

## OBSERVATIONS ON TWO HUNDRED DARTMOOR CONVICTS.\*

By JOHN J. LANDERS, M.B., B.Ch., D.P.H.,

Medical Officer, H. M. Prison, Dartmoor.

SOCIETY'S attitude towards those who commit crime is undergoing a fundamental change. Interest in criminals has changed from the moral and legal to the psychological and sociological aspects, with the result that the criminal to-day has acquired a new importance. In the old days the community set out to punish the criminal and did so with considerable severity. The Law still continues to keep as its first consideration the protection of the community, and the claims of society are considered greater than those of the individual. Nevertheless, intensive study of individual offenders is essential if we hope to be able to advise society as to the best methods of dealing with those members who will not or cannot obey its rules.

For this paper I examined 200 unselected Dartmoor convicts, all of whom I have known for at least a year and many for nearly five years.

In the cases described later, I have not rigidly adhered to any particular school of psychology but have interpreted them according to the school which to my mind offered the simplest explanation. (It has been suggested that because prison medical officers are officials, they are not likely to obtain as much co-operation from prisoners in any psychological examination as an outside psychologist would. I cannot accept this suggestion, as I believe that a convict is more suspicious of a comparative stranger than he is of a medical officer he has known for years.)

## DEGREE OF RECIDIVISM.

The average age of the men examined was 39 years. The age at first offence varied from 10 to 45 years, and the average age for this was 19½ years. When first convicted, 15% were school boys under 14; 12% between the ages of 14 and 16; and 47% between 16 and 23 years—that is the age-period during which a boy is eligible for Borstal. 21% had been to Borstal and 8.5% to both Borstal and a reformatory or industrial school. 65% had been convicted before they were 21 years old; 28% had not been out of prison for a year or more at any time since their first imprisonment.

\* Extracts from a paper read at the Annual Conference of Prison Medical Officers, 1938. Published with the permission of H.M. Prison Commissioners, though it does not necessarily represent their views.

The total number of convictions, excluding summary convictions, recorded against these 200 convicts is 2,211—an average of 11 convictions per man. As one conviction may be for several separate crimes, the number of crimes committed is much larger than the number of convictions. All but two had convictions for acquisitive crime; 22 had been convicted at some time of a sexual offence, 41 of crimes of violence of a more serious nature than common assault and 9 of these of both sex and violence crimes.

#### PHYSICAL HEALTH AND FITNESS FOR WORK.

As a body of men the 200 convicts examined were in good physical health, and this is also shown by the fact that there was an average increase in weight of 7 lb. during their sentence, and the daily average number of patients in hospital last year was 1.4% of the average population of the prison. This should meet any suggestion that the environment is unhealthy or that the food supplied to the convicts is other than satisfactory in quality or quantity. Fifteen of this series of 200 men had a physical defect, such as war wounds or other injuries, hernia, defective vision, etc., sufficient to impair to some extent their capacity to earn an honest living. In the labour market 72% would be considered unskilled, 23% semi-skilled and 5% as skilled workmen.

#### INTELLIGENCE.

Goring wrote "On statistical evidence, one assertion can be dogmatically made: it is, that the criminal is differentiated by inferior stature, by defective intelligence and, to some extent, by his anti-social proclivities; but that, apart from these broad differences, there are no physical, mental or moral characteristics peculiar to the inmates of English Prisons". My colleagues, Dr. Grierson and the late Dr. Rixon, in a more recent analysis of 200 male offenders at Brixton Prison (no case being over 35 years of age), using Terman intelligence testing, found that the average mental age of their cases was 14 years. The average mental age of the whole population of this country is probably not higher than this. Routine intelligence testing of my cases was not practical, mainly because of their age. It was very doubtful if many, other than those of good intelligence, would co-operate in the testing. My own impression is that the average mental age of Dartmoor convicts is not below that of the social group from which they came.

There was no case of certifiable feeble-mindedness. In 17 cases, from past history, general conduct and work in prison, and conversation with them, I felt safe in classifying them as below normal in general intelligence.

CASE A, aged 44, is one in which there is evidence of inferior intelligence not amounting to feeble-mindedness.

Prisoner's family history unknown. He himself has three children, the two eldest are certified mental defectives in institutions, the youngest in a Home

Office school. Prisoner's own unchecked story is that he was in Standard V at school, and was sent to a training ship when 14 years old, followed by a few weeks in the Army. He then worked as a bargee on the Thames, never long on any barge, did not get on with the captains, etc. First sentence of imprisonment was for being in unlawful possession of stolen rope: "He did not steal it, he picked up odd pieces when weighing anchor." Without going into detail it is obvious that as a young man he showed signs of social incapacity. Conscripted into the Army late in the war when he was 23 years old. After the Armistice he says he got a job as captain of a barge, but unfortunately ran the barge into Waterloo Bridge and was jammed across the bridge for several hours. This was "not his fault, the steering of the barge had been faulty for over three weeks; he had called the owners' attention to this but they had taken no notice of him". He says he then left the barge and the owners paid him £6 5s.—less than his proper wage. He next accepted work as a mate, but the barge was run down by a ship and sank. Next he was sent to prison for deserting his wife and family, and following this was never out of prison for more than a few weeks at a time. On discharge from his first penal servitude sentence the Central Association helped to get him signed on a boat bound for Australia, but the following day he was late in arriving at the docks and the boat left without him. He was next sentenced to five years' penal servitude for several cases of house-breaking; on discharge the Central Association found him work as a labourer. After five days at this work the foreman found fault with his work and sacked him. Another job was found for him and he was given a new shovel, as he said his own had been stolen from him. After the first day's work, for no apparent reason, he left his job and also left his lodgings. He was next charged with being in an enclosed garden at 10.30 p.m. He says he went there to relieve nature, but that when taken to the Police Station the police forced him to sign an admission to two small charges and later entered eight serious ones over his signature. He is now serving the sentence received for these offences.

He insists that his children are not mentally defective, but that the County Council took advantage of his being in prison to certify them and to force them to work for 6d. a week in the institutions. He admits that he has not seen any of his children for several years. He sends numerous badly written petitions to the Home Secretary on trivial matters, such as requests to have his cell changed, more frequent haircutting in prison, an extra razor blade to cut his corns and a transfer to another prison because he does not like the weather here. With one petition he sent one of his son's letters as proof that his son is not mentally defective. The letter, which I saw, would, if anything, help to prove the opposite. Early last year he escaped from here and was away several hours. He told me he did so to expose the unjust methods used by the police to get him convicted, and to obtain justice for his children. His escape was easy, as at the time he was working outside the prison and took advantage of a sudden mist to leave his party. In prison he is lazy, but is an expert cadger and usually manages to get something from most people. His general health is good; he is a coarse-featured, stupid-looking man.

