

Winter 1929

Study of the Relationship Between Intelligence and Crime, A

Milton Hylan Erickson

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

Milton Hylan Erickson, Study of the Relationship Between Intelligence and Crime, A, 19 Am. Inst. Crim. L. & Criminology 592 (1928-1929)

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.

A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INTELLIGENCE AND CRIME

MILTON HYLAND ERICKSON, M. A., M. D.*

(References in the text are to the Bibliography on the last pages of this article.)

INTRODUCTION

The question of delinquency, which has ever constituted a grave social problem, is arousing a constantly increasing interest as a result of the recent application of scientific methods to the study of crime in all its varied phases. Indeed, before a truly scientific interest could be developed, it was necessary that there be a development of those sciences which throw light on human conduct and behavior such as biology, psychology, sociology, and psychiatry, and particularly so this last-named science. However, the great significance of the problem is scarcely appreciated as yet, and the field of study, so wide and fertile, is relatively untouched, although significant progress has been made in some directions. Possibly, the most notable of advances made has been the beginning recognition of delinquency as a problem belonging almost entirely to the field of psychiatry rather than to the legal realm or to sociology, that field of normal human relationships. The avenues of approach for the study of this problem of delinquency and the aspects for consideration are exceedingly numerous, since every crime is the product of the complexities of human nature reacting in devious and incomprehensible ways to the complexities of the social order. Formerly, only the dull prosaic facts of social and economic existence were considered the sum total of essential knowledge concerning the criminal. Quite otherwise now, a study of crime necessitates in addition an investigation into the behavior reactions, mental attitudes, intellectual and emotional endowments, physical development, habits, predilections, idiosyncrasies, and all possible intimate and personal details of the individual offender in his daily life. Accordingly, any attempt at investigation of this question of such great moment to the welfare of society must be confined of necessity to one particular phase. Nor can any investigation hope to do more than add some small fact to the aggregate of knowledge essential for a proper evaluation and comprehension

*Research Psychologist, Wisconsin State Board of Control, Madison, Wis.

of this most complex and intricate problem of human relationships. Only in this fashion may be reached, sometime in the remote future, a solution to this serious ill of civilization.

In this investigation, realizing that the intellectual endowment of the criminal might well constitute a significant force in anti-social behavior, an attempt has been made to throw some light upon the problem of crime by a study grounded fundamentally upon the grade of intelligence possessed by delinquents. Especially was this felt to be a valuable aspect for study since a careful survey of the literature revealed that practically nothing of a detailed and systematic nature had been done to ascertain the actual force exerted by the intellectual endowment upon criminalistic tendencies. Indeed, the literature obtainable yielded nothing more than broad speculations and generalizations upon feeble-mindedness and crime, with no attempt to specify or determine actual significant details and relationships of intelligence and criminality. This has been attempted in this investigation by grouping delinquents according to the general level of intelligence possessed, and then analyzing these groups in accordance with various pertinent details concerning the individual. By so doing, it was hoped to reveal various criminological trends and tendencies together with group differences and similarities, divergencies and peculiarities, direct and indirect relationships significant either positively or negatively of the influence exercised by intelligence, or the lack thereof, upon the manifestation of anti-social behavior, or tending in any way to explain the phenomena of crime. In addition, an effort was made to note any outstanding characteristics or associated facts becoming manifest during the course of the investigation which might serve to enable a better understanding of offenders either singly or collectively.

MATERIAL AND METHOD

The material for this study was obtained from the case history files of the Psychiatric Field Service of the Wisconsin State Board of Control. In these files are kept complete records of the routine examinations made by the Psychiatric Service of *all* individuals admitted to the various penal and correctional institutions of the state or applying for a parole therefrom. These examinations are of a four-fold nature, embracing the psychiatric, physical, psychological, and sociological aspects of each individual case, the original purpose of the examinations being the betterment of the institutional and post-institutional welfare of the individual delinquent. The institutions yielding material for

this undertaking were the Milwaukee County House of Correction at Milwaukee, the Wisconsin State Prison at Waupun, and the Wisconsin State Reformatory at Green Bay. The period of time covered by this observation extends from July 1, 1926 to June 1, 1928, a period of nearly two years. From the entire number of examinations made for this period of time, a selection was made, based on sex, race, and age, and only those histories of white males twenty-one or more years of age were accepted, all duplicates being discarded. This was done to avoid the complications of sex and race and to exclude minors who may not, in all fairness, be compared to adults. A total of 1690 individual cases answering to the above specifications was thus obtained, and these cases were then divided into the four following groups:

1. *Normal Intelligence Group* comprising.....852 cases
2. *Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group* comprising.....327 cases
3. *High Grade Feeble-minded Group* comprising.....408 cases
4. *Low Grade Feeble-minded Group* comprising.....103 cases

It may be very well stated here that the particular grade of intelligence possessed by the individual, if not obviously normal as shown by the scholastic record, was determined at the time of examination by the application of the Stanford Revision of the Binet-Simon Intelligence Tests. This was done by a qualified psychologist, with the result of the first examination confirmed, in many instances, by a retest. In addition, the history of the individual was regarded as confirmatory, and always considered in the diagnosis of the degree of intelligence possessed, particularly so in regard to the diagnosis of feeble-mindedness. The Intelligence Quotient, or I. Q. as it is commonly termed, of .75, accepted by the American Association for the Study of Feeble-mindedness, was taken as the dividing line between mental deficiency and non-feeble-mindedness. In establishing this Intelligence Quotient as the dividing line, no particular weight has been accorded the present academic dispute among psychologists concerning the most acceptable and exact dividing point. Whether the dividing line is an Intelligence Quotient of .75, .70, .68, or .65, is essentially irrelevant to the purposes of this investigation, since it is desired only to determine the existence, positively or negatively, of an influence exerted by intelligence or the lack thereof upon criminality. There is neither hope nor expectation of determining the exact degree of this influence nor of ascertaining the exact weight or quality of any possible relationship. Further, when the very nature of the human material dealt with is considered, it may be conceded readily that an intelligence quotient of less than .75, combined with the manifest incapacity of satisfactory economic and social

adjustment, as evidenced by conviction for criminality, justifies classification as feeble-minded from medical, social, and legal aspects, if not entirely so from the viewpoint of academic psychology.

The range of the Intelligence Quotient for each of the intelligence levels indicated by the above groupings is presented in the following table taken from Richmond¹ and agreeing with Terman's classification:²

	<i>Intelligence Quotient Range</i>
<i>Normal Intelligence</i>90 or more
<i>Subnormal or Low Intelligence</i>75 to .90
<i>High Grade Feeble-mindedness (High Grade Morons)</i>60 to .75
<i>Low Grade Feeble-mindedness (Low Grade Morons)</i>	Below .60

The respective groups were then carefully analyzed in accordance with the tables given in the appendix to this paper, the tables showing both the numerical totals and the percentages for each item. From these tables, the significant facts and important percentages have been abstracted for use in the body of this discussion, thus obviating any need for constant reference to them.

DISTRIBUTION OF INTELLIGENCE

Since the recognition of the need of studying the criminal as an individual member of society, there has been a growing realization of the necessity of understanding and appreciating the extent and nature of his mental and intellectual endowment. With the development of standardized psychometric tests, a valuable means of estimating the intellectual endowment of the individual became practicable. The results of the application of these tests to the offenders included in this investigation show the following general distribution:

Normal Intelligence Group.....	50.41% of all cases
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	19.36% of all cases
High Grade Moron Group.....	24.14% of all cases
Low Grade Moron Group.....	6.09% of all cases

It is at once evident from the above figures that essentially fifty per cent of delinquents are definitely below normal in intelligence, if 1690 cases of adult white unselected criminals may be considered a fair sample. And undoubtedly they are. Unfortunately, any figures showing the distribution of the general population according to the above levels of intelligence are wholly unavailable. The use of the findings of the army tests is precluded since the very lack of standardization and the actual misinterpretation of the significance of various tests, according to

Brigham,³ and the absolute errors of selection, improper methods of application, and the use of untrained testers, according to Terman,⁴ render the results of the army tests exceedingly unreliable and not a fair criterion of the intelligence of the general public. Common judgment would lead, however, to the conclusion that far less than fifty per cent of the general public are subnormal. And this conclusion is substantiated by the findings of Terman who found less than 20% of a total of one thousand unselected school children with an I. Q. below 90,⁵ and similar findings have been made by other investigators in the same field. While results obtained with children may not be strictly comparable with those obtained with adults, there can be little question of their significance, especially in regard to such a matter as intellectual endowment. Further, the above findings have been more than corroborated by Kuhlmann⁶ working in the reformatories of Minnesota where he found, in a total of 1962 cases, 78% below normal intelligence, a considerably greater figure than that given by the above table. However, the delinquents studied by Kuhlmann, were, on the whole, considerably younger than those of this investigation which may account for the difference in percentages. Likewise in New York, Slawson⁷ found a total of 77% below normal intelligence in a series of 553 juvenile male delinquents, and 60% below normal in another series of 98 cases. While these cases are not wholly comparable to those of adults, the indications of a direct correlation between delinquency and subnormal intelligence are exceedingly strong.

A second point very evident from the above table is the astonishingly high percentage of mentally deficient individuals among criminals, which is shown to be 30% in this investigation. The significance of this high percentage is best appreciated by calling to mind the generally accepted estimate of feeble-mindedness in the population at large, which places the ratio at one mentally deficient person in every two hundred of the general population, an estimate based on eight different surveys made by investigators in various states and confirmed in results by the findings in similar investigations in Europe.⁸ Gillin, however, after a careful consideration of the literature on this question for this country, has estimated a proportion of 2% of the general population as feeble-minded.⁹ Thus, the ratio of feeble-mindedness among criminals is here shown to be at least from fifteen to sixty times greater than that of the population at large! These findings have been repeatedly confirmed by other investigators. Kuhlmann has found an average of 29.1% of the inmates of the reformatories of Minnesota feeble-minded;¹⁰ Slawson, working with delinquent boys in New York State

found 20% to 25% feeble-minded;¹¹ Anderson, after his investigations in the problem, reached a conclusion that 27% to 29% of all prisoners are feeble-minded;¹² and the Wisconsin Psychiatric Field Service, in a total of over 8,000 examinations of the inmates of the various state penal and correctional institutions, has found an average of 27% of all offenders feeble-minded, the percentages varying from 20% to 35% depending upon the particular institution concerned.¹³ Also, various investigations conducted among delinquents in California, Illinois, Indiana, New York, and West Virginia, show percentages of mentally deficient among criminals ranging from 20% to 30%.¹⁴ Accordingly, the genetic force of mental deficiency in the production of crime is not to be doubted. Indeed, Goddard, after his long study of feeble-mindedness, reached the conclusion that every mentally deficient individual is a potential criminal, and further, that 40% of families manifesting feeble-mindedness show criminality and that sex delinquency in such families is practically the rule.¹⁵ The seriousness of this hardly needs mention! However, whether the role played by feeble-mindedness in the production of crime is direct or indirect is not a proposition to be decided here, nor does that question lessen the grave significance of mental deficiency in relation to anti-social behavior and criminality.

