formation have contributed, a thorough study of each individual case, his parents and family history by a person trained for this kind of work is now demanded. One American institution has already put four such persons into the field to do solely this kind of work. The few results obtained so far hold out the promise of at last giving us something both definite and reliable. The establishment of the facts in this field will surely cost a very great amount of labor, but if we can really get the facts there will not likely be any great dispute over their price.

I have said that the first aim of the study of the causes is the prevention of feeble-mindedness. But students of this subject have recognized that the duty of their science does not end with this. It should aim at raising the average largely through the same knowledge that will enable us to prevent or limit actual mental defect. What seem to be the causes of mental abnormality are general and widespread. None of us escape all of them entirely. And we cannot suppose that if they produce a gross defect in one person that they may have left another, who has attained what we now call a normal development, entirely unaffected. I believe the thesis could be successfully maintained that no person has ever quite attained the mental development and efficiency that he might have attained had even our present knowledge of the causes of mental defect been applied in determining his hereditary endowment and rearing. Yet this is the one thing far above all others in all the world that every individual cherishes most.

Ob) General educational problems. The questions arising here are more removed from the immediate concerns of the special institution, or feel the influence of the preceding. I wish to call attention here only to the general question, viz., that of the psychology of learning. Educationalists have of late turned from the consideration of the methods of teaching to the experimental study of the mental processes and other factors involved in learning. This is the fundamental educational problem of today. If we can find out what mental processes the child must go through in learning any particular thing we have the necessary information for helping him. Now psychologically defined from this point of view, the feeble-minded child is simply one who is unable to learn as readily as the normal. He presents the hindrances to the learning process in a pathologically magnified condition, and thus enables us to discover them more readily.

A STUDY OF THE INMATES OF THE ST. CLOUD REFORMATORY.

BY DR. R. M. PHELPS, ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT ROCHESTER STATE HOSPITAL, ROCHESTER, MINN.

The interesting lessons I would point out are many—the difficulty lies in condensing them into one brief article. Supt. F. L. Randall of the St. Cloud Reformatory, from an observation and study of his people, which had seemingly been far more penetrating and pervasive than is customary, began to perceive that many of them were "not right" mentally. After some agitation of the subject, he has brought about a special examination of them.

Personally, in the last ten months, I have reviewed 270 separate cases of this population, which population now numbers about 380. I here present the prominent lessons derived from this study. For greater clearness and brevity, I first present some general results and conclusions; then later the special findings.

1. Hardly any "insanity" (considering the word as used excluding the imbecile forms) is found among the inmates. By the usual course of the cases through the courts, any cases showing insanity or epilepsy, either during or before the trial, will have been diverted to other destinations. Moreover, the age of those committed—usually sixteen to twenty-five, rarely up to the age of thirty—does not favor their being often committed while insane.

2. "Imbecility" is the best name for the defectiveness found. Large amounts of minor imbecility prevail. It is needful at once to make some explanation. Such imbecility may be subdivided into two parts, which two portions may mingle with each other in varying proportions: First, mental weakness or imbecility proper; second, moral weakness or "incorrigibility," as it is commonly called. Most of the cases of imbecility found are of lesser or minor grades, because, of course, the extreme cases have been previously diverted to the Faribault school.

A caution is to be added. Most people carelessly think or infer that a boy who does not go to the Faribault School is not imbecile, or if he does not go to the Red Wing School he is not "incorrigible." Such, of course, is contrary to the fact, these schools getting simply the extreme cases.

Another caution. Most people carelessly infer that the so-called "incorrigibles" are mentally sound, though morally perversive. Though I have not made a specialized extended study of any collection of these boys, I would say that I regard the "typical incorrigible" as a "defective" as one to whom the term "moral imbecile" might be possibly applied. By "typical" incorrigibility I mean that incorrigibility which is a part of the boy—which begins to show as the child develops, just as he does the imbecility proper—which persists during the development in spite of all ordinary motives to the contrary, just as does imbecility proper—which has all varying grades and degrees of grossness, as does imbecility proper.

This is not, however, my main subject, and need not be specially studied in this paper—for I hasten to add that in my marking of these boys of the Reformatory, while influenced somewhat, I tried to make my marking to not depend on that quality alone. For I found sufficient of the more purely mental weakness, to accompany this moral weakness, upon which I could make a downward marking. Thus, of the 49 "incorrigibles" on the list, I have, I find, marked all but six of them as below grade.

3. This imbecility I noted at once could be wisely designated only in terms of "degrees." As I stated it, to designate a case only as "imbecile," stating no degree of the same, is like stating "it has become dark," in that by this latter word we might refer to the passing of a cloud over the sun, or to a twilight darkness, or to a starry night, or to the pitchy blackness of a midnight storm. All degrees of darkness exist, likewise all grades of imbecility.

I therefore constructed a scale running from No. 1 (an average normal state) up to No. 10 (a gross, typical imbecile).
4. The use of such a scale admits fully and frankly that all grades exist, a fact which is practically ignored in practice, though dimly recognized by many people. Most of the cases designated are, of course, of the minor grades of weakness of mind, for the reason that any gross case would usually have been diverted to the Faribault School.

THE FINDINGS.

I examined 270 individuals. These were not all consecutive cases, but a more important "selection of cases" lay in the fact that among the older cases the more favorable ones would be the more apt to have gone on parole, leaving the less favorable ones behind. This kind of selection, however, was unavoidable.

