33-COP-FNK

Dr. Vaux, who has taken charge of the institution for the feeble-minded at Newark, New York, recently reported that he was receiving money from the state of New York to pay the board of children in private homes. He has eight boys and girls living in homes in the town of Newark, who are going to public school. The state furnishes clothing and medical attention. That thing has worked out so successfully that the budget commission is going to give the State Department of Mental Hygiene $25,000 this year to further extend this new project. He has also started another plan in Wolcott, a place of two or three hundred people. He is getting families there to board older men and women, two or three in a family, and Dr. Garvin, of the Binghamton State Hospital, has sent two chronic insane persons to board in this way in this same town to demonstrate whether or not the chronic insane can also be boarded out successfully. Dr. Parsons, director of the Department of Mental Hygiene in New York, is very anxious to have it given a trial. If these individuals can be thus boarded out successfully, Dr. Parsons feels that we will have made a big stride and will save the large overhead expenditure for construction at the rate of $2,500 per bed or, in some instances, even larger costs where a whole new institution must be erected.

Mrs. La Du: We wish to thank you, Dr. Bernstein, for this very interesting and enlightening talk on the colonization of the feeble-minded. We have a long way to go before we can anywhere near approach your project. With us colonization is in its infancy. We haven't the same system that you have in New York, but I am sure we are always very glad to have people, especially specialists, from other states come to us and discuss some of our common problems. You always bring a new point of view, new thoughts, new ideas, in connection with our work.

Dr. Murdoch is also a specialist in this line of work. He has charge of the School for Feeble-Minded in Minnesota. Dr. Murdoch spent many years in this work in other states before coming to us, principally in the state of Pennsylvania.

We also have Dr. Frederick Kuhlmann, director of the Division of Research of the State Board of Control, who is a specialist in this work. He is known nationally for the work that he has done in this field. Dr. Kuhlmann, after receiving his degree of A.B. at college, specialized for three years in this study, making his special field abnormal psychology, including the feeble-minded. He has been instructor in the subject of psychology in a number of universities—Clark University, the University of Wisconsin, the University of Illinois, and the University of Minnesota—but during the past several years he has been connected with the state department in charge of the Research Bureau. Formerly he was stationed at the School for Feeble-Minded at Faribault, but for several years now he has been connected with the central office in St. Paul, and has a staff of workers under him to carry out his plans and his research work in this field. Dr. Kuhlmann is going to speak to us this morning on "Progress in the Care of the Feeble-minded." Dr. Kuhlmann.

A CENTURY OF PROGRESS

By F. Kuhlmann

Director, Research Department, State Board of Control,
St. Paul

I visited the Chicago Fair a few days ago, and when I came back I changed the topic of my paper to "A Century of Progress." The contents, however, will be the same.

A few hundred miles from here a great and modern city is attempting to tell the story of a hundred years of change. Progress is the keynote. It is not only

in evidence; it is overwhelming. Even the most informed visitor finds himself much out of date. It is not within the power of any single mind to keep pace with progress. But this great exhibit selects its material. Not all phases of our human existence can present such a glorious record. History has long noted that in the social and political fields we move with a much more uncertain step. Here our total progress over a period of time may be revolutionary, or very little, or nothing, or even represent retrogression.

Our subject today is feeble-mindedness. What changes have a hundred years wrought in our views, and in our reactions towards the feeble-minded? We have not time to present a history. But let us try to look in on the past at approximately quarter-century periods, and briefly view the high lights of each.

Let the curtain rise on 1830. The care of the feeble-minded had already passed through some notable history. Even the ancients did not neglect them. They threw them into the river. Then for about eighteen centuries they fared variously, according to whether they were regarded as accursed of the gods, possessed of the Devil, or as special messengers from Heaven, or as just interesting fools designed for the amusement of kings. 1830 found a few gathered into asylums, together with the insane and crippled, by Christian Charities of the time, the first manifestation of the purely custodial idea that we still have with us. Thirty years before Itard had demonstrated that the idiot was teachable, and thereby laid the foundation for a truly new era. Two years before Bicetra had been organized as a school for idiots, followed by Salpetriere in 1831, and in 1837 Seguin started his private school for educating the idiot. It was the beginning of a new interest in the feeble-minded, limited for a while almost entirely to a few physicians and educators, with vision enough to have faith in the correctness and value of Itard's results. The aim was to develop the mind of the idiot; in a word, to cure wholly or in part by a specialized method of training and education. The interest spread. Private schools arose throughout Europe. Details of procedure were elaborated. Results attracted public attention.

