JOHN LEWIS GILLIN

THE WISCONSIN PRISONER

Studies in Crimogenesis

A pioneer study of the role of inheritance and environment in producing criminality

MADISON • WISCONSIN
THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN PRESS

THE WISCONSIN PRISONER

Studies in Crimogenesis

By JOHN LEWIS GILLIN

THIS is a pioneer investigation into the factors of inheritance and environment that play a role in producing the criminal of today.

The group studied comprised 486 inmates of the Wisconsin State Prison, including almost 100 murderers, about 125 rapists and sodomists, and some 250 convicted of property crimes—bank robbery, burglary, arson, embezzlement, forgery, larceny, etc. Data were collected on the basis of a carefully conceived plan, and were then analyzed statistically and compared with similar data, so far as they were available, for non-criminals. As a control group the author used, perhaps for the first time in any investigation, about 175 of the prisoners' non-criminal brothers.

Through various channels, including autobiographical contributions of the prisoners themselves, information was assembled on a wide range of factors which were thought to be of possible significance as determinants of adult behavior. Among these were the nativity, economic status, and conjugal relationships of the parents; emotional ties between the prisoner and his parents; physical heritage; intelligence and schooling; age at which financial responsibility was assumed and employment begun; employment history; marital history viewed in the light of husband and wife's comparative intelligence, social and eco-

(continued on back flap)

THE WISCONSIN PRISONER

STUDIES IN CRIMOGENESIS

The Wisconsin Prisoner

STUDIES IN CRIMOGENESIS

By JOHN LEWIS GILLIN
Professor Emeritus of Sociology in the
University of Wisconsin

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN PRESS
Madison, Wisconsin

Second Printing, 1947

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Introduction

EVER SINCE MY GRADUATE SCHOOL DAYS I HAVE BEEN INTERESTED IN THE criminal. About 1920 I became dissatisfied with my study of him from books and reports and decided I must become more intimately acquainted with him by first-hand contact. I felt also that criminology and penology had too long been descriptive rather than scientific. Although the natural sciences had made progress by applying the techniques of experiment, careful observation, and measurement, it was still assumed that the more subtle influences governing human conduct were outside the scope of these methods. With the application of the statistical method to human problems, however, a tool became available with which many aspects of human conduct could be measured. Granted that many of the studies that ensued were not of the greatest significance in revealing why people behave as they do, they were nevertheless objective approaches to the problem. From them we could learn how to improve our study of the criminal and the various methods of treating him.

The first piece of criminological and penological research carried on under my direction was suggested by the conditions existing in the Probation Bureau of the Board of Control. The work was begun in the early twenties and bore fruit in two dissertations: Arthur Henry Moeck's study of adult probation work in Milwaukee County and Harry H. Turney-High's study of adult probation in the state as a whole.[1] The former was frankly a statistical study, but the other, though in part statistical, was chiefly historical. A third study of probation in Wisconsin, which was not under my direction but had my active cooperation, was made by Francis H. Hiller[2] of the National Probation Association and the State Board of Control, with the assistance of graduate students from the University's Department of Economics and Sociology. The first two of these studies explored the possibilities for research in this field in Wisconsin; the third was a

[1] The two dissertations were entitled "A Statistical Study of the Adult Probation Work of Milwaukee County" and "Adult Probation in Wisconsin." They were submitted to the University of Wisconsin in 1925 and 1928 respectively.

[2] *Probation in Wisconsin* (National Probation Association, New York, 1926).

survey of actual probation practices in the state with a view to suggesting improvements.

When University research funds became available for subsidizing graduate students, we undertook to make certain preliminary investigations. The first, done under my direction by Helen L. Witmer, was a study of some of the factors that determine the success or failure of prisoners on parole. The results were published as two papers in the *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*.[3] The second study, carried on in 1926–27, investigated the factors making for the success or failure of adult males on parole. This was summarized by Luman W. Sampson in an article published in the same journal.[4] The third was done by Katherine Lumpkin in 1927–28 under the direction of Professor Kimball Young and myself. Her findings were published in two articles in the *American Journal of Sociology*.[5] In the same year a similar study was made of the boys committed to the Wisconsin Industrial School for Boys; this was done by Morris Cadwell, who worked under the same auspices and direction. A summary of his results later appeared in two professional journals.[6]

In 1930 a further grant from the Research Committee of the University enabled me to undertake the investigation which is here reported. The hypothesis I desired to test was that the early experiences of prisoners have a bearing on their later involvement with the law. Some work on the background of criminals had already been done in this country and certain beginnings had been made abroad, but in general there were few precedents to serve as guides. In 1923 the Census Bureau had made a study of *The Prisoner's Antecedents* on the basis of data recorded on its census schedules, and a few years later, after our project had already been set up, the Gluecks published their report on *Five Hundred Criminal Careers*, a study of parolees from the Massachusetts Reformatory.[7]

In addition a few autobiographies of criminals had been published, such as Clifford Shaw's *The Jack-Roller* and *The Natural History of a Delinquent Career*,[8] and Jack Black's *You Can't Win*.[9] None of these furnished any consistent set of facts that could be treated statistically. It was the reading of these narratives that suggested to me the possibility of getting men in the prison at Waupun to write autobiographies that would supplement the information to be derived from interviews and the prison records. No thoroughgoing attempt had yet been made to reconstruct the early life of prisoners and compare their experiences with those of non-prisoners. If this could be done, I thought, it might be possible to isolate some of the factors that had contributed to delinquent behavior.

[3] "History, Theory, and Results on Parole," *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 18: 24–26 (May, 1927); "Some Factors in Success or Failure on Parole," *ibid.*, 384–403 (November, 1927).

[4] "After Careers of 424 Paroled Wisconsin Criminals," *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 25: 607 (November-December, 1934).

[5] "Factors in the Commitment of Correctional School Girls in Wisconsin," *American Journal of Sociology*, 37: 231–239 (September, 1931); "Parental Conditions of Wisconsin Girl Delinquents," *ibid.*, 232–239 (September, 1932).

[6] "Intelligence of Delinquent Boys Committed to the Boys Industrial School," *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 20: 421–428, 609–611 (November, 1929; February, 1930); "Home Conditions of Institutional Delinquent Boys in Wisconsin," *Social Forces*, 8: 390–397 (March, 1930).

[7] Sheldon Glueck and Eleanor Glueck, *Five Hundred Criminal Careers* (New York, 1930).

[8] Chicago, 1930, 1931, respectively. [9] New York, 1926.

Thus was conceived the project of examining in detail the life history of a large sample of prisoners according to a predetermined plan. And since we could not foresee which factors would be important and which unimportant, it was decided to examine as many as possible. See Chapter 1.

The results as they pertained to murderers were summarized in an American and a German periodical.[10] In 1931–32 a similar investigation was made of a group of sex offenders in the Wisconsin State Prison. A summary of the findings and a comparison of the results with those pertaining to the murderers was published in *Social Forces* and in *Marriage Hygiene*.[11] Four years later, in 1935–36, a study was made of the brothers of the various prisoners we had thus far studied. This served as a control group with which to compare the prison inmates. The results of this study were briefly reported in the *American Sociological Review*.[12]

In all these studies I have had valuable assistance from a number of my graduate students. Funds allocated by the Research Committee of the University made it possible to appoint these men and women as research assistants. Among them were Benjamin G. Wood, now statistician for the Division of Public Assistance of the Wisconsin Board of Public Welfare; Ashley Weeks, now professor of sociology in the State College of Washington; Reuben Hill, professor of sociology in Iowa State College; David Steinecke; Robert Strain; and Margaret G. Smith. Without their assistance the detailed work these studies involved would have been impossible. It is pleasant to report that all these assistants testify that the experience they gained was of decided educational value. They were able "to get their hands dirty" with the raw material with which they were dealing. Statistics became a living thing to them as they strove to bring order out of the chaos of data collected, and to guard against the pitfalls that attend the application of statistics to human material.

My part has been to plan the studies and interpret them. I also had a

[10] John L. Gillin, "The Wisconsin Murderer," *Social Forces*, 12: 550 (May, 1934), and "Die Mörder in Wisconsin," *Monatsschrift für Kriminalpsychologie und Strafrechtsreform*, Jahrgang 24 (1933), Heft 5, S. 17.

[11] John L. Gillin, "Social Backgrounds of Sex Offenders and Murderers," *Social Forces*, 14: 232 (December, 1935), and *Marriage Hygiene*, 1: 226 (February, 1935).

[12] John L. Gillin, "Backgrounds of Prisoners in the Wisconsin State Prison and Their Brothers," *American Sociological Review*, 2: 204 (April, 1937).

share in gathering data by interview for the first study. For four years, as a member of the Pardon Board of the State of Wisconsin, I had the opportunity to become personally acquainted with a large number of prisoners other than those interviewed in the first study.

The present volume is a report of our findings with reference to the early environment and experiences of criminals committed to the Wisconsin State Prison for three different types of offenses. It is partly a statistical analysis of these conditions and partly a series of case histories intended to show concretely the play of conditions and experiences in producing criminal behavior.

The group studied included (1) all prisoners sentenced for life except the few who died, were pardoned, or could not be interviewed because of language difficulties; (2) all sentenced for rape or sodomy; and (3) prisoners sentenced for property crimes—every third one in the prison for most of the categories of data assembled, but the entire group for others.

The findings apply only to these prisoners. They cannot be applied to prisoners elsewhere, nor even to all prisoners in Wisconsin, since no study was made of those who had been granted probation. It cannot be inferred that the same conditions were associated with the careers of prisoners in Wisconsin at an earlier date, or that they will be found to exist in those of future prisoners.

It came as a complete surprise to me to learn that the three groups of prisoners enumerated above, while they had some characteristics in common, had responded so differently to crises in their lives that one could not escape the conclusion that significant differences of personality existed which must be attributed to differences of background. See Chapter 2. They differed from the Wisconsin male population fifteen years of age and over in five particulars: nativity; age distribution at the time of commitment; marital status; fecundity; and intelligence quotient. See Chapter 3. They differed from their brothers available for study in seven respects: age at which they were first employed full time; employment history; marital status; occupation; affection for mother and the extent to which they believed themselves the objects of parental favoritism; and relationships with wife. See Chapter 4.

On the basis of these data it is concluded (1) that the past experiences of these prisoners had been different in certain important respects from those of the non-prisoners in Wisconsin with whom we compared them; (2) that they had developed, partly as a result of these experiences, personalities which responded to life experiences in a criminal fashion; and (3) that their habitual responses to social situations caused them to meet crises differently from non-prisoners. The study does not attempt to answer the question whether their biological constitutions also differed from those of non-prisoners. See Chapter 9.

Contents

APPENDICES

List of Statistical Tables

PART I

THE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

1

The Problem and Methods of Investigation

WHAT KIND OF HUMAN BEING IS THE CRIMINAL? FOR TWENTY-FIVE CENturies or more men have speculated on that question. Homer described Thersites thus:

> *His figure such as might his soul proclaim;*
> *One eye was blinking, and one leg was lame:*
> *His mountain shoulders half his breast o'erspread,*
> *Thin hairs bestrewed his long misshapen head.*
>
> THE ILIAD, Dryden's translation

Somewhat less than a century ago Lombroso enunciated his theory that the criminal is an atavism, a throwback from the prevailing human type who is unable to conform to society's norms of behavior. Later he conceded that only about a third of all criminals were atavistic. In 1919 the Englishman Goring, on the other hand concluded on the basis of his study of some three thousand English prisoners that the criminal is not a variant physical type but a mental defective. Recently Hooton has concluded from his anthropometric measurements of about seventeen thousand sane and insane prisoners in nine states that anthropologically they are deviates from the non-criminal population.[1]

The criminal has also been studied by the psychoanalysts. Though not agreed at every point, they all accept the theory that in some criminals there is an inner conflict between their instinctual drives and the demands of society. Sometimes the criminal accepts prevailing social standards as "right," but again he may adopt those of a group whose norms are quite different.

Representative of the Freudians are Franz Alexander and Hugo Staub, who define three main classes of criminals: (1) the *neurotic criminal*, "whose hostile activity against society is a result of an intrapsychic conflict between the social and anti-social components of his personality," a conflict which,

[1] See his *Crime and the Man* and *The American Criminal*, both published in 1939 by the Harvard University Press.

"like that of a psychoneurosis, comes from impressions of earliest childhood and from circumstances of later life (psychological etiology)"; (2) the *normal criminal*, "whose psychic organization is similar to that of the normal individual, except that he identifies himself with criminal prototypes (sociological etiology)"; and (3) the "criminal whose criminality is conditioned by some pathological process of organic nature (biological etiology)."[2]

All these criminologists have viewed their subject from the standpoint of his genesis; that is to say, they have analyzed the criminal on the basis of the factors they believed had made him anti-social. Their attacks on the problem, praiseworthy as they are, have been one-sided and incomplete. What remains to be done is a synthesis of the several approaches that will furnish an interpretation of the interplay of the various factors.

The present study is much less ambitious than that. It describes not the Wisconsin criminal but the prisoner in the Wisconsin State Prison. He is considered in terms of the crime for which he was sentenced and of the various social and economic experiences he had from birth to the time of his incarceration, so far as we were able to reconstruct them. Obviously we too are trying to describe him in etiological terms by selecting those experiences that seem to be associated with his conduct, and hence our treatment is also one-sided and incomplete. We have made no use of the biological, anthropological, or psychiatric approach except as these factors appear incidentally.

Specifically, our problems were these: Do the three classes of offenders into which we divided our sample—murderers, sex offenders, and property offenders—have the same or different backgrounds and personalities? Do prisoners and their non-prisoner brothers have the same or different backgrounds and personalities? What do the individual case histories reveal regarding the bearing of these differences on the conduct of the prisoners?

The Method

The Sample Studied.—The prisoners studied totaled 486, slightly more than a fourth of the entire prison population of about 1700. Our group of 92 life prisoners included the entire prison population of lifers except sixteen who died during the investigation, were too ill to be interviewed, or knew so little English that they could not be interviewed without an interpreter. We took all the sodomists and rapists in the prison, 128. Those convicted of other sex crimes, like adultery, were so few that we dropped them out. Of the property offenders, we took every third one for most of our data, since the group was too large for our time and funds. In a few

[2] *The Criminal, the Judge, and the Public* (Macmillan, New York, 1931), 53, 54. See also Franz Alexander and William Healy, *Roots of Crime* (Knopf, New York, 1935).

tabulations all the property offenders are included, since the information was easily available from the prison records; thus we were able to determine how representative our smaller sample was, at least with respect to these categories. The larger group of property offenders numbered 933; our smaller sample, including all the men interviewed, numbered 266. For virtually all of the larger group the prison records supplied information relating to intelligence quotient, occupation, marital condition, nativity, circumstances of the trial, and number of arrests previous to the crime resulting in present incarceration. The additional information collected for the smaller group was obtained by personal interviews with the prisoner and careful check-ups with other sources of information. As will appear from the tables, not every item of information sought was obtained from all the prisoners. Sometimes neither they nor anyone in their home communities was in possession of the facts.

Prison Records.—From the record office of the prison we obtained the main facts pertaining to the crime, trial, and sentence of the prisoner, the statement he made upon entering the prison, the results of the physical, psychological, and psychiatric examinations given him upon his entry, the names of the relatives and friends with whom he had corresponded and who had visited him, and, for some prisoners, reports of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and of other institutions in which he had been incarcerated, police reports, reports from social agencies, and reports of parole officers on family conditions and other items of interest in the life of the prisoner in the communities in which he had lived.

Personal Interviews.—By and large, however, these records yielded no more than the sketchiest outline of the prisoner's early life. To obtain information about his family and the conditions that had engendered his habitual reactions, each prisoner was interviewed. At the close of the interview, which in some cases lasted for hours, a summary statement of the man's developmental history was prepared.

Life Histories.—Many of the prisoners also composed a life history for us along the lines of a mimeographed outline we placed in their hands. They were not required to follow this outline, but were told that if they were at a loss what to write, it would suggest the points on which we desired as much information as possible. Some of the men would not cooperate, others could not write. In any case, however, these autobiographies were intended merely to supplement the information we obtained in the personal interview. Many of those we did get were very interesting and revealing.

Analysis of the Life Histories.—By a careful analysis of the life history, checked against the other data obtained, we hoped to learn what subtle influences had operated on the personality. Some of this information we summarized in tabular form, but much of it could not be statistically treated. In the interview we had inquired into several subjective attitudes of the

prisoner, hoping to determine whether his early experiences had engendered antipathies, jealousy, bitterness, or other emotional maladjustments. The life history was valuable in checking on these points.

Field Investigations.—Having been warned that these men could not be believed, we checked up on their stories. An investigator visited most of the communities in Wisconsin and adjacent states from which prisoners had come and got in touch with relatives, employers, social agencies, courts, police, and acquaintances of the prisoners. For the small number of prisoners who had come from places too distant to visit, the check-up was made by correspondence. Some of this information corrected and supplemented what we had already acquired, but on the whole it was not worth the time and money it cost. The men were unexpectedly truthful about their early lives and about everything else except the circumstances of their crimes. About these circumstances we were not particularly concerned, since our aim was to reconstruct the man's life before the crime was committed. Of course the group included a few pathological liars, who could not have told the truth even if they had wanted to, and these were the only ones for whom the field investigation was really worth while. It did, of course, give us the assurance that no source of information had been neglected.

Control Group.—Having determined the facts respecting the background of these prisoners, we had to ascertain whether they differed from those of non-prisoners. With respect to certain characteristics they could be compared with the general population of Wisconsin, for whom statistics on intelligence quotient, occupational and age distribution, school grade reached, etc., could be obtained from census statistics and reports of the army draft of 1917–18. But how to get a group of non-prisoners who would give us analogous information about themselves was something of a problem. I thought of asking for volunteers in the communities from which the prisoners had come, but rejected the idea as impractical. Finally we decided upon another plan: to interview the brothers of prisoners. This plan had the advantage of permitting us to hold certain factors constant. It developed that of the total group of 486 prisoners, 172 had brothers who were available. Each of these was interviewed in accordance with a schedule of questions similar to that used for his prisoner brother.

Statistical Analysis.—Having recorded all the information collected in these various ways, both for the prisoners and for their brothers, we made a statistical analysis of the data. The several categories of information were coded and punched on Hollerith cards, and the data carefully rechecked. The cards were then run on tabulating machines.

A number of the tables which record the opinion, memory, and judgment of the prisoner may be thought questionable on the ground that the data, being subjective, cannot serve as a basis for objective conclusions. Their

purpose, however, is not to establish actual concrete facts but to throw light on the prisoner's attitudes and their origin. When we questioned him about his family's income, favoritism displayed by his parents, whether his economic status had been improving at the time of his arrest, etc., we knew we could not get objective evidence, either from him or from anyone else. What we wanted to learn was how the prisoner himself viewed given situations. Whether his answer was intrinsically true or not, it was true for him, and thus revealed something of the make-up of his personality.

The tabulations having been completed, the differences between the several types of offenders, and between the prisoners and their brothers, were calculated and their statistical significance computed. For the table as a whole chi square was used to test the significance of the differences. The coefficient of contingency (C) was calculated to determine the degree of correlation, and is given wherever it shows a real relationship. Details of these calculations are given in the Appendix tables. To test the significance of the difference between any two groups of prisoners or between prisoners and brothers with respect to any subcategory in the table, we worked out the critical ratio (CR). For this purpose we used the following formula:

$$E^2 = \frac{P_1Q_1}{N_1} + \frac{P_2Q_2}{N_2}$$

All differences more than twice their respective standard errors were considered to be significant.

In this way the different types of offenders—the murderers, the sex offenders as a whole, the rapists and sodomists (subclasses of sex offenders), and the property offenders (consisting of several subclassifications)—were compared. The most minute study of the subclasses was made with respect to nativity, occupation, and intelligence quotient, and the results incorporated in the various tables. The sample of brothers, though smaller than desirable, permits a comparison of prisoners and non-prisoners with respect to the possible determinants of conduct.

Cautions to be Observed.—It should be remembered, in the first place, that these 486 prisoners constitute only a sample of the 1700 in the prison at the time the study was made. The question is whether it was representative of the total prison population. Our group of murderers undoubtedly was representative, since it included 92 of a possible 108. Among the 128 sex offenders studied were included all the rapists and sodomists, but none of the adulterers or certain smaller groups of sex offenders. Of the total number of property offenders our sample includes one-third. Perhaps as a whole our group is as fair a sample as we could expect to get without taking the whole group or a random sample from an infinite universe.

The reliability of the data assembled also needs to be scrutinized. Some

of the information is based in part on the judgment of the interviewer. Many such categories were eliminated as the work proceeded, but our final statistical analysis includes a few on which only tentative generalizations can be based. Moreover, it must be recognized that each of the several interviewers may have had his particular bias, despite the careful instructions given him and the great effort that was made to be objective in recording the material.

Further, the relatively small number of murderers and sex offenders in our samples made it statistically difficult to handle an analysis in which the data are broken down into several subcategories for the purpose of finer analysis. In some instances the number of cases is too small to give much meaning to the coefficient of contingency, and therefore we did not always use it. Moreover, we did not often use the tetrachoric r, which assumes that the series used is continuous quantitatively and is normally distributed. It is believed, however, that none of these limitations invalidates certain conclusions we reached. It does reduce the number of generalizations that can safely be made.

Another aspect of our method that may be open to question is the classification of offenders on the basis of the last sentence imposed upon them. Some of them had previously been convicted of other types of offense. Should they have been classified on a sociological rather than a legal basis? To determine whether in that event the results would have been different, two of my graduate students classified and analyzed the material on a sociological basis. Their findings agreed in almost every particular with my own. A summary of their findings and methods is given in Appendix B.

Finally, one last word of caution respecting the chance occurrence of significant differences. One cannot tell which of any large number of significant differences are due to chance and which are really attributable to the factors under consideration. Usually one may assume that the chance differences are those which are very difficult to interpret. The statistical part of this study includes a few of these. An effort was made to discover them in the case histories and to make proper allowance for them in the final interpretation.

2

Distinctive Characteristics of Each Class of Prisoners

In this chapter are summarized, on the basis of the statistical tables, the differences between the three groups committed to the Wisconsin State Prison for different types of crime. The series of tables in the Appendix may be consulted by anyone interested in the degrees of difference and the statistical measures employed in arriving at them.

The Murderer

Conditions in the Parental Home.—Because we failed to get data on parental home conditions from so many of the lifers (for some categories data were missing for a third of our group), there are only two categories in which the lifer can be said to differ significantly from both the other classes, and two in which he differed significantly from the property offender:

1. He came from a farm family more frequently than either of the two other classes. See Appendix Table 1.

2. More frequently than either the property or the sex offender he and his sibs contributed to the parental family's support before they reached the age of fourteen. See Tables 5 and 6. This conclusion holds even if we assume that none of the murderers for whom this item of information is lacking helped to support his family at so early an age.

3. Like the sex offender, he was much more likely to have had foreign-born parents than the property offender. See Tables 14 and 15.

4. He estimated the parental income much lower than did the property offender, as Table 3 shows. Since this was merely the unsubstantiated judgment of the prisoner, its only value for us was that it revealed the prisoner's appraisal of his family's economic status. The murderer regarded the family income as relatively low.

Conditions in the Prisoner Himself or Operating upon Him as an Adult.—Of the eleven characteristics distinctive of the murderer, three were signifi-

cantly different from those of both the other classes,[1] one was shared by the property but not by the sex offender, and seven were shared by the sex offender but not by the property offender. Apparently the murderer was more similar to the sex offender with respect to this category of factors than to the property offender.

1. More often than either of the other two classes the murderer had been financially independent before the age of fourteen. See Table 32.

2. He was more often the youngest or the only child of the family than either the sex or the property offender. See Table 25.

3. He was more likely to be foreign-born than the property offender. See Table 28.

4. He left school at an earlier age than the property offender. See Table 29.

5. He was younger than the sex offender when he entered prison, but older than the property offender. See Table 30.

6. He had been less steadily employed than the sex offender. See Table 34.

7. He was more likely than the property offender to be an unskilled laborer. See Table 35.

8. He was more likely than the property offender to feel that his economic condition had been improving at the time of his crime. See Table 36.

9. He was more likely to be married than the property offender. See Table 37.

10. He had been arrested less often than the property offender. See Table 44.

11. He had had a jury trial in a much larger proportion of cases than the property offender. See Table 45.

Summary on the Murderer.—Because information on the parental home of many of the murderers is so incomplete, it is impossible to say whether the lifers differed from the two other classes of criminals more than they resembled them on this point. In only two of twenty-one categories does the data in Tables 1–21 reveal them as significantly different from both the other classes, and in two others as different from the property offenders alone.

Conditions in the prisoner himself or operating on him as an adult were divided into twenty categories. In eleven the murderer differed significantly from one or both of the other classes. In seven he differed from the property offender alone, but in only one from the sex offender alone.

From these summaries of the distinguishing characteristics of the murderer it is clear that our statistical studies present a far less clear portrait of him than of the sex and the property offender. The case histories

[1] With respect to age (item 5 below) he differs from both the sex and the property offender, but not in the same direction.

of the lifer, however, help to complete the picture of his personality and the conditions which played upon it. On the whole his background is much more like that of the sex offender than that of the property offender.

The Sex Offender

Parental Home Conditions.—Of the thirteen distinctive characteristics of the sex offender's parental home, only two were significantly different from that of the murderer, ten from that of the property offender, and one from both.[2] It may well be, however, that if we had data on all the murderers, other differences between the home conditions of the several classes would be revealed.

1. The sex offender was raised in a farm family much oftener than the property offender, but less often than the murderer. See Table 1.

2. To a greater extent than the property offender he reported that the parental wage earner was irregularly employed. See Table 2.

3. Significantly oftener than the property offender he felt that his parents' income was "low." See Table 3.

4. Less often than the murderer he reported that his sibs had contributed to the family income before they reached the age of fourteen. See Table 5.

5. Significantly less often than the murderer he reported that he had contributed to the family income before he was fourteen, but more often than the murderer that he had first contributed after that age. See Table 6.

6. Much less frequently than the property offender he reported that he had contributed nothing to the family income. In other words, to a greater extent than the property offender he stated that he had contributed to the support of his family. See Table 6.

7. Less often than the property offender he reported that he had been raised in a family in which overt disharmony existed. See Table 7.

8. He gave his parents a less favorable reputation than did the property offender. See Tables 9 and 10.

9. He asserted less often than did the property offender that he was the favorite of someone. See Table 11.

10. More often than the property offender he had foreign-born parents. See Table 14.

11. Less frequently than the property offender he reported that there was chronic disease in his home. See Table 16.

12. More often than the property offender he reported that his father exercised control over the family. See Table 19.

13. He was less sensitive to severity of family control than was the property offender. See Table 21.

[2] With respect to item 1 he differs from both the property offender and the murderer, though not in the same way.

Conditions in the Prisoner Himself or Operating upon Him as an Adult.— This category included seventeen items with respect to which the sex offender differed significantly from one or both of the other classes of criminals:

1. The I.Q. of the sex offender was lower than that of the property offender. See Table 22.

2. He was more likely than the property offender to have been the youngest or only child in the family. See Table 25.

3. More often than the property offender he was foreign-born. See Table 28.

4. He left school at an earlier age than did the property offender. See Table 29.

5. He was older upon entering prison than either the murderer or the property offender. See Table 30.

6. More often than the property offender he reported that he had contributed to the parental family's support. See Table 33.

7. He had been more steadily employed than either of the two other classes of prisoners. See Table 34.

8. Less often than the murderer he had been financially independent before the age of fourteen. See Table 32.

9. More often than the property offender he had been an unskilled laborer. See Table 35.

10. He was more likely than the property offender to feel that his economic condition had been improving at the time of his crime. See Table 36.

11. He was more likely to be married than the property offender, probably because he was older. See Table 37.

12. He had a larger family than either of the two other classes. This too may be partly attributable to his age. See Table 38.

13. He was more likely than the property offender to have a wife of the same nationality, education, and premarital economic status. See Tables 39–42.

14. He had been arrested less often than the property offender. See Table 44.

15. He was more disposed to exonerate himself for his crime than the property offender. See Table 46.

16. He was more likely than either of the two other classes of prisoners to claim that his plea of guilty had been made under pressure or misapprehension. See Table 46.

17. He was more likely than the property offender to have pleaded not guilty and to persist in denying the charge or in admitting only certain features of it. See Table 46.

Our data on the sex offenders, being more complete than those on the murderers, present a more definite statistical picture. Of twenty-one categories of factors in the parental home which proved to be valid for comparative purposes, thirteen showed distinctive characteristics of the sex offender. Ten of these distinguished him from the property offender and two from the murderer, and one from both. In short, he is apparently more similar to the murderer than to the property offender, though in view of the gaps in our information on the murderer, this may not be a valid conclusion.

With respect to seventeen of the twenty-five items classifying conditions in the individual himself or operating on him as an adult, the sex offender differed from one or both of the other two classes of prisoners. These figures may suggest that the conditions he met outside the parental home were more influential than those he experienced as a child, but this conclusion does not necessarily follow. In the first place, some of the factors operating on him as an adult, such as early support of his family, the reputation of his father and mother, and emotional indifference, had their roots in the parental home. Moreover, three items in the list pertain to the arrest and trial that resulted in imprisonment, hence have little bearing on the question of what experiences produced the personality that reacted criminally to a given situation. The sex offender's emotional indifference which this statistical analysis reveals was probably born of early experiences in the parental home and later frustrations of one sort and another. Since our sample of sex offenders includes a preponderance of rapists, whose I. Q. is usually low, the group as a whole tends to appear mentally dull, economically handicapped, and socially isolated.

To summarize the statistical findings, the sex offender was a man born into a family handicapped by limited economic resources and a foreign background, and requiring financial assistance from the children at an early age. Schooling was not very important in the eyes of the family or of the prisoner himself. Of low intelligence and the youngest or only child, he had stuck closely to the family and consequently had developed an ingrown personality. He neither loved nor hated strongly. To a notable extent he reported that he was the favorite of no one. He was incapable of strong emotions other than the most elemental, hunger and lust. He was relatively insensitive to paternal control, although his father had usually been the dominant member of the family. He gave his parents a poor reputation, despite the fact that his home had been relatively free from overt disharmony. He had married a woman with a background much like his own and had a large family. It is not surprising, in view of his low emotional tone, to learn from the case histories that his conjugal ties were on a level not far above the sexual. Obviously the sex offender is a quite different person from the property offender, and in some respects from the murderer, especially on the emotional side. The case histories will round out this statistical analysis.

The Property Offender

Conditions in the Parental Home.—Of the eleven characteristic features of the property offender's parental home, seven[3] differentiate him from both other types of offender and four from the sex offender alone. His apparent dissimilarity to the murderer can probably be attributed to the inadequacy of the data on the lifers.

1. The father of the property offender was more frequently a skilled laborer than was the father of the murderer, and a farmer less frequently than was the father of either the sex offender or the murderer. See Table 1.

2. In significantly fewer cases than either of the two other classes of prisoner he reported that his father was not regularly employed. See Table 2.

3. Oftener than the two other classes he reported that his family had a "high" income. See Table 3.

4. The proportion of property offenders who contributed nothing to the parental family's support was larger than in either of the other classes. See Table 6.

5. A fifth of the property offenders, a significantly larger proportion than in either of the other classes, reported that the parental home had been broken by overt disharmony—divorce, desertion, or separation. See Table 7.

6. The property offender gave his father and mother a better reputation than did the sex offender. See Tables 9 and 10.

7. More frequently than the sex offender he was the favorite of father or mother, or both. See Table 11.

8. He was less frequently born to two foreign-born parents and more frequently to parents of different nationalities than either of the two other classes. See Table 14.

9. More frequently than in the case of either of the other classes English, or both English and a foreign language, were spoken in his home. See Table 15.

10. More often than the sex offender he reported chronic disease in his family. See Table 16.

11. His mother exercised control of the family home to a greater extent than did the mothers of the sex offenders. See Table 19.

Conditions in the Prisoner Himself or Operating upon Him as an Adult.—Of the fourteen characteristics in this category which distinguish the property offender from others in our sample, eight differentiated him from both the other types of offenders, five from the sex offender alone, and one from the murderer alone.

[3] Note that with respect to item 1 he differed from the lifer on one score and from both the other classes on another.

1. His I. Q. was higher than that of the sex offender (25 per cent below 70; sex offenders, 49.1 per cent). See Table 22.

2. He was more likely to be native-born than the lifer or the sex offender. See Table 28.

3. He left school later than either of the other classes. See Table 29.

4. He was younger when he entered prison than either of the other types of offender. See Table 30.

5. He had become financially independent later than the lifer. See Table 32.

6. He had contributed to the parental family's support less often than the sex offender. See Table 33.

7. He had been less steadily employed than the sex offender. See Table 34.

8. He was less likely than members of the two other classes to have engaged in unskilled occupations. See Table 35.

9. Less often than the two other classes he felt that his economic status had been improving at the time of his crime. See Table 36.

10. He was more likely to be single than either the sex offender or the murderer. See Table 37.

11. If married, he was more likely than the sex offender, and as likely as the lifer, to have been divorced. See Table 37.

12. He was more likely to have married a woman with a background dissimilar to his own than either of the other classes. See Tables 39–42.

13. He had been arrested much oftener than either the murderer or the sex offender. See Table 44.

14. He was more likely to have pleaded guilty than the sex offender. See Table 46.

To summarize the foregoing statistics, the property offender was distinguished from the murderer or the sex offender, or both, in eleven of the nineteen statistically valid categories of conditions in the parental home and in fourteen of the twenty-five categories of factors pertaining to the prisoner himself or operating upon him as an adult. Thus the property and the sex offender are different from each other in a few more ways than they are similar. How the statistical balance between significant and nonsignificant categories stands with respect to the lifer is impossible to say because of the inadequacy of the data collected.

Interpretation of the Differences—Had anyone suggested to me before this study was begun that we should discover marked differences between the backgrounds and personal characteristics of the three classes of offenders, I should not have believed him. It was well known, of course, that old men and imbeciles were often guilty of attacks on children and young women. Embezzlers and bank robbers were believed to be more intelligent than the ordinary thief, and Goring had shown that the several classes of property

offenders differed in intelligence. But so incredulous was I of the other differences that seemed to be revealed in the statistics that I had the data checked and rechecked before accepting them.

What do these differences mean? Do they suggest why these men committed different crimes? Or did their experiences simply disqualify them to respond satisfactorily to a critical situation? Was the particular crime they committed attributable to the nature of the crisis? What bearing do the distinctive characteristics of the lifer, let us say, have on the fact that he committed murder? It is doubtful whether this question can be answered from the statistical tables alone, for the bearing of some of the differences upon the nature of the crime is not readily apparent. For example, how could the fact that a man was an intermediate child rather than the youngest tend to make him a killer rather than some other type of criminal? Why should his crime have been committed at a later age? Of what significance is the fact that he was more likely to be married? Or that he had been arrested less frequently than the property offender?

Are there any other differences that are more obviously associated with the crime? Put that way, the question is unanswerable. No single external circumstance and no single factor in the complex of a person's habits and attitudes determines his behavior. That old fallacy of determinism has prevailed and confused us all too long. Like the ancient quarrel between the hereditists and the environmentalists, it results from the attempt to oversimplify the explanation of human behavior. Human conduct is born not of one or two factors but of the interaction between the human constitution, varying in a multitude of minor details, and the complex circumstances of life. What the science of statistics does enable us to do is to say that when particular events in a person's career tend to be associated with a given type of behavior, the relationship is probably one of cause and effect, however difficult it may be to explain. In many sciences empirical results have been observed to be associated with certain conditions, although the reason is not known. Of course, we must beware of the fallacy of *post hoc, ergo propter hoc*—because this is associated with that, this is the cause of that.

Our problem, then, is to discover which of the differences between the several classes of offenders were functionally connected with the crime committed. This relationship will be suggested by the case histories, which reveal more clearly how certain conditions prepared these men for their later careers.

3

Differences between the Prisoners and the Male Population of the State

ON ONLY A FEW POINTS WERE THE DATA AVAILABLE FOR A COMPARISON between the prisoners studied and the male population of Wisconsin fifteen years of age and over.

Nativity.—Our group of prisoners included a significantly smaller proportion of foreign-born whites than did the state's male population fifteen years of age and over, and a larger proportion of Negroes and other races. See Table 28.

Age upon Entering Prison.—The ages at which the prisoners were incarcerated differed from the age distribution of the state's male population in that a significantly larger proportion were from twenty to twenty-nine years old. Of the sex offenders, an undue proportion, as compared with the other prisoners, were thirty years old or over. See Table 30.

Marital Status.—A significantly larger proportion of the Wisconsin prisoners than of the state's male population were single or divorced; conversely, a smaller proportion were married. See Table 37. The numbers in the general population between fifteen and twenty who had not been married might help to explain the difference in the figures on divorce, but at the same time it heightens the contrast between the percentages of single men. The population statistics did not enable us to analyze the marital status of the Wisconsin population by age groups.

Fecundity.—On this score the married prisoners differ markedly from the married population of the state as a whole: (1) significantly fewer of the married prisoners had no children, and (2) more had from five to eight children. In short, they were a more fecund group than the married males in the Wisconsin population. See Table 38.

Intelligence Level.—The only non-prisoners in the Wisconsin male population for whom intelligence data were available were the men drafted for World War I who had taken the Alpha test. The mean mental age of our prisoners was 1.26 years lower than that of this group of drafted men.

A much larger proportion of the prisoners were below the mental age of eleven years, the ratio being 1.75 to 1; when the Reformatory inmates were added to the sample from the prison, the ratio was 1.67 to 1. See Tables 22–24. It must be borne in mind, however, that the local draft boards rejected without any test whatever many of the men whose intelligence was manifestly very low, and that some of those who were drafted and sent to camps were too handicapped by language difficulties to take the Alpha test.

Despite these considerations, however, it is apparent from the case histories that a low I. Q. probably played a part in the delinquency of the prisoners, since it prevented them from foreseeing the consequences of their behavior. The bearing of these differences will be discussed after we have considered the differences between the prisoners and their brothers.

4

Differences between the Prisoners and Their Brothers

CONTROL GROUPS WITH WHICH TO COMPARE PRISONERS HAVE BEEN SOMEwhat difficult to secure.[1] In the present study the backgrounds of prisoners in the Wisconsin State Prison were compared with those of their non-delinquent brothers. So far as I know, this is the first attempt to use brothers as a control group for adult delinquents. Unfortunately only 172 of the 486 prisoners had brothers who were available for such a comparison. No foster brothers were included.

With each of these prisoners and later with their brothers a personal interview was held. The statements of the prisoner were supplemented and corrected by whatever social history was contained in the records of the institution, various social agencies, and the courts, and by information obtained from persons who knew him. From his brother we sought the same type of information respecting himself. The differences between the two were then determined and their statistical significance computed. It was assumed that the distribution of the factors in the backgrounds of each pair of sibs was identical except as the factors were a function of time and of change in family conditions due to the passage of time. In such cases the age differential might affect the validity of the differences. Most of the brothers were older.

Certain limitations of this comparative study should be noted here. We cannot generalize for all the 486 prisoners from this sample of 172,

[1] A number of sociologists, psychologists, and criminologists have attempted to test the theory that early experiences determine the conduct of criminals. Most of these studies, such as those of Healy, Slawson, and Burt, have been concerned with juvenile offenders. Goring in England and Murchison, Stone, Zeleny, Adler, and some others in America have studied the mental level of criminals as compared with that of the general population. The Gluecks have made a study of the backgrounds of male inmates of the Massachusetts reformatory. Goring compared his Pankhurst Prison inmates with certain control groups in free society. The Gluecks used material from the federal and Massachusetts censuses on certain points in their study.

since we cannot say that the smaller sample was representative of the larger. Not only did we exclude all prisoners who had no non-delinquent brothers, but in some cases we selected a particular brother only because he was the one available for interview. If one brother was not available, or would not cooperate, or also had a prison record, another brother was taken. In other words, our method of selecting the control group resulted in a bias toward stability. But since our purpose was to explain the stability of the brothers (in the sense that they had no prison record) in the light of backgrounds similar to those of the prisoners themselves, this is not so serious. Certain questions may be raised also about the reliability of the data. These have been discussed above, pages 7–8. On the other hand, whatever bias one interviewer may have had may well have cancelled out that of another, since the sample of brothers was about equally divided among the three investigators.

It is also a question whether the interviewer's approach to the prisoner and to the brother were just the same, and whether the mental set of the prisoner or the greater complacency of the brother may not account for some of the differences in the more subjective data. Other differences may perhaps be attributed to the fact that the prisoners were interviewed at different times than their brothers; that is to say, the circumstances of the moment may have affected the memories of both.

The small size of our samples, especially those of sex offenders and murderers, creates other problems. With such small numbers it is difficult to hold factors constant. Finally, in connection with a number of categories the age differential between prisoner and brother should be taken into account. It was difficulties such as these that dictated the elimination of certain categories originally included in the schedule.

It cannot be denied that some differences between the prisoners and their brothers are the result of mere chance. To obtain some conception of the role that chance played in our determinations, the standard error of the differences between the proportions was computed.[2] All differences that were more than twice as large as their standard errors were considered to be significant. This procedure of course assumes that there is no correlation between brother and prisoner, whereas such a correlation probably does exist, since they came from the same family. Because of the nature of the data, however, little seems to be gained by correcting for such correlation.[3] In general the correction would reduce the error of the differences: those

[2] $E^2 = \frac{p_1q_1}{n^1} + \frac{p_2q_2}{n^2}$.

[3] Since the factors considered are largely qualitative, it would be necessary to compute coefficients of contingency or tetrachoric coefficients of correlation. Our samples, however, hardly include a large enough number of cases or cells to give much meaning to the coefficient of contingency. The use of the tetrachoric r likewise assumes that the series are continuous, quantitative, and fairly normally distributed. These conditions cannot be claimed for most of the factors in this study. In view of these difficulties it was felt that a correction for correlation would give a false guise of accuracy to the analysis.

now significant would tend to become more so, and some now lacking significance would become significant.[4]

Significant Differences between the Total Group of Prisoners and Their Brothers

Prisoners were found to differ significantly from their brothers in the following respects:

1. Age upon leaving school (murderers only). See Table 47.
2. Age at which first full-time job was taken (murderers and all the prisoners as a group). See Table 48.
3. The feeling that they were the objects of favoritism. See Table 49.
4. Appreciation of the mother. See Table 50.
5. Average length of time on job. See Table 51.
6. Occupation. See Table 52.
7. Steadiness on job (property offenders only). See Tables 53 and 54.
8. Marital status. See Table 55.
9. Marital status of those who had been married. See Table 56.
10. Relations with wife. See Table 57.
11. Education of wife. See Table 58.
12. Nationality of wife. See Table 59.
13. Religion of wife. See Table 60.
14. Premarital economic status of wife. See Table 61.

What differences existed with respect to the other categories were not statistically significant. This does not necessarily mean that they had no influence upon the conduct of the prisoner or his brother, merely that they had little influence upon their adult behavior, or that the sample was too small to reveal a significant difference. These non-quantitative differences will appear in the case studies in the following chapters.

Age upon Leaving School.—Table 47 shows that on this score the prisoners as a whole did not differ significantly from their brothers. A significantly larger proportion of the murderers than of their brothers, however, had left school before the age of fourteen and were thus removed from one of the important agencies of social control. The difference is not very great; it could have occurred by chance four in a hundred times. Moreover, if the

[4] From a formula for the standard error of a difference between proportions of correlated series ($E^2_{12} = E^2_1 + E^2_2 \pm 2r_{12} \cdot E_1 \cdot E_2$) it is apparent that if the correlation is positive, the original error is reduced. On *a priori* grounds it seems improbable, with one or two exceptions, that there should be a negative correlation between brothers and prisoners with respect to any of the factors studied.

comparison is made on the basis of age sixteen instead of fourteen, the difference is reduced to insignificance. But the critical ratio of the difference between prisoner and brother with respect to the proportions who had left school before the age of fourteen shows that the difference could not occur by chance oftener than twice in a hundred times.

Age at Which First Full-Time Job Was Taken.—Table 48 shows that if the chi-square test is applied to the data pertaining to all prisoners and their brothers, and if all the subcategories are taken into consideration, the differences with respect to this factor are not significant. More of the prisoners than of their brothers went to work before they were fourteen, but the proportion who did so is only 25 per cent. For three-fourths of the prisoners, therefore, it cannot be shown statistically that this factor played a greater role than in the case of their brothers. Hence we must conclude, despite earlier studies,[5] that it cannot be heavily relied upon to explain the criminality of these prisoners. A distinctly larger number of the murderers than of their brothers had a full-time job before they were fourteen, but even in this group the proportion was only 40.7 per cent.

Prisoner's Feeling That He Was Favorite of Parents and His Appreciation of Mother.—Significant differences appeared also between the prisoners and their brothers with respect to their judgment whether or not they were favorites of either parent or of some other person. A larger proportion of the total group of prisoners than of their brothers thought they were favorites of the mother, and a significantly smaller proportion that they were favorites of no one. Of the murderers and the property offenders a significantly smaller percentage, and of the sex offenders a larger percentage, than of their brothers felt that they were favorites of no one. The situation was the same with respect to appreciation of the mother. Whereas the prisoners as a group showed greater affection for the mother than did their brothers, the sex offenders did not differ significantly from their brothers. Apparently "mother fixation" played no part in the adult behavior of the sex offenders, whereas it may have been a factor in the conduct of the two other classes of prisoner. See Tables 49 and 50. Thus the emotional tone of the sex offenders and their brothers was more neutral, probably because of a constitutional difference or a difference in emotional conditioning in early life. The case histories may offer an explanation.

Stability on the Job.—Table 51, which tabulates the data regarding the average length of time prisoners held their jobs, reveals some important differences. Significantly fewer of the entire group of prisoners in the

[5] Previous investigations had indicated a connection between early employment and delinquency. See Kate H. Claghorn, *Juvenile Delinquency in Rural New York* (Children's Bureau Publication No. 32, Washington, 1918), 32–33; George B. Mangold, *Problems of Child Welfare* (New York, 1914), 305; and the *Summary of the Report on Condition of Women and Child Wage-Earners in the United States* (U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Bulletin, Whole No. 167, Washington, 1916), 274, 275.

sample, and also of property offenders and murderers, than of their brothers remained on a job for more than a year. This difference does not hold for the sex offenders. The difference between the murderers and the sex offenders and their brothers was in the same direction, but was not significant. Another indication of the greater economic instability of the property offenders is the fact that they had worked in a larger number of towns and for a larger number of firms. See Tables 53 and 54.

Occupation.—With respect to occupational distribution the prisoners as a whole, as tested by chi square, did not differ significantly from their brothers, but some differences existed between each class of offenders and their brothers. Also, there were significant differences between the prisoners and their brothers in respect to certain occupations. Fewer of the total group of prisoners and fewer of the sex offenders than of their respective brothers were farmers. More of the property offenders than of their brothers had been engaged in skilled occupations and fewer in unskilled occupations. Fewer of the sex offenders, also, had come from the unskilled trades. See Table 52.

Do these findings mean that farming—perhaps because of the sheltered environment—is conducive to stability of conduct? Or do they mean that various occupations attract persons whose traits predispose them to socially acceptable or socially unacceptable conduct? The statistical data warrant only the conclusion that an association does exist between occupation and conduct.

Marital Status.—The assumption is that a man's family relationships have a bearing upon his conduct. Table 55 shows that significantly fewer of our total sample of prisoners than of their brothers were married and more were single. Similarly significant differences were found to exist between property and sex offenders and their brothers, but the difference between murderers and their brothers was no greater than could be accounted for by chance alone.

Of those who had married, a significantly larger proportion of brothers than of prisoners were still married; that is, more of the prisoners had been widowed, separated, or divorced. Table 56 shows how large a proportion of the prisoners had been divorced. In any interpretation of these differences the age and social status of the subjects must be considered, as well as the fact that imprisonment is recognized as a ground for divorce in Wisconsin.

Relations with Wife.—As Table 57 shows, greater disharmony existed between the whole group of married prisoners and their wives, and between the several classes of offenders and their wives, than between the corresponding brothers and wives. In the case of the murderers the statistical result is doubtful because of the small sample. But observe that of the 92 murderers, 18 had killed their own wives—certainly an evidence of domestic disharmony.

This difference could be interpreted either as further evidence of the

relative instability of the prisoners as compared with their brothers, or as an indication that the prisoners had been more unfortunate in their choice of a mate, provided that an undue number had not been divorced after imprisonment. It is regrettable that we did not inquire whether divorce was obtained before or after imprisonment, but the fact remains that the greater frequency with which the prisoners reported disharmony is significant.

Education of Wife.—To throw some light on the causes of disharmony in the prisoner's family, a study was made of the relative education of prisoners and their wives and of brothers and wives, the results of which appear in Table 58. It was found that a significantly smaller percentage of the total group, of the murderers, and of the property offenders than of their respective brothers had married women of about the same education as themselves, and a significantly larger percentage had married women of more education. The difference between the sex offenders and their brothers is in the opposite direction, although it is not significant. The greater incidence of domestic disharmony in the families of murderers and property offenders than in their brothers' families may perhaps be partly explained by the greater disparity in the education of husband and wife.

Nationality of Wife.—On the theory that difference in nationality may also have contributed to disharmony, prisoners and their brothers were compared with respect to the nationality of their wives—whether it was the same as or different from their own. See Table 59. The only significant differences disclosed were those between all prisoners and their brothers and between property offenders and their brothers. Fewer prisoners than brothers, and fewer property offenders than brothers, had married women of the same nationality as themselves. These findings suggest that difference of nationality may be a serious cause of friction between husband and wife.

Religion of Wife.—Table 60 presents a similar comparison with respect to religion. Significantly fewer of the total group of prisoners, of the property offenders, and of the sex offenders than of their brothers had married women of their own religion. Thus difference of religion, it appears, may also be a cause of disharmony.

Premarital Economic Status of Wife.—On this point there were no significant differences between murderers and sex offenders and their respective brothers; however, as Table 61 shows, significantly fewer of the total sample of prisoners and of the group of property offenders than of their brothers had married women of the same economic status as themselves. The significance of this difference may lie in its effect on the harmonious relations of the family.

Thus the property offenders, to a much greater extent than their brothers, had married women whose backgrounds were quite different from their own. For this class of offenders at least, and possibly for the sex offenders

and murderers also, the fact that their family relationships were less harmonious than those of their brothers may perhaps be attributed to the greater disparity of background between husband and wife.

Summary.—To summarize, the prisoners differed from their brothers on fourteen points. On eight of these the total sample of prisoners differed significantly from their brothers; on eight the murderers from their brothers; on four the sex offenders; and on ten the property offenders.

Thus the prisoners as a group departed from the accepted pattern of conduct, even aside from delinquency, more than did their brothers. The statistical data—which is confirmed by details of the case histories—suggest that rather early in life, especially during adolescence, the prisoners had developed a pattern of reactions to life's situations which ultimately resulted in an unstable economic career and inharmonious domestic life. They were prevented from striking roots economically and socially which would have helped to guard them against delinquency. Their admission that they had been the objects of favoritism and their affection for the mother suggest, although it does not prove, that they had developed rather early in their lives a self-centeredness inimical to social stability. We cannot be sure that this sample of prisoners having brothers is truly representative of the larger group we studied, much less that it is representative of prisoners in general. What we can say is that so far as our samples are concerned these rather striking differences are manifest.

Regarding some aspects of the prisoners' backgrounds the data yielded no positive results. In some instances the reliability of the statistical results was questionable, either because data on too many of the sample were lacking or because the definitions were not sharp enough. On some points the differences between the prisoners and their brothers were too small to be significant. Virtually nothing of value came out of the study regarding the effect of a broken home upon the conduct of the prisoners and their brothers. No significant differences between the prisoners and their brothers were revealed with respect to whether they had left home or not, the reasons for leaving home, the age at which they had left, part-time employment while in school, the grade attained in school, unemployment during the twelve months previous to the arrest of prisoners and the interview with brothers, number of children, population of the place of residence, and number of marriages. The significant differences brought out by our methods were four: the emotional tone apparently developed during childhood; occupation; work record; and, for the married men, relationships with wife.

PART II

CASE HISTORIES

5

The Use of the Case Histories

THE FACTORS THAT ARE THOUGHT TO ACCOUNT FOR CRIMINALITY HAVE been widely studied. Usually their connection with criminal events has been deduced from the fact that they are statistically associated. Few investigators except the psychiatrists have made a detailed study of the development of the criminal's personality throughout his life. The psychiatrists have made their most important contributions in the analysis of neurotic and psychotic criminals and in the study of juveniles.[1]

The statistical analyses in the preceding chapters reveal the distinctive characteristics of the prisoners' backgrounds. The conclusions pertain only to the questions we posed, and these in turn were limited to items on which we thought it possible to get data and which could be statistically treated. Consequently our conclusions do not cover all the factors that operated to produce a particular pattern of conduct leading to imprisonment.

If it is true that a person's conduct is actually the result of a given biological organism, responding in various ways to life's experiences, study of the criminal's characteristics and his experiences during early development should be illuminating. Hence we undertook to trace the development of each prisoner from birth to the time of his crime. As much information as possible about the emotional, intellectual, and physical characteristics of the criminal's parents and about his own childhood experiences was obtained from his own recollections and from parents, relatives, and others

[1] The psychoanalysts first attacked this problem from the standpoint of the individual social variant. Freud's influence has been very important, but it has been supplemented by the studies of Adler and Jung, with whom the study of criminals was incidental to a study of other types of social variants. In recent years some of their disciples have devoted themselves more particularly to the psychoanalysis of the criminal. Psychiatrists have also made distinct contributions in this field. One of the pioneers among the American psychiatrists was Dr. William Healy, author of *The Individual Delinquent* (Boston, 1924). Another important contributor was Dr. William A. White, author of *Insanity and the Criminal Law* (New York, 1923) and *Crime and Criminals* (New York, 1933). More recently a large number of books on the subject have appeared in the United States, among them Ben Karp-

who knew him during the various periods of his development. From these data was calculated the frequency with which a given type of events occurred in the samples. But one cannot really comprehend how a personality with distinctive social attitudes develops unless he has a rather carefully worked out case history. Such histories were secured by interviews with the men, a number of whom supplemented this material by written autobiographies. Some of the latter were naturally more thoughtful and more significant than others.

The statistics are used to show general similarities in the backgrounds of the prisoners and the frequency with which certain events occurred. The case histories relate how these and other factors operated to produce a given personality with anti-social attitudes. By such a combination of methods, it was hoped, most of the factors that had operated in the lives of these men could be identified, and the generation of certain attitudes would be explained. The actual interplay of innate and acquired characteristics with the experiences of life would be revealed, and some of the processes in the making of the criminal.

In the following pages an attempt has been made to fit together into a coherent whole the incidents in the lives of some of these individuals that apparently had a decisive effect on their characters and behavior. The significant characteristics revealed by the statistical treatment are illuminated by descriptions of specific events and the individual's reaction to them.

man, *The Individual Criminal* (Washington, 1935); Franz Alexander and Hugo Staub, *The Criminal, the Judge, and the Public* (New York, 1931); Franz Alexander and William Healy, *The Roots of Crime: Psychoanalytical Studies* (New York, 1935); Thompson, "Some New Aspects of the Psychiatric Approach to Crime," *Mental Hygiene*, October, 1936, p. 533; Edgar A. Doll, "A Study of Multiple Criminal Factors," *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, vol. 2, no. 1 (May, 1920). A number of European students have also published studies on the problem of crime causation, among which are Johannes Lange, *Verbrechen als Schicksal* (Leipzig, 1929), translated as *Crime and Destiny* (New York, 1930); Franz Exner, *Krieg und Kriminalität-Oesterreich* (Vienna, 1927); Ernst Seelig, "Anlage, Persönlichkeit und Unwelt bei jugendlichen Schwerverbrechern Oesterreichs," *Mitt. d. Kriminalbiolog. Gesellschaft*, vol. 4; R. Fetscher (Dresden), "Die Wissenschaftliche Erfassung der Kriminellen in Sachsen," *Monatsschrift für Kriminal-psychologie und Strafrechtsreform*, 23 (1932): 321–335, and "Kriminal-biologische Erfahrungen an Sexualverbrechern," *Zeitschrift für Sexualwissenschaft und Sexualpolitik*, 17 (1930): 356–363; 18 (1931): 265–274.

Among the few contributions of sociologists are Clifford Shaw's *The Jack-Roller: A Delinquent Boy's Own Story* (Chicago, 1930), *The Natural History of a Delinquent Career* (Chicago, 1931), and *Brothers in Crime* (Chicago, 1938).

For case studies of juvenile delinquents see Cyril Burt, *The Young Delinquent* (New York, 1925); William Healy and Augusta Bronner, *Delinquents and Criminals: Their Making and Unmaking* (New York, 1926) and *New Light on Delinquency and Its Treatment* (New Haven, 1936); and Samuel W. Hartwell, *Fifty-Five "Bad" Boys* (New York, 1930). Only in Burt's study and that of Healy and Bronner were control groups used.

In other words, we have tried to put flesh on the bones of our statistical findings. In some cases it has been possible to show how a concrete factor, such as jealousy, a feeling of unjust treatment, or exclusion from a social circle which tended to be stabilizing gave a decided bent to the personality, bred a feeling of frustration, and resulted in the demoralization of the whole character.

6

How Murderers Are Made

To give in a brief life history a complete account of the development of the impulse to kill a fellow man is impossible. Our cases, however, do reveal something about the growth of personalities which in the face of a crisis resorted to murder.

Apparently murder is not always a result of a given kind of background or a given type of personality. The cases described below illustrate striking diversities in background and personality and in the circumstances leading to the crime.

A Murder Incidental to Robbery: The Y Case

This man, the second of three children, was born and raised in a large American city. His father, an accountant deeply engrossed in his business and eager to improve his standard of living, wanted his children to follow him in a business career but seemed to take no other interest in them. The mother was emotionally rather unstable; she screamed her commands to the children and frequently wept with hysteria. The boy was obviously not the favorite of either of his parents, both of whom held his brother and sister up to him as examples.

The father, believing that he was teaching his children to be independent, often refused to give them spending money. The sister and brother habitually stole money from about the house and then lied to their parents. They also tattled on their brother and thus aroused his antagonism toward them and toward his father and mother. Thus was generated his hatred for tattlers, which, after he was imprisoned, was extended to the "rats" among his fellow prisoners. When told to earn money for himself, he often did so by stealing and by selling milk bottles, sacks, and junk. Home became unbearable to him, and he failed to satisfy his social desires anywhere except in the neighborhood gangs, with whom he early learned to associate. These gangs, at first simply clubs of congenial boys, soon developed into predatory groups.

The neighborhood had few places in which to play undisturbed, and home

offered little to interest Y. Hence he and his gang sought amusement and adventure in the streets, where they were often chased by the "coppers." They came to despise the law and its representatives, for they were quick-witted enough to perceive that the officers themselves did not always respect the law—that they loafed in saloons, favored some of the criminals and often turned their backs on real crimes, and sometimes used their office and prestige to enable their political backers to engage in graft. Before long Y came to the conclusion that the police must make arrests frequently enough to make a show of earning their salary, and that one way in which they did it was to arrest members of neighborhood gangs.

Naturally the boys were resentful. Bent on retaliation, they began annoying the police, hissing and jeering them whenever they appeared, dropping pebbles or water on them from roofs of buildings, turning in false fire alarms, and ultimately organizing open hostilities. The gang congregated in alleys, whence they sallied forth after nightfall to satisfy their adolescent appetites from their neighbors' kitchens and to engage in other escapades of one sort and another. In these pranks Y came to be accepted as a leader, for the others recognized his quick mind, his daring, and his ability to command. Whatever food was obtained they all shared.

According to the code of these gangs it was not dishonest to steal food or small articles to sell, nor to engage in exploits against their elders or a person who was better off economically. Loyalty to one another was emphasized, and hatred of the cops was inculcated.

Y was quick in school, but a good school record did not satisfy his desire to be recognized as a leader. So he naturally exploited his ability to lead others into mischief. His teachers came to expect trouble from him, and he arrogantly resisted their attempts to control him.

