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The Congrès International d'Anthropologie Criminelle, which has held six meetings, was organized largely through the initiative of the late Professor Lombroso, the leader of the so-called Italian school of criminologists. The first congress met at Rome on November 16, 1885, at the same time as the International Penal Congress. A program for the congress had been prepared by a committee composed of Lombroso, Ferri, Garofalo, Sciananna, Morselli, Lacassagne, Kraeplin, Tarde, Albrecht, Drill, Frigerio, Pasquali, Sergi, Romiti, Piegila and Porto, and the questions to be studied were grouped into two sections, a biological and a sociological section.

The organization of the first congress was as follows: Presidents, Lombroso and Ferri; Vice-Presidents, Sergi, Sciananna, Garofalo and Pugliese; General Secretaries, Mayor and Porto, and Scientific Secretaries, Couette and Fioretti.

Lombroso detailed before the first congress his theories of the physical anomalies of criminals and his classification of criminals as "born criminals," criminals by occasion and matoids. Ferri expressed his view of crime as a degeneration more profound than insanity; for in most insane persons the primitive moral sense has survived the wreck of their intelligence. Along similar lines were the remarks of Benedikt, Sergi and Marro. On the other hand, M. Anguilli called attention to the importance of the influence of the social environment upon crime. Professor Lacassagne thought that the atavistic and degenerative theories as held by the Italian school were exaggerations and false interpretations of the facts, and that the important factor was the social environment.

This radical divergence in the views of the Italian and the French schools was reflected in the proceedings of the second congress, held at Paris, August 10-17, 1889, during the French Exposition. Professor Lombroso summarized the results of the observations of the positive school since the last congress, laying stress upon epilepsy in connection with his theory of the "born criminal." Professor Manouvrier characterized Lombroso's theory as nothing but the exploded science of phrenology. The anomalies observed by
Lombroso were met with in honest men as well as criminals, Manouvrier claimed, and there is no physical difference between them. Garofalo, Drill, Lacassagne and Benedikt opposed Lombroso’s theories in whole or in part. Pugliese found the cause of crime in the failure of the criminal to adapt himself to his social surroundings, and Benedikt, with whom Tarde agreed, held that physical defects were not marks of the criminal qua criminal.

Conditional liberation was the subject of a report by Dr. Semal, director of the insane asylum at Mons, Belgium, in which he advocated the system as affording a means for the reformation of the criminal. M. Drill remarked that the system of conditional liberation required the exercise of two functions: that of the judgment of the court in passing upon the guilt of the criminal, and that of the subsequent treatment of the criminal, and that these are entirely different and ought to be separated. The first belongs to the court, the latter to the administration of the penitentiary, in which should be invoked the aid of scientific experts. M. Bertillon begged the congress not to forget that the important end to be kept in view is the safety of society and that the reform of the criminal is but a secondary aim. Anthropometry in connection with the identification of criminals was also considered and the moral perversions of infants were treated of in a paper by Dr. Magan of the asylum of St. Anne at Paris. A communication on Criminal Statistics in the United States was presented by Thomas Wilson, delegate from the Smithsonian Institution.

The second congress, upon motion of Baron Garofalo, appointed a committee of seven to make comparative observations on a series of one hundred living criminals and on one of the same number of honest men. The committee made no effort to make such observations, but at the third congress, held at Brussels from the 7th to the 14th of August, 1892, Manouvrier presented a report in his own name showing the difficulty, indeed, the practical impossibility, of carrying out such a scheme of observations. An able and convincing report on the question, “Does there exist an anatomically determined criminal type?” was presented by Dr. Emile Houze and Dr. Leo Warnots of the University of Brussels. They concluded that the proposed type designated by Lombroso as the born criminal was not a real type; that the division of individuals into criminals and non-criminals was purely arbitrary and not a scientific classification, and that a certain number of criminals present pathological and degenerative characteristics but that these do not constitute a special category of degenerates. The discussion of these reports developed so complete an
opposition to the theories of the so-called Italian school that M. A. Bournet, Editor of the Archives d'Anthropologie Criminelle, in his summary of the work of the congress, stated as the first of its four principal achievements "the complete dissipation of the criminal type and of the born criminal of Lombroso." The other three he stated to be a preliminary effort to construct a theory based solely on the experimental method; the approach toward a common meeting point of "free will" and "determinism," of law and biology, of the magistrate and the physician; and lastly, the closer association of criminal law with the problems of criminal anthropology in order to facilitate the reform of criminal legislation and of prison administration. One other report of the first importance presented to the third congress should be mentioned, that of Professor E. Gauckler on the respective importance of the social and anthropological elements in the determination of punishment. Professor Gauckler gave as the final results of his discussion the points: First, that the essential function of criminal law is the prevention of crime by intimidation and this function is conditioned exclusively by the social elements; second, that a secondary but considerable function is to ensure the future harmlessness of the criminal and this is conditioned by the anthropological factors; thirdly, that to a less degree reparation to the victim of the crime should be an end, and finally, that the pursuit of this threefold end would satisfy the social sentiments of justice, of hatred and of pity, which manifest themselves in connection with every crime.

An increasing attention to practical applications characterized the work of the fourth congress, held at Geneva in 1896, and of the fifth congress, held at Amsterdam from the 9th to the 14th of September, 1901. At the Amsterdam congress, in particular, much attention was paid to the social causes of crime, and the subject of sexual inversion and perversion was also prominent in the papers and discussions. Among the reports presented was one by Dr. Clark Bell, Editor of the Medico-Legal Journal, on the indeterminate sentence in New York. Among other subjects considered were: The notion of crime, criminality of the insane, degeneration and criminality, the juvenile delinquent and the etiology of crime. Miss Louise Rabinovitch was the official delegate from the United States to this congress.