Of the 270 cases, I find that I have marked 98 cases as notably defective or imbecile. This omits 49 other cases of the 270, who had a marking so slight that it seems best to omit it at this time. I would again caution that these 98 cases are not grossly imbecile in many cases—not so gross as to render their admission to the Faribault School easy. Perhaps not more than ten would be admitted. Yet half imbecile faces are plainly seen at a glance at the grouping of them, while large numbers of them cannot learn in school or are lacking in other ways. Testimony to this effect can be gathered from themselves. Several of the inmates, restless under the examination, protested that they were not insane, volunteered the admission that "of course a good many of the boys are weak and simple of mind." Also by their testimony, those caring for the boys seemed to also see quite clearly the feebleness of mind of those under their watch.

Again, in the letters coming to the superintendent concerning the previous history of these boys, I noted frequent expressions such as that the boy "is not quite right," "is not very bright," "was a queer and eccentric boy," "was always incorrigible," and so on through varying phraseology.

Education—A gross lack of education is noted. But it is the lack of "ability to learn" that brings the most significance. One after another, they would frankly admit (one day five out of six consecutive cases thus admitted) that learning was slow and difficult with them. They would say that they were unable to learn like their comrades or brothers. Often the inability was quite gross. To confirm this, we had the school record of each after coming to the Reformatory, and it usually made the matter worse rather than better.

Of the 270, only three had graduated from high school and only 24 had ever been in a high school at all. Only 45 more had ever seen the eighth grade. At the other end, about 120 had never been beyond the fourth grade in school, though remaining in school, with a few exceptions, until twelve or fourteen or sixteen years of age. Surely there is nothing "incidental" about all this. I would add a list to show this, selecting them as they run among the list. I give the age they quit school and the grade in which they quit. Age thirteen, third grade; age fourteen, fifth grade; age twelve, second grade; age fourteen, fifth grade; age sixteen, fifth grade; age fifteen, sixth grade; age twelve, fifth grade; age thirteen, third grade; age fourteen, fourth grade. Using figures only, we continue the quotations: Fifteen, 4; 12, 3; 10, 4; 14, 3; 12, 5; 14, 3; 16, 5; 15, 2; 14, 4; 14, 5; 12, 4; 13, 2; 14, 4; 13, 4; 13, 3; 12, 3; 14, 5; 1 2, 3; 14, 3; 14, 4; 13, 2; 17, 3; 12, 2; 14, 4; 14, 3; 12, 4; 14, 4; and many others approximating the same. These boys were kept in school, but they did not learn. Some, it is true, say they did not try, but even if so, their ability must be below par. Many freely admit their lack of ability. Moreover, the Reformatory school tested them again. Before coming to the Reformatory 59 of the 270 stopped in the second or third grade and 34 more stopped in the fourth, while others had vaguely slight and indefinite schooling, not noted by grade. Surely, this is a most significant fact.

Incorrigibility—Of the 270 cases, 32 had spent time in a reform school and 17 more admitted having been "threatened" with being sent to such a school. This means 49 confessed incorrigibles, to which number could doubtless be added some 25 others who had by chance escaped being "threatened" or sent. Incorrigibility, when it is typical, has commenced early in childhood, and has persisted as a moral weakness or perversion through the teens. Even casual observers have noted that it does not seem so much acquired as "inborn." Stealing seems to be the most common court complaint against these incorrigibles, yet a background of general viciousness is commonly present. As the study progressed, the conviction grew more and more strong that the moral obliquity, wickedness or weakness was accompanied in most all cases seen at the Reformatory with more or less mental weakness. All but six of the above 49 are among the 98 cases above marked as of low mental grade. However, the most grossly imbecile ones were not usually those who had been in a reform school.

Inebriety—As the examiner meets case after case, drifting along in an atmosphere of dull, sodden drinking and saloon life, the impression grows that the whole group of crime rises out of drinking; that drinking is the foundation soil that nourishes and fosters all this viciousness and degradation and crime. Losing all their money while drinking, losing their work on account of drink, and drunk when they committed the crime. Losing all their freedom while drinking, losing their friends, and drunk when they committed the crime. Losing all their energy while drinking, losing their health, and drunk when they committed the crime. Losing all their money while drinking, losing their home, and drunk when they committed the crime. Losing all their strength while drinking, losing their manhood, and drunk when they committed the crime. Losing all their health while drinking, losing their reason, and drunk when they committed the crime. Losing all their property while drinking, losing their liberty, and drunk when they committed the crime. Losing all their happiness while drinking, losing their peace, and drunk when they committed the crime. Losing all their friends while drinking, losing their self-respect, and drunk when they committed the crime. Losing all their youth while drinking, losing their best years, and drunk when they committed the crime. Losing all their beauty while drinking, losing their self-control, and drunk when they committed the crime.
Tramping—Though without very exact statistics, many, if not a majority, had tramped more or less even young as they were. By tramping, we mean beating their way from town to town without paying. Of course, they would work at times, as, indeed, most tramps probably do. But most of the rest of the 270 were movable from place to place, from city to city, to the woods in winter or the harvest fields in summer. We imagine hardly a dozen would have the dignity of a trunk if they wished to move. Probably not over 30 were living in a home at the time of the crime. Hardly any had ever saved up property to $100 or $500. Indeed, few had ever saved up even $100 except as they were paid up after a job. Practically none of them had any property left behind to be seen to.