The history of this case suggests some degree of mental defect and an attempt was made to determine his mental age, according to Burt's revision of the Stanford-Binet tests. But the prisoner was suspicious and did not co-operate, and was convinced that the County Council was trying to obtain information about him. The results of tests, however, supported the general impression that he had a non-certifiable degree of mental defect with a mental age of  $10\frac{1}{2}$  to 11 years. He is obviously unfit to have control of a barge and it is not surprising that he caused consternation on the Thames. But he is capable of earning an honest living at some routine labouring job, and the mental defect can only be regarded as a contributory cause of his criminal career. It is interesting to note that even this comparatively slight degree of mental defect is recognized by his fellow convicts and is reflected in their attitude towards him.

## CONSTITUTIONAL PSYCHIC INFERIORITY.

Constitutional psychic inferiority is suggested in the following case, B, aged 34 :

An only child, he was brought up by his grandparents, as his parents separated when he was a few months old. When 11 years old he was certified as a moral defective by the School Medical Officer and sent to an institution for mental defectives. It is reported that there he greatly improved in his habits and conduct, but he was not discharged till he was nearly 18 years old. He then joined the Navy, but a few months later was discharged for stealing. He had stolen money from a man who had won it from him gambling, and absented himself without leave. He got work as a labourer, but was described as an unsatisfactory workman, a bad timekeeper and dissatisfied with his wage. Now 18 years old, he started his criminal career. The first eight convictions were for larceny, then six for burglary and since 1922 he has been sentenced to twenty-two years imprisonment in all.

During his first penal servitude sentence he escaped from prison with another man, and, on capture, gave as the reason for doing so that he " could stand it no longer, other prisoners had been importuning him to commit acts of indecency ". Prior to release from this sentence he was confident that he did not need any assistance, and informed the Central Association to this effect. However, on the day after his release he called at the offices of the Central Association to say that all his plans had fallen through. He was given maintenance for three weeks, but failing to find any work during this time in London he went to relatives in the provinces, where, after a time, he found work as a labourer. He says he did not get on very well with his relatives, so after a fortnight he suddenly left his work and also left the district. At a neighbouring port he found work on a fishing trawler and on the strength of this got married. He was soon out of work and after a few months on the dole was sentenced to four years penal servitude for house-breaking. While he was in prison his wife married another man and was bound over for bigamy. On release he rejoined his wife and for the next three months they were helped by the Public Assistance Authorities. To obtain further assistance it was now necessary for him to work on a local relief work scheme and this he did for two months. He suddenly left this work, and a month later was convicted of twenty-six charges of house-breaking. Having broken into two houses in a road, he was attempting to break into the third house in the same road when a police officer arrested him. He tells me that the reason he gave up his work and went house-breaking was that his wife had deserted him. For these offences he is now serving a sentence of five years penal servitude and five years preventive detention. He is 34 years old.

He has recently suffered from cholecystitis, but is now in good physical health. He is of a rather effeminate physique and appearance, and it is quite likely that other prisoners have made unwelcome overtures to him. It is not surprising that on one occasion he reacted to these overtures by running away, as this is typical of his reaction to life's difficulties. His intelligence is not below that of his normal fellows, but he appears to have a character defect which can best be described as lack of will-power and ambition. One feels that whatever the circumstances he will always take the easiest course. In the outside world he is lazy and inefficient, and drifts from one job to another, but in prison, where work is both compulsory and non-competitive, he does quite well, has become a useful carpenter and is now on the highest rate of pay given to prisoners. This is in great contrast with his passive inadequacy in adapting to his environment outside prison. Although he was once certified as a moral defective, I cannot find any reason for regarding him as such now. All his crimes appear to be the result of weakness rather than viciousness, being the easiest solution of his immediate difficulties.

There were 8 cases of definite constitutional psychic inferiority. They were of inferior physique; all but 2 were under 5 ft. 6 in. in height, the average being 5 ft. 4 in., and all but 2 were below average weight for height on reception. Six of the 8 were of slightly inferior intelligence. Some observers would limit the diagnosis of constitutional psychic inferiority to cases which show signs of physical as well as mental inferiority. I did not do so. However, it is true that nearly all my cases were of slightly inferior intelligence and physique. In my opinion, the principal characteristic of the constitutional psychic inferior is his passive inadequacy or failure, from an early age, to deal with his environment, a failure not due to inferior intelligence or physique, or to an unusually different environment. He drifts through life and reacts to its difficulties by running away from them.

The following case, C, aged 27, is interesting because diagnosis may be open to question :

The story given by prisoner, which is, on the whole, confirmed by reference to official records, is that his father died when he was 4 years and his mother when he was 17 years old. He lived in comfortable circumstances, was educated at a private school until 10, followed by a "prep." school till 14, when he became an assistant in a physical laboratory at a college of technology. Asked why he left school at 14, says he does not know, but perhaps his mother was not so well off at the time. Did not matriculate, although he "knew enough to pass the examination except for languages". His mother was very indulgent and gave him everything he asked for—in one year she gave him three bicycles. Never committed any offence till after her death, there being no need to, as he was given everything he wanted. After his mother's death he found himself destitute except for about £10 from the sale of furniture and effects. Asked why this was so if his mother was in comfortable circumstances and he the only surviving child, he said it was a complicated story. His mother's affairs were settled by an aunt of his, in whose house she died. He did not know where his mother's money came from, but after her death found a lot of papers in the house—wills, insurance policies and letters which traced his family back for generations—but all these he burned on the impulse of the moment. He can still remember looking at the pile of ashes. He was now working for a firm of motor engineers, but being unable to make ends meet, he invited a married woman (who was separated from her husband) and her daughter, aged 14, to live in the house and share the expenses. He was not in love with the woman, although she was interested in him, but there was a platonic friendship between him and the daughter. After three weeks of this, it was decided that he should find lodgings and the woman and daughter should continue to live in the house. He saw the landlord about the change of tenancy, but the landlord refused to have the woman as a tenant because she was immoral. This was awkward, as he had told the woman she could continue to live in the house and he could not bear the thoughts of going back to tell her of the landlord's decision—he was always too kind-hearted. He therefore did not return to the house and found himself alone in the world without money or personal possessions. He told a friend of this and the friend offered to show him how to get some money, and that night they committed a small burglary. Shortly afterwards prisoner stole a motor-cycle, not because he was short of money, for he did not try to sell it, but because he was "mad on speed". For this offence he was put on probation, but still having no money he committed another burglary and was sent to Borstal when 17 years old. After fifteen months at Borstal he gained a special release as a person likely to do well. On discharge, work was found for him as a motor engineer at 25s. a week. His employer's son, a wealthy young man about town became