Further, the above table shows that fully 20% of the total number of feeble-minded among delinquents, or 6% of all criminals coming within the scope of this investigation, are low grade morons. The significance of this will be better appreciated when it is realized that the defect of intelligence in low grade morons is so severe that authorities are well agreed that they can be cared for properly only within the confines of an institution designed for the care of the feeble-minded.¹⁶ Indeed, the capacity of low grade morons for social and moral responsibility at law is nil according to Richmond¹⁷ and Kuhlmann¹⁸ after long study of the problem, and these investigators feel that even in regard to the high grade moron, legal responsibility is very frequently "debatable and subject to proof." Yet these delinquents with such marked deficiency of intelligence are allowed to serve their terms unrecognized legally for what they are, and then are discharged and permitted to return to society for which they are absolutely unfit socially, morally, and economically, there to reproduce their kind and to repeat their contribution to the crime problem! And that they will is no matter of pessimistic speculation, since, to the low grade moron, consideration for others, altruism, probity, and moral and ethical principles are vague, incomprehensible things. And in his intellectual blindness he gropes and stumbles through the social maze of life wan-

dering into forbidden paths all along the way, knowing no better and unable to know better.

CRIMINAL HISTORY

That there is a relationship between deficiency of intelligence and criminality has just been pointed out. Whether that relationship is direct or indirect, as would be shown by group comparisons, may be somewhat indicated in the following table which shows the present extent of the criminal histories of the individuals of the various groups under examination:

Present Criminal History	Normal Intell. Group	Sub- normal Intell. Group	High Grade Moron Group	Low Grade Moron Group
Misdemeanors	45.54%	49.54%	46.08%	49.52%
One Conviction.....	76.52%	78.59%	80.88%	84.47%
2-3 Convictions.....	20.31%	18.66%	17.89%	14.56%
4 or More Convictions.....	3.17%	2.75%	1.23%	.97%

Careful scrutiny of the above table suggests that, while the tendency toward crime does occur more often among the mentally deficient, the manifestation of that tendency in the individual does not vary in extent and frequency with the degree of intelligence possessed. In other words, while deficiency of intelligence allows for a greater number of individuals with criminalistic tendencies, the manifestation of those tendencies, in so far as the total number of offenses committed is concerned, varies in no degree from the manifestation of the criminalistic tendencies of the non-feeble-minded. Indeed, the parity of the group percentages for each item of the above table very strongly suggests an indirect relationship between criminality and intelligence, and indicates that the criminal tendency is a thing apart from the intellectual endowment and hence little influenced directly by the degree of intelligence possessed. However, the degree of intelligence may play a role in the particular form of specific manifestations of anti-social behavior. As a conclusion, justified by the above findings, it may be stated that the tendency to criminal behavior appears to be dependent upon factors other than intelligence, and that deficiency of intelligence seems conducive to criminality only by virtue of allowing a more frequent occurrence of this tendency.

A second matter for consideration suggested by the above table is the extent of recidivism, which amounts to an average of 17% when only actual convictions with prison terms are considered. With

the inclusion of all offenses against the law, misdemeanors as well as felonies, percentages for recidivism are markedly increased. That the inclusion of misdemeanors in calculating recidivism is entirely justifiable in a study of the nature of criminality is not to be doubted, since there is nothing inherent in an offense against the law which makes it either a felony or a misdemeanor.¹⁹ Indeed, the mere circumstances of the situation often determine whether the particular manifestation of criminal tendencies constitutes a misdemeanor or a felony,²⁰ and in the vast majority of cases, the standards of judgment are entirely arbitrary. Accordingly, the following table is given showing the percentages with the inclusion of all offenses:

Total Present Criminal History	Nor- mal Intell. Group	Sub- normal Intell. Group	High Grade Moron Group	Low Grade Moron Group
One Offense.....	39.44%	39.14%	41.93%	48.55%
2-3 Offenses.....	50.23%	50.16%	50.23%	45.63%
4 or More Offenses.....	10.33%	10.70%	7.84%	5.82%

In the foregoing table, for each individual, a history of misdemeanors, whether one or many, is considered as a single offense, and actual convictions of felonies constitute all additional offenses. Since all individuals included in this study have at least one conviction, the first item of the above table shows the percentages of those having one conviction with no history of misdemeanors, while the other two items show the percentages based upon the inclusion of misdemeanors with felonies.

Thus, it is shown above that the actual recidivism ranges from 45% for the low grade morons to 50% for the other three groups. These findings are quite in agreement with the findings of Anderson: in his investigation of Wisconsin criminals among whom he found 45% recidivists.²¹ Glueck, in an investigation at Sing Sing found a total of 66% recidivists,²² while in Massachusetts, for the years of 1921-1922, the percentage of recidivists among all offenders sentenced in the state ranged from 51.3% to 55.1%,²³ and in New York City 47% of the inmates of the workhouse were recidivists in a study conducted before 1916,²⁴ and 47% of all prisoners admitted to the state prisons in New York in 1921 were recidivists.²⁵ When it is considered that recidivism is one of the surest signs of the instinctive and incorrigible offender,²⁶ and that, according to a former head of Scotland Yard, a great part of the serious crimes are committed by recidivists,²⁷ the need of recognizing the recidivist as such and accord-

ing him treatment designed for that class of offenders is at once apparent.²⁸ Further, the very fact there is such a high percentage of repeaters shows the ineffectuality of our present penitentiary system both for correction and intimidation.²⁹

Likewise deserving of comment is the marked extent of habitual criminality, which ranges from 6% for the low grade feebleminded criminals to 10% for those of normal intelligence, an average of 9.9% of all criminals. That one-tenth of criminals are habitual offenders emphasizes the seriousness of the problem constituted by such individuals alone, and renders at once apparent the need of some special socio-legal provisions for such unfortunate individuals. It is, indeed, fortunate that the greater part of the crimes committed by habitual offenders are petty in nature.

A fourth consideration apparent from the above table is the extent of recidivism among the low grade morons. As has been mentioned above, 45% of the low grade morons have been in court and found guilty of crime two or three times. In addition, approximately 6% are habitual offenders. Yet these low grade morons have not been recognized for what they are and placed in the proper institutions. Likewise, and to an even greater extent, the same holds true for the high grade morons, hence rendering the social wrong much greater. Thus is the inadequacy of the present judiciary system made apparent as well as the inadequacy of present social provision for such individuals, since there are provided as yet neither the means of recognizing such social unfits nor the institutions to receive them. Indeed, a total of 6% of adult criminals coming into the courts are low grade morons who may be cared for properly only by institutionalization. Yet that they are not recognized as such, but are treated in the same fashion as their fellows of unimpaired intellect constitutes, both a social tragedy and a severe criterion upon social enlightenment. Further, as shown above, 30% of all adult criminals are feebleminded and 56.7% of these are either recidivistic or habitual criminals. Hence they are obviously in need, at the very least, of constant and careful supervision from the standpoint of deficiency of intelligence alone, not to mention criminalistic tendencies, in order to conduct themselves and their affairs in a prudent social manner. These considerations render the appalling need of social and judicial recognition of this problem most apparent. When, eventually, the forces of social organization do take this problem into consideration there will be, in all probability, a marked alteration in the current of crime.

LENGTH OF SENTENCE

Serving to substantiate the points made above concerning recidivism and the inadequacy of present social and judicial provision in regard to the recidivistic mentally deficient are the findings in regard to the length of the sentence imposed upon the offender by the court of trial, given in the following table:

Length of Sentence	Normal Intell. Group	Sub- normal Intell. Group	High Grade Moron Group	Low Grade Moron Group
1 year or less.....	8.45%	9.79%	10.54%	13.59%
2 years or less.....	26.52%	28.44%	30.39%	27.18%
3 to 4 years.....	27.11%	29.05%	24.50%	17.48%
5 to 9 years.....	21.48%	14.37%	16.43%	18.45%
10 years or more.....	14.44%	13.15%	14.95%	18.45%
Life imprisonment.....	2.00%	5.20%	3.19%	4.85%

From this table, it is at once evident that the general distribution of each group of offenders is very much the same, about 65% of each group serving sentences less than five years. The low grade morons, however, show a tendency to depart from the general levels of distribution, and particularly is this marked in the percentages for the more drastic sentences, where the low grade morons show a decided increase above the other groups. While the severity of the sentence administered may not be taken as an accurate indication of the seriousness of the offense, nevertheless, inasmuch as sentences are determined in the main by statutes, the length of the sentence does constitute such a measure to a very considerable extent. Accordingly, the similarity of the percentages for the more drastic sentences strongly suggests that the feeble-minded are fully as capable of committing very serious crimes as their fellows of more normal intelligence, with a seemingly increased tendency on the part of the low grade moron. Especially does this appear to be the case since the feeble-minded have the greatest percentage of life imprisonment sentences. And inspection of the records of the low grade morons serving terms of ten years or more or of life imprisonment reveals such crimes as murder, assault to murder, incest, and sexual assaults upon small children, all crimes most heinous to social feeling. Hence, it is evident that of the criminal class the low grade moron is even more of a menace to society than his more normal but criminally inclined fellow, and that the high grade moron is fully as great a menace as his fellow delinquent of greater intelligence. Also, judging from the sentence imposed according to the restrictions of the statutes, pettiness of

offense is not a characteristic of deficient intelligence. On the contrary, intelligence apparently plays little part in determining the seriousness of the crime committed except in regard to the low grade moron, and there it probably is the lack of intelligence which constitutes the important factor. Indeed, the gravely dangerous criminal tendencies in the mentally deficient are even more serious since they have not the saving grace of intelligence wherewith to hope for a control, even partial, of their anti-social tendencies. The gravity of this is further emphasized by reference to the preceding table which shows the failure of the courts to recognize the mentally deficient even upon the occasion of many court visits. All this stresses greatly the total inadequacy of the present court system, which falsely considers only the offense and not the offender, which is the empirical method of treating the symptoms without specifically considering the disease causing them. Thus the laws fail to protect society because they are concerned with the superficial criterion of the crime and not with the essential criterion of the nature of the delinquent³⁰ and hence there can be no treatment of the criminal in direct accordance with his own particular needs. The latter is an easy matter only in regard to the mentally deficient where institutionalization or colonization might solve the problem most satisfactorily.

Illustrative to a still further degree of the point made above concerning the ineffectualness of the present penal system are the results of a comparison of the percentages for recidivism with those for long-term sentences. As may be seen above, although 56.7% of offenders are recidivistic or habitual offenders and hence incorrigible in the main, as has been mentioned above, only 16% to 23% are serving long term sentences. This fact, then, signifies that the greater per cent of recidivists are serving terms of more or less brevity. That little benefit to society may be expected from such terms is not to be doubted since sentences of three to five and even ten years are without effect upon recidivistic offenders and possess value only by virtue of segregating the offender for a while and thus sparing society a greater or less number of crimes.³¹ At best, such sentences, in so far as recidivists are concerned, constitute nothing more than a flimsy makeshift in dealing with the problem of repeated criminality. Indeed, the statistics of crime as well as the teachings of history confirm the absolute inadequacy of the present system of punishments against crime.³² Especially is this so in regard to the feeble-minded recidivists who are accountable for a full 25% of the entire problem of repeated criminality and whose deficiency of intelligence effectually

and completely militates against any possibility of regeneration or correction. That penalties are established by statutes and are based wholly upon a consideration of the material act constitutes an actual social injury since society thereby derives a false sense of having adequately and securely provided against a danger. In reality, it has not, for the harm is merely postponed. Commitment to prison should be determined not by the nature of the offense but by the nature of the offender,³³ and with a view toward the causes of the delinquency, the effect upon the individual, and the moral prognosis.³⁴ Only in this way may adequate social provision be made for the warped, deficient, defective, and unregenerate enemies of the social order.