Though all but a few (probably not over ten) visited loose women, yet only eleven had had syphilis and only 48 had had gonorrhoea. Practically none of them had any property left behind to be seen to. If anyone imagines there was much of excitement or adventure or vicious romance in the stories, he is grossly mistaken. Sordid and commonplace is the repeated story of dull, gross, drunken yielding to some unexciting vice or crime. Such a foolish lot of dull crimes would hardly be supposed. Usually done while drunk or drinking, the forgery or the theft rarely involves $50, usually it is $5 or $10 or $20 or $30. Often it is a little old junk. Sometimes it is whiskey or cigars. Rarely is the value enough to pay a man to escape from the city. Rarely is it enough to pay the purse of the man, if he leaves town. Yet they risk five to ten years of servitude for this bit of money. Verily, as some of them say themselves, it is all "foolishness." Moreover, it is done in a dull way and they usually plead guilty.

The trouble in using the word "inherited" for this and for all kinds of things as compensation for evil. If there were, the present laws would give a ludicrous caricature of it. For, if a man aim a gun at another man, if he kills the man, he hangs; if he injures him slightly, he gets a slight imprisonment; if he misses he may often get no penalty at all. Yet the intent and action on his part were exactly the same in all three cases. These boys truly say "there are hundreds outside as bad as we are."

These opinions are going to meet some opposition. Some have argued that they know many boys, dull in school, who in later life have fitted into a success in some occupation. Truly so, but this does not contradict the fact that most of the imbeciles and many reform school boys have failed to learn well. In fact, I might admit still more:

1. In public schools, all grades of ability are seen. There are nearly always some too dull to keep up. The very school children will tell you of this.
2. In any bunch of young men like those in lumber woods, in mines or slums, cases that are below grade mentally could be picked out.
3. In any town of say 1,000 people, where all individuals can be known, one can pick out examples of low grade intellects.
4. Not all imbeciles are "vicious" weaklings. Probably each of us knows some of good repute.
5. The uneducated classes hold the larger number of the low grade intellects, but this is largely because the low grade intellects do not become educated.

Now, I hold that all the above admissions enforce my theories, rather than contradict them. They all point toward varieties both in strength and form of mental endowment.

Opposition to the full acknowledgment of a continuous gradation can only be fully met by a quiet persistence and gradual education of the mass of people up to these views. It may take many years, perhaps a century of them. Old habits and customs yield slowly. Indeed, as a practical thing, it is perhaps best that an adoption should not come too rapidly. This is because our ability to accurately judge AHEAD of time and in the early childhood of the boy is, unfortunately, very poor as compared with our judgment of the defectiveness as it has shown itself and proven itself in AFTER years. But the fact of there are such grades or differences need not be denied for any such reason.

You will note, also, that I have avoided the use of the word "heredity." When using it in previous papers I have found myself often misunderstood. I therefore use the words "innate" or "inborn" or perhaps better, "constitutional." I mean that the quality is a part of the boy's makeup; is a something that training has not given to him.
A side thought seems fitting in this place. I never before so clearly realized that for this class of moving, tramping, "away from home" population, there is hardly anything open to them out of work hours except the saloons. Several of the boys put it quite vividly.

"Where am I to go? We can't shut ourselves in a room. No families receive us. All our associates, almost to a man, drink and get their recreation in saloons. It is almost impossible for us to keep from drinking." Probably several thousand boys in the state are in this condition. The saloons get about all their wages and without the drinking, much of the subsequent crime, and much of the venereal diseases would be avoided. Of course, the crimes themselves, are but incidents, growing out of the general low, vicious living which prevails among them.

In a spirit of caution, so easily do wrong inferences seem to arise, I would explicitly state as follows:

1. Most of the defectiveness or imbecility is of lesser degree, or, as sometimes stated, of "high grade."

2. Traces of imbecility or defectiveness could also be found in groupings outside the Reformatory, but not in such large numbers.

3. I do not see changes of commitment or other disposition in institutions that I would propose or commend, except perhaps in the most extreme cases.

Before concluding this presentation, I would like to enforce some of the points at greater length. The central points of difference, about which most debate might centre, and concerning which clear thought is needed are the two following:

First, the admission of "degrees" of mental feebleness of imbecility.

Second, the admission that typical "incorrigibility" is a defective mental and moral state.

The first of these two is the only one needing much attention here. It is that imbecility exists in "degrees" from that of a gross "idiot" knowing practically nothing at all, up and up till only the slightest traces of imbecility are to be found. I have been led to consider this opinion many times before in connection with the study of insanity as including imbecility.

So frequently is this idea admitted in practical life that it would hardly seem to need argument or detail. For, wherever you may go, among teachers or citizens, or any educated men, you will meet the common statements that "that boy is not very bright" "that boy is dull" "that boy was never bright mentally" "that boy was always odd and erratic" "that is a sort of foolish boy" "that boy is somewhat feebleminded," etc., etc., indefinitely.

Again, from my standpoint in examining the insane, it has become a habit for me to take the younger admissions and inquire back through the "teens" of the boy to find in them traces of imbecility, or of erratic and defective mental state of other form. We occasionally get typical imbeciles committed as insane, but of those with mild traces of imbecility, the number is also surprising. Such traces are attested by statements from near and dear friends like the following: "was never very bright." "was always an odd child," "always kept by himself and never said much." "was never of strong mind." etc., etc., such statements coming not from any examiners, you see, but by such inexpert friends as would see usually only the more gross features of abnormal kind.

I have just run over the last year's admissions of men to see how this has been stated statistically and find that we have admitted a total of 221 men, ten of whom are quite typically imbecile and commonly known as such. Of this total of 221 admissions, there are among the younger patients admitted, ten others who are known before coming as having varying yet quite distinct traces of imbecility. Also, among our present total population of 624 men, we now have 19 quite typical imbeciles.