The controversy over the theories of Lombroso, which the third congress, at which none of the Italian school were present, thought it had settled, was revived when the congress met again in Italy.

The sixth congress was held at Turin, April 28-May 3, 1906,
the proceedings of the congress being issued in a volume of 675 pages in 1908. An interesting summary of the work of the congress from the standpoint of the actual state of criminal anthropology as a science was published by Dr. G. Papillault in the *Revue de l'Ecole d'Anthropologie de Paris* for January, 1909. He classifies the various communications presented to the congress under the four heads of Somatology, Ethology, Sociology and Economics. Somatic studies of criminals seemed to occupy the most important place in the proceedings of the sixth congress, as was, perhaps, natural on the home ground of the Italian school. Lombroso, in defense of his theory of the born criminal, drew an ingenious parallel between the homosexual individual and the criminal. Specialists, he said, distinguished the occasional and the insane homosexual, and, finally, those born inverted, who, from their earliest years experience an attraction toward persons of the same sex and often exhibit special characteristics. He thought it strange that authorities such as Nacke, Lacassagne, Gross and Krafft-Ebing should refuse to credit the existence of born criminals and yet affirm the congenital character and consequent irresponsibility of the born homosexual. Dr. Papillault remarks that while he considers the term “born criminal” unsatisfactory, he believes there are among criminals a certain number who approach what might be called the half-civilized type, who are less able than normal persons to adapt themselves to the exigencies of modern social life. M. Enrico Ferri proposed to distinguish among the born criminals those who are inferior, having preserved through atavism ancestral characteristics, and those on the contrary (some political criminals, for example), who are in advance of their time. Dr. Papillault wittily observes that he would have no objection to such a captivating theory if M. Ferri would point out the means of diagnosing the atavistic from the eugenic criminal; but that, perhaps, Mr. Galton and his Eugenics Society may yet provide a method of recognizing and cultivating the latter. Dr. Audenino drew another distinction among the born criminals, namely, between those who represent an accumulation of degenerate characteristics who constitute the true type, and those who have acquired the type through morbid heredity simply, or through arrested development during the period of gestation. The latter he would call the “congenital-acquired criminals.”

Leaving now the subject of “born criminals,” so peculiarly the creation of the Lombroso school, several of the most interesting papers on general morphology are noted. M. Minovici reported a
study of 150 prostitutes and 50 female criminals in Roumania, compared with a series of 50 normal women. The anthropometric measurements, including shape, width and circumference of chest, size of ears, facial angle and cephalic index disclosed no marked differences between the three classes. M. Minovici found in 400 prostitutes, 40 cases of rachitis, 13 cases only of dysmenorrhea and four cases of tribadism. “En somme,” says Papillault, “on ne peut que feliciter les prostituées roumaines de leur tenue physique et morale.” Dr. Marro presented a study of some uncommon cranial anomalies, principally of the middle occipital fossa. He claimed that his results accorded with the theories of the Lombroson school. In another paper, Dr. Marro thought that the cerebral condition accompanying homicide might be described as a “psychic hyperesthesia,” which he defined as an excitation of the cerebral cortex, setting up a motor irritation which the individual is unable to control. The most important predisposing causes he considered to be chronic alcoholism, climatic conditions, such as periods of extreme heat, and the disturbances of the period of puberty. Brain anomalies were treated of in two communications, one by M. Lattes on the convolutions of the brains of female criminals, the other by M. Roncoroni on anomalies in the brains of 33 epileptics and 16 “born criminals.” Neither, however, included any comparison with normal brains.

A number of interesting papers under the heads of ethology, sociology and economics are summarized by Dr. Papillault. The bands of criminals, so common in Italy, was one point of attention. M. Prins stated that crimes committed by such bands were on the increase. Dr. Angiolella spoke of the societies of brigands, noting the persistence of the Camorra in the province of Bari under the name of Malavita, and the organization of a new band in Calabria under the name of Piccioteria. The professional criminal as recruited from the servant class was the subject of a communication by M. Raymond de Ryckere, and the same type as recruited from soldiers was treated by Drs. F. di Cavallerleone and Consiglio Placido. Dr. Slingenberg examined the influence on crime of the competition between the classes, concluding that there is a direct relation between criminality and class conflicts in the sense that in times of more violent class conflicts crime increases. A study of crime among Austrian laborers was presented by M. Hugo Herz. He believed that modern industrial conditions which more and more take the woman away from the home result in an increase of crime; the most noticeable effects of this progressive dissolution of the family being upon the children.
The general tendencies of the discussions so far as they relate to practical action might be summarized in two propositions: First, to apply to convicts such rational treatment as will reform those who are not beyond reformation; second, to arrest the formation of a criminal class by a preventive social hygiene. The last proposition was particularly dealt with by M. M. Albanel, Van Hamel, Kahn, Magnaud and Mme. Gina Lombroso. To these ends studies by exact and scientific methods, both of criminals and of the organic and social factors of crime, must continue to be made just as in medicine pathology necessarily precedes therapeutics.

The seventh congress was to have been held at Cologne during August of this year, but has been postponed to October, 1911.

The proceedings of each congress have been published under the title “Actes du Congres International d’Anthropologie Criminelle.” Full accounts of the various congresses and summaries of the proceedings have appeared in the “Archives d’Anthropologie Criminelle” and also in the “Revue Scientifique.” A very complete report of the proceedings of the second congress by Thomas Wilson appeared in the Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institution for 1890, and there is an account of the third congress in “Abnormal Man,” by Dr. Arthur MacDonald.