father's inferiority and inadequacy. So he goes about accomplishing his purpose
his own way, and his behavior marks him as a problem. He defies the par-
parental authority which stands in his way of becoming independent. He is dis-
obedient and insolent, and even resorts to questionable means of obtaining money
to buy his own playthings. As is usually the case, the situation is carried over
into the school, where his record is none too good.

There is much to be done in this case, but the first step indicated for the boy
is to put him in a military or boarding school where he can compete on his own
merits and learn the game of give and take.

In this very brief and superficial discussion I have tried to bring out these
points:

Feelings of inferiority are practically universal, but they are scarcely de-
serving of the name complex unless the compensatory reaction is anti-social or
brings about friction in the individual's environment.

Inferiority complexes are probably founded on two factors: one an actual
marked inferiority, the other an imaginary inferiority arising from the ego, am-
bition or emotions within the individual himself.

Extravagant behavior represents the individual's effort to compensate for his
inferiority in one respect by placing himself in a superior position in some other
way.
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DELINQUENCY AND FEEBLE-MINDEDNESS

E. K. Wickman, Psychologist, Minneapolis

"The intelligence of the conventional criminal is of a low order and ver-
rather upon the cunning of the savage, the simplicity of the child and the instinctive
of the animal," Thus wrote August Drahm in 1899. He was supported
in his ideas by Lombroso. Their studies mark the beginning of a period rich
scientific research and in the promulgation of many theories regarding the
causes and treatment of delinquency. Among these theories and beliefs, there are
a few which have been quite generally accepted, and one of these concerns this
subject of the intelligence of the delinquent and its influence in the causation of
his unacceptable behavior.

The inferior order of the intellect of the delinquent was not an entirely new
idea conceived by present-day criminologists, but its general recognition has been
established in very recent years. It came about in somewhat the following way.
The anthropometric measurements made by Lombroso led him to a belief in the
existence of physical differences between the delinquent and the non-delinquent in-
dividuals. This made it possible for him to account for criminality and delin-
quency very largely on an hereditary basis, influenced, of course, to some extent
by some environmental and accidental factors, but, on the whole, it relieved the
desire for explanation on the principle that there are innate differences between
the delinquent and the non-delinquent. Then, in 1913, Charles Goring, in an ex-
haustive study of the English convict, was able to disprove this belief of physical
differences in the criminal. With the destruction of this explanation, it was felt
that the delinquent must differ psychologically or mentally, and this belief has
stimulated many researches and formulated a new explanation. It was about
this time that the psychologists had invented their new measuring stick of the
mind, the intelligence tests, and, on being introduced in this country, it was quite
natural that they should be tried out on delinquent individuals, with the hope
that they would scientifically establish mental differences that would help to ex-
plain the problem of delinquency.

The tests were accordingly administered. They fulfilled all expectations.
Studies showing 60, 70, and even 90 per cent of delinquents testing feeble-
minded were reported . . . . Such reports lent scientific accuracy to the pop-
ular conceptions and were quickly accepted by many psychologists and social
workers. They provided a ready explanation to the problem of delinquency and
brought psychologies and their tests into court. Given a delinquent individual,
his was tested, found to possess inferior intelligence, and the problem of causation
was solved. The individual was delinquent because he was feeble-minded and
could not be expected to be other than socially maladjusted.

This idea of the intimate relationship between delinquency and feeble-min-
dedness has become an accepted principle of explanation. The deduction was
rapidly made that all feeble-minded are potential delinquents because they are
feeble-minded. Once feeble-mindedness is established, we are relieved from
further explanation, and our responsibility lies in proper segregation. This has
become the general attitude of courts, psychologists and social workers. Mental
tests have almost become a routine in courts and with social agencies dealing with
delinquent children. If mental deficiency can thereby be established the problem
is solved. The delinquent child has come to be regarded as incapable of social ad-
justment. The terms defective and delinquent have become synonymous. It is
believed that social behavior is largely dependent upon intelligence, reasoning
ability and judgment. If an individual has defective judgment his social be-
behavior cannot be expected to be acceptable, and must necessarily come in conflict
with social customs, morals and law. He simply doesn't know any better. If,
on the other hand, a delinquent is found to have adequate intelligence, he is
labeled willfully perverse and is in need of punishment.

This explanation, however, has not remained unquestioned. It is an interest-
ing query: how much does intelligence and reasoning and judgment influence
social behavior? Does the child who truants from school, or the child who steals
a bicycle or the girl who commits sex offenses do so because he or she doesn't
know any better, or because he has poor judgment in these matters? We find
these delinquencies occurring in both feeble-minded and in superior children.
Can they be explained on the one hand on the basis of defective mentality and on
the other by willfulness or poor training or unfortunate circumstances? May
there not be common factors in both?

1August Drahm, "The Criminal," p. 92.

