

Marc-Adélarde Tremblay (1922 - )

Anthropologue, retraité, Université Laval

(2003)

# “Alexander H. Leighton’s and Jane Murphy’s Scientific Contributions in Psychiatric Epidemiology”

Un document produit en version numérique par Jean-Marie Tremblay, bénévole,  
professeur de sociologie au Cégep de Chicoutimi

Courriel: [jmt\\_sociologue@videotron.ca](mailto:jmt_sociologue@videotron.ca)

Site web pédagogique : <http://www.uqac.ca/jmt-sociologue/>

Dans le cadre de la collection: "Les classiques des sciences sociales"

Site web: [http://www.uqac.ca/Classiques\\_des\\_sciences\\_sociales](http://www.uqac.ca/Classiques_des_sciences_sociales)

Une collection développée en collaboration avec la Bibliothèque“

Paul-Émile-Boulet de l'Université du Québec à Chicoutimi

Site web: <http://bibliotheque.uqac.quebec.ca/index.htm>

Cette édition électronique a été réalisée par Jean-Marie Tremblay, bénévole, professeur de sociologie au Cégep de Chicoutimi à partir de :

Marc-Adéland Tremblay (1922 - )

*"Alexander H. Leighton's and Jane Murphy's Scientific Contributions in Psychiatric Epidemiology"*. Hommage rendu à Halifax en 2003 à mon directeur de thèse doctorale.

The Leighton Symposium  
The Canadian Anthropology Society/La Société canadienne d'anthropologie  
Dalhousie University, Halifax, May 10, 2003

M Marc-Adéland Tremblay, anthropologue, retraité de l'enseignement de l'Université Laval, nous a accordé le 4 janvier 2004 son autorisation de diffuser électroniquement toutes ses oeuvres.



Courriel : [matrem@microtec.net](mailto:matrem@microtec.net) ou [matremgt@globetrotter.net](mailto:matremgt@globetrotter.net)

Polices de caractères utilisée :

Pour le texte: Times, 12 points.  
Pour les citations : Times 10 points.  
Pour les notes de bas de page : Times, 10 points.

Édition électronique réalisée avec le traitement de textes Microsoft Word 2001 pour Macintosh.

Mise en page sur papier format  
LETTRE (US letter), 8.5'' x 11''

Édition numérique réalisée le 29 juin 2005 à Chicoutimi, Ville de Saguenay, province de Québec, Canada.



“Alexander H. Leighton’s and Jane Murphy’s Scientific  
Contributions in Psychiatric Epidemiology”

Marc-Adélarde Tremblay Ph. D.  
Emeritus Professor, Laval University

l'hommage rendu à Halifax en 2003 à mon directeur de thèse doctorale

The Leighton Symposium  
The Canadian Anthropology Society/La Société canadienne d'anthropologie  
Dalhousie University, Halifax, May 10, 2003

I am deeply honoured to be the first speaker of the day-long conference celebrating the many scientific contributions of two pioneers in psychiatric epidemiology : Alexander Hamilton Leighton and his wife Jane Murphy. You will have noticed that I changed the title of my presentation. Upon beginning the write up of my speech, I felt that I had to widen its scope so as to make it possible to give due credit to someone who has accompanied Dr. Alexander Leighton, almost from the beginning of the Stirling County Studies up to now. Fifty-two years elapsed since Jane Murphy arrived at Cornell in 1951 to become the Administrative Assistant of the Director of the Stirling County Study. One year later she participated in the Family Life Survey (the FLS as it became to be called) carried throughout the County as a skilled and successful interviewer. With many others, I was one of her co-workers

and it was at that period that we learned that she wanted to undertake graduate studies in anthropology in order to get a doctoral degree. We were all aware that she had the academic prerequisites, the skills and the strong will required to achieve her intellectual goal. As a matter of fact, she got her degree from Cornell in 1960.