When he learned that he could earn money by wrapping merchandise, making deliveries, and running errands after school hours, he asked his father for a bicycle. When he was refused, he saved his money and bought one himself. It was stolen. He bought another, and finally a third, only to have them stolen again. Then he decided to steal one himself. He took two or three from well-to-do families in his neighborhood or more distant sections, but these also were stolen from him. Thus one more step had been taken in the development of an anti-social attitude toward the property of others.

When he had finished the eighth grade he was not encouraged to continue his education. He went to work as delivery boy at ten dollars a week, half of which he gave his mother for board and room. Later he obtained work in an electric shop, where he rose to the position of straw boss. But he saw no chance for further promotion, so quit the job. In another shop a fellow workman borrowed a set of tools from him, which were never returned; whenever he asked for them he was put off with one excuse or

another. To recoup his loss he took a kodak from the workman and sold it to repay himself for the loss of his tools. His brother, for whom he had secured a position, squealed on him because he refused to divide the money with him. Although he never got his tools, he had to buy a new camera for the workman.

Next he worked in a battery shop. While on this job he was arrested along with his roommate, who was suspected of a burglary. They were "third-degreed" by the police and placed in jail. Y spent four months awaiting trial and then was released. While he had been in jail, his brother had sold all his belongings on the pretext that they were not needed in prison. He now went to work in another battery shop. The detectives who had arrested him earlier once saw him leaving it, and he explained that he was working there. Next day his employer dismissed him because, so Y believes, the cops had told the shopowner of his arrest.

He got another job, but was discharged when his references were checked. Then he secured a position in a garage. One day he went to his old place of employment to get some batteries; he was recognized by his former employer, who promptly informed the new one that he was a crook. Again he was discharged.

Seek as he might he could find no employment. Often he was arrested for loitering on street corners or in pool halls and thrown into jails overnight. Finally he concluded that he could not earn his living by honest labor. He bought a gun and began holding up delivery wagons coming in with Saturday night collections. But he realized he might be caught, so left the city and bummed his way west and south. He failed, however, to find a job which promised a future. This peregrination increased his occupational instability, taught him a great deal about life, and increased his disrespect for the law and legal practices.

Finally he returned to his native city and with another man, an ex-convict, opened a pool room and gambling joint. Many crooks hung around the place, whom he learned to like and respect more than the workman, who frequently did not pay his bills. This association with anti-social individuals estranged him still more from stabilized society.

Eventually he sold his interest in this establishment and joined his partner in cracking small safes. The two men would load the safes on trucks and take them to an old barn, where they opened them and studied their mechanisms. When this too failed to satisfy his ambition, he drifted into counterfeiting half dollars, which he sold to streetcar conductors for twenty-five cents.

Presently he engaged in still another racket. He would order a suit delivered to an unoccupied apartment and take it from the delivery man. He was caught at this and arrested. Neither of his parents, who had just been divorced, was in a frame of mind to assist the wayward boy. Moreover,

his father, thoroughly disgusted by this time, wished to conceal from a fellow employee, credit manager of the store where he worked, that he had such a son. Y got a sentence of one to fourteen years in the state reformatory. When he tried to escape, he was transferred to the state penitentiary. Through some friends with political influence he was released on parole, but the treatment he and the other prisoners had received at the two institutions had prejudiced him strongly against prisons and reformatories as correctional institutions.

He now decided to use the information about safeblowing he had picked up in these institutions to get the money he needed to make a fresh start. He found work in an automobile factory in a small industrial city in the state. He lived at the local YMCA, where he contracted influenza but got no Christian sympathy from the members. He left owing perhaps two weeks' rent. They held his mail. Meanwhile someone had blown the safe, and the management was sure he was guilty. When officers searched the house where he was staying and found some woodworking tools, he was thrown into jail, his parole was revoked, and he was returned to prison.

There he was visited by his boyhood friend, who brought him some tools with which he sawed his way out. He soon assembled a gang of four to blow safes, two of whom presently dropped out. On one job his boyhood pal was caught and held on thirty-thousand-dollar bonds. These Y got reduced to nineteen thousand and blew a safe for fifteen hundred with which to pay a professional bondsman. His friend jumped the bonds.

Just after the war he accompanied another man to a Wisconsin city, where they planned to blow the safes at several industrial establishments. At one of these they secured about fifty thousand dollars in cash and bonds. They ordered a taxi and instructed the driver to take them to a large city in a neighboring state. Claiming to be out of gas, the driver drove up to a garage, ostensibly to have the gas tank filled, and ran inside screaming that he was being held up. A policeman who happened to be loafing in a dark corner of the garage came out fumbling for his gun. Y, following the driver into the garage, saw the officer and shot him in order to get under cover. The bullet penetrated the victim's back, mortally wounding him.

From this history it is obvious that Y's career was the result of a combination of factors. His sensitive nervous organization he may have inherited from his mother, who was unquestionably a somewhat unbalanced and impulsive woman. He is a man of considerable mental ability, having an I.Q. of 95 and the ability to think clearly when his emotions are not involved. He also has some inventive talent; for instance, he said he had learned never to attempt to crack a safe until he had made a blueprint of the whole building. He writes well and talks intelligently, but is often emotionally disturbed. He must have been an alert boy, eager to awaken

response in others. When he met nothing in his home except repression and what he felt to be unjust discrimination, he became jealous of his sibs. Among the boys in the neighborhood, however, boys who also sought satisfaction in organized anti-social activities, he was recognized as a leader. Impulsively he tried to compensate for the loss of his tools by appropriating the property of the borrower who refused to return them. The turning point in his life seems to have occurred after his first experience in jail, when he was unable to keep a job because of his record. Only from criminal associations did he derive economic satisfaction and prestige. From that point on it may be said that he developed into a professional criminal.

A Murderer by Impulse: The P Case

This young man had been sentenced to life imprisonment at the age of twenty-two. He was born in a Middle Western state. His paternal grandfather was an Irish immigrant. His paternal grandmother had died at his father's birth and henceforth his father and the other children of the family were separated. His father was adopted by a family with Irish ancestry on both sides, who made him a joint heir with their own children. The prisoner discovered at the time of his trial that he had one insane aunt on his mother's side.

P was the third of six children. For the first few years of his life he was brought up by his parents on a rented farm. Later, because his mother was not equal to the rigor of farm life, his father moved to a small city, where he obtained work in a nursery. Not long after, his mother developed tuberculosis and soon died. Her death seems to have created a crisis in his life, for he was very fond of her. His father, on the other hand, never played with him but would chastise him for any misbehavior and gave most of his affection to a sister and brother. It is plain that he believes that his father had lost all affection for his mother—in fact, that he may have hastened her death with medicine he gave her. Her own mother, he claims, also believed that his father had a hand in her sudden death. Although P did not sense this estrangement as a child and only learned of it later, it is obvious that he was emotionally conditioned by his mother's death, the negative attitude of his father toward him and his mother, and his quite different attitude toward P's brother and sister. His father hired a housekeeper, and P found himself in a very lonely situation. Apparently his father wished to place the children in an orphanage, but his maternal grandmother prevailed upon one of his aunts, who had been recently married and had no children, to care for him until a home could be found for him. The father was to furnish clothes for the boy until his aunt and uncle decided whether they would keep him permanently. P feels that his father was ready to agree to anything that would rid him of his son.

From his story it appears that in his early childhood he was somewhat

given to fears, significant of his emotional insecurity. He tells, for example, of the terror that possessed him on one occasion as he looked out of an attic window and saw a cultivator standing in the yard. To him it appeared as a great monster coming to get him. He confesses that to this day any unusual sight causes him momentary unrest.

P's experiences in his new home were most unpleasant. The uncle was a strong young German twenty-six years old, his aunt frail and sickly. The uncle, frugal and anxious to get out of debt, worked hard, and expected P also to do a great deal of work, perhaps too much for so young a boy. P started to school in the country, where again he felt lonely and missed his mother very much. Although his uncle and aunt decided to keep him, they were unwilling to adopt him. During this early period and until young manhood he suffered enuresis, which was probably caused by emotional conflict. He thinks this affliction may have been one reason why his father did not like him.

His father, a Catholic, and his mother, a Protestant, had decided that their children should be allowed to decide for themselves what church they would attend. His Protestant uncle and aunt, on the other hand, subjected him to a religious discipline so rigorous as to create in him an aversion to all religion. He was taught to pray not as a child but as a man with years of religious training. Every Sunday he went to church, where, instead of being allowed to sit with other children in the Sunday school, he was forced to sit with his uncle, who was determined, as he himself said, to see that the boy learned something. Consequently P listened to sermons addressed to adults and participated in religious exercises that left him unmoved. When his uncle and aunt urged him to join the church, he put it off as long as he could and finally did so only when threatened with punishment for further delay.

In school P was an apt pupil. Because of his willingness to study, he says, he became one of the teacher's favorites. Whether true or not, this statement reveals his desire for emotional security.

At the age of nine he had a very severe sickness, the exact nature of which the doctor was unable to diagnose, but which he believes should be ascribed either to malnutrition or to overwork. At any rate P was unable for a time to use his legs and one of his arms. His uncle and aunt wanted to get rid of him because he was so much trouble, but his grandmother came to the rescue, nursed him tenderly, and paid the doctor bills. He went to school as usual that fall, but in about a month became nervous and acted strangely. He was taken to a doctor, who diagnosed his ailment as St. Vitus dance. His uncle, who had bought an additional farm, was more frugal than ever and worked the boy harder. He discountenanced companionship with other boys outside of school. When he refused to buy the skates which P wanted so badly because the other boys had them, he precipitated his nephew's first crime.

P finally bought a pair of skates with some money a neighbor had left at the house in his uncle's absence. When the theft was discovered, he was whipped so hard that he carries the scars to this day. He was given no toys, even at Christmas time, only such practical gifts as a cap, a pair of mittens, or a knife. When he was twelve he and a schoolgirl fourteen months his senior became infatuated with each other. With this girl he continued to keep company until he had finished two years in high school, at the age of seventeen. Their relations were such that P felt he must get away from her.

During these years in his uncle's home he developed an interest in music. He surreptitiously acquired a violin, which his uncle soon discovered and broke to pieces. However, a week later he bought P a cheap guitar and arranged that a neighbor should give him lessons. His interest in music has remained with him to the present. He played several instruments in the prison orchestra and found in music a pleasant release from the monotony of prison life.

Throughout his story he shows that there was a close bond between his grandmother and himself. Moreover, at his grandmother's house he found opportunity to see his sweetheart frequently. There they spent many happy evenings, she playing the piano and he the guitar. But as his relations with his uncle became increasingly strained and he finally became convinced that he was being exploited, he ran away and joined a circus troupe, the only job he could find. After six weeks he had become so disgusted with the loose conduct of his companions that he quit. For a short time he was associated in some capacity with a man who proved to be a criminal. When he learned the truth, he was frightened and got himself a job in another city.

This unsettled life led to association with women whom he did not respect and increasing occupational instability. At one place in his home state he was charged by his employer with having stolen some money. He insists that he was entirely innocent and that his employer blamed his own defalcations upon him. After holding a number of jobs he came to Wisconsin, where he found employment on a large dairy farm. It was just after he and a fellow worker had resigned to take a trip to California that the murder occurred. P asserts that he and his pal had some words about a young woman in whom both had been interested and that he proposed that they get out of the car in which they were riding to fight it out like men. In the squabble he killed the other man—accidentally, he says.

Thus a series of unfortunate social experiences had forced P into an unstable life lacking the props that support the average person during childhood and adolescence. He may have been afflicated with nervous instability; we do not know enough about his heredity to be certain of that, but there is the fact that he had an aunt who was insane. In any event, from the time

of his mother's death until he ran away from his uncle's farm he was subject to conditions which bred emotional conflict and prevented satisfaction of his social impulses except by illicit relationships with his sweetheart. Equally unsettling were his experiences in industry. He shifted from job to job, and from place to place, spent money almost as fast as he earned it, and rejected opportunities for a settled conjugal life. He had developed the habit of fleeing from difficulties instead of facing them. The only persons other than his grandmother from whom he elicited any emotional response after his mother's death were the sweetheart of his boyhood and his later one. With neither of them was he deeply in love, and he fled from the responsibilities which such attachments naturally involve. His history exemplifies clearly the effect of unsettling conditions in early life on a sensitive and none too resolute nature.

A Jealous Husband: The L Case

This case is a good example of murder as a crime of passion. L is a man of high intellectual capacity (I.Q. 110) whose family background was exceptionally good. He wrote as follows:

> Coming by birth from a family whose character and social standing were above reproach, I lived the life of the average, healthy, normal boy, and later loved and was loved by the girl who became my wife. Our union was blessed with six boys, three of them dying in infancy, and for eleven years our married life was one of happiness and devotion on the part of both.
>
> A neighbor and pretended friend attacked my wife and, she told me, attempted rape, and this resulted in my borrowing a revolver and assaulting this man. We were arrested, and without appearing in court I paid a fine of $15.00.
>
> Followed four years of protracted infidelity on the part of my wife, causing a mental condition that could no longer be endured, so I enlisted in the U. S. Army with the intention of a permanent separation, but sickness and the children and constant and urgent appeals from the wife caused me to return home.
>
> In less than a week I found a baker by the name of —— having sexual relations with my wife and as a last resort agreed to take her to a new home where her indiscretions would be unknown. Coming to —— I had continued evidence of infidelity and was so depressed mentally that I purchased a revolver intending to end my life, and after a night of mental strain and dreams of an exciting nature, I shot my wife and myself.
>
> This brief résumé of my case is evidence that my crime resulted from circumstances that came into my life and is no reflection on the part of my ancestors, who were all people of splendid character.

The testimony given at the trial is an elaboration of this story. He shot his wife four times with a 32-caliber revolver, which he had bought only two days before the tragedy. He claims he had bought it for the purpose of committing suicide.

In a medium-sized city of the state in which he was born and raised both he and his wife were members in good standing of a prominent church. His

father, a minister of the same denomination and a Civil War veteran, was of German descent, and his mother was the descendent of Scottish and Irish immigrants. The entire family was active in community affairs, especially in the church, and encouraged their children to take an active part in all forms of community life. The parental relations were always pleasant. L left school at the age of sixteen, when he had finished the eighth grade, and went to work. At twenty-two he married the nineteen-year-old daughter of poor, respectable parents, a girl with some musical talent who was employed in a local shirt factory.

L started as a night clerk in a hotel, then worked in a restaurant, then for eight years in a furniture factory, and for ten years thereafter at other factory work.

There is no evidence of any abnormal conditions in his early life or in his development. But he was obviously unprepared, because of nature or training, perhaps both, to meet sanely the crisis in his marital relationships. The rupture with his wife seems to have occurred when she became intimate with one of the choir members. Church officials and the choir felt that the wife was as blameworthy as the man, and the facts suggest that they were right. She next became intimate with a grocery clerk, as she herself admitted when her husband accused her of infidelity. At this juncture he enlisted in the army, but was discharged about nine months later because his dependents were in need. Even while he was in service his wife had written him about a man who had been kind to her, given her presents, and offered to buy her a home. Upon his return L learned from fellow workmen that she had been a frequent visitor at this man's home, and she herself admitted having been intimate with him.

L and his wife talked the matter over and decided they would try to live together elsewhere. But the change of location did not remedy the situation. He reports that whenever they went uptown his wife flirted with men. His suspicions aroused, he returned from work early one day, concealed himself behind the house, and presently saw a man come out of the back door.

After the tragedy he was examined by a psychiatrist, who pronounced him sane. Evidently the family situation had become too difficult for him, and he tried to resolve it by killing himself and the woman.

He made an excellent record in prison and has since been released.

The Worm Turns: The F Case

This man was born in 1885 to Polish parents who upon their arrival in America had settled in a high-class Polish neighborhood but were later forced to move to the poor and unattractive section in which F spent the latter part of his childhood and his adolescent years. He was next to the youngest of a family of seven, four boys and three girls.

The father, a hard drinker, had a domineering attitude toward his family; even when sober he was more or less harsh and brutal, and when drunk became very abusive. The mother was also a hard drinker and a slattern as well; at one time she had been mentally unbalanced. Yet F thought more of her than of his father. There may have been something of a mother fixation in his attitude.

The family was often in straitened circumstances, lacking even the necessities of life. So poor were they at times that F's mother required him to pick up coal along the railroad tracks. His father forced him to turn over his earnings to him and to account for every penny that he was permitted to spend on himself. He beat the boy often, and in general treated him more harshly than his sisters of about the same age. His older brothers, too, teased him constantly, pulling his hair and pushing him about. His father wanted him to stay in school until he was old enough to work, but his mother kept him home so often to help with domestic duties that he fell far behind and finally quit school altogether. The result was that he had little more than a second-grade education.

Thus home conditions were far from favorable to the development of an integrated personality, especially in view of the nervous instability which F inherited from his mother. Without question this was one of the immigrant families which remained virtually untouched by American life and social custom. The boy suffered from a culture conflict which, with the severity of the home discipline, eventually drove him outside the home for companionship. He became one of a gang of boys who pilfered small articles and snatched fruit from peddlers. From these associates he also learned to drink.

The inner conflict engendered by this childhood and adolescent upbringing was not mitigated by his marriage. He and his wife had had sexual relations before their marriage, and F claims that this was part of a plot to force him to marry her. However that may be, their first child was born two months after their marriage. Shortly thereafter a friend of his wife's teasingly asked F how he could be sure that the child was his own, unnerving him so much that he fled to another room and wept. His wife induced her friend to tell him that she had merely been joking, but the suspicion thus implanted continued to linger and impair the conjugal relationship.

After three years of married life F was in a very disturbed emotional state. He was afflicted with dizziness, which sometimes caused him to topple over, and with impairment of memory. Obviously he was suffering from a typical neurosis, an escape from thoughts about the unpleasant situation at home. His wife was totally lacking in sympathy; she mocked, tantalized, and ridiculed him for his innocence and lack of virility. She neglected her home to visit at her mother's or sister's, where she sought the compan-

ionship of a male boarder. When F learned of this situation, he warned her to stay away, and she promised to do so. One day shortly thereafter, however, finding his wife absent when he returned home early, he found her again at her mother's house, joking and fooling with the man she had promised to avoid. She introduced F to him as "nothing but a fool of mine." She tortured her husband by telling him that she was trying to drive him insane, by comparing his sexual potency with that of other men she had known, and by reminding him that there was nothing to prevent her from entertaining other men without his knowledge. The check he gave her each week she turned over to her sister and sister-in-law, stoutly denying that she did so. He not only decided that his wife was an inveterate liar but became convinced, after learning that her mother had once been hospitalized for insanity, that she was also insane. He says she made grimaces at him and called him names, neglected the child and the house, and was disgustingly dirty in her personal habits. He was told by a number of persons that she was unfaithful to him.

All these disturbing factors—his wife's general attitude toward him, her nagging and mocking, her criticism of his sexual weaknesses, the evidence that she cared nothing for him, the current gossip about her, and his long-standing feeling of inferiority, which her superior air intensified—led to terrific emotional upheavals, heavy drinking, neglect of his work, and frequent changes of occupation. Eventually the situation reached such a pass that he could no longer face it, and he shot and killed his wife.

Whether this recital is true in every detail is impossible to ascertain. Investigation corroborated much of the prisoner's story and disproved none of it. Evidently it contains enough truth to explain the emotional crisis that developed in this rather weak, unstable, and poorly integrated man. The interviewer could not escape the feeling that his was definitely a pathological case. He is a person greatly to be pitied, for these things are real to him, whether they are intrinsically true or not.

This, then, is the history of an individual in whom biological heritage, early conditioning, and an unfortunate marriage combined to produce murder rather than separation, desertion, or divorce. His is one of eighteen cases of wife murder in our sample and one of several in which the outcome seems to have been inevitable in view of the particular combination of circumstances.

Murder Incidental to a Sex Crime: The H Case

H's ancestors, of German and English lineage, came to this country long ago. His father was a successful professional man, an active member of a leading church, and a member of an important lodge. He had always been a real companion to his two sons, of whom H was the younger, and was much interested in their development. H's mother, one of four children of a mid-

western farmer-lawyer, had received a university education and a good musical training and was active in community organizations wherever she lived. In fact, both parents were highly respected members of society, and the whole family was looked upon as a model one.

At the time of H's birth the family was living in his mother's native state. Here he attended school for eight years but never with much interest. When he was eight years old, he began taking violin lessons and practising certain hours each day, for his mother hoped he would become a musician. It may be that this maternal ambition and H's emotional dependence on his father set up a conflict within him, but there is no evidence that he failed to develop normally during boyhood, both physically and socially. He much admired his brother, who was five years his senior and considerably larger, and was prepared to settle with his fists any skepticism of the older boy's powers and attainments.

When H had finished grade school his father moved the family to another state in the hope that the mother's poor health would improve. He attended high school there for two years, during which time he vainly strove, despite his small size, to win an athletic letter. When his parents decided that the hotel life they were living was not a good thing for their boy, he was sent by his own choice to a military academy, which he came to like very much during the year he was in attendance.

Presently, however, the war spirit of 1917 gripped the sixteen-year-old lad, and he itched to join the army, partly because his brother had done so. Twice he enlisted against his parents' wishes, and twice they got him out by reporting his true age to the military authorities. Finally the father, persuaded by his elder son, gave his consent when H was seventeen. After eighteen months of active military service, which he enjoyed very much, he received an honorable discharge. He decided he would like to go to West Point now, but learned that he must have two years of college. Thereupon he entered college, only to find the work irksome after the active life of a soldier. After a year he quit, despite the pleas of his parents and brother that he persevere.

This lack of interest in school was in part attributable to his first real love affair. The girl, a Catholic, became his wife, and H, who was a Protestant, agreed that their children should be brought up as Catholics. He speaks highly of his wife, but other sources of information indicate that as a Catholic she believed in marital relations only for procreation. Consequently their relationship was sometimes strained, and by the time of the crime his wife was seeking a divorce, although they had three children.

He had become an automobile salesman after his marriage and at times had done very well, but at others not so well. Moreover, his business threw him with associates who were not averse to helping him spend his money and encouraging him to indulge in social drinking. He began going about

with women, and for a few years, at the very time he was finding it difficult to support his family, he lived a very loose life. Finally, ostensibly because of his meager earnings, his wife went back to her parents and H to his. It is possible, although the evidence is inconclusive that there was some difficulty between them at this time, although H occasionally visited his wife and her parents. It may be that his dissipation and his lack of real success as a salesman were born of a deep dissatisfaction with his wife in the matter of sexual relations.

In the apartment above that occupied by H's wife and her parents lived a young salesman and his wife. Apparently H's wife was well acquainted with them, and possibly H knew them also. One cold afternoon H's wife and her father heard a scream upstairs and a thud on the floor. H's father-in-law asked his daughter to see what the trouble was. When she found the door locked and got no response to her calls, she summoned the police, and a few minutes later two detectives arrived. Upon unlocking the door with a skeleton key, they found the salesman's wife dead on the floor. She had been strangled, then criminally assaulted, and finally stabbed through the heart and one side of the neck. As they were entering to look around, H had run down the stairs and collided with a detective who had been posted to see that no one escaped. After a tussle H escaped part way across the street, then slipped and fell, and was captured. A gun was found on him, and he was taken to police headquarters. In response to questioning he said he had gone to the apartment hoping to sell the woman a radio, since the automobile business was bad; that he had found her dead, become very much frightened and, when he heard the detectives coming, locked the door. His wife and father-in-law saw him trying to escape from the house, and H explained that he had tried to escape because he realized he was caught in an incriminating situation. He has continued to assert his innocence. Nevertheless a post-mortem examination showed that the woman had been criminally assaulted, and H's underwear revealed the presence of seminal fluid. In addition, two small spots of blood were found on one of his shirt sleeves and another on his tie. The circumstantial evidence was all against him and he was convicted.

A number of explanations have been offered as the cause of this crime. One rather eminent psychiatrist has diagnosed H as a sadist. Such a person, while not insane, is abnormal in his emotional reactions.

Another explanation is possible on the basis of H's history. He was the youngest boy, very much doted upon by his mother, and had been very strictly brought up. Indeed he himself says that at the age of sixteen, after his first sex experience with a girl of about his own age, he felt a terrible revulsion against both the girl and himself. This reaction may be related in some way to the fact that he was a "mamma's boy." During his many months in the army, he says, he had no strong sexual urge.

Even more significant, perhaps, are his relations with his wife. At most times she was unapproachable, so he obtained sexual satisfaction with loose women. Financial difficulties, too, contributed to the deterioration of his character. If he is guilty of the crime, it is not hard to explain. He went to the apartment and found this young and attractive woman alone. Yielding to his impulses, he made approaches and was rejected. Then, conscious of the difficulties that would ensue if she told his wife, he choked her into insensibility and assaulted her. Finally, in a frenzy of fear, he killed her to prevent her from betraying him.

The circumstances in H's background which seem to be significant for his development are his close attachment to his mother, his unfulfilled ambitions to be recognized as his brother's equal and to become an athlete, his reaction to an early sex experience, his unsettled life in the army, his subsequent failure in business, and his association with men and women whose life patterns were entirely different from those inculcated by his family. What his early experience may have done to him and what part his wife's attitude had in the demoralization of his character we can only guess. The latter, however, seems to have a good deal of significance.

He is one of the most intelligent men in the prison, and is very frank and honest on matters aside from the crime for which he is charged, even those about which many prisoners tend to prevaricate. He is reticent, however, about his relationship with his mother and his intimate relationships with his wife. The facts on these two points had to be obtained from others. It is probable that early conditioning did not prepare him to meet the economic and emotional crises which ultimately faced him.

Cultural Conflict and Murder: The B Case

B is the son of an Osage Indian father and an Oneida Indian mother. As a young man his father had been given to wandering about the country, and it was in the course of his travels that he met B's mother in New York and married her. This roving disposition his father never overcame; about three years before his death, according to B, he rigged up a house-wagon on an automobile chassis and traveled about the country.

B, who is the third of seven children, was born on a reservation in northern Wisconsin, but before he reached school age his family moved to a city in another part of the state. It was here that he first became aware that he was different from other people; until he moved to a white environment, where he was made to feel inferior, he had never been disturbed by a consciousness of race difference. He reacted stubbornly against the white man's attitude toward him and has always tried to compensate for it.

He entered school when he was six, but at the age of thirteen had reached only the fifth grade. He says he quit school because of lack of interest, which may have been born of his consciousness of racial discrimination or

of his low I.Q. (70), perhaps both. He strove to win recognition by developing skill in boxing and baseball, and later in pool-playing and gambling. To these achievements he soon added exploitation of women. He had no capacity for enjoying solitude.

Although his parents were by no means poverty-stricken, since both received a government allowance, he wanted more spending money. So after leaving school he began his irregular occupational career. At eighteen he was induced to join the navy, from which he was dishonorably discharged in 1920. Thereafter he worked in many parts of the country, though mostly around Milwaukee, Kenosha, and Chicago. He fell in with associates whose culture sanctioned promiscuity, and he adopted their standards, although he says he has never had venereal disease. He has always been strong and healthy.

Three years after his discharge from the navy he married in the state of New York. For a time, apparently, the couple was happy, but his race rankled in the minds of his wife and her relatives. When she refused to accompany him to Wisconsin, he came alone and filed suit for divorce. There were no children. After a time he met a girl on the street, with whom he kept company intermittently for over a year. Much of this time he seems to have lived at her mother's house. She would not marry him, however, until he got a steady job, for he had been very irregularly employed. It was she, he says, who persuaded him to file application for the position of fireman in a city fire department and to lie about his schooling in order to strengthen his case. This falsification, which was brought out at the trial, is believed to have counted against him. He passed the necessary tests and at her suggestion asked for a transfer to the police department. Notwithstanding this measure of success, however, and the fact that he had become a Catholic to please the girl, an estrangement developed between them, the cause of which is not quite clear. It seems probable that some of her people objected to him because he was an Indian. It is possible also that jealousy on her part may have contributed to the rupture, although B declares that it was unfounded.

After he got his police commission, B learned that she wanted to see him. Since he had not yet obtained his uniform and gun, he borrowed a gun from a friend and called at her home to impress her with his new position. In the course of his visit she was shot in the side, and her head was banged up and down on the floor. B's story is that he shot off his gun merely to show off and scare her, but in his excitement hit her in the side; that he became frantic when he realized she was hurt and shook her so vigorously in attempting to revive her that he accidentally injured her head. The testimony of the attending physicians was that death had been due primarily to concussion of the brain rather than to the wound.

Persons who had known him during his childhood and youth and in

Milwaukee testified that he had never been in trouble with anyone. Even the police in his home town regarded him as a "square shooter." He was characterized as generous to a fault, sociably inclined, and always well dressed and presentable, but often hurt by the attitude people took toward him when they discovered that he was an Indian.

Mention should be made of one other possible factor. On one of his jobs a great weight of cement fell on him and injured him. He says that he soon recovered, but was thereafter occasionally troubled with dizziness and forgetfulness. There is no evidence, however, that this injury had any bearing on his crime. It seems clear that this is a case of sudden passion aroused by the girl's refusal to marry him because he was an Indian.

A Draft Resister Who Became a Killer: The K Case

K, the eldest of five brothers, was born to parents of German descent and lived most of his life on their farm in north-central Wisconsin. His father, a kindly old man, owner of a fairly prosperous farm, was well liked by the neighbors. His mother was an intelligent, strong-minded woman who determined the family's social and economic policies, and dominated both her husband and her sons. She was a fanatical member of a small Protestant sect and reared her children in accordance with a very strict code. She often spoke of her family as being without blemish. The result of this matriarchal situation was a family that was not integrated into the community and was regarded as "queer." The boys were family-centered, having few contacts with outsiders. Though of different ages, they were bound by very close ties, enjoyed association with one another, and provided their own entertainment. They idolized their mother, who seems to have been the only woman to enter their lives. They all worked hard and never learned to play. All of them attended church and Sunday school until they were grown. Indeed K was an active member of a Sunday school class until he was thirty-three years old.

In school he was a good student. According to all reports, he was a peaceable, alert but never aggressive boy who gave his teachers no trouble. Although of a good physical build, he did not participate in school athletics because of his religious training. After finishing high school he entered a small college in the northern part of the state, from which he was graduated.

Before the tragedy that resulted in K's imprisonment the father died, and the sons, under their mother's guidance, assumed management of the farm. They were all thrifty, hard-working men who made every effort to get along financially. They owned a woodsaw and a threshing machine, the first in their community, and contracted for woodcutting jobs and threshing among the neighbors. They kept the farm in excellent shape and became so prosperous that they were able to build a farmhouse that was a model

for the time, the finest barn in the community, and other modern and efficient farm buildings.

Their independence of outsiders increased as time went on, and they came to be regarded as "queer" and arrogant, and to be avoided. Better farmers than most of their neighbors, they displayed a sense of superiority, which was resented in the community. The neighbors' reaction to this superior attitude in turn helped to feed the hostility and suspiciousness of the family.

Their segregation from the rest of the community was due in part at least to their strict adherence to beliefs and practices at variance with those in the neighborhood, indeed with those of members of the same church. Dancing and all social gatherings not connected with the church were "worldly" and therefore taboo. The Pope was the Anti-Christ, and the World War was of his making; he was about to land his soldiers, mobilize the Catholics in the United States, and seize the government. Another basis of antagonism was the fact that the family was German, the community non-German. The situation became more strained after the father's death. The boys, headed now by K, were exceedingly stubborn in their dealings, though absolutely dependable and thorough in their work. They asked no favors and took no sides in neighborhood disputes. Only one of them, the second youngest, ever interested himself in girls. Their recreation consisted largely of reading and outdoor sports, notably hunting. They were all good marksmen, but they were mainly interested in making money and, secondarily, in Bible study and the reading of religious magazines.

This social situation was brought to a climax by the first World War. All five boys refused to register. At first the community regarded this merely as another eccentricity of a very strange family. But when local pressure was brought to bear on them, they stiffened their resistance. Although the first draft would have taken only one of the five, two being above and two below the draft age, they all refused to register. The community was concerned because the family was German and unsympathetic to the American cause. For hours neighbors and friends argued with K, who at first became angry, then sullen. Finally, however, he and his brothers all reigstered. Actually, the boys had resisted the draft because of their religion and prejudices, not because of physical cowardice or national disloyalty.

When one of the sons eligible for the draft was called, he refused to answer the call and disappeared. The federal marshal from a nearby town, the sheriff, and several deputized men came to the farm to get him. K and his oldest brother were cutting corn near the road. The marshal stopped his car and shouted that he wished to talk to them. He suggested coming into the field, but K told them to stay where they were, and the boys went on with their work. They had a gun, and when a shot was fired, supposedly by one of the posse, K and his brother shot back, puncturing the hat of one

of the men. In the exchange of shots K was hit in the ankle. The officers and posse ran back toward the town, and K and his brother retreated toward the house.

When the affair was reported in the nearby town, a mob formed, proceeded to the farm, and surrounded the buildings. K and two of his brothers were trapped in the barn. From there they shot to keep the posse away from the house, which they thought the mob was preparing to burn. When the farm bull, a valuable breeding animal, was shot, the boys in the barn directed their fire toward the man who had shot the animal, finally hitting him. Another member of the posse had his gun shot from his hand and his right arm fractured. About this time the depot agent drove up in a car, stepped from his machine waving a gun—part of a shipment which K and his brothers had ordered by mail, and which had been suspected and opened by the agent. One of the boys in the barn shot him, and he dropped dead.

Firing continued until dark despite many attempts to make a truce. K and his brothers, who had escaped from the barn to the house to defend their mother, refused a truce. Finally a neighbor persuaded K, weakened by loss of blood from his leg wound, to give up, but two of his brothers and their mother held out. At this point the posse, reinforced by some of the newly drafted home guards and others, surrounded the house. The two other brothers escaped through the lines and hiked north toward another town, leaving the posse to burn the barn and capture their mother. The mother, still refusing to surrender, was dragged from her home. Finally a posse found the younger of the two brothers asleep in the loft of an old mill, and shot him to death. The mother and the other brother, who was finally captured, were placed in jail. K and one of the other brothers were convicted of first-degree murder and given life sentences. The mother was acquitted after a long and expensive trial.

At the time of our interview the mother and the boy who had been jailed were on the farm. Little by little some of the land had been sold. The brother who had been sent to prison with K soon began to act queerly and was transferred to the Central Hospital for the criminal insane. The mother refused to believe that the boy who had been shot had been killed.

Naturally K is very suspicious and secretive. He repeatedly refused to be interviewed and displayed an attitude of superiority. At last he has been pardoned. He says that, since he is innocent, he has no crime to repent of. While in prison he read a great deal and appeared intelligent and well-informed, but his manner was gruff and uncooperative.

This case involves a family with a streak of queerness, conditioned to a sense of superiority and having the psychology of the pioneer, exaggerated by religious fanaticism. The crime is attributable primarily to a conflict of cultures growing out of the "queer" personality of a religiously fanatical woman.

A Murderer Playing a Heroic Role: The C Case

This murder, an unusually atrocious one, was widely publicized. C, a man of fifty, killed the woman whom he had married bigamously, cut her body into pieces, and buried the fragments in nine different places in a forest. When his crime was discovered and he was charged with it, he pleaded guilty.

He was born of Scotch-Irish ancestry in a rural Southern state. He was the only boy and the youngest child of three. His father had been in an institution for the insane, and one maternal aunt had been insane.

His family moved to a Northern state when he was a child, where he was brought up on a farm. After finishing high school, he attended a college in the state capital for two years, working his own way. In some manner not entirely clear he obtained six hundred dollars from the woman operating his rooming house. He claims she made amorous approaches and lent him the money of her own accord. She, on the other hand, states that he obtained the loan by misrepresentation and refused to repay it. After trial he was sentenced to a term of three and a half years' imprisonment. Upon his release he entered the employ of a Prisoners' Aid Association and married a girl whom he had known as a boy. Of this marriage three children were born. He says his married life was unhappy because his wife's people, who lived with them, alienated her affections. He adds, however, that he was disappointed in his wife after his marriage. They separated and he continued to travel about the state for the Prisoners' Aid Association. In 1926 he married a widow in a Wisconsin city without securing a divorce. He claims that he believed his wife had obtained a divorce when she left him and accompanied her parents to a Western state. This statement hardly holds up in the face of the fact that he had never been served with divorce papers, although his wife had returned to the town where they had lived.

During their honeymoon C and his second wife camped just across the river from Wisconsin. According to his story, she started a quarrel when she attempted perverted methods of sexual intercourse, and attacked him with a baseball bat and a hammer. In self-defense he struck her a mortal blow and brought her body across into Wisconsin, knowing that the penalty for murder in the adjacent state was death. Later it was revealed also that he had cashed certain of her bonds.

The examination he was given upon entering the prison showed that he was in good physical condition and had an I. Q. of 116. The examining psychiatrist described him as "a degenerate-minded individual par excellence" and suggests certain defects in his mental make-up.

The story he wrote for us reveals certain marked characteristics. He is exceedingly wordy, given to very florid expressions. It was only with difficulty that we got him to limit his account to about two hundred pages.

He writes that women were constantly pursuing him, and that when he was traveling for the Prisoners' Aid Association women "fell for him hard." He asserts that he always treated them respectfully and disclaims ever having had any "evil" thought about them. He describes numerous situations in which he played the hero, such as his boyhood attempt to tame a fractious horse which threw him and seriously injured his head—so seriously, he suggests, that it may have affected his subsequent career.

His parental home was a deeply religious one, and C himself seems to have been a very religious man. He had been active in the work of various churches, and while traveling always made it a point to attend service. Yet that did not prevent him from striking a man who was about to reveal to a young woman in whom they both were interested the fact that he was an ex-convict. He says he struck the man on the mouth to force him to keep silent. He dwells on his impeccable moral character, carefully pointing out that his relations with women were purely platonic and that he gave up an insurance job because his business associates were a "fast set." Even his wife, he says, proposed to him, and the woman whom he married bigamously forced herself upon him.

He confesses that once, when he was manager of a business men's credit exchange in two Wisconsin cities, he almost had to face charges for embezzlement. He denies any guilt in the matter, however, claiming that his financial affairs had become badly disarranged as a result of his philanthropic provision for his wife and her parents. He characterizes himself as kind and liberal with his wife and her parents. But just as he discovered that his wife did not exactly correspond to his recollections of her as his boyhood sweetheart, so he discovered, he says, that the second woman had had other lovers and was sexually perverted. Furthermore, he accuses Wisconsin officials of torturing him into making a confession of first-degree murder.

For the interpretation of this case the following factors are significant: 1. He probably inherited nervous instability, for insanity had been present in both the paternal and maternal families. 2. As the youngest child and the only boy in the family, he was spoiled by his mother and older sisters, who had taught him to expect women to comply with his wishes. 3. His affections had been so strongly fixed on his mother and sisters that he had built up an image of womanhood which did not materialize either in the woman he married or in the woman he robbed. 4. Having this phantasy-image of woman, he probably was honest in saying that women fell for him hard, but not in the way he meant, and that they were a disappointment to him. He expected women to treat him as his mother and sisters had done, and did not know how a man is expected to treat a woman. 5. As a result he felt he was being pursued and persecuted when a woman showed that she resented his exploitation. 6. He saw no inconsistency between his religious professions and his business and sexual conduct. His mother and

sisters had not upbraided him when he took money from them or when he exploited their affections. In their eyes he could do no wrong. Hence in his own eyes he did no wrong when he treated other women similarly.

This case is a good illustration of Freud's theory of the Oedipus complex. It is an almost perfect example of a psychopathic personality which may be attributed to an unsound biological organism subjected early to experiences conducive to social deviation.

An Insane Wife Murderer: The E Case

This man was an only child. Both his parents were descendants of hardy, industrious farmers who had been among the first settlers of a central-western state. Both families had always been in good repute among their neighbors, as is evidenced by the offices that many of them held.

Both father and mother were well educated according to the standards of their day. E describes his father as a cheerful man, a clear thinker, ambitious, temperate, clean, sober, broad-minded, generous, tolerant, hard-working, and sociable, but dominated by his wife. His mother was much engrossed in her only child and made every effort to control his development. She refused to let him associate with the families of two uncles who lived near by because their wives had said he was illegitimate, although he was born only six days before she had been married nine months. She was also suspicious of and angry at her own people. With two of her sisters who lived only sixteen miles away, she would have little to do. E says he never went to his uncles' homes, was not allowed to attend their funerals, though he was then thirty years old, and was taken only twice to the home of one of his mother's sisters and once to the home of the other. All the evidence suggests that his mother was rather queer.

Maternal solicitude and domination seems to have affected E's life very early. His early childhood, he says, was handicapped by ill health. He was forbidden to go hunting lest he shoot himself, or to go swimming lest he drown. He was not permitted to play with the neighbors' children because their social status was not acceptable. In short, he was a child ruined physically and emotionally by maternal solicitude.

In time E experienced a terrific emotional reaction. He lost confidence in his mother, was irritated by her, and doubtless developed the pattern of reaction to women which brought tragedy to his married life.

E's school history is one of continued success from the beginning. He was first in his class of twenty when he graduated from the eighth grade, despite the fact that he had skipped the seventh grade after taking an examination. In high school he finished second instead of first, he says, only because of an adolescent love affair. After attending a state teachers college for a time, he taught in a country school for thirty-five dollars a month. One year he worked for a World's Fair, having obtained his position in a competitive

examination taken by five hundred, of whom only eleven were fortunate enough to be selected for positions.

He returned to the teachers college and graduated. He was selected as the only student speaker at the alumni banquet, and shortly thereafter was elected to the faculty. He says that he was often told he was a genius. He admits that he had original ways, which sometimes were described as "crazy." There is no doubt that he displayed unusual ability and originality in business.

His wife he met while he was attending another institution in his home state. He speaks of her in the highest terms, despite the fact that he murdered her. He regrets that he did not understand her in the beginning, but pleads that no one had ever told him how to treat a woman. He admits frankly that outwardly he showed very little affection for her, that in fourteen years of married life he never brought her flowers, never expressed appreciation of her cooking and housekeeping, never complimented her on her appearance, and constantly resisted her efforts to get him into society.

Ambitious for business success, he used what time he could spare from his teaching to promote real estate developments in the Wisconsin city in which he lived. All his energy, mental and physical, was expended in his teaching and his business enterprises. He did not like society; his wife craved it. She had always assumed a dominating role in her own family, and she now set about to make over her husband. When she failed to accomplish this by asserting herself, she tried to handle him by what she called tact, but which he recognized to be lying and chicanery. She persuaded his mother to help her try to change him. Under this double onslaught of mother and wife the reactions generated in early life were intensified. He finally developed a psychosis, convinced himself that his wife was interfering with his success, that his mother was in league with her, and that his father, under the influence of the two women, had turned against him. He contemplated suicide. In the meantime he had formed a clandestine alliance with another young woman, who gave him the encouragement his wife denied him. This alliance was discovered by his wife, who nevertheless refused to divorce him. Before the tragic end came, E had suffered from three breakdowns, the last one shortly before he murdered his wife.

Here are exemplified the tragic results of an unfortunate combination of circumstances: a pathological inheritance, the attempt to project upon a growing child the wishes of a strong-minded but over-solicitous mother, and marriage to a strong-minded woman bent upon repeating the domination role of the mother.

Murder Growing Out of a Community Grudge: The M Case

This case is famous in Wisconsin annals of crime because of the part that science played in securing the conviction of the prisoner. The follow-

ing account of M's background is largely as he gave it, unchecked as to its veracity.

He was born in Sweden, the next to the youngest of six children, three boys and three girls. He says he was his mother's favorite and was always a helpful and obedient child. When he was four, his father came to America, leaving the family behind. Two years later, having contracted tuberculosis, he returned to Sweden and died shortly thereafter. Thus the boy never had much contact with his father and was brought up largely by his mother. The family, left with the farm in Sweden, was in rather poor circumstances when the boy was young. When he was ten, his mother remarried and the entire family got along well with the stepfather.

At seven he entered an ungraded school and ultimately obtained the equivalent of an eighth-grade education. He claims that school was not difficult for him, though he disliked history and memorizing the catechism. He claims he was eager to learn and that he read widely.

One by one the older children left home, eventually finding their way to America through correspondence with an uncle in Wisconsin. When M was fifteen, an older sister returned to Sweden for a visit and he accompanied her back to America.

His work history demonstrates the instability that characterized all his early manhood. He worked on small farms, was a marble-cutter, brass-polisher, itinerant harvest worker, lumberjack, soldier in the Spanish-American war until discharged because he was under age, tender of a cargo of mules shipped to South Africa during the Boer War, soldier in the Boer army for a brief period, and wanderer in South Africa after the collapse of the rebellion. During his wandering he met a Hindu mystic who proved to be a congenial spirit. This perhaps throws light on the emotional state that developed later. When he returned to the United States, he went to Chicago to meet his mother, whom he had not seen since he left Sweden. He remained with her for some time and again got employment as a stone-cutter. After taking a course in mechanics he was employed for two years as a chauffeur by a rich man, then shifted to another job at a larger salary. After seven or eight years in Chicago he went to a small Wisconsin town, bought eighty acres of cut-over land and some cows and started a dairy farm. During World War I he prospered and cleared more land. His buildings and machines were always in good shape. Apparently his wandering had ended.

In 1921 a local drainage project was proposed to make available some nearby swampland and enable the neighboring city to dispose of its sewage. The farmers' lands were threatened, and the matter became a political issue.

Led by M, the farmers defeated the proposal in the election. Then the proponents of the project persuaded a majority of the farmers to allow the ditch to be put through their farms and empty into a creek, but failed to

live up to their agreement. As the plan was published the ditch was to end at M's farm. Work was begun, and the ditch had almost reached M's farm when the dredge was blown up one night. Because M had been most active in the opposition, he was suspected, but no action was taken against him.

M was further incensed when, upon receiving his tax notice, he discovered that his tax for the ditch was almost equal to all his other taxes combined. When he asked for an explanation, he was given the "run-around" by the politicians. Later he learned that his tax was double that of others who had even larger farms. He blamed the tax assessor, one of his neighbors. On Christmas morning the latter received a box. When he and his wife opened the package, it exploded, killing his wife and seriously injuring the assessor.

M was arrested and charged with second-degree murder. The officers used third-degree methods to force him to confess, but without success. What ultimately led to his conviction was the work of two scientists. One of them, from the United States Forest Products Laboratory, testified that the wood in the fatal box was exactly the same in structure as shavings found in M's farm shop; the other, a chemist from the University of Wisconsin, identified a piece of the bomb as having been cut from a length of pipe in M's shop. M himself, however, has always protested his innocence, and some of his neighbors have contended that the evidence was planted by the guilty person. They say he was a good worker and a fine neighbor, always willing to help his fellow farmers. His mechanical ability and his skill as a worker in stone, wood, and metal, which were well known in the community, probably did not help him in his trial.

During this later period, as throughout his young manhood, he gave evidence of a strongly mystical nature. His neighbors ascribe psychic powers to him, on the basis of the hypnotism and fortune-telling he practised at social gatherings. In Chicago he had frequently attended spiritualistic meetings. He was known in his community as a good church man, and he had the respect at least of those who sided with him in the ditch fight.

After a number of years in prison he became insane and was transferred to the Central State Hospital, the Wisconsin institution for the criminal insane.

Thus M may be characterized as shrewd, mechanically skillful, socially adapted to the frontier life of the Wisconsin locality in which he settled, ruggedly independent, a leader in the neighborhood, mystically inclined and credited with having some measure of occult power, and generally regarded as a good neighbor.

We do not know enough about his early relationships in the parental family or about his early emotional development to say to what extent they determined his personality traits. His statement that he was the favorite of his mother may have some significance, but is not conclusive. His occu-

pational mobility before he settled on the Wisconsin farm suggests an emotional instability pregnant with danger in the face of a severe crisis. The threats he made when it seemed that the city politicians would override the farmers' objection to the ditch also indicate that he was a high-strung man, prepared to take desperate measures to accomplish his purpose. The insanity that developed after imprisonment confirms the conclusion that his nervous constitution was not proof against severe stress, though he was able to channel his actions in such a way as to avoid suspicion, or so he thought. His sending of the bomb to the man he regarded as most responsible for the unhappy outcome of the project is consistent with his character. With his cool, calculating self-sufficiency, he refused to accept a situation in which he felt he had been duped. Failing to get a satisfactory explanation of his high taxes, he saw only one way to satisfy his outraged sense of justice.

It appears, then, that this man became a murderer because of a strong, egoistic, impulsive nature, conditioned to overcome difficulties by individualistic rather than cooperative methods. He is a product of the frontier, independent, self-sufficient, and direct. In the transition from an individualistic frontier civilization to a more complex, legalistic organization, he held tenaciously to the pioneer's direct methods of protecting his rights.

Our study includes other psychopathic murderers. The cases that have been discussed above serve to illustrate the type of personality that was typical of all of them and the variety of social factors that may contribute to the formation of habitual reactions to critical situations. Although in each case a unique combination of circumstances has influenced the development of the personality, and different factors have unequal weights, there are certain general characteristics which most of them have in common, which will be summarized later.

Analysis of Case Histories According to Circumstances of the Murder

It may be assumed that a human act is the outcome of earlier experiences that have given a certain set to the individual's reactions. These experiences may have prepared him for some kind of socially unacceptable conduct, not necessarily murder or any other specific crime, though certain types of constitution and some experiences tend to lay the ground for murder rather than some other form of transgression.

The crimes of the murderers for whom we have case histories are not attributable to a single motive, nor did they occur in the same general situation. They may be broadly classified as murders committed (1) in connection with another crime; (2) as the immediate result of a quarrel; and (3) as the sequel to a long-standing feud or grudge. On this basis the distribution of the murderers is as follows:

	No.	*Total*	*Percentage*
In Connection with Another Crime[1]			
Robbery, incidental murder	9		
Resisting arrest, murder as a means of	7		
Robbery, murder as a means of	11		
Sex crime, murder as a means of	15	42	43.75
Immediate Quarrel[2]			
When murderer was drinking	15		
When murderer was not drinking	8	23	23.95
Long-standing Feud or Grudge			
Marital difficulties	19		
Desire for revenge or a long-standing quarrel with person other than wife	12	31	32.3
	96	96	100.00

I. ROBBERY INVOLVING INCIDENTAL MURDER: NINE PERSONS

All nine of these men were amateurs in crime. Only one had a record of delinquency over a long period of years, and even for him we have no evidence that he had committed a felony during the ten years previous to his conviction for murder. Three had never been implicated before, and two who had been charged with previous crimes had never been convicted. One had paid a fine for manufacturing liquor but had never been convicted of a felony. One had been delinquent during his boyhood but had committed only one other felony.

In their own eyes these men had done nothing that was morally reprehensible. They were members not of the group that formulates laws but of groups whose acts are legislated against, groups that were not criminal per se but followed patterns of behavior not sanctioned by the law and the folkways of the dominant social group. The lack of acumen with which their crimes were executed suggests that they were of very low mental caliber, and that they had had little training in the techniques of a criminal career.

Whether one should characterize these men as "weak," as Bjerre does, or should interpret their crimes as infantile reactions to given situations is a question. From the standpoint of cooperation with the larger social groups that exercise control through the medium of the law, they are marginal individuals whose past has not been anti-social so much as asocial.

[1] In every case where the prisoner was an accomplice before or during the act, he is included in the same group as the perpetrator of the crime.

[2] This is the group that remained after those who had killed their wives or grudge enemies had been excluded. For instance, several who killed their wives after a long history of marital difficulties were drunk at the time of the crime. Five or six of this group are really unclassifiable.

II. MURDER AS A MEANS OF RESISTING ARREST: SEVEN PERSONS

Five of these men had appeared earlier in the courts of their home communities. Four were professional criminals; two were novices driven to their crime by a sense of family isolation and solidarity.

All but these latter two had been economically unsuccessful. They had frequently been out of jobs or had been failures in business. They were ill-adjusted socially; that is, they are anti-social persons who have never merged with the larger group. They may constitute a group whose code differs radically from that of both the normal population and the rest of the murderers.

III. MURDER AS A MEANS OF ROBBERY: ELEVEN PERSONS

This group was convicted mainly on the basis of circumstantial evidence and their own confessions, the worth of which is sometimes doubtful. The crime was first-degree murder for all those whose guilt is in no doubt. As their life stories reveal, only three of them were fairly good citizens in the eyes of their home communities, and these were in need of money at the time the crime was committed. All the others had either made considerable trouble or had served sentences.

One of the group, who has since been transferred to a state hospital for the insane, was hysterical after the murder. The others were all very matter of fact, showing no special remorse. Their descriptions of the deed are casual and objective, giving no evidence of emotional disturbance. Two were drunk when the crime was committed. One is definitely feeble-minded. Four had motives in addition to robbery. The others are best described as village ne'er-do-wells. All eleven were attempting to secure money for various purposes, though in some cases this motive was secondary to some other one.

In four cases accomplice and perpetrator committed murder to collect the insurance of the spouse. These are included here because they were apparently motivated chiefly by the desire to secure money.

This group of murderers differs from the others in that they planned and executed their crimes with utter lack of emotion. Apparently they are entirely devoid of conscience, for their stories reveal no horror of murder. Whereas many of the other murders must be attributed to a given situation, here we are justified in speaking of motive.

IV. MURDER INCIDENTAL TO SEX CRIME: FIFTEEN PERSONS

Of this group, only one had an earlier criminal record—arrest on a murder charge, of which he had not been convicted. None of the fifteen had been punished for unnatural sex practices. The crimes for which they were serving prison terms include murder of an illegitimate child, an incestuous relative, the husband of a paramour, and a pregnant sweetheart or unfaithful mistress (the most common).

All but two of the fourteen men (one of the group was a woman) had made fairly satisfactory social adjustments except on the sexual level. Most of them had been fairly successful economically. It may be that their social intimates sanctioned a type of sexual behavior that did not fit into the larger pattern.

Two of the group committed murder while drunk. None was committed as insane, but one became insane thirteen years after incarceration. None was having serious financial difficulty. This group represents in part what the older criminologists called "criminals by passion." We shall apply that term to all the murderers, though in a different sense.

V. MURDER AS OUTCOME OF A QUARREL WHEN PRISONER WAS DRUNK: FIFTEEN PERSONS

This group consists of the drunken murderers who cannot be classified on the basis of motivation. In each case alcohol apparently released impulses that normally were held in restraint. All these men seem to have very unstable personalities. Their family backgrounds are on the whole more unfavorable than those of any of the other groups. Their histories include boyhood gangs, delinquencies of one sort and another, and arrests for previous misdemeanors. They are from the same economic classes as the other groups, mainly unskilled and skilled laborers, but none of them had been equal to the task of earning a living. Their work records are very erratic. The fact that so many of them were habitual drinkers suggests that they sought escape from the situation in which they found themselves. The weapons they used ranged from the revolver and cutting instruments to the bare hands.

VI. MURDER AS THE OUTCOME OF A QUARREL WHEN PRISONER HAD NOT BEEN DRINKING: EIGHT PERSONS

With respect to economic and social status this is a mixed group. Some of them were the aggressors in the quarrel, others not.

Three of the eight have been sent to the Central State Hospital. In general their own statements suggest a paranoid type of mind, and one of them is definitely a paranoic with systemized delusions. That others are victims of violent tempers may be inferred from the type of crime they committed. Still others, however, give no evidence of this trait. Four reveal no outstanding traits that can be regarded as the cause of their criminality.

All except one was armed with a deadly weapon at the time his crime was committed. Apparently they felt the need of a weapon as an alternative to our institutionalized forms of redress of grievances.

VII. MURDER AS THE SEQUEL TO MARITAL TROUBLE: NINETEEN PERSONS

Various types of persons are included in this category. Some were suffering from mental conflicts. Some had been subjected to serious handicaps in their early environment. Many had been unfaithful. A number were married to women who had always been promiscuous or who became "sporting" after marriage. Some had been deserted by the wife because she could not endure her husband's habits and his treatment of her. Trouble with the in-laws existed in some cases, in one case with the step-parent. Some of the group were cruel and tyrannical husbands who, when the wife rebelled or caused a disturbance, killed her or some ally in the quarrel.

There is a large group of mental cases here, as in the group that committed murder as the result of a long-standing quarrel. Most of them involve a multiplicity of factors.

VIII. MURDER AS THE CLIMAX TO A LONG-STANDING QUARREL: TWELVE PERSONS

Many of this group were committed as insane. In fact, all were found to have been either insane or drunk at the time of the crime. Virtually without exception they had failed to make a satisfactory social adjustment. Many had become exceedingly introverted, withdrawing from situations that made them feel they were not liked or appreciated.

In contrast to the group that committed a murder incidental to robbery, they had been comparatively successful economically. One might almost suspect that they had compensated for a feeling of social inadequacy by directing all their energies into their farms or their jobs. Their crimes are rooted in their inability to cope with the tools of social intercourse. Many have the necessary intellectual capacity but manifest a distinctly psychopathic attitude toward others. They are suspicious, have delusions of persecution, and commit personal violence when their interests appear to be threatened. Although they are older than the men in the other groups, six are single. The only one who had ever before been placed in an institution was a war veteran who had been discharged from the army as a mental case.

Thus it appears that murder results from a fairly wide range of circumstances. Those who committed murder in connection with some other crime constitute almost 44 per cent of the total number, those whose crime was the sequel to an immediate quarrel almost 24 per cent, and those whose crime was the result of a long-standing quarrel about 32 per cent. The unstable personality appears especially in the murders connected with sex, drunkenness, and marital difficulties, but also in most of the others. Such instability appears to be the result of a peculiar constitutional make-up, of home and community conditions, or of both.

Relation of Murderers' Characteristics to Their Criminality

In the first three chapters we pointed out how the characteristics of the murderers, as revealed by statistical analysis, differed from those of the Wisconsin adult population and those of their own non-criminal brothers. From the case histories one may learn how these characteristics prepared the way for violent action in the face of a crisis, and how certain experiences, though not necessarily peculiar to the murderers, combined with heredity to develop the type of personality likely to resort to violence when forced to cope with a difficult situation.

EARLY ENVIRONMENT

A larger proportion of the murderers than of the sex offenders and property offenders came from a farm environment. This fact undoubtedly has significance only in connection with other characteristics. On the farm social relationships are comparatively simple. Adjustment to other personalities, other things being equal, is comparatively easy, for life is largely centered in one's family and neighbors. Some people so conditioned find it difficult to adjust to the more complex urban environment.

Of course, the fact that a boy is farm-born does not in itself explain his subsequent behavior. In some of these crimes low intelligence played a part, in others the prisoner's reaction against the whole parental family situation, and in still others his desire for recognition or his selection of companions with anti-social standards of conduct. But the fact that the farm does not provide training for approved behavior in the complex environment of a large city is probably one factor in the subsequent career of a farm-born criminal.

AGE OF EMPLOYMENT

Similarly, the early age at which the sibs of the prisoner contributed to the family income is distinctive of the small sample of the murderers, but must be considered in connection with other characteristics. Even if we assume that none of the sibs of the 28 murderers for whom data on this point are lacking had worked before they were fourteen (Table 5), the proportion who did contribute to the family support under that age would still be 42.4 per cent. If these 28 were distributed the same as the 64 for whom we do have data, the proportion would be 61 per cent. The difference between these proportions and that of 17.9 per cent for the sex offenders and 16.1 per cent for the property offenders is significant.

The early age at which the prisoner himself contributed to the family income also marks the murderer. See Table 6. On this point we had data for only 82 of the 92 murderers. But even if we assume that none of the 10 for whom data are missing worked before he was fourteen, the proportion of

murderers who contributed to the family income at an earlier age is still 63 per cent, as compared with 27 per cent of the sex offenders and 22 per cent of the property offenders. If these 10 were distributed as were the 82 on whom we have information, the proportion would be 69.5 per cent.

