added a few occupations which are not really essential to the running of the institution, but which furnish training and employment to inmates, and, in a few scattered instances, inmates get a slight remuneration for their work. Here lack of funds is only one of the causes of the slow progress. Complications in disposing of the products of the inmates' labors is a second cause. Objections are likely to come from both capital and labor when the state enters any market with its own goods.

In my own judgment, improvement of our institution along these last two lines is the most important matter to which to direct our efforts. It would make the training of feeble-minded children for outside guardianship, and the rehabilitation of the adults immeasurably easier and more effective. It would permit of gradations in the release from close supervision within the institution itself, and would make the next step of outside guardianship less abrupt, easier to take and more successful. It would make a much happier life for all the higher grade

inmates, and would go far toward winning the support and coöperation of parents and other relatives of the feeble-minded, where now we often encounter opposition to commitment or to retention in the institution.

Dr. A. C. Rogers, one time superintendent of the Minnesota School for Feeble-Minded, and for a generation a national leader in the work with feeble-minded, often spoke of what he regarded as the ideal institution. He was fond of describing what he called the "Village Community" for feeble-minded. A brief account of such a village, as I recall it, will show how truly prophetic this vision was. While we have not gone far in realizing this ideal, we have accepted several of the basic ideas involved. The Village Community would be in physical appearance much like any town of normal people, with its individual residences, apartments and flats, and stores, shops, factories, and schools. Many of the inmate "citizens" would be married, after sterilization, and live in individual homes. All capable of any employment would be at some kind of work, largely of their own choice and in accordance with the vocational training received in this village community institution. They would receive remuneration in proportion to the value of their services. The unemployable would be cared for by trained inmate citizens much in the same way as the normal community cares for its cripples and dependents. All would be under supervision, which would be graded according to the needs of the case and the nature of the employment. With a small group of such supervisors, and a few others needed for things too difficult for even the highest grade defectives, our village community would be complete in itself. It would furnish the closest possible approach to normal living for feeble-minded.

We cannot say that Minnesota is planning to build such a village community institution for its feeble-minded. But it is aiming to reach much the same ends in other ways. One of these ways or steps in that direction, is through the Boarding Home Guardianship.

Boarding Home Guardianship. Two such homes have been established, and a third is planned at present. They are under the general supervision of the Department of Feeble-Minded of the Children's Bureau of the Board of Control. The maximum number per home has been about thirty and perhaps this is about as large as would be advisable. Only moron girls have been admitted so far, but a similar home for moron boys would probably meet with equal success. The boarding home offers several advantages which the institution at present at any rate cannot completely furnish. The first is the remunerative employment of the inmates, the inmates themselves getting what they can earn. The second is the greater freedom. They go out daily to their various places of employment, returning to the home evenings immediately after work hours. The aspect of confinement is very largely eliminated. A third is the greater ease of furnishing employment adapted to the needs and capacities of each case. Especially in the larger centers, such as the Twin Cities and Duluth, this offers no difficulty, whereas in the institution itself it is impossible. A fourth

is the dissociation from the institution. The higher grade cases are intelligent enough to partly grasp the meaning and significance of confinement in the institution, and are not very happy under these circumstances. The same is true, of course, in a greater degree of many of their parents and other relatives. A fifth is the greater economy. It is expensive to maintain a case in the institution. The Boarding Home can be made self-supporting, and leave a margin of savings for the inmates.

Without going into further details, it is clear that the Boarding Home is a big step away from the institution and toward giving the feeble-minded under state guardianship as nearly a normal life as possible. That not all high grade cases can be managed in a boarding home needs no discussion, especially not when we remember that the majority of adult defectives get committed only after they have failed to make good outside. We must also expect a certain number of failures with this method. There is always the temptation to give somewhat questionable cases a trial in the Boarding Home, as well as urgent requests from parents. Nevertheless, expansion of the Boarding Home method to include larger numbers and greater varieties of cases is a big part of Minnesota's program, fully justified by the results of experience in this and other states.