friendly with prisoner and offered him work as his private chauffeur and valet. This man kept a private flat where he entertained chorus-girls and others during weekends, and prisoner's duties were to live in and look after this flat in addition to his work as chauffeur, and for these services he was to receive 25s. a week and board. This, he says was the beginning of his downfall, for he then developed a liking for the life of the West End of London. All went well for a time till the young man who employed him overspent the allowance from his father and was without money to pay prisoner. Prisoner said to him "Well, I must have something to eat, so the only thing I can do is to pawn one of your suits". This he did, and was sentenced to three months imprisonment for stealing the suit. On release, work was again found for him. He got friendly with a girl of 16, a waitress in a café. He says he was sorry for the girl and committed several burglaries in order to give her presents, such as jewellery, etc. After he had known her about two months, intimacy took place, this being his first experience of sexual intercourse, and was continued at intervals for the next four months, till he was sentenced to two years imprisonment for numerous burglaries. He appeared in the dock in evening dress, and with an air of indifference confessed to fifty other burglaries. During this sentence he heard that his girl was pregnant, so decided to escape from prison in order to marry her. He escaped, but was at liberty for only eight hours, during which time he committed three burglaries, so he was unable to give effect to his good intentions. He again appeared in the dock in evening dress and pleaded to be allowed to marry the girl in prison, but this was refused and he was sentenced to eighteen months imprisonment to run concurrently with the sentence of two years he was serving when he escaped. As he had only served three months of his old sentence he was not unduly worried by the fresh sentence. His adventures were described in great detail by some Sunday newspapers; he was described as a master crook, a sort of glamour was cast over his offences, attention was directed towards his evening dress, his escape from prison, and the refusal to allow him to marry, and it was stated that his case had excited the interests of criminologists all over the country. No suggestion was made that house-breaking was wrong or that by his burglaries serious loss was inflicted on honest people. The notoriety this prisoner received encouraged him, as indeed there is reason to believe it has others, in his anti-social activities. He admits being very pleased by the glamour which enveloped him and says he felt more of a hero than a criminal. On release from prison he went to see the girl, but decided not to marry her because the baby, then about 14 months old was not at all like himself, but bore a definite resemblance to a lodger in the girl's household, and also because a waitress who worked in the same café told him that after he went to prison his girl had been going about with commercial travellers. Although he refused to marry her he was still fond of her and thought that the best way to keep her affection was to make her jealous. To help to do this he borrowed a big car, but without the consent of the owner, who was on holiday at the time. At first he used the car to take girls for joy rides (the commercial travellers had cars) and then thought he might as well use it at his work, for he now had a job as door-to-door salesman. After three weeks he returned the car before the owner returned from holiday. Unfortunately for him, this borrowing became known to the police and he was sentenced to six months imprisonment. This sentence, he said, made him very embittered, as he thought it very unjust that he should suffer for such a trivial offence—he even offered to pay for the petrol he had used. When asked if anything was missing from the car when he returned it, he said, "No, except a rug which I practically gave away". One of his customers did not want any of his goods, but wanted a table cover; the thought flashed through his mind that the car rug would be the very thing for her, so to oblige her he let her have it for 5s., practically a gift. He really did this out of kindness and thought no more of it till the police brought it up against him. On release from prison he returned to burglary as a means of livelihood, but again his downfall was really due to kindness; he says he seems to have a "fatal fascination for women" and is himself attracted to them. If he

meets a girl who is in any way poor or oppressed he feels he must give her presents. To one of his many girl friends he says he has given jewellery worth more than £1,000. The total value of the stolen property was given as £1,000 when he was next convicted of twenty-five burglaries and sent to penal servitude. On release from this he again reverted to burglary in order to help women in distress, and at 25 years of age received his second sentence of penal servitude, which he is now serving. When asked about his relations with his numerous women friends he said he had remained true to his first love and felt proud that his nature was not sexual. When the question was repeated a few minutes later he said that the reason why there were no sexual relations was because he was not at liberty long enough for the affairs to progress so far.

He has come to definite conclusions as to the causes of delinquency in his case and claims that these conclusions are the result of reflection and introspective observation. He blames his mother for her indulgence and society for failing to deal properly with him as an individual. Invited to say how society should have dealt with him on the last offence, he suggests training with a firm of motor engineers at a fee of £30 as a useful and economical alternative to keeping him in prison for three years. He claims to be entitled to more generous consideration than the honest unemployed because he has ability and could be a useful member of society. He is satisfied that most of the convicts are here because of bad environment and admires what he describes as their courage in protesting against their environment by breaking the law. Prisoner was asked to give his reasons for continuing in a criminal career. He said he would prefer to give a written statement after due thought. It was hoped that this might throw some light on his early life. The statement, however, showed no signs of the introspective observation he claimed, and was on political and social lines. The following brief extracts will show that it was a justification and in no sense an apology. "It is no perversion of fact to say that crime and its ramifications are as essential to the structure of a civilized state in the columns that support those tribunals which aim at crimes solution. Of the many and varied constituents that go to the making of a perfect society, that of crime cannot be denied its important place." "During the ages there has arisen in the dark horizon of man's inhumanity to man a negligible number of people really interested in the reformatory solution of society's outcasts. With their limited understanding of its vital issues—forgetting its function as a national prop and the meal-ticket of a multitude of officials—these poor misguided individuals have seen their noble efforts end in smoke." Of himself he writes, "Finally when I am discharged the future will hold for me (as it does for 90% of the men here) ostracism, no immediate prospect of employment, and a three years non-conversancy with the outside world to equilibrate".

Prisoner is in good health and of good appearance and physique, though somewhat effeminate, with good features and well-groomed wavy hair. A complete extravert, he is pleasant-mannered, intelligent, full of self-confidence, careful of his personal appearance and extremely conceited. His conceit and vanity are colossal, but so artless as to be quite disarming. One day during an interview with my colleague, Dr. Milner, prisoner took the opportunity to advise him how to prepare a report so that it would impress others with his efficiency, and to express his pleasure at seeing such earnest endeavour in a young man. Prisoner feels superior to most of the others here, he is rather proud of his criminal career and frequently refers to himself as a "gentleman crook". In criminal courts he has accepted responsibility for ninety-one offences, all burglary or house-breaking, since he started his criminal career less than ten years ago. During that time he has been at large for only brief periods, and punishment appears to have had no deterrent effect. He is not convinced that a life of honest work is preferable to the life of a "gentleman crook", and it is obvious that he intends to resume his criminal career at the first opportunity. While not claiming success in life, he is not prepared to admit that he is a failure, when in fact he is merely a very unsuccessful criminal who spends nine-tenths of his time in prison. Some of his crimes were rather

foolish, and the proceeds of his many burglaries: he lavished as gifts on his **woman** friends, who were not expensive courtesans but humble maidens in distress whose moral qualms could probably have been resolved in a much less costly manner. He glories in his crimes and is obviously pleased to relate them. A striking feature in this case is that he does not appear to realize the futility of his crime, although his intelligence is, if anything, above normal and in this respect he could certainly compete with his fellows on equal terms. But he differs from the average recidivist in that his crimes were characterized by very little, if any, previous planning, no great desire for personal gain, and by a variety of motives which were inadequate when compared with the risk involved. Each crime appears to have been committed merely to satisfy some passing whim, with little thought of the consequences.

