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PREFACE.

In preparing this work for the public the chief objects in view were to point out the pernicious uncertainty of verdicts in insanity trials, with the hope that by arousing attention to the magnitude of the evil, at least, some of the more objectionable features of our medical jurisprudence may be removed; to faithfully call attention to the more prominent causes of that uncertainty; "to hold as 'twere the mirror up to nature; to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image;" and, with the most friendly feelings for both my own and the legal profession, to criticise severely, and to censure when necessary, not the individuals, but the system which has made insanity trials a reproach to courts, lawyers, and the medical profession. My intention at the first was to prove every proposition introduced ab initio, but after carrying out the intention for some time, I found I had written over seven hundred pages, and had not then fairly commenced the discussion of the points particularly contemplated; and, believing that
few readers would be content to toil through so many pages of preliminary matter; and, that in place of one small volume, there would be several large ones; that part of my plan was abandoned, and instead I have laid the conclusions of standard writers under large contribution, with just enough of the authors’ reasoning to give them coherence, referring in every case to the work quoted, so that my readers may investigate the subject more fully if they so desire. By the aid of the “physical media” theory here introduced, and, I think fully established, by abolishing legal tests of insanity so called, and by securing efficient, trustworthy expert testimony in every trial, through the scheme herein proposed, it is believed that the disgraceful, haphazard trials of the past, and present, will give place in the future, to trials as orderly, and in which verdicts will be regarded as certain and trustworthy, as those in any other class of cases brought before the courts. The work being designed for members of the legal, as well as of the medical profession, the use of technicalities, psychical, metaphysical, and medical, has been studiously avoided.
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