TYPE OF CRIMES COMMITTED

It is generally conceded that the particular crime committed, with few exceptions, is of no particular significance in the comprehension of the problem of the criminal. Blanc has very rightly said that the essence of crime does not lie in the material act but in the psychical state of the agent and that there are no crimes but only criminals.³⁵ Similarly, Aschaffenburg in his text-book on crime declares that criminals are not particular in their choice of crimes of psychologically equal value.³⁶ Indeed, crime is only a manifestation of an unsocial or anti-social nature, in reality, merely a symptom of disease or distortion of social relationships. The particular type of crime committed is, within the reasonable limits established by the fundamental nature and capacities of the individual, determined almost entirely by the circumstances serving to call forth the malefaction. Thus, the individual of criminalistic tendencies whose powers of volition are weak may become an habitual drunkard, or he may abandon his family, or, upon attaining a position of trust, he may become an embezzler. But by no means may he be classed according to the particular offense committed, since the essential thing is the constitutional defect of his nature permitting him to become guilty of an anti-social act. However, it must be recognized that the constitutional defect may vary in extent with different individuals and, with this variation, there is a corresponding variation in the degree of criminality. Thus, one criminal is rendered more or less a petty offender while another with more marked defect may run the whole gamut of the criminal calendar. Very much in support of the proposition that there is no particular class of crimes for any particular group of criminals, except as determined by circumstances over which they have

no control, is the following table listing the various crimes committed:

Crime Committed	Nor- mal Intell. Group	Sub- normal Intell. Group	High Grade Moron Group	Low Grade Moron Group
Crimes against:				
Property	57.04%	51.38%	46.08%	37.86%
Persons	6.69%	9.79%	7.84%	17.48%
Chastity and Morals.....	9.98%	11.62%	10.30%	16.51%
Automobile Thefts.....	8.10%	5.50%	5.88%	1.94%
Statutory Rape.....	8.10%	11.01%	15.20%	15.53%
Abandonment	6.34%	4.28%	8.82%	7.77%
Otherwise	3.75%	6.42%	5.88%	2.91%

It is evident from the above table that the distribution of offenses is essentially the same for each of the various groups with only slight group differences. Thus, automobile thefts occur more frequently among those of normal intelligence, in all probability because of the need of intelligence in conceiving and executing such a theft. The same interpretation probably holds true for the comparative decrease in the incidence among low grade morons of crimes against property, since many such crimes require good intelligence and careful planning. On the other hand, abandonments occur to a greater extent among the mentally deficient than among those not feeble-minded, because of the increased difficulty entailed by deficiency of intelligence in bearing family responsibilities, as had been noted in a previous investigation.⁵⁷ The most significant differences in the table above are in regard to the crimes against persons and against chastity and morals, wherein, with the decrease in intelligence there is an increase in incidence. This is very suggestive that in crimes of passion intelligence may play an inhibitory role, or that the deficiency of intelligence tends to limit the expression of criminalistic tendencies to animal methods. However, outside of the limits of specified offenses and the natural handicaps of the individual, intelligence appears to have little significance in the determination of the nature of the offense committed, thus substantiating the proposition that the malversation committed is not a true criterion of the class of the delinquent. Further, the above table emphasizes again the seriousness of the part played in crime by the mentally deficient, for it shows that their criminality differs in no great wise from that of their more normal fellows. This is even more serious since there can be no good hope of regeneration of such offenders, particularly so with regard to the low grade morons, who manifest as a group the greater tendency toward the more socially injurious crimes.

SUBJECTIVE CAUSATIVE FACTORS UNDERLYING CRIME

Subjective causative factors underlying crime would be sought most naturally in the table of *Reasons, Excuse, or Explanation* offered by the offender. However, it must be recognized from the very outset that the rationalized explanation of his crime given by the criminal upon inquiry, unless substantiated by case work, so desirable for accurate information, is most unreliable from a scientific point of view. Hence, conclusions drawn therefrom must be made cautiously. Nevertheless, the very remarkable agreement in percentages between the various groups so widely divergent on the scale of intelligence necessarily gives the explanations offered a significant, if not indisputable, cast of reliability. Therefore, the various outstanding reasons given are presented for consideration and their possible significance suggested:

Reason Given	Normal Intell. Group	Sub- normal Intell. Group	High Grade Moron Group	Low Grade Moron Group
Economic Distress.....	20.31%	14.99%	12.25%	15.53%
Bad Company.....	6.93%	7.34%	5.39%	2.91%
Liquor	19.13%	23.24%	22.06%	20.39%
Miscellaneous	41.54%	43.42%	48.05%	51.46%
No Reason.....	12.09%	11.01%	12.25%	9.71%

Careful scrutiny of the above table shows no outstanding subjective causative factor peculiar to any one group. The feeble-minded give the same reasons as those not feeble-minded, and do so in approximately the same proportion of cases. Accordingly, the factors represented above must be considered as purely environmental in nature, or that the deficiency of intelligence in the feeble-minded is of such nature as to prevent their true recognition of the impelling factors in their criminality. The latter is difficultly tenable as an explanation.

That such a reason as *Economic Distress* has practically the same percentages for each group is most surprising, for the lesser earning capacity of the feeble-minded would lead to the presumption that individual poverty would be much more of a subjective criminogenic factor among the mentally deficient than among their intellectual superiors. Especially so would this be the presumption since it is well recognized that poverty and lack of necessities often impel toward theft with the view of satisfying the individual's own needs.³⁸ However, this similarity of percentages for the various groups is highly suggestive that *Economic Distress* is a purely environmental factor

in the production of crime. Thus, while poverty may have a subjective value in impelling toward anti-social conduct, its force is not determined by individual peculiarities or deficiencies but by the environmental force of circumstances.

That *Bad Company* constitutes a no more important subjective factor for the feeble-minded than for those not mentally deficient as shown by the above table is presumably false, since the feeble-minded are probably entirely incapable of properly appreciating the influence exercised over them by bad associates. The part played by evil companions is unquestionable, as individual cases frequently show, but the extent of that part is, in all probability, unmeasurable.

That *Alcoholism* is still a gravely potent factor in the production of delinquency would be a most ready inference if the percentages of the various groups giving *Liquor* as the subjective causative criminogenic factor could be accepted at face value. However, to accept the percentages as given above would be a most dubious procedure, for the excuse of "I was drunk and didn't know what I was doing" or "I got to drinking and then I didn't care what I did" is too easily made and is too palliative from the individual's point of view for any great amount of reliance to be placed upon it. That alcohol does play a part in individual cases and in crime in general is not to be questioned, for it has been proved conclusively by Pearson & Elderton,³⁹ and Howard.⁴⁰ But in how many individual cases it has played a part and to what extent is quite another matter, very probably unmeasurable with any degree of accuracy. Especially is this so since the most important relation between alcohol and crime is economic and social rather than physiological, the alcohol destroying economic efficiency, breaking down self-respect, and leaving the field open for bad conduct.⁴¹ Nevertheless, in the above table, the marked extent of agreement between the various groups, so widely differing in intellectual endowment, in attributing delinquency to alcoholic indulgence indicates very strongly that liquor does play a definitely subjectively recognizable part in the causation of crime. Further, the equality of percentages for the various groups signifies that *Liquor*, like *Economic Distress*, is an environmental factor rather than a group peculiarity, which is quite contrary to expectations. That the low grade morons show scarcely any greater alcoholic indulgence than their mental superiors is indeed surprising, and the same holds true for the high grade morons. However, this may be due to the decreased earning capacity of the mentally deficient, thus preventing indulgence. But in

general it appears that the degree of intelligence possessed bears no relation to the tendency toward alcoholic indulgence in so far as subjective appreciation is concerned.

MILITARY SERVICE AND DELINQUENCY

In the first part of his "Utopia," Sir Thomas More makes the earliest mention of the significance of war in the production of increased delinquency.⁴² This opinion he based upon observations following the wars with France. Since his time, following every war, the same general observation has been made. After the Civil War, an extensive investigation into this question was made, and a marked increase in crime incidence following the war was noted.⁴³ However, because of various errors of inclusion and selection of data, the reliability of the results of the investigation is somewhat questionable.⁴⁴ In this investigation, a history of participation in the World War seems to be of very considerable significance in regard to the criminogenic factors of delinquency, as may be gleaned from the following table:

	<i>Service in the World War</i>
Normal Intelligence Group.....	18.65%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	14.68%
High Grade Moron Group.....	7.35%
Low Grade Moron Group.....	13.59%
WEIGHTED AVERAGE FOR ALL GROUPS.....	14.76%

To properly evaluate these percentages, it must be borne in mind that the criminal population is entirely unselected as regards physical perfection, age, and freedom from dependents, qualifications which obtain in the selection of men for military service. Accordingly, a percentage of the unselected criminal group exceeds in actual numerical value the same percentage of the selected and hence smaller military group coming within the same general grouping of the population. Hence, 14.76% of the entire criminal group, as given above, in reality signifies a much higher percentage of the actual military group included by the criminal groups. How much higher it may be, is, of course, impossible of statement, but considering the military qualifications, an estimate of half again as much is, in all probability, entirely fair. Further, the number of white males coming within the age limits of 21 to 70 years established by the criminal classes herein under examination is 27,153,759,⁴⁵ and the total of white troops who saw service amounts to 3,306,178,⁴⁶ thus giving a proportion of 12.1% of

the general comparable population in 1920 serving in the World War. In the eight years since 1920, vast numbers of minors have reached their majority, thus markedly changing the constituency of the general population. Hence the proportion of the present comparable population having a history of service in the World War is unquestionably and decidedly less than the 12.1% given above, as contrasted to the 14.76% of the present criminal population. Bearing this in mind, it is at once evident that the percentage of ex-service men among offenders against the law is disproportionately high, a fact holding true, essentially, for each of the various groups, and to a similar degree, showing no striking relationship between degree of intelligence and history of military service. That approximately one out of every seven criminals has served in the World War as compared to one out of every ten or more of the general population suggests a direct relationship between that service and the anti-social behavior of the individual. This same high percentage of ex-service men among the inmates of penal and correctional institutions has been previously noted by Lorenz⁴⁷ who found a total of 25% for Wisconsin in 1923. Accordingly, the potency of military service as a factor in delinquency is not to be doubted, whether directly as consequent upon the disorganization of personality due to military experiences, or indirectly either as consequent upon the difficulties of re-adjustment in civil life in the post-war period, or as a result of army-learned habits and morals carried over into civil life.⁴⁸ This disproportion of ex-service men among criminals may be appreciated to a still further degree by calling to mind the very significant facts that the age group of 21 to 24 years inclusive has the greatest crime incidence as shown by the census report of 1904,⁴⁹ and the census report of 1923,⁵⁰ and that the median age of those committed to penal servitude for a term of one year or more, which would include the 1,690 cases of this study, is 28 years.⁵¹ Indeed, criminality is an attribute of personality which tends to show itself early in life.⁵² These facts strongly emphasize the increased percentage of World War veterans inasmuch as they are, on the average, well beyond these ages. Accordingly, even for a long time afterwards, nearly ten years in this study, delinquency must be regarded as a due toll of war.