The headmaster at the preparatory school which he attended from 10 to 14 years describes him as "high spirited, very troublesome at times and always ready to be led into mischief. He was the type who would delight to plan an escapade in order to boast about the achievement. Not industrious". In answer to a question as to his honesty said "once to my knowledge in trouble". When sentenced to Borstal the social worker who saw him at Wandsworth Prison noted him as "Intelligent, full of vitality, but with all this one trembles for his future—his moral principles are so easily swept aside by the exigencies of the moment". The Medical Officer wrote as follows: "His particular misfortune is that he has an undue and uncontrolled talent for imaginative imagery. From his habitual self-deception it results that he feels now to be a rather misguided and slightly pathetic orphan, whereas really he is far on the way to being a canting rogue. His sentence therefore has not pierced his armour of carefully preserved self-esteem; he is largely impervious to shame, or, at any rate, rapidly recovers from it." On Ballard's Columbian Group Test he scored 77 out of a 100 possible marks. Prisoner made a much better impression at the Borstal Institution. His Housemaster noted as follows: "Conduct excellent, with Prefects' responsibilities he became steady and level-headed. I have every confidence that he will do well. Personally, I would trust him anywhere. He should find little difficulty in settling down, as he is a good worker, reliable and trustworthy." The Medical Officer at Borstal noted: "Above average intelligence, this boy has a certain insight into his character defects which should stand him in good stead for the future."

If I adopt Healy's views on psychopathic personality, this case could be included in that category. Healy describes the general characteristic of these cases as an abnormal reaction to some of the ordinary stimuli of life. Such abnormal reactions are almost universal in these persons. "Socially," he says, "the important points are their weakness of will, and their inability to cope with the demands which society makes as regards self-restraint." East suggests "that constitutional psychic inferiority appears to lie between mental deficiency and normality, and cases of psychopathic personality, as we see them in prison, seem to occupy a position between unsoundness of mind and normality. In other words, it appears that the qualities of the constitutional psychic inferior which affect criminal conduct are negative, and those of the psychopathic personality are positive. He describes psychopathic criminals as "those whose behaviour anomalies are not due to defective intelligence but to abnormal modes of emotional and instinctive reaction which are habitual and appear to be mainly due to inherited factors". In contrast with the constitutional psychic inferior, whose conduct in prison is good, that of the psychopathic personality is usually bad. The following points are in



favour of a diagnosis of constitutional psychic inferiority in this case: His failure, from an early age, to deal with his environment in anything like a satisfactory manner, a failure not due to inferior intelligence or physique, or to an exceptionally difficult environment; his good conduct in prison. To some, certain aspects of this case might suggest the possibility of moral defectiveness. There are criminal propensities on which punishment appears to have had no deterrent effect, and an apparent lack of wisdom, as shown by his unprofitable career and the stupidity and apparent lack of adequate motive for several of his crimes. But evidence of any defect of a moral sense is not so clear. There is no history of sexual precocity, wanton cruelty or destructiveness, and all his crimes have been of an acquisitive nature and lack the variety usually shown by moral defectives. The following points are not in favour of a diagnosis of constitutional psychic inferiority: He is a complete extravert, vain, conceited and full of self-confidence. His conduct outside prison is rather aggressive. As a rule, outside prison, as far as the public is concerned, the constitutional psychic inferior is more a nuisance than anything else, but this man, owing to the number and serious nature of his crimes, is more than a nuisance. A few constitutional psychic inferiors are aggressive, but it is usually the aggression of despair. This man is aggressive in his conduct outside, because of his vanity and his desire to be a "gentleman crook". His abnormality is evident, it is difficult to place a label on him, and I am not certain that I was correct in including him in the constitutional psychic inferiors.

#### OTHER MENTAL ABNORMALITIES.

There were no psychotics, but 14 were considered mentally inefficient; they were 6 temperamentally unstable adults, 4 paranoid personalities and 1 each of the following, a homosexual, a sadist, a schizoid and a cycloid. These mentally inefficients, added to the 17 of inferior intelligence and the 8 constitutional psychic inferiors already mentioned, give 39 out of 200 as the number showing a definite mental abnormality.

This small amount of abnormality is probably an under-estimate as regards the recidivist group as a whole, as convicts known to be in poor physical or mental health are sent elsewhere.

CASE D, aged 40, is that of a recidivist whose criminal propensities appear to be connected with a psycho-sexual maladjustment. Family history is that father and maternal grandfather died in asylums. This man is the youngest of a family of three boys and one girl. Eldest brother he describes as a "respectable married man", the next brother was last heard of in the French Foreign Legion and his sister is dead—cause of death unknown. This man, now 40 years old, says he does not remember his father and has some reasons for believing that he himself is illegitimate and that the man who died in the asylum was not, in fact, his father. He was exceptionally fond of his mother; she was, however, a drunkard and he often stole to get money which she spent on drink. When an infant she nicknamed

him "Nime" because he called her nipples her "Nime" and when wishing to go to the breast kept repeating this word. He strongly resented being called this nickname by his school chums, but was generally known by it. He can remember his mother boasting that "he never had a bottle" and from this it is inferred that he was kept at the breast for a long time and went from it to ordinary food. He says he can remember when he was between 6 and 7 years old going with his drunken mother into public houses, being given pennies by strange men and told to go out and buy sweets. One Saturday he got back rather quickly to the public house and in a small private room off the public bar he saw his mother having, what he later knew to be sexual intercourse with a man. "After that my mother never again looked me straight in the face, but I still loved her." For stealing he was sent to an industrial school when 10 and to Borstal when 16 years old. Soon after release from Borstal, imprisoned for stealing and on discharge from prison joined the Army. Discharged from the Army for stealing, he later rejoined and was sent to France towards the end of the War. On the morning of the day he was leaving for active service he married a woman much older than himself—he was 20, she was 35. Describes his wife as "very like my mother, they were both big women and rough spoken". His mother objected to the marriage but attended the ceremony and got very drunk afterwards. On the day of his marriage he attempted to have sexual intercourse, this being his first experience of it. He says it was not satisfactory, as it gave him a bad headache and he failed to have an emission. Soon after his arrival in France he practiced mutual masturbation with a young man whom he describes as "22 years old, had never shaved and looked more like a girl than a man". He does not admit masturbation prior to this (he was now nearly 21) but agrees that he had known about it for some time. He tried normal sexual intercourse with a French prostitute, but again failed to have an emission, though when masturbating he always had one. His companions told him the usual stories of the evils of masturbation and he says an Army doctor told him that if he continued he would grow old rapidly and get a hole in his brain, and by this he understood he would become insane.

