

1924

American White Criminal Intelligence

Carl Murchison

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Carl Murchison, American White Criminal Intelligence, 15 J. Am. Inst. Crim. L. & Criminology 239 (May 1924 to February 1925)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

AMERICAN WHITE CRIMINAL INTELLIGENCE

CARL MURCHISON¹

PREFACE

The material presented in this book has been used as supplementary material in courses in social psychology, applied psychology, and abnormal psychology. There may be others who would find it useful in the same way. The data should not be restricted to courses in psychology, as it can serve equally well in courses in sociology or in practical statistics.

During the period immediately following the signing of the Armistice, while the writer was acting as Chief Psychological Examiner at Camp Sherman, Ohio, it became possible to begin the collection of data presented in this monograph. The writer had been asked to appear before a joint session of the Finance Committee of the Ohio General Assembly, for the purpose of presenting some data in regard to the prevalence of feeble-mindedness in the State of Ohio. At that meeting, the writer met Warden Thomas of the Ohio Penitentiary, and he suggested that a mental test be given to the prisoners in that prison. General Smith, Commanding General of Camp Sherman, generously allowed the author the necessary leave, and ordered any help needful. All the men in that prison who could be spared from their duties were marched in groups into the dining hall and given the Alpha mental test under the same conditions described for recruits in Volume 15 of the *Memoirs of the National Academy of Sciences*, except that no literacy requirement was used.

Shortly afterwards, the writer gave the Alpha test to the criminals in the Ohio Reformatory, the Ohio Penitentiary for Women, the Ohio Prison Farm, the Illinois Penitentiary at Joliet, the Illinois Reformatory at Pontiac, the Indiana Penitentiary, the Indiana Reformatory, and various criminal groups in and about Camp Sherman.

In the fall of 1922, Doctor E. A. Doll, during a conversation in the Princeton Psychological Laboratory, generously offered to give to the writer any data whatever that the writer might care to select from the files in Trenton, New Jersey. In that way, data on about twelve

¹Professor of Psychology in Clark University.

hundred cases from the New Jersey Penitentiary came into the writer's possession.

In the spring of 1923, the writer received permission from the warden of the Maryland Penitentiary, Colonel Sweezey, to give the Alpha test to his prisoners. Colonel Sweezey also very generously allowed the writer access to his files. In that way, a large amount of new and interesting data was gathered.

It seemed best, for purposes of publication and for clarity of treatment, to divide the data into four groups: white native born men, white foreign born men, negroes, and women. This monograph deals exclusively with the first group. The other groups are to be treated in later publications.

The data obtained from the above sources is presented in full in the third part of this monograph. This is done in order that others may check the writer's conclusions and may suggest better treatments of the data. Many problems connected with this data have necessarily been left untouched for the present.

No assumption is made as to whether the Alpha test measures anything that is native. For the practical purposes of this monograph, intelligence is whatever is expressed quantitatively as measured by the Alpha test. This makes practical comparison possible. Professional psychologists will readily understand the practical necessity for this division of discussion.

A detailed bibliography will not at present be attached to this monograph, since there are so many excellent bibliographies already accessible. The best bibliography devoted exclusively to the problems discussed in this book is "A Bibliography on the Relations of Crime and Feeble-Mindedness," by L. W. Crafts, in the *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 1916, 7, pp. 544-555. It consists of 210 references, chiefly English and German. A good and more recent bibliography is contained in "Deficiency and Delinquency," by J. B. Miner, 1918, pp. 324-343. For the general field of Criminology, probably the most complete and most important bibliography is contained in the *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, Volume 15, pp. 259-317, 350-371, 379-446, 463-501, 515-557, 567-621, 635-714. This bibliography consists of 359 pages of approximately 10,000 references. It is dated 1911, and is practically complete for that date. The *Index Catalogues of the Library of the Surgeon General's Office* is another such bibliography, and is complete in the two series of 1888 and 1898, but the fourth volume of the Third Series will probably not be out for another year. For a restricted popular bibliography along the same

lines, the reader is referred to "Guide to Reading in Social Ethics and Allied Subjects," 1910, pp. 109-121, formulated by a group of teachers in Harvard University.

Sincere thanks are extended to The Johns Hopkins University, which by its bestowal of the Johnstone Scholarship facilitated the elaboration of the data and the production of the monograph. The author is also under obligation to Professor Knight Dunlap, who has given both council and practical assistance. However, only the author should be held responsible for the general method of treatment and the conclusions. The author wishes also to express his gratitude to Doctor E. A. Doll, to the wardens of the various prisons from which the data came, and to many others who have given assistance and advice. Finally, he wishes to thank the numerous prisoners who so effectively gave their co-operation in a work the importance of which they could only take on trust.

CARL MURCHISON.

Clark University, Worcester, Mass., January, 1924.

CHAPTER 1

PRE-WAR CONTEMPORARY OPINION

One of the most important discussions concerning the relation of feeble-mindedness to crime is the following rather extended quotation from Doctor H. H. Goddard's "Feeble Mindedness," page 6-10, published in July, 1914.

"Society's attitude toward the criminal has gone through a decided evolution, but that evolution has been in the line of its treatment rather than of its understanding of him and of his responsibility. Almost up to the present time there has been a practically universal assumption of the responsibility of all except the very youngest children and those recognized as idiots, imbeciles or insane. The oldest method of treatment was in accordance with the idea of vengeance, an eye for an eye. The god Justice was satisfied if the offender suffered an equal amount with those whom he had made suffer. Later came the idea of punishing an offender for the sake of deterring others from similar crimes. This is the basis of much of our present penal legislation. But students of humanity have gone farther and now realize that the great function of punishment is to reform the offender.

"We have had careful studies of the offender from this standpoint. Studies have been made of his environment and of those things

which have led him into crime. Attempts have been made to remove these conditions, so that criminals shall not be made, or having reformed, they shall not again be led into a criminal life. A great deal has been accomplished along these lines. But we shall soon realize, if we have not already, that on this track there is a barrier which we cannot cross. Environment will not, of itself, enable all people to escape criminality. The problem goes much deeper than environment. It is the question of responsibility. Those who are born without sufficient intelligence either to know right from wrong, or those who, if they know it, have not sufficient will-power and judgment to make themselves do the right and flee the wrong, will ever be a fertile source of criminality. This is being recognized more and more by those who have to do with criminals. We have no thought of maintaining that all criminals are irresponsible. Although we cannot determine at present just what the proportion is, probably from 25% to 50% of the people in our prisons are mentally defective and incapable of managing their affairs with ordinary prudence. A great deal has been written about the criminal type and its various characteristics. It is interesting to see in the light of modern knowledge of the defective that these descriptions are almost without exception descriptions of the feeble-minded.

"The hereditary criminal passes out with the advent of feeble-mindedness into the problem. The criminal is not born; he is made. The so-called criminal type is merely a type of feeble-mindedness, a type misunderstood and mistreated, driven into criminality for which he is well fitted by nature. It is hereditary feeble-mindedness, not hereditary criminality, that accounts for the conditions. We have seen only the end product and failed to recognize the character of the raw material.

"Perhaps the best data on this problem come from the prisons and reformatories. It is quite surprising to see how many persons who have to do with criminals are coming forward with the statement that a greater or less percentage of the persons under their care are feeble-minded. They had always known that a certain proportion were thus affected, but since the recognition of the moron and of his characteristics, the percentage is found ever higher and higher. The highest of all come from the Institutions for Juveniles, partly because it is difficult to believe that an adult man or woman who makes a fair appearance but who lacks in certain lines, is not simply ignorant. We are more willing to admit the defect of children. The discrepancy is also due to the fact that the mental defectives are more apt to die

young leaving among the older prisoners those who are really intelligent.

"The following list of reformatories and institutions for delinquents with the estimated number of defectives undoubtedly gives a fair idea of the amount of feeble-mindedness. The differences in the percentages are probably due more to the standards used in estimating the defective than to actual differences in numbers. It is the most discouraging to discover that the more expert is the examiner of these groups, the higher is the percentage of feeble-minded found. For example, Dr. Olga Bridgeman, who has made one of the most careful studies on record, finds that 89 per cent of the girls at Geneva, Illinois, are defective.

Institution	Per Cent Defective
St. Cloud, Minnesota, Reformatory.....	54
Rahway Reformatory, New Jersey (Binet).....	46
Bedford Reformatory, New York—under 11 years.....	80
Lancaster, Massachusetts (girl's reformatory).....	60
Lancaster, Massachusetts, 50 paroled girls.....	82
Lyman School for Boys, Westboro, Massachusetts.....	28
Pentonville, Illinois, Juveniles.....	40
Massachusetts Reformatory, Concord.....	52
Newark, New Jersey, Juvenile Court.....	66
Elmira Reformatory	70
Geneva, Illinois (Binet).....	89
Ohio Boys School (Binet).....	70
Ohio Girls School (Binet).....	70
Virginia, 3 Reformatories (Binet).....	79
New Jersey State Home for Girls.....	75
Glen Mills Schools, Pennsylvania, Girls Department.....	72

"The percentages above given are not in all cases the official figures given out by the examiners, but are the author's interpretation based on the facts given in the reports.

"Unfortunately we cannot average the percentages because the reports from which these figures were taken do not always state the number of persons upon whom the estimate is made.

"A glance will show that an estimate of 50 per cent is well within the limit. From these studies we might conclude that at least 50 per cent of all criminals are mentally defective. Even if a much smaller percentage is defective it is sufficient for our argument that without question one point of attack for the solution of the problem of crime is the problem of feeble-mindedness.

"It is easier for us to realize this if we remember how many of the crimes that are committed seem foolish and silly. One steals something that he cannot use and cannot dispose of without getting caught. A boy is offended because the teacher will not let him choose

what he will study, and therefore he sets fire to the school building. Another kills a man in cold blood in order to get two dollars. Somebody else allows himself to be persuaded to enter a house and pass out stolen goods under circumstances where even slight intelligence would have told him he was sure to be caught. Sometimes the crime itself is not so stupid but the perpetrator acts stupidly afterwards and is caught, where an intelligent person would have escaped. Many of the 'unaccountable' crimes, both large and small, are accounted for once it is recognized that the criminal may be mentally defective. Judge and jury are frequently amazed at the folly of the defendant—the lack of common sense that he displayed in his act. It has not occurred to us that the folly, the crudity the dullness, was an indication of an intellectual trait that rendered the victim to a large extent irresponsible."

The above extended quotations constitute the text of Doctor Goddard's entire discussion of the problem of criminality. It has been given in order that there may be no possibility of misrepresentation. It is a typical discussion of its type, and is probably as important as any discussion developing the same point of view. The reader should carefully consider its errors, the more important of which are as follows:

(1) The majority of the institutions reported are institutions dealing wholly or in part with girls. It is not valid to assume that the mentality of incarcerated girls is typical of criminals in general. Relatively few girls are in prison, and the list of their crimes differs from the catalogue of male crimes. Also, there is always a possibility that a woman who gets to prison is either overwhelmingly guilty or completely unable to vamp the jury. Certainly, nothing can be said about the female criminal should be applied without investigation to the male criminal.

(2) All the cases reported are juveniles. It is not valid to assume that the mentality of juveniles is typical of criminals in general. Most incarcerated juveniles are either friendless or helpless. Powerful men may land in prison, but the children of powerful men do not land in juvenile institutions.

(3) The number of cases is not given, neither is the method of their selection described. It is not valid to assume that the mentality of selected cases is typical of the entire group, unless the sample is large and is selected according to chance.

(4) It is admitted that various standards were used in estimating

the degree of defect. Those standards are not described, and it is thus impossible for one to be certain that the standards were valid.

(5) It is stated that the percentage of defectives increased with the skill of the examiner, it being inferred that a completely perfect examiner would find that all criminals were mentally defective.

(6)) A definition of "mental defectiveness" is not given. The facts reported are facts of interpretation only, the interpretation getting its significance from an interpretation or a definition that is not given.

(7) The discussion deals with criminals in general, yet there is not a single report from a penitentiary. The criminals that society is greatly concerned about are the criminals that are incarcerated or ought to be incarcerated in the state penitentiaries. It is not valid to assume that one can infer the mental condition of penitentiary inmates.

In 1913, just one year previous to the appearance of "Feeble-Mindedness," appeared Doctor Charles Goring's monograph on "The English Convict." This monograph is in many respects the best reported investigation of the subject that has yet appeared. It is tedious, but as accurate as one could well be at that time. The following extensive quotations are taken from pages 237-263, the selections being made with great care, in order that Doctor Goring's position may be made clear.

"Our inquiry turns to the twofold problem connected with the mental differentiation of the criminal; in other words, our object is (1) to test whether, as it has been stated, the criminal is characterized by special degrees of mental characters—the so-called mental stigmata of a criminal type, and (2) to measure the extent to which criminals, committing different kinds of crime, are distinguished from each other, and to which criminals, as a class, are differentiated from the law-abiding public, by general mental capacity.

"Of these two directions now taken by our inquiry, the former leads to results of relative minor importance criminologically, and possibly, in the opinion of many, to conclusions of doubtful validity; the second path should lead us among some statistical facts of the very first significance, whose soundness should be beyond question.

"Unfortunately, mental characters, unlike physical attributes, cannot be submitted to precise measurement by calipers or tape; but we certainly would not assert on that account that all observations of mental characters are necessarily untrustworthy, and valueless as material for scientific generalization. Estimates of mental qualities can be made; and every day the world, colloquially, does make them, with a more or

less broad degree of accuracy. Many judgments of the kind, truly, are quite valueless; for, in so many cases, distinctions of mental and moral characters are animated by personal feeling. Yet, because opinions, biased by feelings of generosity or malice, must be ignored, that is no reason for disregarding the judgments of a just critic on the grounds that mental characters are beyond the range of legitimate observation. Personal estimations of both mental and physical attributes, if carefully made and recorded by an unbiased and disinterested investigator, whose personal equation can be estimated and allowed for, represent evidence of substantially the same character, and of equal value scientifically, as that produced by measurement.

"For examples of the alleged mental stigmata, we might quote from many pages of *L'homme Criminel*. The moral insensibility of the criminal and his lack of foresight, his vanity, vengefulness, and cruelty, his gambling proclivities, his lasciviousness and laziness, and, particularly, the absence of remorse in him, are asserted, not upon statistical evidence, but as general impressions, received by observation of prisoners. These impressions, indeed, are rarely supported by figures, but mainly by the citation of particular cases, and by the descriptive methods of the old psychologists.

"The criminal may be vengeful, lazy, cruel, and lascivious; but the mere assertion of these generalizations—whether credence may be given to the narrative of particular cases, in support thereof—is idle in the absence of random sample statistics of criminals, and of comparative statistics, relating to the law-abiding community. Moreover, many of the stigmata quoted refer to mental and moral qualities that are either inseparable from the committing of crime, or that can hardly be investigated statistically in a law-abiding community; the criminal may be without remorse for, he may be vain-glorious of his crimes, for instance, but how are these mental states of the criminal to be tested with the corresponding conditions of the law-abiding subject who has not committed crimes for which to be remorseful? And this is why we stated that our inquiry as to the existence of mental stigmata is of minor importance criminologically, and that it may, in the opinion of many, lead to conclusions of questionable validity. On the other hand, the differentiation of the criminal in general mental capacity is a subject which should lead to fruitful results when investigated statistically, being, as it is, a matter of the greatest practical importance, and one that may prove to be very much at the root of many criminological problems.

"The following is a list of the qualities we are going to examine:

(1) Four characters referred to in the schedule of data, under the heading *Temperament*, viz.:

(a) *Suspiciousness*, recorded within the three categories of suspicious, trustful and medium: the last category registering degrees of this character, within a range intermediate between the two extremes, and corresponding to the observer's impression of what might be styled an average degree of suspiciousness.

(b) *Sanguine*, as opposed to plegmatic, temperament; with an average category connecting these two extremes.

(c) *Contented*, opposed to *discontented*, frames of mind: neural tendencies in these respects being classified within an intermediate category.

(d) *Egotism*, recorded within the three categories of egotistic, sympathetic, and betwixt.

(2) *Temper*, recorded within a category of good or amiable or serene temper, as opposed to a category of bad temper; which latter, on one hand, is denoted by hot and violent forms, and, in another direction, includes sullen and violent forms, of temper.

(3) *Facility*, this, like temperament and temper, is a fundamental form of human personality; and convicts are classified within the three categories of facile, obstinate, and medium, according to their tendency to respond or to be resistant to the influence of other personalities and of circumstances.

"The classification of convicts, according to the degree in which they possess the above-mentioned mental attributes, was determined from general impressions received during many months' intimate acquaintanceship with their respective personalities. Their graduation, in respect of the next three attributes, was determined by objective tests corresponding more closely to measurements.

(4) *Conduct*, graduated by the average number of reports for bad behavior during one year's sojourn in prison.

(5) *Suicidal tendency*, estimated from the recorded facts of attempt to commit suicide.

(6) *Insane diathesis*, measured by the fact that a convict has, or has had, been in an asylum at some time of his life.

" . . . We conclude that there is no relation between the temperament of criminals and the kind of crime they commit. We see, however, that criminals are highly differentiated in general intelligence; and also that the more feeble their intelligence may be, the more marked become the average degree of melancholic tendency, of discon-

tentment, and especially of suspiciousness, displayed by criminals. Accordingly, to the above-stated conclusion that the criminal temperament is unrelated to crime, we would add that any apparent differentiation in this respect results solely from the fact that criminals, according to the crimes they commit, differ widely in general intelligence or mental capacity.

" . . . We conclude that criminals convicted of violent crimes are distinguished by hot and uncontrolled tempers, and by obstinacy of purpose, but that other differences of temper, will, and conduct, amongst convicts, depend entirely upon the grade of their general intelligence.

