1926

Crime from a Psychiatrist's Point of View

Charles W. Burr

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

Charles W. Burr, Crime from a Psychiatrist's Point of View, 16 J. Am. Inst. Crim. L. & Criminology 519 (May 1925 to February 1926)

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.

CRIME FROM A PSYCHIATRIST'S POINT OF VIEW¹

CHARLES W. BURR, M. D.²

Psychology is the last of the sciences to become useful. Formerly, under the influence of scholasticism, it was purely theoretical. Profoundly educated men, born with a metaphysical trend, who held themselves aloof from the study of natural history, as it was then called, and looked with some disdain on chemists and physicists, as rather inferior persons who wasted time studying matter, studied, by introspection, their own mental processes and excogitated hypotheses to explain thought. Many were unconsciously biased by the theological training they received at home, in school and at the universities; some, born conservatives, consciously believed it was their duty to fight for traditional truth against all comers; a few, born with the spirit of revolt, broke loose and tried to disprove, by reason, beliefs with which reason has no relation, but which can only be accepted or rejected by faith. The old, scholastic psychology has gone somewhat out of favor, because of new methods of study, partly resulting from, and partly causing, the changed attitude of men of science of today.

The psychology of today has a wider field, and has welcomed aid from other sciences. The first step forward, or, at least, in breaking away from traditional methods of study, was in accepting the results of the study of cerebral physiology as throwing light on such questions as sensation, the special senses, speech and motion. The discovery that certain parts of the brain have special functions, caused a change in the psychologic point of view. A very vital and important step was combining the study of psychiatry with psychology, in the hope that each would illuminate the other. So far, the result has not been as fruitful as was hoped, but it was a tremendous step in advance to realize that a diseased mind is not a mind that has been acted on by some mysterious thing, but a machine out of order.

The study of child psychology and the careful observation of the development and growth of the mind from infancy, through adolescence and up to maturity is bound to lead to improvements in methods of education, and may throw some light on processes of thought. For

¹Presidential Address at the Eugenics Research Association, Thirteenth Annual Meeting, at Cold Spring Harbor, Long Island, June 27, 1925.

²Professor of Mental Diseases, University of Pennsylvania.

example, we are today quite ignorant as to the average age, and how wide are the normal age limits, at which the different mental qualities appear. When does color begin to cause pleasure? When does the child begin to get pleasure and pain from sound? When does form first arouse aesthetic interest. In general, what is the order, if there be any order, in which sensations arouse aesthetic feeling? When does a sense of right and wrong begin? What racial differences are there in mental growth? Hundreds of questions like these need to be studied. Knowledge of them may lead to very important results.

How far comparative psychology, the study of mental processes in the animal world, will throw light on the human mind, no one can foretell. Accepting as true the dogma that emotion is separate and distinct from reason, then the study of emotion (its physical causes) in animals may help us. It is probable, indeed, it seems to be proven, that emotion is present not only in the anthropoid apes, but in many mammals, and may be present in lower vertebrates. So far, we have no means of discovering the existence of emotion in animals lower in the scale. Their nervous systems are so unlike our own, their sense organs so different, that we cannot be sure even that their sensations, let alone their emotions, if they have any, are in any way comparable to ours. They probably are sensitive to rays that do not affect us in any way, and whether such rays act purely reflexly or consciously, we can not know. But anthropoids, dogs, elephants, and several other mammals certainly have emotions such as love (in its lower manifestations), jealousy, and hate (the memory of pain, with anger, at the presence again of the person or animal causing it). The fact that emotion exists in man's older ancestors, in which reason, either does not appear, or is present only as the shadow of what later will grow, means that it is more fundamental than reason. Its longer heredity means its greater fixity, its greater importance.

Memory, too, has been handed down from man's prehuman ancestors. It is widespread throughout the higher animal world, but how low down it begins is unknown and probably unknowable or rather undiscoverable. There is, even in the multicellular organisms, a cell memory, which may exist without consciousness. Indeed, memory is always unconscious; only the act of recollection is conscious. Most important of all, we have no means of knowing where in the animal scale consciousness begins. A discussion of memory and consciousness, however, would lead us too far away, and finally land us in that country of dreams, if not of nightmares, metaphysics.