One night he was on sentry duty at a post considered dangerous, as several sentries had been shot there. He remembers seeing about fifty men marching down a road towards him; it was very dark; he challenged them and, getting no reply, started to fire rapidly at them. He next remembers being in an Observation Ward in a Base Hospital in France. Asked if the fifty men returned his fire, he says "they cannot have done so as I was not even wounded". He was sent home to the mental block of a war hospital and invalided from the Army with "neurasthenia" in 1919. He now returned to live with his wife, but finding her sexually unattractive, he soon left her.

For many years he has masturbated almost daily, his usual fantasy is having intercourse with a girl of 14, who at one time lived near him, but to whom he had never spoken. He says he wishes to discontinue this practice, but that on the few occasions he succeeded in doing so he felt irritable and had a bad headache. His physical health is fair; he is small and anæmic. His general intelligence is on the lower levels of normal. He has no knowledge of psychology or experience of psychotherapy. He complains of bad dreams, of which the following two are examples: He dreamt that he went down a few steps into a large square room. There were no windows or lights, but he could see well. He saw me standing in the centre of the room and I had something hidden in my hand. He was surprised to see me; I looked out of place, so he asked me what I was doing. I replied: "waiting for that door in the ceiling to open". On looking up he could not see a door. Then there was a noise like thunder. I pushed him aside with my left hand and he saw the bodies of three men with ropes round their necks come down through a door in the ceiling—the two outer men were wearing overcoats. With a knife, which up to this time I had kept hidden in my right hand behind my back, I cut the bodies open from the neck down to the testicles, at the same time cutting through the ropes. The bodies fell into stone coffins on the floor. He then said

to me "Oh, Doctor, you should not have done that, you should wait till they die". I made no reply to this, but wiped the knife, still dripping with blood, on his shirt. He then noticed that he was dressed in his shirt only. Second dream: He was on the seashore with another man, a fellow convict here. On looking round they saw about a hundred detectives pointing guns towards them. They ran onto a ship and prisoner said to his friend "I don't want to go far from the land". His friend said "This ship only goes up the river". When they got off the ship up the river, the detectives were there. Prisoner, now alone, got over a wall and found that he was in his married brother's yard. He went into the house and up to his brother's bedroom, where they talked about their mother, who, although she had been dead for some years, seemed to be present there with them all the time. Prisoner then noticed that he was wearing his shirt only. Suddenly his brother turned him out, saying "I don't want detectives in here". Prisoner went, but, on looking back, saw that his brother was covered with blood. His brother shouted at him "you have drained mother's blood and slung it over me".

The manifest content of his dreams is obviously related to his present environment. The latent content can be interpreted in a way in keeping with his known psycho-sexual history. The dreams simply bristle with Freudian symbols, male and female—knives, guns and three descending figures, two of them wearing overcoats, on the one hand, and coffins and a ship, on the other hand. In the first dream he objects to the bodies being placed in the coffins because they are still alive, and in the second he is afraid of the ship, although he realizes it is his only way of escape. Perhaps all this can be interpreted as a picture of the conflict of a homosexual masturbator who is afraid and ashamed of these tendencies and yet has tried and failed to find a heterosexual way of escape. The draining of his mother's blood in the second dream may conceivably be a disguised reference to the prolonged suckling for which he experienced a conscious shame during childhood.

According to his story, he began to steal at an early age with the approval and for the benefit of his mother. Whether the later crimes had any sexual component or are merely due to a firmly acquired habit, it is difficult to say. He does not appear to experience any conscious sexual excitement when committing them, but it is perhaps significant that some of his crimes have been sacrilegious. As he was at that time a practising Catholic, these must have been associated with a strong feeling of guilt. During the brief periods he has been free he has associated with women occasionally, but with no desire for sexual intercourse. When possible he either borrows or steals a woman's glove and this he uses as a fetish object during masturbation.

From the history it is evident that he has a strong maternal fixation which has persisted into adult life. At the age of 20 he married a woman much older than himself and very like his mother, but failed to obtain sexual satisfaction from her. Shortly afterwards he had his first experience of homosexuality and found it satisfactory. His subsequent sexual history is one of homosexuality and frequent masturbation, with a few unsuccessful attempts at heterosexual gratification. His account of the onset of the mental illness during his war service suggests a hysterical fright reaction. Since then he has spent most of his time in prisons and has twice been certified insane. In 1921 he attempted suicide by hanging and was certified as suffering from melancholia. A few years later he again attempted suicide by coal gas in prison, but on this occasion was not certified.

His offences have not been sexual, but in addition to many burglaries he has been convicted of stealing an offertory box and, on four other occasions, of church-breaking. The second attempt at suicide in prison was carried out after very theatrical preparations. At the time he was an altar-server in the prison chapel and, before turning on the gas, he prepared the altar and laid out the vestments for a Requiem Mass.

As regards treatment, I very much doubt whether psychotherapy would meet with success in this case. His intelligence is below normal, criminal tendencies

have been present for thirty years, and his attitude towards psychological examination is not very encouraging. It was found that he was deriving a certain amount of self-importance by discussing his interviews with the medical officers with other prisoners.