Thus this study bears out the findings of previous investigations that early employment is associated with delinquency. The reason is that children are unprepared to meet the problems connected with employment, too immature to choose their associates wisely. They are denied opportunity for play and are likely to feel that they have been deprived of something which other children enjoy. They are beyond the reach of the guiding hands of parents; often they are taken out of school and thus deprived of the formative influence of teachers. They are called upon to direct their own lives before their judgment has been trained. They tend to develop the feeling that they do not belong to the family, and hence seek a position in other groups, which are not always wholesome.

The effect of early employment is manifest in the case of H, the son of a poor laborer with a large family. When he was only eight years old his father placed him with a German farmer to work for his board. This was done from time to time until he was twelve years old, when he quit school, having finished only the fourth grade, and began to earn his own living. He was sent to the Boys Industrial School for delinquency, an experience that further lowered his social status. He became an unstable workman wandering about the country, was sent to prison for another crime, and when he came out was a still more demoralized person. This case is by no means unique: in its main outlines it may be considered typical of a large proportion of the murderers who contributed to the family income before the age of fourteen. The family ties are still further loosened if the child becomes financially independent at an early age.

Table 32 shows that a larger percentage of the murderers than of the other classes of prisoners had been financially independent before the age of fourteen, though the proportion is not high—only one out of five. For this 20 per cent, however, the early separation from the parental family, the emotional experiences incident to it, and the associations resulting from it probably contributed to the formation of habits and attitudes important for their future careers. From the case histories it is clear that departure from home and self-dependence at an early age do influence the conduct of a person, principally because he is removed from the controls of the family and the school and is thrown without proper preparation into the company of associates whose habits and standards of conduct depart from those upheld by the law, the community, and society in general. He is forced to make his own way and to order his own conduct at an age when he has also the crisis of adolescence to meet. It is probable that financial independence

is related to early discontinuance of school (see Table 29) and early contribution to the support of the family (see Table 6). The cases previously cited illustrate the play of this factor. One additional case may be cited.

One of the prisoners had lost his parents when he was three years old and had been put in an orphanage. After a time he went to live with his father's mother, who taught him to pick up wood and grain along the railroad track. Failing to do well in school, he soon left. He was further demoralized by the misplaced efforts of a Rotary Club to help him, then got into trouble over a bicycle, and went to work on a farm while still very young. He soon left this job and began to wander around the country getting what work he could. In this work he made acquaintances who contributed still further to his personal disorganization.

FOREIGN PARENTAGE

A large proportion of the murderers, like the sex offenders, had foreign-born parents. See Table 14. Of the murderers 47.1 per cent were born of foreign parentage as compared with 29.2 per cent of the property offenders and 27.7 per cent of the Wisconsin population. The large proportion of immigrants' children among delinquents, which has often been noted, is usually ascribed to the conflict of cultures to which they have been subjected during early development. In the American environment the child loses respect for the culture of his parents and is eager to identify himself with that of America. Finding himself torn by a double loyalty, he escapes from parental control, but has difficulty in adjusting himself to the socially approved American pattern of conduct, for which he has not been trained. In this situation he is likely to adopt the culture of a group not approved by the community. The F case detailed above illustrates how the foreign culture of a home and community differing markedly from that of the larger American society may induce a conflict of loyalties in a child.

FAMILY HISTORY OF DISEASE

The statistical analysis shows that in the families of the murderers the incidence of chronic disease, queerness, insanity, and mental deficiency is higher than in the families of the sex offenders and the property offenders. But since data on about a third of the lifers are lacking, it cannot be said that these differences are distinctive of the families of murderers. In so far as they appeared in the families of any of the prisoners they tended to influence the child's reaction to life situations. The case histories reveal how often such conditions played a role in the make-up of the personality. The story of Cases C and E (pages 50, 52) outlines one kind of queerness in a family. In the history of Case 43 (page 83) is cited a paternal cousin who was very queer and certain other eccentric individuals in the ancestry.

Case 76 (on file) shows a streak of queerness in the mother. The father of No. 69 (on file) suffered delusions of persecution and was very suspicious of people. Among the antecedents of No. 94 on his mother's side were several who were notably queer, and one maternal cousin died as an inmate of the Illinois State Hospital. The queerness of these various relatives was probably due to mental disturbance, even when it was not scientifically so diagnosed. No. 71's father had a definite mental disorder, although he had never been committed to an institution. No. 29's father was bedridden with a nervous disease from the time that his son was twelve years old. The murderers themselves give even more evidence of mental instability.

INTELLIGENCE

Like the sex offenders, the murderers have a much lower intelligence quotient than the property offenders and the adult male population of Wisconsin. What is the bearing of this low intelligence upon conduct? Once it was believed that mental deficiency in itself predisposed a person to anti-social conduct, but that thesis is no longer accepted. What persons of low intelligence lack is foresight and the ability to judge the consequences of a given course of action; hence they may become the dupes of more intelligent people. They are more suggestible than people with high intelligence, who can foresee consequences. Moreover, their mental incapacity is often accompanied by emotional instability. They have a feeling of inferiority, for which they endeavor to compensate by association with the most anti-social elements in the community and by conduct which is not socially acceptable. They develop grudges and in the face of a crisis are unable to think their way through to a socially approved solution. If they are surrounded by stronger personalities of intelligence and high social ideals, they will adjust well to the conditions of life. If, on the other hand, they are not helped to compensate satisfactorily for their sense of inferiority, they are likely to react to a crisis in an impulsive, explosive manner, with dire consequences to themselves and to society. Instead of following the safe adage "When you don't know what to do, do nothing," they follow the infantile, undeliberate principle "When you don't know what to do, for God's sake do something." What they do is dictated by their emotions. Some of the cases already cited illustrate how frustrations of one sort or another may lead to trouble.

Table 31 is invalid statistically because the data are lacking on too many of the prisoners. But some of the case histories indicate that jealousy of the siblings played a role in producing a disorganized personality. Jealousy, which may spring either from a sense of inferiority or from a feeling that one has been discriminated against, produces a decided disturbance of the emotions which may lead to anti-social conduct.

RACE AND FOREIGN BIRTH

Our sample of murderers and sex offenders included a much larger proportion (14 per cent) of Negroes, other races, and foreign-born whites than did the property offenders, the total sample of prisoners, or the total adult population of the state, and a much smaller percentage of native whites than did the three other classes of offenders, all prisoners, or the state's adult male population. All these individuals had had the disturbing experience of being subjected to more than one culture.

In interpreting the significance of the comparatively large proportions of Negroes, other races, and foreign-born in our sample of murderers, due weight must be given to this culture conflict, though it must not be overemphasized. A culture conflict also handicapped some prisoners, namely those with foreign-born parents, who are included among the native-born in our statistical analysis. As earlier studies have shown, children who experience a conflict of loyalties between the culture of their parents and that of Americans, or between the culture of the community in which they were reared and that of the community into which they later move, may suffer an emotional disturbance which, unless it is resolved early in life, tends to foster association with undesirable characters and to produce anti-social behavior. The cases previously described in detail illustrate some of its consequences, and many others might be cited.

AGE AT LEAVING SCHOOL

Our statistical analysis (Table 29) shows that 25.2 per cent of the murderers either did not attend school at all or left before the age of eleven. This proportion is significantly higher than that for the property offenders. The murderers also left school at a significantly earlier age than did their brothers. See Table 47. Such a person has a harder time learning the pattern of reaction approved by society than one who has continued in school, where he has had contact with other pupils and with the teacher. This factor is probably highly intercorrelated with others, such as low I. Q., mental conflict, and other psychopathic conditions more closely related to anti-social conduct, and therefore will not be further illustrated from the cases.

Table 30 reveals that the distribution with respect to age at time of imprisonment was decidedly different from that of the Wisconsin male population fifteen years of age and over. The proportion of murderers in the age group 20–24 was decidedly different from that of the sex offenders, in age group 30–34 quite different from that of both the sex offenders and the property offenders, and in age group 35–44 quite different from that of the sex offenders.

This difference between the age distribution of the murderers and that of the Wisconsin male population fifteen years of age and over is in part a

reflection of a similar difference between all the prisoners in the sample and that of the Wisconsin male population. Of our total sample of offenders the greatest percentage falls in the age groups 20–24, 25–29, and 30–34. The low percentage in the age group 15–19 as compared with the Wisconsin male population is probably to be explained by the fact that youthful delinquents are not sent to prison. The high percentage of our prisoners who were from 20 to 34 years old upon entering prison accords with the findings of other studies in the United States. It is at these ages that young men of unstable make-up are more likely to have trouble in their domestic or business relationships. If they have not made a satisfactory social adjustment by that time, they tend to become upset over their failure to do so and to yield to anti-social influences. By association with others of a similar nature they develop the courage and energy necessary to commit a crime.

To explain the distinctive age distribution of the murderers is more difficult. While it is statistically significant, it is hard to interpret, and is therefore suspect. It would appear, however, that the high percentage of murderers in the age group 25–29 is due to the fact that they have been conditioned by their emotional instability, their relatively low intellectual level, and their early experiences to resort to undeliberate, violent action when faced with the crises that come to people in these years. The high percentage of murderers between the ages of 35 and 44 is probably attributable in large part to the difficulties of middle-aged men with their spouses. Age is not per se a causative factor; it merely happens to be intercorrelated with certain physical, mental, and social factors that determine conduct.

OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY

Table 34 shows that of the three classes of criminals the murderers included the greatest percentage whose average length of time on their jobs was less than three months. When occupational mobility is accompanied by economic advancement, it is of course merely the result of a desire to get ahead. Often, however, it is born of a restless, unstable temperament which may manifest itself in other irregularities of social conduct. Such instability of employment is in turn both effect and cause. On the one hand it may be the effect of an unstable nature not yet geared to the responsibilities of social life, and on the other it operates to prevent the establishment of those ties that help so much to bestow social status. Occupational mobility seems to be rather closely correlated with anti-social conduct, as is illustrated by the cases described below.

One of the murderers was born in Mississippi of working people on both sides. When he was two years old, his father, a railway engineer, was killed in a wreck, and his mother moved to Arkansas to be near a brother. There he went to school, working concurrently as a delivery boy. His spare time he spent in solitary play. Three years later his mother moved to Kentucky. When she became ill, he quit school and worked in a tobacco factory for four years and later in the railroad shops, although he was under legal age for such work. Physically he had the appearance of a grown man. After a short time in the shop, he and a pal went to Chicago for seven months, then to New York and several other Eastern cities. Finally he left his chum and went to Milwaukee, where he got a job and shortly thereafter was married to the girl with whom he had been in love in Kentucky. She was the type of person against whom his mother had often warned him, and proved to be unfaithful to him. He met the situation with his customary lack of deliberation and killed her.

Another case which illustrates the association of occupational mobility with murder is that of the son of Czechoslovakian immigrants. The father was bent on dominating the family, especially the children, and succeeded in controlling some of them but not the prisoner. In him the situation produced an instability of which his occupational history is a manifestation. Except for one job which he held for six years it is the story of one short-time job after another. At nineteen he left home and went to Chicago, where he worked in a garage. After two years of sporadic employment and loafing he came home broke. Shortly thereafter he returned to Chicago, then came home once more, where he loafed and worked at odd jobs, most of the time trying to get money by dishonest and violent methods. He had a reputation for petty stealing and is suspected of having murdered several persons for their money. He was finally convicted of killing a man in the course of robbing him.

The family of another murderer was a harmonious and fairly prosperous one, but the father was a wilful and headstrong person who dominated the mother, although he left much of the family discipline to her. Even in childhood this boy, also wilful and headstrong, was a problem; evidently he strongly resented the paternal domination. His work history is a succession of different jobs and occupations. He was farm laborer, cowboy, and casual laborer between the age of fifteen, when he ran away from home, and twenty-two, when he returned and married. Then followed his desertion of his wife, divorce, and marriage to a childhood friend. Presently he became a barber, but soon gave that up, visited Nebraska for a short time, and returned home to enter the dray business with his brother. Presently he persuaded his brother to sell this business and buy a pool hall with him, a venture that lasted about two years, after which he took up his father's trade of painting and general carpentering. Yielding to the persuasion of an ex-convict he attempted to rob an old hermit reputed to have a great deal of money. During the robbery he killed his victim and was sent to prison for life. As in many of the other cases, occupational mobility was merely one manifestation of a generally unstable, unsettled nature.

The last case to be cited in this connection is another story of occupational

instability. Among the factors that have a bearing on the ultimate crime are parental domination of the children, jealousy between the prisoner and his older brother, pathological lying and pilfering from earliest childhood, and the social isolation he suffered because of the stupid and queer demeanor that was the product of his low I. Q. (48).

His work record is very uneven. Because of his inveterate lying and pilfering he could hold no job for long. After working on a farm for a short time, he left the community under suspicion of having fired a barn. He bought a forty-acre lot and built a small one-room shack, in which he lived for only a short time. He took a job in a sawmill but was discharged for pilfering. In this case again occupational instability was accompanied by lack of social adjustment in almost every other respect.

Occupational instability is only a symptom of emotional instability generated by social influences earlier in life. But the habit of fleeing from a situation in turn aggravates it. Instead of solving the problem of the person at war with himself, it merely lessens the possibility of coming to grips with the real difficulty.

THE BEARING OF OCCUPATION

Table 35 shows that a much larger proportion of the murderers and of the sex offenders than of the property offenders were unskilled workers. This is not surprising in view of the large proportions who had a poor education, who had gone to work at an early age, who were foreign-born, and who had a low intelligence. Many such cases have already been cited in other connections. A few selected more or less at random from the total gtoup will present a concrete picture of the development of some of these unskilled workers.

One of these was a man born in northern Italy to a farmer and his wife, the third child of seven. When he was nine or ten, the family moved to France, where a year or so later his father died. He became a laborer in a shipbuilding yard and soon lost contact with the rest of the family. He says that his father was a severe man who enforced obedience in the children by corporal punishment, but that his mother was kindly and indulgent.

When he was twenty he was drafted into the Italian army. After serving for a couple of months, he deserted and returned to France, where he worked as a casual farm laborer. At the age of twenty-seven he married and returned to Italy. Later he emigrated to America with his family and became a mine worker in Michigan. He worked in the mines for about twenty years, throughout which time he bore a good reputation as an unskilled laborer, despite his low I.Q. (45). Although he had been laid off whenever work was slack, he had managed to buy his own home and to save three or four thousand dollars.

He was, however, a heavy drinker and was very mean when intoxicated.

When his wife died he was deprived of a stabilizing influence and began to get into trouble with his neighbors over their women folk. As his daughter puts it, he became "girl crazy." He began to drink more heavily and several times got into minor scrapes in saloons. In one of these he met a prostitute, to whom he became attached. She occasionally lived with him, and frequently entertained her customers in his home. Finally she married him, probably for his money. She treated him so badly that many of the neighbors ridiculed him for putting up with her. Often he had bad fits of temper, especially when he had been drinking.

Shortly after this second marriage he and his wife, in company with an Italian friend, went to a neighbor's, where they got drunk. After they returned home something occurred to make him jealous of his friend, whom he ordered to leave the house. When his wife protested, he got a gun and shot his guest, then turned the gun on her and shot her twice, though not fatally.

Another case is that of an unskilled laborer with a quite different background. His family, of old American stock, lived in a midwestern state. His father was a millwright and blacksmith who earned a comfortable living for the family. His mother died when he was six, and his father soon remarried. The stepmother treated the children well, but she too died and the father was married a third time, this time to a woman who was severe with the children and whom our subject came to hate so much that he left home. Shortly thereafter his father obtained a divorce.

It is evident that this prisoner was jealous of his brother, who had been the father's favorite and had secured a better education than the rest of the children. He had an I.Q. of 101, hence low intelligence was not a factor. He entered school at six and continued until he was thirteen, at which time he was in the seventh grade. For some reason, however, he was expelled from school. Thereafter he worked successively for a meat market, in a grocery store, and in his father's blacksmith shop, where he learned the trade, though he never followed it. Following a quarrel with his father he took a trip through the Middle West. Upon his return to Wisconsin he worked as a truck driver for about a year, then spent two or three years doing odd jobs, and thereafter returned once more to the trucking job.

At this time he met, and subsequently married, a divorced woman whose parents lived in the same city as he. After their marriage she continued to work as a stenographer, dietician, and practical nurse. The marriage was not a happy one; his wife's parents interfered constantly, and he spent virtually every evening in the pool hall. Before long he deserted his wife and left the state to join his father in a second-hand automobile business. Nine months later, having quarreled again with his father, he came back to Wisconsin, where on the night after his return he committed the crime for which he was imprisoned. With three companions he went into a speakeasy

to rob the slot machine, and when the proprietor reached for his gun, shot and killed him.

This is a picture of an unstable childhood, jealousy of sibs, an irritable and quick-tempered nature, and occupational instability—all growing out of a personality poorly adjusted to the demands of social life.

The bearing of occupation on criminal conduct is of course indirect. The more immediate factors are the associates a man has, the attitudes and ideals he imbibes from them. On the other hand, a man's personality traits may determine the occupation he chooses. While it is clear that the economic motive was the least important of the factors precipitating the murders, it is probably true that the pattern of conduct that made the crime possible was engendered to a considerable extent by the economic environment of the murderer's childhood and youth.

MARITAL STATUS AND RELATIONSHIPS

Table 37 shows that the murderers, like the other prisoners, included larger proportions of single and divorced men than did the Wisconsin adult male population, and that more of them than of the property offenders or of the Wisconsin adult male population were widowers. Age distribution probably accounts for some of these differences.

Table 43 indicates no significant differences between the different classes of offenders on the score of domestic harmony or disharmony. Tables 39–42, dealing with the premarital background of husband and wife respectively, reveal only one significant difference between the several classes of offenders: the murderers and property offenders differed from their wives in education more than did the sex offenders. Disharmony between the murderer and his wife, it appears, is not much more pronounced than between married people in free society. Dickinson and Beam, in *A Thousand Marriages* (Baltimore, 1931), have shown that of a thousand couples who came to them for advice, about 50 per cent had inharmonious relations, as compared with 58 per cent of the married murderers in our study. The fact that about one out of five of the murderers killed his own wife seems to indicate, therefore, that marital disharmony is a potential cause of murder only in the case of persons whose emotional stability is very much below that of the general population.

The large number of the murderers who are emotionally unstable is partially indicated by the proportion who were either insane at the time they committed the murder or were sent to the Central State Hospital after being sentenced.

A concrete picture of the personalities of some of these murderers, of the process by which these personalities were developed, and of their reaction in a domestic crisis may be obtained from some of the case histories.

The first we shall cite is one of a group of Kentuckians who some years

ago moved to northern Wisconsin, where many of whom have given trouble to local officials. His I. Q. is low (74), and he has had very little schooling; yet he writes interestingly of his life, albeit with bad spelling and poor grammar. Probably his native capacity is greater than his I. Q. indicates. He was born into a farm family of good character and remained on the farm until he was grown. Before his father's death he joined a friend who had gone to Wisconsin, then returned to Kentucky for a year or two, worked on the farm for a time, and then went to Covington, where a sister lived. There he took to drinking and associating with loose women. His father died, the mother went to live with a brother, and he returned to Wisconsin. Presently he became enamoured of the daughter of the proprietor of the hotel at which he stayed, a woman who, he says, was married to a drunken good-for-nothing. She obtained a divorce and married the prisoner. Rumor had it that she was rather free with other men, arousing her husband's jealousy, and that he often quarreled with her and sometimes beat her. It was said that she had sent for the man her husband murdered, saying she needed his protection. The prisoner claims that he acted in self-defense, and some of the community believe him. Others recall that he was quarrelsome when drunk, still others that his wife was involved with the man he killed. It is certain that there was friction between husband and wife which had a bearing on the murder. Whatever the facts, our subject was apparently very fond of his wife and jealous of her.

The next case illustrates another way in which domestic disharmony may play a part. The grandparents of this murderer had migrated to the United States from Germany. On both sides the ancestors seem to have been sound, long-lived, and well-to-do. His I. Q. was so low (53) that at the age of fifteen he had reached only the third grade. He remembers his teachers and his father as cruel and mean persons, his mother as sympathetic and affectionate. He recalls very few happy incidents in his childhood. He was worked hard from an early age, and his family, he thinks, played no constructive part in his development. Notwithstanding the handicap of a low mentality, he was interested in mechanics and had done fairly well as a blacksmith and fireman.

At sixteen he left home. He worked on a railroad for six years, during which time all his brothers also left home. His father persuaded him to return and help on the farm, but he found the work distasteful after his experience on the railroad. He soon left for Milwaukee, where he was employed by a bridge company as riveter, blacksmith, and fireman, with three intermissions.

His attitude toward women had been retiring and bashful, but at twenty-four he met and courted a minister's daughter. He now dwells at length on a message he received from God not to marry her, but at the time he gave it only a passing thought. From the beginning his married life was a disap-

pointment. He pictures himself as a long-suffering man mated to an unfaithful shrew. All his difficulties—trouble with neighbors and with the truant officer, arrests for drunkenness, her suit for divorce—he attributes to his wife's temper, to her desire to get him out of the way so as to have a clear field for other lovers, and to her greed for money. He feels that the neighbors picked on him and that his wife's men friends derided him. His present sentence is due in part, he believes, to the fact that he had voiced his dissatisfaction with the way in which the judge's brother had handled his divorce case, and to the lies his wife told lawyers and judge in order to get him into the house of correction for drunkenness. He claims that his wife "allowed a man to fool around with his sixteen year old daughter." When he objected his wife nagged "the hell out of" him. Enemies told lies to his wife. When a fortune-teller predicted that he would soon die, she became interested in other men. This is undoubtedly the case of a paranoic. A similar mysticism also characterized his father, who frequently resorted to fortune-tellers for guidance in business affairs.

A check with neighbors and relatives indicates that his wife, who did not understand him, is partly responsible. He was faithful to her and has no history of promiscuity, either as a boy or as a man. But he felt his inferiority and it seems probable that he fell far below her expectations. The crisis came when she determined to get a divorce, as she had threatened to do once before. The court ordered him to stay away from home, and his wife was given charge of the children. He was very fond of them and got along with them better than with adults. One night when he went to see them after drinking heavily, a boy friend of his daughter and a nephew drove him away. He came back with a gun, killed both these young men, and then attempted to commit suicide.

This case is a good illustration of what may happen to a man of low intelligence who does not have the guidance of some stronger understanding person. Had his wife been more sympathetic, she might have forestalled this tragedy, although he might have been difficult to guide because of his early conditioning.

That emotional instability may lead to violence in cases of domestic disharmony even when the I. Q. is high is illustrated by two other cases.

The first is the case of a prisoner who murdered a paramour's husband. The murdered man was of a fluctuating temperament, sometimes violent and cruel and at other times kindly. Repeatedly he beat his children and his wife, who was no paragon of virtue, and sometimes was abusive to the patrons of his restaurant. In the community many were of the opinion that the prisoner was having an affair with the wife of his victim. In any case, she hired him to kill her husband, agreeing to pay him two thousand dollars. One evening the two men went out in a car to get some chickens for the restaurant, and on the trip our prisoner shot the husband three times.

The prisoner himself was born into a very disharmonious family with a foreign culture. His father was a hard drinker, a poor provider, a casual deserter of the family, and a tyrannical patriarch. The boy received no moral instruction and gradually was taught to steal. As the favorite of his hard-working and long-suffering mother and as the only son, he bore the brunt of his father's harshness. His school career was checkered. He often played truant, associated with a gang of bad boys, and engaged in fighting, stealing, breaking windows, and other destruction of property. Finally, like some of the others, he was sent to the Industrial School when he was about eleven, placed on parole, which he violated, and was sent to Green Bay. These experiences bred in him a mean and stubborn nature. He enjoyed teasing his mother and sisters, and was utterly lacking in respect for his family and for society in general. When he began earning money he spent it on himself instead of contributing to the family budget. The very fact that after his return from Green Bay he changed his name from a Polish to a Scandinavian one is significant. His conceit, his cruelty, and his selfishness probably represent a reaction against his father's brutality and an attempt to compensate for the sense of inferiority he had acquired in the home and at school. The picture includes three disorganized families: the parental one, his own, and that of the man he murdered.

The next case is that of a man who pleaded guilty to killing his wife. Much family difficulty had preceded the tragedy.

Born on a northern Wisconsin farm of German parents, the fourth child of six and the only boy, he spent a rather isolated childhood without playmates. He was his mother's favorite, and his father very early found it hard to control him. It is probable that the boy had developed a mother fixation. He had a low I. Q. (68) and disliked school, although he managed to reach the sixth grade by the age of fifteen. More to his liking were solitary recreations. He was a stubborn child and from a very early age displayed a quick temper and uncontrolled emotions. The entire family except his father let him have his way. As an adult he was kindly when not angry or drunk, and was said to be so tender-hearted toward animals that he found it hard to slaughter one; indeed, according to his neighbors and relatives, he could not go hunting until he had imbibed a few drinks.

His work record is one of frequent shifts from one occupation to another, revealing a great temperamental restlessness. For a time he traveled with a circus. He married the only girl with whom he had ever kept company, and settled down on the home farm, but failed as a farmer. His mother had died when he was twenty-two, his father when he was thirty. After that he began to drink heavily, drifted into bad company, and when drunk was irritable and dangerous. Gradually he developed ideas of persecution. Several times he assaulted people he thought were making fun of him.

Almost from the start his married life was an unhappy one, though he

loved his children. He suspected his wife, who was pregnant when they married, of having been promiscuous. He began to go out on wild parties himself, and soon the marital relationship became very strained. He was constantly at odds with his wife, who often refused to speak to him for days at a time. His boss in the creamery where he was a buttermaker often talked with him about his family situation, urging him to stop drinking and to treat his wife better. Twice he was induced to go to the Soldiers' Hospital to take the cure for alcoholism, but each time he stayed only a short time and came home uncured.

The family situation gradually became worse. Finally, in a moment when he was crazed with drink, he shot his wife, while she pleaded for mercy, and his two oldest children. One of the smaller ones crawled out of sight and another ran from the house. He called a neighbor and forced him at the point of a gun to drink with him, help pile up the dead bodies, and then call the priest, who arrived at the same moment as another neighbor. When they entered the house and viewed the situation, they left hurriedly in different directions, whereupon the killer said to the first neighbor, "Drink up; we're going to have one hell of a good time tonight. We'll build a stack of bodies eight feet high and then I'll put you on top and in the morning I go." Finally, realizing what action his neighbors would probably take, he started out across the field to lie in wait for the sheriff. In his drunken stupor he stumbled over a furrow, hit his head and lay for some time unconscious, and finally went back to the house, where he was easily taken by the officer. When interviewed at the prison he was very remorseful and was unable to talk without a great show of emotion. "I don't know why I done it," he said. "You know a man's crazy that does a thing like that. I loved them kids. It is them I worried about. I have been in the insane asylum twice for drinking. Why the hell didn't they let me stay?"

In this case early conditioning in the family produced a stubborn resistance to authority; an unstable adolescence, manifest in an irregular work record and extensive wandering; a career of drinking, which possibly was begun as an escape from a sense of inferiority; and a domestic situation with which an unstable nature could not cope.

PREVIOUS ARRESTS

Table 44 shows that a larger percentage of the murderers than of the two other classes of offenders had not been arrested before (murderers 46.7 per cent; sex offenders 38.1 per cent; property offenders 8.8 per cent). The difference between the murderers and the property offenders is too significant to attribute to chance. It means that previous arrest was not one of the primary factors in the murderers' demoralization, and that other factors must be invoked to explain the conduct of half of them.

Among the murderers who had previously been arrested and incarcerated

was one who had been sent to the Industrial School for Boys for theft and vandalism, sentenced to four months in the county penitentiary at Rochester, New York, for larceny, and to ten years in the Wisconsin State Prison for burglary. Another had been arrested three times, though in each instance he had been released: in Green Bay on suspicion; in Helena, Montana, for vagrancy; and at Cushing, Minnesota, for drunkenness. A third had been arrested five times in five or six years, usually on a liquor charge. A fourth had been arrested on a narcotic charge and sentenced to six months in the Milwaukee House of Correction. Another had been twice court-martialed while in the navy. One lifer had been dishonorably discharged from the army for desertion, sentenced to three years in the Wisconsin State Reformatory for burglary, twice arrested for assault and battery, and once for carrying concealed weapons. Still another had once been sent to the Milwaukee House of Correction for drunkenness. One was fined twenty-five dollars and costs for assault and battery in Illinois, fined a second time for assault and battery, and a third time for drunkenness. One had been arrested in Kentucky for breaking windows and fined in Milwaukee for disorderly conduct.

The misdemeanors and felonies which brought these men into conflict with the law were born of an emotional instability which ultimately led to violence. They support the hypothesis, as do other phases of the study, that a large percentage of the murderers were by nature and training emotionally maladjusted.

MENTAL DISEASE

As already indicated, a considerable percentage of the murderers were in the custody of the Central Hospital for the Insane, the institution that cares for those who have committed what would legally be crimes had they been responsible for their actions. The lifers include a larger proportion of mental cases than do the two other classes, most of them being afflicted with dementia praecox and paranoid tendencies. These are the men in whom the sense of lost status is so strong that they have delusions of persecution and react violently against those they believe to have wronged them. One became insane after he was committed to the prison, the diagnosis being dementia praecox, paranoid type, and his brother, also a lifer, was sent to the Northern Hospital as insane for about a year. These two brothers and their mother, it appears, had all entertained certain fixed ideas which were premonitory of mental derangement and emotional instability—for example, that the war between Germany and the United States was merely a ruse whereby the Pope would get control of this country.

Among the paranoiac prisoners was one who had been so dominated by the delusion that his wife, her parents, and his own parents were conspiring against him to ruin his financial career that he finally killed his wife, whom

he regarded as most immediately responsible for his difficulties.

Still another wife-murderer, a victim of dementia praecox, paranoid type, had long suffered from delusions. At the time of his marriage—which had been promoted by his match-making landlady—he wanted to have a wedding picture taken, but the girl objected without giving a reason. A few weeks later he was arrested at his place of work on a warrant signed by his wife, charging him with beating her. He was fined fourteen dollars and costs. From that time on his domestic life was most unhappy. He thought she acted too friendly toward strange men, but when he talked with her about it, she became angry. Finally she left him to live with friends, and succeeded in getting the divorce which she had sought twice before. Early one morning, after drinking virtually all night, he decided to see her and urge her to return to him. When he met her in front of the house, she threatened to have him arrested if he did not let her alone. He pulled out a hunting knife and stabbed her twice in the throat. Here all the circumstances indicate that he had been suffering from delusions throughout his entire married life.

Another of the murderers, who is mentally deficient, is psychotic. He had been convicted four times of burglary. He committed the murder for which he was in prison during a fight with another man who, like himself, was drunk. After entering the prison he began to have delusions of persecution. He was obsessed with the idea that the captain of the guards had it in for him because he had reported the cruel treatment he was receiving from prison employees. He finally became so disoriented that he had to be sent to the institution for the criminal insane.

The prevailing form of insanity among these cases is dementia praecox, either of the hebephrenic or of the paranoid type. Other forms are paranoia, manic-depressive psychosis, senile psychosis, psychosis with psychopathic personality, alcoholic psychosis, mental deficiency with psychosis, and psychopathic personality without psychosis.

A number of the other prisoners show signs of emotional disturbance which, while they may not be serious enough to warrant commitment to an institution for the criminal insane, are indicative of the instability which under stress may result in violence.

Case Histories Illustrating Differences between the Murderers and Their Brothers

The case histories cited thus far illustrate the traits that differentiate the murderer from one or both of the other classes of offenders or from the general population. In the Appendix are a number of tables that show how the prisoners differed from their brothers. These differences are illustrated by the case histories cited below.

AGE AT LEAVING SCHOOL

Table 47 shows that a larger percentage of the murderers than of their brothers left school before the age of fourteen.

The story of one of these illustrates what an unfortunate effect premature termination of schooling may have. His family, of old American stock, lived in a small Indiana town. He himself is the third of six children. He evinces some jealousy of his oldest brother, who was the favorite at home and obtained a better education than the other children. The prisoner started to school when he was six and continued until he was thirteen, when he was expelled. He then went to work, first as a delivery boy in a meat market and later in a grocery store. The brother continued longer in school, made a better adjustment than the prisoner, and helped to support his family.

Another of the murderers left school after finishing the fifth grade, whereas his brother finished the eighth grade, learned a trade, and has remained steadily employed at one place for sixteen years. The early discontinuance of school, though it was only one of several circumstances unfavorable to the development of a socially well-integrated personality, was an important one in that it resulted in bad associations and the development of habits inimical to a steady life.

Another of our prisoners, also born into an American family, had reached only the fourth grade at the age of fourteen. He had an I. Q. of 73. His brother, on the other hand, attended high school for three years and would have gone further had he not been obliged to go to work. As a baby the prisoner had had infantile paralysis, which left him slow of speech. His schoolmates teased him about his slow progress, making him shy and reserved, and probably quite ready to stop school at an early age. In this instance the abbreviated schooling was probably only an index of a general incapacity which had an important bearing on his conduct.

Still another prisoner was born in this country of a Norwegian father and German mother. He left school at twelve, when he was in the fourth grade. His brother finished the eighth grade at the age of fifteen and wished to go to high school. In view of the fact that his father had mental trouble, being subject to fears and very excitable, it may be that the prisoner's short school life was the result rather than the cause of his unstable nature. He was sent to the institution for the criminal insane after he had killed his wife's sister and a male friend.

The last case to be cited is that of a prisoner born into a Kentucky family which migrated to northern Wisconsin. He started to school when he was seven, but attended only part time during the winter for three or four years. He was not interested, and his father did not believe in much schooling.

Furthermore, he was less intelligent than his siblings and unprepossessing in appearance, hence was often ridiculed by other children when he was young and later by adults. Apparently the fact that he had less schooling than his brother is attributable solely to his lower intelligence. It was only one of the results of his lack of capacity to adapt himself to social relationships.

The early age at which these prisoners left school was only indirectly a factor in their later maladjustment. Sometimes, but not always, it meant that they went to work earlier than their brothers; sometimes it merely indicates that their physical and mental capacity was inferior to the brothers'; sometimes it indicates an early emotional disturbance which the brother did not experience.

FAVORITISM

Tables 49 and 50 show that some prisoners were "pets" of the family, spoiled by lack of proper discipline, and that a significantly larger proportion of the prisoners than of the brothers were mothers' favorites and expressed greater appreciation of their mothers.

One of these is a man who is the eldest of the four children of a German couple. At the age of twenty-six or twenty-eight he married a woman with whom he never got on, but had nine children by her. He bullied her all their married life, mistreated the children, and finally wound up by hanging her.

This case might perhaps be explained by the Freudian hypothesis of early fixation upon the mother with the consequent carry-over of the mother image as a measure of all women, especially the wife. There was no jealousy between him and his brother; in fact, his brother thinks the prisoner was not too much to blame.

A second illustration is the case of a prisoner who was born in Wisconsin of German parentage. The family lived in a German community, and German was spoken in the home. The prisoner was the fifth son in a family of five boys and a girl. He was his mother's favorite child, and it appears that his father, too, gave him special privileges. He married at nineteen and lived happily with his wife and five children. He ruled his wife and children, however, with an iron hand, perhaps according to the German concept of family control. After his first wife died, he married a young Norwegian woman who refused to meet his demand for absolute obedience. All sorts of difficulties followed. She began to go out secretly with other men, arousing her husband's suspicions and making him very jealous. On several occasions she deserted him for other men, but returned to her husband when they tired of her. One day she came back with a man in an automobile, waved at her husband, tantalized him, and finally returned without her companion for some of her clothes. Her husband took her and her clothes in his car and on the way to town killed her with an automobile hammer and then attempted suicide. His brother, four years older, is more intelligent and has never had to meet a similar crisis in his domestic relationships.

The next case shows the consequences of favoritism in a family. The prisoner, born in England into a middle-class working family, was next to the youngest of five boys and a girl. As the youngest boy he was favored and spoiled by over-indulgence. He left school at thirteen, and the next year went to work in London. He had a sweetheart, but decided he was not in a financial position to marry, and instead emigrated to Canada and later to the United States. While he was working in Milwaukee, he was joined by his married brother, who brought his family over from England. He bought furniture to enable the newcomers to set up housekeeping, and boarded with his relatives until he quarreled with his sister-in-law. He had become a rather heavy drinker before he left England, and he was drunk when he attempted to remove the furniture from the house. His brother called a policeman, whom the prisoner shot when he arrested him, after which he tried to shoot his brother and sister-in-law.

The differences between the backgrounds of this man and his brother are many. They received different treatment during childhood, and this is important in its bearing on the dissimilarities in their occupational history, drinking habits, and marital condition.

There are others in our sample who considered themselves mother-favorites, and some of these were so considered by others. In many of these cases the trouble was not mother-fixation in the Freudian sense, but a preference for the mother because she babied him, perhaps because of illness, the father's unusual strictness, or mental incompetence, or perhaps merely because he was the youngest child.

From the case histories it appears that mother-favoritism and a prisoner's belief that he was the favorite are simply indications that much more important factors were producing in him a feeling of inferiority, emotional disturbances, and often an anti-social attitude. The prisoner's assertion that he was the favorite, whether true or not, indicates that he had become self-centered in trying to compensate for the feeling of rejection born of his struggle for status.

MARITAL STATUS

Table 55 shows that a significantly smaller proportion of the murderers than of their brothers were married (59.3 and 77.8 per cent respectively) and Table 56 that a larger proportion of the married prisoners than of the married brothers were divorced (25 and 0 per cent respectively).

One reason for this difference between the prisoner and his brother is illustrated by the following case. The brother, who is the elder by ten years, had not had much contact with the prisoner, though he had affection for him. The prisoner had had infantile paralysis when he was a year old, which

had left him very slow of speech, backward in school, and shy and reserved. He became the butt of the other children's teasing, and as compensation his mother centered her affection on him. His crime was the result of a love affair. When he became engaged, the girl's mother created trouble and refused to sanction the marriage. Under intense emotional excitement he killed the girl and then tried to kill himself. Both he and his brother are highly emotional, but whereas the prisoner was physically handicapped and retarded in his social development, his brother was normal in both these respects.

Another case suggests how failure to marry may deprive a man of an important stabilizing influence. The prisoner and his brother, both men of low intelligence, inferior personality, and little education, came from a poor family living in a rough community. They worked together on the parental farm and were closely associated most of the time before the prisoner's arrest. The brother, however, married, whereas the prisoner did not. The latter became a heavy drinker, frequented taverns, and was sexually promiscuous. He lived an irregular life in general and ultimately killed a woman with whom he was having illicit relations. The more stable personality of the brother may undoubtedly be ascribed in part to his marriage.

A second case that illustrates how a single life may foster instability is that of the prisoner who "batched" it on a farm he owned. The brother was married and well settled, and his greater emotional stability may perhaps be ascribed partly to this fact and his normal sex life. The prisoner was deprived of these influences and was apparently unattractive to women, for they would have nothing to do with him. In the face of this situation he made advances to the niece of his sister-in-law. The latter interfered, so infuriating him that he killed her.

Difference in domestic status throws light also on the dissimilar conduct of another prisoner and his brother. The latter was happily married and for a time shared his home with the prisoner. Finally the family could no longer tolerate the prisoner's conduct, which was often so disagreeable and threatening as to frighten his sister-in-law, and he moved to other lodgings. When his brother and sister-in-law refused to permit their daughters to take supper with him in his room, he became enraged and visited them to make a protest. He was bluntly reminded that the girls did not belong to him, whereupon he started a row. His brother called a policeman, who ordered him to leave the house. The prisoner, who had been drinking, pulled a revolver and killed the officer, and then shot at the two girls and their parents, but fortunately missed them all.

It is not clear whether his anger was aroused solely by the denial of his request or whether deeper emotional factors were operative. For more than a year he had lived in the home of his sister-in-law and her two daughters, all of whom were attractive. It is quite possible that some deep urge within

him had been balked, and that when his inhibitions had been released by drink he attacked those who frustrated him in his desire to fulfill them.

These and similar cases reveal what emotional disturbances may be engendered by frustration of the sex impulse, which is very deeply ingrained in most persons. Society has provided the family as the normal relationship for the satisfaction of this "biological imperative." Associated with the family are various other values—the possibility of constant affection, little attentions by the spouse, opportunities for the expression of kindliness, self-sacrifice, and love of children, the social esteem of one's neighbors and friends, and social position. When the bachelor secures sexual satisfaction outside of marriage, he loses some or all of these other values. No other biological impulse is so closely connected with emotional stability or instability. Frustration affects a person's psychological and often physiological reactions; jealousy and anger often develop; hatred may rise to a high pitch; social obligations are forgotten. Often the whole being is so fundamentally disturbed that reason is choked and fury is concentrated upon those who appear to be responsible for the frustration.

The emotional insecurity resulting from frustration of the sex impulse is of course not limited to the unmarried. Divorce and separation are the evidences of a fundamental lack of harmony between man and wife (see Table 57). Moreover, the divorced or separated person is likely to feel the deprivation more acutely than the single person because he has usually tasted the satisfactions of married life. Often he becomes embittered when they are denied him.

BRIEF SUMMARIES OF OTHER CASES

To present a complete picture of the various differences in personality and background between the prisoners and their brothers, summaries are added of a few more cases selected at random. Each of these brief catalogs shows how different experiences eventuated in strikingly different conduct. The letter *P* stands for the prisoner, *B* for the brother.

No. 52 and His Brother[3]

1. *B* has always been in good physical health. *P* when he was young had a serious fall which left him unstable and subject to fits and passionate anger when aroused.
2. *B* was stable occupationally; he had worked forty-two years for a single concern. *P* never held a job for any length of time and was out of work when he committed his first burglary.
3. *B* was careful with his money; *P* spent it as it came, quite foolishly.
4. *B* drank moderately, never got drunk; *P* drank heavily and was drunk at the time of most of his arrests.
5. *B* had a respected position in a group of high-type friends; *P* associated with loafers, saloon hounds, and bums.

[3] The numbers are those assigned to the case histories in the author's file.

6. *B* had never been arrested and has a healthy attitude toward authority; *P* spent two terms in the House of Correction and is serving his third stretch at Waupun. He has been at odds with the law for many years.

7. *B* was happily married and had a satisfactory home life; *P*'s wife was constantly giving her affections to another man. She left her husband after nine years when she found her former sweetheart again. The two children went with her.

8. *B* always had work and had faced few dangerous crises. *P* was constantly facing a crisis because of his temper and lack of money. The incident which led to murder was an argument with an Irishman over Germany's part in World War I. *P*, enraged when he was berated for taking Germany's part, hit the man with a stone and caused his death. Both men were drunk.

No. 95 and His Brother

1. *B* was one of the youngest in the family, *P* the oldest.
2. *B* was a full son, *P* an illegitimate stepson.
3. *B* did not know his father well. *P* had numerous difficulties with the father and finally left home because of him.
4. *B* had always had good health. *P* had had numerous diseases and had never been in very good health.
5. *B* was well-balanced emotionally. *P* had delusions and suspicions of persecution, and had so deteriorated mentally that he was transferred to the Central State Hospital after his commitment to the prison.
6. *B* married happily; *P* was sexually promiscuous, and he had married only in order to have someone cook for him.
7. *B* had steady employment with one concern for about twenty years. *P* moved about a great deal and did not last long at any one place.
8. *B* stayed at home until his mother died; *P* left home early.
9. *B* did not use liquor at any time. *P* was drunk at the time of the crime.

No. 32 and His Brother

1. *B* had better mental and physical health than *P*, who had been overworked in the navy during eighteen months service and at the time of the crime had just recovered from a nervous breakdown caused by worry and fatigue.
2. *B* was a bit stubborn, introvert, unforgiving; *P* was impulsive, extremely extrovert, forgiving easily after a quarrel.
3. *B* was more methodical and plodding, although very intelligent. *P* was quick, witty, but not master of his thoughts, not a student nor creative thinker.
4. *B* was aloof with women. *P* was a ladies' man, and women have caused him endless grief, a charge of adultery, and an open break with his wife because of a college graduate who was pursuing him. This last episode resulted in the crime for which he was imprisoned.
5. *B* continued his education until he got his Ph.D. degree. *P* quit just after starting college because he did not like it, and got married.
6. *B* had been employed regularly after leaving college and had attained a very influential position. *P* held five jobs in four and a half years and was not making enough to keep his family together.
7. *B* used no liquor; *P* was addicted to wine and women and got into trouble.
8. *B* married and lived a normal wedded life without family interference. *P*'s grief started when he married. His wife was a fine woman, but she was young and a Catholic. She believed sexual intercourse permissible for procreation only and had scruples against intercourse during pregnancy and against the use of contraceptives. Her parents were dissatisfied with *P*'s religion and with his ability as a breadwinner, and would allow him to see his wife at their home only at limited intervals.
9. *B* had no criminal record; *P* had been arrested twice previously.
10. *B* served in the army during World War I and advanced to the rank of second lieutenant; *P* served in the navy but was too young to be advanced.
11. *B* limited his musical studies to appreciation; *P*, a talented musician, played the violin beautifully and sang well.
12. *B* had a charming personality and preferred people of his own age; *P* had a precocious personality, had always preferred people years older than himself, was always trying to outshine them.

No. 43 and His Brother

1. *B* was not sickly until after he had been gassed in World War I. *P* had all the children's diseases and was especially susceptible to colds and "blood poison."
2. *B* was mentally well. *P* became insane and had been suffering from delusions of persecution for about seven years before the crime.
3. *B* was congenial at home. *P* was a problem child, had little respect for authority and was impossible to supervise.
4. *B* finished high school and wished to go to college; *P* played hooky and quit after the eighth grade because "they couldn't teach me anything more."
5. *B*, comparatively stable, had spent most of his life in Chicago and in a small Wisconsin town. *P* had bummed about since before World War I and would never stay at home or on a job after he had earned enough to leave.
6. *B*'s friends were of a fine type. *P* enjoyed association with bums, loafers, and hoboes. "I found them intelligent, gentlemanly, and greatly to be preferred to people who live a more orderly life," he said.
7. *B* was single and is reported to be moral. *P* had been promiscuous sexually from the age of sixteen and at different times had cohabited with two women for long periods.
8. *B* did not use liquor. *P* drank himself to insanity and life imprisonment. He would drink anything with "fire" in it, and drunkenness was closely related to his cycles of depression.
9. *B* had a good reputation and a good record with the police. *P* had twice been charged with grand larceny and had been arrested on other charges before being convicted of murder.

No. 94 and His Brother

1. *B* was single; *P* was married and loved his wife and children.
2. *B* was incompetent. *P* was competent enough in business affairs, but had troubles of a different sort.
3. *B* had no worries and did not brood; anxiety and depression were *P*'s chief trouble.

No. 72 and His Brother

Only two years apart in age, these two brothers had been closely associated until about eighteen months before the murder. Of sixteen children in the family, nine were living. Family ties were strong, and the brothers were fond of each other. Their backgrounds (farm chores, school, and play) were similar during childhood and adolescence. In their teens both hired out and lived the typical life of farm laborers—hard work, relieved by country parties and dances.

The break between the two began when *P* was married in 1924. From that time on their experiences differed:

1. Within a year after his marriage *P* went to New York, became a bootlegger, associated with questionable companions, and drank excessively. *B* continued to work steadily, married, and settled down on the farm.

2. *P*'s wife craved excitement and was unfaithful to her husband. *B*'s wife was a faithful helpmate.

3. *P* was much disturbed by his wife's actions; *B* had no such crisis to meet.

The difference in their respective domestic situations explains their divergence in conduct.

No. 51 and His Brother

1. *B* was fairly even in temperament and fairly well balanced despite his experiences with *P*. The latter had always been somewhat peculiar, was easily hurt and insulted, was excessively introvert and easily angered.

2. *B* reported no favoritism on the part of his mother or father but congeniality with both. According to the brother, *P* was babied by his mother and spoiled when he was small. He liked his father none too well; called him "the old man."

3. *B* was happily married, *P* was single.

4. *B* had had the responsibility of dependent children; *P* had never had any responsibility except for himself, no home "except where I lay my hat."

5. *B* drank only moderately. *P* took to drink years ago, and was a demon when drunk.

6. *B* was sociable and had many friends. *P* was unsocial, lived by himself, and spent hours sitting and looking into space.

7. *B* reported no major crises except those with his brother. *P* says he found himself in a trap set by his brother and "when a person gets into a trap the first thing he usually does is to think of getting out of it the quickest way he can, even the instinct of animals teaches them to do that, and the first thing that flashed through my mind was that I had that gun on me and it would be found. I drew the gun from my pocket and shot the policeman in the side." This crisis came when his inhibitions were at their lowest.

No. 79 and His Brother

1. *B* got along satisfactorily at home. *P* fought with his mother.

2. *B* was a good provider. *P* sometimes allowed his children to go without enough to eat and to wear.

3. *B* was happily married. *P* and his wife were not congenial.

4. *B* had a sense of humor and was good-natured. *P* had fits of passion, anger, and temper; he would brood and become angry without provocation.

5. *B* was an extrovert. *P* had few friends, was a poor neighbor, and did not care what other people thought of him.

No. 82 and His Brother

1. *B* had more schooling than *P*.

2. *B* was happily married, whereas *P* was single.

3. *B*, although crosseyed and unprepossessing in appearance, was apparently normal in his social relations. *P* was slow of speech and queer, had difficulty in adjusting himself to adult personalities, preferred association with children, and was suspected of making improper advances to the niece of his brother's wife. He felt his inferiority and tried to compensate by making money.

4. *B* was emotionally stable, whereas *P* was timid, did not mix well with others, and held grudges.

5. *B* drank only moderately. *P*, a heavy drinker, was drunk at the time of the crime. His drinking was probably an escape from his feeling of inferiority and frustration.

Conclusion

Both the statistical analysis and the case histories show that our sample of men committed to the Wisconsin State Prison for murder differs from the samples committed for sex offenses and for property offenses. The differences are of a degree that cannot be attributed to chance in any substantial number of cases. In certain respects these prisoners also differ from the brothers with whom they were compared. Do these analyses reveal any factors important in the making of a murderer? May certain characteristics be developed in childhood that will make the adult more likely than others to commit murder? Does either the statistical analysis or the analysis of the case histories give grounds for predicting with any assurance that persons with a given background are dangerous to society?

In general both analyses leave one with the impression that the potential murderer, whether he is of high or of low intelligence, is one whose fundamental wishes have been frustrated at some period in his life. Many of the case histories illustrate the role of early emotional maladjustment, which under sufficient provocation leads to violent conduct.

Clearly, too, none of these murderers had been able to compensate for frustrations and rejections by socially approved modes of conduct. Some of their brothers, on the other hand, when faced with similar disappointments, had found compensations which reduced the emotional tension and made for satisfactory adjustment.[4]

Many people in the general population have experiences not unlike those that proved too much for these murderers. That they do not resort to murder is due to counterbalancing factors, some of which are suggested by the comparison of prisoners and brothers. Sometimes background is the crux of the situation. A number of the prisoners, to a much greater extent than their

[4] William Healy and Augusta Bronner, in their study *New Light on Delinquency* (Yale University Press, 1936) emphasize the effect of "rejection" on their delinquents, but fail to point out what saved their siblings who were likewise "rejected" from becoming delinquent. In our cases the brothers either were not subjected to the same provocation as the prisoners or had learned to accept disappointment quietly. John Dollard *et al.*, in their *Frustration and Aggression* (Yale University Press, 1939), p. 1, assume that "aggression is always a consequence of frustration," and that "the existence of frustration always leads to some form of aggression." Our conclusion is that neither statement is true. Indeed, the discussion in the Dollard study itself shows that frustration does not always lead to aggression, that the frustration may be "displaced." Many cases of aggression can be traced to frustration, but not all. There are other roots.

brothers, had been petted and spoiled as children, had developed a sense of inferiority, or had been greatly handicapped by frustrated desires of one sort and another. In other cases where personality traits or early experiences seem to have been fundamentally similar, the brother had been spared the emotional crisis that the prisoner had met so unsuccessfully. The adult experiences that seem to be most significant as determinants of conduct are those pertaining to employment and to conjugal relationships. Perhaps many of the brothers too, had they remained unmarried or failed to hold a satisfactory job, might have committed murder in the face of a severe crisis.

Common to the murderers' histories are (1) an incapacity to adjust normally to life situations; (2) harmful emotional experiences in early life; and (3) a crisis too severe for an unstable person to cope with sanely. Most murders are crimes of passion—explosive reactions to a difficult situation. More concretely, the factors our study reveals to be most important in the making of the murderer are these:

1. An organism which through heredity, disease, or accident is defective in the physical vigor, nervous stability, or mental capacity required to meet the demands of life.

2. An environment which, because it fails to prepare a person for self-support or denies him the opportunity to make a fair living, limits his cultural opportunities and choice of associates, and tends to engender the undesirable attitudes and habits that prevail in certain poorly paid, rough occupations.

3. An experience in the home which produces a sense of inferiority and of economic, emotional, or social insecurity; resistance to established authority; deep-seated resentment and grudges; misguided efforts to compensate for frustrations; and an irritable nature that breaks bounds in the face of a crisis. The home is an important factor in the adjustment of personality.

4. An educational experience which is inadequate, either because it is too short or is unsuited to the molding of a well-adjusted personality. The boy whose education is prematurely cut short is deprived of the socializing influences of the school and frequently of home influences also.

5. Subjection to community influences which create a pattern of responses and attitudes condemned by the larger society—excessive drinking, sexual promiscuity, and violent methods of achieving desired ends. The home, the school, the community—these form the complex of influences which largely determine the personality that will develop from natural endowments.

6. Frustration, from whatever cause, of the fundamental desire for security, satisfaction of the ego, recognition by one's fellows, and new experiences. Such frustration may cause serious emotional disturbances, destroy ambition, undermine the desire for social status in the larger society, and foster anti-social methods of satisfying the ego.

7. Disruption of relations with spouse or lover. The emotions attending

love are among the strongest that govern the individual, and any threat to their satisfaction may create a serious emotional upheaval.

8. The appearance of a crisis—a sudden unexpected event or the culmination of a series of unfortunate events—which threatens one of the fundamental drives of the individual, and an explosive reaction to it.

9. More than 30 per cent of these murderers were drunk at the time of the crime or at least had been drinking. Almost 26 per cent were either insane when they committed the murder or became insane after incarceration. About 6 per cent were psychopathic. Four of the murderers were both insane and drunk when the crime was committed, and one was both drunk and psychopathic. Thus more than three-fifths of the total number were either drunk or mentally unbalanced at the time of the crime. Most of the others were either temporarily upset emotionally or committed murder incidental to robbery or a sex crime.

7

The Making of the Sex Offender

IN CHAPTER 2 THE DISTINCTIVE SOCIAL FACTORS IN THE MAKING OF THE SEX offender were treated statistically. This chapter furnishes illustrations from the case material of those factors the statistical study revealed to be significant and discusses the operation of certain factors that were not thought important when the study was begun or that could not be treated statistically.

On July 1, 1933, there were 279 male sex offenders in the prison and 16 in the Central State Hospital for the criminal insane. The statutory crimes for which they had been sentenced are listed below.

Adultery	32	Incest	12
Assault with intent to commit rape	20	Keeping house of ill fame	2
Bigamy	2	Pandering	4
Carnal knowledge of female children	4	Rape	127
Fornication with feeble-minded females	3	Statutory rape	25
Fornication	2	Sodomy	26
Indecent liberties	18	Other crimes	2
		Total	279

Because funds were insufficient for a complete study, only the prisoners committed for rape, for incest, and for sodomy (including homosexual relations and relations with animals) were considered. These three groups were reclassified, on the sociological basis of the act rather than on the legal basis, as (1) rapists, (2) statutory rapists, including incestuous statutory rapists, and (3) sodomists.

Wisconsin law defines rape as the act committed by "any person who shall ravish and carnally know any female of the age of sixteen or more by force and against her will" (*Wisconsin Statutes*, 1935, Section 340.46). What is popularly called "statutory rape" is legally defined as an act of "any person over eighteen years of age who shall unlawfully and carnally know and abuse any female under the age of eighteen years" or an act of "any person of the age of eighteen years or under who shall unlawfully and carnally know and abuse any female under the age of eighteen years" (*Wisconsin*

Statutes, 1935, Section 340.47). Cases of assault with an attempt to commit rape, which are dealt with in a separate section of the *Statutes* (340.48) and for which a very much lighter sentence is provided than for either forcible or statutory rape, were not included in our study.

A number of the cases of forcible rape and statutory rape were really cases of incest, which is defined as the act of persons "within the degree of consanguinity within which marriages are prohibited or declared by law to be incestuous and void, who shall intermarry with each other or who shall commit adultery or fornication with each other." (*Wisconsin Statutes*, 1935, Section 351.21). Most offenders under this section were prosecuted and committed under Section 340.47, probably for reasons which will be explained below under "Statutory Rape."

Sodomy is defined as "the crime against nature, with mankind or beast," and such crime "may be committed by the penetration of the mouth of any human being by the organ of any male person as well as by the penetration of the rectum." (*Wisconsin Statutes*, 1935, Section 351.40).

Of the 279 sex offenders in the prison at Waupun on July 1, 1933, 178 cases of rape, statutory rape, and sodomy were tentatively selected for study. The other categories of sex crimes were ruled out because there were

Data on 178 Cases of Rape, Statutory Rape, and Sodomy in Prison on July 1, 1933*

	Rape	Statutory Rape	Sodomy	Total
Total prison cases	127	25	26	178
Prison cases excluded:				
Commitment before January 1, 1927	*23*	*0*	*1*	*24*
Without relatives in the state	*13*	*1*	*2*	*16*
Discharged before interview by parole, pardon, commutation, or expiration of sentence	*10*	*4*	*1*	*15*
Unable to speak English	*5*	*2*	*1*	*8*
Death before interview	*1*	*0*	*0*	*1*
Refusal to cooperate	*0*	*1*	*1*	*2*
Total cases excluded	*52*	*8*	*6*	*66*
Total prison cases studied	75	17	20	112
Inmates of Central State Hospital studied	5	2	9	16
Total sex offenders studied	80	19	29	128

* This table does not check with the preceding one because it is based on the social definition of statutory rape, whereas the other is based on the legal definition. The reclassification was necessitated by the fact that a number of cases of incest proved to be rape, and some cases of statutory rape probably involved forced relationships.

only a few cases in each and because they seemed less significant for a sociological study. Of these 178 cases, 66 were excluded for the reasons tabulated on page 89. From the Central State Hospital for the criminal insane 16 cases were added, making a total of 128 cases committed for the three types of sex crime. The study is based on this sample of the entire number of sex offenders.

In the statistical analysis comparison was made between the murderers, the property offenders, and the three classes of sex offenders selected for study. On the basis of the tables in the Appendix and the statistical technique there employed, it is possible to identify the factors in the early home backgrounds and in the personalities of the sex offenders which are significantly different from those of the murderers and property offenders, as well as the significant differences between the brothers and the prisoners. The significant characteristics of the sex offender are summarized on pages 11–13.

Study of the cases uncovers some of the subtle emotional influences that are difficult to reduce to statistical categories; it also shows that certain factors which do not appear as significant in the statistical analysis did actually play a part in producing anti-social behavior. The case histories also picture concretely the play of these subtle factors in the development of delinquent conduct.

Existing Literature on Sex Crimes

The psychology of sex offenders, a field in which Freud was a pioneer, has received more attention than the psychology of murderers. The psychoanalytic school of Freud, Adler, Jung, Rank, Stekel, and some of their colleagues and disciples has produced most of the writing on homosexuality and incest. These men differ on certain points, but the fundamentals of the psychoanalytic theory can be indicated by a brief outline of Freud's theory.