Let me stop here for the time being in order to let you know how I will proceed so as to reconstruct the best achievement profile for both within the time allowed. At first, I shall sketch Alec's career : it is undoubtedly a very exceptional one which is unique and integrates diversified facets when we take into account the many scientific disciplines in which he worked and the rare excellence he achieved in each of them. It will not be feasible to provide here a due account of his many feats, so to speak. Leighton's profile will be followed by Jane's research itinerary, at first on the St Lawrence Island, located near the Bering Strait, in cross-cultural work and later on as she became a key figure of the Stirling County Project. A brief conclusion will follow which will highlight the main concrete aspects of their joint legacy. Such legacy is still being reinforced since they are yet both engaged in building the analytic scheme and theoretical parameters required to carry with validity the full interpretation of the 1952-1970 Stirling cohorts' data.

In attempting to define the major aspects of Leighton's legacy, I feel that I have to refer to his training, to the width and breath of his professional experiences and to his personality. As I said earlier, I will not be able to cover in an adequate manner these three complex universes. Indeed, I prefer to draw an incomplete profile rather than shy away from the immense debt of gratitude I owe to a mentor that has so significantly contributed to my scientific training and professional undertakings. He is an internationally renowned scientist whom has made his mark by the richness of his interdisciplinary training and through the innovative character of his scientific endeavours in a career that spans almost over seventy years. He had the vision to become a pioneer, the questioning mind and the intellectual skills required to find satisfactory answers to multifarious phenomena, the health and stamina to persevere

and achieve positive results in everything he undertook and the type of charismatic personality to attract close collaborators from many different fields to make its professional activities last over such a phenomenal period of time! And yet he still has a young mind, is a proficient actor professionally and is truly at ease with members of different generations.

The framework of reference used to outline such a rich human trajectory has to take into account the constituting elements of his training and of his experiences in psychiatry and cultural anthropology so as to be able to understand why and how he carried pioneering work in psychiatric epidemiology. Such a course of action would normally lead to : a) the spelling out of the main concepts he used in such a field of study to build an original conceptual framework; b) the identifying of the independent variables used to measure the prevalence rates of psychiatric disorders in given contrasting environments (social level of analysis) or among particular individuals showing varying life experiences related to these variables (the individual level of analysis); c) the main prevalence findings at both levels along with explanatory schemes; and d) the pragmatic fall outs of this scientific activity in clinical psychiatry, in applied anthropology and in the training of generations of students in these two disciplinary fields. Such a theoretical orientation will remain a general guideline or a source of inspiration in my paper hoping that other speakers will fill some of the many gaps of my paper.

Alexander H. Leighton was born in Philadelphia. He was fortunate and talented enough to be trained at some of the most prestigious universities in the United States. At Princeton, he received an A.B. in 1932. He earned an M.A. degree from Cambridge in 1934 and his M. D. from John Hopkins in 1936. Shortly thereafter, from 1937 to 1941, he undertook his internship and later his residence in psychiatry at the same University and was strongly influenced by the internationally reknown psychiatrist Adolph Meyer, whom he considered a mentor and from whom he

borrowed for his theoretical outlook the pathological influence of biology and physiology among psychiatric patients.

It was during his psychiatric training at the latter university that he was granted a Social Science Research Fellowship allowing him to carry extensive field work among the Navahos in the American Southwest and among the Inuit of St Lawrence Island under the sponsorship of Columbia University. Such field studies allowed him to carry life histories and find out how these were influenced by environmental conditions, cultural norms, institutional frameworks and the type of social organizations in which they lived. The Life Story of *Gregorio the Hand Trembler*, a Navaho medicine man, is typical in that respect. These first anthropological field experiences prepared him to be chosen as the qualified candidate to analyze in depth very complex situations related to war conflicts. Studies of the displacement of the American Japanese in Southern Arizona and those on the drop of the atom bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki were indeed very unusual and instructive social and human changes in life conditions having a strong impact on the mental health of individuals and on the stability of social institutions. The sum of these early field experiences, were to provide, as time went on, the kinds of theoretical and methodological tools that were to be used in Stirling County. When we look in retrospect at all these scientific and human experiences of Alec, one wonders how they came to be. Of course, it could not be foreseen. But, one thing is sure. Leighton was the kind of man to prepare himself to meet the challenges of his time, the type of individual to cross the borders of disciplinary fields in order to find new pathways, in brief, the sort of scientist able to build new explanatory schemes with the view to understand better the many components of human reality as much in its colourful expressions as in the not so beautiful ones.