2R. Pintner, "Intelligence Testing," p. 204.
That delinquency can be explained either "en masse" or even in any individual on the basis of one causation such as feeble-mindedness or mental subnormality, is a theory which cannot be proven, even though such a common factor as mental deficiency may appear to be present in a majority of cases. We have always to beware of our natural tendency to search for an explanation, and to classify and pigeonhole. Such a simple explanation has a tendency to satisfy to the extent of relieving us from further responsibility, especially when that explanation lies beyond our immediate power to remedy. This may well be the case with the feeble-minded delinquent. We have apparently found a cause for his delinquency and we have then satisfied our sense of responsibility for complete understanding. It is a very convenient explanation and classification. In this respect it becomes necessary to recall the scientific principle that there is no single explanation (no one cause) for anything in the world, that causation is always multiple. The problem of delinquency cannot be explained either in the whole or in any individual by any one cause such as feeble-mindedness. This has led many investigators to seriously question this supposed relationship between delinquency and feeble-mindedness. The disproof of it is principally established by two arguments: first, the earlier investigations, which found a high percentage of feeble-minded among delinquents, have not been verified by subsequent studies; second, it has been found that the feeble-minded individual is by no means always a potential delinquent, and that when delinquency occurs in the feeble-minded, it is not the mere fact of feeble-mindedness in and of itself that produces delinquency.

Recent studies of delinquents indicate a smaller percentage of feeblemindedness than we were at first led to believe. The 60, 76, and 90 per cent reports have been modified to 7 to 31 per cent. There are a number of reasons to account for these discrepancies. Some of them are due to faulty construction of the intelligence tests, which have been greatly remedied through experience. The most important reason is to be found in differences of interpretation of what constitutes feeble-mindedness. The upper limit of deficiency has generally been lowered from twelve to eight or nine years. The army experience has helped to these changes. Perhaps the most comprehensive study of the relationship of intelligence to delinquency has been made under the direction of Dr. Herman Adler, of Illinois. These results indicate that in adult offenders, the distribution of intelligence is identical with the distributions of United States Army Draft. There is no heavier percentage of feeble-minded among adult offenders than was found in the United States Army. Among juvenile offenders in state institutions, however, a heavier percentage was found, but the tendency is to interpret much of this difference on the selective factors of the court. The mentally low-grade juvenile offender is much more apt to be sent to institutions for delinquents than the high-grade. For example, about 59 per cent of the girls in the State Industrial School were committed for sex offenses, while only 10 per cent of the boys were charged with this offense. The girls' school had 50 per cent more feeble-minded individuals than the boys. Obviously these girls did not represent all the sex offenders in the state, and because of the very nature of the offense, the high-grade sex offenders were either not apprehended, could take care of themselves, or were given more chances on probation than the low-grade, for whom the court held little hope of successful treatment.

Of the first 444 cases studied by the Child Guidance Clinic in the Twin Cities this past year, about 14 per cent were found to be feeble-minded. A large number of these were not referred as definite behavior problems, but for vocational guidance. Another 15 per cent were found to be subnormal or borderline, and 55 per cent indicated that in comparison with non-delinquent children, a slightly heavier percentage than the feeble-minded were found to be average in intelligence, and 16 per cent were superior. This percentage of children were referred who were mentally inferior; and other things led to become delinquent and to develop behavioral disorders than one of average or because feeble-mindedness produces the delinquency, or that feeble-mindedness is children of all grades of intelligence develop behavior disorders and that all children are more or less potential delinquents. The vast majority of delinquents, conditioning factors in the determination of delinquency.

Some interesting studies have recently been made of the feeble-minded themselves. In a study of 201 ex-students of special classes for mental defectives in Cincinnati after a 5-year interval, it was found that only 22.2 per cent had court reports. Of 121 individuals diagnosed feeble-minded by the Cincinnati Vocational Bureau from 1919 to 1923, only 18.2 per cent had court or institutional records.

This brings us to the very meat of the problem. Given a feeble-minded delinquent child, how much does the fact of feeble-mindedness itself explain the problem? What role does intelligence play in social behavior?

John is twelve years old. He is in the fourth grade, which is beyond his mental capacity, though he is the eldest in his grade. He cannot do the problems that the younger boys solve readily. His reading is an annoyance to both teachers and pupils, and likewise to himself. He has frequently been reported for truancy. Before he goes to court, a psychologist finds his intelligence quotient 75. He is subnormal? Can we blame his mental inferiority for his delinquencies? In this connection we are immediately confronted with the query: if John were in some other social situation than in his grade at school, would he be delinquent? We have a great discrepancy between John as an individual with limited intelligence on the one hand and the demands of intellectual requirements of fourth grade on the other. The supply of intelligence cannot fill the demand. This John cannot do the tasks required of him. Accordingly he is confronted with a constant series of social disapprobations. He, an individual with strong desires to win social approval and recognition, is incapable of fulfilling the requirements. Now, it is his way to promote their own individual welfare. John instinctively recognizes that the school situation is out of harmony with his own welfare. He evades it and this restores his equilibrium. He needs to set himself up in the eyes of his boy friends. He steals a bicycle, some money. Intellectually he knows this is wrong, but he achieves thereby a feeling of well-being and equality. It is his own individuality...
working for his own welfare, solving his own problem. The difficulty comes
ting with the social order arises and punishes him because it has been offended by
his behavior.

Here is the situation: John's delinquencies arose because of the discrepancy
between his ability to adjust himself and the requirements that social custom and
order demanded of him.