We may skip to 1850. News of the success met by private schools and some public institutions in Europe in educating the feeble-minded spread to America, where the idea of educating all children in public schools was universally accepted and most generally practiced. A few private schools for feeble-minded were in operation into which the European methods had been transplanted. The first state school for feeble-minded, established at South Boston, was two years old. New York followed in 1851, after one legislative failure to authorize state expenditure for such a purpose. From this point on the relative importance of the private schools rapidly fades into the background, and we will limit ourselves to public attempts to care for the feeble-minded. The problem at that time was simple, as conceived even by the savants. They had yet much to learn. It was a problem merely of special education, in special state schools, such as the regular public schools could not furnish. After a brief period of years in the state schools, the feeble-minded were to return to their homes, cured in various degrees up to complete restoration to a normal condition by special education. Let us not, however, look down on these pioneers from the magnificent heights of our 1930 perfection. Today we do not always bother to take them into state schools. We give them a little special training in the public schools, little enough related to their future needs, and then let them go on as though they were quite normal.

In 1850 the feeble-minded were not regarded as a burden to the public. No one suspected their numbers. And the variety of social problems they give rise to had not yet dawned on even the best informed. The plea for state schools was made in the interests of the feeble-minded, not for the public interest. And the

public objected to state expenditures (somehow this sounds familiar), not so much because of the money to be spent as because it regarded such expenditures as money wasted. At the beginning, as now and perhaps forever, an uninformed public stood in the way of progress. One with a little sense of humor today reads with a smile New York's experience in establishing in 1851 the second state school for feeble-minded in the United States. One gathers that the bill authorizing it was somewhat railroaded through the legislature. Even a member of the board appointed thereafter by the legislature to launch it was not convinced. Against the expert testimony of the time, including that of the immortal Seguin, he said: "Do not take it as personal, but I must say I think none but fools would think of teaching fools."

Let us close our eyes to what immediately followed 1850 and look in on 1880. There are now eleven state schools for the feeble-minded. The total population is 2,429, a little less than the number committed to the care of the Board of Control in Minnesota today. Minnesota's state school is one year old. On the whole the experimental period is past. The public has come to regard it as proper for the state to train the feeble-minded, with, however, frequent outcrops of adverse opinions. Witness the Governor of progressive Massachusetts when he says in 1883: "When the state shall have sufficiently educated every bright child within its borders, it will be time enough to undertake the education of the idiotic and feeble-minded. I submit that this attempt to reverse the irrevocable decree as to the 'survival of the fittest' is not even kindness to the poor creatures who are at this school." (Referring to the Massachusetts School for Feeble-Minded). The stated purpose of the state school remains the same. It is still improvement or cure by special training, with subsequent return to their homes. Faith in the possibility of fulfilment is somewhat shaken, but not nearly as much as it is going to be soon. Let us listen to Seguin at about this time. "Not one in a thousand has been entirely refractory to treatment; not one in a hundred who has not been made more happy and healthy; more than thirty percent have been taught to conform to social and moral law, and rendered capable of order, of good feeling, and of working like the third of a man; more than forty percent have become capable of the ordinary transactions of life under friendly control, of understanding moral and social abstractions, of working like two-thirds of a man, and twenty-five to thirty percent come nearer and nearer to the standards of manhood, till some of them will defy the scrutiny of good judges when compared with ordinary young men and women." The original procedure of sensory and motor training by more or less formal exercises is being supplemented more by industrial or occupational training. This innovation is dictated by the increasing recognition that it is needed if they are really to be successfully returned to society, and by the immediate needs in the state schools. The development of **intelligence** by functional training is thus to some extent superseded by the development of **skill** by training. Important as this distinction is, it was to take another quarter century before the difference was really recognized. And it is interesting to note that in 1878 Connecticut objects to the innovation. Says Knight of the Connecticut school: "We attempt no trades at our institution—many of our patrons would object to their children being placed at work." Notice that he says "institution." The big schoolhouse of the previous generation was beginning to change into something else. Besides new admissions, old pupils lingered after their school age had passed, because their training had not accomplished the hoped-for improvement that would enable them to return home, or because they had no home to which to return. Additions were built on to the school. Dormitories in separate buildings came next. Some shops for occupational training were added. The school of

yesterday was changing into the institution of tomorrow. The yesterday had known only "school pupils." The tomorrow was to have also "custodial inmates." Compulsory, permanent commitment, that sinister monster for many a grieving parent since, was looming on the horizon. Let us here draw the curtain until 1900. When we look in again, we shall see a different picture.

In 1900 the number of state schools, or institutions as we may now call them, had increased to twenty-five. Most of the pupils had now turned into inmates, and they numbered something over 15,000. The original single large building had grown into a group of buildings, and we called it a "colony." A large farm acreage was a part of the plan. It admitted adults as well as children, and both of all grades of mental deficiency. The idea of admitting only trainable, improvable children had been given up. The colony was admittedly a custodial institution as well as training school. The ideal and fully developed colony included an administration building, a school plant, separate dormitories for inmates classified and grouped according to sex, age, and grade of deficiency. It had shops for industrial training and the manufacturing of articles needed by the institution. It had land for general farming, dairies, and vegetable farming, likewise used for farm training and for producing food supply needed by the institution. It had its own power, light, and heating plant, its own kitchen, bakery, and laundry. It had its own hospital and training courses for attendants and nurses. All this called for a great variety of different kinds of work. It had been learned long before this that the feeble-minded could be taught to do most of it under supervision. Their training became training for life within the institution—in a double sense, "for life within the institution." For the next decade or more the "colony plan" of providing and caring for the feeble-minded was almost universally accepted as about the only one that was feasible and satisfactory.