For typical imbeciles, we mean those who do not have delusions, who are not feeble-minded because of epilepsy but who are simply feeble in mind more or less grossly, and have been so since childhood in greater or lesser degree.

So easily as shown by the above, do ordinary people admit the degrees of imbecility to be present in the general population. Yet when the same facts are presented in a blunt statement that all degrees of weakness of mind exist, they shrink. Many doctors will also shrink. In fact, no physician, of course, will wish to so state about his immediate community, nor will any citizen wish to so state about his immediate friends. And blame no one for such reserve. It is an instinctive, conservative attitude toward one's family and one's community life. It is usual to ignore that "imbecility" till it is so fairly gross that it 'forces' itself to the attention. And for the present I rather think that is the fairly right thing for ordinary society to do.

But, considered scientifically, and in the way of a study of conditions, there seems no way of reasonably doubting that varying abilities exist. To deny it would be to me an untruth. Of course, in judging, I should supposevably lean toward the side of normality in all matters of doubt.

A subordinate question has appeared at times. It is this: "Is LACK OF ABILITY the same as imbecility?" The answer would be that if this lack of ability is due to an injury or disease acquired in adult life, it usually does not take the name of imbecility even in the courts of mind. But when it comes in childhood, whether evident from the time of birth or due to accidents or disease at or near birth or due to a defective development after birth or from epilepsy beginning in early childhood, it checks full development and is then the common, and usually known, imbecility. In its essence, this is a lack of ability.

"Insanity" in its broad sense, and in the text books is, as a rule, defined so that it includes and covers imbecility. Thus we, in hospitals for the insane, are technically in legal position to take in imbeciles also. But the more restricted meaning of the word insanity is the one usually used.

It is to be understood, of course, that the "ten" degrees outlined by me are selected in a purely arbitrary manner. Various degrees are noted by authors but the subject seems not to have been fully developed. Various words are used to designate degrees. The term "high grade imbecile" meaning one near the normal state, has become quite a standard term.

A side thought seems fitting in this place. I never before so clearly realized that for this class of moving, tramping, "away from home" population, there is hardly anything open to them out of work hours except the saloons. Several of the boys put it quite vividly.

"Where am I to go? We can't shut ourselves in a room. No families receive us. All our associates, almost to a man, drink and get their recreation in saloons. It is almost impossible for us to keep from drinking." Probably several thousand boys in the state are in this condition. The saloons get about all their wages and without the drinking, much of the subsequent crime, and much of the venereal diseases would be avoided. Of course, the crimes themselves, are but incidents, growing out of the general low, vicious living which prevails among them.

In a spirit of caution, so easily do wrong inferences seem to arise, I would explicitly state as follows:

1. Most of the defectiveness or imbecility is of lesser degree, or, as sometimes stated, of "high grade."

2. Traces of imbecility or defectiveness could also be found in groupings outside the Reformatory, but not in such large numbers.

3. I do not see changes of commitment or other disposition in institutions that I would propose or commend, except perhaps in the most extreme cases.

Before concluding this presentation, I would like to enforce some of the points at greater length. The central points of difference, about which most debate might centre, and concerning which clear thought is needed are the two following:

First, the admission of "degrees" of mental feebleness of imbecility.

Second, the admission that typical "incorrigibility" is a defective mental and moral state.

The first of these two is the only one needing much attention here. It is that imbecility exists in "degrees" from that of a gross "idiot" knowing practically nothing at all, up and up till only the slightest traces of imbecility are to be found. I have been led to consider this opinion many times before in connection with the study of insanity as including imbecility.

So frequently is this idea admitted in practical life that it would hardly seem to need argument or detail. For, wherever you may go, among teachers or citizens, or any educated men, you will meet the common statements that "that boy is not very bright" "that boy is dull" "that boy was never bright mentally" "that boy was always odd and erratic" "that is a sort of foolish boy" "that boy is somewhat feebleminded," etc., etc., indefinitely.

Again, from my standpoint in examining the insane, it has become a habit for me to take the younger admissions and inquire back through the "teens" of the boy to find in them traces of imbecility, or of erratic and defective mental state of other form. We occasionally get typical imbeciles committed as insane, but of those with mild traces of imbecility, the number is also surprising. Such traces are attested by statements from near and dear friends like the following: "was never very bright." "was always an odd child," "always kept by himself and never said much." "was never of strong mind." etc., etc., such statements coming not from any examiners, you see, but by such inexpert friends as would see usually only the more gross features of abnormal kind.

I have just run over the last year's admissions of men to see how this has been stated statistically and find that we have admitted a total of 221 men, ten of whom are quite typically imbecile and commonly known as such. Of this total of 221 admissions, there are among the younger patients admitted, ten others who are known before coming as having varying yet quite distinct traces of imbecility. Also, among our present total population of 624 men, we now have 19 quite typical imbeciles.

For typical imbeciles, we mean those who do not have delusions, who are not feeble-minded because of epilepsy but who are simply feeble in mind more or less grossly, and have been so since childhood in greater or lesser degree.

So easily as shown by the above, do ordinary people admit the degrees of imbecility to be present in the general population. Yet when the same facts are presented in a blunt statement that all degrees of weakness of mind exist, they shrink. Many doctors will also shrink. In fact, no physician, of course, will wish to so state about his immediate community, nor will any citizen wish to so state about his immediate friends. And blame no one for such reserve. It is an instinctive, conservative attitude toward one's family and one's community life. It is usual to ignore that "imbecility" till it is so fairly gross that it 'forces' itself to the attention. And for the present I rather think that is the fairly right thing for ordinary society to do.