Peter is in the subnormal room. There is no difficulty in his ability to meet
the requirements of school tasks. But on the school ground he wants to play ball
with the fellows his own age. He can play ball too. But the boys call him
"Dummy" and "Crazy." Peter then becomes a bully and a constant fighter. Here
no we have a discrepancy. It is between Peter's mental inferiority in school
work and the recognized standards of mentality defined by the other boys of
the school. Peter is compelled to achieve recognition and he resorts to physical
protests, on which basis he can compete. It is the natural defense of his own
welfare.

Mary is a feeble-minded girl of eighteen. She has all of the bodily develop­
ments and urges of any girl of her age. She sees other girls and boys invited
to social affairs to which she is not asked. There is the same discrepancy
between her mentality and the higher mentality of her community. The result
of sex delinquency is not surprising. It is Mary working out her own individual
welfare. Not gaining satisfaction in the usually acceptable modes of behavior, she
yields to the socially unacceptable. I venture to say that intelligence has very
little to do with her delinquency. She realizes it is not proper, but once this form
of behavior is established, it is as difficult for her to break up the habit as it is
for girls of high-grade intelligence.

We emphasize this idea of a discrepancy between the individual limitations
and the requirements of social order because it is an aid in the explanation of
behavior problems in general. We cannot expect the feeble-minded or subnormal
to meet the social and intellectual requirements which have been developed for
the average individuals. If the social demands and stresses are too great for his
limitations, we must expect behavior that will offend the social order. When the
feeble-minded is placed in situations where the requirements are at their own
level they respond with behavior that is acceptable. This point has been amply
proven by the efforts of many social workers. Likewise we cannot expect indi­
viduals whose conditions of health, education, training, economic status, and
social intercourse are so limited as to produce a serious discrepancy with the
demands of social order to conform at all times with the accepted requirements
of social behavior. Any child, whose interests, whose likes and dislikes, whose
personality are discrepant to the interests and personalities of the parent, becomes
a behavior problem. The school boy whose physical development is below the
requirements of his classmates and who becomes branded a "sissy," seeks his gratification in extravagant behavior that becomes an annoyance to the school.

The adolescent whose sex drives are not satisfied in acceptable directions of
interests and activities, frequently becomes a sex delinquent. Thus, the child who
feels himself inadequate in meeting the demands of intellectual, social and physi­
cal requirements, strives to accomplish his own individual welfare, and in so
doing, often comes in conflict with the rules of the game.

The part that intelligence plays in social behavior is not as great as we
have been led to believe. The superior or average child who develops delinquent
tendencies knows full well that his behavior is objectionable. But he continues,
and it appears that his intelligence and judgment is inhibited just as our own
behavior is frequently so unintelligible. This holds true for the feeble-minded.
It does not require a high order of intelligence to distinguish between what is
socially "right" or "wrong." Ask any feeble-minded child, barring the very low­
grade imbeciles and idiots who are institutional charges, if this or that activity
is right or wrong, and he will answer you correctly. Intelligence then becomes
only one factor in this whole determination of behavior. It may determine the
type of delinquency. It may direct one individual to forgery and another to
larceny. It is a tool for the delinquent. The high-grade offender may use his
intelligence in working out his delinquent schemes, and the low-grade simply
performs on a lower level.

We indicated before that the mentally handicapped child is somewhat more
likely to become delinquent than one of average mentality. The reason for this
is not inherent in the fact that he is mentally inferior. Rather, it is because the
greater discrepancy between his limitations of adjustment and the requirements
of his social group provide more opportunities for difficulties in adjustment.

There is one further point regarding the problem. Do feeble-minded and
subnormal children respond to efforts in socially acceptable behavior?
Is it possible to establish socially acceptable habits in them? The evidence at pres­
ent is entirely in the affirmative, but there are two points to be remembered. First,
it requires a longer period of training to establish such habits in the feeble-minded
individual in comparison with the non-feeble-minded of the same life age. But
the significant thing is that these habits can be established. The second point
is even more important. Once habits of conduct are established in the mentally
inferior, they are more difficult to alter. This, in terms of social control, means
that when unacceptable habits are established in feeble-minded and subnormal
children, the problem of reeducation is more difficult. On the other hand, if we
can get these handicapped children early enough, it is quite possible to establish
acceptable habits, and we can turn these children into profitable economic positions
with an assurance that their social behavior will remain acceptable under usual
conditions. This has provided a hopeful measure of treatment for such handi­
capped children.

In the clinic the treatment of mentally inferior children has not been unsuccess­
ful. Often they are more amenable to treatment than the superior child, possibly
because the social forces that operate in their lives are more controllable.

The burden of this paper is to indicate that the generally supposed relation­
ship between delinquency and mental deficiency does not exist, that the feeble­
headed individual is not delinquent merely because he is feeble-minded; that the
establishment of inferiority in a delinquent does not explain or solve the problem,
but that is dependent on other conditioning factors, and that feeble-minded and
subnormal children are trainable in socially acceptable behavior. These facts,
we hope, will lend encouragement in the treatment of the defective delinquent.