The following is an example of a type of paranoid personality found in prison :

CASE E, aged 32. Prisoner's father was well-known locally as a convicted thief and an associate of criminals. Prisoner himself first came into conflict with the law when 11 years old. He was put on probation for stealing rugs. He had been sleeping out with other boys who had run away from home ; they stole rugs and he was blamed with them. Soon after he was sent to an industrial school for truancy, and there his conduct was unsatisfactory. Within a few weeks after discharge was sent back to the school for stealing ; again he says he was blamed for what others did. A month later absconded ; when caught, he escaped from the police, but was eventually taken back to the school. When finally discharged he was sent to work on a farm, but a few days later ran away from the farm and returned home. When 17 years old was sent to Borstal for shop-breaking with a boy he knew at the industrial school. This time, in addition to denying all guilt, he goes further and says he did his best to prevent the other boy doing it. I now saw him for the first time. He was an unattractive boy, with a hang-dog expression and no ambition, and very ready to put the blame for everything on others. His mental age was  $12\frac{1}{2}$  years. He complained that the police had been "down on him" for some eighteen months ; that since he left the industrial school, they had often said that they would get him sent to Borstal. He had a strong feeling of injury and injustice. The Medical Officer at Borstal noted him as "quiet and civil, but inclined to brood and imagine he had been unjustly treated". After twenty-three months at Borstal, he returned home. During the next two years he was charged several times with street fighting and assault, and twice had his Borstal licence revoked for stealing. On final discharge from Borstal, he was sent to sea by the Borstal Association, but left after one short voyage and soon after return home was sent to prison for stealing. During the next five years he was sent to prison twice for periods of six months for assaulting police and twice for assaulting others, and on three occasions was fined for motoring offences, such as ignoring police signals. The next year he received a sentence of twelve months for office-breaking and the following year one of five years penal servitude for warehouse-breaking. From prison he attempted to send threatening letters to the police ; he threatened to injure some of them and get others dismissed from the Force for interfering in his private affairs. The character given him by the police at this time may be briefly stated as "never known to do honest work and when not actually engaged in crime, a street-corner loafer". On discharge from penal servitude he returned home and for a short time assisted his mother in a small business, but still continued to associate with well-known thieves and receivers of stolen property. His next conviction and penal servitude sentence was for workshop-breaking. He had approached the caretaker of the workshop—it was said in Court with threats of blackmail—and believed that he could count on his help. The caretaker informed the police, who were in hiding in the building when prisoner and two others broke in. Prisoner's defence at the trial was that the caretaker, at the instigation of the police, invited them to the building to steal the safes, and he still adheres to that story. Concerning his future he says "I'll stay out of prison and get on all right if they (the police) let me alone. If I go to the pictures they escort me there and home again". He gets on very well with the other convicts, he is never aggressive in his attitude towards them ; he feels they are also enemies of the police. On first impression this man appears a timid, rather harmless individual, but during conversation he soon reveals a slightly hostile and suspicious attitude towards

officials. Since I first saw him nearly fifteen years ago, his character has not changed, it still seems unbalanced by a strong sentiment of hatred of the police. Even the "hang-dog" expression I noted so many years ago is still very evident.

In this case the persecutory ideas seem to have been present since adolescence. As a youth of 17 he complained to me that the police had been "down on him" for eighteen months. His animosity against them has persisted and he has twice been convicted for assaulting police and has attempted to send threatening letters to them from prison. He has a positive hatred of the police, and to a less degree, of prison officials and any representatives of law and order.

If we accept McDougall's explanation of hatred as a blending of fear and anger, it is not difficult to imagine how this sentiment was formed. This man's father was a criminal, so that a fear of the police was probably inculcated at an early age. During adolescence he himself resorted to crime, and thus found himself in actual conflict with the law, so that his combative impulse was aroused. If I am asked why a sentiment of hatred should develop in this case and not in other similar cases, I can only suggest that this man has a strong combative instinct, and this is shown by the violence and recklessness of his crimes.

The following is the only case of hysteroid personality I found in the 200 examined :

CASE F, aged 46. Joined the Army when 21 years old and in it worked as a carpenter. On active service during the War, but not wounded. Says he was invalided from the Army in 1917 for "neurasthenia"; from his description of his illness, he was obviously a case of conversion hysteria. He says he had loss of voice and weakness of right arm and leg, which were cured by a long course of electrical treatment. While in the Army he had no domestic troubles, but in civil life his responsibilities in this matter increased; there was domestic friction, and as a result of this he started drinking. He says that because of his drinking his wife became ashamed of him, and frequently upbraided him for using bad language and giving a bad example to the children. At this time she was becoming more independent of him by going to work herself. He gradually became unreasonably suspicious of the relationship between his wife and her employer, for whom she did daily housework. One evening she was later than usual in leaving her work; this to him seemed to confirm his suspicions, so he smashed the windows of her employer's house. For this he was sentenced to two months' imprisonment, and while he was in prison his wife obtained a legal separation on the grounds of his cruelty, which he denies. On release he was unable to find his wife and children, and since then has spent most of his time in prison.

During this sentence of penal servitude he has been a patient in hospital on six occasions, but repeated examinations failed to show any signs of organic disease or anything abnormal in central nervous system. Wassermann was negative. At various times he complained of general weakness, pains in eyes, backache and pyorrhœa. All his teeth were extracted, and he was supplied with dentures, but he felt that his general health did not improve. In hospital he complained of insomnia when he was sleeping fairly well, of diarrhœa when he was having formed motions, and his complaints became more numerous when he expected discharge from hospital. Always willing to talk about himself and his complaints, but it was obvious that he had no real anxiety concerning his health and he was easily

satisfied by some placebo. A reconciliation with his wife and children was at last effected—it is obvious from his wife's letters to him that she had agreed to this reconciliation from religious motives and a desire to help him—and he is to return to them on release. He himself then became very religious. One day, holding a Bible in his hand, he told me that for the future he would live according to this book and be a credit to his wife and children. However, he says his wife is to blame for all his troubles, she should not have left him and it is noble of him to forgive her. When I reminded him that it was his wife who obtained the legal separation from him on account of his conduct, he replied "people always blame the husband". He came to the conclusion that I discussed his attitude towards his family with him because his wife had written to me asking for information about him. It took some time to convince him that his wife had not done so, and he then concluded that I was writing a book about his case. When not in hospital he did not get on well with the other prisoners, mainly because of his irritable disposition and his efforts to dodge his share of the work. He prided himself on not using bad language like the others, and claimed to have a good influence on them. He was confident that he would not return to prison and was in no way anxious about the future.

This appears to be a case of a hysterical personality who avoided a criminal life for forty-five years until alcoholic deterioration of character was superadded to his existing psychic inferiority. For ten years before the War this man served in the Army and was able to hold his own in this easy, uneventful, ordered life. But the difficulties and dangers of war service were too much for him, and conversion hysteria was his way of escape. He then found himself in a highly competitive environment of post-war civil life and married to a domineering, righteous or self-righteous woman, and from these difficulties he sought refuge in drink. After fourteen years of this he had reached the almost psychotic stage of morbid suspicion, with ideas that his wife was unfaithful, and, as a result, committed his first offence—maliciously breaking windows. Since then, as already stated, he has spent most of his time in prison. Becoming aware, during his first prison sentence, of the many amenities of prison life, he subsequently regarded it as an easy way of escape from the difficulties of life outside. In prison he showed many well-marked hysterical traits. His dramatic protestations of salvation, Bible in hand, were combined with an absence of any genuine moral feeling. His chronic hypochondriasis served the double purpose of avoiding work in prison and, more important, of enlisting his wife's pity. Although purposive, I do not think the motive of this was fully conscious, and therefore regard it as hysterical rather than malingered. The whole picture appears to be that of a hysterical personality, who, in search of an escape found refuge in conversion symptoms, drink, prison life and chronic hypochondriasis.