When we pass from memory and emotion to reason, pure intellect, there seems to be almost a complete break between the highest animals and man. There has, of course, been a great deal of nonsense written both by the animal lovers, who wish to prove kinship, and the theologically minded who wish to disprove it. For example, members of the first group gravely tell us, that a dog saves a baby from an angry sea out of good-heartedness, and because it reasons that, if not saved, the child will drown. When we, i. e., men of my mental species, tell the animal lovers that a dog would, and repeatedly has, saved a stick floating in the waves, and that such acts do not prove reasoning powers, they react toward us in a way which illustrates how much more deep-seated emotion is in man, than reason. On the other hand, mammals do show fragmentary signs of ability to reason. For example, one of Prof. Kohler's apes did, spontaneously and without teaching, join one stick to another, in order to make a pole long enough to reach fruit and draw it to him.

The study of the animal mind is beset with obstacles, because, in the absence of speech in animals, we can draw conclusions only from their behavior, from their acts. There is a great temptation to assume, especially when, after a series of complicated acts, the material result is well fitted for its purpose (as often occurs, e. g., in the nests of birds) that reason controlled the acts. Thus, the cells of the honey comb are architecturally well fitted for their purpose. But, for reasons dependent on the laws of mechanics, and entirely outside the reasoned wish of the bee, it must make the comb as it does. This has been proven experimentally with soap bubbles. Much that has been written to prove reasoning power in animals has a sentimental origin. Thus, Kropotkin's book on "mutual aid" assumes great intelligence in animals, especially those living in societies, but then Kropotkin was a sincere anarchist, and that, in human clinical psychology means he was a sick emotionalist. The truth is that anthropoid apes have rudimentary and fragmentary powers of reasoning, similar in kind to that found in man, but in them, and in several other mammals, the emotional nature is much more nearly allied to that of man.

The field of psychology has, therefore, as just shown, been widened in the present generation. The important result has been, so far, not so much the increase in knowledge, as the alteration of the point of view. The study of mind has been taken out of the domain of metaphysics and philosophy and has become one of the biological sciences.

What has all this to do with us, students of eugenics? Much more than you would, at first blush, think, and for this reason, psychiatry is

today much interested in the study of people who come in conflict with the law, and if the conclusions that some psychiatrists have come to are correct, then it is the duty of every student of eugenics carefully to study the matter, whatever his final opinion may be.

Let us first review, briefly, the changes in popular belief in psychiatric matters. A very interesting book could be written on the history of popular opinion as regards insanity. I have not the time, nor is this the occasion, for me more than very briefly to sketch out the change that has taken place in the last hundred years, first in scientific, and later in popular opinion. Up to the time of Pinel in France, and later in England, but little attention had been paid to the study of mental disease. There still lingered, indeed flourished, the idea that insanity was a visitation of God. Long after the physical world was acknowledged, by everybody, to be ruled by law, the mind was supposed to be outside of, or above law. God and the devil both intervened in, or interfered with, its action. Soon after, Pinel, on humanitarian grounds, began to preach that madmen should be treated as human beings, one of the by-products of his teaching was the arousing of a scientific interest in insanity. This was the birth of modern psychiatry. Very soon the question of the responsibility of the mentally ill began to receive great attention. Not very long after, insanity began to be pled in defense in murder cases. Let me say, parenthetically, that for centuries madness and idiocy had been recognized by courts, but the madness had to be of a kind that the wayfaring man though a fool would recognize. For many years nothing happened, except that occasionally in this country and in England, a man, who in the old days would have been hung, was sent to an asylum for the insane, and more and more people became interested in the study of criminals, some from purely humanitarian motives, some from the unemotional point of view of science. About a quarter of a century ago in this country, insanity rapidly became more frequent as a defense and finally resulted in much scandal, even in accusations of bribery of mental experts, until today it is said, and with little exaggeration, that judges and juries pay no attention to expert opinion. But good is coming out of evil, for more and more men, both special students of the subject and clear-thinking citizens, are becoming interested in the relation of crime to disease.

Our business, as eugenists, is to discover what crime is, what are its causes inside and outside the individual, what criminals are, and also, the proper treatment of them from the point of view of the welfare of the race.

First, we must define terms, a thing necessary in any discussion, but vitally so when, as in this matter, lawyers on the one hand and psychiatrists on the other, have been using the same words to mean different things. The legal definition of crime is simple, the doing of anything the law forbids or the not doing of anything that law orders to be done, or assumes a man will do. In law, crime is not synonymous with sin. Crime assumes injury to the state; sin is injurious to the man's immortal soul, and hence, against the moral (i. e., the church) law. A criminal is a person who commits a crime. I think my definitions though simple, are accurate and would be accepted in any court.