" . . . We conclude that criminals convicted of violent crimes, as well as being distinguished by hot and uncontrolled temper, and by obstinacy of will, are also differentiated from other types of convicts by increased suicidal tendency, and by an augmented procivility to be eventually certified insane; but that in other respects—excluding a slightly increased degree of egotism displayed by offenders technically convicted of fraud,—differences of temperament, temper, will, conduct, suicidal tendency, and insane procivility, amongst convicts, depend entirely upon their differentiation in general intelligence.

"Marked unlikeness of mental characters exists between criminal groups, precisely as it abounds in great variety among different sections of the law-abiding community; but this unlikeness is associated, not with a differentiation in criminal tendency, but with the criminal's differentiation in general intelligence.

" . . . Our conclusion now is, not that criminals are a mentally undifferentiated class of the community, but that no mental differentiation exists in criminals beyond an extent accounted for by differences in general intelligence.

"According to estimates of their general intelligence, our criminal subjects have been distributed within the five categories called intelligent, fairly intelligent, unintelligent, weak-minded, and imbecile, respectively. Regarding this classification, we may say that it consists chiefly and originally of a two-fold division of criminals into weak-minded or imbecile, and non-weak-minded—a simple separation, based upon broad estimates of mental capacity, which we may safely state to be entirely free from the personal equation of any one observer. The conditions, in fact, determining the official description of a prisoner as weak-minded, are so manifold and stereotyped, and include the exercise of, and agreement between, the judgments of so many individuals, that the actual relative weak-mindedness of the officially desig-

nated weak-minded prisoner may be regarded as an established fact, subject to no greater amount of error than attaches to any general consensus of verdict between men whose metier is it to express opinions upon technical subjects of the kind we are considering. In regard to the subsequent sub-division of the non-weak-minded class into intelligent and unintelligent, the latter category is also fairly free from the bias of personal equation, consisting mainly, as it does, of individuals concerning whose possible fitness for the weak-minded contingent the verdict of general opinion is doubtful or divided; nevertheless, since the unintelligent category also includes certain other persons who, in the opinion of only one observer, possess mental qualifications not far removed from those of the officially designated weak-minded, the unintelligent, is not, on this account, so clearly defined as the mentally defective category. Finally, the division between the fairly intelligent and the unintelligent was determined solely by one individual's opinion; and, consequently, this part of the whole classification might be regarded as possibly biased by the influence of personal equation.

"It is clear, from the above description, that between criminals classified as intelligent, fairly intelligent, and unintelligent respectively, there is no definite line of demarcation, but that the several categories merge into each other. The only question is whether the original basis of the whole classification—the separation of mentally-defective criminals from the non-defective contingent—can be similarly regarded? Do the weak-minded or mentally defective form a distinct breed of criminals, naturally, as well as conventionally, separated from other offenders, in the same way as criminal lunatics are naturally distinguishable from those who are mentally sound? Or, should the term weak-minded be regarded only as conventional nomenclature, describing the notion of a class of offenders whose general intelligence has been found to be below a certain mark on the scale of common intelligence?

"We fully admit the existence of pathological imbeciles, or of persons whose natural mental development has been indisputably interfered with by morbid processes; and, while we cannot gainsay that some hidden pathological process may be at the source of the mental defectiveness of the weak-minded class of prisoner, we must, nevertheless, insist upon the fact that, apart from exceptional cases, the inherent defect in mental mechanism, postulated for individuals belonging to this class, if existent, has never yet been demonstrated as fact, and rests only upon the plausibility of an unverified hypothesis. On the other hand, if we turn to the facts, we find these harmonizing with

the conclusion that the kind of mental defectiveness we are discussing is only a convenient description of the relative degree of general intelligence of persons displaying objectionable and dangerous degrees of mental qualities, which, in some degree, are shared equally by persons of all intelligence grades.

"The Mental Capacity of the Population at Large. So far as we are aware, only one authoritative enumeration has been made of adult persons with defective intelligence in these islands; and, for particulars of it, we turn to the Report of the Royal Commission on the Care and Control of the Feeble-minded, published in the Midsummer of 1908. It will be found stated in this Report that, at the outset of their inquiry, the Commissioners were confronted with the difficult fact that no trustworthy estimate was existent, and that no statistics were available, upon which to base an estimate of the proportion of mentally defective persons in the population of Great Britain. Accordingly, one of the first acts of the Commissioners was to make an enumeration of defectives in sixteen representative districts of the British Islands; and their estimate, from the returns of the inquiry, was that .46 per cent of the whole population of England and Wales are mentally defective.

"In addition to the Inquiry in the general population already referred to, the directors of the Commission on Feeble-Mindedness also appointed medical investigators to make an enumeration of mentally defective persons in local prisons, casual wards, shelters, etc., and the report of the investigators was to the effect that 242 such persons were found out of 2353 examined, or 10.28 per cent.

"Sir Bryan Donkin, one of the Directors of Convict Prisons, speaking at a conference in Birmingham, said that the bald statement may be accepted that the weak-minded amount to between 10 and 15 per cent of the total number of persons committed to prison; and that the true maximum is probably higher than this. And, later on, he again stated that owing to their inherited incapacities and to certain surroundings, a large number of mental defectives tend to become criminals, and the considerable proportion, even 20 per cent, of so-called criminals or law-breakers are demonstrably mentally defective.

"We see then that Sir Bryan Donkin's minimum estimate of mental defectiveness amongst prisoners generally is identical with that reached by the Feeble-Mindedness Commissioners, viz., 10 per cent; and, moreover, that it very interestingly accords with a minimum estimate of mentally defective convicts, obtained from records embodied in the yearly reports of Directors of Convict Prisons. We may take it

then, that all authorities seem agreed upon an approximation of 10 per cent as a minimum estimate of the proportion of mentally defective persons in English prisons generally.

"... Accordingly, against the .46 per cent of defectives in the general population, the proportion of mentally defective criminals cannot be less than 10 per cent, and is probably not greater than 20 per cent. It is clear that criminals, as a class, are highly differentiated mentally from the law-abiding classes."

In spite of the fact that Doctor Goring's discussion is probably the best and clearest on the subject, its errors are none the less very glaring. The more important such errors are as follows:

(1) The report of the Royal Commission on the Care and Control of the Feeble-minded, published in 1908 before any reliable mental tests had been formulated, consisted of an "enumeration of defectives" in the general population. It was found that .45 per cent of the general population was defective mentally. Such report could have included only those persons that had been recognized legally as mentally defective. It could not possibly have included those persons who actually were mentally defective, but were living fairly normal lives among relatives and friends, or were living on the charity of religious and other organized and unorganized charitable organizations. The defectives in the population that actually are legally listed as defective are only the worst and most helpless cases. An estimate based upon the results of mental tests given to the entire population would, depending upon the standard arbitrarily agreed upon, probably be several times as great. It is not valid to assume that the legally listed mental defectives are the only mental defectives in the population. Unless a mental test can be given to large samples of the population, any estimate can be little more than a mere guess.

(2) The report of the same Commission on the percentage of mentally defective criminals consisted of an "enumeration of defective persons in local prisons, casual wards, shelters, etc." It is quite unlikely that representative criminals will be found in "local prisons, casual wards, shelters, etc." Mental defectives, through sheer hunger and helplessness, would eventually gravitate to such places before being sent to regular institutions for the feeble-minded. We might expect the percentage of mental defectives in such institutions to be several times as high as in regular state prisons and penitentiaries. In the light of Doctor Goring's keen insight into the problem he is discussing, it seems strange that he should commit such glaring and self-evident errors.

In 1915, Doctor William Healy published his important book, "The Individual Delinquent." On page 447, he gives his views in the following two paragraphs: "The subject of mental defect is of great import in the study of delinquency and its causation. Just what percentage of delinquents are feeble-minded appears to be a matter of perennial interest, but well-founded statistics, even if obtained in particular places, may not be applicable to different situations. There can be no doubt that separate reformatory or prison populations if tested would show from 10 to 30 per cent or even more, to be feeble-minded. No essential purpose is subserved by exaggerated statements concerning the proportions which might be found in court work, or in various penal institutions. We might discuss at great length the numbers of mental defectives among offenders from our many notes on the subject; there has been much advance since 1910, when the author was *rapporteur* for this subject at the International Prison Congress and received astonishingly variant statements from different institution people, ranging from the opinion that in certain reformatories none were feeble-minded, to the assertion that 40 per cent or more were defective. But the gist of the situation is that mental defect forms the largest single cause for delinquency to be found by correlating tendency to offend with characteristics of the offender.

"Lest there be misapprehension we should here state that even with this clear-cut cause for delinquency, one rarely finds personal characteristics as a sole causative factor of criminalism. Defective offenders, in most cases, upon study prove to be individuals who easily succumb to social temptations, easily learn from vicious examples, easily are stimulated to develop criminalistic trends of thought. In morals they prove themselves wanting in resistance when neglected by their families or by society, so that they have to meet undue temptation and suggestion to immorality. In other words, in these highly representative members of the so-called criminal type one must conclude that the development of criminalism is partially the result of environment as well as of innate tendencies. If one does not believe this, let him study similar defective individuals in the conditions of a good training school for the feeble-minded, and see, under appropriate environment, how small an amount of criminalistic tendency is evolved."

It is interesting that Doctor Healy should be convinced that prison populations, "if tested," would show the traditional minimum of 10 per cent mental defectives. It should also be noticed that Doctor Healy, in the first paragraph, states that mental defect is the "largest single

cause of delinquency;" while in the second paragraph he points out that mental defect is largely a concomitant of delinquency.

The extensive quotations in this chapter may seem to the reader altogether too extensive. But the quotations represent the ablest and most distinguished opinion on the problem that can be found in the pre-war literature. In no case had a prison population been tested with a standard mental test, yet all three were convinced that at least 10 per cent of all criminals are mentally defective, and that probably twice that number would be more accurate. No one of the three has suggested comparing the mental distribution of criminals with the mental distribution of the civil population. Rather, all three are discussing qualitative norms that never can be anything but an arbitrary agreement. Probably no man ever lived who was not mentally defective in some way. The large group tests of the American Army were necessary before it could become clear to psychologists that the mental distribution range of seemingly normal persons is perfectly tremendous, and that it is practically impossible to cut off a section of the distribution curve and label it "feeble-minded." It is easy to compare two or more distribution curves with each other, but it is very difficult to interpret each succeeding point on a single distribution curve.

In 1915, the classic writers on the subject were agreed that criminals are largely mentally defective, and there was agreement that 10 per cent was the minimum of defectiveness. In the absence of exact measurements, and the prevailing impossibility of making direct comparisons with large samples of the population, the question arises as to how such ideas ever got abroad in the world.

CHAPTER II.

HOW DID THE IDEA EVER GET ABROAD THAT CRIMINALS ARE FEEBLE-MINDED?

When one reads of a man like Napoleon risking his life and the lives of millions of other men, gambling the very existence of his country, one exclaims, "What a great genius, what intellect, how like a god!" When one looks at the picture of a man who risked all his money and the money of thousands of other men who trust him in some great financial gamble which succeeded, one exclaims, "What a noble brow, what a mind the man must possess, what superhuman power!" When one reads the story of religious martyrs who spoke words and acted deeds that meant inevitable wretchedness and death,

one exclaims, "What courage, what sacred and holy zeal, what an example to be followed!"

But when one reads of a man who has murdered his own family, one exclaims, "What a beast, what stupidity, how like a devil!" When one looks at the picture of a man who has been found guilty of stealing money from his bank, one exclaims, "What a sneaking expression, what an idiot, what weakness!" When one reads the story of the recidivists, the men who are on intimate terms with the inside of many prisons, one exclaims, "What cowards, what mental blindness, what folly!"

The two groups of emotional reactions are both the result of our own ignorance. There is no more reason for admiring the silly ass who succeeds than there is for despising the silly ass who fails.

When the writer visited a large penitentiary for the first time, he had the privilege of watching the inmates go marching by in silent files. He shivered as he watched the ferocious jaws, the stupid brows, the eyes of cunning and beastlike expression. He was convinced that criminals are not like other men. But the idea occurred to him that he might try an experiment on a crowded street-corner. So he went to a busy corner in the heart of the city, took his stand, and watched the passing faces while trying to imagine that he was watching the criminals march by after being released from prison. Almost immediately, the street became filled with ferocious jaws, stupid brows, and the eyes of cunning and beast-like expression.

In Havelock Ellis' book on "The Criminal," there is a comparison of a composite of 30 pen-sketches of criminals with a composite of 30 actual photographs of criminals. The result is amazing, and indicates the large part that imagination plays in the description of criminal types.

After hearing the guards in a certain penitentiary describe in condescending terms their ideas on criminals, the author had an opportunity to compare the mental test scores of the guards with the mental test scores of those same criminals. The average score of the criminals was just 75 per cent higher than the average score of the guards. The only reason the guards continued to live was because the architects of that prison had done their job well. But how did the idea ever become so general that criminals are feeble-minded.

TRADITION. Religious tradition has undoubtedly had great influence. What perfect idiots Adam and Eve were, carrying on conversations with snakes, and doing things that they could not possibly prevent from being found out. How idiotic the behavior of Judas,

even though he had been considered the most level-headed business man in the group. What a perfect ass the Devil was, with his imbecilic and foolish types of temptations—temptations which would not even appeal to the Devil himself, much less to Jesus. The author is not acquainted with any historical religion that has an intelligent and wise devil. Only the good are wise and intelligent. The devil and his followers are always foolish and idiotic. Consider the *wise* virgins and the *foolish* virgins. What a weak fool Peter was, even though he was the only man in the crowd with an ounce of courage. "Thou *fool*, this night thy soul shall be demanded of thee." "*Fools*, hypocrites, etc!" It is not necessary to ring in all the phrases and stories that are so familiar to all.

Literary and dramatic tradition was certainly influential. One is familiar with the "fool" that came on the stage following the dramatic climax, or filled in between the important scenes. In some of the Miracle Plays, one finds a fool and a devil. In other Miracle Plays, the devil and the fool are one. Why was it easy for the two functions to be performed by the same personality? Because the two functions were so similar. The only other person in the Miracle Plays who could conceivably have become amalgamated with the function of the Devil was Judas himself,—yet Judas had been considered the most level-headed business man in the group.

HYPOTHESES. On pages 6-7 of De Quiro's "Modern Theories of Criminality," is the following illuminating paragraph: "Three generations after the beginnings of psychiatry, the theory of *degeneration* is set forth in France by Morel. Nevertheless, according to Dalmagne, he rather owes his ideas on degeneration to natural sciences. Morel, in his classical treatise, *Physical, Intellectual, and Moral Degeneration of the Human Species*, looks upon degeneration as a kind of retrogressive natural selection, a degradation, using the word not in its ethical sense, and without any meaning of contempt. His starting point is the existence of a primitive type which the human mind reproduces in its own thought as the masterpiece and culmination of creation—a view which agrees so well with our own ideas,—and that the degeneration of our nature is due to the going astray of the primitive type, which contains in itself all the necessary elements for the preservation of the species. Intent upon making the latest scientific discoveries come within the scope of the purest orthodoxy, Morel establishes as the starting point of degeneration the combination of the new conditions brought about by the original fall. Then he studies the role heredity plays—a theory already confirmed in relation to the

transmission of crime by Lucas, in his *Treatise On Natural Heredity*,—in the genesis and development of the deviation of the primitive type; and, tracing through the generations the evolution of the psychopathic process, succeeds in establishing for the first time the relation between criminality and degeneration. The strange and unknown types which people our prisons, said he, were not so strange and unknown to those who study the morbid varieties of the human species from the double point of view of the psychic and moral condition of the individuals that compose them, for they personify the various degenerations of the species, and the evil which produces them constitutes for modern society a greater danger than the barbaric invasion did for the old."

Such hypotheses are influenced in their formulation by ancient traditions, but being hypotheses, they carry greater weight and dignity. After a generation or so, such hypotheses become facts and are described in terms of exact percentages.

Lombroso was the type of investigator who mingled hypotheses and facts in a most ingenious way. His work determined definitely the prevailing opinion that criminals are mentally defective. It must be remembered that Lombroso simply gave definite form to an already established belief. His position was not one that was arrived at after laborious research, and he did not attempt to prove or establish more securely his position after arriving at it. In the 1911 American edition of his "Criminal Man," on pages 135-136, he gives a typical statement of his position: "The criminal is an atavistic being, a relic of a vanished race. This is by no means an uncommon occurrence in nature. Atavism, the reversion to a former state, is the first feeble indication of the reaction opposed by nature to the perturbing causes which seek to alter her delicate mechanism. Under certain unfavorable conditions, cold or poor soil, the common oak will develop characteristics of the oak of the Quaternary period. The dog left to run wild in the forest will in a few generations revert to the type of his original wolf-like progenitor, and the cultivated garden roses when neglected show a tendency to reassume the form of the original dog-rose. Under special conditions produced by alcohol, chloroform, heat, or injuries, ants, dogs, and pigeons become irritable and savage like their wild ancestors.

"This tendency to alter under special conditions is common to human beings, in whom hunger, syphilis, trauma, and, still more frequently, morbid conditions inherited from insane, criminal, or diseased progenitors, or the abuse of nerve poisons, such as alcohol, tobacco or morphine, cause various alterations, of which criminality—that is,

a return to the characteristics peculiar to primitive savages—is in reality the least serious, because it represents a less advanced stage than other forms of cerebral alteration.

“The aetiology of crime, therefore, mingles with that of all kinds of degeneration; rickets, deafness, monstrosity, hairiness, and cretinism, of which crime is only a variation. It has, however, always been regarded as a thing apart, owing to a general instinctive repugnance to admit that a phenomenon, whose extrinsications are so extensive and penetrate every fibre of social life, derives, in fact, from the same causes as socially insignificant forms like rickets, sterility, etc. But this repugnance is really only a sensory illusion, like many others of widely diverse nature.”

