

forms the necessary basis of a social pathology and, if properly applied, should form the foundation of social legislation. One appreciates how pathology in this respect goes far beyond the application of well established pathological facts to the welfare of one individual alone, and this branch of pathology will form in the future one of the most important biological studies.

Orth mentions an example which may be cited in this connection in order to illustrate how intricate problems may arise: A person has suffered an accident by receiving a blow in the region of the stomach. Some time later, cancer of the stomach develops in this person. The cancer ulcerates and perforates into the peritonæum, causing a purulent peritonitis; death occurs with the symptoms of a weakened heart. We have to answer in the first place, what is responsible for the death? The peritonitis undoubtedly induced heart weakness and heart death, and the former in turn depends on the perforating carcinoma of the stomach. But, it may well be asked, what relation has the blow to this whole complex? Can everything perhaps be traced to the blow as a cause? On the other hand, if it can be demonstrated that the carcinoma existed at the time that the blow was delivered, may not the blow stand in a causal relation to the perforation and the following peritonitis and heart death?

To take another example: A person may be engaged in an occupation which requires constant bending over and considerable pressure just over the præcordial area. He suddenly collapses and dies. Autopsy discloses rupture of the heart as the result of a hæmorrhagic infarction. The questions here are somewhat similar. Did the pressure of occupation perhaps cause a circulatory condition in the heart favorable to the production of the infarct, or did it at least contribute towards it?

In the second place, if it appears that the infarction cannot be directly attributed to the injurious