Private Home Guardianship. The private home sponsoring such guardianship may be the case's own home or that of some other relative or friend. In any instance, success depends as much on the home as on the case under guardianship. If the responsible party fully understands his nature and needs, is both in position and willing to look after the case, such guardianship is more effective than any the state can give through a boarding home, especially in the case of girls employed in the home itself. It also brings the feeble-minded case one step closer to normal living conditions. He is remuneratively employed according to his abilities, and receives the same care the normal minor does in his own home, with approximately the same freedom, and he is dissociated from any institution or group of feeble-minded. The Department of the Feeble-Minded under the Children's Bureau has placed a small number of selected cases in such private homes. The method finds its chief limitations in the difficulties encountered in finding proper homes and in knowing that they are adequate. It calls for considerable investigation, instructions, and follow-up visits after the case has been so placed. This involves trained field workers and traveling expenses, which makes it less economic than the Boarding Home method. As the number of cases under private home guardianship increases, the per capita cost will decrease in proportion. At its worst it is cheap as compared with maintenance in the institution.

Discharge from Guardianship. We might call this a fourth stage in the effort to bring a case committed as feeble-minded back to society. There are instances where discharge is feasible, though the number, to be sure, is not large. Everyone engaged in work with the feeble-minded knows of some good natured, harmless moron who has found his

place in the world, who is contentedly employed in some particular occupation, who satisfies his employer, manages his own simple affairs, disturbs no one, and is in no sense a problem. To this class may be added others who have relatives or friends who can be relied upon for giving any care and guardianship that may be needed. Again, there are married morons where the spouse furnishes the needed guidance, and where separation would create a social problem where none existed before. In all these instances of cases discharged from guardianship it is assumed, of course, that reproduction will not take place, either because of sterilization or other reasons.

There remain for consideration several other lines of effort the state is making concerning the feeble-minded. One of these is the special training given them in the public schools. The others are the anti-marriage, and sterilization laws.

Special Classes for Subnormals. The state pays any local public school a hundred dollars a year for every mentally subnormal child the school places in a special class, organized and maintained in accordance with the regulations made by the State Department of Education. These subnormals include morons and border line feeble-minded of school age. Over 2,500 morons now attend such special classes. I cannot go into details on the nature of the training received. The good points about the special class, so far as it affects the moron, are, first, that it reaches larger numbers and a wider range of cases than could ever be institutionalized. Second, it gives them a much better training than they could get in the regular class. Third, the parents learn much about the limitations, and special needs of the moron during childhood and after. Morals and habits receive more attention, and there is a better understanding of the fact that after these special class children reach maturity they may still need some guardianship. The shortcomings of the special class are chiefly that it does not give sufficient vocational training of the sort the moron needs, and it allows the moron to be lost sight of the moment he leaves school. The moron needs concrete job training, and this the public schools are not in position to furnish to any great extent. Then also the social problems of the moron are the really important ones rather than the school problems, and these begin chiefly at the time when the state drops all responsibilities.

The Anti-Marriage Law. As with most states, Minnesota forbids the marriage of a feeble-minded person. As in every state that forbids, the experience here has been that mere forbidding never prevents. Several steps essential for its enforcement seem to be lacking. One lies in the absence of information for the marriage license clerks and others concerned as to who is to be prevented from marrying because of feeble-mindedness. No one knows in the first place who all are feeble-minded. Secondly, the law prescribes no way of placing the information about the *known* feeble-minded before license clerks so that recognition is obligatory. Thirdly, no adequate penalty for non-compliance is provided. It seems to me entirely possible to add these missing parts to the law, so that it could be made effective at least against those who

have been duly found feeble-minded by our courts. It would be a considerable aid to outside guardianship, and eliminate some failures.

Sterilization. Sterilization of the feeble-minded is an old measure, though new in Minnesota. Years of discussion have not resulted in any commonly accepted view. We still have extremists who believe all feeble-minded should be sterilized and discharged from guardianship, and others who are opposed to sterilization of any case under any circumstances. Perhaps it is too early to speak in much detail of any settled policy in Minnesota. Any one attempting to do so also runs the risk of confusing his own personal views on sterilization with what can be said to be an accepted policy. It is only with this understanding that I venture to discuss the subject.

Reproduction is effectively prevented by segregation in an institution. If, and as long as, a case cannot be satisfactorily taken care of outside the institution, there is no reason for sterilization. This at once excludes two large groups of the committed cases. The first are the so-called custodial cases, too low in intelligence to make a living outside and with no relatives or friends to whom required guardianship can be entrusted. The second are the higher grade cases who are intelligent enough to make a living outside but who likewise lack satisfactory guardians outside, and who, because of their conduct, have become social problems, especially those with whom the risk of sexual immorality is too great a one to take. A third group is excluded from sterilization because of poor health or physical condition that would make the operation too great a risk. It should be remembered in connection with the second group mentioned that with a very large percentage of the higher grade cases that get committed as feeble-minded the reason for commitment is sexual immorality. Sterilization of such cases would make satisfactory guardianship outside more difficult rather than easier. When all these considerations are taken into account, it will be understood that the majority at least of our actually committed cases of feeble-minded are not proper subjects for sterilization.