Psychiatrists contend that the legal definitions are arbitrary, unscientific, and untrue. They maintain that criminality is a state of mind, that there are a certain number of people who, either because of inherited or congenital twists in mental make-up, or from acquired disease, are so unlike the rest of the community, in which they live, that they are asocial and hence criminal; that there are people who can not be taught a sense of duty toward their fellows, people who are morally color blind; that a man may be a criminal and yet never commit a crime, because his environment is such that, he can satisfy all his desires without coming in conflict with the law, and finally, that putting to one side, the question of free will in normal people, the criminal is so controlled by emotional impulse that reason plays a very minor part in his life.

To the psychiatrists, therefore, the criminal's act is of secondary importance; his mental make-up impelling him to it is the primarily important thing which stamps him as belonging to a species mentally unlike his fellow men. The act is, therefore, merely a symptom to be interpreted; in law, the act itself is the thing which makes the man a criminal.

From still another point of view, law and psychiatry are antagonistic. Law today maintains (it gave up the notion of vengeance long ago) that the purpose of punishment is to deter others, to keep the criminal out of mischief forever or for a time, and to give him an opportunity to think over the wisdom of changing his mode of life. The thorough going psychiatrist maintains, the criminal is an abnormal man, who should be treated as a patient and when, as is usually the case, the abnormality is congenital and the result of heredity, there is no hope of cure; when it is the result of acquired disease, the outlook is a little better.

Once more, I must emphasize the fact that every one who commits a crime (in law) is not a criminal (psychiatrically). Many youths, and a smaller number of men of mature age, under the stress of sudden temptation or in moments of anger or passion, commit crime, but are not criminals in the sense I am using the word. They frequently, not only never come in conflict with the law a second time, but often maintain, through life, a normal power of inhibition over criminal impulses. They belong to that relatively large class, who are profoundly influenced by environment and who can be taught self-control to a greater or less degree, varying with the individual. There is still another type of man, morally lower, who escapes conflict with the law; he who is kept straight both by fear of punishment and selfish regard for public opinion, who decides early in life "crime does not pay." His real nature often comes to the surface in the crimes of his children.

What I have said, I think correctly represents the old legal attitude, but matters now are complicated by the fact that a recent creation, the municipal and juvenile courts, are all more or less, and some completely, under the control of men profoundly influenced by the most recent and sometimes very ill-digested opinions of the most rabid psychiatrists, men who are themselves controlled by emotion, not by reason. The result is, that boys and girls, guilty of crime, are treated as if they were the innocent victims of a terrible civilization. Too often they are put into the hands of incompetent social workers to be studied and guided. No unmarried young woman should be allowed to undertake such work, and no boy over ten should be in the control of a woman. Now let us see if, by a clinical study of crime and criminals, trying to keep from being controlled by emotion, that oldest and most powerful quality of man, we can throw any light on this important question.

It is the more necessary to let reason, not feeling, guide us, because the world is passing through a period of intellectual rebellion, perhaps revolution, which is affecting, and infecting, all of us and making even the most rationally controlled sometimes uncertain of their own mental stability. In the physical sciences, the very foundations have been uprooted. Our conceptions of atoms and molecules have changed entirely. One generation ago, molecules were represented as minute spheres, and the text books on physics had simple diagrams, resembling piles of old-fashioned cannon balls; today we are told, and believe, they are little solar systems. Relativity is so complex, that probably less than five thousand men, out of the two billion inhabitants of the

earth, really comprehend it, but we all believe in it. The universal ether, formerly accepted as explaining so many things, has, or so I understand, ceased to exist. The same spirit of rebellion has attacked psychology, and, it almost seems proven, so weird and fantastic are some of the doctrines taught, that the old saying that psychiatrists are a little, if not altogether mad, could, with truth, be applied to our tamer brothers, the psychologists. Indeed, one school, which appropriates as its own property the phrase "new psychology" and denies to any one else the right to use the word "psychoanalysis," not only exhibits madness in some of its disciples, but a curiously abnormal taste in hunting up nasty interpretations of dreams. I refer to Freudism. It is a psychology based solely on sex. (I ought in fairness to say that when the public balked at swallowing pure, crude sex as the one motive in life, Freud and some of his disciples explained that "libido" means sex only figuratively.) They use "libido" psychologically, in a Pickwickian sense. Freudism is built on assumptions. It assumes an unconscious mind, that dreams are struggles of the unconscious mind to assert itself in sleep, that "free association" reveals the real nature of a man. None of these assumptions are proven; no attempt is made to prove them. They are accepted as axiomatic. Yet, though it assumes much and proves nothing, it is the most popular psychology today. It calls itself science, and science is the people's God. Hence, "the people" worship it. It is significant that Leon Trotsky, the Bolshevik leader, regards it favorably.