To understand this radical, although far from abrupt, change we must consider what had been learned about the potency of special training for curing or improving the feeble-minded and about the ability of the feeble-minded so trained to take their place in society as normal citizens. A few quotations will tell the story. In an editorial in the Journal of Psycho-Asthenics of 1897 we read: "To those who have been led to believe that the feeble-minded can become normal and go out into the world as full citizens, the results of their training do not justify their expectations—. It should be distinctly understood that **a feeble-minded child never becomes normal.**" In 1902 Barr writes: "As one by one our institutions become patriarchal, having received successive generations of defectives, we find growing upon the pages of their reports a clearly implied interrogation: 'We have trained for—what?'—'Cutting loose from early traditions, we need to build upon the experience which has demonstrated the impossibility of training for the idiot.'" (The term "idiot" is used here for all grades of feeble-mindedness.) This conviction was based on the observation of the feeble-minded in training, when they did not respond as at one time it was thought they would. But that observation was dramatically verified by the continual failure of the feeble-minded after training when returned to their community. "Everyone here," says Johnson of Indiana, in addressing superintendents of institutions in 1900, "is convinced that the proportion of the feeble-minded who are fit to go out from our schools at twenty-one to take a common man's or common woman's place in the great world, with all that that implies, is so small that it may be safely disregarded in adopting a policy."

With this as the accepted view, the policy of permanent commitment, commitment for life, to the institution was turned to as the only alternative. Indeed this is what was in effect being practiced in a large measure as the automatic result

of the feeble-minded remaining what they were in spite of years of special training. Of necessity they accumulated in the institutions and remained indefinitely. Thus for many years superintendents of institutions pleaded for life commitment as a state policy. "I think," says Carlson in 1903, "most of the superintendents are in favor of some stringent law which would give us the power to hold cases permanently in institutions." Johnson of Nebraska in 1906, in addressing the American Association for the Study of the Feeble-Minded, says: "I believe that every member will agree that the segregation and even permanent detention of at least a great majority, if not all of the feeble-minded, is the proper procedure." And Rogers of Minnesota: "The very condition that renders the existence of institutions for feeble-minded necessary as custodial homes in the broad, general sense, contraindicates the probability of placing out mental defectives successfully."

Into such an atmosphere of opinion, held almost universally by the best informed of the time, was born the special class for mental defectives in the public school. These special classes began with an understanding, a generation or two behind the times. They took the feeble-minded and called him something else. They proposed by special training to make him normal in school achievement. They did not even question his ability to function as a normal citizen when he reached maturity.

They saw him in no other connection than as a school child. What superintendents of state institutions thought of this new move may safely be left to your imagination to fill in. The special class was destined to outstrip the state institution in number of feeble-minded children coming under its influence.

This period marks the awakening of observers to a phase of feeble-mindedness of which we had heard as yet relatively little. The accumulation of feeble-minded who had passed through the institution and back again into the community gave opportunity to observe them as citizens. Of course, other feeble-minded, a hundred times as many as had gone to institutions, had remained in the community unrecognized. But because of this very fact that they were unrecognized, they taught us nothing. The known feeble-minded returned from institutions were beginning to function as our instructors. They taught us that many of our social ills originated in a large measure with them. They hampered the schools by their inability to make progress, by their truancy and all other forms of school misbehavior. They were incorrigible at home. They were sexually promiscuous. They lied, they stole, and they robbed. They were never economically independent. They received most of charity's contributions. They married young, raised large families, mostly of more feeble-minded children. By such lessons as these we learned that the feeble-minded were a burden to society. It created a change in attitude. Before, the feeble-minded merited only our sympathies and endeavors to help them. Now many began to feel that society, rather than the feeble-minded, was most in need of protection. This change, however, need not be and has not been detrimental to the interests of the feeble-minded. Providing for their needs and protecting society are almost entirely two aspects of one and the same process.

Our next step should be 1930. But so much seems to have happened during the last thirty years that I shall change procedure a little, and try to select the outstanding contribution in order instead of attempt a cross-section view at 1930. One is struck by the variety of things that are new and by their possibly far-reaching consequences. Perhaps this is because events are yet too near in time and to one's own personal experience to be properly evaluated in the light of history. It is customary for the Present to think well of itself.