Homosexuality or Sodomy.—As I understand Freud, his theory of the development of homosexuality is that the libido, or "sexual instinct," in the newly born is bi-sexual; that is, the sexual object is not clearly defined and may be either male or female. The child learns its first lessons in attachment to persons from its mother's care. Later this attraction to the mother, especially on the sexual level, is suppressed, and the child usually finds its proper sexual object in one of the opposite sex. Homosexuals, however, are sexually attracted to one of their own sex. Some homosexuals are absolutely inverted; for others the sexual object may be someone of either sex; still others are only occasionally inverted. Reduced to its simplest terms, Freud's theory of the psychological roots of homosexuality is as follows:

1. In every fixed aberration from the normal sexual impulse (heterosexual) a "fragment of inhibited development and infantilism" is present.[1]

[1] From a summary of Sigmund Freud's *Three Contributions to the Theory of Sex* (*Nervous and Mental Disease Monographs*, No. 7, New York and Washington, 1930), 87. Freud treats the matter in greater detail and with varying emphasis in " 'A Child Is Being Beaten': A Contribution to the Study of the Origin of Sexual Perversion," *Collected Papers* (London, 1924), vol. 2, chap. 17; "The Psychogenesis of a Case of Homosexuality in a Woman," *ibid.*, chap. 18; "Certain Neurotic Mechanisms in Jealousy, Paranoia, and Homosexuality," *ibid.*, chap. 19, pp. 240–243; "A 'Civilized' Sexual Morality and the Modern Nervousness," *ibid.*, pp. 84–87; "Fragment of an Analysis of a Case of Hysteria," *ibid.*, vol. 3, p. 73; "A Phobia in a Five-Year-Old Child," *ibid.*, p. 251; "A Case of Paranoia," *ibid.*, pp. 426, 444, 448; and "Some Psychological Consequences of Anatomical Distinction between the Sexes," *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 8 (1927): 133–142. E. Wulffen discusses homosexuality briefly in his article "Der Sexualverbrecher," *Encyclopädie der Modernen Kriminalistik* (Berlin, 1910), vol. 8, chap. 7.

The infant has the fundamentals of sexual activity at birth, and while nursing enjoys a sexual gratification, which is sometimes continued in thumb-sucking. It also gets sexual excitation of the erogenous zones when being cared for by nurse or mother.

2. Then follows a period of latency, from the age of three to five, during which sexual barriers are built up through the admonitions of the child's elders. Part of the sexual impulse is repressed and diverted into other channels, but another part escapes and manifests itself as sexual activity. This consists of gratification through the excitation of erogenous zones and may be termed "auto-erotic."

3. The interest in the genital zone and the choice of the sexual object have their beginnings in childhood, but undergo their most pronounced development at puberty, when the other sources of sexual feeling become subordinate to the genital zone. The socially approved channeling of the sexual impulse and the unification of the erotic function is usually accomplished through training.

4. At any time from childhood to adulthood the sexual impulse may be fixed on a socially disapproved object, or may develop contrary to the socially approved course. The disturbing factors, which may be either innate or external—inherent constitution or repression or such accidental experiences as seduction—induce perversions, among which is homosexuality. Neurosis is a psychological escape from such perversion.

Among the other writers of the psychoanalytical school who have discussed this problem are Otto Fenichel, E. E. Hadley, Felix Boehm, A. L. de Groot, Otto Rank, M. Klein, and B. Z. Seligman.[2] Havelock Ellis has

[2] Otto Fenichel, "Pre-Genital Antecedents of the Oedipus Complex," *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 12 (1931): 141–166; E. E. Hadley, "Origin of the Incest Taboo," *Psychoanalytic Review*, 14 (1927): 298–316; Felix Boehm, "History of the Oedipus Complex," *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 12 (1931): 431–451; A. L. de Groot, "Evolution of the Oedipus Complex in Women," *ibid.*, 9 (1928): 332–345; Otto Rank, *Das Inzest-Motiv in Dichtung und Sage* (Leipzig and Vienna, 1912) part 1, chap. 1; M. Klein, "Early Stages of Oedipus Conflict," *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 9 (1928): 167–180; B. Z. Seligman, "The Incest Barrier: Its Role in Social Organization," *British Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 22 (1932): 250–276; Otto Rank, *The Trauma of Birth* (New York, 1929).

a section on "Sexual Inversion" in his *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*,[3] a work which was one of the pioneers in English and still remains one of the most important contributions to the subject.

A more recent German writer, who was once a member of the Freudian school but has now broken with his master, is William Stekel,[4] who formulates his notion of the development of homosexuality as follows:

> A person with abnormally strong instinctive cravings is induced early in life to surround these cravings with inhibitions. The early awakening of his sexual instinct and its precocious functioning bring him into conflict. The process of repression and of sublimation sets in to deal with these cravings much earlier than in other persons. For one reason or another the heterosexual components are repressed and the homosexual are evolved. The heterosexual cravings are hemmed in and rendered useless by disgust, hatred, or fear. . . . Homosexuality arises out of bi-sexuality as a result of certain particular attitudes which become determined very early in life.[5]

Iwan Bloch concedes that some of the genuine homosexuals have a morbid constitution,[6] but he differs from R. Krafft-Ebing and some of the Freudians in his belief that the nervousness or neurasthenia of other homosexuals has developed at some time in life out of an originally healthy state, and that still others, in fact the largest section of original homosexuals, are perfectly healthy, physically normal persons.[7]

M. Hirschfeld, who established the *Jahrbuch für Sexuelle Zwischenstufen* in 1899 and is the author of one of the most important books on the subject, considers that the tendency to homosexuality is inborn or at least hereditary.[8] He states that at least 75 per cent of the homosexuals he studied were born of healthy parents and of happy and often prolific marriages, and that nervous or mental anomalies, alcoholism, blood-relationship, and syphilis are no more frequent among ancestors of homosexuals than among the ancestors of those endowed with normal sexuality. He is inclined to believe that something in their heredity predisposes them strongly toward homosexuality.[9]

Alexander Lipschütz believes that homosexuality is produced, in some cases at least, by "disturbances in the endocrine function of the sex glands or some other organ of internal secretion, or by the suppression of the endocrine function of these glands." He adds that this "does not imply that

[3] Vol. 2, part 2 (New York, 1936).

[4] Wilhelm Stekel, *Onanie und Homosexualität*. The part of this work dealing with homosexuality has been translated by James S. Van Teslaar and published in America as two books: *Bi-Sexual Love* (New York, 1934) and *The Homosexual Neurosis* (New York, 1934).

[5] *Bi-Sexual Love*, 49.

[6] *The Sexual Life of Our Time in Its Relation to Modern Civilization* (New York, 1914), chap. 19.

[7] *Ibid.*, 490.

[8] *Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes* (Berlin, 1914).

[9] *Ibid.*, 492–493.

external factors are without significance. . . . It is not impossible that in some cases external factors are alone sufficient to account for the abnormal condition."[10] Stekel believes, however, that we do not yet know enough about the endocrine glands to determine the effects of their malfunctioning.

In general the earlier writers ascribe the homosexual tendency to inheritance, whereas later writers stress the importance of the individual's experiences after birth. The division is not clear-cut, however, for even the Freudians are not agreed what role inheritance plays. The majority hold that pronounced homosexuals have a similar ancestry or at least a history of neurosis. So far as one can tell from published reports and a careful reading of many cases, there is some truth in each of these views. In his latest statement Freud himself accepts both. In certain cases the hereditary factor seems the most important, in others the influence of what have been called "sexual traumas."

Freud and his followers have perhaps made the greatest contribution to our knowledge of the process by which sexual inversion develops, but some of Freud's terms are unfortunate. For example, to English-speaking people "incest" has too specific a meaning to be applied to the undoubted preference of the infant for the mother. Freud shows that emotional attachment to the mother or nurse, or sometimes the sister, is indeed freighted with sexual feeling. On the other hand, the development of a boy's hatred for his father and of narcissism are not necessarily the result of sexual feelings toward the mother. The boy could certainly be envious of his father without having such definite sexual feelings as Freud ascribes to him. As Havelock Ellis has remarked, "it is inaccurate to term this love of the child 'incest.' " There can be no doubt that a boy's love for his mother often involves feelings which in later life develop into sexual love. Sometimes it can be explained on the basis of his own feminine disposition, which prompts him to shun the amusements and society of his own sex and to cultivate the sympathy, tastes, and attitudes of his mother or sister.

In view of the theories reviewed above, we were surprised to find that the sex offenders in our sample show less preference for the mother than either of the other classes of criminals. Relatively four times as many of the murderers and five times as many of the property offenders felt that they were the mother's favorite. See Table 11. Equally striking is the fact that 83.8 per cent of the sex offenders, as compared with 49.3 per cent of the murderers and 20.9 per cent of the property offenders, declared themselves to be favorites of no one. Thus from both points of view sex offenders exhibit a pronounced apathy toward others in the family. What does this mean?

[10] *The Internal Secretions of the Sex Glands* (Baltimore, 1924), 371. For an interesting study of the relationship between homosexuality and endocrinology by a Brazilian, see Leonidio Ribero, *Homosexualismo e Endocrinologia* (Rio de Janeiro, 1938).

It may be that the sex offender, if his desire for affectional response was thwarted in childhood, reported the situation inaccurately; or that an early emotional difficulty growing out of family relationships ultimately resulted in suppression of the emotions; or that something in the constitutional make-up of the sex offender inhibits a lively emotional development. This last theory is supported by the fact that the prisoners do not differ significantly from their brothers with respect to appreciation of the mother, father, and others. See Tables 49 and 50. Sex offenders were more similar to their brothers in this respect than were the other classes of offenders. It might be suspected that the apathy of the sex offenders is attributable to their relatively low I. Q. were it not for the fact that those who deal with feeble-minded children in institutions say that they are quite as jealous as other children, and hunger just as much for human sympathy and kindness.

The case histories and my interviews with the men lead me to believe that an early repression of their desire for affection led to a deadening of sensibility, that a growing feeling of rejection finally resulted in emotional apathy and indifference. On the other hand, the striking difference in emotional tone between the sodomists and the rapists must be remembered. It may be that such emotional apathy is characteristic only of the rapists, and that their greater number in the total sample of sex offenders colors the results shown in Tables 11, 12, 49, and 50. Proportionately three times as many of the homosexuals as of the rapists felt that they were the favorites of someone. Moreover, relatively fewer of the sodomists than of the rapists felt that they were favorites of no one in the family.

Incest.—The psychoanalysts, although they have given much attention to homosexuality, have almost neglected incest, despite the emphasis that the Freudians have laid upon the incestuous feelings of the infant as an explanation of the development of the sexual impulse. Nowhere is their theory of incestuous relations among adults stated explicitly, though it may be inferred from their arguments. Most writers dwell at greater length on the existence of the taboo against incest than on the factors that cause it to be violated.

Havelock Ellis, for example, in several pages on the incest taboo, states that lack of sexual attraction between those who have lived together is due to the absence of those stimuli, differences in attitudes, dress, etc., which give rise to passion. He states that "the occasional sexual attraction between near relations in early life and its usual disappearance at puberty or adolescence are then both alike natural and normal."[11] This does not, however, explain the passion of a father for a daughter or a stepdaughter, or that of a brother for a sister. Westermarck does not agree that the psychological root of the aversion to incest or close intermarriage is the "sexual

[11] Havelock Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* (New York, 1936), 2: 208, 209; 3: 505, 506.

indifference to housemates." In his view the psychic attitude grows out of the biological consequences of interbreeding established by natural selection.[12] Iwan Bloch believes that "in exceptional cases only does incest . . . depend upon pathological causes," that "at the present day incest occurs often exclusively as the result of chance associations—as, for example, in alcoholic intoxication, the consequences of close domestic intimacy in small dwellings, in the absence of all other opportunity for sexual intercourse."[13] Freud insists, as do most other psychoanalysts, that the male child tends to have a sexual interest in his mother. She is his primary love-object, and hence his father becomes the rival for her affection. Here arises the Oedipus complex.[14] Ellis and others contend that only by the very greatest accommodation of language can this emotional attraction to the mother be said to be of a sexual nature.

Freud believes that the "incest barrier belongs to the historical acquisitions of humanity and like the other moral taboos it must be fixed in many individuals through organic heredity." He argues that in infancy the libido naturally goes out to the mother or "the person whom it has loved since childhood" with, so to speak, a suppressed libido. The sexual inhibitions against incest, which may be fixed through organic heredity, and the delay of sexual maturity, which provides time for the erection of moral prescriptions, operate to prevent the selection of both the person beloved in infancy and a blood relative as sexual objects. Freud's only explanation of incest in adult life is found in his implied assumption that an infantile attitude may carry over into adult life when organic heredity fails to establish the sexual barrier, or when the moral prescriptions which strengthen it are lacking.[15]

The explanations given by others are social rather than biological or psychological. Westermarck states that sexual intercourse with a near relative may take place when a more suitable partner is not available.[16] Bloch has a similar explanation. Ellis has little to say on the question.[17] Thus the literature leaves us with a number of theories of the root, or roots, of incest. On some of these writers differ; on others there is more or less agreement. Some stress an inherently vigorous sexual impulse, others the

[12] Westermarck, *A History of Human Marriage* (New York, 1933), 2: 193, 218–239.

[13] Bloch, *The Sexual Life of Our Time in Its Relation to Modern Civilization*, 639.

[14] Freud, *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis* (New York, 1934), chap. 5. For an earlier and less fully developed theory see Freud, *Three Contributions to the Theory of Sex*; "Sexuality and the Etiology of the Neuroses," in *Collected Papers* (New York, London, and Vienna, 1924), chap. 11; "My Views on the Part Played by Sexuality in the Etiology of the Neuroses," *ibid.*, chap. 14; "On the Sexual Theories of Children," *ibid.*, vol. 2, chap. 6; and "The Infantile Genital Organization of the Libido," *ibid.*, chap. 20.

[15] *Three Contributions to the Theory of Sex*, 82, 84, 85.

[16] Westermarck, *History of Human Marriage*, 2: 201.

[17] Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*.

lack of proper training, still others the denial of a socially approved sexual object and easy access to a socially disapproved one. It seems clear that the basis of incest has received less attention than the origin of the taboo against it. It is probable that the strength of the sexual drive varies with different persons, but we have no measure of that difference, nor do we know whether some highly sexed individuals resist the impulse to commit incest. The literature shows no evidence of the use of control groups with which the incestuous persons studied were compared in any particular. So long as this condition prevails, we have no test of the validity of these various theories.

Rape.—On this subject the psychologists are as silent as the tomb. Neither the psychoanalytic school nor any other students of abnormal psychology seem to have given it their attention. Even the literature on criminology contains little on the subject. Havelock Ellis has discussed the connection between rape and the periodicity of the sexual impulse, and a number of European criminologists have treated the periodicity of sexual misdemeanors along with other crimes. These students find that sexual crime occurs most frequently in the hot months of May and June and least often in the cold months from November to January.[18]

It was in the light of this literature that our study of sex offenders was undertaken. Aside from the psychological contribution on sodomy and the smaller one on incest, the field was virgin. The study of the sex offender had been confined pretty largely to the relation of sexual crime to season of year, alcoholism, economic status, housing conditions, social precepts of the home and community, and precocious sexual maturity.

In the biological field virtually the only contributions were studies dealing with the connection between sexual activity and epilepsy, feeble-mindedness, especially of the hereditary type, and the functioning of the endocrine glands. Some attention had been given to such causes of incest and rape as crowded home conditions, drunkenness, the employment of mothers, who thus deprived their daughters of the proper guardianship, and the influence of low sexual morals in the community. A recent study also emphasizes the ignorance of sexual matters which prevails in many homes.[19]

Case Histories of Sex Offenders

The statistical analysis pictures less concretely than the case histories how various situations operated upon the delinquent. Consequently we are

[18] Havelock Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, 1: 150; F. Lentz in the *Bulletin de Société Medicine Mentale Belgique*, March, 1901; G. Laurent, *Les Habitues des prisons de Paris* (Paris, 1890), chap. 1; Sr. Penta, *Revista mensile de psichiatria* (1899); G. Aschaffenburg, *Crime and its Repression* (Boston, 1913), 16–27. See also Aschaffenburg's articles in *Centralblatt für Nervenheilkunde*, January, 1903, and in *Monatschrift für Psychiatrie*, 1903, Heft 2; C. Lombroso, *Crime, Its Causes and Remedies* (Boston, 1912), 4–11; and J. L. Gillin, *Criminology and Penology* (New York, 1945), 72, 73.

[19] J. A. and R. W. Goldberg, *Girls on City Streets* (New York, 1935), chaps. 6, 7.

citing the case histories of a number of those convicted of sodomy (homosexuality in our cases), incest, and rape. In our statistical analysis we attempted to compare sodomists and rapists in only three respects: I. Q., favoritism, and occupation (see Tables 12, 22, and 35). The sodomists had a higher I. Q., and a larger proportion were professional men or unskilled laborers. The rapists showed less emotional sensitivity than the sodomists.

CASES OF SODOMY

The sodomists in our sample include a number with a very low I. Q., others of very high intelligence, and still others who are actually demented.

Case S2 is that of a second-generation Bohemian thirty-five years old. He is an unskilled laborer, unmarried, and a Catholic, and has an I. Q. of 69. He was sentenced to prison for committing *fellatio* with several boy minors. Several complaints of exhibitionism had previously been made against him to the police, who also suspected him of having had homosexual relations with boys on various occasions.

He was the fifth of six children and the youngest boy. His parents had migrated to this country immediately after their marriage and settled in a medium-sized Wisconsin city. His father was a skilled laborer who had always succeeded in keeping his family comfortable. They were devout Catholics, especially the mother, who had virtually no interests outside her family and the church.

At the age of seventeen, by which time he had reached only the eighth grade, S2 left school. He went to work for a brother-in-law on a farm in a neighboring state, but returned home eighteen months later because of homesickness. From then on he worked as an unskilled laborer, earning about twenty dollars a week at the most.

He states that he was the favorite of his mother, who obviously spoiled him, and he was apparently very dependent on his relationship with her. Until her death, a year before his entry into prison, he had given her his entire pay check each week. He had always been so effeminate a person that he had been dubbed "Lipstick Bill." He disliked athletic sports, preferring to draw and paint. He had been a favorite of the nuns in the parochial school because of his pleasant disposition and the fact that he clearly preferred them to the boys in the school. As he grew older he attended picture shows, but never drank and says he never had a girl, having always sought the friendship of young boys or adult women. He had never had sexual relations before the death of his mother. There is no question that for years his sexual tastes had been definitely perverted. His ambition as a boy had been to become a priest, but his mental capacity was too limited for that.

The death of his mother, breaking the only emotional tie he valued greatly, seems to have created a distinct crisis in his life. His habits suddenly changed, and he became slovenly in his dress and person. In prison he had such filthy habits and such piggish table manners that his fellow prisoners

would have nothing to do with him. He had to be forced to bathe. All the evidence points to the conclusion that he had been so dependent on his mother and on the church, which he identified with her, that without her he became an utterly disorganized person. While the perverted pattern was established in early life, no overt expression of it occurred until his mother's death created a severe emotional crisis.

The brother with whom we compared the prisoner had a quite different history but is an almost equally disorganized personality. Whereas the prisoner had remained at home until his mother died and had a definite mother fixation, his brother had left home early and abandoned home ties. The brother drank heavily, the prisoner never. The brother was large, strong, and rough; the prisoner had been a fastidious dresser and even used cosmetics. The brother's few friends were men of his own age; the prisoner had preferred young boys. The brother had been arrested for bootlegging and drunkenness; the prisoner had never been arrested before, although he had been a suspect. The brother was married and had deserted his wife and family; the prisoner had never even had a girl. The brother was unstable at work and a roamer; the prisoner had been on one job for fourteen years and was a home boy.

In the light of these differences one would expect the brother to be the delinquent and the prisoner a good citizen. The decisive factor, however, is the prisoner's mother fixation and the homosexuality to which he had been conditioned at an early age.

S4, one of a number of psychotic cases, became insane after incarceration. He is an unskilled laborer and has a low I. Q., having reached only the fourth grade at the age of fifteen. He is single, forty-nine years old, native-born of French-Canadian parents, and a Catholic. The crime of which he was convicted and sent to the Central State Hospital was sodomy committed with an eleven-year-old boy. He had frequently been suspected of exhibitionism, and the police had received numerous complaints against him for seducing young boys. He had served a year in a house of correction for sodomy.

He is the oldest of four children. The father, who was thirty-eight years old when he married, was seventeen years older than the mother. The family was a devout one whose entire social life centered in the Catholic church and the home. So far as one may judge, the family relationships were harmonious. The father was regularly employed until he became too old to work, when the main support of the family devolved upon the prisoner, who remained at home until the time of his commitment at the age of forty-one.

There is evidence of a good deal of fixation upon the mother and resentment against the father, who disciplined him severely and had him arrested

for many small offenses. Of his mother the prisoner always speaks in terms of the greatest endearment. He says he cannot recall ever having had a whipping or a scolding from her.

He began work in a printing shop, later was employed by the International Harvester Company, then by a railroad company as a machinist helper until he was incarcerated. He states that he had never had any desire to marry because he wanted to make a good home for his parents, but this is probably only a rationalization of his perverted sex impulse, which dates back to an early age and was apparently directed to young boys. Because of his mental incapacity he was often the butt of practical jokes by his fellow workmen, who destroyed whatever sense of self-esteem he may once have had. His drinking, which seems to have been an escape from a sense of inferiority, helped to break down his inhibitions.

The home background of his brother, who was the baby of the family, was different. Whereas the prisoner felt so keenly that his father was persecuting him that he developed a feeling of frustration and loss of status and an emotional conflict, the brother was spared all this. He had companions of his own age, unlike the prisoner, who had none because he was weak, constantly ailing, and unable to participate in other children's games. The brother was happily married; the prisoner had no desire to marry and was closely attached to his mother because she had taken his part when the father disciplined him. He had undoubtedly developed a mother fixation which prevented any desire for marriage and fostered homosexuality.

Case S5 is the native-born son of German parents, single, forty-nine years old, and without church affiliation; he has an I. Q. of 68. In the community from which he was committed he has a long history of homosexuality but no record of previous arrests.

He was the youngest of the seven children of a skilled laborer in good circumstances. Both his parents were nominal members of the Lutheran church and had excellent reputations in their community. His mother died, however, when he was six, and he was raised by an elder married sister, whose home he never left until he was sent to prison.

At fifteen, having graduated from grade school, he became a clerk in a grocery store. He continued at this kind of work until World War I, after which he worked as a painter. He had always had an income sufficient to satisfy his taste for leisure and the collection of antiques. Very early he manifested effeminate traits. He was an excellent housekeeper, and his favorite recreation was to decorate and care for his summer cottage on a neighboring lake. He declares that he had many women friends, but had never had sexual relations with any of them; that he had always admired good-looking boys, but had never had immoral relations with them until five years before his commitment. After that, however, he had had several

affairs with boys and was living with the youth with whom he committed the offense.

This case shows better than most how homosexuality may be produced by an early conditioning. As the youngest child he was favored and somewhat spoiled. He loved his mother, and her death was an emotional shock. Her place was taken by his sister, who continued to treat him as his mother had. The case is a good illustration of what Frankwood Williams has described as the improper treatment of some children by their women folks. He so idealized his mother and sister that he could not imagine himself entering into heterosexual relationships. His only outlet was with those of his own sex.

An older brother, who resembles the prisoner in intelligence and love for his mother, differs from him in many other ways. He spent his boyhood in his father's home and developed heterosexual interests early. He was married twice and had three children, two by his first wife and one by the second. It may be noted, however, that he was not enthusiastic about either of his wives, which may possibly be a sign of a homosexual tendency that did not develop because he married. Unlike the prisoner, he is strong and vigorous and has always done heavy work; his friends are of a fairly good type; the prisoner's friends had homosexual tendencies, and it is suspected that an older man introduced him to homosexual practices. It is clear that his homosexuality is born of a combination of innate tendencies, physical and mental, with early and later circumstances.

Our sample contained a few cases of bestiality, usually on the part of men of low intelligence who were living in rural communities. Such a person is case S6, a man of sixty-four who was divorced. He was the youngest of eight children of native-born parents, an unskilled laborer, and a Methodist. His I. Q. is 72.

In his background are several arrests for drunkenness, supporting the diagnosis of chronic alcoholism made by prison authorities. He was convicted of sodomy with a female goat.

The community and family background were very demoralized. When he was eight years old, he lost his parents and was sent to an orphanage, where he remained for about a year and was then sent to live with foster parents on a farm in another county. The foster father was very cruel to the boy and beat him unmercifully; the foster mother protected him and he remembers her with much affection. He finally ran away, and when he was thirteen was placed in the home of his sister. His school work had of course been much interrupted, and he finally stopped at the age of thirteen, when he had reached the third reader.

Thus his childhood was a poverty-stricken one—financially, recreationally, and socially. He enjoyed few of the established relationships that do

so much to stabilize a personality. He was a docile, high-grade imbecile, and so much of a home body that as a young man he was known as "Grandpa."

He had worked for a number of firms as a common laborer. His wages were always low, but he was an industrious worker whenever he could get a job. Before his commitment he had been out of work for about four years, and at the time of his arrest was an inmate of a county poorhouse.

He had his first sexual experience at the age of twenty-one and until his unhappy marriage four years later was promiscuous. His wife, abetted by her mother, was unfaithful to him. The couple continued to live together for about twenty years, however, though they separated several times. They had a large family, several of whom died in infancy. Most of the others became charges upon the public.

With such a background this aging man, denied normal relationships and probably affected by senile deterioration, which is sometimes accompanied by strong sexual desires, saw no way to satisfy them except through bestiality, an infantile method of sexual expression not infrequent among men suffering from senility. His low I. Q. probably helped to set a lifelong pattern of social irregularity. He had never developed self-control nor established a socially approved pattern of behavior.

The following are cases of homosexuality among sex offenders of average or superior intelligence.

Case S9 is twenty-six years old, native-born of native parents, single, and a school teacher. He has an I. Q. of 111.

He is the eldest of the seven children of a saloon-keeper in fair circumstances. When he was nine years old his father's death left the family in a precarious financial position, and he was obliged to shoulder a large share of the financial burden. The mother, a high-strung but extremely capable woman and a good but fussy housekeeper, treated her children as if they were adults. S9 worked after school and on Saturdays, and with the help of relatives and various fraternal organizations managed to keep the family together. Among the men who took an interest in him was a minister of homosexual tendencies, who employed him throughout his high school years. The family belonged to no church, although the mother was sympathetic toward religion. Her favorite child was the next younger brother, with whom she habitually compared the prisoner unfavorably. At the time of our interview with him he was constantly having dreams of his mother, born of the emotional disturbance caused by the favoritism she showed the brother and her lack of appreciation of his efforts. The trend of these dreams, that he was asking a favor of her which she always refused, is a sure Freudian sign of strong "incestuous" yearnings holding over from childhood.

He has had considerable illness. At the age of three he had infantile paralysis and has never been in robust health since. At twenty he had a nervous

breakdown, possibly from overwork but more likely from an emotional conflict.

He was a most industrious worker, both as a boy and later. He earned part of his way through high school and normal school, and upon his graduation taught rural schools in the northern part of the state in order to recuperate from his nervous breakdown. Upon his recovery he became a successful teacher in a high school and at the time of his arrest was principal of a grade school in central Wisconsin. His superintendent said he was the most successful grade school teacher he had ever known.

His history shows clearly that he had very little time for recreation after his father died, and that his association with the minister influenced him greatly. Although he declares no overt homosexual act occurred, his attitude toward the man was definitely that of lover. It was a great blow to him when the minister was ousted from his position because of fraudulent financial transactions. He states that he has always been strongly attracted to the extremely masculine type of man, and that he lived with such a man in northern Wisconsin and derived great satisfaction from the friendship. He was converted to the Catholic faith as an adult. His reaction to the Mass was a kind of ecstasy. The symbolism of the cross, the use of candles, the emotional satisfaction he got from the celebration, seem to have taken the place of other emotional outlets. After entering prison, however, he lost his faith in the church.

Certain facts are clearly significant. Thwarted in his love for his mother —not by the father but by the next younger brother—he sought compensation in at least platonic relations first with the minister, then with other very masculine types of men, and ultimately with younger boys. The homosexual tendency was confirmed not only by association with men who encouraged the feeling of dependence upon them but by his choice of a profession which tended to limit his contacts with women. For a time he found an outlet for his deepest emotions in these platonic loves for men and in Catholicism. Probably the homosexual attitude toward the young boys in his charge was a reaction against the inferior position he had always occupied in the love relationship.

The history of a brother six years younger than the prisoner differs significantly in certain respects. Whereas the prisoner's whole history shows intense jealousy of this brother, with whom he competed for his mother's affections, the brother never experienced any such feelings. The prisoner, despite the sacrifices his family had made to enable him to go to normal school, felt abused because he had been obliged to help support the family at so early an age. The brother did not begin work until he was thirteen or fourteen years old, when he helped a second cousin on his farm during the summer. The prisoner worked at various places as he grew up; he clerked in a store, held a stenographic position, worked in a movie theater, and handled a group of bill distributors. At normal school he had charge of a student store and directed school pageants. The brother, on the other hand, worked as a farm hand in a wholesome community. He also worked at times in the woods, and for the man who later became his father-in-law. When twenty-four the brother married; the prisoner remained single. The prisoner, having learned about the neurotics on the mother's side of the family and that an aunt and a grandfather were insane, feared that he too might lose his mind. This knowledge did not upset the brother emotionally. Apparently the beginning of the prisoner's overt sexual activities was his seduction by a homosexual while he was in normal school. This produced in him so strong a feeling of guilt that he had a nervous breakdown. He is nervous, excitable, imaginative, and unstable emotionally, whereas the brother is practical and faces reality without emotion. The prisoner is a dreamer following fantasies probably induced by his early feeling of inferiority to his brother and by his emotional fixation upon his mother.

Another prisoner of good intelligence is S10, a second-generation Pole and an ex-priest. He is thirty-seven years old and single, and has an I. Q. of 92. He was convicted of sodomy upon the person of another adult when both were intoxicated. This very interesting case shows clearly how a dominant mother, by projecting her wishes upon a child, can so frustrate him that his whole personality is demoralized. Though he had not been arrested before, his history shows progressive demoralization from a very early age.

He was the youngest of five children whose father held a responsible position in one of the larger manufacturing plants of Wisconsin. His mother was a dominating personality who took complete charge of the children and of the household finances. She was extremely devout, and the prisoner says she inculcated religion in him every moment of the day. The father, who was not a very religious man, apparently reacted quietly against his wife's religion as one method of compensating for her dominance.

Family discipline was strict, religious exercises being used as a method of chastisement. Whenever the prisoner was naughty he was required to pray for a certain length of time. Thus religion, instead of being a source of inspiration, was repressive. Yet he was prevailed upon by his mother, whose favorite he obviously was, to prepare for the priesthood. At the age of fourteen he entered a boarding school and continued his education through college and seminary, returning home only for short vacations until he was twenty-six, when he became a teacher in a Catholic high school and college. From this position he was discharged and apparently unfrocked, probably for homosexuality, though he does not say so. For the next three years he traveled abroad and then returned to America. He had been unemployed for two years before his arrest.

His recreational history is barren. As a child he gave up, in accordance

with his mother's suggestion, the companionship of other boys and instead played with dolls, did embroidering, and was in general very effeminate. Later his time was occupied with devotions, although he claims to have been fond of sports and of reading. He had many women friends but was barred from sexual relations with them until he was unfrocked. Ten years before the interview he had had a girl friend with whom he had relations for a time. He confesses that he always enjoyed the effeminate type of man, but seemed to have been able to control himself except when under the influence of liquor. He never had any long-standing love affair with a man but apparently had had many casual experiences.

This case shows how a domineering mother, by projecting her wishes upon her son, fostered his homosexual yearnings. The vocation he entered to satisfy her desires was not congenial. He seems to have found irksome the tasks it involved and resented quietly the restrictions it placed upon his natural desires, which were consequently diverted into homosexual channels.

The prisoner's brother, who was twelve years older, grew up in the same family situation, except that he was the father's rather than the mother's favorite. His mother tried to project her wishes upon him also, but though he followed her plans for a time, he was for some reason expelled from the seminary and became a lawyer. Unlike the prisoner he married, at the age of twenty-seven, and had a harmonious married life. He had not taken a drink for years, whereas the prisoner began to drink heavily after his dismissal from college.

Another man of high intelligence, a teacher with an I. Q. of 95, was the native-born son of foreign parents. He was thirty-five years old at the time he was committed, married, and a Methodist. He represents the bi-sexual type of homosexual.

Though he had obviously been a confirmed homosexual from the age of sixteen, he had no record of previous arrests and had not been recognized as a pervert in his home community until just before he was arrested on a charge of homosexual relations with a nineteen-year-old boy, to which he pleaded guilty.

He was the youngest of the eight children of a farm family in good circumstances. He was ten years younger than the seventh child, having been born when his mother was forty-seven and his father seventy. He was the favorite of his mother and largely through her efforts received educational advantages denied the older children.

The children's upbringing was quite strict, but the prisoner, being an effeminate boy who never worked in the fields and had few playmates, escaped most of the discipline. Much of his time was spent with his mother in feminine pursuits, and under her direction he became as efficient a housekeeper as a woman. Even after his marriage he did part of the housework. When he was twelve his mother bought him a piano, at which he spent much

of his time. He also took great pleasure in playing the organ in church. Virtually his only playmate was a nephew three years his junior, with whom he had casual sexual relations from the time he was thirteen until his marriage. In spite of this limited social background, he grew up to enjoy social life, entertaining, and travel.

He received a college education and after his graduation made a distinct success of teaching. At the time of his arrest he held an important administrative position in the public schools.

His mother even selected his wife, a woman who, like herself, was devoutly religious. He was never completely satisfied with her, however. In fact, recalling his early experience with his nephew and later with others, he stated at the time of the interview that he believed homosexual love to be much finer than heterosexual. Naturally his close attachment to his mother did not promote satisfactory marital relations. Right up to the time of his arrest he apparently spent a great deal of his free time with her, looking out for her and taking her to see her friends. When his total personality is considered, his relations with men during his entire married life are not surprising. He was as circumspect as possible and usually made contacts, as many as possible, at teachers' conventions.

He was arrested because of relations with a boy whom he treated as a mistress. Both had given up virtually all social activities to be together as much as possible, and so strong was the bond between them that they became extremely jealous of each other. From all appearances this is a case of pure perversion.

The prisoner had been trained to accept a feminine role, and all his activities and recreational preferences tended to accentuate his training. His wife's jealousy of his mother may have helped to fix the homosexual pattern. His wife may have accepted the mother role toward the prisoner until children were born and then may have transferred her affection to them. If so, this would have tended to strengthen still further the adolescent pattern of homosexuality.

The differences between this prisoner and his brother are very instructive. The latter, unlike the prisoner, is strong and physically masculine. Having been raised with the other children, he had a more normal upbringing; he shared the severe home discipline and received no preferential treatment in the matter of education and financial help. Less well educated than the prisoner, he spent his life on the farm. He never married.

These selected case histories show that numerous factors go to produce homosexuality. Not all appear in each case, and some are probably more important than others. Some of the prisoners seem almost to have been destined by physical constitution and early conditioning to become homosexuals. In others homosexuality developed only when the proper stimulus occurred. In some, which strengthen the contention of Freud and Stekel

that everyone is potentially bi-sexual, the individual was capable of both heterosexual and homosexual relationships.

Among the factors that emerge as particularly important are a weaker and smaller frame than that of the sibs and sickness resulting in a sense of physical inferiority or a fixation of the affections upon a female relative. A sick child is likely to be petted and spoiled, especially by mother or sister, and this may produce a fixation. It is noteworthy that of the twenty-six sodomists in our sample, eight were the youngest in the family and a number of others were treated as the family "baby"; only six were the oldest in the family. Another important factor is an improper emotional development which impedes the growth during adolescence of a normal attitude toward girls. Any peculiarity in a man which prevents response from women of his own age is likely to turn his libidinous feeling toward men.

A number of the offenders had no homosexual difficulties until they had lost status, were feeling discouraged, or, having given up hope of having a wife and family, had taken to drink, which weakens the inhibitions and fosters association with demoralized companions. Most of these had already been initiated into acts of perversion, and the evidence suggests that constitutional nature or early conditioning may make resistance to seduction difficult.

Further research, especially on emotional development during childhood and adolescence, will doubtless help to solve a difficult problem. Meantime it is clear that social circumstances, especially in the family and in the community, do much to determine a person's attitude toward life and his response to a given situation. A crisis in his life may of course change his attitudes. In most cases the root of the offense lies deeper than the intellect, inasmuch as the sodomists include men of both low and high intelligence. The evidence indicates that the basic cause is emotional distortion of some sort during the course of personal development.

Although the Freudian theory of homosexuality does not explain why it is so often practised only when heterosexual objects are inaccessible, it does seem applicable to a number of our cases. These were the prisoners who distinctly preferred homosexual love relations, were fond of female pursuits, and had the physical characteristics of the female, and who felt closer ties of affection with the mother or considered themselves her favorite. It may be that if we had been able to psychoanalyze all the cases in our samples, more of them would have substantiated Freud's theory, but as things stand, we cannot say that any large percentage do so. In most of these offenders overt homosexuality is attributable to physical and mental traits which repelled women, to seduction early in life, or to economic circumstances which precluded heterosexual relations, either lawful or illicit. Most of them had either lost status altogether or had failed to attain it in a law-abiding group. Almost all had demoralized associates, and many had

deadened by excessive drinking whatever inhibitions they may once have had. All of them, whether of low or high intelligence, have a history of emotional frustration, some of social example and incitement to perversion.

CASES OF INCEST

The statistical analysis shows that as a group those guilty of incest (1) had a lower I. Q. than the sodomists, (2) included a greater percentage of farmers and skilled laborers, and (3) were more apathetic emotionally (Tables 12, 22, and 35).

The case of I–1 is that of a man who was committed for relations with his twelve-year-old stepdaughter and his seven-year-old daughter. He was the youngest of the eighteen children of a father who was an extremely hot-headed person, ever ready to pick a quarrel with the children and the mother, who usually took the children's part.

The brother with whom we compared the prisoner had been raised in the same severely disciplined family. He, however, had married a compatible wife from the vicinity where he was born and reared, whereas the prisoner had married a woman of poor reputation, who was in poor health and sexually incompatible with him. The brother had taken over the father's farm; the prisoner worked as a farm laborer until he was drafted into the army. The brother was thrifty; the prisoner was easily swindled and steadily lost economic status after his marriage, partly because of poor management and partly because of the expense of his wife's illnesses.

The case of I–2 and his brother illustrates how even persons of low intelligence may adjust themselves socially and economically if they are subjected to constructive social influences, whereas under the pressure of temptation they may commit a crime.

These two brothers were first-generation French-Canadians who lived in a community where the French language and French customs prevailed. The community was a close-knit one having few contacts with outsiders and hence no conflict of cultures.

Both brothers married, but the prisoner's wife died and he continued to live on the farm with his stepdaughter, a girl of thirteen who was large for her age. Denied his normal sexual object, the prisoner had relations with her.

The brother, his family intact, remained on the farm, was steadily employed throughout his life, and never left the solidly French community. The prisoner worked on a ranch in Montana, and in his home community changed jobs so often that he was looked upon as "worthless."

One other difference may have some bearing on the prisoner's delinquency. Whereas the brother remained a loyal Catholic, the prisoner, when he married a widow without religion, renounced his faith. He became a frequenter of cigar stores, pool halls, and taverns, and associated with a

group whose standards were none too high. Apparently the outstanding differences between the two brothers lie in family and neighborhood conditions, and in the character of their associates.

The crime in the case of I–3, a man with an I. Q. of 55, was an attack upon his young niece. He came of a family that was poorer than most of its neighbors, and the home was a quarrelsome one. The father, a farmer and carpenter of sorts, was a chronic drinker, who did not make a very good living. Most of the family's social life centered in a Norwegian lodge and a Norwegian church. Both the prisoner and his brother, who was probably brighter if one may judge from his economic and social status, left home to escape the unpleasant environment. The brother lived with a sister until he was sixteen; liked school and was reluctant to quit; married and settled down to a fairly normal life; and had respectable associates. The prisoner remained single, began to drink, and visited prostitutes. He was easily led and squandered his money on worthless companions, who merely derided him for the foolish things they persuaded him to do. Disharmony in the parental family, low intelligence, and demoralized associates seem to account for this man's crime.

Case I–5 is that of a man committed for having relations with his thirteen-year-old stepdaughter. His conduct, as contrasted with that of his respected younger brother, can be partly explained on the basis of their respective backgrounds. The latter had been more protected, for after he was eight years old his abusive, drunken father was away from home a good deal. The prisoner had quit school and left home at the age of thirteen and was thus cut off from his mother's influence. He worked irregularly, associated with rough companions and soon learned to drink, and married a prostitute. He had a record of twenty previous arrests. When the brother was fifteen years old, the father died. The mother made the most of her opportunity to attain greater respectability and was able to guide the brother in the right direction. He finished high school and eventually was twice married, both wives being girls with fine reputations. He never drank and was a stable worker.

A number of the prisoners discussed above are of medium or low intelligence. Case I–6, however, who was committed for incest with his two daughters, aged ten and four, had an I. Q. of 96. He came from a home that was rather poverty-stricken both economically and socially. The family lived first in northern Wisconsin and later in Milwaukee, where it became interested in the church.

The prisoner had married, much against the wishes of both families, a woman who was already pregnant by him. After their marriage she complained that he made excessive demands upon her, and they quarreled frequently. Moreover, since he had no trade and was only fairly efficient as a common laborer, he held a job only very irregularly and was constantly

having to depend on relief of some kind. He associated with a crowd of demoralized individuals and was addicted to drink. He declares that he was drunk when he committed incest with his two daughters.

The brother, on the other hand, was happily and normally married. He had learned a skilled trade, was able to hold fair jobs, and was financially independent except during the depression years. He was a home-loving person and a total abstainer.

Behind these external circumstances lie some differences in early experience. The father, a strict churchman, had beaten the prisoner for masturbating. Moreover, he favored the brother, with the result that the prisoner felt discriminated against. This favoritism of the father and the jealousy it engendered in the prisoner may have laid the foundation for the latter's later rebellious attitude toward family and social conventions.

Sometimes insanity is associated with the crime of incest. Mental disorder is of course likely to be accompanied by emotional unbalance, fears, hallucinations, and delusions of persecution. All such distorted ideas are likely to be expressed in erratic actions, sometimes impulsive, sometimes carefully planned.

Such a case is that of I–7, a second-generation German laborer thirty-five years old, who has an I. Q. of 90. He was sent to prison for sexual relations with his ten-year-old stepdaughter. He had never been arrested previously.

He is the eighth of ten children, of whom the four oldest died in infancy. His father, a farmer in good circumstances, died when he was seventeen. The family was a close-knit one having few contacts outside the Roman Catholic church, of which they were staunch members. An older sister became a nun, and the prisoner himself was educated for the priesthood.

Several members of his family had been deranged. An aunt was known to be queer, almost a monomaniac on the subject of religion, and an insane uncle committed suicide. Three of the mother's sibs became insane.

A taste for solitude manifested itself even during the childhood of the prisoner, when he shunned play in order to practise the violin or read. As a young man he refused to attend parties, and with the years he became constantly more seclusive. Throughout childhood and adolescence his interest was in religious activities.

Shortly after his father's death he had a nervous breakdown, after which he continued to suffer from recurrent spells of melancholia. He had gonorrhea at the time of his entrance into prison. At the age of twenty-one he was dismissed, because of his mental state, from the college that was preparing him for the priesthood. This frustration of his ambition probably impaired his rather precarious balance. Returning home, he ran his mother's farm until he was drafted. The army discharged him with a medical certificate after keeping him in a mental ward for some time. He then began to work in a paper mill in northern Wisconsin, but did not succeed in holding

this nor any other job for long. He moved frequently from city to city until his arrest in 1927.

After his discharge from college, which impaired his social status as well as his nervous balance, he married a woman of ill repute with an illegitimate daughter. She proved a poor housekeeper and absolutely undependable. Thus his marriage supplied no stabilizing influence. Ten children were born of the union.

The Catholic chaplain of the prison reports that his mood fluctuates greatly; at times he is troubled by religious scrupulosity, at others he reacts violently against the church. His relations with his wife and children had been equally changeable. There is no question but that a family history of mental disorder and emotional instability go far to explain the conduct of this prisoner.

Personal unattractiveness, whether due to a physical handicap, a mental defect, or personal habits distasteful to others of the same age, often places an individual quite outside the pale of his age group. The adolescent who cannot win recognition from the girls in his circle is very likely to have such a feeling of inferiority that he is ready to yield to an opportunity provided by a female in his own family. The low-grade mental defective without careful parental control is especially subject to this danger. Physically unattractive as he usually is, and ignorant of the arts of courtship, he fails to win response from an intelligent girl and finds closed most of the avenues to a realization of his adolescent desires. He may find easy access to an equally unattractive sister. If he succeeds in winning a wife and she for any reason becomes inaccessible, he may resort to his daughter or stepdaughter. The next two are cases in point.

Prisoner I–9 is an unmarried man nineteen years old who was committed for sexual relations with his twelve-year-old sister. He is an unskilled laborer, a second-generation Austrian, and a Catholic. He has an I. Q. of 60. He was the second of the eight children of a bricklayer who deserted his family many times and was probably of low intelligence himself. The family had been on relief intermittently for twenty years, and frequently lived in a single room in the most squalid conditions. His mother worked as a scrubwoman whenever she found work and consequently had to leave the children unsupervised much of the time. Both parents were heavy drinkers, the father a chronic drunkard.

As a child this prisoner had been afflicted with rickets and tuberculosis of the hip, which left one leg shorter than the other. He quit school at sixteen, after completing the sixth grade, and went to work in a chair factory, where he was employed steadily, but at the lowest wages. He never had any girl friends because, he says, he was "bashful with girls." Before his arrest he loafed around bowling alleys and earned some extra money by

setting up pins in the evening. He had a feeble-minded brother who might have been equally delinquent had he not been sent to the state school for the feeble-minded.

With a heritage of feeble-mindedness and a sordid home life in a neighborhood totally lacking in constructive influences, he was unable to find any sexual gratification except with his twelve-year-old sister.

The case of I–10, a feeble-minded man of thirty-four with an I. Q. of 52, is even more sordid. He is a second-generation French-Canadian, an unskilled laborer, and a Catholic. His parents had thirteen children, of whom he was the fourth, and his mother also had five children by an earlier marriage. He was in prison for relations with his brother's daughter.

The father was an unskilled laborer in very poor circumstances, and the family was dependent on various social agencies. The mother and four of the prisoner's brothers were diagnosed as feeble-minded. Only one of the boys was capable of holding a job and contributing to the family's support. Another brother was arrested for robbery and confessed to helping in seventeen holdups. So demoralized were home conditions that the children were taken away when the prisoner was eight years of age. He himself was sent to the Industrial School.

From the age of thirteen, by which time he had reached only the third grade, until he was eighteen years old the Industrial School paroled him on farms. Thereafter he continued farm work until he was twenty-two, when he returned to his family for the first time in fifteen years. His work record is that of an incompetent, feeble-minded person unable to hold any job for long. He was caught in many minor thefts by his employers, but always made restitution when discovered. He is a pathological liar, and when he talked with the investigator exaggerated greatly his ability to earn a living. When he married he was earning only five dollars a week as a restaurant porter, and he and his wife became chronic relief cases. The social workers, however, say that his wife was the one person in the family who had any sense, despite his accusation that she was unfaithful and extravagant.

He and his wife had separated, and for two years before the crime he had been living with his married brother, in whose daughter he found an outlet for his sexual craving. The brother, though also of low intelligence, was able to make a living and, as is frequently the case, was saved from delinquency by a harmonious marriage.

Another case, I–12, shows how critical an unsettled and inharmonious marital life may be for a person of low intelligence. This prisoner had an I. Q. of 57, and his brother was looked upon as a peculiar but nice old fellow who never caused any trouble and had a good reputation.

At the age of fourteen the prisoner began to work in the woods during the winter months and on the home farm in the summer. Thereafter he was

employed eighteen years by one firm, but for some time before his commitment worked much less continuously. He married a woman with whom he did not get along well.

Two years before his crime he discovered that his wife had been "stepping out" on him for a long time. This upset him so much that he took to drink. His poverty, the poor housekeeping of his wife, her infidelity, and the large number of children utterly discouraged him. During one of her frequent absences from home, and while drinking, he found his sexual objects in his stepdaughter and his own daughter.

The history of the brother differs in two major respects. Although his experiences had been almost identical to those of the prisoner up to the time they set out for themselves, he had settled down on a farm and prospered, and he had an agreeable family life.

In almost every newspaper account of rape the attacker is described as a "moron." Apparently, by journalistic definition, any man who attacks a female is a moron. True, among our 128 cases there are a number of actual morons, but there are many with normal intelligence or better.

The case of I–13 is that of a married man thirty-nine years old who is a second-generation German, an unskilled laborer, and a Lutheran. He is a low-grade, feeble-minded, oversexed person who was neglected throughout the years of his development and finally found himself in the clutches of the law, too late to save society from the evils of his untrained nature. He has an I. Q. of 65.

His long history of sex misdemeanors and other delinquencies began in 1917, when he was arrested on a charge of bastardy. Later he was sentenced to a house of correction for taking indecent liberties with a minor. Social workers know of two other sex offenses (an assault upon a maid in a friend's house and an attempted assault upon his wife's sister) for which he was not arrested. In addition, he has bootlegged liquor, run a house of assignation, and been guilty of passing counterfeit money. In 1931 he was imprisoned for incest with his thirteen-year-old daughter.

He was the only child of his father and mother, but had a stepbrother ten years his senior, his mother's son by a previous marriage. His father was a saloonkeeper in good circumstances, and the family was rather prominent in German circles of their home city. The prisoner had always been very leniently treated and showed a great deal of affection for his parents. But he was never taught self-control and was generally spoiled. His mother pampered him, and both parents often gave him money and helped him in other ways when he should have been disciplined. He grew up in a community where street gangs were common and the saloon an accepted institution. His associates, both in these gangs and in the saloon, were of the lowest type.

He disliked school and frequently played truant or stayed at home to

work in his father's saloon. At fourteen, when he quit school, he had reached only the third grade. He now became a factory operative for three years and succeeded in building up some savings, which he put in his parents' custody. When he was twenty they gave him nineteen hundred dollars and a little later, upon their death, he inherited sixteen thousand dollars. He made an investment in timber land, all of which he lost when the price of lumber fell. He returned to the city and held a succession of jobs, several of which he lost as a result of sheer laziness and inefficiency. He dissipated what he had left of his inheritance and was never able to save again.

His marriage and domestic relationships contributed further to his personal demoralization. His wife was a woman of low character who, far from helping him, encouraged his delinquencies. Together they were implicated in all kinds of immorality. At one time they conducted a house of assignation, and both were ostracized by their relatives. She was physiologically incapable of satisfying his oversexed nature, and he overtaxed her so severely that she had ten children in as many years, several of whom died. They neglected their family so badly that one of the children froze to death, and the rest were taken from their mother when the prisoner was committed to the house of correction.

In sum, the prisoner was a pampered child who had never been taught self-control. He was of weak moral fiber, easily led, and so limited in mental ability that he could not fit himself unaided into either the school or the industrial world. For that failure he compensated by securing status in groups of low social ideals and by boasting of his financial success. His sex impulses, since he had never been taught to control them, found expression in all manner of illegitimate actions.

The contrast between the background of the prisoner and that of his stepbrother is illuminating. They have different fathers, which may be significant, though we do not know of any hereditary mental defect in the family. Whereas the prisoner has an I. Q. of only 65, the stepbrother gives the impression of having average intelligence. He was shown no favoritism during his childhood; indeed, he did not get along well with his stepfather. He is highly moral and has a strong will. He has worked for thirty-four years in one factory, is thrifty and cautious in his spending, and has learned to save. He is married to a fine woman who has been a real helpmate to him, and their friends are citizens of a high type.

Our sample includes many other cases that illustrate the potential menace of feeble-minded men who are not carefully conditioned in early life. Some of them got into trouble under the influence of low associates, others because of an emotional conflict born of domestic disharmony with which they were unable to cope. Some of them show the influence of drink in their demoralization.

Comparison of the life experiences of Case I–14, whose I. Q. is 92, with

those of an equally intelligent brother, throws light upon the influence that parental home conditions and the choice of associates during adolescence may have even upon people of high intelligence. The training of the emotions is more important even than intelligence.

Both these boys grew up in a home where the mother dominated the yielding, placid father, who for many years was a sailor on Great Lakes steamers and therefore away much of the time. The home was a poor one, and the mother was obliged to work part of the time. She ruled her children with a very strict and rather hysterical discipline, and both boys tried to escape her stern repression by staying away from home as much as possible.

The decisive factor in the different conduct of these two boys seems to have been the kind of associates they chose as they grew into adolescence. The prisoner affiliated himself with a wild group of boys who had a clubhouse in the neighborhood, and began to develop a pattern of conduct which he never outgrew. As he passed into manhood he began to drink heavily, became promiscuous, changed jobs rather frequently, and associated with rough men and loose women. He never married, but for nine years lived with a woman who already had a daughter. Sexual relations with the latter led to his imprisonment.

The brother, on the other hand, associated during adolescence with a group of young people who were church members and who led him into church activities. Though he was expelled from school for causing trouble and though he made an unsuccessful marriage at twenty-five, he was never promiscuous and he has had a good work record. He divorced his wife a year after their marriage because of trouble with her family, and eight years later married his present wife, with whom he is congenial. He was employed for twenty years by one firm, then took another job, which he has held ever since. During his entire occupational career he has missed scarcely a day.

Many cases show that home conditions both in the parental and in the marital home may influence conduct greatly. Some cases of incest and many of rape and sodomy are rooted in early home conditions. The inaccessibility of a wife, from whatever cause, is the factor in many of the incest cases.

The importance of early background and of marital harmony are illustrated by the differing careers of I–16 and his brother, two second-generation Poles. Both are Catholic, both married. Both had a step-parent; both associated during adolescence with a crowd of rough Polish boys who were suffering from the conflict between the Polish and the American way of life.

Against these similarities of background may be listed many differences. The prisoner had an I. Q. of 68, the brother seems brighter. The prisoner was fifteen when his father deserted the family, whereas his brother was an infant of three months. When the mother remarried, the brother remained with her and continued to be subject to her firm supervision until he was

grown. The prisoner, who disliked his stepfather, was constantly moving from the home of his own father, who had also remarried, to that of his stepfather and mother. When he got tired of the discipline of one, he went to the other, and so was deprived of steady and consistent control. He became the object of his mother's ridicule and abuse, whereas the brother was in her good graces. She says of the two boys, "B and P are like day and night. B has never been any trouble, and P has never been anything but trouble."

The brother has always been in good health; the prisoner has had numerous physical ailments and was discharged from the navy because of disability. The brother had a grade-school education and three years work in a vocational school, after which he was apprenticed to a plumber. The prisoner never liked school and quit early to go to work. The brother early discarded his rough associates and did not drink. The prisoner associated with drunkards and persons of low caliber, and drank heavily; according to his mother, he "will drown some day in the drink he consumes." The brother was stable occupationally, having remained in one city all his life, and was seldom out of funds. The prisoner had been all over the world and was often unemployed.

The brother married a compatible girl, to whom he was faithful. The prisoner married on short acquaintance a woman twelve years his junior who, though she was a nice person, was sickly and often inaccessible to him sexually. He is described as crazy about women, being willing, as his mother puts it, "to sell his coat for one." This pattern of conduct she attributes to his experiences in the navy. Because his wife was inaccessible, he began to have illicit relations with his stepsister.

His low intelligence, his undisciplined adolescent life, the influence of low associates, his experience in the navy, and the inaccessibility of his wife were undoubtedly all determining factors.

SUMMARY OF THE INCEST CASES

The statistical tables show that 51 per cent of those guilty of incest have an I. Q. of less than 70. Only those committed for arson have a lower rating.

Forty per cent of them have an irregular work record. This is comparable to the records of all sex offenders, 32.6 per cent of whom held jobs for less than a year. See Table 34.

In 53.3 per cent of the cases the prisoner's relations with his wife were disharmonious or the wife was sexually inaccessible. This is slightly less than the corresponding percentage for all sex offenders (58.3 per cent; Table 43).

Of the forty-five incest cases 24.4 per cent had associates with low morals. It is our impression that this is a much larger proportion than among their brothers.

Only 8.8 per cent of those guilty of incest, in contrast to the 15.1 per cent of all sex offenders, were drinking at the time the act was committed.

The case histories show that the important psychological factors are low intelligence and lack of emotional control. The sexual impulse is imperious and unless it is conditioned to expression in socially approved ways, or to sublimation, it tends to burst all the bounds set by the conventions and laws of society. Social training cannot modify the intelligence, but it can teach control of the fundamental impulses. In most of our cases there is little evidence that those guilty of incest were naturally more highly sexed than their brothers, but much evidence that the sociological conditions of their development were very different. Lack of training in behavior approved by society, a consciousness of rejection by those who provide emotional security, loss of the prestige and self-respect which comes with economic security and stability, habitual association with persons of socially disapproved habits, inability to secure a wife, and often the interruption of satisfactory marital relationships through death, illness, or disharmony, these are the sociological factors that loom large in the case histories.

CASES OF STATUTORY RAPE

Of the 89 prisoners in our sample sentenced for statutory rape, 46 were actually cases of incest. Most of these had committed incest with a girl under eighteen and were sentenced for statutory rape rather than under the incest statute. The reasons for this policy of the courts are probably these: (1) it is easier to convict a person for relations with a female below the age of consent than for incest, and (2) so great is the revulsion against incest that the court authorities feel that the sentence for statutory rape better fits the crime than that for incest. For the latter the sentence is two to ten years, whereas the sentence for statutory rape by a man over eighteen is one to thirty-five years or a fine of $200.

We were unable to find any significant differences in social background or in personal characteristics between those convicted under the statute governing incest and those convicted of statutory rape. This was probably due to the fact that of those convicted of statutory rape more than half had committed incest. Therefore the only cases cited here are an unusual one involving both a man and his wife and a few others that illustrate how a well-intentioned law may be used for purposes of blackmail or revenge or to prevent the threatened disgrace of a girl's family.

One of our cases of statutory rape is interesting for the fact that it involves the active concurrence of the prisoner's wife. SR–5 is a native American with an I. Q. of 80, is married, and at the time of his commitment was thirty-nine years old. He has no professed religion. He had never been arrested before, although he had apparently indulged in very irregular conduct for some time. There is some evidence that he and his wife had attempted to blackmail a well-to-do citizen of their community. The couple are both in prison, he on the charge of having relations in his own house with several girls, she for having abetted him by enticing the girls to their home and persuading them to submit to her husband.

The prisoner was the youngest of a family of eight children, and his background was none too good. His father was a shoemaker, but his chief source of income was a Civil War pension of thirty dollars. The family, though it did not enjoy a position of prominence, was regarded as respectable. They were members of the Methodist church, and the father was a member of the local G.A.R. post.

As a child the prisoner was regarded as more or less queer by the community. He did not care for athletic sports as did the other boys his age, and he seems to have been the butt of their practical jokes. This naturally engendered a feeling of frustration, for which he attempted to compensate by fabricating stories centering around himself as the hero.

When he was fifteen years old his mother died and his father remarried. He found his stepmother so difficult to get along with that he left home when he was seventeen. This situation and the unfortunate death of his mother just at the period of adolescence were probably very disturbing emotionally.

His health history reveals no childhood illness of positive significance for his later conduct, but as an adult he suffered from a number of afflictions. In the army he received an injury to his foot, was gassed and shell-shocked, and contracted gonorrhea. Thereafter he had several sieges of illness and mental disturbance and was unable to work for any length of time.

His occupational career began at the age of fourteen, when upon graduation from grade school he became a grocery clerk. After he left home he worked in various manufacturing plants in a nearby city and became a skilled toolmaker. To this work he returned after a period of service in the army, but was forced to give it up because of the disability his military service had caused. With his disability pension and the insurance his wife's former husband had left her he bought a small farm near his old home town, and here the couple were living a quiet life of semi-retirement. Apparently his only recreation was loafing about with other men of the community.