AGE DISTRIBUTION

Another matter of interest was the age distribution for the various groups under study, which is given in the following table:

	21-30	<i>Age Groupings</i>		
		31-40	41-60	61—
Normal Intelligence Group.....	58.32%	24.54%	14.79%	2.35%
Subnormal Intelligence Group.....	57.19%	23.85%	15.29%	3.67%
High Grade Moron Group.....	52.69%	23.29%	19.36%	4.66%
Low Grade Moron Group.....	35.92%	36.90%	24.27%	2.91%

It is at once evident from the above table that there is a considerable degree of relationship between the amount of intelligence possessed by the offenders and their age distribution. The greater proportion of younger offenders is to be found in the more highly intelligent groups, while the greater proportion of older offenders is to be found in the groups of lowest intelligence. As shown above, 64% of the low grade morons have passed the age of 30 years, as compared to 42% of those of normal intelligence. Similarly, 49% of all feeble-minded delinquents have passed that age as compared to 42% of those not feeble-minded. Further, the per cent of mentally deficient delinquents included by the age period of 41 to 60 years is relatively 36% greater than the same percentage for those of more normal intelligence. This increase is even more marked in the case of the low grade feeble-minded, who show a relative increase ranging from 25% above the high grade morons to 67% above the normal intelligence group. Apparently then, delinquency among feeble-minded adults occurs at a considerably later age on the average than among those not feeble-minded. An interpretation that may be suggested for this is that the passing of the years renders the problems of life more and more strenuous for the mentally deficient individual because of his naturally decreased powers of occupational adaptation and consequently decreased powers of social adaptation. Accordingly, he finds the burdens of life relatively more difficult than his fellow of more normal intelligence who is not compelled to confine his efforts to sustain life to the "drawing of water and the hewing of wood." And in individuals of already weak moral fiber, any added strain may be sufficient to break the slender threads holding the individual from wrong conduct. On the other hand, rather than a postponement of the age of incidence, it may be that the curve of crime incidence for the feeble-minded, after reaching its highest point at the age group of 18 to 24 years, does not decline as does the curve for crime incidence in general.⁵³ Rather, it may be that it continues as a plateau, extending much farther into the later age groups. This appears entirely reasonable since the deficiency of intelligence of the feeble-minded negates any well-founded hope of regeneration of such an individual after he has once embarked upon a criminal career. Nor can there be any well-

justified expectation of the feeble-minded acquiring wisdom with one experience with penalization. On the contrary, it seems reasonable to expect that the tendency toward crime would remain unchanged and that the manifestations would continue unaffected and undiminished in number.

MARRIAGE AND DELINQUENCY

Marriage is well-recognized as a stabilizing influence for the individual,⁵⁴ and constitutes an actual moral force in the prevention of crime by providing happiness and stimulating worthy activity.⁵⁵ Accordingly, a decreased incidence of marriage or an increased disruption of marriage might reasonably be expected among criminals. In substantiation of this inference is the report of the Census Bureau which shows that the unmarried among criminals outnumber the married more than two times per 100,000 population of the age of 15 years or more.⁵⁶ However, this is probably a distortion of the real truth since the criminal population with that age limit contains an exceedingly great proportion of juvenile and young adult offenders, as is shown by the census reports mentioned above on the age of crime incidence. This investigation, however, includes only individuals of marriageable age, and their marital status has been investigated for any significant manifestations. The findings are given in the following table together with similar findings for the general comparable population of the United States:⁵⁷

Marital State	Normal Intell. Group	Sub- normal Intell. Group	High Grade Moron Group	Low Grade Moron Group	U. S. General Comparable Population*
Single	43.67%	49.54%	45.59%	46.60%	25.1%
Married	56.33%	50.46%	54.41%	53.40%	68.3%
Separated	5.83%	4.84%	2.25%	3.63%	} 6.6%
Divorced	20.62%	18.78%	20.27%	18.18%	
Widowed	5.62%	12.72%	9.91%	7.27%	

*White race and 21 or more years of age.

As may be readily seen, there is no striking disproportion between the married and the unmarried of the criminal classes. The one state obtains essentially as frequently as the other, the married having a slight majority. Comparison, however, of the percentages for the criminals with those for the general population shows a decided decrease in the incidence of marriage among offenders of all types. Accordingly, the assumption of the stabilizing influence of marriage appears well substantiated. Or, it may be that the fundamental con-

stitution of the delinquent is of such a nature that he is frequently antagonistic toward the assumption and maintenance of marital duties and thus fails even to experience contact with any presumably stabilizing influences of marriage. At any rate, marriage, together with any of the beneficial influences it may exert upon the individual, is of markedly less frequent occurrence among criminal classes than among the general population.

A second point concerning the decreased incidence of marriage among malefactors as shown above, is the similarity of the percentages for the various groups. There is no decrease in the extent of marriage concomitant with the decrease in the intellectual endowment as might be expected from the assumption that intelligence is a requisite for the assumption of matrimonial duties. Moreover, the equality of the percentages for the feeble-minded groups and the non-feeble-minded groups demonstrates that even deficient intelligence is infinitely far from constituting an effectual barrier to the marriage of the unfit—even those unfit who manifest the combined defects of criminality and of mental deficiency!

That slightly over 50% of criminals, including even the low grade morons, are married with the consequently increased possibilities of the propagation of the species is somewhat disheartening. However, a more hopeful aspect of the matter is obtained by bringing into consideration similar statistics in regard to the marriage of college graduates who undeniably represent the better stock of the land. Investigation in the alumni records of Harvard and Yale for the period of 1851 to 1890 shows the percentage of male graduates married ranging between 74% and 78%.⁵⁸ A similar investigation at Syracuse University covering a period of 50 years reveals 81% of the male graduates married,⁵⁹ and similarly, Stanford University has a percentage of 73.2% of the men of the classes from 1892 to 1900 married.⁶⁰ Thus, a comparison of these percentages with those of delinquents affords a hopeful eugenical outlook, and also, it shows the decreased incidence of marriage among delinquents. To be sure, the figures given in the table above are less than their true value inasmuch as more marriages will occur among the offenders herein under investigation, but the possibility of their marriage percentage ever reaching the level of that of college-bred men is extremely doubtful. Particularly is this so in regard to those of deficient intelligence wherein the average age is considerably beyond the usual age of marriage.

Another instructive aspect of the above table is the very great frequency of marital disruption among the criminal groups as compared with the general population. Divorce alone is accountable for three times as much marital disruption among criminal classes as divorce and death among the general population. However, it must be borne in mind that conviction of felony constitutes grounds for a divorce in Wisconsin and various other states. Although this fact probably does account for some of the increase, it is not conceivable that it would account entirely for the markedly increased incidence of divorce among criminals. Particularly does this seem to be the more tenable since the prevalence of divorce is practically the same for each of the various groups. This equality of incidence is strongly suggestive that the criminally inclined nature, regardless of intellectual endowment, is fundamentally lacking in those personal and social requisites essential for the assumption and maintenance of marital duties. Or it may be that this marked prevalence of divorce indicates the failure of the stabilizing influences of marriage and home life because of the inherent instability of the criminal classes preventing the reception of any such benefits. Both inferences are further substantiated by a consideration of the percentage of separations. This, for the two more intelligent groups, amounts to over 25% of the general divorce rate for those groups, thereby greatly increasing the percentage of disrupted married life. While comparable figures for the general population are not available to enable a proper evaluation of these percentages of separations, common judgment alone is sufficient to realize that figures for separations among the criminal classes are undoubtedly increased over similar figures for the general population. The same thing is true of the percentages for the widowed, as is shown by the figure above for the general population of 6.6%, which includes both the widowed and the divorced. As it is, the percentages of actually disrupted marriages range from 29% for the low grade morons to 36% for the group of subnormal intelligence and 32% for the normal intelligence group. And when it is considered that 36% to 58% of the groups respectively are still within the age group of 21 to 30 years, it is reasonable to suppose that a contrasting of these percentages with figures for a like proportion of the general population would render the above figures comparably much higher. However, from a eugenical point of view as regards the propagation of the species, this high percentage of disrupted marriages is a most hopeful sign.

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC RESPONSIBILITIES

Related in significance to the table above on *Marital Status* is the table on *Social and Economic Responsibilities*. This table includes data only for those individuals who are married or have been married at some time. Following is the table:

(Married Individuals Only)	Normal Intell. Group	Sub- normal Intell. Group	High Grade Moron Group	Low Grade Moron Group
Without children.....	32.29%	24.85%	21.17%	24.45%
With children				
With one child.....	26.04%	25.45%	27.94%	20.00%
With two children.....	20.21%	19.39%	20.27%	14.55%
With three children.....	8.75%	11.52%	9.90%	10.91%
With four or more (average of five)	12.71%	18.79%	20.72%	29.09%
AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHILDREN PER FAMILY.....	1.56	1.93	2.02	2.27

It will be noted at once that the greater number of children and the greater number of families with children occur in the groups of deficient intelligence, particularly so in the low grade moron group. This is quite in accord with the findings of other investigators and the generally conceived opinion of the greater fecundity of the classes of deficient intelligence.⁶¹ While some consideration must be given to the greater average age of the feeble-minded of the above table in evaluating the percentages, the significant distribution of the percentages, and the low percentages of childless marriages strongly suggest the justifiability of comparing them on an equality with the other groups. How serious is this fecundity of the criminal classes as shown here may be judged somewhat by comparable figures for other classes of society. Thus, an investigation of the families of 1,000 American men of science who had attained some degree of distinction showed 22% childless and an average of less than two surviving children for each one.⁶² And an investigation conducted in regard to 1,986 prominent Methodist clergymen showed 97.44% married, with only 11% childless, 12.5% with one child, 20.4% with two children, 18.5% with three children, and the remaining 37.6% with four or more children, an average of 3.26 children for each individual.⁶³ Also, an inquiry made in regard to graduates of Harvard and Yale revealed an average of 2.17 children for each individual.⁶⁴ And another investigation of the Harvard Graduates of 1894 revealed 20% without children, 13.1% with one child, 18.1% with two children, 22.5% with three children, and 25.5% with four or more children.⁶⁵ This makes an average of 2.44 children for each individual, a figure

which gives the college bred man of Harvard the lead over even the low grade moron delinquent. Further, it has been estimated by Kehrer that the proportion of childless marriages for civilized countries ranges between 10% and 15%,⁶⁶ which means that the ordinary middle-class citizen, taking the criminalistic and the college-bred classes as the extremes, bears the burden of restocking the population. This renders less alarming the belief of the overfecundity of the defective and deficient classes. Nevertheless, that over 50% of the criminal classes are married and tend, despite the prevalence of disrupted marriages, to reproduce themselves to the same extent as our leading intellectual classes constitutes an indisputable ill to society. Nor can there be any doubt of the gravity of this when it is realized that for the 328,820 adult male delinquents in prison⁶⁷ there are only 508,714 men enrolled as students in universities, colleges, and professional schools in the United States,⁶⁸ a figure including minors as well as adults.