The kernel of the whole matter we are studying is the answer we may give to a question discussed by Plato two thousand years ago, and probably it was an old question then, do healthy-minded men lead criminal lives? And in this is included the larger question still, is a man a free agent, the captain of his soul, the determiner of his own destiny? To assume that we can answer these questions correctly, is to assume the infallibility of human reason, the omniscience of human mind. They are, of course, unanswerable. The nearest we can get to the truth is to endeavor to reach pragmatic truth, namely, to accept as true the opinion which, acted on, will influence, as far as man can influence, civilization for its own good.

How strongly is man's nature influenced by factors beyond his control? First, heredity. Even the most violent believers in environmental influences admit that heredity is so far important, that animals and plants can breed only their own kind. Even the wilfully ignorant admit the inheritance of individual physical qualities, e. g., hair and skin color, height, facial expression and the like. The only question

in dispute is mental inheritance. To say in dispute is to put it too strongly. The denial of mental inheritance is upheld only by the unintelligent. The people who are writing popular books, teaching the young that they are all equal in mind, that they can all be geniuses, if they work hard enough, are not only propagating academic error, that would be harmless, but are actively increasing the number of cases of adolescent mental breakdown. Every psychiatrist sees the wrecks resulting from mental overwork in youths whose ambition is greater than their ability. We must accept the inheritance of mental potentialities.

The type of brain, and the other organs of the body which influence its function, as the organ of mind, each person has, depends on heredity. It is not a mere quantitative matter. The type of mind depends primarily on the nerve cells, but it is probable that the calibre of the blood vessels within the skull has some influence on mental function, though it has not, as yet, been proven. It is true only in a general way, that the larger the brain, the more and larger the cells, and, therefore, the higher the grade of mental power. A brain under a certain weight means its owner is bound to be an imbecile. On the other hand, it does seem to be a fact, that brains having the greatest number of nerve fibres joining different parts, the so-called association fibres, are best fitted for intellectual work. All these factors depend primarily on inheritance.

There are great differences in quickness, intensity, and character of response to external stimuli. Thus, one person perceives color much more quickly than another, and also has a different emotional reaction to it. One person gets pleasure from color, another is indifferent. The same is true of form. In the purely intellectual functions, one person apprehends quickly, one slowly, and some never apprehend anything beyond the merest rudiments of knowledge.

As to morals, it is probable, that some misconduct is due to the fact that, in some people, external stimuli act more strongly, than on the normal man, or in a different way. Thus, in the case of the periodic drinker, alcohol causes sensations that the normal man never feels. This, too, depends on heredity.

The most important factor, in morals, is power of inhibition, which is the technical term for self-control. The normal man's power of inhibition is well developed: in the weakling, it scarcely exists. Fortunately for the human race, it can be improved and strengthened, and the sooner we get away from the false idea that the moral sense

of children depends upon intellectual training (scholarship), and pay more attention to training in self-control, the better.

We know nothing of the method of mental inheritance, not even what is carried from parent to child. How two cells as small as the human egg and sperm can carry potentialities is unknown. But we know experimentally, that children are born with very varying potentialities. The average boy has an average mind, about equally able to develop along all lines. Men of talent are more able in certain things. One has mathematical ability, another is musical, another scientific. Most rare of all, is the genius, who perceives things which the common man never dreams of. He alone creates, and sees relations between things which the common man has always looked at, but never perceived.

There is no relation between amount of intellectual development and the moral sense. Some of the greatest geniuses have been criminals, from the psychiatrist's point of view, while millions of men, with mediocre intellect, have an acute and correct sense of right and wrong. This continues even today, when but little attention is paid to the most important element in education, training in self-control. School ought to be, according to the sentimentalists, one long, sweet time of play, and the child must be allowed to follow his own instincts. Another popular doctrine is that boys must be kept innocent, all knowledge of evil must be hidden from them, never must they be allowed to meet temptation. The result, if and when such ideas are carried out on a large scale, will be moral death. Already, in America, virility is dying.

Before conception, germ cell or sperm cell or both, may contain elements which will lead to the development of a child predestined to be mentally or physically a cripple. Fortunately, the result is not infrequently death in utero. From conception on, there is a never-ceasing battle between the human organism and external forces trying to destroy it. Illness or injury to the mother, during pregnancy, may act injuriously on the embryo. Abnormality of the maternal bony pelvis may, by interfering with labor, cause permanent injury to the newborn, or even death. After birth the child continues to meet obstacles to its development. If they be successfully resisted, new ones appear throughout life, until they finally conquer and death ensues. The normal person is he who can resist till old age comes.

