

SOME AMERICAN VIEWS ON PENOLOGY.*

BY SIR WALTER J. BUCHANAN, K.C.I.E., M.D.,
late Inspector-General of Prisons in the Presidency of Bengal
(1902-19), and Member of the Indian Prisons
Commission (1919-20).

[*Read December 15th, 1921.*]

I have the honour this evening to lay before you some considerations on certain aspects of prison reform and "penology," which I had the opportunity of examining when engaged as a Member of the recent Indian Prisons Commission, which in 1919-20 went round the world for the purpose of studying the prison systems of other countries with a view to their application, as far as may be, to India.

The proposal that a Joint Committee of officials and non-officials should be appointed in India was made before the Great War, and it was revived soon after the Armistice. The Commission was appointed by the Governor-General in Council in April, 1919, and Sir Alexander Cardew, K.C.S.I., who was then acting as Governor of Madras Presidency, was appointed Chairman, and as Members Sir James du Boulay, K.C.I.E., then Home Secretary with the Government of India; Colonel (now Major-General) James Jackson, C.I.E., I.M.S., then Inspector-General of Prisons, Bombay, and the present writer, Sir Walter J. Buchanan, who had been for seventeen years Inspector-General of Prisons in the Bengal Presidency. The Home Office, London, added Mr. Mitchell-Innis, a senior and experienced official of the Prisons Department, London. As non-official members the Government of India nominated the late Khan Bahadur Hamed Hossain to represent the Mahomedhan community, and the Dorai Raja of Pudukotah, a skilled lawyer, to represent the Hindus.

After spending three months in England and Scotland visiting prisons, reformatories, industrial schools, and children's courts, interviewing and examining many leading officials, the Commission sailed for the United States early in September, 1919, and spent two months in that country, where they visited a large number of penal institutions of all kinds in many cities from New York to San Francisco, and in this work they were ably assisted by Mr. O. Lewis and Mr. Decatur

*This word, *Penology*, is not satisfactory, but it is convenient, and is much used in the United States of America.

Sawyer, who had been nominated by the New York Prison Association to accompany the Commission, and to whom they are indebted for being able to meet many prominent men interested in many sides of social welfare.

After leaving America the Commission went to Japan, China, and the Philippines, and while at Manila made a special study of the well-known Bilifid Prison, a good example of an oriental prison run on American lines. From Manila the Commission went to Hong Kong, thence to Ceylon and India, and while in India spent four months visiting prisons and similar institutions in all parts of India and Burma, including a special detailed examination of the transportation system as working in the Andaman Islands.

The Report of the Commission was published as a Blue Book (Government Central Press, Simla) in March, 1921.

It is here quite impossible to deal with more than a portion of the various matters discussed in this elaborate report, so I have selected a few subjects only, these being three to which our very special attention was drawn in the United States. These subjects are the *prevention* of committal to prison (probation, child offenders, first offenders, etc.); the *indeterminate sentence* with its corollary *parole*, and the question of *mental defect* and *mental abnormality* as causative factors in crime, the latter being a subject which was insistently pressed upon our notice and forms an increasingly important part of American legal procedure.*

We soon found that much work was being done as to the prevention of imprisonment. This takes the form of a Probation System and special Children's Courts. I need not say much on this part of my subject, as though the first impulse came from America much has been done in this direction in Great Britain and in Ireland, especially since the passing of the Children Act of 1908, in which the committal of children to prison, whether convicted or under trial, has been definitely prohibited, and the fact that the number of children and young persons admitted to the prisons of England and Wales has fallen from a yearly average of over 1,000 (in the years 1901-4) to a total of only 28 in the year 1917-18 shows how much has been done, and the Children's Courts which we saw at work in London are doing excellent work.