INDIVIDUAL ECONOMIC STATUS

Possibly the first author to discuss the relationship between poverty and criminality was Sir Thomas More in his "Utopia."⁶⁹ Since his time poverty has become very widely recognized as more or less of an inseparable companion to crime in general.⁷⁰ The exact role played by poverty in its relation to crime is not known, but in all probability, its role is indirect since poverty generally means low status, with little to lose, little to respect, little to be proud of, and little to sustain efforts at improvement.⁷¹ In this study, poverty is strikingly manifest in regard to the individuals of each of the groups of offenders. Following is the table showing the *Economic Status of the Individual*:

	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Good</i>
Normal Intelligence Group.....	86.39%	13.38%	0.23%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	86.24%	13.46%	0.30%
High Grade Moron Group.....	88.23%	11.77%
Low Grade Moron Group.....	90.29%	9.71%

In the above table, the term *Poor* signifies a hand-to-mouth existence, the term *Fair* signifies the possession of a small amount of taxable property with slightly more than the bare necessities of life, and the term *Good* signifies a comfortable and reasonably secure living with educational and cultural opportunities available. Such designations, to be sure, are inexact and uncertain, but do possess a very considerable value in aggregate usage. While data showing the economic status of the general population on such a scale as the above is not available, it is, nevertheless, very reasonable to suppose that the

percentage of hand-to-mouth existences would fall far short of that shown by criminals. This same opinion is concurred in by Gillin, Bonger, Garofalo, and Sutherland in their respective texts upon criminology, all of which tends to substantiate the reliability of the above table and the conclusions that may be drawn therefrom. Indeed, various investigations have shown that less than 50% of the general population is without property as compared to the 86% to 90% of criminals given in the table above.⁷² Thus it is evident that a very considerable stabilizing force is lacking in the lives of the criminal class, since the possession of property serves as a preventative to crime by creating a sense of responsibility and reliability and by awakening the acquisitive instinct.⁷³

It is to be noted, strikingly enough, that there are no real differences between the percentages for the various groups, and that the feeble-minded show no greater incidence of poverty than those not mentally deficient. This similarity in percentages suggests very emphatically one of two things, and possibly both. The first of these is the environmental nature of poverty as a factor in delinquency. The second is the possibility of a fundamental deficiency in the character of criminals which renders poverty a characteristic accompaniment in that it represents a level of existence to which they naturally descend.⁷⁴ Both of these interpretations are further suggested by the fact that of the vast numbers of the poor, only a comparatively small part become delinquent, and further by the fact that virtue may thrive as richly in poverty-stricken homes as in those of wealth. Nevertheless, poverty itself does weaken the moral sentiments and thus it does pave the way for anti-social behavior.⁷⁵ Moreover, it constitutes an obstacle to education, the want of which may prevent moral development.⁷⁶ However, that poverty may have a direct relationship to delinquency must not be overlooked, as individual cases will show, a relationship dependent upon individual factors and made manifest by circumstances. Accordingly, while the conclusion that there is a relationship between crime and poverty may be drawn justly in view of the above evidence, this conclusion does not signify that the disappearance of poverty would herald the end of crime nor even modify the extent of occurrence of social dereliction to any considerable degree.⁷⁷

PARENTAL ECONOMIC STATUS

Parental poverty unquestionably shares in the production of delinquency, probably through the interference it occasions in the proper rearing of the child. Family poverty results often in the absence of

the parents from home, the lack of proper and needed discipline, resort to the streets and bad companions, denial of safe and simple pleasures, lack of recreation, and consequent social starvation—all of which forms a wide background of deprivation in youthful lives with no instruction or opportunity of satisfying normal safe desires.⁷⁸ In addition, it results in bad environments, and the deprivation of educational and cultural opportunities.⁷⁹ Thus even those individuals capable of absorbing the sound principles of law and morality are all too often not even exposed to such teachings. Instead, they are exposed to the undesirable teachings and evil precepts of the wretched environments in which they are compelled to live. And in such environments bad habits are learned by imitation,⁸⁰ and actual delinquency is often directly attributable to the deleterious influence of the community, as has been shown by investigations,⁸¹ and court records,⁸² for criminality, whether in the family group or in the community, always breeds crime.⁸³ The extent of parental poverty among criminal classes for this particular investigation is shown in the following table on the *Parental Economic Status*, the descriptive terms of which have the same significance as in the previous table on *Individual Economic Status*:

	Percent Having Parents with Economic Status of:—		
	Poor	Fair	Good
Normal Intelligence Group.....	29.34%	68.08%	2.58%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	29.67%	70.33%
High Grade Moron Group.....	31.13%	68.63%	0.24%
Low Grade Moron Group.....	30.10%	69.90%

The above percentages do not, in all probability, reflect the exact truth since they are based on remote memory, and especially would this be so in regard to the feeble-minded. However, comparison of the percentages for the different groups leads to the conclusion that they may be considered as fairly reliable, especially the first two groups. The general trend of the figures is in accord with common judgment and the various groups, so widely divergent in mental endowment, agree in general most consistently. Accordingly, the above table shows an obviously great dearth of homes affording educational and cultural opportunities and a distressfully large extent of hand-to-mouth existences in the parental home conditions. The influence of parental poverty in the production of anti-social behavior has been recognized repeatedly, and the above findings are fully substantiated by those of Breckenridge and Abbott,⁸⁴ and Bailly.⁸⁵ Undoubtedly the influence of the parental home conditions is indirect, as has been suggested, with those of defective quality accomplishing an undesirable end through the faulty develop-

ment of the individual, and by the continuance of those conditions of life which allow for the further reproduction and development of such faultily constituted individuals.⁸⁶ With homes of defective quality, the social harvest in a vast number of cases must necessarily be poor indeed!

DISRUPTED HOMES AND DELINQUENCY

Along with parental poverty, another factor, probably of much greater significance in the production of social derelicts, is the matter of broken or disrupted home conditions in the childhood and youth of the individual. The following table shows the status of the home previous to the eighteenth birthday of the offender:

	Percent of Homes Disrupted, Per- by Death, cent Divorce, of Desertion, Homes or Sepa- Unbroken ration
Normal Intelligence Group.....	63.97% 36.03%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	62.08% 37.92%
High Grade Moron Group.....	60.54% 39.46%
Low Grade Moron Group.....	70.87% 29.13%

As may be readily appreciated from the above figures, the percentage of disrupted homes in the childhood of the individual offenders is surprisingly high for all except the low grade morons, the interpretation of which will be made later. Shideler has estimated, by a method accepted by criminologists in general as apparently sound and conservative, that 25% of all children come from disrupted homes, and that, from various of his studies made of delinquent minors, 40% to 70% of all juvenile offenders come from disrupted homes.⁸⁷ Healy,⁸⁸ Breckenridge and Abbott,⁸⁹ and Healy and Bronner⁹⁰ have shown in their studies that at least 50% of juvenile delinquents come from disrupted homes, and Sutherland, in his study of the literature, has reached the conclusion that the disrupted home occurs twice as frequently among delinquent minors as among non-delinquents.⁹¹ Also, the census report of 1923 shows that 46% of all juvenile delinquents come from disrupted homes.⁹² With such findings for juvenile offenders, it is only reasonable and logical to assume that the same conditions would hold true to a comparative extent for adult offenders, since practically all confirmed criminals begin their careers in their childhood or youth.⁹³ And this assumption is substantiated by the findings of Lorenz, who found, in his study of 300 cases of ex-service men in penal institutions, that 59% of those

cases were individuals whose childhood home had been disrupted.⁹⁴ And Brace, in his early study of adult offenders, found that 55% of the adult criminals in New York penitentiaries came from disrupted homes.⁹⁵ Thus, as a conclusion, it may be considered that the disruption of the home during the developmental period of the individual exerts an inimical influence upon normal social development, and may lead indirectly to the production of soil fertile for the growth of anti-social behavior. The reasons therefor are undoubtedly many and varied. Increased economic difficulties of life, deprivation of educational and developmental opportunities otherwise available, and the failure of the normal guiding influences of home training may each constitute serious handicaps to correct social development. In addition, disruption of the home frequently leads to child labor which causes delinquency by placing the individual under responsibilities and in situations with which the ability to cope is lacking or undeveloped, or by rendering the individual pecuniarily independent at an age when the need of guidance is greatest.⁹⁶ A still further consideration and one wholly unmeasurable but worthy of serious consideration is the probable inheritance of various undesirable traits of personality which served to disrupt the home in many instances, and which render social adaptation more difficult for the child of that home.

As will be noted from the table above, the percentage of disrupted homes for the low grade morons is considerably below that of the other groups, and is but little higher than Shideler's estimate for the general population. While the exact significance of this is difficult of determination, abstract reasoning suggests either that the home of the low grade moron is devoid of influence in the development of the individual, or that the influence is of such a nature that little difference is made whether the home is disrupted or not. Or it may be that the mental deficiency of the low grade moron is so severe that criminalistic tendencies are a matter of endowment rather than distortion of development as may be the case with those of better mental endowment. At any rate, disruption of the childhood home of the low grade moron appears to be without particularly marked effect upon the individual of that home.

PARENTAL NATIVITY

A much contested but apparently important contributor to delinquency, especially so in regard to offenders of less than normal intelligence, is the element of unselected foreign stock in the population of

the state. This may be judged from the following table showing the *Parental Nativity*:

	Parents Native- Born	Parents Foreign- Born	One Native, One Foreign- Born
Normal Intelligence Group.....	48.95%	38.96%	12.09%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	47.40%	40.98%	11.62%
High Grade Moron Group.....	44.36%	44.86%	10.78%
Low Grade Moron Group.....	22.33%	73.78%	3.89%
United States Population in General ⁹⁷ (white race only)	61.60%	31.00%	7.40%

The above table shows clearly that the foreign-born stock does produce more than its due quota of our specified delinquents, especially so in regard to those of deficient intelligence. This is most marked regarding the low grade morons, where the foreign-born stock produces more than 235% of its due quota of offenders as determined by population ratios while the proportions for the other three groups ranges from 125% for the group of normal intelligence to 144% for the high grade feeble-minded delinquents. This finding is substantiated by the findings of the Immigration Commission of 1910.⁹⁸ and also by Laughlin in his report to the Congressional Committee.⁹⁹ And similar findings have been reported by the Massachusetts Department of Corrections.¹⁰⁰ In addition, Laughlin also found that the second generation of foreign stock had an increased crime incidence over and above that of foreign stock in general, probably because that generation represents the transitional stage between the discarding of the customs of the old country and the adopting of those of the new. Undoubtedly this fact accounts for a proportion of the increased percentages in the above table. Obviously then, there is an undeniable danger in the admission of unselected foreign stock, both from the aspect of their own undesirability and from the aspect of their reproduction of their kind. Hence, there is an unquestionable and appealing need of a closer and more intelligent supervision of immigration, with more ample provision for the means of so doing.