Many writers have pointed to Mr. Robert Dugdale's sensational book, “The Jukes,” first published in 1877, as a proof that criminality is inherited and is closely related to feeble-mindedness. All such proofs are entirely invalid, as a close examination of the book will reveal. In the 1910 edition of the book, it is stated on page 16 that “lines of intermarriage between Jukes show a minimum of crime,” that “crime beings in progeny where Juke crosses X blood,” and that “crime preponderates in the illegitimate lines.” This would indicate that criminality is not transmitted from one generation to the next directly, and so is not comparable to feeble-mindedness in that respect. Not only is criminality not inherited, but it rarely occurs where heredity is kept restricted, as in in-breeding. The Juke criminal is almost always the result of Juke blood being crossed with other blood. Recent studies in the comparative mentality of pure and mixed tribes might lead us to suppose that these Juke criminals were much more intelligent than the other Jukes.

Certainly Mr. Dugdale had no idea that his Juke criminals were feeble-minded. On page 49 he states, “Crime as compared to pauperism indicates *vigor*; criminal careers are more easily modified by environment, because crime, more especially contrived crime, is an index of *capacity*. . . . The misfortune of one generation which throws the children into an alms-house, may lay the foundation for a criminal career for that generation if the children are of an *enterprising temperament*.” Mr. Dugdale very clearly points out that the Juke variety of criminal possessed more mental vigor on the whole than did the other Jukes.

Doctor Goddard's earlier work, “The Kallikak Family,” published in 1912, shows that he believed then that criminals are largely recruited from the ranks of the mental defectives. On page 54, occurs

the following statement: "The reader must remember that the type of feeble-mindedness of which we are speaking is the one to which Deborah belongs, that is, to the high grade, or moron. All the facts go to show that this type of people makes up a large percentage of our criminals."

If Doctor Goddard is right in his conviction, we should expect that the Kallikak family itself, being traced so carefully, would show a large number of criminals. But among the 480 members of the family that were investigated in detail through more than a century, only three are reported as ever having been classified as criminal. Probably no family could show any better record than that.

Doctor Goddard, perceiving this possible flaw in his argument, explains it on page 62 as follows: "We have claimed that criminality resulting from feeble-mindedness is mainly a matter of environment, yet it must be acknowledged that there are wide differences in temperament and that, while this one branch of the Kallikak family was mentally defective, there was no strong tendency in it towards that which our laws recognize as criminality. In other families there is, without doubt, a much greater tendency to crime, so that the lack of criminals in this particular case, far from detracting from our argument, really strengthens it. It must be recognized that there is much more liability of criminals resulting from mental defectiveness in certain families than in others, probably because of difference in the strength of some instincts."

Nevertheless, the "other families" have not yet been investigated, and some families that may show a greater tendency to crime may also show a much greater intelligence.

In the light of the discussion in this chapter and in the preceding one, it seems fairly obvious that the pre-war prevailing opinion that criminality and feeble-mindedness are closely related, was certainly not built upon a solid foundation of collected facts. The progenitors of the theory are not to be condemned on that account. There were no existing norms of general intelligence in the civil population. Until those norms should be formulated, no examination of criminals alone could reveal whether criminals were more or less feeble-minded than the general population. Average intelligence was greatly respected in those days. But the war has changed that too. We know now that average intelligence is nothing to be proud of. A great deal of dignity has been lost from the democratic man. Through the masses of the social group there is so much of low and mediocre mentality, that the criminal need not fear the result of direct comparison.

CHAPTER III

THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE ARMY AND CRIMINAL
NORMS ARE REPRESENTATIVE

The eventual value of this investigation depends upon the extent to which the Army norms are representative of the civil population of the country, and the extent to which the inmates of penitentiaries are representative of the criminal element in our society. It is not necessary that the degree of representativeness be known exactly, but it is necessary to know whether the two groups of norms are equally representative or not. Let us discuss the Army norms first.

The Army consisted of young men chiefly between the ages of 21 and 31. Of course there were a few younger men, and quite a number of older men. But the majority of the men were between 21 and 31. Is it valid to assume that the intelligence of the men between those age limits is representative of the adult intelligence of the country? In answering this question, it is only necessary to point out the results of testing men of various ages. In adult life, there does not seem to be a wide variation of intelligence with age. The very old men rank somewhat lower, to be sure, than young men, but such would be expected. The degeneration of intelligence follows closely upon the degeneration of the body. But among men in their physical prime, no mental tests have shown that there is a variation of score with age. So, in so far as we know anything about general intelligence, we are safe in assuming that the men between 21 and 31 years of age represented mentally the adult population of the country. We mean the last statement to refer to all men between 21 and 31, and not merely those in the Army.

It is well known that many of the men of the country were classified in preferred occupations, and were not subject to the Draft. Is it valid to assume that the men who were not so classified, and were caught by the Draft, were mentally representative of the entire adult population? The importance of this question depends upon the total numbers of men classified in preferred occupations. That number was tremendous, since it included railroads, farms, ships, and factories. But the Government was furnished with lists of preferred employees by each such employer, and it is safe to assume that the lists contained the most valuable men. That would result in the more intelligent men being placed on such lists, and exempted from military service. In this case the claim must be allowed that the Army norms are too low. It seems practically certain that the preferred occupa-

tions, in retaining their most valuable workers, retained at the same time their most intelligent workers.

Before the Draft was inaugurated, large numbers of young men volunteered for service in the various arms of the military organizations. Is it valid to assume that these men are of the same average intelligence as the draft quota? Data bearing on this question would naturally not be very extensive. The individuals concerned were very probably possessed of temperamental factors of a characteristic type. They were men who loved excitement and adventure. They were quite likely the type of men who flocked to the West half a century ago. The results of mental tests seem to indicate that the West is superior in intelligence to the average of the entire country. It is possible to assume, consequently, that the young men who volunteered early for army service were probably more intelligent in general than the average of the country. The proof is not overwhelming, but it is fairly tangible. Probably it should be allowed, therefore, that the Army norm, being based on the Draft, are not only too low for the civil population of the country, but are also too low for the entire Army.

Many men were exempted from the Draft because they had domestic dependents. Would such men, if they had been included in the Army, have raised the average mental scores of the Army? Men who have dependents are usually men who are not afraid of responsibility, and are not afraid to assume it according to general social regulations. They are the men who determine the forms of institutions, and really represent the race in the building of civilized communities. Is their average intelligence only the average of the civil population, or is it higher? The married criminals are more intelligent than are the unmarried ones, but the same may not hold true for non-criminals. But the author is perfectly willing to admit the possibility, and concede once more that the Army norms are too low as a result.

There were many conscientious objectors and various types of slackers who were not caught by the Draft and used in the determination of the Army norms. Is it possible that those objectors and slackers were more intelligent than the willing recruits, and so can not be represented by the latter? Such objectors as were caught by the Draft and were given a mental test, did, as a matter of fact, show an average intelligence higher than that of the army in general. The most intelligent objectors probably had their religious records so accurately made out and recorded, that they escaped the Army altogether. As for the slackers, they probably had initiative and physical vigor, in order to elude the Army agents. Some of the more prominent ones are well

known, and certainly possess plenty of intelligence, even if lacking in some other virtues. The author is perfectly willing to admit that the objectors and slackers were probably more intelligent than were the willing recruits, and that the Army norms are too low as a result.

On the other hand, we must remember that the physically unfit were not included in the Army. The Draft Boards in all parts of the country assisted in this elimination, and the men who were sent to the various camps were the well and sound, the choice of the communities. The physical wrecks who were left at home, nevertheless, constituted part of the adult population of the country. However, it is not known that physical deformity is accompanied by mental defectiveness. In the light of such facts as we have, it is not likely that such selection made any mental difference. The author wants to be fair here. It would be to his advantage to make much of this point. But such advantage is waived.

In so far as possible to prevent it, no insane men were sent to the Army. Of course many mild forms found their way there. But the worst cases were detected, certainly. Such cases would constitute part of the adult civil population, and would not be represented in the Army. Are they not of lower intelligence than the average? It is not known that general intelligence varies with degree of sanity, at least not till degeneration sets in. An insane man who is due to die within a year or so probably should not be considered a member of the adult civil population. So, the elimination of the insane would probably not make any difference, so far as general intelligence is concerned.

The worst cases of the feeble-minded did not get into the Army at all. Some bad cases got there, but not the worst cases. Yet the feeble-minded are members of the adult civil population. This might make the Army norms seem too high, instead of too low. But such cases of extreme feeble-mindedness do not constitute a large percentage of the population. However, such facts must be considered.

Persons suffering of incurable diseases were not allowed to enter the Army. However, they constitute part of the population. Could they not be considered of lower intelligence than the rest of the general population, or than the Army? The author is willing not to claim this point, since there is no indication that disease reduces intelligence, except through the means of physical degeneration.

In the light of all the above arguments, it would seem reasonable to presume that the Army norms are too low to be representative of the adult civil population of the country. The author admits the reasonableness, and can see no reason for disputing it.

But now let us consider the criminal norms. The author, in this book, frequently assumes that the criminals here reported are representative of the criminal element of society. Are the norms here reported too high or too low, to be representative of the criminal element?

None of the data reported in this book was gathered from Federal prisons. Since the criminals in the Federal prisons are men convicted of crimes that require a large amount of care and planning, such criminals can be considered possessed of more than average criminal intelligence. Since none of them are included in this investigation, the resulting norms should be considered too low for the important types of criminal groups.

The author was unable to find any wealthy men among the inmates of the various prisons investigated. As a general rule, it requires superior intelligence, in addition to other characteristics, to amass and retain considerable property. The possession of wealth would make conviction difficult, because of the amount of legal power that could be summoned. The men who get convicted are usually without wealth and without friends. As a result, it might be expected that the resulting mental norms would be too low to represent the important criminal element in society.

Many criminals are never suspected, and consequently are never caught. It requires intelligence to plan crime so cleverly that the perpetrator is not suspected. The criminals who have never been suspected are probably much more intelligent than are those who have been caught. It is impossible to have any common sense at all, and not assent to that proposition. Consequently, the men who are caught can scarcely be considered as possessing intelligence enough to furnish norms representative of the criminal element of society.

Of course, the inmates of penitentiaries are men who have actually been convicted. Many suspected men are caught and tried, but are not convicted because of the skill of legal talent and personal skill in cross-examination. Such men are probably more intelligent than are those suspected men who lack the skill and necessary wealth and influence to gain acquittal. As a result, the mental norms of convicted criminals are too low to be representative of the criminal element in society.

The mental examinations reported in this book did not exclude the physically unfit. Such were excluded from the Army, but they are not excluded from the prisons. The author does not claim that the prisons are lower as a result, but he wishes to call attention to the

fact that the physically unfit contributed to the norms that are reported in this book.

The examinations reported in this book did not exclude the diseased. Men suffering from incurable diseases were excluded from the Draft, but nothing prevents their landing in prison. Their presence may make no difference in the resulting mental forms, but their presence should be remembered.

Neither did the examinations reported in this book exclude the feeble-minded, and some were present.

In the administration of the Alpha mental test in the Army, a literacy requirement of five years was usually required. This eliminated large numbers of individuals who would otherwise have increased the percentage of low scores. No such literacy requirement was demanded of the criminals who took the Alpha test. All men sent to the examiner were given the test, and every test paper that carried any possible identification mark was graded and used in the tabulation of results.

The author concludes that if the Army norms are unrepresentative because of being too low, the criminal norms are even more unrepresentative for the same reason. That is, the criminal element of society, as will be shown by the facts reported in this book, does not possess a lower average intelligence than the adult civil population; assuming the Army norms and the criminal norms here reported to be equally representative enough for the purposes of this discussion. This is well substantiated by the report in Volume 15 of the *Memoirs of the National Academy of Sciences*, 1921. On page 800, a comparison of 3,368 criminals at Fort Leavenworth with the 94,004 cases of the sample of the Army, shows that the criminals have the advantage in Alpha scores.

Letter Grades	Percentage of Army	Percentage of Leavenworth Prisoners
E	7.1	6.0
D	17.0	18.8
C—	23.8	20.8
C	25.0	23.8
C+	15.2	16.0
B	8.0	8.8
A	4.1	5.8

The author has no desire to play the part of the Devil's advocate in this book. He does not hold the conviction that criminals have more able minds than do the more conservative members of society. But he is convinced that great harm has been done and is being done by the propaganda which creates the impression that the criminal is

feeble-minded, and an individual to be fawned over and petted. It would be of greater service, if the thinking element in society could have their minds directed to the idiotic expressions on statute books, and the imbecilic attempts to execute such idiotic expressions.

CHAPTER IV.

SOME GEOGRAPHICAL CONCOMITANTS.

1. Comparison of the entire White Native Born Criminal Group With the White Draft. According to the tables on page 690, Volume 15, Memoirs of the National Academy of Sciences, and the general discussion that accompanies the tables, the distribution of the White Draft in terms of Alpha can be accepted as approximating to the following distribution of a sample of 44,223 cases:

Alpha Score	Cases	Percentage
0- 9	1,774	4.
10- 14	1,535	3.5
15- 19	1,855	4.2
20- 24	2,040	4.6
25- 34	4,640	10.5
35- 44	4,810	10.9
45- 59	6,754	15.3
60- 74	5,913	13.4
75- 89	4,684	10.6
90-104	3,609	8.2
105-119	2,618	5.9
120-134	1,703	3.8
135-149	1,118	2.5
150-212	1,170	2.6

It is assumed that the percentage column above is a close approximation to the percentage column that would result from a detailed distribution of the entire group of more than a million cases tested with Alpha. In case one has grown accustomed to thinking in terms of the Army letter grades, it is only necessary to combine the percentage figures in groups of two, in the order of the letter grades. The percentage column would then read as follows:

E	7.5
D	8.8
C-	21.4
C	28.7
C+	18.8
B	9.7
A	5.1

It is quite likely that some of my readers have accustomed themselves to thinking in terms of curves. I must plead with all such to bear with me in my method of presentation, since even they would

probably never forgive me if I published the tremendous number of curves necessary for this book. So I am using the less visually striking technique of cases and percentages for my medium of presentation.

It should be remembered that the above letter grades are supposed to approximate to certain dimensions of the Gaussian Curve. However, it is not necessary to discuss the theoretical characteristics of the Gaussian Curve, for such characteristics probably exist nowhere except in the mind of the professional mathematician. But if the above percentage column did express relatively and in order the dimensions of the Gaussian Curve, A would be the same size as E, B would be the same size as D, C would be the same size as C—, while each would bear a certain theoretical relationship to the whole curve or to any given part of it. In this case, however, it should be noted that A is less than E, that B is greater than D, while C+ is less than C—. That is, the E half of the curve contains 52 per cent of the total number of cases, while the A half of the curve contains 47.9 per cent of the total number of cases. These facts are of no significance except in so far as they may be used as norms for purposes of comparison. It would be a very simple matter to reverse the skewness, simply by changing the limitations of the letter grades. The failure to understand this has been more general than in the case of any other single element of the problem of mental testing.

Comparing the distribution of the entire white native born criminal group with the white draft in terms of Alpha, we have the following:

Alpha Score	Criminal Cases	Percentage of Criminal Cases	Percentage of White Draft
0- 9	185	4.7	4.
10- 14	113	2.8	3.5
15- 19	124	3.2	4.2
20- 24	147	3.7	4.6
25- 34	324	8.3	10.5
35- 44	382	9.5	10.9
45- 59	553	14.	15.3
60- 74	565	14.5	13.4
75- 89	485	12.3	10.6
90-104	413	10.5	8.2
105-119	274	7.	5.9
120-134	170	4.4	3.8
135-149	106	2.7	2.5
150-212	101	2.6	2.6

It is of interest to observe in the percentage columns that the criminal group is in the minority in all cases save one in the groups below 60, and in the majority in all cases save one in the groups higher than and including 60. If a combination is made into the letter grade groups, the result is as follows:

Letter Grade	Criminal Cases	Percentage of Criminal Cases	Percentage of White Draft
E	298	7.5	7.5
D	271	6.9	8.8
C-	706	17.8	21.4
C	1,118	28.5	28.7
C+	898	22.8	18.8
B	444	11.4	9.7
A	207	5.3	5.1
Total	3,942	100.2	100.0

It is quite evident that the criminal group is superior to the white draft group. In percentage of cases, a comparison of the halves of the two curves of distribution might be made as follows:

	A Half	E Half
Criminal Group	53.8%	46.5%
White Draft	47.9%	52%

Interesting and significant as such comparative figures are; it would be a sad logical error to assume as a conclusion from the comparison that the criminals of America are more intelligent than was the American Army. Such an inference might be true. There is probably no proof to the contrary. Nevertheless, logical errors are just as detrimental in science as history has proven them to be in politics and in theology. The above differences can be explained in terms of geographical concomitants. Such explanations may not ultimately be the true one, yet it must be taken into consideration before any sweeping statement can logically be made either for or against the intelligence of the criminal group.

Before the entire Alpha sample of the white draft can be accepted as a norm by which to measure geographically selected groups of criminals, it will be necessary to observe the range of the group units that went to make up that sample. Let the California unit be compared with the North Carolina unit.

Alpha Score	California Cases	N. Carolina Cases	California Percentage	N. Carolina Percentage
0- 9	16	55	1.6	8.
10- 14	19	44	1.9	6.3
15- 19	24	54	2.5	7.7
20- 24	32	66	3.3	9.4
25- 34	83	100	8.5	14.3
35- 44	83	97	8.5	13.9
45- 59	137	89	14.1	12.7
60- 74	128	69	13.1	9.8
75- 89	113	50	11.6	7.1
90-104	134	38	13.7	5.4
105-119	78	21	8.	3.
120-134	55	6	5.6	.8
135-149	32	9	3.3	1.3
150-212	41	4	4.2	.6
Total	975	702	99.9	100.3

The marked superiority of the California group as compared with the North Carolina group is obvious, and becomes clearer in a letter grade comparison.