In the United States it is agreed that in criminal matters the child stands in a quite different grade of responsibility from the adult. A *healthy* child's delinquency is largely the result of want of care and bad surroundings, and the State therefore

*Since then much increased attention has been paid to this subject in England, and many articles have been written upon it.

recognises a certain degree of responsibility for him, that is, he is regarded as being as much sinned against as sinning. He or she is not charged with a definite offence but with delinquency generally, and if found to have violated the law he is treated not as a convict but as a ward of the court, and this quasi parental position is never lost sight of. When the police arrest a child, boy or girl, they take him home, or, if the offence is serious, to a "detention home." Then a petition is filed in the court alleging that the child is a delinquent, and the facts constituting the delinquency are stated. The child's parents or guardians are then sent for and appear in court, which is held in a separate room or building, and the whole procedure is devoid of all formality and marked by simplicity and elasticity. Lawyers have the right to appear but seldom do so, as it is recognised that the court is concerned not so much with the punishment of the guilty as with the conversion of the child from the error of its ways.

The court then makes an order, committing the child to its home or to the care of some reputable person or to some society or association, or to the care of a probation officer to be boarded out in some suitable family home.

There is a strong feeling in the United States in favour of boarding out juvenile delinquents in preference to the *easier* method of committing them to an institution. In Ohio, we were told, hundreds of such boys had been boarded out among the farmers with excellent results, and this was being done on even a bigger scale in California. In fact, it is recognised in the States that institutional treatment is only to be adopted as a last resort. It is also agreed that it is usually a mistake to place a boy on probation a second time and after a first failure, and that it is a serious blunder to continue the use of probation in spite of repeated failures.

In the United States the majority of children found to be delinquents are placed under the supervision of probation officers; in the State of New York there were over two hundred salaried probation officers, and over 20,000 persons are annually placed on probation. The special features of the American system are the method of collecting information through probation officers, and the increasing attention paid to the mental examination of the children (a subject I deal with below). The probation system is more frequently used in the States than it is in England; for example, in a recent year 3,343 children were so dealt with in New York City, whereas only 3,616 children were so disposed of in the whole of England and Wales (Clarke Hall, *The State and the Child*, p. 118).

One working defect of the probation system which we

found both in England and in the States was the tendency to give too much work to each probation officer. The effectiveness of probation depends largely upon the amount of time the officer can give to each offender, and it is agreed both in England and in the States that on the average not more than sixty cases should be at one time in the hands of one officer, and this should be the limit unless the probation officer is able to rely upon *adequate* voluntary help. In America the tendency is for the court to make more and more use of the probation officer. In England considerable reliance is still placed upon voluntary aid, but Mr. Clarke Hall, from his experience as a magistrate of the Children's Court at Old Street, London, is strongly of the opinion that it is incumbent on the State to make larger and better provision for a more systemised scheme of probation work, and in his work (above quoted, p. 130) he shows his agreement with American views when he writes that "*no child should be sent to an industrial school or reformatory school if there is any reasonable hope of improving him by any other means.*"*

Much more could be said on the working of the probation system for child offenders, as well as on the Borstal system for the "juvenile-adults" of English prison parlance (boys or girls of over 16 and under 21 years), but time forbids.

The Indeterminate Sentence.

The system of the indeterminate sentence is, if we may use the expression, the most revolutionary idea applied in America to the criminal law. This law or system differs in the various States, for each State in the Union is a sovereign body and exercises complete control on all matters not specially reserved to the Federal Government. It must also be remembered that, with some exceptions, the Judiciary in the States is not appointed as in Great Britain and India by a central authority, nor does it hold office during good behaviour. It is elected for a fixed term of years by a popular vote and a legal training, though generally forthcoming, is not an essential part of the candidate's equipment.

The *indeterminate sentence* is one which is not fixed or determinate, that is, the actual period of imprisonment undergone is settled with reference not merely to the crime before the court but also to the subsequent conduct and to the character of the prisoner, and to the progress towards reformation of which he may give evidence. It purposes *not to release him*

*Also see Mr. Secretary Short's Home Office Circular of April, 1921.

till he is fit for release, and not to detain him after he has reached the presumed fitness.