But, considered scientifically, and in the way of a study of conditions, there seems no way of reasonably doubting that varying abilities exist. To deny it would be to me an untruth. Of course, in judging, I should supposably lean toward the side of normality in all matters of doubt.

A subordinate question has appeared at times. It is this: "Is LACK OF ABILITY the same as imbecility?" The answer would be that if this lack of ability is due to an injury or disease acquired in adult life, it usually does not take the name of imbecility even in the courts of mind. But when it comes in childhood, whether evident from the time of birth or due to accidents or disease at or near birth or due to a defective development after birth or from epilepsy beginning in early childhood, it checks full development and is then the common, and usually known, imbecility. In its essence, this is a lack of ability.

"Insanity" in its broad sense, and in the text books is, as a rule, defined so that it includes and covers imbecility. Thus we, in hospitals for the insane, are technically in legal position to take in imbeciles also. But the more restricted meaning of the word insanity is the one usually used.

It is to be understood, of course, that the "ten" degrees outlined by me are selected in a purely arbitrary manner. Various degrees are noted by authors but the subject seems not to have been fully developed. Various words are used to designate degrees. The term "high grade imbecile" meaning one near the normal state, has become quite a standard term.
2. Average normal.
3. Low grade normal.
4. High grade imbecile.
5. Feeble-minded.
6. Imbecile.
7. Idiot (or grossly imbecile).

One other point. Ordinarily a bright manner of talking, will lead the hearers to declare the person must be considered as normal. Ordinarily it may be true, but occasional cases may show much defectiveness with that brightness and sparkle of talk. It may even be imbecility (which is ordinarily a quite symmetrical weakness) but it is more apt to be that unsymmetrical form called "defectiveness." By the word "defective" we recognize a greater ability along some lines of thought than along some others.

So, too, with ability to "learn." Occasionally one may learn well yet be quite defective in judgment. He may not have "good sense." Of course, most imbeciles of high grade talk with fair accuracy, "far more accurately than do the insane. Of the 19 enumerated as now in this hospital, most every one of them could discuss ordinary matters with accuracy and not give any delusions. This is, also, ordinarily true of "epileptic" patients especially during the early years of their epilepsy.

I feel the need of adding some explicit statements. I wish to state explicitly that while I have recorded findings of degrees of weakness of mind in the inmates of the Reformatory, I would find them in other groupings of people of like ages also. I think of them in this collection at the Reformatory only as more common and more gross.

I wish to explicitly state that no one would go into private homes and make very free statements concerning weakness of mind, even if he saw them clearly.

I wish to explicitly state, also, that the judgment of degrees of imbecility are "approximate.

I wish to explicitly state, also, that we could not take a group of babies or very young children and pick out so accurately the ones who would thus develop weakness of mind. The demonstration is largely by means of the later behavior.

I wish to explicitly state that I am not advising any change in present methods of commitment. Naturally to be inferred from the above arguments, not the Reformatory alone, but each state institution contains many variations in grade. Every public school contains many grades of ability and it is becoming one of the modern problems how to make all scholars pull together without holding the more able ones back. A hospital for the insane holds many variations and grades; from an inebriate who is nearly sane, or the convalescing one who is nearly recovered, down to the lowest dement. It also usually holds samples of imbeciles, incorrigibles and epileptics. We cannot have separate institutions for each grade.

Again, I would state the opinion, putting it more cautiously and as a personal opinion, that I am not so afraid as some seem to be of confining and limiting the freedom of one who is not quite right mentally. That is, I would not recommend that a mere taint of imbecility or eccentricity or abnormality should free from all penalty of wrong doing. I would hold that the imbecility or insanity must be fairly obtrusive before it frees a man from the usual penalties. This is the present practice.
to them, they get along pleasantly, do more or less constructive work, and learn to lead a comparatively useful life under conditions which develop contentment and satisfaction. Those, on the other hand, who have already gone so far in their criminality, or at least their life in bad environment, as to find special satisfaction in it, and who are very anxious to get out into the world again, resisting and resenting constraint, and promoting discontent among their associates (who look upon them as heroes), such individuals could not be cared for in the Faribault institution. This simply suggests that there is yet a field which is not covered, and a very important field, because the class of cases represented are those in the borderland; they have a weak sense of responsibility, coupled with a considerable knowledge of the evils of the world, and are therefore especially capable of doing a great deal of damage to society if not taken in hand early in life.

Referring to two points in Dr. Kuhlman's paper: First, the census. The doctor probably has the number of feeble-minded still too low. It is very difficult to classify defectives accurately in society, not only because of the difficulty in locating all defective individuals but because of the epileptics who are in almost all cases more or less affected mentally as a result of the disease, but not generally regarded as defective. Thus, if we include epileptics, and those who are feeble-minded without the epileptic complication the number would be much larger. I should say, from the best information we have, that there is at least one in three hundred or thereabouts. Second: As to the classification of the feeble-minded in the institution, the doctor spoke of the custom, which has been maintained for many years, of having the person or persons in the institution, from experience best qualified to pass upon the degree of feeble-mindedness, make the classification and determine the place in the scheme of training to which the person should be assigned.

There is another factor that comes into the practical administration of an institution of this kind, and that is the attitude of the parents and friends. Of course, we all understand how the personal equation of the individuals to us, because the class of cases represented are those in the borderland; they have a weak sense of responsibility, coupled with a considerable knowledge of the evils of the world, and are therefore especially capable of doing a great deal of damage to society if not taken in hand early in life.