Letter Grade	California Percentage	N. Carolina Percentage
E	3.5	14.3
D	5.8	17.1
C-	17.	28.2
C	27.2	22.5
C+	25.3	12.5
B	13.6	3.8
A	7.5	1.9

If the members of state units in the white draft could differ so tremendously in ability to make scores in the Alpha test, is it not likely that criminal units from different states would also differ equally markedly? Certainly, in the light of the above facts, the comparison of criminal groups from a few states with the white draft from all the states is not an exhaustive process. The geographical differences in the white draft, whatever the causes of these differences might be, may be duplicated in the criminal population.

2. Comparison of the Criminal Population of a Given State With The White Draft From That State. In such comparison the states used will be Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, New Jersey, and Maryland. In the case of each state, we will compare the criminal population examined within the state with the white draft from that state. Such comparison, to be sure, may comprise errors which will be rectified later. Let us begin with Illinois.

Alpha Grade	Illinois Criminal Population	Illinois Draft Cases	Criminal Percentage	Draft Percentage
0- 9	27	75	3.1	3.5
10- 14	10	62	1.1	2.9
15- 19	17	78	2.	3.6
20- 24	18	65	2.1	3.
25- 34	44	208	5.	9.7
35- 44	76	204	8.7	9.5
45- 59	128	347	14.5	16.2
60- 74	133	298	15.1	13.9
75- 89	130	241	14.8	11.2
90-104	112	206	12.7	9.6
105-119	79	135	9.	6.3
120-134	57	98	6.5	4.6
135-149	27	61	3.1	2.9
150-212	33	57	3.8	2.7

In terms of the letter grades, the comparison would be as follows:

	Criminal Percentage	Draft Percentage
E	4.2	5.4
D	4.1	6.6
C-	13.7	19.2
C	29.6	30.1
C+	27.5	20.8
B	15.5	10.9
A	6.9	5.6

It seems evident that the Illinois criminal population group ranks higher in terms of Alpha than does the Illinois draft group, the difference being just as striking as in the comparison of the entire white native born criminal group with the entire white draft.

The comparison of the Ohio criminal population group with the Ohio white draft unit is as follows:

Alpa Grades	Ohio Criminal Population	Ohio Draft Cases	Criminal Percentage	Draft Percentage
0- 9	49	33	3.4	1.4
10- 14	44	40	3.1	1.7
15- 19	41	79	2.9	3.4
20- 24	41	63	2.9	2.7
25- 34	120	197	8.5	8.5
35- 44	140	240	9.9	10.4
45- 59	213	358	15.	15.4
60- 74	207	307	14.6	13.2
75- 89	175	273	12.3	11.8
90-104	154	214	10.9	9.3
105-119	104	178	7.3	7.7
120-134	59	139	4.2	6.
135-149	40	104	2.8	4.5
150-212	31	93	2.2	4.

Translating the percentage columns into letter grade percentages, we have as follows:

	Criminal Percentage	Draft Percentage
E	6.5	3.1
D	5.8	6.1
C-	18.4	18.9
C	29.6	28.6
C+	23.2	25.
B	11.5	13.7
A	5.	8.5

In the case of Ohio, the comparison shows a decided advantage on the side of the draft group. Nevertheless, the Ohio criminal group, in terms of Alpha, is far superior to the North Carolina draft group. Let us proceed to a comparison of the Indiana groups.

Alpha Grades	Indiana Criminal Population	Indiana Draft	Criminal Percentage	Draft Percentage
0- 9	36	1	5.6	0
10- 14	20	0	3.1	0
15- 19	21	52	3.3	4.4
20- 24	36	68	5.6	5.8
25- 34	60	151	9.3	12.9
35- 44	57	147	8.9	12.5
45- 59	87	217	13.6	18.5
60- 74	83	175	12.9	15.
75- 89	89	119	13.9	10.1
90-104	69	100	10.8	8.5
105-119	41	74	6.4	6.3
120-134	25	37	3.9	3.1
135-149	12	21	1.8	1.8
150-212	5	9	.8	.8

In letter grades, the comparison is as follows:

	Indiana Criminals	Indiana Draft
E	8.7	0.0
D	8.9	10.2
C-	18.2	25.4
C	26.5	23.5
C+	24.7	18.6
B	10.3	9.4
A	2.6	2.6

In spite of the fact that the Indiana draft shows no cases in the E group, the criminal group shows a marked superiority. The lack of E cases in the Indiana draft is purely the result of the method of selecting the Indiana sample, as the writer remembers distinctly some of the atrocious Alpha grades made by certain Indiana units. Let us consider next the comparison of the New Jersey groups.

Alpha Scores	N. J. Criminal Population	N. J. Draft	Criminal Percentage	Draft Percentage
0- 9	63	164	8.5	17.5
10- 14	31	45	4.2	4.8
15- 19	40	42	5.4	4.5
20- 24	39	59	5.3	6.3
25- 34	80	77	10.8	8.2
35- 44	86	79	11.7	8.4
45- 59	87	134	11.8	14.2
60- 74	101	79	13.7	8.5
75- 89	62	79	8.4	8.5
90-104	55	47	7.5	5.
105-119	37	50	5.	5.3
120-134	19	35	2.6	3.7
135-149	15	16	2.	1.7
150-212	23	31	3.1	3.3

Translating the percentage columns into letter grades, we have:

	Criminal Percentage	Draft Percentage
E	12.7	22.3
D	10.7	10.8
C—	22.5	16.6
C	25.5	22.7
C+	15.9	13.5
B	7.6	9.
A	5.1	5.

There is nothing in either of the New Jersey groups to be proud of. Nevertheless, such differences as are evident are to the advantage of the criminal group. Let us compare the Maryland groups.

Alpha Scores	Maryland Criminal Population	Maryland Draft	Criminal Percentage	Draft Percentage
0- 9	10	18	3.9	2.9
10- 14	8	19	3.1	3.1
15- 19	7	33	2.7	5.4
20- 24	13	34	5.1	5.5
25- 34	20	72	7.8	11.7
35- 44	22	60	8.6	9.7
45- 59	38	102	14.9	16.6
60- 74	31	95	12.2	15.4
75- 89	29	59	11.4	9.6
90-104	23	55	9.	8.9
105-119	23	28	9.	4.5
120-134	10	16	3.9	2.6
135-149	12	15	4.7	2.4
150-212	9	10	3.5	1.6

Translating the percentage columns into letter grades, there results:

	Criminal Percentage	Draft Percentage
E	7.	6.
D	7.7	10.9
C—	16.4	21.4
C	27.1	32.
C+	20.4	18.5
B	12.9	7.1
A	8.2	4.

Here again it is evident that such differences as exist are to the advantage of the criminal group.

In short, the above comparisons of criminal populations with state draft units show, with but one exception, a superiority in terms of Alpha on the part of the criminal groups. The one exception is the case of Ohio. This discrepancy on the part of Ohio can be explained. On page 554 of the Memoirs referred to above, it is stated that the records from Camp Sherman were not included in the sample

from which the state draft units were drawn. That means that the Ohio draft unit is composed of Ohio men examined in other camps. In the light of evidence that will be presented later, the result of such selection of Ohio cases will cause the Ohio draft unit to rank too high. A little work on the adding machine will reveal the fact that the Ohio draft unit, as reported on page 690 of the Memoirs, averages more than 10 per cent higher than the draft unit from any other state in the Middle West. Such fact is no compliment to Ohio, but is simply the result of the method of selection used in drawing for the sample. That is, the Ohio draft unit reported on page 690 of the Memoirs should actually have been reported from six to ten per cent lower, and would have been, if the Camp Sherman records had been used in the drawing for the sample. That statement will become accepted by the reader later in this chapter. Under no circumstances should this paragraph be construed as a criticism of the psychologists who compiled the Memoirs. Nevertheless, it is a pity that a drawing was not made from the Camp Sherman group examination records, such drawing made under the same conditions that obtained for the other drawings. The results could have been published in separate tables in the Memoirs.

For purposes of accuracy, let us compare the total white native born criminal group with the total white draft and with the white draft from the five combined states of Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, New Jersey, and Maryland.

Alpha Scores	Percentage of Criminal Cases	Percentage of White Draft	Percentage of Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, New Jersey and Maryland Draft
0- 9	4.7	4.	4.
10- 14	2.8	3.5	2.3
15- 19	3.2	4.2	3.9
20- 24	3.7	4.6	4.
25- 34	8.3	10.5	9.8
35- 44	9.5	10.9	10.2
45- 59	14.	15.3	16.1
60- 74	14.5	13.4	13.2
75- 89	12.3	10.6	10.7
90-104	10.5	8.2	8.7
105-119	7.	5.9	6.5
120-134	4.4	3.8	4.5
135-149	2.7	2.5	3.
150-212	2.6	2.6	2.8

Translating into letter grades, we have the following:

	Percentage of Criminal Cases	Percentage of White Draft	Percentage of Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, New Jersey and Maryland Draft
E	7.5	7.5	6.3
D	6.9	8.8	7.9
C-	17.8	21.4	20.
C	28.5	28.7	29.3
C+	22.8	18.8	19.4
B	11.4	9.7	11.
A	5.3	5.1	5.8

It would be interesting to have some of the experts on criminal problems take the above three percentage columns and the three titles that go with them, and assign to each column its appropriate title. But close scrutiny indicates that the Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, New Jersey, and Maryland combined draft is superior to the total white draft but still inferior to the criminal group. The differences are slight, but slight differences are not necessarily insignificant. And it should be remembered that the differences would be greater if the Camp Sherman records had been used. The proof for that statement is to be offered later.

3. Possible Factors of Distance, Industrial Attractiveness, and the Frontier. The total criminal population of any given state comprises a large percentage of men who were born outside of that state. These men have come from varying distances, and from communities of varying industrial attractiveness and degree of social development. Do these different experienced influences make any difference in the mentality of the criminal population of any given state? Let us compare the criminals born west of the Mississippi River with those born east of the Mississippi, not including any born in Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, New Jersey, or Maryland. It must not be assumed that the writer is making any assumptions concerning the differences in industrial attractiveness, social development, and general degree of civilization, between the western and the eastern halves of the United States. The differences which will be indicated may be the result of other factors altogether. But distance and the frontier are probably real factors, not in a causative, but in a selective sense. Other things being equal, a moving population is probably more intelligent than a stationary one. It is not the movement that makes the difference, but rather the reverse.

Alpha Grades	Cases West of Mississippi	Cases East of Mississippi	Percent- age West	Percent- age East
0- 9	7	35	2.9	3.3
10- 14	2	34	.9	3.2
15- 19	6	36	2.5	3.4
20- 24	7	40	2.9	3.7
25- 34	15	102	6.3	9.3
35- 44	14	91	5.9	8.6
45- 59	30	139	12.6	13.1
60- 74	34	174	14.3	16.3
75- 89	28	109	11.8	10.2
90-104	34	110	14.3	10.3
105-119	19	80	8.	7.5
120-134	17	45	7.1	4.2
135-149	12	30	5.	2.8
150-212	13	38	5.5	3.6

Translating into letter grades, we have the following:

	Percent- age West	Percent- age East
E	3.8	6.5
D	5.4	7.1
C-	12.2	17.9
C	26.9	29.4
C+	26.1	20.5
B	15.1	11.7
A	10.5	6.4

Not a single state in America sent a draft quota into the army that could compare mentally with the criminals born west of the Mississippi and confined in Eastern prisons.

Now let us compare the criminals born in Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, New Jersey, and Maryland, and confined within their home state, with the criminals born in those same states but confined outside their home state.

Alpha Scores	Cases Confined in Home State	Cases Confined Outside Home State	Percentage of Former	Per- centage of Latter
0- 9	137	6	5.8	2.3
10- 14	72	5	3.	2.
15- 19	74	9	3.1	3.5
20- 24	94	4	4.	1.5
25- 34	188	18	8.	6.9
35- 44	256	19	10.8	7.3
45- 59	350	36	14.6	14.
60- 74	322	35	13.8	13.5
75- 89	312	32	13.1	12.3
90-104	235	34	9.9	13.1
105-119	155	21	6.5	8.1
120-134	87	23	3.8	9.
135-149	54	8	2.3	3.1
150-212	40	10	1.7	4.

Translating into letter grades, we have the following:

	Percentage Confined in Home State	Percentage from Same States, But Con- fined Outside Home State
E	8.8	4.3
D	7.1	5.
C-	18.8	14.2
C	28.4	27.5
C+	23.	25.4
B	10.3	17.3
A	4.	7.1

It is obvious that the criminals who migrate to other states to commit their crimes are superior in Alpha grades to their fellow citizens who commit their crimes at home.

Now let us compare the criminals incarcerated in their home state with all the native born white criminals examined in prisons outside their home state.

Alpha Grades	Cases Con- fined Outside of Home State	Percentage Confined Outside Home State	Percentage in Home State
0- 9	48	3.	5.8
10- 14	41	2.6	3.
15- 19	50	3.2	3.1
20- 24	53	3.4	4.
25- 34	136	8.7	8.
35- 44	126	8.	10.8
45- 59	203	13.	14.6
60- 74	243	15.5	13.8
75- 89	173	11.	13.1
90-104	178	11.3	9.9
105-119	119	7.6	6.5
120-134	83	5.3	3.8
135-149	52	3.3	2.3
150-212	61	3.9	1.7

Translating into letter grades, we have the following:

	Percentage Outside Home State	Percentage in Home State
E	5.6	8.8
D	6.6	7.1
C-	16.7	18.8
C	28.5	28.4
C+	22.3	23.
B	12.9	10.3
A	7.2	4.

The differences here are marked, though not so clear cut as in the case of the comparison of home incarcerated criminals with fellow citizens imprisoned outside their native state. But the reason is

obvious. The criminal group contains a large number of relatively low grade men from Kentucky. This pulls down the average of the men confined outside their home state, while the average of men confined within their home state is not at the same time lowered by the inclusion of the still lower grade men confined in the prisons of Kentucky. In this study the Illinois, Ohio, and Indiana prisons alone have contributed 126 criminals from Kentucky. It might be interesting to compare the Kentucky groups.

Alpha Grades	Cases of Kentucky Criminals	Cases of Kentucky Draft	Percentage Kentucky Criminals	Percentage Kentucky Draft
0- 9	4	62	3.	7.4
10- 14	7	51	5.3	6.1
15- 19	6	62	4.5	7.4
20- 24	5	63	3.8	7.5
25- 34	19	114	14.4	13.6
35- 44	11	102	8.3	12.2
45- 59	19	125	14.4	14.8
60- 74	21	103	15.9	12.3
75- 89	16	46	12.1	5.5
90-104	12	52	9.1	6.2
105-119	5	23	3.8	2.7
120-134	3	15	2.3	1.8
135-149	3	11	2.3	1.3
150-212	1	8	.7	.9

Translating into letter grades, we have the following:

	Percentage of Kentucky Criminals	Percentage of Kentucky Draft
E	8.3	13.5
D	8.3	14.9
C-	22.7	25.8
C	30.3	27.1
C+	21.2	11.7
B	6.1	4.5
A	3.	2.2

It is difficult to study the influence of single factors in the behavior of such complex organisms as human beings. And it is true that, psychologically, such terms as distance, degree of social development, industrial attractiveness, and the frontier are vague at best. But, eliminating the five states in which criminals were examined, let us divide the United States into three traditional sections. There are certain connotations that accompany the terms the South, the North and the West. The South is noted for its conservatism, its small communities, its lack of frontier life, its inbreeding, and, till recently, its industrial apathy and educational indifference. The North has ever been washed with migrating hordes from Europe, and has experienced a perpetual renewing of social frontiers. However, the

North has retained its small communities, has developed educational and social conservatism, but still offers large industrial and professional rewards. The West has been the country of frontier, of large communities in terms of space, of outbreeding, of liberalism, of education for the masses, of indifference to great distances. Of the three, the South is most ancient in its civilization, the West most recent. How will the criminals from these three sections of the country compare? The southern criminals are bound to be either the most intelligent or the least. The same can be said of the western criminals. The northern criminals will be between the other two. Let us compare them.

Alpha Grades	Cases South	Cases North	Cases West	Percentage in Order of		
				South	North	West
0- 9	12	26	8	4.6	3.5	2.6
10- 14	9	25	2	3.5	3.4	.6
15- 19	14	22	7	5.4	3.	2.3
20- 24	8	30	8	3.1	4.	2.6
25- 34	32	63	20	12.4	8.5	6.6
35- 44	23	61	18	8.9	8.2	6.
45- 59	35	103	34	13.6	13.9	11.3
60- 74	43	120	42	16.6	16.2	14.
75- 89	29	75	36	11.3	10.1	12.
90-104	18	76	46	7.	10.3	15.3
105-119	12	55	30	4.6	7.4	10.
120-134	11	33	17	4.2	4.5	5.6
135-149	6	21	16	2.3	2.8	5.3
150-212	6	29	15	2.3	3.9	5.

Translating into letter grades, we have the following:

	South	Percentage in Order of	
		North	West
E	8.1	6.9	3.2
D	8.5	7.	4.9
C-	21.3	16.7	12.6
C	30.2	30.1	25.3
C+	18.3	20.4	27.3
B	8.8	11.9	15.6
A	4.6	6.7	10.3

In tabulating data for the above three sections, it was assumed that the South consisted of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Louisiana; that the North consisted of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware and West Virginia; while the West consisted of Michigan, Wisconsin, and all states west of the Mississippi river except Arkansas and Louisiana.