The very important task of deciding when this stage has been reached is entrusted to a Board, called the Parole Board, usually appointed by the Governor in each State. Moreover, release on the recommendation of this Board is *always conditional*, and the prisoner is liable to be recalled to prison if he breaks the conditions or in any way violates his parole.*

It has been long admitted that the mere detention of a criminal in no way supplies a remedy for the social evil of which crime is the manifestation. It is always (in the States) borne in mind that *the main object of imprisonment is the reformation of the criminal*, so that he may return to ordinary civil life as an ordinary decent citizen. No one can pretend that imprisonment and removal from the free life of the world is beneficial to the individual; long terms of imprisonment cannot but tend in a majority of cases more or less to destroy the prisoner's power of initiative, his power of mind, and his capacity for free action. To gain the end in view (that is, to turn out decent ordinary citizens) it is desirable to shorten the long sentence *provided* always that it can be done without injury to the community. Therefore (it is argued) no person should be kept in prison longer than is necessary *to deter him and others from the commission of crime.*

The effect of the punishment of a criminal on the community is largely produced by the original sentence and the disgrace and publicity attached. Certainty of detection is more important than severity of punishment. The older view considered chiefly the crime and the punishment was intended to "fit the crime"; the more modern view, held largely in the States, is, I think, more rational, that is to make the punishment *also* "fit the criminal."

The court in America is held to be greatly helped by the report furnished by the medical and psychiatric expert, which is the feature of American procedure to which I must shortly direct attention.

In counties where this expert aid is not available it must often happen that a court is compelled to pass sentence in at least partial ignorance of the prisoner's true character or history, except in regard to the actual facts of the case as they emerge during the trial.

If therefore we admit that it is not possible to overcome the difficulties of adjusting the sentence to the criminal at the

*I should add that in most States certain offences (such as murder, treason, arson, rape) are excluded from the operation of the indeterminate sentence.

moment when the sentence is actually pronounced we must further agree that it is (at least theoretically) sound for the court to refrain from passing a fixed or determinate sentence, but rather it should decide merely whether the person is guilty or not and then hand him over to an expert body to be detained and dealt with in accordance with his subsequent conduct and on the further information which they can collect as to his previous history, his character and his physical and mental condition. Opportunity for this to be done is given by the pronouncement by the court of an "indeterminate" sentence.

Now, whether we who are accustomed to older methods agree with this or not, there is no doubt that this idea of an elastic or indeterminate sentence has won its way throughout the United States of America, though no State has extended it to its full logical conclusion. In most States the indeterminate sentence means that a definite fixed period is no longer pronounced, but a more elastic one introduced, the one most generally adopted being a sentence involving a fixed minimum and a fixed maximum. To the Parole Board is left the decision as to what period between the two limits a prisoner may be safely released, but if released it is almost invariably *upon conditions*, and during the period of the parole he is under the supervision not of the police but of a parole officer, who acts in relation to him much as the probation officer acts towards the child offender on probation.

No State which has introduced the system of the indeterminate sentence has ever gone back upon it since its introduction over fifty years ago. I may also add that at the Eighth International Penal Congress in 1910, held at Washington D.C., the principle was almost unanimously approved.

The indeterminate sentence system cannot be separated from the parole system, which is an essential part of it. As I have said, a prisoner under the indeterminate system is not released unconditionally (as happens in cases where a fixed sentence has expired), he is only let out on parole, or, to use the expressive Americanism, he is "*let out on a string*." The prisoner before release must understand and sign to the conditions. He is, moreover, *and this is most important*, provided with a job of work on release, and he must not leave that employment without the knowledge and consent of the parole officer. These conditions hold good for times which vary in the different States, but in no case for longer than the maximum period of the original sentence; that period being passed the sentence is fully liquidated, and the prisoner can only be arrested on some fresh charge.