He and his wife seem to have been fairly happy together, despite a statement in the record, perhaps simply part of her defense at the trial, that her husband had forced her to entice girls into their home. In the local community the couple had a good reputation and were said to have an excellent home. The wife was apparently well liked by the other women of the town, who described her as a real lady and found it hard to believe her guilty of the crime with which she was charged. The findings of a psychiatrist who diagnosed her may furnish an incidental explanation of the marriage relationship. He believed that she was probably the aggressor in the affair, that she was of a sadistic temperament which derived sexual satisfaction from

the pain the girls suffered through her husband—a unique case in our sample. The decisive factors in the case were the emotional upset which the prisoner suffered upon his mother's death, his inability to find a substitute in his stepmother, the accentuation of his personal characteristics by his war experience, and his relationship with his wife.

The brother of this prisoner, though he has never been in trouble with the law, is likewise a poor citizen. About twice a month he goes on a spree and remains drunk for several days. His wife is forced to take in washing to supplement her husband's income. The only significant differences in the backgrounds of the two men are the ages at which they faced the disruption of the parental home, the difference in their war experiences, and the character of their respective wives. Under similar circumstances the brother might also have reaped a prison sentence.

The following cases have no bearing on the factors that contribute to the making of the sex offender, but they do explain how some of these men come to be in prison. They show how important it is that law enforcement officials examine carefully into each case to prevent abuse of the statute. A plea of guilty should be accepted by the court only after it has been ascertained by careful inquiry that the accused understands the meaning of the statute and that it is not being misused by the accusing parties. On the whole the judges of the state are fairly careful to protect defendants against the machinations of unscrupulous persons by inquiring into the character and the circumstances of the crime, but some injustices have been done. The following cases are instances of its abuse.

Case SR–6 is that of a second-generation Norwegian twenty-three years old, an unskilled laborer with an I. Q. of 92. He is a Lutheran. He received a sentence of twelve to fourteen months for having relations with a seventeen-year-old girl. The light sentence probably testifies to the court's feeling that he was not entirely to blame. In fact, he fully intended to marry the girl as soon as his economic circumstances improved and actually did marry her after his conviction to protect the child and its mother. The girl's parents objected to the marriage and used the law in an attempt to prevent it.

The case is an almost perfect illustration of the difference between local custom and the law. In the group in which the prisoner had been brought up his relationship with the girl was looked upon as a normal one for an engaged couple. He had no intention of commiting a criminal act, and in none but the legal sense could he be termed a criminal. Yet the law, enacted for the protection of innocent girls, put the stigma of a prison sentence not only upon him and his wife but also upon their child, who will carry it through the years to come.

SR–7 is a married man thirty-eight years of age who has an I. Q. of 76. He is native-born and a farmer, and professes no religion. He was sentenced for

having relations with a fourteen-year-old girl who was working in his home. The only previous charge against him was one of assault and battery, for which he was fined.

He was a disreputable citizen, but so too was the girl. At a time when his wife was inaccessible to him the girl, who was promiscuous, consented readily to having relations with her employer. Later her relatives and others with whom she had been promiscuous induced her to use the law in an effort to blackmail the man.

Another case is that of an ignorant farm hand who had come to the state to work as a factory operative. He rented a room from a widow, who shortly invited him to cohabit with her and a little later suggested that he cohabit with her daughter. She then informed him that he was subject to prosecution because her daughter was under eighteen, but that a payment of fifteen hundred dollars would square the matter. When he refused, she lowered her price to five hundred. He laughed at her, and she turned the case over to the court. He admitted the act, but felt that he was guiltless since he had been solicited. He was given a stiff sentence.

Our group of statutory rapists includes a number of such offenders. They were guilty of fornication, and legally of statutory rape, but the law was used for a different purpose than had been intended by the lawmakers. Many of the prisoners knew nothing about the age of consent. Habituated to promiscuity, they approached any likely girl whatever her age.

A survey of the case histories reveals a number of facts with respect to the social and personal backgrounds of the statutory rapists:

1. Of 41 rapists whose intelligence had been measured, 46 per cent had an I. Q. below 70. This is a smaller proportion than for the incest cases (51 per cent), and slightly lower than that for all sex offenders (49.1 per cent). See Table 22.

2. Of the 44 rapists on whom we have information, 34 did not have access at the time of the crime to legitimate sexual objects. Of these 15 were single, 2 widowed, 4 divorced or separated from their wives, and 13, though not separated, were denied sexual relations because of health, disharmony, pregnancy, or incompatibility.

3. Of the 44 cases only 7 said that they had never been promiscuous before. In their social circles illicit connections seem to be a part of the folkways, an impression strengthened by a comparison of these cases with a recent study of male college students.[20] Of 592 undergraduate men, 48 per cent had not had sexual intercourse. The men in our sample are, to be sure, older, but most of those who admitted having had sexual experience stated that it had occurred early in life.

[20] Dorothy Dunbar Bromley and Florence Haxton Britten, *Youth and Sex* (New York, 1938), 133.

4. But these men had been sent to prison for having relations with girls below the age of consent, although prostitutes or "easy" women were accessible. Most of them of course could not afford to pay a prostitute, for nearly half were either feeble-minded or on the borderline. They therefore sought out innocent, experienced, or feeble-minded girls. Most of them had been reared in families whose standards in sex matters were low, and many had grown up in a culture which considered sexual relations with anyone available as a trivial matter. Few of them knew anything about the law of the age of consent. And, finally, 21 of the 44 had experienced frustration in their homes or had been petted or spoiled, and were emotionally so apathetic that they reverted to an adolescent pattern of behavior.

5. Of the 44 cases, only 12 were drunk or had been drinking at the time of or just before the crime. Thus in the majority of cases the crime is not attributable to alcohol, which breaks down the inhibitions. In any event excessive drinking is itself now regarded as a possible symptom of emotional maladjustment.

6. Senility is often named as a factor in sexual crimes, especially attacks on young girls, but of 43 cases in our sample only 2 were sixty years of age or older. These two, as they became senile, degenerated physically and mentally and reverted to infantile patterns of sexual behavior. For all the others different explanations must be sought. The statutory rapists were somewhat older than the sex offenders as a whole, 86 per cent being over thirty, as compared with 70 per cent of the latter.

7. By far the majority came from homes that were not conducive to the formation of habits in harmony with the social requirements of the law. Dissension in the parental family or a broken home without an adequate substitute was common. A number of the prisoners had no adequate parental guidance during adolescence, and were thrown with associates whose moral code was of the loosest character. They were not trained in the nature of sex and were often repressed in their emotional development, with the result that they were ill prepared for their role as members of a family.

CASES OF FORCIBLE RAPE

Of the 128 sex offenders in our sample only 14 aside from those classed as cases of statutory rape or incest were convicted of forcible rape. Even these 14 cases include a number that clearly did not involve forced relations, though the charge of forced relations had been brought by the woman or some of her friends. In 4 cases involving 6 men the relations were probably forced. In one the girl testified that intercourse had been voluntary but that from it she had contracted gonorrhea; in another the girl and the man had spent the night together in a hotel, but the girl claimed that the man had forced her to commit sodomy on him and that he committed sodomy on her. The doctor testified that both her vagina and rectum had been torn.

One case involved a prostitute whom there is reason to suspect of attempting blackmail. One case involved two farm boys who said that they had had relations with the girl but only on her invitation. Because the boys pleaded guilty, not understanding the distinction between fornication and rape, they had no attorney and only a bench trial, at which only the girl's testimony was taken. Another case involving two men, one for the crime, the other for aiding and abetting it, was clearly a case of forcible rape committed when the man was drunk. In another case the man admits relations but says they were not forced. In two other cases, involving three men, evidence clearly points to the use of forcible measures.

The two men involved in cases R–1 and R–2 had undoubtedly used forcible methods on a number of occasions. One of them, the leader, was a second-generation Belgian twenty-seven years old, married, an unskilled laborer, and a Catholic. He had an I. Q. of 60. He was the youngest in a family of eight and the favorite of both father and mother, and was therefore probably spoiled during boyhood.

He did not get along well in school, partly because of his low mentality and partly because of a culture conflict between his family and that of the American community in which they lived—a conflict which the other children, however, have resolved satisfactorily. He had reached only the third grade at fifteen.

He left home at the age of seventeen, when his father retired from the farm. He became promiscuous early, contracted gonorrhea at the age of twenty-two, and when he entered prison had an old case of uncured syphilis. At eighteen he enlisted in the army and served a year. After returning home he became a machine operator in various factories; the last firm to employ him kept him three and a half years. In 1924 he was sentenced to the state reformatory for receiving stolen property.

His transfer from the farm to the city was probably the critical event in his career. Having been deprived of proper discipline in the parental home, he was an easy prey to vicious influences. He began to visit roadhouses and dance halls, where he picked up girls. He was a heavy drinker and sexually promiscuous even after his marriage, which occurred about a year before his arrest. His wife, with whom he never lived for any length of time, was not a person who could manage him, and he declares that she also was promiscuous. Despite his low intelligence he was able to exercise a great deal of influence over his partner in the crime.

R–2 was a twenty-year-old, second-generation German who was also married. He was an unskilled laborer and a Catholic. His I. Q. was 76.

The family was a thoroughly demoralized one. R–2 was the second of six children, the youngest of whom was illegitimate. The father was alcoholic and promiscuous, and finally deserted the family when the prisoner

was eight years old. The mother, a weak character unable to control her children, had been an inmate of a county hospital for mental diseases. She too was sexually promiscuous, both before and after her marriage. One of the prisoner's brothers had been arrested several times for various crimes from stealing to rape, and the other two had been in correctional institutions, one in Wisconsin and the other in a neighboring state. One of his sisters had a record of sexual delinquency, and the other had been committed to a Catholic institution for delinquent girls when she was arrested with one of the boys for larceny. The family had been a charge upon public and private charitable agencies almost continuously after the father's desertion.

The prisoner himself had been a sickly child. At seven he was committed to the county home for dependent children, where he remained for some time. At twelve he was arrested for larceny and committed to the Wisconsin Industrial School for Boys. At sixteen he ran away from this institution and returned to his mother, with whom, at her request, he was allowed to remain on good behavior. He worked for an uncle on a farm for a year and then returned to the city and worked as a punch-press operator. Some time later he was arrested for failing to stop after injuring a pedestrian with his car and was put on probation for two years by a municipal court. The next year he was arrested for bastardy but settled the case by marrying the girl.

His later career was the result of his association with the man (R–1) who led him into the crime for which they were both imprisoned. He was persuaded to live with this man, and together they would go to dances, make the acquaintance of girls, and offer to take them home. Then they would drive into the country and with or without the consent of the girls have relations with them. The break did not occur until one of the girls became pregnant and blamed the prisoner. This led to the bastardy charge and his marriage to the girl in order to escape arrest. He took her to live with his mother, but trouble soon arose between the two women. Then he was again persuaded to live with his former companion in crime, and they renewed their old practices, the outcome of which was their arrest and sentence on three charges.

In this case the significant factors are many: an alcoholic father who was also sexually promiscuous and who deserted his family; a weak mother who was mentally disturbed and sexually promiscuous; a demoralized home giving the children no proper discipline; a history of early illness; residence at the tender age of seven in a home for dependent children; and an almost continuous history of delinquency with no chance to acquire status in a law-abiding group.

Case R–3 is a native American thirty years old, an unskilled laborer, and a Methodist. He has an I. Q. of 79. His first arrest was on a charge of bastardy, but he settled the case out of court by marrying the girl. Later he

was arrested for violation of a traffic ordinance, but for no other serious offense. Eight years after his first arrest he was convicted of taking a nineteen-year-old girl into the country and forcing her.

He was the fifth of the eight children of a farmer in poor circumstances. When he was seventeen his parents lost the farm and the family moved to one of the larger cities of Wisconsin. The father secured steady employment as an unskilled worker in an industrial plant, and the prisoner secured seasonal, though fairly steady, work with various contractors.

Though the mother had been divorced from a former husband, family relations were harmonious. Both parents exercised their discipline impartially, though neither was very strict. The family belonged to the Methodist church, but attended only irregularly and had very little social life outside the home.

As a child the prisoner was never sick, but at sixteen he almost died from an appendectomy, and as an adult he had contracted a light case of smallpox and had suffered from gonorrhea.

He became sexually promiscuous at an early age and at twenty-two was involved in the bastardy case. He lived only six months with his wife, who secured a divorce on the grounds of abusive language and threats of bodily harm. After his divorce he drank heavily and continued his sexual promiscuity, picking up girls at dances and roadhouses. He was a seclusive person and had no very intimate friends. Although he hunted and fished, his chief recreation was dancing.

Thus the superficial factors in the case were low economic status, promiscuity ending in an unfortunate marriage and divorce, and heavy drinking. In addition, the family has a history of mental disease. His maternal grandmother became insane, and the child of a sister is feeble-minded. Doubtless a strain of instability, aggravated by the pressure of external circumstances and bad habits, contributed to the crime.

The prisoner has an older brother who is a respected member of his community and economically far more successful than the father had been. Unlike the prisoner he was reared to manhood and was married while the family still lived in the country. His wife was a helpful mate, and he was able to concentrate his energies and interests in his home and business. He drank only moderately. His more normal career may be attributed to the steadying influences of a sound community life and a harmonious home, as contrasted with the prisoner's transfer from the farm to a city environment, where he succumbed to bad influences.

Cases R–5 and R–6 involve two men, not brothers, one of whom, while drunk, forcibly raped two women. Both had been left half-orphans by the death of their fathers, one at the age of four and the other at the age of twelve. Both had strong family feelings and affection for their mothers,

but their family situations were quite different. The man who committed the double rape had an I. Q. of 105 and the other, who was convicted of aiding and abetting the crime, an I. Q. of 92. While the two were on a vacation in northern Wisconsin, they met a couple of women whom they took to a dance. After drinking heavily R–5 forcibly raped both of them. He is twenty-six years old, the son of native-born parents, married, a clerk, and a Seventh Day Adventist. His case is one of the most remarkable in our sample. He had no previous police record, nor is there any evidence that he was ever implicated in any criminal activity.

He was the sixth of ten children besides one adopted child. His father, a small-town merchant in fair circumstances, died when he was twelve years old, and his mother later remarried. His relations with his stepfather were always harmonious; indeed, there seems to be only one factor in his early background, aside from the loss of his father, that has any possible significance. His mother was a somewhat queer woman and was the dominant personality in the home. Her discipline of the children was strict; though she never whipped them, she punished them by denying them luxuries and sending them to bed. She was a pious Seventh Day Adventist and reared her children in that faith.

R–5 always had good health and succeeded in getting a good education. At twenty he had completed a two-year normal school course after working during vacations and a year in the woods as a lumberjack. He taught rural schools for two years and then moved to a large city, where he held a position with one corporation for a year and a half and then obtained a clerkship with a telephone company, in whose employ he was at the time of the crime. He had a good reputation with his employers.

Perhaps the most significant factor in his case is his marital history. He married at the age of twenty-two, but had lived with his wife only a short time when their relations became strained because of the interference of his mother-in-law, on whom his wife was very dependent. One child was born to them, but they were increasingly unhappy, and she secured a divorce shortly after he was imprisoned.

At some point in his early life he broke loose from his strict moral training and became habituated to sexual promiscuity, which he continued after his marriage. He says he was not used to drinking and does not know whether he committed the crime or not, though the evidence seems conclusive. Drink undoubtedly unloosed something in his physical and psychological make-up, which cannot be identified from the evidence. It may have been a reaction against the strict precepts of his mother, an emotional imbalance born of his unhappy relations with his wife, some reaction induced by his promiscuity, or a combination of all these factors. The man has a pleasing personality, good address, and a superior mentality, and it is probable that after this severe lesson he will do well upon his release.

R–6, who was convicted of aiding and abetting the crime, was a second-generation German twenty-five years old. He was a clerk by occupation and a Lutheran in religion, and he had an I. Q. of 92.

He was the youngest of the four children of German immigrants. The family was in comfortable circumstances until the father's death when the prisoner was four. Then the home had to be sold to provide a living for the family until the older children became wage earners, and for a few years the mother found it necessary to do housework for others. Even in this situation she seems to have had no especial disciplinary problems, for the family was a close-knit one.

As the youngest child the prisoner had greater educational opportunities than the others and was not obliged to go to work at so early an age. After attending a commercial high school for two years he became a bank clerk, at the age of seventeen, and held this position for two years. When he was arrested he had worked for four years in his next position, with a telephone company.

He had had no affairs with women except a few casual contacts and did not attack either of the women who were victims of the crime. It is quite probable that if these two men, unaccustomed as they were to liquor, had not been drinking, the crime would not have occurred.

Recently some attention has been given to the possible effect of sleeping sickness on conduct. Of our sample of 128 sex offenders only one had been afflicted with the disease, which probably is not of great importance in producing criminality. This case, however, reveals how social factors may operate on an organism damaged by the disease. The prisoner is a second-generation German twenty-eight years old, single, a skilled laborer, and a Lutheran. His I. Q. is 66. He was sent to prison on a charge of forcibly raping a woman of about his own age. He had previously been arrested and convicted twice for violation of the prohibition law, and had in each instance paid a fine of two hundred dollars and served two months in jail. The police had also received complaints against him for annoying women.

He was the seventh of ten children. When he was fifteen his father, a farmer in good circumstances, died, and his mother took her family to a nearby city. They continued to live comfortably, for the children turned over their pay checks to their mother. They were members of the Lutheran church and had an excellent reputation in the community. There is no evidence that the prisoner was a favorite child, but he felt responsible for his mother and lived with her after the others had left home.

As a child he had a long siege of sleeping sickness, which, his mother says, made a nervous and unstable person of him. When he was twenty he contracted gonorrhea.

He went to school until he was fifteen, when he had completed two years of high school. He was then apprenticed to a plumber until he had learned

the trade, after which he had steady employment with two firms in the city. Then he rejoined his mother to manage a roadhouse on the home farm. Partly as a result of his business he became sexually promiscuous and had casual contacts with numerous girls, mostly of the type that frequents roadhouses. He says he never had any inclination to marry.

A brother twelve years his senior has a quite different background. He has always enjoyed good health, has held one job for about thirty years, and is married to a fine woman who makes him a pleasant home. He has never been a frequenter of roadhouses and has an excellent reputation in the community.

Prisoners R–8 and R–9 were sent to prison for twenty years on the charge of forcibly raping a young woman whom they were escorting home from a dance. For them, as for some of the other sex offenders, the court apparently did not function efficiently as an instrument of justice. Sentence was pronounced on the plea of guilty and on the statement of the sheriff.

Under the misapprehension that rape meant any sexual relations with a female the boys pleaded guilty, and were not set right until they arrived at the penitentiary. They did not have counsel, and their side of the story was not properly presented. Both admitted having had relations with the girl but maintain that it was at her own request. If their story is true—and it may well be, for the girl's reputation was not good—they were guilty not of rape but of fornication.

R–8 is the twenty-year-old son of a Polish farmer, is unmarried, and has an I. Q. of 66. He had previously been sentenced to the Wisconsin State Reformatory for burglary, had been paroled, and had violated his parole by the offense for which he was in prison.

He was the oldest of the eight children of Polish peasants living in a Polish-American farming community, which supplied virtually all the social contacts of the family. The father spoke very little English and was the disciplinarian in the home. He is said to have had a violent temper when moved to anger. The family was Catholic, attended church faithfully, and was in good standing with the local priest.

At the age of fourteen R–8 left school to help on the farm, having then reached the seventh grade. Before long he became alienated from his father, with whom he could not agree, and at the age of seventeen left home. He worked in logging camps for a time, but had difficulty getting other work because of his small stature. One night, being without funds, he broke into some stores in search of food, was apprehended, and sentenced to the reformatory. When he was paroled he worked again for his father, shouldering much of the responsibility for the farm work despite the fact that he was not in good physical condition and was emotionally upset by the experience he had been through.

He claims to have had no sexual experience before he committed his offense, though he had begun to have girl friends early. He is of a gregarious temperament and pleasing personality despite his low I. Q. Especially after his reformatory experience he seemed to be desirous of making friends, of orienting himself to the American pattern of culture, and of acquiring the status that lack of opportunity had denied him. The prison authorities state that after coming to prison he developed a homosexual love affair with another one of the inmates, a man who had also been committed on a charge of rape.

The background and personality of the brother are sufficiently different to be significant. He is slow of wit and, unlike the prisoner, is homely and unattractive. Though he is an extrovert and has always been in excellent health, he is more self-sufficient. As a boy he had few friends and had nothing to do with girls, perhaps because he got along well with his father. He has never left home.

The other boy involved in this case, R–9, has a similar background. He is the oldest child in a Polish farm family of the same community, a Catholic, and unmarried. His I. Q. is 61. He has no record of previous arrests, and no other member of the family, which is a large one, has ever been in difficulty. He left school to help on the farm even earlier than his fellow prisoner —at the age of nine.

Like his chum he claims that the offense he committed was his first sexual experience. The two boys were bosom friends, and both were bent on making contacts outside the Polish community. Unfortunately they affiliated themselves with the lower elements of the American community and, being ignorant of American standards of approved conduct, got themselves into trouble. They formed the habit of visiting dance halls and skating rinks and mingling there with the young people, the less desirable elements of the community. In the case of R–9 this active search for new experiences may be partly attributed to the hyperthyroidism from which he was discovered to be suffering upon his entry into prison.

The background of the prisoner's brother was different in several respects. He was of an easy-going temperament and was physically and mentally in good health. He was able to stay in school until he was sixteen, and succeeded in finding satisfaction at home among his own people. Thus he had no close friends who might have tried to wean him away from the self-sufficient life he was leading.

Neither of the boys involved in this case had criminal intentions; their act of fornication was tolerated, if not approved, by the cultural folkways of the youth of both the Polish and the American community. They both were hard-working farm boys seeking recreation and new experiences outside the family. They were the victims of their own ignorance and of the machinations of a girl who, in order to avenge herself on one of the boys for jilting her, signed a complaint against them.

Our rape cases include none of those attacks on children which the newspaper press plays up so much, but the group is probably typical of this type of offender nevertheless. Attacks on children, which are usually committed by mentally unsound degenerates of the lowest order, are actually not very numerous, but they so shock the moral sense of the community that they arouse great public indignation.

A survey of the rape cases suggests that the offenders were youths with strong sexual impulses who had discovered that certain groups in the community tolerated and even encouraged forms of satisfaction condemned by the home, the school, and the church. This inconsistency of standards creates confusion in the mind of the adolescent and breaks down his inhibitions, with the result that under the stress of a strong emotion he acts impulsively and unwisely.

For many of the prisoners the confusion born of this lack of uniformity in moral standards was aggravated by the conflict between a European culture and the American culture they met as they grew up. In the face of such a conflict the youth's respect for the family code tends to be undermined, and when a crisis arises he has nothing to guide him. Moreover, many of the men involved in the cases of rape, including statutory rape and incest, are inferior in intelligence, and hence lack the acumen to see through the maze of conflicting standards to the result of a given course of conduct. The actual number of such offenders probably greatly exceeds the number who have been caught and convicted of their crimes.

The sexual impulse is one of the two primary drives of the human being. Had it been less compelling the human race could not have survived the rigors to which it has been subjected during the course of its development. But today, under conditions far different, the impulse needs to be controlled in the interest of social welfare. In modern man, it has been estimated, the sexual impulse is four times as strong as it need be to perpetuate the race under present conditions. Such control is much more difficult in a society of clashing cultures, disintegrating codes, and uncertain sanctions.[21]

Summary of the Sex Offenders

The distinctive characteristics of the sex offenders were tabulated in Chapter 2, and differences in background have been illustrated by case histories. Below is a synthesized summary of the characteristics of the sex offenders as a whole.

1. A background offering only very limited opportunities for economic success is common, the specific handicaps being a relatively low I. Q., an unduly brief educational experience, foreign birth or foreign parentage, and early contributions to the support of the paternal family. All these are impediments to the development of self-esteem, recognition in the community,

[21] Wile, "Society and Sex Offenders," *Survey Graphic*, November, 1937, p. 569.

the attainment of a settled position, the choice of desirable associates, and marriage to the proper wife, a woman who will encourage conduct that accords with the norms of the law-abiding elements in the community. A large proportion of the men were unskilled laborers.

2. A peculiar emotional insensitivity is distinctive of the sex offender. He gives his parents a more favorable reputation than does the property offender and, despite the evidence of the case histories, reports less domestic disharmony in the parental family. He less often claims that he was shown any favoritism during boyhood and was less sensitive to the severity of family discipline. His emotional apathy and the hopelessness of his social position help to explain his lack of ethical standards in sexual behavior. Unlike the murderer, he seldom gives way to emotional outbursts.

3. Physical disability or disfigurement, mental twists, and lack of the social graces caused a number of the sex offenders to look for companionship among the most disorganized personalities of the community. For the same reason some of them failed to marry. Those who did marry, having less scope in the choice of a mate than the murderers and property offenders, more frequently married a woman of the same mental capacity and social status as themselves. Their unattractiveness to women also helps to explain why they sought sexual satisfaction in illegitimate ways.

4. Drink played a part directly in the crimes of only 15.1 per cent of the sex offenders, in striking contrast with 30.7 per cent of the murderers, but indirectly in most of the other cases, through association with drinking companions.

5. Are there some conditions inherent in the constitutions of these sex offenders that had a decided influence on their adult behavior? Some probably inherited a mental weakness, but many children from families with a history of mental defectiveness or mental imbalance do not become sex offenders. This suggests that even with such persons it is early experiences that determine what response the hereditary equipment will make to social situations in adulthood. The native endowment, which undoubtedly plays its part, cannot be altered, but it can be directed by those charged with a child's upbringing. When proper direction is lacking, the child, and later the youth, seeks associates who respond to his emotional needs and molds his conduct by their standards. Many of the sex offenders had obviously been mishandled by their families or had so resented family control that they broke away and adopted the habits of anti-social companions.

6. For the married sex offenders, disharmonious marital relations frequently provided the crisis which they were unable to meet in socially approved ways.

7. A minority of the sex offenders did not intend to break the law, in fact did not know what was the law. But the larger percentage are men who were unprepared—economically, emotionally, and intellectually—for the

circumstances of life, and hence were led into an acceptance of the mores of disorganized personalities.

8. Not only do the sex offenders as a whole differ in some respects from the murderers and property offenders, but there are several distinct differences between the homosexuals and the other sex offenders. The sodomists are emotionally more apathetic than the rapists (including those convicted of incest), more likely to have an average or a high I. Q., though they left school earlier, more likely to have been steadily employed, to have remained home longer, and to have developed a fixation on mother or sister. They are less aggressive and reacted less against the conditions surrounding their upbringing. These are the characteristics of a personality unable to cope with the conditions of our complex society.

9. In most of the cases of incest the immediate cause of the crime was the inaccessibility of the wife and the accessibility of some young girl, usually a member of the family. The more fundamental causes were the habits formed years before, the lack of principles about sexual relations in accord with the law, and the failure to establish habitual and socially approved control of the sexual urge.

10. Of the sodomists, both married and single, some were perverts only in the absence of a sexual object of the opposite sex. Others had a decided preference for their own sex. This latter group is characterized by some deep-lying abnormality; whether it is hereditary or the natural libido conditioned very early by seduction and habit cannot be determined from our cases. Though there is widespread tolerance of extra-legal heterosexual relations, most people are so antagonistic to homosexuality that only the very rationalistic can enjoy such a relationship without a feeling of degradation.

11. Sexual offenses, especially rape (including statutory rape), are the result of a desire not only to satisfy the sexual urge but also to secure prestige in certain circles. Criminal sexual intercourse, as such, does not of course give status in such groups, but it does represent conquest of a girl, which is somehow regarded as a measure of a man's virility. Many young fellows of the sort we have been describing, seeking status in some group, meet derision and scorn if they have not "made" at least one girl. Those who are not alert in choosing a victim and in covering up the deed are caught; most of the "smart" ones go free.

12. The great majority of the rapists—the statutory rapists and those guilty of incest—show rather clearly the conflict between opposing standards of sexual conduct. Some were brought up in a group which tolerated, if it did not actually approve, relationships outside wedlock. Others in whom strict standards had been inculcated had abandoned them to adopt the code of a group with looser morals.

13. The four statistically significant differences between the sex offenders

and their brothers, all but the second of which have been discussed incidenally, are the following: (1) the prisoner was far less frequently the favorite of anyone, the difference being one that could not occur by chance oftener than about twice in a hundred times (P .0238, Table 49); (2) the prisoner was a farmer much less often than his brother (P .01, Table 52); (3) the prisoner was less often married than his brother (P .01, Table 55); and (4) his relationship with his wife was decidedly less harmonious than the marital relations of his brother (P .01, Table 57). The second of these differences means that in a large proportion of cases the prisoner left the farm where he was born. Because this entailed adjustment to strange conditions, it put him at a disadvantage, especially in view of his other handicaps. The case histories show in detail that he was unprepared to deal with many of the conditions to which he was subjected.

8

The Making of the Property Offender

PSYCHOLOGISTS AND PSYCHIATRISTS, AS WE HAVE SEEN, HAVE MADE CONSIDERable study of murderers and sex offenders, but they have done much less with the property offender. Only the pyromaniacs (a section of those guilty of arson) and the kleptomaniacs (a group of those guilty of stealing) have been studied by a few of the earlier writers.

Some of the earlier discussions of the relation of psychological factors to the commission of property crimes are descriptive and classificatory rather than fundamentally analytical. For example, Eugen Bleuler[1] treats pyromania under the head of "The Reactive Impulses (Impulsive Insanity of Kraepelin)." He points out that pyromania is often the outcome of an unbearable situation, such as that of the young servant girl who has been separated from her family and has failed to find a satisfactory emotional outlet in her new environment; or of an unfortunate sexual affair or unhappy sexual aspirations; or of moodiness, anxiety, homesickness, digestive disturbances, or some other ailment. Even less satisfactory is Bleuler's discussion of kleptomania.

William Stekel,[2] who has treated kleptomania, gambling, and pyromania from the psychoanalytical point of view, finds that any of them may be rooted in frustration of the sexual impulse, in which case they are not the acts of real criminals. But for those property offenders whose deeds cannot be connected with sexual distortion he offers no explanation. Thus he discusses only a small minority of the property offenders.

The first to make a more profound study of property crimes from the psychological or psychiatric point of view was William Healy.[3] He describes certain types of theft and arson as pathological, but such cases are so infrequent that they are probably of only minor significance. In another study,[4] which is devoted exclusively to pathological liars, accusers, and

[1] *Textbook of Psychiatry* (New York, 1924), 538–539.
[2] *Peculiarities of Behavior* (2 vols., New York, 1934).
[3] *The Individual Delinquent* (Boston, 1915, 1924), 770–775.
[4] *Mental Conflicts and Misconduct* (New York, 1917).

swindlers, Healy shows the connection between mental conflict and theft in the juvenile offender. He has been influenced in his approach by European students of the problem, including some of the analytical school.[5] With the sum of their knowledge in mind, he attributes most property crimes to psychological and social factors.

More recently the psychoanalysts have been uncovering the subconscious motivation of property crimes, and their increasing prestige in the United States and England has given their findings great weight. Influenced by them, Franz Alexander and Hugo Staub have studied all crimes, including property offenses, from the point of view of the deep-seated, subconscious motives that account for them.[6] In a chapter entitled "A Psychoanalytic Table of Criminological Diagnosis" they include a group entitled "Chronic Criminality," which is divided into subgroups. The first of these is described as the criminal behavior of those whose ego is considerably damaged or totally paralyzed as a result of toxic or other destructive forces. The toxic state seems to be only the secondary result of a neurosis which, the authors argue, causes many of the states that lead to crime. Thus criminality due to a neurosis in which behavior is prompted by subconscious motives forms a second subgroup, which covers compulsive or systematic crimes such as stealing, arson, and pathological lying. Sometimes the crime is committed to assuage the painful sense of guilt from which an individual may suffer when personal desires and the social code conflict. In other words, stealing and other property crimes may bring to the offender a sense of relief from mental torture of some sort.

The third subgroup is the normal, non-neurotic criminal whose superego is criminal. Here the authors include those types who act in accordance with the moral code of their groups, however much it may conflict with the law or the general mores. Codes of this sort often govern tramps, beggars, gangsters, and such professional criminals as pickpockets, burglars, and receivers of stolen goods. A fourth subgroup is the genuine criminal—one who lives on the level of primitive man—an individual without a superego.

A later book by Alexander and Healy[7] extends the psychoanalytic procedure by analyzing a number of cases to show the play of subconscious motives. For example, they discuss the case of a boy who lost his father when he was six and who from his eighth year had been an inveterate thief. Investigation revealed that his conduct was attributable to irrational, emo-

[5] Among the European studies to which Dr. Healy is indebted are Hans Gudden, "Die Zurechnungsfähigkeit bei Warenhausdiebstähler," *Vierteljahrschrift für gerichtliche Medizin*, 33 (1907), Suppl. Heft 64, and "Das Wesen des moralischen Schwachsinns," *Archive für Psychiatrie*, 44 (1908): 376–391; and O. Mönkenmöller, "Zur Psychopathologie des Brandstifters," *Archive für Kriminalistik*, vol. 48, Hefe 3 and 4, pp. 193–310.
[6] *The Criminal, the Judge, and the Public* (New York, 1931), 145–152.
[7] *The Roots of Crime: Psychological Studies* (NewYork and London, 1935), 66–68.

tional, and subconscious motives rather than to the rational motive of gain. Specifically, the factors that contributed to his criminal behavior were (1) a strong sense of inferiority, for which he compensated by an attitude of bravado and toughness; (2) a sense of guilt for his unjustified jealousy of his brother; (3) a spiteful reaction to his mother; and (4) the desire for economic dependence, such as was represented by a free existence in prison.

Again, in the case of the girl suffering from an emotional conflict grounded in hatred of her mother and love of her father, the consequent sense of guilt was relieved by stealing—a less serious misbehavior to her than her feelings for her father and mother. In a third case the criminal behavior is interpreted as an undue display of aggressiveness and bravado to compensate for infantile regression.

In the chapter on "The Interplay of Social and Psychological Factors" the authors declare that analysis of the etiology of crime is not complete without the simultaneous study of both the social and the psychological factors.[8] They give a scheme of the determining factors in the formation of personality: (1) congenital equipment (hereditary and intra-uterine influences), which they call the constitution; (2) early-acquired reactive tendencies; (3) family influences; (4) the influence of the social environment in a broader sense (these last three they put under the general heading of postnatal development); and (5) general ideological trends in a given civilization.[9] Pointing out that even in the worst slums a part of the population is non-criminal, they argue that the social environment acts as a selective agent upon those whose characteristics, inherent or acquired, make them particularly susceptible to anti-social influences.[10]

These authors do not maintain that all criminality is the result of unconscious motivation. "It would be erroneous," they state, "to deny the reality and importance of the more tangible conscious conflicts deriving from the actual situation or to consider them always as mere excuses for relieving unconscious aggressions in the form of antisocial behavior."[11]

Studies such as these have thrown new light on crimogenesis. With respect to some of the factors of unconscious motivation and constitution, the property offender is shown to resemble other types of criminals. Current psychoanalytical studies of criminals, however, tend to overemphasize the role of unconscious motivation, though Alexander and Healy are careful to point out that the psychoanalytic technique may be applied to only a part of the criminals. For this part, criminality is the alternative to neurosis, in the view of the psychoanalysts. In this view they are following their teacher Freud.

The literature on the sociology of property crime is a fairly extensive one. The main contributions of sociological writers on the subject are presented in the more general criminological works mentioned in previous

[8] *Ibid.*, 275. [9] *Ibid.*, 278, 279. [10] *Ibid.*, 275. [11] *Ibid.*, 291.

chapters, but the work of one or two investigators calls for special mention here. Bonger approaches the problem of crime from the standpoint of the Marxian socialist, and he sums up as does no other writer the findings of European sociologists with respect to the close connection between the economic organization of a society and the amount of criminality in it.[12] Naturally he places especial emphasis on the property crime, but he also tries to show how the economic system may produce other types of criminality. Ferri, socialist member of the Italian school of criminology, lays a broader basis than Bonger in that he gives more consideration to social and psychological factors.[13] He too, however, gives especial attention to the specific factors that produce the offender against property. Clifford Shaw deals with the ecological factors underlying the social and economic conditions that produce the delinquent. In *The Natural History of a Delinquent Career* he analyzes the factors that were operative in a single case. In *The Jack-Roller* he does this for a property offender.[14] Sutherland, in a book based on a story written by a professional thief, gives an interesting and illuminating analysis of the genesis of the man's criminality.[15]

So far as I know, the present study is the first which attempts on the basis of so large a number of cases to isolate the factors statistically and to distinguish by a careful examination of case histories the factors that seem to be of particular significance in the case of the property offender. It is not assumed that the several types of crime have no common roots. On the contrary, the statistical analysis indicates that some of the factors are common to all three classes of offenders.

Significant Differences in Early Background between the Property Offenders and the Sex Offenders and Murderers

The summaries given on pages 9–15 above show that in many ways the backgrounds of the several types of offenders were quite different. In some respects the backgrounds of the property offenders were not only better than those of the sex offenders and murderers but were, to all appearances, actually favorable to normal development rather than to anti-social conduct. For example, fewer of the property offenders left home, went to work, and contributed to the family income at an early age, and more of them gave a good reputation to their fathers and mothers. It must therefore be concluded that the anti-social behavior of the property offender has in many instances a different basis than that of the murderer or the sex offender.

The statistical tables show which factors were present in all three groups

[12] W. A. Bonger, *Criminality and Economic Conditions* (Boston, 1916), part 2.
[13] E. Ferri, *Criminal Sociology* (Boston, 1917).
[14] *Delinquency Areas* (Chicago, 1929); *Natural History of a Delinquent Career* (Chicago, 1931); *The Jack-Roller* (Chicago, 1930).
[15] E. H. Sutherland, *The Professional Thief* (Chicago, 1937).

of offenders and which were unevenly distributed. Of the twenty-one tables analyzing the parental homes of the prisoners, only eleven show the property offender to have been subjected to conditions significantly different from those surrounding either or both of the other classes. Four others cannot be used because the data are unreliable, and the remaining six show no significant differences. Some of the differences which seem to suggest that the property offender was surrounded by conditions more favorable to the development of a wholesome personality than were the other classes are the following: his father was more frequently a skilled laborer than the lifer's (Table 1); the parental family's income was higher than that of the other classes (Table 3); he gave his father and mother a better reputation than did the sex offender (Tables 9, 10); to a greater extent than the sex offender he felt he was the favorite of one or both of his parents, and to a lesser extent that he was the favorite of no one (Table 11); to a less extent than the murderer or the sex offender he was reared in a home where a foreign language, or both English and another language, was spoken (Table 15).

In only two respects were the differences of a nature that might be regarded as unfavorable to the property offender. More often than the sex offender he reported chronic diseases in his parental family (Table 16) and the exercise of the family discipline by the mother (Table 19). The feeling of so large a percentage of the property offenders that they were the favored children would seem to be the only factor that could have contributed directly to the development of a character unable to withstand the stresses and strains of life. It may indicate a sensitiveness to slight which had a profound influence on the emotional development. On the whole, therefore, parental home conditions appear to have had less influence on the later conduct of the property offender than on that of either of the other two classes of prisoner.

The differences between the prisoners and their brothers reveal more clearly the factors affecting the conduct of the property offenders. Fourteen of the sixteen comparative tabulations reveal striking differences between the prisoners and their brothers. For the list of statistically significant differences see page 21.

Among these differences is the greater disposition of the prisoners to consider themselves the favorites of the mother and to express appreciation of the father or mother, and the fact that they were more likely to have left home because of disharmony in the family. Thus even in the parental home they were egocentric. To their emotional instability and irritability may be ascribed their less stable economic history, their choice of wives with backgrounds very different from their own, their disharmonious marital relations, and the number of times they had been arrested. It is clear that a number of these property offenders were disorganized personalities who had become progressively more unstable as they grew older.

Cases Illustrative of the Crimogenetic Factors in the Making of the Property Offender

From a study of individual cases, by the method applied to the murderers and the sex offenders, we may perhaps see how the significant factors operated in the development of property offender.

ARSON CASES[16]

Of all the offenders we studied, those who had been convicted of arson had the lowest intelligence, more than 73 per cent having an I. Q. of less than 70 (Tables 22 and 23). About 21 per cent of them were foreign-born, as against only 8.3 per cent of the property offenders as a whole; in this respect they approximated the murderers and sex offenders (Table 28). The percentage of prisoners over thirty years old was much larger for the arsonists (89.5 per cent) than for the property offenders as a whole (48.7 per cent) and larger than for any subgroup except the embezzlers (92.3 per cent) and for the total group of offenders studied (Table 30). More than 48 per cent of the arsonists were farmers, a much higher frequency than among property offenders as a whole (23.1 per cent), among other subgroups of property offenders, or among the murderers and the sex offenders (Table 35). In respect to marital condition they differed markedly from the total group of property offenders, 26.3 per cent being single, 44.7 per cent married, and 13.2 per cent widowed, whereas the respective percentages for the larger group were 49.3, 34.1, and 4.2 (Table 37). No other group of property offenders except the embezzlers included so large a proportion who had never before been arrested, the percentage being 81.6 (Table 44).

The motives for the crimes, as expressed by the arsonists themselves were three: (1) the desire for revenge; (2) the hope of collecting the insurance, either on the part of the criminal himself or of the owner, who had hired him to commit the crime; (3) the enjoyment of seeing a building burn (pyromania).

The desire for revenge may be illustrated by two cases, one of which involved a rather low-grade feeble-minded person and the other a man with a high mental capacity.

The case of A–1 is that of an unmarried man forty years old, the youngest child of a German father and an American mother of German extraction. His I. Q. is 63. He was serving a term of six to eight years for attempting to burn a building belonging to the woodworking company by which he

[16] The roots of arson have received the greatest attention—and that attention is chiefly along psychological and psychiatric lines—from European scholars, especially in Germany. There are a few items in French and in English. See Richard C. Steinmetz, "Investigation of Arson: A Selected Bibliography," *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 32:233 (July-August, 1941).

was employed. He did it, he himself says, "to get even with the company. They paid us a bonus last year and then deducted it out of our wages this year."

The family from which he came was known as "queer," though they were people of frugal habits who had accumulated enough to retire and live comfortably at the level to which they were accustomed. The prisoner had always lacked not only the capacity for leadership but even the ability to make a place for himself economically and socially. So inferior did he feel, albeit subconsciously, that he never had a friend for long. He disliked school and quit early in order to go to work. After interviewing him I wrote the following summary of my impressions: "A typically feeble-minded individual of low economic status who has always dimly felt his inferiority, but did not understand it; until just before the act which brought him into prison, he was not sufficiently incensed at his inferiority to react to it in any compensatory way except to withdraw into himself."

The brother, likewise inferior in mental capacity, probably has a somewhat higher I. Q. At any rate he was admitted into the army during the first World War, and after his discharge took pride in the service he had given his country, thus acquiring a measure of social status. The prisoner had no such experience to compensate for his feeling of inferiority.

The case of A–2 illustrates how the desire for revenge operated to produce criminality in a person of high intelligence. The prisoner, a single man twenty-seven years old, has an I. Q. of 92. He was committed to Waupun on the charge of arson on two counts and sentenced for three to ten years and one to three years, the sentences to run concurrently. He pleaded guilty and upon his admission to the prison stated, "The fellow I worked for mistreated me until it got under my skin and I burned the barn."

He was born of parents of Pennsylvania Dutch extraction. The father was a Wisconsin farmer in comfortable circumstances, and the family had average standards in the community. Discipline was strict, the father being more severe than the mother. Nervous instability appears in the family history, however, especially on the mother's side. Whatever tendency toward instability the prisoner may have inherited was strengthened by an attack of sleeping sickness when he was five, which his parents say left him a nervous, active, somewhat unstable person.

The decisive factors seem to be four. The sleeping sickness left him a troublesome, somewhat unstable child determined to have his own way in the face of any persuasion or punishment. His parents were disposed to baby him, however, because of his sickness, with the result that the brother assumed control. The latter, a slow-going, matter-of-fact person, exercised a rather severe discipline which the prisoner came to resent. During adolescence he reacted against the rather strict tenets of the family, grew increasingly resentful of his brother, whom he felt to be the favorite of his

parents, and developed a sense of inferiority because he was picked on at school and chided by his brother. He became so disturbed mentally that he was placed in a state hospital for three months. Finally, the well-meant but unintelligent treatment he received from his brother so aggravated his nervous instability that he began acting in the most impulsive manner. When he appropriated an automobile without the consent of the owner, he was sent to prison, and was on parole when he committed the crime of arson. Cases of encephalitis must be handled with much more understanding and tact than was displayed in this one.

The commission of arson to enable a friend to collect the fire insurance on a building is illustrated by case A–3. This prisoner is an unmarried man of twenty-five with an I. Q. of 84. He has an eighth-grade education, which he completed at the age of fourteen.

He is a second-generation German whose family has an unfavorable history. His maternal grandfather was an epileptic, his father committed suicide, an elder brother had been jailed for drunk and disorderly conduct, and an uncle had also been jailed for drunkenness. He himself was a hard drinker and said upon his entrance into the prison that he was drunk when he "helped a fellow burn his father's feed mill so that he could collect the insurance."

He had been in trouble a number of times before, the first time for contributing to the delinquency of a minor, though this case was dismissed. He had served a year in the state reformatory for burglary and was later convicted of arson and put on probation to the State Board of Control for one to twenty-five years. When he violated his probation thirteen months later, he was sent to prison.

As a boy he obviously had no settled place in the family structure, but grew up with a sense of inferiority. He felt he was discriminated against because he was required to help with the farm work, whereas his brother was not. Upon the death of his father he was sent to his grandparents; later, when his mother remarried, he lived with her and his stepfather for a time. But he never actually settled down anywhere, as his very irregular occupational history reveals. After working on the home farm for a couple of years, he was employed in an automobile factory for two years and a half and thereafter as a harvest hand in Dakota. Then he came home, but two years later left for the West coast, where in the brief span of eighteen months he held a succession of jobs. In California he worked on the docks, in lumber camps, and as a truck driver, then migrated to the state of Washington, where he picked apples. After this he returned home once more, and was farming at the time of his arrest.

Thus his career was comprised of a succession of events calculated to aggravate his nervous instability. He was constantly fleeing from hard reality, never finding a niche in which he could establish himself securely and satisfy his fundamental impulses. He not only drank to excess but was

sexually promiscuous. Indeed, every phase of his life was marked by emotional imbalance. When he was drunk he was open to any suggestions, especially from his friends.

His brother, who was older, was more stable occupationally and drank less heavily. Apparently he was better oriented to life at the time of his father's death and succeeded in finding fairly satisfactory relationships in his mother's family and in the community. Both boys seem to have had normal intelligence, but whereas one suffered from a sense of inferiority, the other was able to make the adjustments necessary to satisfy his fundamental desires.

Another case of arson, A–4, involves a high-grade moron who was thirty years old when he committed the crime and was unmarried. He has an I. Q. of 62 and had completed only the third grade at the age of fifteen. He was convicted on two counts and sentenced for two terms of three to six years, to be served concurrently. He says that he pleaded guilty to save getting his head blown off. He confesses that he set the fire and also that he received fifty-five dollars from the owner, but claims that this was payment for painting his house and had nothing to do with the fire. He had twice been in jail for larceny, for thirty and sixty days respectively, and had been arrested a third time on the same charge, but had been released.

He comes from a very good German-American farm family, no other member of which has ever been arrested. The parents spoke German in the home, but the children never learned the language. His father had been in business for a time and in this enterprise had utilized the boy's services, as he did on the farm.

The prisoner feels that he was overworked as a boy and as a result was denied opportunities for recreation. He was frequently at odds with his father, but had his mother's sympathy and support as long as she lived. She died when he was fourteen, and his sister, though she was only a year or two older, became housekeeper for her father and brothers.

The prisoner left home for a time when he was twenty-two, got a job in a junk yard dismantling automobiles, and learned some of the work of a mechanic. He returned to the farm, however, only to find that he still could not get along with his father. Once more he left home, and thereafter held a succession of jobs in Chicago and Milwaukee, none of which he kept very long.

He claims he did not drink excessively and was never drunk in his life. He was sexually promiscuous, however, and the evidence shows that he had had syphilis. He had been a patient at the Wisconsin General Hospital following an injury to his head, and the prison psychiatrist says he is an inveterate liar. Upon entrance into prison he gave evidence of neurasthenic psychoneurosis, his psychoneurotic inventory being 51. He has been looked upon as rather queer both in his home community and in prison, although

his emotional imbalance has cleared up somewhat under the prison regime. He has the delusion that he is an inventor and many other queer ideas, which probably may be regarded as an attempt to compensate for a sense of inferiority.

In a number of respects his brother, who is three years younger, is quite different. Though he became crippled in childhood as the result of infantile paralysis, he does not suffer from a sense of inferiority and has a good reputation in the community. He is probably the brighter of the two, to judge from the fact that he completed the eighth grade at the age of fourteen. Occupationally he has been much more stable. He has worked chiefly as a farm hand on his father's and neighboring farms and, in the busy season, in a canning factory. He had made only one trip away from home, when he worked for eleven months on a Minnesota farm.

The chief difference, however, between the two men is the fact that the prisoner was far more easily influenced and was at times mentally unbalanced, according to his brother's testimony. The crisis was born of his association with a group of men in Chicago who succeeded in manipulating him for their own ends. It was they who persuaded him to commit the crime for which he was sentenced.

After his release from prison he married and settled down, and seems to be getting along very well. Apparently the stabilizing influence of his wife is enough to offset his lack of mental capacity and emotional instability.

The case of A–7, a thirty-six-year-old farm laborer with a low I. Q., comes closer to illustrating pyromania than any other case in our sample. This man was sentenced on two counts and had previously been suspected of starting another fire. He had tried to get a position with the local fire department and had been much chagrined when his application was rejected. According to his own story, he set fire to the barn and then put it out before it had done much damage, simply to show up the village fire department. He talked constantly, however, of the pleasure it gave him to see a good fire.

He was the youngest of the eight children of German-born farm parents. The home seems to have been satisfactory to him, and conditions in the community were not particularly unwholesome. The family was considered "queer," however, particularly the prisoner, who had a low I. Q. (62) and was never quite sound mentally. He went to school until he was fourteen, but reached only the fifth grade.

We do not know enough of his early sex habits to judge whether, in accordance with Freudian theory, his pyromania grew out of a sexual complex, but he was sexually promiscuous before his marriage, and his wife claimed that his sexual demands were excessive. As long as he remained on the farm he got into no trouble.

His wife was not as wholesome a personality as she might have been.

While still married to another man she had had an illegitimate child which neighbors believe to have been the prisoner's. They suspect, too, that a child born after he married her was not his own. He himself was not enthusiastic about her.

His ambition to belong to a fire department may have grown out of sexual frustration. When his application was rejected he became keenly resentful and rationalized the situation by projecting upon the fire department his own incompetence. The fact that he was the favorite of his mother and was dominated by her may possibly be significant.

His brothers are fairly good citizens. They are happily married, work steadily, and have never been in trouble. They drink much less and are married to women suited to their capacities and temperament.

The case illustrates how a feeble-minded person ill equipped to meet disappointments or to foresee the consequences of his acts, and lacking a mate able to solve his sexual problems, may try to compensate for a sense of inferiority and in the end overcompensate to such an extent that he lands in prison.

One can make no generalizations on the basis of twenty-three cases, but it may be worth while to summarize the findings on these arsonists. Superficially the crime was motivated by (1) the desire for revenge, (2) for monetary gain, or (3) for the satisfaction of seeing a building burn, all of which are probably rationalizations of deeper motives. Probably only one is a case of actual pyromania, a compulsion born of some frustration, possibly sexual, repressed into the unconscious. But in every case a sense of inferiority was a factor—the frustration of a desire for social status, economic position, and emotional security. In some cases proper adjustment to the demands of society was hampered by a poor nervous or physical inheritance. A large majority of the group had a low mentality. Most of them had sought to compensate for a sense of inferiority by associating with an element which had rejected the socially accepted norms of behavior.

LARCENY CASES

Our sample of property offenders interviewed included only nineteen larceny cases. Of the larger sample of 1148 for which the prison supplied data on intelligence quotient and occupation, 136 were larceny cases.

The nineteen larceners in our sample had a lower mean I. Q. than did prisoners committed for any other crime except arson and breaking and entering. See Table 23. Of the total 1148 property offenders in the prison, those committed for larceny include a larger proportion with an I. Q. below 70 than any other group except the arsonists. See Table 23. With respect to nativity, the larceners did not differ much from the property offenders as a whole or from the adult population of the state, the proportion of native-born in the three groups being 90, 88.6, and 84.9 per cent respectively. See

Table 28. With respect to occupation, however, they differed strikingly from the total group of prisoners studied and from the property offenders as a whole; a much larger percentage were farmers (33.8 per cent as compared with 23.1 per cent of all property offenders and 20.8 per cent of all prisoners at Waupun; see Table 35). The age distribution of those committed for larceny was not much different from that of property offenders as a whole and the total group of prisoners studied. See Table 30.

Case L–1 is that of a thirty-year-old farm laborer with a rather low I. Q. (75). He is married, has three children, and was sentenced to from one to five years for the theft of an automobile.

His ancestors, German and English, had been in this country for some generations. The stock seems none too sound, for one of his cousins was epileptic and a paternal uncle was insane. None of the family was considered very "smart" by the community.

The father had a very small farm, and the family was hard-working and pious. Its economic and cultural standards were low, however, and the parents were doubtless lacking in the capacity to train their children properly.

This man demonstrated at a very early age a tendency to break away from ordinary social controls. At sixteen he became promiscuous and says he was intimate with no fewer than twelve girls. His first sentence was a term in the state reformatory at Green Bay for adultery with the married woman who was later his common-law wife. He was paroled after ten months, but violated his parole four months later when he married the woman without the consent of the parole board and was returned to the reformatory. Fifteen months later he escaped but was apprehended and returned, only to escape again in five months. When again apprehended he was sentenced to the state prison for one to two years and served his sentence. This is his third conviction for felony.

People in the community report that he takes satisfaction in disregarding accepted standards of conduct. One person says that he "takes pride in running around with people that have done things against the law. He thinks it is smart to do little things against the law;" another, that "he lies a great deal so we don't know what to think;" still another, that "he is a stinker and always running around with people doing things they shouldn't be doing. When at Waupun he was where he belongs."

Occupationally his history is also very irregular. After leaving school at the age of sixteen he worked at odd jobs for a sash-and-door company, then for his father during the two years previous to his Green Bay sentence. After his discharge he worked on the farm for a time, then at barbering, but was never able to settle down to a steady job. He has always been untruthful, and his father says he had constant trouble with him. He suspects him of being jealous of his more successful brother.

The crisis of his life came as the result of his association with a family of wild and promiscuous girls, including one who was married and whom he himself later married. He says he had relations with seven of the eight, including the married one, a woman ten years his senior and the mother of eight children. For this misdemeanor he was sent to Green Bay, and the woman served sixty days in jail. As his wife she had a very unwholesome influence upon him.

The brother, though he is of about the same mental capacity and has had much bad luck, has always been a good citizen. He was easy to control as a boy, has always associated with honest, respectable people, and is an honest person himself. He is married to a fine woman and has never run around with demoralized associates. Occupationally, too, he has been stable; he worked on his brother's farm until he was twenty-eight, then married and began to buy a place of his own.

Significant in the formation of the prisoner's character are his early opposition to parental control, his feeling that he was discriminated against because of his disobedience, his habit of promiscuity from the age of sixteen, his attempt to compensate for loss of status in the family by associating with people of immoral tendencies, and finally his entanglement with the wild, immoral woman who eventually became his wife. Underlying all these traits is a low intelligence incapable not only of planning a course of action calculated to give him an honorable status but also of understanding that his emotional disturbance was due to loss of status.

Case L–2 is that of an unmarried farm laborer twenty-five years old whose I. Q. is 80. He had served an earlier sentence for the larceny of chickens, but this is his first conviction for a felony. His father, who owned the car the prisoner drove, was in jail for the same offense.

His early life had been spent in rural communities among other families whose morale was high. His own family, however, was rather shiftless and dishonest, and was occupationally unstable, moving from one rented farm to another and finally migrating to the adjacent city, where the father got a job as an unskilled laborer. The culture of the prisoner's home was lower than that of his school associates, though he was accepted by his schoolmates because of his athletic ability. He never formed any close friendships with people of higher cultural standards. It is perhaps significant that the children were required to turn over their wages to their parents. The home gave little if any constructive discipline except on money matters. The prisoner does not feel that his parents showed any favoritism, but after he was sixteen he worked away from home and apparently no longer maintained close ties with the family.

Like his father, he was occupationally very mobile. His frequent shifting from job to job, his enlistment and later desertion from the army, his breaches of discipline, both as an employee and as a soldier, his wanderings over the

country, his psychosis and fifteen-month commitment to an institution, his violation of probation, and his failure to make satisfactory adjustments economically and socially—all these are symptoms of emotional instability.

His brother, on the other hand, who is of about the same mental level, is emotionally well balanced. He remained at home, accepted the parental discipline, and chose wholesome associates, including a fine girl with whom he went steadily; he has never been promiscuous. He was careful with his money, whereas the prisoner would squander a hundred dollars in a single night if he had it, according to the father. Whereas the prisoner did not finish the fifth grade, the brother finished high school and has from boyhood shown his ability to stick at a job. He has spent most of his life in the home community.

After the prisoner was discharged from Waupun he married a good woman and settled down to a steady life. Apparently experience and the influence of a stable, socially adjusted wife has changed his whole attitude and outlook. This is one of many cases which indicate that the kind of a wife a man marries may be a decisive factor.

Case L–3 is that of a man with an I. Q. of 60, the second lowest in the group, which dips to 57. He was given a sentence of one to three years for breaking into a jewelry store and stealing a watch. Previously he had served two years for perjury.

He was born to parents of English ancestry who had been in this country a long time. His father was a farmer. His mother died when he was not yet three years old, and he was raised by an uncle and aunt until he was sixteen, when he joined his brother in learning the carpenter's trade. The family history showed one feeble-minded uncle. The rural community in which he was reared was one of churchgoing but hardfisted people who possessed the rough manners, the virtues, and the vices of pioneers.

In the home of his uncle and aunt he was driven very hard. At eight he was working in the field; at ten he was milking ten cows, and at twelve was doing a man's work. He went to school until he was thirteen, but reached only the third grade. Because of his queerness his schoolmates made fun of him.

The personal interview and investigation leave the distinct impression that the prisoner has suffered all his life from a feeling of inadequacy. He has pitied himself. He wonders why he should have had so much trouble when he has been so helpful to others and has always wanted to do the right thing. He has built up a defense for himself about every questionable episode in his life. He does not understand why the pupils in school slighted him; why his aunt and uncle and his father tried to exploit him; why his wife cut him out of her will; why the district attorney wanted so much to convict him, and his lawyer failed to help him more at his trial.

Life has been too much for his limited abilities. He rationalizes all his

conduct, a habit of mind born of mental incapacity, his uncle's exploitation of him, his lack of normal recreation because of his queerness, and his hard-working life. He had always impressed people much as he did me, as a simple-minded, queer, self-pitying, defensive, sly individual who obviously was suspicious of everyone with whom he came in contact. He is clearly a person with just enough mentality to sense that he does not fit into the society of which he is a part but not enough to save him from developing a pattern of submission, aversion, suspicion, and bewilderment. He has failed financially and socially and in his family relations. To compensate for his sense of inferiority he boasts of his abilities. Lacking the capacity to command recognition, he strove constantly to demonstrate that he actually had ability and thus to achieve recognition and status.

The background of his brother is different. He is much more intelligent, liked school, and finished the eighth grade. He too was raised in a family other than his own, because he was only six when the mother died, and he too felt that his foster parents worked him too hard. But when he went back home, he easily adjusted himself to his father and stepmother, whereas the prisoner felt that emotionally he was an orphan. The brother associated with the better elements of the community; the prisoner drifted into the more unstable groups.

Many others in our sample have a low I. Q. Their backgrounds vary, but in general they have grown up in circumstances which did not protect them from vicious influences. As a result of early experiences many of them came to feel that they were different from others and therefore could not find a satisfactory niche in the social organization. Frequently they developed feelings of persecution, grudge, and self-pity. They were easily influenced by more forceful personalities and got into trouble because those who could protect them and guide them neglected to do so.