It is characteristic of high intelligence to resent conservatism, conformity and social suppression. That is one of the possible explanations of the uniformly high intelligence of the criminal group.

Liberal political theory in this country has ever been the product of the frontier. In Revolutionary times, it was the frontier that ran close to the Atlantic. In more recent times, it has been the frontier west of the Mississippi. It is necessary to go to the West to find the cradle of the Republican Party, the Populist Party, the Progressive Party, the Farm Bloc Party and the I. W. W. Liberalism and certain forms of socialism and individualism flourish on the frontier. And from such sections come the criminals of high intelligence. Both of the old political parties are viewing with alarm the growing power of those western non-conformist groups in politics. The occasion for such alarm in the North and South will increase for at least fifty years yet.

The factor of distance alone, without great regard to the frontier, can best be demonstrated by comparing the inmates of home-state prisons with prisoners who have come great distances from all directions. Let us select for this purpose the men from Maine, Massachusetts, Florida, Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, Texas, Arizona, California, Oregon, North Dakota, Minnesota, Nebraska and Colorado. These men compare with the men from Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, New Jersey and Maryland, imprisoned in their home state as follows:

Alpha Scores	Cases of Home Prisoners	Cases of Distant Prisoners	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	137	1	5.8	.6
10- 14	72	1	3.0	.6
15- 19	74	3	3.1	1.9
20- 24	94	4	4.	2.5
25- 34	188	9	8.	5.7
35- 44	256	7	10.8	4.5
45- 59	350	15	14.6	9.6
60- 74	322	24	13.8	15.3
75- 89	312	15	13.1	9.6
90-104	235	23	9.9	14.7
105-119	155	14	6.5	8.9
120-134	87	20	3.8	12.7
135-149	54	11	2.3	7.
150-212	40	10	1.7	6.4

Translating into letter grades, we have the following:

	Percentage of Home Prisoners	Percentage of Criminals from Great Distances
E	8.8	1.2
D	7.1	4.4
C-	18.8	10.2
C	28.4	24.9
C+	23.	24.3
B	10.	21.6
A	4.	13.4

The superiority of the criminals from great distances is overwhelming, and is of significance in social and historical science.

A further indication of the above factors can be obtained by comparing the New York criminals in the New Jersey prisons with the New York criminals in the prisons of Maryland, Illinois, Ohio and Indiana. New Jersey is very near New York, while the other states are much further away.

Alpha Grades	New York Cases in New Jersey	New York Cases in Illinois, Ohio, Indiana and Maryland	Percentage New York Cases in New Jersey	Percentage in Four States Farther Away
0- 9	7	4	4.	3.2
10- 14	6	3	3.4	2.4
15- 19	6	2	3.4	1.6
20- 24	5	3	2.9	2.4
25- 34	20	6	11.4	4.8
35- 44	20	7	11.4	5.6
45- 59	28	18	16.	14.3
60- 74	26	24	14.8	19.1
75- 89	12	16	6.8	12.7
90-104	15	20	8.6	15.9
105-119	11	13	6.3	10.3
120-134	7	2	4.	1.6
135-149	6	3	3.4	2.4
150-212	6	7	3.4	5.6

Translating into letter grades, we have the following:

	Percentage New York Cases in New Jersey	Percentage New York Cases in Maryland Illinois, Ohio and Indiana
E	7.4	5.6
D	6.3	4.
C-	22.8	10.4
C	30.8	33.4
C+	15.4	28.6
B	10.3	11.9
A	6.8	8.

In this regards also, the Pennsylvania criminals in the prisons of New Jersey and Maryland might be compared with the Pennsylvania criminals in the prisons of Illinois, Ohio and Indiana. Pennsylvania borders on New Jersey and Maryland, but in the case of the other three states, on a small section of Ohio only. It might be expected that the Pennsylvania criminals in Illinois, Ohio and Indiana, will be

superior to the Pennsylvania criminals in New Jersey and Maryland. The comparison will be as follows:

Alpha Grades	Cases in New Jersey and Maryland	Cases in Ohio, Illinois and Illinois	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	7	3	5.6	1.9
10- 14	4	5	3.2	3.2
15- 19	9	1	7.3	.6
20- 24	10	4	8.	2.6
25- 34	15	9	12.1	5.8
35- 44	13	14	10.5	9.
45- 59	16	25	12.9	16.
60- 74	17	26	13.7	16.6
75- 89	9	22	7.3	14.1
90-104	8	13	6.4	8.3
105-119	6	10	4.8	6.4
120-134	1	15	.8	9.6
135-149	6	3	4.8	1.9
150-212	3	6	2.4	3.9

Translating into letter grades, we have the following:

	Percentage of Pennsylvania Cases in New Jersey and Maryland	Percentage of Pennsylvania Cases in Illinois, Ohio and Indiana
E	8.8	5.1
D	15.3	3.2
C-	22.6	14.8
C	26.6	32.6
C+	13.7	22.4
B	5.6	16.
A	7.2	5.8

No further comment is necessary concerning the significance of the above figures. At this point it might be well to add that it is greatly to be regretted that the criminal population has not been tested in the states of California, Texas, Nebraska, Iowa and Missouri. Comparative data from those states would be of tremendous interest for the discussion of this problem. But enough data has been presented to the serious reader to make quite clear to him that the problem of criminal intelligence can no longer be discussed adequately without due reference to geographical concomitants. This is no isolated problem. We are dealing here with factors that influence social behavior in general, and a solution of the problem will contribute not only to a more adequate understanding of the behavior of the obscure inmate of the prison cell, but also will contribute something toward an understanding of historical migratory success. It may not be too daring to suggest that the revolutionist and the prophet might be better understood through an adequate solution of the above problem.

CHAPTER 5

INTELLIGENCE AND TYPES OF CRIME

Criminal offenses change in number and variety almost as frequently as do social customs. The criminal offenses in one age of history may be largely civil offenses in the succeeding age, while the civil offenses of one age may be largely criminal offenses in the succeeding age. In addition to this interchange, there is an accretion from and a loss to the purely individual and personal interests. Murder, for example, came into the category of criminal behavior after being borrowed from the category of purely personal affairs. This interchange between the criminal group and the civil population will bring about a similarity between the two as far as intelligence is concerned, unless there are other factors not necessarily criminal alone. A careful study of the history of types of crime would itself lead to the conclusion that criminal intelligence can not differ very widely from the intelligence of the civil population. But economic, geographical and emotional factors may bring about a real difference. It is a most stupid fallacy to assume that the criminal, per se, must be feeble-minded. It takes high intelligence to perceive in the changing social order, just what constitutes criminal behavior. To imagine that the criminal in all ages will perceive and elect such behavior, being feeble-minded, is sheer nonsense. The inmates of a certain prison in this country averaged nearly a hundred per cent higher in the Alpha test than did the guards of that same prison. Which group was feeble-minded?

The white native born criminal intelligence that is being discussed in this book landed behind prison bars because of the commission of approximately seventy-two different crimes. Some of these crimes were committed by hundreds of individuals, while others were committed by only one or two. The law of probability prevents a small group of two or three from being comparable to a group of several hundred. The writer suggests that the seventy-two crimes, for purposes of comparison, be classified into seven groups as follows: (1) Obtaining property through deception and fraud known legally as forgery, embezzlement, false pretenses, conspiracy, confidence games, receiving stolen property, blackmail, counterfeiting, and uttering of fraudulent checks. (2) Obtaining property through force, known legally as robbery, burglary, assault to rob, breaking and entering, entering to commit felony, burglary and larceny, safe blowing, attempted burglary, kidnapping, child stealing, housebreaking, attempt

to rob, and burglary of inhabited dwelling. (3) Obtaining property through common thievery known legally as larceny, pocket picking, vehicle taking, horse stealing and automobile stealing. (4) Statutory offenses known legally as unlawful use of motor vehicle, illegal sale of drugs, illegal sale or possession of intoxicating beverages, carrying concealed weapons, unlawful use of explosives, operating motor vehicle without owner's consent, violating automobile law, having burglar tools, concealing weapons to aid escape, escaping prison and removing railroad property. (5) Crimes of physical injury known legally as murder, maiming, manslaughter, assault to murder, accessory to murder, cutting, shooting or stabbing to kill or wound; arson and malicious destruction of property. (6) Crimes of social dereliction, known legally as abandonment, desertion, vagrancy, begging, non-support, neglect of minor child, child abandonment, bigamy, lewdness, seduction, perjury, publishing of obscene writing, abduction, and receiving earnings of prostitute. (7) Sex crimes known legally as rape, sodomy, indecent liberty with child, incest, assault to rape, crime against nature, assault to commit crime against nature, crime against child, adultery, and carnal abuse.

The first group, consisting of 331 cases, is distributed as follows:

Alpha Scores	Cases	Percentage	Alpha Scores	Cases	Percentage
0- 9	3	.9	60- 74	49	14.8
10- 14	5	1.5	75- 89	44	13.3
15- 19	13	4.	90-104	38	11.5
20- 24	14	4.2	105-119	34	10.3
25- 34	16	4.8	120-134	18	5.5
35- 44	22	6.6	135-149	17	5.1
45- 59	34	10.3	150-212	24	7.2

Translating these percentage figures into the traditional letter grades, we have the following:

Letter Grade	Percentage of Cases	Letter Grade	Percentage of Cases
E	2.4	C+	24.8
D	8.2	B	15.8
C-	11.4	A	12.3
C	25.1		

It is obvious that crimes of deception and fraud are committed by men of no mean ability. Only 22% are inferior to a grade of C, while 52.9% are superior to a grade of C.

The second group, consisting of 1542 cases, is distributed as follows:

Alpha Scores	Cases	Percentage	Alpha Scores	Cases	Percentage
0- 9	58	3.7	60- 74	220	14.3
10- 14	40	2.6	75- 89	191	12.4
15- 19	44	2.8	90-104	176	11.4
20- 24	45	2.9	105-119	108	7.
25- 34	127	8.2	120-134	74	4.9
35- 44	160	10.4	135-149	41	2.7
45- 59	236	15.3	150-212	32	2.1

Translating the above percentage figures into the letter grades, we have the following:

Letter Grade	Percentage of Cases	Letter Grade	Percentage of Cases
E	6.3	C+	23.8
D	5.7	B	11.9
C-	18.6	A	4.8
C	29.6		

The third group, consisting of 992 cases, is distributed as follows:

Alpha Scores	Cases	Percentage	Alpha Scores	Cases	Percentage
0- 9	46	4.7	60- 74	140	14.2
10- 14	26	2.6	75- 89	128	13.
15- 19	30	3.	90-104	120	12.1
20- 24	43	4.3	105-119	70	7.
25- 34	80	8.1	120-134	43	4.3
35- 44	90	9.1	135-149	22	2.2
45- 59	133	13.4	150-212	21	2.1

Translating the above percentage figures into the letter grades, we have the following:

Letter Grade	Percentage of Cases	Letter Grade	Percentage of Cases
E	7.3	C+	25.1
D	7.3	B	11.3
C-	17.2	A	4.3
C	27.6		

The fourth group, consisting of 187 cases, is distributed as follows:

Alpha Scores	Cases	Percentage	Alpha Scores	Cases	Percentage
0- 9	7	3.7	60- 74	31	16.6
10- 14	5	2.7	75- 89	22	11.8
15- 19	8	4.3	90-104	16	8.5
20- 24	6	3.2	105-119	12	6.4
25- 34	15	8.	120-134	9	4.8
35- 44	17	9.1	135-149	2	1.1
45- 59	33	17.6	150-212	4	2.1

Translating into letter grades, we have:

Letter Grade	Percentage of Cases	Letter Grade	Percentage of Cases
E	6.4	C+	20.3
D	7.5	B	11.2
C-	17.1	A	3.2
C	34.2		

The fifth group, consisting of 521 cases, is distributed as follows:

Alpha Scores	Cases	Percentage	Alpha Scores	Cases	Percentage
0- 9	36	7.	60- 74	70	13.3
10- 14	17	3.3	75- 89	67	12.8
15- 19	16	3.1	90-104	45	8.7
20- 24	20	3.9	105-119	31	6.
25- 34	52	10.	120-134	14	2.7
35- 44	50	9.6	135-149	15	2.9
45- 59	78	15.	150-212	10	1.9

Translating into the letter grades, we have:

Letter Grade	Percentage of Cases	Letter Grade	Percentage of Cases
E	10.3	C+	21.5
D	7.	B	8.7
C-	19.6	A	4.8
C	28.3		

The sixth group, consisting of 119 cases, is distributed as follows:

Alpha Scores	Cases	Percentage	Alpha Scores	Cases	Percentage
0- 9	11	9.3	60- 74	14	11.8
10- 14	7	5.9	75- 89	10	8.5
15- 19	8	6.8	90-104	12	10.
20- 24	1	.8	105-119	10	8.4
25- 34	13	11.	120-134	5	4.2
35- 44	11	9.3	135-149	2	1.7
45- 59	12	10.	150-212	3	2.5

Translating into the traditional letter grades, we have the following:

Letter Grade	Percentage of Cases	Letter Grade	Percentage of Cases
E	15.2	C+	18.5
D	7.6	B	12.6
C-	20.3	A	4.2
C	21.8		

The seventh group, consisting of 253 cases, is distributed as follows:

Alpha Scores	Cases	Percentage	Alpha Scores	Cases	Percentage
0- 9	24	9.5	60- 74	35	13.9
10- 14	12	4.8	75- 89	20	7.9
15- 19	12	4.8	90-104	15	6.
20- 24	15	5.9	105-119	15	6.
25- 34	24	9.5	120-134	6	2.4
35- 44	33	13.1	135-149	4	1.6
45- 59	32	12.7	150-212	6	2.4

Translating into the traditional letter grades, we have the following:

Letter Grade	Percentage of Cases	Letter Grade	Percentage of Cases
E	14.3	C+	13.9
D	10.7	B	8.4
C-	22.6	A	4.
C	26.6		

If we now assemble the letter grades of the seven groups of types, we have the following:

Letter Grade	Fraud	Force	Thievery	Statutory	Physical Injury	Dere- liction	Sex
E	2.4	6.3	7.3	6.4	10.3	15.2	14.3
D	8.2	5.7	7.3	7.5	7.	7.6	10.7
C-	11.4	18.6	17.2	17.1	19.6	20.3	22.6
C	25.1	29.6	27.6	34.2	28.3	21.8	26.6
C+	24.8	23.8	25.1	20.3	21.5	18.5	13.9
B	15.8	11.9	11.3	11.2	8.7	12.6	8.4
A	12.3	4.8	4.3	3.2	4.8	4.2	4.

Grouping the letter grades inferior to C, and doing the same for the letter grades superior to C, we have:

Inferior	Type	Superior
22.	Fraud	52.9
30.6	Force	40.5
31.8	Thievery	40.7
31.	Statutory	34.7
36.9	Physical Injury	35.
43.1	Dereliction	35.3
47.6	Sex	26.3

It would seem that statutory crimes and crimes of physical injury are causally related very slightly to intelligence, in so far as intelligence can be measured by mental tests. But more than half of the individuals who commit crimes of fraud are superior individuals, according to the Army norms. At the same time, about half of the individuals who commit crimes against sex are inferior individuals according to the same standards. Crimes of social dereliction are committed by a large percentage of unusually superior individuals and also by a large percentage of unusually inferior individuals. Temperament must play a much larger role than intelligence in the commission of statutory crimes, crimes of physical injury, and crimes of social dereliction. Of course, it is quite possible that temperament, meaning by temperament the emotional complex, plays the chief role in the commission of all crime.

In discussing the high intelligence of men who commit fraud, it might be well to point out certain similarities in our general social life. One remembers the large amount of news that has appeared

lately in the daily press concerning the failure of certain brokerage and promotional firms. These men are the type we are discussing. One remembers also the sensational exposure of certain prohibition leaders. These men also are the type we are discussing. One remembers the ignominious flight of a certain minister. Here also is the type. War contractors and prominent politicians furnish examples of the same type. Certain would-be religious leaders who obscure great truths are the same type, but their genius, through the force of circumstances, has been confined to religious fraud.

There are important geographical concomitants to be considered in a discussion of types of crime. Let us compare, in the case of each type group, the criminals imprisoned in their home state with the criminals imprisoned outside their home state. Let us consider the fraud group first.

Alpha Scores	Cases at Home	Cases Away From Home	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	1	2	.5	1.3
10- 14	4	1	2.2	.6
15- 19	9	4	5.	2.6
20- 24	9	5	5.	3.3
25- 34	9	7	5.	4.6
35- 44	17	5	9.4	3.3
45- 59	23	11	12.7	7.3
60- 74	26	23	14.4	15.3
75- 89	23	21	12.7	14.
90-104	20	18	11.	12.
105-119	18	16	10.	10.6
120-134	9	9	5.	6.
135-149	7	10	3.9	6.6
150-212	6	18	3.3	12.

In letter grades, the percentage distribution of the above group is as follows:

Letter Grades	Percentage at Home	Percentage Away from Home
E	2.7	1.9
D	10.	5.9
C-	14.4	7.9
C	27.1	22.6
C+	23.7	26.
B	15.	16.6
A	7.2	18.6

It is clearly to be seen that the criminals who are imprisoned away from their home state are almost as numerous as and far superior to the home grown variety. Slightly more than 45% of this group was born outside the state in which it is now incarcerated.

Let us consider in the same way the second group, the "property by force" group.