It is obvious that under the indeterminate sentence system

the duty of the Parole Board is very important, and we found that though enlightened opinion in America was strongly in favour of the system, it was also alive to possible defects. The composition of a Board with such powers is obviously of the highest importance, and to aid them American opinion urges the necessity of putting before that Board the most complete psychological report on the prisoner, and indeed many Americans claim that the furnishing of a psychological report is as much part of the system as is parole itself.

It is also obvious that any tendency toward the automatic release of a prisoner as soon as his minimum period is passed is to be sternly resisted. We also had some evidence that the period of parole was often too short, and while it is generally admitted that the period of greatest danger of relapse is in the few months after release, it is agreed that the evidence is in favour of making the parole period a substantial one. Another factor working against the success of the system is the paucity of parole officers, and some figures were received at Michigan and at St. Quentin Prison, near San Francisco, showed that the number of conditionally released prisoners placed under one parole officer gave no fair chance to the parole system.

Mental Deficiency and Mental Abnormality and Crime.

I now come to the consideration of an aspect of the crime problem which was most insistently brought to our notice in America. This is the degree in which mental defect and mental abnormality are to be regarded as causative factors in crime. We discussed this question repeatedly with officials of all classes—with doctors, with advocates, and we were lectured on the subject by a chief justice.

In the treatment of the criminal, it was urged, one should seek for and try to understand the *cause* of the crime. *Why* is crime committed? *Why* do some criminals repeat their crime and become recidivists?

Every country, every prison system has the same monotonous tale to tell. Much advance has been made in the treatment of children and adolescents, but probation systems, industrial schools, reformatories and prisons all alike fail with a certain number of offenders. Why is this failure on all sides? The answer is contained in a remark taken from a report of the famous Elmira Reformatory School in New York State—*"Give us reformable material and we will reform."*

Many have been the theories of the causation of crime. Dr. Mercer, an able English authority, went near to a solution, so did Dr. Goring in his monumental statistical study of the English convict. He showed that the English convict was

mentally and physically inferior to the average of the general population, and he also showed that bad housing and poverty were *not* the *main* causes of crime, but American workers have endeavoured to come to a fuller explanation of the causation of crime.

These American penologists recognise the "accidental" criminal who falls into temptation or is led astray by bad example. Such a person is eminently reformable. They also recognise that the confirmed criminal begins in early youth, and they fully admit the share to be taken by bad homes and parental neglect, but they urgently insist that there is one factor—the greatest single causative factor—which has hitherto not been properly understood. This factor is mental defect and mental abnormality, and "psychic constitutional inferiority." These (they tell us) are the sources of failure in schools and in reformatories; these, to a very large extent, explain the residuum of irreformables, the recidivists.

Writers in the States are careful to point out clearly that all criminals are not feeble-minded or do not suffer from mental abnormalities, but they do emphatically insist that such persons (feeble-minded or abnormal) are more likely to commit crime, are exceedingly difficult to reform, unless possibly by very early and efficient treatment.

The feeble-minded child or youth is lacking in judgment and in self-control; he is prone to follow bad example, he cannot face social difficulties. These are the individuals who become criminals and furnish a very large proportion of the failures.

In his great work, *The Individual Delinquent*, William Healy states that mental defect is the largest single cause of delinquency. Though the mental condition in any such individual may be difficult to class under any specific category of mental disease, yet a steady advance is being made in our ability to determine mental abnormality in a scientific manner.

Terman, of the Stanford University, California, has said: "No investigator denies the fearful rôle played by mental defect in the production of vice, crime and delinquency." The Governor of the Elmira Reformatory, N.Y., in 1915 reports that "practically all the persistent violators of rules in a well-conducted institution will be found to be feeble-minded or mentally or physically abnormal. . . . All mental defects are by no means incorrigible, but all incorrigibles are mentally defective."

To answer the query: "Why does the offender offend?" William Healy says the following matters must be considered: What is the subject's mental ability, independent of the results

of a formal education? Does the subject suffer from aberrational mental functioning, whether border-line or fully developed psychosis?