It was during his Columbia years (1939-1940), that he had the opportunity to meet Bronislaw Malinowski (functional analysis), Ralph Linton and Abram Kardiner (associated to the basic personality concept which reflects the behaviour imposed to

the individual by the group on account of economic and technical environmental conditions and type of education), Clyde Kluckhohn (the Navaho specialist from Harvard who promoted the notion of pattern, configurations and culture profile), Robert Redfield (a member of the Chicago School who carried comparative studies on small rural communities and urban ones), Margaret Mead (the specialist of child rearing practices on a comparative basis) and many others of the same professional standing.

In 1941, he joined the U.S. Navy Medical Corps where he stayed until 1946 and left with the rank of Commander. While being in the Navy, he was invested with many functions of high responsibility. He became Chief of the Morale Analysis Division and as a result, became the leader of a research interdisciplinary field that carried out exceptional experimental observations among the Japanese American evacuees of the Relocation Center, at Poston Arizona. Such a social experiment allowed him to write a classic, that is, *The Governing of Man*. One research question almost imposed itself in that situation. It could be expressed in the following manner. Is it possible to find out how a group of evacuees, sent more or less in disorder at Poston, reorganized the social fabric of their human relationships so as to function normally in an artificially-created social environment? Years of observation of a multidisciplinary team made it possible to identify a number of principles which are still today at the roots of successful governing patterns. The Leighton book spells out, through rigorous methodological procedures, how the evacuees reconstructed their social environment so as to make it functional, that is livable. Dr. Leighton was during these years a member of the Office of the War Information and served as leader of the Post-War Strategic Bombing Survey in Japan where he analyzed the impact of the Atom Bomb on Japanese civilians. After such exceptional field experience, he wrote *Human Relations in a Changing World*. In 1946, he received two prestigious awards. The first one was a Human Relations Award from the American Association for the advancement of Management and the second one, a Guggenheim fellowship.

In 1946 Leighton was appointed full professor in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Cornell University. During his stay at Ithaca he taught also at the School of Labor and Industrial Relations and at the Cornell Medical School in New York. He remained at Cornell until 1966. I had the good fortune of registering as a doctoral candidate in anthropology in the fall of 1950 through the recommendation of Dr. Leighton. I had spent the summer of that year as a research associate on the Stirling County Project carrying field work among the Acadians of Saint-Malo. Upon registering at the Graduate School, Professor Leighton became the head of my Doctoral Committee and thesis director. During these two decades at Cornell, Alexander Leighton was highly active in interdisciplinary research and led three significant research projects that became training laboratories to a large number of graduate students and young colleagues from various medical, social and human sciences. He headed the well-known Cornell Southwest Applied Project among the Navahos from 1948 to 1953. In 1948 he also began the Stirling County studies in which fifty-five years later he is still an active participant with his wife Dr. Jane Murphy.

From 1956 until 1966, he became the director of the Cornell Programme in Social psychiatry which amalgamated the previously separate Mid-Town and Stirling County Projects in psychiatric epidemiology. The success of that comparative venture led to his appointment as Professor of Social Psychiatry and Head of the Department of Behavioral Sciences at the Harvard School of Public Health until 1975. Then, for a period of ten years, he became the Canadian National Health Scientist in the Department of Psychiatry at Dalhousie University. I am omitting to list the numerous awards he received between 1956 and 1996 (a total of eleven national and international ones), the organizational memberships to which he belongs (fourteen of them spreading over a wide spectrum of scientific fields) and the numberless functions he performed as senior advisor to Foundations, Government Departments, Advisory Boards and Groups, International organizations, including the WHO and National institutions. The listing of these would be just too long.