It is not possible in a paper of this length to give examples of each type of abnormality found. I thought it better to give a few cases at length rather than many cases briefly. A short description would necessarily be a dogmatic expression of my own opinion, whereas we are dealing with slight degrees of abnormality in which the diagnosis may be open to question.

## TYPE PSYCHOLOGY.

At first an attempt was made to classify the 200 cases according to Kretschmer's physical types and Jung's psychological types, but this attempt was abandoned. Their physiques were such that it would be difficult to allot them to the very definite types described by Kretschmer without the use of considerable imagination. With Jung's classification on the introvert-extravert scale it was felt that imprisonment of itself, with long hours of solitude, tends to render a man more introspective than he is outside, and observations made in prison would probably give an erroneous picture of his normal temperament. Although an analysis of these cases along the lines of group psychology was not possible, yet the psychological viewpoint was very helpful in understanding individual cases. Unfortunately it was not equally helpful in suggesting a line of treatment. By the time a man graduates to Dartmoor his standard of values has so altered that crime has become a habit and a recognized means of livelihood, and the value of psychotherapy then is very doubtful.

## CAUSATION.

In attempting to solve the problem of why convicts failed to become socialized, questioning the men themselves is of limited use, as most of them have resorted to rationalization and excuse themselves on the grounds of social and economic disadvantages. It is difficult to determine whether recidivism may be an expression of inability to understand social requirements, an antagonism against them or merely an inability to conform to them.

In a paper of this kind it is necessary to mention the much-debated question of a herd instinct and its importance as a factor in the socialization of the individual. McDougall believes that one of the special functions of this instinct of gregariousness, this urge towards grouping, is to adapt conduct to social life. But even McDougall, when he comes to his theories of society, does not make as much use of this instinct as one would expect, and appears to regard most of social feeling as derived from the parental instinct. Other psychologists have very different views of the herd instinct and the allied concept of a "group mind". Some writers believe that such an instinct may exist in man, but that its real manifestations have become so altered and indistinct by the growth of intelligence that it is now difficult to recognize it as an instinct at all. Others, such as Henderson and Gillespie, deny its existence and regard the "so-called" herd instinct merely as certain later acquired reactions. From our point of view I think that the less we ascribe to the herd instinct the better. It would be delightfully simple to postulate an innate tendency to observe the rules of law and society and to explain recidivism as an inherent defect of this instinct. But it would lead us nowhere, and there are other equally probable explanations. Moreover, social conduct

cannot be explained entirely in terms of innate tendencies. Environment, education and experience play their part. In our present state of knowledge these environmental factors are of more practical importance in that they can be to some extent modified by individual and public effort. Psychological factors of practical importance are those acquired deviations from the normal which, in contrast with inborn deficiencies, can sometimes be corrected by psychological treatment.

It is perhaps interesting to note that of the 200 convicts examined, 78 were eligible for service during the War: all but 4 served in one of the fighting forces, but 37 were discharged with bad characters. They responded with others when the call of the herd was exceptionally strong. That so many were discharged for misconduct shows that even then they were unable to suppress their individualistic traits and so failed to comply fully with their social obligations.

Judging from the expressed opinions of the men, many regard society as selfish and not really interested in them beyond sending them to prison when they break the law. The convict is not much concerned with public opinion unless it affects him personally. His interest in prison reform is limited to the possibility of more comfortable conditions in prison, or of abolition of the ticket-of-leave after release, and he is inclined to regard any departure from uniformity of treatment as unfair unless he himself benefits by it. Quite a few profess Communistic views, and they are amongst the most difficult men to deal with in prison; their attitude is always hostile, they spread discontent amongst the others and, when possible, evade regulations rather than break them. Most of the others have no very definite political views. With men living in close association a fairly high degree of uniformity of conduct is induced by community pressure and prison routine. Informers, or, as they are known here, "coppers", because they offend against a sense of group-loyalty, are hated by the others.

#### A SUGGESTED CLASSIFICATION.

At Dartmoor there are, to my mind, three types or groups of convicts, and the attitude of each group towards imprisonment is different and fairly constant.

The largest group—48% of my cases—is the *subnormal group*, and in it are those of subnormal intelligence and the constitutional psychic inferiors. These have either an incorrect understanding of their actions and of their social obligations or an impaired capacity to fit in with their environment. Outside prison their mental and social assets are low; they are economically inefficient. Their subnormality is constitutional. But not all the members of this group have an obvious constitutional defect. The great majority are those we know as "quiet old lags" whose subnormality appears to be a



gradually acquired one, perhaps the result of long imprisonment. Or it may be that they are constitutional psychic inferiors whose inferiority only became evident following long periods of detention. To my mind they are now subnormal, though they may not have appeared so in earlier life, and it is not easy to describe in what way they are subnormal. Kretschmer, speaking of healthy persons, who, after a period of forced seclusion are unable to find a proper place in a normal environment, said: "It is said occasionally that they are 'broken in spirit'. That is a sentimental expression, but it signifies something which is quite correct. The process, in fact, has a reactive origin as a purposeful adaptation to an impoverished and oppressive situation, as a loss of 'starch' in the personality, as a diminution of will and energy, as a limitation of interests and needs. One would expect that the personality, when relieved of the outer pressure, would spring back to its former position; but in some cases it fails to do so. Instead, the patient finally exhibits a loss of vitality, a certain desolation and indolence which causes him to shrink in discontent from formerly valued activities."

As a general rule the attitude of this group towards imprisonment is one of passive indifference; they are comfortable and contented in prison, where they spend most of their time, and some candidly admit this. I found one rather interesting case, a man of 34 years, who commits crime in order to be sent to prison, where he says he is more comfortable and treated better than he has ever been in a Poor Law institution. He is in good health and I could find no signs of mental abnormality. He has no convictions for any offence other than arson, of which he has been convicted on five occasions in rapid succession. On the first three occasions he set fire to the haystacks of a former employer, against whom he felt he had a grievance, but on the other two did not know who the owners were. On every occasion he gave himself up to the police immediately after setting fire to the haystacks and he has not been out of prison for more than a few weeks at any time since his first offence. I could discover no psychological explanation for his crimes. His explanation is that he is aware that arson is considered a serious crime and usually punished by a penal servitude sentence, which is what he desires.