Referring to two points in Dr. Kuhlman's paper: First, the census. The doctor probably has the number of feeble-minded still too low. It is very difficult to classify defectives accurately in society, not only because of the difficulty in locating all defective individuals but because of the epileptics who are in almost all cases more or less affected mentally as a result of the disease, but not generally regarded as defective. Thus, if we include epileptics, and those who are feeble-minded without the epileptic complication the number would be much larger. I should say, from the best information we have, that there is at least one in three hundred or thereabouts. Second: As to the classification of the feeble-minded in the institution, the doctor spoke of the custom, which has been maintained for many years, of having the person or persons in the institution, from experience best qualified to pass upon the degree of feeble-mindedness, make the classification and determine the place in the scheme of training to which the person should be assigned.
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who will be entirely incapable of training, not because there is any difference in their mental outfit, but because there is a difference in the capacity to use that outfit, which is inherent in the constitutional makeup of the individual.

We are coming to appreciate more particularly another thing that Dr. Kuhlman referred to; that is the significance of what is called the anatomical basis of these conditions. We have been studying this for years. I can remember, its full flower began about the time of the beginning of my work, about twenty-five years ago, when the dictum of all pathologists at work on the nervous system was that there was an anatomical basis for all forms of nervous disease or defect, and out of that dictum grew the question as to what might be done for these people. Under this method of study the fact was lost sight of entirely—because no comparative studies were made—that there is a wide difference between form and function, that while there is no difference histologically between a cortical cell in a new born child and a cortical cell in an adult, there is an enormous difference in the functional capacity of those cells, and that nature in the brain, as well as in the other organs of the body, is prodigal; that is, there is always much more functional tissue than is needed for any one given form of activity; consequently, if this functional tissue is limited and there are these anatomical differences, it is still possible, if the rest of the organism is sufficiently sound, to maintain the nutrition of the growing elements of the nervous system, to train the capacity of that individual to a fair degree of uniformity. The reason the one fails and the other succeeds is not because of difference in form, nor even, altogether, difference in functional capacity, but because of the inability of the rest of the organism to maintain the nutrition of the growing elements in the nervous system, because if they are fewer in number it means that they have to be trained to just that much greater capacity, and power of activity, and that what we have to look for and what these investigations are going to determine, is the basis, finally, for our saying which child is capable of development and which child is not, and the basis will not be any apparent intellectual lack, but rather the condition of the whole organism as it represents capacity for growth and development in that particular individual. The apparent paradoxes referred to and the exceptions which are so often used as arguments by the uninformed are composed of the class of individuals in whom the feeble-mindedness is apparent and, yet, where there is capacity for development because the rest of the organism is able to maintain the necessary degree of nutrition for the development of the limited number of active elements that may exist in this particular individual.

Then there is another term that we use very commonly, and which a great many people object to because they think it is indefinite—the fault is not with the term, but the way in which it is used—and that is the word "defective." Now, when we use the term "defective," if we use it properly, we mean simply that the individual is not effective, and that after that it is a question of degree. Anybody who is not effective up to a normal standard is to that degree defective. It does not mean because he is defective that he is an idiot or defective so far as to be apparent in his makeup, or in his appearance, or in his conduct; and if we keep that fact clearly in our minds there need never be any confusion as to the proper application of this term.

Then there is another side to this same question due to the significance of the word "intelligence" as we ordinarily use it. Here the confusion arises because most people confuse the terms "intelligence" and "capacity." I don't know of any better illustration of the significance of the word "intelligence" as we use it than to say that it simply means that we have all of the elements necessary to normal mental activity properly correlated. If they are not properly correlated then they are unable to do their work, and the failure is not a failure in intelligence, but a failure in capacity. It makes no difference whether the difference in the work is the difference in the quality of the activity itself, or the difference in the terms in this sense or whether we don't, and the more these investigations are made, the more clear these proper differences become. The confusion arises from the fact that people do use terms in other than their proper etymological, or graphic sense.

The basis for this difference is the change which is gradually taking place in methods of study. Up to within the last ten years—it may be longer, but actively ten years—we have approached all these subjects from the anthropometric point of view, from the standpoint of the developed man. There has been a growing tendency in the last ten years particularly to study them from what is really the proper point of view, the biological, to study the highest developed form of organism from the standpoint of the lower organism out of which he grew, and to recognize the fact that those qualities which we designate as mental, and the capacity which we speak of as intellectual, are simply growths and complications of the simpler characters which belong to all animal life, and that so far as vegetative existence is concerned, there is no difference in the nature of the activities in a single cell and the activities in a whole organism, so we know that there is no basic difference between the activities of the simplest form of nervous system and the activities in the highest form of nervous system, and that when we have a lack of development it means, in terms of biology, a persistence of rudimentary characteristics. Now, one of the principal functions of the nervous system, since there has been an organized nervous system, has been that of inhibition—that is, the ability to check and control the activities of the organism—and the one characteristic which is present in all forms of defect in the higher functions of the nervous system—the mental functions, or the psychic functions—is this lack of control. You don't find any anatomical difference in studying the brains of these people, except, reduction in the number of elements, and perhaps some difference in their form, but so far as the structure is concerned, it is similar. In the feeble-minded child we are dealing with futility and incompleteness varying in degree. The question we have to determine is the basis for that futility and incompleteness, and how far the organism of the individual generally is capable of responding to our efforts in the training of the functional activities of the nervous system so that the results may be more uniform, and more complete, and for this reason a great deal of study which is regarded as a waste of time by people who call themselves practical, has for its object the ascertainment of these facts as a basis for progressive work. That takes time, a great deal of it, and an enormous amount of material, before any definite con-
toward the community, they have no hesitancy in utilizing whatever means they can to satisfy their desires. You will find, too, I think, if you search the court records with regard to the commitment of this type of person, just as you find it with regard to the commitment of the insane, that they won't work; and they become a burden on the community. We know that men steal successfully on a very large scale, and that insane people, in the same condition, and are regarded sometimes as an ornament to it; just as the insane are not committed to our institutions because they are insane, but because they are no longer able or willing to work, or because they are regarded as dangerous; consequently, if we are going to do anything permanent toward the appreciation of what these conditions really mean, and get the proper viewpoint on the part of society in general with regard to them, we must teach society to separate the result from the cause, and it is only when they fully appreciate the significance of that that they will be willing to apply the necessary preventive measures and be able to do so intelligently.