I will omit all reference to the injuries and diseases which result in idiocy and imbecility and consider only those children who are, or at least seem, normal at birth, and escape the results of the common

infectious fevers of childhood, but who later become mentally abnormal, or criminal as defined by the psychiatrist.

Normal children vary much in intellectual ability, much more than in the moral sense. But it is impossible to foretell in childhood what the mental future of the apparently healthy child will be. Because a child develops normally during infancy and childhood, does not prove that normal development will continue. The first critical period is the beginning of puberty, and more people break then, and during adolescence, than at any other time. Criminal instincts also, usually appear then. Boys who will become professional criminals often have histories like the following:

First there is the moral imbecile. He who can never be taught, can never understand, the moral code. As a child, he is a continuous thief and liar, and continues to be cruel long after the period at which the normal boy has complete appreciation of pain in others. The law refuses to recognize this condition, and asserts such children could go straight, if they so desired. The law is in error, as it usually is, when it ceases to use common sense as its guide, and has opinions on technical matters. There is such a thing as moral imbecility, the condition in which, without any or but little intellectual defect, the boy can not understand his duties to his fellows. Intense egotism is the most noticeable characteristic. I have seen, in my own practice, more than a few of these boys. Their world is egocentric. One was inhuman in his complete and supreme selfishness. He began to steal, from the bureau drawer at home, when six years old; when sent to school, at seven, he pilfered from his schoolmates; at twelve, he began to steal larger sums, and, because he was sexually precocious, spent them on pleasures with girls. The amounts grew larger, and his father was kept poor by paying for his thefts. Finally, at fifteen, he was arrested for burglary and taken to jail. While awaiting trial, he was told by his father, that the law would be allowed to take its course. He was convicted, and the same day carried out a threat of suicide. He had told me repeatedly, that unless he could live a free life, by which he meant unless he could obey all his impulses, he would choose death. He was not insane and not an imbecile. He was of average intelligence, and reasoned well on matters that were impersonal. He was neither vain nor conceited, but completely egocentric, and his judgment about himself, save as concerned his conduct, was rational, but he was completely asocial, and could not conceive the idea of duty. He was an animal with the reasoning power of a man.

There is another group of mental defectives, who, while retaining moral sense, degenerate intellectually at, or soon after, puberty. For example, a boy who until twelve, develops just like other children, begins to go backward, to lose power of attention, ambition, and all intellectual interests. Such a boy, grown to manhood, ends as a casual laborer. He does not become a criminal, because the natural reflexes and instincts, which, uncontrolled lead to misconduct, either do not develop or early cease to exist.

The statement, made in some of the popular books on child psychology, that all boys pass through a period of thievery and smuttiness of thought and conduct, is a gross exaggeration. Many boys never think of stealing, after they are old enough to understand what stealing is, and escape also the dirty epoch. A few have such excellent power of inhibition, that even though the environment may be far from good, they go straight.

The outstanding mental defect in professional criminals is the lack of moral sense. Their conduct, not only their criminal acts, but their daily life, shows they lack the social instinct, the one thing that holds society together and makes civilization possible. Man became man, mentally, only when he began to realize intellectually, and appreciate emotionally, that other men have rights. Then only, could families join, to form communities living together. Then human law was born. The most primitive races existing today possess the social instinct. They do not reason about it, and probably would think anyone who asked them, why they have a code of social morals, a very dull and stupid person. They possess it, accept it, and, not being civilized, do not waste time discussing it. It is not fair to claim, that the tribes living now, which we call primitive, are, in all regards, similar to our early human ancestors, but in this matter, they probably are. The social instinct was the first step in civilization. Of course, it is not an instinct in the physiologist's meaning of the word, but merely a special evidence of the moral sense.

Lombrose tried to prove the existence of an anatomical type, indeed several types, of criminals. He failed. The most striking thing in the physiognomies in any jail, is not the presence of the plug ugly type, that is rare, but the number of weak faces. Effeminacy is common, but, of course, is less frequent in those convicted for assault and battery and similar offenses, than in those who live by their wits and commit petty crime, especially petty financial crimes.

In all discussions on crime, great emphasis is laid on murder, indeed, the mental state of other criminals is rarely discussed, but fre-

quent as murder is, and rapidly as it is increasing, in the United States, it is not nearly so important as the general run of crime. It attracts attention, because of its melodrama, and gets headlined in the newspapers. Much more important is the professional criminal, the man who lives by crime. Murder is usually an isolated act in a person's life, and usually is a response to a sudden impulse. Very few men are professional murderers. Criminal jurisprudence has broken down entirely. Juries fail to convict and, in the case of a wife who kills her husband, it has been decided judicially, she is entitled to his insurance to double the amount, if the policy states that death by accident increases by that much the amount to be paid.