In 1900 there was at least another decade ahead in which the conviction grew that permanent commitment and the colony plan was the only satisfactory method. "For nearly two decades," wrote Fernald in 1924, "all our knowledge of the feeble-

minded indicated that the obvious and logical remedy was life-long segregation, and this became the policy in nearly every state." Naturally, such a deep-rooted idea, be it right or wrong, is discarded slowly. But apparently we are in the process of doing so. By 1910 there were obvious signs of a break. The institutions were more than ever lagging behind in keeping down the waiting list. There was a better understanding of the large number outside, and it was beginning to dawn on many that the colony plan was doomed to fail as a method of caring for more than almost a negligible percentage of the existing feeble-minded. New ideas and methods were appearing. Fernald investigated the after-careers of cases returned from the institution to the community. He found a considerable number with at least acceptable records over a number of years. Farrell made a similar study of the careers of special-class children after leaving the public schools, and found similar results. Others repeated these observations, with no substantial difference in the findings. Although these studies had no control observations to show how the records of these feeble-minded compared with the records of similar groups of normals in the same communities, they revealed, at least, that previous conceptions about the inability of the feeble-minded to get along satisfactorily without aid from the state needed to be revised. State supervision of cases paroled from the institution was the logical next step. The "period of pessimism," placed by Fernald at 1911, had been passed. By 1917 Wallace was able to write about "the type of feeble-minded who can be cared for in the community." In this article we find that: "It cannot be considered a practical solution of the problem to segregate all of them in institutions. In fact, such a course, if it were practical from a financial standpoint, would be neither necessary or desirable. The institution, important as it is, must be considered but a factor in the solution of this problem." V. V. Anderson in 1922, after studying the careers of former special-class children, says: "We are convinced that a large proportion of feeble-minded persons can be handled economically and safely out in the community if properly trained and adequately supervised." And Fernald, originator of the idea, I believe, and pioneer in its application, says in 1924: "We now know that not all feeble-minded can be permanently segregated in institutions. We believe that the **vast majority** will never need such provision, but will adjust themselves at home as they have always done in the past." Thus we see that opinion has changed in the course of relatively few years from the colony plan with lifelong commitment for all to supervision in the community for the majority. This is not, of course, a return to the beginning of state schools in 1850, which returned the feeble-minded to the community without supervision. We are not forgetting what we have learned about the incurability of feeble-mindedness. In this new plan permanent supervision is retained, and it is pointed out by the exponents of the idea that its success depends as much on the supervisor as on the supervised. "In considering what class of feeble-minded individuals may safely remain in the community," observes Wallace, "it is of more importance to study what communities are safe for the feeble-minded."

We may return now to a plan that lies intermediate between the old colony idea and community supervision. This is the temporary and mobile colony or group plan of Bernstein. Since Superintendent Bernstein himself has been here to tell you about this it would be more than superfluous for me to try to add anything more. You should be reminded, however, that while many others were marking time for want of a new idea or for courage to experiment, Bernstein forged ahead. Already in 1906 his new colony idea was under way, and before anything else had been even seriously attempted the practicability of Bernstein's plan had been well tested.

Within this last thirty-year period there were a number of happenings that

have resulted in fundamental changes in our views about the feeble-minded. The causes of feeble-mindedness had been under investigation for over a century. Surprisingly little progress had been made in the establishment of definite facts. In 1900 Mendel's law of inheritance was rediscovered. A few years later Goddard had completed a study which concludes that the inheritance of feeble-mindedness follows Mendel's law. Biologists soon found Mendel's explanation and interpretation inadequate, but apparently it did not affect the statistical rule governing results. Goddard's data have been severely criticized as unreliable, but Meyerson, after telling us that his own data are free from this fault, ends with Goddard's conclusion. It seems established, at any rate, that Mendel's law is a most practical rule to follow in the control of matings of human beings. The value of this in the care of the feeble-minded is too obvious to need further comment.

In 1908 the Binet-Simon mental tests were published. Their first application and immediate development took place in their use with the feeble-minded. Fernald describes their importance as follows: "The theory and practice of mental testing and the discovery of the concept of mental age did more to explain feeble-mindedness, to simplify its diagnosis, and to furnish accurate data for training and education than all the previous study and research from the time of Seguin." This is rather strong language. Coming from the acknowledged leader for almost two generations in the care of the feeble-minded, gives it unusual weight. We may quote further in elaboration of this view. "Think of the tragedy of the fruitless efforts of the devoted teachers in our institutions who for nearly forty years tried to teach first-grade work to a defective child with a three-or-four-year mind . . . The concept of the intelligence quotient was another brilliant discovery, which enabled us to predict accurately the adult mental age and adult scholastic level of a given feeble-minded child . . . . This dramatic fulfillment of the prophecy and hope of Dr. Wilbur enormously simplified the whole problem of the feeble-minded. Not the least of its benefits was its revelation that we could not, as we had previously hoped and believed, increase the intelligence of a defective person . . . . The immediate popular understanding and acceptance of the principle of intelligence testing enormously increased the interest of the public in the feeble-minded." There is little or nothing that the psychologists of today could wish to add to Fernald's account of the role of the mental test in the care of the feeble-minded. Note that we drifted for a hundred years thinking that the natural slow mental development in the feeble-minded and associated increase in ability to do more things was all the result of the special training given him. Another major contribution that mental testing has made to our program for the care of the feeble-minded, which is implied, at least, in Fernald's remarks, is the entirely revolutionized idea about the number of existing feeble-minded. Until mental tests appeared, we thought that only a fraction of one percent of the general population was feeble-minded. We now know that it is several percent, so much larger than previous estimates that few even now have the courage to accept the facts. If we have ten cases where we thought we had only one, it obviously must make a vast difference in the general program.