The most striking contribution of Dr. Leighton's career has been the training of many young scientists and his lifelong involvement in interdisciplinary work. His training in biology, physiology, the natural sciences, psychology, psychiatry, anthropology and the social sciences opened up new scientific vistas and covered a wide spectrum of research endeavours ranging from the vulture's eyes, work relationships among beavers, porpoise life habits, to Navaho religion, community management, ethnomedical practices among the Navahos and the Inuit of St Lawrence Island and, most of all, his epidemiological studies and reports on mental illness in Stirling County, New York, Western region, Nigeria, Sweden and in some other cross-cultural settings. These studies in psychiatric epidemiology were carried out with a theoretical framework which integrated into a whole somatic, psychological and cultural components. *My Name is Legion* is but one example of the cluster of variables that served as a theoretical foundation for the Stirling studies. His pioneering work on such a vast scale in psychiatric epidemiology and cross-cultural psychiatry has yet to be fully assessed. We know, however, that many scientists, working in psychiatric research, have been strongly influenced in their research design, methodological procedures as well as in their measuring instruments by the Leightonian perspective. This is a legacy that is likely to still become more important as it is rooted in score of institutional settings.

Another feature of Alec's career in which he has been successfully engaged –and this is another facet of his legacy- refers to his ability to strike the right balance between fundamental research and applied Projects and Programmes. His Poston daily field observations and analyses as well as those of his difficult mission in Post-War Japan led him to express new principles on the governance of human societies and to underscore the emergence of new types of human relationships in a world that is changing at such a fast pace. All his research work in the mental health field in his own country and cross-culturally as well as in social psychiatry (*Further Explorations in Social Psychiatry*) was as much an effort to reveal the etiological components of

psychiatric disorders and to make epidemiological counts of the mentally ill at one period in time as it was to formulate new therapeutic processes and to create an awareness for social prevention taking into account historical configurations, culture patterns, individuals' life habits, people's health trajectories and socio-environmental risk factors. *Caring for the Mentally Ill People* stands as a good example of his views on clinical practice. Leighton's teachings in applied anthropology is undoubtedly the best I have ever seen in my whole anthropological career. He was among the few who created the American Society for Applied Anthropology.

A paramount aspect of the Leightonian commitment to Science has been his concern for the publication of research results as articles in learned Journals or as full-fledged accounts in book form. He has published extensively alone and also with his collaborators. I can say without hesitation that his books, without exception, were imaginative in scope, conceptually derived from a framework of reference, rigorous and coherent in the development of their component parts and in a clear and beautiful style that is accessible to scientists and informed people alike.

Dr Leighton has been among the first promoters of teamwork research in psychiatric epidemiology, in anthropology and in other social sciences. He has devoted his full life to implementing the idea and to being rather successful over the years with a wide «National» variety of field workers. As the director of those research teams, he has always been a researcher with high ethical guidelines and scientific standards which applied in fieldwork to daily note taking and field reporting, data analysis and the writing up of final reports. At the same time, he was highly sensitive to individual researcher's needs and to the imperatives of harmonious social relationships with the team. He committed himself entirely to his research and his research associates. His keen interest in people and his altruistic ideals always kept him close to individuals and communities under observation. I was associated with the Stirling Project from 1950 to 1960 on a formal basis and until 1964 on an informal association. Upon returning to Laval University in 1956, I applied

extensively Leighton’s formula for carrying research. I did research on a number of different topics, but when it came to dealing with health and health-related subjects, I invariably found the Leightonian theoretical parameters very useful and stimulating. On a number of occasions, I asked him to provide a critical look at some of my research results. Within a short period of time I received from this very busy man detailed and relevant comments that enriched the content of my report and made suggestions as to further steps to be undertaken.