The state cannot afford to engage in any practices that would tend to materially increase venereal disease or even immorality alone as a preventive measure to reduce the number of feeble-minded in the next generation. Indiscriminate sterilization of the feeble-minded with discharge from guardianship is impossible. To sterilize an immoral moron and then turn her loose is unthinkable. To do so would be to aggravate an evil much greater than that of feeble-mindedness. If we can all think clearly on this one point, and remember at the same time that a sterilized moron is still a moron, we will be well on the way toward a generally accepted policy on sterilization of the feeble-minded.

Having excluded certain classes of cases as not eligible for sterilization, we may consider what kinds of cases should be included. These are easier to name. They comprise, first, a very large group of morons who are not sex delinquents, and in whose conduct there are no other factors that would make outside guardianship impossible. Quite contrary to what is getting to be a wide-spread opinion, let me say, the

great majority of morons are not sex delinquents, nor delinquents in any other way. Unfortunately a very small percentage of these get committed as feeble-minded. With the help of some relatives, or without it, they manage to get along in a way, get married and furnish our defectives for the next generation. A few of these get committed as feeble-minded because they are also dependent children. For these sterilization is in order, on reaching maturity. Some married morons get committed solely because they neglect their children. For the moron already married sterilization often solves the only existing serious problem, especially after neglected children are otherwise provided for.

This leads me to mention another application of sterilization, which I shall do entirely on my own responsibility. There are many morons for whom marriage after sterilization would be permissible. They are capable of maintaining a home, though with standards somewhat below average. There are always persons willing to marry them, and who in other respects have sufficient intelligence to escape the need of guardianship. I can see no serious objection to letting them do so. It often would remove the necessity of state guardianship entirely, or at least convert an institution case into an outside guardianship case.

I have on other occasions discussed some other matters in which our state program for the feeble-minded is lacking. Time will not permit to repeat this here. Let me say in a word that I believe progress will depend more on education of the general public concerning the facts about the feeble-minded than on all other things combined. Legislatures are not supposed to give us anything for which there is not a public demand. People will demand better provisions and care for the feeble-minded as soon as they learn how intricately and closely their daily affairs are connected with the feeble-minded. They can learn this best by observing the feeble-minded in their own community. These observations they are not making because morons are not recognized as such by laymen. The continuative name and address census of the feeble-minded which I have frequently advocated would tell each community who they are.

C. JOINT SESSIONS

DIVISION I—SECTIONS ON CHILDREN AND FAMILY

THE FUNCTION OF A CHILDREN'S AGENCY AS COMPARED WITH A FAMILY AGENCY

Miss Lucia Clow, Supervisor of Districts, Family Welfare Association, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

When I put the general question how does a children's agency vitally differ from a family agency—"vitally differ" to several people who have been in both type of organizations, the replies came back almost invariably, "Well, do we differ, in anything really fundamental?" Miss Richmond's definition of social case work as "consisting of those processes which develop personality through adjustments, consciously effected, individual by individual, between men and their social environment", would without question be accepted by both types of organizations. The children's worker and the family worker each believes in the fundamental worthwhileness of the individual. Certainly there is no difference in underlying philosophy and goals to be attained.

When we come to the subject of our techniques, again I am venturing to state that there are no vital differences. Of course, if the old conception were true of children's work as consisting of processes directly concerned with children as contrasted with family case work consisting of processes concerned with adults, and, only incidentally with children, there might be differences in technique. But long ago we realized that family case work which does not pivot around the children in the home is lacking in purpose and ultimate effectiveness and, in turn, that the success of work with children depends upon plans carried out through adults whether they be foster or real parents. There is the same so-called first interview and subsequent inquiry, the same skills required in interviewing. Deserters, relatives, employers, school teachers, foster mothers, alleged fathers, all present the same knotty problems for the case worker from either organization. However, the consideration of whether there are specialized groupings of these techniques required by the problems handled in each agency brings us to the question under discussion, what are the respective functions of a children's agency as compared to those of a family agency? If we accept these fundamental likenesses in under-