Closely related to this are new developments that result in the earlier recognition of cases of feeble-mindedness and in increasing numbers. Social agencies of all sorts have multiplied. Largely under the influence of the National Committee fo[illegible]ntal Hygiene hundreds of psychiatric and child guidance clinics have been [illegible]d. Social and child welfare organizations have been established by cities, [illegible]ounties, states and federal government in ever increasing numbers. A [illegible]sychologists are engaged in mental examining. A million mental tests [illegible]mate for the annual output. The feeble-minded has been found guilty

of so large a share of our social ills that many have apparently come to believe that all feeble-minded are delinquent and that all delinquents are feeble-minded. The public is learning who is feeble-minded faster than was ever true in our history. The forgotten link in our program is being forged.

This brings us to some closing remarks. History is of little value unless made the basis for guiding future progress. Even the syncopated sketch presented here reveals that in our understanding of the feeble-minded and in the methods of caring for them we have made progress. In no phase of this do we remain where we started. Viewed, however, from the standpoint of the relative number of feeble-minded we are reaching, our record could not be much worse. At the rate we have been going in this field, it apparently will take several centuries more before all feeble-minded will receive any special supervision outside of what their own relatives and friends will on their own initiative give them. Not over five percent are at present reached even in the states most advanced in the work. **State and other public officials may do ever so good a job in handling those who are committed to their charge, it will not help much towards reaching our goal unless we can speed up the rate of commitments.** Past experience should have taught us by this time what has prevented commitments. To my mind there have been three outstanding factors.

The first is the natural repugnance, on the part of both the higher-grade feeble-minded and the normal relatives, of being committed, especially permanently committed, to an institution. This is rooted deep in human nature, and we cannot hope to ever change it. We must find our way around it, and that way is outside supervision. This comes nearest to offering the feeble-minded an opportunity to live a natural, normal life. It comes nearest to removing the objections of relatives to commitment to state guardianship. We must develop our methods of outside supervision so that they will give that degree of control more easily obtained by the institution and temporary colony plan, without arousing the resistance to commitment that the latter have created.

The second factor is the objection to the costs. The remedy for this is reduction of the costs by use of cheaper methods, which outside supervision already supplies, and the education of the public to an understanding that the most costly way is to cut necessary costs for effective supervision.

The third factor is early identification of all existing feeble-minded. For over a century we have gone on the absurd assumption that this first essential step will take care of itself. The need and importance of providing for taking this first step has been repeatedly pointed out during the past twenty years. So far only Massachusetts and South Dakota have made legal provisions for getting this early identification. Let us hope that Minnesota will be next.

And that brings me to the conclusion. I have not taken time to keep track of Minnesota in this march through the century. Be assured, however, that "History records" that Minnesota, relative to its age, began very young to provide for its feeble-minded. It led all other states for a time in the relative number of feeble-minded under state care, and never fell below second or third in rank in this respect. It is still the most "lavish" in expenditures for the special classes in the public schools. It was never outdistanced in speedy discarding of outworn methods of care and in the adoption of promising new ones. Time has marched on, and Minnesota has kept the step.

Mrs. La Du: Thank you for that very splendid paper, Dr. Kuhlmann. I think you had a very happy thought when you changed the subject of your paper to "A Century of Progress."

I think those of you most familiar with the subject would agree that perhaps there has been no greater development, for instance, in the field of electricity, where they were able to light the huge Century of Progress at Chicago with the rays of a distant star, than there has been in the scientific development of the understanding care and treatment of this mental deficiency and other human ills.

We have a little time left for the discussion of this subject which has been so ably handled, and we are going to ask Dr. Murdoch to open the discussion. Dr. Murdoch.

Dr. Murdoch: It surely has been a pleasure to have Dr. Bernstein come here and give us this interesting account of the working colonies he has established in New York.

And Doctor Kuhlmann has led us step by step through the development of our work in caring for the feeble-minded. From his thorough knowledge of the subject, he has given a remarkably complete, interesting and accurate account of the changes that have taken place.

One thing that we must bear in mind, in considering this account of the care and the thought concerning the feeble-minded over the century, is that at each point the attitude has been different. We are likely to think the story has been told and the book closed, but time marches on and in the future we may have different views from those we have today.

After listening to Dr. Bernstein and talking with him, I have jotted down a few thoughts with reference to our work in Minnesota.

With our institutions for the feeble-minded crowded far beyond their rated capacity, and a long waiting list of children urgently in need of institutional care, it is quite evident that every effort should be made to limit admission to those who are definitely in need of institutional care and to get every individual out of the institution who is not urgently in need of such care. Fortunately we have learned that the great majority of the feeble-minded do not require institutional care. In fact, at least ninety per cent of the feeble-minded are getting along fairly well outside of our institutions.