A second consideration evident from the above table is the increase among offenders of individuals having one parent foreign-born and the other native-born. The percentages given above nearly double that for the general population. Various investigations have shown that there is a decided tendency for the home of mixed parental nativity to produce delinquents.¹⁰¹ This fact has been attributed to the conflict of standards within the home serving to destroy proper discipline.¹⁰² This strongly substantiates inferences made above concerning the importance

of the home in the proper rearing of the child, with defective homes resulting in social loss and injury.

INDIVIDUAL CITIZENSHIP

That the individual of foreign birth himself, if not of unselected and inherently faulty stock, is not an undesirable citizen, is evident from the following table showing the *Individual Citizenship*:

	Native	Alien	First Papers	Natur- alized
Normal Intelligence Group.....	84.28%	4.58%	3.05%	8.09%
Subnormal Intelligence Group.....	82.87%	6.73%	3.06%	7.34%
High Grade Moron Group.....	78.92%	8.83%	5.88%	6.37%
Low Grade Moron Group.....	52.43%	26.21%	10.68%	10.68%
United States Population ¹⁰³ (white race only)	85.50%

Here it is evident that the foreign-born individual, unless of subnormal or deficient intelligence, is responsible for no more than a fair share of delinquency as determined by population ratios, and that from a standpoint of potential criminality he is not one bit worse than his native-born brother. However, the increased incidence of crime among those of deficient intelligence suffices to raise the average of crime incidence for the foreign-born individuals far above that of the native-born, as may be ascertained from the above table. This finding is in accord with the general findings of the United States Immigration Commission of 1910,¹⁰⁴ and a similar finding has been made by the Census Bureau in 1923, which reports, for adult white male delinquents, an actually increased criminality among those of foreign birth.¹⁰⁵ Particularly does the above table show that as the amount of intelligence possessed by the individual decreases, the foreign-born have a decidedly increased crime incidence, and especially is this so in regard to the low grade morons. It has been estimated by capable students that 6% to 7% of the many thousands of immigrants arriving yearly are feeble-minded.¹⁰⁶ Moreover, it is reported that many of those declared unfit to land are permitted to enter this country.¹⁰⁷ Accordingly, it is easy to understand why so large a proportion of the criminal mentally deficient are of foreign extraction. Indeed, while but 14.5% of the population at large is of foreign birth, 47.57% of the low grade moron delinquents are of foreign birth, which places their proportion of crime, as determined by population ratios, at 327% of their fair quota. That this high incidence of crime may be due in part to the inability of the mentally deficient alien to adapt himself to the new social order of his adopted country, rather than entirely to inherent criminal propensities, does not

alter nor palliate one iota the fundamental fact of his undesirability. Particularly in this table is the need made evident of an intelligent and selective system of immigration with adequate and complete facilities for culling the undesirables who constitute both a detriment and a menace to the social and economic welfare of the whole country.

Another revelation of the above table is that 26.21% of the low grade feeble-minded delinquents are aliens and that an average of 10.41% of all criminals are aliens and hence subject to deportation. Were the proper and adequate provisions in existence to meet this problem fully, society would experience a most decided benefit, probably at no greater economic cost than that of their criminality. Nor does this conjecture take into consideration the item of the social cost of criminality, which, so often, is infinitely more than the economic.

A further matter of interest in the above table is the percentages of the feeble-minded delinquents who have either applied for citizenship papers or who have been granted them. For the low grade feeble-minded this percentage amounts to 21.36% and the weighted average for both groups of mentally deficient totals 16.66%. That such a large proportion of the feeble-minded, particularly so of the low grade mentally deficient, have been granted citizenship constitutes an exceedingly severe criterion upon society. It evidences a failure to provide the judiciary with the ways and means of evaluating, understanding, and classifying the individuals who come before it. Until society makes the adequate provision essential to enable the courts to understand with what sort of human material they are dealing, there can be no good hope for the dispensation of justice nor the protection of citizenship. Especially is this so in criminal cases—indeed, in all cases where the primary consideration is human nature itself!

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions reached in this investigation and apparently justified by the data at hand are as follows:

1. There appears to be a very definite relationship between criminality and deficiency of intelligence. This relationship becomes decidedly more marked the greater the deficiency.
2. The feeble-minded or mentally deficient constitute 30% of our specified delinquents, a proportion fifteen to sixty times greater than that of the general population.
3. The low grade feeble-minded constitute 20% of the mentally deficient delinquents and 6% of all criminals.

4. The relationship between criminality and intelligence may be considered indirect since criminal tendencies are manifested to a similar degree and with a similar frequency by offenders regardless of intellectual endowment.

5. Recidivism appears unrelated to the intellectual endowment since it occurs with essentially the same frequency among the mentally deficient offenders as among those of better intellectual capacities.

6. Recidivism, both for the feeble-minded and those not feeble-minded, is responsible for 49% of crime, thereby indicating by its very extent the ineffectualness of the present penal system for both deterrence and correction.

7. Habitual criminality appears to be accountable for 9.9% of offenders, and is more frequently found in offenders of normal or nearly normal intelligence.

8. There appears to be none or slight relationship between the gravity of the offense committed and the degree of intelligence possessed since both high and low grade feeble-minded commit crimes as serious as those of their more intellectually gifted fellows.

9. There appears to be a greater tendency on the part of the low grade feeble-minded to commit a greater number of the more serious crimes as judged by the duration of the sentence administered.

10. The extent of feeble-mindedness among recognized criminals and the marked recidivism among mentally deficient delinquents as well as among those not feeble-minded indicates an utter inadequacy of the present social, judiciary, and penal systems to cope satisfactorily with the problems of criminality.

11. The feeble-minded delinquents, despite the very questionable outlook of regeneration for them and regardless of their evident need of permanent segregation or supervision, receive the same sort of sentences and consequent treatment as their more normal brothers.

12. Only 16% to 23% of offenders, whether of normal, subnormal, or deficient intelligence, receive long term sentences despite the fact that an average of 56.7% are recidivistic or habitual offenders and hence difficult and doubtful in the main of regeneration.

13. There appears to be no relationship, except in certain specific instances and within the limitations imposed by the actual capacities of the individual, between intelligence and the type of the crime committed. The distribution of offenses is essentially the same for each level of intelligence.

14. Economic distress has a subjective value, approximately equally so for each level of intelligence, in the causation of crime, and as such a factor, it appears to be entirely environmental in nature.

15. The influence of bad company has no greater subjective value in the causation of delinquency for the feeble-minded than for those of more superior intelligence.

16. Alcoholism is a definitely recognizable subjective factor in delinquency. It is recognized to a similar extent at each level of intelligence, and hence may be considered as environmental rather than individual in nature.

17. For each level of intelligence, a disproportionately high percentage of ex-service men are included among delinquents, thereby indicting military service as a genetic force in crime.

18. There appears to be a considerable degree of relationship between the endowment of intelligence and the age distribution of offenders. The greater proportion of younger offenders is in the groups of greater intelligence, and the greater proportion of older offenders is in the groups of lesser intelligence.

19. There appears to be a somewhat decreased incidence of marriage among criminals in general, which is manifest to a similar extent for each level of intelligence.

20. The combined defects of subnormal or deficient intelligence and criminality do not constitute an effective barrier to the marriage of the unfit.

21. The extent of conjugal incompatibility among criminal classes, as evidenced by divorce and separation, is markedly increased above that of the general population. This holds true for each level of intelligence, but least so for the lowest level.

22. The disruption of marital life may constitute a causative factor in the production of delinquency, or it may be coincidental evidence of additional inherent constitutional defects in the nature of the criminal.

23. The criminal classes tend to reproduce themselves to almost the same extent as do the college-bred classes, the greater fecundity of the criminal classes being shown by the groups of lowest intelligence.

24. Individual poverty appears to be a very definite factor in the causation of delinquency. As such a factor, it seems to be entirely environmental in nature since it is equally distributed for the various levels of intelligence.

25. Parental poverty appears to constitute an indirect and environmental factor in the production of crime, manifest to an essentially

equal degree for each level of intelligence. And as a result of this parental poverty, there is a very great dearth of homes affording educational and cultural opportunities.

26. A significantly large percentage of criminals come from disrupted childhood homes, thereby suggesting that such homes are inimical to correct social development. With a decrease in intelligence there is a concomitant decrease in the percentage, with the low grade morons having the fewest number of disrupted childhood homes, thereby suggesting a lesser value for their type of homes.

27. Individuals of foreign parentage appear to be responsible for an increased quota of crime as determined by population ratios. This is increasingly manifest as the endowment of intelligence decreases, the low grade moron of foreign parentage being responsible for more than 235% of the population quota of crime.

28. There appears to be an increased proportion of mixed percentage, one native-born, one foreign-born, among criminal classes thereby suggesting the probability of an unfortunate social result of such a home.

29. The foreign-born individual not of subnormal or deficient intelligence appears to be responsible for no more than a fair share of delinquency as determined by population ratios.

30. The foreign-born individual of subnormal or deficient intelligence appears to be responsible for an overwhelmingly increased incidence of crime as determined by population ratios. This increased incidence reaches the proportion of 327% of the fair quota for the low grade morons.

31. Of the low grade feeble-minded offenders, 26% are aliens, and an average of 10% of all criminals are non-citizens.

32. Of the foreign-born feeble-minded delinquents, a proportion equalling 16% of the entire number of mentally deficient have either applied for citizenship papers or have been granted them. This signifies a failure of the social provision of proper judicial machinery for the best handling of human material, and the protection of citizenship.

APPENDIX OF TABLES

TABLE I

GENERAL DISTRIBUTION ACCORDING TO INTELLIGENCE

	<i>No. of Cases Percentage</i>	
<i>Total Number of Individual Cases Examined.....</i>	1,690	100.00%
Cases Found of Normal Intelligence.....	852	50.41%
Cases Found of Subnormal or Low Intelligence.....	327	19.36%
Cases Found of High Grade Feeble-mindedness.....	408	24.14%
Cases Found of Low Grade Feeble-mindedness.....	103	6.09%

TABLE II
TOTAL CRIMINAL HISTORY

	No. of Cases	Percent of Group
<i>Normal Intelligence Group</i>		
Cases Guilty of Misdemeanors.....	388	45.54%
Cases Having:		
One Conviction.....	652	76.52%
Two or Three Convictions.....	173	20.31%
Four or More Convictions.....	27	3.17%
Cases Having:*		
One Offense (a conviction).....	336	39.44%
Two or Three Offenses.....	428	50.23%
Four or More Offenses.....	88	10.33%
<i>Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group</i>		
Cases Guilty of Misdemeanors.....	162	49.54%
Cases Having:		
One Conviction.....	257	78.59%
Two or Three Convictions.....	61	18.66%
Four or More Convictions.....	9	2.75%
Cases Having:*		
One Offense (a conviction).....	128	39.14%
Two or Three Offenses.....	164	50.16%
Four or More Offenses.....	35	10.70%
<i>High Grade Feeble-minded Group</i>		
Cases Guilty of Misdemeanors.....	188	46.08%
Cases Having:		
One Conviction.....	330	80.88%
Two or Three Convictions.....	73	17.89%
Four or More Convictions.....	5	1.23%
Cases Having:*		
One Offense (a conviction).....	171	41.93%
Two or Three Offenses.....	205	50.23%
Four or More Offenses.....	32	7.84%
<i>Low Grade Feeble-minded Group</i>		
Cases Guilty of Misdemeanors.....	51	49.52%
Cases Having:		
One Conviction.....	87	84.47%
Two or Three Convictions.....	15	14.56%
Four or More Convictions.....	1	.97%
Cases Having:*		
One Offense (a conviction).....	50	48.55%
Two or Three Offenses.....	47	45.63%
Four or More Offenses.....	6	5.82%

*In these cases, a history of misdemeanors constitutes a single offense, and conviction for felony constitutes all additional offenses.