Investigation by mental tests will determine *the general intelligence* of an individual. The system which is largely used in America is that devised, in 1904, by MM. Binet and Simon in France. The tests have been thoroughly revised by the Stanford University, and its revision is in general use in the United States.

MM. Binet and Simon undertook an examination of normal French children, and they gradually built up a series of tests suitable for the various ages of children; that is, a normal child of, say, six years could answer all the tests allocated to six years and so on. With infinite patience they elaborated a "norm" or standard for each year from three to twelve of *average healthy childhood*. If a child of known age can answer to the tests of that age one can safely say that the child is normal, if otherwise one can equally say that this child, of known age, is retarded one or more years, or, it might be, that he is in advance of his "mental age."

At the time of our visit to the States these tests had been but little used in England, but they had been widely used in the States, and from the mass of figures collected the fact emerged that close upon two per cent. of all children of the school-going age had not or would not develop beyond the "mental age" of eleven or twelve, *i.e.*, two per cent. of the total child population of the United States. From this two per cent. are drawn the failures in schools, the failures in industries and in social life, and too often the failures in prisons and in reformatories, etc.

It is significant of the value attached to these tests that in the emergency of the Great War they were at once made use of in recruiting for the army and navy of the United States. In the Great War no country rejected recruits for trivial reasons. The United States came very late into the war and determined to make up for lost time. She did not want to waste precious time in training bad material nor was she likely to waste it on any sort of fad. The authorities determined to use these mental tests for all recruits and "mobilised the psychologists." From a certain date all recruits were thus tested, and thousands were rejected on these tests alone. There was an opposition, of course. It was not easy for a combatant officer to realise that by such tests the psychologist could decide in under an hour what the regimental officer could only arrive at by the actual criterion of success or failure in several months of training. Yet such was the case. Of course mistakes were made and unfits passed through, but the military authorities were able to

report that the *psychologists were essentially correct in their estimate of the military aptitude of over a million and a half of recruits so examined.**

So much for the use of these intelligence tests, which are of great use in finding out as well as in estimating mental defect.

So far I have only discussed mental defect or lack of mind, but there are other mental *affects* or psychoses which also contribute to the production of crime.

The first mental affect to which our attention in America was directed was the disease now differentiated as *dementia præcox*, a common disease in all asylums, East and West. Kraepelin, of Munich, one of the first authorities on the disease, studying the subject from the viewpoint of a physician, in an early chapter of his book, writes: "We find (in such cases) manifold contradictions of the penal code, and during the course of the disease deeds dangerous to the community are often committed."

Many of the victims of *dementia præcox* join the crowds of vagabonds and beggars, and live between the public highway, the prison and the workhouse. They are weak, tired, irresolute, without initiative. If women they usually become prostitutes, though few of them are usually recognised as sufferers from mental disorders and still fewer come under treatment by the alienist. The epilepsies are commonly connected with crime. The English writer, Clouston, has said that murder by an epileptic might be said to be a symptom of the disease.

Other forms of mental derangement are associated with crime, such as, for example, paranoid insanity, maniac depressive insanity, and syphilitic cerebral disease, but a most important section are those *borderland cases* which cannot be easily classified under the older conceptions of insanity. For example, there is a wide group suffering from what is called "psychic constitutional inferiority." This group supplies the world with its unbalanced individuals, eccentric cranks, faddists, and sexual perverts. Many of them are superficially brilliant, but the class also includes chronic tramps and vagrants. They are

*As examples—On basis of Spanish War figures it was calculated that accommodation would be needed in the army for about 50,000 military defaulters. In actual trial in the war it was found that of the tested men, 5,000 (one-tenth of the estimate) defaulted, and of this 5,000 further examination showed a big majority to be mentally deficient. Another case: Officers classified 765 men on their knowledge of them in training, then the psychologists examined them independently, and agreement between the two methods of testing was found in 88 per cent. of cases. In another instance 306 men had been found by their officers as unfit for oversea service. These were then examined by the intelligence tests, and it was found that 90 per cent. (of these 306) were *men of the mental age of ten*, and that time had only been wasted in attempting to train them.

weak-minded, selfish, suggestible, egotistic and suspicious. They may also be physically abnormal. The best of them are the dreamers, idealists, "kerbstone Bolshevicks." They are not uncommonly of a somewhat pleasing address, are excellent talkers, but they are seldom successful in life or good at any continuous effort.