Another case, L–5, is that of a man of thirty who had once been a railroad worker but who at the time of his commitment was a farm laborer. He had completed an eighth-grade education at the age of sixteen. He had an I. Q. of 82.

He was the fifth of six boys born to parents of German and English ancestry who had been in this country a long time. The father had a good position after he left the farm, and the home was rather better than others in the community. Both parents had a good reputation, and none of the other sibs had ever been in trouble. Nothing that is known of the family history would explain his delinquency. The more active social control in the family was exercised by the mother, and her control was consistent. The parents did not play favorites, but the prisoner did have greater affection for the father. Conditions in the community were not such as make for anti-social conduct. In early life the prisoner's associates were good; indeed he was a

clean-cut, well-behaved young man until his marriage. He had never cared for girls until he met the one who became his wife.

His relationship with her seems to have provided the turning point in his career. He had been raised a Protestant, she was a Catholic. He was frugal and saving, she somewhat a spendthrift. Their interests and tastes were different. He was conscious that she felt superior to him. She was moral in sex matters. The crisis, which had been fostered from the beginning by the interference of the wife's parents, came after their two children were born. The prisoner felt that his wife did not take any interest in the home. She would not get his meals when he came in late from his run on the railroad, and this seems to have disturbed him greatly. He began to associate with wild women and rough men, lost his job, and began to drift, taking what work he could get. He was fined for the larceny of tires and spent three months in the county jail for forgery. At a time when he was out of a job, he stole bus tickets from the station to use in his search for work.

So far as we can see from the history of the case his family situation, which led to association with loose and immoral companions, the loss of his job, and ultimately his conviction, was the chief factor in the demoralization of this man.

The other cases of larceny in our sample are only variations of those cited above. In some, home and community conditions induced a pattern of behavior that ultimately led to trouble. In others, the treatment received in early life prevented emotional security and engendered a feeling of ostracism from the family or the law-abiding part of the community. In still others the prisoner's own domestic relations were the deciding factor. In virtually every instance demoralized associates, either early in life or later, induced criminal behavior. In a number of cases the loss of a job during the depression, bringing hardship on the family, seems the chief factor. But since these experiences were faced by others who did not yield to the temptation to commit crime, one must conclude that the determining factors were those that were at work during the formative years of childhood and youth, the relationships with family and other associates. These relationships affected the emotions and determined the attitude toward life and the habitual response to its situations.

BREAKING AND ENTERING

The data given in Table 23 indicate that those committed for breaking and entering are of about the same mentality as those committed for larceny, the proportions having an I. Q. of less than 70 being 29.7 and 30.9 per cent respectively. But the mean I. Q. of all property offenders (79.96) is higher than that of those guilty of breaking and entering (77.32). This

finding approximates that of Charles Goring respecting English convicts.[17]

The proportion of farmers in this subclass of property offenders (35.3 per cent) is larger than in any of the other subclasses except the arsonists (48.4 per cent), though it is not much greater than among the larceners (33.8 per cent). It is larger also than in the whole group of property offenders (23.1 per cent) and in the total group of prison inmates (20.8 per cent). See Table 35.

With respect to nativity this group did not differ much from the property offenders as a whole, from the total group of prison inmates, or from the Wisconsin male population 15 years of age and over. See Table 28.

Their age distribution was similar to that of prisoners committed for larceny, but on the whole they were older than the property offenders as a whole and the total group of prison inmates. See Table 30.

They included a larger percentage of single men (60.9) than any of the other subclasses, than property offenders as a group (49.3), and than all prison inmates (46.2). See Table 37. The proportion for burglary was almost the same, 60 per cent.

The case of BE–1 is that of an unskilled laborer fifty-two years old, the son of American Baptists. He has an I. Q. of 57 and finished the sixth grade at the age of fifteen. He was sentenced to prison from one to seven years for breaking and entering. His record shows eight sentences for drunkenness and one for burglary. He was on probation for one to two years when he committed the crime for which he was in prison.

His father was an unskilled laborer, whose home ranked fair in a community of working people. One cousin is in an institution for the feeble-minded.

The prisoner has an unstable occupational history. He worked as a truck driver for a succession of firms and was sometimes out of work because of his drinking habits. Much of his leisure time was spent with pool-room and saloon associates.

He married a woman who belonged to a different church and was a poor housekeeper. They did not get along well, and finally his wife divorced him and he married again.

During his youth he mixed with rough, drinking, sexually promiscuous associates who were able to lead him because of his low intelligence. One of these was his partner in his last crime.

The prisoner's brother may have a little higher intelligence. Both are unskilled laborers, however, and both were brought up under the same family conditions and in the same neighborhood. The significant difference between them lies in their choice of associates.

After a short period of work in an adjoining state the brother returned to his native city, married, and has been steadily employed ever since. His

[17] *The English Convict*, abridged edition (London, 1919), 181.

marriage was harmonious, and he passed his evenings at home. He does not drink.

Obviously the chain of factors that led to the prisoner's undoing are his low mentality, inadequate schooling, unwholesome associates, disharmonious family life, drinking habits, unsteady employment, and loss of social status.

Also of limited intelligence is BE–3, a married man of thirty-four with an I. Q. of 72, who is a farm owner. The case of this prisoner is complicated by the fact that after being committed he developed dementia praecox. The psychiatrist described him as an illogical man with simple mannerisms, mutisms, auditory hallucinations, ideas of persecution, confused and retarded thought processes, emotional ataxia, and poor memory. His orientation is correct, but insight is lacking, and reasoning and judgment are impaired. After being committed to the prison he was sent to the Central State Hospital for the insane, but was subsequently readmitted to the prison. He did not get along well there, however, and was returned to the hospital, where he was interviewed.

He was the youngest of ten boys born to a German couple who had cleared cutover land and made a success of farming. Two of the others have been in trouble with the law.

When he was two years old the prisoner developed infantile paralysis, which left him crippled. This physical disability bred in him a definite sense of inferiority, though he made every effort to compensate for it. Living as he did in a community where physical activity and hard work were highly rated, he undertook to do the same kinds of work his brothers did and to get ahead financially. Naturally the family tried to make things easy for him, and he was petted and spoiled. One brother says that as a child he stole from the family. Had he been endowed with greater mental ability, he probably would have succeeded in assuaging his sense of inferiority without overcompensation.

His married life seems to have been happy, but his wife, who was also mentally subnormal, exercised no restraining influence over him. When one of the hired men on his farm urged him and another man to break into a neighbor's shack and steal dynamite for use in clearing land, he was unable to resist the suggestion. He had been drinking and was without funds to buy the needed material; indeed he was in debt some thirty-five hundred dollars. Nor was this the first time he had taken the property of others. Evidently he shared with his brothers a great respect for economic prosperity. His physical infirmity and the disposition of the family to protect him gave birth to self-pity and a rationalization of his dishonest acts which got the best of him despite his best efforts. With the fear of the economic consequences of the depression before his poorly equipped mind, it is not difficult to understand how he could have been persuaded to commit the crime

he did. The psychosis he developed in prison was doubtless only the culmination of earlier tendencies, for he was known to many of the neighbors as "Dippy." Worry over the welfare of his wife and the fear that he might lose his farm resulted in the development of dementia praecox.

The critical factors in this man's career are his low intelligence, his mother's indulgence, and his physical infirmity, for which he tried to compensate by getting the best of others financially, including his brothers.

Among the prisoners committed for breaking and entering are a number who have fairly high intelligence. One such, BE–4, is an unskilled laborer twenty-three years old, who has an I. Q. of 87. At the time of his admission to the prison he had syphilis, which the Board of Control believes to have been congenital. He is the son of German-born immigrants, who subjected him to a stern German upbringing. Even as a boy, however, he was hot-tempered and reacted strongly against the father's discipline. Here probably was laid the foundation of his heedless resistance to authority. He got along well in school until sent to a parochial high school in Milwaukee. After he had finished the second year there, at the age of seventeen, he felt he wanted to go to work, so deliberately got himself into trouble and was expelled.

He belonged to a set of rather wild boys, whose leader he became. Apparently his ego was satisfied by daring, reckless conduct, and he took pride in performing feats for which the others lacked the courage. Eventually he got into trouble with the law and was sentenced to a year in the reformatory at Green Bay and subsequently to two years in the state penitentiary for petit larceny. For the present crime of breaking and entering he was first given two to three years on probation and later, when he broke probation by leaving the state, was sent to prison. He was very resentful over his commitment to Green Bay because some of the other pranksters, one of whom was the son of his employer, were let off more easily. So angry was he over this discrimination, he says, that he did not care what happened to him after his discharge. He was an unruly inmate both at the reformatory and at the prison.

The decisive factors in this man's development are revealed by a comparison of his history with that of a younger brother. At fourteen the latter was sent to a school of the Capuchin brothers, where he remained eight years. He had the same fiery temperament, but evidently the superior of the order knew how to handle such a nature better than the boy's father did. So well did he learn to control his temper during his years in the school that it has never got him into trouble. The prisoner, on the other hand, had clearly been mishandled in both the home and the community, with the result that he developed a resistence to authority which neither the reformatory nor the prison succeeded in overcoming. The institutions of society sometimes fail to develop the right attitude in certain high-spirited and fairly

capable children who might with different treatment become useful citizens. In this case the family—particularly the father—the school, and the reformatory all failed.

The case of BE–6 is also that of a man with good intelligence, an unskilled laborer with an I. Q. of 90. His father was Norwegian, his mother German. He was thirty-five years old when sentenced, under an alias, for fifteen to forty years for breaking and entering a bank building.

He was the oldest of the thirteen children in a very poor family of low social status. The father, who was a drinking man, was without steady work. The mother had a constant struggle to feed the large family, and it ultimately became necessary to send two of the children to an orphanage. The prisoner attended school until he had finished the eighth grade, at the age of fifteen, but even as a boy he led a rather isolated life. Both in the home and in the community he failed to find recognition. As soon as he was old enough to do so he left home, but did not stick long at any job and soon became a wanderer.

From a very early age he had been in conflict with the law. As the eldest child he learned to steal early to augment the family's low income, and at one time the juvenile court placed him on six months' probation for petit larceny. As a young man he was sent to the Minnesota State Reformatory, from which he was paroled before he had served his term but was returned when he violated parole regulations. Later he was sentenced to ten years in the Iowa State Reformatory for larceny, and after a month was transferred to the Iowa State Penitentiary. The fourth sentence, a term in the Missouri State Prison, was for burglary and larceny. The fifth was for possession of burglar's tools, which charge is still pending against him. His fourth conviction, for felony, brought him a sixth sentence, the one he is now serving.

The unwholesome family conditions in which he was reared, his social isolation, his boyhood thievery, and his vagabond life with demoralized companions gradually shaped a man lacking respect for the law and existing only to satisfy his elemental needs. He never drank, but became sexually promiscuous at an early age. He is thoroughly asocial and demoralized. The home conditions and early associations which determined his later career had a similar effect on two of his brothers, who were with him in the prison for the same crime. They also have a history of early and almost continuous delinquency.

Case BE–7 is that of an unskilled laborer of fifty-five. He has an I. Q. of 85 but had reached only the fifth grade at the age of thirteen. He had been married and had three children, but was separated from his wife.

He came of old American stock. Among his family are several highly respected citizens, and he is the only one who has a criminal record. Both

parents were Methodists. His father died when he was seven, and his mother did her best to keep the family together. He kept in close contact with her until her death.

It may be significant that he is the youngest of five children, three boys and two girls. The woman he married was of the same nationality and about the same education as himself but of a lower economic status and a quite different temperament. With the years she gradually became more nervous, irritable, and faultfinding. The prisoner says she was a good housekeeper, cook, and mother, but made life increasingly miserable for him. Possibly his drinking and his failure as a provider contributed to the growing tension between them. He says she was erratic in her attitude toward him. He drank only now and then, and sometimes she objected, sometimes not. The neighbors did not associate with her because of her temper, and she seemed to care for no one but the children. In other words, he found her impossible to understand. It may also be that his mother-in-law, who had disapproved of the marriage, interfered in family affairs. He denies that sexual incompatibility was the root of the disharmony. Whatever its basis, the growing rift with his wife ultimately led him to drink more heavily, and it was while drunk that he and another man convicted with him broke into a moonshine-whiskey storeroom.

His prison record was good throughout. He seemed to have self-control and was trusted out on one of the farms. He showed no evidence of mental or emotional disturbance except when his domestic affairs, thoroughly puzzling to him, were under discussion. The critical factors in this case are probably the prisoner's early attachment to his mother and his marriage to a woman unsuited to his disposition.

These case histories, though only a small part of the total, give a fairly representative picture of the prisoners in our sample who were committed for breaking and entering. Certain factors which recur frequently confirm the statistical data respecting the role of social conditions in the development of an ill-adjusted personality. Sometimes, though by no means always, the case histories reveal constitutional inferiority, perhaps a low I. Q. or a defect in the family stock. Low-grade mentally defectives, morons, and borderline mentalities are often unable to foresee the consequences of their actions. Moreover, they suffer from the consciousness that they are different from other people, which often leads to bewilderment, emotional disturbance, grudges against others, or a sense of unjust treatment, sometimes even hostility toward persons in authority. Such persons seek status wherever they can find it, often among demoralized associates. Even the bright individual may feel discriminated against, develop resentment against persons in authority, and react vigorously against obstacles to the attainment of his fundamental desires.

In most of these cases the parental homes were largely responsible for

the attitudes that culminated in anti-social conduct. A number of the men, however, had had a good upbringing in the home and had faced no especially unsettling situations in their communities. With these it was often domestic difficulties that had undermined their morale and upset their emotional balance. The influence of boyhood and later associates is also clearly revealed. When the constitutional make-up or the early conditioning is unfavorable, a crisis such as domestic trouble or economic need may be met with criminality. A technique for measuring the several factors that are operative must await more intensive research on the constitutional components of personality and the development of habit-patterns through life experiences. Though economic hardship may provide the occasion for a crime, the basic motivation lies deep within the personality, which is created by the interaction of experience with constitutional characteristics.

BURGLARY CASES

Of the property offenders whose I. Q. and occupations were ascertained, 156 had been committed for burglary. In general this was a group that was deficient in mental ability and was somewhat at a disadvantage economically. It included 23.2 per cent, almost the same proportion as the assault and battery group, whose I. Q. was less than 70, as compared with 26 per cent of all property offenders and 28.6 per cent of the total group of prisoners. Similarly, their mean I. Q., like that of the arsonists, those convicted of breaking and entering, and the larceners, is lower than that of all property offenders, though the difference is less than in the case of these other groups. See Table 23. A larger proportion were unskilled laborers than in any other group of property offenders, the percentage being 40.4 per cent, as against 28.6 per cent of the property offenders in our sample. See Table 35.

The nativity of 153 of the burglars was learned, of whom 87 per cent were native whites, as compared with 88.6 per cent of all the property offenders studied and 85.3 per cent of all prisoners studied.

As a group they were older than the property offenders as a whole and the 1153 prisoners whose age was known, the respective proportions thirty years old or older being 62.1, 48.7, and 51.5 per cent.

Of the 153 burglars whose marital status was ascertained, 60 per cent were single, as against 49.3 per cent of the 933 property offenders whose marital status is known. With respect to number of divorcees (15 per cent) they do not differ very markedly from the property offenders as a whole (12.4 per cent) or from the 1153 prison inmates committed for all crimes (11.9 per cent). They do differ widely, however, from the embezzlers, only 7.7 per cent of whom were divorced, and from two groups of property offenders with much higher proportions of divorcees: the forgers (27.2 per cent), and the thieves (25.8 per cent). Even more markedly do they differ

from the total prison and reformatory population of the United States in 1923, only 2.7 per cent of whom were divorced. See Table 37.

Of the 156 prisoners convicted of burglary we interviewed 28. One of these was B–1, an automobile mechanic twenty-six years old who had been taken out of school when he was in the third grade and sent to an industrial school. He is single and has an I. Q. of 68. When he entered prison his psychoneurotic inventory (P. I.), reflecting some emotional disturbance, recorded thirty-three wrong answers. Under the regime of prison life, however, the disturbance had almost subsided by the time we interviewed him.

He was the fourth of the eight children of poverty-stricken parents, who were of German descent. The father was a boilermaker. Both the children and the parents, apparently, were of rather low mental capacity, and the psychiatrist at the prison regards the prisoner's mental instability as "due probably to a neurotic constitution."

When he was ten years old his father, who was a heavy drinker, deserted the family. One brother was later on probation for larceny. The prisoner disliked school so much that he constantly ran away from home from the time he was only five or six years old, and his mother finally had him committed to the Industrial School for Boys at Waukesha, where he remained for about eight years. During this time he was once placed on parole, but was returned when he broke it. Later he was sentenced to the reformatory for five years on a charge of assault for rape. He was paroled for three years, but was again returned to complete his sentence because of friction with the foreman at his place of work.

At nineteen, after being discharged from the Industrial School, he became promiscuous and occupationally very unstable. He moved about a great deal and much of the time was unemployed. From adolescence his associates had been of a very unwholesome character, and he drank to some extent.

All the evidence indicates a neurotic strain in the family, which he probably inherited and which was intensified by his lack of ability and the conditions in his home. From earliest childhood he had lived in a thoroughly demoralizing environment. Thus there was nothing in his make-up, in his home life, or in his occupational experience to stabilize him. Undisciplined as he was, he early developed a resistance to all authority and a disposition to flee from difficulties instead of overcoming them. His early demoralization was increased by his institutional experiences, and at the time of the interview his attitude was markedly anti-social.

Comparison of his history with that of his youngest brother is also revealing. When his father left home, the prisoner was much disturbed, despite the rough treatment he had received from him. His brother, a baby at the time, never knew his father. He always lived at home, finished a four-year vocational course, refrained from drinking, and had nothing to do with

girls. Unlike the prisoner, who had a bad reputation with all the local police, he was friendly with the officers. He lived with his mother, making her home the center of his interests.

B–2 is a full-blooded Oneida Indian, an unskilled laborer twenty-seven years old and unmarried. He has an I. Q. of 70 and a second-grade education. He was the youngest of the six children of a couple who farmed land allotted them by the government. Their first allotment they lost, and the second they are gradually losing also. All the Indians in this part of the state are poverty-stricken as compared with most of the whites, who look down upon them. Most of them manage to keep out of trouble despite their handicaps, but of the prisoner's family several had been committed to correctional and penal institutions, including his grandfather and a cousin, who were inmates of the Wisconsin State Prison.

As the youngest child he was not required to take any responsibility and was somewhat spoiled, according to his brother. He spent two years at an Indian school in an adjoining state, but as with many another Indian the experience merely served to aggravate the culture conflict he faced when he returned home. The government's attempt to educate these Indians away from home has too often implanted ideas inconsistent with the situation in which they find themselves later.

Some of the critical factors in the prisoner's career are revealed by comparing it with the brother's. Both were subject to the same culture conflict, both were conscious of their inferior status as Indians; but the brother, being older, had been required to take more responsibility. Both men had had bad as well as good associates, but the brother was less easily influenced than the prisoner, who had let his closest friend lead him into crime. Like the prisoner, the brother had done only odd jobs before his military enlistment, but he apparently succeeded in orienting himself fairly well in the army, whereas the prisoner's experience at the Indian school merely made subsequent adjustment more difficult. The brother finished the sixth grade; the prisoner got no farther than the second. The brother married a woman suited to him, whereas the prisoner early became promiscuous and remained single. The brother succeeded in remaining out of the hands of the law; the prisoner lost by a previous incarceration whatever status he may once have had.

That military service warped some of the soldiers, especially the younger ones, is suggested by the case of B–4, a man of thirty-four at the time of our interview with him. He had a high I. Q. (109) and did very well in school, as is proved by his graduation from high school at the age of sixteen. He attended college for a year and would doubtless have graduated had he not enlisted for service in World War I.

His mother was a native American, his father an Italian. Discipline was

largely in the hands of the mother, inasmuch as the father's work as a construction engineer kept him away from home much of the time.

The parents wished their son to finish school, but the war enthusiasm got the better of him, and at the age of seventeen he enlisted. While in the army he began to take a decided interest in women and became sexually promiscuous. After his demobilization he married and had one child, but he broke with his wife after four years. A little later he married again and had two children by this marriage. He lauds his second wife, but later was separated from her also.

After his return from France, where he had been gassed, he was in a veteran's hospital for two years. Upon his discharge he began to draw government compensation, which made it unnecessary for him to work steadily. He moved frequently from job to job, chiefly as a salesman, and became one of a demoralized set in Milwaukee. He was twice convicted of forgery and punished nine times for traffic violations. All these experiences have somewhat unbalanced him emotionally, for his mother's training had not prepared him for the crises he was called upon to face.

Thus it was a combination of factors that left the prisoner so ill equipped for life's experiences, despite his fine mind—his protected boyhood in a family with a good income and little discipline; his facile success in school; the ease with which he was able to gratify all his desires; his service in the army, where he was thrown into situations which he could not handle properly and which fostered undesirable attitudes and habits; and the government income that enabled him to loaf at least part of the time. His experience with his first wife was a painful one, which even the pleasant home made by his second wife could not entirely eradicate. His spendthrift habits resulted in his first prison sentence, for cashing a check on a bank in which he had no funds. This further injured his social status and impeded his adjustment.

Another case is an example of the curious conflict of cultures that has resulted from the migration, during the last twenty years, of a large number of Kentucky families into the cutover region of northern Wisconsin. A number of these Kentuckians, of whom B–5 is one, have infringed Wisconsin law largely because their attitudes, habits, and mores are different from those of their neighbors—so different, in fact, that they really present an opposing culture.

B–5, a married man forty-five years old at the time of the interview, was a farm owner whose parents were native Kentuckians. He had reached only the fifth grade at the age of fourteen, though he has an I. Q. of 91. He was brought up on a farm and has always lived and worked on a farm. His family was very poor, and he was easily induced to join another man in breaking into a store and stealing merchandise needed by his family.

In Kentucky, he says, he was brought up in a Christian home of very

strict morals. Later he moved with his family to northern Wisconsin, where almost all Kentuckians are looked upon as queer because of their peculiarities of speech, their clannishness, and other characteristics of their culture, such as carrying a gun and taking the law into their own hands.

He had divorced his first wife and married a rather simple-minded girl from a degenerate family in the south-central part of the state. He has two children. His I. Q. indicates good native ability, but his actions in the face of the social situation in which he found himself in Wisconsin indicates a naïveté which in a native of Wisconsin would accord with an I. Q. of 50. He was unquestionably habituated to a way of life quite different from that of the community in which he was living, and as a result was often in trouble with his neighbors. He once spent thirty days in the county jail for carrying a concealed weapon, and later was fined for assault and battery. Even now he cannot understand why he was arrested. His rationalization is that the man who led him into burglary was trying to dispose of him before approaching his wife. He cannot understand why the neighbors were so desirous of getting rid of him.

In many communities Kentucky settlers are given no quarter when they get into trouble, for they are regarded as undesirable neighbors. As a class they are rather poor and have no compunction about going on relief. Among our cases are a number who have been imprisoned for crimes for which a non-Kentuckian would probably have had no stiffer sentence than a fine or a period on probation. But when a Kentuckian gets into trouble with the law the Wisconsin natives do not hesitate to "put him away." B–5 is a criminal only in the sense that he is not adjusted to the social norms of the people among whom he was living. The culture conflict he experienced is essentially the same conflict that the European immigrant experiences when he settles in America.

Case B–7 shows how family discord and inability to cope with conditions in a great city combined to produce the downfall of a country boy of superior mentality. This prisoner, who was thirty at the time of the interview, has a fine personality, many fine qualities, and apparently no sense of inferiority. He has an I. Q. of 105 and has had two years of high school and two years of university work in steam engineering. When he entered the prison he had a psychoneurotic inventory (P. I.) of 20, symptomatic of a slight psychoneurotic tendency, which cleared up rapidly under the prison regime.

He was brought up in a fairly well-to-do family of Irish extraction on both sides. The father was a skilled cheesemaker, and the mother also worked some outside the home. As the only boy in a family of five children and the first grandchild, he was somewhat spoiled by his aunts and uncles, but a more serious factor was the lack of harmony between his parents. His mother prejudiced him against his father, who eventually, after the

prisoner had left home, deserted his wife for another woman. The prejudice instilled by his mother prevented him from getting along well with his father and he found himself in an impossible emotional situation. After he had been in prison the first time, he says, he casually met his father and learned to really know and admire him.

In the meantime, at the age of fourteen, he slipped off to a large city, where he found a job for a time. With his country upbringing, however, he was utterly unprepared to cope with city conditions. During an interval when he was without work he committed burglary and was sentenced to the reformatory. He was released on parole, which he broke by going to Chicago, where he succeeded in finding work. But he was keenly sensitive to the loss of social status his reformatory experience entailed and thus found it easy to take up with an attractive young woman who was a member of a criminal gang. He fell in love with her, and they lived together and had a child. After a time she induced him to join her gang, and he participated in a burglary, for which he was sent to Joliet. He was released on parole to the Wisconsin authorities and broke this parole by committing the crime for which he was sent to the Wisconsin State Prison. In his own words, he committed the crime because he "couldn't get any work and had a Mother and four sisters to take care of as Father had got a divorce."

These cases are fairly typical of the entire sample of burglars whom we interviewed. Although they represent a wide range of mental ability, all of them tend to be emotionally upset by the experiences of life. In some the disturbance springs from a conflict of family loyalties, in others from a conflict of cultures. The former is usually, as one would expect, the more potent, but a number of cases illustrate clearly how seriously a conflict of cultures may affect an individual who cannot weave their diverse elements into an integrated pattern. The struggle for status appears frequently. Failure in lines of activity approved by society induced many of the prisoners to seek status in an anti-social group which exercised a demoralizing influence. Economic need was, in my opinion, only the immediate cause of the burglary. Behind it lay a constitutional make-up, determined by heredity and by experiences in the home or community, which made it easy for the man to commit the crime or put him at the mercy of others' suggestions. In some cases the pattern of behavior developed throughout childhood and youth was adequate under ordinary circumstances and broke down only in the face of a crisis.

ASSAULT AND ROBBERY CASES

Of the total group of property offenders in the prison 269 were convicted of assault and robbery. Of these, 23 per cent, approximately the same proportion as of the burglars, had an I. Q. below 70. See Table 22. About equal proportions were unskilled and skilled laborers (34.9 and 32.7 per cent respectively); 13.9 per cent were farmers, 10.8 per cent were clerks, 2.2 per cent owned their own business, and 4.5 per cent were professionals. See Table 35. This class ranked second to burglars with respect to the representation of unskilled labor, as Table 35 shows. A large proportion (86.2 per cent) were native-white, almost the same proportion as among property offenders as a whole (88.6 per cent) and among the total group of prisoners studied (85.3 per cent). See Table 28.

Table 30 shows that the majority were included in the age groups 25–29 and 30 and over (32.5 and 50.8 per cent respectively), a distribution which approximates that of property offenders as a whole (28 and 48.7 per cent) and of the 1153 prisoners studied (26.3 and 51.55 per cent). It differs most sharply from the age distribution of the arsonists (of whom 10.5 and 89.5 per cent respectively were in these two age groups), from burglars (28.1 and 62.1 per cent), from embezzlers (7.7 and 92.3 per cent), and from forgers (24 and 70.4 per cent).

Of this group 53 per cent were single, 31 per cent married, 2.6 per cent widowed, and 13.4 per cent divorced. It includes a higher percentage of single persons than do the property offenders as a whole (49.3 per cent) or the total sample of 1153 prison inmates (46.2 per cent), and a slightly higher proportion of divorcees than do the 933 property offenders (12.4 per cent) or the 1153 prison inmates (11.9 per cent). It differs most widely from embezzlers (single, 15.3 per cent; married, 77 per cent; divorced 7.7 per cent), from forgers (single, 32 per cent; married, 29.6 per cent; widowed, 11.2 per cent; divorced, 27.2 per cent), and from thieves (single, 44.8 per cent; married, 25.8 per cent; widowed, 4.5 per cent; and divorced, 25.8 per cent). See Table 37.

Of the 269 prisoners in the group, 74 were interviewed. Twenty-seven of these had brothers with whose backgrounds we could compare those of the prisoners. Details from a few of the case histories will illustrate the development of these men and will supplement the outline provided by the statistical study.

As with criminals in other groups, a transfer from the country to a city often provided the crisis which overwhelmed the individual who had developed an unconventional attitude. Prisoner AR–1 was sentenced at twenty-seven for three to seven years for armed assault and robbery, the crime having been committed with two or three young accomplices. He was born to honest, hard-working, religious German parents in a Wisconsin farming community. He had completed the seventh grade at the age of fourteen, had an I. Q. of 64, and a psychoneurotic inventory (P. I.) of 20 upon entrance to the prison. This is his fifth conviction, though his first on a charge of felony. He had been fined once for speeding, once for another traffic violation, and a third time for driving armed, and he had served thirty days in the house of correction for speeding.

Early he developed a resistant attitude toward his very strict father, although his brothers submitted to the father's domination. Being of a gregarious nature, he disliked the dullness of farm life and began at an early age to attend parties with neighboring boys. As an adolescent he was involved in some wild escapades. On one occasion, when he was fifteen, he and some companions stole barley from a neighboring farmer and sold it. For this his father beat him severely. Angered, he announced that he was going to Milwaukee to work and left home for good. This was only the culmination of a growing antipathy toward his father, who did not understand how to control him without physical force. He was looking for new experience, which he could not find in the home or the community.

He first worked for an uncle but changed jobs frequently. He fell in with wild companions who aggravated his anti-social tendencies, became promiscuous, and began to drink excessively. He was restless at his work and happy only when he was on some wild party, dancing and running around with girls. It was not long before he was in trouble with the authorities.

The older brother we interviewed seems to have about the same intellectual capacity. But his associates even in the home community were of different caliber, his few friends being quiet, well-behaved farm boys. He also responded differently to the father's domineering discipline. As he puts it, "I do what I am told and keep my mouth shut and I get along all right." Under certain circumstances he too might have gone astray if he had not liked the farm enough to stay on it. Like the prisoner, he is single, though he had gone steadily with a girl. He was never very gregarious, but had a passive, submissive nature which demanded little in the way of excitement and new experiences. He held one job for eight years, whereas the prisoner was employed in more than ten places after he left home. He drinks beer occasionally, but never hard liquor.

The influence of domestic situations in the development of character is illustrated by the case of AR–3, a truck driver who at the age of thirty-three was committed for two concurrent terms of one to twenty years. He has an I. Q. of 87, had completed the eighth grade at fourteen, and had attended vocational school for a year and a half.

Both of his parents were German. His father died when he was seven years old and his older brother thirteen. This was a hard blow to the family, both emotionally and economically. The mother had to go to work, and the children were neglected. The prisoner, along with other youngsters in the neighborhood, soon began to engage in vandalistic pranks and thefts of one sort and another. The situation was not improved when his mother, after two years of scandalous behavior, married a man who, though a good worker, was a drunken, dissolute fellow whom the prisoner found uncongenial. For five years he was in a state of emotional disturbance as a result of his father's death and the unhappy home conditions produced by his mother's remarriage, and this doubtless had much to do with his later emotional instability. At the age of fourteen he quit school, which he did not like, and went to live for a short time with his sister in another state.

He worked in Montana for a few years, then wandered about the country for some time, and finally came back to Wisconsin, where he continued to be occupationally unstable. His first arrest was for grand larceny, for which he spent a year in the Wisconsin State Reformatory. Later he was arrested and fined for lewd and lascivious conduct, and subsequently sentenced to a year in the Wisconsin State Prison for assault and robbery. His present is his fourth conviction and his third felony.

After he left home, possibly before, he became sexually promiscuous. He married a woman who had syphilis; they did not get along well, and she soon divorced him.

He began to associate with older persons when he was fifteen. He has always resisted guidance, an attitude that was probably born of his mother's neglect of him as a child. He is a good example of a young fellow out of control who wanted to be a man before he was mature enough to act like one. Today he is one of the most hardened and embittered of the men who were interviewed. So troublesome has he been in the prison that he has been on escort most of the time.

The brother, who left the parental home when the mother remarried, escaped the disturbing influences caused by his mother's remarriage, although he too suffered from the loss of his father. Instead of wandering over the country, however, he remained in the home community, became a good worker with a fine reputation, married a congenial woman who made him a good home, and developed into an eminently stable person. The factors that saved him were undoubtedly occupational stability and domestic happiness.

It would have been a miracle had the prisoner turned out to be anything but an enemy of good society. Almost continuously from the age of seven he had been conditioned to a lawless life.

The hypersensitive and the spoiled child appear often in this category of offenders. The AR–5 case is that of a man in whom hypersensitivity had developed early. He was convicted at the age of twenty-seven on two counts, armed assault and robbery and unarmed assault with intent to rob, and was sentenced to two terms of five to ten and one to two years respectively, to run concurrently. He has an I. Q. of 99 and at the age of fifteen had finished two years of high school. He is single. The psychiatric report shows that upon entrance to prison he was suffering from neurasthenia, his psychoneurotic inventory (P. I.) being 33. This was his third conviction for a felony.

He was born in this country to Italian parents, the third of six children. His father was a skilled workman with a good income, and the family was highly respected in the Italian community in which they lived.

At an early age the prisoner developed the habit of stuttering, which caused trouble with his teachers and subjected him to the ridicule of his classmates, to which he was very sensitive. His brothers and acquaintances whom we interviewed say he has always been excitable and nervous, and this is substantiated by the institutional reports of nervous instability. Emotionally he was very closely tied to his mother, and her death, when he was seventeen, created an emotional crisis which he believes to have been the beginning of his difficulties. He felt that he had lost the one person who understood and sympathized with him.

He has a shifting work record, having been employed by seven firms in two towns. At the time of his crime he was unemployed and was also suffering, he says, from a nervous breakdown.

After his mother's death he got into bad company, was convicted of larceny, and was sent to the state reformatory for a year. Later he served thirty days in the house of correction for vagrancy. A third conviction was for burglary, for which he received a sentence of one to three years in the state prison. He had been out only a short time when he was convicted of the crime for which he is now imprisoned.

I am inclined to conclude from the evidence that the boy's nervous condition was the cause of his stammering. When he was ridiculed by his associates, he developed a feeling of inferiority, which only his mother's understanding and support could assuage. When she died, his world fell to pieces. Being sensitive to the opinions of others, he struggled to win their esteem as a substitute for the sense of security his mother had given him. The wild conduct by which he sought to command the admiration of his companions is a good illustration of overcompensation for a feeling of uncertainty of status.

Institutional and court statistics show that crimes against property increased during the early part of the depression, and a number of the prisoners convicted of armed assault and robbery were men who had been seriously affected economically. Since they represent only a small percentage of the victims of the depression, one may conclude that they were the unstable persons for whom an economic crisis was the final straw. Some of them perhaps did not know how to obtain help. Others were so lacking in morale that they yielded to the impulse to commit a crime.

Case AR–6 is one whose crime seems to be attributable to the depression. He was twenty-six when he was convicted of armed assault and robbery, and sentenced to three terms of three to twenty years each, to be served concurrently. He has an I. Q. of 85 and had completed the eighth grade at fifteen. He is single.

He was born in this country to Polish parents in comfortable circumstances, who were respected members of the Polish community in which they lived and belonged to the Polish church and most of the Polish social organizations. He was the third of nine children, and the oldest boy. His father, a foreman in a large manufacturing plant, had always earned good money until the depression. All the boys attended church until they were confirmed but gradually dropped out during adolescence. None of the other children in the family had been in serious trouble, though one of them had been in jail for drunkenness.

The boy reacted against certain features of the old-country culture of his home and against the solidarity of the Polish community. He wanted to be known as an American, not as a "Polack." He found life most interesting in the neighborhood gangs of boys, which was an important influence in his life. Conforming to the pattern of the group, he was promiscuous from an early age. He liked active pursuits, taking special pride in his physical prowess, which he frequently put to the test in neighborhood fights.

Occupationally he was very unstable, the longest he worked for one firm being the nineteen months he was employed by a bakery.

With other members of his gang he early got into trouble. In 1929, four years before his present imprisonment, he was put on probation for a year on a charge of burglary. This probation was terminated when he was found guilty of forgery, for which he was sentenced to the state reformatory for two to three years. He was paroled in 1932 and seven months later was sentenced on the present charge.

At the time he was released from the reformatory the depression was at its lowest ebb. His parents gave him money in the hope that he would not be tempted again, but this was soon gone. Moreover, having been habituated in early adolescence to a wild life, he felt the need not only of money but of excitement. He was certainly guilty of participation in a number of crimes with which the police did not connect him.

His case illustrates how the culture conflict that arises when an immigrant group settles in a strange country may produce a maladjusted, demoralized personality. From an early age the prisoner felt the play upon him of two diverse cultures, the one forced upon him by his family, the other playing upon him in school and neighborhood. He soon discovered that the parental patterns of conduct and attitudes were not those of the larger society in which he lived, and he was torn between loyalty to his family and loyalty to his gang. The conflict was manifest in his attitude toward the school, toward a steady job, toward the established mores of the whole society. In his gangs he found recognition which he did not get in his family, dominated as it was by the old-country ideals of loyalty to church and to Polish customs and moral standards. These gangs represented an attempt to organize a mode of life that would satisfy the fundamental

urges of a group of boys bewildered by the conflict of cultures in which they were growing up. Whether such a conflict will produce crime or conformity to society's demands depends on the character of the individual's associates.

It is clear that in this case the underlying factor was the situation in which the prisoner grew to manhood; the depression merely provided the occasion for the last crime. That being the case, why did not his younger brother also get into trouble? The two boys grew up in the same home and both were members of gangs, though the brother's gang did not develop into a criminal one. Certain differences in their situations may give the answer.

1. The prisoner's first sentence was a lesson to the younger brother, though it taught the prisoner nothing. Indeed, it only estranged him further from law-abiding society, for he returned to the old gang as soon as he was free.

2. The prisoner's work record was very irregular. He left jobs, just as he had left school, because he could have more fun elsewhere. The brother, on the other hand, was occupationally stable.

3. The prisoner was always out of money and soon learned to get money without working for it; the brother saved and had a bank account.

4. Perhaps the most important influence for good to which the brother was subjected was that of the young woman he expected to marry. Early in his adolescence, like the prisoner, he had been rather promiscuous, but the girl he loved alienated him from his gang and steadied him. The prisoner, on the other hand, never went steadily with any girl and depended on his gang to meet his fundamental emotional and social needs. These conclusions are of course based on the assumption that the constitutional make-up of the two men is the same. For that assumption we have no proof.

AR–7 is another prisoner who says he was a victim of the depression. He is twenty-four years old and is serving a sentence of four to ten years for armed assault and theft. He had been dishonorably discharged from the army for a car theft. In another state he had been given from five to fifteen years in the state reformatory for the larceny of an automobile, but was released on parole after sixteen months and kept it.

He is the youngest of the five children of Norwegian parents who settled in Wisconsin. His father was an unskilled laborer. He had acquired an eighth-grade education at the age of thirteen, when he left home to go to work. He has an I. Q. of 85. When he entered prison he had a psychoneurotic inventory (P. I.) of 22. Until his marriage he had been sexually promiscuous from an early age, but was later happily married; his domestic situation therefore seems unrelated to his crime. Nor did he drink very much until three or four months before his conviction. Because of the depression he was out of work.

He is a weak individual with a colorless, unprepossessing personality.

During the interview he spoke just above a whisper. Most of his life he had been a farm hand working in his home community. After his discharge from the army he did hotel work for a short time and then worked in a lunchroom pantry for three months. He has not had a steady job since.

The apparently significant differences between him and his non-delinquent brother, who also suffered from the depression, are the following:

1. The prisoner left home at thirteen and was therefore deprived of the home influence earlier than his brother, who continued to work on the farm until he was of age. After drifting for a time the prisoner enlisted, got into trouble, and lost status even in the army when he was dishonorably discharged.

2. The brother liked school and wished to continue; the prisoner disliked school and quit early to go to work.

3. The prisoner had a very unstable occupational history; the brother stuck steadily to farming.

4. The brother was surrounded by wholesome associates, whereas the prisoner led an irregular life from the age of thirteen, associating with the type of men who got him into this trouble.

Thus the depression was only one factor and perhaps the least important one in his career.

Another prisoner who blames the depression for his trouble is AR–10, a twenty-six-year-old man with an I. Q. of 91 who is serving a sentence of one to two years on the charge of assault with intent to rob. He finished the seventh grade at fifteen, and thereafter had a year of vocational school. He is married and has one child. One side of his face is badly distorted by a scar. He had been arrested many times before—for disturbing the peace, for threatening to do great bodily harm, for drunk and disorderly conduct, and for burglary. For this latter crime he was given two years on probation to the State Board of Control, which he broke after a year by disorderly conduct, when he was sent to the state reformatory for one to two years. In ten months he was given a parole, which he kept. Twice thereafter he was given ten days in the county jail, once for drunkenness and once for trespassing.

For his last crime, his second felony, the prisoner blames the depression, yet it is obvious that the roots of his criminality lie in his early environment. His father, who was Irish, exercised most of the control over the children. But he was away a great deal, and during his absences discipline was relaxed, for the mother babied this boy. When he was an adolescent, his father and mother separated. He left school, began to associate with tough characters, became promiscuous, and began to drink. Even earlier he had associated with rather rough boys in the neighborhood. At seventeen he enlisted in the navy, but was dishonorably discharged for having a still on shipboard. Because of his character he was unable to hold a job, and

during the depression was unable even to get one. He became a bootlegger, associated with tavern and pool-hall habitués, and lived a wild life generally. He married a loose woman, who contributed to his instability. Thus step by step he prepared himself for anti-social activities.

He has a brother who is a good citizen and has an entirely different history. Ten years the prisoner's senior, he was much more strictly disciplined, for his father was home much more during his childhood than later. He went to work early and did not drink excessively. Though he was divorced by his first wife, by whom he had one child, he ultimately married a woman with three children who proved to be a stabilizing influence. He also served in the navy but was given an honorable discharge and has been steadily employed since. He and his second wife have five children and get along well.

The histories of these brothers show that the depression was only one element, and not the most important, in the prisoner's criminality. His early conditioning, uncorrected by later experiences which might have sobered him, made anti-social activity almost inevitable. Had he succeeded in attaining status, economic and social, he might have satisfied his fundamental drives in acceptable ways. Lacking such status, he had a sense of frustration, which he tried to overcome by activities which fed his ego and aroused the admiration of his associates.

AR–11 is the only case in the sample to which the depression seems closely related. This man of thirty-four, a naturalized American born to German parents in Germany, was convicted on two counts of armed assault and robbery and sentenced to two terms of three to four years to be served consecutively. He has a seventh-grade education, which he completed at sixteen, has an I. Q. of 92, and is single. None of his family had ever been arrested before. His half brother, whom until a short time ago he believed to be his full brother, was sent up for the same offense.

Family relations seem to have been harmonious, although the home was a rather poor one. During the depression, at a time when neither the father nor any of the sons had work, the mother was hospitalized with an incurable disease. The family was unable to meet its obligations when the hospital began to press for payment or to buy the delicacies the invalid needed. In the face of this situation the prisoner and his half brother decided that they would commit robbery to get the necessary funds. All the children were devoted to her, but these two yielded to the impulse to get money in whatever way they could.

Even in this case the family history reveals aspects of these boys' upbringing which help to explain their surrender to anti-social impulses in the face of a crisis. The family had always been poor and not very sociable. They had no fixed status in the community and lived pretty much to themselves. Though they had a high degree of social solidarity, they lacked connections and therefore community supports in time of trouble. They did not drink, and neither the prisoner nor his father had ever entered a saloon, but both AR–11 and his brother were promiscuous. Both had to quit school at an early age to help support the family. In the prisoner's case, stuttering was an added incentive to leave school rather early. The family, the only social unit of importance to any of them, was so closely knit that the needs of the mother and their inability to satisfy them was harrowing in the extreme. In this case, then, the depression was a positive factor in the genesis of the crime.

The cases cited are fairly typical of the sample as a whole. They all show the importance of healthy conditions in the parental family, the neighborhood, and the prisoner's own family. They indicate that it is emotional stability and economic security which prevent departure from socially approved conduct in the face of a crisis, and that the foundations are laid early.

The prisoners convicted of assault and robbery are for the most part of low mentality. Low intelligence, however, is important only when it is associated with undesirable social and economic conditions. Poverty in the home, which is common, is apparently not a decisive factor. Occasionally favoritism prevents the discipline and training necessary to the establishment of desirable responses to difficult situations. Sometimes disharmony in family relationships or their disruption produces a conflict of loyalties difficult for the growing child to handle constructively. Of great importance in many cases are the rough, unwholesome associates of childhood and adolescence. Sometimes, on the other hand, the early history is barren of positively unwholesome influences, and it was not until a crisis occurred in the man's own household, such as friction, separation, or divorce, that he suffered the emotional disturbance that led to anti-social activities. With respect to these subtle emotional factors the assault and robbery cases do not seem to differ from other types of property offenders.

FORGERY CASES

Of the large sample of 1118 inmates in the Wisconsin State Prison for whom we got certain data, 126 were convicted of forgery. Of these, 33 were interviewed.

Of the 126 forgers 36.5 per cent were skilled workers, 23.8 per cent farmers, 16.7 per cent clerks, 15.9 per cent unskilled laborers, 4.8 per cent professional men, and 2.3 per cent owners of businesses. See Table 35. Like the bank robbers and embezzlers, only a small proportion (15.1 per cent) had an I. Q. of less than 70.

The proportion of native-born was 94.4 per cent, a figure exceeded only by the bank robbers (97.8 per cent). The proportion is larger than it is in the total group of property offenders in the prison (88.6 per cent), all

prisoners in the institution (85.3 per cent), and the Wisconsin male population fifteen years of age and over (85.3 per cent in 1930). See Table 28.

Seventy per cent of the forgers were thirty years old or over, a percentage surpassed only by the embezzlers (92.3 per cent). See Table 30.

Thirty-two per cent were single. Only the embezzlers included a smaller proportion of single men (15.3 per cent). A larger proportion of the forgers were divorced (27.2 per cent) than of all property offenders studied (12.4 per cent) and of all prisoners (11.9 per cent). See Table 37.

The mean I. Q. of the forgers was 2.18 higher than that of all property offenders. This gave a critical ratio of the difference of 1.8, which may not be significant, since the difference could have occurred by chance about seven in one hundred times (Table 23).

We are safe in saying, therefore, that as a whole the prisoners in this sample did not forge because they lacked the mental capacity to distinguish between right and wrong or to foresee the consequences of their acts. There is only one case of insanity, one of epilepsy, and one of mother fixation.

Case F–1, a young man of twenty-seven with an I. Q. of 95, serving one to three years for forgery, was the son of native-born parents whose paternal ancestors had come from Belgium and maternal ancestors from Germany. He was brought up in a good middle-class home without exposure to the rigors of poverty, and the community in which the family lived was one of the better sort. He never had to contribute to the support of the family. The parents were church members; his father was a Mason and his mother an Eastern Star. The reputation of the family was spotless, and he was the only child who got into difficulty. Although he seems to have made good grades and finished the eighth grade at fourteen, he did not like school very well, because he thought it was run like a factory. Evidently no individual attention was given to his problems. There is no evidence of the influence of unwholesome associates before he left home.

Nevertheless his early environment had some shortcomings. His father was a strict disciplinarian, but his discipline was intermittent because he was away from home a good deal. Moreover, the prisoner thinks that his father never liked him, and there is some evidence that the father favored the other children. Some disharmony existed between the father and the mother, the nature of which could not be ascertained. Further, the boy was small and so felt inferior to his companions. He did not take kindly to discipline and was sensitive to real or fancied slights. A number of his older relatives had been in the navy, and their experiences had been talked about in the family. At sixteen he ran away and joined the navy, lying about his age. This he did with his mother's knowledge, while his father was away. Thus he fled from the emotional difficulties born of his uncertain status in the family and in the school.

He was sent to the Orient and was thrown among a group of hardened and reckless sailors older than himself, among whom he strove to establish himself. At sixteen he had his first sexual experience. He spent his shore leave showing his companions that he was as good a man as any of them, drinking, taking cocaine, and visiting the prostitutes of the Oriental ports. When he returned to America he deserted and was dishonorably discharged. Thereafter he made contacts with others of similar anti-social habits, continued his use of drugs and drink, and committed a series of offenses that got him into trouble with the law. He was fined for being drunk; arrested for vagrancy and given six months' probation to the Big Brothers, which he broke in two months by failing to report; arrested a third time for breaking and entering in the nighttime and given a three-year prison sentence, of which he served twenty-five months, when he was paroled; sentenced to thirty days in the house of correction for issuing a worthless check; and, finally, arrested a fifth time for the present crime. All these offenses were committed when he was under the influence either of drink or of drugs.

He had a younger brother who at the time this study was made was about to graduate from high school. While the prisoner was in the navy, his parents were divorced and both married again. The younger brother remained with his mother and stepfather, who was congenial and took a great interest in him. He is a well-behaved individual who seeks decent companions and is bookish in his tastes. He is highly praised by his stepfather.

The important factors in the prisoner's life were, first, discrimination against him in the home, which gave him a feeling of inferiority and undermined his sense of emotional security, and, second, his consequent flight from home at the age of sixteen. In the navy, to secure the satisfaction which comes from recognition by a group, he adopted a pattern of behavior at variance with that of his family and home community. For a time he enjoyed status among his fellow navy men and satisfied some of his primal impulses, but ultimately he came to feel an outcast from decent society. By the time he returned home his habits had become so fixed that he found it difficult to fit into his home community and so took refuge in drink and drugs. At the present time he shows some signs of dementia praecox.

Among the property offenders the one clear case of insanity is that of F–3, a victim of dementia praecox with an I. Q. of 98. The case is not important as an illustration of the statistical data on the forgers, but it shows the workings of a mind caught in a psychological net from which it cannot extricate itself. The report of one of the examining psychiatrists describes his condition as "dementia praecox, a well organized, delusional system of paranoid type. Delusions grouped around his belief that he is a great detective and that he has five thousand dollars worth of silver in his stomach. Auditory hallucinations to which his reactions are schizophrenic, dream states suggestive of epilepsy; mannerisms, probably future duration permanent." Another psychiatrist diagnosed him as a psychopathic person-

ality. However, he was discharged later. His psychoneurotic inventory (P. I.) was 26, indicating a psychoneurotic tendency.

He was thirty-four years old when he began serving his sentence of one to three years for uttering forged paper. He had been graduated from high school at the age of seventeen, and had been two years at a military academy. He says he was a refrigerator engineer. He had been married and divorced twice and has one child by his second wife. Since his discharge from the prison he has married again and is separated from his third wife. His occupational history is very irregular; after serving in the navy he drifted all over the world, holding no job for more than a short time.

He was the youngest of five children born to wealthy parents, well-respected in their community. One of his brothers heads an important business and all the other sibs are well adjusted. The home was very comfortable, even luxurious, but not harmonious. The prisoner feels that his parents and all but one of his sibs have been against him. Yet his father has spent a fortune in making good the worthless checks he has issued and has bought him an annuity which yields him a monthly income, probably in the hope that it would remove the temptation to commit forgery. Sometimes the checks he issued were signed with the name under which, he says, a lady for whom he once worked left him a large sum of money. These funds, he says, are so tied up that he cannot get them without making himself liable to prosecution for forgery.

The critical difference between his history and that of his next older brother, apart from the inherent differences that may exist, lies in the treatment they received from their parents, who were divided in their attitude toward the children. The father favored the two older boys, the mother the two girls and the prisoner, whom she frequently shielded from the father's disciplinary measures. The prisoner shows a very definite preference for his mother and for one sister, despite the fact that his father spent perhaps a hundred thousand dollars in getting him out of trouble, according to the brother's estimate. As a result of the differing treatment they received in the family, and perhaps their differing constitutions, one developed into a dementia praecox case with criminal tendencies and the other into a solid business man in the community where both were raised.

Case F–4 was committed, at the age of twenty-six, for one to seven years on a charge of forgery. He had an I. Q. of 75 and had reached only the seventh grade at seventeen. He is one of two sons born to a father of English and a mother of Danish descent. He also has a half sister born to his mother and stepfather. Both his father and mother died of tuberculosis, his father when he was eleven and his mother four years later. His stepfather, he says, was not congenial, but according to the brother he treated both boys very well. Thus it is evident that even in the home the prisoner reacted

differently from his brother. Even as a child he was constantly in trouble because, as he says, he was always doing something that was forbidden. Both the prisoner and his brother had tuberculosis. The outstanding differences in their backgrounds are as follows:

1. The brother is of at least average intelligence, having finished the eleventh grade at the age of nineteen despite bad health; the prisoner is "simple," as is evidenced by his I. Q. and the testimony of the interviewer and of the brother and sister-in-law.

2. The brother reacted wholesomely to his stepfather and to the foster parents with whom he lived after his mother's death when he was fourteen; the prisoner took a hostile attitude toward his stepfather.

3. The brother continued in school until he was nineteen, when his health broke down; the prisoner left school and went to work at the age of fifteen, when his mother died.

4. In the sanatorium in which both were treated for tuberculosis, the brother was a model patient, the prisoner a rebellious one.

5. The brother has been occupationally stable, having had only one employer; the prisoner is unreliable at work and unstable in all his reactions.

6. The brother never touches liquor; the prisoner was drunk at the time of his last delinquency.

7. The brother has always been economically independent; the prisoner expects the world to give him a living and expected his relatives to make good the check he forged.

8. The brother married a respectable, congenial woman and has a child and a pleasant home; the prisoner has been sexually promiscuous since the age of thirteen and has never settled down.

9. The brother is mentally well-balanced; the prisoner seems rather deranged. He takes no responsibility for his actions but blames someone else for his troubles. He has a tendency to lie his way out of difficulties.

10. The brother has always had fine friends; the prisoner preferred companions of a low social order.

The different patterns of reaction in the two boys may be due to differences in constitutional make-up or to early conditioning, possibly to both.

Certainly the prisoner has much the lower intelligence of the two and is emotionally much the more unstable.

Among this sample of forgers is one who gives rather definite evidence of mother fixation. This is F–5, a cook and baker, who was twenty-three years old when sentenced for one to two years. He had reached the ninth grade in school when he was thirteen and thereafter had three years of part-time work in a vocational school. He is single and has an I. Q. of 86.

This is his third felony and second forgery. He was first convicted for attempted robbery, and was given eighteen months' probation, which he

broke just before its expiration by committing forgery. For the latter crime he served thirteen months of a maximum two-year sentence in the state reformatory, was given a parole, and kept it.

He is the third of the thirteen children of a German father and a mother of Bohemian descent. When the prisoner was born, the father was a farmer, but later moved his family to a city, where he began drinking excessively.

So far as the prisoner's reaction to life is concerned, the significant thing is his feeling that the relationship between the different members of the family was not a harmonious one. He never got along well with his father or with his brothers, whom he believed his father favored. The two older brothers, he says, were selfish like their father. He says that when he was fourteen years old he became conscious of his father's favoritism for his brothers, and of the fact that his mother and sisters treated him more sympathetically.

At fourteen he left home because of disagreements with his father and elder brothers and went to live with an aunt and uncle. Later he worked for a farmer, from whose home he went to school. Still later he worked in a neighboring city and attended vocational school.

He says that his first offense, robbery, was committed while he was drunk and that he remembers nothing about it. For his two forgery offenses he has no explanation except that he was worried. He was not earning enough to take care of the family, which was in need because of his father's drinking and low earnings. He thinks also that he may have been worried over his disagreements with his father and the refusal of one of his elder brothers to help the family. He says that his forgeries were committed on a sudden impulse, that he cannot understand why he should have done so foolish a thing, and that he wonders whether he was not "kind of crazy." He reveals in his talk how much upset he is by his relationships with his father and brothers. There is a good deal of evidence of mother fixation and violent jealousy of his father and brothers, who resemble him physically. Even his choice of the baker's trade is closely related to his emotional dependence on his mother.

The brother with whom we compared him also tried the baker's trade, but disliked it and became a printer. He did not acknowledge that his father showed any favoritism or discriminated against the prisoner. He says the prisoner did not stick to any job long enough to master a trade and did not work as hard as the older brothers but leaned too much on them. This brother has had a stable occupational history, is married to a fine woman, and is a respected member of the community, whereas the prisoner was occupationally unstable and sexually promiscuous.

All these irregularities fit the hypothesis that at fourteen, as he came into adolescence, he developed an Oedipus complex which upset him emotionally and bred an antagonistic reaction against his father and brothers.

This mental conflict and emotional restlessness in turn produced occupational instability and ultimately anti-social action.

These cases of forgery illuminate some of the points brought out in the statistical study. They also provide certain supplementary information which throws light upon the development of personality and character.

The number of forgers who commit the same crime again and again is striking. All 33 in our sample had been convicted of some crime before, and 24 had previously been convicted of forgery. This recidivism has been commented upon by judges and by a number of criminologists and psychiatrists, who are inclined to attribute it to some deep-seated emotional twist. But in general their histories are similar to those of other types of offenders, characterized as they are, in about the same proportions, by resistance to discipline, unwholesome associations, addiction to drink, sexual promiscuity and subjection to poverty, unemployment, and domestic disharmony. Comparison with their brothers occasionally reveals a difference in constitutional vigor or a crippling illness, but no more frequently than in other cases of property offenders. So also with the social backgrounds of the forgers, which differ from those of their brothers in essentially the same ways as do those guilty of other crimes. How explain, then, this tendency to recidivism among forgers? Study of the case histories suggests three theories:

1. The ease with which the penalty for forgery may be escaped. In Wisconsin a person who issues a bad check is ordinarily not prosecuted if he makes it good within a few days. Frequently the relatives of a young man will make good a bad check or other instrument in order to save him from prosecution.

2. The rather light sentence Wisconsin imposes for the crime, as compared with the penalty for other property crimes. The risk is therefore none too great even if the charge is brought against the offender.

3. The suggestions and example offered by persons who commit the crime without being punished. A man who sees his associates succeed in forgery may come to feel that this is an easy way to obtain needed funds. This factor operates, of course, in all types of crime.

BANK ROBBERY CASES

The bank robbers, embezzlers, and forgers constitute the intellectual aristocrats not only of our sample of property offenders but of the total prison population, the first two groups having a somewhat higher intellectual capacity than the forgers. Our sample of property offenders included 48 bank robbers, only 14.6 per cent of whom had an I. Q. of less than 70. See Table 22. Their mean I. Q. was 87, that of property offenders as a whole, 80. That this difference cannot be attributed to chance is proved by the critical ratio of this difference, which is 3.297. See Table 23.

Occupationally the distribution of bank robbers was somewhat unusual. They included a larger proportion of men who had owned a business than did the other groups, and also a larger proportion from the clerical occupations. The percentage of farmers was smaller than the average for property offenders as a whole. The proportions of skilled laborers was about the same as in the total sample of property offenders, but that of unskilled laborers was smaller.

A larger percentage of the bank robbers, 97.8, than of the 1153 prisoners on whom we got data were native-born.

A larger proportion of this group (47.8 per cent) than of any other class of offender were 25 to 29 years old. The class having the next highest proportion in this age range are those committed for assault and robbery. Both are crimes of violence requiring daring and youthful vigor.

With respect to marital condition bank robbers do not differ markedly from the other groups of property offenders except that the percentage of single men (54.4) is third highest, being surpassed only by those committed for breaking and entering (60.9 per cent) and burglary (60 per cent). See Table 37.

One of the bank robbery cases that may be cited to illustrate many factors not revealed by the statistical analysis is that of a man whose family had moved from Kentucky to a Wisconsin community that was undergoing transition from a logging to a farming economy. Here they found a culture quite different from the one they had left behind. The settlement was one of rough, self-reliant pioneer lumbermen, in which tradition and custom had not had time to crystallize into agencies of social control and the whole social situation was somewhat chaotic. Bootlegging was common during the prohibition era.