TABLE III
LENGTH OF SENTENCE

	<i>No. of Cases</i>	<i>Percent of Group</i>
<i>Normal Intelligence Group</i>		
One Year or Less.....	72	8.45%
More than One Year and Not More than Two.....	226	26.52%
Three to Four Years Inclusive.....	231	27.11%
Five to Nine Years Inclusive.....	183	21.48%
Ten Years or More but Not Life Imprisonment.....	123	14.44%
Life Imprisonment.....	17	2.00%
<i>Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group</i>		
One Year or Less.....	32	9.79%
More than One Year and Not More than Two.....	93	28.44%
Three to Four Years Inclusive.....	95	29.05%
Five to Nine Years Inclusive.....	47	14.37%
Ten Years or More but Not Life Imprisonment.....	43	13.15%
Life Imprisonment.....	17	5.20%
<i>High Grade Feeble-minded Group</i>		
One Year or Less.....	43	10.54%
More than One Year and Not More than Two.....	124	30.39%
Three to Four Years Inclusive.....	100	24.50%
Five to Nine Years Inclusive.....	67	16.43%
Ten Years or More but Not Life Imprisonment.....	61	14.95%
Life Imprisonment.....	13	3.19%
<i>Low Grade Feeble-minded Group</i>		
One Year or Less.....	14	13.59%
More than One Year and Not More than Two.....	28	27.18%
Three to Four Years Inclusive.....	18	17.48%
Five to Nine Years Inclusive.....	19	18.45%
Ten Years or More but Not Life Imprisonment.....	19	18.45%
Life Imprisonment.....	5	4.85%

TABLE IV
TYPE OF OFFENSE COMMITTED

	<i>No. of Cases</i>	<i>Percent of Group</i>
<i>Normal Intelligence Group</i>		
Offenses against Property	486	57.04%
Offenses against Persons	57	6.69%
Offenses against Chastity and Morals.....	85	9.98%
Statutory Rape.....	69	8.10%
Automobile Thefts.....	69	8.10%
Abandonment	54	6.34%
All Other Offenses.....	32	3.75%

Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group

Offenses against Property	168	51.38%
Offenses against Persons	32	9.79%
Offenses against Chastity and Morals.....	38	11.62%
Statutory Rape.....	36	11.01%
Automobile Thefts.....	18	5.50%
Abandonment	14	4.28%
All Other Offenses.....	21	6.42%

High Grade Feeble-minded Group

Offenses against Property	188	46.08%
Offenses against Persons	32	7.84%
Offenses against Chastity and Morals.....	42	10.30%
Statutory Rape.....	62	15.20%
Automobile Thefts.....	24	5.88%
Abandonment	36	8.82%
All Other Offenses.....	24	5.88%

Low Grade Feeble-minded Group

Offenses against Property	39	37.86%
Offenses against Persons	18	17.48%
Offenses against Chastity and Morals.....	17	16.51%
Statutory Rape.....	16	15.53%
Automobile Thefts.....	2	1.94%
Abandonment	8	7.77%
All Other Offenses.....	3	2.91%

TABLE V

REASON, EXCUSE OR EXPLANATION

	No. of Cases	Percent of Group
<i>Economic Distress</i>		
Normal Intelligence Group.....	173	20.31%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	49	14.99%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	50	12.25%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	16	15.53%
<i>Bad Company</i>		
Normal Intelligence Group.....	59	6.93%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	24	7.34%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	22	5.39%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	3	2.91%
<i>Liquor</i>		
Normal Intelligence Group.....	163	19.13%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	76	23.24%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	90	22.06%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	21	20.39%

Other reasons given for which no significance could be found were:

Drugs.
Ill-health.
Fun and Excitement.
Miscellaneous.
No reason offered.

TABLE VI
MILITARY SERVICE IN WORLD WAR

	<i>No. of Cases</i>	<i>Percent of Group</i>
Normal Intelligence Group.....	159	18.65%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	48	14.68%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	30	7.35%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	14	13.59%

TABLE VII
AGE DISTRIBUTION

	<i>No. of Cases</i>	<i>Percent of Group</i>
<i>Twenty-one to Thirty Years Inclusive</i>		
Normal Intelligence Group.....	497	58.32%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	187	57.19%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	215	52.69%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	37	35.92%
<i>Thirty-one to Forty Years Inclusive</i>		
Normal Intelligence Group.....	209	24.54%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	78	23.85%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	95	23.29%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	38	36.90%
<i>Forty-one to Sixty Years Inclusive</i>		
Normal Intelligence Group.....	126	14.79%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	50	15.29%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	79	19.36%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	25	24.27%
<i>Sixty-one or More Years</i>		
Normal Intelligence Group.....	20	2.35%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	12	3.67%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	19	4.66%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	3	2.91%

TABLE VIII
MARITAL STATUS

	<i>No. of Cases</i>	<i>Percent of Group</i>
<i>Distribution of Unmarried</i>		
Normal Intelligence Group.....	372	43.67%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	162	49.54%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	186	45.59%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	48	46.60%
<i>Distribution of Married</i>		
Normal Intelligence Group.....	480	56.33%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	165	50.46%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	222	54.41%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	55	53.40%
<i>Distribution of Divorces*</i>		
Normal Intelligence Group.....	99	20.62%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	31	18.78%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	45	20.27%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	10	18.18%

*Distribution of Separations**

Normal Intelligence Group.....	28	5.83%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	8	4.84%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	5	2.25%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	2	3.63%

*Distribution of Widowed**

Normal Intelligence Group.....	27	5.62%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	21	12.72%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	22	9.91%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	4	7.27%

*These tables represent only those individuals who are married or who have been married at some time.

TABLE IX

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC RESPONSIBILITY

	No. of Cases	Percent of Group
<i>Married, without Children</i>		
Normal Intelligence Group.....	155	32.29%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	41	24.85%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	47	21.17%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	14	25.45%
<i>Married with One Child</i>		
Normal Intelligence Group.....	125	26.04%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	42	25.45%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	62	27.94%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	11	20.00%
<i>Married with Two Children</i>		
Normal Intelligence Group.....	97	20.21%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	32	19.39%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	45	20.27%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	8	14.55%
<i>Married with Three Children</i>		
Normal Intelligence Group.....	42	8.75%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	19	11.52%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	22	9.90%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	6	10.91%
<i>Married with Four or More Children</i>		
Normal Intelligence Group.....	61	12.71%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	31	18.79%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	46	20.72%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	16	29.09%

TABLE X

INDIVIDUAL'S ECONOMIC STATUS

	No. of Cases	Percent of Group
<i>Economic Status of, POOR</i>		
Normal Intelligence Group.....	736	86.39%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	282	86.24%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	360	88.23%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	93	90.29%

Economic Status of, FAIR

Normal Intelligence Group.....	114	13.38%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	44	13.46%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	48	11.77%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	10	9.71%

Economic Status of, GOOD

Normal Intelligence Group.....	2	.23%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	1	.30%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....

TABLE XI

PARENTAL ECONOMIC STATUS

	<i>No. of Cases</i>	<i>Percent of Group</i>
<i>Economic Status of, POOR</i>		
Normal Intelligence Group.....	250	29.34%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	97	29.67%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	127	31.13%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	31	30.10%
<i>Economic Status of, FAIR</i>		
Normal Intelligence Group.....	580	68.08%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	230	70.33%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	280	68.63%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	72	69.90%
<i>Economic Status of, GOOD</i>		
Normal Intelligence Group.....	22	2.58%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	1	.24%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....

TABLE XII

CONDITION OF CHILDHOOD HOME*

	<i>No. of Cases</i>	<i>Percent of Group</i>
<i>Childhood Home Unbroken</i>		
Normal Intelligence Group.....	545	63.97%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	203	62.08%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	247	60.54%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	73	70.87%
<i>Childhood Home Disrupted†</i>		
Normal Intelligence Group.....	307	36.03%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	124	37.92%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	161	39.46%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	30	29.13%

*This table shows the status of the home previous to the individual's eighteenth birthday.

†This data shows the homes disrupted by Death, Divorce, Desertion, or Separation.

TABLE XIII
NATIVITY OF PARENTS

	No. of Cases	Percent of Group
<i>Parents of Native Birth</i>		
Normal Intelligence Group.....	417	48.95%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	155	47.40%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	181	44.36%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	23	22.33%
<i>Parents of Foreign Birth</i>		
Normal Intelligence Group.....	332	38.96%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	134	40.98%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	183	44.86%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	76	73.78%
<i>One Parent of Native, Other of Foreign, Birth</i>		
Normal Intelligence Group.....	103	12.09%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	38	11.62%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	44	10.78%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	4	3.89%

TABLE XIV
CITIZENSHIP OF THE INDIVIDUAL

	No. of Cases	Percent of Group
<i>Native-born Citizens</i>		
Normal Intelligence Group.....	718	84.28%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	271	82.87%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	322	78.92%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	54	52.43%
<i>Aliens</i>		
Normal Intelligence Group.....	39	4.58%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	22	6.73%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	36	8.83%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	27	26.21%
<i>Aliens with First Papers</i>		
Normal Intelligence Group.....	26	3.05%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	10	3.06%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	24	5.88%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	11	10.68%
<i>Naturalized Citizens</i>		
Normal Intelligence Group.....	69	8.09%
Subnormal or Low Intelligence Group.....	24	7.34%
High Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	26	6.37%
Low Grade Feeble-minded Group.....	11	10.68%

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Richmond, F. C., "Mental Testing and Measuring," *Medico-Legal Journal* (1927), Volume 44, No. 3, p. 70.
2. Terman, L. M., *The Measurement of Intelligence* (1916), p. 79.