We have become such a lawless nation, partly, indeed, largely, because we have become so emotional, that even when a murderer is arrested, which is not a very frequent occurrence, juries will not convict, unless race hatred, as in the case of negroes, comes into play, if they can find the slightest excuse to bring in a verdict for a lesser crime. Our emotionalism is also shown by the fact that, if the newspapers describe any given murder as being particularly atrocious, public feeling would hang the man before his guilt is proven. The proposal to decrease murder by abolishing capital punishment is about as wise as it would be to propose to stop thieving by prohibiting any one to expose to public view any article that might tempt a thief.

What disease may so change the nature of a person, previously normal, as to lead to his adopting a criminal life? The most important acquired disease, attacking children, which causes a loss of moral sense and continuous misconduct, but always with more or less intellectual disorder, is lethargic encephalitis. Very frequently, children who, before the attack, were mentally, both intellectually and morally, normal, afterwards show a definite and permanent change in personality. The change is always for the worse, never a betterment. Thus, a boy 13 years old, who had been a bright boy, a good student, cheerful and glad to do his school work, became unable to fix his attention, grew quarrelsome and cruel to little children, became profane, destroyed property and, after being in a correctional school for months was finally lost sight of. He presented, when I saw him, none of the usual physical sequelae of the disease. He did not have, as is usual, the paralysis agitans face or attitude, tremors, myoclonus or tic.

Another boy, 19 years old, who had been a hard working, industrious boy, became dull and stupid, sat around, lost all ambition and was quite willing to remain an inmate of an almshouse. He had the physical

signs of paralysis agitans. He did not become criminal in the active sense, because all his emotions were so deadened that he felt no impulse of any emotional sort. He was criminal in a negative way, in that, he had lost all sense of duty. He, who had contributed largely to the support of his mother, was entirely unconcerned when she was sent to another almshouse. I could report many other cases of change in personality, with criminal conduct, following this disease. Indeed, so frequent is it, that I now examine very closely along this line, into the past medical history of every youth brought to me.

Next let us consider the insanities which may lead to crime. Adolescent insanity (*dementia praecox*) is an occasional cause, especially of murder and sexual assault. It never results in crime requiring thought or planning. No sufferer from it could cunningly arrange a scheme by which the victim would be induced to put himself in peril. All crimes committed by the adolescent insane are done on impulse. Folly, with disastrous consequences, is far more frequent than criminal acts. Loss of sexual inhibition is a very early symptom in the prodromal stage, and frequently leads to silly marriages, and too often to conception. In one large hospital, to which I am attached, several times each year, a youth is brought in from one to four weeks after his marriage. This does not mean, as a cynical friend claims, that all love is madness, but it is one of the results of the free and easy way in which American parents allow their children to marry without any investigation.

At the end of life, senile dementia has an underlying physical cause, either a primary degeneration of the cerebral cells or a cerebral arterial thickening. The most usual crime associated with it is sexual assault, especially on children. To send such men to jail, for a short term, does no good. They are entirely uninfluenced by it. Every case, I have seen of an elderly man, of previously good habits, who has committed such a sexual crime has ended in a clean cut senile dementia. Divorce, in elderly people, also is frequently a result of senile dementia. Delusion of marital infidelity is a common early symptom and, in the male, prostatic enlargement often leads to sexual irritability. Very often, the senile dement, in the early stage, talks so plausibly that the referee in divorce is impressed by his intelligence, and divorce is granted, when what is needed is guardianship. For example, a very successful business man had been married thirty-five years. He began to suffer from sexual irritability. His wife refused. He soon believed, she had other reasons for refusing. He left her, taking all his deeds, stocks and bonds, and a large sum of money and

went to Europe. He then became entangled in the net of an adventuress, and made a will cutting off his son (he had sided with the mother) and leaving the mother only what the Pennsylvania law compelled him to do. In a few months, he died. Most of his estate had disappeared. The man was insane. The case was not unusual.

Paresis causes much crime in middle life. Usually, there is a long prodromal stage, shown by a slowly changing personality. The man who is careful in speech, lest he offend his own sense of decency, becomes lewd in talk. One previously careful in business, becomes careless, spends recklessly, and soon his affairs are in confusion. Then suddenly he makes a violent assault of some kind, frequently sexual. In the fully established diseases, diagnosis is easy. At the beginning it is difficult.