It must, however, not be overlooked that the eccentricity or deviation of these psychopaths is often of a more normal kind. A man may have "a bee in his bonnet," yet not be at all antisocial. It is when the "kink" of his mind takes a wrong twist that he turns to criminality. Such individuals cannot be measured by the narrow law of certifiable insanity.

There is, too, another class which have only been recently studied by psychologists. There are the cases of mental conflict. In these, it is said, that the subconscious mind works on definite lines, and early experiences buried in the subconscious may lead to crime.

Certain statistical figures in support of the conclusions connecting crime with mental defects and with mental abnormalities are given below in a footnote.*

Dr. Christian, of the Elmira Reformatory, examined 1,000 consecutive admissions to that institution as regards their capacity for industry. He found—

38 per cent. were capable of self-support.

42 per cent. were semi-dependent.

20 per cent. were dependent.

He sums up his study by saying: "The crime problem as it exists to-day is 10 per cent. *accidental*; 40 per cent. *sociological*, and 50 per cent. *medical*."

The Special Committee appointed by the State of New York reported (1916) that "the reports coming from Elmira, the Woman's Reformatory, from Auburn and Sing Sing Pri-

*W. Healy (op. cit.) gives the following figures:—

(1) Of 823 juvenile repeated offenders (560 males, 263 females) the following causative factors were found:—

Mental abnormalities ...	590 times	Improper sex experiences ...	192 times
Defective home conditions... 556	"	Bad companions ...	279 "
Mental conflicts ...	73	"	"

(2) At Elmira Reformatory a special study of 500 youths who failed on parole revealed the following:—

Responsible offenders	16 or 3	per cent.
Defectives	181 or 35	"
Psychopaths	115 or 23	"
Drug addicts	28 or 6	"
Epileptics	53 or 11	"
Alcoholics	31 or 6	"
Vagrants	16 or 9	"
Gangsters or hooligans	21 or 4	"
Insane	9 or 2	"

i.e., of the 500 reformatory failures, only 3 per cent. could be classed as "responsible" and only 2 per cent. as "insane"—*i.e.*, certifiably so.

sons speak in no uncertain tones of the conditions found so as *to make clear a definite relationship between delinquency and mental disease and defect.*"

Of 683 cases examined at Sing Sing 50 per cent. were classified in terms of deviation from normal mental health, and of these 28 per cent. possessed a degree of intelligence equivalent to that of an average American child of 12 or under.

The Committee also quote the following from the Municipal Clinic at Boston, U.S.A.:—"One hundred consecutive cases of feeble-minded offenders were examined. These 100 had been arrested 1,825 times, placed upon probation 432 times, placed in non-penal institutions 118 times, sentenced 735 times.

. . . Not one of the 100 possessed more intelligence than a child of 12; 75 per cent. had a 'mental age' of 10 and under, and 75 per cent. of them had never been legitimately self-supporting."

Termer, in his book, "*Surveys in Mental Delinquency*," writes:—"If an individual grades below ten years' level it appears that a normal social life is so difficult that the term 'feeble-minded' practically always applies. We have never yet tested an adult person below that level who could by any reasonable use of the term be called normal. Such an individual may be equal to certain kinds of unskilled labour under supervision, but supervision will always be necessary. Lacking it, the individual is non-dependable and incompetent and a social menace."

A study of such families as the Jukes or the Kallikak family (the latter a made-up name to hide the real one) only confirms the above opinions. We may also refer to the series of Zola's novels which illustrate the same facts.