3. Brigham, Carl C., Eugenical News, "*Proceedings of 67th Meeting of Galton Society*," The Eugenics Research Association and American Eugenics Society (May, 1928), Vol. XII, No. 5, pp. 67-69.
4. Terman, L. M., *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. XII, No. 6, p. 330.
5. Terman, L. M., *The Measurement of Intelligence* (1916), p. 78.
6. Kuhlmann, F., *Outline of Mental Deficiency* (1925), p. 32.
7. Slawson, J., *The Delinquent Boy* (1926), Table 25, p. 134.
8. Bulletin of Iowa State Institutions (October, 1922).
9. Gillin, J. L., *Criminology and Penology* (1926), p. 117.
10. Kuhlmann, F., *Outline of Mental Deficiency* (1925), p. 32.
11. Slawson, J., *The Delinquent Boy* (1926), Table 25, p. 134.
12. Anderson, V. V., "*Mental Disease and Delinquency*," *Mental Hygiene* (1919), Vol. III, No. 2, pp. 177-198.
13. Richmond, F. C., "*Biennial Report of the Wisconsin Psychiatric Field Service*," *Medico-Legal Journal* (March-April, 1927), Vol. 44, No. 2, p. 47. (This embraces 4,000 cases, the remaining 4,000 not yet published.)
14. Gillin, J. L., *Criminology and Penology* (1926), p. 110.
15. Goddard, H. H., *Feeble-mindedness: Its Causes and Consequences*, New York (1914), pp. 497, 498, 516.
16. Kuhlmann, F., *Outline of Mental Deficiency* (1925), p. 14.
17. Richmond, F., "*A Classification of Delinquents*," *Medico-Legal Journal* (1926), Vol. 43, No. 4, p. 108.
18. Kuhlmann, F., *Outline of Mental Deficiency* (1925), p. 14.
19. Queen, S. A., *The Passing of the County Jail*, pp. 75-82.
20. Sutherland, E., *Criminology* (1924), p. 23.
21. Anderson, V. V., *Wisconsin Mental Deficiency Survey*, Madison (1920), p. 2.
22. Glueck, B., "*A Study of 608 Admissions to Sing Sing Prison*," *Mental Hygiene* (1918), Vol. 2, pp. 94-123.
23. Commissioner of Correction, *Annual Report of Department of Correction, Commonwealth of Massachusetts* (1922), p. 158; *ibid.* (1923), p. 113.
24. Bulletin of the City Club, Chicago, "*Prison Progress in New York City*" (February, 1916), p. 45.
25. Sutherland, E., *Criminology* (1924), p. 416.
26. Garofalo, R., *Criminology* (1914), p. 328.
27. Hopkins, A., "*Criminals and the Law*," *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* (May, 1911), Vol. II, p. 69.
28. Garofalo, R., *Criminology*, p. 326.
29. White, United States Chief Justice, *Transactions of the New York Medical Association* (1896), p. 815.
30. Ferri, E., *Criminal Sociology* (1917), p. 446.
31. Garofalo, R., *Criminology* (1914), p. 332.
32. Ferri, E., *Criminal Sociology* (1917), p. 216.
33. Sutherland, E. H., *Criminology* (1924), p. 443.
34. Healy, William, "*Present Day Aims and Methods of Studying the Offender*," *Bulletin of American Academy of Medicine*, Vol. 14, p. 345.
35. Blanc, Une Nouvelle Conception du Delit, N. R. (January, 1894).
36. Aschaffenburg, G., *Crime and Its Repression* (1913), p. 222.

37. Erickson, M. H., "Some Aspects of Abandonment, Feeble-mindedness, and Crime," Manuscript, University of Wisconsin (1928).
38. Lombroso, C., *Crime: Its Causes and Remedies* (1911), p. 133.
39. Pearson and Elderton, "A Second Study of the Influence of Parental Alcoholism," *Eugenics Laboratory Memoirs* (1910), Vol. XIII.
40. Howard, G. E., "Alcohol and Crime," *American Journal of Sociology* (July, 1918), Volume XXIV, p. 61.
41. Sutherland, E. H., *Criminology* (1924), p. 176.
42. More, Sir Thomas, *Utopia* (American Edition), pp. 28-29.
43. Wright, C. D., Chief of Bureau, *Report of Massachusetts Bureau of Labor* (1880), pp. 123, 195.
44. Sutherland, E. H., *Criminology* (1924), p. 49.
45. United States Bureau of the Census, *Abstract of the Fourteenth Census* (1920), Tables 46, 53, pp. 140, 218.
46. Kerby, F. W., "The World War" (Part II), Washington Bureau of Investigation.
47. Lorenz, W. F., "Delinquency and the Ex-Soldier," *Mental Hygiene* (1923), Vol. 7, p. 472.
48. Gillin, J. L., *Criminology and Penology* (1926), p. 241.
49. United States Bureau of the Census, *Special Report: Prisoners and Juvenile Delinquents in Institutions: 1904* (1907), p. 49.
50. United States Bureau of the Census, *Census of Prisoners: 1923 (Preliminary Report)* Table 5, p. 6.
51. Sutherland, E. H., *Criminology* (1924), p. 91.
52. Laughlin, H. H., "Analysis of America's Modern Melting Pot," Hearings before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, House of Representatives, 67th Congress, 3rd Session (November 21, 1922), Serial 7-C, p. 742.
53. Sutherland, E. H., *Criminology* (1924), p. 89.
54. Gillin, J. L., *Criminology and Penology* (1926), pp. 137-138.
55. Bonger, W. A., *Criminality and Economic Conditions* (1916), p. 462.
56. United States Bureau of the Census, *Special Report: Prisoners and Juvenile Delinquents in Institutions: 1904* (1907), p. 54.
57. United States Bureau of the Census, *Abstract of the Fourteenth Census* (1920), Tables 52, 53, pp. 216, 218.
58. Phillips, J. C., "A Study in Birth Rates in Harvard and Yale Graduates," *Harvard Graduates Magazine* (1916), Vol. XXV, No. 97, pp. 25-34.
59. Banker, H. J., "Co-education and Eugenics," *Journal of Heredity*, Vol. VIII (1917), pp. 208-214.
60. *Journal of Heredity*, "Stanford's Marriage Rate" (1917), Vol. VIII, pp. 170-173.
61. Guyer, M. F., *Being Well-Born* (1920), Chapter X, pp. 289-339.
62. Popenoe and Johnson, *Applied Eugenics* (1924), p. 268.
63. *Journal of Heredity*, "The Birth Rate of Methodist Clergymen" (1917), Vol. VIII, p. 455.
64. Phillips, J. C., "A Study in the Birth Rates in Harvard and Yale Graduates," *Harvard Graduates Magazine* (1916), Vol. XXV, pp. 25-34.
65. Woods, F. A., "Is Human Mind Still Evolving?" *Journal of Heredity* (1928), Vol. 18, p. 306.

66. Kehrler, E., *Ursachen und Behandlung Der Unfruchtbarkeit nach Modernen Gesichtspunkten* (1922).
67. United States Bureau of the Census, *Census of Prisoners: 1923 (Preliminary Report)*, Table 4, p. 5.
68. Kerby, F. W., *Washington Bureau of Investigation*. (Private Communication.)
69. More, Sir Thomas, *Utopia* (American Edition, Part I).
70. Ducpetiaux, E., *Pauperisme dans les Flanders*, p. 39.
71. Sutherland, E. H., *Criminology* (1924), p. 169.
72. Bonger, W. A., *Criminality and Economic Conditions* (1916), pp. 225, 226.
73. Von Valentine, H., *Das Verbrechen im Preussischen Staat*, p. 58.
74. Gillin, J. L., *Criminology and Penology* (1926), p. 249.
75. Stursberg, H., *Die Zunahme der Vergehen und Verbrechen und Ihre Ursache* (1878).
76. Garofalo, R., *Criminology* (1914), p. 156.
77. Garofalo, R., *Criminology* (1914), p. 147.
78. Gillin, J. L., *Criminology and Penology* (1926), p. 201.
79. Sutherland, E. H., *Criminology* (1924), p. 169.
80. Bonger, W. A., *Criminality and Economic Conditions* (1916), p. 155.
81. Burgess, E. W., "Juvenile Delinquency in a Small City," *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* (1916) Vol. VI, pp. 724-728.
82. St. Louis Juvenile Court Report (1908-1913), p. 17.
83. Saleilles, R., *The Individualization of Punishment* (1911), p. 118.
84. Breckenridge, S. P., and Abbott, E., "The Delinquent Child and the Home," New York Charities Publication Committee (1912), pp. 85, 89.
85. Baily, W. B., *Children before the Courts of Connecticut*, United States Children's Bureau, Publication 43, p. 80.
86. Gillin, J. L., *Criminology and Penology* (1926), p. 183.
87. Shideler, E. H., "Family Disintegration and the Delinquent Boy in the United States," *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* (1918), Vol. VIII, p. 715.
88. Healy, William, *The Individual Delinquent* (1915), Book II, Chap. 6, p. 290ff.
89. Breckenridge, S. P., and Abbott, E., "The Delinquent Child and the Home," New York Charities Publication Committee (1912), p. 93.
90. Healy, William, and Bronner, A. E., "Youthful Offenders," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. XXII, pp. 50-51.
91. Sutherland, E. H., *Criminology* (1924), p. 143.
92. United States Bureau of the Census, *Children under Institutional Care: 1923 (Preliminary Bulletin)*, p. 9.
93. Fernald, G. G., "The Recidivist," *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* (1913), Vol. III, p. 869.
94. Lorenz, W. F., "Delinquency and the Ex-Soldier," *Mental Hygiene* (1923), Vol. VII, p. 480.
95. Brace, C. L., *Dangerous Classes of New York* (1870).
96. Bonger, W. A., *Criminality and Economic Conditions*, pp. 407, 419.
97. United States Bureau of the Census, *Abstract of the Fourteenth Census (1920)*, Table 22, p. 99.

98. United States Immigration Commission, *Immigration and Crime* (1910), Vol. XXXVI, pp. 14, 16, 67, 86.
99. Laughlin, H. H., "*Analysis of America's Modern Melting Pot*," Hearings before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, House of Representatives, 67th Congress, 3rd Session (Nov. 21, 1922) Serial 7-C, pp. 742, 790.
100. Commissioner of Correction, *Annual Report of Department of Correction, Commonwealth of Massachusetts* (1920).
101. Laughlin, H. H., "*Analysis of America's Modern Melting Pot*," Hearings before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, House of Representatives, 67th Congress, 3rd Session (November 21, 1922), Serial 7-C, p. 790.
102. Commissioner of Correction, *Annual Report of Department of Correction, Commonwealth of Massachusetts* (1920).
103. United States Bureau of the Census, *Abstract of the Fourteenth Census (1920)*, Table 21, p. 97.
104. United States Immigration Commission, *Immigration and Crime* (1910), Vol. XXXVI, p. 1.
105. United States Bureau of the Census, *Census of Prisoners: 1923 (Preliminary Report)*, Table 7, p. 7.
106. Guyer, M. F., *Being Well-Born* (1920), p. 281.
107. Committee of the Eugenic Section of the American Breeders Association, First Report of, "*On Immigration*," *American Breeders Magazine* (1912), Vol. III, No. 4. Second Report, *Journal of Heredity* (July, 1914).

Pages 636 through 691 containing Judicial Decisions, Reviews and Criticisms and Bibliography are omitted from this reproduced number.