Paranoia is the most interesting of all the insanities, not only in its relation to crime, but in itself, and the clinical picture it presents. Fortunately, it is very rare, making up less than one-half of one per cent of the insane. It has, however, a bastard brother, paranoid dementia, which is unfortunately very common, and just as dangerous so far as criminal acts are concerned.

The paranoiac is not a sufferer from disease, the victim of some external stress, but is congenitally defective. He is born, not made. Sometimes he is precocious, as a child, and his parents think they have been blessed with a genius. More frequently, he passes an uneventful childhood, and the symptoms appear only during adolescence. Very rarely he shows no abnormality till maturity. As a rule between 14 and 16 he begins to be moody, to lose affection for the members of his household, to have outbursts of anger. He, who may have been popular among his schoolmates, in his earlier boyhood, begins to be solitary. At the age when he should be suffering from his first attack of love sickness, he shows evidences of a homo-sexual trend. He grows suspicious of his family, and thinks they are not friendly to him. Meanwhile, his seeming intellectual brightness deceives those who meet him. He is a great talker. He has opinions on politics, religion, science, and talks with such verbosity, that the average person is deceived, and regards him as a mental giant. Then come delusions, always of persecution, and always of grandeur. He is the savior of the world, a great inventor, the greatest of statesmen, the most learned scholar. He is persecuted through envy or a desire to injure him. His delusions are systematized, and he reasons about them. His moral sense, by now, is gone, and frequently he murders,

Acute mania is prone to occur in early maturity, but may be a symptom of beginning senile dementia. It is the most terrible of all insanities, because there may be, and often is, recovery from an attack with complete restitution of mental health, but almost inevitably, it recurs throughout life. There is no greater tragedy in life than comes to these unfortunates, part of the time gentle, clean-minded, clean-thinking, often with great mental power. Then suddenly all is changed, and they become wild as hungry tigers, controlled by impulse, having no thought. There is also a chronic type, lasting for life, characterized by ill-humor, with periods of violent anger without external cause, sullenness, alternating with other periods of talkativeness, and merriment, changing to quarrelsomeness, if crossed, and often leading to assaults. Many tramps are such because of this disease.

Melancholia never results in crime, except that, sometimes, a parent kills a child to save it from the horrors of life, and suicide, which in law is a felony, sometimes occurs. Manic-depressive insanity, in which there is a recurring cycle of mania, melancholia and mental health is, if possible, more terrible than acute mania. It is very frequent. Cases vary in intensity. In the mildest, the man or woman is, through life, subject to periods of mild elation, alternating with other periods of slight depression, or, there may be periods between, in which there is good mental health. It is especially prone to affect people of high mental grade, whether or not they are educated, and some of the world's best work is done by people of the manic-depressive type. It is the insanity which proves the truth of the saying, "Great wit to madness closely is allied."

These types of insanity are not difficult to diagnose, save in the early period of the prodromal stage, and courts accept them, and properly, as a defense of crime. If such men were sent to hospitals for the criminal insane for life, no evil would result, but with us, in this country, that does not always happen. Too often they are detained only a short time, if at all, and then the quiet ordered life of a hospital, having caused a submergence of their symptoms, they are set free, sometimes sexually to debauch the young, sometimes to propagate their kind, never to do good.

The serious problem for psychiatrists, legislators, judges, juries, and citizens is how to treat that great mass of social misfits who commit crime short of murder and rape, who pass their lives in passing from the house of correction to the street, to the jail, to the street again, and do, fortunately, usually, die rather early in life, from tuberculosis, syphilis, alcohol, or, more rarely, other drug habits.

They are not the product of the slums. The stream of crime is fed by rivulets from all ranks of society. Crime is not, largely, the product of economic stress. There are areas of Europe where, for centuries, dire poverty has been the lot of all, and yet crime is uncommon. Here, in America, where poverty is negligible, where wealth, or at least, a competence, can come to any man who works, crime is steadily increasing and the moral tone is getting lower and lower. No, the claims of the uplifters, that crime comes from economic stress alone is just as untrue as their other claim, that it is solely the result of bad moral environment.

Whatever the cause may be, the criminal, as the psychiatrist defines the word, is born and not made. His defect is not, in large degree, intellectual (I am throwing out the imbecile class) but moral. He is, first and foremost, a perfect egotist. He does not understand and comprehend the rights of his fellows. He is not a mere hypocrite. He sees the world unlike the rest of us. He may be, and often is, intelligent in matters that are entirely impersonal, but he is unintelligent as to facing life. It seems as if there are two kinds of intelligence, one of which concerns ability to apprehend facts (mathematics, language learning, memory for historic matters) and another, which enables a man to get through life without conflict with the law. He often fails to be industrious, because he cannot fix attention, day in and day out, on any one thing. It requires some power of attention and fixity of purpose even to work with the pick and shovel. Impulse which rules him, compels him to do nothing long, and little good. He is controlled by the emotion of the moment, and this may make him appear, temporarily, to have good instincts. Thus, a sentimental friend of mine asked me to examine a youthful murderer, saying there must be some good in him, because he was so kind to a pet bird in his cell. He was very kind apparently, but one day, when the bird sang, when he told it to be quiet, he momentarily became violently angry, wrung its neck and threw it to the floor, and then talked quietly of indifferent things. Murder, too, may happen in a moment.