Alpha Scores	Cases at Home	Cases Away From Home	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	42	16	4.4	2.7
10- 14	26	14	2.7	2.4
15- 19	28	16	3.	2.7
20- 24	26	19	2.7	3.3
25- 34	69	58	7.2	10.
35- 44	100	60	10.4	10.3
45- 59	147	89	15.3	15.3
60- 74	129	91	13.4	15.6
75- 89	125	66	13.	11.3
90-104	112	64	11.7	11.
105-119	68	40	7.1	6.9
120-134	47	27	4.9	4.6
135-149	24	17	2.5	2.9
150-212	17	15	1.8	2.6

Translating into the letter grades:

Letter Grades	Percentage at Home	Percentage Away from Home
E	7.1	5.1
D	5.7	6.
C-	17.6	20.3
C	28.7	30.9
C+	24.7	22.3
B	12.	11.5
A	4.3	5.5

In this group, the influence of nativity is not so marked. However 38% of the group is incarcerated outside its home state. Robbery and burglary are the two chief crimes in this group. In burglary, the geographical factors are fairly clear, but such factors are practically lacking in robbery. It might be well to compare the two crimes. Let us take robbery:

Alpha Scores	Cases at Home	Cases Away From Home	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	12	7	3.4	3.3
10- 14	7	5	2.	2.3
15- 19	10	1	2.8	.5
20- 24	7	7	2.	3.3
25- 34	28	15	8.	7.
35- 44	41	25	11.6	11.7
45- 59	46	34	13.1	15.9
60- 74	45	29	12.8	13.5
75- 89	46	23	13.1	10.7
90-104	39	31	11.1	14.5
105-119	27	18	7.7	8.4
120-134	22	11	6.2	5.1
135-149	13	3	3.7	1.4
150-212	9	5	2.6	2.3

Translating into letter grades:

Letter Grades	Percentage at Home	Percentage Away from Home
E	5.4	5.6
D.	4.8	3.8
C—	19.6	18.7
C	25.9	29.4
C+	24.2	25.2
B	13.9	13.5
A	6.3	3.7

Let us now consider the group of burglars, and compare them with the robbers. The burglars are distributed as follows:

Alpha Scores	Cases at Home	Cases Away From Home	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	17	5	5.4	3.1
10- 14	8	5	2.5	3.1
15- 19	5	5	1.6	3.1
20- 24	9	6	2.8	3.8
25- 34	23	8	7.2	5.
35- 44	30	9	9.5	5.7
45- 59	53	22	16.8	13.8
60- 74	40	31	12.6	19.5
75- 89	45	21	14.2	13.2
90-104	45	13	14.2	8.2
105-119	19	11	6.	6.9
120-134	15	9	4.7	5.7
135-149	2	7	.6	4.4
150-212	5	7	1.6	4.4

Translating into letter grades, we have:

Letter Grades	Percentage at Home	Percentage Away from Home
E	7.9	6.2
D	4.4	6.9
C—	16.7	10.7
C	29.4	33.2
C+	28.4	21.4
B	10.7	12.6
A	2.2	8.8

It would seem from the comparison that the robbers are the criminals least influenced by geographical factors, and data concerning them influence the entire second group of criminal types. It may be possible to reconsider this peculiarity later.

We shall now consider the distribution of the third group, the "common thievery" group, consisting of 992 cases.

Alpha Scores	Cases at Home	Cases Away From Home	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	35	11	6.2	2.6
10- 14	18	8	3.2	1.7
15- 19	21	9	3.7	2.1
20- 24	27	16	4.7	3.8
25- 34	52	28	9.1	6.6
35- 44	66	24	11.5	5.7
45- 59	72	61	12.6	14.5
60- 74	68	72	11.8	17.1
75- 89	78	50	13.6	11.9
90-104	64	56	11.2	13.3
105-119	43	27	7.5	6.4
120-134	13	30	2.3	7.1
135-149	9	13	1.6	3.1
150-212	6	15	1.1	3.6

Translating into letter grades, we have the following.

Letter Grades	Percentage at Home	Percentage Away from Home
E	9.4	4.3
D	8.4	5.9
C-	20.6	12.3
C	24.4	31.6
C+	24.8	25.2
B	9.8	11.5
A	2.7	6.7

In this group also, the geographical factor is seen to be a very distinct consideration.

Let us proceed next with a distribution of the fourth group, the group of statutory offenses.

Alpha Scores	Cases at Home	Cases Away From Home	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	6	1	5.4	1.3
10- 14	4	1	3.6	1.3
15- 19	5	3	4.5	3.9
20- 24	4	2	3.6	2.6
25- 34	6	9	5.4	11.7
35- 44	11	6	10.	7.8
45- 59	23	10	20.9	13.
60- 74	17	14	15.4	18.2
75- 89	13	9	12.7	11.7
90-104	9	7	8.2	9.1
105-119	5	7	4.5	9.1
120-134	5	4	4.5	5.2
135-149	1	1	.9	1.3
150-212	1	3	.9	3.9

Translating into letter grades, we have:

Letter Grades	Percentage at Home	Percentage Away from Home
E	9.	2.6
D	8.1	6.5
C-	15.4	19.5
C	36.3	31.2
C+	20.9	20.8
B	9.	14.3
A	1.8	5.2

So, in this group also, we find the geographical factor. Let us continue with the distribution of the fifth group, the group of crimes involving physical injury. This group will consist of 521 cases. We omitted to state above that the fourth group consisted of 187 cases.

Alpha Scores	Cases at Home	Cases Away From Home	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	28	7	8.5	4.2
10- 14	6	11	1.8	5.8
15- 19	9	7	2.7	3.7
20- 24	16	4	4.8	2.1
25- 34	31	21	9.3	11.2
35- 44	35	15	10.5	8.
45- 59	60	18	18.	9.6
60- 74	42	28	12.6	14.9
75- 89	49	18	14.7	9.6
90-104	21	24	6.3	12.2
105-119	15	16	4.5	8.5
120-134	7	7	2.1	3.7
135-149	9	6	2.7	3.2
150-212	5	5	1.5	2.7

Translating into letter grades, we have:

Letter Grades	Percentage at Home	Percentage Away from Home
E	10.3	10.
D	7.5	5.8
C-	19.8	19.2
C	30.6	24.5
C+	21.	21.8
B	6.6	12.2
A	4.2	5.9

The geographical concomitants are clear here, except that there is a larger percentage than should be expected of the E men among those incarcerated away from home. Foreign-born parentage may explain this, and will be discussed later.

Let us proceed now to the distribution of the sixth group, the group of social dereliction, consisting of 119 cases.

Alpha Scores	Cases at Home	Cases Away From Home	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	7	4	13.2	6.1
10- 14	4	3	7.5	4.5
15- 19	2	6	3.8	9.1
20- 24	1	0	1.9
25- 34	7	6	13.2	9.1
35- 44	3	8	5.7	12.1
45- 59	5	7	9.4	10.6
60- 74	7	7	13.2	10.6
75- 89	6	4	11.3	6.1
90-104	6	6	11.3	9.1
105-119	3	7	5.7	10.6
120-134	1	4	1.9	6.1
135-149	0	2	3.
150-212	1	2	1.9	3.

Translating into letter grades, we have the following:

Letter Grades	Percentage at Home	Percentage Away from Home
E	20.7	10.6
D	5.7	9.1
C-	18.9	21.2
C	22.6	21.2
C+	22.6	15.2
B	7.6	16.7
A	1.9	6.

The presence of a geographical factor is very clear, and needs no further comment just yet. Let us proceed with the distribution of the seventh group, a group consisting of sex crimes and comprising 253 cases.

Alpha Scores	Cases at Home	Cases Away From Home	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	18	6	10.6	7.2
10- 14	10	2	5.9	2.4
15-19	5	7	2.9	8.4
20- 24	13	2	7.6	2.4
25- 34	16	8	9.4	9.6
35- 44	21	12	12.3	14.4
45- 59	22	10	13.	12.
60- 74	20	15	11.8	18.
75- 89	15	5	8.8	6.
90-104	12	3	7.1	3.6
105-119	8	7	4.1	8.4
120-134	3	3	1.8	3.6
135-149	3	1	1.8	1.2
150-212	4	2	2.3	2.4

Translating into letter grades, we have the following:

Letter Grades	Percentage at Home	Percentage Away from Home
E	16.5	9.6
D	10.5	10.8
C-	21.7	24.
C	24.8	30.
C+	15.9	9.6
B	5.9	12.
A	4.1	3.6

With the exception of group two, the geographical concomitants bring about distinctions within each group that are just as clear as the differences between the groups themselves. This merely shows how highly co-ordinated with intelligence the geographical concomitants are. Either that, or the differences between types of crimes are not differences that can be expressed in terms of intelligence with much accuracy.

The percentages of men from different sections of the country committing certain types of crime might be compared with the percentages of men imprisoned at home who have committed the same types of crime. Let us take the traditional sections of North, West

and South, and compare the percentages from these sections with the percentages incarcerated at home. This comparison will not consider the Alpha scores, but merely the number of cases committing each type of crime.

Types of Crime	Percentage of Men from Each Section of Country Committing the			
	Given Type of Crime	West	North	South
Fraud	9.	10.5	10.7	7.6
Force	39.3	41.9	35.3	40.7
Thievery	25.6	30.9	26.1	24.2
Statutory	5.6	5.1	5.9	4.7
Physical Injuries	11.3	11.1	15.	13.3
Dereliction	5.3	4.8	4.8	2.2
Sex	3.6	7.4	2.4	7.2

CHAPTER VI.

INTELLIGENCE AND RECIDIVISM

1. Gross Comparison of Recidivists with First Offenders. The data on recidivism is confined to the states of Indiana, New Jersey and Maryland. For various reasons, such data was not obtainable in Ohio and Illinois. In this chapter, the discussion will be confined to data from Indiana, New Jersey and Maryland. Of the 1639 cases from those three states, 979 are first offenders and 660 are recidivists. These two groups compare grossly as follows:

Alpha Scores	Cases First Offenders	Cases of Recidivists	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	67	42	6.8	6.4
10- 14	39	28	4.	4.3
15- 19	48	20	5.	3.
20- 24	57	30	5.8	4.5
25- 34	112	48	11.4	7.3
35- 44	95	68	9.6	10.3
45- 59	112	100	11.4	15.
60- 74	111	103	11.3	15.6
75- 89	112	69	11.4	10.4
90-104	76	71	7.7	10.8
105-119	67	34	6.8	5.2
120-134	34	19	3.5	2.9
135-149	24	16	2.4	2.5
150-212	25	12	2.5	1.8

Translating into the traditional letter grades, we have the following:

Letter Grades	Percentage of First Offenders	Percentage of Recidivists
E	10.8	10.7
D	10.8	7.5
C-	21.	17.6
C	22.7	30.6
C+	19.1	21.2
B	10.3	8.1
A	4.9	4.3

As can be seen, the recidivists have 33.6% superior to a grade of C, and 35.8% inferior to a grade of C. On the other hand, the first offenders have 34.3% superior to a grade of C, and 42.6% inferior to a grade of C. In percentage of individuals superior to a grade of C, the two groups are approximately equal. But in individuals inferior to a grade of C, the first offenders are more numerous. In addition, the recidivists possess a much larger percentage of C individuals. It seems fairly obvious that the first offenders, as a group, are not so intelligent as the recidivists.

To many, it will seem astounding that recidivists should be found more intelligent than are first offenders. Such a conclusion will be found to be exactly the opposite of the traditional beliefs on the subject that is, of those beliefs that are founded on hearsay and on illegal generalizations from limited observation. But traditional beliefs, like the traditional methods of treating disease, are usually fallacious. It should be remembered that no attempt is made in this book to define the term intelligence. Intelligence and Alpha score are assumed to be synonymous for the purposes of this book.

2. First, Second and Habitual Offenders. The gross comparison of first offenders and recidivists is probably not exact enough for scientific requirements, though such has been the general practice. Let us compare the first offenders with second offenders and with habitual offenders.

Alpha Scores	Cases of Each in the Order			Percentages in the Order of		
	First	Second	Habitual	First	Second	Habitual
0- 9	67	24	18	6.8	5.4	8.5
10- 14	39	13	15	4.	2.9	7.
15- 19	48	11	9	5.	2.5	4.3
20- 24	57	22	8	5.8	5.	3.8
25- 34	112	34	14	11.4	7.7	6.6
35- 44	95	52	16	9.6	11.6	7.5
45- 59	112	78	22	11.4	17.4	10.4
60- 74	111	74	29	11.3	16.6	13.7
75- 89	112	43	26	11.4	9.6	12.2
90-104	76	44	27	7.7	9.8	12.8
105-119	67	22	12	6.8	5.	5.6
120-134	34	15	4	3.5	3.4	1.9
135-149	24	8	8	2.4	1.8	3.8
150-212	25	8	4	2.5	1.8	1.9

Translating into letter grades, we have the following:

Letter Grades	Percentages in the Order of		
	First	Second	Habitual
E	10.8	8.3	15.5
D	10.8	7.5	8.1
C-	21.	19.3	14.1
C	22.7	34.	24.1
C+	19.1	19.4	25.
B	10.3	8.4	7.5
A	4.9	3.6	5.7

Let us consider the three groups in terms of percentages superior to a grade of C, percentages inferior to a grade of C, and percentages of C.

	Inferior To C	C	Superior To C
First	42.6	22.7	34.3
Second	35.1	34.	31.4
Habitual	37.7	24.1	38.2

Approximately half of all first offenders become second offenders, and approximately half of all second offenders become habitual offenders. In any given group of first offenders, what grade of intelligence is most likely to return for a second treatment? It is clear that the average man, the C man, is the one most likely to return. In any given group of second offenders, what grade of intelligence is most likely to return for still more treatment? It is clear that the inferior and the superior individuals are equally likely to return, while the average individual is more likely to have enough of it. If it is true, as some have claimed, that feeble-mindedness is an important factor in recidivism, it is equally true that high intelligence is just as important a factor. It behooves the serious worker in this field to discontinue the paternal and mightier-than-thou attitude towards the criminal, and at least attempt a closer relationship with the facts. And it is possible that the facts may not be as palatable as one might wish. But most of our guiding ideas concerning the criminal have drifted in from Italy, where graft and corruption in the administration of justice is of notorious and common practice, and where only the friendless, the feeble-minded and the boobs ever get to prison. Even in this country, the daily stories in the press concerning the shortcomings of the mighty and influential citizens are not very often followed by stories of conviction. If justice really were blind, it would be almost impossible to build prisons secure enough to hold the captains of industry, the politicians, the lawyers, the promoters, the bankers and the other hosts of brilliant geniuses that would become victims of justice. Justice has never been blind, but sometimes works in a clarified atmosphere, sometimes in the fog.

3. Gross Geographical Concomitants of Recidivism. Let us compare the recidivists imprisoned in their home state with the recidivists imprisoned outside their home state.

Alpha Scores	Cases at Home	Cases Away from Home	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	28	14	7.6	5.
10- 14	16	5	4.4	1.7
15- 19	11	9	3.	3.2
20- 24	25	5	6.8	1.7
25- 34	28	20	7.6	7.
35- 44	44	24	11.9	8.4
45- 59	58	42	15.8	14.7
60- 74	52	52	14.1	17.9
75- 89	47	22	12.8	7.7
90-104	34	37	9.2	13.
105-119	14	20	3.8	7.
120-134	3	16	.8	5.6
135-149	7	9	1.9	3.2
150-212	1	11	.3	3.9

In letter grades, the comparison becomes clearer.

Letter Grades	Percentage at Home	Away from Home
E	12.	6.7
D	9.8	4.9
C-	19.5	15.4
C	29.9	32.6
C+	22.	20.7
B	4.6	12.6
A	2.2	7.1

It is obvious that the recidivists from other states are more intelligent than are the home grown variety. Let us compare also the first offenders imprisoned at home with the first offenders from other states.

Alpha Scores	Cases at Home	Cases Away from Home	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	46	21	9.2	4.4
10- 14	22	17	4.4	3.6
15- 19	26	22	5.2	4.6
20- 24	30	26	6.	5.4
25- 34	52	60	10.4	12.5
35- 44	50	45	10.	9.4
45- 59	64	48	12.8	10.
60- 74	41	70	8.2	14.6
75- 89	67	45	13.4	9.4
90-104	40	36	8.	7.5
105-119	31	36	6.2	7.5
120-134	12	22	2.4	4.6
135-149	7	17	1.4	3.6
150-212	11	14	2.2	2.9

In letter grades, the comparison becomes:

Letter Grades	Percentage at Home	Away from Home
E	13.6	8.
D	11.2	10.
C-	20.4	21.9
C	21.	24.6
C+	21.4	16.9
B	8.8	12.1
A	3.6	6.5

Let us arrange the letter grades of the home grown recidivists parallel to the letter grades of the home grown first offenders.

Letter Grade	Percentage of Recidivists	Percentage of First Offenders
E	12.	13.8
D	9.8	11.4
C—	19.5	20.6
C	29.9	20.9
C+	22.	21.3
B	4.6	8.5
A	2.2	3.5

Let us also compare the letter grades of recidivists and first offenders born outside the state in which incarcerated.

Letter Grade	Percentage of Recidivists	Percentage of First Offenders
E	6.7	8.
D	4.9	10.
C—	15.4	21.9
C	32.6	24.6
C+	20.7	16.9
B	12.6	12.1
A	7.1	6.5

The relatively large number of average or C men in both groups of recidivists should be noticed. The transient recidivists are more intelligent than the home grown variety, and are more superior to the transient first offenders than are the home grown recidivists to the home grown first offenders.

4. Geographical Concomitants of First, Second and Habitual Offenders. Let us consider first, from among those incarcerated in their home state, the first, second and habitual offenders.