Those who need institutional care, training and treatment are a select group, consisting of the low-grade, helpless type and those who on account of emotional instability or antisocial traits have shown themselves unfit to be at large. If the home is good and the local school gives training in manual work, there is no reason why the average feeble-minded child should have to go to an institution, provided he does not interfere with the social development and lives of other children in the family or community.

When the child is sent to the institutional school, every effort should be made to give such training and treatment as will render the child sufficiently stable to be returned to his family or placed in a favorable environment outside of the institution.

The selective process in sending children to the institution and the necessity of preparing as many as possible for life outside, has materially altered the kind of training given within the institution. In the first place every effort is made to place the child in the best possible physical condition, giving attention to the teeth, tonsils and adenoids, glandular therapy where there is endocrine disturbance, vigorous physical exercises, drills and competitive games, abundance of life in the open, habits of cleanliness and order established. Manual training is taught in the school and character building is stressed above all.

With reference to the Minnesota plan of commitment of the mentally deficient, in the light of our present knowledge we are indeed fortunate in the set-up for the care of the feeble-minded in our state in that they are committed to the care and

custody of the State Board of Control rather than to the institution. The Board of Control, through its department for the feeble-minded, with the assistance of the county child welfare boards, is thus enabled to thoroughly investigate and study the case and, where possible, arrange for care in the child's own home or foster home under supervision without the necessity of ever sending the child to the institution.

We cannot get away from the fact that being sent to an institution places a stigma upon a child already handicapped, and should be avoided whenever not absolutely necessary. In this connection efforts are frequently made to send a child who is getting along fairly well at home to the institution because the economic condition of the family has changed, and the family has been forced to apply to some agency for financial aid, and aid has been withheld because the child has not been sent to the institution. Now, it costs the state and the county about $200 a year to care for the child in the institution. A lesser amount provided the family might enable the family to get along and keep the child at home.

In recommending parole, we in Minnesota give more weight to personality than to intelligence levels or manual ability. Among the feeble-minded we have introverts and extroverts in about the same proportions as we find in so-called normal persons. Obviously, the introspective type does not adjust so well as those whose interest is not self-centered. It is much easier to teach girls to cook and sew, to do laundry work and all branches of housework, it is much easier to teach the boys manual work in the shops and in the fields, than it is to adjust them socially. They are much more likely to get into trouble in their leisure time than when at work.

Another good feature of our Minnesota law is the law concerning sterilization. This makes possible the parole of many who otherwise could not be recommended for life outside the institution. While sterilization does not insure against immoral sexual relations, it does prevent the birth of a child. Mental defectives do not make good parents regardless of the mentality of the child. Quite a number of our good looking moron girls have married after sterilization and parole and are living with their husbands. They are now well adjusted, happy and contented.

With regard to the small working colony, such as Dr. Bernstein has established and maintained so successfully in New York: Inspired by Dr. Bernstein's monumental work, the Minnesota Board of Control established working colonies, or clubs, for girls in the larger cities of our state. To these clubs were sent girls who for one reason or another could not be returned to their own homes, or for whom suitable private homes could not be found. These girls had undergone a course of training and been sterilized before being sent to these clubs. These clubs were most excellently managed and prior to the depression there was little difficulty in finding employment for the girls. However, with hundreds of workers of normal mentality being thrown out of employment, it has become increasingly difficult for these girls to find and hold positions.

As to the work colonies for boys, Minnesota being primarily an agricultural state, and farm work the type of work for which mentally deficient boys are as a rule best adapted, we give our boys special training in agricultural pursuits and, after training and sterilization, endeavor to return these boys to the farms from which they came or, through the county child welfare board, place them upon farms in the home county.

For those boys who are too low-grade, or who on account of emotional instability or habits would be a menace outside of the institution, or who are not physically able, we have four work colonies upon the institution farm of a thousand acres of some of the finest farm land in Minnesota. Two of these colonies are two

miles south of the institution on a tract of 500 acres. One is about three-fourths of a mile east, where we have our truck garden, and one is near the dairy, where we have a herd of 120 Holstein cows, which provides the milk supply for the institution. These boys drive teams, plough, cultivate, milk, and care for the farm stock, raise chickens and most of the vegetables for the 2,500 people at the institution.

In addition to these four farm colonies, we have a working boys' cottage, in which we have a group of boys who aid in the work of the institution, in the shops and in the manifold activities of the institution where there is an opportunity for all types of work to be found in any community of two or three thousand inhabitants. These boys are well adjusted, and live happy, contented lives. They are on the payroll, receiving from twenty-five cents to a dollar a month. They are as a rule satisfied, are an asset rather than a liability to the state, and there is no lack of employment.

Now, in closing, I wish to emphasize the importance of the utmost care in the selection of the mental defectives to be sent to the institution. Minnesota has more special classes for handicapped children in proportion to the population than any other state in the Union. The institutional school should only be resorted to when the home is inadequate or the personality of the child is such that no other plan can be made. Of those who come to the institution, we make every effort to train body and mind and to inculcate habits of industry and social traits which will make as many as possible acceptable to society on parole.