Such is the problem; such are the difficulties before the prison or social reformer. "Give us reformable material and we will reform," as we quoted above.

We may make another quotation from the admirable Report of the New York Special Committee:—

"The existence of mental disease and deterioration, intellectual defects, psychopathic personality, epilepsy and the like in a fairly large proportion of the inmates of these institutions makes it obvious *how futile it is to go on blindly administering the law instead of endeavouring to solve the problems these individuals present.*"

This problem of mental defect and unstable mental conditions becomes more defined as a nation becomes more civilised. It is the large city that tries out the defective and unstable. An adult with a 10 or 12 year mentality may get on tolerably in the country, especially if of good bodily physique. He may

never harm society save in propagating a fresh generation of mental defectives, but now-a-days in our big industrial cities the defective is put to a far higher test. A higher standard of education is demanded, he cannot reach it; a higher degree of manual skill and technical knowledge is asked for, he cannot supply it. When industrial crises arise or bad times come the first to be discharged and the last to be re-employed is the mental defective. The probability of a recourse to crime is here plainly indicated.

The penologist therefore in the United States stands for the study of the individual. Up till now every prisoner has been treated alike. We need to get at the underlying cause of crime. It is true that, as in disease, you may be able to treat without knowing the cause, but you treat infinitely more intelligently and efficiently when you do know the cause.

It is abundantly evident that if we accept these views a very large and radical change in our prison methods will be necessary, and this, in America at least, is recognised. The able Special Committee (whose report I have several times quoted from) demands the following changes:—“(1) That medical clinics, as in Chicago and Boston, should be established, it being practical economy to attempt the proper adjustment of individuals who exhibit abnormal mental conditions, and we should not wait till mental deterioration has taken place and criminal habits fixed. (2) That certain conveniently central prisons be set apart as ‘clearing houses,’ all admissions to be carefully examined, mentally as well as physically, trained as far as may be vocationally, pending (3) distribution to reformatories, industrial prisons or to agricultural prisons, according to their needs. (4) Those found insane should be sent to the State Hospital for the Insane; (5) the mental defectives, the psychopaths and the epileptic to institutions specially adapted to their peculiar requirements.”

The American theory of crime seems to me to be correct. The interests of the neglected and delinquent child are safeguarded to the benefit of society; the special needs of the plastic and impressionable years of adolescence are provided for. The adult is no longer to be regarded as a number but as an individual. The system will thus benefit the normal offenders, the defectives, and also the State.

I am of opinion that these views explain to a very great extent what has for long puzzled and disheartened prison official and reformer alike—the inexplicable crime, the failure of reformatory methods, and the threatening cloud of recidivism. Wisely and thoroughly put into effect it must be of great benefit to the country. Money will be wisely spent and

effort rightly directed. The irreformable individuals will be recognised, and society protected against their depredations; the mental defective will be given such instruction as he can absorb and such training as he can assimilate, and he will be placed under conditions where he will have a reasonable chance of leading a social life, and, in addition, the full energy and attention of the ordinary institution can be expended on the really reformable criminal.

"Give them reformable material and they will reform."

REFERENCES.

- Report of Indian Jails Commission, 1921* (Central Press, Simla), and especially Appendix VII. to Report, written by Colonel (now Major-General) James Jackson, C.I.E., I.M.S., in co-operation with the present writer.
- The Measurement of Intelligence*, L. M. Terman (Houghton, Mifflin Co., N. York).
- The Defective Delinquent*, Wm. Healy (Little, Brown & Co., Boston, U.S.A.)
- Handbook of Mental Examination Methods*, S. I. Franc (Macmillan & Co.)
- The English Convict*, C. Goring (H.M. Stationery Office, London).
- The State and the Child*, W. Clarke Hall (Headley Bros., London).
- The Probation System*, Cecil Leeson (P. S. King & Co., London).
- The Criminal and the Community*, Dr. J. Devon (John Lane, London).