Alpha Scores	Cases of First	Cases of Second	Cases of Habitual	Percentages in Order of		
				First	Second	Habitual
0- 9	46	18	10	9.2	6.6	10.4
10- 14	22	11	5	4.4	4.	5.2
15- 19	26	8	3	5.2	2.9	3.1
20- 24	30	19	6	6.	7.	6.3
25- 34	52	21	7	10.4	7.7	7.3
35- 44	50	34	10	10.	12.5	10.4
45- 59	64	46	12	12.8	16.9	11.5
60- 74	41	43	9	8.2	15.8	9.4
75- 89	67	31	16	13.4	11.4	16.6
90-104	40	23	11	8.	8.5	11.4
105-119	31	11	3	6.2	4.	3.1
120-134	12	1	2	2.4	.4	2.1
135-149	7	5	2	1.4	1.9	2.1
150-212	11	1	0	2.2	.4

Translating the percentages into letter grades, we have the following:

Letter Grades	Percentages in the Order of		
	First	Second	Habitual
E	13.6	10.6	15.6
D	11.2	9.9	9.4
C-	20.4	20.2	17.7
C	21.	32.7	21.9
C+	21.4	19.9	28.
B	8.6	4.4	5.2
A	3.6	2.3	2.1

The outstanding features are the large number of average or C men among the second offenders, and the large number of C+ men among the the habitual offenders.

Now let us compare the first, second and habitual offenders among those incarcerated outside their home state.

Alpha Scores	Cases of First	Cases of Second	Cases of Habitual	Percentages in Order of		
				First	Second	Habitual
0- 9	21	6	8	4.4	3.2	7.3
10- 14	17	2	3	3.6	1.	2.7
15- 19	22	3	6	4.6	1.6	5.5
20- 24	26	3	2	5.4	1.6	1.8
25- 34	60	13	7	12.5	6.8	6.4
35- 44	45	18	6	9.4	9.4	5.5
45- 59	48	32	10	10.	16.7	9.2
60- 74	70	31	20	14.6	16.2	18.3
75- 89	45	12	10	9.4	6.3	9.2
90-104	36	21	16	7.5	11.	14.7
105-119	36	11	9	7.5	5.8	8.3
120-134	22	14	2	4.6	7.3	1.8
135-149	17	3	6	3.6	1.6	5.5
150-212	14	7	4	2.9	3.7	3.7

Making the transition into the letter grades, we have:

Letter Grades	Percentages in the Order of		
	First	Second	Habitual
E	8.	4.2	10.
D	10.	3.2	7.3
C-	21.9	16.2	11.9
C	24.6	32.9	27.5
C+	16.9	17.3	23.9
B	12.1	13.1	10.1
A	6.5	5.3	9.2

The habitual offenders are distinguished both by the large number of low grade men and by the number of high grade men.

Using the percentages given above, let us compare the first offenders imprisoned at home with the first offenders imprisoned away from home.

Letter Grades	First Offenders in Order of Home and Away	
	Home	Away
E	13.6	8.
D	11.2	10.
C—	20.4	21.9
C	21.	24.6
C+	21.4	16.9
B	8.6	12.1
A	3.6	6.5

The geographical concomitants are marked. Let us make the same comparison in the case of the second offenders imprisoned at home and imprisoned away from home.

Letter Grades	Percentage of Second Offenders	
	Home	Away
E	10.6	4.2
D	9.9	3.2
C—	20.2	16.2
C	32.7	32.9
C+	19.9	17.3
B	4.4	13.1
A	2.3	5.3

The geographical concomitants are exceedingly marked in the above comparison. The usually high yet similar percentages of average or C men should be noted. Now let us make the same comparison for the habitual offenders.

Letter Grades	Percentage of Habitual Offenders	
	Home	Away
E	15.6	10.
D	9.4	7.3
C—	17.7	11.9
C	21.9	27.5
C+	28.	23.9
B	5.2	10.1
A	2.1	9.2

The geographical concomitants are more marked than ever in the case of the habitual offenders.

5. First Offenders, Recidivists and Types of Crime. In this respect we shall use the seven types of crime that we have previously agreed upon, and in each type shall compare the recidivists with the first offenders. Some of the types, to be sure, are represented by too few cases to be considered seriously in this respect.

From the three states of Indiana, New Jersey and Maryland, data on 146 cases of fraud was obtained. Of these, 58 were reci-

divists and 88 were first offenders. The distribution of the two groups compares as follows:

Alpha Scores	Cases First Offenders	Cases of Recidivists	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	0	2	3.4
10- 14	3	1	3.4	1.7
15- 19	3	1	3.4	1.7
20- 24	3	7	3.4	12.1
25- 34	5	2	5.7	3.4
35- 44	5	4	5.7	6.9
45- 59	6	6	6.8	10.3
60- 74	7	11	8.	19.
75- 89	14	9	16.	15.5
90-104	8	5	9.1	8.6
105-119	10	1	11.3	1.7
120-134	6	4	6.8	6.9
135-149	6	2	6.8	3.4
150-212	12	3	13.6	5.2

Translating into letter grades, we have:

Letter Grades	Percentage First	Percentage of Recidivists
E	3.4	5.1
D	6.8	13.8
C-	11.4	10.3
C	14.8	29.3
C+	25.1	24.1
B	18.1	8.6
A	20.4	8.6

In this group of crimes, the first offenders are far more intelligent than are the recidivists. Certainly, the relatively high intelligence of recidivists in general is not brought about by the recidivists in crimes of fraud. But the high intelligence of the first offenders in this group should be noticed. Such men are not the type who get caught very frequently. Let us continue with the distribution of 474 cases in the second of the seven types, the "force" group.

Alpha Scores	Cases First Offenders	Cases of Recidivists	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	14	13	5.2	6.5
10- 14	12	5	4.4	2.5
15- 19	10	7	3.7	3.5
20- 24	15	5	5.5	2.5
25- 34	42	16	15.3	8.
35- 44	23	23	8.4	11.5
45- 59	35	33	12.8	16.5
60- 74	39	33	14.2	16.5
75- 89	32	21	11.7	10.5
90-104	18	23	6.5	11.5
105-119	19	11	6.9	5.5
120-134	9	3	3.3	1.5
135-149	4	6	1.5	3.
150-212	2	1	.7	.5

Translating into the letter grades, we have:

Letter Grades	Percentage First	Percentage of Recidivists
E	9.6	9.
D	9.2	6.
C-	23.7	19.5
C	27.	33.
C+	18.2	22.
B	10.2	7.
A	2.2	3.5

In the above comparison, we have a fine example of the tendency of recidivists to be grouped about the average. In this group, however, there is not so large a percentage of superior men among the recidivists or the first offenders, and the recidivists and the first offenders are more nearly alike in all respects except in the case of the C men.

Let us observe a comparison of the recidivists and the first offenders in the third group, the "common thievery" group.

Alpha Scores	Cases First Offenders	Cases of Recidivists	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	15	19	5.8	7.6
10- 14	9	10	3.5	4.
15- 19	11	7	4.3	2.8
20- 24	18	12	7.	4.8
25- 34	18	19	7.	7.6
35- 44	26	25	10.1	10.
45- 59	34	36	13.2	14.3
60- 74	30	35	11.7	14.
75- 89	34	24	13.2	9.6
90-104	26	29	10.1	11.6
105-119	12	17	4.7	6.8
120-134	11	9	4.3	3.6
135-149	7	4	2.7	1.6
150-212	6	5	2.3	2.

Translating into letter grades for convenience, we have:

Letter Grades	Percentage First	Percentage of Recidivists
E	9.3	11.6
D	11.3	7.6
C-	17.1	17.6
C	24.9	28.3
C+	23.3	21.2
B	9.	10.4
A	5.	3.6

Here again, the recidivists and the first offenders do not differ so much in the percentages of superior men or of inferior men, but rather in the percentage of average men.

In the case of the statutory offenses, there are only 69 cases, of which 18 are first offenders and 51 are recidivists. This in it-

self is the most important fact that can be pointed out concerning this group. The cases are too few for a comparative distribution, but we shall make such a distribution for purposes of completion.

Alpha Scores	Cases First Offenders	Cases of Recidivists	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	3	2	16.6	4.
10- 14	2	1	11.1	2.
15- 19	2	2	11.1	4.
20- 24	1	4	5.5	8.
25- 34	3	5	16.6	10.
35- 44	0	2	4.
45- 59	3	11	16.6	22.
60- 74	2	9	11.1	18.
75- 89	2	5	11.1	10.
90-104	0	6	12.
105-119	0	3	6.
120-134	0	0
135-149	0	1	2.
150-212	0	0

Translating into the letter grades:

Letter Grades	Percentage First	Percentage of Recidivists
E	27.7	6.
D	16.6	12.
C-	16.3	14.
C	27.7	40.
C+	11.1	22.
B	6.
A	2.

In the above group, the recidivists are much superior to the first offenders. In spite of that fact, the recidivists are far more numerous than the first offenders through the C range of the Alpha scale.

Let us now observe the distribution of the first offenders and the recidivists in the fifth group, the group of "physical injury" crimes. In this group there are 187 first offenders and 66 recidivists.

Alpha Scores	Cases First Offenders	Cases of Recidivists	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	19	3	10.2	4.5
10- 14	6	0	3.2
15- 19	13	0	7.
20- 24	14	0	7.5
25- 34	24	5	12.8	7.6
35- 44	21	12	11.2	18.2
45- 59	24	12	12.8	18.2
60- 74	12	12	6.4	18.2
75- 89	22	8	11.8	12.1
90-104	11	6	5.9	9.1
105-119	13	1	7.	1.5
120-134	4	2	2.1	3.
135-149	2	3	1.1	4.5
150-212	2	2	1.1	3.

Translating into the letter grades, we have:

Letter Grades	Percentage First	Percentage of Recidivists
E	13.4	4.5
D	14.5
C-	24.	25.8
C	19.2	36.4
C+	17.7	21.2
B	9.1	4.5
A	2.2	7.5

In the above group, the percentages of superior men are about equal in the case of recidivists and first offenders. However, there are very few low grade recidivists and relatively a large number of average recidivists.

In the case of the sixth group, the group of "social dereliction," there are 50 first offenders and only 6 recidivists. This makes it impossible to compare the letter grades of the recidivists and the first offenders, but their distribution on the Alpha scale can be observed.

Alpha Scores	Cases First Offenders	Cases of Recidivists	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	4	0	8.
10- 14	3	0	6.
15- 19	4	1	8.	Omitted
20- 24	0	0
25- 34	6	1	12.	Omitted
35- 44	4	0	8.
45- 59	5	0	10.
60- 74	8	1	16.	Omitted
75 -89	1	0	2.
90-104	4	0	8.
105-119	5	1	10.	Omitted
120-134	2	1	4.	Omitted
135-149	2	0	4.
150-212	2	1	4.	Omitted

The fact of so few recidivists in the above group renders it impossible to discuss the group in this book to much advantage. That problem must lie over till the writer issues his monograph on psychology and the criminal law.

Let us consider next the distribution of first offenders and recidivists in the seventh group, the "sex" group. In this group there are 105 first offenders and 21 recidivists. The number of cases is not large enough for exact comparison, but the distribution on the Alpha scale will be interesting.

Alpha Scores	Cases First Offenders	Cases of Recidivists	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	12	3	11.4	14.3
10- 14	4	4	3.8	19.
15- 19	5	2	4.8	9.5
20- 24	5	2	4.8	9.5
25- 34	14	0	13.3
35- 44	16	2	15.2	9.5
45- 59	5	2	4.8	9.5
60- 74	13	2	12.4	9.5
75- 89	7	2	6.6	9.5
90-104	8	2	7.6	9.5
105-119	8	0	7.6
120-134	2	0	1.9
135-149	3	0	2.9
150-212	3	0	2.9

Translating into the letter grades, we have:

Letter Grades	Percentage First	Percentage of Recidivists
E	15.2	33.3
D	9.6	19.
C-	28.5	9.5
C	17.2	19.
C+	14.2	19.
B	9.5
A	5.8

The recidivists who commit sex crimes are far inferior to the first offenders in these crimes.

6. Geographical Concomitants and Types of Crime of First Offenders and Recidivists. In this discussion also, it must be remembered that in some instances the number of cases is not large enough to merit serious consideration. In all respects, however, the distributions will be given for the sake of future additions and comparisons.

We shall consider the "fraud" group first, in the order of first offenders and of recidivists. The first offenders are distributed as follows:

Alpha Scores	Cases at Home	Cases Away	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	0	0
10- 14	2	1	6.6	1.8
15- 19	2	1	6.6	1.8
20- 24	1	2	3.3	3.6
25- 34	0	5	9.
35- 44	2	3	6.6	5.4
45- 59	1	5	3.3	9.
60- 74	2	5	6.6	9.
75- 89	5	9	16.6	16.1
90-104	2	6	6.6	10.7
105-119	5	5	16.6	9.
120-134	2	4	6.6	7.1
135-149	3	3	10.	5.4
150-212	3	7	10.	12.5

Translating into the letter grades, we have:

Letter Grades	Percentage at Home	Percentage Away
E	6.6	1.8
D	9.9	5.4
C—	6.6	14.4
C	9.9	18.
C+	23.2	26.8
B	23.2	16.1
A	20.	17.9

Let us compare the above distribution of first offenders with the recidivists of the same group. Following is the distribution of the recidivists:

Alpha Scores	Cases at Home	Cases Away	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	1	1	3.	4.2
10- 14	1	0	3.
15- 19	0	1	4.2
20- 24	6	1	17.6	4.2
25- 34	1	1	3.	4.2
35- 44	3	1	8.8	4.2
45- 59	5	1	14.7	4.2
60- 74	8	3	23.5	12.5
75- 89	6	3	17.6	12.5
90-104	1	4	3.	16.6
105-119	0	1	4.2
120-134	1	3	3.	12.5
135-149	0	2	8.3
150-212	1	2	3.	8.3

Translating into the letter grades, we have:

Letter Grades	Percentage at Home	Percentage Away
E	6.	4.2
D	17.6	8.4
C—	11.8	8.4
C	38.2	16.6
C+	20.6	29.1
B	3.	16.7
A	3.	16.6

It appears that in crimes of fraud, the home grown first offenders are about as intelligent as the other first offenders, but the home grown recidivists are quite inferior to the other recidivists. Also, the home grown recidivists contribute quite largely to the phenomenon previously noticed of unusually high percentage of C men among second offenders.

Let us consider next the distributions of the second group, the "property by force" group, taking the first offenders first.

Alpha Scores	Cases at Home	Cases Away	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	8	6	6.1	4.2
10- 14	6	6	4.6	4.2
15- 19	6	4	4.6	2.8
20- 24	6	9	4.6	6.3
25- 34	21	21	16.1	13.9
35- 44	8	15	6.1	10.4
45- 59	20	15	15.4	10.4
60- 74	14	25	10.8	17.4
75- 89	19	13	14.6	9.
90-104	10	8	7.7	5.5
105-119	8	11	6.1	7.6
120-134	4	5	3.1	3.5
135-149	0	4	2.8
150-212	0	2	1.4

Translating into the letter grades, we have:

Letter Grades	Percentage at Home	Percentage Away
E	10.7	8.4
D	9.2	9.1
C-	22.2	24.3
C	26.2	27.8
C+	22.3	14.5
B	9.2	11.1
A	4.2

Treating the recidivists in the same way, we have:

Alpha Scores	Cases at Home	Cases Away	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	9	4	8.4	4.3
10- 14	3	2	2.8	2.1
15- 19	4	3	3.7	3.2
20- 24	5	0	4.7
25- 34	8	8	7.5	8.6
35- 44	8	15	7.5	16.1
45- 59	18	15	16.8	16.1
60- 74	16	17	15.	18.3
75- 89	14	7	13.1	7.5
90-104	12	11	11.2	11.8
105-119	5	6	4.7	6.5
120-134	1	2	.9	2.1
135-149	4	2	3.7	2.1
150-212	0	1	1.1

Translating into the letter grades, we have:

Letter Grades	Percentage at Home	Percentage Away
E	11.2	6.4
D	8.4	3.2
C-	15.	24.7
C	31.8	34.4
C+	24.3	19.3
B	5.6	8.6
A	3.7	3.2

It is interesting that the home grown first offenders and recidivists in this group show a large percentage of men in the C range, a phenomenon that is just the reverse among the first offenders and recidivists in the "fraud" group. There are probably some common factors in the wandering forger and the individual who is a burglar in his own community. Otherwise, the geographical factors are not so keenly in evidence in this group.

Let us consider next similar distributions of the third group, the "common thievery" group, taking the first offenders and then the recidivists.

Alpha Scores	Cases at Home	Cases Away	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	12	3	8.7	2.5
10- 14	6	3	4.3	2.5
15- 19	8	3	5.8	2.5
20- 24	7	10	5.1	8.5
25- 34	7	11	5.1	9.3
35- 44	17	9	12.3	7.6
45- 59	17	17	12.3	14.4
60- 74	13	17	9.4	14.4
75- 89	23	11	16.6	9.3
90-104	14	12	10.1	10.1
105-119	7	5	5.1	4.2
120-134	3	8	2.2	6.8
135-149	1	6	.7	5.1
150-212	3	3	2.2	2.5

Translating into the letter grades, we have:

Letter Grades	Percentage at Home	Percentage Away
E	13.	5.
D	10.9	11.
C-	17.4	16.9
C	21.7	28.8
C+	26.7	19.4
B	7.3	11.
A	2.9	7.6

Making the same distribution for the recidivists, we have the following:

Alpha Scores	Cases at Home	Cases Away	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	13	6	9.4	5.3
10- 14	7	3	5.1	2.7
15- 19	3	4	2.2	3.5
20- 24	9	3	6.5	2.7
25- 34	14	5	10.1	4.4
35- 44	19	6	13.8	5.3
45- 59	18	18	13.	15.9
60- 74	12	23	8.7	20.4
75- 89	19	5	13.8	4.4
90-104	14	15	10.1	13.3
105-119	8	9	5.8	8.
120-134	0	9	8.
135-149	2	2	1.4	1.8
150-212	0	5	4.4

Translating into the letter grades, we have:

Letter Grades	Percentage at Home	Percentage Away
E	14.5	8.
D	8.7	6.2
C-	23.9	9.7
C	21.7	36.3
C+	23.9	17.7
B	5.8	16.
A	1.4	6.2

The home grown first offenders and recidivists show a high percentage of C cases, just as in the case of the second type group. The home grown recidivists show a relatively low percentage of average or C cases, while the other recidivists show an unusually high percentage of such C cases. In fact, the distributions of the two groups of recidivists are markedly different.