Minnesota, like every other state in the Union, is lacking in adequate accommodations for all the mental defectives who need institutional care, and it is primarily for this reason that we urge the necessity of extra institutional care.

I cannot agree that a mental defective, even a high-grade moron, is necessarily happier outside than in the institution. A mental defective of the type which needs institutional care is an incongruous element in a normal home and community. Even after the best of training he cannot enter into many of the activities of the family or the community. He is too often made the drudge or is the butt of ridicule. Within the institution he is associated with others who have the same interests. He is under the guidance of those who understand his limitations. Tasks assigned him are within his ability to perform. Suitable entertainment is provided. He is in an environment specially provided to meet his needs. In fact, I honestly believe that in these days of trial and tribulation the mental defectives in our institutions are about the happiest individuals on earth.

Mrs. La Du: Thank you, Dr. Murdoch. Dr. Murdoch stated that Minnesota has a plan which is probably different from that of any other state; that is in the commitment of the feeble-minded by the courts to the State Board of Control rather than to the institution direct.

We have in the Children's Bureau Division of our work a supervisor who has charge of the work for the feeble-minded. This supervisor handles the commitments for every one committed to the care of the State Board of Control, and each case is given individual case study. After that it is decided what is the best plan for the care of this individual. If institutional care is necessary, if we have room we assume that responsibility. If not, we have to provide other care outside the institution. Miss Mildred Thomson, whom most of you know, has charge of this work in the Children's Bureau, and will continue the discussion.

Mildred Thompson, Supervisor of Feeble-Minded, State Board of Control: It is fortunate for you that there is not much time left, because when one woman gets a chance to speak after three men, she might take up all the time there was, but since I have a few minutes only, I shall have to forego that pleasure.

I came to Minnesota nine years ago to undertake the work of the feeble-minded. The following June there was a meeting of the American Association for the Study of the Feeble-minded in the East, so, after being here for only two months and working primarily with the feeble-minded for just those two months, I went East. Previous to that time I had been doing work in psychology in the schools.

The only institution that I visited when I went East was Dr. Bernstein's. I spent several days in Rome, and Dr. Bernstein and his supervisor of girls' colonies gave me a great deal of time and I visited a number of colonies. Naturally, when I came back to Minnesota, I desired to be more of a copy-cat than we had been.

One of the colonies which we visited in New York was in a community where there was a knitting mill or a woolen mill of some sort, and some twenty girls were employed in that one mill.

In discussing conditions with the industrial department here I found there was no such community in Minnesota; that there was no place where we could establish a colony similar to that.

Then I found that Dr. Bernstein had colonies in a number of comparatively small towns where girls went out to work by the day. People as a whole in Minnesota were not accustomed to employing labor under similar conditions. They were more accustomed to having the work laid out in such a way that the people in the home could do it. Consequently, after discussing it with the industrial department and with people in some of the smaller communities, it seemed to be a mistake to undertake it here. So we developed what had been started previously.

When I came here there was a club where six of our wards stayed, run by the Women's Welfare League of Minneapolis. We gradually added to the number until there were twenty or twenty-five girls in the club. The work there was more general. Some got occupation in laundries; some as power machine workers; some girls worked out in homes; some worked as floor maids and some as dishwashers in hospitals. We had a variety of employment.

Gradually, however, as it seemed the girls were succeeding, we got the law changed so that a similar club was established in St. Paul, under the direct supervision of the Board of Control, and later a third one in Duluth. However, conditions have so changed that all but the St. Paul club have been closed.

But that is only a small part of our work with people outside the institution. Today we have probably four hundred or more high-grade girls and women who are sufficiently bright to be self-supporting, or partially self-supporting, definitely counted for outside supervision. We supervise them rather closely, and try to see not only that they have work, but that their wages are adequate and the conditions good. About half have savings. The savings of that half added up would probably come up to ten thousand dollars. Prior to 1928 we had several girls who, after being out of the institution for a period of four or five years, in addition to paying their board in the club and supporting themselves, had saved from three to four hundred dollars, and one girl even had up to about a thousand dollars. Now, however, the money saved in the past has been used by a number of these girls to pay their board and supplement their support during the last three or four years, when they have not been able to earn enough to be self-supporting in a great many instances.

The feature of our plan that seems to me particularly good is the fact that we do have definite supervision. As I understand the plan of the colony at Rome, both from previous talks with Dr. Bernstein and his supervisor and from talking with him now, their period of colonization corresponds in a large degree to our period of institutionalization. That is, we feel that a girl who has become enough

of a social problem to be placed under state guardianship needs to stay in the institution very often, most often, for a period of at least a year or two years or a little more, until she has broken the old associations and has become somewhat stabilized. I believe that in Rome they keep the girls in the institution only around six months. Am I right, Dr. Bernstein?

Dr. Bernstein: Sometimes only six weeks.