The prisoner, who had been a grocery clerk, was serving a sentence for bank robbery which had originally been set at fifteen to twenty years but was later reduced to one to ten years. He was twenty-seven years old when committed and unmarried. His I. Q. was 90. He had previously been fined once for speeding and once for driving while intoxicated. Later he had been convicted of forgery and put on probation to the State Board of Control. This he broke by engaging in a confidence game, for which he was placed in the reformatory for one to two years. His present conviction is his fifth.

The parents of the prisoner, who is the elder of two boys, were of English, Irish, and Scotch descent. In Kentucky the father had been a farmer, but in Wisconsin he was engaged in a tile and retail lumber business, and also ran a sawmill. Judged by the standards of the community, the family was well-to-do. It owned not only its own home but a cottage in one of the resort regions of the state. From the time the boys were thirteen or fourteen years old they never lacked money, and while they were still of high school age their father gave each of them a car costing nineteen hundred dollars. Unwise as this may have been, it would appear that in general the parents exercised a wholesome and consistent discipline without repression of the children or any display of favoritism.

Ownership of a car, however, went to the prisoner's head. He greatly enjoyed the prestige it gave him, so much indeed that at fifteen he quit school, went to work for outsiders, and spent his spare time rushing about with other pleasure-seeking youths of the neighborhood. He had an overmastering desire to be recognized as a leader and almost inevitably became associated with undesirable companions. He became promiscuous very early, boasts that he knew sixty-five women intimately, some of whom were schoolteachers older than himself. By his own confession he had six illegitimate children, for some of which the family had to settle. He never married and continued his promiscuity until he was sentenced to prison.

His parents, imbued with the Kentucky tradition of family solidarity, probably erred in helping the boy out of his adolescent scrapes. Money was regarded as something for any member of the family to use as he wished, with the result that the boy had more to spend than was good for him. When he got into trouble his parents did everything possible to shield him and thus indirectly supported him in his misdeeds. Under different circumstances this family protection might have had a wholesome effect, as the brother's history reveals.

The brother, though he was expelled from school for smoking, had a quite different adolescent career, partly because of a difference in temperament. He took no undue satisfaction in his ownership of a car and was content to stay at home much more than the prisoner. At the age of nineteen he married a farm girl who made him a good wife and settled down. The couple lived with his parents, of whose kind treatment the wife is most appreciative. Thus the brother remained under the influence of the strong family ties which were characteristic of the Kentucky background.

The difference between these two careers is undoubtedly to be explained on the basis of individual temperament. The prisoner, first-born of the two, was of a nervous and aggressive nature. He had a talent for leadership and was more popular with young people. His ego demanded satisfaction outside the home, which he sought among a group of wild and undisciplined companions. Eventually he had a series of conflicts with the law, all of which deprived him of status and frustrated his desire for recognition. The brother, who sought his satisfactions within the family, found that his more dignified behavior brought him not only the approval of the family but prestige among his neighbors.

Case BR–2 is that of a man of thirty who had received a sentence of twenty to twenty-five years. He was the third of the four children of native-born parents and the only one who had been in trouble. He has an I. Q. of 90 and had obtained approximately an eighth-grade education when he quit

school at fifteen. He had served one year for forgery in a state reformatory and three years for burglary in the house of correction. This is his third felony.

The prisoner says that his mother died when he was four years old, his younger brother only two weeks old, and an older brother nine years old. The children were distributed among relatives and foster parents, and the father, an unskilled laborer, ceased to pay much attention to them. The older brother and the prisoner went to live with an uncle and aunt, poor, respectable farmers, whose home was fairly harmonious but rather strict. Very early the two boys showed their difference of temperament in their reactions to the discipline of their home. Whereas the older brother was always amenable to suggestions, liked to work, and got along well, the prisoner did not like to work, felt discriminated against and resisted authority, frequently ran away when chastised, and finally at the age of fifteen moved to a large city in another state. Here he fell in with rough companions who proved to be his undoing. He drifted all over the country and has never worked steadily anywhere.

The youngest boy, who was raised by another family, also poor, had a wholesome development, worked steadily, married and settled down, and became a respected citizen in the community. Thus these two brothers both remained among the kind of people that raised them. They both chose wholesome companions, married suitable wives, and developed personalities that are much alike.

The prisoner, however, not only had some undesirable temperamental characteristics but he suffered an additional handicap after being sentenced to the reformatory in that he found it difficult to readjust himself. That he had married a good wife is indicated by every report, including his own, and by the fact that she stuck to him after he was sentenced to prison. Nevertheless she was unable to eradicate the pattern of conduct he had developed earlier, and he was unfaithful to her.

The genesis of his delinquency, as his story shows, lies in his temperament, so different from that of his brothers, which was manifest at an early age. Whether that temperament was the result of inherent qualities or of the treatment he received as a child from his father and mother or his uncle and aunt is uncertain. It is manifest in his feeling of inferiority and the resistance to home discipline which prompted him, a country-reared boy of fifteen, to leave relatives and friends for a city life and unwholesome companions. Imprisonment in the reformatory and in the house of correction contributed to his emotional instability and anti-social attitude, as did his occupational instability, which was probably also the result of his personality and habits.

Case BR–3 is that of a man of thirty-one who was serving a sentence of fifteen to twenty years for a bank robbery committed in company with

four other men. He had finished one year of high school when he was sixteen. He was sexually promiscuous, and shortly before the commission of this crime had been a rather heavy drinker. Though this was his first conviction, it was not his first offense. He had previously embezzled twenty-seven hundred dollars, but had made restitution and escaped prosecution. He was single and had an I. Q. of 79. For most of his life after leaving high school he had been a bank accountant and teller.

He was the fifth of nine children. His father was by descent Polish and German, and his mother of Polish descent. The father worked in a foundry and later was foreman of a gravel pit. All except the prisoner were respected citizens and he himself had been well-behaved as a boy, though somewhat erratic.

The community in which the family lived is a typical Wisconsin summer resort, frequented in season by all kinds of people from Chicago, among them some bootleggers and gangsters. The permanent residents on the whole conform to accepted morals; the tourists and idlers from the city have another code. Consequently the neighborhood youths, especially those who associate with tourists and try to adopt the living standards of bootleggers and gangsters, face conflicting moral standards.

It was in this community that he committed his first offense. He and some other employees of the bank discovered that the vice-president was appropriating bank funds (it was ultimately discovered that he had embezzled about thirty thousand dollars over a long period of years). The prisoner, who was a very good golfer, had joined a rather fast crowd, had become promiscuous, and had gradually adopted a scale of living somewhat above his income. Influenced by the vice-president's successful peculation and the suggestions of other clerks, he yielded to temptation and himself embezzled about twenty-seven hundred dollars. When the bank examiners discovered the loss, he made good but lost his job. He was recommended to a bank in a neighboring state, however, only to find that the president there was also an embezzler. These two examples of criminality on the part of men in responsible positions and the ease with which they seemed to be escaping detection doubtless had a demoralizing effect upon him. When finally the president's peculations were discovered, the business of the bank fell off so much that the prisoner again lost his job and was unemployed for two or three months except for a little work done for his brother in a tavern. Demoralized by his loss of status, he began to drink excessively. When he met some bootleggers who, knowing he had been a bank employee, urged him to cooperate with them in a bank robbery, he was in a most receptive mood.

The brother, on the other hand, developed into a stable personality. Unlike the prisoner, who was weak-willed and easily led, he had a mind of his own. He observed the mores of the family and community in which he

had been reared, used liquor only moderately, and was always steadily employed. His associates were people of his own kind and he was engaged to a steady girl. He had never been arrested.

Most people think of bank robbers as professionals, and some of them are. But many in our sample are not, such as the two men who robbed several filling stations, held up the same bank twice, and during the second robbery murdered a man. The newspapers spoke of professional criminals from Chicago, only to discover later that the perpetrators were farmers, two brothers, from a rural community in Wisconsin. Each was sentenced for armed assault and robbery to three terms of three to thirty years, for bank robbery to one term of fifteen to forty years, and for first-degree murder to life imprisonment.

Case BR–4, one of this pair, was twenty-seven years old and single when convicted. He had an I. Q. of 76 and had finished only the seventh grade of the country school at the age of fourteen. He had a psychoneurotic inventory of 24.

He is the youngest of nine children born to a father of English, and a mother of German, descent. The family was a very disharmonious one, lacking solidarity and strong ties of affection. The father, a farmer and saloonkeeper, had been in jail for drunkenness and violation of the game laws. He seemed to care little for his children and his queer, penurious wife. Indeed, all the children felt that neither parent was much concerned about them.

There was also a strain of mental unbalance in the family, especially on the mother's side. A maternal aunt had been insane, and two of the prisoner's brothers were in institutions for the mentally deranged. A third brother who has been in prison has an I. Q. of 62. The two who committed the crime were irascible men, as is shown by the frequency with which they were involved in fights and the brutality with which they killed the man in the bank. The brother prisoner, whose I. Q. is 75, was transferred from the prison to the hospital for the criminal insane. The non-delinquent brother who was interviewed has never been involved with the law, but also manifests instability, although it is less marked. This is a clear case of mental instability in the family stock.

How did the brother who was interviewed differ from BR–4? Being much older, he had had a chance to establish himself economically before the depression. He had married early, had never been out of a job, and had a good position when his brothers became lawbreakers. He got along well with his wife, a woman of sound sense who was able to dominate her somewhat unstable, irritable, and none too intelligent husband. The two prisoners, very much younger, left home to find work during the depression years and found it difficult to make a living. Thus the depression provided the

crisis which they were unprepared by constitution and training to meet successfully.

One often hears that a painful experience with the law may turn some men to crime. The following case lends weight to this statement.

The man involved, a tool-grinder thirty-two years old and single, was sentenced to twenty-five to forty years for bank robbery. He had had two years of high school. He had an I. Q. of 97, and he wrote a very intelligent autobiography for us. He was one of ten children and the youngest of four boys. By descent his father was German and French, his mother German. English, however, was the only language of the home, which was a harmonious one with no culture conflict. The father was a mason contractor with a fairly good income, but his reputation in the community was none too good.

Until his first arrest on a charge of rape the prisoner had been a rather decent fellow. After that he was fined once for speeding, given sixty days in the county jail for the larceny of an automobile tire, fifteen days in the county jail for evading a hotel bill, one to four years in the Wisconsin State Prison for assault with intent to do great bodily harm, and finally the present sentence.

The story which furnishes the key to his steady demoralization begins with his arrest on suspicion of criminally assaulting a girl who had been found lying unconscious on the highway. Although he was finally cleared, he spent a number of weeks in jail while the matter was being investigated and again later while the trial was pending. Upon his discharge he felt that his reputation in the community had been ruined, that no decent girl would look at him. He began to seek low company, both male and female, became promiscuous, drank to excess, wandered over the country from one job to another, and finally came back to Wisconsin, where he obtained a position after some effort. While job-hunting he had lived at a hotel until, his last dollar spent, he did not have enough to meet the entire bill. He found another rooming house and told the hotelkeeper that he would pay what was owing as soon as he could, but in a few days was thrown into jail. There he met a man, being held on a very serious charge, who offered to pay him a substantial sum if he would help him to escape. Tempted, and embittered by his previous experiences, he tried after his release to free his jail companion and received one to four years for assault.

After serving his sentence he tried unsuccessfully to get a job in his own community and at last found work in another state. Later he came back to the home community and lived with his sister, but again failed to find employment. He began to drink and to run with a wild crowd. He became convinced that if society would not give him a job, it owed him a living anyway. While drunk he help up a bank.

His experiences with the law had induced in him a feeling that he was being persecuted. When the charge of rape cost him his standing in the community, he took to drinking, and while dead drunk stole an automobile tire for his car. He felt that he had unjustly taken the punishment due to others and, after the episode of the hotel bill and his resulting loss of job, that society was against him. By this time his morale had been shattered.

A mistake made by the police may seriously injure a man's status in society. The unfortunate circumstances may finally generate in the victim a feeling that society and its agencies are unjust; he becomes bitter and convinced that he is justified in taking the law into his own hands.

As a group the bank robbers are among the most intelligent of the prison inmates we studied. The next history is that of a man with an exceptionally high intelligence.

Case BR–8, who had been a chauffeur and bookkeeper, was sentenced to fifteen to forty years for robbing a bank of almost seven thousand dollars. He was twenty-seven when committed and had been divorced. He has an I. Q. of 118 and had completed four years of high school at the age of seventeen.

He had a previous record. He had been in jail once for drunkenness but had forfeited twenty-five dollars bail instead of standing trial. Later he had received a maximum of seven years in a reformatory on a charge of carnal knowledge of a female minor. From that sentence he had been on parole for about two years when he was arrested on the present charge.

He wrote us a life story of more than a hundred typewritten pages, which shows intelligence and skill in writing. While in prison he had several articles published and after his discharge got a position with a publishing firm, in which at last account he was doing well.

He was the oldest in a family of three boys and a girl. The boys were born rather close together, the girl twelve years after the last boy. His grandparents had come from Sweden and Ireland. His father followed various occupations calling chiefly for skilled labor but never earned more than enough to keep the family in fair economic circumstances. He was somewhat neurotic and was addicted to drink when the children were growing up. The prisoner is of the opinion that his paternal grandparents were highly nervous and somewhat unstable emotionally. His mother, a calm, patient, and affectionate woman, was of a quite different temperament from his father.

Perhaps of critical importance in the prisoner's development is the fact that as a child he feared his father, failed to understand him, and felt that he did not have his affection. He knows now that his father made many sacrifices for him. The mother, on the other hand, was always sympathetic with the children, and the prisoner had the very highest regard for her. He also had a great deal of affection for his young sister.

Another important circumstance in this lad's life was the fact that at the age of nineteen, instead of going to the university as he had planned, he married a girl a year younger than himself. The marriage was not successful. Both had been promiscuous before marriage, and both continued to "step out" on each other after marriage. Though the prisoner had nothing but good to say of her and takes his full share of the blame, there is little question that promiscuity had become such a habit that it interfered seriously with domestic harmony. Finally it led to divorce after the prisoner had been sentenced to the reformatory for immoral relations with a girl under eighteen. One sign of the high intelligence and the critical judgment of this man is the careful, detached manner in which he frankly explained all these shortcomings and evaluated their importance in the development of his career. Strangely enough, however, he had not considered the part played by his emotions.

Being of a restless nature, imaginative and nervous, he was unable to stick to one job for long. He made plans at different times to follow various occupations, but admits that after the first flush of enthusiasm he became bored and dropped them. The only abiding ambition he has had is to become a writer. His unstable occupational history and his restless, unsettled nature made it hard for him to settle down in conformity with social conventions. He was constantly craving excitement and adventure, what Thomas calls the "desire for new experience." It is this fundamental urge that perhaps explains this man's career rather than the desire for security or recognition or response, although these also were present.

He associated with a group of boys imbued with the same desire for excitement. In this particular case, however, youthful associations do not seem to be of prime importance, though they doubtless played their part. He also had friends of the highest type and acknowledges that some of them have had an influence upon him. Though he himself believes that greater understanding on his father's part might have resulted in a different attitude toward life, I am inclined to think that his nervous, restless nature would probably never have succeeded in conforming to the demands of society. His intelligence enabled him to foresee the consequences of his acts, but he was also venturesome enough to do the forbidden thing merely to see what would happen.

An important factor is his rather small physique. He never played games well, and on this score early developed a sense of inferiority, which was manifested not only in his boyhood games but in some of his school work. He knew he was intellectually more capable than others, but physically inferior. His intellectual attainments were not sufficient compensation for his physical inferiority, because intellectual accomplishments were somewhat derided by his group. He therefore overcompensated for his inferiority by leading in escapades which also satisfied his desire to experience the

intricacies of the great world. His work record will serve as an illustration. Travelling about the country in one job after another, sticking to none very long, he found in the excitement and constant change of a carnival company in the South his most satisfying experience. If he were more subject to delusions and less competent to analyze his acts with cold-blooded accuracy, one might think of him as psychopathic. True, he has not looked very much into his emotions; he does not appreciate how disordered they have always been. Exceedingly sensitive and nervously constituted as he is, he has probably enjoyed more and suffered more than most men of his age. The prison life has been a constant crucifixion to him, from which he escapes only through books and writing. His desire for new experience was partly an outgrowth of intellectual curiousity, but even more of emotional dissatisfaction.

The findings concerning our sample of bank robbers justify certain generalizations:

1. The popular impression that most bank robbers are professionals is not borne out by this study. Most of those in our sample were either the dupes of a few professionals or high-spirited, adventurous young fellows craving excitement.

2. That a large number of these bank robbers are emotionally maladjusted is clear. Sometimes their disturbed condition had been of long duration, but often it was attributable to a new and critical situation. Where it was of long standing it had frequently originated in the parental home, sometimes the school, as a result of a real or fancied slight. Usually it was marked by a feeling of inferior status, a struggle for recognition. Often there is evidence that low associates had been responsible for the ultimate demoralization, even when the robbery was committed single-handed. The crisis in most of these cases had grown out of domestic difficulties or the loss of a job.

3. In most cases the brothers were rather strikingly different with respect to early experiences, domestic relationships, economic and social status, or nervous constitution. Usually a number of factors worked together, no one of which was paramount.

4. Bank robbers have more physical courage than embezzlers and forgers, in this respect resembling those guilty of assault and robbery. A gun is usually the weapon of intimidation.

5. The crisis which precipitated the crime in almost all these bank robberies was economic need born of the depression, as it was with most of the other types of property crimes.

6. But the depression was only the precipitating crisis. Behind it, as the brothers' histories reveal, were factors, either constitutional or social, sometimes both, which account for this type of response to economic need. The ultimate explanation for the failure to meet a crisis sanely lies in the personality of the individual, which is formed by the interaction of inherited nervous organization and the total experiences of childhood and adolescence.

EMBEZZLEMENT CASES[18]

The statute covering this crime in the state of Wisconsin is a very broad one. The definition of embezzler includes not only any public employee and any employee of any corporation, joint-stock company, or association, but also any "employee or servant of any private person, corporation, copartnership or association, who shall embezzle or fraudulently convert to his own use or to the use of any other person except the owner thereof, or shall take, carry away, or secrete, with intent to convert to his own use or to the use of any other person except the owner thereof, any such money, fund, goods, wares, merchandise, products, lumber, or any other property or thing."[19] Of the 933 property offenders in our sample, only 13 were embezzlers—the smallest of the several categories.

With respect to intelligence, as measured by the I. Q., the embezzlers surpass the property offenders and our sample of offenders as a whole. Only 13 per cent of them, as against 25 per cent of all property offenders, had an I. Q. below 70, and 21.7 per cent, as against 9.1 per cent of all property offenders in our sample, had an I. Q. of 100 or more. See Table 22. The mean I. Q. of the embezzlers differed by 7.21 points from the mean I. Q. of all property offenders, more than did that of any other class.

Their occupational distribution was quite different from that of the property offenders as a whole or any class of them. Thus none of them were professional men, as against 3 per cent of the property offenders as a whole. Relatively eight times as many had owned a business, the respective percentages being 30.4 and 3.9 per cent. Four times as large a proportion had been engaged in a clerical occupation (43.6 and 10.7 per cent respectively). Farming was the occupation of 17.4 per cent of them, as against 23.1 per cent of the whole group. Skilled and unskilled labor were each represented by 4.3 per cent of the embezzlers, in contrast to 30.7 and 28.6 per cent, respectively, of the property offenders as a whole. See Table 35. Hence as regards intelligence and occupation the embezzlers stand out from property offenders as a whole.

In nativity the embezzlers differed little from property offenders as a whole, the total prison population, or the Wisconsin male population fifteen years of age and over. See Table 28.

Of the several types of property offenders, the embezzlers included the

[18] For a study of a hundred Swedish embezzlers who were characterized by pathologically psychic conditions see Svend H. Riemer, "Embezzlement: Pathological Basis," *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, November-December, 1941, pp. 411–423.

[19] *Wisconsin Statutes*, 1937, Sect. 343.20.

largest proportion, 92.0 per cent, in the age group 25–29. This distribution was most nearly approximated by the forgers, of whom 70.4 per cent fell in this age group. The corresponding percentage for property offenders as a whole was only 28 and for all prisoners at Waupun only 26.3. See Table 30.

With respect to marital status the noteworthy fact is that a smaller proportion were single (15.3 per cent) and a larger proportion married (77 per cent) than in any other group of property offenders. For property offenders as a whole the respective proportions are 49.3 and 34.1 per cent, and for the 1153 prisoners in the prison 46.2 and 36.9 per cent. See Table 37.

It is clear, therefore, that statistically the embezzlers were a unique group with respect to intelligence, occupation, age distribution, and marital status.

Though the embezzlers as a group had a higher intelligence than other prisoners, 13 per cent had an I. Q. below 70. The following case is one of these.

Case E–2, a farm laborer and cattle buyer thirty-five years old, had an I. Q. of 68. He was sent to prison for violation of his probation on a charge of embezzlement. He was the son of a German-born father and a mother of German descent. He was married but separated from his wife, who had borne him two children.

He had previously been sentenced to one to two years in the state prison for abandonment, had been on parole for fourteen months, and had kept it. He had been arrested a second time for forgery but had made restitution. After his third arrest and second conviction, he had been placed on probation for a year. He had been returned to prison after four months for keeping company with a woman he was forbidden to see.

Until he was twenty, when he married, he had helped his father on the farm. He went to school until he was seventeen, by which time he had completed the eighth grade. His farm home was a comfortable one, and the family had a good reputation. His father was for many years a member of the County Board. Nothing in the family life while the boy was growing up would explain his later actions.

The first indication of a social factor that may have had some bearing upon his conduct was the character of his wife. She proved to be a woman of loose morals who ran around with other men and, according to the prisoner, infected him with gonorrhea after his first release from prison. She was Norwegian by descent, whereas he was German. He did not get along well with his father-in-law, who, he asserts, had cheated him in a business deal.

His work record is good except for the interruptions caused by his prison sentences. He was employed for five and a half years, at two different times, as a wagon driver for the American Express Company. Thereafter he was employed by a cattle buyer, and finally went into that business on his own account. The fact that he was a farm-bred man may have had something to do with the chicanery he practised as a cattle buyer, which finally got him into trouble.

The influence of his wife upon his future career is suggested by a comparison of his history with that of his brother. The latter married a congenial woman of his own nationality and religion. For thirteen years he had worked on his father-in-law's farm, whereas the prisoner had given up farm work and migrated to town, where the situation was quite different from that in which he had been reared.

In this case the low mentality of the prisoner, his unfortunate marriage, and his departure from the farm are the chief factors related to his entanglement with the law.

Case E–4 is that of a man of fifty-five who had been given a sentence of five to twenty years for embezzling public funds while serving as county clerk. It was his first offense. He was married and had three children. He had an I. Q. of 83 and had finished high school at the age of nineteen. His father, of Scottish descent, and his mother, of Yankee parentage, were well-to-do, highly respected country people. He was the youngest of three living brothers, a fourth having died at the age of four. Relationships between the parents and between the children and the parents seem to have been good. The only suggestion of disharmony was the prisoner's feeling that his parents had perhaps given an older brother more financial help than himself.

His relationship with his wife was also harmonious. However, his wife had been bedridden for many years, and her sickness was the immediate occasion of his misuse of county funds. To meet the excessive expenses of her twenty years of invalidism he began to take public money, at first in small amounts, with every intention of returning it. "I thought each month that I would pay it back," he says. This difficult situation he endeavored to improve by going into the automobile business, but only worsened it. Just before the depression, which wiped him out, he had begun to buy stocks. When pressed for funds, he used the county's money until he had embezzled a total of sixteen thousand dollars over a period of eight years.

His history is not significantly different from that of his older brother, whom he felt his father had slightly favored financially, except that he had an ailing wife who put him to great expense, whereas his brother did not. Both were equally unsuccessful financially, but the brother had never been placed in a position where he was tempted to use someone else's money.

The prisoner, a refined man, was and still is much wrapped up in his family. Indeed he was more loyal to his invalid wife than to himself and to his family's reputation. The interview made it clear that his completion of high school, although he learned with some difficulty, provided an emotional compensation for the slight inferiority he felt to his elder brother. He says that his success in graduating from high school led him to feel that he ought

to teach, and he did so for five years. Then, to prove his business ability to his father and to vie with his brother, he tried to make a success of farming, but was frustrated by his wife's sickness. Following his father's lead, he became a county politician and was elected to office. The expenses incident to his wife's sickness forced him to live beyond his means.

For embezzlement from a bank, E–5 was sentenced for eleven concurrent terms of five to ten years. At the time of his commitment he was forty-two and had been the president of his bank. He was sentenced for violating the law in connection with operations calculated to keep his bank open during the depression.

He had an I. Q. of 101. He had completed four years of high school by the age of seventeen and had had a year of college and a year and a half in a university school of commerce. He was married but childless. He had never before been in difficulty with the law.

When he was fifteen, his father died at the early age of thirty-five, leaving his mother without many resources. She remarried and her husband proved to be a good stepfather to her children. The prisoner, the oldest child, went to work early, learned telegraphy, and after graduation from high school was employed in a local bank for a time. No circumstances in the homes in which he had lived during childhood and youth explain his later conduct. He grew to manhood without a blot on his career and with great promise for the future.

Nor does his work history reveal any tendency to idleness or dissipation. He never smoked or drank, was surrounded by wholesome associates, and started out on a career which promised great success. After his apprenticeship in the bank in his home community, he was for a number of years a real estate man. He developed the techniques of a land salesman and probably became conversant with a code of business ethics that was none too honest. Thereafter he became the cashier of a country bank in another state and advanced rapidly. He was called back to Wisconsin to manage a bank which needed to be extricated from financial difficulties. He says, however, that he did not know how serious the difficulties were, which suggests that he may have lacked business caution.

It was while manager of this institution that his demoralization took place. He succeeded in putting the bank on a better basis temporarily, but the depression again placed it in jeopardy. To keep the bank open he falsified the statements, hoping that time would dispel its difficulties. Matters went from bad to worse, however, until it was necessary to close the bank, with enormous losses to depositors and stockholders. An audit showed that the prisoner, who was officially in charge, had violated the statutes regulating banking operations.

Why did this man who had been brought up in a good home, who had made money and was highly respected, and who had been trained in banking methods, finally engage in legal embezzlement, whereas his brother, also a bank manager, brought his institution through the same severe crisis successfully? In the first place he was undoubtedly under a much greater temptation because of the conditions existing at the time he took charge of the bank. Yet his brother too, like every other banker, must have been tempted to "window dress" the statements of his bank. What further explanation is there for the brother's decision to observe the law and the prisoner's resort to illegal methods?

Two or three aspects of this man's history may furnish a clue:

1. As the oldest child in the family, he had been thrown upon his own resources early and had gradually learned to trust his own judgment. His younger brother frequently pleaded with him during his difficulties to cut down his scale of living, resign from an impossible situation, and allow the bank to be closed. His pride doubtless prevented his accepting this advice, for to have done so would have been to admit poor judgment in accepting the presidency of the bank without a more thorough investigation, but also the failure of his efforts to solve its difficulties, and loss of prestige in the community. He and his wife had built a fine home, engaged in many social activities, and lived rather lavishly. Further, neighboring banks and bank examiners acquie sceein his desire to work out the difficult situation because they feared that the closing of one bank would cause a run on others.

2. His mother, though a fine woman, showed the same disposition to live beyond her income. The family took pride in its standing in the community, and the prisoner's wife shared his social ambitions.

3. His previous success had engendered a pride in his ability to handle difficult situations which his resignation would have hurt. Like many a banker, he took chances during the depression and finally lost. He seems to have made no personal profit from any of the illegalities. He had no intention of cheating anyone, but only a strong desire to save the bank and with it not only his own investment but that of his stockholders and his depositors.

4. He shared the excessive optimism of some of the bankers of the time and refused to believe that the country was in for a serious depression. If all the bankers who violated the letter of the law had suffered his fate, the "Bankers' Club" in most of our prisons would be much larger. In other words, he gradually adopted the standards, none too ethical, which developed during the period of prosperity following the war. In that sense he was the product of the current practices of a certain wing of his bank associates.

The history of the brother differs at some points. He was an extrovert, whereas the prisoner was an introvert. His reputation in his community was based on sound business practices and modest social activities which intrenched him in the esteem of the inhabitants; the prisoner moved about

and had to rebuild his reputation anew in each town he lived in. The brother sought help in his banking deals both from his board of directors and from other bankers; the prisoner had learned to play a lone hand and did so in his management of the Wisconsin bank. The brother had been careful never to be involved in the disputes of the community, with whose social and business life he was intimately familiar. The prisoner had been thrust into a bitter feud between social and business groups of the community and had become the punching bag of both factions. The brother's bank had always been examined regularly by the State Banking Commission; the prisoner was encouraged to adopt shady methods by the "hands off" policy of the examiners, who hoped he might succeed in pulling the bank through. The brother was governed to some extent in his personal life by the standards of his depositors; he and his wife always lived simply, particularly during the depression. The prisoner, on the other hand, though he kept within his income, always lived on a higher scale than his country depositors. He invited criticism by keeping polo ponies, building a pretentious home, and sending his wife to Europe several times. The brother always had excellent mental balance, probably because he was never in so difficult a situation; the prisoner, on the other hand, suffered a nervous breakdown when he was arrested, which was the culmination of poor mental health for several years preceding. The prisoner illustrates the demoralization which gradually takes place when one deviates from the strict standard of morals governing a situation.

Some of these cases of embezzlement show that a nagging, dissatisfied wife or wild companions may develop recklessness in a man and a desire for more money than he can obtain honestly. Still others represent reactions to the hardships of the depression. In general they can be accounted for by factors in the constitution and early conditioning of the prisoner. Those of low I. Q. usually embezzled small amounts; those of higher intelligence played a bigger game. The history of most of the cases reveals an attitude and a pattern of behavior more or less inconsistent with the standards of society, especially those embodied in the statutes regulating banking. In every community there are some business men who violate the strict standard of the statutes. They are Sutherland's "white-collar criminals." Whether or not a man has high business standards depends very much on his constitutional make-up and on the habits of conduct he has formed early in his career. The crisis created by a depression, by the needs of a loved one, or by the demands of illicit associates, both men and women, is merely the strain which tests an individual's integrity and the strength of his ethical principles. The more fundamental factors lie in the heredity, in emotional frustrations of early childhood, and in the pattern of conduct developed during adolescence and business life.

Summary

Chapter 2 set forth the statistically significant differences between prisoners and their brothers, who were used as a control group to determine whether there were any differences in background between those who had been committed to prison and those who had not. The statistical analysis showed clearly that in certain ways the prisoner and his brother had undergone quite different experiences. We could not be sure, however, that these categories indicated all the factors which had a bearing upon the prisoner's conduct. In this chapter a number of cases have been analyzed to illustrate the characteristics already discovered by statistical analysis, their operation in the lives of these individuals, and the operation of still other factors, not studied statistically, which were important in given cases. The science of human behavior has not advanced far enough to permit the relative importance of these factors to be weighed, though one may gain, by careful study of the records, some appreciation of their relative importance in a given case.

The histories also furnish an insight into the subtleties of personality development which no statistical analysis can give. They reveal factors that affect the emotional state of the individual during his development much more profoundly than do many of those to which we applied the statistical method. They also show how that developing personality behaves under the impact of circumstances. If one is to understand how human actions are motivated, one must reject such terms as "the will" and seek to ascertain, on the basis of modern psychology and sociology, how the reactions we call "habits" are built up by the reaction of congenital characteristics to the experiences of life during the period of development. These cases bring to our attention certain circumstances which seem to have a good deal of significance as determinants of anti-social conduct.

9

Conclusion

WHAT IS THE UPSHOT OF OUR STUDY OF THE CONDITIONS ASSOCIATED WITH this group of Wisconsin prisoners? If law-abiding citizens have experienced some or even all of the same conditions and have met similar crises without committing anti-social acts, have we contributed anything to an understanding of crimogenesis? Such questions must be faced frankly.

In the first place, it is pure assumption that any non-prisoner has exactly the same background as a prisoner. While there are, as every study of prison populations has shown, certain broad, statistically measurable differences—in age, nativity, economic status, occupation, etc.—this study shows that the non-criminal brothers whom we were able to match with the prisoners did not have the same backgrounds and did not meet the same temptations. Human motivation is not the result of any single circumstance or set of circumstances. If the study of human behavior thus far has shown anything clearly, it is that we must beware of over-simplification in attempting to explain human conduct. Neither this nor any other study has yet determined what weight is to be attached to the various conditions that determine anti-social or, for that matter, socially approved, conduct. But there is evidence that certain factors, when they occur in certain permutations and combinations, the exact nature of which we do not yet know, tend to produce anti-social behavior. Until we know just what weight is to be attached to each, alone or in combination, we can only say that they are hazardous. Sometimes they engender attitudes which if activated by a precipitating event produce anti-social conduct, but if neutralized by stabilizing circumstances do not.

The conditions that seem to create a hazard are low income of the parents; inferior intelligence, mental deficiency, queerness, and insanity; and drunkenness and disharmony in the parental home. The following conditions are hazardous when they are not offset by countervailing influences: early termination of school and departure from the home; conflict between the culture of the home and that of the community; frustration of the child's fundamental wishes in the home and in the community with resulting emo-

tional conflict; consciousness of inferiority; loss of self-esteem from whatever cause (loss of status, low intelligence, emotional instability, lack of security, economic and emotional); and anti-social companions. Among the circumstances most likely to precipitate anti-social behavior are threats to economic security, threats to emotional security, usually in filial, familial, or sexual relations, and suggestions by clever and unscrupulous individuals.

Among the circumstances that appear to have a steadying effect are stability of occupation, economic security, an occupation suited to the individual's tastes and talents, satisfying domestic relationships, satisfactory status in the community, and personal integration.

What have we learned from this study respecting the importance of economic conditions in crimogenesis? Many previous statistical studies have shown that they are closely associated with crime rates, and it has often been assumed that poverty and economic depression are primary factors in criminality. The present study, however, forces one to conclude that economic conditions, good or bad, affect conduct only as they provide or relieve one of the strains which test a person's habitual responses to life and his emotional stability. Most of the men in our sample came from the lower economic classes, but they constitute only an infinitesimal part of the Wisconsin population subject to substantially the same conditions. Our prisoners were hit no harder by the depression than were many others who did not steal, rob, break and enter, embezzle, forge, or burn buildings. Why did some and not others succumb? The economic determinist does not answer this question, nor does our statistical inquiry, probably because our schedules were defective. The case histories, however, enable us to come close to a satisfactory answer.

In our culture a high evaluation is placed on the ability to get and hold a job and on the economic success necessary to support one's self and family. An individual's social position and self-esteem depend in part on achieving at least that much. If a person fails here and has no compensating success to bolster his ego, he feels that he cannot hold up his head in organized society, look the world in the face, and push ahead without flinching.

But economic status is only one of the factors that affect personality. Occasionally it is in itself the cause of a disintegration of personality; we have cited one or two such cases. But they are relatively few. More commonly those who have been overwhelmed by economic adversity have had other experiences which have left them ill equipped to meet the stresses of life without losing their sense of social worth; they are demoralized. Their earlier history reveals the groundwork of defeatism, emotional instability, negativism, a feeling of inferiority, and over-compensation. These are the persons for whom an economic crisis provides a test they cannot meet.

We have said a good deal about the low I. Q. of most of our prisoners. We have discovered that the once-prevalent notion that the mentally defi-

cient are naturally disposed to criminality is fallacious, that in fact they are no more so than intelligent people. What is true is that they are more easily influenced, since they are unable to count the cost of their actions. If they are trained to form socially acceptable habits, they are likely to act in accordance with them unless they come under the influence of some more intelligent or more dominating personality. Lacking the intelligence to foresee the consequences of anti-social behavior, their only inhibitions against it are the socially approved habits they have formed earlier. Even these can often be overcome by artful suggestion, especially where there is frustration or other emotional disturbance, as there so often is in mental defectives. Many of them suffer deeply from a sense of difference from others, a feeling of inferiority, loss of status, and an undue thirst for recognition. Often they are the butt of pranks at school, or even in their own families. Unless someone—parent, sib, teacher, or neighbor—understands them well enough to engender in them a sense of belonging and of self-esteem, they are likely to seek recognition by resistance to authority and submission to anti-social associates who use them for their own purposes. The histories of many of these men with a low I. Q. give evidence of such frustration and bewilderment. In any case, however, mental deficiency was not an important factor in the criminality of the prisoners in our sample, for only a minority were mental defectives, and even with these the low I. Q. was merely one of the factors in the development of the personality.

The most common and probably the most potent factor in the cases we studied was unresolved emotional disturbance, as is revealed by the statistical data on jealousy, favoritism, appreciation of the mother, and disharmony in the parental family and in the prisoner's own domestic relationships. In these respects prisoners differed from their brothers. The case histories reveal how these emotional conflicts engendered an effort to compensate in some way for a sense of inferiority; how the child or youth, when his emotional security was threatened, tended to develop, if he was without proper guidance, an undesirable pattern of response to social situations. They reveal the struggle for social position in a group, any group, from which he could win recognition and response. Often that group was one which influenced him to behave in anti-social fashion.

Almost all these men had been subjected in childhood, youth, or manhood to some treatment—from parent, step-parent, foster parent, brother, sister, playmate, teacher, or neighbor—which had wounded their *amour propre*. Relationships with others may build or they may distort personality. The distorted personality may seek satisfaction in association with other distorted personalities, or it may eventually embark on a given course of conduct without companionship, in accordance with the standards and habits established by earlier associations. Sometimes this occurs during the formative years, sometimes not until adult life. When it occurred after maturity, it was often the wife or sweetheart who played the critical role; sometimes it was a business associate.

Thus it appears that although the hereditary organism must be considered, the more important factors, so far as our sample reveals, are the social experiences that affect development. The prisoners and their brothers were often, if not always, endowed with similar inherited traits, but differed significantly in their expression of them and in their reactions to life situations. The habitual emotional response seemed to be the result of interaction between the hereditary constitution and the stimulus of associates. The kind of personality developed in childhood and adolescence often determines what kind of associates the adult will select.

Both the statistical tables and the case histories indicate that the backgrounds of murderers and property offenders were similar, but that those of the sex offenders differed from both. The personalities of the sex offenders were likewise quite different from those of the two other classes, being marked by a lack of emotional tone, an attitude of hopelessness, and indifference to community standards with respect to sexual behavior. This was especially true of the incest and sodomy cases; and truer of the rapists than of the sodomists, if one may judge by the infrequency with which they reported that they had been the favorites of some person. See Table 12. Many of the murderers and property offenders felt that they were favorites of some adult and expressed a strong appreciation of the mother. See Tables 11, 49, and 50. By and large, the murderers and property offenders were frustrated and irritable, but not hopeless, personalities. Broadly speaking, their crimes were a defense against a threat to their economic and emotional security.

On the basis of our study we may formulate a theory of the conduct of these prisoners and their brothers:

1. *The Physical Organism.*—Human beings are born with differing biological organisms, which may be affected by accident or disease. One person may be endowed with a body and nervous organization well suited to the circumstances of life; another may be able to adjust himself to the demands of society if he has the proper training; and a third may be congenitally incapable of meeting the demands of life. Some persons who cannot play normally in childhood and are ill equipped to compete economically with their fellows in maturity develop a healthy attitude toward society. Such persons have either found a way themselves, or have been trained, to satisfy their fundamental desires and find a place in the society which controls them; thus they have escaped frustration and the development of anti-social habits and attitudes. It may be that no training will enable certain biological organisms to respond satisfactorily to society's demands, but the evidence does not sustain such a hypothesis. The doctrine of inborn total depravity has had vogue chiefly in theology, and not universally even there. Total or

partial incapacity to meet certain social obligations, yes; but not an inherent bent toward evil which cannot be corrected by proper training.[1]

2. *Life Experience.*—Everyone in a given society meets during his lifetime certain situations common to all men, and some have experiences others do not. Under proper guidance a person learns to adjust his behavior to the culture of his group, whether that culture is common to the great society which sets the standards or is at variance with it, as that of a foreign group is likely to be. He may become well adjusted to the standards of his group and yet develop a behavior pattern that conflicts with the law. Or, through lack of proper guidance, he may react against the treatment he receives because it threatens his desire for economic or emotional security. How often the orphan or the illegitimate child feels that he has no anchorage in the affections of some one whose relation to him is precious! He feels that he does not belong, that he is different from others, that he is being deprived of something other children have. The malformed child, the weak, sickly child, comes to pity himself, frequently is over-indulged. His elders fail to give him a sense of usefulness and independence, which would compensate for his feelings of defeat and inferiority. The sensitive child may only imagine that he is being slighted, that others are more loved, but the effect is the same as if it were true. If he is improperly handled, he may develop a grudge and a negative attitude which distorts his whole behavior. Such an attitude is revealed in many of the case histories of the murderers and property offenders; more often than not they failed to get the help they needed to develop a well-integrated personality.

3. *Social Disorganization.*—There is also the question of the social conditions underlying the demoralization and ultimate lawbreaking of the criminal. Ever since the breakdown of the feudal system Western society has been in a state of flux, which has been particularly radical in its trends and rapid in pace since the Industrial Revolution. The Protestant revolt destroyed the unity of religious control and emphasized the individual's direct relationship with God. The French Revolution destroyed the doctrine of the divine right of kings and the sanctity of the state, and placed new emphasis on the liberty of the individual. The laissez-faire doctrine of classical economics, child of the Industrial Revolution, also stressed the right of the individual to seek for himself the economic welfare that was regarded as his right. Evolutionary science, born in the mid-nineteenth century, challenged some of the doctrines, religious and philosophical, which had ruled men's minds

[1] Freud has stated the relation between the constitutional and "accidental" factors as follows: "The constitutional factor must wait for experiences which bring it to the surface, while the accidental factor needs the support of the constitutional in order to become effective." See "Three Contributions to the Theory of Sex," *The Basic Writings of Sigmund Freud*, translated and edited by A. A. Brill (Modern Library, New York, 1938), 626.

for thousands of years and underpinned their ethics. Philosophy, which for centuries had been the handmaid of religion and social ethics, felt the impact of the economic conditions, of political doctrine, and of evolutionary science, with the result that today we no longer have *a* philospohy but philosophies. We no longer have a unified, harmonious system of thought relating to human behavior, and no single code of conduct. Economically the precept "every fellow for himself and the devil take the hindmost" had long prevailed; and when the corporation was born, it too adopted this standard. In America the situation was further complicated by the arrival of great numbers of immigrants, many of whom had quite different cultures from our own. It was almost inevitable that our social institutions for the control of conduct—the family, the church, the local community—should lose their ancient authority. The child and the adolescent no longer have unified guidance; a babel of voices shout conflicting principles of behavior. When an adult can follow one code of conduct in his business, another in his family, and still another in his social life, can young people fail to be confused?

Social disorganization is promoted also by the fact that what we evaluate highest today is not the welfare of all but individual success and personal power, especially economic success, social prestige, and political power. Instead of combining social institutions into a harmonious whole for the general welfare, we emphasize a set of values which generate selfish competition, conflict, and disregard of the welfare of others.

Consequently our society is composed of groups with differing social values and codes of behavior, many of which conflict with those embodied in the law. To each of these groups its own values and codes seem better than those of the law. It is in one of these groups that every individual secures status, and the ego-satisfaction which comes from status, if he secures them at all. If he fails to secure satisfaction in a group that subscribes to the dominant mores, he will seek it in another, where, as we have seen in our cases, he may become habituated to law-breaking.

4. *The Crisis.*—What we have called the crisis is the event or circumstance that precipitated the crime. Some persons are never called upon to meet a situation which puts their biological organization and personality to the test. They may escape conflict with the law simply because the thing they most value—economic security, emotional satisfaction, or personal safety—has never been threatened. Thus the fact that the brother of a wife-murderer did not commit a similar crime may be partly attributable to his more satisfactory marriage. We must not, of course, overemphasize this factor, for it is clear that in most cases the differentiation between prisoner and brother began long before such a crisis appeared. In some instances, too, the brother did face a crisis similar to that which proved too much for the prisoner and met it in accordance with social standards. A small percentage (2.4) of the married brothers were divorced, and even of

the murderers 25 per cent solved their domestic difficulties by divorce rather than murder. With the latter it was some other crisis which set off the emotional explosion that led to crime.

So with the sex offenders. Many of our prisoners who committed incest did so when their wives were inaccessible. Some of their brothers had not been called upon to meet this particular crisis of suddenly interrupted marital relations. Others had been trained to exercise self-control or were restrained by their position or associates. The same may be said of the sodomists. It is well known that many men have homosexual tendencies who control them, either because circumstances are not favorable for indulging them or because they have learned to restrain or sublimate the impulse. Many of the prisoners, however, had a long history of homosexual practices before they were caught. It is also obvious that the childhood and adolescence of many of them had been marked by mother-fixation, effeminate behavior and failure to develop male attitudes toward women, emotional frustration, and infantile reactions to life. Some of the brothers also had homosexual impulses but were restrained from expressing them overtly by early training, the influence of associates, and the requirements of their social position. Others simply had no opportunity to participate in such practices.

In short, the facts uncovered in our study indicate that the conduct of these prisoners and of their brothers was born of the interaction of the innate constitution with life experiences. In some cases the organic constitution played the greater role, in others life experiences. In general it would seem that life experiences were the most important.

5. *The Role of Common Characteristics in Producing Each Class of Criminals.*—Each class of criminals has had some experiences which are not distinctive of any single class. These too had their effect on the personality. We are more interested in the circumstances that distinguish the several classes of criminals from one another and from non-criminals, but there are also certain common factors that affected all of them and prepared them for some kind of criminal activity if not for a specific crime, that produced a personality which in the face of too great difficulties became neurotic. In view of psychoanalysts' finding that neurosis is often a substitute for crime, it is probable that any population includes many who, given the proper stimulus, would violate the law. In short, there are many more potential than actual criminals. The temperance advocate John B. Gough realized this when he remarked, upon seeing a drunken man lying in the gutter, "There but for the grace of God lies John B. Gough." Anyone who studies prisoners at first hand and becomes acquainted with them must often feel that but for some fortunate circumstance he might have been one of them. For some a parent, a teacher, a neighbor, a sweetheart, or a wife has provided the medium for that "grace of God." Others have not had to face an insuperable crisis.

How reconcile the fact that in general the three classes of offenders differ significantly from one another with the fact that a certain proportion of each class do not differ from those in another? And the fact that most of the prisoners differ significantly from their brothers with the fact that some do not? In other words, how is it that of a pair of brothers who did not differ significantly one was guilty of crime and the other not? The explanation may lie partly in our failure to take into account all the factors that are significant. We studied all that we thought might have a bearing on the commission of crime, but we cannot be sure that none were omitted, for as yet very little is known about the wellsprings of men's conduct. Some of our subjects are probably what Sutherland has called "adventitious" criminals, a term that does not help very much, since it simply means that we do not know why they committed the criminal act. A few of them are probably innocent of the crime of which they were convicted, for there are such cases, as anyone knows who has served on a pardon board. They may have been convicted on circumstantial evidence; they may have taken "the rap" for someone else or been "railroaded" by someone anxious to have them out of the way; or they may be what some of the older criminologists called "criminals by accident."

Moreover, we do not know that any given factor operates with equal force on different individuals. A certain combination of factors may move one person to act, some other combination may move another. These difficulties can be resolved only by continued study of all the possible factors with every refinement of technique that can be devised. We must seek to discover the relative weight of each factor, alone and in different combinations. Whether such a procedure is possible with our present means of segregating and combining factors we can tell only by trying.

Practical Implications of the Study

This study could probably be justified if it throws only a little light on the genesis of criminal behavior, but obviously it will be more valuable if it is of practical value to those who work with lawbreakers, those concerned with the prevention of crime, and those who are charged with the upbringing of youth.

Judges.—Perhaps this study will induce the criminal court judge to make a careful investigation before he gives a man a sentence or decides to put him on probation. The more a judge knows about the offender the better equipped he is to choose wisely between probation and commitment to a correctional institution and, if the latter, what the length of sentence should be. The pre-probation investigations now being made by the probation officers of many courts are intended to provide the judge with the facts he needs to make proper disposition of the case, but many of them are inadequate. Knowledge of a man's I. Q. and of his economic and social history

is not enough; it is desirable to know something also of his emotional reactions. Hence not only his habits and attitudes should be studied but something of his history, so that his frustrations and his reactions to a situation may be understood.

Officers in Correctional Institutions.—Wardens, deputy wardens, guards, educators, shop foremen, etc., now must learn by personal contact with the prisoner what sort of individual he is; indeed, this personal contact will continue to be necessary however much is known of his previous history. But if these officers are aware of the factors which shape personality and if they know something of a man's previous pattern of behavior, especially the deep-lying emotional aspects of it, they are much more likely to understand and handle him effectively. At present they do not have this knowledge and hence are too prone to repress by violence any manifestations of irritability. Such treatment does not help matters; on the contrary, it may even make it more difficult for the prisoner to adjust either to prison or to free life. If the prison or reformatory official knows how sex offenders differ from the murderers and property offenders in background and personality, he is better equipped to prepare them for life in free society. It should go almost without saying, but in the light of the actual situation does apparently need to be said again, that unless these officials know something about the conditions which underlie conduct, both socially approved and socially condemned conduct, they will continue to "order" and "forbid," and penal institutions will continue to aggravate the frustrations of many of their inmates, who will therefore be even less able to function satisfactorily in free society than they had been before commitment.

Parole and Pardon Authorities.—These authorities should have a better basis for deciding whether or not the man should be granted parole or clemency. Here again it is not what the man has done nor even how he behaves as a prisoner that should determine whether he is released. The question is, what kind of person is he? More important, what are the factors which have molded his personality? Without this information it is almost impossible to judge whether he could be expected to become an acceptable member of society or would be likely to resume his previous pattern of behavior. This study has certainly indicated some of the factors about which inquiry should be made. That information should be available to the judge, to the officers of correctional institutions, and to parole and pardon authorities.

Parents.—Fathers and mothers who read this book should glean some suggestions for the wise handling of their children. The case records of these criminals indicate clearly that many of them were mishandled as children. Many of their parents allowed some event to confuse and frustrate the little child and thus to give his development a bent which, in the face of a crisis, made an anti-social reaction almost certain. Our study also shows that

parents need to realize how certain situations, among them a conflict of cultures, may affect the emotions of a child or youth and his attitude toward the law. If they are aware of these factors, they will recognize the signs of emotional disturbance and seek to correct the ideas, standards, and attitudes that may lead to difficulty later.

Teachers and Leaders of Youth.—This study, especially the case histories, reveals what the conditions are which tend to destroy the self-esteem of children and youth and frustrate their fundamental desires. If schoolteachers are to be more than schoolkeepers, they need to understand the conditions that make or mar a developing personality. Many of them are blessed with a personality which, given the proper knowledge and understanding, could handle with skill the problems some children present. True, they have large classes, but only a small proportion of any class gives evidence of difficulty. It is these who offer a challenge to the real teacher, the teacher who realizes that his mission is not merely to teach subjects but to develop personalities.

Legislators.—The laws on our statute books have two functions. In the first place, they provide directions for the discovery and apprehension of those who break the laws, and for treatment of them from the time of their conviction until their release into free society. If one considers the penal and correctional laws and procedures in the light of the facts brought out in such a study as this, he realizes that they are based on very different assumptions. Secondly, our legal code includes measures to insure the economic security of individuals, their education, and their protection in industry; the regulation of the family, divorce, and the placement and adoption of children; and a thousand other matters that have a bearing upon the prevention of crime by virtue of the fact that they provide for the satisfaction of man's fundamental urges. This study provides data which should help lawmakers to draft legislation that will fulfill both these functions.

Clergymen and Other Religious Teachers.—Religion properly presented is a powerful solvent of life's difficulties, and religious workers can be quite as effective social workers as judges, probation and penal officers, and parents and teachers. They too should receive from this book a wider knowledge of the factors operative in the development of personality. With this understanding they can adapt their religious ministrations to the needs of men who are trying to readjust to a free life after release from a penal institution. They can help children, youths, and adults to satisfy their fundamental urges, educate them in the behavior patterns of modern society, and help them to meet adversity in socially approved ways. Indeed, it is their duty to understand, and to apply their understanding to the molding of human personality.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Statistical Tables

Note on the Tables

In the following tables the chi square (χ^2) of the difference between the several categories of criminals (sex offenders, murderers, property offenders) or between control groups (e.g., Wisconsin population, brothers) with reference to the factor under consideration (e.g., occupation) is given in the first column in the lower half of the table. Next to the right is given the critical ratio (*CR*) of the difference between the subcategories. The third column shows the degree of freedom used in calculating the chi square. Finally, the probability that the distribution or the difference could have occurred by chance is shown in two columns, that to the left for the chi square and that to the right for the critical ratio. When the probability is more than five in a hundred (.05), it has not been considered significant. The omission of the critical ratio or the probability in any table means that it is not significant.

The coefficient on contingency (*C*) measures the relationship between the factors being studied by the chi square. It is not shown in tables having fewer than twenty-five cells.

For a detailed explanation of these statistical measures see any good textbook on statistics, such as T. C. McCormick's *Elementary Social Statistics* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1941).

1.—Occupation of the Parental Breadwinner

Occupation	Murderers		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders*		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Farmer	63	69.2	63	49.2	75	28.6	201	41.8
Unskilled laborer	13	14.3	20	15.6	35	13.4	68	14.2
Skilled laborer	8	8.8	29	22.7	82	31.3	119	24.7
Business, professional, clerical worker	7	7.7	16	12.5	70	26.7	93	19.3
	91	100.0	128	100.0	262	100.0	481	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Total table	60.23	.33		6	.01 –	
Murderers and sex offenders	11.00			3	.01 –	
Farmer			3.0			.003
Murderers and property offenders	54.7977	.42		3	.01 –	
Farmer			6.4			.001 –
Skilled laborer			4.2			.001 –
Business, professional, clerical worker			3.8			.003
Sex offenders and property offenders	23.4241			3	.01 –	
Farmer			4.3			.001 –
Business, professional, clerical worker			3.18			.0024

* On two of these no information was obtained. Two were raised in an orphanage.

2.—Regularity of Employment of the Parental Breadwinner

	Murderers		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Regularly employed	67	79.8	101	82.8	234	92.9	402	87.8
Not regularly employed	17	20.2	21	17.2	18	7.1	56	12.2
Total	84*	100.0	122	100.0	252	100.0	458	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Murderers and sex offenders	.29			1	.59	
Murderers and property offenders	11.58	.18		1	.001	
Not regularly employed*			3.5			.001 –
Sex and property offenders	8.94	.16		1	.0029	
Not regularly employed			3.05			.0024
Total table	13.94	.17		1	.01 –	

* Data missing on eight. But even if these eight are included among the regularly employed, the difference is still significant.

3.—Income of Offenders' Parents

Level of Income	Murderers		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
High	5	5.7	5	3.9	69	26.6	79	16.7
Medium	45	51.1	57	44.9	131	50.6	233	49.1
Low	38	43.2	65	51.2	59	22.8	162	34.2
Total	88	100.0	127	100.0	259	100.0	474	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Murderers and sex offenders	1.4866			2	.20	
Murderers and property offenders	23.4158	.25		2	.01 –	
High income			4.35			.001 –
Low income			3.68			.001
Sex and property offenders	44.8764	.32		2	.01 –	
High income			5.33			.001
Low income			5.61			.001
Total table	57.49	.33		4	.001 –	

4.—Tenure of Parental Homes

Category	Murderers		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders		Total		Wisconsin Population, 1910	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Home owned	59	69.4	91	74.6	179	70.2	329	71.2	315,578	64.6
Home not owned	26	30.6	31	25.4	76	29.8	133	28.8	173,787	35.4
Total	85	100.0	122	100.0	255	100.0	462	100.0	489,365	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Total offenders and Wisconsin population	4.92	.072		1	.027	
Home owned			1.7			.0892
Home not owned			2.4			.0164

5.—Age at Which Sibs First Contributed to Parental Family Income

Age	Murderers*		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Under 14	39	61.0	22	17.9	39	16.1	100	23.3
Over 14	15	23.4	83	67.5	132	54.3	230	53.4
Not at all	10	15.6	18	14.6	72	29.6	100	23.3
Total	64	100.0	123	100.0	243	100.0	430	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Murderers and property offenders	53.97			2	.001 –	
Under 14			7.42			.001 –
Sex and property offenders	10.05			2	.009	
Not at all			3.14			.002
Murderers and sex offenders	39.78			2	.001	
Under 14			5.95			.001 –
Total table	71.04	.36		4	.0001	

* Even if the missing twenty-eight murderers fell outside the category "under 14," the *CR* of the difference between murderers and the others would still be large enough to be significant.

6.—Age at Which Prisoner First Contributed to Parental Family Income

Age	Murderers*		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Under 14	57	69.5	34	27.0	58	22.0	149	31.6
Over 14	18	22.0	76	60.3	133	50.4	227	48.1
Not at all	7	8.5	16	12.7	73	27.6	96	20.3
Total	82*	100.0	126	100.0	264	100.0	472	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Murderers and property offenders	64.00	.156		2	.001 –	
Under 14			7.98			.001 –
Over 14			4.52			.0001 –
Not at all			3.59			.001
Sex and property offenders	10.85			2	.001 –	
Not at all			3.2			.002
Murderers and sex offenders	37.50	.39		2	.001	
Under 14			6.04			.001 –
Over 14			6.38			.001 –
Total table	77.97	.37		4	.001	

* Even if the missing ten were excluded from the category "under 14," the percentage of lifers contributing "under 14" would still be significantly greater than either of the two other classes of prisoners.

7.—Overt Manifestation of Disharmony between Father and Mother

Manifestation of Disharmony	Murderers		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
None	78	94.0	113	88.3	210	80.8	401	85.1
Divorce, desertion, and separation	5	6.0	15	11.7	50	19.2	70	14.9
Total	83	100.0	128	100.0	260	100.0	471	100.0

Category*	χ^2	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Total table	10.02		2	.01 −	
Sex and property offenders	3.46		1	.05 +	
Divorce, desertion, separation		3.08			.004

* Because of the small number of murderers, calculations for the other categories have not been made.

8.—Nature of Disharmony between Father and Mother

Nature of Disharmony	Murderers		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders*		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Social	6	37.5	23	65.7	23	33.8	52	43.7
Economic and sexual	5	31.2	7	20.0	20	29.4	32	26.9
More than one kind†	5	31.3	5	14.3	25	36.8	35	29.4
Total	16	100.0	35	100.0	68	100.0	119	100.0

Category‡	χ^2	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability X^2	Probability CR
Total table	10.44		4	.05 +	
Sex and property offenders	10.05			.01	
Social		9.76			.001 −

* Five cases of disharmony, whose nature is unknown.

† This category is exclusive of those in the other classes.

‡ Since the number of murderers is very small, the results for "murderers and sex offenders" are not very reliable. The totals in this table differ from those in the previous table because here any kind of disharmony is counted, whereas in Table 7 only overt disharmony is taken into consideration.

9.—Reputation of Father in Community

Reputation	Murderers		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Good	47	73.4	62	49.6	217	84.1	326	72.9
Fair	6	9.4	48	38.4	31	21.0	85	19.0
Bad	11	17.2	15	12.0	10	3.9	36	8.1
Total	64	100.0	125	100.0	258	100.0	447	100.0

Category*	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Sex offenders and property offenders	50.75	.34		2	.01 –	
Good			7.0			.01 –
Fair			4.0			.01 –
Bad			3.08			.004

* The number of murderers is too small to be reliable.

10.—Reputation of Mother in Community

Reputation	Murderers		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Good	47	81.0	78	62.9	246	96.9	371	85.1
Fair or bad	11	19.0	46	37.1	8	3.1	65	14.9
Total	58	100.0	124	100.0	254	100.0	436	100.0

Category*	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Sex and property offenders	78.35	.42		1	.01 –	
Good			9.01			.001 –
Fair or bad			8.9			.001 –

* The number of murderers is too small to be reliable.