In the case of the fourth group, the "statutory group," the number of cases is not large enough for accurate comparison. However, for the sake of future additions, the distributions will be given. In the case of the first offenders, the percentages will not be given, but the percentages will be given in the case of the recidivists. There are only 18 of the first offenders and 51 of the recidivists. Even in the case of the recidivists, the number is too small for accurate comparison. The distribution of the first offenders is as follows:

Alpha Scores	Cases at Home	Cases Away	Percentages Are Omitted
0- 9	2	1	
10- 14	2	0	
15- 19	1	1	
20- 24	0	1	
25- 34	0	3	
35- 44	0	0	
45- 59	2	1	
60- 74	0	2	
75- 89	0	2	
90-104	0	0	
105-119	0	0	
120-134	0	0	
135-149	0	0	
150-212	0	0	

Making a similar distribution for the recidivists, but also giving the percentages for purposes of gross comparison, we have the following:

Alpha Scores	Cases at Home	Cases Away	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	2	0	8.
10- 14	1	0	4.
15- 19	1	1	4.	3.8
20- 24	3	1	12.	3.8
25- 34	2	3	8.	11.5
35- 44	1	1	4.	3.8
45- 59	6	5	24.	19.3
60- 74	5	4	20.	15.4
75- 89	2	3	8.	11.5
90-104	2	4	8.	15.4
105-119	0	3	11.5
120-134	0	0
135-149	0	1	3.8
150-212	0	0

Translating into the letter grades, we have:

Letter Grades	Percentage at Home	Percentage Away
E	12.
D	16.	7.6
C-	12.	15.3
C	44.	34.7
C+	16.	26.9
B	11.5
A	3.8

Among the recidivists above, the number of C men is unusually high, while the number of C among those born outside the state in which incarcerated is unusually high as in the case of the "fraudulent group." In general, statutory crimes are committed by recidivists. The first offenders who do commit such crimes are of low average intelligence—provided they are convicted!

The distributions of the fifth group, the physical injury group, will now be considered. The first offenders give the following distribution:

Alpha Scores	Cases at Home	Cases Away	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	14	5	11.9	7.2
10- 14	2	4	1.7	5.8
15- 19	7	6	5.9	8.7
20- 24	10	4	8.5	5.8
25- 34	14	10	11.9	14.5
35- 44	13	8	11.	11.6
45- 59	19	5	16.1	7.2
60- 74	7	5	5.9	7.2
75- 89	15	7	12.7	10.1
90-104	5	6	4.2	8.7
105-119	7	6	5.9	8.7
120-134	2	2	1.7	2.9
135-149	1	1	.8	1.4
150-212	2	0	1.7

Translating into the letter grades, we have:

Letter Grades	Percentage at Home	Percentage Away
E	13.6	13.
D	14.4	14.5
C-	22.9	26.1
C	22.	14.4
C+	16.9	18.8
B	7.6	11.6
A	2.5	1.4

The low percentage of C men among those incarcerated outside their home state should be noted. Making the same distribution for the recidivists, we have the following:

Alpha Scores	Cases at Home	Cases Away	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	1	2	2.3	8.7
10- 14	0	0
15- 19	0	0
20- 24	0	0
25- 34	3	2	7.	8.7
35- 44	12	0	27.9	...
45- 59	9	3	20.9	13.
60- 74	8	4	18.6	17.4
75- 89	4	4	9.3	17.4
90-104	3	3	7.	13.
105-119	1	0	2.3	...
120-134	1	1	2.3	4.3
135-149	1	2	2.3	8.7
150-212	0	2	...	8.7

Translating into the letter grades, we have:

Letter Grades	Percentage at Home	Percentage Away
E	2.3	8.7
D
C-	34.9	8.7
C	39.5	30.4
C+	16.3	30.4
B	4.6	4.3
A	2.3	17.4

The high percentage of C men among the home grown recidivists should be noted, equally with the high percentage of C men among the recidivists incarcerated outside their home state. It also is of significance that recidivists of very low intelligence are not likely to commit crimes of this nature. The opposite has usually been taken for granted. This type of criminal does not vary widely from average intelligence. The recidivists have an unusually small standard deviation.

Let us consider now the sixth group, the social dereliction group. Such crimes are rarely committed by any but first offenders, and these

first offenders are usually far from their home state. Crimes of social dereliction are closely related to the breaking of community ties. Of the 57 cases in this type group, there are only 6 recidivists. Of the first offenders, 16 are home grown and 35 are from other states. Of the six recidivists, only two are home grown. For the convenience of future additions, the distribution of the six recidivists is given as follows:

Alpha Scores	Cases at Home	Cases Away	Alpha Scores	Cases at Home	Cases Away
0- 9	0	0	60- 74	1	0
10-14	0	0	75- 89	0	0
15-19	1	0	90-104	0	0
20-24	0	0	105-119	0	1
25-34	0	1	120-134	0	1
35-44	0	0	135-149	0	0
45-59	0	0	150-212	0	1

The 51 first offenders give the following distribution:

Alpha Scores	Cases at Home	Cases Away	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	2	2	12.5	5.7
10- 14	1	2	6.2	5.7
15- 19	1	3	6.2	8.6
20- 24	0	0
25- 34	1	5	6.2	14.3
35- 44	1	3	6.2	8.6
45- 59	2	3	12.5	8.6
60- 74	2	6	12.5	17.1
75- 89	1	0	6.2	...
90-104	3	2	18.7	5.7
105-119	1	4	6.2	11.4
120-134	0	2	...	5.7
135-149	0	2	...	5.7
150-212	1	1	6.2	2.9

Translating into the letter grades, we have:

Letter Grades	Percentage at Home	Percentage Away
E	18.7	11.4
D	6.2	8.6
C-	12.4	22.9
C	25.	25.7
C+	24.9	5.7
B	6.2	17.1
A	6.2	8.6

Perhaps, in the light of the small number of cases, it will be better not to point out the characteristics of the above distributions. The distributions will be valuable for future additions.

In the group of sex crimes, there are only 21 recidivists. But

19 of these 21 recidivists are home grown, which is an important fact to note. The distribution of the 21 recidivists is as follows:

Alpha Scores	Cases at Home	Cases Away	Alpha Scores	Cases at Home	Cases Away
0- 9	2	1	60- 74	2	0
10-14	4	0	75- 89	2	0
15-19	2	0	90-104	2	0
20-24	2	0	105-119	0	0
25-34	0	0	120-134	0	0
35-44	1	1	135-149	0	0
45-59	2	0	150-212	0	0

The lack of high grade intelligence in the above recidivists is the most outstanding characteristic. The more intelligent professional criminals simply are not convicted of these crimes. This is certainly not because intelligent men do not desire such behavior, for some of the first offenders in such crimes are very intelligent men and highly educated. There is a logical inconsistency in the social degradation that is heaped upon these men. They are much better citizens than are the forgers and embezzlers.

The first offenders in the sex crimes give the following distribution:

Alpha Scores	Cases at Home	Cases Away	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	8	4	13.3	9.5
10- 14	3	1	5.	2.4
15- 19	1	4	1.7	9.5
20- 24	6	0	10.	...
25- 34	9	5	15.	11.9
35- 44	9	7	15.	16.6
45- 59	3	2	5.	4.8
60- 74	3	10	5.	23.8
75- 89	4	3	6.6	7.1
90-104	6	2	10.	4.8
105-119	3	5	5.	11.9
120-134	1	1	1.7	2.4
135-149	2	1	3.3	2.4
150-212	2	1	3.3	2.4

Translating into the letter grades, we have:

Letter Grades	Percentage at Home	Percentage Away
E	18.3	11.9
D	11.7	9.5
C-	30.	28.5
C	10.	28.6
C+	16.6	11.9
B	6.7	14.3
A	6.6	4.8

The usually small number of average or C men among the home grown first offenders is especially to be noted. The two distributions

of first offenders are both tri-modal in form. Future additions and analyses will be necessary for an interpretation.

7. Recidivism in Relation to West, South and North. It might be well, since we have referred to the three traditional sections of the country in relation to crime, to give the distributions of first offenders and recidivists in each of those traditional sections.

Let us consider first the cases from the "West."

Alpha. Scores	Cases First Offenders	Cases of Recidivists	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	2	2	3.1	7.1
10- 14	1	1	1.6	3.6
15- 19	0	0
20- 24	3	2	4.7	7.1
25- 34	9	1	14.	3.6
35- 44	5	1	7.8	3.6
45- 59	6	1	9.4	3.6
60- 74	9	5	14.	17.8
75- 89	8	4	12.5	14.3
90-104	7	5	11.	17.8
105-119	6	5	9.4	17.8
120-134	2	0	3.1	...
135-149	4	0	6.2	...
150-212	2	1	3.1	3.6

Translating into the letter grades, we have:

Letter Grades	Percentage of First	Percentage of Recidivists
E	4.7	10.7
D	4.7	7.1
C-	21.8	7.2
C	23.4	21.4
C+	23.5	32.1
B	12.5	17.8
A	9.3	3.6

Approximately one-third of the recidivists are in the C range, while a very small percentage are located in the C— range.

Let us consider in the same way the first offenders and recidivists from the "South."

Alpha. Scores	Cases First Offenders	Cases of Recidivists	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	8	3	9.2	6.7
10- 14	3	2	3.4	4.4
15- 19	5	1	5.7	2.2
20- 24	2	1	2.3	2.2
25- 34	12	4	13.8	8.9
35- 44	9	6	10.3	13.3
45- 59	7	8	8.1	17.8
60- 74	16	9	18.4	20.
75- 89	11	4	12.7	8.9
90-104	2	4	2.3	8.9
105-119	4	2	4.6	4.4
120-134	5	1	5.7	2.2
135-149	0	0
150-212	3	0	3.4	..

Translating into the letter grades, we have:

Letter Grades	Percentage of First	Percentage of Recidivists
E	12.6	11.1
D	8.	4.4
C-	24.1	22.2
C	26.5	37.8
C+	15.	17.8
B	10.3	6.6
A	3.4	...

The criminals from the "South" are of an average much lower than from the other two traditional sections. As a result, the relative position of the unusually high percentage of C men among the recidivists is about the same as the C range among the recidivists of the other sections. But, as in the case of the western group, there is a high percentage of C- men among the first offenders.

Let us consider next the groups from the "North."

Alpha. Scores	Cases First Offenders	Cases of Recidivists	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	13	7	4.9	4.4
10- 14	10	1	3.8	.6
15- 19	13	6	4.9	3.8
20- 24	18	2	6.8	1.3
25- 34	29	12	11.	7.6
35- 44	27	13	10.2	8.2
45- 59	30	30	11.4	19.
60- 74	38	24	14.4	15.2
75- 89	19	9	7.2	5.7
90-104	23	20	8.7	12.7
105-119	18	8	6.8	5.1
120-134	7	10	2.7	6.3
135-149	10	7	3.8	4.4
150-212	9	9	3.4	5.7

Translating into the letter grades, we have:

Letter Grades	Percentage of First	Percentage of Recidivists
E	8.7	5.
D	11.7	5.1
C-	21.2	15.8
C	25.8	34.2
C+	15.9	18.4
B	9.5	11.4
A	7.2	10.1

In the northern group also, we find an unusually high percentage of C men among the recidivists. But the point of especial significance is the fact that the northern recidivists as a group are unusually intelligent as compared to the first offenders. Such is not the case with the southern and western groups. And it is also important to notice that a much larger percentage of northern criminals are recidivists than in the case of the southern and western criminals. It appears

that the factors of recidivism are more nearly related to the characteristics of the northern states, than to the characteristics of the southern or western states. Such at least is a fair hypothesis.

8. Uniformity and Variety in Recidivistic Behavior. Much has been published by the police and other newspaper writers concerning the individual uniformity of criminal behavior. For example, it has been claimed that burglars specialize on particular methods of breaking into houses, some being known as bath-room specialists, others as basement-window specialists, etc. It has been claimed by some that notorious burglars have been traced by their known peculiar and unvarying methods of behavior. No one claims that all criminals can be thus classified. But, in the light of such reports, it might be interesting to compare the recidivists who commit the same crime time after time with the recidivists who vary their criminal behavior. Will the Alpha test indicate any difference between the forger who commits forgery time after time and the individual who deviates from forgery into larceny and rape?

In this discussion, the Maryland data will have to be omitted, since the Maryland records do not indicate the cause of the previous conviction. So the discussion will be based on the Indiana and New Jersey data. We shall consider the type-groups in order, then the total. Let us consider the "fraud group" first.

Alpha Scores	Cases of Variation	Cases of Uniformity	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	2	0	7.7	...
10- 14	1	0	3.8	...
15- 19	1	0	3.8	...
20- 24	3	3	11.5	11.5
25- 34	0	1	...	3.8
35- 44	4	0	15.4	...
45- 59	3	3	11.5	11.5
60- 74	5	4	19.2	15.4
75- 89	2	6	7.7	23.1
90-104	2	2	7.7	7.7
105-119	1	0	3.8	...
120-134	1	3	3.8	11.5
135-149	1	1	3.8	3.8
150-212	0	3	...	11.5

Translating into the letter grades, we have:

Letter Grades	Percentage Variation	Percentage Uniformity
E	11.5	...
D	15.3	11.5
C-	15.4	3.8
C	30.7	26.9
C+	15.4	30.8
B	7.6	11.5
A	3.8	15.3

It is seen that the individuals who persist in the commission of the same crime are more intelligent as a group than are the individuals who have varied their criminal behavior by the commission of dissimilar crimes.

Let us continue with the second type-group, the "force group."

Alpha Scores	Cases of Variants	Cases of Constants	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	8	5	7.	6.8
10- 14	1	2	.8	2.7
15- 19	5	4	4.3	5.5
20- 24	4	0	3.5	...
25- 34	12	3	10.4	4.1
35- 44	13	11	11.3	15.1
45- 59	16	14	13.9	19.2
60- 74	21	12	18.2	16.4
75- 89	9	8	7.8	11.
90-104	15	5	13.	6.8
105-119	7	4	6.1	5.5
120-134	2	2	1.7	2.7
135-149	2	3	1.7	4.1
150-212	0	0

Translating into the letter grades, we have:

Letter Grades	Percentage of Variants	Percentage of Constants
E	7.8	9.5
D	7.8	5.5
C-	21.7	19.2
C	32.1	35.6
C+	20.8	17.8
B	7.8	8.2
A	1.7	4.1

Here, the differences are not marked, but are slightly to the advantage of the constants.

Let us proceed to the third group, the "thievery" group.

Alpha Scores	Cases of Variants	Cases of Constants	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	8	10	8.9	6.8
10- 14	4	6	4.4	4.1
15- 19	3	3	3.3	2.1
20- 24	4	7	4.4	4.8
25- 34	5	11	5.5	7.5
35- 44	15	11	16.6	7.5
45- 59	14	16	15.5	10.0
60- 74	14	21	15.5	14.4
75- 89	4	18	4.4	12.3
90-104	10	19	11.1	13.
105-119	5	11	5.5	7.5
120-134	4	6	4.4	4.1
135-149	0	3	...	2.1
150-212	1	4	1.1	2.7

Translating into the letter grades, we have:

Letter Grades	Percentage of Variants	Percentage of Constants
E	13.3	10.9
D	7.7	6.9
C-	22.1	15.
C	31.	25.3
C+	15.5	25.3
B	9.9	11.6
A	1.1	4.8

Here also, the differences are in favor of the constants.

In the "statutory group," there are 50 variants and only 2 constants. In the "physical injury group," there are 47 variants and 9 constants. In the group of "social dereliction," there are 4 variants and only 1 constant. In the "sex group," there are 18 variants and 2 constants. As a result, the distributions of the last four groups will not be worth giving. Therefore, we shall next give the distributions of the total variants and constants.

Alpha Scores	Cases of Variants	Cases of Constants	Percentage of Former	Percentage of Latter
0- 9	23	18	6.6	6.6
10- 14	11	8	3.1	3.
15- 19	14	7	4.	2.6
20- 24	17	10	4.9	3.7
25- 34	27	17	7.7	6.3
35- 44	45	23	12.9	8.5
45- 59	54	34	15.4	12.6
60- 74	60	40	17.1	14.8
75- 89	27	34	7.7	12.6
90-104	41	36	11.7	13.3
105-119	18	15	5.1	5.5
120-134	9	12	2.6	4.4
135-149	4	7	1.1	2.6
150-212	1	8	.3	3.

Letter Grades	Percentage of Variants	Percentage of Constants
E	9.7	9.6
D	8.9	6.3
C-	20.6	14.8
C	32.5	27.4
C+	19.4	25.9
B	7.7	9.9
A	1.4	5.6

It is possible that the above facts might tend to contradict certain previous explanations used in this book. If such should be the case, the author will not be embarrassed, since he is more interested in discovering the truth than he is in establishing his own ideas. But, of course, it is possible that constancy of criminal behavior may not be interpreted as being conservatism on the part of the criminal!

It is significant that uniformity in recidivistic behavior is confined almost entirely to crimes involving the possession of property—the first three of the type-groups. Crimes of physical violence are almost never committed by individuals who have committed such crimes before. That in itself indicates the emotional complexes connected with such behavior to be causative factors. Certainly, it would be interesting to analyze the theory and practice of criminal law in the light of the psychological and other factors concomitant with recidivism.