Miss Thomson: They stay in the institution just a short time, some six weeks or longer. Then they go out to the colonies for the stabilization period, and stay there for three years. Then they have one year on parole outside, after which they are discharged.

I say "girls" because we have been able to develop so much more for girls than for boys.

The wards here are under indefinite guardianship. It isn't a question of when they go out to their homes or the homes of relatives or somebody else's home, it isn't a question of how long they are to be held under guardianship, because they are just the same mentally that they were when they came to us, and they may get into the same or different difficulties from what they did previously. They need our attention.

I should like to give you one instance of what seems to me a good illustration of why such a law is of advantage to a feeble-minded ward and the public, chiefly the ward. We had a number of girls, who were sent to the institution before the law was passed in 1918 giving the state guardianship, paroled to a clubhouse. When they left the clubhouse directly under our supervision, of course we had no more authority.

One such girl had accumulated about eight hundred dollars during the time spent at the clubhouse. She took French leave, went out of the state, and married. We had had a good report as to the girl, and sent her her check book. In two months' time we heard that she was in Minnesota with her husband, but that he was not often located. Then we heard that she was pregnant and did not have any money. Everything that she had accumulated over a period of time was gone in two months. We did take care of her, even though she was not a state ward. She was quite high-grade and was not committed. We felt under moral obligation to care for the girl.

Another girl, a most stable girl, who had been out of the clubhouse for more than a year and would have been discharged within a short time had we had the other law, met the other girl and her husband. We did not know about it until later. Two months later, after we had heard that the first girl, Katherine, was in the state, we heard that this girl, Edna, was married. Edna had not been sterilized, but this was done before she lived with her husband. The day she was married she asked for her money because she and her husband wanted to leave the state. She had about six hundred dollars. Then we found out that Katherine's husband was also Edna's husband. He was starting a racket, so to speak, to get the money from the girls he married. Later we learned that he had been a bigamist in another state; that he had a wife and children. I do not know how many he would have been able to work the same thing with. The fact that Edna was committed to state guardianship made it possible for us to hold her money for her. We could also hold Edna. Had she not been committed to state guardianship, we would have had to give her her money, and they would have left the state, and would probably have been stranded in some other state within a short time.

I feel that that is an illustration of the fact that even if a girl does do well for two or three years, if she was feeble-minded once, she is always feeble-minded.

Mrs. La Du: Thank you very much, Miss Thomson. I think you have made very clear our parole plan and also the advantage which we have under the Minnesota law.

EVENING SESSION

Mrs. La Du: Since one day of the State Conference is always assigned to the meeting of the quarterly conference of superintendents of state institutions with the State Board of Control, and this has been our day, I have been asked to preside at this evening meeting.

Perhaps some of you would like to know just why it is that on one day of the session of the State Conference you see a lot of state superintendents wandering around looking for some meeting which they feel they should attend, or would like to attend, and I am going to tell you how it came about.

Most of you are familiar with the fact that years ago, as far back as 1883, the Board of Corrections and Charities of the state of Minnesota was created. It had general charge and supervision over the institutions caring for the handicapped of the state for a number of years. But in 1901, by act of the legislature, the State Board of Control was created, and since that time the Board has had charge of the institutions and many of the welfare agencies of the state.

In looking through one of our reports the other day, I found this statement, which I think is very interesting. It read: "The framers of the Board of Control law 'builded better than they knew' in many ways, but in none more so than in that provision requiring the board to meet in conference the superintendents of the institutions."

That was thirty-two years ago, and for thirty-two years, with only a few exceptions, we have had quarterly conferences with the superintendents of state institutions, with the leaders of the divisions of welfare work under our board, and, as many of you here know, with representatives of the other welfare agencies of the state and with leaders in the various fields of institutional work throughout the country. These quarterly conferences are sometimes held in state institutions, where we have clinics and where the work is demonstrated, or where we discuss the problems of that particular institution. Sometimes the sessions are held at our office here in St. Paul, and sometimes, especially during the past six years, with the State Conference. I believe it was in 1927 when the executive committee of the State Conference invited the State Board of Control to hold one of its quarterly conferences in conjunction with the State Conference, and so for the past six years we have been doing so. I want to say that we have enjoyed it very much. I think it has been of much benefit to all of us to have these contacts, and I am very hopeful that they may continue. We are very glad to attend our own morning session and then have an opportunity to attend the round table sessions and divisional sessions of other groups, in that way broadening our point of view and making contacts very valuable in the work.

I was very sorry that we were not able to find you this morning, Miss Mead. We wanted you to have luncheon with us so that you might get acquainted with the superintendents of our state institutions. Last year we enjoyed having Miss Salisbury, the new president, with us. She told me afterwards that whenever she was signing her name to papers which were going out to the superintendents of state institutions she had the feeling that she was writing to a friend and would get a little better response than she otherwise would because they had met her at our conference luncheon. We are very glad that we have had an opportunity of meeting you this evening, Miss Mead, and hope we may become better acquainted during coming years.