Upon ending this brief profile, I would like to express to Dr. Leighton the high esteem and admiration I hold of him as an individual and as a scientist. He has been at the beginning and at the heart of my anthropological career. While being trained at Cornell, I learned from him a work method and a way to make good scientific reporting. He reinforced my thinking about the imperative of making research results useful to the communities being studied. He continues to be a model and a source of inspiration relative to my scientific activities. We have remained in close contact since I first met him in Québec in the spring of 1950 when he was looking for two French-speaking social scientist to carry research assignments among the Acadians of Southwestern Nova Scotia. Needless to say that I was the one who gained the most from such an inspiring relationship. The type of influence that Alec has had on me has been reproduced, with different colours and intensity, among many hundred of others. As a result, I take the liberty to say that «My name is Legion».

The assessment of Dr. Leighton’s prolific scientific production –173 publications on a wide variety of topics and a very large number of them carried in cross-cultural settings have been published for international readership – will require the analytic skills of a whole team of interdisciplinary and interinstitutional researchers. I am aware that Professor Leighton is in the process of preparing a sketch of his intellectual *évolution*. I share the conviction with others that it will be a magisterial piece of work that will reflect his personality and his achievements and will have many lessons for generations to come. We are very much looking forward to reading

it because we are confident that it will contain food for thought related to personality growth, dynamic equilibrium and human relationships in broad environmental contexts, all of these being drawn from a wide spectrum of disciplines.

All of what has been said on Alexander Leighton up to now has built the intellectual context into which we have to examine the many and varied contributions of his closest collaborator, namely Dr. Jane Murphy. Her second field experience was her work on the Inuit of St Lawrence Island where she carried a pilot study in psychiatric epidemiology with an emphasis on understanding Inuit concepts of illness, including mental illness. After getting her doctorate at Cornell with an anthropology major, she became a key person in the cross-cultural work of the Leighton interdisciplinary team. This includes the study of Nigeria which several members of the team carried out together in 1961 and another study there in 1963 which she did on her own. Since during this conference she will be reviewing the cross-cultural extension of the Stirling work, I would like to mention here more specifically her contributions to the Stirling County Study itself.

In 1964 Jane Murphy became the director of the social science part of the team work. This included serving in this capacity for the 1964 Study In New York City and for the assessment of the community development project in Stirling County. Then the first county-wide effort in longitudinal work in Stirling county began in 1968 and went on through 1971. A second sample of the County as a whole was drawn, followed up all of the subjects from the earlier samples while devoted a great deal of effort to update the procedures for studying community integration and disintegration.

Up to that time, the Stirling County researchers employed traditional « key-informant» and «participant-observation» methods to build community models. One of the first tasks Jane undertook as the Social Science Director was supervising a new round of such investigations when they expanded the number of communities to include two outside of Stirling County. It was hoped that they would serve as

«comparison» or «control» communities for the applied anthropology work in community development within the Stirling County. After the experience of trying to coordinate several community studies so that they would be comparable, Jane Murphy became convinced that it was necessary to move to a more structured approach that would synthesize qualitative and quantitative techniques.

One of the tricky aspects of what she faced was that the study of community integration needed to be carried out in some communities in which researchers were also conducting psychiatric surveys. One of her decision was to have the unit of study be the whole population so that the assessment of the quality of community life would not come exclusively from those who were in the psychiatric survey. The hope was that this would guard against interpreting that a community was in poor condition because the image of it came through the eyes of those who were depressed and who therefore tended to disparage their surroundings.

Also, as it is known, the concept of community-disintegration-integration dualism included a gradient from «poverty» to «affluence» but it went much beyond that and concerned the relationships between people in terms of mutual aid and social support. Jane Murphy thought that the techniques available for assessing the economic resources of a community and its residents were quite satisfactory. What was needed was a more quantifiable approach to gathering information about social interactions.