In the second group—41% of my cases—are the *professional criminals*. In quite a few cases they seemed to have adopted crime as a profession following lack of sufficient opportunity to rehabilitate themselves socially after a first or second conviction. Once self-respect and the respect of one's fellows are lost, the temptation to crime is much greater. In a few cases into which I went more thoroughly an economic factor at a certain stage seemed to be an important one in producing the criminal. The following is one such case briefly stated. He had an exemplary character as a boy and later became a sergeant in the Army during the War. After the War, was in a Police Force for four years and was twice specially commended for good work. He was dismissed from the Force for striking a sergeant during a heated argument. Unable to find

work, after a time he took to crime. As he said himself, "I have never been able to get on my feet again since I was dismissed from the Police. I tried hard at first, my friends gradually left me and now my only friends are criminals".

The attitude of this group towards imprisonment is one of adaptation; while disliking detention, they adapt themselves to the conditions and make the best of things. They are particularly careful not to lose remission by misconduct and their aim from the start is to be free at the earliest possible date. Their attitude is governed by the belief that it is more comfortable to behave well in prison. For the professional criminal, crime is a gamble. He specializes and tries to improve his technique. He may win at times, and when he loses, he has very little to lose except his freedom for a time. He often has the capacity to earn an honest living, but eventually does not try to do so.

In the third *abnormal group*—11% of my cases—which is small in comparison with the other two, are the mentally inefficient and the psychoneurotic. This group contains widely divergent types, from the definite psychopaths, paranoid personalities, etc., to those whose mental condition is not far removed from normality. The latter we might describe as slightly abnormal or unstable. In prison they are restless, conceited and "touchy"; outside prison no work is good enough for them, they expect more of everything than they are likely ever to receive and they are easily annoyed at failure to impress others with their self-importance. They fail in the outside world mainly because of an inability to harmonize their own evaluation of themselves with that of others. Many of them wish to reform, but the work they are capable of doing does not as a rule provide the luxuries they feel they need.

The attitude of this group towards imprisonment is one of mild hostility. They are generally restless, frequently asking for change of work, and often a trivial matter is sufficient to evoke grave misconduct. With the exception of some psychoneurotics, they find prison life and discipline very irritating and seem unable to settle down, even during a long sentence.

I made an estimation of the men's attitude towards detention here, independently of a classification into the three groups I have already mentioned. The attitude of each group towards imprisonment is shown in the following table.

	Attitude.		
	Passive indifference.	Adaptation.	Mild hostility.
Subnormals . . . . .	67·5%	23%	9·5%
Professional criminals . . . . .	6%	75·5%	18·5%
Abnormals . . . . .	8%	29%	63%

These figures suggest that there is a relationship between a type of convict and his attitude towards detention. Moreover, the attitude gives some

indication of the effects of detention on the different types. For example, the attitude of passive indifference, usually adopted by the subnormal group, suggests that detention has very little deterrent and is not likely to have much reformatory effect on them.

This classification into three groups may appear crude, but for practical purposes the members of each group can easily be identified. The great majority, even in the subnormal and abnormal groups, are not far removed from normality. In the subnormal group itself there is not much apparent difference between the constitutional psychic inferiors and the large number in the same group I have referred to as "quiet old lags" with perhaps an acquired subnormality. It is perhaps worth noting that, compared with the subnormal group as a whole, the constitutional psychic inferiors were younger, started their criminal careers earlier in life, and had more convictions per man, but no convictions for sex or violence crimes. Generally, the subnormals committed more, but less serious, crime than the professionals, who were more prone to use violence. Of the subnormals, 15% had convictions at some time for sexual offences and 15% for crimes of violence, compared with 3% of the professionals with convictions for sexual offences and 22% for crimes of violence.

At present, if a Court wishes to sentence a man to preventive detention, it must first impose a sentence, usually three years, of penal servitude, and the sentence of preventive detention does not start until the sentence of penal servitude has been served. I think the Courts should have power, after considering a recommendation from the prison medical officer, to sentence certain men to a long period of preventive detention without first having to send them to penal servitude. If the Courts had this power, in time the great majority of the mentally subnormal convicts would be in a separate institution from the others. How best to deal with the professional criminal is a most difficult problem. I am inclined to think that increased police efficiency, resulting in less chance of success in crime, is more effective in reducing the number of professional criminals than any treatment they receive in prison. Unfortunately, in a long sentence in a convict prison, the professional criminal manages to make himself fairly comfortable, and the work he does is less arduous than that of most honest workmen outside. I am not suggesting a return to the severity in the prisons of the past, which failed so hopelessly, but I would suggest that the choice for the professional criminal should lie between honest work outside and harder compulsory work in prison. It must be remembered that there is a vast difference between the professional criminal and the man with a few convictions, who may wish to reform. The former has lost any desire to lead an honest life, but it might be possible to persuade some of them of its advantages by an appeal to their personal comfort. As already stated, convicts of doubtful mentality are not sent here, and in addition

it is not unusual to transfer from here men who, owing to some mental abnormality, find difficulty in settling down to conditions at Dartmoor. Thus the great majority of the mentally abnormal convicts are at Parkhurst. As regards their treatment, in theory, an institution administered mainly by medical men suggests itself, but against this is the difficulty from an administrative point of view and the objection of suggesting to these abnormals that their responsibility is limited and that they are entitled to preferential treatment. The chances of success from any form of treatment now are not great, except in a few selected cases. The main hope for this group lies in early treatment and the psychotherapy now being afforded to younger delinquents should tend to reduce the numbers of this abnormal group in the future. Sometimes, when I read of the extravagant claims made for certain forms of treatment of crime, I am reminded that it is the "quack" doctor who can cure everything. My experience in the Prison Medical Service has convinced me that the problem of crime, especially recidivism, and its treatment is much more difficult than some writers believe.

In conclusion, I wish to thank my colleague, Dr. K. O. Milner, for seeing a few of the cases with me and for his help in the preparation of this paper.

#### REFERENCES.

- (1) GRIERSON, H. A., and RIXON, C. H. L.—"The Intelligence of Criminals," *Lancet*, August, 1926.
  - (2) GORING, CHARLES.—*The English Convict*, 1919.
  - (3) EAST, W. NORWOOD.—*Medical Aspects of Crime*, 1936.
  - (4) HEALY, WILLIAM.—*The Individual Delinquent*.
  - (5) MCDUGALL, WILLIAM.—*An Outline of Psychology*.
  - (6) HENDERSON and GILLESPIE.—*A Text-book of Psychology*, 1936.
  - (7) KRETSCHMER, ERNST.—"Structure of the Personality in Psychotherapy," *Brit. Med. Journ.*, September, 1937.
-