Mr. Randall. Mr. Chairman: I assume the fact to be that the people of one state are not so very different from the people of another state in their makeup, their capacity, their inclinations—in other words, their human nature—and as indicating that persons who are defective, so-called, may be induced, or may induce themselves, to self-restraint, under circumstances where otherwise it would not be anticipated, I wish to cite the fact that in one of the states of the Union—which has a population which is quite considerable although less than the population of this state, white men do not steal, in the sense of pilfering. I was informed by the president of the board of prison managers of that state, when, in answer to his question, I told him that most of our commitments of white men were for larceny, that such was not the fact in his state, and when we visited the penitentiary and the convict farms, we were told by the man who was in charge of those institutions that the commitment of a white man for stealing was most unusual.

I clipped an article from THE STATE, a leading daily newspaper, in September, 1907, from which I read:

WHITE MAN CONVICTED OF LARCENY.

John Thomas, white, was charged with stealing clothes, etc., from a boarding house on Gervais Street on July 21st. The amount of goods which it was alleged that he stole was $37. He entered a plea of not guilty and was given a trial.

Mr. Thomas was represented by Mr. Pringle T. Youmans, who made a hard effort to clear the defendant. The jury returned a verdict of petit larceny.

In passing sentence, the Court announced that in his long life of practice before the bar he had never before seen a white man convicted of stealing. "And it is sad for me," he continued, "to have to pass sentence on a white man for a crime of this kind. We claim to be a superior
race, and we are, but you are a disgrace to the race and I am sorry that I am not allowed to impose upon you a greater sentence than that prescribed for petit larceny. I hope that when you have served this sentence you will go somewhere where the news of this crime has not become known and that you will make some effort to outlive the misdeeds of your past. Your former associates should shun you and you should be ashamed to hold up your head and claim to be a member of the white race.

The sentence imposed was the extreme penalty of the law, 30 days at hard labor upon the public works of the county, or pay a fine of $100.

It seems that stealing is looked upon with so much abhorrence there, by the white people, that even those among them who may be lacking in mental capacity are deterred from incurring the odium which that offense entails.

Henry Wolfer, State Prison: In Florida a year ago, I had a chance to study some of these phases, and it proved very interesting. I took a trip along the Everglade district where they are opening up for settlement a great deal of new country, and stopped in several small settlements. Most of the natives, whose ancestors had lived there for centuries, in the pine woods in little detached settlements—occasionally a small village, lived from hand to mouth. The farm was just a little garden patch. The whole country is controlled by large stock interests, the hogs and the cattle go at large, so much so that for convenience they call the hogs wild. All the cattle are branded but the hogs are not. There it is not larceny for a native to go out and kill a hog or a steer as long as it is for his own use, but if he were to steal and sell it, it is larceny.

'Social conditions are chaotic there compared with the social conditions here, morally, and in every other way. When it comes to the crime of larceny, it is measured by altogether different standards than we are accustomed to here.

Mr. Randall: The state to which I referred is South Carolina. Now, if a condition can be created which will prevent white men from committing larceny, why may we not be hopeful that the commission of other crimes may, in the course of time, be minimized by public appreciation of the dishonor attached.

Mr. Wolfer: Social conditions down there cannot be compared with the social conditions here, morally, nor in any other way, and when it comes to larceny, they have only got another name for it, that is all; and a lot go free down there that would be called to account in this country.

Mr. Randall: If that is the idea, I have been misinformed.

Dr. Tomlinson: I should like to say, to bear out what Warden Wolfer has said, that when I was in Philadelphia and went down in the slum districts to work in those tenement districts where poverty was extreme, where there were no social distinctions, there was almost absolute honesty with regard to personal property.

Larceny, as we ordinarily understand it, did not exist. It struck me at the time—I have often thought of it since—that among the very poor in those tenement districts there was absolutely no disposition to either defraud each other or to take each other's property. In primitive communities history shows the same conditions existed.

Mr. Wolfer: Just illustrating this point that I spoke of:—Mr. Lynch has opened up a very large tract of land down there. He selected one of these squatters, who had been more successful in gardening than any other man in that community, to go onto his place and open up an experimental garden to show what the soil would produce. I met him there and talked with him about his experience in that country, his opinion of the soil, productiveness, etc., and he gave me a general running history of his life. He had always lived there. Among other things, he told me that he had quite a “right smart drove” of cattle himself a few years before; he had accumulated until he had something like five thousand head; and his neighbors and friends became envious; they didn't like to see him prosper. When they wanted to kill a steer or a hog, they would take his instead of that belonging to anyone else, so that the first thing he knew his drove began to melt away until finally he got down to where he started. He didn't have anything. They simply poached on him altogether until he was reduced; and when I said, "Why didn't you have them arrested? why didn't you prosecute them?" he replied: "Well, I reckon they took only what they needed for their own use."