Jane Murphy worked out and implemented a scheme whereby each household in the five key communities in Stirling County –one of them being Lavallée which I studied in 1952- was visited on a time-sampling basis. The group of students she recruited and trained did four rounds of such surveys in each of the five communities so as to have information on how social interactions might vary by season of the year as well as by time of day and by weekends versus work days. In these households both observation and interviewing was carried out in terms of who was where doing what with whom. She also used the concept of «behavioral setting» as put forth by Roger

Barker for gathering systematic information about the functioning of both formal and informal aspects of social interactions. The gathering data for this was completed at the same time that was finished the interviewing of the psychiatric samples and follow-ups in 1972.

The next two years were devoted to the study in Vietnam. Jane and Alec had not intended to carry anymore cross-cultural work. Upon thinking about such a stand, they believed that they should not turn their backs on a need related to the war in Vietnam, especially in view of the fact that they were able to recruit to help them a number of anthropologists and political scientists who had extensive experience in gathering information in Vietnam. While their ostensible objective was to assess the effects of using dioxin for defoliation as a military tactic, the research team was able to gather information about the impact on attitudes and economic resources. For her part Dr Murphy took responsibility for a psychiatric survey among groups of civilian Vietnamese who had undergone different levels of exposure as well as prisoners of war. The outcome of that investigation was that the level of symptomatology among the most exposed groups was higher than anything the research group had seen in any of their other studies. Undoubtedly, Jane will talk about this in her presentation this afternoon.

Shortly after the Vietnam study was written up, Alec retired from Harvard and Jane, remaining at Harvard, became the Director of the Stirling County Study as a whole in 1975. That year was an important dividing line in her life. She had finished writing the article «Psychiatric labelling in Cross-cultural Perspective», which was published the next year in *Science*. It is of interest to note that her first public presentation of the materials she had gathered among the St Lawrence Inuit and Yorubas about native concepts of psychiatric illness was for an audience at Dalhousie University. Dr. Seymour Ketty, who was Head of the National Institute of Mental Health at about that time, happened to be there and told her that he thought the material was extremely important and that she should try to publish it in *Science*. It

takes a long time and many revisions for *Science* to accept a paper, especially one from anthropology and psychiatry, but she did such work and succeeded to get the article published.

Jane Murphy's work on psychiatric illness had led her to interpret that there were more similarities about the concept of «insanity» in the groups she had studied than there were differences. This interpretation was not a welcome message to many anthropologists who were dedicated to cultural relativity, and she was strongly criticized by some. As more studies have been carried out, however, such as those of the World Health Organization, it has become clear that something very akin to schizophrenia is found virtually everywhere and that almost everywhere it is recognized as an illness. I think that most anthropologists now agree with this position.

As far as the psychiatric community in the United States is concerned, Alec told me, the article brought an exceedingly positive response, and numerous people have told him that it is a «classic». Whenever she is introduced nowadays, some mention of that article is usually made. Jane, herself, viewed this article as bringing her cross-cultural work to a close and as allowing her to turn to the longitudinal work in Stirling County. She felt, in this regard, that more was to be learned from following individuals and a population over time than would be true of carrying out more cross-sectional studies in different cultures. So, since then, she has taken the responsibility not only of planning the direction of the Stirling County Study but also raising funds for it.

The late seventies and early eighties were a difficult period for raising money for the Stirling Study and it looked as if it was going to be difficult to get adequate funding to go on and analyze and publish the results of everything that has been done after the Family Life Survey of 1952, including studies on social interactions. Dr. Murphy sized up the situation as due to what was going on in the psychiatric world,

namely, President Carter’s Commission on Mental Health, the evolution of the Third Diagnostic And Statistical Manual (referred to as DSM-111), the launching of the Epidemiological Catchman Area Program that employed the Diagnostic Interview Schedule. The Stirling Study was perceived as a pioneering effort but now a little outdated in terms of its psychiatric approach. Anyone who knows Jane also Knows that she does not give up easily. What she decided to do was to learn everything possible about the new DSM-111 approach and how that approach was going to be implemented in the new round of epidemiological surveys. She had a lot of background for this because after completing her Ph.D. she spent a year at the Cornell Medical School in what is called «psychiatric clerkship» focussed on learning to interview patients and to formulate diagnoses.