You ask the psychiatrist, are such men responsible? It is largely an academic question. The important questions are, how can the state best protect itself from them, and what can and ought it do for, and with, them? The fact that they continue to be criminals, after terms in jail, proves that punishment does not cure them. Will medical treatment? No. Will special institutions, where they can be trained? I do not believe so. They are incurable because they are not suffering

from external stress and strain, but from an inherent defect in protoplasm.

What is the remedy? I shall speak dogmatically, because I have studied the question for many years, and because my opinion is a considered one, not hastily arrived at. As to murder, defined as I have defined it (remember, by murder I do not mean all unlawful killing, but only killing after real premeditation), I think it would be wise to go back to the old fashion of execution. Moreover, it would be better, in cases of insanity to execute, but to allow the plea of insanity to relieve the stigma attaching to the family. I say this for two reasons, first, any insane person who has murdered may murder again, and second, because it is no kindness to keep a man who has killed in maniacal fury, in an asylum for all his life, and to let him go free is a danger to the state.

As to the mass of professional minor criminals, the best treatment is segregation for life. It does not matter whether we call the institutions prisons, or farms, or schools. The inmates could be made to work, and thus partly at least, be self-supporting; they could not procreate their kind, and they could not debauch the young.

The mere accidental criminal, the youth who falls before a sudden temptation, who really has manliness in him, could be discharged when he had shown he had learned his lesson. The only trouble is that in this sentimental and emotional country, with its tremendous increase in effeminacy among men (much more than masculinity in women), too many young rascals would be set free to prey on the rest of us, because they are plausible and soft-spoken.

The criminals I am speaking of, usually have the same history. As small boys they often present no peculiarities, but about puberty, they begin to be rebellious and resent discipline and control. Often they are highly emotional, sometimes they have no emotional reactions save those of the animal. They fail in attempting to learn any trade, or, if they are sent to boarding school or college, fail there. They, as boys, try to escape the results of misconduct by lying, but their lies are always childish and easily seen through. They have no foresight, no sense of responsibility, and never can be taught the art of wholesome living. In this regard their mental level is very low, though they may pass intelligence tests with flying colors.

As to the physical causes of the condition, we are still very ignorant. Today there is a popular school of psychologists, who claim that personality (and it is a disorder of personality we are dealing with) is controlled by the ductless glands and the sympathetic nervous system.

Indeed, people are being classified as hyper- and hypo-thyroids, pituitaries, and the rest. But there is much more hypothesis than known fact. This much is proven. Disease of the thyroid produces cretinism and myxoedema. In both, there are great mental defects, not such as lead to crime, but to harmless imbecility. Hypothyroidism is always associated with sexual frigidity and this prevents much crime. In hyperthyroidism there is often apparent, sometimes real, mental brilliancy, which occasionally passes into acute mania. In dementia praecox, there is sometimes gonadal degeneration, but many authorities think it is consequent upon sexual habits, rather than causative of mental disease. Beyond this all, so far as concerns crime, is hypothesis.

There is a widespread, popular belief that much badness is caused by "pressure" within the skull, the idea being, that since the skull is a rigid body surrounding the brain, any injury to the bones, or any disease of the brain, so decreases the volume of the cranial cavity that the brain is squeezed and therefore functions abnormally. I need not say that the claim that moral disease is produced by "pressure" caused, as is usually alleged, by falls on the head in infancy, and is curable by trephining, is absolutely and entirely false.

My conclusions are: that man is an emotional animal rather than a reasoning one, that he possesses a social instinct (bound up with the moral sense) which is the foundation stone of civilization, that the moral sense is potentially present in all normal children, that wise education and good environment can strengthen it by training, and bad environment, save in the highest types, can and does destroy it, that the criminal, in the very restricted meaning of the word as used by the psychiatrist, is either born without capacity to develop the social instinct and the moral sense, or has lost them by disease, and that such criminals, though not responsible, should be segregated for life, or, if they are of the type that murder or commit rape, should be executed because they are a menace to the state and to the race.