11.—Favoritism Shown Prisoner

Favoritism Shown by:	Murderers		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Mother	21	32.3	10	8.1	117	45.2	148	33.0
Father, others, and both parents	12	18.4	10	8.1	88	34.9	110	24.6
No one	32	49.3	104	83.8	54	20.9	190	42.4
Total	65	100.0	124	100.0	259	100.0	448	100.0

Category*	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Sex and property offenders	137.60	.51		2	.001 –	
Mother			7.23			.001 –
Father, others, and both parents			5.6			.001 –
No one			11.7			.001 –

* The number of murderers is too small to be reliable.

12.—Favoritism Shown Sodomists and Rapists

Favoritism Shown by:	Sodomists		Rapists		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Father, mother, both, or others	9	31.0	11	11.6	20	16.1
No one	20	69.0	84	84.4	104	83.9
Total	29	100.0	95	100.0	124	100.0

Category	χ^2	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Total table	6.21		1	.01	
Father, mother, both, or others		3.73			.0002
No one		3.17			.002

13.—Reasons for Leaving Home

Reason for Leaving	Murderers		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Work	36	40.9	52	41.0	79	30.3	167	35.1
Marriage	7	8.0	24	18.9	29	11.1	60	12.6
Disharmony	9	10.2	15	11.8	44	16.8	68	14.3
Other reasons	15	17.0	20	15.7	70	26.8	105	22.0
Work and any other reason	13	14.8	0	0.0	14	5.4	27	5.7
Never left	8	9.1	16	12.6	25	9.6	49	10.3
Total	88	100.0	127	100.0	261	100.0	476	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Sex and property offenders	20.17	.22		5	.01	
Work			2.1			.018
Marriage			2.1			.018
Work and any other reason			3.4			.001 –
Murderers and sex offenders	23.82	.32		5	.01	
Murderers and property offenders	14.92	.20		5	.02	

14.—Nativity of Parents of Offenders

Racial Stock	Murderers		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders*		Total		Wisconsin Population, 1930 in Thousands	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Both native	41	47.1	53	41.4	134	53.6	228	49.0	1436	56.8
Both foreign	41	47.1	67	52.3	73	29.2	181	38.9	699	27.2
Mixed	5	5.8	8	6.3	43	17.2	56	12.1	392	15.5
Total	87	100.0	128	100.0	250	100.0	465	100.0	2527	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Sex offenders and murderers	.69			2	.70	
Murderers and property offenders	12.58	.19		2	.01	
Foreign			3.0			.004
Mixed			2.6			.01
Sex and property offenders	22.31	.23		2	.01	
Foreign			4.4			.001 –
Mixed			2.9			.01 –

* Sixteen dropped out who were of other races or Negroes, or on whom information was lacking.

15.—Language Spoken in Parents' Home

Language	Murderers		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
English	52	58.4	57	45.2	143	54.2	252	52.6
Foreign	21	23.6	41	32.6	28	10.6	90	18.8
English and foreign	16	18.0	28	22.2	93	35.2	137	28.6
Total	89	100.0	126	100.0	264	100.0	479	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Murderers and sex offenders	3.69			2	.20	
Murderers and property offenders	14.72	.20		2	.01	
Foreign			3.09			.01 –
Foreign and English			3.04			.01 –
Sex and property offenders	29.16	.26		2	.01	
Foreign			5.7			.0001 –
Foreign and English			2.7			.008

16.—Family History of Chronic Disease

History of Chronic Disease	Murderers		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Present	26	36.1	11	8.6	58	22.4	95	20.7
Not present	46	63.9	117	81.4	201	77.6	364	79.3
Total	72	100.0	128	100.0	259	100.0	459	100.0

Category*	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Sex and property offenders	11.13	.17		1	.01	
Chronic disease			3.34			.01 –

* The number of murderers is too small to permit a reliable comparison with other classes.

17.—Family History of Queerness

History of Queerness	Murderers*		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Present	15	20.8	9	7.0	10	3.9	34	7.4
Not present	57	79.2	119	93.0	247	96.1	423	92.6
Total	72	100.0	128	100.0	257	100.0	457	100.0

Category†	χ^2	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Sex and property offenders	1.81		1	.20	

* Data lacking on twenty.

† Data lacking on too many murderers to permit reliable comparison with other classes.

18.—Family History of Insanity

History of Insanity	Murderers*		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders†		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Present	11	15.7	8	6.3	18	6.9	37	8.1
Not present	59	84.3	120	93.7	241	93.1	420	91.9
Total	70	100.0	128	100.0	259	100.0	457	100.0

Category §	χ^2	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Sex offenders and property offenders	.0683		1	50	

* No information on twenty-two. † No information on seven.

§ Data lacking on too many murderers to permit reliable comparison with other classes.

19.—Person or Persons Exercising Control of Siblings

Person or Persons	Murderers*		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Father	34	44.7	68	54.0	103	39.3	205	44.2
Mother	22	29.0	35	27.7	105	40.1	162	35.0
Father and mother	14	18.4	16	12.7	49	18.7	79	17.0
Others	4 } 6	5.3 } 7.9	5 } 7	4.0 } 5.6	5 } 5	1.9 } 1.9	14 } 18	3.0 } 3.8
No one	2	2.6	2	1.6	0	0.0	4	0.8
Total	76	100.0	126	100.0	262	100.0	464	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Sex and property offenders	7.95	.155		2	.02 –	
Father			2.73			.018
Mother			2.38			.02

* Sixteen missing, comparisons therefore unreliable.

20.—Severity of Control as Compared with That of Neighborhood Children

	Murderers		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Less severely treated than neighborhood children	23	36.0	31	25.2	52	21.1	106	24.5
More severely treated than neighborhood children	11	17.2	24	19.5	53	21.5	88	20.3
Equally treated	30	46.8	68	55.3	141	57.4	239	55.2
Total	64	100.0	123	100.0	246	100.0	433	100.0

Category*	χ^2	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Murderers and sex offenders	2.36		2	.34	
More severely treated		3.08			.01
Property offenders and murderers	6.067		2	.04	
Less severely treated		2.10			.0358
Sex and property offenders	.82		2	.96	

* Comparisons unreliable because data is missing on too many of the murderers and property offenders.

21.—Severity of Control as Compared with That of Others in Family

Treatment as Compared with Others in Family	Murderers		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
More severely treated	17	23.9	11	9.1	26	10.6	54	12.4
Less severely treated	16	22.6	9	7.3	59	24.2	84	19.2
Equal treatment	38	53.5	102	83.6	159	65.2	299	68.4
Total	71	100.0	122	100.0	244	100.0	437	100.0

Category*	χ^2	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Murderers and sex offenders	20.51			.001	
More severely treated		2.6			.01
Less severely treated		2.8			.01
Equal		2.3			.0214
Murderers and property offenders	8.33		2	.017	
More severely treated		2.69			.01
Sex offenders and property offenders	16.45			.001	
Less severely treated		3.5			.01

* Data lacking on too many of each type of offender to make comparison reliable

22.—I. Q. of the Several Classes of Prisoners

I. Q.	Murderers No.	Murderers Per Cent	Sex Offenders No.	Sex Offenders Per Cent	Rapists No.	Rapists Per Cent	Sodomists No.	Sodomists Per Cent	Property Offenders No.	Property Offenders Per Cent	Arson No.	Arson Per Cent
40–49	4 } 15	5.7 } 21.4	3 } 19	2.5 } 15.6	1	1.0	2	8.0	10 } 67	1.1 } 7.2	2	6.7
50–59	11	15.7	16	13.1	12	12.2	4	16.0	57	6.1	10	33.3
60–69	13	18.6	41	33.5	37	37.8	4	16.0	165	17.8	10	33.3
70–79	15	21.4	25	20.5	21	21.4	4	16.0	253	27.4	4	13.3
80–89	14	20.0	15	12.2	11	11.2	4	16.0	219	23.7	2	6.7
90–99	3	4.3	13	10.2	8	8.2	5	20.0	137	14.8	2	6.7
100–109	8 } 10	11.4 } 14.3	5 } 10	4.0 } 8.0	5	5.1	0	0.0	63	6.8 } 9.1	0	0.0
110–119	2	2.9	5	4.0	3	3.1	2	8.0	19 } 21	2.1	0	0.0
120–129	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	.2	0	0.0
Total	70	100.0	123	100.0	98	100.0	25	100.0	925	100.0	30	100.0
Average I.Q.	75.7		74.5						80.0			
Median	74.7		70.6						79.1			
Quartiles	61.9		62.9						69.9			
	74.7		70.6						79.1			
	86.8		84.8						89.5			
Deviation	12.45		10.95						9.8			

Category*	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Property and sex offenders			3.9		.01	
Below 60			3.41			.001–
60–69			3.41			.001–
Below 70			6.91			.001–
Total table	51.941	.21		10	.001	

* Data missing on too many murderers to permit reliable comparison with other classes.

Assault and Robbery No.	Assault and Robbery Per Cent	Bank Robbery No.	Bank Robbery Per Cent	Breaking and Entering No.	Breaking and Entering Per Cent	Burglary No.	Burglary Per Cent	Embezzling No.	Embezzling Per Cent	Forgery No.	Forgery Per Cent	Larceny No.	Larceny Per Cent	Total No.	Total Per Cent	I.Q.
3	1.1	0	0.0	2	1.4	3	1.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	17	1.5	40–49
14	5.2	1	2.1	8	5.8	14	9.0	1	4.3	1	.8	8	5.9	84	7.5	50–59
45	16.7	6	12.5	31	22.5	19	12.3	2	8.7	18	14.3	34	25.0	219	19.6	60–69
69	25.7	9	18.7	41	29.7	47	30.3	4	17.4	41	32.5	38	27.9	293	26.2	70–79
63	23.4	11	22.9	31	22.5	37	23.9	6	26.2	38	30.2	31	22.8	248	22.2	80–89
43	16.0	13	27.2	21	15.2	22	14.2	5	21.7	15	11.9	16	11.8	153	13.7	90–99
24	8.9	3	6.2	4	2.9	11	7.1	4	17.4	10	7.9	7	5.2	76	6.8	100–109
7	2.6	5	10.4	0	0.0	2	1.3	1	4.3	3	2.4	1	.7	26	2.3	110–119
1	.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	.7	2	.2	120–129
269	100.0	48	100.0	138	100.0	155	100.0	23	100.0	126	100.0	136	100.0	1118	100.0	Tota

23.—Differences in I. Q. between the Several Types of Property Offenders

Categories Compared	Mean$_1$	Mean$_2$	Difference	CR*
a. Property offenders as a whole	79.96			
Compared with offenders convicted of:				
Arson		65.00	−14.96	63.77
Assault and roberty		81.40	+ 1.44	1.395
Bank robbery		87.08	+ 7.12	3.297
Breaking and entering		77.32	− 2.64	2.226
Burglary		79.26	− 0.70	0.5344
Embezzling		87.17	+ 7.21	2.3196
Forgery		82.14	+ 2.18	1.800
Larceny		78.16	− 1.80	1.397
b. Arsonists	65.00			
Compared with offenders convicted of:				
Assault and robbery		81.4	+16.4	6.6049
Bank robbery		87.08	+22.08	7.0669
Breaking and entering		77.32	+12.32	4.8300
Burglary		79.26	+15.26	5.8432
Embezzling		87.17	+22.17	5.7704
Forgery		82.14	+17.14	6.6989
Larceny		78.16	+13.16	5.0615
c. Offenders convicted of assault and robbery	81.40			
Compared with offenders convicted of:				
Bank robbery		87.08	+ 5.68	2.4737
Breaking and entering		77.32	− 4.08	2.8736
Burglary		79.26	− 2.08	1.3635
Embezzling		87.17	+ 5.77	1.8005
Forgery		82.14	+ 0.74	0.5159
Larceny		78.16	− 3.24	2.1501
d. Bank robbers	87.08			
Compared with offenders convicted of:				
Breaking and entering		77.32	− 9.76	4.1188
Burglary		79.26	− 7.82	3.2126
Embezzling		87.17	+ 0.09	0.0241
Forgery		82.14	− 4.94	2.0769
Larceny		78.16	− 8.92	3.6821
e. Offenders convicted of breaking and entering	77.32			
Compared with offenders convicted of:				
Burglary		79.26	+ 1.94	1.1874
Embezzling		87.17	+ 9.85	3.0233
Forgery		82.14	+ 5.82	3.7570
Larceny		78.16	+ 0.84	0.5197

* A critical ratio of 2 or over is significant.

23.—Differences in I. Q. between the Several Types of Property Offenders—*Continued*

Categories Compared	Mean$_1$	Mean$_2$	Difference	CR*
f. Offenders convicted of burglary	79.26			
Compared with offenders convicted of:				
Embezzling		87.17	+ 7.91	2.3940
Forgery		82.14	− 2.88	1.7495
Larceny		78.16	− 1.10	0.6434
g. Embezzlers	87.16			
Compared with offenders convicted of:				
Forgery		82.14	− 5.03	1.5397
Larceny		78.16	− 9.00	2.7328
h. Forgers	82.14			
Compared with offenders convicted of:				
Larceny		78.16	− 3.98	2.4434

* A critical ratio of 2 or over is significant.

24.—Intelligence of Prisoners and of Wisconsin Drafted Men

Letter Grade	Mental Age	All Prisoners		Wisconsin Draft*		χ^2	Probability
		No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent		
A	18.0–19.5	22	2.0	57	5.7	19.80	.00
B	16.5–17.9	54	4.8	101	10.1	20.16	.00
C+	15.0–16.4	100	9.0	187	18.8	37.30	.00
C	13.0–14.9	301	26.9	279	28.0	.21	.83
C−	11.0–12.9	352	31.5	220	22.1	17.37	.00
D	9.5–10.9	188	16.8	92	9.2	22.99	.00
D−	0.0– 9.4	100	9.0	61	6.1	5.56	.02
Total		1117	100.0	997	100.0	123.39	.0001

Mean mental age of prisoners 12.32
Mean mental age of draftees 13.58
Difference 1.26
Error of the difference 1373
Difference ÷ error of the difference = 9.16 (extremely significant)

6 degrees of freedom
C = 123.39 ÷ (123.39 + 2114) = .25

* *Memoirs of the National Academy of Sciences*, Vol. 15 (1921), Table 220, pp. 682–683, entitled "Variable: Alpha × State. Groups I and II: White Draft. For men who took Alpha only."

25.—Birth Rank of Prisoners

Birth Rank	Murderers		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Eldest	21	24.7	30	23.4	57	21.5	108	22.6
Intermediate	56	65.9	68	53.2	148	55.9	272	56.9
Youngest	4 } 8	4.7 } 9.4	30 } 30	23.4	52 } 60	19.6 } 22.6	86	18.0
Only child	4	4.7	0	0.0	8	3.0	12	2.5
Total	85	100.0	128	100.0	265	100.0	478	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Sex and property offenders	.27					.86
Murderers and sex offenders	7.08	.18		2	.027	
Youngest and only child			2.6			.01 –
Murderers and property offenders	7.21	.14		2	.029	
Youngest and only child			2.69			.01

26.—Birth Rank of Siblings in Relation to That of Prisoner*

Birth Rank of Siblings	Older than Prisoner		Younger than Prisoner	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Next to prisoner	99	97	102	101
Second from prisoner	79	69	71	73
Third from prisoner	54	53	56	48
Fourth from prisoner	39	38	35	30
Fifth from prisoner	18	25	25	20
Sixth from prisoner	20	14	14	19
Seventh from prisoner	12	9	6	8
Eighth from prisoner	5	6	6	3
Ninth from prisoner	3	1	3	3
Tenth from prisoner			2	3
Eleventh from prisoner				1
Twelfth from prisoner				

* There are seven prisoners who had no siblings and four on whom data was lacking.

27.—Birth Rank of Property Offenders

Birth Rank	Distribution of All Children in Families of Offenders*		Distribution of Offenders	Observed Distribution of Offenders†	Expected Distribution of Offenders‡
	No.	Per Cent	Per Cent	No.	No.
1	240	17.57	23.14	59	44.8
2	240	17.57	18.82	48	44.8
3	220	16.11	16.08	41	41.1
4	190	13.91	11.76	30	35.5
5	161	11.79	13.33	34	30.1
6	115	8.42	3.53	9	21.5
7	83	6.08	5.10	13	15.5
8	58	4.25	3.92	10	10.8
9	36	2.64	2.75	7	6.7
10	23	1.68	1.58	4	4.3
Total	1366	100.00	100.00	255	255.1

* Families with more than ten children and those with only one child were eliminated.

† The birth rank distribution of property offenders is based on families having two or more children. These offenders are of course all males, whereas the birth rank distribution of all children includes females. But since it is reasonable to assume an even distribution of males and females in the birth ranks, and since females are included in determining the birth ranks of offenders, a comparison of offenders with all children seems justified.

‡ The "expected" distribution of the 255 offenders is that which would result if it were in the same proportions as that of all children—that is, 255 distributed according to the percentages given in the column for all children.

In comparing the percentage distribution of all children with that of offenders, two categories appear to be significant, birth ranks 1 and 6:

	Difference	*SE*	*CR*	*P*
1	5.57	2.38	2.34	.02
6	4.89	1.74	2.81	.005

The significant excess of offenders who are the eldest of two or more children tends to support the Goring thesis. If we are to accept this fact at its face value, however, the problem arises how to explain the more significant deficiency in rank 6.

The chi-square test applied to the expected and observed distributions gives $\chi^2 = 13.9$, which with 9 degrees of freedom would occur by chance roughly 20–30 times in 100. The two distributions, then, considered as a whole, are not significantly different. As a whole these calculations do not lend much support to the Goring thesis.

28.—Nativity of Prisoners and of Male Population of Wisconsin

Nativity	Murderers		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders		Arson		Assault and Robbery		Bank Robbery		Breaking and Entering		Burglary		Embezzling		Forgery		Larceny		Total Offenders		Male Wisconsin Population 15 Years and Over, 1930		Nativity
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	
Native white	57	62.0	101	78.9	826	88.6	30	79.0	231	86.2	45	97.8	114	90.0	133	87.0	11	84.7	118	94.4	120	90.0	984	85.3	1,282,337	84.9	Native white
Foreign white	19	20.6	25	19.5	78	8.3	8	21.0	28	10.5	1	2.2	11	8.0	17	11.0	2	15.3	6	4.8	6	4.5	122	10.6	214,677	14.2	Foreign white
Negro	12	13.0	2	1.6	15	1.6	0	0.0	3	1.1	0	0.0	1	0.7	3	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	3.7	29	2.5	5,811	.4	Negro
Other races	4	4.4	0	0.0	14	1.5	0	0.0	6	2.2	0	0.0	2	1.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	.8	3	2.2	18	1.6	7,990	.5	Other races
	16	17.4	2	1.6	29	3.1																			13,801	.9	
Total	92	100.0	128	100.0	933	100.0	38	100.0	268	100.0	46	100.0	138	100.0	153	100.0	13	100.0	125	100.0	134	100.0	1153	100.0	1,510,815	100.0	Total

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Murderers and property offenders	58.99	.23		2	.001	
Native white			7.0			.001 –
Negro and other races			2.11			.036
Murderers and sex offenders	18.54	.28		2	.001 –	
Native white			2.75			.016
Negro and other races			4.53			.001 –
Sex and property offenders	16.60	.16		2	.001 –	
Native white			3.06			.014
Foreign white			3.96			.01
Total cases and Wisconsin Male population	142.68			2	.001 –	
Foreign white			3.46			.001
Assault and robbery vs. bank robbery			2.24			.026

29.—Age at Leaving School

Age at Leaving School	Murderers				Sex Offenders				Property Offenders				Total	
	No.		Per Cent		No.		Per Cent		No.		Per Cent		No.	Per Cent
Never attended	8	12	9.6	14.4	5	6	4.0	4.8	7	10	2.7	3.9	20	4.3
Under 10	4		4.8		1		.8		3		1.2		8	1.7
10–11	9	49	10.9	59.1	7	90	5.5	71.4	3	137	1.2	53.1	19	4.1
12–13	15		18.1		33		26.2		29		11.2		77	16.5
14–15	25		30.1		50		39.7		105		40.7		180	38.6
16–17	14		16.9		14		11.1		81		31.4		109	23.3
18–19	6	22	7.2	26.5	5	30	4.0	23.8	19	111	7.4	43.0	30	6.4
20 and over	2		2.4		11		8.7		11		4.2		24	5.1
Total	83		100.0		126		100.0		258		100.0		467	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Murderers and sex offenders	15.47	.26		6	.018	
Never attended plus			2.020			
Under 10			2.05			.041
10–11			4.090			.01
16–17			2.180			.0292
Murderers and property offenders	37.02	.31		6	.003	
Never attended plus			3.4			.001
Under 10			2.6			.01
16 and over			3.75			
Sex and property offenders	35.86	.29		6	.003	
10–15			3.4			.001
16 and over			3.85			.0008
Under 14			4.5			.001 –

Data are lacking on nine murderers; but these, however distributed, would affect the results very little.

30.—Age Distribution of Male Population of Wisconsin 15 Years Old and Over and Age at Which Offenders Entered Prison*

Age Group	Male Population of Wisconsin		Total Offenders		Murderers		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders		Arson		Assault and Robbery		Bank Robbery		Breaking and Entering		Burglary		Embezzling		Forgery		Larceny		Age Group
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	
15–19. . . .	137,500	12.7	32	2.8	2	2.2	6	4.7	24	2.6	0	0.0	1	0.2	0	0.0	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	15–19
20–24. . . .	123,712	11.5	222	19.3	17	18.6	12	9.4	193	20.7	0	0.0	44	16.4	4	8.7	20	14.5	15	9.8	0	0.0	5	4.0	17	12.7	20–24
25–29. . . .	114,879	10.6	303	26.3	22	23.9	19	14.8	262	28.0	4	10.5	87	32.5	22	47.8	40	29.0	43	28.1	1	7.7	30	24.0	40	30.0	25–29
30 and over .	703,886	65.1	595	51.55	51	55.3	90	70.3	454	48.7	34	89.5	136	50.8	20	43.5	76	55.1	95	62.1	12	92.3	88	70.4	76	56.7	30 and over
Total. . .	1,079,977	100.0	1152	100.0	92	100.0	127	100.0	933	100.0	38	100.0	268	100.0	46	100.0	137	100.0	153	100.0	13	100.0	123	100.0	133	100.0	Total

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Sex and property offenders	27.15	.16		3	.004	
20–24.			9.5			.001 –
25–29.			3.2			.0026
30 and over			4.6			.0001 –
Murderers and property offenders . .	1.57			3	.67	
25–29.			2.79			.01 –
30 and over			4.02			.001 –
Murderers and sex offenders.	8.50	.19		3	.03	
20–24.			2.0			.045
30 and over			2.29			.022
Prisoners and Wisconsin population .	449.57			3		.00001

* Wisconsin male population, 1930; murderers, 1931; rapists, sodomists, and property offenders, 1933.

31.—Relative Age at Which Prisoners First Contributed to Family Support as Compared with Siblings

Relative Age	Murderers			Sex Offenders			Property Offenders			Total Cases	
	No.	Per Cent		No.	Per Cent		No.	Per Cent		No.	Per Cent
Earlier than siblings	7	10.9		17	13.9		81	34.0		105	27.3
Same as siblings	57	89.1	57	98	80.4	105	120	50.4	157	236	61.3
Later than siblings	0	0.0		7	5.7	86.1	37	15.6	66.0	44	11.4
Total	64	100.0		122	100.0		238	100.0		385	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Sex and property offenders	30.23	.29		2	.001	
Earlier than siblings			4.4			.0001

32.—Age at Which Prisoners Became Financially Independent*

Age	Murderers		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders		Total*	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Under 14	18	20.7	10	8.0	28	11.2	56	12.1
14–20	54	62.1	98	78.4	181	72.1	333	71.9
Over 20	15	17.2	17	13.6	42	16.7	74	16.0
Total	87	100.0	125	100.0	251	100.0	463	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Sex and property offenders	1.80			2	.41	
Murderers and sex offenders	8.62	.20		2	.016	
Under 14			2.7			.007
Murderers and property offenders	5.27			2	.058	
Under 14			2.4			.016

* Twelve prisoners who never became financially independent are omitted from the calculations.

33.—Financial Contribution to Parental Family

Extent of Contribution	Murderers*		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Entire support of family	3(15)	3.8(16.0)	10	7.9	8	3.1	21	4.5
Partial support of family	55(67)	68.7(73.8)	86	67.7	149	57.5	290	62.2
No contribution to family	22(34)	27.5(37.0)	31	24.4	102	39.4	155	33.3
Total	80	100.0	127	100.0	259	100.0	466	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Murderers and sex offenders	1.56			2	.45	
Murderers and property offenders	3.73			2	.15	
Sex and property offenders	11.16	.17		2	.008	
Partial support			2.0			.046
No contribution			3.06			.003

* Data are lacking on twelve murderers. If we assume that all of them were included in one or another of the three categories (see the figures in the parentheses above), how would it affect the proportions? The statistical analysis above is based on the assumption that they were distributed in the same proportions as the eighty on whom data were available. The analysis below shows what the results would be if they were distributed as indicated:

	CR	Probability
Murderers and sex offenders:		
Total support of family (including the missing 12)	2.16	.031
No contribution to family (including the missing 12)	2.4	.016
Murderers and property offenders:		
Total support of family (including the missing 12)	4.6	.0001
No contribution to family (including the missing 12)	2.8	.006

34.—Average Length of Time on Jobs

Time	Murderers		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
More than 1 year	50	54.3	85	67.4	119	47.4	254	54.2
3 months to 1 year	24	26.1	34	27.0	111	44.2	169	36.0
Less than 3 months	18	19.6	7	5.6	21	8.4	46	9.8
Total	92	100.0	126	100.0	251	100.0	469	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Murderers and property offenders	13.75	.19		2	.005	
3 months to 1 year			3.04			.003
Less than 3 months			2.89			.004
Sex and property offenders	13.62	.17		2	.005	
More than 1 year			3.67			.0004
3 months to 1 year			3.21			.0026
Murderers and sex offenders	10.59	.21		2	.008	
Less than 3 months			3.19			.0006

35.—Occupation of Prisoners

Occupation	Murderers		Sex Offenders		Sodomists		Rapists		Property Offenders		Arson		Assault and Robbery		Bank Robbery		Breaking and Entering		Burglary		Embezzling		Forgery		Larceny		Total Offenders		Occupation
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	
Professional	0	0.0	6	4.7	5	17.3	1	1.0	28	3.0	1	3.2	12	4.5	1	4.2	0	0.0	6	3.8	0	0.0	6	4.8	1	0.7	34	2.9	Professional
Ownership of business	5	5.4	6	4.7	0	0.0	6	6.1	36	3.9	6	19.4	6	2.2	4	8.3	2	1.4	5	3.2	7	30.4	3	2.3	3	2.2	47	4.1	Ownership of business
Clerical	6	6.5	6	4.7	2	6.9	4	4.0	99	10.7	0	0.0	29	10.8	5	20.8	6	4.3	9	5.8	10	43.6	21	16.7	14	10.3	111	9.7	Clerical
Farmer	14	15.2	11	8.6	1	3.4	10	10.1	214	23.1	15	48.4	40	14.9	7	14.6	49	35.3	23	14.7	4	17.4	30	23.8	46	33.8	239	20.8	Farmer
Skilled labor	31	33.7	35	27.3	4	13.8	31	31.3	285	30.7	4	12.9	88	32.7	14	29.2	38	27.3	50	32.1	1	4.3	46	36.5	44	32.4	351	30.6	Skilled labor
Unskilled labor	36	39.2	64	50.0	17	58.6	47	47.5	266	28.6	5	16.1	94	34.9	11	22.9	44	31.7	63	40.4	1	4.3	20	15.9	28	20.6	366	31.9	Unskilled labor
Total	92	100.0	128	100.0	29	100.0	99	100.0	928	100.0	31	100.0	269	100.0	48	100.0	139	100.0	156	100.0	23	100.0	126	100.0	136	100.0	1148	100.0	Total

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Murderers and property offenders	10.3			10	.40+	
Unskilled laborers			2.112			.0352
Murderers and sex offenders	8.88	.198		10	.50+	
Sex offenders and property offenders	33.0	.174		10	.01−	
Farmers			3.776			.001−
Unskilled laborers			4.91			.0001−

36.—Economic Status of Prisoner at Time of Crime as Compared with Previous Status

Status	Murderers		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Same	40	43.5	68	55.3	171	64.3	279	58.0
Improving	18	19.6	17	13.8	5	1.9	40	8.3
Declining	34	36.9	38	30.9	90	33.8	162	33.7
Total	92	100.0	123	100.0	266	100.0	481	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Murderers and sex offenders	3.100			2	.23	
Murderers and property offenders	38.62	.31		2	.001	
Same			3.49			.006
Improving			6.15			.0001
Sex offenders and property offenders	22.38	.23		2	.002	
Improving			4.59			.0001

37.—Marital Status of Prisoners as Compared with That of Male Population of Wisconsin 15 Years Old and Over

Status	Murderers*		Sex Offenders*		Property Offenders*		Arson		Assault and Robbery		Bank Robbery		Breaking and Entering		Burglary		Embezzling		Forgery		Larceny		Male Population of Wisconsin		Commitments to Prisons and Reformatories in U. S., 1923		Total Offenders		Status
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	
Single . . .	30	32.6	43	33.6	460	49.3	10	26.3	142	53.0	25	54.4	14	60.9	92	60.0	2	15.3	40	32.0	60	44.8	392,557	36.3	9,337	53.9	533	46.2	Single
Married. . .	42	45.7	66	51.6	318	34.1	17	44.7	83	31.0	15	32.6	50	21.7	36	23.5	10	77.0	37	29.6	34	25.8	625,578	57.9	6,896	39.8	426	36.9	Married
Widowed . .	7	7.6	8	6.2	39	4.2	5	13.2	7	2.6	0	0.0	3	2.2	2	1.3	0	0.0	14	11.2	6	4.5	48,946	4.5	609	3.5	54	4.7	Widowed
Divorced . .	11	12.0	10	7.8	116	12.4	6	15.8	36	13.4	6	13.0	21	15.2	23	15.0	1	7.7	34	27.2	34	25.8	10,814	1.0	475	2.7	137	11.9	Divorced
Common law	2 } 13	2.1 } 14.1	1 } 11	0.8 } 8.6	0 } 116	0.0 } 12.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	0.3	Common law
Unknown . .	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2,082	.3	565	0.0	0	0.0	Unknown
Total. . .	92	100.0	128	100.0	933	100.0	38	100.0	268	100.0	46	100.0	38	100.0	153	100.0	13	100.0	125	100.0	134	100.0	1,079,977	100.0	17,882	99.9	1153	100.0	Total

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Murderers and sex offenders	2.05			3	.35	
Murderers and property offenders	10.45	.11		3	.008	
Single			3.05			.003
Married			2.22			.027
Sex and property offenders	17.84	.13			.002	
Single			3.34			.001—
Married			4.52			.0001—
Total cases and male population of Wisconsin		.04				
Male population of Wisconsin	1272.44			3		.000001

Category	CR	Probability
Burglary vs. embezzling		
Single	9.89	.001—
Married.	13.05	.001—
Burglary vs. forgery		
Single	4.65	.001—
Embezzling vs. forgery		
Single	3.94	.001—
Married.	10.85	.001—

* Sixty-two of the 92 murderers interviewed had been married, 85 of the 128 sex offenders, and 131 of the 266 property offenders. In this and some of the other tables property offenders who had not been interviewed are included, since the information was available in the records.

38.—Number of Children in Married Prisoners' Families

Number	Murderers*				Sex Offenders*				Property Offenders*				Total		Wisconsin Families†
	No.	Per Cent			No.	Per Cent			No.	Per Cent			No.	Per Cent	Per Cent
None	23	37.1			13	16.1			34	26.0			70	25.5	38.4
1	8	12.9	17	27.4	12	14.8	24	29.6	37	28.2	62	47.3	57	20.8	20.9
2	9	14.5			12	14.8			25	19.1			46	16.8	16.7
3	9	14.5	12	19.4	9	11.1	15	18.5	18	13.7	26	19.8	36	13.1	10.3
4	3	4.9			6	7.4			8	6.1			17	6.2	6.0
5	7	11.3			11	13.6			0	0.0			18	6.6	3.5
6–8	3	4.8	10	16.1	14	17.3	29	35.8	6	4.6	9	6.9	23	8.4	3.7
Over 8	0	0.0			4	4.9			3	2.3			7	2.6	0.5
Total	62	100.0			81	100.0			131	100.0			274	100.0	100.0
Average	1.95				3.31				1.80				2.28		

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Sex offenders and murderers	11.26	.27		3	.01 –	
1 or 2			2.56			.021
5–8 or more			3.31			.002
Murderers and property offenders	9.53	.21		3	.024	
1 or 2			2.65			.005
5–8 or more			2.00			.046
Sex and property offenders	29.52	.36		3	.001	
None			10.1			.0001
5–8 or more			3.3			.001
Prisoners and Wisconsin population	6.72			3	.09	

* Sixty-two of the murderers interviewed were married, 85 of the sex offenders, and 131 of the property offenders. In these tables, unless otherwise stated, the significance of the difference indicated by *CR* is not affected by the fact that the data pertain to less than the total number in the category.

† Number of children under 21. *Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930*, vol. 6, p. 44.

39.—Premarital Economic Status of Wife as Compared with That of Prisoner

Relative Status	Murderers		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Higher than prisoner's	4	6.9	15	18.1	23	18.1	42	15.7
Same as prisoner's	45	77.6	61	73.5	60	47.3	166	61.9
Lower than prisoner's	9	15.5	7	8.4	44	34.6	60	22.4
Total	58	100.0	83	100.0	127	100.0	268	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Murderers and sex offenders	4.748			2	.09	
Murderers and property offenders	14.971	.27		2	.008	
Same as prisoner's			3.86			.001
Sex and property offenders	20.182	.30		2	.001	
Same as prisoner's			3.76			.001

40.—Nationality of Wife

Nationality	Murderers*		Sex Offenders*		Property Offenders*		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Same as prisoner's	48	84.2	55	69.6	59	45.4	162	60.9
Different from prisoner's	9	15.8	24	30.4	71	54.6	104	39.1
Total	57	100.0	79	100.0	130	100.0	266	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Murderers and sex offenders	3.834			1	.05	
Murderers and property offenders	24.387	.34		1	.001 –	
Different from prisoner's			4.94			.0001
Sex and property offenders	11.63	.22		1	.001	
Different from prisoner's			3.37			.001 –

* Sixty-two of the murderers interviewed were married, 85 of the sex offenders' and 131 of the property offenders. In these tables, unless otherwise stated, the significance of the difference indicated by *CR* is not affected by the fact that the data pertain to less than the total number in the category.

41.—Religion of Wife

Religion	Murderers*		Sex Offenders†		Property Offenders		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Same as prisoner's	42	79.2	46	69.7	75	58.6	163	66.0
Different from prisoner's	11	20.8	20	30.3	53	41.4	84	34.0
Total	53	100.0	66	100.0	128	100.0	247	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Murderers and property offenders	7.00	.19		1	.01 –	
Different from prisoner's			2.64			.01 –

* Nine missing. † Nineteen missing.

42.—Education of Wife

Extent of Education	Murderers*		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Same as prisoner's	16	35.6	63	75.0	40	30.8	119	46.0
More than prisoner's	18	40.0	16	19.0	59	45.4	93	35.9
Less than prisoner's	11	24.4	5	6.0	31	23.8	47	18.1
Total	45	100.0	84	100.0	130	100.0	259	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Sex and property offenders . .	40.55	.40		2	.001	
Same as prisoner's			6.31			.01 –
More than prisoner's			3.96			.01
Less than prisoner's			3.38			.01

* Seventeen missing, therefore comparison with other classes useless.

43.—Relationship with Wife

Nature of Relationship	Murderers		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Harmonious	25	41.7	35	41.7	66	52.4	126	46.7
Disharmonious . . .	35	58.3	49	58.3	60	47.6	144	53.3
Total	60	100.0	84	100.0	126	100.0	270	100.0

Category	χ^2	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Murderers and sex offenders	.01	1	.01	.94
Murderers and property offenders	1.86	1	1.86	.172
Sex and property offenders	2.31	1	2.31	.129

44.—Number of Arrests Previous to Commission of Crime

Number of Arrests	Murderers		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders		Arson		Assault and Robbery		Bank Robbery		Breaking and Entering		Burglary		Embezzling		Forgery		Larceny		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
None . . .	43	46.7	48	38.1	82	8.8	31	81.6	122	45.5	20	43.5	52	37.7	37	24.2	11	84.7	28	22.4	45	33.6	173	15.0
1.	16	17.4	30	23.8	180	19.3	4	10.5	105	39.2	14	30.4	74	53.6	83	54.3	1	7.7	39	31.2	56	41.8	226	19.6
2.	9	9.8	16	12.7	174	18.6	3	8.0	25	9.3	10	21.7	5	3.6	20	30.1	1	7.7	25	20.0	21	15.7	199	17.3
3 or more .	24	26.1	32	25.4	497	53.3	0	0.0	16	6.0	2	4.4	7	5.1	13	8.5	0	0.0	33	26.4	12	9.0	553	48.1
Total. .	92	100.0	126	100.0	933	100.0	38	100.0	268	100.0	46	100.0	138	100.0	153	100.0	13	100.0	125	100.0	134	100.0	1151	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Murderers and sex offenders	2.39		3.8	3	.50	.001
Murderers and property offenders	114.9	.32	10.7	3	.001	.057 –
Sex and property offenders	98.25	.28	9.5	3	.001	.001 –
			2.09			.001 –
			5.0			
			5.92			

45.—Circumstances of the Trial

	Murderers		Sex Offenders*		Property Offenders		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Bench trial without attorney	16	17.6	36	39.5	520	55.8	572	51.3
Bench trial with attorney	26	28.6	24	26.4	299	32.1	349	31.3
Jury trial	49	53.8	31	34.1	113	12.1	193	17.3
Total	91	100.0	91	100.0	932	100.0	1114	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Murderers and property offenders	114.74	.32		2	.001	
Bench trial without attorney			6.96			.01
Jury trial			10.35			.01

* Thirty-seven cases missing; hence comparison with other classes worthless.

46.—Pleas and Reaction to Trial

	Murderers		Sex Offenders		Property Offenders		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
1. Pleaded guilty	53	59.6	59	48.0	731	78.4	843	73.6
2. Pleaded guilty, allegedly under advice or misapprehension	1	1.1	2	1.6	13	1.4	16	1.4
3. Confession, allegedly secured under duress (any sort of threat)	3	3.4	0	0.0	2	0.2	5	0.4
4. Pleaded guilty, but later denied all or portions of the charge	1	1.1	15	12.2	30	3.2	46	4.0
5. Pleaded not guilty and continued to deny crime	18	20.2	35	28.5	93	10.0	146	12.8
6. Pleaded not guilty, but admitted certain features of charge	12	13.5	10	8.1	45	4.8	67	5.9
7. Pleaded not guilty, but after conviction admitted crime or certain features of it	1	1.1	2	1.6	19	2.0	22	1.9
Total	89	100.0	123	100.0	933	100.0	1145	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Sex and property offenders	54.06	.22		2	.001 —	
Pleaded guilty			7.33			.001 —
Categories 5, 6, 7			5.69			.001 —
Murderers and property offenders	18.14	.13		2	.01 —	
Pleaded guilty			4.03			.001
Categories 5, 6, 7			4.23			.001
Murderers and sex offenders	.482			2	.09	

47.—Age at Which Prisoners Left School as Compared with Brothers

Age	Property Offenders				Sex Offenders				Murderers				All Prisoners			
	Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
8–9 . . .	2	2.3	1	1.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.9	0	0.0	3	1.8	1	0.6
10–11. . .	0 } 14	0.0 } 15.9	5 } 23	5.5 } 25.3	2 } 15	3.9 } 28.9	2 } 13	3.9 } 25.5	5 } 11	19.2 } 42.3	0 } 3	0.0 } 12.5	7 } 40	4.2 } 24.1	7 } 39	4.2 } 23.5
12–13. . .	12	13.6	17	18.7	13	25.0	11	21.6	5	19.2	3	12.5	30	18.1	31	18.7
14–15. . .	38	43.2	37	40.6	27	51.9	22	43.2	10	38.5	17	70.8	75	45.2	76	45.8
16–17. . .	28	31.8	20	22.0	6	11.5	10	19.6	3	11.5	3	12.5	37	22.3	33	19.9
18–19. . .	4 } 8	4.5 } 9.1	7 } 11	7.7 } 12.1	0 } 4	0.0 } 7.7	4 } 6	7.8 } 11.7	2 } 5	7.7 } 7.7	0 } 4	0.0 } 4.2	6 } 14	3.6 } 8.4	11 } 18	6.6 } 10.8
20 or over.	4	4.6	4	4.4	4	7.7	2	3.9	0	0.0	1	4.2	8	4.8	7	4.2
Total. .	88	100.0	91	100.0	52	100.0	51	100.0	26	100.0	24	100.0	166	100.0	166	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Murderers.	64.42	.33		2	.04	
Under 14			2.35			.019
14–15.			2.29			.022

The only significant difference as tested by the chi square is that between the murderers and their brothers, and this could have occurred by chance 4 times out of 100. But there were significant differences between the murderers and their brothers in the categories "under 14" and "14–15."

48.—Age at Which Prisoners and Brothers Held First Full-Time Job

Age	Property Offenders				Sex Offenders				Murderers				All Prisoners			
	Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Under 14	12	13.3	11	12.2	17	32.1	10	20.4	11	40.7	3	11.5	40	23.5	24	14.5
14–20	70	77.8	72	80.0	33 } 36	62.3	39 } 39	79.6	15 } 16	55.6	20 } 23	76.9	118	69.4	131	79.4
Over 20	8	8.9	7	7.8	3	5.6	0	0.0	1	3.7	3	11.6	12	7.1	10	6.1
Total	90	100.0	90	100.0	53	100.0	49	100.0	27	100.0	26	100.0	170	100.0	165	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Murderers	5.80	.30		1	.016	
Under 14.			2.42			.015
All prisoners	4.80			2	.09	
Under 14.			2.11			.036

49.—Persons Who Were Favorites of Prisoners and Brothers

Person	Property Offenders				Sex Offenders				Murderers				Total			
	Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Mother	41	45.6	8	10.8	5	9.8	5	11.6	8	38.1	1	4.0	54	33.3	14	9.9
Father	7 } 9	7.8 } 55.6	5 } 6	6.8 } 18.9	0 } 5	0.0 } 9.8	7 } 12	16.3 } 27.9	0 } 9	0.0 } 42.9	1 } 3	4.0 } 12.0	7 } 64	4.3 } 39.5	13 } 29	9.1 } 20.4
Others	2	2.2	1	1.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.8	1	4.0	3	1.9	2	1.4
None	40	44.4	60	81.1	46	90.2	31	72.1	12	57.1	22	88.0	98	60.5	113	79.6
Total	90	100.0	74	100.0	51	100.0	43	100.0	21	100.0	25	100.0	162	100.0	142	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Property offenders	25.49	.34		2	.001	
Mother			4.84			.01—
None			4.8			.01—
Sex offenders	5.17	.22		1	.0226	
Mother, father, others			2.27			.0238
None			2.26			.0238
Murderers	5.64	.33		1	.0175	
Mother, father, others			2.38			.0238
None			2.38			.0238
All prisoners	24.36	.27		2	.001	
Mother			4.92			.01—
None			3.59			.01—

50.—Persons for Whom Prisoners and Brothers Felt Greatest Appreciation

Person	Property Offenders				Sex Offenders				Murderers				Total			
	Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Mother	52	56.5	25	37.3	25	48.1	21	46.7	14	87.5	11	44.0	91	56.9	57	41.6
Father	10 } 10	10.9 } 10.9	3 } 4	4.5 } 6.0	5 } 6	9.6 } 11.5	5 } 5	11.1 } 11.1	1 } 15	6.3 } 6.3	1 } 12	4.0 } 4.0	16 } 17	10.0 } 10.6	9 } 10	6.6 } 7.3
Others	0	0.0	1	1.5	1	1.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	.6	1	.7
No especial person	30	32.6	38	56.7	21	40.4	19	42.2	1	6.2	13	52.0	52	32.5	70	51.1
Total	92	100.0	67	100.0	52	100.0	45	100.0	16	100.0	25	100.0	160	100.0	137	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Property offenders	9.27	.23		2	.01	
Mother			2.39			.014
No especial person			3.03			.01
Sex offenders	.04			2	.98	
Murderers	9.11	.44		1	.0026	
Mother			3.02			.01
No especial person			3.92			.01
All prisoners	10.57	.19		2	.009	
Mother			3.24			.01
No especial person			4.01			.01

51.—Average Length of Time Prisoners and Brothers Remained on Job

Length of Time	Property Offenders				Sex Offenders				Murderers				Total			
	Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
More than 1 year	45	50.6	62	70.4	34	65.4	41	80.4	15	55.6	21	80.8	94	56.0	124	75.1
3 months to 1 year	41	46.1	18	20.5	16	30.8	7	13.7	9	33.3	5	19.2	66	39.3	30	18.2
Less than 3 months	3	3.3	8	9.1	2	3.8	3	5.9	3	11.1	0	0.0	8	4.7	11	6.7
Total	89	100.0	88	100.0	52	100.0	51	100.0	27	100.0	26	100.0	168	100.0	165	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Property offenders	13.93	.26		2	.001	
More than 1 year			6.2			.01 —
Murderers	3.87	.25		1	.0483	
More than 1 year			6.2			.00001 —
All prisoners	18.10	.23		2	.001 —	
More than 1 year			2.69			.008
3 months to 1 year			3.62			.0001

52.—Occupations of Prisoners and Brothers

Occupation	Property Offenders				Sex Offenders				Murderers				Total			
	Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Professional	3 } 11	3.3	4 } 10	4.8	4 } 9	7.5	3 } 8	6.2	0 } 3	0.0	0 } 3	0.0	7	4.1	7	4.4
Ownership of business	8	8.8	6	7.1	3	5.7	2	4.2	1	3.7	3	11.2	12	7.0	11	6.9
Clerical	11	12.0	5	5.9	2	3.8	3	6.3	2	7.4	0	0.0	15	8.8	8	5.0
Farmer or farm laborer	16	17.6	17	20.3	4	7.5	14	29.2	7	25.9	11	40.7	27	15.8	42	26.4
Skilled labor	36	39.6	21	25.0	12	22.7	10	20.8	8	29.7	7	25.9	56	32.7	38	23.9
Unskilled labor	17	18.7	31	36.9	28	52.8	16	33.3	9	33.3	6	22.2	54	31.6	53	33.4
Total	91	100.0	84	100.0	53	100.0	48	100.0	27	100.0	27	100.0	171	100.0	159	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Property offenders	10.09	.23		4	.03	
Skilled laborers			2.05			.04 —
Unskilled laborers			2.72			.01 —
Sex offenders	8.85	.28		3	.03	
Farmers			2.83			.01 —
Unskilled laborers			2.01			.045
Murderers	1.54			3	.65	
All prisoners	8.43			5	.15	
Farmers			2.34			.019

53.—Occupational Mobility of Property Offenders and Brothers in Terms of Number of Communities in Which They Had Worked

	Property Offenders		Brothers	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Itinerate	8	8.70	3	3.26
One or two towns	41	44.57	60	65.22
More than two towns	42	45.66	28	30.43
No information or never worked	[1]	[1.09]	[1]	[1.09]
Total	92	100.00	92	100.00

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Property offenders	8.66	.21		2	.015	
One or two towns			2.88			.01
More than two towns			2.15			.0316

54.—Number of Employers for Whom Property Offenders and Brothers Had Worked

No. of Firms or Individuals	Property Offenders		Brothers	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
1 or 2	6	6.52	21	22.83
3–6	52	56.52	33	35.87
More than 6	33	35.87	36	39.13
Never employed or data lacking	[1]	[1.09]	[2]	[2.17]
Total	92	100.00	92	100.00

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Property offenders	12.71	.24		2	.001	
1 or 2 firms			3.21			.01
3–6 firms			2.87			.01

55.—Marital Status of Prisoners and Brothers

Status	Property Offenders				Sex Offenders				Murderers				Total			
	Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Never married	46	50.0	30	32.6	23	43.4	11	20.8	11	40.7	6	22.2	80	46.5	47	27.3
Married	46	50.0	62	67.4	30	56.6	42	79.2	16	59.3	21	77.8	92	53.5	125	72.7
Total	92	100.0	92	100.0	53	100.0	53	100.0	27	100.0	27	100.0	172	100.0	172	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Property offenders	6.05	.17		1	.0139	
Never married			2.43			.015
Sex offenders	6.23	.23		1	.0122	
Never married			2.49			.10
All prisoners	13.59	.21		1	.001 —	
Never married			3.69			.01

56.—Marital Status of Prisoners and Brothers Who Had Been Married

Status	Property Offenders				Sex Offenders				Murderers				Total			
	Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Married	29	63.0	59	95.2	20	69.0	37	88.1	12	75.0	20	95.2	61	67.0	116	92.8
Separated	5	10.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	5.5	2	1.6
Divorced	11 } 17	23.9	3 } 3	4.8	5 } 9	17.2	0 } 5	0.0	4 } 4	25.0	0 } 1	0.0	20 } 30	22.0	3 } 9	2.4
Widowed	1	2.2	0	0.0	4	13.8	3	7.1	0	0.0	1	4.8	5	5.5	4	3.2
Total	46	100.0	62	100.0	29	100.0	42	100.0	16	100.0	21	100.0	91	100.0	125	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Property offenders	18.06	.37		1	.001	
Married			4.22			.01
Divorced			2.78			.01 –
Sex offenders	3.96	.18		1	.0466	
All prisoners	23.59	.31		1	.001 –	
Married			4.74			.01
Divorced			4.30			.01

57.—Prisoners' and Brothers' Relationship with Wife

Nature of Relationship*	Property Offenders				Sex Offenders				Murderers				Total			
	Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Harmonious	16	39.0	55	90.0	17	56.0	38	90.5	7	44.0	20	95.0	40	46.0	113	91.1
Disharmonious	25	61.0	6	10.0	13	44.0	4	9.5	9	56.0	1	5.0	47	54.0	11	8.9
Total	41	100.0	61	100.0	30	100.0	42	100.0	16	100.0	21	100.0	87	100.0	124	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Property offenders	30.31	.47		1	.001 –	
Harmonious			5.51			.01
Sex offenders	11.09	.36		1	.0011	
Harmonious			3.38			.01
Murderers†	12.21	.50		1	.001	
Harmonious			3.47			.01
All prisoners	52.27	.44		1	.001 –	
Harmonious			7.25			.01

* The terms "harmonious" and "disharmonious" are those of the prisoners and brothers modified by any evidence of disharmony discovered by the investigator from interviewing people and agencies in the neighborhoods in which the prisoner and brother had lived.

† One class very small.

58.—Education of Prisoners' and Brothers' Wives as Compared with That of Husband

Education of Wife	Property Offenders				Sex Offenders				Murderers				Total			
	Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Same as husband's	8	18.2	41	66.1	20	66.7	19	44.1	2	18.2	12	57.2	30	35.3	72	57.1
More than husband's	26	59.1	15	24.2	9	30.0	18	41.9	8	72.7	7	33.3	43	50.6	40	31.8
Less than husband's	10	22.7	6	9.7	1	3.3	6	14.0	1	9.1	2	9.5	12	14.1	14	11.1
Total	44	100.0	62	100.0	30	100.0	43	100.0	11	100.0	21	100.0	85	100.0	126	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Property offenders	23.81	.42		2	.001 —	
Same as husband's			4.88			.01
More than husband's			3.55			.01
Murderers	4.49	.35		1	.0339	
Same as husband's			2.11			.035
More than husband's			2.12			.035
All prisoners	9.96	.21		2	.008	
Same as husband's			3.11			.01
More than husband's			2.74			.01

59.—Nationality of Prisoners' and Brothers' Wives as Compared with That of Husband

Nationality of Wife	Property Offenders				Sex Offenders				Murderers				Total			
	Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Same as husband's	19	43.2	48	77.4	21	75.0	32	74.4	12	75.0	15	75.0	52	59.1	95	76.0
Different from husband's	25	56.8	14	22.6	7	25.0	11	25.6	4	25.0	5	25.0	36	40.9	30	24.0
Total	44	100.0	62	100.0	28	100.0	43	100.0	16	100.0	20	100.0	88	100.0	125	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Property offenders	12.98	.33		1	.002	
Same as husband's			3.7			.01
All prisoners	6.91	.18		1	.0086	
Same as husband's			2.64			.01

60.—Religion of Prisoners' and Brothers' Wives as Compared with That of Husband

Religion of Wife	Property Offenders				Sex Offenders				Murderers				Total			
	Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Same as husband's	23	51.1	54	87.1	17	73.9	41	94.4	10	62.5	16	76.2	50	59.5	111	88.1
Different from husband's	22	48.9	8	12.9	6	26.1	2	5.6	6	37.5	5	23.8	34	40.5	15	11.9
Total	45	100.0	62	100.0	23	100.0	43	100.0	16	100.0	21	100.0	84	100.0	126	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Property offenders	16.75	.36		1	.001 —	
Same as husband's			4.0			.01 —
Sex offenders	6.48	.30		1	.0109	
Same as husband's			2.44			.015
All prisoners	23.02	.31		1	.001 —	
Same as husband's			4.82			.01 —

61.—Premarital Economic Status of Prisoners' and Brothers' Wives as Compared with That of Husband

Status	Property Offenders				Sex Offenders				Murderers				Total			
	Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother		Prisoner		Brother	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Higher than husband's	10	23.2	3	4.9	6	20.7	8	18.6	1	6.7	4	19.1	17	19.5	15	12.0
Same as husband's	18	41.9	55	90.2	20	69.0	29	67.4	12	80.0	17	80.9	50	57.5	101	80.8
Lower than husband's	15	34.9	3	4.9	3	10.3	6	14.0	2	13.3	0	0.0	20	23.0	9	7.2
Total	43	100.0	61	100.0	29	100.0	43	100.0	15	100.0	21	100.0	87	100.0	125	100.0

Category	χ^2	C	CR	Degrees of Freedom	Probability χ^2	Probability CR
Property offenders	28.26	.45		2	.001 —	
Higher than husband's			2.73			.01
Same as husband's			5.29			.01
Lower than husband's			4.01			.01
All prisoners	15.18	.25		2	.001	
Same as husband's			3.67			.01 —
Lower than husband's			3.26			.01 —

62.—Summary of Differences between Prisoners and Brothers with Respect to Disparity between Backgrounds of Husband and Wife

Item of Comparison	Property Offenders	Sex Offenders	Murderers	All Prisoners
Education of wife				
Same as husband's	4.88	None	2.11	3.11
More than husband's	3.55		2.12	2.74
Nationality of wife				
Same as husband's	3.7	None	None	2.64
Religion of wife				
Same as husband's	4.00	2.44	None	4.82
Economic status of wife				
Higher than husband's	2.73			
Same as husband's	5.29	None	None	3.67
Lower than husband's	4.01			3.26

Appendix B: Sociological versus Legal Definitions in the Classification of Offenders

After this study was made two graduate students in my seminar on Research in Social Pathology raised the question whether the results would be the same if the prisoners were classified according to the sociological nature rather than the legal definition of the crimes committed. These two men, Robert Schmid and William Fuson, attempted to answer the question by making a study of their own.

They eliminated from the murderers all those who did not kill for revenge or in a fit of rage or irritation, thereby reducing the number from 92 to 76. They felt also that the sodomists should not be grouped with the rapists as sex offenders. When they were eliminated, the result was a total of 92 sex offenders instead of 128. Defining property crimes as crimes for profit, they eliminated from the group all who were guilty of arson and set up two subcategories: those who resorted to violence and those who did not. In the first of these subcategories they included offenders who had committed murder incidentally to a property crime. This regrouping resulted in a total of 252 property offenders instead of 266, as in the original study.

These new categories of offenders were examined with respect to seventeen of the more than fifty factors considered in the study, for the purpose of determining whether reclassification by sociological criteria would affect the results. Using the same techniques as in the original study, they came to the following conclusion respecting the question of sociological versus legal definition as a basis for classifying offenders:

"No statistically significant differences are established between the Fuson-Schmid 'sociological' and the Gillin 'legal' types of criminal offenders. However, the methods used to test the actual differences present are so very crude that a conclusive testing of our null hypothesis is not yet accomplished. It might be possible if samples were taken from the universes of each type without having any case appear in both samples. Care would have to be taken, of course, that other factors did not vitiate the experiment."

Fuson and Schmid also raised the question whether some other statistical technique would alter the results concerning the interrelations within a group of factors and the differences between categories of factors. In dealing with this question they used (1) the Tetrochoric $r(r_t)$ to suggest correlations between dichotomous factors; (2) the chi-square test of the significance of the differences between two series of frequencies, the one empirical and the other theoretical; and (3) multiple correlation for the purpose of holding constant one of the factors under consideration.

The results of these procedures were not conclusive. In some instances it was difficult to apply the Tetrachoric $r(r_t)$ to the material because it assumes a continuous variable "which is obviously absent in our qualitative dichotomies." On the factors studied by Fuson and Schmid their findings in brief were as follows:

Parents' Occupations and Income.—On this factor the chi-square test gave substantially the same results as the original study. Applying multiple correlation, they found that if they controlled the factor of occupation, a disproportionately large number of the property offenders came from the high-income group, whereas among the murderers and sex offenders the low-income group was more largely represented.

Nativity of Parents and Language in the Parental Home.—The r_t test produced a high correlation between these two factors, but the correlation between Native vs. Mixed-Foreign and English vs. Mixed-Foreign is less: for murderers .93, for sex offenders .93, for violent property offenders .84, and for non-violent property offenders .69. The chi-square test reveals no significant differences between the several types of offenders as reclassified with respect to proportions of native and foreign-born (grouping the mixed with the foreign-born) or proportions speaking English and speaking a foreign language in the home. Controlling nativity by multiple correlation, the two investigators found that native-born murderers and sex offenders came more frequently from homes in which English was spoken than did property offenders.

Reputation of Parents and Favoritism.—Here the findings of Fuson and Schmid confirmed those of the original study. On some points differences between the three classes of offenders were revealed, but by all three tests the sex offenders were found to differ significantly from the two other classes.

Marital Status, Age, and Number of Children.—By the various tests applied the three types of criminals as reclassified were found to differ significantly in most respects, thus confirming the findings of the original study.

Differences between Prisoner and Wife (Education, Religion, and Nationality and Their Relation to Marital Harmony).—By their three tests Fuson and Schmid obtained substantially the same findings as in the original study, although they felt that the r_t test may have yielded unreliable results, since large errors were possible with the sampling to which it was applied.

Occupation, Age, and Intelligence Quotient of Prisoners.—No findings were obtained that were of any positive value in throwing light upon the differences found in the original study.

Hence the chief value of the analysis made by these two men was (1) to show that the results are much the same whether a sociological or a legal definition of the crime committed constitutes the basis of classification and (2) to indicate a few areas in which further research might throw light upon the origin of the differences between the three types of offenders.

INDEX

Index

(continued from front flap)

nomic status, religion, etc.; prisoner's previous involvement with the law; and the circumstances of the crime and court trial.

How these and other factors less amenable to statistical treatment operated to produce a personality with anti-social attitudes is revealed in the scores of case histories that constitute Part II of the volume.

From the statistical analyses and the case histories emerge several important findings: (1) that the past experiences of these prisoners had been significantly different in certain ways from those of non-prisoners; (2) that in part at least these experiences were responsible for the development of personalities that responded in anti-social fashion to life situations; and (3) that, in the face of a crisis, this anti-social attitude took the form of a criminal act.

One conclusion was not anticipated even by the author. "It came as a complete surprise to me," he writes, "to learn that significant differences existed between the three groups of prisoners which must be attributed to differences in background." That is to say, certain circumstances in the life of an individual may be regarded as potentially productive not only of crime but of a specific type of crime.

The volume will be welcomed by all who are concerned with the prevention of crime and with the training and guidance of youth: officers of the law and of correctional institutions, parole and pardon authorities, legislators, parents and teachers, and social leaders in general.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN PRESS
811 State Street, Madison 5