Dr. Rogers: This is another illustration of the fact that there may be two methods of accomplishing the same result. When I was in Venezuela it was very interesting to me to learn that in the streets of Caracas the peons would take a wheelbarrow of gold to or from a hank and go through the streets entirely unattended, and nobody thought anything about it; there was no danger of robbing; but if you wanted to transact an important matter of business, you might have to pay anywhere from fifty to five hundred dollars to an official before he would perform the duty which the law required of him.

I was glad that Dr. Tomlinson discussed in such an excellent manner the relation of feeble-mindedness to the terms used, classification, etc. The Doctor takes up the whole subject from the historical attitude, in which insanity stands in a sort of mother relation to feeble-mindedness.

With regard to Dr. Phelps' paper it seems to me that it owes its value to the knowledge which he has derived from long experience with, and observation of, mental alienation and mental abnormality. It is of genuine value in a field where there is little standardization, even though the survey would doubtless vary with every observer. In his discussion, however, I fear he might leave the impression that feeble-mindedness is still classified as a form of insanity, and that no attempt had been made to give a definite meaning to the terms "feeble-minded," "imbecile," and "idiot." Each at the present time has acquired a fairly well-defined definiteness of meaning, and feeble-mindedness, while it falls within the derivative meaning of the term insanity (unsoundness); it is fairly well differentiated from it by reason of its essential character, the age at which manifested, and the character and purposes of the means employed for its treatment. It is essentially a defect, not a disease. It dates its manifestations from birth or early childhood as a result of an arrest in the evolutionary development of the brain and nervous system. Its treatment is pedagogical, rather than medical, and involves the sociological provisions of a segregated community for life as distinguished from hospital treatment with a view of returning the patients to general society.

As to classification, there is now a very satisfactory grouping both by definition and diagnostic test.
Mental Status of Reformatory Inmates

The English Royal Commission of 1904 formulated the following definitions—except that I have substituted the term "feeble-mindedness for "mental deficiency for the word "morons" for "feeble-minded."

FEWWEE-MINDEDNESS is a state of mental defect from birth or early childhood due to arrested or imperfect cerebral development, as a result of which the person so affected is unable to perform his duties as a member of society in that station in life to which he is born.

1. IDIOTS: Those so deeply defective in mind from birth or early childhood that they are unable to guard themselves from common physical dangers.

2. IMBECILES: Those feeble-minded persons whose mental development exceeds that of idiots, but who are incapable of earning their own living.

3. MORONS: Those feeble-minded persons whose mental development is less than normal but exceeds that of imbeciles, and who are capable, under favorable circumstances, of earning their own living.

The American association for the study of feeble-mindedness has adopted this grouping and added the diagnostic age equivalent as determined by the Simon-Binet test, viz.—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mental age</th>
<th>High grade</th>
<th>Middle grade</th>
<th>Low grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morons</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imbeciles</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idiots</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the text books up to within the last two years used the old terms with great confusion. Of course, the terms that imply some pathological condition are still applied; for instance, the microcephalic,—the child having the small head; the hydrocephalic,—the child with the large head—from water in the ventricles of the brain; the microcephalian,—the child with the large head—from excessive connective tissue development; the cretin; the Mongolian; etc. I have referred to this matter thus fully because I consider it too important to pass lightly.
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P. M. Ringdal, Chairman: I should like to ask Dr. Newman a question. If I understood his paper aright, it was to the effect that he recommended twenty-five hundred acres of land in connection with an institution for the criminal insane.

Dr. Newman: Yes, sir.

The Chairman: Would that he without regard to the number of inmates?

Dr. Newman: Yes, sir.

The Chairman: It wouldn’t then be for the purpose of giving more opportunity to employ themselves in agricultural pursuits, but to give them plenty of room in which to roam about?

Dr. Newman: Plenty of room to roam and plenty of room in which to employ themselves.

C. J. Swendsen, State Board of Control: May I ask a question or two?
Mr. Swendsen: If you don't guarantee him as cured then a criminally insane person should never be let out.

Dr. Kilbourne: There are some forms of crime that are persistent, no matter what the punishment, aside from that which finally winds up their career, and any ordinary punishment doesn't prevent it. The minute they get out they are at the same old tricks again.

The Chairman. I should like to revert to one more point that Dr. Kuhlman made—the increase in the percentage of feeble-minded from one census period to another for the past thirty years. As I understood it, he accounts for this as being merely the result of better methods of taking the census now. At the same time the population of the country has been changing materially from a country population to an urban population, and the urban population has increased very materially. I should suppose that the larger cities, where there are slums, would produce a great many more of this class of people. Now, would that be a correct assumption? Would not the increase in the number of people in the cities to some extent account for this?

Dr. Kuhlman: I think that point would be in general well taken. I think it is true, judging from the figures we have in some instances, that the larger cities produce the larger percentage of defectives. On the whole however, I think it would be very difficult to say absolutely whether this difference in census figures, showing apparent increase in the relative amount of defect, is absolutely due to change in method of taking the census, or whether there is an increase in defect, although in general we regard it as an improvement in the method of census taking rather than anything else. We know that census methods on this point have been very defective. Parents, in general, have come to realize more the importance and necessity of reporting cases when they exist; that is to say, they would not now avoid the census reporter on this point as much as they did before. Things of that sort have to be taken into consideration.
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