Such a psychiatric clerkship became available to Jane after Dr. Leighton had told Dr. Oscar Diethelm, who headed the Cornell Department of Psychiatry at that time, that what people trained in the behavioral sciences needed, if they were to contribute maximally to psychiatric epidemiology, was first-hand knowledge of what a psychiatric disorder is and how it can be diagnosed. Dr. Diethelm understood and made it possible for Jane to be attached to the Payne Whitney Psychiatric Outpatient Department for that year to interview new cases and to attend all the clinical conferences.

While boning up on DSM-111, Dr. Jane Murphy also re-read all the materials about the psychiatric evaluations of the 1952 surveys. Two things resulted. The first one was that she concluded that the evaluation procedures were strikingly similar to the DSM-111 approach and that, if she could bring about an understanding of that similarity in the psychiatric community, it might be possible to begin to raise funds again for the Stirling Study. She wrote up these parallels in an article titled : «Continuities in Community-based Psychiatric Epidemiology» that was published in *Archives of General Psychiatry*. The editor, Dr. Daniel Freedman, was very impressed by it and made it the lead article in that issue. The second point was that



she realized that the reliability of the evaluations was good enough so that she could build a computer program that would replicate those evaluations. With such a computer program, it would be possible to analyze in a consistent fashion the psychiatric data that were gathered from the beginning of the study. This was a breakthrough. Jane convinced assessors that such an analysis with proposed tools was a step in the right direction. She was able to raise money to begin writing up the longitudinal results, those that pertained to analyzing the data from 1952 through 1970.

The achievement convinced Jane that she could do more. Then she decided to try to raise funds for bringing the whole study up to the 40-year mark. The part of her plan that she had to fight hardest for was to be able to draw a totally new sample as well as to do a complete follow-up of everybody who had entered at earlier dates. She was successful. It meant that the Study continued to be one in which a population is followed for understanding trends and individuals are followed for seeing who becomes ill, who becomes well, who stays ill, who dies and so on.

Thus between 1991 and 1996, Dr Murphy went into another phase of active field work and came out of it with a database that now concerns just over 4000 subjects. For virtually all these subjects the Project not only has information based on interviewing them but also has information from their physicians. Of course, Dr. Leighton served as a senior consultant for the study and they are now in the process of writing up the 40-year findings and beginning to see them published. I am quite sure that the Stirling Study would not have gone beyond what was learned from the 1952 effort if it had not been for Jane's research skills and commitment. She is now working on a proposal to submit soon for three more years of funding. She hopes very much that she will get this award and so does Alec.

My story about Dr. Alexander Leighton and Dr. Jane Murphy is far from being exhaustive. It is unique in many ways and demonstrates how two scientists with

vision, stamina, commitment, cross-cultural experiences, motivated with high achievement ideals, strongly supported by a large group of collaborators over half a century were successful in making the Stirling Study one of the most remarkable research endeavours of the twentieth century in psychiatric epidemiology. They deserve to be congratulated not only for providing a better knowledge of the dynamics of mental illness but also for suggesting new caring pathways for the mentally ill and new support mechanisms for their natural aids.

The field of psychiatric epidemiology has been fortunate indeed to have within its ranks two of its innovative pioneers who did not dare to extend the disciplinary boundary of psychiatry with the view to providing new knowledge and to finding out how such scientific advances could be implemented in therapeutic processes. I am proud to have been associated with the Stirling Study at its beginning and to have been able to follow its permanent researchers during their highly productive journey. On my behalf and on behalf of all those who are in attendance and the many others who could not be with us today, I extend to you Jane and Alec our most grateful words of thanks, for your exceptional scientific production, for the quality training received by so many of us while accompanying you and for your warm and unconditional friendship and help. God bless you both and give you many more years to come.

The Leighton Symposium

The Canadian Anthropology Society/La Société canadienne d'anthropologie

Dalhousie University

Halifax, May 10, 2003.